

RV commentary: introductory remarks and abbreviations

As a companion to the Jamison-Brereton English translation of the R̥gveda (*The R̥gveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India. An English Translation*, Oxford UP, 2014), one of the two translators, Jamison, is providing a more detailed commentary on the translation, intended for readers with Sanskrit who are interested in how, starting from the text, we arrived at the translations we did, especially in the frequent cases in which our translations diverge from the standard ones, esp. Geldner's. For a project of this sort, online posting seems the ideal medium. The commentary is being posted piecemeal, and its various pieces are updated from time to time. As of now (January 2024) Jamison has commented on all hymns for which she had primary responsibility and has now turned to Brereton's, with Maṇḍalas II and III now complete. (For the division by translator, see the published translation, pp. 83–84.)

When citing from the comm., please give the date of access as well as the date of the posting of the file, since updated versions of already posted files will be regularly substituted, with the date of re-posting.

Comments will not only point out our differences from standard interpretations and explain the reasons for them, but also touch on any matters of language or content that strike us as worth discussion -- especially poetic and rhetorical figures, puns and word plays, and curious or aberrant syntax and morphology. Our own doubts about our translations of particular passages will also be noted, with possible alternative translations provided, and comments and suggestions subsequently made by others will be incorporated. Errors and omissions in the published translation will also be rectified. Lists of emended or alternate translations and of typos in the published edition are also provided, as well as a list of lexical items treated in the commentary, with the location indicated.

We will not generally provide info. readily available elsewhere (e.g., parallels, repeated passages, standard metrical resolutions, which are generally noted by Geldner in the first two cases and Oldenberg in the last) except when it's necessary for our argument. Nor will we catalogue *all* our differences from all the standard translators/interpreters, though we will usually do so for Ge. Nor engage with most of the sec. lit. And we will try to repeat info. from our published translation only when nec. to make the point clear. We thus expect that readers will have access at least to our published tr. and Geldner, with Grassmann, Renou (ÉVP), Oldenberg (Noten), and Witzel-Goto useful to have to hand as well. Many of the references to other secondary literature will be made in an abbreviated style and will assume that the interested reader can decode these references, although at some point we may provide a more formal bibliography.

The commentary is, not surprisingly, ordered by hymn and verse number. Hapaxes will be discussed in the passage in which they're found, as will particular morphological forms. Words that appear rarely and require lexical discussion will generally be discussed only once (and not necessarily in the first passage in which they are found). An index is provided for these.

Abbreviations: Unless otherwise indicated, “publ. intro” = the introduction to the hymn in question in our published translation. Other abbreviations: tr. can = translation(s), translator(s), translate(s); interpr. = interpret(s), interpretation(s). Gr = Grassmann, Ge = Geldner, Re = Renou (ÉVP unless otherwise noted), Old = Oldenberg (Noten, unless otherwise noted), Th = Thieme, Hoff / KH = Karl Hoffmann, WG = Witzel Gotō, Sāy = Sāyaṇa, Bl = M. Bloomfield, RR = *Rig-Veda Repetitions*, Macd = Macdonell, HvN = Holland & van Nooten RV ed., Mau = Walter Maurer, *Pinnacles of India’s Past*, Lub = Lubotsky, *Rigvedic Word Concordance*, Lü = Lüders, *Varuṇa* (unless otherwise noted), Schmidt / HPS B+I = Hanns-Peter Schmidt, *Brhaspati und Indra*, Kü = Kümmel, *Perfekt*, Scar = Scarlatta, *Wurzelkomposita*, Klein / JSK = *Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda*, Schaeffer, *Intensiv*, Krick, *Das Ritual der Feuergründung*, Don = Wendy Doniger *The Rig Veda*, C-H = Caland-Henry *L’Agniṣṭoma*. Personal comms.: JL = Jesse Lundquist, ET = Elizabeth Tucker, IH = Ian Hollenbaugh, JTK = Joshua T. Katz, DL = Diego Loukata., MLW = Michael Weiss, JC = John Clayton, CL = Colton Lavalette, PS = Paolo Sabattini, EM = Elisa Migliaretti, TY = Tony Yates, AR = Alex Roy.

Although we welcome comments (and appropriate comments from readers will be incorporated into later posted versions with due attribution), the posted commentary is deliberately not set up to receive comments directly. Please communicate with the translator(s) personally.

Lexical discussions:

(Hapaxes are treated in the commentary to the passages in which they appear.)

<i>amśú-</i>	IV.1.19
<i>ákava-</i>	V.58.5
* <i>akásya</i>	IV.3.13
<i>aktú-</i>	VII.79.2
<i>akrá-</i>	I.189.7, III.1.12
<i>agadá-</i>	X.97.2
<i>ágohya-</i>	X.64.3
<i>agni-jihvā-</i>	X.65.7
<i>aṅkuśa-</i>	X.44.9
<i>āṅgiras-</i>	X.14.3
<i>acitrā-</i>	VI.49.11
<i>añjaspā-</i>	X.92.2
√ <i>at</i>	VI.9.2
<i>atasāyya-</i>	I.63.6, II.19.4
<i>atrā-</i>	V.32.8
<i>āditer upāstha-</i>	X.70.7
<i>ādbhuta-</i>	V.87.7
<i>adbhutainas-</i>	V.87.7, VIII.67.7
<i>adveśās-</i>	X.35.9
<i>adhapriya-</i>	VIII.8.4
<i>ādhrigu-</i>	I.61.1, VIII.22.11
<i>adhvara-śrī-</i>	X.66.8

<i>anarvá(n)(a)-</i> II.40.6	VIII.31.12, X.92.14, 99.3–4, I.37.1, 185.3, V.51.11, VI.48.15,
<i>ánas-</i>	I.126.5
<i>anā</i>	X.94.3–4
<i>anānudá-</i>	II.21.4
<i>ánirā-</i>	VIII.48.11
<i>ánutta-</i>	III.31.13
<i>anudéya-, -ī-</i>	VI.20.11, X.85.6, 135.5–6
<i>anulbaná-</i>	X.53.6, VIII.25.9
<i>anṛkṣará-</i>	I.22.15
<i>anehás-</i>	X.61.12
<i>antarvāvat</i>	I.40.7, VI.8.3
<i>ándhas-</i>	IV.1.19
<i>ányā-</i>	VIII.1.10
<i>ápavrata-</i>	I.51.9
<i>apás-</i> n. ‘work’	I.64.1
<i>ápāka-</i>	I.110.2
<i>apikakṣá-</i>	X.134.7
<i>āprāyu(s)-</i>	I.127.5, V.80.3
<i>āpsas-</i>	IX.88.7
<i>apsujít-</i>	VIII.13.2
<i>abhímāti-</i>	X.27.11
<i>abhiśrī-</i>	X.66.8

<i>abhīka-</i>	III.56.4
<i>āma-</i>	I.63.1
<i>āmati-</i>	X.42.10, 39.6
<i>amāti-</i>	I.73.2
<i>ayāśya-</i>	I.62.7, X.67.1
<i>arati-</i>	I.59.2, VIII.19.1, X.61.20
<i>āram</i>	VIII.92.24–27, X.9.3
<i>arī-</i>	IX.79.3
<i>āriṣaṇyant-</i>	I.63.5
<i>aryá-</i>	X.68.3
<i>aruṇāpsu-</i>	I.49.1
<i>ārvan(t)-</i>	X.46.5
<i>arśasānā-</i>	X.99.7
<i>√ arh</i>	VIII.20.18
<i>alāṭṭṇā-</i>	I.166.7
<i>avapāna-</i>	VII.98.1, X.43.2
<i>āvara- (/ pára-)</i>	X.55.4
<i>āvartī-</i>	III.58.3
<i>āvāta-</i>	VIII.79.7, IX.96.8–9
<i>avātá-</i>	I.38.7, VIII.79.7
<i>avóh</i>	VI.67.11, X.132.5
<i>avratá-</i>	I.51.9
<i>asāya-</i>	VI.33.2, VIII.73.9

<i>aśúṣa-</i>	I.101.2, 174.3
<i>ásva-budhya-</i>	I.92.7–8
<i>-asānā-</i>	IV.3.6
<i>asinvá-, ásinvant-</i>	X.79.1
<i>ásu-</i>	X.12.1
<i>ásunīti-</i>	X.59.5
<i>ásprta-</i>	IX.3.8
<i>áha</i>	VII.20.2, VIII.33.17, IX.77.2
<i>áhar</i> (v. <i>div-</i>)	IX.86.19, 41
<i>ahar-víd-</i>	I.156.4, VIII.5.9
<i>ahī-</i>	IX.77.3
<i>ahīsū-</i>	VIII.32.2, X.144.3
<i>*áhrayas-</i>	IX.54.1, X.93.9, III.2.4
<i>ā+ABL</i> ‘all the way to’	I.92.17, III.6.7
<i>ākará-</i>	VIII.33.5
<i>āké, (ā)kenipá-</i>	X.44.4
<i>āghṛṇi-</i>	VI.53.3
<i>ātmán-</i>	X.92.13
<i>ātmanvánt-</i>	I.182.5, IX.74.4
<i>ādat</i> (√ <i>dā</i> + <i>ā</i>)	V.32.8, II.12.4, X.68.6
<i>ānuṣák</i>	X.49.5
<i>āyú-</i>	X.49.5, 74.4
√ <i>ār, āritá-</i>	VIII.16.6

<i>āraṇa-</i>	VIII.70.8
<i>ārjīka-</i>	VIII.7.29
<i>āśīta</i>	X.37.11
<i>ās</i> (√ <i>as</i>)	X.85.6–12
<i>āhanás-</i>	V.42.13, X.10.6
√ <i>i</i> + <i>ádhi</i>	IV.17.12
√ <i>i</i> + <i>nīḥ</i>	I.37.9
<i>iḷás padé</i>	I.128.1
<i>itāūti-</i> , <i>itá ūtí-</i>	VIII.99.7
<i>itthā</i>	VII.56.15
<i>íd</i> (+ verb accent)	VI.34.3
<i>ínakṣa-</i>	X.8.9
<i>indrāgnī</i>	VII.35.1, X.65.2
<i>indrāparvatā</i>	I.122.33
<i>ībha-</i>	VI.20.8, IV.4.1
<i>íyakṣa-</i>	VI.21.3, X.8.9
<i>iradh</i>	I.129.2
<i>irīṇa-</i>	VIII.4.3, X.34.1
<i>írya-</i>	V.58.4
<i>īṣ</i> √ <i>kṛ</i>	VII.76.2, IX.39.2
<i>iṣaṇa-</i>	IV.16.9
<i>iṣaṇyá-</i>	IX.96.8
<i>iṣirá-</i>	X.68.3

<i>iṣudhyá-</i>	I.128.6
<i>iṣe</i>	IV.23.6, VI.22.5, X.20.7
<i>iṣṭí-</i>	IX.97.42, I.112.1, II.1.9, 28.7
<i>iṣmín-</i>	I.87.6
<i>īrmā</i>	VIII.22.4
$\sqrt{īś}$	VII.32.18
<i>īśata</i>	I.23.9
<i>īśāna-kṛt-</i>	I.61.11
<i>īṣa-</i>	V.86.4
<i>uttānā-</i>	II.10.3
<i>udbhíd-</i>	VIII.79.1
<i>upamā-</i>	I.31.15
<i>úpamāti-</i>	VIII.40.9
<i>úpara-</i>	X.27.20
<i>upavaktár-</i>	IX.95.5
<i>upahvará-</i>	I.62.6
<i>urāṇá-</i>	IV.6.3
<i>urusáṃsa-</i>	II.27.9, 28.3
<i>uśádhak</i>	III.6.7, 34.3
<i>uśánā</i>	X.22.6
<i>uśíj-</i>	III.15.3, 60.1
<i>uṣarbúdh-</i>	I.44.1
<i>usr-, usrās</i>	VI.3.6

<i>ūdhar</i> ‘cold’	VIII.2.12
√ <i>ūh</i> (+ <i>ápi</i>)	VII.104.14, X.52.3
<i>ṛkvan-</i>	X.64.4
<i>ṛcīṣama-</i>	I.61.1
<i>ṛjipyá-</i>	IV.27.4
<i>-ṛjīka-</i>	VIII.7.29
<i>ṛjīti-</i>	X.79.7
<i>ṛjīpín-</i>	IV.26.6
<i>ṛñjasāná-</i>	IV.21.5
<i>ṛñjase</i>	IV.8.1
<i>ṛṇá-</i>	VI.12.5
<i>ṛṇa-yā-</i>	X.127.7
<i>ṛṇóti/ṛṇvāti</i> + <i>ví</i>	I.58.3
<i>ṛtá-</i>	X.85.1
<i>ṛtú-</i> / <i>ṛtuthá</i>	X.28.5
<i>ṛtvíya-</i>	III.29.10
<i>ṛdūdára-</i>	III.54.10
√ <i>ṛdh</i> + <i>sám</i>	VI.2.10
<i>ṛdhak</i> / <i>ṛdhák</i>	VI.49.10, IX.64.30, X.49.7, 105.8
<i>étagva-</i>	VIII.70.7
<i>etárī</i>	V.41.10
<i>énas-</i>	V.87.7
<i>ése</i>	V.86.4

<i>oṇí-</i>	VI.20.4, IX.16.1
<i>óhate</i> (etc.)	V.52.10, X.65.10, I.30.4
<i>kadhapriya-/prī-</i>	I.30.20
<i>kam</i>	see <i>hí kam</i>
<i>karásna-</i>	III.18.5
<i>kálpa-</i>	IX.9.7, I.102.6
<i>kārā-</i>	I.131.5, V.29.8
<i>kāvya-</i>	X.55.5
<i>kimīdín-</i>	VII.104.2
<i>kíyāti</i>	I.113.10
<i>kīrī(n)-</i>	V.52.12
<i>kīstá-</i>	I.127.7
<i>kukṣí-</i>	X.28.2, III.36.8, VIII.92.24
<i>kuvíd</i>	VIII.80.3, II.35.1, VII.91.1
$\sqrt{kṛ} + sam-ā$	X.84.6
<i>kṛtām ví</i> \sqrt{ci}	X.42.9
<i>kṛntátra-</i>	X.27.23
<i>kṛp-</i>	X.20.3
$\sqrt{kṛṣ}$	X.28.10, 49.7
<i>kṛṣé, kṛṣe</i>	VIII.3.20, X.49.7, 50.5
$\sqrt{kḷp}$	IX.9.7
<i>ketú-</i>	X.111.7
$\sqrt{kṛand}$	IX.22.7

<i>krándas-</i>	II.12.8
<i>krāṇā</i>	I.58.3, IX.86.19
<i>krívi-</i>	I.30.1, V.44.4, II.17.6
<i>kṣapāvānt-</i>	I.70.5
$\sqrt{kṣam} + abhí$	II.28.3
$\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘rule over’	X.22.11
$\sqrt{kṣi} + ádhi$	IX.92.14
<i>kṣudrá-</i>	VIII.49.4
<i>kṣaíta(vant)-</i>	VI.2.1
<i>kṣonñ-</i>	I.57.4, I.173.7, VIII.99.6
<i>khaja-</i>	VII.20.3
\sqrt{khid}	VI.22.4, X.116.4
$\sqrt{khyā} + antár$	V.30.9
<i>gádhyā- / -gandhya-</i>	IX.98.12
$\sqrt{gam} + áram$	X.9.3
<i>gúhā yát</i>	X.68.7
<i>gūrtí-</i>	X.61.15
<i>gr̥ṇīṣāṇi</i>	VI.15.6, VIII.12.19
$\sqrt{gṛ} + ápa$	V.29.4
$\sqrt{gṛ} + abhí$	X.49.11
<i>gójāta-</i>	VI.50.11, X.53.5
<i>godhā-</i>	X.28.10
<i>gmás (abl./gen.)</i>	X.22.6

<i>grāma-</i>	X.27.19, 78.6
<i>ghaná-</i>	I.4.8
$\sqrt{ghṛ} + \hat{a}$	V.48.3, IV.17.14, X.6.4
<i>ghṛtaprúṣ-</i>	X.78.4
<i>ghṛtaśrī-</i>	X.65.2
<i>ghṛtasnū- / ghṛtásnu-</i>	III.6.6
<i>ghṛtácī-</i>	X.139.2
<i>ghóṣi</i>	IV.4.8
<i>cakrada-</i>	IX.64.3
<i>cakṣi</i>	IX.97.33
<i>caná</i>	X.49.5, VIII.1.5, V.34.7, X.56.4, IV.18.8, II.24.12
<i>cánas</i> $\sqrt{dhā} / cánohita-$	III.2.2
<i>candrāmas-</i>	X.64.3
$\sqrt{car} + \acute{a}ntar$	III.55.8, VI.27.7
$\sqrt{car} + pári$	V.29.13
<i>carátha- / carā́tha-</i>	I.66.9, 70.3, 7, X.28.10
<i>cárkṣe</i>	X.22.1
<i>cāyamāna-</i>	VII.18.8
$\sqrt{ci} + ví$	I.90.4, X.42.9, X.87.5
\sqrt{ci} ‘requite, punish’	II.21.3
<i>(á)cikrada-</i>	IX.22.7, 64.3
<i>cid</i> ‘like’?	I.173.7
<i>cékite</i>	II.34.10

<i>cetú-</i>	IX.81.3
<i>-cyút-</i>	IX.79.2
<i>cyautná-</i>	X.50.4
<i>chánda(s)-</i>	V.52.12, VIII.7.36, I.92.6
<i>chandá(s)-</i>	VI.11.3
<i>jámhas-</i>	VI.12.2, 3.5
$\sqrt{jañj}$	I.168.7
<i>janíttra-</i>	X.56.1
<i>jánya-</i>	IV.55.5, X.42.6, IV.38.6, II.39.1
<i>jambháya-</i>	II.23.9
<i>jálāṣa-</i>	I.43.4
<i>jātávedas-</i>	I.44.7
$\sqrt{ji} : jigīváṃs-$ V	I.19.7
$\sqrt{ji} : jigīṣa-, -ṣu$	I.38.6, X.4.3
<i>jihmá-bāra-</i>	see <i>-bāra-</i>
$\sqrt{juṣ}$	X.105.8
+ <i>práti</i>	IX.92.1
<i>juhuranta, -āṇa-</i>	I.43.8, 173.11
<i>juhū-</i>	II.27.1
<i>jūtí-</i>	III.3.8
$\sqrt{jṛ} [gr] + sám$ IV.3.15, 4.8	
<i>jénya-</i>	I.128.7
<i>jóṣa-</i>	X.105.8, 158.2

<i>johũtra-</i>	II.10.1
*- <i>jri-</i>	V.54.2
√ <i>taṃs</i>	X.106.1
<i>takvavi̇(ya)-</i>	I.134.5, I.151.5
√ <i>tac</i>	IX.32.4
<i>taḍĩt-</i>	II.23.9
<i>táturi-</i>	VI.68.7
√ <i>tan + abhĩ</i>	VIII.6.25
<i>tanũkĩt-</i>	I.31.9–10, 71.7
<i>taráni-</i>	III.11.3
- <i>tárĩ</i>	X.61.12, V.41.10.
<i>títikṣa-</i> (√ <i>tyaj</i>)	III.30.1
<i>tujánt-</i>	IX.91.4
<i>turá-</i> ‘strong’	V.86.4
<i>turaṇyá-, -yú-</i>	X.61.11
<i>turĩpa-</i>	I.142.10
<i>tuvikũrmĩ-</i>	III.30.3
√ <i>tuś</i>	VIII.38.2
<i>tũtujāna-</i>	VI.29.5
<i>tũtos, -t</i>	VI.26.4, X.50.5
<i>tũrĩni-</i>	III.11.5
√ <i>tṛd + abhĩ</i>	IX.110.5
<i>tṛpála-</i>	IX.97.8

$\sqrt{t\bar{r}} + \tilde{a}$	II.17.2
<i>tyád</i> (... <i>ha tyád</i>)	I.63.4–7, VI.18.3, VIII.96.16–18
<i>tripṛṣṭhá-</i>	IX.78.8
<i>triśóka-</i>	X.29.2
<i>triṣṭúbh-</i>	VIII.7.1
<i>tvāṣṭrá-</i>	X.76.3
<i>dāmṣṭra-</i>	X.31.9
<i>dāmsu</i>	I.134.4
<i>dákṣa-</i>	VI.23.2
<i>dákṣa-pitar-</i>	VIII.63.10
<i>dakṣāyya-</i>	I.91.3, 129.1
<i>dakṣinít</i>	V.36.4
<i>dátra-</i>	IV.17.6
<i>dadat</i> ($\sqrt{dā}$)	X.35.41
<i>dásoṇi-</i>	VI.20.4
$\sqrt{dā}$ ‘divide’?	II.33.10, VII.100.1
$\sqrt{dā}$ ‘tie’ + <i>sám</i>	I.139.10, IX.10.8, 79.4, 99.7
<i>dāti</i> / <i>dāti</i>	V.58.2, IV.8.3
<i>dāti-vāra-</i>	V.58.2, I.167.8
<i>dānā-</i> (aor. part.?)	V.52.14, X.32.9
<i>dānu-</i>	I.32.9
$\sqrt{dās}$	VI.16.20, 31; II.19.4, 27.12
<i>dāśvāms-</i>	X.104.6

<i>dāsa- ārya- vṛtrá-</i>	VII.22.10
<i>dāsvant-</i>	VI.33.1
√ <i>dī</i> ‘destroy’?	III.34.1
<i>didhiṣāyya-</i>	I.73.2
<i>didhiśú-</i>	I.71.3, X.26.6
<i>div-</i> ‘day’ (v. <i>áhar</i>)	IX.86.19
<i>divákṣas-</i>	X.65.7, III.30.21
<i>divít(mant)-</i>	IV.31.11
√ <i>diś</i>	X.92.9
<i>dīdaya-</i>	X.30.4
<i>dīdihí/ didīhí</i>	IX.108.9
<i>dīrgháprasadman-</i>	VIII.10.1
<i>dīrghaśrút-</i>	X.114.2
<i>dīrghāyu(s)-</i>	X.85.39
<i>dúdhita-</i>	IV.1.17
<i>duroṇá-</i>	X.120.7
<i>duróṣa(s)-</i>	VIII.1.13
<i>durmārṣa-</i>	X.45.8
<i>durmitrá-</i>	VII.18.15, 28.4
<i>durvidátra-</i>	X.35.4
<i>dúvas- / duvasyá-</i>	IX.65.3
<i>dúvaḥ</i> (pl.)	I.37.14, VI.29.3
<i>duhīya-t</i>	IV.41.5

<i>duhúḥ</i>	II.34.10
<i>dūtá-</i>	IX.99.5
√ <i>dṛ</i> (intens.)	IV.16.8
<i>devátāt(i)-</i>	III.26.2
<i>devān</i> (gen. pl.?)	X.64.14, I.71.3, VI.11.3, 51.2
<i>deva-vī-</i> (etc.)	X.49.11
<i>dyúbhiḥ</i>	X.59.4
<i>dyumnā-</i> (pl.)	X.42.6
<i>dyaúḥ</i> as fem.	I.57.5, VIII.40.4
<i>druṇā</i> (<i>dāru-</i>)	IX.1.2
<i>dróṇa-</i>	VI.2.8
<i>dvāro devīḥ</i>	X.29.3
<i>dvibārhas-</i>	X.63.3, VII.21.2, II.31.5
<i>dhána-</i> [cf. <i>dháne</i>]	X.120.7
<i>dhánutar-</i> , <i>-trī-</i>	IX.93.1, VIII.8.12
<i>dhānus-</i> , <i>dhānvan-</i>	VI.75.2, II.33.10
<i>dháne</i> (<i>hité</i>)	I.31.6, VI.45 (intro.)
√ <i>dhan(v)</i>	VIII.19.1
<i>dharmasí-</i>	I.105.6
√ <i>dhāv</i> , <i>dhū</i>	IX.72.4, 8, X.134.3–4
√ <i>dhā</i> + <i>abhí</i>	X.145.6
√ <i>dhā</i> + <i>ví</i>	X.85.4
<i>dhāti</i>	II.38.1

(-) <i>dhāyas-</i>	III.38.3, 44.3, 50.3, X.67.7
<i>dhāsí-</i>	I.62.3, 140.1, V.41.17
<i>dhiyasāná-</i>	V.33.2, X.32.1
<i>dhitāvan-</i>	III.40.3
<i>dhiyāyá-</i>	IX.15.2
<i>dhiṣānā</i>	I.160.1, IX.59.2
<i>dhiṣā</i>	I.173.8
<i>dhiṣṇya-</i>	I.3.2
<i>dhī-</i>	VI.14.1
<i>dhītí-</i>	VI.14.1
<i>dhūni-vrata-</i>	V.58.2
<i>dhúr-</i>	X.28.5
<i>dhénā-</i>	I.2.3, 101.10, V.30.9
<i>dhvasáya-</i>	I.140.3, X.73.6
√ <i>dhvaṃs</i>	IV.19.7
<i>dhvas(i)rā-</i>	IV.19.7, X.40.3
<i>ná</i> (pāda-final)	VIII.76.1, X.21.1, 111.7
<i>nákis</i>	VI.67.10, VIII.21.14, X.11.9
√ <i>nakṣ</i>	II.24.6
<i>nadáya-</i>	IX.97.13
<i>nabhanú-</i>	IV.19.7
<i>nārāśāmsa-</i>	II.34.6, VI.24.2
<i>nári ápāṃsi</i>	VIII.96.19

<i>návedas-</i>	X.31.3
√ <i>naś</i> + <i>ví</i>	X.27.20, 64.15
<i>náhus-</i> (etc.)	VI.26.7, IX.88.2, X.80.6, 99.7
<i>nānā</i>	II.12.8, X.79.1
<i>nābhi-</i>	X.61.18
<i>nāyám</i>	VIII.2.28, VI.3.3
√ <i>niṃs</i>	VIII.43.10, IX.85.3, X.74.2
<i>nigút-</i>	IX.97.53
<i>nicīna-bāra-</i>	see <i>-bāra-</i> ; also X.106.10
<i>nītya-</i>	X.44.1
<i>nidhā-</i>	IX.83.4
<i>nidhí-</i>	X.59.2
<i>niyút-</i>	VII.90.1, X.26.1
<i>nirníj-</i>	IX.86.46, 70.1, X.49.7
<i>niṣkṛtá-</i>	X.40.6
<i>niṣtúr-</i>	VIII.32.27
<i>niṣthā-</i>	III.31.10
<i>niṣṣídḥ-</i>	III.51.5
<i>nṛcákṣas-</i>	III.53.9, X.87.8
<i>nṛmṇá-</i>	IV.22.9
<i>nṛñ</i>	I.146.4, IV.2.15, 21.2, X.29.4
<i>néma-</i>	VI.16.18
<i>nemádḥiti-</i>	I.72.4

<i>néśat</i>	IV.1.17
<i>paḍbhīḥ</i>	IV.2.12
<i>pāpri-</i>	I.52.3
<i>parāḥ</i>	X.27.21
<i>pāritakmyā-</i>	I.31.6, V.30.13–14
<i>pāri</i> [close sandhi]	II.13.1
<i>pāriṣūti-</i>	IX.85.8
<i>pariṣṭúbh-</i>	IX.62.24
<i>pārīṇas-</i>	I.166.14
<i>pārus-, pārvan-</i>	IX.15.6, IV.22.2
<i>pārśāna-</i>	VII.104.5
<i>pāvate</i>	IX.3.3
<i>pāvītar-</i>	IX.83.2
<i>pastyà/ā-</i>	I.40.7, IX.97.18
$\sqrt{pā} + ví$	VII.22.4, III.53.10, I.191.10
<i>pājas-</i>	I.58.5, IX.76.1, III.14.1
<i>pāthas-</i>	X.92.15
<i>pānt(a)-</i>	I.122.1, 4, IX.98.8
<i>pāṣṭi-</i>	I.56.6
<i>pībdanā-</i>	VI.46.6, IX.15.6
<i>pīyāru-</i>	III.30.8
<i>punarbhū-</i>	I.62.8
<i>pūrīṣa-</i>	I.163.1, X.27.21

<i>puruniṣṭhā-</i>	VIII.2.9
<i>purubhū-</i>	IV.44.4
<i>puruspṛh-</i>	X.46.10
<i>purū</i> (sg.)	V.33.4, X.94.5
<i>purohitā-</i>	I.44.10, 12
<i>puṣṭā-</i>	X.55.4
$\sqrt{pū} + ā$	IX.7.8
<i>pūrdhī</i>	VII.24.6
<i>pūrvácitti-</i>	I.112.1, IX.99.5
<i>pūrvyá-/pūrvya-</i>	X.48.1
<i>pṛkṣ-, pṛkṣā-</i>	II.34.3
$\sqrt{pṛc}$	X.10.12, VIII.24.14
$\sqrt{pṛc} + úpa$	I.40.8, VI.28.8
$\sqrt{pṛch} + sám$	IV.18.2
<i>pṛtanā-</i>	X.29.8
<i>pṛtanā-ṣāh-</i>	III.24.1
<i>pṛtsutí-</i>	I.110.7
<i>pṛśanī-</i>	IX.97.54, X.73.2
<i>pṛśni</i>	VI.6.4.
<i>péru-</i>	IX.74.4
<i>pótar- / potár-</i>	IX.67.22
<i>praketā-</i>	III.30.1
<i>pratyāñc-</i>	X.18.14

<i>pradakṣiṇīt</i>	V.36.4, X.22.14
<i>pradīvaḥ</i>	X.37.3
<i>pradís-</i>	X.110.7
<i>pradhí-</i>	X.102.7
<i>prápatha-</i>	I.166.9
<i>prapathín(tama)-</i>	I.166.9
<i>prámati-</i>	I.71.7
<i>prámahas-</i>	VIII.25.3
<i>prayúj-</i>	X.33.1
<i>práyuta-</i>	V.32.2
<i>pravátvant-</i>	VIII.13.7
<i>prásiti-</i>	IV.4.1, X.40.10
√ <i>prā. aprās</i>	X.1.1
<i>prātarítvan- / -yāvan-</i>	I.125, II.39.2
<i>prāvī-</i>	I.34.4
<i>-psu-</i>	I.49.1, IV.38.2
<i>phaligá-</i>	I.62.4
<i>bád</i>	V.84.1
<i>-bārhas-</i>	X.63.3
<i>barhiśád-</i>	IX.68.1
√ <i>bādh, bābadhe</i>	VII.36.5
<i>-bāra-</i>	VIII.40.5
<i>bāhútā-</i>	VIII.101.2

<i>bṛhaddivā-</i>	X.64.10
<i>bradhñá-</i>	IX.97.52, VII.44.3
<i>brahmaprī-</i>	I.83.2
<i>bhaṅgurāvant-</i>	VII.104.7
√ <i>bhand</i>	III.2.12
<i>-bharas-</i>	V.54.10
<i>bhārahūti-</i>	I.129.2, V.29.8
<i>-bharṇas-</i>	IX.60.2
√ <i>bhas</i>	VI.3.4, 14.1, 59.4
<i>bhāṛjīka-</i>	I.44.3
√ <i>bhid</i> + <i>áva</i>	X.8.9
√ <i>bhid</i> + <i>úd</i>	VIII.79.1
<i>bhujema</i>	IV.3.13
<i>bhuríj-</i>	IX.26.4
<i>bhúvas, -at</i>	IV.16.18, X.8.5–6
√ <i>bhū</i> + <i>ā</i>	X.84.5–6
√ <i>bhū</i> + <i>ví</i>	VI.15.9, 14
<i>bhūman-</i>	IX.101.7
√ <i>bhūṣ</i> + <i>ā</i>	X.11.7
√ <i>bhūṣ</i> + <i>ví</i>	VI.15.9
√ <i>bhr̥</i> + <i>ánu</i>	X.61.5, I.88.6
√ <i>bhr̥</i> + <i>áva</i>	VIII.93.23, X.171.2
<i>bhr̥gu-</i>	X.92.10

$\sqrt{maṁh}$	II.17.7
<i>makhá-</i>	I.18.9, III.31.7, X.172.2
<i>matsaríntama-</i>	IX.76.5
<i>mathrá-</i>	VIII.46.23
<i>mada-cyút-</i>	IX.79.2, I.85.7
<i>mádhvaḥ</i>	I.14.4, IX.89.3
$\sqrt{man} + abhí$	X.27.11
\sqrt{mar}^2 ‘wait’	X.27.20, 31.2
<i>manótar-</i>	II.9.4
<i>manotár-</i>	VIII.8.12
<i>mántu-</i>	IX.73.6
<i>mandasāná-</i>	IV.3.6
<i>mandrá-</i>	VII.42.3
<i>mandhātár-</i>	X.2.2
<i>mánman-</i>	X.138.1
<i>mányamāna-</i>	X.8.9
<i>mayobhū-</i>	V.58.2
\sqrt{mah} ‘bring about’	I.94.1, VII.97.2
<i>mahemate</i>	VIII.13.11
$\sqrt{mā} + ānu$	VII.21.7
<i>māmścatvá-/māmścatva-, māmścatú-</i>	VII.44.3, IX.97.52
<i>mākis</i>	X.11.9
<i>mākīm</i>	VI.54.7

<i>māna-</i>	VIII.63.2, X.27.23
<i>māmāh-</i>	II.17.7
<i>mitá-jñu-</i>	VI.32.3
<i>mitá-dru-</i>	IV.6.5
<i>mithuná-</i>	I.83.3, 179.3, X.40.12
<i>mūra-deva-</i>	VII.104.24
<i>mṛgá-</i>	IX.32.4, X.136.6
<i>mṛgaya-</i>	X.49.5
$\sqrt{mṛj} + ní$	II.38.2, VII.26.3, X.39.14
$\sqrt{mṛś} (+ vī)$	X.65.7
$\sqrt{mṛṣ}$	X.45.8
<i>mégha^{le}</i>	II.34.13
<i>medín-</i>	X.38.2
<i>ménā-</i>	I.62.7
<i>mení-</i>	X.27.11
$\sqrt{yakṣ} + prá$	III.31.3
$\sqrt{yaj} + ā$	X.63.7, III.4.2, IX.7.8
<i>yajáthāya</i>	II.28.1
<i>yantúram</i>	III.27.11
<i>yāvāya-</i>	X.127.6
<i>yātudhāna-</i>	VII.104.15
<i>yātumāvant-</i>	VII.104.23
$\sqrt{yād}$	III.36.1, 7

<i>yāman-</i> ‘plea’	X.64.1, VIII.52.5
(-) <i>yāśu-</i>	I.126.6
√ <i>yu + ní</i>	X.93.9
+ <i>prá</i>	see <i>práyuta-</i>
+ <i>ví</i>	II.18.8
<i>yúj-</i>	X.102.9
<i>yujā</i>	I.39.4
<i>yújyāya</i> √ <i>vṛ</i>	IX.88.1
√ <i>yudh</i>	X.48.6
<i>raghú-</i>	IX.86.1
<i>raghudrú</i>	X.61.16
<i>rājas-</i>	X.105.7
<i>ráthaspāti-</i>	V.50.5
<i>rathirá-</i>	X.76.7
√ <i>ran</i>	X.59.5, VIII.92.12, V.54.13
<i>ran-</i>	VI.27.1
√ <i>rapś</i>	IV.20.5
√ <i>rabh + sám</i>	X.53.8
- <i>ram</i> (3 rd pl. mid.)	IX.7.1
<i>raśanā-</i>	VI.67.1
<i>raśmí-</i>	I.135.3
<i>rāti-śác-</i>	VIII.28.2, VII.38.5
√ <i>rādh, rādhya-</i>	II.24.10

<i>rāḍhas-</i>	II.24.10
<i>rāspiná-, -irá-</i>	I.122.4
$\sqrt{ric} + prá$	X.32.5
<i>ríp-</i>	see <i>rúp-</i>
\sqrt{ribh}	VI.3.6, IX.66.9, 97.8, 57
<i>riśāḍas-</i>	I.2.7, V.60.7
<i>rīty-āp-</i>	IX.106.9
<i>rúp-/ríp-</i>	IV.5.7, X.13.3, 79.3
<i>rurucuḥ</i>	IV.7.1, 16.4, VI.35.4
<i>réknas-</i>	X.132.3, X.61.11
<i>rebhá-</i>	VI.3.6, IX.66.9, 97.8
<i>rocaná-</i>	III.61.5
<i>vāṃsaga-</i>	X.102.7
<i>vákva(n)-</i>	I.51.11, IX.91.1
<i>vakṣāṇā-</i>	X.27.16
<i>vañkú-</i>	I.51.11, 114.4, V.45.6
$\sqrt{vac} + ví$	X.11.2
<i>(návyasā) vácaḥ</i>	VIII.39.2, I.26.2
<i>vaco-víd-</i>	IX.91.3
<i>vajrivaḥ</i>	X.22.4
$\sqrt{vañc}$	III.39.1, IX.2.2, 91.1, X.47.7; I.51.11, 114.4
$\sqrt{vat} + ápi$	I.128.2
<i>vānanvant-</i>	VII.81.3, VIII.1.31

<i>vanús-</i> , <i>vanuṣyá-</i>	IX.64.29, III.27.11
<i>vápsas-</i>	I.181.8, VIII.45.5
<i>váyas-</i>	I.31.9–10, I.71.7
<i>vayúna-</i>	II.34.4, X.49.5, II.24.5
<i>vayyà-</i>	IX.68.6
<i>vará-</i>	X.85.8–9
<i>varasyā-</i>	VI.49.11
<i>váriman-</i> / <i>varimán-</i>	X.28.2
<i>várūtrī-</i>	III.62.3
<i>várūtha-</i>	X.61.17
<i>várpas-</i>	X.99.3
<i>várṣman-</i> / <i>varṣmán-</i>	X.28.2
<i>vavṛmáhe</i> , <i>vavṛsé</i>	VI.4.7
<i>vaṣā-</i>	II.7.5
<i>vásavāna-</i>	V.33.6
<i>vásta usrā/áh</i>	V.49.3
√ <i>vah</i> + <i>prá</i>	II.15.4
<i>vahatú-</i>	X.32.3, 85.13
<i>vāghát-</i>	I.3.5
<i>vājáya-</i>	IV.17.16
<i>vājina-</i>	III.20.2, X.56.3
<i>vājínīvant-</i> (- <i>vasu-</i>)	I.48.6, VI.26.2
<i>-vāta-</i>	IX.96.8–9

<i>vātāpya-</i>	IX.93.5, I.121.8
<i>vāyú-</i> (pl.)	II.11.14
<i>vār-</i>	I.132.3
<i>vāvaś-</i>	III.35.9, VI.51.14, VIII.3.18
<i>vāhas-</i>	X.29.3
<i>vīj-</i>	I.92.10
<i>-víd-</i>	IX.64.7
√ <i>vid</i> + <i>sám</i>	X.10.14, 14.4
<i>vidátha-</i>	VIII.39.1, III.38.5
<i>vidaḥ</i>	I.42.7–9, IX.20.3
<i>vidā(h)</i>	IX.19.6, VI.48.9, IX.40.4
<i>vidúṣ</i>	I.71.10, VII.18.2
(<i>yáthā</i>) <i>vidé</i>	IX.86.32
<i>vidmanāpas-</i>	I.31.1, 111.1
√ <i>vidh</i>	II.24.1
<i>vidhartári</i>	VIII.70.2
<i>vídharman-</i>	IX.4.9, 64.9
<i>víp-</i>	IV.48.1
<i>vípra-vīra-</i>	IX.44.5, X.104.4
<i>vibhā-vasu-</i>	I.44.10
<i>vibhva-taṣṭá-</i>	V.58.4
<i>víbhvan-/vibhván-</i>	X.76.5
<i>vibhvā-sáh-</i>	IX.98.1

<i>vi√rapś</i>	I.122.4, VIII.72.12
<i>vīrūpa-</i>	X.14.5
<i>vivákṣaṇa-</i>	VIII.45.11
<i>vivásvant-</i>	IX.10.5, 66.8, 99.2, X.14.5
<i>√viś + sám</i>	X.55.2
<i>viśva-</i> (voc.)	X.15.6
<i>viśvá-deva-</i>	X.125.1
<i>viśvá-dhāyas-</i>	X.176.1
<i>viśvá-vedas-</i>	IV.8.1
<i>viśvápsu-/viśvāpsu</i>	I.148.1
<i>viśvápsnya-</i>	VIII.97.15
<i>viśvávedas-</i>	I.44.7
<i>viśváścandra-</i>	see -ścandrā-
<i>viśvāyu(s)-</i>	VI.17.9
<i>√viṣ *‘flow’</i>	I.178.2
<i>viṣpitá-</i>	VIII.83.3
<i>viśrúh-</i>	V.44.3
<i>vihi</i> (√vī)	II.26.2
<i>√vī</i>	I.74.4, IV.48.1
<i>√vī + prá</i>	I.34.4
<i>√vī + prāti</i>	VIII.39.5
<i>vīdú-</i> (cmpds)	II.24.13
<i>vītá-</i>	IX.97.17

<i>vītá-havya-</i>	VII.19.3
<i>vītí-hotra-</i>	II.38.1
<i>vīrápesas-</i>	IV.11.3
<i>vṛka-</i>	IX.79.3
√ <i>vṛj</i> + <i>pārā</i>	X.61.8
+ <i>pāri</i>	X.61.8
+ <i>sám</i>	VIII.75.12, X.61.17
<i>vṛjáṇa-</i>	X.28.2
<i>vṛt-</i>	VII.98.4
√ <i>vṛt</i> + <i>ví</i>	X.27.21
<i>vṛdhasānā-</i>	IV.3.6
√ <i>vṛṣ</i> + <i>ā</i>	X.44.4, 116.4
+ <i>úd</i>	VIII.61.7
<i>vṛṣan-</i>	IX.64.1
<i>vṛṣāyá-</i>	X.44.4, IX.71.3, X.98.1
<i>vṛṣtí-dyu-</i>	IX.106.9
<i>vṛṣṇi</i>	VIII.96.19
√ <i>vṛh</i> + <i>ví</i>	X.10.7
√ <i>vṝ</i> (pf.)	VI.4.7
<i>védas-</i>	III.60.1
√ <i>ven</i> , <i>venyá-</i>	VI.44.8
<i>vená-</i>	VIII.100.5
<i>vépas-</i>	I.80.12, X.46.8

<i>veśá-</i>	VII.37.7, X.49.5
<i>véḥ</i> (√ <i>vī</i>)	II.5.3
<i>véḥ</i> ('bird' nom. sg.)	I.173.1
<i>vyāṃsa-</i>	III.34.3
√ <i>vyac</i>	X.96.4
<i>vyāti-</i>	IV.32.17
<i>vyāśva-</i> , <i>vyaśvavát</i>	IX.65.7
√ <i>vyā</i> + <i>pári</i>	IV.1.7, 3.2
<i>vratá-</i>	X.111.4
<i>vrā-</i>	VIII.2.6
<i>vrādhant-</i>	X.49.8
√ <i>śams</i> + <i>abhí</i>	X.164.3
+ <i>ā</i>	X.164.3
+ <i>nīs</i>	X.164.3
+ <i>ví</i>	VIII.1.1, X.143.3
<i>śaktí-</i> / <i>śákti-</i> 'spear'	II.39.7, X.134.6
<i>śatātman-</i>	IX.98.4
√ <i>śad</i> 'exult'	X.120.5
<i>śāmtama-</i>	V.42.7
<i>śaphārúj-</i>	X.44.9
<i>śamāyá-</i>	VIII.86.5
<i>śāmbhaviṣṭha-</i>	V.42.7, II.39.5
<i>śambhú/-ū-</i>	V.42.7

<i>śayátha-</i>	X.67.5
<i>śayú-</i>	IV.18.12
<i>śaryaṇāvant-</i>	VIII.6.39
<i>śaryahán-</i>	VI.16.39
<i>śásītyas-</i>	IV.32.3, V.61.6
<i>śásvant-</i>	X.48.1, IV.32.3, V.61.6
√ <i>śas</i> + <i>ví</i>	X.143.3
√ <i>śā</i> + <i>ní</i>	X.28.6
√ <i>śās</i>	III.1.2
+ <i>ā</i>	IX.99.5
* <i>śāsā-</i>	II.23.12
<i>śíkṣa-</i> (+/- <i>ā, úpa</i>)	I.112.19 VIII.42.3, I.173.10, VI.31.4, X.48.2
<i>śikṣānará-</i>	I.53.2
<i>śímī(-vant)-</i>	X.8.2
<i>śīrá-</i>	VIII.43.31
<i>śundhyú-</i>	V.52.9
√ <i>śubh</i>	X.77.1
<i>śurúdh-</i>	IX.70.5
<i>śúśujāna-</i>	X.27.2, 34.6
<i>śūṣā-</i>	IX.97.54, X.31.3
<i>śévr̥dha-</i>	V.87.4
<i>śéśas-</i>	X.16.5
(-) <i>ścandrā-</i>	I.165.8

<i>śraddhā-</i>	VI.26.6
X- <i>śrī-</i>	III.26.5
<i>śrutārvan-</i>	VIII.74.13
<i>ślōka-</i>	I.51.12, IX.92.1
<i>śvaghñīn-</i>	X.42.9
(-) <i>ṣāṭ</i> (√ <i>sah</i>)	IX.88.7
<i>saṃyāt-</i>	V.34.9, IX.86.15
<i>saṃvīd-</i>	X.10.14, 14.4
<i>saṃgīr-</i>	IX.86.16
<i>sācā</i>	IV.31.5, VI.26.4
<i>satās</i>	X.27.4, VII.104.21, IX.21.7
<i>sāt-patī-</i>	VIII.69.4
<i>satyā-</i>	X.85.1
<i>sātvan-</i>	I.173.5
<i>sādam īd</i>	I.114.8
<i>sadaḥ</i>	IX.2.2
<i>sadhanī-/sadhanyā-</i>	IV.1.9, VI.51.3
<i>sadhāstha-</i>	III.6.4
<i>saṇṣyā-</i>	III.2.3
<i>sānemi-</i>	VII.38.7
<i>saṃtanī-</i>	IX.69.2
<i>santya</i>	III.21.3
<i>saṃdadī-</i>	I.139.1, IX.99.7, II.39.7

<i>sapátna-</i>	X.166.1
<i>saptá íṣayah</i>	IX.103.3
<i>sabar-</i>	IX.12.7
<i>sábharas-</i>	V.54.10
<i>sama-</i>	X.29.4, VI.27.3, X.54.3, VIII.21.8
<i>samáyā</i>	I.113.10
<i>samará-</i>	VI.9.2
<i>samīcī</i>	X.24.4–5
<i>samīdh-</i>	VI.2.10
<i>saścát-</i>	III.9.4
<i>sasavān</i>	X.29.2
<i>sasvár</i>	V.30.2
$\sqrt{sah} + nís$	I.127.3, X.48.7
<i>sahasānā-</i>	IV.3.6
<i>sahásrabharṇas-</i>	see <i>-bharṇas-</i>
<i>sāno áv(ya)ye</i>	IX.86.3
<i>sāmanā-</i>	III.30.9
$\sqrt{sic} (/ṣic)$	IX.107.1
<i>sína-</i>	II.30.2
<i>simá-</i>	X.28.11
<i>sīrā-</i>	X.97.9
<i>súkrta-</i> v. <i>sukrtá-</i>	III.29.8
<i>sucetú-</i>	IX.81.3

<i>sudevá-</i>	VIII.69.12
<i>sutúka-</i>	VII.18.9
<i>suprāyaṇá-</i>	II.3.5
<i>suprāvī-</i>	I.34.4
<i>sumánman-</i>	VIII.101.9
<i>suvidátra-</i>	II.9.6
<i>suvṛktī-</i>	I.61.2, II.4.1
<i>suvratá-</i>	IX.57.3
<i>suśrávas(tama-)</i>	III.45.5
<i>sūda-</i>	VII.36.3
<i>sūnṛtā-</i>	I.48.2
$\sqrt{sṛj}$ + <i>áva</i>	X.28.11
+ <i>sám</i>	X.27.10
<i>sṛprá-</i>	I.96.3, VIII.32.10
<i>sétu-</i>	IX.41.2
<i>sénā-</i>	X.156.2
\sqrt{sku}	VIII.6.41
<i>stavān</i>	VI.24.8
<i>stuṣe/-é</i>	I.122.7–8, X.22.1, 93.9
<i>stíyā- (?)</i>	VI.44.21
<i>stóma-taṣṭa-</i>	X.15.9
<i>strī-</i>	X.34.11
$\sqrt{sthā}$ + <i>ápa</i>	IX.19.6

+ <i>áva</i>	X.48.5
<i>sthātúḥ</i>	I.58.5
<i>sthūñā-</i>	VI.66.5
√ <i>spṛś</i> + <i>ní</i>	X.95.9
<i>sma</i>	X.102.2
<i>smáddiṣṭi-</i>	III.45.5
<i>svágūrta-</i>	VI.68.4
<i>svāñc-</i>	VI.15.10
√ <i>sva(ñ)j</i>	I.182.7, VI.60.10
<i>svadhā-</i>	X.14.3
<i>sván-</i>	VI.46.14, IX.66.9
<i>svápati-</i>	X.44.1
<i>svápāka-</i>	IV.3.2
<i>svayúj-</i>	X.78.2
<i>svàṛṇara-</i>	IV.21.3, IX.70.6
<i>svardṛś-</i>	I.44.9
<i>svā́dman-/svā́dmán-</i>	I.69.3
<i>svāvesá-</i>	VII.97.7
<i>hánta</i>	VIII.80.5
<i>háras-</i>	X.16.7
√ <i>hā</i> ‘move’	X.49.5
<i>hí</i> + IMPV	I.10.3, 14.12, X.18.12, and passim
<i>hí kam</i>	VI.51.14

<i>huraś-cít-</i>	IX.98.11
<i>hótrā-</i>	IV.48.1, X.17.11
<i>hóman-</i>	VIII.63.4
<i>hrút-</i>	VI.4.5, IX.61.27
<i>hvāras-</i>	IX.3.2
√ <i>hvṛ</i> (<i>juhuranta</i>)	I.43.8

VII.18.7 (alt.)

VII.18.9 (alt.)

VII.18.10

VII.18.13

VII.18.21

VII.19.3

VII.19.10

VII.21.5

VII.22.2

VII.22.9

VII.26.1 [alt.]

VII.27.3

VII.27.4

VII.32.2 [alt]

VII.33.4

VII.33.10 [alt.]

VII.33.11

VII.33.12 [alt.]

VII.33.13 [alt.]

VII.34.8

VII.35.14 [alt.]

VII.36.2

VII.36.6 [alt.]

VII.37.4 [alt.]

VII.37.7 [alt.]

VII.38.8

VII.39.1

VII.39.2

VII.40.1

VII.42.1

VII.42.3

VII.42.5

VII.43.1 [alt.]

VII.55.8 [alt.]

VII.57.3 [alt.]

VII.58.3 [alt. 2x]

VII.68.2 [see comm. ad X.9.3]

VII.81.4 [alt.]

VII.90.1

VII.90.4

VII.91.3 [alt.]

VII.92.3

VII.93.2 [alt.]

VII.93.4 [alt.]

VII.94.1 [alt.]

VII.97.1

VII.97.7

VII.98.3 [alt.]

VII.99.3 [alt.]

VII.100.1

VII.100.3

VII.103.5

VII.103.10

VII.103.9

VII.104.9

VII.104.14 [alt. 3x]

VIII.1.1

VIII.1.15

VIII.2.9 [alt.]

VIII.2.28

VIII.3.20 [alt.]

VIII.5.8

VIII.5.14

VIII.5.38

VIII.6.12 [alt.]

VIII.6.38

VIII.7.1

VIII.7.15 [alt.]

VIII.7.23 [alt.]

VIII.7.36 [alt.]

VIII.8.22 [alt.]

VIII.12.9 [alt.]

VIII.12.11

VIII.12.13

VIII.13.3

VIII.13.6

VIII.13.21 [alt.]

VIII.13.27

VIII.18.21

VIII.20.2, 8

VIII.21.8

VIII.21.13

VIII.21.14 [alt.]

VIII.24.15

VIII.24.29 [alt.]

VIII.25.7

VIII.25.9

VIII.25.14

VIII.25.16

VIII.25.18

VIII.26.24

VIII.31.12 [2x alt.]

VIII.32.3 [alt.]

VIII.32.10

VIII.32.16 [alt.]

VIII.32.22 [alt.]

VIII.32.27

VIII.33.5 [alt.]

VIII.33.8 [alt.]

VIII.33.9 [alt.]

VIII.33.12

VIII.33.13

VIII.39.5 [alt]

VIII.40.11

VIII.41.2

VIII.41.3

VIII.43.30: insert “all” in “may we be”

VIII.44.1 [alt.]

VIII.45.11

VIII.45.18

VIII.45.24: “to <great> generosity”

VIII.46.16 [alt.]

VIII.46.23 [alt.]

VIII.47.1–18

VIII.47.6

VIII.52.10 [alt]

VIII.60.8

VIII.61.9 [alt]

VIII.62.6

VIII.63.2 [alt.]

VIII.64.9

VIII.66.4

VIII.66.14

VIII.67.6 [alt.]

VIII.67.12

VIII.69.1

VIII.69.16

VIII.70.2

VIII.71.5

VIII.72.13

VIII.74.9

VIII.74.10 [alt]

VIII.77.6 [alt.]

VIII.78.4

VIII.86.3

VIII.92.7–8

VIII.92.27

VIII.93.23

VIII.96.16–18

VIII.97.13

VIII.101.4 (2)

VIII.101.14

IX.5.9

IX.6.9 [alt.]

IX.14.2–3 [reverse vss.]

IX.16.4

IX.18.2

IX.18.7

IX.20.3

IX.21.4 [alt.]

IX.22.5

IX.24.5

IX.26.2 [2nd reading]

IX.31.3 [alt.]

IX.33.6 [alt.]

IX.35.4 [alt.]

IX.38.4 [alt.]

IX.38.5 [2nd reading]

IX.40.4 [alt.]

IX.45.2

IX.47.5

IX.50.2–3

IX.52.4 [alt.]

IX.53.2

IX.54.1 [alt.]

IX.55.4

IX.59.4 [alt.]

IX.61.1 [alt.]

IX.61.11

IX.61.16 [alt.]

IX.61.18 [alt.]

IX.62.20 [alt.]

IX.64.3 [alt.]

IX.65.1 [alt.]

IX.65.3

IX.65.26

IX.66.15 [alt.]

IX.66.18

IX.66.26

IX.67.1 [alt.]

IX.67.9

IX.67.22 [alt.]

IX.69.3 [alt.]

IX.70.1 [alt.]

IX.70.2 [alt.]

IX.70.6 [alt.]

IX.71.4

IX.71.5 [alt.]

IX.71.7

IX.72.3

IX.72.6 [alt.]

IX.72.7=86.21 [alt.]

IX.73.3

IX.73.6

IX.74.2 [2x alt.]

IX.74.3 [alt.]

IX.74.6

IX.74.7 [2x alt.]

IX.75.1

IX.75.2

IX.76.4 [2x alt.]

IX.78.2

IX.79.4

IX.80.1 [alt.]

IX.82.3 [alt.]

IX.84.3 [alt.]

IX.85.3 [alt.]

IX.85.11 [2x]

IX.86.3 [alt.]

IX.86.4 [alt.]

IX.86.14

IX.86.19 (2x)

IX.86.24

IX.86.28

IX.86.34

IX.86.41

IX.87.5 [2x]

IX.87.9 [alt. 2x]

IX.88.1

IX.88.4 [alt. 2x]

IX.89.5

IX.89.6 [alt.]

IX.90.1 [alt.]

IX.90.4 [alt.]

IX.90.6

IX.91.1

IX.92.1

IX.92.4 [alt.]

IX.93.3

IX.96.18

IX.97.7

IX.97.12

IX.97.15

IX.97.22

IX.97.23–24

IX.97.24

IX.97.26

IX.97.31

IX.97.37

IX.97.53

IX.97.54 [alt.]

IX.98.11

IX.99.5

IX.102.5

IX.102.8

IX.104.3

IX.106.3

IX.106.8

IX.106.9

IX.107.8

IX.107.10

IX.107.15 [alt.]

IX.107.25

IX.108.10 [alt.]

IX.110.3

IX.110.5

IX.110.6

IX.112.3

IX.113.2 [alt.]

X.2.3

X.3.3

X.3.4 [3x alt.]

X.4.5

X.5.5

X.7.4 [alt.]

X.8.4

X.8.6

X.8.9

X.10.1

X.10.6

X.11.1 [alt.]

X.11.2 (2x)

X.11.3

X.11.4

X.11.6

X.11.7

X.11.8

X.11.9 [alt.]

X.12.9 [alt.]

X.13.1 [alt.]

X.13.4

X.14.3

X.14.4

X.14.5

X.14.6

X.14.10

X.14.16

X.15.11

X.16.6 [alt.]

X.18.8

X.18.9

X.18.13

X.20.6

X.21.1 (and passim)

X.21.7

X.22.11

X.23.2

X.23.4 [alt.]

X.24.2

X.25.3

X.25.5 [alt.]

X.25.11

X.26.2

X.26.4

X.26.5

X.26.6

X.27.4

X.27.11

X.27.14

IX.27.18

X.27.20

X.27.21

X.27.23

X.28.4

X.28.8

X.28.11

X.29.1

X.29.3 (3x)

X.29.5

X.30.2

X.30.9

X.31.4

X.31.5 2x (one alt.)

X.31.9

X.31.10

X.31.11

X.32.1 (2x)

X.32.4

X.32.9 (alt.)

X.33.1

X.34.1

X.35.4

X.35.5

X.35.9 [alt.]

X.35.10 [alt.]

X.36.8 [alt.]

X.37.3

X.37.12

X.39.5

X.39.6

X.39.14

X.40.6

X.40.8

X.40.10

X.40.11

X.40.12 (2x)

X.42.3 (alt.)

X.42.6

X.43.2

X.43.6 [alt.]

X.43.8

X.44.1

X.44.4

X.44.5 (2x)

X.44.9 [alt.]

X.45.8

X.46.1

X.46.2

X.46.3

X.46.4 [alt.]

X.46.6 [alt.]

X.47.7 [alt.]

X.48.1

X.48.6

X.48.7 [alt.]

X.49.1

X.49.3 [alt.]

X.49.4a, b [alt.]

X.49.5a [alt.], b [alts.], c

X.49.11 [alt. 3x]

X.50.2 [alt.]

X.50.3

X.50.4 [alt.]

X.50.5 [alt.]

X.51.7 [alt.]

X.52.2 [alt.]

X.52.5 [alt.]

X.53.6

X.53.8

X.53.9

X.53.11 [alt.]

X.54.3

X.54.5 [alt.]

X.55.4

X.55.7

X.56.2

X.56.3

X.56.4 [2x]

X.59.5 [alt.]

X.60.1 [alt.]

X.60.5 [alt.]

X.61.1 [alt. x2]

X.61.2

X.61.3

X.61.5 [alt.]

X.61.6 [2x, 1 alt.]

X.61.7

X.61.9

X.61.11

X.61.12

X.61.13

X.61.15

X.61.17

X.61.18

X.61.19

X.61.20

X.61.22 [3x]

X.61.27

X.62.4

X.62.7

X.63.3

X.64.3

X.64.14 [alt.]

X.65.6 [alt.]

X.65.7 [alt.]

X.65.8 [alt.]

X.66.8

X.67.2 [alt. 2x]

X.67.5

X.67.8 [alt.]

X.68.1 [alt.]

X.68.6 [alt.]

X.69.9 [2]

X.69.11

X.69.12 [alt.]

X.70.7 [alt.]

X.73.1 [alt.]

X.73.4

X.73.5 [alt.]

X.73.10 [alt. 2x]

X.74.2 [alt.]

X.74.4 [alt.]

X.76.2

X.76.3 [alt.]

X.76.6 [alt. 2x]

X.76.7 [2x]

X.77.4

X.78.2

X.78.3 [alt.]

X.78.5 [alt. 2x]

X.78.6 [alt. 2x]

X.78.7 [alt.]

X.79.5 [alt.]

X.79.6

X.79.7

X.80.2

X.80.6 [alt.]

X.84.5–6

X.85.1

X.85.2

X.85.4

X.85.7

X.85.12

X.85.16

X.85.21 [alt.]

X.85.23

X.85.24

X.85.32 [alt.]

X.85.37 [alt. 2x]

X.85.44 [alt.]

X.86.9

X.86.20 [alt. 2x]

X.87.4

X.87.5

X.87.12 [alt.]

X.88.6

X.89.8 [alt.]

X.89.9

X.89.13

X.89.17 [alt.]

X.91.13

X.92.1 [alt.]

X.92.2 [alt.]

X.92.3

X.92.4

X.92.7

X.92.12 [2x]

X.93.4 [alt.]

X.93.9 [alt.]

X.93.11 [alt.]

X.94.3–4

X.95.3 [alt.]

X.95.5

X.95.14

X.96.1

X.96.9 [alt.]

X.97.4, 8 [alt.]

X.97.11

X.97.12 [2x]

IX.99.1 [alt. 2x]

X.99.7 [2x]

X.99.8 [3x]

X.99.9

X.99.10

X.99.11 [alt.]

X.100.3

X.101.8

X.101.9

X.102.1 [alt.]

X.102.6

X.102.7

X.102.8 [2x]

X.103.3

X.103.6

X.104.8

X.105.1

X.105.6

X.105.7 (2x)

X.105.9

X.105.11

X.106.4

X.106.10

X.107.3 [alt.]

X.111.2

X.111.4 [alt.]

X.111.7 [alt.]

X.111.8

X.112.5 [alt.]

X.112.10 [alt.]

X.113.1 [alt.]

X.113.7 [alt.]

X.114.1 [alt.]

X.114.2

X.115.1

X.115.6

X.115.8

X.116.3 [alt.]

X.117.1

X.117.6

X.119.2

X.120.1

X.120.6 [alt.]

X.120.7 [alt.]

X.120.8 [alt.]

X.122.2 [alt.]

X.122.6

X.123.3 [alt.]

X.125.1 [alt.]

X.127.5 [alt.]

X.127.8

X.128.5

X.131.3 [alt.]

X.132.3 [alt.]

X.133.5 [alts.]

X.134.6

X.138.1 [alt.]

X.138.2

X.139.1 [alt.]

X.139.2 [alt.]

X.140.2

X.142.5 [alt.]

X.142.7–8

X.143.2 [alt.]

X.144.4 [alt.]

X.148.2 [alts.]

X.148.3 [alt.]

X.149.1 [alt.]

X.149.3 [alt.]

X.150.2

X.160.4 [alt.]

X.161.1 2x

X.161.2 [alt.]

X.167 intro.

X.174.2 [alt.]

X.176.4 [alt.]

X.181.3

X.189.1 [alt.]

Maṇḍala I

[I.1 Agni JPB]

[SJ: The repetition of the dedicand's name in initial position in the first 5 vss. of the hymn in a variety of different cases – the versified paradigm -- has been long and often remarked upon, including famously by de Saussure. Perhaps more interesting is what happens when the pattern breaks, in vs. 6. The expected form of *agní-* is absent, but in 2nd position is the relatively rare particle *aṅgá*, a phonological scrambling of the divine name, followed by an initial voc. *ágne* in the 2nd pāda, and another phonologically scrambled form, voc. *aṅgiráḥ*, ending the verse. Though this vs. breaks the pattern, it has an over-abundance of reminiscences of it. Vs. 7 provides a vocative *agne* in modified 2nd position in the first pāda; vs. 9 an initial voc. *ágne* in pāda b. Vs. 8 is perhaps the most interesting with regard to the pattern: it is the only vs. that lacks any form of *agní-*. While vss. 6 and 7 seemed to be keeping the sequence going by other means, vs. 8 breaks it off definitively. *Except* it is the only vs. that is not syntactically self-contained. It consists of a series of acc. sg. phrases all characterizing Agni, which must be syntactically dependent on the acc. *tvā* in 7a, which immediately preceded the last representative of *agní-*. The unnamed god is insistently present and tied to the last mention of his name. Note also that this is the first time since vs. 1 that Agni appears in the accusative (1a *agním īle*), so vs. 8 creates a sort of syntactic ring with the opening of the hymn.]

I.2 Vāyu, etc. (Praūgaśastra)

The recipients of the various ṛcas making up these two rather simple hymns are clearly signalled. All three verses making up the first ṛca to Vāyu (vss. 1-3) open with a voc. *vāyo*; the second ṛca (to Indra and Vāyu, vss. 4-6) opens with the voc. *indravāyū*, while the next two begin with the famous “Vāyav Indraś ca” construction (on which see Jamison 1988). The pattern is varied in the Mitra and Varuṇa ṛca (7-9), with the conjoined accusatives *mitrām* and *vāruṇam ca* opening the first and second pādas of vs. 7, and the dual dvandva *mitrāvāruṇā(v)* in second position in the next two verses, first as a vocative, then as a nominative.

There appears to be some attempt to create bridges between the ṛcas: verses 3 and 4 both sketch a reversal of the usual ritual model; vss. 6 and 7 both concern our ‘insight’ (*dhî*).

I.2.2: Ge. suggests that *jarante* here can be ambiguous, belonging not only to ‘sing’, but also to ‘awaken’, with identical present stem. This is possible, but only with an intransitive sense of ‘awaken’: “the singers awaken / wake up to you,” since the ‘awaken’ present is only intrans. (see Gotō 1987: 150). In any case surely the primary sense is ‘sing’, given the etymological figure produced by its grammatical subj. *jaritārah* ‘singers’.

I.2.3: The difficult words *dhénā* and *praprñcatī* complicate the interpretation of this verse. The former, investigated in detail by H.-P. Schmidt (Gd. Nyberg), is now generally interpreted as ‘(milk)stream’, rendering Geldner’s ‘lip’ and Renou’s ‘tongue’ out of date. As for *praprñcatī*, the simplex *prñcatī* appears in another Praūgaśastra hymn (I.23.16),

modifying waters and referring to the mixing of milk (acc.) with honey (instr.). Given the similarity of context, a direct object referring to a liquid should be supplied.

What is also puzzling here is in what way the ‘stream’ is Vāyu’s: it should not originate with him, but rather be destined for him, but then why is the ‘pious man’ apparently receiving the benefit of it? As in the next verse, there seems to be a bit of role reversal here, with the gods depicted as providing the ritual benefits rather than receiving them. Presumably the point is that the pious man gets the benefit secondarily, by having pleased the god, but the dative *dāsūṣe* is striking, esp. as it is apparently parallel grammatically (though it cannot be functionally) to the dat. *sómapītaye* ending the verse. Although the verse presumably depicts the sacrificer’s offering of soma to Vāyu to drink, the lexicon and the case usage complicate the message.

I.2.4: As noted in the comment on the last verse, the ritual model here is shaken up a bit: Indra and Vāyu are urged to come *with práyobhiḥ*, a word generally used of ‘pleasurable offerings’ that are presented *to* the gods and *to which* they come (cf. VIII.60.4 *abhí práyāṃsi ... gahi*). Our translation “with delight,” agreeing with most other translators, avoids, and conceals, the problem. The gods should not be bringing *práyāṃsi*. The little disturbance of the ritual model is confined to these two verses in this hymn.

The pāda-final position of *hi* here is unusual, and I have no explanation for it, esp. as it does not take second position in its clause as is usual.

I.2.7-9: As mentioned in the intro., this *ṛca* contains the trio *dhī* ‘insight’ (vs. 7), *krātu-* ‘intention’ (vs. 8), and *dākṣa-* ‘skill’ (vs. 9), the three elements necessary to conceive and carry out an action. Their interconnection is emphasized by the fact that all three are in the accusative and each is stationed initial in the last pāda of its verse.

The juxtaposition across vss. 8-9 of *krátum* (beginning 8c) and *kavī* (beginning 9a) may also be meant to evoke the well-established compound *kaví-kratu-* ‘having the will/resolve of a poet’, ‘having a poet’s purpose’, an occurrence of which is found in the preceding hymn by the same poet (I.1.5).

I.2.7: Here and everywhere else it is found, the word *riśādas-*, an epithet of various gods, is opaque. There are currently two competing and entirely different interpretations: that of Karl Hoffmann (Aufs. 564 n. 16) as ‘discriminating, fastidious’ (< ‘picking at food’) and Paul Thieme’s ‘caring for the stranger’ (*Fremdling*). See EWA s.v. The contexts are not diagnostic, and it is probably the case that the epithet was no longer understood even as it was being deployed (note that it is almost always pāda-final, possibly a sign of formulaic freezing).

Throughout our translation we have followed the Thieme interpretation, but not with any great conviction. One thing in favor of the Thieme interpretation is that the word is regularly applied to one or more of the Ādityas (as here), who might be expected to show care for humans in their charge. That it is also regularly used of the less ethically inclined Maruts might give us pause (though these contexts are generally benevolent ones) – except that ‘fastidious’ is even less a likely quality of the Maruts than ‘caring for the stranger’.

I.2.8: The unaccented voc. *ṛtāvṛdhāv* opening the 2nd pāda has been thus transmitted, though we would expect **ṛtāvṛdhāv*. In fact there is a striking string of 13 unaccented syllables in this hemistich, starting after the first word of the vs., *ṛténa* (14, counting -*na*). See Old, who has no good explanation for the lack of accent on the first word of the 2nd pāda, though he considers it an old error. It cannot be simply a peculiarity of this hymn, because I.3.1b (forming part of the Praügaśastra sequence with I.2, as discussed in the publ. intro.) opens with an initially accented voc. *drávatpāṇī* (to the stem *dravátpāṇi*).

I.3 (Praügaśastra continued)

As in I.2 the recipients of the various ṛcas are emphatically signalled. In vss. 1-3 to the Ásvins, the voc. *ásvinā* opens the first two verses, while their alternative name *nāsatyā* opens the second pāda of the third. The voc. *índra* opens all three verses of the next ṛca (4-6). The Viśvedevāḥ ṛca contains three instances of that phrase: the voc. in 7b, nominatives opening vss. 8 and 9. The final ṛca to Sarasvatī likewise contains three occurrences of her name in the nominative, but all three end their pādas (10a, 11c, 12a).

I.3.2: *sāvīra*- rendered as ‘powerful’ in the publ. tr. But see disc. below ad I.30.17.

dhīṣṇya- and related forms are obscure and much discussed; indeed Ge. refuses to translate the word. We generally follow the view of Pinault (UTexas Vedic Workshop), who takes it to mean ‘related to / proper to the holy place’, thence simply ‘holy’. See disc. of *dhīṣṇā*- ad I.160.1

I.3.3: In the compound *rudra-vartanī*, number is of course neutralized in the first member. The Maruts are regularly called Rudras (without ṛddhi or derivational suffix) after their father. The ‘course of the Rudra/Maruts’ is simply a reference to the midspace (antarikṣa) much frequented by the Maruts, where the Ásvins are now driving.

I.3.5: The peculiarly formed stem *vāghát*- clearly refers to a ritual officiant of some sort, but in the absence of both a set of diagnostic contexts and a convincing etymology, it is hard to narrow his function down. Because his voice (*vāṇi*-) figures in a simile (I.88.6 *vāgháto ná vāṇiḥ*); because he is associated with verbal products, like the *bráhmāṇi* here; because Vāghats are the agents at vying sacrificial invocations (e.g., I.36.13 *vāghádbhir víhváyāmahe*; cf. III.8.10, VIII.5.16); and because they are associated with the Āngirases, the singers in the Vala myth (X.62.7), we chose to render the term by ‘cantor’, though this is only a guess – esp. since in most of the occurrences the ritual role and priestly activity are pretty generic. The word is also twice applied to the Ṛbhus (I.110.4, III.60.4).

I.3.7: On the voc. of *visva*- see comm. ad X.15.6.

The use of *dāsvāms*- to modify gods is striking; here it is in reciprocal usage with gen. *dāśúṣaḥ*, used of a pious mortal in its ordinary usage. For the few other divine *dāsvāms*, see comm. ad X.104.6.

I.3.8: A small grammatical mismatch here: the phrase *visve devāsaḥ* and the adjectives modifying it (*aptúraḥ*, *túrṇayaḥ*) are nominatives and should not be the subject of the imperative *ā ganta*. Ge. (and WG) ignore the problem by translating the nom. as voc.

(“Thr Allgötter”). Although the effect is minor, my translation reflects the grammatical disjunction by rendering pāda b as an interjection.

Another question is why 7b contains the same 2nd pl. imperative, except with a different grade of the root: *ā gata* vs. *ā ganta*. Both forms are reasonably well attested, with 7b a repeated pāda (=II.41.13a, VI.52.7a). Whatever the history of the distinction, the synchronic distribution seems to be metrical, with *ā gata* almost always final, providing an iambic cadence in dimeter verse, and *ā ganta* found earlier in the verse.

In b *tūrṇayaḥ* was carelessly omitted from the tr. In the meantime I have reassessed the meaning of *tūrṇi-* (see comm. ad III.11.5) and would now render it ‘crossing, advancing’. Note the presence of *aptūr-* ‘crossing the waters’ in pāda a, a connection also found in III.51.2.

I.3.9: I follow the analysis of the hapax *éhimāyāsaḥ* as a frozen 2nd sg. imperative phrase, “*éhi mā+yāḥ*” (“come! don’t go”), transformed into an adjective in the nom. pl. masc. – an analysis that goes back at least to Sāyaṇa. Ge also follows this analysis, though it is somewhat difficult to excavate from his “willkommen und ungern fortgelassen.” I interpret it as representing the words of the singers’ invitation regularly heard by the VDs. The other currently competing explanations, as a frozen phrase “*éhi māyā*” [better voc. *māye?*] “come here, magic” (Old) or as a deformation of *āhi-māya-* ‘vielgestaltig’ (Gr) [=‘snake-sly’ (J+B)] (BR, followed by Gr), fit less well into the content of the hymn, which after all focuses on calling the various gods to the ritual; note the *ā gata*, *ā ganta* of vss. 7-8 addressed to the same VDs. Support for this analysis may also come from the next hymn (I.4), attributed to the same poet, in which successive vss. (3c, 4a) contain the imperatives *ā gahi* ‘come here’ and *pārehi* ‘go away’, with at least the former addressed to the god Indra.

I.3.11-12: Note the contrastive values of the simplex pres. *cétantī* ‘perceiving, taking note’ and the -āya-pres. (*prā*) *cetayati* ‘makes perceived, reveals’ in successive vss.

I.4 Indra

I.4.2: *godā(h)* of pāda c echoes *godúhe* of 1b. I consider pāda c a proverbial expression – when a rich man is pleased, he gives cows – though it’s obviously applied to Indra here.

I.4.4: Striking is the abrupt change of subject of the 2nd sg. imperatives, from Indra (3c) to an unidentified human companion (4a).

My interpretation differs substantially from those of most others in pāda b. In my view, the accusative *índram* marks Indra as the one directly interrogated, rather than (with most interpretations) the one to be asked about. Most interpreters take *vipaścítam* as identifying the person to be interrogated (e.g., Ge. “einen Weisen”), thus assuming two different referents for the accusative singulars in that pāda: “ask the wise one about Indra.” I find that unlikely, in part because, though *vipaścít-* can be used of humans, it more often qualifies gods.

Taking Indra as the one interrogated has further effects on the interpretation. For others the relative clause in c has Indra as its subject (*yāḥ*) and the 2nd ps. *te* refers to the human interrogator: it is Indra who is dear(er) to you, the poet, than your comrades. I, on

the other hand, take pāda c as a syntactic hybrid, with an underlying direct discourse question, directed to Indra, “who [expected *kāh*] is your choice from among your comrades?” incompletely converted into a relative clause in indirect discourse “ask (Indra) about (the one) who [*yāh*] is your [=Indra’s] choice...” In my view the 2nd ps. ‘your’ of “your choice” in pāda c refers to Indra, not to the subject of the imperatives *pārehi* and *prchā* of ab, while Indra is in the 3rd ps in pāda b. (I will not even contemplate the possibility that *prchā* in b is a 1st ps subjunctive: “Go away. I will ask / let me ask Indra...”)

Although this interpretation complicates the syntax, in my opinion it fits better into its trca and better reflects the relationship between Indra and humans. As often in Indra contexts, the poet worries that Indra will favor others over the poet himself, and this verse poses the question directly to Indra: who do you like best? Indra’s presumed and desired answer is “you!” This answer then allows the poet to dismiss those who criticize him for not spreading his devotion around to other gods (vs. 5) and defends this exclusive focus as a good bargain, as the rest of the world has to admit (vs. 6). The first defense of henotheism?

I should admit, however, that the standard view is somewhat compatible with my larger interpretation, in that “... ask about Indra, who is your [=poet’s] choice from among your comrades” could reinforce that message that our focus is only on Indra, not on other gods. But I do not see how questions *about* Indra fit with the next two verses.

I.4.5-6: Most interpretations take these two verses as syntactically parallel (e.g., Ge. “Mögen ... Und mögen ...”), but the impv. *bruvantu* and the opt. *vocéyuḥ* are surely doing different things: the imperative is concessive: “let them say / even if they say ...” while the optative expresses the conclusion that the rest of the world would have to draw. The parallel *utā*’s that open these verses might give us pause, but they may have something like the value “on the one hand ... on the other.”

I.4.7: The cmpd *yajña-śrī*- belongs to the interpretationally problematic group of *-śrī*-root-noun cmpds, on which see comm. ad III.26.5. Our cmpd is quite parallel to *adhvara-śrī*- (see ad I.44.3) and may well be better taken as transitive “perfecting the sacrifice.”

The b and c pādas both end with an adjective modifying the implicit object soma, a compound of the root *√mad* ‘exhilarate’ (the second time in its byform *mand*) and a noun expressing the personal object of the verb, but in exactly opposite order: *nṛ-mādana*- and *mandayāt-sakha*-, what might be called a “compound chiasmus.” A less complex etymological figure is found at the beginning of the verse: *āśúm āśāve*. (JL)

Gr gives a lemma *patayāt-sakha* ‘den Freund beflügelnd’, but of course only *patayāt* is actually found, beside *mandayāt-sakha*-. Gr obviously thinks *-sakha*- was gapped in this phrase and should be supplied. (So also AiG II.1.30.) But there is no reason to do so, and in fact such a sequence would detract from the “compound chiasmus” noted by JL. Best to take *patayāt* as an adverb with adverbial accent shift (or else attribute its final syllable accent to redactional matching to *mandayāt*-. Lowe (*Participles*, 283)) rejects the adverbial interpr. and suggests either following Gr’s suggestion, augmented by Ge’s (n. 7c) that the underlying form in that cmpd is caus. **pātayāt*-, or assuming that *patayāt* is “a nonce metrical replacement ... for *patāyantam*.” The former requires too much machinery, and if we allowed every inconvenient RVic

form to be interpr. as a metrical replacement for the form we want, we could rewrite the RV with no controls whatsoever!

I.4.8: My occasional tr. of *ghaná-* as ‘bane’ was inspired by my husband’s treatment of etymologically related nominal constructions in Greek and Germanic (Watkins 1996: 418ff., 423). I think JL for reminding me of this.

I.4.9: (JL) Etymological figure also in *vāṇṇeṣu vāṇṇam*, immediately followed by *vāṇṇāmasi*, which, however, is synchronically distinct from the ‘prize’ words.

I.4.10: There may be bit of ring composition here, with 10b *supārāḥ* echoing the first word of the hymn, 1a *surūpa-*.

I.5 Indra

I.5.1: Seems deliberately to echo the last vs. of the preceding hymn (I.4.10), with pāda b *īndram abhī prā gāyata* “sing forth to Indra” matching I.4.10c *tāsmāi īndrāya gāyata* “sing to him, to Indra” (the difference in case being governed by the presence of the preverb *abhī* in I.5.1). I.4.10 is then exactly repeated in I.5.4c. The *sākhāyaḥ* of I.5.1c also recalls I.4.10b *sākhā* — though the latter refers to Indra and the former to the priest-poets. But I.4.4c contains a pl. *sākhībhyah*, which in our analysis has the same human referents as I.5.1, showing the reciprocal relation between men and gods that was one of the points of I.4.

I.5.2: *purūtāmam purūṇām* is pleonastic, meaning literally “the first of many, of the many ones.”

I.5.3: My interpretation of these sentences as questions is not overtly marked in the text, but seems a reasonable use of the subjunctives.

On the distorted word order of pāda c, see comm. on the parallel in III.13.1.

I.5.5: The double dative *sutapāvne ... vītāye* with *yanti* is more literally “... go to the soma-drinker [lit. ‘pressed (soma) drinker’] to pursue (him).”

I.5.10: A whiff of ring composition – 10c *īśānaḥ* ‘having control over’ echoes 2b *īśānam*, both modifying Indra. In 2b the god controls something undeniably positive, “choice things,” which he will presumably distribute to his favorites. In 10a he controls “the deadly weapon” that other mortals might wield against us. The identity of expression ties together the very different sentiments.

I.6 Indra and the Maruts (per Anukr.)

As noted in the intro. the Anukramaṇī’s identification of the divinities as Indra (1-3, 10), Maruts (4, 6, 8-9), and Indra and Maruts (5, 7) does not conform to the content of the hymn, which is quite disjointed, but appears to concern, at least in part, the Vala myth. The Maruts do not seem to figure at all in the hymn; the plural entities with Indra

are probably the Aṅgirasas. For my view of the structure (which is informed by the discussions of Ge and Old), see publ. intro.

I.6.1-2: These verses begin identically (*yuñjānti* ‘they yoke’), inviting the audience to equate the action of the two verses.

1b: The referent of the apparent acc. plural *tasthūṣaḥ* ‘(those) standing still’ is not given. Ge. (/WG) thinks it refers to stable things on the earth, but if the sun is referred to in the first pāda, it is more likely to “move around” celestial features than earthly ones, and the stars or other luminous heavenly bodies are referred to in the next pāda. Re’s interpretation (flg. Ludwig) of *tasthūṣaḥ* as an abl. sg. (“from the one standing still” – “à partir de (l’espace) immobile”) is ingenious and would match the minor syntactic idiom ‘yoke from ABL’ (e.g., I.115.4 *yadéd āyukta harītaḥ sadhāsthāt*), so it cannot be dismissed. The ablatives in the final verses (9-10) might lend weak support for Re’s view.

2b: The hapax compound *vīpakṣasā* is difficult and has been variously interpreted. The second member, *pākṣas-* (and related and more common *pākṣā-*), can mean either ‘wing’ or ‘side’; the first member, *vī-*, is most likely the preverb *vī-*, but in compounds this element has a number of possible meanings: ‘without’, ‘distant’, ‘wide’, ‘alternating/opposite/different’, ‘dispersed’. It could also possibly represent *vī-* ‘bird’, which has been claimed as the first member of some other compounds (see EWA s.v. *vāy-*, KEWA III.266). The possible combinations of these two ambiguous elements allow for a number of interpretations. I more or less follow the Sāy/Gr interpretation, ‘auf beiden Seiten des Wagens gehend’, though I take it as an adverbial instrumental, not a dual. (The presence of a number of duals in *-ā* in the verse does not favor an adverbial interpretation, however.) Re’s “aux ailes d’oiseau” obviously takes the first member as the ‘bird’ word, while WG “die mit weiten Flügeln” takes *vī-* as the preverb, but with the second member meaning ‘wing’ as in Re’s interpretation. Ge’s ‘auseinanderstrebenden(?)’ treats the second member quite loosely.

I.6.3: The baffling part of this verse is the voc. plural *maryāḥ* ‘o young men’ in b, embedded in a verse that otherwise has 2nd singular reference (*ajāyathāḥ* c, along with sg. ptcpl. *kṛṇvān* in a). There is no clear referent for this voc., though it may refer to the unidentified plural subjects of the verbs in vss. 1-2 (*yuñjānti*) and 4 (*eriré*). In the plural *mārya-* is often used of the Maruts, which may account for the Anukramaṇī identification of them as divinities of the hymn. Though Ge suggests the “young men” here may constitute the audience for the singer and Re that they are the singers themselves, this seems unlikely because when *mārya-* has an identifiable referent, it is never a human. I tentatively assume that it refers to the Aṅgirasas as the fire-priests who first kindled Agni, the subject of the verse.

As for the subject of *ajāyathāḥ*, contrary to most interpretations I take this as primarily referring to Agni, not the sun, though perhaps, with Re, “Agni solaire.”

I.6.4: Grammatically problematic is the accent on the verb *eriré* in b, a fact that seems to have been elided in most translations, including mine. Old suggests that the particle *āha* may have conditioned the accent, but this seems unlikely because *āha* doesn’t have this effect elsewhere in the RV. However, see Pāṇ. VIII.1.39–40, which prescribes accentuation of verbs after a number of forms, including *āha*. For accented exx. in Vedic

prose (and one ex. in the AV), as well as a thorough treatment of the particle and its history, see Z. Rothstein-Dowden, “On the Etymology of Vedic *áha*” (JAOS 142.1 [2022]). I would now alter the translation to make vs. 4 syntactically dependent on vs. 3, without an overt subordinator. Thus, “you were born together with the dawns, / (as/when) just after that they once again roused ...” Again, though most commentators (save Old) consider this to concern the rebirth of the sun, I think it more likely that Agni/the ritual fire is the object, esp. as *erire* +/- *ní* is regularly used of establishing the ritual fire (e.g., I.134.4). As for c, the service to the ritual fire of the unnamed subjects (=Aṅgirases?) would account for their receiving a name worthy of the sacrifice; see, e.g., I.72.3.

I.6.5: As noted in the intro., this verse helps resolve the unclear referents in the earlier part of the hymn by giving a relatively clear sketch of the Vala myth, with Indra finding the cows after his companions “break the stronghold (=Vala).”

I.6.6: This verse contains, in my opinion, what Re might call a “legère zeugma,” in which the verb *anūṣata* “they bellowed” takes (as is usual) an acc. of the target of the bellowing (“to the finder of goods,” i.e., Indra) in the frame, but in the simile it takes an acc. of the content of the bellowing (“their thought”). Ge avoids this mismatch of acc. function by removing *matīm* from the simile by supplying a form of \sqrt{bhr} ‘bear, present’, leaving *devayāntaḥ* as the only term directly compared in the simile: “Wie Gottverlangende, die das Lied [vortragen], so haben die Lobreden ... hergerufen.” It is certainly true that *matī-* is common as the object of \sqrt{bhr} and that \sqrt{nu} doesn’t normally take an acc. of content, but since the poet of the hymn has pushed the linguistic limits elsewhere, I prefer to think he meant the jarring figure. Note that there is also a mismatch between the two subjects, with the simile referring, implicitly, to human actors, while the frame has ‘songs’ (*gīrah*) as subject (unless we take the Aṅgirases or the cows as subj. and allow *anūṣata* to take two accusatives: “they bellowed their songs to the finder of goods” – however, \sqrt{nu} doesn’t take two acc., to my knowledge).

The zeugma may iconically represent the fact that the verse connects across a temporal gap as well: the simile seems to refer to present-day worshippers producing their praise, but the frame (with augmented verb form) refers to the mythic past of the Vala tale. This verse thus serves as a transition to the here-and-now of the current ritual, which is treated in vs. 7.

I.6.7: As noted in the intro., this verse pairs structurally with vs. 3; I therefore take Agni to be the subject, with the verse expressing the kindling of the fire at the time when Indra arrives to receive the morning offering.

The form *dṛkṣase* is isolated, but its grammatical identity is fairly clear (see Narten, Sig. Aor. p. 146): a 2nd sg. mid. *s*-aor. subj. with the “wrong” grade of the root (expect **darkṣase* or **drakṣase*); it is probably based immediately on the other *s*-aor. middle form, 3rd pl. indic. *adṛkṣata* (5x, once accented) of the same metrical shape (minus augment), which always appears final, as does *dṛkṣase*, and usually in dimeter verse as here.

The two beings in pādas ab, one as unexpressed sg. subj. of the verb, one in the instr., are then referred to as a pair in the du. nom. of pāda c, the predicate of an unexpressed nominal sentence “you two are...”

I.6.8: The Āngirases are presumably the referents of the instr. phrases, and the verse is, like 5, a pretty clear allusion to the Vala myth.

I.6.9: As suggested in the intro., this is the last real verse of the hymn, as vs. 10 is a mere variant of 9, and it shows a bit of ring composition: the *diváh ... rocanāt* echoes *rocanā diví* of 1c, and if we were to accept Re's interpr. of 1b *tasthúṣaḥ* as an ablative, the ablatives *átah* and *rocanāt* would match it grammatically.

This is a rare example of the present middle *ṛñj* not taking an acc. (see Tucker 2002: 284 n.17, HS 115 "RV rgmín-, ṛgmíya- and ṛñjate"). (JL)

I.7 Indra

I.7.1: *anūṣata* provides a link to the immediately preceding hymn, I.6.6.

I.7.2: Though a number of interpreters (Gr, WG, Scar) take *vacoyújā* as an instr. sg. and supply *ráthēna* 'chariot', this form otherwise (4x) is only du. and modifies *hárī* 'the two fallow bays'. Thus, it seems better to follow the Sāy/Ge/Re interpr. As Ge points out, the untethered *ā* in b allows a form of *√sthā* to be supplied, in the idiom *ā√sthā* 'mount'. The verse is then slightly unusual in referring to Indra's twin horses in two grammatical cases in the same sentence (*háryoḥ* loc., [*hárī*] *vacoyújā* acc.).

I.7.3: A more felicitous tr. of *dīrghāya cákṣase* might be "to be seen for a long time," but "for the long view" allows the phrase to be read as referring to either time or space ("to be seen for a long distance") or both.

The usage of the instr. *góbhiḥ* is somewhat strange; it is clearly not meant either as an instr. of agent/instrument or of accompaniment, at least of simple accompaniment. It might be an instr. of separation, or, as in this tr., an adjunct or accompaniment to the obj.: "the rock (which was) with cows." ET points out to me that such a construction would be very unusual; I suggest that it could derive from an instr. of accompaniment: "the rock along with its cows."

I.7.5: The phrase *mahāddhané ... árbhe* "when the stake is great and when it's small" is an example of the occasional gapping of a 2nd cmpd member in a parallel construction; we would expect **arbha-ddhané*. So already Gr; the ex. is cited by Wack (AiG II.1.35). The same phrase is found in I.40.8.

I.7.6: For the pot, see intro. The doubling of the 1st pl. pronoun (*naḥ* in a, *asmábhyam* in c) is probably simple redundancy, with *naḥ* a Wackernagel placeholder at the beginning of the sentence, anticipating the full pronoun that opens c. However the *naḥ* could possibly be construed with the voc. *sátrādāvan* 'who give in every way' in b, though it seems a bit distant from the enclitic.

I.7.7: Improper relative, as shown best by Re's rendering, "Les corps-de-louange qui, poussée, (vont toujours) plus haut..." (Re's suspension dots). The masc. nom. pl. *yé ...*

stómāḥ of ab has no matching grammatical referent in the main clause of c, though it is picked up by its semantic and etymological equivalent, fem. sg. *suṣṭutī-*.

I.7.8: Connected to vs. 6 by shared vocab., *vṛṣan-* (a) and (the rather rare) *āpratiṣkuta-*, though separated by vs. 7.

I.7.9: Incomplete sentence, consisting only of rel. cl., completed by main cl. of 10. The *ékaḥ* opening this last sentence of the hymn and the *kévalaḥ* ‘exclusively’ that is its last word are more insistent counterparts of *íd* in the opening pādas of vss. 1-2. Once again Madhuchandas seems to be faintly signalling ring composition.

I.8 Indra

I.8.2: Incomplete sentence, with relative hanging off *rayīm* ‘wealth’ in the previous verse. Two methods of fighting are contrasted: ‘fighting (*-hatyā-*) by fist’ (*muṣṭi-*, my ‘bare-knuckled’) and ‘on horseback’ (*ārvatā*). Although the two terms are grammatically parallel (instrs. *muṣṭi-hatyāyā* and *ārvatā*), they are not semantically, since it’s the first member of the compound, *muṣṭi-* that corresponds to *ārvatā*, and ‘fighting’ must be supplied with the second term.

The verse shows overt signs of late grammatical features: esp. the *-ai* ending of the middle subjunctive *ruṇádhāmahai* (rather than *-e*), but also the longer *-ā*-stem instr. *-āyā* (rather than *-ā*), though of course the latter is fairly well distributed throughout the RV.

I.8.3: Concatenation of *tvótāsaḥ* (pāda a) with the same form in 2c, though the one in 2c requires distraction (*tuvo-*), but not the one in 3a. Ge/Re take *ghanā* as (an archaic) instr. sg., but nom. pl. *ghanā(h)* seems preferable, esp. as Madhuchandas uses the same word in the sg. as a personal designation in I.4.8 (where it applies to Indra and which I tr. ‘bane’). So Old. Although designating animate beings (namely “us”) as “hammers” may seem unusual, it’s not unprecedented, at least in English: cf. the rock song entitled “Sometimes you’re the hammer and sometimes you’re the nail,” and (gleaned from Google) a quotation from an American poet unknown to me, Edwin Markham (1852–1940), “For all your days be prepared, and meet them ever alike. When you are the anvil, bear – when you are the hammer, strike.”

I.8.6: The whole verse is a relative clause with accented verb (*yá āśata*), with no overt antecedent available in either the preceding or the following vs. My solution follows Old, who suggests that it implicitly hangs off vs. 5: Indra’s power is (for those) who... This fits the message of the hymn, that men’s success is entirely dependent on Indra’s aid and intervention, a message that is reinforced by the interdependence of various vss. already noted (1-2 [main cl., rel. cl.], 2-3 [lexical concatenation]) and to be described below [7-10].

Though *āśata* lacks expressed obj., ‘him’ (=Indra) should be supplied, on the basis of passages like I.85.7, VIII.97.9.

In the publ. tr. I follow Gr's deriv. of *samohá-* from *sám √ ūh* 'shove together', but I now think that it is better analyzed as *sa-mohá-* to *√ muh* 'be confused' (see comm. ad IV.17.13) and would slightly modify the tr. here to "in the confusion (of battle)."

I.8.7: Yet another untethered rel. cl. In my view, the description of Indra's physical capacity serves as the basis for the expressions of Indra's vast liberality and help in vss. 8-9, each of which begins with *evá hí* "for just in the same way." Therefore the *yáh* 'which' of 7a seems a substitute for *yáthā* 'even as', the usual relative with *evá*. Although I do not so translate it, 7-8 could be rendered "even as his cheek ... swells ..., even so is his liberality..."

For *kukṣí-* as 'cheek', not 'belly', see Jamison 1987 (Gs. Cowgill).

I.8.8: The image of Indra's generosity as "a ripe branch" is an unusual one; I do not know of a parallel. In any case, "ripe branch" must be a condensed expression for something like a branch laden with ripe fruit. (JL)

I.8.10: Despite sharing the *evá hí* opening with vss. 8-9, this verse is not entirely parallel with those two, which express the vastness of Indra's liberality and help. Here it is what we owe Indra, praise and recitation, that are implicitly suggested to be as vast as what he gives us. A tr. more parallel to the previous two verses would be "Just the same [that is, just as vast] are those things beloved of him, the praise-song and recitation to be proclaimed ..." However, I favor the published tr., with *śáṃsyā* 'to be proclaimed' as predicate, because it provides a hortatory end to the hymn.

I.9 Indra

I.9.1: *somapárvan-* 'soma-joint' could refer either to the segments of the stalk of the soma plant (e.g., Re) or to the segments of the Soma Sacrifice (e.g., WG). Ge suggests it's a word play. It is difficult to judge, but I weakly favor the horticultural interpretation.

There is no explicit 2nd ps. in c, but the general interpretation of this pāda as referring to Indra seems correct.

I.9.2: For the doubling of the enclitics *īm enam* see Jamison 2002.

I.9.6: With Re I take the two acc. pl. -*vant*-adjectives (*rābhasvataḥ ... yásasvataḥ*) as proleptic, with the acquisition of these qualities being the result of Indra's impelling of us – rather than taking them as qualities we already possess, as most translators do.

I.9.8: *rathín-* should of course mean 'possessing chariots' or express some looser association with a chariot or chariots (such as Re's "carried on chariots") but since there's no obvious association of refreshments with chariots, an idiomatic and figurative use like Ge's "wagenvoll" seems appropriate – hence my "by the cartload."

I.9.9: In my view *gr̥ṇánta(h)* is an instance of the comparatively rare (but more common than generally supposed) predicated present participle. Other translators (Ge, Re, WG) take the participle as attributive and consider the sentence incomplete.

I.9.10: As Thieme (Fremdling, pp. 11f.) points out, the verse sets up an implicit contrast between Indra, who is “at home” (*nyòkas-*) wherever soma is pressed, and the stranger – but this opposition also implicitly suggests that, despite being a stranger or foreigner, any man can offer soma and praise to Indra, who will make himself at home in those foreign parts. This contrast would be better expressed by “even the stranger chants...” rather than the published “the stranger himself chants...”

The position and function of *ā* (embedded in *éd*) in b are unclear. The verb *\√arc* doesn’t take *ā* and in any case preverbs don’t usually ended up stranded in the middle of a pāda (of course the etymological figure *brhád brhaté* could have been fronted around it); a mid-pāda position suggests a role as adposition, but as an adposition *ā* doesn’t take a dative.

I.10 Indra

I.10.1: The first three pādas almost, but not quite, provide a tripartite ritual speech division: Sāmaveda, R̥gveda, X? Veda. The last is the problem: the “formulators” don’t work very well as speakers of Yajurveda yajuses, and it’s too early for the brāhmaṇa priest to be associated with the Atharvaveda, as in later Vedic.

Pace most translators, pf. *yemire* is ordinarily presential in value; see Kümmel s.v. *yam*.

I.10.2: Most translators take the subject of ab to be the sacrificer, but Indra seems a more likely candidate, esp. since *kártva-* ‘to be done’ is regularly used of the prospective deeds of Indra (e.g., II.30.10, IV.18.2, VIII.63.6).

I.10.3: On *hí* with the imperative marking that clause as the causal basis of the next clause, here initiated by the logical connector *átha*, see Brereton 2012 [Bronkhorst Fs.].

I.10.5: The rt noun cmpd *puru-niṣṣídḥ-* appears at first to be an exception to the apparent rule that such cmpds with direct-object 1st members do not also include preverbs (on which see comm. ad I.124.7), but this cmpd appears to be a bahuvrīhi (‘providing many fulfillments’), and further, the word *niṣṣídḥ-* seems completely lexicalized, with an uncertain history.

rārāṇat: pf. subj. with presential value, like the whole pf. system of this root. See Kümmel s.v. *ran* and Jamison (García Ramón Fs).

I.10.6: The case usage here is somewhat odd, in that the three benefits we beg Indra for, in strict parallel structure, are in loc., dat., and loc. respectively (underlying forms *sakhitvé ... rāyé ... suvīrye*). However, all end in *-e* — showing that surface phonetic agreement can sometimes trump case function.

The transformation of an epithet (*śakrá-* ‘able’) into its associated verb (*śakat* ‘he will be able’) is a neat little figure and demonstrates the importance of gods’ dynamically living up to their verbal attributes. (For the almost identical pāda see VIII.32.12.) It is an example of a type of verbal transformation of divine epithets into desired divine action that Elizarenkova (1968: 267–68) attempted to claim as the, or an, organizing principle of

RVic hymnic composition, despite its relative rarity. Of the other standard translations, only Re (“... le puissant; qu’il exerce .. sa puissance”) captures the etymological figure.

I.10.7: The two compounds in pāda a, *suvivṛtaṃ sunirājam*, do not occur elsewhere and are grammatically and interpretively ambiguous. The semantic reference of the two words is clear — the easy opening (*vī√vr*) of the Vala cave and the easy driving out (*nir√aj*) of the cows, using the standard lexemes for those actions — but 1) what are their stems? and 2) assuming they are adjectival, what do they modify? Gr/Lub analyse them as *-a*-stems -- also AiG II.1, though AiG II.2 takes *sunirājam* as belonging to an *a*-stem (p. 86) but *suvivṛtaṃ* to a root noun (p. 43) [and Hauschild’s Index to AiG lists them both as root nouns, somewhat emphatically] -- while, e.g., Old and Scar take both as root nouns. There is another formal anomaly: the pāda they form, *suvivṛtaṃ sunirājam*, has only one internal heavy syllable, the final syllable of the first word, where the initial consonant of the second makes position. A very unusual metrical line. Arnold (VM 125–26, 290) suggests the possibility of reading *suvivṛtaṃ* on the basis of the lengthening of the final vowels of the preverbs *āpi*, *abhī*, *pāri*, etc., before forms of *√vr*. Thanks to ET for pointing this out.

As to their reference, the general approach has been to take them as modifying an unexpressed *īndram*, supplying the whole structure of 6a (*tām ... īmahe* “we beseech him”) or some similar verb phrase to provide a grammatically acceptable referent for the two forms in 7a. But this solution is not very satisfying: Indra appears in the 3rd ps. *nominative* in 6c and as 2nd ps. *vocative* and *subject* of impv. in 7bcd, so extracting an acc. from a pāda in the past seems arbitrary. Scar suggests that the two words might instead modify *yásah* in b, which has the merit of providing a referent close by; however, this would technically eliminate the possibility that the two are root nouns, since *yásah* is neut. and presumably nom., and if the two words in pāda a are root nouns, they can only be acc. sg. I am nonetheless attracted by this solution (and would therefore be open to the *-a*-stem interpretation), with the possible modification that the two might actually be nouns (“the easy opening ... , the easy driving ...”) that specify the glory (*yásah*) of b. I have not troubled myself to figure out how the accent and other details of the formation would work, however.

On the possible double sense of *tvāḍātā* in b, see publ. intro.

I.10.8: *jéṣah*: The standard translation take this *s*-aor. subj. as a functional impv. parallel to *dhūnuhi* in d, whereas I take it as having real subjunctive value. This has the merit of providing a main clause to the subordinated *hí* clause of ab. Moreover, the otherwise identical pāda VIII.40.10 with 3rd sg. subj. *jéṣat* has clear subjunctive value, and in addition there is already a well-attested “*-si* imperative” *jéṣi* (7x) that fills that function for the *s*-aor., so it seems unlikely that *jéṣah* would be so used.

I.10.9: *āśrutkarṇa śrudhī*... shows the same transformation of an epithet into a derivationally related divine action as 6c.

I.10.10: Takes the verb phrase of 9a *śrudhī hávam* and elaborates on both its members, with b *havanaśrútam* and c *hūmahe*.

I.10.11: Kuśika is the ancestor of the Viśvāmitras, the family to which our poet belongs. As this is the last hymn attributed to Madhuchandas in this set, an ancestral reference is in order.

Dunkel (1997: 21) claims that the *ā* that opens this vs. cannot be the preverb, but most be his “asserative, sentence-initial **eh* ‘hey!’,” because *√pā* doesn’t otherwise appear with *ā*. He dismisses those who supply a verb of motion like ‘come’. But the numerous exx. of “come and drink” (e.g., VIII.65.5 *éhi naḥ sutām piba*; VIII.4.8 *tūyam éhi drāvā pība* and its variants) would favor a reduced expression of the sort “(come) here (and) drink...” Moreover, *ā tūl tū* is a common pāda opening.

I.11 Indra

I.11.1: The phraseology involving “songs” (*gīraḥ*) and “strengthening” (*√vṛdh*) matches that of the last verse of the preceding hymn (I.10.12) attributed to the father (or other ancestor) of this poet.

“Lord of prizes and lord of settlements” in d may set up an implicit contrast between battle and battle-like activity (contests with prizes) and peace.

I.11.2: “Conquerer” (*jétar-*) as epithet of Indra here may be responsible for the poet’s name Jetar in the Anukramaṇī.

I.11.3: Though the printed text reads *yádī* ‘if’, with (as often) lengthened final vowel, nothing prevents us from taking this as *yád ī*, ‘when’ + enclitic acc. pronoun, anticipating the expressed acc. obj. For this phenomenon, see Jamison 2002.

I.11.5: Though it may seem odd that the enemy Vala is called ‘fearless’, the other solution, to take *ābibhyuṣaḥ* as an “irregular” nom. pl. masc. pf. part. (expect *ābibhīvāṃsaḥ*) (so Sāy/Old), is not satisfying, esp. as it’s hard for me to see how the gods could be both “fearless” and “being pushed back” (although ET points out that they could have come to Indra’s aid without fear, even though being pushed back). The question is what syntactic function the gen./abl. *ābibhyuṣaḥ* is fulfilling. Re seems to take it as a gen. agent with *tujyāmānāsaḥ* (“pressés par le (dieu) sans peur”), but gen. agents are rare and confined to semantically and grammatically specialized situations (see Jamison 1979), and an ablative value “before,” as implied by Ge, seems better. Since expressions of fearing take the ablative, we can even assume an underlying implicit contrast: “the gods, (fearful) of [=from] the fearless one...”

I.11.6: Although Ge suggests simply that the poet is announcing Indra’s gifts to the river of his native land, this may have a further mythological reference. Esp. in X.108 (Saramā and the Paṇis), the (Vala) cave in which the Paṇis have trapped Indra’s cows is on the edge of the world, across the river (Rasā) that borders the world. Here the poet may be evoking this myth to indicate the efforts that he (and Indra) must expend to retrieve the good things his community desires, and to emphasize that poets and wise men (see also vs. 7) must bear witness to Indra’s deeds performed far away in order to attract his munificence.

I.12 Agni

I.12.6: The plethora of ritual fires implied by the āmreḍita *agnīm-agnim* in vs. 2 is made more explicit in this expression of the kindling of one fire by another, presumably (as Ge suggests) through the taking out of the Āhavanīya fire from the Gārhapatya, much treated in the later ritual lit. The Āhavanīya may be referred to in 5a *ghṛta-āhavana-* ‘whose oblation is ghee’, and in this vs. the second pāda (6b) might contain allusions to the three ritual fires, *grhāpati-* ‘household’ a transparent reference to the Gārhapatya and *yūvan-* ‘youth’ referring to the newly kindled Āhavanīya (see pāda a). However, this would leave *kavī-* ‘poet, sage-poet’ as a designation of the Dakṣiṇāgni, which doesn’t make a lot of sense, as far as I can see.

I.13 Āprī

On the Āprī hymns see the detailed examination by Lourens P. van den Bosch (IIIJ 28 [1985] 95–122, 169–89).

I.13.5: The singular *amṛtasya* ‘of the immortal’ seems to refer to the collectivity of gods who will come to the sacrifice and sit on the barhis. Vss. 7, 9 name some of the individual gods who will sit on the barhis.

I.14 All Gods

I.14.3: All these gods names are in the accusative, but there is no verb to govern them, either in the verse or in the immediately preceding or following pādas. One solution is to reach back to 2a *ā ACC kṛtvā ahūṣata* “The Kaṇvas have called ACC here,” though skipping over the intervening syntactic constructions is not appealing. However, the recurrence of a similar construction in 5ab *īlate ACC ... kṛtvāsaḥ* “The Kaṇvas solemnly invoke ACC” may suggest that the structure of invocation underlies the hymn.

I.14.4: Acdg. to Gr, *mādhvaḥ* is a nom. pl. masc. adj., modifying *drapsāḥ*. But it is surely a gen. sg. of the neut. noun: “drops of honey” (so also, e.g., Ge). Note the identical form in 7c, which has to be a gen. sg., varying with *mādhvaḥ*, also gen. sg., in the flg. vs. (8c) in the same metrical position. In fact, no exx. of *mādhvaḥ* identified as m. or f. nom. or acc. pl. are secure; they can all be interpr. as the gen. sg. of the noun. See further disc. ad IX.89.3.

I.14.6: By making pāda a a nominal sentence, from which the relative clause of bc hangs, I avoid the need to supply a main clause verb for c that other tr. encounter. E.g., Ge “Die ... Fahrrosse, die dich fahren, (mögen) die Götter ... her(fahren).” However, in the following vs. (7) Agni himself is urged to bring the gods here, so lumping together the transport of Agni and the gods as in my interpretation of 6 may not be in the spirit of their separation in 7. Nonetheless, I still feel that the syntactic argument is strong.

I.14.7: The ab pādas literally mean “make (the gods) possess wives,” but we know from the ritual that this refers to the coming of the gods *along with* their wives. Cf. III.6.9 *pātnīvataḥ ... devān ... ā vaha*. Ge translates our phrase literally: “Die Opferwürdigen ...

mache beweibt,” but then paraphrases it in his note: “D. h. bring ihre Frauen mit.” The problem would be solved by supplying the preverb *ā*, because *ā√kr* generally means ‘bring/attract here’. Although I am generally loathe to supply material without a clear warrant, it is the case that the immediately preceding pāda, 6c, begins with *ā*, which might have been taken to have domain over what follows.

I.14.9: The hapax *ākīm* (so, e.g., Gr, Aufr, HvN, Lub) or, more likely, *ā kīm* contains what is apparently a now meaningless particle *kīm*, matching the shape of the acc. particles *īm* and *sīm*. Though clearly derived from the interrogative **k^u*-stem, it has lost all interrogative value, presumably “laundered” through the weak negative indefinites *nā kīm* (or *nākīm*) and *mā kīm* (or *mākīm*). It is not at all clear what, if anything, *kīm* is doing here.

I.14.10: Instrumental plurals begin (*viśvebhiḥ*) and end (*dhāṁabhiḥ*) the verse. The question is whether they should be construed separately or together. Ge chooses the latter path: “Mit allen Verkörperungen des Mitra (der Freundschaft).” But because the hymn is dedicated to the Viśve Devas and there is an emphasis on them throughout (see esp. vss. 1, 9, with ‘gods’ or words referring to them collectively in vss. 2, 6, 7, 8), I prefer to supply ‘gods’ with *viśvebhiḥ* and take *dhāṁabhiḥ* separately (sim. Re, WG), interpreting *mitrāsya* not as the god’s name (or not principally the god’s name) but as referring to the alliance that undergirds the sacrificial system.

I.14.12: The construction involving the normally causal particle *hi* and the imperative is a troubling one. Brereton (2012 Bronkhorst Fs.) plausibly argues that in cases like this, with two imperative clauses in sequence, the *hi* clause expresses the action necessary for the second one to take place. In other words, the usual causal value of *hi* is found there as well, though the addition of imperative modality makes it difficult to render in English.

I.15 Sequential deities (for the ṛtugrahas)

Although this hymn is in some ways a rote and formulaic listing of the Ṛtugraha deities with invitations to drink of their respective cups, the poet does inject some life in the hymn by varying the expected phraseology. After having established the formula DRINK *ṛtúnā* in the first few verses, the poet introduces deviations from that formula. In vs. 5 he urges Indra to drink not from the Brahman’s cup (as would be standard: see II.36.5), but from the Brahman’s “largesse” (*rādhasaḥ*) and *ṛtúm ānu* substitutes for *ṛtúnā* (note the phonological crossing of *únā: ānu*). In vs. 6 there is no invitation to drink, though *ṛtúnā* is found in another expression. In vs. 7 the expected deity (“Wealth-giver”) appears in the nominative (*draviṇodā(h)*) as expected, but there is no attached predicate: the verse goes off in a different direction. The Wealth-giver is the subject of the next three verses (8-10) as well, but it is only in vs. 9 that any drinking goes on. Here the imperative “drink!” is replaced by the desiderative “desires to drink” (*pīpīṣati*), and though there is an ablative of a priestly cup, it is one belonging to a different priest and the verb used with it is not ‘drink’. Although this is not high art, it does show that even the most cut-and-dried litany affords some room to tinker with the verbal form.

I.15.1 The accent on *pība* is syntactically unnecessary and not well explained. Oldenberg (ZDMG 60) suggests either that it's a not explicitly marked foundation clause for the following clause, or that *pība* has a tendency to emphatic accentuation. Although he does not want to get the accent from *pībata ṛtúnā* in the next verse, where the accent is correct (following voc. *márutaḥ*; cf. also *pība ṛtúnā* in 4c, again with correct accent), this seems a possibility. One might also note that in the second Ṛtugraha hymn sequence (II.37.1-3), the verb is accented in the phrase *pība ṛtúbhiḥ*, though again the accent is unnecessary. So perhaps *pība ṛtúnā/ṛtúbhiḥ* was a separable refrain-phrase in the Ṛtugraha ritual, and therefore received accent even when incorporated into a hymnal context. See now comm. ad III.32.1.

I.15.2: *sudānavaḥ* lacks accent and is therefore a vocative, not (as the tr. implies) a predicative nominative. The predicated vocative has been much discussed in the lit.; see Old, *Noten* ad loc. and Bloomfield, *RR*. On this repeated pāda see comm. ad VIII.7.12.

I.15.3: Tvaṣṭar is called Neṣṭar ('leader') here because he regularly "leads" the wives of the gods.

I.15.4: The three wombs are presumably the three ritual fires, so "at/by" would be a more felicitous translation than the published "in."

I.15.6: The voc. *dhṛtavrata* 'of steadfast commandments' is apparently a *singular* in the Saṃhitā text, though the Pp. reads -ā. There is, however, no sandhi situation that could have triggered a shortening of the final vowel. Although the epithet is several times found in the du. modifying Mitra and Varuṇa (VIII.25.2, 8), it is more often in the singular modifying only Varuṇa (e.g., I.44.14, 141.9), and this may have been the intent here. The *vrata* is really Varuṇa's province, not Mitra's. However, the matter is complicated by the fact that the clear dual dvandva voc. *mītrāvaruṇa* in b also has a singular ending, rather than expected -ā. I would attribute this shortening to an attempt to match the short final of sg. *dhṛtavrata*, rather than assuming the shortening affected both words for the same reason. Alternatively, as JL points out to me, it would be possible to consider the final short vowel of *dhṛtavrata* an example of Kuiper's Law, with loss of final laryngeal in pausa, though this could not account directly for the following *mītrāvaruṇa*, which is the real problem.

I.15.9: For *prā√sthā* with soma as expressed or implied obj., see parallels cited at VI.41.2.

I.16 Indra

I.16.1: It's not clear why Indra's horses are called *sūracakṣas*- 'having the eye of the sun', a word otherwise (3x) used of gods. The awkward doubling of the enclitic *tvā* (found in both a and c, as object of the same verb) might suggest that the c pāda was borrowed from elsewhere. And indeed this hymn gives the impression of being assembled from ready-made formulae; the proportion of repeated pādas is fairly high (see Bloomfield, *RR*), not to mention sub-pāda repetitions. JL suggests, however, that the repeated *tvā*

might not be the result of careless doubling, but rather the stranded object of a gapped repetition of *vahantu* in pāda a.

I.17 Indra and Varuṇa

I.17.3: The other standard translations take *tarpayethām* as a self-beneficial reflexive “satisfy yourselves” with *anukāmām* referring to the gods’ desire (e.g., Ge “freuet euch nach Herzenslust”; Re “Rassasiez-vous à votre gré”), but this doesn’t make sense. The whole hymnic context depicts Indra and Varuṇa as givers, not takers, and it’s not clear to me that gods ever desire wealth, per se. It is much more likely that the poet is asking the gods to grant *us* wealth, and that the *kāma* is the mortals’, not the gods’. For further discussion, with a strikingly parallel usage, see Jamison 1983: 140-41 and esp. n. 73, though I would not now emend the text to **ānu kāmam*, as I suggested there. Curiously, though Ge *translates* the verb as a reflexive, he goes to elaborate pains to *interpret* the whole phrase as urging the gods to give us their wealth, in other words much the same meaning as I favor.

In b *rāyā ā* is ambiguous as to case; it could be either dat. *rāye* or abl./gen. *rāyas* (so Pp.). Ge takes it as a gen., construed with *anukāmām*, but *rāyā ā* is a fairly well-established expression (e.g., I.81.7, III.56.6) and the *rāya* seems too distant from *anukāmām* to be naturally construed with it. Most other tr. seems to favor the dat. (see esp. disc. of Old ad loc, also Re.), but I weakly favor an abl. reading “from (your) wealth.”

A further question is what noun to supply with *nēdiṣṭham* ‘closest’ or what else to do with it. Ge suggests ‘wealth’ in a note; Re seems to take the word as adverbial (“de la manière la plus proche,” whatever that means). My supplied “friendship” is based on two occurrences of *āpyam* (VII.15.1, VIII.73.6) and one of *āpīm* ‘friend’ with *nēdiṣṭham*. Esp. telling is VIII.73.6 *nēdiṣṭham yāmy āpyam* “I beseech (you two) for closest friendship,” with the same verb as here.

I.17.4: A curious construction: $\sqrt{bhū} + \text{GEN.}$, which seems to express partitive value: “become (part of) X” → “partake of,” though the path to partitive meaning is not straightforward. (Other translators seem to feel less guilt about making this leap than I do.) Closest to it formulaically is *vidyāma* + GEN, “might we know of X.” Cf. *vidyāma sumatīnām* (I.4.3, X.89.17) “might we know (of) your favors.” The oddity of the construction is exacerbated by the emphatic pāda-initial repetition (a, b) of indeclinable *yuvāku* ‘of you two’.

I.17.5: As noted in the intro., this is the middle verse of the hymn and the only one in which Indra and Varuṇa are separated, and in my view translations that don’t take this into account are likely to be on the wrong track. (So, Ge’s “Indra, Varuṇa sind der preisliche Rat der rühmlichen Tausendschenker,” which puts all nominatives and all genitives together.) The rhetorical structure of ab, nom. sg. – gen. pl. / nom. sg. – gen. pl., invites an association of each nom. sg. with its immediately following gen. pl., producing a contrastive pair of Indra associated with thousand-giving and Varuṇa with (something) to be proclaimed. I have followed this rhetoric clue and, further, have tentatively supplied

a noun ('master') to head the gen. phrase. Alternatively, *krátuḥ* of c may be the head ("Indra becomes the *krātu* of ..."), as WG take it (also Ge).

There is the further question of what *śamsyānām* refers to. I have somewhat reluctantly supplied 'riches', since this is a theme of the hymn and *śamsyā-* several times modifies *rayī-* and similar words (e.g., VIII.60.11, X.47.2). However, it also regularly qualifies verbal products like *ukthyā-* or *ukthā-*, and given Varuṇa's nature, an association with "(solemn words) to be proclaimed" is probably more likely than with "(riches) to be proclaimed." I might therefore modify my published translation, though the desire for wealth is quite strong in this hymn (see vss. 3-4, 6-7).

I.17.8: The doubled *nū nū* 'now now, just now' is found only here, though doubling with an intercalated particle is found (*nū cin nū* I.120.2, VI.37.3, VII.22.8). It is possible that the sequence *nū nū vām* is meant to evoke a form of \sqrt{nu} 'bellow, shout', in this verse concerning the poet's praise of the gods. Various forms of song and so forth serve as subjects of \sqrt{nu} . Cf. nearby I.6.6, 7.1.

I.17.9: *suṣṭutī-* 'lovely praise' is not a particularly good obj. of *huvé*, which ordinarily takes the addressee, not the content of the call. (See ... *vām ... huvé* in vs. 7.) Here the semantic disharmony may suggest that the lovely praise is personified and urged to do her part to please Indra and Varuṇa.

I.18 Brahmanaspati and Sadaspati

I.18.1: Though *somānam* is assigned to a *-man-*stem by Debrunner (*AiG* II.2.760), it seems preferable to analyze it, with Kuiper (IJ 15 [1973]: 190–94 [my thanks to ET for the ref.]), as having the so-called "Hoffmann suffix" (*-*Hon-* / -*Hn-*) (Hoffmann 1955 = *Aufs.* II, 378-83) added to the thematic noun *sóma-*, of the same type as Aves. *mθrān-* 'possessing *mθras*' to *mθra-*. Our *somānam* is a hapax, so there are no diagnostic forms; a masc. agent noun in *-mán* would also have suffixal accent and a long suffixal vowel (cf. *dharmānam*, *-as* 'upholder(s)'). In favor of the Hoffmann-suffix interpretation is the quadrisyllabic scansion, inviting distraction of the *-ā-*, which should not occur in a *man-*stem. The accent might be a problem; Hoffmann is somewhat cagey about the accent of these forms (not difficult, since most of his examples are Avestan), but he does suggest (p. 381) that the original accent of the acc. sg. might fall on the suffix, as here. Kuiper makes no mention of the accent. For another likely ex., see *stavān* and comm. ad VI.24.8.

Most translators (Ge 'Lautsingenden(?)', Re, Schmidt B+I, WG) take *svāraṇam* to the 'sound' root \sqrt{svar} , though Gr connects it with *svār-* 'sun' ('glanzreich'). The metrical distraction to *suvāraṇam* might favor a connection with the 'sun' word, since, as far as I know, the 'sound' root is never so distracted. This hapax is also phonologically reminiscent of *svārṇara-* 'possessing solar glory', whose initial cluster is always distracted and which almost always occupies the end of the pāda, as our word does. At the very least, it is likely that *svāraṇa-* is a pun.

It is surprising to find Kakṣīvant Auśija, the dazzling poet of I.116-26, in the context of this rather simple and mundane hymn, for Medhātithi certainly lacks Kakṣīvant's skill. The request must then be seen as a species of wishful thinking. I

translated *auśijā-* literally, as ‘descendant of a fire-priest’, though it is also Kakṣīvant’s metronymic, because I think the word previews the Agni theme of the second half of this hymn. However, I now think the final clause *yá auśijāh* may be an izafe-like construction further specifying Kakṣīvant by this metronymic. The publ. tr. follows Ge in assuming a desired identification of Medhātithi with Kakṣīvant: Ge “Mach ... zu einem (zweiten) Kakṣīvat.” ET points out that there is actually no overt mention of Medhātithi and the verse could simply mean “make Kakṣīvant a possessor of soma ...” But then we still must explain the presence of Kakṣīvant here.

I.18.3: The *śámso áruruṣaḥ ... mártasya* “(male)diction of the grudging mortal,” which is dreaded by the poet, anticipates the desirable *nárāśámsa-* ‘praise of men’ that opens the last verse of the hymn (9).

I.18.6: *ayāsiṣam*: I take this form to the root $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘beseech, implore’, not to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive, go’, which does, admittedly, have a well-attested *-sis-*aorist. So also WG, though other translators (including Schmidt, B+I) render as a verb of motion (Ge “habe ich ... angegangen”). That interpretation isn’t impossible, but ‘beseech’ fits the context better.

I.18.7: If the referent of *yásmāt* is Agni and the two halves of the hymn concern the verbal and the physical parts of the sacrifice respectively, as I argue in the intro., this verse makes particular sense: even a skilled poet has to get the oblations right.

I.18.8: All standard tr. take *hótrā* as nom. sg. and the subject of the clause. But since the point of this verse and the last one is the labor Agni expends in making the sacrifice succeed, it seems better to keep him as subj. of *gachatī*, as he was of *ṛdhnotī* (a) and *kṛnotī* (b). *hótrā* can then be an instr. sg. of the *-ā*-stem, as commonly. The ritual model in which Agni goes to the gods with the offering is of course quite widespread in the RV.

I.18.9: Note the high proportion of sibilants in this verse.

The meaning of *makhá-* and its relatives (here represented by the second cmpd. member *-makhas-*) is much discussed. I consider it to have both martial and bountiful senses. I take the original sense to be martial and, despite some difficulties, believe the often suggested connection with Grk. μάχομαι. The ‘bounteous’ sense comes, in my opinion, from secondary association with *maghá-*, etc. In this compound *sádmamakhas-* most tr. take the second member in a ‘give, be bounteous’ sense (e.g., Ge “der einen Wohnsitz beschert,” Re “qui confère-généreusement un siège,” WG “den ... mit einem Himmelssitz freigebigen”). However, the martial sense fits the context well. The image is of the smoke of the ritual fire rising to, and thus visually ‘besieging’, heaven itself (so Gr). See Old’s disc.; Scar (277) questioningly suggests both.

I.19 Agni and the Maruts

I.19.4: Note the double etymological figures *arkám āṇṛcúḥ* ‘chanted the chant’ and *ugráḥ ... ójasā* ‘strong ones ... through strength’, with the former nested inside the latter. There is also phonological play between ...*ám āṇṛ-* and *ánādhṛ-*

I.19.7–8: Ge (sim. Re) supplies a verb (“kommen”) with 7b. I am, as usual, reluctant to do so, but as ET points out, swinging the mountains across the sea is a very peculiar image. I would prefer to supply the ‘stretch’ (*ā ... tánvantī*) of the next verse, since the b pādas of 7–8 are structurally identical, producing a tr. of 7ab “Those who make the mountains swing, (as they stretch) across the undulating sea.” However, Ge/Re don’t construe the ‘stretch’ verb with 8b either.

I.20 R̥bhus

I.20.1 Calling the R̥bhus “the godly breed” (*devá- jánman-*) is a bold way to begin this hymn precisely because they did not begin as gods but obtained immortality by their wondrous deeds — the deeds about to be recounted in the hymn.

I.20.2: Although *vacoyújā* is principally a dual acc., modifying the two fallow bays (*hárī*) as usual, it could also secondarily be taken as an instr. sg., modifying *mānasā* ‘with mind’. In any case, ‘speech’ and ‘mind’ are implicitly contrasted in this verse, and in addition *mānasā* contrasts with *āsayā* ‘by mouth’, referring to the means of creating.

I.20.3: Though Ge (/WG) takes *sabardúgha-* as the cow’s name, the word has a literal sense that works well in context.

I.20.5: A reference to the Third Pressing, with which the R̥bhus are associated.

I.21 Indra and Agni

The verbal “hero” of this hymn is the nom.-acc. du. pronoun *tā* ‘these two’, which represents the pairing of the otherwise very different gods Indra and Agni. The form appears 6x in the hymn, with an additional gen.-loc. *tāyoḥ* in 1b.

I.21.6: The opening of this vs., *téna satyéna*, is of course the standard signal of the later truth formulation (satyakriyā). It is difficult to impose such a value here, but the phrase *can* be seen as a summary of the praise-hymn that precedes this final vs. and therefore as the grounds on which the poet asks for their vigilance and help.

Ge (followed by WG) considers the *padá-* that is to be watched over the track or traces of something demonic or monstrous (“Die Spur der Unholde”), presumably the *rākṣas-* of the previous vs. But Re (XIV.121) points out that the root \sqrt{gr} ‘be watchful, wakeful’ always governs an object with favorable sense. Still, the exact reference of *padá-* is unclear. As the word is often used of the ritual ground (e.g., in the phrase *īlās padé* “in the footprint of refreshment” [I.128.1, etc.]), I have interpreted it in this way in the transl. But it’s also possible to invoke another common use of the word, for the cosmogonic footsteps of Viṣṇu, an example of which is in the last verse of the next hymn, also close to a form of \sqrt{gr} (I.22.21): *jāgrvāṃsaḥ ... víṣṇor yát paramám padám* “watchful (over) what is the highest footprint of Viṣṇu.” These two views can in fact be reconciled. As noted below, the “highest footprint of Viṣṇu” in that verse is probably a reference to the sun, identified with the ritual fire, and therefore here “the footprint of discernment” can be both the ritual ground and Viṣṇu’s footprint in heaven.

I.22 Various divinities

I.22.4: The use of the diminutivizing *-ka*-suffix on *dūraké* ‘at a (little) distance’ reinforces the point of the verse, that it’s not much of a trip for the Aśvins to come here.

I.22.6: It is not entirely clear why we “desire the commandments (*vratāni*)” of Savitar, though I think it is likely that it is because his *vratā* keep the world functioning, esp. the cyclical rising and setting of the sun.

I.22.10: Note the opening phonetic figure *ā gnā agna*.

The shadowy goddess figures mentioned here are difficult to sort out. I assume that there are three goddesses here, with Hotrā Bhāratī the double name of the deified libation belonging to the Bharatas. In this passage Ge takes them as two different figures (also in II.1.11, III.62.3), but in I.142.9 as a doubly named single figure. See Old (SBE, ad I.142.9): “Hotrā Bhāratī, i.e., the personified Offering of the Bharatas, seems to be one goddess, more usually called simply Bhāratī,” with reff.

I.22.11: The goddesses “with unclipped wings” (*āchinnapatra-*) are found only here in the RV, but appear in a set of YV mantras used in the Agnicayana at the placing and heating of the ukhā pot (for firing the bricks). See VS XI.61, MS II.76, KS XVI.6, ŚB VI.5.4.8, etc. A number of other female divinities are mentioned in the same context. What *āchinnapatra-* actually refers to is unclear to me. Griffith (ad VS XI.61) suggests “moving freely and without interruption.” It might evoke the myth of the originally winged mountains, whose wings Indra clipped so that they would settle down. But the mountains are masculine figures. I also do not see any sign of the later Agnicayana employment here, simply an association with other female divine figures.

I.22.13: *mahī* is grammatically ambiguous, as it can be either fem. singular or fem. (or neut.) dual. Most tr. take it as the former, modifying only *dyaúh*, but all things being equal, it is preferable to take *dyaúh* as masculine (though fem. occasionally is unavoidable), esp. as *mahī* by itself can refer to the earth without further specification. I see no reason why *mahī* cannot be dual here, modifying the conjoined NP *dyaúh pṛthivī ca*. For the contribution of passages like this to the rare “fem.” forms of *dyaúh* see disc. ad I.57.5.

I.22.14: The meaning of this verse is entirely obscure to me, and it comes as a surprise in a hymn (or set of hymns) displaying no other verbal tricks at all. (It is true that the Gandharva spreads obscurity almost every place he appears in the RV.) I might speculate that what the verse is conveying is that by their inspired hymns the poets have achieved a place in the highest firmament, where the Gandharva often seems to be located, and where they consume the luscious food produced by Heaven and Earth. If this speculation has any merit, the instr. *dhītibhiḥ* should not be taken as an instrument of licking (“lick ... with their poetic insights”), but rather as an instr. of cause (“by reason of their [prior and successful] poetic insights”), so the publ. tr. could be amended accordingly.

I.22.15: On *anrkṣarā-* as ‘not sweeping men away’, rather than ‘thornless’, see Jamison 1993 (Fs. Rix). The standard ‘thornless’ interpretation has no real support; I derive the word instead from *a-nṛ-kṣara-*, to the root $\sqrt{kṣar}$ ‘flow, stream’, cognate with Greek φθείρω ‘I destroy’. Formulaic and textual support for this analysis is given in the art. cit.

“A place to settle down” (*nivésanī*) might have been better tr. adjectivally “bring to rest, causing to settle down,” but this causes awkwardness in the English.

I.22.16-18: This *ṛca* is marked by minor ring composition: the *ātaḥ* [sandhi *āto*] ‘from there’ that begins 16a also begins the last pāda of 18, in the same sandhi form.

I.22.20: The image in pāda c needs a little unpacking. The “eye in heaven” is of course the sun; the incongruity is that it is depicted as “stretched out,” which might suggest an elongated ovoid sun, not a happy picture. The concentrated expression of pāda c rests on the common formula of the sun stretching (through space) with its rays (*raśmī-*), as in VII.47.4 *yāḥ sūryo raśmībhir ātatāna* “towards which [=waters] the sun has stretched with its rays.” Note that *sūrāyaḥ* ‘patrons’ ending b phonologically evokes the absent *sūrīya-* in c.

I.22.21: This verse also contains some semantic incongruities: “kindling the footstep” is of course a curious expression, and that poets, presumably human, perform this action on the “highest footstep of Viṣṇu,” usually an expression for highest heaven, makes it all the odder. Ge (also Old, WG) plausibly identify “the highest footstep of Viṣṇu” here as the sun, and the verse would therefore express the common notion that priests kindling the ritual fire at dawn cause the sun to shine.

I.23 Various gods (Prauḡaśāstra)

I.23.4-6: This *ṛca* to Mitra and Varuṇa stations the two names in three different ways in the three verses. In 4 *mitrā-* opens the first pāda and *vāruṇa-* the second; in 5 they are expressed in the dual dvandva *mitrāvāruṇā* in c; in 6 they again open the first two pādas, but with *vāruṇa-* first and *mitrā-* second.

I.23.8: It is striking that all of ab is made up of vocatives, with each one accented: because of the place of the accent, three of the four words *have* to be vocatives; only *īndrajyeṣṭhā(h)* could be nom. pl., since *īndra-* has inherent initial accent. The first word of c, *vīśve*, may also be and probably is a voc., making a pair with voc. *dēvāsaḥ*, which opens the preceding pāda. On the voc. of *vīśva-* see comm. ad X.15.6.

It would be satisfying to have three GOD-X bahuvrīhis parallel in semantic and morphological structure, but although Ge (followed by WG) interprets the *rāti-* in *pūṣa-rātayaḥ* as an agent noun (“mit Pūṣan als Gönner”), *rāti-* both as simplex and in its fairly numerous compounds is always an abstract ‘giving’ or concretized version thereof (‘gift’), as its morphology as a deverbal feminine abstract would require. I therefore take the third cmpd as a tatpuruṣa *pūṣa-rāti-* the gift(s)/giving of Pūṣan’. It owes its initial accent to the fact that it is a voc. (as does the bahuvrīhi *mārudgaṇāḥ* [expect **marúdgana-*].) The ‘gift’ or ‘giving’ of Pūṣan is described as auspicious (*bhadrā*) in VI.58.1.

I.23.9: Ge (WG), following Gr, tr. *sáhasā* as an adj. modifying Indra (“mit dem starken Indra”), but this is of course impossible. With that accent it must be a neut.; accent shift to **sahás-* would turn it into an adjective, but this form is unattested (versus, e.g., *yásás-* ‘glory’ → *yásás-* ‘glorious’).

On the analysis of fairly common 3rd sg. *īśata* (always with *mā(kiḥ)*) as an injunc. to a reduplicated aor., see Hoffmann 1967 (*Injunk.*): 64-66 (seemingly accepted by Lub, Concordance). Although he adduces semantic and syntactic factors that impose this interpretation, it nonetheless does not seem entirely satisfying, because the thematic stem envisioned (*īśa-* [never accented]) seems insufficiently distinguished from the presential perfect stem *īś-*, and Hoffmann does not suggest a mechanism for deriving such an aorist stem from either the presential perfect stem or directly from the root. Moreover, his argument that *mā* preventive clauses should have an aorist might falter in the face of a root that simply lacks an aorist. (See now IH’s work demonstrating just that.) I prefer Debrunner’s explanation, rejected by Hoffmann, that *īśata* represents a re-marking of *īśa* with *-ta* to make it more clearly a 3rd sg. Judging from the accent (*īśe*, *īśāna-* [versus *īśānā-*]), the old presential perfect had been mostly reanalyzed as a root present, and *īśa* would be an anomalous 3rd sg. injunctive to such a present.

I.23.13-15: As noted in the intro., I take the “king” that Pūṣan is returning as Agni, not, with most tr., Soma. The theme of the finding and returning of the god-in-hiding in 14 is much more appropriate for Agni than for Soma, and the “glittering barhis” is also more likely to be associated with Agni. Both Agni and Soma are called “buttress, support” (13) (Agni in V.15.1–2) and both are called king (14). The drops (*indu-*) in 15 might seem rather to indicate Soma, but in VI.16.16 Agni is strengthened by drops (*indubhiḥ*), which must be drops of ghee.

I.23.15: The ritual referent of the “six yoked” entities (*ṣaḍ yuktān*) is unclear, no matter whether Soma or Agni is taken as the main referent: those in the Soma camp consider the yoked ones to be the dakṣiṇās due the poet; I consider them the flames of the recovered Agni, roused by the drops of ghee. In terms of the simile in c, the six yoked ones are clearly the teams for plowing. See esp. AV VI.91.1, cited by Schaefer (1994: 197). On *anu √sidh* as ‘entlangtreiben’, see Schaefer 1994: 196–97.

In my translation I have reversed the renderings of the finite intensive (unaccented *carkṛśat* in c) and the intensive participle (accented *anuséṣidhat*) to make the relationship between simile and frame clearer.

I.23.16: Contra Ge and others but with Re, I construe the gen. pl. *adhvarīyatām* ‘of those performing the rites’ with *ādhvabhiḥ* ‘along the roads’, as I do not think the waters are the mothers of the priests (Ge “Die Mütter der diensttuenden (Priester)”).

I.23.18: Ge and others attach b to a, with c a separate sentence, which is also possible.

I.23.19: Again I disagree with most tr. in the disposition of the b pāda. I take it with a, because I think we mortals are to glorify the waters. Others think the gods should become

strong or victorious in order to praise the waters – but gods are not usually the agents of such praising.

I.23.20-23 = X.9.6-9, save that the fourth pāda of 20 is missing in X.9.6.

I.23.20: The semi-direct speech and esp. the casual conversational tone of this verse are quite unusual for the RV. Although most tr. take the whole as indirect speech (“Soma said to me that...”), the construction of the verse seems to me to mix direct and indirect speech, with c, couched in the acc., shading into indirect speech. I take the final pāda separately, as it is absent from the parallel in X.9.6.

Note the distraction of the *apsú antár* phrase that opens 19a into two pāda opening words: 20a #*apsú* ... b #*antár*.

I.23.22: The construction of the 2nd hemistich is complex, containing a double *vā* conjoining two *yád* clauses and an *utá*, which reaches back to conjoin the indefinite *yát kím ca durítám mama* “whatever trouble is in me” (b) and the final word of the vs. *ánrtam* (d). The two *yád* clauses of cd are alternative expansions of the indefinite expression of b, while *ánrtam* is a new term. So Ge, WG, and, with explicit disc. of the construction, Klein (DGRV I.301). By contrast Lü (417; sim. Ober II.37) takes *ánrtam* as part of the 2nd *yád vā* clause and seems to ignore the *utá*: “... was immer Sunde an mir ist, was ich betrogen habe oder was ich geschworen habe als Lüge

I.23.23: Most tr. take *āpah* as acc. here (“I have followed the waters.”). This is of course possible: the nom. of this stem does get used for acc. occasionally in the RV. However, such an interpr. is not nec. in this case, since it is easy to supply an acc. “you.” And the fact that the two previous vss. (21a and 22a) contain vocatives *āpah* and *āpah* respectively supports a vocative interpretation here.

I.23.24: It is difficult to know what, if anything, is the referent of *asya*. I have tentatively supplied ‘hymn’, but the poet may simply be calling upon the gods to witness the general situation (so Ge). The same expression √ *VID me asya* is found in the refrain of I.105, except with accented *asyá*, for which reason I more confidently supply ‘speech’ there.

[I.24–25 JPB]

I.26 Agni

I.26.1: As often, the *hí* in the first of two imperative clauses marks the action urged in ab as subordinate to and the basis for the consequence expressed in c. See Brereton 2012.

I.26.2: As on some other occasions the pāda-final *vācaḥ*, superficially a nom.-acc. (or a stem form), is to be construed as an instr. with the instr. adj. (*divítmatā* in this case), whatever the source of this truncated form. (See M. Hale [Fs. Melchert] for an attempt, unsuccessful in my view, to see it as an archaic zero-grade *s*-stem instr. [*-*es-H*, not the renewed and standard *-*es-eH*]. For further disc. see comm. ad VIII.39.2.) In this particular phrase, the existence of a fully instr. parallel in X.76.6 *vācā divítā divítmatā*

strongly suggests that *vācaḥ* should indeed be construed with *divítmatā* here. On *divítmant-* itself, see comm. ad IV.31.11.

I.26.3: A paradigm ex. of the use of the act. of \sqrt{yaj} to express sacrificing on behalf of someone other than the grammatical subj.

I.26.5: In the phrase ... *asyá naḥ, mándasva sakhyásya ca* most tr. render the *ca* as ‘also’ and construe the demonstrative with the noun (Ge “... freue dich auch dieser Freundschaft mit uns”). However, the most natural way to take the syntax is as a conjoined NP: “of this (x) and the comradeship of ours.” The question is what *asyá* is modifying. Following Gr I supply ‘ritual grass’, because *barhíḥ* is the most recent ritual referent (4a). Although “rejoicing in ritual grass” may seem an odd activity, cf. VIII.13.4=VIII.15.5 *mandānó asyá barhíṣo ví rājasí*, with the same verb \sqrt{mand} ‘rejoice’ and the fuller version of the nominal phrase. (As it happens, in that passage I construe the *barhíṣ* phrase with the main verb *ví rājasí*, but it is certainly ambiguous.)

I.26.8: Although most tr. implicitly take pāda a as subordinated to b (e.g., Ge. “Denn wenn ..., so...”), again the *ca* suggests rather that they are coordinate structures, with pāda a a nominal sentence (*svagnáyaḥ* predicated of *devāsaḥ*) coordinated with the finite verb *dadhiré* in b. This verb is accented because it is under the domain of *hí* in a. In this reading, pāda c functions as the main cl. of ab.

I also supply ‘him’ (=Agni) as first object of *dadhiré*, again unlike most tr. (eg., Ge “so bringen sie auch uns Erwünschtes”). For the reasons for this in the structure of the hymn, see disc. in intro.

I.27 Agni

I.27.1: *vandádhyai* is a predicated infinitive, serving as the main verb.

Pāda a contains a likely pun, the possessive -*vant*-stem adj. *vāravantam* modifying Agni. In the first instance it means ‘having (that is, providing) choice things’ (*vāra-*, to \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’), but the homonym *vāra-* means ‘hair, tail-hair’ (cf., e.g., nearby I.32.12) and so the -*vant*-stem can mean ‘possessing (long) tail-hair’. Either of these meanings is applicable to the horse of the simile, which has tail-hair by nature and brings choice things by winning races and contests. ‘Bringing choice things’ is more applicable to Agni than ‘having hair’, but his flames could be so conceived. Note that Agni is characterized as “ghee-haired” (*ghṛtā-keśa-*) in VIII.60.2.

I.27.2: With Old I supply *śávasaḥ* with *sūnūḥ*, to complete the common epithet of Agni “son of strength,” which is suggested by the associated instr. *śávasā*. Indirect support might come from the parallel voc. *sahasō yaho* ‘o young (son) of strength’ (with a different word for strength, also regularly appearing as an epithet of Agni) that ends the preceding hymn (I.26.10c). However, this supplement is not strictly necessary, and most tr. do not supply it (e.g., Ge simply “unser Sohn”). In favor of a translation like Ge’s is the presence of *naḥ* in pāda a. However, this could simply be a Wackernagel place-holder for *asmākam* in c. Although the difference might seem slight, in fact the two interpretations are quite different. Ge’s emphasizes that *we* have created Agni, supplying

‘our’ with *śávasā* (“unser Sohn durch (unsere) Kraft”); this might suggest that Agni is in our debt because we begot him and he ought therefore to become our benefactor. The other tr. invest Agni with his own strength and hopes that he will graciously use some of it to benefit us.

I.27.6: With Ge (/WG) and Re I take the expression in pāda b as a simile or comparison that provides the basis for the verb ‘stream’ (*kṣarasī*) in c. Agni/the fire cannot literally be on or in a river’s wave.

I.27.7: It is difficult not to interpret the agent noun *yantā* in c as a periphrastic future, given the subjunctives in ab, *pace* Tichy 1995: 226. Although it is sometimes claimed that no examples (or “no certain examples”) of this usage are found in the Saṃhitās (see esp. Macdonell VGS §152), there are too many passages in the RV where a future interpretation of the *-tar*-stem is more natural and fits the context better than a purely agentive one.

I.27.8: Since this verse continues the thought of 7, the agent noun *paryetā* in b should likewise be future in value, despite Ge’s “Keiner überholt ihn.”

asya ... kāyasya cit: most tr. take these two genitives as coreferential, with the indefinite referring to a person – so Ge’s “Keiner überholt ihn, wer er auch sei.” But the person in question has already been defined as a client of Agni’s, and so an indefinite seems odd in context. Moreover, the other two instances of *paryetār*- both take inanimate complements; cf. VII.40.3 *nā tāsya rāyāḥ paryetāsti* “There exists no one who can encompass his wealth.” Therefore I take *kāyasya cit* as referring to anything belonging to the favored man, expressed by *asya*. Ge’s note seems to lean in this direction, but not his tr.

On *śravāyya*- see I.31.5 below.

I.27.10: The supposed voc. *jārābodha* in a is problematic on several grounds. It is generally taken to mean something like “attentive to the early call,” but 1) the first member, *jārā*-, is only attested in the meaning ‘old age’ (hence Old’s suggested “im (bis zum) Greisenalter wachend”), and 2) the second member, the thematic nominal *bodhā*-, is not otherwise found in the RV (though it does occur in the AV). I therefore prefer to interpret it as a pair of linked imperatives, *jārā bodha*. The latter is found 5x in the RV, as impv. to the thematized aor. to *√budh* ‘awake’; the former would belong to the thematic pres. *jāra*- of *√gr̥jṛ* ‘sing’. Although this present is ordinarily only middle (vs. *jāratī* ‘make old’), attraction in voice would not be surprising in a construction like this. The long *-ā* of *jārā* simply reflects the common lengthening of the 2nd sg. impv. Although we might expect *bodha* to be accented, it may have lost the accent when the construction ceased to be understood, or it may never have received it in this close semantic nexus. Under this analysis the order of imperatives is actually “sing (and) awake!” which I have reordered for clarity. Alternatively, we might take *jārā* to *√gr̥jṛ* ‘awake’, which likewise builds a Class I middle pres., and translate “awake (and) take heed.” See Gotō 1987: 150-56 for discrimination of the various Class I *jāra*- presents.

Since *dṛśīka*- is otherwise a neut. substantive, I have rendered it as appositional to *stómam* rather than as an adjective (e.g., Ge “ein schönes Lied”). So also Re (“un corps-

de-louange, chose belle à voir”). Note also the synesthesia, with the praise-song something to be seen, not heard. This usage somewhat anticipates the later Vedic notion that ṛṣis “see” divinely bestowed sāmāns.

I.28 Indra (Abbreviated Soma Rite)

See intro. for detailed discussion of my interpretation of the context of the hymn, which differs significantly from the standard view. I discuss this further in a treatment of the prehistory of the śrauta/gṛhya ritual split: “Vedic Ritual: The Sacralization of the Mundane and the Domestication of the Sacred” (Thite Fs., 2019, ed. Lauren Bausch).

Note the *l*-forms *ulūkhala(ka)-* (vss. 1–mn.6) and *jalgulaḥ* (1–4), which fit the low-register, popular content of the hy

I.28.1: Both *prthūbudhna-* ‘having a broad bottom’ and *ūrdhvā-* appear to be double-entendres. The salacious references continue, more clearly, in vss. 3–4.

I.28.3: On the medial *śikṣate* with acc. see comm. ad VIII.42.3.

I.28.4: The word *mānthā-* occurs only here in the RV; it clearly refers to the churning stick later known as *mantha* or *cāt(t)ra-*, which is bound around with cords that, manipulated by a priest, move it rapidly back and forth while its bottom tip is inserted in the hole (*yoni*) of the lower kindling stick (*arāṇi-*) to create the friction that produces fire. The cords here are obviously likened to reins. For equine imagery in this context and for further disc. of the process, see comm. ad X.27.14.

Here there is a bit of slippage between frame and simile (as Ge also notes, n. 4a): though acc., the reins (*raśmīn*) should not be directly compared to the churning stick, also acc. (*manthām*), and we might rather expect instr. **raśmībhiḥ*. However, it’s quite possible that *raśmīn* is actually dependent on *yāmitavaī* and is not directly parallel to *manthām*. So perhaps “when they bind the churning stick, as if to control the reins” (vel sim.); for other passages in which *raśmīn* is obj. of *√yam* see I.144.11, VIII.35.21.

What is somewhat puzzling is what the reference to the churning stick is doing in this hymn focused on the preparation of soma, since the implement and the process are characteristic of the production of the ritual fire. Either kindling the ritual fire is considered part of the soma preparation here, or, more likely, the pestle used to pound the soma stalks has been homologized to the churning stick, in great part because of the highly sexualized nature of that implement in the fire-kindling ritual (see comm. ad X.27.14).

The inf. *yāmitavaī* here is one of the few not appearing in the configuration *-tavā u*, on which see Klein, Particle *u*, 164–67. Inter alia, the substitution of *iva* for **u* gives the desired iambic cadence.

I.28.6: The reference in this verse is not entirely clear, but “the lord of the wood” (*vānaspāti-*, ordinarily a word for tree, or an esp. prominent tree, then applied the sacrificial post) is probably here the pestle and metaphorically the erect penis. If so, *āgram* might be better tr. ‘tip’ than ‘top’ and the whole clause as “the wind blows across [rather than ‘through’] your tip.” In an unpublished paper on this hymn, “Rgveda I.28 and the Two Forms of Pressing Soma,” Hanns-Peter Schmidt cites a Kuntāpa verse AV

20.136.6 = ŚŚŚ 12.24.2.7, which he tr. “The harlot, stepping over the mortar, said, ‘Just as on thee, o tree (o wooden mortar), they strike (with the pestle) so may they strike on me,’” which also shows the connection of mortar and pestle with unlicensed sex. If the tr. is correct, the “lord of the wood” there is the mortar, not the pestle, as it seems to be here. In vs. 8 below, both the mortar and the pestle seem to be so called.

I.28.7: On the motions involved, see Schaefer 1994: 163-64.

I.29 Indra

I.29.2: Ge takes ... *táva dāṃsánā* as a nominal sentence “du hast ja die Machtvollkommenheit.” This is possible. But with Gr and Re, I prefer to take *dāṃsánā* as an instr. (as it often is), in order to allow the whole verse to be a single sentence.

I.29.7: On *jambhāya*- ‘crush’, see comm. ad II.23.9 and my *-āya*-Formations, p. 93.

I.30 Indra, Aśvins, Dawn

I.30.1: The word *krívi*- makes trouble wherever it shows up. In some of its occurrences it appears to be a personal name, but that is unlikely here. It is not even clear if all the occurrences of *krívi*-, even in non-personal uses, belong to a single stem -- in fact it seems unlikely (see comm. ad V.44.4). Here the context favors an equine reference, and I have taken it as designating a particular color of horse, viz., ‘blood-red’. Assuming, with most scholars, that *krívi*- in at least some of its usages is connected with *krívís*- in the hapax adj. *krívīr-dant*- (I.166.6), which possibly means ‘having gory teeth’, and that both are etymologically connected with *kravís*- ‘raw, bloody flesh’, as a color term ‘blood-red’ would work well. The details of the derivational relation I leave to others, but a putative -*i*-stem to the underlying root *krū* < **kruh₂* (in *krūrā*- [AV+]) would have the shape **kruh₂-i*- > **kruv-i*-, and assimilation to *krívi*- would not be difficult.

The verse is structured by number disharmony — the pres. part. *vājayántaḥ* is nom. plural, but the finite verb *siñce* is singular — reflecting the common conceptual fluctuation between the collectivity of priests and singers and the priest-poet speaking in his individual voice.

I.30.2: The number disharmony continues here, at least in my view. Ge. takes the sg. rel. pron. *yáḥ* as referring to Indra and then supplies the verb ‘drinks’ to governing the ‘hundred’ and ‘thousand’ phrases referring to soma. But if *yáḥ* is instead taken as referring to soma and coreferential with the (unexpressed) subj. of the verb in the main clause *rīyate*, no material needs to be supplied. Instead the singular ‘which (soma)’ is defined as consisting of a hundred or a thousand separate drinks. So also Re.

I.30.3: The form *śuṣmīṇa* (in sandhi) can represent either *śuṣmīne* (dat. sg.) or *śuṣmīṇaḥ* (in turn, either gen.-abl. sg. or nom.-acc. pl.). (The Pp. reads -*e*.) Any of these possibilities is possible in context, and so it may well be that the ambiguity is meant. As a nom. pl. it could characterize the subj. (‘they’ = soma drinks), as Re. takes it. As a gen. sg. it could refer to Indra, who is indeed regularly modified by this adj. As a dat. sg. it

could modify *mādāya* (so Ge), or it might still refer to Indra, in well-known double dative construction of the type “for the tempestuous one for his exhilaration” → “to exhilarate the tempestuous one.” I favor an interpretation that attributes the word to Indra; among other things, this makes the unaccented *asya* in b easier to account for. Preferably genitive *śuṣmīṇaḥ*, though I have not been able to find a parallel expression.

On the surface, pāda a lacks a main verb, but it is possible that it is lurking there. The subordinator *yád* appears as *yán* in sandhi before a nasal. The otherwise unattested 3rd pl. injunctive of \sqrt{i} ‘go’ would have the same shape and is the expected verb in this idiom (cf., e.g., 3rd pl. impf. *sám āyan* X.27.8). I therefore suggest we have a notional haplology *sám *yád yán*.

I do not understand the function of *hí* in b, which triggers accentuation of the main verb *dadhé* in c. I would at all costs prefer to avoid attributing pure emphatic function to *hí*, but this passage comes perilously close to that.

I.30.4: *ohase* is generally taken as a 2nd sg. mid. to the root $\sqrt{ūh}$ / *oh*, which has a messy set of forms. Cf., e.g., Ge. “Diese Rede von uns weisst du gewiss zu würdigen.” However, I interpret it as a 1st ps. -*se* form of the type *stuṣé* ‘I shall praise’, *gṛṇīṣé* ‘I shall sing’, all of which fall into this semantic sphere. Indeed the root has a -*se* formation of different shape in VIII.5.3 *vācam ... ohiṣe*, with almost identical object (our passage: *vācaḥ*). For the thematic/(pseudo-)subjunctive form here, cf. *arcase* ‘I shall address’ (X.64.3). Despite the complications involved in positing a second 1st ps. -*se* form to this root and separating *ohase* from the identical form in VIII.80.9, which I take as a 2nd sg. in passive usage, I prefer my interpretation to that of Ge (/WG) ‘value’, Re ‘take into consideration, take note of’, because these latter seriously attenuate or alter the meaning of the root, which otherwise means ‘solemnly proclaim, praise, vaunt oneself’.

I.30.5: The word order of ab is rather tortured. The clause is simply a nominal sentence forming a relative clause, but the relative pronoun phrase *yāsya te*, instead of appearing in 2nd or modified position after pāda-initial *stotrām* as is overwhelmingly common (see, e.g., modified 2nd in 2a *śatām vā yāḥ ...* above), comes at the very end of the hemistich, separated from its noun by three vocative phrases, which take up the rest of pāda a and most of pāda b: ... *rādhānām pate, gírvāho vīra* This still *counts* as 2nd position since the vocc. are extra-sentential, but the poet is cheekily pushing the limits. The *te* is simply there to indicate that the rel. pron. has 2nd ps. reference, which is of course not syntactically coded onto the relative. Cf. the common phrase *tām tvā* (e.g., 10a below), where the 2nd ps. pronoun has the same function: to give 2nd ps. ref. to the demonstrative.

I.30.8: *yádi* here stands for *yád *ī*, ‘when ... it’ rather than ‘if’. The pronominal enclitic *ī* has been shortened before the initial cluster of *śrávat*. See Jamison 2002.

I.30.9: Although *huvé* in c is morphologically problematic, its interpretation is imposed by context: a past-tense 3rd ps. ‘he called’. But this is the only 3rd ps. *huvé* (in contrast to over 70 exx. of 1st ps. *huvé*, -*e*), and it must be preterital not present, as *huvé* otherwise is. I have no explanation.

The referent of *te* ‘your’ in the same pāda is unclear. Assuming the relevant constituent is “your father” (*te ... pitā*), *te* should refer to the poet, or some poet, in whose

lineage “you” are, but I would expect the poet to be the 1st ps. speaker of the first *huvé* (pāda b). Perhaps the reference to the “ancient house” in pāda a indicates that another, more venerable poet is on the scene, whose model (and that of his forebears) the current poet is following. The publ. tr. of pāda a supplies “your” with “ancient house” – implying that the current poet is modeling himself on “you” and “your father,” but it should be remembered that the “your” of a is not explicit in the text. It could well be “my ancient house” (or indeed someone else’s). Though the pāda is repeated in VIII.69.18, that passage is not helpful in interpreting this one. However, I.87.5 contains an occurrence of *pratnā-* modifying father that seems to assert a similar entitlement to poetic speech by lineage: I.87.5 *pitūḥ pratnāsya jánmanā vadāmasi* “We speak by virtue of our kinship with our primordial father.”

I.30.11: Though it modifies *asmākam* ‘of us’ and “we” are definitely male, *śipriṇīnām* ‘of the (well-)lipped ones’ is a *feminine* gen. pl. The form must be contextually motivated: the other two pādas end with (masc.) gen. pls. in -*Vnām* / -*Vnaam* (*somapāvnām* [my preference, for HvN *somapāvnām*], *sākhīnām*). Esp. the latter, with -*īnām*, invites a type of dittography: **śipriṇām* → *śipriṇīnām*. See also *śipriṇīvān* in X.105.5. Although *śipriṇīnām* reminds us of the equally unexpected fem. for masc. *nāvyasīnām* V.53.10, 58.1, I explain the latter differently. See comm. ad V.53.10.

I.30.12: Ge (WG) take *iṣṭāye* as “dass du rasch kommst,” without comment, but it is not clear to me what root they are using to produce ‘come quick’. There are several roots $\sqrt{iṣ}$ to which *iṣṭāye* could belong: ‘seek, desire’ and ‘send’ are the most likely, along with the marginal root ‘prosper’ found in *iṣāyati*. A zero-grade of \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice’ could (and does) also produce *iṣṭī-*. None of these comes close to ‘come quick’; my conjecture is that they are connecting it with ‘send’, but forms of this root are always transitive. Re more reasonably assigns it to the ‘seek’ root: “... que (tu) cherches (des biens pour nous),” but must supply much material for it to work. I suggest that it belongs to this same root, but in the sense ‘desire, want’, and that the message here is the mutually reinforcing “we want you to want what we want.” This expression is somewhat reminiscent of *sā naḥ sanītā sanāye* in vs. 16: “he the winner, for us to win it,” though using two different but synonymous roots, rather than the etymological figure of 16.

I.30.13: A noun needs to be supplied with *revātīḥ* ‘rich (fem.)’. Old suggests *īśaḥ* ‘refreshments’, which works formulaically with the rest of the lexicon in the passage (including the verb in c; cf., e.g., VII.64.3 *iṣā madema*, with an instr. as in our *yābhir madema*). Ge’s “Geschenke” (gifts) is not so happy.

sadhamāda out of sandhi could end in either -*e* (so Pp., followed by most) or -*aḥ*. Complicating the decision is the fact that both a thematic stem *sadhamāda-* and a root noun *sadhamād-* are well attested. Though most tr. take presumed underlying *sadhamāde* as loc. to the thematic stem (Ge “bei dem Mahlgenossen”), I think it possible that it is the dat. of purpose to the root noun. It may be that Re’s “pour le symposium” also assumes such a dative.

I.30.14: Vss. 14–15 are parallel in structure and phraseology, but this does not help as much as we might like. To begin at the beginning, it seems odd to refer to Indra as “one

like you” (*tvāṁvān*), and grammatically it is also problematic, because *tvāvant-* ordinarily takes a 3rd ps. verb, not 2nd ps. as here. It is tempting to follow Ge’s path and make ab into a subordinate clause (“Wenn einer wie du...”), but this doesn’t work because the initial *ā* of pāda a must be construed with the *ṛṇóḥ* of c. The rest of the first hemistich, two participial phrases, is somewhat awkwardly phrased (at least in translation) but comprehensible: the praisers obtain Indra (or his like) in his own person and implore him for aid, which he provides in c. That pāda uses an idiomatic expression for fitting an axle between two wheels. As the presence of *ná* in 14c and the structure of vs. 15 show, this expression is a simile, to which some other action of Indra is being compared, even though in 14 there is no obvious frame. The meaning of *ā ṛṇóḥ* in the frame is somewhat different from the idiomatic usage, but not, to my mind, the “untranslatable wordplay” that Ge sees. I take it mean ‘fit out’, namely ‘provide’. In 14c I supply ‘refreshments’ from the preceding vs. (13), the first vs. of the *ṛca*. Nonetheless, this translation of the *ṛca*, esp. 14–15, strikes me as less than satisfactory.

I.30.17: *śávīra-*. Although this may just have a suffix *-īra-*, it is tempting to see it as a bahuvrīhi containing a Caland form *śavi-* (root *śū-*, cf. *śūra-*) plus *īrā-* ‘refreshment’, so ‘possessing powerful refreshment’. For the accent, see the many compounds with *śuci-*, e.g., *śuci-jihva-* ‘having a blazing tongue’. If this is correct, the translation of the same word in I.3.2 should be modified. There it modifies *dhī-* ‘insight’, which might not be as apt, but thoughts and hymns that provide refreshment are not foreign to the RVic conceptual universe. Although we might expect **śuvi-*, ET suggests comparing presumed Caland forms RV *ákravihasta-* and PN *dabhīti-*, which apparently show full grade of the root.

The neut. adjectives *gómat* and *híraṇyavat* are generally taken to refer directly to the gifts that the Aśvins will provide us (e.g., Ge “Rinderbesitz ... Goldbesitz (sei uns)!”) But (as Ge suggests in his note) in I.92.16 and VIII.22.17, where the pāda is repeated, the adjectives modify *vártiḥ* ‘circuit, course’, in turn the object of forms of *√yā* ‘drive’ in VIII.22.17 (and often elsewhere). Since 17b contains *yātam*, I supply *vártiḥ* here as well.

I.30.18: Because *yójana-* has a number of different meanings (‘yoking, stage of journey, distance, route’), the compound *samānáyojana-* has received a number of different translations. The analytic phrase *samānéna yójanena* occurs in I.92.3 of Dawn’s journey, where again ‘route’ best fits the context.

I.30.19: Other passages also depict the Aśvins’ chariot with one wheel at rest (presumably on earth, on the ritual ground) and the other in motion (V.73.3, VIII.22.4), as Ge explains in his note.

The “head of the inviolable (bull)” is somewhat opaque, but is probably a mystical expression for the ritual ground – more clearly expressed in *mūrdhán yajñásya* “on the head of the sacrifice” (II.3.2, IX.17.6). Others have speculated that the whole complex (the two wheels and the bull’s head) refer to a constellation. See WG n.

I.30.20: “Fair-weather friend” translates the voc. *kadhapiṛye* and is an attempt at an idiomatic English rendering of ‘when-friend’, i.e., ‘uncertain, fickle, or capricious friend’ – following Bloomfield’s (*RR*, ad I.38.1) attractive explanation of closely related

kadhapri- as built to the Aśvins' epithet *adhapriyā* 'then-friends'. The epithet is appropriate to the usually reliable Dawn in this verse because the poet questions her as to where she will bestow her presence and favors.

I.30.21: All of pāda c is a vocative, though it is syntactically peculiar for the noun in the simile to be in the vocative: *ásve ná*, literally "like o mare." It must have been attracted into the voc. by the voc. adjectives that are the points of comparison: *citre aruṣi* "bright and ruddy." See also I.57.3 below.

I.31 Agni

This is the first of five hymns attributed to Hiranyastūpa Āṅgīrasa and the only one addressed to Agni. It is noteworthy that the hymn begins and ends with references to the Āṅgīrasas: 1a (*agne ...*) *āṅgirā ṛṣiḥ*, 2a (*agne ...*) *āṅgirastamaḥ* and 17a (the last vs. before the extra-hymnic summary vs.) (*agne*) *āṅgirasvād āṅgiraḥ*, a reference to his parentage and a word that often plays off its phonological similarity to *agnī-* (cf. RV I.1), a voc. of which occurs in every vs. in this hymn.

I.31.1-2: Some reciprocal vocabulary: in 1c the *kavīs* (the Maruts) are born under the *vrata* of Agni, while in 2b Agni as *kavi* tends to the *vrata* of the gods.

I.31.1: Wackernagel treats the structure of the bahuvrīhi *vidmanāpas-* differently in different parts of the grammar. It is clear that the first member is the instr. of *vidmán-* 'wisdom, know-how', but in some places (II.1.234, III.268) he suggests that the 2nd member is the secondary adj. *apās-* (so also Gr) and that the first member is accented (as is customary in bahuvrīhis), but with end-accent *vidmanā*, rather than the attested independent *vidmánā* (I.110.6, etc.) (so explicitly III.268). Elsewhere (esp. II.1.301) he groups it with other bahuvrīhis containing *-as-* stems as 2nd members, which have accented 2nd members (on the 1st syllable), such as *prthu-pákṣas-* (and cf. *purū-rávas-* in 4b). The latter analysis must be correct: inter alia, we don't expect bahuvrīhis of similar sense to have adjectives as 2nd members, and it seems arbitrary to assume ending accent of the instr. against the independent usage of *-n-* stems. Therefore, the compd. must represent *vidmanā-ápas-*, built to the neut. *-as-* stem 'work', inflected as a masc. nom. pl. because the compd. is a bahuvrīhi and hence an adjective. The meaning should be literally 'having/displaying work with know-how'.

I.31.2: In c note the phonetic figure **vibhúr víśvasmai bhúvanāya**, with the two elements of the first word distributed over the next two.

Note that Agni here is said to have "two mothers" (*dvimātā*), while in vs. 4 he swells in his "two fathers" (*pitróḥ*; see also 9a) -- in both cases referring to the kindling sticks. Although both "two mothers" and "two fathers" can refer pregnantly, as it were, to a mixed gender set of parents, it is striking that both are used so close together here, and of the same referents.

It is esp. interesting in light of the word *śayú-*. As disc. ad IV.18.12 the interpr. of this term as 'orphan' (or better 'fatherless') on the basis of apparent Middle Iranian and Balto-Slavic cognates can be seen in its punning use in a few passages like this one. I

would slightly emend this tr. to “... having (just) two mothers, fatherless/lying down in so many places ...” For a similar passage see III.55.6.

I.31.3: The mythology behind *ab* is related in I.143.2, as Ge points out; see also VI.8.4. It is not clear here why a mythological situation should be couched in the imperative (“become manifest!”), esp. as the second hemistich contains three augmented imperfects, but I cannot see any way to fix it. As Old points out, various scholars have suggested reading injunc. *bhavaḥ* but it is not easy to switch that form in, esp. because 1) the hymn has no other injunctives, and 2) the stem *bháva-* doesn’t have any clear injunctives, certainly no *bhavaḥ*, in the RV. In I.143.2 the same myth is related in the same phraseology in the impf.: *āvír agnír abhavan mātariśvane*.

sukratūyā must mean something more than simply *krátvā / krátunā*; see the denom. *sukratūyase* in X.122.6.

I.31.4: Purūravas is found only here in the RV outside of his dialogue with the Apsaras Urvaśī in X.95. It’s not entirely clear why he is here, but his is a speaking name (‘having much roaring’), which fits with the bellowing in pāda a. Moreover his son Āyu figures several times in this hymn (vss. 2, 11), and Iḍā, said to be Purūravas’s mother in X.95.18, also appears in vs. 11.

Contrary to most tr., I have segregated *sukṛte sukṛttaraḥ* as a separate clause, since this expression is found in different context in I.156.5. *sukṛt-* is usually used of the priest or ritual performer, and this interpretation fits with the 2nd hemistich, which refers to the ritual here and now. Starting a new sentence in pāda b also helps mitigate the tense disharmony in this verse, where the present in the subordinate clause (*múcyase*) is by most accounts connected to an imperfect in the main clause of d (*anayan*), the action of which should temporally follow the verb in c (or to the imperfect *avāśayaḥ* in a). By connecting c instead with the last part of b, this temporal reversal is avoided.

Ge (following Gr) tr. *śvātra-* as simply “Kraft,” but the noun belongs with the root $\sqrt{śū}$ ‘swell’, and the image in this pāda is a vivid one: Agni’s “swelling” in his two parents refers to the flaming up of the fire created by the kindling sticks (already referred to in 2d). Both Re and WG render the ‘swell’ sense. With Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 4c) I take *pitróḥ* with *śvātrēṇa*, not with *múcyase*. On “two fathers” see comm. ad vs. 2. Because of the contrast between the two mothers in 2 and the two fathers in this vs. and 9a, I would now alter the tr. of both 4 and 9 to “in your two fathers.”

I do not understand what the final pāda is conveying. I have tr. *pūrvam ... āparam punaḥ* as “to the east ... then again to the west”; Ge has “vorwärts und wieder zurück.” But in either case the ritual ref. is hard to decode, since generally the fire “taken out” of what will later be called the Gārhapatya fire, situated at the west of the ritual ground, is carried to the east to become what will later be called the Āhavanīya fire. Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 4d) takes the vedi as the reference point, with one part of the fire going to the east (Āhavanīya) and one to the west (Gārhapatya), but this is not how the placement of the ritual fires happens.

I.31.5: *údyataśruce ... śravāyyaḥ*: Ge’s (/WG’s) “ruhmbringend” is not possible for *śravāyya-*, because this is a (pseudo-)gerundive and hence passive. The dat. *údyataśruce*

can serve as agent, because RVic gerundives can take dat. agents (see Jamison 1979 [Die Sprache 25] 137–38 n. 14), as also in other IE languages.

The publ. tr. renders *bhavasi śravāyyaḥ* as “should be celebrated,” because a more lit. “become one to be celebrated” is clumsily heavy. However, despite its awkwardness, the more literal tr. should probably be preferred. The use of $\sqrt{bhū}$ + GRDV may well indicate that Agni/the ritual fire only deserves celebration after he/it has been kindled and placed to the west. The *āhuti-* in the next pāda may be an indirect ref. to the thus-placed fire as receiver of oblations, what will, by the time of the AV, be called the *Āhavanīya*.

The rel. pronoun *yāḥ* in c has double reference: in c it refers to the priest in the 3rd ps. and is the subject of accented *védā*; in d it refers to Agni in the 2nd ps. and is the subject of the accented *āvívāsasi*. Both referents are present in the main cl.: the priest as *údyataśruce* in b and Agni of course as *tvām agne* in a. This grammatical play cannot be easily rendered in English.

ékāyu- is a hapax and also probably a pun. On the one hand it is formed like *viśvāyu-* ‘having a complete lifetime’, *dīrghāyu-* ‘having a long lifetime’, hence ‘having a single lifetime’; on the other, it can contain the proper name of Āyu, who is found in vss. 2 and 11 of the hymn, hence Ge’s tr. “im Alleinbesitz des Āyu,” WG “den Āyu (als) einzigen (Opferer) hatte.” Although Ge (/WG) do not recognize the “lifetime” possibility, the parallel formations make such a reading hard to avoid. In the lifetime meaning, the compound presumably refers to the ritual fire’s duration through a single sacrifice or, perhaps more likely, through the lifetime of the sacrificer. In the personal-name reading, it would mean that Agni and our ritual fire have the ur-Aryan sacrificer and clanlord (see 11b) Āyu on their side (‘having Āyu as [yours] alone’?). In vs. 11 Agni is identified with Āyu the clanlord, and so here, in that identity, he brings together the *viśaḥ* ‘clans’. The publ. tr. does not register the personal-name reading, which should be remedied: I would add as an alternative tr. “having Āyu as yours alone.”

āgre: Although in absolute usage this word can refer to the beginning of time, as it were, that sense seems unlikely here because of the present tense verb. I therefore consider it to reflect a phrase like *āgre yajñāsya* (VII.15.5), at least in the primary reading. Secondly, with the second meaning of *ékāyu-* (‘having Āyu as yours alone’), it may allude to the primal sacrifice.

I added the parenthetical “divine” qualifying “clans” because gods (or their qualities) are the usual object of *āvívāsa-*, and I still think that is the more likely interpretation. However, ET points out to me that, in light of vs. 11b *tvām ... devā akṛṇvan náhuṣasya viśpátim* “You ... did the gods create as the clan-lord of Nahuṣa,” it might instead refer to human clans. Proferes (2007) argues at length, though not mentioning this hymn, that a royal fire can unite several clans.

I.31.6: *sákman* is a hapax, rendered by Ge as “in der Freundschaft” but by Re as “en détresse” (followed explicitly by WG “aus der Not”). The former interpretation is surely the correct one, taking it as a derivative of the very common root \sqrt{sac} ‘accompany’ and directly cognate with Aves (O+Y) *haxman-* ‘association, community’. (So EWA s.v.) Re suggests a derivation rather from \sqrt{sac}^2 ‘dry up’, but the semantics of the derivation are not straightforward, and such a connection requires both the apparent Avestan cognate and RVic hapax *sákmya-* ‘comradeship’ to be decoupled from *sákman-*. It is hard to see the motivation for this proposal. It must have been that the context seemed not to be one

of comradeship, but in fact there is no problem with that meaning in context: Agni demonstrates his comradeship with the man at issue by giving him aid.

I interpret the first hemistich to be entirely concerned with the sacrifice, as the loc. *vidáthe* ‘at the ceremony’ suggests. In my view *vr̥jiná-vartani-* ‘having twisting turns’ envisions the sacrifice as a race-course, which the sacrificer must navigate, esp. the tricky turn at the further end. That the sacrifice was commonly envisioned as a course to traverse is clear from the word *adhvará-* ‘ceremony, rite’, related to *ádhvan-* ‘road, way’ and found in expressions like *rathīr adhvarāṇām* ‘charioteer of the rites’ (I.44.9, cf. VI.7.2). Although *vr̥jiná-* ‘twisted, crooked’ often has a morally negative sense (like its English glosses), in this case the twist(s) would simply be tricky (that is, challenging) to steer. It is possible, with some other tr., to assume that the twisting turns are not ritual but refer to unfortunate life circumstances, but then *vidáthe* is hard to account for.

The image of the sacrifice as a race-course in ab then transitions to the image of a race or contest in general in pāda c. *páritakmye* ‘at the crucial turn’ picks up the *vr̥jiná-vartani-* of pāda a. As so often, *dháne* is a truncated loc. absol. for the common expression *dháne hité* (I.40.2, etc.) ‘when the stake is set.’ Contra Gr and Ge, I do not take *páritakmye* as an adj. with *dháne*; like me, Re. and WG keep the two expressions separate, and Re. suggests that *páritakmye dháne* is ‘abregé’ from *páritakmyāyām ... dháne hité*. Although I am leery of characterizations like ‘abregé,’ in this case I think that the form we have has been manipulated in some such way. Gr lists an adj. *páritakmya-* to which our form is said to belong, but this stem does not exist: all clear forms belong to the fem. noun *páritakmyā-*, almost all of whose forms are loc. sg. *páritakmyāyām* at the end of a Triṣṭubh line. This stem is subject to various poetic deformations: see comm. ad V.30.113–14. I believe that our *páritakmye* here also belongs to this noun stem and reflects a loc.; it is positioned exactly like the *páritakmyāyām* forms, at the end of a trimeter line after an opening of 5. But to conform to the Jagatī line this loc. has been replaced by an apparent masc./neut. loc. in -e, and the independent loc. absol. *dháne* has been added to supply the requisite light + anceps ending. For further on the phrase *dhána-hitá-* see comm. ad VI.45.

The last pāda thus turns the contest image into an actual battle; the line between contest and battle is a thin and permeable one in the RV.

I.31.7: Though both Ge and Re make *amṛtatvé* ‘immortality’ and *śrávase* syntactically parallel, despite superficial appearances they are in different cases and should be so rendered.

In the 2nd hemistich *kṛṇóṣi* has a complex direct and indirect object phrase: *ubháyāya jánmane máyaḥ kṛṇóṣi práya ā ca sūrāye*, with the chiasmic structure DAT.-IO ACC-DO VERB ACC-DO DAT-IO arranged around the verb. In such a structure we might expect coordinating *ca* to be positioned immediately after the 1st term of the second object complex, that is, after *práyaḥ* (*práyaś ca*); see Klein DGRV I.54 and passim. The interruption of this balanced construction by *ā* is also curious; the point seems to be that Agni makes refreshment for the first, mixed set of beneficiaries in an unspecified place but the meal for the patron right here (*ā*) on the ritual ground. It may be that the propensity of *ca* to follow preverbs in tmesis (/adverbial usage) has dictated the position; Klein implies as much (DGRV I.134 and n. 49, 227).

I.31.8: The question in ab is who is winning the stakes. I take it to be “us,” with our winning enabled by Agni’s giving glory to our poet. Most take it to be the poet himself, a poet identified as ours (“for our bard to win the stakes”). This is certainly possible. Indeed Old (SBE) actually interprets *sanáye ... kṛṇuhi* as a periphrastic causative “make/cause to win,” with the poet the first object. Although Zehnder (Periphrastic Kaus., 2011) does not discuss this passage, he does recognize (p. 61) other examples of periphrastic causatives to \sqrt{san} ‘win’, which does not build a morphological causative (expect **sānáyati*, or possibly **sanáyati*, neither of which would cause phonological problems). Of course at this period of the language, underlying transitive verbs like \sqrt{san} should not build double transitive causatives (“cause X to win Y”).

apásā návena: the suffixal accent of *apásā* should rule out a tr. ‘work’, but most tr. ignore (Re actually cites it in his notes as *ápas-*) or overrule the accent. So Ge “durch das neue Machwerk” (i.e., the hymn), sim. Re, WG. Although Gr cites other forms of *apás-* in the meaning ‘work’, none of these is convincing. Therefore, although it would simplify the tr. to take it as neut. ‘work’, the transmitted text can only mean ‘worker, laborer’. My tr. implies that we have a new poet, or perhaps the bard, made glorious by Agni in pāda b, who takes a new lease on his poetic life. Alternatively, we might follow Old (SBE), who alone paid attention to the accent and tr. “with the help of the young active (Agni).”

The introduction of Heaven and Earth as recipients of our prayers in the last pāda of this vs. is odd, giving the vs. the appearance of a hymn-final vs., since extraneous gods are often brought in at that point. The fact that the vs. is in Triṣṭubh, rather than the Jagatī that prevails in the hymn (save for 16 and 18) also supports the view that this vs. marks at least an internal boundary, and though the initial *tvám (no) agne* sequence continues in the vss. that follow, the subject matter subtly changes. See publ. intro.

Note the phonological play in bc (... *kārúm kṛṇuhi ... kárma*), which may imply a folk-etymological connection of *kārú-* ‘bard’ with $\sqrt{kṛ}$, and in d (*devair dyāvā pṛthivī prāvataṁ*)

I.31.9-11: Some patterned responsion in these two verses: 9 *tanū-kṛt ... prāmatih* / 10 *prāmatih ... vāyas-kṛt*. However, although these two verses are roughly in the middle of the hymn and patterned responsion is characteristic of omphalos verses, the repetitions do not seem sufficiently important to constitute an omphalos. On the relationship between *prāmati-* and *vāyas-* and between *tanū-* and *vāyas-* see disc. ad I.71.7, where it is suggested that *tanū-* and *vāyas-* are the tangible and intangible elements that together make up a living being.

The “two fathers” in 9a ushers in the paternal imagery found in the rest of 9–11 (and beyond). Besides the *tanū-kṛt* ‘body-creator’ and *vāyas-kṛt* ‘life-force-creator’, which jointly define the parental contribution to a new human being, we have the repeated word *prāmati-* ‘solicitude’, which is strongly associated with the father (see disc. ad I.71.7). Here the word first appears by itself in 9c, then along with *pitā-* in 10a (as well as 14c, 16c). The father figure in these vss. switches back and forth: Agni is first “in the lap of his two fathers” (thus implicitly the son) in 9a, but has the fatherly role in 9cd, 10ab -- then switching back to the son in 11d. The two remaining allusions to the father (14c, 16c) cast Agni in that role again.

I.31.9: As noted above (ad vs. 4), I would now change “your two parents” to “your two fathers” because of the contrast with the “two mothers” of 2.

The *naḥ* in 2nd position in the vs. does not fit easily into the first hemistich (though cf. Ge “Du Agni (sei) uns im Schosse der Eltern als Gott ...”). I have postponed it to the 2nd hemistich -- with no verb in the 1st this seems possible -- and taken it as a gen. dependent on *kārāve* ‘bard. It could also be taken as a dat. with *tanūkṛt* in a chiasmic construction exactly like that of 7cd discussed above. Hence, “become body-creator for us and fatherly solicitude for the bard. Otherwise it might be possible just to assume that it was generated to the pattern *tvām (no) agne* in the rest of the hymn, when another syllable was needed. Both Re and Old (SBE) simply ignore it.

I.31.11: On Āyu and Idā see disc. ad vs. 4 above. This verse clearly refers to the primal institution of the ritual fire at the Ārya sacrifice, but the details are somewhat obscure.

Because of the tense differences between c and d (augmented impf. *akṛṇvan* vs. pres. *jāyate*), I follow Re in taking d as the content of Idā’s instruction, namely that in mundane current-day terms Agni/ritual fire has a mere human father, the sacrificer, though it was the gods who originally created him/it.

I would now tr. *mānuṣasya* as “of Manu,” since this refers to the original establishment of the sacrifice.

I.31.12: The theme of protection gets hammered home by the use of three different roots in this semantic sphere: $\sqrt{pā}$ (*pāyúbhiḥ* a), $\sqrt{rakṣ}$ (*rakṣa* b, *rakṣamāṇaḥ* d), and $\sqrt{trā}$ (*trātā* c).

In the conjoined NP *maghónaḥ ... tanvās ca, tanvāḥ* must be reflexive “(we) ourselves,” despite *tanū-kṛt*, where *tanū-* refers specifically to the body.

In c the standard tr. construe the genitives *tókasya .. gāvām* with *trātā*, but I take them with *tānaye*, which they flank, as in the symmetrical constructions discussed above ad vss. 7 and, possibly, 9.

Pāda d can be seen as a paraphrase of 9b, with *ānimēṣaṃ rākṣamāṇaḥ* “unblinkingly watchful” an expansion of *jāgrviḥ* “wakeful,” and of 10d, with *rākṣamāṇas tāva vraté* “watchful in accord with your commandment” expanding *vratapā-* “protector of the commandment.”

I.31.13: The man who lacks even a quiver lacks weapons and is therefore defenseless.

My interpr. of cd differs significantly from the standard (though it is close to Ge’s alternate, given at the end of his n. on 13cd). Most take *yó rātāhavyaḥ* as a nominal rel. cl. referring to the worshipper, with coreferential resumptive pronoun *tām* in the main clause *vanóṣi tām*, whose subject is Agni (e.g., Ge “Wer Opfer spendet ... den begehrst du.”). (Its initial position in its clause would of course account for the accent on the main verb.) This interpretation has several merits: the skeletal syntactic structure is clear; it explains the unusual position of the *tām*; it parallels the structure of 14b; and *rātāhavya-* is more often used of mortals than of gods (a usage that might be supported here by the parallel compound *práyatadakṣiṇa-* in 15a). However, it makes the phrase *kīrés cin mántram mánasā* impossible to construe: the acc. sg. *mántram* has nothing governing it, and the “solution” in such tr. is simply to set it off by dashes and hope for the best. I therefore prefer to take cd as a single relative clause with Agni as subject. The adj.

rātāhavya- can modify gods, including Agni in IV.7.7. This reconfiguring of the syntax allows *māntram* to be the obj. of *vanóṣi*, with the point being that Agni, by properly performing his ritual duties, acquires a powerful mantra for the weakling in his charge. (The perhaps overly heavy tr. “mental spell” was meant to highlight the etymological relationship with *mānas-* ‘mind’.)

My interpretation differs from the standard in other smaller ways. In c I take *dhāyase* not as a quasi-infinitive to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place, establish’ (e.g., Ge “um sich Sicherheit zu schaffen”), a formation not otherwise found, but to the standard *s*-stem *dhāyas-* ‘nourishment’ to $\sqrt{dhā(y)}$ ‘nourish’. I also take *kīrēś cid* with the preceding dative phrase, rather than with *māntram*.

I.31.14: Again my interpr. differs from the standard, though not as radically as in vs. 13. Most tr. take ab as a single clause with, implicitly, an embedded nominal relative clause *spārham yád réknaḥ paramám*. The main clause resumes with *vanóṣi*, hence the accent, and the *yád* clause is picked up by *tād*. The problem is that the RV does not ordinarily allow embedded relatives; (almost) all relative clauses are either pre- or postposed, as M. Hale has argued in the past. I therefore supply the frame “you are kindled as protector” + DATIVE from the parallel vs. 13ab. Note that Agni as protector also begins the next verse (15). I have now partially rethought this interpr., based on my discovery that izafe-like nominal relative clauses can be embedded (see my 2022 “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe”). Unfortunately the relative clause we have here is not quite an izafe type: we should expect something like **réknaḥ spārham yát paramám ...* vel sim., “the legacy worth seeking that is highest,” with the head noun in the main clause. However, I now would suggest an alternative tr. “for the cantor chanting far and wide what is the highest legacy worth seeking, you win that,” as an extension of the izafe-type embedding.

The phrase *prá pākam śāssi prá díśaḥ* in d causes problems, because, despite the strong superficial parallelism, the two accusatives *pākam* and *díśaḥ* do not appear to be parallel. I have translated them as parallel, but admit the awkwardness. If the verb *prá śāssi* is used in the same way in both iterations, the “quarters,” that is, the geographical directions, are receiving the same instruction as the simple man. In support of this interpretation ET remarks “my guess is that the poet intends a contrast between two extremes (the limited simple man and the vast semi-divine quarters) as recipients of instruction from the one who is superior to all in knowledge.” Ge supplies a different verb with the second *prá* phrase: “du (gibst) Weisungen,” suggesting that while *pākam* refers to the person who receives the instruction, *díśaḥ* might rather express the content (“directions”) of the instruction.

I.31.15: In *upamā* I prefer to see the first attestation of the root noun compound *upamā*- ‘likeness’ (< ‘measure’), rather than the adverbial instrumental preferred by Old and apparently followed by the standard tr. How an instr. would function here is not clear to me, and Ge’s “der kommt zu oberst im Himmel” seems to push *sópamā diváḥ* further than the meager expression will take it. Old’s objection is that for such a root noun we would expect nom. sg. *upamāḥ*, but this isn’t apposite: in this sandhi situation *upamā* would be the outcome in any case, so it is only the Pp. reading that enforces an underlying *-ā* final. Moreover, the parallel compounds *pramā-* and *pratimā-* are attested in

the RV with clear asigmatic nom. sg. (X.130.3), suggesting that they have been reinterpreted as *-ā*-stems (see Scar p. 378). There is no reason that an *upamā-* wouldn't have been treated similarly. See also *upamā* in VIII.60.13.

I.31.16: I interpret *mīmṛṣaḥ* slightly differently with its two different objects, as “make X forgotten” and “make us forget X” respectively. The verb ‘forget’ is an I/T verb of perception (in the terms of my 1983 book), and its causative thus can take two different types of constructions.

Agni is “whirling” (*bhṛmi-*) because of the movements of his smoke and flames.

[I.32 JPB]

[SJ] I.32.9: John Clayton (p.c.) points out the phonological similarity of the coreferential *dānuḥ* and *dhenúḥ*, polarized at the beginning and end of pāda d, in frame and simile respectively. This is one of two places in the RV where we meet Vṛtra's mother by name (and indeed at all), the other being in the bahuvr. *sahádānu-* in III.30.8. Vṛtra himself is called *dānavá-* on several occasions (II.11.10, V.30.1, 4, 7, probably V.29.4, the only 5 occurrences of this stem). I am inclined to see this designation of Vṛtra as equivalent to YAv. *dānauua-* (Barth. ²*dānav-* “bezeichnet einen den Iranern feindlichen *tūrischen* Volksstamm”), with the name of Vṛtra's mother Dānu backformed from that – rather than taking Dānu as the name of a riverine goddess, who may or may not be attested elsewhere in IE (esp. Celtic), as some others do.

In any case the stem(s) *dānu-* are difficult to sort out. In addition to the fem. form here (perhaps coerced into that gender), there are 4 masc. forms referring to a demon or demons (pl. only in the late X.120.6), with the 3 sgs. either referring clearly to Vṛtra (II.11.18, also containing *dānavá-* in vs. 10; II.12.13) or with Vṛtra as likely referent (IV.30.7). In addition there are the neuts. *dānu-* ‘gift’ and *dānu-* ‘drop’, which can be hard to separate in context, since “drops” (of rain, esp.) are also “gifts.” There is also a single fem. form that must belong to one of these otherwise neut. stems, in I.54.7, whose non-neut. gender is shown by the nom. sg. *-s* and its specifically fem. gender by the adj. *úparā* (*dānur asmā úparā pínvate diváh* “For him the gift [drop] of heaven swells here below.”). In context this fem. obviously cannot designate Vṛtra's mother. I have no explanation. It is worth noting that what anchors *dānuḥ* as a fem. in I.54.7 is the adj. *úparā* based on the directional preverb *úpa*, just as in our passage the feminine is established earlier in the hemistich by the phrase *úttarā sūḥ* “the mother was above,” with the adj. based on the directional preverb *úd*.

[SJ] I.32.12: This vs. contains a famous crux. The first hemistich reads *ásvyo vāro abhavas tād indra, sṛké yāt tvā pratyáhan devá ékaḥ*, rendered (up through *pratyáhan*) in the publ. tr. as ‘You, Indra, then became the tail of a horse when he struck his fangs at you’. Indra is clearly addressed in the 2nd ps., as shown in pāda a by the 2nd sg. *abhavaḥ* and the voc. *indra* and in pāda b by acc. *tvā*. This means, by easy process of elimination, that the subject of the verb *pratyáhan* ‘struck at’ must be Vṛtra. What then to do with the following nominative phrase, *devá ékaḥ* ‘the one god, the god alone’? Indra's arch-opponent in the Rig Veda is emphatically not a god, and certainly with Indra on the scene he could not be the *one* god. There are several alternative solutions to this conflict

between grammar and sense: to read this nominative phrase as an independent nominal clause, or as a continuation of the clause in pāda a with the dependent clause *ṣṛké yāt tvā pratyáhan* embedded within it (the solution in the publ. tr.), or as anticipating the next hemistich, where Indra returns as the 2nd sg. subject of the verbs *ájayah* ‘you conquered’, etc. Thus, the first possibility: ‘you became the tail of a horse when he struck his fangs at you; (you are) the one god / (you as) god (were) alone’ (etc.); for the second: ‘o Indra, you became the tail of a horse -- when he struck his fangs at you -- (you) the god alone’; for the third: ‘you became the tail of a horse when he struck his fangs at you; as god alone, you conquered ...’. None of these is impossible, but they are all ad hoc, constructed under desperate circumstances to avoid the semantic clash between the undoubted subject of the verb *pratyáhan*, namely Vṛtra, and the immediately following nominative phrase that conceptually should not modify him, despite their close quarters in the pāda.

There is a potential way out of this conundrum, however. The verb *áhan* is the 3rd sg. imperfect to the famous root present *hánti*; its older form should have been **ahant*. I tentatively suggest that the sequence **áhant evá*, containing the emphatic particle *evá*, at an early stage underwent external sandhi voicing assimilation to **áhand evá* and then resegmentation to *áhan devá*, rather than displaying the expected synchronic sandhi development to **áhann evá*. This aberrant resegmentation was facilitated by the existence of the ubiquitous noun *devá-* and the following adj. *ékaḥ*, with which that noun could be construed. My proposed underlying original **áhand *evá ékaḥ* has the particle *evá* stationed after the verb to emphasize the unusual use of Indra’s signature verb *áhan*, found in this hymn five times with Indra as subject (1c, 2a, 3d, 4a, 5a; cf. also 11c *jaghanvān* in the vs. immediately preceding ours), with Vṛtra as subject. The following *ékaḥ* emphasizes the single combat between Indra and Vṛtra: the equal balance between the two opponents is a feature of this part of the hymn -- cf. esp. 13c *índraś ca yád yuyudhāte áhiś ca* “When Indra and the serpent fought with each other ...,” with middle dual verb and conjoined subject NP. This contrasts sharply with the much more one-sided depiction of the battle in the earlier parts of the hymn. I would therefore translate 12b as ‘when just he, alone, struck his fangs against you’.

One major stumbling block to accepting this scenario: the sandhi of **evá ékaḥ*. The hiatus found in the transmitted text in the sequence *devá ékaḥ* is of course expected from underlying **devás ékaḥ* (/ **deváḥl*z), with loss of the final consonant of the nom. sg. and the resulting hiatus maintained. But we would ordinarily expect the final vowel of the particle *evá* to coalesce with the initial of *ékaḥ* to produce **evaíkaḥ* (as in IV.54.5, X.44.7 *evaívá*, X.173.2 *ihaívaídhi*). However, the application of the sandhi rules governing the coalescence of final and initial vowels is by no means exceptionless. For further discussion, with reff., see my “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verb Endings in the Ríg Veda,” Fs. Kazuhiko Yoshida (2019).

I.33 Indra

I.33.1: There is no overt interrogative marker in b, but the *kuvíd* of c may suggest a similar question in b.

The transitive thematic subjunctive *vāṽrdhāti* is assigned to the “Aorist des Caus.” by Gr, but the properly formed redupl. caus. aorist *ávīṽrdha-* occupies that slot. Other

than our form, all forms belonging to the *vāṛdha-* stem are medial, and it seems best to follow Kü (471) in seeing this thematic stem as built to the perfect in order to allow the root-final consonant to be maintained in forms like 2nd sg. impv. *vāṛdhásva* (since athem. **vāṛtsvá* could be taken to the root $\sqrt{\text{vṛ}}$ ‘turn’); see now further my 2017 art. on perf. impv (García Ramón Fs.). These medial intrans./reflex. forms in turn generated the oppositional trans. act. *vāṛdhāti*.

I take *kétam páram* in d as referring to Indra’s “distant intention” (which we hope to move closer to us; see *úpa* in 1a, 2a), rather than our “highest wish,” as is standard. The middle voice of *āvárjate* may support this. However the other interpretation is certainly possible.

I.33.2: Given the importance of the close/distant theme in these verses and the repeated *úpa*’s of 1a and 2a, *upamébhiḥ* in c should probably be rendered not only as “best” but also “nearest/most intimate.”

I.33.3: Although the gen. in the rel. cl. *yásya váṣṭi* appears to be parallel to *aryáh*, as I’ve tr. it, it may be better as a datival gen. “for whomever he wishes,” that is, Indra redistributes cows belonging to enemies to his friends.

I’ve tr. the part. *coṣkūyámāṇaḥ* as an impv. to avoid the awkwardness of “continuing to poke...”

In my opinion *asmád ádhi* continues the “distance” theme, and is equivalent to the common *āré asmát*.

I.33.4: *vádhiḥ ... ghanéna*, with verbal $\sqrt{\text{vadh}}$ and nominal $\sqrt{\text{han}}$ reverses the expected distribution found, e.g., in VII.104.16 ... *hantu mahatā vadhéna* (cf. also I.94.9), with verbal $\sqrt{\text{han}}$ and nominal $\sqrt{\text{vadh}}$.

The phrase *ékaś cáran* is a first instantiation of the lexeme famous in much later times from the Rhinoceros(-horn) Sūtra. For the phrase in the dharma lit. and the association with the rhinoceros (not, in my opinion, its horn), see my 1998 “Rhinoceros toes, Manu V.17-18, and the Development of the Dharma System” (*JAOS* 118: 249–56).

upaśāká- is only here, but *śāká-* is several times used of the Maruts or Aṅgirasas in their roles as helpers of Indra (IV.17.11, V.30.10). Therefore, though there is a disjunction between “going it alone” and being accompanied by a host of helpers, I take *upaśākébhiḥ* as personal here. The *upa-* may mark them as particularly subsidiary, or it may simply have been prefixed to the stem because it is a signature word in this part of the hymn.

Other tr. take *sanaká-* as the name of a group, but it seems a perfectly well-formed *-ka*-suffixed form of *sána-* ‘old’, with a pejorative diminutive sense appropriate to belittling one’s enemies. So Edgerton (1911 [k-suffixes]: 53): “the old rascals.” My “old codgers” is also an attempt to capture the slangy and deprecatory tone. On the demotic value of *-ka-* see Jamison 2009 (IIJ 52).

Ge takes *prétim īyuh* as an idiom “gingen in den Tod,” but despite the later such usage of *pra* $\sqrt{\text{i}}$, this idiom does not appear in the RV. As indicated in the intro., I take this as referring to the separation of sacrificers from non-sacrificers.

I.33.5: Because the verb in d, *adhamah*, is unaccented, something must be supplied to complete the subordinate clause of c (*prá yád ...*). It seems simplest to supply a form of the verb \sqrt{i} ‘go’, esp. as *prá√i* is found in 4d. Ge’s solution, to supply the same verb as in d, is possible, but seems pleonastic.

I.33.6: The Navagvas are ordinarily adherents of Indra’s. In order to preserve this alliance, we must assume that the plural reference in pādas a-c alternates, with a and c referring to Indra’s enemies, and b to his friends.

vṛṣāyúdhō ná vādhrayaḥ is the clearest echo in this hymn of the phraseology of the immediately preceding, very famous hymn depicting the Indra-Vṛtra battle: I.32.7c *vṛṣṇo vādhrīḥ pratimānam búbhūṣan* “a steer who tried to be the measure of a bull.”

cītāyantaḥ is unclear, as forms built to this stem often are, and the tr. differ appreciably: Ge “zu Einsicht kommend,” WG “erkennend,” Re “se rendant compte.” In my opinion, it is in its usual intrans. value “appearing” and adds a simile-like aspect to the main verb *āyan*, a sort of utprekṣā.

I.33.8: The verse is full of adornment/clothing terms; clear are *śumbhamāna*- ‘adorning themselves’ in b and *pari√dhā* ‘clothe’ in c. In pāda a the middle participle *cakrāṇāsaḥ* has a clear parallel in the adornment phrase in VIII.14.5 *cakrāṇā opaśām divi* “creating for himself a headdress in heaven.” As in the previous verses, there seem to be two contending sides, the enemies found in pādas abc and the friends in d. “Having made for themselves a girdle from the earth” in a is easily interpretable in this framework: the enemies have fallen and are perhaps dead, partially covered by earth. But “adorning themselves with a golden amulet” in b is more difficult, since a golden amulet sounds like a positive decorative item. However, Younger Avestan has a compound *zarənu-maini* (Yt. 14.33), apparently made of related verbal material, which is the epithet of a vulture, found in a passage in which the vulture spies bloody meat from far distances. If there is a connection between the two (see EWA s.v. *mañī*), “to adorn oneself with a golden amulet” may mean figuratively “to become food for vultures.” In contrast to Indra’s doomed adversaries in ab, in d he clothes his “spies” with the sun; sunlight is often a symbol of untroubled life, as in the often repeated wish “to see the sun” (*sūryam dṛśé* and related expressions).

For a detailed discussion of this vs., esp. pāda b and its Iranian correspondents, see my 2018 “A Golden Amulet in Vedic and Avestan” (Ged. H.-P. Schmidt, *Dabir* 6: 57–66). I would now emend the publ. tr. of pāda a to “having made for themselves a coverlet from the earth.”

I.33.9: ET points out that the verb of ab *pári ... ábubhojīḥ* “you coiled around” might be more appropriate as a description of Vṛtra; it is almost as if Indra is appropriating the qualities of his opponents in addition to his own and thereby showing himself to be even more powerful. The form *ábubhojīḥ* itself is isolated, the only reduplicated form to the root \sqrt{bhuj} ‘bend’. Kü gives it a lemma in his monograph on the perfect (351–52) but does not commit himself further, beyond stating that the form is a 2nd sg. preterite “in der statisch-attingenten Bedeutung” and suggesting that there might have originally been a stative perfect that is no longer alive in Vedic. This would allow a plausible analysis of our form as a pluperfect, with a renewed ending *–īs*, to avoid expected but non-

transparent **abubhok*. JL points to the phonetic echo *ubhe ábubhojīr* across the pāda boundary.

adhamah in d needs to be read with both pādas, c and d.

I.33.10: The rel. clauses with plural subj. in ab have no possible connection with anything in the second hemistich. I take them instead as completing the portrayal of the conflict between the two moieties depicted in the earlier parts of the hymn. The pl. rel. prn. *yé* has no direct antecedent in the preceeding pāda (9d), though it can pick up the intent of sg. *dásyum*; it can also hark a little further back to 9c *ámanyamānān* ‘heedless ones,’ as H-P Schmidt suggests (B+I).

If pādas ab close the preceding myth, the rest of the verse seems to allude glancingly to the Vṛtra (c) and Vala (d) myths.

I.33.11: *abhí dyūn*: acc. pl. *dyūn* almost always refers to ‘days’ (as in the expression *ánu dyūn* “through the days,” which regularly occupies this same metrical position. However, *pace* Re’s “pour toujours” (which is, in any event, not equivalent to “through the days”), a temporal interpretation does not work here. Ge (/WG) “für die Himmels(götter),” for which there is no support (their I.190.4 is better tr. otherwise) and whose datival “für” is an odd rendering of *abhí*. My “to high heavens” (the “high” being imported from the English idiom) rests on the adj. *abhídyu-* ‘heaven-bound’; as ET suggests it can be taken as a decomposition of this adjective, which, as it happens, is almost always pāda final.

I.33.12: Bloomfield’s disc. of the 2nd hemistich (RR) is interpretively useful, though somewhat dismissively phrased. It is too long to paraphrase here, but he acutely observes that previous translators have glossed over the problem that Indra is uncharacteristically depicted as at the end of his strength.

I.33.13: Stylistically the verse is marked by 4 fronted preverbs in tmesis, an effect not possible to convey in English without awkwardness.

I.33.15: *śáma-* ‘hornless’ found only here and in I.32.15, another piece of shared terminology.

I.34 Aśvins

I.34.1: “Three times a day” (*tríḥ ... adyá*) opens the hymn, announcing the hymn’s “three” theme and also linking it to the three pressings of (some Ṛgvedic versions of) the Soma Sacrifice.

Predicative voc. *navedasā* here rendered as part of a phrasal verb, with impv. *bhavatam*.

The second hemistich is built on an etymological relationship between the instrument noun *yantrá-* (c) and the gerundive *abhyāyaṃsénya-* (d), both built to the root *√yam* ‘hold’ (the second form presumably to the *s*-aor. of that root; so AiG II.2.503, though the reason for using this base isn’t clear). This word play is lost in Ge’s (/WG’s) tr., but I have aimed to keep it, unfortunately producing some awkwardness in the English.

I.34.4: *suprāvyèḥ prāvī-* and related forms I take, following Old (Noten ad II.13.9; also Scar. 501) to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, rather than to \sqrt{av} ‘help’ (e.g., Gr). The forms are specialized for the pursuit of ritual activities; verbal forms of $\sqrt{vī} + prā$ have a wider range of meanings, but can be used of ritual activities. The lexeme is disc. by Scar (501) but not to much avail. Gr’s thematic stem *suprāvyā-*, supposed found here and in II.13.9, can be stricken. Both forms belong to the root noun cmpd. – here a dative, in II.13.9 a gen.

tredhēva “as if threefold” presumably refers to the Aśvins, who, though only being a pair, are as effective as if they were three.

With Ge (/WG) I take *akṣārā* (in *akṣāreva*) as nom. sg. fem., corresponding to the Aśvins, who are subject to *pinvatam*. See Old’s somewhat inconclusive disc. (*ZDMG* 63 [=KlSch p. 310]) of the various options. Rivelex (I.16–17) takes it as a neut. nom. pl. collective; Gr. also as a neut. pl., though without specifying case.

I.34.5: *sūre duhitā* “daughter of the Sun” preserves, by most accounts, the archaic sandhi of final *-as > -e* before initial dental. For further disc., see my 2010 “Sūre Duhitār’s Brother, the ‘Placer of the Sun’: Another Example of *-e < *-as* in Rigvedic Phrasal Sandhi” (Fs. Melchert, 159–66). The myth on which this pāda is based, Sūryā’s marriage, is not otherwise mentioned in this hymn. On the formulaic representation of the myth in the RV see my 2001 “The Rigvedic svayamvara? Formulaic Evidence” (Fs. Parpola, 303–15).

I.34.6: Ge (/WG) take *māmakāya* as referring to the poet himself (“... meiner Wenigkeit”), with *sūnāve* in apposition and identifying the poet as the Aśvins’ son (“als (eurem) Sohne”). This is certainly possible and in line with the self-deprecatory use of *māmaka-* in I.31.11 for the poet-sacrificer’s self-reference. It is by no means necessary, however, and it does introduce extra machinery.

I.34.7: On *aśāyatam* see VI.33.2. This stem is found with *pāri* also in X.43.6.

ātméva vātaḥ is an underlying grammatical pun. Though *vāta-* is of course an Indo-Iranian word for ‘wind’, historically it is actually a thematized present participle to the ‘blow’ root. Here I think it is an adjective ‘blowing’ qualifying *ātmā*, which is itself being compared to wind in this simile. *ātmán-* here shows its older ‘(life-)breath’ sense, not the ‘self, soul’ that already begins to take over in the RV.

I.34.8: I take the *kṛtām* in b as predicated of both *āhāvāḥ* and *havīḥ*, with number agreement with the nearer noun and slightly different senses (at least in English).

I.34.9: The “three wheels” (*trī cakrā*) here are surely imposed by the insistent “three” theme of this hymn. Vedic chariots ordinarily had two wheels (see Sparreboom, Ved. Ch., 10–11), and how a third wheel would even be affixed isn’t clear to me.

I.34.10: It is a physical oddity that the two Aśvins are apparently credited with plural mouths. There are two possible solutions: 1) The plural expression has been adopted from elsewhere. There is one other occurrence of *madhupébhir āsábhiḥ* (IV.45.3), unfortunately also in an Aśvins hymn; however, other examples of *āsábhiḥ* occur in

plural context. 2) The mouths don't belong exclusively to the Ásvins, but to other soma-drinking gods. The 33 gods who accompany the Ásvins here for drinking in the next verse might support this latter possibility.

I.34.12: The *ca* of *d* has no obvious function; Klein (DGRV I.227-28) ascribes the construction to "looser nexus," which isn't terribly helpful.

I.35 Savitar

I.35.4: I take *kṛṣṇā rájāṃsi* loosely as an accusative of extent. Others (Ge, Re) supply a verb to govern this phrase ("verbreitend" and "pour traverser" respectively), while still others (Macd., Falk 1988, WG) take it as a second acc. with *dádhanah*, as appositive to *táviṣīm* "assuming the dark realms as his power." This latter solution is possible grammatically and does not require additional material to be supplied, but I am somewhat dubious that the dark realms constitute his power.

I.35.6: This verse of cosmic mystery decked out in numerology comes as a surprise after the simple, descriptive beginning of this hymn. The syntax of *c* is ambiguous: Ge (Re / WG) takes *amṛtā* as nom. pl., supplying "him" as acc. with *ádhi √sthā*: "Alles Unsterbliche ruht (auf ihm) ..." I follow Old, who takes it as acc. pl., citing III.38.4 *ā viśvárūpo amṛtāni tasthau* "Having all forms, he mounted on the immortal (things?)."

Note the fem. numeral *tisráḥ* with *dyāvah*, a stem ordinarily masc. On the occasional gender switch see comm. ad I.57.5 and VIII.40.4, as well as the next vs., 7.

I.35.7: In some ways a responsive verse to the previous one(s): *ví ... akhyat* (a) parallels 5a *ví ... akhyan*; *ciketa* (c) responds to *ciketāt* in 6d; and the three heavens of 6a are alluded to in the query in 7d *katamām dyām* "to which heaven (of three or more)?"

The fem. gender of *katamām* signals 'heaven' as fem., one of the rare examples of this gender switch, quite possibly induced here by the fem. *tisró dyāvah* in the immed. previous vs. On pronominal fem. forms in this situation, see comm. ad VIII.40.4.

I.35.8: In b I read *trī* with both *dhánva* and *yójanā* (taking both as neut. pl.). The position of the numeral favors taking it with *dhánva*, which could, however, be singular; in favor of reading the numeral (also) with *yójanā* is X.86.20 *dhánva ca yāt kṛntátram ca, káti svít tā ví yójanā* "Wasteland and chasm -- how many yojanas (of distance) are they away (from here)." (Note that *dhánva* is singular in that passage.)

I.35.10: On *svávām* as nom. sg. of the *-s*-stem *sv-ávas-*, see AiG III.287. The Pp. analyses it rather as *svá-vān* 'possessing property'. Curiously Macdonell (Ved. Reader, ad loc.) claims to be following the Pp., but tr. 'aiding well'.

Most tr. take *pratidośám* as a temporal, "towards evening" or "every evening." I think rather that it's spatial, construed naturally with *ásthāt* 'took his place, stood'. The god is facing west. (Cf. Peter Pan: "straight on 'til morning," presumably meaning "east.") The same expression, also of Savitar, is found in VI.71.4, though it does not clinch the interpretation.

I.35.11: Although it is possible to construe c directly with d, it seems best, following Ge, to supply a verb of motion in c. The d pāda has a close parallel in I.114.10, suggesting that it is independent.

Note the unusual duplication of the nominal referent in both rel. and main clause:
yé ... pānthāḥ ... / tébhiḥ ... pathíbhiḥ.

I.36 Agni

I.36.1: *purūṇām* is generally construed as qualifying *yahvám*, but this requires taking the latter as an implicit superlative (Ge “den Jüngsten unter vielen”), which it is not. (JL points out that a derivative of the real superlative, *yáviṣṭhya*, appears twice in the hymn, vss. 6, 15.) Better to take it as parallel to *viśām*, though, since *viś-* is fem., not modifying it as Proferes (2007: 31) does.

I.36.10, 17: As often, it is difficult to know when to tr. analyzable words as PNs rather than literally. There is no particular reason that I explicitly allowed both possibilities in vs. 10 and only the PN in 17.

I.36.13: *añjibhiḥ* would have been better rendered as ‘ornaments’ than ‘unguents’, and as ET suggests, these ornaments could be vocal.

I.36.14: On *vidā* versus *vidāḥ*, see comm. ad IX.19.6. Since the verb is parallel to three impvs. (*pāhi* a, *daha* b, *kṛdhī* c), an imperatival interpr. works better than a subjunctive.

In keeping with I.37.14, it might be best to change ‘favor’ to ‘friendship’ for *dúvaḥ* in d.

I.36.16: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

On *ghanéva* see comm. ad I.63.5.

I.36.17: *mitrótá* has been variously interpreted. The Pp. analyzes it as *mitrá utá*, which is surely correct, with *mitrá* as a dual. Ge takes this as an acc., parallel to *médhyātithim*, referring to Turvaśa and Yadu in 18a: “den beiden Verbündeten.” Better, with Gr and Old, to take it as an elliptical dual, “Mitra (and Varuṇa)” and a nom. parallel to Agni as subj. Wackernagel’s idea (AiG II.1.36) that it is truncated from the PN **mitráīthi-* (found only in X.33.7) by gapping from *médhyātithi-* was properly rejected by Old and Ge; that PN was clearly not widespread, and a bare form *mitrá* would surely be interpr. by the audience as referring to the god or the common noun ‘ally’.

I.36.18: Ge (/WG) takes *dāsyave sáhaḥ* as a phrasal personal name “Dasyave Sahas,” a personal name that would have to be neuter. Better to follow Old (SBE) by taking it as a qualifier of Agni. Re also rejects the personal name interpr., but considers it a pāda-final truncation of the instr. *sáhasā*. (Because *sáhaḥ* can be construed without problem as the nom./acc. neut. it appears to be, there is no reason to resort either to Re’s truncation or to an archaic instr. sg. zero-grade ending **-h₁* in the mode of Hale [Fs. Melchert].) Old’s interpretation finds support in 19, where the second pāda contains an entirely parallel

phrase qualifying Agni, with neut. noun construed with benefactive dative: *jyótir jánāya* “a light for the people.”

I.36.19: *ukṣitā-* is ppl. to both $\sqrt{vakṣ}/ukṣ$ ‘grow’ and $\sqrt{ukṣ}$ ‘sprinkle’; both meanings are apt for Agni.

I.36.20: I read *ná* twice in b, both as the neg. with the dat. infinitive *prātītaye* and as a simile marker, evoking the common phrase *mṛgó ná bhīmáḥ* (I.154.2, etc.) and its variants.

I.37 Maruts

I.37.1: There are two ways to take the apparent masc. acc. phrase *anarvāṇam ratheśúbham* in b. In the publ. tr. I interpret *ratheśúbh-* as a noun, ‘beauty on a chariot’, modified by masc. *anarvāṇam*, with the phrase an appositive to the neut. *śárdho mātutam* in pāda a. But there are some problems with this. First, the indep. noun *śúbh-* is fem. Of course, its acc. is also *śúbham*, and it is arguable that the bahuvrīhi adj. *anarvān-* would make a fem. of the shape *-āṇam*, rather than a deriv. fem. **anarvaṇī-* (acc. **-aṇīm*). So the interpr. of the publ. tr. remains (barely) possible. However, the standard tr. treat the phrase as adjectival with the preceding neut. acc. This interpr. finds support in V.56.9 *śárdham ratheśúbham*, with masc. *śárdham*, and also from VI.48.15, where masc. acc. *anarvāṇam* apparently modifies the same neut. phrase as here, but in a simile *śárdho ná mātutam*. See comm. ad loc. To construct a proper neut. for our phrase here is enough to provide the answer: **anarvá ratheśúp* is remarkably unappealing, and a slide into a form more recognizably acc. and more recognizably associated with the underlying stems is easy to understand. For *anarvá-* see comm. ad I.185.3.

I.37.1-2: An “improper” relative construction, with masc. pl. *yé* in 2a picking up *śárdhaḥ* ‘troop’ of 1a, which is grammatically neut. sg., though conceptually plural.

I.37.3: The Pp. reads pl. *kásāḥ* ‘whips’ here, and standard tr. follow this, making it the subj. of *vádān*. But *kásā-* is otherwise only sg. in the RV, even when plural entities wield it. I therefore take it as sg. *kásā* and as the subj. of *śṃve*, with the Maruts as unexpressed subj. of *vádān*. This also makes better sense of the positions of both *eṣām* and *yád*: most tr. construe *eṣām* with *hásṭeṣu*, which means the unaccented pronoun would begin a clause. And *yád* would be too far to the right in its clause: we expect *yá-*forms to follow at most one constituent. (Of course, it might be possible to interpret *eṣām kásā hásṭeṣu* “the whip in their hands” as a single constituent, but this would be pushing it.)

I.37.5: It is possible to take *prá śamsā* as 1st sg. subjunctive, as Re. does, though there seems no compelling reason not to continue with a 2nd sg. impv., following the 2nd pl. *gāyata* in the previous pāda (4c).

Pāda b seems an incipient izafe construction, with an appositive introduced by *yád* -- even though it is grammatically impeccable as a standard rel. cl. (allowing for the attraction in gender to neut. *yád* of putative **yám*, whose antecedent *ághnyam* is masc.).

Ge unaccountably interprets the med. pf. *vāṇṛdhe* as a 1st sg. (“Ich habe mich ... gestärkt”; so also WG), though he doesn’t read *prá śamsā* in a as 1st ps. Although this is grammatically possible, context suggests that the Marut troop is the subj. of this verb.

I.37.6: Although nouns not in the vocative case generally lose their accent in vocative phrases (type *sūno sahasaḥ* “o son of strength”), the conjoined genitives *divás ca gmaś ca* retain their standard accent though being part of the voc. phrase headed by *dhūtayaḥ* “o shakers” – presumably in part because the pāda needs to begin with an accented word and also because this particular voc. phrase is not only structurally complex (with a conjoined NP as gen.) but also not a fixed idiom. Of course, since *divás ca gmaś ca* opens the pāda, it would have to be accented one way or other, but if it had received default voc. accent we would expect *dívaś ca gmaś ca*.

I.37.7: With Ge, I read *ní* with both clauses. For c (*ní*) ... *jíhīta*, cf. VIII.7.2 *ní párvatā ahāsata* “The mountains have bent down.”

I.37.9: The syntactic structure of this verse is not clear, in great part because it contains no finite verbs, and most tr. leave the structure undefined. In my interpr. pāda a is a causal clause dependent on the main clause of pāda b, with *yát ... śávaḥ* in the relative clause of pāda c coreferential with the *váyaḥ* of b. The point is that at the moment of birth, in a stable situation (a), the Maruts had the strength to leave their mother’s womb on their own (*nír√i* is a lexeme specialized for birth contexts; cf., e.g., IV.18.2, V.78.9) (b), and that same strength remains with them (c).

I construe *ānu* with preceding *sīm* (“follows them”); cf. I.141.9.

I.37.10: The standard tr. separate pādas a and b and supply a verb with the former (e.g., Ge “stimmen”) with no obvious source. I prefer to take the two pādas together and take *kāṣṭhāḥ* as an unmarked simile: “their songs (like) race-course posts.” The lexeme *úd√tan* then has the meaning ‘stretch upward, erect’; this is the only finite form of the idiom in the RV (or, it seems, anywhere), which is mostly attested in the frozen adjective *uttāná-* ‘stretching upward, stretching out’.

Why their knees are bent is a matter of speculation, but it probably refers to a crouching position suitable for driving (cf. VIII.92.3).

I.37.11: Although most tr. take the “child of mist” to be the rain, its physical description here (“long and wide”) makes better sense for a cloud.

āmṛdhra- normally means ‘not neglectful, not slighting’, but this doesn’t yield much sense here. I therefore take it in the passive sense ‘not (to be) neglected / slighted’; English “not negligible” provides a perfect idiomatic counterpart.

I.37.13: The mutual chatter of the Maruts on their journey refers of course to the thunder.

I.37.14: For plural *dúvaḥ* pl. see Schindler, Rt. noun, p. 25, EWA s.v. *dúvas-*. The same nom. pl. is found in VI.29.3.

I.37.15: This final verse is oddly disjointed. For one thing there must be a change of person from 2nd (*vaḥ*) to 3rd (*eṣām*) in ab in reference to the Maruts; it is difficult not to take these pl. pronouns as coreferential. I supply *dúvaḥ* in a, because this pāda is structurally similar to 14b; however, this is not strictly necessary, and an interpretation like Ge's "Denn es gibt etwas für euch zum Schwelgen" is certainly possible. As for pāda b, it is generally taken to mean "we are theirs," and, again, this is possible. But given its structural similarity to the immediately preceding pāda, I interpret it in similar fashion, as suggesting that we have something to offer them. The last pāda then expresses what our service to the Maruts should bring about for us.

I.38 Maruts

I.38.1: For *kadhapriyaḥ* see I.30.20. In this passage the connection of this voc. with the interrogative is esp. clear, since the pāda begins *kād dha* "what indeed?" *kād* is translated twice, for clarity.

I.38.2: The gen./abl. form of *divāḥ* and *pṛthivyāḥ* is somewhat surprising, but, with Old, it is best to assume they depend on *kvā*. Although the *nā* separating them is also somewhat surprising, it is possible to take it as a real simile particle rather than a bleached connective (Re's "aussi bien que..."). Since the point of this tṛca is the anxiety occasioned by the Maruts' absence from our sacrifice, the poet worries that the Maruts have disappeared to some other sacrificer on earth as definitively as if they had gone off to heaven.

In the simile in c, "in a pasture" is supplied on the basis of the formula *√RAN gāvo nā yāvase* (V.53.16, etc.). Note that the expected *yāvase* shows up below in 5a, in a slightly off-kilter simile. This might be taken as "poetic repair" (see Jamison 2006: Paris poetics), but simultaneously "de-repair," in that it introduces an element from one verbal complex into another, where it is unexpected.

I.38.5: See remarks ad vs. 2 on the simile here.

The "path of Yama" is of course the path to death (or after death, to Yama's world). The prohibitive *mā* of pāda a must have domain also over pāda c.

I.38.6: *durhāṇā* and related forms are most likely Middle Indic developments of **durhīṇā* (etc.) 'evil rage' from *√hr̥* 'be angry'. See EWA s. *HAR*¹.

Ge (WG) take *pārāparā* as representing *pāra+apara-* 'further and nearer, earlier and later', but Old's interpr. (followed by Re) as an āmreḍita preposition 'further and further, ever further' is more appealing. As Re points out, the adv. *pārā* and related forms are characteristic of *nīrti-*.

I.38.7: The standard interpr. of *avāta-* here is 'windless', but with Gr (see also Lub) I take it to the homonymous stem 'unextinguishable, unquenchable' (*√vā* 'extinguish'). The point here is that even in a waterless place the Maruts can make rain: wind is irrelevant, but water that doesn't give out is crucial. Cf. *avānīr avātāḥ* "unquenchable streams" in I.62.10.

I.38.8: “lightning bellows” – a mixed image, of a type not uncommon in Marut hymns.

I.38.10: Ge (WG) takes the *sádma* phrase as a parallel subject to *mānuṣāḥ* (requiring a sg. form of *reja-* to be supplied), but an acc. extent-of-space interpretation works just as well, without needing an extra verb. So also Re.

The last three verses (7–9) describing the thunderstorm are all couched in the present tense, so the augmented imperfect *ārejanta* is somewhat surprising. Vs. 10 does begin a new *ṛca*, however.

I.38.11: *ródhas-* is a bulwark or fortification (\sqrt{rudh} ‘obstruct’), in this context indicating the ‘banks’ of a river, which keep the waters within.

I.38.12: The change of person between pādas, 2nd pl. *vaḥ* in a, 3rd pl. *eṣām* in b, is exactly the same as in I.37.15 and equally inexplicable. I have therefore failed to tr. *eṣām*. It is possible, of course, that *eṣām* doesn’t refer to the Maruts, but to part of the listed equipage, perhaps the chariots – hence “Let your wheel-rims be steady, and (your) chariots and their horses” – but the parallel structure in the previous hymn makes that unlikely.

I.38.13: I have tr. *jarāyai* as ‘to awaken him’, but this is probably wrong, however appealing in context. The noun *jarā-* only means ‘old age’, and therefore some version of Ge’s “dass er das Greisenalter (uns schenke)” is better. Its intent would match the last pāda of the previous hymn, I.37.15c “in order (for us) to live a full lifetime,” and the two hymns have much in common.

I.38.14: The first two pādas contain two punning verbs, whose double meanings reinforce each other: *mīmīhi* can belong to $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘bellow’ and $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’ (generally assigned only to the latter and so tr.). In the first meaning it refers to the sound of the song, in the second to its regulated production, that is, to its meter. *tataṇaḥ* can belong to \sqrt{tan} ‘thunder’ and \sqrt{tan} ‘stretch out’ (Gr assigns to the former, but standard tr. reflect the latter). In the first meaning it again refers to the sound of the song, in the second, again to its method of production – in this case, the prolonging of a tone or note. The second meanings of both verbs clearly belong to the technical vocabulary of singing (see the next pāda, 14c, as well), the former connect the poet’s sounds to those of the Maruts’ thunderstorm (cf. *mīmāti* ‘bellows’ in 8a).

I.38.15: The two occurrences of *tveṣā-*, 7a and 15b, both referring to the Maruts, should have been harmonized in tr. (currently ‘dazzling’ and ‘glittering’ respectively). A regrettable if minor lapse.

I.39 Maruts

I.39.1: *māna-* seems to activate the same pun on the homonymous roots $\sqrt{mā}$ as was noted in the preceding hymn, I.38.14. The Maruts project both their bellowing and the measure of their song. (Standard tr. only recognize the ‘measure’ sense.)

“Like a flame” – what does *śocīḥ* correspond to in the frame of the passage? Ge (/WG) take it as parallel to “you” (=Maruts), as the agent of throwing, and supply an object “(ihren Schein).” But since *śocīś-* is a neuter, it can as easily be an accusative and express the thrown object, and this seems to me the more likely interpretation (perhaps influenced by the modern flame-thrower). In a Marut context it could stand for the lightning they deploy in addition to the thunder represented by *mānam*. For further on this image see disc. at vs. 10.

I.39.2: The two contrastive pādas of the first hemistich express offensive and defensive procedures respectively.

I.39.3: Standard treatments (including Old) divide pāda a into a rel. cl. and a main clause (e.g., Ge “Was fest ist, stosset ihr um”), accounting for the accent on *hathá* by its placement immediately after the rel. cl. However, this interpr. requires taking *yát sthirám* as an embedded relative, preceded by the preverb+part. associated with the main verb (*pārā ha*). Since RV does not (ordinarily) have embedded relatives, it is best to take *yád* as the subordinator for the whole hemistich (with domain over *vartáyatha* as well). This also makes the two pādas more parallel: Ge’s tr. of b as also consisting of rel. cl. main cl. (“was schwer ist, bringet ...”) is impossible. Nonetheless, since I now see that nominal relative clauses can be embedded, I am willing to consider an alt. tr. “What (is) steadfast, you smite to the far distance,” though the argument about parallelism still seems strong.

I.39.4: The opening of pāda c is identical to 2c. The rest of this hemistich presents a few problems. The phrase *tánā yujā* is rendered variously. My translation is based on the observation that in almost every single instance *yujā* follows an instr. in an expression meaning “with X as yoke-mate” (X may either be animate [e.g., I.8.4 *tváyā yujā*] or inanimate [e.g., X.83.3 *tāpasā yujā* “with fervor as yokemate”]). In this case, I take the root noun *tán-* to refer to the Marut’s entire lineage, in other words their family heritage and their sibling connections to each other. The instr. phrase *sārvayā vísā* “with your whole clan” in the next vs. (5d) may convey the same meaning. Taking *tánā* as ‘lineage’ here also has the merit of allowing a semantic connection with *tánāya* in 7a.

I separate the two pādas (so also Re), in great part because of the position of *nū cid*, which usually opens its clause (here after an extra-sentential voc. *rúdrāsah*). However, a tr. similar to Ge’s, “your might is never to be open to challenge,” would also be possible.

I.39.5: The two other occurrences of *durmáda-* ‘badly drunk’ (I.32.6, VIII.2.12) are both in martial context and seem to refer to warriors intoxicated on the frenzy of battle. The other occurrences are quite negative, whereas here we must take the word as positive or neutral in describing the Maruts, who are, to be sure, frequently depicted as being almost out of control. I think this is the point of comparison.

I.39.8: The threatening *ābhva-* (< privative *á-* + $\sqrt{bhū}$; cf. WG “Unwesen”) that besets us represents the Vedic fear of formlessness. See my forthcoming “The Blob in Ancient India.”

I.39.9: The signature word of this final *tr̥ca* is *ásāmi-*, Ge’s “vollkommen” “complete.” It literally means “without a half, not halved,” and the insistence on this unusual form merits a literal translation, in my view, although it is less fluent than the paraphrase.

kāṇvaṃ dadā “you gave Kaṇva” -- the grammar is clear, but the meaning somewhat odd. What is presumably meant is the ancient poet Kaṇva, ancestral to the current line.

I.39.10: This verse shows a type of ring composition with vs. 1, in sense though not vocabulary. The hymn begins (1b) with a shooting/throwing metaphor, *śocīr ná m̐nam āsyatha* “(when) you cast your measure/bellowing like a flame.” The last pāda of the hymn (10d) makes the shooting image more pointed: *īṣuṃ ná sṛjata dvīṣam* “you launch your enmity like an arrow.” The “shooting” verb *√as* of 1b is replaced by more generic *√sṛj* ‘launch, release’, but the simile specifies an arrow, rather than the potentially destructive but less specific ‘flame’. The responsion between these two expressions may give added support to the interpretation of *śocīḥ* as an accusative in vs. 1; see discussion there.

I.40 Brahmanaspati

I.40.3: The sense of the hapax *pañktīrādhas-* ‘whose gifts come in fives’ is unexplained. It may of course be some ritual reference (and the range of available explanations tends in that direction), but I suggest that it might be a reference to the fingers and mean that gifts come by the handful, that is, abundantly.

I.40.4: I would now take *īlām* as both ‘refreshment’ and deified Refreshment; the verb *āyajāmahe* then indicates not merely that we win refreshment by sacrifice, but we attract the goddess Iḍā to our sacrifice by our performance. For a similar passage, but with deified *hótrā-* ‘Libation’, see X.63.7 and comm. ad loc.

On the basis of my re-eval. of *anehās-* (ad X.61.12), I would now slightly alter the tr. to “flawless refreshment,” the point being that the refreshment is physically complete, lacking nothing, rather than it is morally without fault.

I.40.6: The rendering of *anehās-* here as ‘faultless’ works better with mantra, than with refreshment in vs. 4 (q.v.). However, I would still change the tr. to ‘flawless’: the mantra should likewise be complete, lacking no necessary words.

The *ca* in c is subordinating, as the verbal accent shows (*pratiháryathā*). See Klein: DGRV I.240.

I.40.7: Although the standard tr. take *antarvāvat* as referring to territory “in between” (e.g., Ge “das dazwischen liegende (Land)”), I follow Schmidt’s (B+I, 102; see also Old ad loc., AiG II.2.893) suggestion that it is a pleonastically marked variant of *antárvant-* ‘pregnant’, an interpretation that works nicely with the following verse. Although my translation implies that *antarvāvat* modifies *kṣáyam*, this cannot be true because *kṣáya-* is masc. My rendering is an abbreviated form of “made his dwelling place into (something) pregnant” (cf. Schmidt “seinen Wohnsitz hat er zu etwas gemacht, das ... schwanger ist”).

Where I differ from Schmidt (and some others) is in the interpr. of *pastyābhiḥ* in pāda c. Opinion is split over whether this stem (and *pastyā-*) means ‘stream’ or ‘dwelling place’, and Schmidt goes with the former. Although that meaning works well in this passage -- Schmidt takes pāda d as meaning “pregnant (with streams),” that is, well-watered -- on balance the ‘dwelling place’ interpretation fits more contexts better. (Curiously in the same work [B+I, p. 64] Schmidt renders *pastyānām* in VII.97.5 as “der Häuser.”) For disc. see EWA s.v. *pastyā-* (favoring ‘dwelling place’ for *pastyā-* and, less strongly, for *pastyā-*) and Brereton (*Ādityas*, 94–96 n. 45). For additional if indirect evidence for ‘dwelling place’ see comm. ad IX.97.18.

I.40.8: Most tr. (including Schmidt) render *pr̥ñcītā* with the anodyne ‘increase’, but *úpa √pr̥c* is a sexual idiom (‘inseminate’ < ‘engorge’; see, e.g., VI.28.8). The accent on this verb probably results from its adjacency to accented *hánti* (on which see, HO and JSK – reff.).

Note the gapping out of compound in the contrastive phrase *mahādhané ... árbhe* “when there is a large stake or a small,” where the independent loc. *árbhe* is functionally parallel to the 1st compound member *mahā-*. See disc. ad I.7.5, which contains the same phrase.

I.41 Ādityas

I.41.4: The voc. *ādityāsaḥ* was omitted from the tr. “O Ādityas” should be added at the end of the first line.

I.41.8: The first two pādas have elicited a fair amount of discussion and disagreement. The questions are these: 1) What is the nuance of *prāti √vac* and, in particular, what is the function of the accusative construed with it? 2) Are *ghnāntam*, *śāpantam*, and *devayāntam* parallel accusatives, or is there a dependency relationship among them? Ge (/WG) take *devayāntam* as the object of *ghnāntam* and *śāpantam* (Ge “der den Gottergebenen schlägt oder flucht”), while Re (EVP V) and Old consider the three accusatives parallel, with the first two given as negative examples, the third one as a positive one. Although I think the latter view is correct, I do not follow these scholars in their assessment of the function of the accusative with *prāti √vac*: both take it as the topic spoken about (as opposed to Ge and WG). However, though *prāti* is rare with *vac* (one other occurrence in the RV, VIII.100.5, non-diagnostic because it is not construed with an accusative there), when that preverb appears with other verbs of speaking (*√vad*, *brū*, *ah*), the complement identifies the person spoken to, not the contents of the speech. I therefore take the clause to mean that “I” will not bother to answer back to a man who behaves badly, either physically (*ghnāntam*) or verbally (*śāpantam*), though I would to a godly man. The parenthetical “as if” could be omitted here, as ET points out. With *devayāntam* freed from its potential as object of the first two participles, they can instead take *vah* ‘you’ as their object (though admittedly how a mortal can “smite” the Ādityas is a bit unclear).

I.42 Pūṣan

I.42.1: Note the regularly contrasting preverbs *sám* and *ví* opening the first two pādas.

Though Re and, judging from his tr., Ge take *sákṣvā* to \sqrt{sac} ‘accompany’, following Gr., according to Narten (265 and n. 834, and already so in BR, Whitney’s *Roots*, etc.) it belongs with \sqrt{sah} ‘conquer’. That *prá* \sqrt{sah} is fairly common in the RV (including nominal compounds) while *prá* \sqrt{sac} occurs only once (X.27.19) may support this root assignment. I am, however, disturbed by the position of the preverb and its accompanying enclitic pronoun *naḥ*: the collocation looks like the start of a new clause. I wonder if we don’t in fact have two imperative clauses here, the second with a gapped *ihī*. Cf. VIII.17.9 *índra préhi purás tvám*. My translation “go forth ... to victory” reflects this possible interpretation.

I.42.3: On *huraś-cít-* see comm. ad IX.98.11.

I.42.4: *tápuṣi-* is attested only twice elsewhere, both times modifying *hetí-*, hence the supplied ‘weapon’ here.

I.42.7-9: *vidaḥ* is formally an injunctive and therefore functionally multivalent. Hoffmann (1967: 263) is not certain that it has modal value, though most tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take it as an impv. (e.g., Ge “schaff hierfür Rat!”). The other question is whether the *krātu-* that Pūṣan is to find is his own or meant for us (e.g., Re “procure (nous)...”). I have chosen to take the injunctive not as an impv. but a future-oriented indicative and to interpret the *krātu-* as Pūṣan’s, not ours – the point being that Pūṣan will find the resolve at our sacrifice to fulfill the requests we make of him in the imperatives. However, the other possibilities sketched above are not excluded, and at least in IX.20.3 an imperatival value of *vidaḥ* is likely; see comm. ad loc. I therefore put forth the alternative tr. “find resolve” for the refrain in this tṛca.

I.42.8: My “with” tr. of pāda b obscures what I think the grammatical structure is. *Pace* Gr and Old, on accentual grounds *navajvārā-* should not be a bahuvrīhi, but rather a karmadhāraya ‘new suffering’. The question is what relationship its pāda bears to the previous one. Re’s suppressed purpose clause (or so his supplied “qu’il n’y ait” suggests) may be the best possibility syntactically. If we simply assume an imperatival “let there not be ...” (so Maurer, sim. WG “nicht (sei uns)...”), parallel to pāda a, we should expect *mā*, not *ná* as the negative. It may be, however, that existential prohibitives (of the “let there not be” type) are blocked, because the root \sqrt{as} ‘be’ does not build an aorist and also lacks injunctive present forms, although functionally similar *mā bhūt* does occur. I have not found a discussion of this issue in Hoffmann 1967, but I may have missed it.

I.42.9: Though most of the verbs represented in this catalogue of imperatives normally take objects, the rhetorical point of this listing is the stark abruptness, and the inclusion of an object (*udāram* ‘belly’) with the final verb lays particular stress on this last desire expressed, to eat one’s fill.

I.43 Rudra and Soma

I.43.1: Tr. of *vocéma* repeated for clarity.

I.43.2-3: It is striking that Aditi and her two most illustrious sons, Mitra and Varuṇa, are depicted here as closely connected with Rudra. It is not entirely clear why, though perhaps it is simply an attempt in this relentlessly upbeat hymn to associate Rudra, who can be viewed ambivalently, with these powerful and positive figures.

I.43.4: *jālāṣa-* is “of unclear meaning” (so EWA s.v.) and shows non-Indo-Aryan phonology. In the RV it occurs twice independently and twice in this compound *jālāṣabheṣaja-* (and one of its independent occurrences is adjacent to *bheṣajā-*), always in association with Rudra. The translation ‘healing’ (see also Kuiper, *Aryans* 25-26, 46) therefore makes contextual sense, despite the lack of etymological support.

I.43.5: A verse-length relative clause, which can be construed either with vs. 4 (so Ge) or, by my preference, with vs. 6 (so also Re, WG). There is no strong evidence either way, however.

I.43.6: Global ref. to human kind as “men and women” is vanishingly rare in the RV. I know only one other potential case, the identical dative phrase in VIII.77.8, though it has a more restricted sense in that passage.

I.43.8: The supposed root noun cmpd (with both direct object and preverb, against standard practice; see comm. ad I.124.7) *somaparibādh-* (so Pp., Gr) is now taken by most interpr. as voc. *soma*, fld. by the preverb-root noun cmpd. *paribādh-*. See Scar (345 n. 484).

Although *juhuranta* and related forms are assigned to the root $\sqrt{h\bar{r}}$ ‘be angry’ by Insler (1968: 219ff.), an assignment accepted by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *HAR*^h) and further developed by Kü (602–3), such a meaning simply doesn’t make sense in this passage or in III.55.2, and so I take the form to $\sqrt{hv\bar{r}}$ ‘go crookedly, go amiss’. The phonology is perfectly apt, with a zero-grade having vocalic *u* and consonantal *r* before vowel, despite the metathesized zero-grade *hru* found in some forms.

I.43.9: The construction of the various parts of this rhetorically ambitious verse is not entirely clear, and various tr. make various choices. (In addition to the standard ones, see Lüders [231–32] and Hoffmann [Injunk. 260].) I take *amṛtasya* as modifying *te*, rather than construing it with *prajāḥ* (as, e.g., Ge does). I consider the two locatives, *pārasmin dhāman ṛtasya* and *nābhā*, to be parallel and to express the two geographically opposed places where Soma will be searching: highest heaven and the navel of the earth (supplying *pṛthivyāḥ* with *nābhā* as often). The larger meaning of this verse is addressed in the publ. intro.

I.44-49: For illuminating remarks on the rhetorical and grammatical connections among these hymns, see Jesse Lundquist 2014 (25th UCLA IE Conf., Proceedings).

I.44 Agni

I.44.1: On the locatival *-ar* in *uṣarbūdḥ-*, see Lundquist 2014.

I.44.2: *sajūs-*, opening pāda c and here rendered ‘jointly’, is etymologically related to *jūṣṭa-* ‘enjoyable, delightful’, which opens the verse, and the poet clearly recognizes the connection. A tr. “in joint enjoyment with...” seems too heavy, however.

I.44.3: My interpretation of *bhāṛjika-* I owe to Thieme (Unters. 40 n. 2; see EWA s.v. *ṛjika-*). MLW drew my attention to the article of Sabine Ziegler, “Altirisch (*im*)*bārach* und ved. *bhāṛjika-*: Eine uridg. Kollokation” (*HS* 124 [2011]: 268–76), where she connects the Vedic word with an Old Irish word meaning ‘morning’.

adhvaraśrī-. Pace Gr, Old (SBE) Ge (/WG), I very much doubt that *-śrī-* in this compound (or others) has transitive value: ‘das Opferfest verschönend’. For extensive disc. see Scar (545–46), who lays out a number of interpretive possibilities but seems to lean towards the one I also favor. (So also Re.) – So I wrote previously. However, I am now open to the possibility that this cmpd (and other *-śrī-* cmpds with ritual first members) do/can have transitive value. See comm. ad III.26.5. And so I’d now entertain an alternative “perfecting the ceremonies.”

Related to the analysis of this compound is the interpretation of *yajñānām adhvara-*. Ge (WG) take the former as dependent on the latter (clearest in WG “der die Opferhandlungen der Opfer verschönt”), but I think it more likely that the two nouns are parallel and depend on *-śrī-*, one as an independent gen., one as 1st compound member. So Re.; Scar adduces VIII.44.7 *adhvarāṇām abhiśrīyam*, with an independent gen. of *adhvarā-*, which supports this analysis. This can be fit into the above, revised transitive interpr.: “perfecting / perfecting of the ceremonies, of the sacrifices.”

I.44.4: The initial word of this verse, *śréṣṭham* is the superlative associated with *śrī-*, the last word of the previous verse. A translation “glory ... / Most glorious...” would have captured this connection.

I.44.6: All standard tr. take *suśāṃsa-* in an active sense (e.g., Ge “der ...Schönes sagt”) with the singer the recipient of Agni’s good speech. Certainly when applied to mortals, this has to be the sense, but when applied to gods I take the adj. in passive sense ‘good to proclaim/laud’, with here the singer in the dat. (*gṛṇatē*) as the agent of the praising.

I.44.7: The very common epithet *viśvávedas-*, used especially of Agni, has a potential double sense in all its occurrences: ‘possessing all possessions’ and ‘possessing all knowledge’. In fact, although the latter is generally favored in standard RV translations, the former may be the more stable sense, in that its 2nd member *védas-* is widespread in the meaning ‘possession, property’, but not found as a simplex in the meaning ‘knowledge’ (save at III.60.1, q.v). The parallel formation *jātávedas-* (see above, vs. 4) has a similar problem. Though generally rendered as ‘who has knowledge of the beings’ it could as well mean ‘who has possession of the beings’. Since *jātávedas-* seems to have become more opaque to its users than *viśvávedas-*, which does often (?) participate in its context, in the publ. tr. we do not translate *jātávedas-*.

I.44.8: Pāda a, with the list of gods in the accusative, is an expansion of *devān* in 7d. Though b begins with a god's name in the acc. (*agnīm*), this is to be construed with the following pādas.

I.44.9: As with vs. 4, the beginning of this verse connects with the final word of the previous one: 8d ... *svadhvara* 'o you of good ceremony' / 9a ... *adhvarāṇām* 'of the ceremonies'.

svardṛś- is a difficult word, with multiple interpretations. See Scar (pp. 234-39) for discussion of the various possibilities, though his favored one ("das Sonnenlicht sehend") seems to me the less common, since the adj. generally modifies gods. I generally take it as meaning 'having the look/appearance of the sun', that is 'looking like the sun', but occasionally as 'having the sight of the sun', that is, 'seeing the sun'. Interpretations like Ge's "deren Auge die Sonne ist" are unlikely because *dṛś-* is not 'eye'. See Re (EVP XII.81). In this particular passage, it is possible that 'seeing the sun' might also be appropriate, as anticipating the description of Agni in the next vs. (10b) *viśvādarśata-* 'visible to all'. In other words, the gods in 9 "see the sun" and in 10 Agni, often homologized to the sun, is something that everyone sees.

I.44.10, 12: In my opinion, *purohitā-*, though preserving its literal meaning 'set in front', also often already refers technically to a priestly office, the figure later known as the Purohita. Agni is called *purohitā-* both because he is literally 'set in front', that is, moved to the east to serve as the offering fire (later called the Āhavanīya), and because he serves as priest. JPB, however, does not believe that the word has developed this technical meaning in the RV. See esp. his 2004 "Brāhman, Brahman, and Sacrificer," in Griffiths and Houben, eds., *The Vedas: Texts, Language & Ritual: Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002*, 325-44.

I.44.10: As just noted, this verse also shares lexicon with the previous one: 9d X-*dṛś-*, 10b X-*darśata-*.

"Rich in radiance" is a less clumsy alternative for a literal rendering of the bahuvrīhi *vibhā-vasu-* 'whose goods are radiance'.

I.44.11: Another lexical reminiscence across verses: 10d *mānuṣaḥ*# 'descendant of Manu' and 11c #*manuṣvāt* 'like Manu'. As with the other examples, it is the last word of the previous verse that is matched in the next.

I.44.12: Again, lexical echo, though in this case it's the next-to-last word of the preceding verse: 11d *dūtām* / 12b *dūtyām*.

Note the synaesthesia in the second hemistich, with the sounds of the river's waves compared to the visual flashing of fire. The gen. *agnēḥ* here is a common noun referring to the substance fire, not to the god. Its parallelism with *sīndhoḥ*, also pāda-initial, helps ground this usage.

I.44.13-14: The emphasis on hearing in these verses is continued in the next hymn (vss. 2-3, 5, 7).

I.44.13: *váhni-* is usually ‘conveyor’, but here the gods cannot be conveying Agni, and the word seems to be quite loosely connected with the notion of conveyance. My ‘passengers’ is probably pushing it beyond where it should go.

I.44.14: The final pāda makes a little ring with 2c.

I.45 Agni

The theme of “hearing,” found also in the last two verses of I.44, is further explored here, with its complement, the “call” that the gods should hear.

I.45.1: My understanding of the structure of this verse is quite different from the consensus, which takes *yājā* of 1c as a 2nd sg. imperative, addressed to Agni, governing all the accusatives in the verse (“sacrifice to the Vasus ...”). I instead take *yājā* as 1st sg. subjunctive, governing only the accusatives of the 2nd hemistich, and supply *ā vaha* ‘bring here’ from 2d to govern those in the 1st hemistich. (This is supported by the fact that *trāyastriṃśatam* ‘three and thirty’ in 2d is a virtual shorthand for 1ab *vāsūn ... rudrām ādityām utá*, the three divisions of the gods, adding up to 33).

Despite the extra machinery, I think my interpretation better accounts for the contrast between the accusatives in ab and cd: the first set names the large generic groups of gods expected to attend the sacrifice, brought by Agni. The accusatives in the second set do not fit this category; in fact, their most likely referent is Agni himself: *svadhvarā-* ‘of good ceremony’ is primarily and characteristically applied to Agni, including in the previous hymn (I.44.8, a hymn that insistently associates Agni with the *adhvarā-* in 2b, 3d, 9a; see also 4c of this hymn), and *mānujāta-* ‘born of Manu’ cannot be applied to other gods, but is appropriate to Agni; see *mānuṣa-* ‘descendant of Manu’ in the previous hymn (10d) and also used elsewhere of Agni, as well as passages like VII.2.3 ... *agnīm mānunā sāmiddham* “... Agni, kindled by Manu.” It’s true that *ghṛtapruṣ-* ‘ghee-sprinkling’ is not a particularly Agnian epithet, though it could work if a passive interpretation of the root noun *pruṣ-* is allowed (‘ghee-sprinkled’; cf. I.58.2), and that *jāna-* is somewhat awkward as a designation of Agni (see my uneasy ‘being’).

Still, the standard interpretation of the verse is more awkward: if the accusatives in cd are held to refer to the gods (“the divine race”; see 10a *daívyam jānam*), they are described by adjectives that ill befit them; if Agni is held to be their referent (as supported by the above arguments), then the verse calls upon Agni to sacrifice to himself; if the accusatives refer to the human race, then the verse calls upon Agni to sacrifice to *humans*, which is entirely contrary to the Vedic model of sacrifice. By separating the two halves of the verse into different clauses and by interpreting *yājā* as a 1st singular, I account for the different referent types of the two sets of accusatives and avoid having Agni sacrifice to himself by providing another agent for the verb in cd.

I.45.3: On *vírūpavát* see comm. ad X.14.5. This is the only place in the RV where *vírūpa-* has to be interpr. as a PN.

I.45.4: *máhikeru-* is a hapax of unclear meaning. Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *máhikeru-* and *céru-*) plausibly suggests a connection with *√ci* ‘observe, take note’; so also Old. Its

apparent structural similarity to *mahivrata* in 3c might invite a complementary semantic analysis.

The etymological figure *śukréṇa śociṣā* is not rendered so in English because “blazing blaze” strikes me as limp.

I.45.8: Note the phonetic figure in c: *bṛhád bhā bíbhrato havír*, playing with *b*, *bh*, and *h*; *r* and *r*.

Most tr. take *bṛhád bhāḥ* ‘lofty light’ as coreferential with *tvā* (=Agni), not as object of *bíbhrataḥ*, parallel with *havíḥ*. This in some ways makes better sense, though the word order weakly favors my tr. Old (SBE) also takes the phrase as the obj. of *bíbhrataḥ* and adduces a telling parallel, IV.5.1 *kathā dāśemāgnāye bṛhád bhāḥ*, where the phrase is emphatically not coreferential with Agni.

I.45.10: I tr. *sudānavaḥ* as “you of good drops,” rather than “of good gifts,” which is always also possible for this ambiguous stem, because of “the Maruts of good drops” (*marútaḥ sudānavaḥ*) who ended the previous hymn (44.14) in the same structural position. But as a general descriptor of the gods in this verse it might be better as “of good gifts.”

[I.46-47 JPB]

I.48 Dawn

I.48.1: The voc. *uśaḥ* was carelessly omitted in the published tr.

I.48.2: With most tr./comm. I follow Bloomfield in interpr. *viśvasuvíd-* as haplology for **viśva-vasu-vid-* (for details, see Scar 489–90). This, however, produces a three-member cmpd, very rare in the RV. For a somewhat similar cmpd with karmadhāraya as 1st member, cf. *puruvāra-puṣṭi-* I.96.4.

The pāda break favors taking *bhūri* with the verb, as most do (e.g., Ge “geben sie sich viele Mühe”), but semantically it goes better with pāda a. Cf. expressions like *bhūri te vāsu* (I.81.2, 6, VIII.32.8), *bhūri vāmam* (I.124.12, VI.71.4), and esp. *bhūri ... saubhagam* in 9c below.

On *sūnītā-* as ‘liberality, liberal (gifts)’, see Re’s discussion here (EVP III.17), summarizing previous work.

I.48.3: Most tr. take *jīrā* as agentive with an objective genitive (e.g., Ge “die Wagen in Bewegung setzend”), but I think this unlikely because it would be the only such usage of *jīrā-*. (*gō-jīra-* in IX.110.3 is sometimes so interpreted [Ge ‘die Kühe zutreibend’] but need not be.) Although not taking *jīrā* as transitive leaves *rāthānām* without any clear governing word, that seems preferable to claiming a unique value for *jīrā-* in this passage. That Dawn may be “the lady of the chariots” is also suggested by her hundred chariots in 7c.

The referent of *yé* in c and the affiliation of that rel. cl. are disputed. Ge takes the rel. pronoun as referring to the *rāthānām* of b. This has the merit of associating the rel. with an adjacent noun in the proper number and gender and keeping the relative clause

syntactically confined to the verse in which it appears. However, it affords these chariots more agency and significance than I think they deserve. Instead, the rel. cl. of cd seems to group more naturally with the identically structured *yé* clause in 4ab, which also has a 3rd pl. presential reflexive verb preceded by a loc. pl. and also contains a genitive referring to Dawn. The two clauses also begin with a metrically irregular 11-syllable pāda with a rest right before the caesura, an irregularity that also speaks for their association. This pair of relative clauses is resolved by the main clause in 4cd. Such an enjambed structure is characteristic of pragāthas. (Re also take the two verses this way.)

Then there is the question of the meaning of *dadhriré*. It belongs to the root \sqrt{dhr} ‘hold, support’, and in this (rare) middle usage seems to have reflexive value ‘hold oneself’/‘hold oneself fast’, with the possible pregnant sense ‘hold oneself ready’ (so Re, WG, Ge n.). I take it as having slightly different meanings in simile and frame (a favored poetic strategy of Vedic bards). In the simile it depicts sailors (or some sort of boatmen) standing firm against the rigors of the voyage, whereas in the frame the subjects (who are identified in the parallel rel. clause of 4ab as patrons) hold themselves ready to give, an action that is also the topic of that parallel rel. clause. In fact, one could almost construe (or supply) the *dānāya* of 4b with *dadhriré* as well as with its own clause.

I.48.4: This verse is somewhat oddly constructed, especially the distribution of elements in cd. The opening of c, *átrāha tād*, seems overburdened with functionless elements, esp. the *tād*, which has no obvious referent. As it turns out, this opening is found elsewhere (I.135.8, 154.6), with a likewise referent-less *tād*. I therefore assume that the *tād* here emphasizes the temporal/logical *átra*. Then we find two gen. plurals, *eṣām* and *nīṇām*, separated from each other, but probably ultimately coreferential. I assume that enclitic *eṣām* serves as the correlative for *yé* in pāda a (though we might expect *téṣām*) and that the unusually heavy opening of the pāda has bumped it into pseudo-second position after the first real word of the clause, *kāṇvaḥ*. But until we understand more about the interaction of the placement of these various elements, this is simply an after-the-fact description. It should be noted that *eṣām* generally does not show the standard Wackernagel’s Position behavior (modified 2nd position) that we might expect from an enclitic, and in particular has a tendency to take final position. The *nīṇām* at the end of the verse simply doubles and further specifies *eṣām*. I have tr. *nāma* twice, for ease of English.

I.48.6: The first pāda depicts the usual effect of Dawn – sending all creatures on their daily business.

ódatī. Though this form appears to be a fem. pres. participle to a Class I present (also in its other occurrence VIII.69.2), such an analysis is formally troublesome, because the feminine stem is weak (-at-ī), though a strong suffix is expected in Class I (e.g., *bhávantī*). Moreover, there are no other forms to the putative present **ódatī*; the standard present is nasal-infix *unátti* with transitive value. And *ódatī* lacks participial sense: it simply means ‘wet’. It thus seems best to take it as a non-participial -ant- adjective (as *járant-* is often interpreted). It is worth noting that Whitney (*Roots*) classifies it as a primary derivative of the root and gives no Class I present and that Gotō makes no mention of it in his monograph on Class I; it is likewise undiscussed in Lowe’s monograph on RVic participles.

As for its meaning here, it is used simultaneously in two senses: the literal one, ‘wet’, referring to the dew characteristic of early morning, and ‘lubricious’, referring to Dawn’s notorious hyperfeminine and sexual qualities, also reflected in 5ab *yóṣeva ... prabhuñjatī* “giving delight like a maiden.”

vājīnīvant- (also *vājīnī-vasu-*). This fairly common adjective is obviously a derivative of extremely well-attested *vājīn-* ‘prize-winning (horse)’, itself a possessive adjective formed to *vāja-* ‘prize’. The usual tr. of *vājīnīvant-* are rather attenuated — Gr ‘gabenreich’, Ge (here) ‘du Reichbelohnende’, Debrunner (AiG II.2. 875) ‘gabenreich’ — or render it as if it were identical to *vāja-vant-*; so Re. (here) ‘porteuse des prix de victoire’, WG ‘du Rennpreisbesitzende’. By contrast, I feel that both the apparent feminine *vājīnī* and the second possessive suffix (-*vant-* in addition to -*in-*) should be noted and I interpret the stem as meaning ‘possessing prize-winning mares’. *vājīnīvant-* is esp. characteristic of Dawn and other female figures (e.g., Sarasvatī), who might be expected to have female animals; though *vājīnī-vasu-* is almost entirely confined to the Aśvins, those gods are very closely associated with Dawn. Debrunner (AiG II.2.409) instead ascribes the -*ī-* to “Erweiterung durch -*ī-* nach Analogie anderer Wörter,” but doesn’t in this case suggest what other word(s) might be involved.

I.48.9: The standard tr. take the injunctive *uchat* as a modal (Ge “soll ... hinweg leuchten”), but since this verb is parallel to a presential perfect *nānāma* (so Kü 278-79, *pace* WG “hat sich ... gebeut”) and a pres. indic. *kṛṇotī*, I see no reason to ascribe modal value to *uchat*.

I.48.10: The publ. tr. “with your lofty chariot ... heed our call” implies that the chariot is the instrument of her hearing. This was not the intent: the chariot is simply one of her attributes.

I.48.11: *sukṛtaḥ* is multiply ambiguous. Though it literally means ‘doing/performing well’ / ‘of good action’, it is ordinarily specialized for performing the sacrifice well and refers to the human actors in the ritual. However, it can also on occasion be used of gods (e.g., X.63.9). In this passage most tr. take it as a gen. sg. referring to the sacrificer and dependent on *adhvarān* (e.g., Ge “zu den Opfern des Frommen”). However, this leaves *ā vaha* without an object. I therefore read *sukṛtaḥ* as acc. pl., and in fact I read it so twice — once as obj. of *ā vaha* and referring to gods (so also Gr) and once as the goal of *ā vaha* and referring to the mortal sacrificers. The first reading seems confirmed by the first pāda of the next verse, 12a, which “repairs” the less clear expression with *viśvān devāṃ ā vaha*, using the same verb. The second reading, referring to the sacrificers, allows the *yé* of 11d to have an antecedent of the right grammatical number. It would of course be possible to take *sukṛtaḥ* only once, as referring to the gods, assuming the gapping of a pronominal antecedent to *yé*, but this loses the neat equation of gods and sacrificers.

I.48.14: The relative clause of ab (lit. “which previous seers ...” *yé ... ṛṣayaḥ pūrve...*) has no explicit referent in the main clause, but implicit is the notion that our praises should receive the same favorable response from Dawn as theirs did, so there is a suppressed gen. pl. *téṣām* or the like. The other passage containing the 3rd pl. mid. pf.

juhūrē (VIII.8.6) is constructed almost identically to this one, though in dimeter meter, with a similar implicit understanding of the relation between subordinate cl. and main cl.

I.49 Dawn

On this hymn and, especially, on its “versified sandhi paradigm” (in JL’s felicitous phrase) and the aberrant voc. *uṣar* (4c), see Lundquist 2014. The appearance of this entirely anomalous form in the final verse of Praskaṇva’s Dawn ritual series (I.44-49) defines this series as a type of ring: *uṣar-* as an *-ar* locative occurred in the first verse of the series (I.44.1) in the compound *uṣar-budh-* ‘waking at dawn’.

The hymn itself has a simple ring structure: *bhadrēbhiḥ* in 1a (with which ‘rays’ is supplied on the basis of I.48.13) matches *rāśmibhiḥ* in 4a, *rocanāt* in 1b matches *rocanām* in 4b, while the genitive *divāḥ* of 1b anticipated in 3d.

I.49.1: The tr. of *aruṇāpsu-* as ‘of reddish breath’ is owing to Thieme (Fs. Schubring). See EWA s.v. *psu*.

I.50 Sūrya

Although this is the last hymn in the Praskaṇva group (I.44-50), it does not belong directly with the preceding hymns, which are clearly grouped in pairs and belong to the Prātaranuvāka litany.

I.50.3: I separate pādas a and b and supply a verb of extension with b. Most tr. take *ādṛśram* as the main verb of the whole verse. Although my interpretation requires more machinery, it takes account of the fact that *vī* is vanishingly rare with the root $\sqrt{dṛś}$ (though it must be admitted that there’s an example in the nearby Praskaṇva hymn I.46.11), while it is common with roots like \sqrt{tan} ‘stretch’, which also appears regularly with *raśmī-*. Cf. X.129.5 *vītato raśmīḥ*. However, the standard tr. is certainly possible. ET also suggests that since *vī* is fairly common with $\sqrt{bhrāj}$, that might be the verb to understand with bc: “... his rays flashing widely through the peoples like fires.” Of course, ordinarily participles with preverbs are unverbated, but not always.

I.50.4: I don’t understand Ge’s “pünktlich” for *tarāṇiḥ*, which does not seem to reflect any of the possible meanings of $\sqrt{tṛ}$ ‘cross over, surpass, etc.’. Here the idea is clearly that the Sun crosses the sky.

I.50.6: The first mention of any divine being but the Sun. The question here is whether we have two additional gods or one. The two vocatives *pāvaka* and *varuṇa* are in two different pādas (a, c), and the former is almost exclusively used elsewhere of Agni. However, already in the hymn (vs. 1) another standard epithet of Agni, *jātāvedas-*, has been applied to a different god (Sūrya), and so it may be that aspects of Agni, an alter ego of the Sun in some sense, are being distributed to other gods in this hymn. Moreover, the sun is regularly considered Varuṇa’s eye, but not, I think, Agni’s. Re, however, takes *pāvaka* as Agni.

The other question is the identity of the “bustling one” (*bhuranyānt-*). The root \sqrt{bhur} and its derivatives are sometimes used of Agni and this referent is possible here,

but I think it more likely that it refers to the human ritualist, who is active at the dawn sacrifice.

I.50.8–9: I assume that the seven mares of vs. 8 are the same as the sleek daughters (*śundhyúvah ... naptiāḥ*) (or granddaughters) of the chariot, but I do not know why the rare word *napti-* is used of them. Thieme (KlSch: 220), on the basis of *śundhyúvah*, thinks they are wild geese (“...hat sich sieben Wildgänse als Tochter des Wagens angeschirrt”), but this seems to introduce an unnecessary complication since *śundhyú-* can be taken in its literal meaning.

I.50.8: The reassignment of Agni epithets continues in this verse: *śocīṣkeśa-* ‘flame-haired’ is otherwise only of Agni.

I.50.9: *sūrah*: Although most take this as nom. sg. (Gr, Ge, Th, Lü), Re makes a good case for it as gen. sg. (followed, it seems, by WG), also adducing V.31.11 *sūraś cid rátham*.

I.50.12: ET comments “1.50.12 is AVS 1.22.4, AVP 1.28.4, the final verse of 4-verse compositions for getting rid of jaundice. However, it’s interesting that in both AV recensions the first verse refers to the sun, but it’s not the same as RV 1.50.11. The RV seems to have a *ṛca* which incorporates the verse that appears as 1.50.12 whereas AV tacks it on to a different *ṛca*. On the other hand, the 1st pl verb forms are jarring in RV 1.50.12, but in the AV they harmonise with other 1st pls.” This formal and structural argument suggests that the verse was taken over from Atharvan context, a possibility that its contents also support.

I.51 Indra

This vs. shares a number of details with X.99, an impossibly obscure Indra hymn. See the list in the intro. to the comm. Unfortunately, due to the nature of X.99, these parallels don’t help much in interpr. this hymn.

I.51.2: This verse displays a type of “poetic repair”: the first hemistich has a grammatical subject that is ordinarily inanimate (*ūtáyah* ‘[forms of] help’) with a verb that ought to have a personal subject (*abhí ... avanvan* ‘they attained to / gained’), with an object possessing a number of qualities, but unnamed; the third pāda solves this slight puzzle by giving names to both: the subject is the R̥bhus, the object Indra.

The spatial contrast in b between filling the midpace, but being himself enclosed by his own powers (muscle-bound?) is nice.

jávana- occurs only here in the RV, but the *-ana-* suffix ordinarily makes transitive nominals (*pace* Ge’s “raschhandeln,” Re’s “véloce”).

I.51.3: Though the verse starts promisingly, with two identifiable myths (Vala, pāda a; Atri, pāda b -- though the 100-doored [house] is unclear; see X.99.3 for an equally obscure occurrence), the second hemistich brings obscurity. As noted in the intro., the standard myth about Vimada involves the Aśvins bringing him a wife, usually with the verb (*nī*) *√ vah*. Is this the same story, with *vāsu* ‘good thing’ a generic substitution for

‘wife’, or is Indra’s relationship with Vimada of a different sort from the Ásvins’? As for pāda d, the action here is completely obscure (see Ge’s somewhat desperate note attempting to make this about a rocky nest [Felsenest] of robbers), and what it has to do with the Vimada story is equally puzzling. Since *nartáyan* in d is only a participle, it should be attached to the main clause in c rather than relating a separate myth. A final bit of obscurity is *saséna* ‘with grain’, which opens c. The stem *sasá-* generally shows up in enigmatic phrases referring, probably, to the ritual grass and/or the cereal ritual oblations.

I.51.4: This verse, by contrast, clearly concerns the Vṛtra myth and is for the most part unchallenging. It is worth noting that its first pāda is structured almost exactly like 3a and begins and ends identically: *tvám ... (a)vṛṇor ápa*. The verse also contains an occurrence of *vásu* (in b), which unfortunately doesn’t shed any light on the mysterious *vásu* in 3c. In fact 4b is the only part of this verse that is somewhat unclear: the *dānumad vásu* (‘drop-laden goods’, taking *dānu* to ‘drop’ with Gr and Re, rather than ‘gift’ with Ge [WG]) is of course the water confined in the mountain by Vṛtra, which Indra releases. But why does Indra hold it fast (*ádhārayaḥ*) in the mountain rather than releasing it as usual? The passage is similar to the Indra ātmastuti X.49.9 *ahám saptá sraváto dhārayam vṛṣā*. Perhaps he gave the waters, as it were, emotional support – but this doesn’t sound like either the Rigveda or Indra. At best we’re left with an attenuated meaning like “help out.” Or — a long shot — this is an expression like I.103.7 *sasántam ... abodhayó him* “you ‘awakened’ the sleeping serpent,” where *abodhayaḥ* is meant to evoke its opposite, ‘put to sleep’. See intro. to that hymn and Jamison 1982/83. In that case ‘hold fast’ would evoke ‘let go’. For a possibly similar passage with Indra “bringing to rest” the waters rather than releasing them, see V.32.1 and comm. thereto. However, the formulaic nexus between \sqrt{budh} ‘awake’ and \sqrt{sas} / *svap* ‘sleep’ is very strong, whereas \sqrt{dhr} is not regularly paired with, say, forms of \sqrt{srj} ‘release’, and so I advance this possibility only very tentatively. ET offers another intriguing suggestion. She cites the well-known Old Persian PN *Dāraya-vahu* (corresponding phonologically to Skt. **dhārāya-* + *vásu*, and wonders “Could the poet be deliberately using, perhaps even punning on, an inherited Indo-Iranian collocation of the verb **dhr̥* with object **vásu*?”

I.51.5: Note alliteration: ... *pipror ... prārujaḥ púrah, prá ...*

I.51.6: JL cleverly suggests that the verse contains a word play on the PN of Indra’s defeated opponent Arbuda: by characterizing him as ‘great’ (*mahānt-*), the poet implicitly evokes the semantic opposite *ārbha-*, *arbhaká-*, which resembles the PN phonologically and would help regularize the non-Indo-Aryan -b- in *arbudá*. So, “you trampled down Arbuda (the little one), though he was great.” As JL points out, support for this interpretation comes from 13a *ádadā árbhām mahaté ..., kakṣīvate vṛcayām ...* “You gave little Vṛcayā to great Kakṣīvant.

I.51.7: The phrasing of pāda b is conceptually backwards, strikingly so. Ordinarily Indra drinks the soma and is moved to be generous, whereas here his (latent) generosity rouses itself in anticipation of the soma.

vísṁāni carelessly omitted in publ. tr.: “all the bullish strengths.”

More alliteration: *vr̥scā śátror áva víśvāni vr̥ṣnyā*, with sequences of *v* with either *i* or *r̥*, followed by *ś* or *ṣ* (with a few more *v*'s and a *ś* thrown in).

I.51.9: The *avratá-* 'having no commandment' of 8b is transformed into the even less savory *ápavrata-* 'against/rejecting commandments' and contrasted with their opposite number, the *ánuvrata-* 'following commandments'.

The image of Indra's transformation into an ant (*vamrá-*) presumably concerns his ability to pass unnoticed in the enemy camp and then bring the fortifications down from within. However, "smashing apart" (*ví√han*) doesn't seem a likely action for an ant, or even a huge nest of ants, so the combined image is somewhat unsettled.

The identity of the enemy in this hemistich is not clear. The other occurrence of the phrase *dyā́m ínakṣant-* (X.45.7) refers to Agni, but that identification seems unlikely here. It should also be noted that the other genitive phrase referring to this enemy, *vr̥ddhásya cid vārdhataḥ* "the one who, though already full grown, kept growing," is grammatically problematic because the active present participle *vārdhant-* should be transitive, as the rest of this extremely well-attested active inflection is. Gotō (1987: 291) notes the problem but has no explanation either. Expected middle **vārdhamānasya* would of course not fit this metrical position, but that is not enough for a Rigvedic poet to contravene grammar. However, the active part. more nearly matches the paired ppl. phonologically: *vr̥ddha... vardha...*, and this may have influenced the poet to use the active form.

I.51.10: A nice adjacency figure, *nṛmaṇo manoyujāḥ*.

Ge (WG) supplies "with strength" with *pūryamānam* 'being filled', but Re's "with soma" (an alternative allowed by Ge in his n.) seems more likely on the basis of other "fill" phrases involving Indra. Esp. apposite is V.34.2, adduced by Ge, where Indra fills his belly with soma while Uśanā offers him a weapon, much as here. Indra's exhilaration in the immediately following verse here (11a) also supports the soma interpretation.

I.51.11: *vañkū vañkutārā* is generally taken as characterizing the speed of the two horses, and I agree that that is the general idea -- but think this meaning arises indirectly. Ge takes it as 'flying', Re as 'rapid', Hoffmann (Inj. 221) 'ever faster moving', WG 'ever faster galloping', but this basic meaning does not fit the root to which it most likely belongs, *√vañc* 'move crookedly', or the other occurrences of *vañkū-*, esp. I.114.4. I think the nuance here is the same one found in the deriv. adj. *vākva(n)-* 'billowing' → 'surging'. The non-linear movement of the root is here concretized as a wave motion, with the attendant speed and power associated with waves.

The c pāda presents some difficulties of construction, particularly the two accusatives *yayīm* and *apāḥ*, which do not match in number. Ge and Re supply 'mounts' (*ádhi tiṣṭhati*) from the end of pāda b (or perhaps *ā ... tiṣṭhasi* from 12a) and 'chariot' with *yayīm* and begin a new clause with *nír*. So, "the powerful one (mounted) the speeding (chariot); he released the water in a stream." Alternatively Ge suggests that c is a single clause, but that *apāḥ* is not an acc. pl., as is usual, but the rare gen. sg. construed with *srótasā*, so "the powerful one released the speeding (chariot) with the water's stream(speed) [mit des Wassers Strom(schnelle)]." Neither of these fussy solutions is

appealing. With regard to the latter, *nir apāḥ* [acc.pl.] \sqrt{srj} appears to be formulaic (cf. I.103.2, X.124.7, the only other examples of *nīḥ* \sqrt{srj} that I know of), and so a gen. sg. is unlikely; with regard to the former, it seems overly elaborate to supply so much material in a pāda that can be read as a unity. I follow Old in taking *yayīm* as an epithet of (so Old) or, better, an appositive or qualifier to the waters. Since *āp-* ‘water(s)’ is in essence a plurale tantum, a parallel singular would not be surprising. For *yayīḥ*-qualifying waters, cf. X.78.7 *sīndhavo ná yayīyaḥ* “coursing like rivers,” adduced by Old (also X.92.5). My tr. “for coursing” rather than “as coursing” or the like is a concession to English.

I.51.12: Another verse with tricky constructions. In the first pāda the loc. *vr̥ṣapāṇesu* goes misleadingly easily into English (“you mount the chariot to...” like “the bus to town”). Despite my tr. I think it more likely that *vr̥ṣapāṇesu* is functionally a loc. absolute of the type “when bullsh drinks (are available)” → “on the occasion of bullsh drinks / when there are bullsh drinks.”

In pāda b most tr. (Gr, Ge, Re, WG) take *prābhṛtā* as representing *-āḥ* out of sandhi – following the Pp., hence a nom. pl. m. past participle – but as Old points out, this is very disruptive to the syntax. Better, with Old, to interpret it as a loc. sg. to the *-i-* stem *prābhṛti-* ‘presentation’, a possibility suggested by Pischel (see Old) and mentioned by Ge in his n.

Pāda c is standardly taken as preposed to d and the verb is tr. as indicative (e.g., Ge “du ... deine Freude hast,” Re “tu prends plaisir”), but *cākānaḥ* is undeniably subjunctive; *yāthā* + subjunctive regularly builds purpose clauses, which are regularly postposed. I therefore take pāda c with ab: the purpose of Indra’s mounting of the chariot is the pleasure he will receive at the soma sacrifice.

In d all tr. take *ślókam* as ‘fame’, but the noun refers rather to a very perceptible noise or call that signals some event. The event is often the sacrifice and the *ślōka-*, the noise, is often issued by the pressing stones (e.g., I.113.3, 139.10, III.53.10); the noise of the *ślōka-* is loud enough to reach to heaven (e.g., I.83.6, 190.4). This pāda contains this same notion of the *ślōka-*, the audible signal of the sacrifice, going to heaven, but it seems also, oddly, to suggest that Indra follows it there. Perhaps this refers to Indra’s departure to heaven at the end of the sacrifice, a common theme.

I.51.13: Indra’s transformation into a human female is no more surprising than his changing into an ant in vs. 9, and is better supported. See Ge’s note, as well as my 1991 *Hyenas*, where in a widespread story in Vedic prose Indra is transformed into a female hyena.

I.51.14: The standard tr. take pāda b as a nominal sentence (“the praise song is a doorpost”), but the verb of pāda a, *asrāyī* ‘has been fixed, propped’, fits b very nicely, as Old argues. Ge suggests such an interpretation in his notes, without rendering it in tr.

The poet Kakṣīvant mentioned in vs. 13 is associated with the Pajras, who are mentioned a number of times in the hymns attributed to Kakṣīvant. ET points out that pāda b probably contains a pun on the PN *pajrā-*, which literally means ‘sturdy, steadfast’, a meaning which works well with the fixed doorpost.

I take *prayantā* in d as a periphrastic future, not a straight agent noun.

I.52 Indra

I.52.1: The verb *mahayā* can either be a 2nd sg. imperative (so Ge [/WG]) or a 1st sg. subjunctive (so Re). In favor of the former interpretation is the parallel initial verse of the last hymn, I.51.1. *abhī tyām meṣām ... madatā*, with imperative (2nd pl.); in favor of the latter is the other main verb in this verse, 1st sg. opt. *vavṛtyām*. Either is possible; I weakly favor the 1st ps. subjunctive.

Since *subhū-* ‘of good essence’ is adjectival, a noun should be supplied as the subject of pāda b (*pace* Ge, who simply tr. “Kräfte”). The likely solution is found in vs. 4 *subhvāḥ svā abhīstayāḥ* “his own superior powers of good essence,” and I have supplied *abhīstayāḥ* here. (So also, it seems, WG.)

The standard tr. take cd as a single clause, with the acc. *īndram* of d identified with the *rātham* of c. Although this is not impossible, turning the literal chariot of a god towards the sacrifice is a common practice in the RV, just as turning the god himself is, and an equation of Indra and the chariot is somewhat awkward. I therefore think we have two separate clauses, with *ā ... vavṛtyām* applicable to both.

The c pāda has, in my interpretation, a non-insistent but appealing syntactic play, with the compound *havana-syād-* “rushing to the summons” parallel to the simile *ātyaṃ nā vājam* “like a steed (rushing to) the prize” — the suppressed term being a form of the root *√syand* and the accusative *vājam* matching the first compound member *havana-*.

I.52.3: A challenging verse, describing Indra in unusual ways and deploying unusual words and constructions.

The first pāda contains the difficult but clearly related words *dvaró dvarīṣu*, which seem also to belong with *vṛka-dvaras-* (II.30.8) ‘having the X of a wolf’. Wackernagel (1918 [see details in EWA s.v. *dvará-*] = KISch 325-26) adduces the Avestan root *duuar-*, which expresses a daevic way of moving. If *vṛka-dvaras-* means ‘having the movement/gait of a wolf’, I tr. the words in this passage as ‘skulking, skulker’, as characteristic of a wolf.

The rest of the first pāda consists of *vavrā ūdhanī*. The latter is clearly a locative, but the former is taken by the Pp. as *vavrāḥ*, nom. sg. of *vavrā-* ‘cave, cavity’ out of sandhi, an interpretation followed by the standard tr. and argued for by Old. (Gr, however, takes it as a 3rd sg. pf. to *√vr-* ‘cover’, *vavré*.) The sense is taken to be “a cavity at the (soma) udder”; that is, Indra’s mouth, throat, and stomach are an enormous empty space to be filled with soma. By contrast I take it as a loc. to the same noun *vavrā-* and a simultaneous reference to the Vṛtra myth and the Vala myth, as well as fitting the image conjured up by the *dvar*-words. To start with the last, caves are good places to skulk and quite possibly a haunt of wolves. As for the Vṛtra myth, Vṛtra himself is called a *vavrā-* in V.32.8, while Vala is itself a cave and the word *vavré* is several times used of this myth and Indra’s involvement in it (IV.1.13, V.31.3). Thus Indra is “skulking” in the vicinity of these mythological enemies in the first part of this verse. The published tr. limits the reference of *vavré* to the Vṛtra myth; I would now expand that.

I then take the adjacent loc. *ūdhanī* as contrastive and construe it with pāda b: Indra skulks near his enemies (the “cavities”), but at the (soma-)udder he becomes roused to elation and display his golden foundation, that is, the riches he will dispense in return

for the soma. Indra's bright *budhná-* here contrasts with the *budhná-* associated with Vṛtra in vs. 6, where the latter lies on the *budhná-* "of the dusky realm" (*rájasah*).

The last part of the last pāda, *sá hí pápriṛ ándhasah*, is also problematic. It is universally interpreted as "he is filled / fills himself with soma," which makes good sense. Unfortunately it does violence to the grammar. First, *pápri-* does not otherwise mean 'filling' (in my opinion, but see, e.g., Grestenberger, JAOS 133.2: 271, though she does not give exx.), but either 'providing' or 'delivering'. Furthermore, reduplicated *-i-* nominals are otherwise agentive (AiG II.2.291-93) and regularly take accusatives (see esp. VI.50.13 *dānu pápriḥ* 'supplying gifts') (see Grestenberger JAOS 133.2). Ge is aware of the morphological problem (though not, it seems, the semantic one) and in his n. suggests that the form is either reflexive or that *jathāram* 'belly' should be supplied, but there is no basis for either of these solutions. Therefore, although I see the attractions of "is filled with soma," I do not see a way to wrest this meaning out of the text. Instead I take *ándhasah* as a causal ablative and *pápriḥ* in the same fashion as VI.50.13. The clause then paraphrases pāda b: Indra provides wealth because he becomes exhilarated on soma.

I.52.4: It is not clear to me why Indra's superior powers have barhis as their heavenly seat, but this does not license the grammatically impossible tr. of Ge and Re, who seemingly take *sádmabarhiṣah* as modifying *índram*.

For *avātá-* see comm. ad I.38.7 and VIII.79.7.

I.52.5: *svávṛṣṭi-* is found only here (and 14c below, in the same phrase), and the etymological identity of *vrṣṭi-* is not clear. Easiest (with Gr) would be to take the second member as *vrṣṭí-* 'rain', but 'having his own rain' doesn't make much sense. Ge (n. to 14bc) connects it with *várṣman-* 'height', *várṣiṣṭha-* 'highest', *vṛṣan-* 'bull', tacitly positing a root $\sqrt{vrṣ}$ 'be high/great' and tr. 'Eigengrösse'. One of the difficulties with this interpretation is that the word should be a bahuvrīhi (so Old) not a karmadhāraya, judging from parallel formations (cf. *svá-yukti*, *svá-vṛkti* [pace Gr, Old]). I prefer the interpretation that links the word to the IE root **uerg* 'work', found in Aves. *varəz* (and of course Engl. work, Grk. ἔργον) (see EWA s.v. *svávṛṣṭi-*). So, evidently, Re: "son action propre," though Re also takes it as a karmadhāraya. Because of the formal parallels, I interpret it as a bahuvrīhi 'having his own work', even though this causes some problems: in this clause Indra must be referred to both in accusative, in this compound, and in the genitive, in the phrase *asya yúdhataḥ*, which depends on *māde*. Nonetheless, as usual I don't feel we can ignore grammar whenever it complicates interpretation.

I.52.6: *durgṛbhiśvan-* clearly belongs with *durgṛbhi-*, but the *-śvan-* is curious. Probably best to explain it, with Scar (116) as a Kunstbildung based on *rjísvan-* and possibly *mātaríśvan-*. For this reason I've translated it as a nickname.

I.52.7: I take *yújyam* as having gerundive force, construed with *te*, rather than simply 'his own' < 'associated (with himself)' of other tr.

I.52.9: Another puzzling verse, and my interpretation is accordingly not at all certain. I take the first pāda, couched in the neuter, to refer to the sun (n. *svâr-*), the placing of which in heaven (as m. *sūryam*) was Indra's last act in vs. 7. In the 2nd pāda the subjects

of *ākṛṇvata* (note the middle, which should have self-beneficial force) make this sun into their own means of getting to heaven. As an *-ana*-nominal, *róhana-* (only here) should have transitive-causative force.

However, I think there is more going on here, for in the 2nd hemistich Indra is identified as the sun (n. *svâr*), while his helpers, the Maruts, are associated with humans, the descendents of Manu (*mānuṣa-*), and their activities. If Indra is the sun, then the sun of pāda a, which the Maruts/gods used to get themselves to heaven in pāda b, may well be Indra. For this identification note the *-(ś)candra-* reminiscent of Indra's *candra-* in 3b, and in 6a the glowing heat surrounding Indra and his flaring power seem to depict something very like a solar Indra. The Maruts' aid to Indra in the Vṛtra battle (4c, where they are called *ūtāyaḥ* as here) stood them in good stead, enabling them to bridge the distance between the human world and heaven by hitching their wagon to a star (=sun, =Indra).

I do not quite understand the *bhīyasā* of b, though it obviously must be considered in connection with the same word in the same metrical position in the b pāda of the next verse. I assume it refers here to the awe- and fear-inspiring aspects of Indra in his celestial form.

I.52.10: I agree with Ge (against Pp, Gr, Old, Re, WG) that loc. *vājre* should be read for Pp. nom. *vājraḥ* and that this locative is functionally, but not grammatically, parallel with *āheḥ svanāt* "from the sound of the serpent."

With Ge and Old (and back at least to Ludwig), I see no choice but to accent the apparent voc. *rodasī* as *ródasī*. In the publ. tr. it should therefore be marked with an asterisk.

I.52.11: I supply a form of *√tan* 'extend' in the first pāda, though with a general injunctive sense, not the subjunctive of *tatānanta* in b. The "ten coils" of pāda a invite an interpretation of increased or increasing space, as do the next verses with their emphasis on distance and vast space.

I.52.13: The 2nd sg. act. forms *bhuvah* and *bhūḥ* that serve as the main verbs of the first two pādas respectively are difficult to distinguish. (Note that Hoffmann [Inj. 214–15] translates them both as "bist.") The problem is made more acute by the fact that though *bhūḥ* is definitely a root aor. injunctive, *bhuvah* can either be the injunctive (on which see comm. ad IV.16.18) or the subjunctive to the root aor., as it is, in fact, in 11d. I have made an effort to distinguish them in tr., and given the general preterital cast of this verse and the previous one I am reluctant to interpret *bhuvah* as subjunctive ("you will become the counterpart of earth"), though that interpretation is not beyond possibility.

I.53 Indra

I.53.1: I am puzzled by Ge's (/WG) interpretation of this pāda, which introduces a thief with no support from the text ("Noch nie hat ja einer das Kleinod wie (ein Dieb) bei Schlafenden gefunden"). As far as I can tell, the proposed purport is that it's easy for a thief to find (and presumably steal) a treasure that belongs to people who are asleep, but not so easy for us to do so in this case. WG remark that stealing something from sleepers

is a favored theme in later literature. But it is not otherwise met with in the RV, as far as I know, and it doesn't fit the context very well. I think the point is rather simpler: we had better get to work presenting our praise to Indra because the lazy and somnolent don't get rewarded – “asleep at the switch” is an English idiom for people who don't pay attention.

I.53.2: The slightly slangy tone of the previous verse is continued here, in the repeated verb *durāḥ* ‘break out’ and the cpd. *ākāmakarśana-* ‘not shorting desires’, as well, perhaps, as *śikṣānarā-* (for which see AiG II.1.316–17, which classifies it with cmpds of the type *trasā-dasyu-* with verbal 1st member governing the 2nd). There is surely more to be said about *śikṣānarā-*; among other things, its accent doesn't match the *trasādasyu-* type. But at least for now I will avoid the very contentious topic of such cmpds. *śikṣānarā-* is also found in IV.20.8.

I.53.3: *mā ... kāmam ūnayīḥ* “don't leave the desire lacking” matches the compound *ākāmakarśanaḥ* “who does not short their desires” in 2c.

I.53.6: *tāni vṛṣṇyā* can be either nom. or acc. Most tr. opt for the former, but I do not see how “bullish powers” can be the agent of exhilaration in the same way that soma drinks are. Surely the point is to rouse Indra's bullish powers for the fight to come.

Ge (/WG) take *dāsa ... sahasrāṇi* as “ten thousand,” while Re separates the two numbers as I do. The former interpretation is certainly possible, although the distance between the words mildly supports taking them separately. The compound numbers in vs. 9 are adjacent to each other. However, note *navatīm ... nāva* ‘99’ in I.54.6d.

A little phonological play: *barhīsmate ... barhāyaḥ*.

I.53.7: Note the parallel complex double figures opening pādas a and b: *yudhā yūdham* and *purā pūram*, with instr. and acc. sg. of a root noun in each instance.

A certain Namī Sāpīya (or Sāyīya) is a client of Indra's in X.48.9 as well as VI.20.6. In the latter, Namuci is the joint enemy, as here. Given the patronymic in the other two passages, it seems likely that *sākhīyā* here is a pun on that name.

I.53.7–8: Indra's slaying of Karañja and Parṇaya for the benefit of / with the help of Atithigva also figures in X.48.8, just as Namī Sāpīya is found in the flg. vs. (X.48.9).

I.54 Indra

I.54.1: The *mā* prohibitive lacks a verb, and there is nothing nearby to supply. The universal solution, “leave, abandon,” does the trick, although it would be nice to have some support for it.

róruvad vānā is variously interpreted. I have taken *vānā* as extent-of-space, though construing it as a second object of *ākrandayaḥ* (WG) would also be possible, save for the fact that the same phrase recurs in 5b and WG must construe it with a different verb. There seems no reason to supply a separate verb to govern it, as Ge does: “(du knackest),” and taking *vānā* as agreeing with *róruvat* as Re does (“les arbres (ont) grincé-violemment”) introduces unnecessary grammatical complications. (Is he thinking of this as a variant on neuter pl. + sg. verb?) For an expression similar to my suggested

interpretation see *vāne ... vacasyate* “display his eloquence in the wood” in the next hymn (55.4).

I.54.3: The construction of the second hemistich is not entirely clear. Most tr. take *barhānā kṛtāḥ* together (e.g., Re “créé par une pression-violente”), but this requires supplying a verb with the first part of pāda d (e.g., Re “(s’est mis)”). I instead think the idiom is *purāḥ* √ *kṛ* ‘put in front’ (I.102.9, VIII.45.9, X.171.4, of which the first two have ‘chariot’ as obj. – e.g., VIII.45.9 *rātham purāḥ ... kṛnotu*). I do *not* take *hāribhyām* as an ablative, because 1) *purāḥ* + ABL is only dubiously attested, and 2) setting Indra-as-chariot in front of his horses would be literally putting the cart before the horse. I take *hāribhyām* as dative, and think the idea is that Indra/the chariot is set out front for the horses, that is, for them to be hitched up.

Ge and Re take *vr̥ṣabhāḥ* with *rātho hī śāḥ*, but this is basically impossible, given the position of the *hī*, which overwhelmingly takes 2nd position. Nonetheless I agree that Indra is being identified with the chariot (not, however, with Ge the chariot(-fighter)); WG supply “word” as the referent of *śāḥ*, but the striking equation of Indra and chariot better fits the extravagance of the praise of Indra.

I.54.5: *nī ... vr̥ṇākṣi* is here tr. ‘yank down’, whereas in the preceding hymn, 9d, I render *nī ... avṛṇak* as ‘wrenched down’. The two should have been harmonized in the publ. tr. More serious is the question of what object the verb takes here. Most tr. use *vānā*, which, admittedly, is the only available accusative, but I am reluctant to follow this interpretation for two reasons: 1) As noted above *rōruvad vānā* also appears in 1c, which suggests that these words belong together and one shouldn’t be extracted to serve as a complement for a different verb; 2) I really doubt that there’s an alternate version of the Śuṣṇa story that involves felling trees on his head. In fact Śuṣṇa himself serves several times as the object of (*ni*) √ *vr̥j* (I.101.2 *śuṣṇam aśuṣam ny āvr̥ṇak*, also VI.18.8, 26.3). In nearby I.51.11 Indra destroys Śuṣṇa’s fortified strongholds (*dṛṇhitāḥ ... pūrah*), and I’m inclined to supply them here, with Indra wrenching them down onto the head of their hapless defender. Note that Indra also destroys *pūrah* in the next vs. (6d). I would thus change the publ. tr. to “as you wrench down (the fortresses) of the snorting Śuṣṇa onto his head.”

The question in the last pāda, *kās tvā pári*, lacks a verb, but it does contain the preverb *pári*, which suggests the solution: *pári* √ *vr̥j* is a common idiom meaning ‘evade, avoid’, and since the root √ *vr̥j* supplies the main verb of the earlier part of the verse (5a *nī ... vr̥ṇākṣi*), there is support for supplying it here, with the pleasing effect that the two different preverbs used with it provide two different idioms.

I.54.6: Support for supplying ‘help’ in pāda c (from *āvitha* in a) comes from VIII.50.9 *yáthā prāva étaśam kṛtvye dhāne*, with the same root √ *av* ‘help’ and the same situation depicted.

I.54.7: As Ge notes, *prāti inoti* is not otherwise attested, and so its sense here is unclear (Ge “der sich an das Gebot hält,” Re “qui ... va au-devant de l’ordonnance,” WG “der ... das Gebot entgegensendet”). I prefer to read the *prāti* as adverbial ‘in turn’, not as a preverb, and *invati* in its usual transitive sense ‘drive, advance [smtg]’. See I.55.4.

On the apparent fem. *dānu-* ‘drop/gift’ see comm. ad I.32.9.

I.54.10: A poetically dense verse with striking images and concomittant difficulties.

The first problem is the isolated compound *dharúṇa-hvara-*, modifying *tāmaḥ* ‘darkness’ in pāda a. The compound is generally interpreted as a tatpuruṣa, with *-hvara-* in verbal sense governing the first member (e.g., Ge “die den Urgrund der Gewässer zu Fall brachte”), but the accent is wrong: we would expect final accent of the type *puram-darā-* ‘fortress-smashing’, *brahma-kārā-* ‘formulation-making’. By accent the compound should be a bahuvrīhi (so WG “deren Wölbung ihr Grund war”). The *s*-stem *hvāras-* means ‘snare, tangle’ (from the meaning of the root \sqrt{hvr} ‘go crookedly’). I suggest that *hvarā-* has a similar meaning and the whole compound means ‘whose tangles were the foundation (of the waters: *apām*)’. And what would this mean?

In order to decode it, we must first note the use of *dharúṇa-* elsewhere in the Savya hymns: 52.2: *pārvato ná dharúṇeṣu ácyutaḥ* “like a mountain, immovable on its foundations” and 56.5-6: *ví yāt tiró dharúṇam ácyutam ...* “when you traversed the immovable foundation” and ... *divó dharúṇam ... pṛthivyāḥ ...* “the foundation of heaven and of earth.” Given the connection of *dharúṇa-* with *ácyuta-* and *pārvata-* elsewhere, I think we can confidently take the *tāmaḥ* in a and *pārvataḥ* in b as coreferential (unlike Ge [WG], Re). Remember also that *Vṛtra* is associated with murky darkness (e.g., his lying “on the foundation of the dusky realm” in I.52.6). In other words the mountain within *Vṛtra*’s belly in pāda b is the pure darkness of pāda a. Its “tangles” represent the inability to see a clear path in the dark and may also represent what happens to vision as it gets dark, the blurring and distortion of objects. These tangles provide a foundation, and an enclosure, for the waters. If I am correct, it is a powerful image.

The second hemistich is also problematic. At issue is the meaning of *anuṣṭhāḥ*, which Indra smashes. The form must be acc. pl. feminine (though Scar [644] allows the possibility of a nom. sg. masc., which would necessarily separate it from the preceding *vísavāḥ*). The lexeme *ánu* $\sqrt{sthā}$ straightforwardly means ‘stand by, stand following, stand along’ and can be used for helpers who stand by a leader (as indeed in nearby I.52.4); see exx. adduced by Scar. Scar then reasonably suggests that *anuṣṭhāḥ* here refers to ‘Gefolgsleute’ (sim. WG). But this introduces a set of subordinates and helpers to *Vṛtra* that do not otherwise figure in this well-known myth. Ge takes it as “Einsperrer” (barriers), which makes sense but is hard to extract from the form. Re’s “les positions-successives” is apparently an attempt to render Ge’s translation in a lexically legitimate way, but it doesn’t make much sense. My “rows (of palings) ... in succession” is a similar attempt, with the palings a complete invention. I do not feel that a satisfying solution has yet been reached.

I.55 Indra

I.55.1: phonetic figure ... *ví papratha*, ... *pṛthivī* ... *prāti* #

I.55.1–2: The two stems *varimán-* and *várīman-* appear here in successive verses without clear differentiation in meaning (though they do appear in different grammatical forms, nom. sg. and instr. pl. respectively).

I.55.2: The object of the verb *prāti grbhñāti* in the frame, which would correspond to the rivers in the simile, is not expressed. Ge (/WG) supplies “die Somaströme,” Re “chants.” Given the liquid nature of the simile, Ge’s suggestion seems the most likely.

Unfortunately most of the examples of *vī√śri* are used of the opening of the divine doors in Āprī hymns, so there is no formulaic material to aid in determining what to supply.

The phrase *yudhmā ójasā* is repeated in 5b and *ójasā* alone in 6b, both in the same metrical position.

I.55.3: As Ge notes, *√bhuj* ‘enjoy, derive benefit’ is formulaically associated with mountains, however odd that association may be to us. The question is then what does Indra enjoy *like* a mountain. Ge takes it to be one of the elements in b, either the ‘principles’ (neut. pl. *dhárman-*) or the ‘manliness’ (neut. sg. *ṛmṇá-*), and interprets masc. sg. *tám* in pāda as attraction from *tāni* or *tád* respectively. This is not impossible, but I prefer to take the object in the frame as soma, which has the correct gender and number, appeared in the previous vs. (2c), and is certainly something Indra enjoys (although I have found no passages in which soma is explicitly construed with *√bhuj*). The message of this first hemistich of vs. 3 – that Indra displays manly power in order to enjoy the soma – is essentially the same as that of 2c, where he “acts the bull” to drink the soma.

Re rather trickily interprets the simile / frame construction with one verbal expression in the frame (*irajyasi* “tu règnes sur”) and one in the simile (*bhujé* “comme on jouit”), but this completely violates the structure of RVic similes, which always hold the verbal notion constant between simile and frame. See Jamison 1982 (IIJ 24). WG supply soma, as I do, but also supply the verb ‘drink’ in pāda a and separate it syntactically from pāda b. There seems no reason to do that.

In c I am very tempted to read **devātāti* with one accent, the loc. sg. of *devātāt-*, rather than the transmitted *devātāti*, that is, *devātā + āti*, with the adverbial instr. to *devātā* plus the preverb *āti*. (An asterisk should therefore be inserted in the publ. tr.) The loc. **devātāti* would convey essentially the same meaning as *devātā*, and though *prá√cit* is very common, *prá-āti√cit* would only occur here. For a parallel construction with *prá cékite + instr. and loc.*, see VI.61.13 *prá yā mahimnā mahínāsu cékite* “The one who by her greatness shines ever more brightly among the great (rivers).”

I.55.4: What’s going on in this verse is a little baffling, but it seems to concern Indra’s participation in the ritual as a (quasi-)priest-poet, speaking along with the other priests (*namasyúbhiḥ*)(a) and (b) announcing his own name at that ritual. (That ‘name’ should be supplied here is clear from I.57.3, another Savya hymn, with *nāma indriyām*.) Indra’s “singing along” with the human priests, as it were, is also found in the passages adduced in Ge’s n. to 4a. It is a familiar topic.

Indra also seems to be homologized to soma in the first pāda: the only other occurrence of *vacasyate* is found in a soma hymn (IX.99.6), where soma “displays his eloquence” while sitting in the cups (*camūṣu*). Our word *vāna-* ‘wood(en)’ is often used in the soma maṇḍala for the wooden cup in which soma is put, and a well-attested formula combines *vāne*, the bull (there =soma), and noisemaking, as here: IX.7.3 *vīṣāva cakradad vāne* “the bull has roared down into the wood(en) cup” (cf. IX.74.1, 88.2, 107.22). This superimposition of soma imagery on Indra contributes to the obscurity of

this pāda, esp. what “in the wood” means in reference to Indra. Ge (n. 4a) seems to think of a sort of summer camp in the woods for ṛṣis and their families, while Re suggests a “marche” in the forest. I doubt both scenarios, although I do not have a satisfactory solution of my own. If *vāne ... vacasyate* evokes the phrase *róruvad vānā* of the immediately preceding hymn (54.1, 5), it can on the one hand refer to Indra’s loud roar while doing battle in a natural setting; but in a ritual context it might refer to the sacrificial posts or to the wood for the ritual fire, though I am not entirely persuaded by either.

Indra’s benevolent aspect, despite his bullish nature, is emphasized in the second hemistich.

I.55.5: As noted in the intro., this martial verse contrasts with the peaceful preceding one, a contrast emphasized by their parallel structure.

Acdg. to JSK (DGRV I.286) this is one of only two exx. (though I think there are more) of *caná* in non-negative value. I do not understand its use in this vs. For further disc. of *caná* see comm. ad X.49.5 and other discussions referred to there.

A cute play in *nighánighnate*, where the preverb *ní* appears to repeat in the middle of the word, although the second *ní* consists of the root-final *n* of the intensive reduplication followed by an *i*-liaison.

I.55.6: This verse cannot be a single clause (as Re, WG seem to take it) because the finite verb *srjat* in d lacks accent, while *hí* in the first pāda should induce accent on the verb. But if we separate the last pāda from the rest, there is no main verb, just the pres. participles *vināśāyan* and *kṛṇvān*. Although present participles are rarely predicated (as opposed to past participles), there are cases of such predication (*pace* Lowe 2012), and I consider this one of them. In fact I connect the first three pāda of this verse with the preceding verse, 5cd – with 6abc giving the reasons why the people trust Indra – and the present participles in some sense reflect the intensive (that is, iterative-frequentative) participle of 5d: he “is doing” rather than “did/does” the actions; they are repetitive and ongoing.

I.55.7: “mind on” is the English idiom and is therefore used here, despite the Skt. dative *dānāya*.

I interpr. *yá indra te* as an embedded izafe-type relative cl.; see my “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian” (Fs. Mark Hale).

kéta- can belong either to gods or to men; here they must be Indra’s since they are identified with his *sāṛathi-* ‘coachmen, charioteers’. His intentions are presumably to come to the sacrifice for praise and soma and, more to the point from our point of view, to give to us, as expressed in the first pāda.

I.55.8: The etymological figure in b, *ásālham sāhaḥ*, rendered here with the somewhat awkward “undominatable dominance” and belonging to the root \sqrt{sah} ‘vanquish, conquer’, is notable in part because the two root syllables *śālḥ* and *sah* share no surface phonemes, since the past participle has undergone several regular phonological processes that obscure its relationship to *sah*. Nonetheless any Vedic speaker would instantly see the connection.

The simile in c is a little unclear in the absence of real-world knowledge of life in Vedic India. WG suggest that, on departure from a temporary stopping place, wells need to be covered over to avoid their getting filled in or otherwise damaged; this seems reasonable, although I don't see that this action needs to be restricted to camps that are being left. In general it makes sense also in permanent settlements to cover wells to avoid their being contaminated. In any case, the simile seems rather more pointed and precise than necessary: that Indra has many hidden powers, mental and physical, is a commonplace, and the image of wells seems, at least to me, a bit of a distraction.

I.56 Indra

I.56.1: A bit of a mess, but very clever, once decoded.

For the first hemistich two features of interpretation are crucial: 1) I read **avatásya* 'of the well' instead of *áva tásya*, a reading already suggested by Gr (s.v. *áva*). The 'well' word appears in the last verse of the preceding hymn (55.8c) and so belongs to Savya's diction. 2) The simile / frame structure of ab involves a disharmony, with the verb to be interpreted in two different senses. In the frame, *prá ... úd ayamsta*, with the medial *s*-aorist to *√yam* 'hold', has a fairly literal meaning: 'raised forth for himself'. The object is the "many dippers" (*pūrvīḥ ... camrīṣaḥ*) of the well (**avatásya*). (In the publ. tr. "this" should probably be replaced by "the," since *tásya* is by my reading no longer there.) The word *camrīṣ-* is found only here, but it appears to be related esp. to *camrīṣá-* (I.100.12), apparently 'beaker', and the 'cup' words (*camasá-*, *camū-*) specialized for the serving of soma. The well is of soma; in X.101.5-7 the preparation of soma is likened to raising water from a well. In the simile (pāda b) the verb is used reflexively: the horse "raises himself up and forward" to (mount) the mare, a pretty good representation of equine copulation. The acc. *yóṣām* in the simile is not parallel to the acc. *pūrvīḥ ... camrīṣaḥ* of the frame: the latter is a direct object, while the former is a goal. The excitement of the mounting stallion is implicitly transferred to Indra's excitement at the many drinks of soma in store for him.

In c I take *dákṣam ... hiranyāyam* "golden skill" as a descriptor of soma: golden because of its color, skill because drinking it gives Indra the ability to do battle. It is a bit like calling alcoholic drinks "Dutch courage." (In the next vs. Indra is, or has become, the "lord of skill.") The verb *pāyayate* is a lovely example of a reflexive double I/T (in the terminology of my 1983 book): "he causes himself to drink X," with the appropriate middle voice. It is hard to know what (if anything) to supply with *mahé*. I supply *kárman-* 'deed', whose only appearance in the RV is in the preceding verse (55.3), Ge (/WG) "Kraft," while Re takes *mahé* as standing for an abstract, "pour (sa) grand(eur)." Any of these is possible; none is highly favored over the others.

In d "ingenious" may not be the happiest tr. of *fbhvas-* as applied to an inanimate thing. The word refers to craft or skill, and Re's "habile(ment construit)" may be the point.

I.56.2: On *nemannísah* see the lengthy treatment by Scar (55-56). I take *pārīṇasaḥ* somewhat loosely, following Gr, as an adverbial ablative.

In c Ge takes *sáhaḥ* as a pāda-final truncation of instr. *sáhasā* as sometimes elsewhere, but this seems unnecessary. In the final verse of the preceding hymn (55.8)

Indra took *sáhas-* into his body. It does not seem odd that he would here be identified as *sáhas-* itself. The odd placement of *nū* may support this analysis: the NP *vidáthasya ... sáhaḥ* may be structurally parallel to *pátim dáksasya*, and the 2nd- position *nū* could mark the second NP as a new syntactic unit.

I.56.3: “Like a mountain peak, ... glints with its thrusting” – the image seems to that of a pointed, snow-capped mountain, with the snow shining in the sun and the point appearing to thrust into the sky, though of course it doesn’t move.

Again Ge suggests that pāda-final *śávaḥ* could be for instr. *śávasā*, though he doesn’t so tr. – only wistfully remarks that ab could be a single sentence if *śávaḥ* were instr.

I.56.4: *arhariṣváṇiḥ* is completely unclear; *-sváni-* is ‘sound, noise’, but the first member appears nowhere else and has no etymology. All tr. take it as a cry of triumph, but this unanimity reflects a dearth of other choices rather than conviction in its rightness. Ge suggests *arhari* might be onomatopoeic, but it’s hard to see what sound it’s imitating. One tack might be to play with MIA possibilities, but juggling the phonology according to known MIA sound laws has not so far yielded anything useful.

I.56.5: Though Gr and Lub take *tiráḥ* as the prepositional adverb, standard tr. interpret it as the 2nd sg. injunctive to *tiráti*, which is surely the correct analysis. There is a surprising disagreement among tr. as to what *ácyutam* ‘immovable’ should modify. I take it with *dharúnam* on the basis of Savya’s I.52.2 *dharúṇeṣv ácyutaḥ*. I take *rájah* as obj. of *átiṣṭhipaḥ*, despite the pāda boundary, since otherwise this causative aorist is left without an expressed object.

I.56.6: *pāśyâ* has neither an etymology nor a secure meaning; it occurs only once elsewhere (*pāśyôḥ* IX.102.2). Although the stem is given by Gr as (*pāśya*), *pāśía*, it is better taken to a *vṛkī*-type *-ī*-stem *pāśī-* (see Old ad loc.; AiG I. Nachtr. p. 126; tentatively also EWA s.v. *pāśāna-*). By this analysis both forms can be du., and both contexts support an interpr. as a twinned body part. In this passage it is used of something belonging to *Vṛtra* that gets broken apart, so “jaws” is a contextually attractive translation. Savya’s I.52.6 *vṛtrásya ... nijaghántha hánvor indra tanyatúm* “when you, Indra, struck your thunder down upon the two jaws of *Vṛtra*” is similar to our *ví vṛtrásya ... pāśyârujaḥ* “you broke apart the two *pāśī* of V.” In IX.102.2 the ref. seems to be to the two jaws of the soma-press. Despite the similarity of their aberrant phonology, it is hard to connect our *pāśī-* with later *pāśāna-* ‘stone’, widely distributed also in Middle and New IA. See EWA s.v. *pāśāna-* and, for the rejection of the connection, Old.

I.57 Indra

I.57.1: Unlike the standard tr., I take d to mean not that his generosity is meant to *display* his power, but rather that his generosity has opened up to, that is, has been set in motion by his exercise of power.

I.57.2–4: A bit of word play in the sequence *haryatá(h)* (2c), *haríto* (3d), *harya tád* (4d).

I.57.2: Note the Wackernagel particle *ha* positioned between the preverb *ánu* and the verb *asat*, despite the material preceding it in its clause.

With Ge I supply a verb of motion in b, because the “like waters to the depths” simile regularly appears with one (e.g., V.51.7 *nimnám ná yanti síndhavaḥ*).

I.57.3: The phrase *úṣo ná śubhre* is quite problematic. In the first place, it is syntactically odd to have a voc. in a simile (“X like o Dawn”). *úṣaḥ* may be vocative by attraction from an underlying nominative, as in I.30.21 *ásve ná citre aruṣi* “O you, dappled bright and ruddy like a(n o) mare.” Then, for reasons given in the intro., I am certain that the fem. voc. *śubhre* in b cannot be addressed to the Sacrificer’s Wife, despite the standard view, but that leaves the identity of the addressee baffling. Fem. *śubhrā-* is ordinarily used of Dawn herself, not someone or something *like* Dawn. However, its other standard referent is Sarasvatī or another river or rivers (III.33.1-2, VII.95.6, 96.2, V.42.12; waters V.41.12, maybe II.11.3; drops IX.63.26), so it is barely possible that the water similes of vss. 1-2 here evoke an actual river to bring the materials to the sacrifice. Better, but textually problematic: perhaps the identity of simile and frame should be reversed, and the phrase means “O Dawn, like a lovely (river), assemble ...” (assuming an underlying **úṣaḥ śubhrā ná...*). This would make fine sense in the passage: Dawn comes at the beginning of the sacrifice, bringing materials for it, and is compared to a river that picks up material from its banks. Although this requires more manipulation of the text than I would like, a sequence such as I just reconstructed, with the *ná* following two feminine singulars, might have seemed anomalous and been restructured to a more conventional order: X *ná* X’. On balance and with due caution, I endorse this solution and would now translate the phrase as suggested above.

As for the object of *sám ... ā bharā*, I supply ‘everything’, based on *vísvam* in 2a, also referring to the sacrificial materials.

The semantic basis for the simile in d is somewhat obscure. On the one hand, the “tawny mares” (*harít-*) are often the horses of the sun, so that Indra has been made a light (*jyótiḥ*) like the sun’s horses. On the other hand, Indra’s name and form (*dhāma ... nāmendriyām*) are as suited for fame as horses are for running.

In d *nāyase* is analyzed (starting with the Pp.) as *ná áyase*, but this produces a bad cadence. I do not see any obstacle to assuming a preverb *ā*, so *ná āyase* ‘for coursing hither’, which fixes the cadence.

I.57.4: The translation “Here we are -- those of yours” reflects the annunciatory *imé* as well as the *te ... té vayám*, which identifies the speakers as Indra’s own.

In c I take *cārāmasi* as an independent verb, meaning to ‘carry on’ with life and activities, though it is possible that it is an auxiliary verb with the gerund *ārābhya*, as Ge takes it.

On *kṣoṇī-* as ‘war-cry’, see Thieme (1978[79]: KZ 92: 46), EWA s.v.

I.57.5: *dyaúḥ bṛhatī* is one of the few supposed examples of fem. *dyaúḥ* (for a listing of which see the beginning of Gr’s entry *dív, dyú, dyó*). The gender here and sometimes elsewhere is carried by a fem. adj. in *-ī*, and in my view has been adapted from – and indeed may still express – a dual fem. referring to the two worlds (*ródasī*) / Heaven and

Earth. Cf. in this case nearby I.59.5 *brhatī ... ródasī*. For an example in which the placement of the *-ī* adjective appears to mark *dyaúh* as fem., but the context allows, indeed favors, a dual reading, see, e.g., I.22.13 *mahī dyaúh prthivī ca* “the great ones, Heaven and Earth.” Such passages allow the occasional extension of fem. gender to *dyaúh* in a Heaven-and-Earth context. For fem. deictics with *dyaúh* see comm. ad VII.40.4.

táva smasi is a paraphrase of 4a (*imé*) *te ... té vayám*

I.57.6: The “cut” in the first hemistich is ambiguous in English but is a past tense rendering pf. *cakartitha*. I added ‘apart’ despite the absence of *ví* because unadorned English “cut the mountain” sounds odd. The *vájreṇa vajrin* opening pāda b at least provides the desired *v-*.

Verbal play, in which two unrelated words mimic an etymological connection: *párvatam* (a) ... *parvaśāh* (b) “mountain ... joint by joint.” The two items are in the same metrical position, and each is in a pāda that begins with an alliterative pair: *t'vám tām* and *vájreṇa vajrin*.

I.58 Agni

I.58.1: Phonetic figure spanning the end of the first hemistich and the second (esp. its end): ... *vivásvatah*## #*ví*... , ... *havísā vivāsati*##

The lexeme *ní√tud* is generally taken to mean something like ‘spur on’, but that tr. fails to render the *ní*. I prefer to take it in the literal sense ‘push down, force down’, meaning that, in the English idiom, you can’t keep Agni down.

I connect pāda b with c, rather than with a, as the standard tr. do, because of the difference in tense (pres. *ní tundate*, impf. *ābhavaṭ*). This tense mismatch requires the *yád* of b to have the sense “ever since” (Ge/[WG] “seitdem,” Re “depuis que”), which does not seem to me to be natural to it. By contrast, Agni’s assuming the office of messenger in b leads directly to his journey in c.

I.58.2: In b *tiṣṭhati* can mean, as I take it, “stays (within)” or, with Ge, “stands up (in).” In the latter case, the image would be of a forest fire, fed by brush, flaring up. This is possible, but in the absence of the preverb *úd* or similar directional indications, I prefer the former.

I.58.3: On *krāṇā* ‘successfully’, derived from the old fem. instr. sg. of the med. root aor. participle of *√kr* in adv. usage, see Old (Fs. Kern [1903] 33–36 = KISch 1111–14 [details in EWA s.v. *krāṇā*]).

Since *ví/ āpa + ṛṇóti/ṛṇvāti* regularly refers to the unclosing of doors and the like (e.g., I.128.6 *dvārā vy ṛṇvati*; IX.102.8 *ṛṇór āpa vrajám*), the tr. ‘distribute’ (Ge ‘teilt ... aus’, WG ‘verteilt’, Re ‘répartit’) seriously manipulates the idiom. I therefore prefer ‘disclose’ – that is, uncloset and reveal to sight. (So also Old SBE.) In this usage the stem has clearly assimilated itself to *ūrṇoti* (*√vr*) + *āpa/ ví* ‘open’, and one wonders if they were felt to belong to different roots by the poets. For further on this stem see Kü 104–5.

I.58.4: The voc. *rúśad-ūrme* ‘o you possessing gleaming waves’ should, strictly speaking, not be accented. It may owe its accent to IV.7.9 *kṛṣṇám te éma rúśataḥ puró bhāḥ* “Black is your course, (though) you are gleaming; your light is in front,” with a gen. sg. part. *rúśataḥ* following an identical opening. (So tentatively Bl RR.) Or perhaps as the first of two voc., in post-caesura position, it was felt to begin a new syntagm.

I.58.5: On *pājas*- see Re ad loc. (n.; EVP XII) and EWA s.v., with lit. It seems to refer to a surface or face, then to shape, area, or dimension in general, often with the sense of ‘full dimension’, esp. in the instr. In the nom./acc. ‘leading edge’ often works better, esp. in dynamic contexts.

On *sthātúḥ* (in the pair *sthātús carátham* “the still and the moving”) as neut. sg. to the *-tar*-stem (< **-t̥*) see AiG I.23, 301; III.204 and most recently Frotscher 2012. Tichy (1995: 71) rejects this explanation, but her alternative (a masc. nom. sg. to a *-tu*-stem) breaks the tight rhetorical structure of this merism by pairing a masculine with a neuter (*carátham*). Thus, whatever phonological problems there may be in assuming an **-t̥#* > *-ur#* change (as opposed to **-t̥s* > *-ur* as in the gen. sg. of *-t̥*-stems), I have favored the older view. Frotscher’s suggestion that accented final *-t̥* develops to *-úr* may help solve the problem. In any case the nom./acc. neut form here would also be reinforced by the semantically identical *genitive* sg. phrase *sthāthús ca ... (jágataś ca)* (I.159.3, II.31.5). MLW has suggested to me that *sthātúr* was reinterpreted as an indeclinable on the basis of passages in which it is unclear whether the form was gen. or nom./acc. (He suggests II.31.5, where the interpr. is indeed difficult.) Certainly in the merism *sthātús carátham* here and in the nearby Parāśara hymns (I.68.1, 70.7, and in altered form in 72.6) *sthātúr* could present itself as indeclinable).

I.58.6: The last halves of the two hemistichs are parallel and complementary, referring to humans and gods respectively: b: ... *jānebhyaḥ#* / d: ... *divyāya jánmane#*

In c *mitráṃ* is of course ambiguous: it can refer simply to the god of that name (so Re), but more likely is at least a pun on the meaning of the common noun ‘ally’. Agni is often so called because he serves as go-between between gods and men.

I.58.7: The “seven tongues” (*saptá juhvaḥ*) are somewhat puzzling, or rather the phrase has several possible interpretations. Re takes it as a “pré-bahuvrīhi” (probably better expressed as “de-composed” bahuvrīhi), referring to the priests “having seven offering ladles” (*juhū-* meaning both ‘tongue’ and ‘ladle’); it is, of course, also possible to take the ladles as subject without reference to an underlying bahuvrīhi (so Old SBE, Ge), since inanimate things often have agency in the RV. But the other meaning ‘tongue’ could also be meant literally (either in a de-composed bahuvrīhi or not): (priests having) seven tongues, that is seven voices devoted to praising Agni. See Ge’s n. (also WG). This interpretation would make the first pāda semantically parallel with the second, where ‘cantors’ (*vāghátāḥ*) is the subject. And I will add another, more distant possibility, but one that makes better sense of the ‘seven’ – viz., the seven rivers or streams. The seven rivers are credited with giving birth to and nourishing Agni in a mystical passage in III.1.3–6, where they are also identified as seven *vāñīḥ* ‘voices’ (III.1.6d). Seven is a number especially characteristic of rivers, and since rivers are often said to be noisy (indeed the word *nadī-* ‘river’ is derived from the root *√nad* ‘roar’), calling the rivers

“seven tongues” here would fit semantically (and the long thin shape of rivers works visually with ‘tongue’ as well). In the end I don’t think that choosing one of these possibilities and eliminating the others is the right strategy; the phrase is meant to be multivalent, evoking a number of features of the ritual context.

I.58.8–9: Vs. 9 is essentially a paraphrase of vs. 8, with several parallel expressions. And the final pāda of 9 is the Nodhas refrain.

I.59 Agni Vaiśvānara

I.59.2: On *aratī-* as a spoked wheel, which often serves as the symbol for the ritual fire, see Thieme (Unters. 26ff., EWA s.v.).

I.59.4: The first pāda of this verse is metrically disturbed, which, in conjunction with its syntactic incompleteness, leads some tr. to consider the text corrupt. I’m afraid I find that reasoning too convenient.

This verse is variously interpreted, with its difficulties in great part arising from the fact that there is no finite verb, but it can be decoded by paying attention to the functional roles of the nominal complements. What seems to unify the verse is the presence of a dative recipient in pādas a, cd, and I therefore (with most tr., but not Ge) take the verse to be a single sentence, with the datives throughout referring to Agni. The objects presented to Agni are songs (*gírah* b), qualified as many (*pūrvīh* c), and implicitly compared to exuberant maidens (*yahvīh* d), based on the fact that *gír-* ‘song’ is feminine in gender. The grammatical subject is *hótā* in b, with parallel subjects in similes: the two world halves (*ródasī*) in the first pāda and “skill” (*dákṣaḥ*) in the second. The *manuṣyāḥ* in b I read twice: on the one hand, its position directly before *ná* marks it as the first word of the simile, going with *dákṣaḥ*, hence “Manu’s/manly skill,” but I believe it should also be read with the immediately preceding *hótā* (“manly/human Hotar”). In Agni hymns the title Hotar is ordinarily specialized as a designation of that god (see, e.g., immediately preceding I.58, vss. 1, 3, 6–7), and *manuṣyāḥ* here would make it clear that the human priest is at issue, with Agni himself the dative recipient. The last question is what verb to supply, and in a sense the exact identity of the verb is not terribly important, as long as it has approximately the right meaning and the right case frame. With Old (SBE, Noten) I supply ‘bring’ (*√bhr*), which is frequently used with *gírah* and a dative recipient (e.g., I.79.10 ... *agnáye / bhárasva ... gírah*), but ‘sing, present, give,’ etc., would all work. I do not see any reason for, or justification of, supplying a 1st-person subject, however, *pace* Old SBE (1st pl.), Ge, Re (1st sg.).

I.59.5–6: 5d pāda here = VII.98.3d, of Indra, and Nodhas uses a similar expression of Indra in I.63.7d. Vs. 6 is even more Indraic. As noted in the intro., this part of the hymn is designed to associate Indra and his great deeds with Agni.

I.59.7: The rest of pāda a essentially glosses *vaiśvānarāḥ*.

I take *puruṇīthá-* as a qualifier, not a personal name, contra most tr.

I.60 Agni

Taking off from my comment below on vs. 5, JL has further articulated the structure of this hymn. What follows is mostly verbatim from his comments, with some additions and light editing of my own:

I think this little hymn might have a slightly more elegant structure than has been appreciated (I thought of this following JL's mention ad vs. 5 of the "faint ring"). It seems to me that the 5 verses are nicely balanced rings within rings revolving around vs. 3, the omphalos-like *jāyamānam... jījananta*, harking back to Agni's double birth in 1c. The outer rings would be, as mentioned ad vs. 5, vss. 1c *rayīm iva praśastām* = 5 *pátim ... rayīnām, prá śamsāmaḥ*. Vss. 2 and 4 contain the same word *vikṣú*; note esp. the alliterative and partly etymological figure in 2d *viśpátir vikṣú vedhāḥ*. The hymn has not only a ring structure, but also forward momentum provided by the movement from the larger social organization of the *vis-*, in the full expression *viśpátir vikṣú* (2d), to the more intimate setting of the home, emphatically presented in 4c *dámūnā gr̥hapatir dāme*. The momentum can also be tracked in the expressions of lordship involving *pāti-*: *viśpāti-* (2d) to *gr̥hapāti-* (4c) and finally the solemnly pleonastic *rayipátī rayīnām* (4d). Agni, celebrated (*√ śams*) "like wealth" in 1c (*rayīm iva*), is transformed into the lord of wealth in 4d. This final title is repeated in 5a *pátim agne rayīnām*, with his name interposed between the two elements, and again the object of *√ śams*. The use of these three *-pāti-* compounds may convey the message that Agni will deploy his wealth in the arenas of clan and house.

I.60.2: *divás cit pūrvah* is standardly taken as temporal "before day(break)," but this case form of *div/dyu* is more often spatial than temporal (note *divás cid ... br̥hatāḥ* in the immediately preceding hymn, 59.5), and *pūrvā-* + ABL. has a spatial sense elsewhere in just this ritual context: e.g., X.53.1 *ní hí śátsad ántaraḥ pūrvo asmát* "for he [=Agni] will sit down (as Hotar) close by, in front of us." Cf. also II.3.3 *mānuṣāt pūrvah*.

I.60.4: Note the extraordinary pile-up of 'house' words in this vs.: *dámūnā gr̥hapatir dāma ā*. On the relation between the *dám(a)-* and *gr̥há-* designations for 'house' and their use in the RV, see my 2019 "The Term *gr̥hastha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder," in *Gr̥hastha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*, ed. Patrick Olivelle (pp. 3–19).

I.60.5: ab *pátim ... rayīnām, prá śamsāmaḥ* picks up 1c *rayīm iva praśastām*, forming a faint ring.

I.61 Indra

For general discussion of the intricate structure of this hymn, see the publ. intro. as well as Jamison 2007: 60-68.

I.61.1: *īcīṣama-*, an epithet of Indra, is an impossible word; Ge wisely refuses to tr. it. However, it is difficult not to see in it a combination of *īc-* 'chant, song' and *samā-* 'like, same', however obscure the morphological details are – and obscure they certainly are. The first member cannot, straightforwardly, be a case form of *īc-* because the case-ending should be accented. The length of the *-ī-* might be analogical to the long *ī* in phonologically similar *ījīpīn-*, *ījīśīn-*, but motivating a short *-i-* (in putative **īci-*) is hard

enough (Caland compounding form, like *śúci-*?). It is tempting (and some have succumbed to the temptation) to connect *-sama-* with another designation of ritual speech, *sāman-*, but the difference in vowel length is probably fatal. Note that in our passage the word is adjacent to another old crux, *ádhrigu-*, the controversies about which (see KEWA and EWA s.v.) should have been definitely settled by comparison with OAv. *drigu-* ‘poor, needy’ (Narten, YH 238–40). Both *īcīśama-* and *ádhrigu-* are disproportionately represented in the VIIIth Maṇḍala, the home of much aberrant vocabulary. In the end those who elect to tr. *īcīśama-* take it as a compound of the two elements suggested above: Re ‘égal à la strophe’, WG (somewhat peculiarly, though starting with the same elements) ‘der im Preislied (immer) als dieselbe Person erscheint (?)’; so also the publ. tr. ‘equal to song’. For further, see EWA s.v.

I.61.1–2: Here and throughout the hymn, there is a certain amount of phonological and lexical chaining (in addition to the repeated fronted demonstratives). Here 2b *bhārāmi* picks up both 1c *harmi* and 1d *brāhmāṇi*, and 2a *asmā́ id u prāyaḥ ... prá yaṃsi* playfully echoes 1a *asmā́ id u prá...*, with *prāyaḥ* of 1b substituted for the bare preverb *prá*.

I.61.2: In addition to the inter-verse echoes just noted, alliteration in 2c *mānasā manīṣā* and 2d *pratnāya pátye*. JL adds 2a *prāya iva prá yaṃsi*.

bādhe in 2b is universally taken as a dat. infinitive (as it is in I.132.5), but this makes semantic difficulties because $\sqrt{bādh}$ means ‘thrust, press, oppress’. Ge’s “um (ihn) ... zu nötigen(?),” Re’s “pour contraindre (le dieu),” and WG’s “um (ihn) ... zu überhäufen” thus misrepresent the sense of the verb. The $\sqrt{bādh}$ is esp. common with the preverbs *āpa* and *vī* in the meanings ‘thrust away, thrust apart’, but I here take the *prá* of pāda a with both verbs (*bhārāmi* and *bādhe*) in pāda b. As for morphology, I take *bādhe* as a 1st sg. mid. pres. (the root is always inflected in the middle), rather than as an infinitive, which allows the root to maintain its standard sense: I push the hymn toward Indra with particular forcefulness. As a finite verb, *bādhe* owes its accent to its initial position in the new clause.

suvṛktī- is a bahuvrīhi specialized for praise hymns (and occasionally the gods who receive them) and is often simply tr. ‘praise(-song)’ (e.g., Ge ‘Preis’ here). I prefer to render it literally; *-vṛktī-* belongs to the root $\sqrt{vṛj}$ ‘twist’, and the English idiom “good twist” refers to particularly clever turns in a plot or other verbal products.

Most tr. take c with d, not ab. This is possible, but not necessary.

I.61.4: As Ge suggests (in n. 3 to his n. to 4ab), the apparent pleonastic doubling of the simile particle (*rāthaṃ ná tāsṭā-iva*) may instead signal that two images have been crossed here: one with a simplex *hinomi* (“I impel the praise like a chariot”) and the other with *sām hinomi* and the addition of the carpenter as subject (“I, like a carpenter, put together praise, like a chariot”).

I.61.5: *juhvā* has its standard double meaning, ‘tongue’ and ‘offering ladle’, a pun that is enabled by the verb *sām añje* “I anoint”: anointing with the tongue means producing praise, while ‘offering ladle’ fits better with the literal meaning of the verb.

dānaúkas- is likewise of double sense, both ‘accustomed to giving’ and ‘accustomed to gifts’, representing the reciprocal trade in praise and sacrifice given to the gods, in return for the gods’ material gifts to us.

I.61.6: The *tváṣṭā* here has been prepared for by 4b *táṣṭā*, and both appear in alliterative phrases: *táṣṭeva tátsināya* and *tváṣṭā takṣat*.

Another word with a standard double sense: *rāṇa-*; both senses are possible here, also in vs. 9 below.

The position of *yéna* in this subordinate clause is anomalous, as we expect at most one constituent to precede the *yá-* form. I have no explanation, but there is much that is off-kilter in the deployment of sentence parts in this hymn.

I’ve tr. the participle *tuján* as it were a finite verb, because the English otherwise dribbles off into unintelligibility. In fact, because of the rel. cl. in c, it’s better to take d as a new cl. with *tuján* as predicated participle (“Gaining mastery, he was thrusting ...”). On this stem see comm. ad IX.91.4.

The unclear *kiyedhā-* is found only here and in vs. 12. See EWA s.v. and Scar’s (250–52) discussions of previous attempts at explanation. I favor the suggestion registered (and dismissed) by Scar that it consists of the weak stem of *kíyant-* ‘how much, how great’ + the root noun *dhā-*, with the development **-nt-dh- > *-adzdh- > *-azdh- > -edh-*, despite Hoffmann’s dismissal of the posited phonological development (Aufs. 400)—although I recognize the phonological problems of this solution. Re’s “lui qui confère (on ne sait) combien” represents this etymology one way or the other.

I.61.7: On the introductory gen. *asyá* referring to Indra, even though Indra is otherwise in the nominative in this verse (as subj. of *papivān* [b] and of *vidhyat* [d]), see disc. in intro. and in Jamison 2007 noted above.

The verse concerns Indra’s surreptitious drinking of his father’s soma right after birth, an act enabled by his mother (ab), and Indra and Viṣṇu’s vanquishing of the Emuṣa boar (cd), a rarely told tale. For Indra’s mother’s complicity in the soma-drinking, see esp. III.48.2–3. In our passage Indra’s father is not directly referred to (only by initial *mahāh* ‘of the great [one]’ in b), but the beginning of the next word promises the genitive of ‘father’ (i.e., *pitúr*), and only the final consonant of *pitúm* removes that possibility — one of the many tricks Nodhas plays on us in this hymn. (Ge ascribes the absence of *pitúh* to Worthaplogie, but I think rather that Nodhas is laying a trap.)

On the basis of other tellings of the Emuṣa myth, the word to supply with *pacatām* is *odanām* ‘rice-porridge’; cf. VIII.69.14, 77.6, 10.

The final pāda is quite artfully composed, beginning and ending with alliterative phrases: *vidhyad varāhām* and *ádrim ástā*. Moreover, the first of these is a variant of the very common formula that compresses the Vṛtra slaying, *áhann áhim* “he/you slew the serpent.” Here, with the victim beginning with *v-*, the poet substitutes a verb beginning with *v-*.

I.61.8: Although I tr. *devápatnīh* as ‘wives of the gods’, it is grammatically ambiguous, since it can also be a bahuvrīhi ‘having the gods as husbands’ (with the fem. stem *patnī-* substituted for the masc. equivalent *pati-* in this feminine adjective). Although the cmpd has apparent bahuvrīhi accent, *-pati-* compds vary in their accent; see, e.g., the tatp.

grhāpatnī- ‘mistress of the house’ (not bv *‘having a house as husband/master’). It reminds us of *dāsāpatnī*- ‘having a Dāsa for a husband’ or ‘wife of a Dāsa’, applied to the waters confined by Vṛtra, often identified as a Dāsa, most famously in I.32.11 but also twice elsewhere of the waters and Vṛtra (V.30.5, VIII.96.13). Since the context here is the Vṛtra battle (*ahihātye*), the complementary terminology is probably deliberate.

JL notes that there is complementarity also in the second hemistich: 8c has *pāri jabhre* with Indra as subject and *dyāvāprthivī* as object, while 8d reverses this: *nā ... pāri staḥ* with *dyāvāprthivī* as implicit subj. and Indra as implicit object (via his *mahimānam*). This theme and its lexicon are picked up in 9ab: *mahitvām / divās prthivyāḥ pāry antārikṣāt*.

I.61.9: The phrase “reverberant tankard” (*svarīr āmatraḥ*) is striking, but intelligible in R̥gvedic context. Indra is compared to a large drinking vessel because of his immense capacity and size, also described in 8cd and 9ab; “tankard” hints at his ability to drink vast quantities of soma and implicitly promises his generosity because he can contain vast quantities of goods. I follow Old in taking all forms of *āmātra*- as belonging to a single stem (*pace* Gr, Lub, and EWA). As for ‘reverberant’ (*svarī-*), it echoes *svarāḥ*, which opens the preceding pāda; it also suggests the deep sound made when a large (empty) vessel is struck and Indra’s own war-cries. (For a possibly similar image, see I.100.12.)

I.61.10: Numerous phonological plays in this verse: a *śāvasā śuśāntam*; b *vī vṛscad vājreṇa vṛtrām*; c *gā nā vrānā avānīr* (in this last example note the rhyme of the 1st two words with the 2nd one).

I.61.11: This verse nicely juxtaposes a well-known deed of Indra’s, when he stops the waters to make a ford for his client(s), with the even better known deed of releasing the stopped waters in the Vṛtra myth, treated in the preceding vs. (10). On the playful transition between these two myths here, see Jamison 2007: 113–14 n. 20. The stopping of the waters causes mild surprise immediately after a verse concerning their release.

tveśāsā is universally taken as belonging to Indra, whereas my published tr. ascribes it to the rivers. I would now probably correct this, also to take it as Indra’s: “just this one – with his turbulence/glittering,” because of the parallelism between 10a *asyéd evā śāvasā* and 11a *asyéd u tveśāsā*. But I am still disturbed by the form. Its accent suggests that it should be adjectival, not a neuter -s-stem abstract like *śāvas-*, despite AiG II.2.224, which implies that it is nominal despite its accent. It is curious that the expected root-accented neut. noun (**tvēśas-*) is not attested, and this is the only (supposed) attestation of the suffix-accented stem. If it is a real adjective, it could modify *vājreṇa* in pāda b, but this not only breaks the parallelism between 10a and 11a just noted, but, more seriously, would have to be extracted from one clause and plunked into the next. (Ge in his note suggests supplying *vājreṇa* in pāda a.) The *a*-stem adj. *tveśā-* is also sometimes used of waters, e.g., VI.61.8 *tveśāḥ ... arṇavāḥ* “glittering/turbulent flood,” which accounts for my original connection of *tveśāsā* with the rivers.

The distribution of elements in pāda b is odd, with the subordinating *yād* in normal 2nd position, but *sīm*, ordinarily another 2nd position element, just before the verb.

īśāna-kṛt- is variously interpreted, either with the 1st member in a direct object relationship with the 2nd -- “zum Herrscher, mächtig machend” (Scar’s tr; sim. also Ge, Re, WG) – or in a sort of appositive subject relationship, “als Herrscher handelnd” (Scar’s tr.; sim. Gr). Because the first member *īśāna*- is itself a participial form ‘being lord, showing mastery’, I prefer the 2nd alternative. Note also that independent *īśāna*- is used three times of Indra in this hymn (6d, 12b, 15b), and it is more likely that the same form in the compound refers to Indra’s masterful ways, not to someone else whom he makes masterful. Scar allows both, though somewhat preferring the 2nd.

More phonological play: c *dāśūṣe daśasyan*; d *turvītaye ... turvāṇih*.

I.61.12: On this very tricky verse, I simply reproduce (slightly paraphrased) my discussion of it in Jamison 2007: 66: The beginning of 12 appears to return us from the mythological past to the realm of the current-day poet of vss. 1-5; not only does it start with the dative pronoun after a series of verses with the genitive phrase but it continues with a standard lexeme for presenting a hymn to a divinity: *prā √ bhṛ. asmā́ id u prā bharā ...* Cf. from the same poet also with a dative recipient I.64.1b. *nódhaḥ suvṛktīm prā bharā marúdbhyaḥ* “O Nodhas, present a well-turned (hymn) to the Maruts.” But the phrase in 61.12 quickly goes awry. At the opening of the next pāda, where Indra’s name has been prominently placed in previous verses (*indrāya* 1d, 4d, 5b, 8b), we find, most shockingly, the name of his arch-enemy, *vṛtrāya*, immediately followed by the accusative object *vájram*, Indra’s weapon, not the word for hymn we were expecting. The relevant parts of the half-verse *asmā́ id u prā bharā...*, *vṛtrāya vájram...* must mean “Towards just this one, towards Vṛtra, bear down the mace...” The poet has simply tricked us, having laid a trap with conventional phraseology and syntax and with the stylistic patterns established earlier in the hymn. He also skillfully exploits the morphological ambiguity of the verb form *bharā*: given the pattern set in vss. 1-5 we are primed to interpret *bharā* as a 1st sg. subjunctive (cf. indicative *bhārāmi* in vss 2-3), but as the half verse unfolds, it becomes clear that *bharā* must rather be taken as a metrically lengthened 2nd sg. imperative. [end of citation]

In order to let the audience in on the trick, the poet has imported much of verse 6, the first mention of the Vṛtra conflict in this hymn: 6d reads *tujānn īśānas tujatā kiydhāḥ* “gaining mastery, thrusting with the thrusting (mace), while conferring (who knows) how much,” while 12ab echoes this with *... tūtujāno, ... īśānaḥ kiyedhāḥ* “thrusting, gaining mastery, conferring (who knows) how much.”

In d *īṣyan* echoes *īśānaḥ* of pāda b (as well as 11c) and anticipates *īṣṇānāḥ* of 13c.

I.61.13: On this verse as a species of “poetic repair” of verse 12, see Jamison 2007: 66–67. The expected offering of praise to Indra thwarted in 12ab is successfully effected in 13ab.

I.61.14: *dyāvā ca bhūmā* has the appearance of a dual dvandva, interrupted by the *ca* that connects it to the NP with which it’s conjoined, *girāyaś ca ḍṛihāḥ*. But the uninterrupted dvandva is actually *dyāvābhūmī*, with a different stem for ‘earth’, and *bhūman*-(n.) has no dual attested (and its dual should of course not be *bhūmā*, but probably **bhūmanī*). See the next hymn for a variant on this usage. It is likely that the lengthened N/A sg. form or the N/A pl. form is being used, but why? On this problem, see AiG II.1.152.

In the publ. tr., “other” was careless omitted at the end of the first hemistich: it should read “against each other.”

The mention of the poet Nodhas at the very end of the verse has perhaps been prepared by several not entirely expected *o*’s: *úpo ... jóguvāna oṇīm, sadyó*, only the last of which is a normal sandhi *o* < -as. The poet’s fondness for his own vowel may account for the appearance of several relatively rare words: the intensive *jógu-* and the noun *oṇí-*.

I.61.15: I follow Ge’s suggestion (in n. 15a, also followed by WG) that the unexpressed subject that is being conceded to Indra is the soma-drink. The parallel he adduces, V.29.5, contains the gods, the soma-drink, the concession, and Etaśa:

*ádha krátvā maghavan túbhyaṃ devā ánu víśve adaduḥ somapéyam
yát sūryasya harítaḥ pátantīḥ puráḥ satīr úparā étaśe káḥ*

Then according to your will, o bounteous one, all the gods conceded the
soma-drinking to you,

when you put the flying golden mares of the Sun behind, though they were in
front, in Etaśa(’s presence).

In the publ. tr. I take *eṣām* as a genitival agent, somewhat reluctantly. However, ET suggests a much more attractive solution, which rescues the syntax: that *eṣām* is dependent on *asmai* “just to this one of them [=gods].” The singularity of Indra would then be emphasized by the *ékaḥ* that begins the next pāda.

Etaśa is the horse of the Sun and is not, as far as I know, a soma-presser (the physical image is a little comical). Against all tr., I therefore do not take *súṣvim* in d as coreferential with *étaśam* in c, but rather as a second object with the verb. Nodhas is now juggling the mythic past (the aiding of Etaśa) and the desired future (the aiding of the soma-presser), as he nears the end of the hymn. I read the participle *paspṛdhānám* twice, once with each object, with a different desired goal in the locative for each. I also give the verb *āvat* two simultaneous morphological analyses, fitting its two objects: the first as augmented imperfect to the Class I present *āvati*, the second as perfect subjunctive to the pf. *āva* (cf. *āpas*, *āpat* taken by Hoffmann 1967: 64 n. 102, 101 n. 220, and Kümmel 2000: 118 as subjunctives to pf. *āpa* √ *āp* ‘attain’). Although such an interpretation might be too artificial in some cases, I have no hesitation in assuming Nodhas is capable of this.

Another phonetic play: d *saúvaśvīye súṣvim*

I.61.16: *hāriyojanā* is unaccented and therefore taken by most as a vocative addressed to Indra. I follow Old in emending to an accented form (*hāriyojanā*), modifying *bráhmāṇi*. See in the next hymn *bráhma hariyójanāya* “formulation for the fallow-bay-yoking.” As Old points out, taking it as a vocative with Indra requires either shortening the last vowel or allowing a lengthened vocative ending (which is not usual), and possibly also shortening the first vowel.

This verse is extra-hymnic in some ways: its opening breaks the pattern set in the previous 15 vss.; it makes a meta-announcement about the contents of the hymn just recited; and it ends with the Nodhas refrain. But it also forms a ring with the first verse, with the repetition of *bráhmāṇi*, and with the first part of the hymn concerning the presentation of praise-hymns, with the reappearance of *suvṛktí*, which was a signature word there (2b, 3d, 4c).

I.62 Indra

Shares much vocabulary with I.61 and sometimes plays off the turns of phrase in that hymn.

I.62.1: Rich with phonetic figures: a *śavasānāya sūṣām*; b *āṅgūṣām gírvaṇase āṅgirasvát* [note that *āṅgūṣām* participates in both: it rhymes with preceding *sūṣām*, but its initial matches *āṅgirasvát*, while *gírvaṇase* takes up the 2nd syllable of *āṅgirasvát*]; cd *ṛgmīyāya, ārcāma arkām* [this last also a clear etymological figure].

śavasānāya sūṣām recalls *śavasā sūṣāntam* of 61.10a in the same metrical position, with our phrase referring to Indra, the one in I.61 to Vṛtra.

The Pp. reads *stuvaté* in c, a reading that is universally followed. But this dative is awkward: if it is coreferential with the other datives in the verse, it must refer to Indra, and Indra “praising” is an odd concept in a hymn devoted instead to presenting praises *to* him. Although Indra occasionally joins in the verbal parts of the sacrifice (see above ad I.55.4), he does not ordinarily (or ever?) praise others. Nonetheless, this is Re’s solution: “(dieu) louangeur.” Schmidt (1968, B+I, 163) suggests a variant of this: “den mit guten Liedern (selbst) preisenden,” but self-praise suggests a medial form, not the active we have. If the participle does not modify Indra, another person in the dative needs to be introduced, despite the unlikelihood of a separate dative referent. This is Ge’s solution: “ihn [=Indra], der für den Sänger ... zu preisen ist,” construing *stuvaté* with *ṛgmīyāya*. So also WG with slightly different tr., though both they and Ge consider the “praising” possibility. But the difficulty disappears if, against the Pp., we read instead *stuvatāḥ*, genitive sg. of the participle, as I do.

I.62.2: This verse is in some ways a double of vs. 1. They both begin with *prá*, and the opening phrases *prá manmahe* and *prá vo mahé* rhyme, although the two *mahe*’s have entirely different analyses. (Note also the *mahé máhi* play in 2a.) The next phrase of 1a, *śavasānāya sūṣām*, is paralleled in 2b, with the first word identical and *sāma* substituting for the second (both *sūṣām* and *sāma* referring to the verbal product offered to Indra). At the beginning of the second pādas, *āṅgūṣyām* of 2b matches *āṅgūṣām* of 1a. “Like the Aṅgirasas” (*āṅgirasvát*) of 1b is picked up by the Aṅgirasas themselves *āṅgirasah* in 2d, and the heavy etymology figure involving the root *√ arc* ‘chant’ is reprised by the participle *ārcantaḥ* in 2d, which opens its pāda just as the finite verb *ārcāma* does in 1d.

I.62.3: I follow Janert (1956, *Sinne und Bedeutung des Wortes “dhāsi” und seiner Belegstellen im Rigveda und Awesta*) in taking *dhāśí-* as ‘wellspring’.

The post-caesura phrase in c *bhinád ádrim vidád gāḥ* contains rhyming verbs followed by their objects; the disyllable *ádrim* contrasts with monosyllable *gāḥ*, creating an almost syncopated effect. The strict parallelism of the two VPs may account for the unnecessary accent on *bhinát*, which functions rhetorically like a fronted verb, just like *vidát*. In fact, as my tr. indicates, I consider the initial subject *bṛhaspátiḥ* to be essentially extrasentential, a very topicalized topic. The same is true for the repetition of this pāda in X.68.7.

The second of the VPs is also a mirror-image of the final phrase in 2d *gā ávindan* (imperfect in 2, versus aorist in 3), and it can be considered a “repair” of the somewhat opaque *vidát ... dhāśím* “found the wellspring” that intervenes (3b).

I.62.4: The repetitions and lexical and phonological echoes that have served Nodhas well in the first three verses increase here, to an almost incantatory level. To point to a few of these: a *sá suṣṭúbhā sá stubhā* (again a syncopation, as in 3c); b *svaréṇa ... svaríyo ...*; c: *saranyubhiḥ* echoes the *sá*'s of a and the *s(v)ar*'s of b, while finding its own faint echo in the final *śakra* of the pāda; d *rāveṇa* is a virtual anagram of *svaréṇa* in b, *darayo* is almost a rhyme form of *svaríyo* in b in the same metrical position, and both *svaríyo* and *darayo* precede the hemistich-final words ending in *-gvaiḥ*.

All other tr. take this verse as a single sentence with 2nd ps. subj. However, as I have shown (1992: “sa figé”), *sá* with 2nd ps. reference is limited to imperatives and should not appear with an injunctive like *darayaḥ*. I therefore consider the first hemistich to continue the 3rd ps. reference of vs. 3, with a switch to 2nd ps. in the second half. This type of switch is quite common in the RV.

In c I do not take *saranyú-* and *phaligá-* as personal names, *pace* Ge et al. The tr. ‘bolt’ for the latter follows Hiersche (*Asp.*, ‘Riegel, Verschluss’), based on a possible connection with *parigha-* (Up+) ‘iron bar for shutting a door/gate’; see EWA s.v. However, as ET points out, a less specific sense such as ‘barrier’ would fit the contexts better and would also make fewer assumptions about early technology.

I.62.5: The instrumentals in b (*uśásā sūryeṇa góbhiḥ*) are not parallel with *ángirobhiḥ* in a. The Āngirases there are the agents of the passively used participle *gṛṇānāḥ* (and also potentially instrumental of accompaniment with the main verb, as Indra’s helpers: “along with the A’s you uncovered ...”). The instrumentals in b are the additional elements that Indra uncovered.

ándhaḥ is a potential pun, as a homophone meaning both ‘blind darkness’ and ‘soma stalk’. The former is surely the first reading in this treatment of the Vala myth, with the cave a black hole, as it were. So Ge, Re, WG. But soma is never far from Indra’s mind, and the cosmogonic deeds with which he is credited in the second hemistich are often performed under the influence of soma. Schmidt (p. 164) favors ‘(Soma-)Flut’, following Bergaigne and Lüders.

I.62.6: This verse has to be Nodhas’s joke. It is conspicuously placed, as the central verse of the hymn and thus a potential omphalos, and it announces Indra’s deed (*kárma*) with extraordinary fanfare, including two superlatives (*práyakṣatamam ... cārutamam*). But in a hymn so far devoted to what *is* one of Indra’s greatest deeds, the opening of the Vala cave, the poet springs on us instead a deed of utter obscurity involving the swelling of four rivers, an act with no other clear mentions in the RV. Ge valiantly seeks parallels, but the two passages he adduces (I.104.3–4 and I.174.7) have little or nothing in common with our passage and it’s not even clear that there are rivers in the second. Lüders (*Varuṇa* 335–37) predictably sees these as heavenly rivers — four because they flow “nach den vier Himmelsgegenden.” Re also sees them as associated with heaven, while Schmidt (*B+I* 164) and WG seem to see them as being “under” (something unspecified). I have no solution for the affinities of this scrap of mythology, although I tend to agree generally with Lüders that the rivers are more likely to be celestial than terrestrial, and I would suggest that it may have to do with producing rain. But I still think the point here

is that Nodhas has set us up for a grand announcement and then, by bait and switch, given us a myth that none of us has ever heard of.

The *astī* in this hemistich may provide another bit of evidence for this view. Unaccented *astī* almost always has existential value (“there exists...”) because the 3rd sg. pres. copula in equational sentences (“X is Y”) is regularly (indeed, probably by rule) gapped. But an existential sense here doesn’t work (“There exists this most conspicuous deed...”). I suggest that the overt *astī* here signals a strong assertion in the face of expected opposition (“This *is* his most conspicuous deed” – rather like American children’s quarrels: “*is too*” “*is not*”).

The disputed word *upahvaré* adds to the obscurity of this bit of myth. It is clearly a derivative of $\sqrt{hv\bar{r}}$ ‘go crookedly, deviate’, but the exact sense of this nominal derivative is not clear. In this passage Ge takes it as ‘lap’ (Schoss), Re as ‘fold, crease’ (repli), WG as ‘abyss, chasm’ (Abgrund), while Schmidt bypasses any literal rendering with “im Felsen.” Lüders considers it the name “für den Behälter des himmlischen Urquells,” which of course fits his larger picture of the heavenly ocean. I consider the word to convey in the first instance a visual image, that of a meander or deviation from the straight. In connection with rivers (as also in VIII.96.14) it refers to eddies, the circular or oval shapes produced against the current by uneven flow -- or to the “oxbows” or “meanders” created in a river’s course by such uneven flow (Google images are quite striking). In other geographical contexts it can refer to byways, detours from the straight path, and ultimately to remote places, the backeddies, as it were, of the mountains.

I.62.7: Nodhas continues to deploy his tricks in this verse. He has moved on from the obscure four-river reference in the preceding verse, to a more standard domain for Indra to display his power: the two world halves. But in the first hemistich Indra is not depicted as filling them or propping them apart or any of his usual actions with regard to them, but rather as “uncovering” them, using the same lexeme $\bar{v}i\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$ as was just used in a Vala-myth verse (5a $\bar{v}i\sqrt{var}$, 7a $\bar{v}i\sqrt{vavre}$). (That lexeme is close to being the signature Vala verb, though it is actually more commonly $\acute{a}pa\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$, with the same sense, but a different preverb.) Notice that the two occurrences of $\bar{v}i\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$ surround the pseudo-omphalos verse 6, in the usual manner in which concentric lexical rings signal an omphalos. So Nodhas thus presents this new mythological theme as if it were the old one, the Vala myth found in vss. 2-5, though he is entering different mythological territory.

He also reuses the \sqrt{rc} lexical theme from vss. 1-2, with *arkaīḥ* in b, which is apparently qualified by the middle participle *stávamānebhiḥ* (remember *stuvatá* in 1c). This participle is somewhat disturbing; like all middle participles to the root \sqrt{stu} , it is used passively here, but unlike all the other passive uses, its subject is not the god praised but the praises themselves. It may be that Nodhas want his audience to take notice of such an aberrant usage. However, I am tempted to read **stavamānaibhiḥ* here – that is, nom. sg. *stávamānas* + pron. *ebhiḥ*, with rare double application of sandhi: *-as + e- > -a + e- > -ai-*. The participle *stávamānas* would modify Indra, as would be expected; *ebhiḥ* occurs several times with *arkaīḥ* (IV.3.15, 10.13) and the passive of \sqrt{stu} also appears with this instr. (see passages adduced by Ge in n. 7b, where he suggests a similar, but far from identical, reanalysis of the form in the text, calling it “vielleicht Hypallage”). If the emendation is accepted, I would change the tr. to “the irrepressible one being praised by

these chants.” The *arkaiḥ* might also be construed secondarily as it currently is in the tr., with *vī vavre*, as the instrument with which he performed the uncovering.

ayāśya- regularly qualifies Indra; there is no reason to take it as a personal name, identifying a distinct second figure here (*pace* Ge, Re). For further on the stem, see HPS (B+I 165–66, 227–28) and comm. ad X.67.1.

Phonetic figure: *sanājā sáníle* taking up the *sa*’s in vs. 4 and prefiguring the *sa*’s that will be conspicuous in the next few verses.

The second hemistich contains a clever pun between simile and frame. In the frame (pāda d) Indra supported, that is, held up, the two world halves in familiar fashion (somewhat repairing the less standard uncovering he performed in ab, though cf. VIII.96.16). In this task he is compared to the god Bhaga (though it is not an activity that I think of as particularly associated with Bhaga). But in the simile *bhāga-* is used as a common noun ‘(good) portion’, which provides support for two consorts (*méne*) – the point presumably being that a man needs a particularly large portion of property to support two wives. I do not follow Hoffmann’s view (1960: 245; KZ 76) that *méne* here is an elliptical dual referring to concubine and lawful wife, and in fact I believe that *ménā* in general has a wider sense than he allows. He restricts it to concubines, but the derivation from *√mi* ‘exchange’ suggests a larger application, with the wife as an “exchange token” in the economic transaction of marriage.

I.62.8: From the spatial dual females of vs. 7 Nodhas now moves to the temporal: night and dawn, also dual females, whose activities have kept occurring “from of old” (*sanāt*), linking them lexically to the two world-halves of 7a who were born of old (*sanājā*).

In *dívam pári bhūmā* we encounter the not-quite-dvandva also met in 61.14; there in *dyāvā ca bhūmā*, *dyāvā* was definitely dual, but its partner *bhūmā* was either singular (with lengthened final) or plural. Here *dívam* is definitely singular, with *bhūmā* either of the choices just given, probably singular.

punarbhū- later (already in the AV) has a specialized legal application as a designation for a remarried widow (see Thieme Kl.Sch. 445-60 = KZ 78, 1963), but this sense does not seem to be in play here or in the other RV passages.

Though most take *aktā* (which only appears here) as the ppl. of *√añj* ‘anoint’, serving as a poetic designation for ‘night’, I favor a root connection with the ‘night’ word, with zero-grade in the root syllable, esp. since *aktú-* ‘night’ is probably so connected (*pace* EWA s.v.). See EWA s.v. and AiG III.234, though both are skeptical. Of course secondary association with *√añj* would be natural.

JL notes the chiasmic *kṛṣṇébhir aktā-uṣā rúsadbhiḥ* of c; for a similar chiasmus see 11c.

JTK suggests that *vāpus-* here and in other dawn/night passages refers to bridal clothing and suggests a tr. ‘finery’.

I.62.9: Although the first hemistich is perfectly easy to tr., it is not at all clear what it is referring to. First, what is the “partnership” (*sakhyām*)? Ge thinks it is with the beings named in vss. 7-11, while Sāy thinks rather of the sacrificers. Nothing in the context helps to define what type of partnership it is or with whom, and the verb that governs it, “supported” (*dādhāra*), seems oddly chosen. The subject of this verb is also not fully identified: the larger context of course points to Indra, and *sudāmsāḥ* ‘possessing very

wondrous power’ was just used in 7c of Indra (where he was likewise the subject of a form of \sqrt{dhr}), and see *dāmsaḥ* applied to his deed in 6b. But who is he the “son” (*sūnú-*) of? and more to the point, the epithet *śávasaḥ sūnúḥ* “son of strength” is ordinarily Agni’s. Here we have the variant *sūnúḥ ... śávasā* with instr., and *sūnúḥ śávasā* is used of Agni in I.27.2. On the other hand, *śavasāná-* is twice use of Indra in the beginning of this hymn (1a, 2b) and *śavasāvan* in 11d, *śavasāna* in 13c; cf. also the clear *śávasaḥ sūnúm índram* in IV.24.1. I tentatively suggest that there is an attempt to blur the lines between Indra and Agni here, and that the partnership or fellowship may be the mutually beneficial relationship between gods and men centered on the sacrifice, where Agni officiates. But I cannot point to hard evidence for this interpretation.

The paradox of the cooked milk in the raw cows is a standard one, often trotted out as a natural wonder to contemplate. Here it seems to be taken further: there are literal milk and literal cows in c, but in d the black and red cows are likely to be the nights and dawns (as in 8cd) and the “gleaming white milk” the early light known as the “milk of the dawn cows” (see Watkins MoreDawnCows). As far as I can see, this hemistich has no integral connection with the first half of the verse, and the shift from 3rd to 2nd person underlines this disconnect.

I.62.10: A nicely balanced alliterative pāda *sanāt sáníḷā avánīr avātā*, with the first phrase picking up 7a *sanājā sáníḷe*. Note also that the first word of b, *vratā*, echoes *avātā*. On *avātā-* see comm. ad I.38.7 and VIII.79.7.

Again the reference of this verse is somewhat obscure. Are the streams here the same as the four rivers in 6cd? or are they the streams released from Vṛtra’s confinement? (Ge suggests sensibly that Indra gave them the command to wander in I.61.12, though it is their own commandments, not Indra’s, that they safeguard here.) The identity of the sisters of cd, compared to wives, is even less clear. Are they the same streams as ab? or possibly praise-songs (*gíraḥ* appear with the same simile, *jánayo ná pátnīḥ* in I.186.7, and in our next vs., 11cd, “inspired thoughts” [*manīṣāḥ*] are compared to eager wives). Again, I think the reference is supposed to be shifting, with the literal streams of mythological time replaced by the thoughts and praises of the ritual here-and-now, mediated by the feminine gender of the words used of both streams and praises. The temporal shift in this part of the hymn, or rather the double temporal vision, is signalled by the repeated initial *sanāt* ‘from of old’ and related terms (8a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 13a) and its contrast with the present tense verbs that prevail in this section.

I.62.11: *sanāyú-* ‘age-old’ is found only here, and was clearly created to match the other pāda-initial *sanā-* ‘old’ forms in this section, while matching its nom. pl. *sanāyúvo* with *vasūyávo*, which opens the next pāda. JL suggests that part of the motivation for creating this particular hapax is to invoke the paradoxical juxtaposition of *sana-* ‘old’ and *yuvan-* ‘youth’. Verse 8 contains the same juxtaposition: *sanāt ... yuvatī* “from of old the two young girls,” and the theme of old and new runs throughout this hymn, indeed in this verse.

JL also notes the chiasmic *pátiṃ ná pátnīr uśatīr uśántam* of c.

I.62.13: *sanāyánt-* is likewise only here. Note its semantic opposite *návyam* at the end of the pāda, the same contrast as *sanāyúvo ... návyo* in 11a.

Like the last verse of the preceding hymn (I.61.16), this verse is extra-hymnic in some ways, but also has connections with the rest of the hymn. The “old” pattern continues to open the verse, and the voc. *śavasāna* in c forms a ring with the same stem in the dative in 1a.

I.63 Indra

I.63.1: The very first hemistich of this hymn presents us with a syntactic problem: although the most natural way to read this is with a rel. clause beginning with *yó ha* and continuing through the second pāda, the verb there, *dhāh*, is unaccented. There are three possible ways to handle this. The first, the one I followed in the publ. tr., is to assume that *dhāh* got de-accented for some reason. Several possible reasons are available, though none of them strong: 1) it lost its accent redactionally from being matched to (properly) unaccented *dhāt* in 2b, also at the end of its hemistich; 2) the same idiom *āme (...)* *dhāt* is found in nearby I.67.3 (unfortunately by a different poet) and this caused the loss of accent redactionally; 3) because the 2nd hemistich of the verse in question is also a subordinate clause (beginning *yād dha*), the previous subordinate clause lost its verbal accent and became a kind of “honorary” main clause, because the action of *cd* is based on that of the relative clause that precedes it. (This seems to be one possibility that Old floats, though he is rather sketchy about it.) Though Ge does not mention the lack of accent, he tr. the whole as a rel. clause.

The other two ways to deal with the problem involve having the rel. clause end at the end of the first pāda. Old also suggested the possibility that the rel. cl. is limited to *yó ha śúṣmaiḥ*. Re, Hoffmann (1967: 181), and WG all follow this path, with tr. of the type “You are great, Indra, who are (so) because of your *śúṣma*.” I rejected that because of its awkwardness, although I recognized that it solves the accentless verb problem, since the main clause can occupy pāda b without problem. A third way, also ending the relative clause with the end of the first pāda, seems to me to be less clumsy, and that is to make all of the first pāda the relative clause. Though *yāh* appears to be fairly far into that clause, in fact it is not preceded by more than one constituent (plus a vocative, which doesn’t count). This produces a tr. “(you) who are great because of your *śúṣma*-, you placed ...” This actually has a parallel in IV.22.3 *yó devāḥ ...*, ***mahó*** *vājebhir mahádbhīś ca śúṣmaiḥ* “The god who ... is great by reason of his prizes and his great *śúṣma*.” I would therefore now change the tr. accordingly, to this third option.

The next problem in this half verse is the construction of *āme √dhā*. All the standard tr. render it more or less as “you put Heaven and Earth in panic/fear.” This makes sense of the syntax, but attenuates the meaning of the noun: *āma-* is an attack or onslaught, or more abstractly offensive power, whereas ‘panic, fear’ suggests the opposite. Therefore, although slightly more machinery is required, I tr. this idiom (found also in I.67.3, IV.17.7) as “put X in the path/way of your onslaught.”

Notice that here Nodhas manages to deploy a perfectly orthodox de-coupled dual dvandva for Heaven and Earth (*dyāvā ... pṛthivī*). See remarks on I.61.14, 62.8.

The subject NP(s) of *cd* are neatly interwoven: with *vísṣvā ... ābhvā* (neut.) chained with *girāyaś cid ... dṛlḥāsah* (masc.).

Hoffmann (p. 181) argues convincingly that *naījan* should not be interpreted as *ná aījan* with the Pp., but with the injunctive *éjan*.

I.63.2: If my new parsing of the syntax of vs. 1 is correct, these two verses are structurally parallel, with a relative/subordinate clause in a, the main clause in b, and a further subordinate clause, esp. dependent on the main clause, in cd.

Note the phonological trick, where (*ā*) *yád dhá(rī)* opens 2a, apparently matching *yád dha* of 1c (which in turn shows *dha* for *ha*, found in the grammatically different rel. clause *yó ha* in 1a). The verse ends with more alliteration: *d púra(h)... puru- ... pūrvīh*.

The meaning of *vīvrata-*, several times of Indra's horses, but also with a few other referents, isn't entirely clear, because it depends on which of the many value of *vī* to assume. I favor 'having separate commandments', that is, acting independently but each in obedience to Indra, but it could also mean 'without commandments' (which must underlie Ge's 'widerspenstige' [stubborn], followed by Hoffmann [but with ?]).

The c pāda lacks a caesura and in its place has a somewhat bizarre compound, voc. *aviharyata-kratu-*. The second member is clear, and the whole must be a bahuvrīhi. The first member appears to contain the well-attested adj. *haryatā-* 'gladdening', but this presents certain problems: the present *hāryati* does not appear with the preverb *vī* and it is difficult to construct an appropriate meaning, esp. one that would harmonize with *krātu-* 'resolve'. Possibly, with double negation via *a + vī*, "whose resolve is not undelightful" – not a particularly compelling possibility. Nonetheless, this derivation seems the path of least resistance and is probably responsible for Ge's "dessen Rat nicht verschmäht wird" and WG's "... nicht unbeliebt ist" (possibly also Hoffmann's "... nicht zu unterschätzen ist" – it's hard to tell). But all of these must take the *-haryata-* in a passive sense, although the simplex adjective never has that value.

I think it's likely that the compound involves some complex word play, scrambling and recombining the (*d*)*hārī* and *vī(vratā)* of pāda a. Despite the ad hoc explanations required, I'm inclined to consider the *-viharyata-* somehow a derivative of *vī* √*hvr* 'deflect, swerve, overturn', a well-established idiom. (Re's "dont le pouvoir est incontrariable" seems to reflect this.) Two negated nominal derivatives of this lexeme are found in the RV: *āvihruta-* 'unswerving', jpb: 'not overturned' (V.66.2, X.170.1) and *āvihvarant-* jpb: 'not overturning' (IV.36.2). Unfortunately the morphological details are not going to be easy. Accounting for the loss of the *v* in a putative **avihvaryata-* is not so difficult: it can be ascribed to dissimilation, in combination with the word play on (*d*)*hārī* just mentioned. But what about the rest of the word. For the suffix *-ata-* I can only invoke the (small) class of *-ata-* adjectives with full-grade root syllable of the type *darśatā-* '(lovely) to be seen', *yajatā-* 'worthy of the sacrifice', and the aforementioned *haryatā-* 'delightful'. As for the intermediate *-y-* between root syllable and ending, I again invoke the play on (*d*)*hārī*, with the *-y-* representing the sandhi of *-ī-* before the suffix *-ata-*. If word play is indeed involved here, it's possible that a second reading of the first member could be "not without his fallow bays" and the whole compound means "who has no resolve without his fallow bays."

I am fully aware of what a house of cards this is and only sketch these scenarios because I think Nodhas is capable of such manipulations. I do think it possible, however, that the lack of caesura and the problematic compound are connected and that the transmitted text is not what Nodhas originally composed. It should be noted that the word division *yēnā viharyatakrato* is also a possibility, but this doesn't help either with the lack of caesura or the analysis of the compound.

I.63.3: I interpret *dhṛṣṇúḥ* as governing the acc. *etān*, though as a goal not a direct object..

I.63.4–7: *tvám ha tyád* provides the opening of the next four verses. Although *tyád* is a neut. pronoun and in 4a could function as the object of the otherwise object-less *codīḥ*, in the following verses it does not have pronominal function; the expression X *ha tyád* is a way of providing emphasis, particular of the 2nd ps. pronoun (cf., e.g., VII.19.2, VIII.96.16–18). I would now be inclined to tr. the vss. in this sequence with “It was just you who ...” rather than the rather recessive “You then, ...”

I.63.5: This verse contains many small problems of interpretation that hinder putting together the whole. I’ll start with the details and turn to the construction of the whole thereafter.

āriṣaṇyan is universally taken as intrans., patient-oriented ‘not receiving harm, not being harmed’, but in all cases this stem is better taken as ‘not allowing harm’. The finite verb *riṣaṇyāti* also has this meaning “intends harm, allows harm”. The parallel stem *āriṣaṇya-* in II.29.4 has the same meaning and takes a genitive (*āriṣaṇyā tanūnām* “not allowing harm to our bodies”), and I construe the gen. *mārtānām* in b with *āriṣyan*: “not intending harm to mortals.”

The next problem is *ḍṛḷhāsya*. Ge takes this as the causer of the harm to Indra (gen. agent), while Hoffmann, followed by WG, construe it with *ājuṣtau*, with the gen. pl. *mārtānām* dependent on *ḍṛḷhāsya* (KH “bei Missfallen selbst eines Feststehenden unter den Sterblichen”), but both the Ge and the WG interpretations require that *ḍṛḷhā-* be a person. This is unprecedented: this past participle is virtually always used of a place, a fortified stronghold. Indra is once (VIII.44.12) called *ḍṛḷhā-*, presumably because he is as steadfast as a fortress (in the vein of “a mighty fortress is our god”), but I know of no examples with people so called. If at all possible it should have the standard meaning here. I think this is possible, by reading the verb *ví ... var* of pāda c also with the first hemistich and supplying the word *dúrah* ‘doors’. In fact, the other two passages containing the gen. sg. *ḍṛḷhāsya* strongly support this solution, as they both contain the verb *ví√vr* and the headnoun *dúrah*: VI.62.11 *ḍṛḷhāsya cid gómato ví vrajásya, dúro vartam ...* “Open the doors of the cattle pen, even though it is shut fast” and VII.79.4 *ví ḍṛḷhāsya dúro ádrer aurṇoḥ* “you opened up the doors of the firm-fixed stone.” Note that *ví ... var* is rather more appropriate to this hemistich than it is to the pāda in which it’s found. (Recall the double use of *ví√var* in I.62.5 and 7.)

The last word to be accounted for in this hemistich is *ājuṣtau*. Unlike most tr. I take it to be Indra’s displeasure. The object of his displeasure is not expressed, but it is easy to supply — presumably Vala, since Indra is opening up his stronghold. His displeasure at Vala (or other demonic enemies) is implicitly contrasted with his benevolent care not to injure mortals.

I am less sure about what pāda c is conveying. I assume this is a racing image: Indra starts the race by opening the barriers at the starting line. Ge and Re take the injunctive *ví ... var* as a functional imperative, but this is certainly not necessary. I tr. as a past tense, in keeping with its rendering in the first hemistich, but it would be possible to take it as a present in c, as Hoffman/WG do. The phrase *asmád ā* “(coming) from us”

seems a bit heavy simply to express that it's *our* horse, so there may be some racing terminology embedded here.

In d *ghanéva* contains the old instr. *ghanā*. The same phrase is found in I.36.16 and IX.97.16.

I.63.6: The gerundive *atasāyya-* is taken by Ge as belonging to \sqrt{at} 'wander' and tr. "soll ... erreichbar sein," while most (Gr, Re (?), AiG II.2.286, Hoffman, WG) take it to mean "to be asked for/begged" and derived from the hapax *atasī-* supposedly 'beggar' (VIII.3.13). But this is entirely circular, with the meaning of each of these two words determined on the basis of the other, with an occasional nod towards \sqrt{at} 'wander' as their possible root (whose relevance Mayrhofer casts doubts on; see EWA s.v. *atasī-*). I instead take it as a negated gerundive to \sqrt{tams} 'tug, yank, shake', which forms a similar gerundive to its intensive, *vitantasāyya-*. Negated gerundives do not ordinarily take accent on the privative (AiG II.1.217), and the derivational opacity of *atasāyya-* would make it likely to receive the usual *-āyya-* gerundive accent. Ge also suggests the possibility of derivation from \sqrt{tams} in a note. See also disc. ad II.19.4.

I.63.7: "one after the other" is my attempt to render an "object-distributive" value for the intensive *dardah*. (For this notion see Schaefer 1994: 86–87, though she considers *dardar-* lexicalized and does not attribute this sense to it, pp. 135–36.)

The use of *vārg* 'you twisted' differs in tone in simile and frame. In the frame it is distinctly hostile and destructive, but in the simile it simply expresses the ritual action of twisting the barhis grass into seats for the visiting gods.

I.63.8: *āpah* in b can certainly be the old nominative plural used as an accusative, as occasionally happens in late RV (so Gr and implicitly most tr.), but as I suggested elsewhere (1982: 260), it may be the nominative plural it appears to be; this may be an example of case disharmony in a simile, exploiting the ambiguities in syntax of the verb \sqrt{pi} 'swell' that the poets were always happy to capitalize on. In the frame *pīpayah* is transitive ("you swell the refreshment"), but in the simile intransitive ("as waters [swell]").

I take *tmānam* as functioning as a reflexive pronoun ("extend yourself"), while most tr. take it as a noun (Ge 'Lebensgeist', WG 'Lebenshauch'). This is the only acc. to the truncated stem *tmān-*, and so its usage is hard to determine. The oblique cases (dominated by instr. *tmānā*) generally refer to the self ('by yourself, for ourselves', etc.), without a full-blown nominal sense, which accounts for my tr. However, the active form of *yāmsi* gives my pause, and so the standard tr. should be considered (though I am not ready to adopt it). "Extend nourishment to us" seems to be formulaic, with an active form of \sqrt{yam} , and so that voice may have prevailed here, despite the reflexive *tmānam*; cf. III.1.22 *prā yāmsi ... īṣo nah*, IV.32.7 *sā no yandhi ... īṣam*.

I.63.9: I supply 'hymn' as subject for *ākāri* in the first pāda and take *brāhmāṇy ūktā* in b as a separate nominal clause. It is of course grammatically possible to take the latter phrase as subject of *ākāri*, since neuter plurals famously can take singular verbs. But, fame aside, this construction is quite rare in the RV, and in this case there are two

different recipients, Indra in a and the horses in b. However, I do not consider the other interpretation impossible.

I.64 Maruts

I.64.1: Ge argues that *apó* (apparently the acc. pl. of ‘waters’) should be emended to **ápo* (neut. acc. sg. of ‘work’). His parallels are persuasive, and I previously accepted the emendation, suggesting that the accent shift may have been made redactionally, on the basis of vs. 6, which contains *apó* ‘waters’ in its first pāda and *vidátheṣv ābhúvaḥ* in its second, as here. However, the existence of other *apás-* forms that seem to mean ‘work’, not ‘worker’ or ‘waters’, esp. *apási* III.1.3, 11, give me pause, and I now think it likely that, beside *apás-* ‘having work, worker’, there are a few forms of neut. *apás-* ‘work’ (with the same meaning as the more morphologically orthodox neut. *ápas-* ‘id.’). This stem could owe its accent shift to the analogy of the vastly more common ‘water’ word, with root accent in nom. pl. *āpas* but suffix/ending accent in the oblique, esp. acc. pl. *apás*. On the other hand, it would be possible to take *apáh* here as the acc. pl. of waters and tr. “Wise in mind, with dextrous hands I anoint the hymns, like waters standing ready at the rites.” And a pun is always possible. By contrast WG accept the reading as given, but take it as “Werkmeister,” i.e., to the internally derived adjectival stem *apás-* ‘possessing work’. This would be appealing save for the fact that the masc. nom. sg. should be **apās* (i.e., *ápā* in this sandhi context), and their interpr. is therefore impossible. This morphological problem is not mentioned.

I.64.4: *vy āñjate* here responds to *sám añje* in 1d, though here the verb is reflexive and in the 1st vs. it is transitive but with subject involvement (“I ornament [my own] hymns”). I tr. the verbs slightly differently because the ‘anoint’ sense doesn’t work very well in vs. 1, esp. with the simile, whereas here the etymological figure with *añjībhīḥ* ‘unguents’ enforces the more literal sense.

Gr suggests emending *mimṛkṣur* ‘they rubbed’ to *mimikṣur* ‘they were fixed/attached’ (accepted by WG), since this verb *√myakṣ* is used elsewhere of spears in similar contexts. However, ‘rub’ makes fine sense, and the poet may well be playing with a well-known phrase. (This perhaps should give us pause about emending *apó* to *ápo* in 1.)

Pāda d *sākāṃ jajñire svadháyā* ... “They were born all at once by their own power” -- that the Maruts were self-born is asserted in I.168.2; see also V.87.2.

I.64.5: Very alliterative verse, esp. in 2nd half, with pāda c *duhánty ūdhar divyāni dhūtayo* (cf. also *dhúnayo* in pāda a) and d ... *pinvanti páyasā párijrayaḥ*. Cf. also b *vātān vidyútas (ta)vi(ṣībhir)*.

Most tr. take *ūdhar divyāni* together (e.g., Ge “die himmlischen Euter”). Although *divyā-* does modify *ūdhar-* elsewhere in similar context (e.g., IX.107.5 *duhānā ūdhar divyām mādhu priyām*), the collocation is not grammatically possible here, since *ūdhar* is definitely singular and *divyāni* is definitely plural. At best one would have to argue that short-vowel neut. plurals to *n*-stems, which are identical to their neut. sgs., provided some sort of model (cf., e.g., I.173.3 *sādma mitā* “fixed seats”) for interpr. *ūdhar* as a plural. Old (ZDMG 55.273 n. 1 [=KISch 732]) claims that this is a vicarious introduction (“ein

vicarirendes Eintretung,” whatever that means) of the sg. *ūdhar* since the plural of *ūdhar* doesn’t exist. (We would expect **ūdḥāni*, like *āhāni* to *āhar*, though Old bizarrely produces **ūdḥīṇi* instead.) I see no reason why **ūdḥāni* could not exist and assume its non-attestation is an accidental gap. But the issue here is not the singular of ‘udder’, but the plural of ‘heavenly’, which the poet could easily have made singular (as in the parallels) if he had wanted. The root √*duh* can take a double accusative, as in IX.107.5 just quoted: “milking the heavenly udder of its dear honey”), and this is how I interpret *divyāni* here, supplying a form of *vāsu* ‘goods’, which *divyā-* regularly modifies. In one way or another this alternative goes back to Gr and Delbrück AiS.80 and is accepted by WG. Again, Nodhas seems to be playfully evoking a familiar phrase but modifying it.

On *pārijrayaḥ*, supposedly a cmpd with root noun *-jri-*, lacking the usual *-t-* extension, see comm. ad V.54.2.

I.64.6: *vidātheṣv ābhúvaḥ*, repeated, as noted above, from 1d, is ambiguous. It can modify the waters of the first pāda, as Ge (/WG) take it, or the Maruts (so Re). I have tried to maintain the ambiguity. In vs. 1 the phrase qualified the hymns (fem. pl. *gírah*) and, if *apó* of pāda c is not emended, those waters as well.

I.64.8: *piśá-* in b occurs only here in the RV, so although the meaning assumed by most (‘mottled [deer]’ vel sim., beginning with Sāy) is plausible, it has no other support. The plethora of wild animals in this run of verses (7: buffalos, wild elephants, 8: lions, snakes) does suggest that this term names animals too. Re by contrast tr. the etymological phrase *piśā iva supísaḥ* as “bien ouvragés comme des oeuvres-peintes,” though he is more cautious in his n. Kulikov (JIES: 2009) suggests ‘cheetah’ or ‘leopard’ on the basis of the wild animal company it keeps in its AV occurrence (AVŚ XIX.49.4 = AVP XIV.8.4). This is plausible but by no means certain.

I.64.9: As noted in the intro., *ródasī* is a pun. In pāda a it refers to the two world-halves, but in cd the unexpressed subject is feminine and mounts the Maruts’ chariot. This can only be Rodasī, the Maruts’ consort (for mounting their chariot, see I.167.5–6), who ordinarily is accented *rodasī* but here must be generated by otherwise homonymous *ródasī* in pāda a.

āhimanyavaḥ should probably be unaccented, in a voc. phrase with *śūrāḥ*, but since the phrase *śávasāhimanyavaḥ* is exactly repeated from the preceding vs., 8d, where it is properly nom., it could hardly have failed to acquire an accent redactionally.

I.64.10: Properly speaking, the tr. should read “have taken their arrow in their fists,” since *íṣum* is singular. With dual *gābhastyoḥ* the passage is shorthand for “(each) has taken his arrow in his two fists.”

I.64.11: *payovídh-* has several possible values. In addition to the ‘milk-strong’ in the publ. tr., it would also be possible to take the *-vīdh-* transitively: “strengthening with their milk [=rain]” or “strengthening the milk [=rain]”; either alternative is supported by vss. 5–6.

The lexeme *úd√han* is quite rare and occurs with the verb stem *jíghna-* only here. Since the exact sense of the lexeme is not certain, it is difficult to know how to complete

the simile. I have interpreted the verb to mean ‘beat up’; with regard to roads there is a nice parallel in the English idiom “pound the pavement.” I assume that *āpathi-* refers to walkers on a path and supply ‘road’ as the object parallel to the mountains and their feet as the instrument of pounding that is parallel to the wheel-rims. ET compares the French idiom ‘frayer le chemin’, used of blazing a trail, which may well be the sense meant here. Ge takes the verb as ‘aufreissen’ (tear open/up) and supplies ‘stones’ as the object (sim. WG). I am a little puzzled as to why his Strassenfahrer would be tearing up stones, but I suppose it might be to clear a rugged path. Re: “... arrachent les montagnes, tels des frayeurs-de-voie.” I do not know what he means by this.

I.64.12: The word *sūnū-* ‘son’ in the singular takes one aback in a hymn devoted to celebrating the very plural Maruts. It clearly refers to the ‘flock’ (*gaṇā-*) in pāda c, but I have tr. ‘offspring’ to avoid the misleading “we hymn the son of Rudra...”

I.64.13: Ge (/WG) construes *āpīchyam krátum* with *ā kṣeti*, giving the latter the meaning ‘possess’. But this Class II present means only ‘inhabit, dwell’ (as opposed to Class I *kṣáyati* ‘rules over, owns’ to a different [synchronic] root $\sqrt{kṣ}$). Re clearly recognizes the problem and tries to reconcile the meaning of the root present with its construal with an object, producing the very odd “il habite une force-spirituelle digne-d’être-recherchée.” It seems preferable to me to take *āpīchyam krátum* with the previous pāda and tr. *ā kṣeti púsyati* separately. The two verbs (admittedly without the preverb *ā*) form a fixed expression (I.83.3, V.37.4, VII.32.9). The position of the preverb also does not favor construing the preceding accusative with *ā kṣeti*: we might then expect the preverb to begin the clause, though this argument is considerably weakened by the fact that the pāda would begin **ā āpīchyam*, in sandhi *āpīchyam*, and the separate preverb would be essentially lost. As for the sense of *bharate ... āpīchyam krátum*, I interpret it as what I think Re would call a “legère zeugma.” The first two objects of *bharate*, *vājam* and *dhánā*, are both physical objects that the subject carries from one place to another; the third proposed object is a mental attitude. The English idiom “carries himself” and the English noun “bearing” use ‘carry, bear’ in a similar sense, to refer to a person’s mental self-presentation, and the middle voice of *bharate* would neatly fit such a value.

I.65 Agni

I.65.1–2: The first halves of these two vss. contain the elements of the myth of the pursuit of the vanished and hidden Agni. In particular 1ab *paśvā ná tāyūṃ gúhā cātantam* and 1ab *sajóṣā dhîrāḥ padaír ánu gman* closely resemble X.46.2bc *paśūṃ ná naṣṭám padaír ánu gman / gúhā cātantam ...*

I.65.2–3: These verses contain 3rd pl. act. root aorists *ánu gman* (2b) and *ánu ... guḥ* (3b) to the associated roots \sqrt{gam} and $\sqrt{gā}$ respectively, with no apparent difference in semantics. Here one might almost invoke the much over-used explanation of metrical convenience: both of these 3rd plurals are always (*gman*) or almost always (*guḥ*) pāda-final, with the first “making position” with a preceding light syllable (often *ánu*) and the latter not.

I.65.3: The second half of this verse is very economically and ingeniously expressed. First, the syntactic modes of simile and frame are entirely different. The frame consists of a single noun, nominalized from an underlying verb (*páristih* ‘enclosing’ < *pári* √ *as* ‘enclose’), with the object (Agni, an underlying objective genitive) to be supplied from context (“the enclosing [of Agni]”). The simile contains both subject and object in the appropriate cases (nom. *dyaúh* and [presumably] acc. *bhūma*) but no verb, which must be generated from the noun *páristih* (“as heaven [encloses] the earth”), which in turn was generated from the underlying verb. Thus, the frame and the simile are in syntactic complementary distribution – the former with a verb (or verb substitute) but no overt nominal complements, the latter with nominal complements but no overt verb. That the verb-y half is expressed nominally and the noun-y half as if it contained a governing verb is a further bit of cleverness. This syntactic skew produces case mismatch, with the nom. “heaven” of the simile apparently compared to nom. “the enclosing” (*páristir dyaúr ná*), and, further, the mismatch between the single (presumed) complement of the frame and the two overt complements in the simile gives an impression almost of case disharmony of the type treated in Jamison 1982, although in fact the objective gen. “of Agni” that must be supplied matches the acc. object *bhūma* in the simile.

Or at least it matches *bhūma* acdg. to the standard renderings (Ge, Re, WG, Lü, *Varuṇa* p. 590, and the publ. tr.). However, *bhūma* is a neuter and ambiguous as to case, and heaven enclosing the earth does not strike me as a standard Vedic image — though it slips easily into our round-earth cosmological worldview. Far more commonly in Vedic heaven and earth together encompass something else (e.g., X.27.7, under an epithet) or fail to (II.16.3, again under an epithet), or they themselves are encompassed (see the expressions quoted in Jamison 1998). For a nicely balanced passage in which the two appear both as object and subject, see nearby (but attributed to a different poet) I.61.8cd *pári dyāvāprthivī jabhra urvī, nāsya té mahimānam pári ṣṭah* “He held encircled broad heaven and earth; they did not encompass his greatness.” I therefore now wonder if *bhūma* should be taken as a nominative parallel to *dyaúh*, with an object to be supplied (“... as heaven [and] earth [encompass X]”) or even if *dyaúh ... bhūma* should be recombined into a dual dvandva (cf. *dyāvā-bhūmī*, with slightly different 2nd member) and taken as an object (“as [X encompasses] heaven [and] earth”). (Note that the disyllabic reading of *dyaúh* could accommodate a *dyāvā*.) In any case, I believe that the poet kept these possibilities open by the ambiguous concision of his wording.

Yet another aspect of this little expression is its relation to other such expressions in this small group of hymns attributed to Parāśara Śāktya (I.65-73): twice elsewhere in this collection Agni is depicted as encompassing something else, with the lexemes *pári* √ *bhū* (I.68.2 *pári ... bhúvat*, I.69.2 *pári ... babhūtha*), while in I.72.2 something else is enclosing Agni, configured as a calf (*vātsam*), using *pári* √ *as*. (I wonder if the somewhat pleonastic presence of *bhúvat* in our passage is meant to resonate with those *pári* √ *bhū* passages.) Thus, though in our passage Agni is clearly the *object* of enclosure in the myth of his hiding in the waters, he himself can take the role of encloser in this tight-knit collection – allowing for the possibility that he might here be supplied as *subjective* genitive with *páristih*, save for the mythological context.

All in all, I.65.3cd packs a lot into its ten syllables and five words, as witnessed by the many more words (more than ten times as many) in this entry required to describe its syntactic and semantic tricks.

I.65.4: The initial sequence in this vs. *vārdhantīm* can, uncontroversially, consist of the 3rd pl. act. pres. *vārdhanti* and the enclitic pronoun *īm*, as the Pp. and all subsequent analyses take it. I wonder, however, if it should not be analyzed like nearby I.67.4 *vidāntīm* (q.v.; also a Parāśara hymn), where I segment the sequence as *vidānt īm*, with the old secondary ending *-ant preserved because it was misanalyzed as -ānti + īm. In I.67.4 there is stronger motivation to accept my reanalysis because *vidā-* is otherwise only an aorist stem and should not have indicative forms with primary endings. Here, of course, *vārdha-* is a present stem and *vārdhanti* would be perfectly at home. Nonetheless, the first four vss. of this hymn treat the disappearance of Agni and his concealment in the waters and are couched in the past -- note esp. *ānu guḥ* ‘they followed’ in 3a, the vs. paired with this one. I would therefore tentatively emend the published tr. to “the waters strengthened the lovely child.” For this and other such passages (esp. I.65.4 and I.85.11), see my 2019 “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verb Endings in the Rig Veda” in Fs. Yazuhiko Yoshida.

It is unclear with what part of the sentence the instr. *panvā* should be construed. I take it with the verb *vārdhant(i)* (though I do not go as far as Old, who suggests that the phrase is equivalent to *panāyanti*), while Ge (/WG) and Re, in slightly different ways, take it with *sūśīsvim*. The stem is a hapax and there is no obvious way to decide the matter, though the passages Re adduces for his instr. of characterization (IX.85.11, 86.31 *sīsum .. pānīpnatam* and III.1.13 *apām gārbham ... pāniṣṭham jātām*) may tip the scales in his direction. So I might modify the publ. tr. to “The waters strengthen(ed) the lovely child in his wonder” or (see below) “... strengthen(ed) the one growing well with/in wonder,” though construing it with *vārdhant(i)* still seems to yield more sense.

The matter is made more difficult by the fact that *sūśīsvi-* is also a hapax. It is generally taken as an adj. “schön wachsend” (ultimately to $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘swell’), and this is certainly possible. But because of *sīśvā*, instr. of *sīśu-* ‘child’, in 10c, I follow Old (SBE, “the fine child”) and Re (“le beau Nouveau-né”) in taking it as a noun.

I.65.5: It is tempting to take the adjectives *raṇvā*, *pṛthvī*, and *śambhú* as referring to Agni and specifying the term of comparison with the item in the simile (“broad like a place of peaceful dwelling,” etc.), and in fact Ge (mostly) and Re (entirely) give in to this temptation. However, all three adjectives agree in gender with the noun in the simile (fem. in the first two, neut. in the last), and although it would be possible to explain this agreement as “attraction” (so Re), a simpler solution is to assume that the adjective belongs with the comparandum. (So also WG.) The phrase *girī ná bhujma* poses a different problem, in that *girī-* is masc., and therefore if *bhujmā* is an adjective, it does not modify *girī* — unlike the otherwise entirely parallel expression in VIII.50.2 (Vālahk.) *girī ná bhujmā*. We should either emend the text (→ *bhujmā*, so Gr) to agree with that passage (“like a beneficial mountain”) or take it as a nominalized neut. “source of benefit,” the solution adopted in the publ. tr. On this characteristic of mountains, see, e.g., I.55.3.

I.65.6–7: The similes continue in these verses, but with less strict parallelism in structure.

I.65.6: The construction of *síndhur ná kṣódaḥ* is clarified by its occurrences in the next hymn, I.66.10 *síndhur ná kṣódaḥ prá nīcīr aīnot* “Like a river its gush, he has sent forth those [=butter offerings?] heading downward.” Hence the “(sending)” supplied here.

I.65.7: *ībhya-* is found only here in the RV, though it occurs later. It is a derivative of *ībha-*, which is slightly better attested in the RV and seems to mean ‘(group of) servants, retinue’. Tr. of *ībhyañ* split dramatically between ‘wealthy’ (Ge “die Reichen,” WG “die Begüterten”) and ‘vassal, servant’ (Re “les vassaux”), and the Pāli cognate *ibbha-* is also glossed with both, though with the ‘vassal’ sense first and dominant (see the newest ed. of the PTS dictionary, 2001 s.v.: “a member of a king’s entourage; a vassal; dependent; wealthy”). I will not enter into a reexamination of all the Sanskrit and MIA evidence, but in my opinion context here favors ‘vassal, dependent’ rather than ‘wealthy’. See Proferes’s disc. of vss. 7–9 (2007: 111–12); although he refuses to tr. *ībhyañ*, he argues that it refers “to those who are subordinated to the king,” quite possibly the clans — as the AV passage he adduces suggests: AV IV.22.7 *vīśo addhi* “eat the clans,” addressed to the king at his consecration.

I.65.9: Strictly speaking, given the position of *ná*, the *apsú* should go with the frame, not the simile: “he hisses in the waters, like ...” This is presumably a reference both to the myth of Agni’s hiding in the waters treated earlier in the hymn and to his identification with Apām Napāt, but the *haṃsá-* is surely sitting in the waters, too — though the primary point of comparison is the hissing noise both make.

How to construe gen. *vīśām* is not clear. I take it loosely as a datival gen. with the *cētiṣṭhaḥ*, while Re considers it dependent on a “virtual” *vīśpāti-* (“le plus remarquable ... de (ceux qui président aux) tribus”), and Ge and WG, in slightly different ways, take it as dependent on *uṣarbhūd* (Ge “der Frühwache der Ansiedelungen”; WG “der von Niederlassungen am Morgen wach wird”). Proferes’s rendering is quite awkward, but closest to my own in intent: “the clans’ brightest as concerns strategems.”

I.65.10: The simile in cd is unclear; its purport depends on what meaning is assigned to multivalent *vībhū-*, whose senses include ‘conspicuous’, ‘distinguished’, and ‘wide-ranging’, to which Ge adds ‘sich mehrend’, Re ‘abondant’, and WG ‘kräftig’. In Ge’s and Re’s readings, the point of the simile would be the size of the herd and its growth through the birth of its young. This is certainly possible, and the point of contact with Agni would be the growth, that is, the blazing up, of the fire after its kindling. However, I do not see ‘increase’ as one of the core meanings of *vī√bhū* and prefer ‘wide-ranging’ here, with the simile expressing the grazing behavior of herds and the frame the fire’s tendency to spread. See 8b *vānā vy ásthāt* “he has spread out through the wood.” The final word of 10, *dūrébhāḥ* ‘far-radiant’, may support this interpretation. I do admit, however, that *śísīvā* ‘with their young’ makes less sense than in the Ge/Re interpretation.

Note that the opening of the last hemistich of the hymn, *paśúr ná śísīvā*, “unpacks” the hymn’s first word *paśvā* in a type of ring comp., and that this phrase was in a sense anticipated by 4b *panvā súśíśvim*.

I.66 Agni

I.66.1: The fem. gender of *citrā* is a problem. The standard solution (see, e.g., Gr) is to assume that *rayī*, which is normally masc., is occasionally fem. (so also, supposedly, in nearby I.68.7, though see disc. there). I find this unsatisfactory and explain the gender by assuming that *citrā* modifies not only *rayī* but also fem. *saṃdṛk* and agrees with the latter.

Gr takes *sūrah* as the nom. sg. of the thematic stem *sūra-*; in this he is apparently followed by Re: “(propre à la) vision (des hommes) comme le soleil.” I find this unlikely, since *saṃdṛś-* regularly takes the gen., incl. *sūryasya* (II.33.1, X.37.6, X.59.5). I therefore take *sūrah* as gen. of *svār-*, with, apparently, Ge (/WG).

More problematic is *āyur nā prāṇāḥ*, where the first word should be the neut. noun *āyus-* ‘lifetime’, since Gr’s supposed adjectival stem *āyu-* ‘beweglich’ does not exist (only the neut. noun *āyu-*, also ‘lifetime’). Thus, properly speaking, we should have an equational simile “breath like lifetime,” represented in Re’s “souffle-animé comme la vie (même)” and WG “der Atem gleichsam als Leben.” Nonetheless I consider the interpretation as an improper compound, as in Ge’s “wie der Lebenshauch,” to make more sense.

I.66.2: Both *tákvan-* and *bhūrṇi-* have received diverse tr., which I will not treat in detail here. For \sqrt{tak} as ‘plunge, rush’, etc., see EWA s.v. *TAK*; here and in *takva-vī-* I take it to refer to a “swooping” bird of prey. As for *bhūrṇi*, it belongs to \sqrt{bhur} ‘quiver’, and I tr. it here as ‘restless’ to capture the constant circling and diving of birds of prey. How then can he ‘cling’ (*śiṣakti*) to the wood? The image must be of the flames of the fire constantly licking and dancing (to use our preferred metaphors in English), but always in contact with the wood. My “clings” is a more vivid version of the literal “accompanies, keeps company with.” To avoid the appearance of contradiction, the phrase might better have been rendered “ever restless, like a swooping (bird), he (yet) clings to the wood.”

Note that the second syllable of *vānā* somewhat echoes the *nā* simile markers of previous pādas.

The simile of c is syntactically problematic, consisting of a neut. NA sg. *pāyaḥ* ‘milk’ and a fem. nom. sg. *dhenūḥ* ‘milk-cow’, with the relation between them unspecified. Ge simply takes it as a functional compound (“wie die Kuhmilch”), though unlike “life-breath” in 1c, the order of the elements would be wrong; Re takes *dhenūḥ* as if it were gen. (“comme le lait (de) la vache-laitière”), while Old (SBE) and WG render it as two similes (Old “like milk, like a milch-cow”). I have supplied a verb “(yielding),” allowing *pāyaḥ* to serve as acc. object, on the basis of IV.57.2 *dhenúr iva pāyaḥ ... dhukṣva*. None of these solutions is immediately satisfying. One clue might be whether the adjectives in d (*śúcīr vibhāvā* ‘blazing/gleaming and ‘far-radiant’) are applicable to either the one or the other of the nouns in the simile, but this doesn’t turn out to be very helpful. Although both adjectives are regularly used of Agni, they are characteristic of neither milk nor cows. One exception is V.1.3 *śúcīr ankte śúcibhīr góbhīr agnīḥ* “blazing Agni is anointed with blazing cows,” but there the “cows” stand for products of the cow, either milk (so the publ. tr.) or, more likely, ghee, so that a metaphorical application to either noun is possible. And it may be that the simile in c is to be taken by itself, detached from the adjectives in d; see, e.g., 3cd, where the two pādas, one a simile, the other not, are semantically independent.

I.66.3: As Re notes, we might expect suffix-accented *jetā* with gen. *jānānām*. WG, following Tichy (1995: 343–44), interpret the gen. in dative function (“als Sieger für die Menschen”) to avoid nominal rection with a root-accented agent noun. But since this accentual “rule” is often broken, I see no problem with the standard interpr. as objective gen. “conquerer of peoples.”

On the comparison of Agni to a delightful home, see VI.3.3.

I.66.5: The two halves of this verse are conceptually more complex than those preceding. Most tr. take a and b as implicitly contrastive: Agni’s blaze is undomesticated but he is nonetheless intimately familiar -- e.g., Ge “Dessen Flamme schwer heimisch wird, (und doch ist er) eingeboren wie die Einsicht.” This is certainly possible. However, although I recognize the contrast between *duróka*- and *nitya*-, I think the poet is equating the two elements in a clever play: Agni’s flame can’t be controlled and “domesticated” anymore than a man in the grip of his own will.

As for the second half, I find it hard to believe that the poet is implying that one’s wife is at the disposition of everybody, with the distasteful sexual connotations this implies -- as in Re’s “(se mettent) à disposition pour chacun comme l’épouse sur la couche.” Rather I think this is the Papageno situation: all it takes for anyone to be happy is his own wife in his lap.

I.66.6: The “horse” generally supplied with *śvetāḥ* ‘white’ is based on the regular co-occurrence of that adj. with *ásva*- and other expressions for ‘horse’, including metaphorically of Agni (e.g., V.1.4). It of course also harmonizes nicely with the chariot of cd.

I.66.7: In the RV it’s necessary to allow *sénā*- to mean both ‘army’ and ‘weapon’; although the latter could make sense here (so Re), an army is more likely to produce an onslaught than a single weapon.

I.66.8: As discussed in the publ. intro., this verse is quite opaque and breaks the pattern of Agni-describing similes that has prevailed up to now in this hymn (and the last one). It has, not surprisingly, stimulated much discussion and some fanciful interpretations, all the details of which I will not rehearse here. The first question that must be addressed is what the first word (and the fourth), *yamáḥ*, represents here. Is it the PN Yama, naming the first man and the king of the dead? or the common noun ‘twin’? or even the common noun ‘controller’ (though we might then expect the accent *yáma*-)? What one decides about this question determines the direction of interpretation of the rest of the verse. Ge (/WG) take it as Yama, here identified with Agni; Re and Old (and I) as ‘twin’, with the two twins displaying different characteristics. The rhetorical structure of the verse favors this interpretation; not only do the first two pādas both begin *yamáḥ*, a repetition that invites (but does not require) a “the one ... the other ...” reading, but the contrastive characterizations found in cd also support it.

The next problem is the gender discrepancy between *jātāḥ* (m.) and *jānitvam* (n.) in what appear to be parallel equational clauses. To solve this Ge (/WG) simply supply a verb with the second, to which *jānitvam* serves as object: “als Yama (erzeugt er) das künftiges Geschlecht.” But this would disturb the balanced structure of the verse, and it

seems best to allow *jānitvam* to be predicated of *yamáḥ*, as Old and Re (and I) do. Where I differ from these latter is in my interpretation of the two equations. Old and Re take both twins to be identified with Agni, with each “twin” representing one aspect of Agni’s nature. I think that each twin is identified first with another entity, which is then secondarily identified with Agni. Although this might seem over-complex, it allows the other parts of the verse to bear more meaning than the exclusive “Agni = one twin, Agni = other twin” interpretation admits. As indicated in the publ. intro., I take the verse as reflecting the circumstances of the early morning ritual, when the fire is kindled at sunrise and the soma is pressed for the first offering. Under that interpretation the twin that has (already) been born (*jātáḥ*) would be the sun, at whose appearance the ceremony gets started. The twin that is the substance to be born (*jānitvam*) would be the soma. The two are not only twins of each other, but each is the twin of Agni. Soma and the sun are not infrequently identified (see, e.g., IX.66.18 *tvám soma sūra éṣaḥ* “you, Soma, are the sun”); the identification of Agni and the sun is a commonplace; and Agni can also be identified with Soma (see, e.g., the trca IX.66.19–21), and they frequently share epithets (like *śúci-*, discussed above 2d, though in another context).

I then take the two pādas cd as referring to the sun and the soma respectively. The sun is “the lover of girls” because he appears with the Dawns. For the same phrase, in the acc., referring (most probably) to the sun, see I.152.4. Whereas in IX.86.32 our same phrase *pátir jānīnām* is applied to Soma, where the “women/wives” are the milk-drinks with which he is mixed. As for the secondary reference to Agni, of these characterizations, either group of females (or both) might refer to the offering ladles (fem. *juhū-*) that approach the ritual fire with their oblations or the streams (fem. *dhārā-*) of melted butter being offered. See the fem. pl. *nīcīḥ* in 10b.

Despite the complications of this interpretation, it provides a rich reading of the enigmatic verse, which fits well with the two ritually centered verses that end the hymn.

I.66.9: As indicated in the publ. intro., I consider the last two verses of the hymn to reflect the ritual situation. This scenario is supported by the presence of 1st and 2nd pronouns (*vayám* and *vaḥ* respectively), with the 2nd ps. enclitic indicating, as often, the other human participants and observers besides the poet and priests, who are the “we.”

The crux in this verse is *carāthā*. The first problem with it is the long *ā* in the 2nd syllable, the only instance of such a stem in the transmitted RV beside regularly formed *carātha-* (13x). However, the situation is more complex: 4 of the transmitted *carātha-* forms occur in the Parāśara hymns (I.68.1, 70.3, 7, 72.6), but of these, 3 (68.1, 70.3, 7) would be metrically better if read **carāthā-*. I have no explanation for the variation and will not pursue the issue further. More interesting is the grammatical identity of the form and the semantic role it plays in the verse. Old (SBE, Noten) and Ge (/WG) take it as a nom. pl. ‘wanderers’, neuter if flg. the Pp., though Ge suggests that it might reflect masc. *carāthāḥ*. They further interpret it as conjoined with *vayám* (Old, Ge) or identified with it (WG). However, in the Noten (ad loc., fn. 1) Old allows the possibility that the form could be an instr. parallel with *vasatyā* (“mit Gehen und mit Verweilen”), an idea that Re develops, suggesting that the pair are semantically parallel to the contrastive pair *yóga / kṣéma* (roughly “activity and rest”). Re believes that the instrumentals characterize Agni (“(soit) dans (sa) marche, (soit) dans (sa) demeure”). This is possible, though it would be a slightly odd use of the instr. With Re I consider *carāthā* an instr. contrasting with

vasatyā, but think that the pair is applicable to “us”: we approach Agni with homage with both our movable goods, that is, the livestock that provides the butter and milk offerings, and our household establishment that supplies the rest.

The 3rd pl. *nākṣante* (*nākṣanta* in sandhi) does not agree with its 1st pl. subject *vayām*. With Ge I take it as attraction to the immediately preceding simile, *āstaṃ nā gāvah*. It is accented because it begins the pāda.

I.66.10: The fem. pl. *nīcīḥ* has almost too many possible referents -- waters, flames, cows, or butter offerings (configured as cows) – all of which have been proposed by one or more tr. I favor butter offerings. See also VIII.101.13, also containing *nīcī* and showing the same range of possibilities; sim. V.44.4. The cows of c may well be the same offerings metaphorically.

See publ. intro. for the ring compositional final pāda. As Re points out, *svār dṛśīke* is a nominalizing extension of the infinitive phrase *svār dṛśé* “to see the sun,” and we need not try to interpret *svār* as a genitive.

I.67 Agni

I.67.1: ‘Demand’ may push \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’ a bit, but the simile suggests a degree of coercion.

Adverbial *ajuryām* is lit. ‘undecaying, unaging’, but in the developed sense ‘unfailing’ or, in English idiomatic terms, ‘without fail’.

I.67.3: On the idiom *āme* $\sqrt{dhā}$ see disc. ad I.63.1; this expression must also be considered in relation to Parāśara’s *āmam* $\sqrt{dhā}$ in the preceding hymn (I.66.7). Although a tr. like WG “setzt er die Götter in Schrecken” is easier, I do not think we should lose the sense of ‘onslaught’ for *āma-* by redefining it as ‘panic’ or ‘terror’ in this idiom. Here I think the point is that the leaping flames of Agni put even the gods in his way, even though he is, for the moment, sitting undetected. The first pāda of the hymn (*vāneṣu jāyūḥ* “a conquerer amid the wood”) also implicitly contrasts his martial power with his apparently humble station.

I.67.4: The anomalous 3rd pl. *vidānti*, to the thematic aorist *ávidat*, is the only apparent primary indicative form to this stem and should belong to a present. However, I think it can be eliminated: rather than following the Pp. *vidānti īm*, we can instead read *vidānt īm*, an injunctive with secondary ending whose final *-t* was preserved in this ambiguous sandhi situation. No alteration of the text is required. The publ. tr. need not be altered either, though a preterital interpretation is in fact better: “They found him there when they recited mantras...” – since this passage appears to refer to the mythological tale of the gods finding Agni hidden in the waters. Cf. I.72.2 (also a Parāśara product), where the immortals did *not* find him (*nā vindan*) though they sought him; they are also described as *dhiyaṃdhā-*, as here. For this and other such passages (esp. I.65.4 and I.85.11), see my 2019 “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verb Endings in the Rīg Veda” in Fs. for Kazuhiko Yoshida.

I.67.5: Tr. of the subj. *ajāḥ* vary between ‘unborn’ (Ge, Re) and ‘goat’ (Old SBE, WG), but parallel passages show that it must be the shadowy divinity Aja Ekapad (“One-footed Aja”), whatever the *ajā-* signifies in that conjunction. (Old recognizes as much in his n.) Cf. esp. AV XIII.1.6 *tātra śísriye ’já ékapādó ’ḍṛmhad dyāvāprthivī bálēna*; also RV X.65.13 where *ékapād ajāḥ* is adjacent to *divó dhartā*. In our passage the word *padā-* appears in the next verse and gestures toward the epithet.

The pf. *dādhāra* is ordinarily always presential (Kü 261); Kü cannot decide whether the pf. of *√stambh* is presential or preterital, but at least in this context I think it matches *dadhāra* in value.

I.67.6: The verse is highly alliterative: ab: *priyā padāni, paśvó ní pāhi*; d: *guhā guhām gāḥ*. For the stylistic figure *guhā guhām* see Hoffmann, KZ 76 (1960) 242–48, esp. 246–47 [=Aufs. I.113–19]. Note that *guhā* has a different accentuation from adverbial *gūhā*.

I.67.7–8: These two verses are syntactically dependent on each other, consisting of three relative clauses (7ab, cd, 8ab) and a main clause with coreferential pronoun (8cd). However, this structure is complicated by the fact that, though two of the rel. clauses have singular rel. pronouns (*yāḥ* 71, 7c) and the pronoun in the main cl. is likewise singular (*asmai*), the intermediate rel. cl. (8ab) has pl. *yé*, though all seem to be roughly coreferential. There is no obvious solution for this jarring inconsistency; Ge simply labels it Anakoluthon. However, certain features of the larger context may have encouraged this syntactic anomaly. First, the relative/correlative construction is of the indefinite “whoever ...” type, where number is functionally, though not grammatically, neutralized. That is, it doesn’t matter how many (or few) people the definitional relative clauses identify: if many people perform the functions, they should all get the reward; if only one does, then only he would. Moreover, as Lüders argues (p. 448), vss. 7–8 respond to vss. 3–4. In those earlier verses Agni goes into hiding (3d), but the “superior men” (*nāraḥ*) find him after they produce and recite effective speech (4). In vss. 7–8 we seem to have the same situation, but in the human realm: he/they who has/have recourse to and do(es) service to the truth (7cd, 8ab) and perceive(s) Agni in hiding (7ab) receive(s) acknowledgement from Agni himself (8cd). Since in vss. 3–4 the discoverers of Agni, the gods, are plural, it may be that the plural crept in here, too. And finally this sequence may anticipate the next hymn, where it is emphasized that “all” (in the plural) perform the proper ritual and devotional functions, and in particular the almost identical phrase *ṛtām śāpantaḥ* (68.4c) echoes our *ṛtā śāpantaḥ* (67.8b).

I.67.8: The verb *ví ... cṛntānti* lacks an overt object, and several different ones have been proposed: Ge (in n.) suggests it’s “the stream of truth” from 7d; Re supplies “(l’énigme)”; and WG read *ṛtā* with this verb as well as the participle *śāpantaḥ* (“welche ... die Rtas aufknoten, (sie) pflegend”). Since the other two occurrences of this root (impv. *ví ... cṛta* I.25.21, ppl. *vícṛtta-*) are both construed with *pāśa-* ‘fetter’, that seems the likely object here as well. More speculatively, on the basis of VII.59.8 *druháḥ pāśān* ‘fetters of deceit’, I have supplied that whole phrase here, since ‘deceit’ contrasts nicely with the emphasis on *ṛtā-* ‘truth’.

The pf. *prā vavāca* is one of the very few pf. forms to *√vac* with full reduplication (against *uvāca*, etc.). On the basis of its agreement with Aves. *vauuac-*, Kü (p. 441)

considers this the older type of reduplication, with the newer type spreading from Samprasāraṇa roots.

I.67.9: The second half of the verse is metrically disturbed. As HvN note in their metrical commentary, it actually reads better as a Triṣṭubh, as is occasionally the case with Dvipadā Virāj.

The syntax of the verse is also problematic. The two *utá*-s of c are difficult to construe, and partly for this reason Gr, Old (SBE [disavowed in Noten]), Re, and Klein (DGRV 358) emend *prajā utá* to *prajāsu* (presumably then **prajāsūtá* in the Saṃhitā text, though it's not stated). If the original text had read this, it is hard to see why it would have become corrupted, given the two other loc. pl. in this verse. I consider the problematic *utá*-s and the problematic *prajāḥ* connected and suggest that the *utá*-s are connecting different entities: the first connects the nominatives *yáḥ ... utá prajāḥ* “who [=Agni] and his offspring” (not grammatical in English, of course, but possibly so in Skt; consider the common “X and which Y” construction), the second the locatives *vīrútsu ... utá prasūṣu antáḥ* “in the sprouts and within the fruitful (plants).” Both Agni and his offspring grow in both media; note that because of its sandhi position *ródhan* can be both sg. (*ródhat*) and pl. and thus construed with both suggested subjects.

Note also that the verse begins *víREL*, just like vs. 8, but with entirely different referents for the rel. pronoun. This might be another reason why 8ab shifts to the plural, to establish the difference between those who serve Agni and Agni himself.

I.67.10: The exact sense of *cittí-* and the syntactic disposition of *apām* are the two issues in this verse. Although *cittí-* ordinarily means ‘perception, insight’ and most tr. so take it, I prefer to make it the abstract to a different, but well-represented, sense of *√cít*, namely ‘appears’, hence ‘apparition’. I also, with Old SBE, take *apām* with *dáme* rather than *cittíḥ*. I find tr. like “la pensée active des eaux” (Re), “der Verstand der Wasser” (WG) hard to interpret, indeed even lacking sense. Since much of the hymn has dealt with the theme of Agni’s hiding – and since his hiding place was the waters, though this was not overtly stated earlier – I think that this verse describes him glowing in the waters (and therefore detectible) and also makes reference to him as *Apām Napāt*.

The *sádma* of c must be read with both simile and frame.

I.68–70 Agni

I consider these three hymns to be thematically and verbally linked, treating the Vaiśvānara fire and encoding this theme by deploying the two words underlying this vṛddhi compound, *vísva-* and *nṛí-*. The first, *vísva-*, dominates I.68, the second, *nṛí-* I.69, and they are juxtaposed in the climactic verses of I.70.9–10. See the introductions to the three hymns in the publ. tr., and for a detailed discussion, Jamison, Fs. J. S. Klein (“Inter-hymnic Rhetorical Structure in Ṛgveda I.68-70: Parāśara Śāktya’s Vaiśvānara Cycle,” 2016).

I.68 Agni

Note that Hoffmann tr. the entire hymn (1967: 141–42) because it contains 10 injunctives. I agree with Hoffmann’s tr. of these forms as presents, although I do not think this requires a Zeitlos-type interpretation.

I.68.1: For this interpr. of *śrīñān*, which lacks overt object, see Narten 1987: 281 (=KlSch p. 351).

Rather than taking *aktūn* as a second object with *vy ūrṇot*, I make it an acc. of extent of time, as it often is elsewhere (e.g., V.54.4).

On the metrical shape of *carátham* see I.66.9.

I.68.2: The second half-verse does not work as Dvipadā Virāj, since it would have pādas of 4 and 6 syllables. It has long been suggested (for reff. see Old SBE and HvN comm., both ad loc.) that putting *devó devānām* in the opposite order would fix this problem. However, Old argues in the Proleg. (97) that this is unnecessary, that Dvipadā Virāj has an affinity to Triṣṭubh, and that this line, though 10 syllables, configures itself nearly as a Triṣṭubh. See I.67.9 above.

The verb *pāri ... bhuvat* lacks overt object, and various suggestions have been made. I assume that its object is the same as the object of 1cd “the still and the moving.” Hoffmann (sim. WG) tr. the verb simply as “überraagt” (stands out), but this interpr. ignores the emphasis on “encompassing” in this set of hymn (see disc. ad I.65.3).

The unaccented gen. pl. *eṣām* presents a problem similar to that posed by *āsām* in vs. 7, though I account for them in different ways. Given its lack of accent, *eṣām* should be a pronominal, not adjectival, demonstrative, but it appears to be construed with *vísveṣām ... devānām* “of all these gods.” Because *devānām* is fairly distant from both *eṣām* and *vísveṣām* and appears to be bound to immediately preceding *deváh*, I would now take *eṣām ... vísveṣām* together, separate from *devānām* and emend the tr. to “When alone of all these, the god among the gods, encompasses ...” Though it may be difficult to maintain this in the face of vs. 7, as I argue in the forthcoming article cited above, the poet is doling out the genitive plurals here and does not want to specify that “these all” are the gods until the last minute, since masc. pl. “all” in this hymn otherwise refers to the unified worshippers of the Vaiśvānara fire.

I.68.4: The publ. tr. has “All have a share in divinity and its name.” I would now replace this with “... your divinity and your name.” As I argue in the art. cit., the “all” literally share the name Vaiśvānara.

The contrast between the joint enterprise of those unified by the Vaiśvānara fire, expressed by *bhājanta vísve*, and the separate actions of each of the members, expressed by *évaiḥ*, is the theme of this verse as well as vs. 8.

I.68.5: The logical and syntactic connections between the nominal expressions of ab and the clause in cd are not clear. Ge simply pronounces ab elliptical and suggests supplying *cakruḥ* from cd, while Re supplies “(telles sont/est)” with the two phrases. My assumption is that the promptings and vision of truth are the indirect cause of the actions in cd by defining the proper tasks that all should perform throughout their lifetimes.

I.68.7: There is a syntactic problem in cd that is ignored by all tr. as far as I can see, though Old treats it briefly (ZDMG 61 [1907]: 829 = KlSch p. 260; see below): the fem. gen. pl. demonstr. *āsām* is unaccented. Oblique forms of the *ayám* demonstrative are unaccented when used pronominally, but accented when used adjectivally. The two

accented forms of *āsām* appear with NPs, *pūrvāsām ... svāsīñām* “previous sisters” I.124.9 and *viśām .. ābhayāñām* “fearless clans” X.92.14, and unaccented *āsām* (25x) is always pronominal (for VII.34.10 and X.75.4 see disc. ad loc.) Yet all interpr. of our passage construe *āsām* with *rayīñām* (e.g., Ge [WG] “der Herr dieser Reichtümer,” Re “le maître de ces richesses”). This produces another anomaly: *rayī-* is overwhelmingly masculine and should not be modified by a feminine demonstrative. (On supposed fem. *rayī-* in I.66.1 belonging to this group of hymns, see disc. ad loc. It need not be, and in my opinion is not, feminine there either.) Although it introduces some complexity, I therefore think that *āsām* “of these” must stand for a different feminine noun also construed with *pāti-*. The problem then is what noun? It should already be present in the discourse, since unaccented forms of *ayām* are anaphoric, but there are no obvious candidates – indeed, no candidates at all if we limit ourselves to overt feminine plurals in the previous verses of this hymn. However, an underlying feminine referent can be generated from the context. I see two possibilities. 1) From *āpatya-* ‘progeny’ in the phrase *mānor āpatye* we can generate the synonym, fem. *prajā-* ‘offspring’ – note their juxtaposition in I.179.6 *prajāñ āpatyam*. The gen. pl. of *prajā-* does not occur in Vedic (indeed no gen. pl. to a root noun in *-ā* does; see Macdonell VG), presumably because it should be *prajāñ* and identical to the acc. sg. (though with possible distracted 2nd syllable). By this interpretation Agni would essentially be *prajā-pati*. 2) More likely, in my view: the underlying noun is *viś-* ‘clan’. Although no direct reference to clans is made in the hymn, as I point out in the publ. intro. and argue in more detail elsewhere (Jamison Klein Fs., 2016; see above), the repeated *viśve* ‘all’ triggers a pun with *viś-* in this set of hymns (see esp. I.70.4) and so would be present in the minds of the poet and his audience. Agni is regularly called *viśām pāti-* and *viśpāti-*, sometimes at the same time – e.g., III.13.5 *hótārañ viśpātiñ viśām*, which also contains *hótar-*, as also here. The mention of Manu might also have triggered the association; cf., e.g., V.4.3 *viśām kavīm viśpátim mānuṣīñām* “the poet of the clans, the clanlord of the (clans) of the sons of Manu.” If this solution seems too fussy, it is possible to follow Old’s explanation of the lack of accentuation (see ref. above): that *āsām* does not modify *rayīñām* but anticipates it (“he is the master of them, of the riches”), while being anaphoric to sg. *rayīm* in 6d. This does not eliminate the gender issue, however, and also seems over-tricky. The *eṣām ... viśveṣām ... devāñām* of vs. 2 makes some problems for my interpretation here, but see discussion there.

I.68.8: This verse has given rise to a number of different interpretations, which cannot be discussed in detail here. I interpret it in the framework of Proferes’s treatment of the joint clan-fire (see publ. intro.; also Fs. Klein), which must be kindled and tended by members of the separate clans working together. This cooperative and reciprocal enterprise is expressed by the phrase *mithás tanūṣu* “mutually among themselves” (at least in my interpretation; it has received varying tr., but with most rendering *tanūṣu* as ‘bodies’), by *sām jānata* “they agree, act in unison” to the resonant lexeme *sām √jñā* (see publ. intro. to I.68 and esp. I.68.9), and by the middle voice of *ichanta* “they seek (from each other).” The *rētaḥ* they seek is, I think, the means of kindling the fire, though I admit that this is not a usual sense of that word. Again, as in 4cd, there is a contrast between joint action (*sām jānata*) and each individual’s contribution to it (*svaír dākṣaiḥ*).

I.68.9: This verse returns us to vs. 3; the b-pādas of both are identical: *krátuṃ juṣanta* “They take pleasure in your/his resolve.” In vs. 3 the subject is “all”; here we can assume that the unidentified subject here is “all” as well, and, since vs. 8 follows easily on vs. 7, we can superimpose “all” as subject there too. In vs. 3 the “all” found this pleasure when Agni was born in cd; the parallelism between vs. 3 and vss. 8–9 supports my view that vs. 8 also concerns the kindling of the fire, and the birth metaphor of 3cd (*jāniṣṭhāḥ* ‘you are born’) further supports my suggestion that the *rētaḥ* ‘seed’ of 8a refers to the means of begetting the fire.

I.68.10: As Hoffmann points out, *vī ... aurṇot* is the only augmented form in the hymn and is esp. striking because it forms a ring with *vy ūrṇot* in 1d. The use of a clear past tense form seems to me to mark the conclusion of the ritual kindling of Agni and the attendant distribution of largesse. In other words, like so many final verses it summarizes the ritual activity whose general description precedes it. The final half-verse, in which Agni decorates the vault with stars, may seem out of place, but it also forms a ring, thematic not lexical, with vs. 1, where Agni approaches heaven and performs his tasks through the nights: the vault (*nākam*) reprises heaven in 1ab, and the stars are appropriate to the nights.

Strictly speaking, *rāyaḥ* is acc. pl., not gen. sg. (*rāyāḥ*), and a more literal translation would follow Ge’s “Er schloss die Reichtümer, die Töre (dazu), auf,” or – to match my tr. of 1cd and accommodate English idiom – “he disclosed riches, opened wide (its) doors.” However, Old strenuously argues that it should be interpreted as gen., and certainly the idiom *rāyó dūrah* (with the correct accent) is found nearby in Parāśara’s oeuvre (I.72.8)

What exactly is meant by Agni’s decorating heaven with stars is unclear. However, in a similar passage (IV.7.3) Proferes (p. 27) argues that the stars in the sky represent the domestic fires distributed though many households.

I.69 Agni

As discussed in the publ. intro. and in the art. cit., this hymn is twinned with I.68.

I.69.1: The etymological figure *śukrāḥ śusūkvān* is not as redundant as it seems, because both forms are found in similes with the sun — *svār ṇā śukrām* (II.2.7, IV.45.2) with the adjective and *svār ṇā śusūcīta* (II.2.10, X.43.9) with the perfect — both are found together in X.43.9 *svār ṇā śukrām śusūcīta*. In other words, since the similes “like the lover of Dawn” and “like the light of heaven” have the sun as their underlying referent, at least one of the *√śuc* forms is, as it were, bound to it formulaically.

I.69.2: This verse is parallel to its twin in I.68, with the same verb: *#pāri ... babhūtha* [*bhūvat* 68.2]... ; the emphasis on Agni’s status among the gods (*devó devānām* 68.2, *devānām pitā* 69.2); and an instr. in *-tvā* (*mahitvā* 68.2, *krātvā* 69.2), though to non-parallel stems (*mahitvā-*, *krātu-*). It is therefore surprising that tr. do not note the parallelism of the two verses or necessarily treat them in the same way. In particular, both Ge and Old (SBE) take the *pāri... bhūvat* in 68.2 as ‘encompass’, but *pāri ... babhūtha* in 69.2 as ‘be superior, excel’. (Re tr. both as ‘encompass’ and WG both as ‘excel’.) Given the focus on encompassing/surrounding in this set of hymns (see disc. ad I.65.3 above), I

think both lexemes should be tr. the same way, and each requires an object to be supplied. In 68.2 I supply “the still and the moving” from the previous verse; here I would use the conjoined world-halves, also from the previous verse.

The poet handles the parallelism between the two verses in almost a syncopated fashion. As just noted, each verse contains the idiom *pāri √ bhū*; in 69.2 this is contained within the first hemistich, whereas the finite form *bhúvat* opens the second hemistich in 68.2. But 69.2 has the almost identical form *bhúvaḥ* in that same position, but not as part of the idiom (see also *bhúvat* I.67.2, 65.3). As Hoffmann argues (e.g., 1967: 236–37), *bhuvah*, *bhuvat* are formally ambiguous, both injunctive to the thematic aorist and subjunctive to the root aorist of *√ bhū*. In the publ. tr. I render *bhúvaḥ* in I.69.2 as a subjunctive, but now I am inclined to take it as a presential injunctive “you become...” parallel to my interpretation of *bhúvat* in 68.2.

I.69.3: Agni is here identified with “the sweetness of foods” (*svādmā pitūnām*). The root-accented stem *svādman-*, which should be, and elsewhere is, neut. (nom.-acc. *svādma* in III. 30.14, 31.11; the other form is an endingless loc. in X.29.6) here shows a long final vowel in the nom. sg. The Pp. reads the form as *svādma*, implying that the Saṃhitā form is metrically lengthened (a heavy 2nd syllable being expected in Dvipadā Virāj). But, as Old points out, it could also be a root-accented masc., beside the expected suffix-accented *svādmán-*, with diagnostic masc. forms (*-ānam*, *-ānas*). The suffix-accented masc. form does not have the expected poss. adj. sense we associate with such internal deriv. (Paradebeispiel: *bráhmaṇ-* → *brahmán-*), but seems to be identical in sense to the root-accented form. For the form here I suggest a compromise: I would not posit a root-accented masc. *svādman-* as an item in the Vedic lexicon, but I think it’s possible that our *svādmā* shows a nonce lengthening not for metrical purposes but better to match the entity with which it’s identified, namely the animate masc. Agni: “Agni is ... the sweetness ...”

I.69.4: I supply *mitráḥ* ‘ally’ on the basis of a number of similar formulaic phrases: *jāne mitró ná* X.22.1; *mitráṃ ná jāne* VIII.23.8 (of Agni); *mitrá iva ... jāne* II.4.1 (of Agni). This would be via the collocation *mitrá séva*; cf. nearby I.58.6 *mitráṃ ná sévam divyāya jánmane* “favorable like an ally to the divine race,” also of Agni, with a different word for ‘people, race’ (cf. also *sévam mitráya* X.113.5, a diff. permutation). Note also, two hymns previously, I.67.1b *márteṣu mitráḥ*, where *márteṣu* is a reasonable equivalent to *jāne*.

āhūrya- is a hapax, universally taken to belong to *√ hvṛ* ‘go crookedly, go astray’; although this derivation is not impossible, it leads to some forced tr. (e.g., Ge Durchgänger [‘bolter’, of horses]). I take it rather as the gerundive to the set root *√ hṛ* ‘be angry’.

I.69.5: The phrase *víso ví tārīt* is variously interpreted. The first issue it raises is whether to take the acc. *vísah* as direct object (so Ge, Re, WG) or to construe it with the preverb *ví* as acc. of extent of space (Old SBE). Both usages are attested for *ví √ tṛ*, but it is worth noting that the latter usage is found in Parāśara’s oeuvre using the same form *ví tārīt* (I.73.1), and I adopt it here. In the simile, “traverse the clans” may refer to the year-long journey of the horse ultimately sacrificed in the Aśvamedha. In the frame it reflects the

idea of the Vaiśvānara fire spread through all the clans, not limited to a single household or small family group.

I.69.6: The intrusion of the 1st sg. speaker through *áhve* “I have summoned” is remarkable. Who is he? Although ordinarily in the RV the default referent of a 1st ps., esp. a 1st sg., is the poet, I wonder in this instance if it is not the leader of the united forces, the Kriegskönig, calling the clans and their leaders and best warriors to unite them for action.

My tr. differs syntactically in several ways from most tr., though it agrees with Re in both. First, I do not construe instr. *nṛbhiḥ* with *sānīlāḥ* (“of the same nest with the men”) but as an independent instr. of accompaniment. This would be the only ex. of *sānīla-* with an instr. By specifying “the clans along with their men,” the poet both refers to the whole social group and singles out its most conspicuous and important members, perhaps the *viśpāti*-s.

Second, I take *devatvā* as an instr. sg., not acc. pl. neut. with *viśvāni*. There are several reasons for this. The first verse of the next hymn (I.70.1) contains the same phrase *viśvāny aśyāḥ*, without further specification, and if at all possible the two phrases should be rendered in the same way. Moreover, as Re points out, no direct cases of the plural are attested in this type of derivative. It’s also the case that Agni is characterized by instrumentals in *-tvā* in this group of hymns (*mahitvā* I.67.9, 68.2; *krātvā* I.69.2), and his divinity is emphasized (I.68.2, 4, 69.2). I am, however, given pause by several passages containing *devatvām* (sg.) $\sqrt{(n)as}$: I.151.9 *nā devatvām paṇāyo nānaśuḥ ...* and III.60.2 *tēna devatvām ṛbhavaḥ sām ānaśa*.

I.69.8: The first hemistich has 11 syllables and is best interpreted as a Triṣṭubh, with HvN.

The verse is otherwise problematic, and my interpretation differs sharply from that of others. The crucial point of difference is *āhan*, which is universally taken as the 2nd sg. impf. of \sqrt{han} ‘smite’. This seems to me contextually very unlikely: \sqrt{han} is a very rare verb with Agni as subject, and when it *is* found, it is almost always of Agni’s special form as *rakṣo-hán-* (see IV.3.14, V.2.10, VI.16.29, and with a different object V.4.5). The context does not favor a verb of violence, and I find it hard to believe that \sqrt{han} would be attributed to Agni out of the blue, esp. without specifying an object and esp. announcing this action as his particular “wondrous power” (*dāmsaḥ*). Instead I take it as the loc. sg. of *āhar* ‘day’, in the formula *samāné āhan* “on the same day” (cf. I.34.3, 186.4), with the *samāné* suggested by (or suppressed by) adjacent *samānāḥ*. (Something like this possibility is considered by Old in his n. in SBE and attributed to Aufrecht in Noten.)

The major argument against this interpr, as far as I can see, is the double *yád*, which is unusual under any interpretation but passes better with two verbs (*yád āhan ... yád ... vivéḥ*) than one. I do not have a good solution for this doubling. Either it is rhetorical or simply pleonastic, or it marks off *nṛbhiḥ ... yuktāḥ* as a quasi circumstantial clause: “This is your wondrous power, that (*yád* 1) on the (same) day, when (*yád* 2) yoked with the same men, you ...” But I know of no parallels for such a usage. Another argument for seeing \sqrt{han} here, made by Old (Noten), comes from X.147.1, which contains both *āhan* and *vivér apāḥ* (see immed. below), but I do not think that very late hymn, dedicated to Indra, should overly influence our interpretation of this passage.

With Old (SBE and Noten) I read *vivér ápāmsi*, against Pp. *vivé rápāmsi*; Old's parallels are very persuasive, and this analysis does not require a change in the Samhitā text. Ge's tr. appears to follow the Pp. reading, however, as does Re's, though in his n. he accepts Old's reading.

I.69.9: The first pāda is identical to 1b and thus forms a ring.

Gr, Ge, Re (apparently), and Lub take *usráh* as gen. to *uśár-*, but since there exists a robust stem *usrá-* 'ruddy', I see no reason not to take it as nom. sg. to that stem, esp. since *vibhāvan-* doesn't otherwise take a gen.: the three passages Ge adduces are not compelling.

As discussed in the publ. intro., I do not follow the standard interpr. of *sámjñāta-rūpa-*, i.e., "having (his) well-known form," since the idiom *sám √jñā* has a quite specific meaning 'come to agreement'. The idiom is distinctive enough, and the compound is heavy enough, that that idiom is surely meant, esp. because it appears in finite form in I.68.8. Instead of being an anodyne description of the fire, this is a meaningful characterization of the shared clan-fire as the symbol of, and the product of, the mutual and unified ritual activity of the clans. Unfortunately, to render this comprehensibly in English requires a heavy and awkward locution.

The referent of *asmai* is not entirely apparent. The standard solution, going back to Sāy, is that it is the sacrificer. This is basically correct. However, the lack of accent on the pronoun should require that the referent is already present in the discourse. I suggest that it is to be found in the 1st ps. subject of *áhve* "I have summoned" in vs. 6, a subject that may be one of the ritual participants or, as suggested above, the Kriegskönig. Switch between persons is of course extremely common in the RV.

I.69.10: The phrase *dúro vy ṛṇvan* echoes *ví ... aurṇod dúrah*, which opens the last verse of the preceding hymn (I.68.10) and which itself forms a ring with *vy ūṛṇot* of I.68.1.

The *tmánā* 'by himself/themselves' must refer to the priests; since Agni is regularly the subject of *√vah*, as the conveyor of oblations to the gods and of the gods to the sacrifice, it is here emphasized that others are conveying *him*.

The last hemistich is identical with the last one of I.66.10, which itself forms a ring with I.66.1. This set of hymns is very tightly knit together! As argued in the art. cit., this verse marks the completion of the fire's transformation into the Vaiśvānara fire. Since that fire is identified with the sun, "all cry out on seeing the sun" is an expression of the unified group's first sight of and recognition of the fire that symbolizes their unity – which has been presented to them by the priests who carry it and throw open the doors for it to be seen in 10ab.

I.70 Agni

Again, for detailed discussion of the thematics of this hymn and its relation to the two that precede it, see the publ. tr. and the art. cited above.

I.70.1: It is perhaps appropriate that this last hymn in the Vaiśvānara series begins with the martial verb *vanema* "may we vanquish," since the function of the Vaiśvānara fire is to unite the clans as a force to oppose its enemies.

The Pp. reads *manīṣā*; most tr. read *manīṣā(h)* (see Old's disc [Noten]). However, I take it as both an instr. sg. -*ā* and acc. pl. -*āḥ*, with the poet, as so often, taking advantage of potential ambiguity. This double reading is supported by I.73.9 (also Parāśara's work), which contains the athem. opt. *vanuyāmā* corresponding to them. *vanéma* here and three pairs of instr. + acc.: *ārvadbhiḥ ... ārvato nṛbhir nṛn, vīraír vīrān vanuyāmā* "Might we vanquish steeds with steeds, men with men, and heroes with heroes."

I.70.3: *sthātām* and *carāthām* are pseudo-genitive plurals to this merism much favored by Parāśara. There's no orthodox way to generate them morphologically; Re's suggestion that *sthātām* is a compromise between **sthātrām* and something that looks more like a gen. pl. and that *carāthām* simply copied it seems a reasonable proposal, however sketchy the details.

I.70.4: A verse subject to numerous clashing interpretations. To deal with *ādrau* first – Ge cites several passages in which Agni is born from or is the son of a/the stone. I think it also likely that it is meant to contrast with *duroṇé*; the fire in the house is actual and visible, while the fire in the rock is merely latent and not easily acquired.

Most tr. take the two hemistichs as independent units, which then necessitates supplying something (what depends on the tr.) to make ab an actual clause. I prefer to take the whole verse as a single clause, with *svādhīḥ* as the predicate, whose complement is *asmai* ("... is very attentive to him [=Agni]").

This leaves the enigmatic expression *viśām ná viśvo amṛtaḥ*. Most tr. want this to refer to Agni; hence their interpretational separation of the two half-verses. I think rather that it refers to those who serve Agni, both gods and humans. The two groups are expressed in different ways and the connection between them is actualized by a pun on *viś-* 'clan' and *viśva-* 'all'; this pun in turn makes the secret connection with Vaiśvānara, the clan fire (see Proferes p. 48). In the phrase, *viśvaḥ* can be read both with *amṛtaḥ* ("every immortal") and with the gen. pl. *viśām* "every (one) of the clans," thus providing an indissoluble link between the mortal and divine realms. And the *ná* makes clear that gods are exactly like men in their devotion to Agni. I am reasonably convinced that this is the correct interpretation, but it does trouble me that it is apparently identical to Max Müller's (as reported by Old, SBE n.), "To him also who dwells in the rock and in the house, every immortal like every one among men is well disposed."

I.70.5: The interpretation of *kṣapāvānt-* as 'earth-protector', containing a zero-grade form of the archaic noun *kṣām-* 'earth', goes back at least to the Petersburg dictionary and is the overwhelming consensus in Western scholarship (see EWA, s.v. *kṣām-*). However, a connection with the root noun *kṣāp-* 'night' has a more ancient pedigree: the Pp. divides the word *kṣapā* 'vān, and Sāy comments *kṣapeti rātrināma / rātrimān / āgneyī vai rātriḥ*. At the very least we have a potential pun, and this pun is actually realized in this hymn, since vs. 7b, two verses later, contains the relatively rare root noun *kṣāp-*. Though vs. 5 has no mention of night and 'earth-protector' works fine in that context, the surfacing of *kṣāp-* 'night' so soon after might make the audience reconsider and produce a secondary semantic association for *kṣapāvān*. With a suggestion of Scarlatta (1999: 303), we could then analyze *kṣapāvānt-* as based on a syntagm with original predicative instrumental

(*kṣapā* “[he is] with night”), which was then provided with a *-vant-* possessive suffix. Scarlatta (1999: 303) also suggests other ways to incorporate *kṣáp-* ‘night’, e.g., by haplology from **kṣápā + pā-* ‘protecting by night’ (his reconstructed initial accent reflects a posited adverbial accent shift from inst. *kṣapā*, see p. 303 and n. 452). The exact details matter less than the fact that the Vedic audience could likely see a pun in this word, between *kṣa-* as a combining form of *kṣám-* ‘earth’ and *kṣap-* ‘night’. The publ. tr. “protector of riches on earth” reflects the standard Western interpr., though with an adjustment to incorporate *rayīṇām*; I do believe that the pun on ‘night’ was available to the audience, however. (See also X.29.1 and Jamison 2015 [Gerow Fs., IJHS 19].) It should also be noted, however, that the analysis ‘earth-protector’ for *kṣapāvān* is reinforced in the next vs. (6ab) by an apparent paraphrase *etā ... bhūmā ní pāhi* “protect these worlds.” The poet seems to be even-handedly offering alternative views of *kṣapāvān*.

Most tr. take ab as a nominal clause with suppressed dative (*asmai* or the like), the antecedent of the *yāh* of the rel. cl. (“Agni is the protector ... [for him] who...”). I follow the interpr. of Velankar (1993: 41), who takes *dāśat* as the verb of both main and relative clauses, accented in the former because it is initial in its pāda (and in a *hī* clause), in the latter because it’s in a subordinate clause. This grammatical and semantic reciprocity would match that of the (*asmai ...*) *asmai*, where the first, suppressed dative refers to the worshiper and the second overt one to Agni. The theme of reciprocity is prominent in this hymn group.

I.70.6: *mārtān* is almost surely an irregular gen. pl., rather than the acc. pl. it appears to be; see *devāñ jānma* in the next hymn (I.71.3), with the apparent irreg. gen. pl. *devāñ*, rather than *devānām* as here. (Though “knowing the races of the gods and (knowing) the mortals” is possible, the tight formulaic connection between gods and men/mortals throughout the RV strongly favors the gen. pl.) Whether it is an archaism or is simply following the morphologically sketchy lead of *sthātām ... carāthām* in vs. 3 cannot be determined.

I.70.7: The phrase *pūrvīḥ kṣapó vírūpā(h)*, lit. “many nights of differing form,” is convincingly taken by most commentators as an elliptical pl. for “... nights (and dawns)...,” since *vīrūpe* regularly modifies the dual dvandva *náktoṣāśā* ‘night and dawn’, including in Parāśara’s I.73.7. (See Old’s lucid presentation in SBE n.) Most tr. take it as the nom. pl. subject of *vārdhān*, but, with Ge, I take it as an acc. pl. expressing extent of time, supplying a pronominal subj. ‘they’, picking up “the races of gods and men” in the previous vs. Either interpr. is possible, and there is little to tip the balance one way or the other. Old argues that under the nominative interpr., which he favors, *kṣapāḥ* should probably be accented **kṣápāḥ* (there are no other nom. pl. forms), and the need to account for the wrong accent (if such it is) and the fact that almost all occurrences of *kṣapāḥ* express extent of time (save for VIII.41.3, where it’s a direct obj.) might favor the acc. interpr.

With essentially all Western commentators starting with Benfey, I read *carātham* for the Pp. *ca rátham*, producing yet again Parāśara’s beloved, but morphologically troubled, merism “the still and the moving.” With most tr. I take it as neut. sg. and a

second subject of *várdhān* (adjusted for number), though Ge interprets it as a gen. dependent on the “Keim” he supplies.

The ppl. *prāvīta*- always means ‘impregnated’ (of females) or, as here, ‘conceived’ (see Scar p. 501); WG’s “den vom Rta gesuchten” seemingly rests on the root etymology to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, without taking into account the idiom.

I.70.8–9: See Proferes (pp. 47–49), esp. for the identification of the Vaiśvānara fire in particular with the sun, and the publ. intro. and the art. cit, esp. for the encoding of the Vaiśvānara fire by the successive grammatical subjects *vísve* (9cd) and *nāraḥ* (10ab).

I.70.9: Note the vocabulary associated with human kingship: *prāśasti*- ‘panegyric, laud’ and *balí*- ‘tribute’. Since kings receive *prāśastis* rather than bestowing them and since the verb *dhiṣe* is medial (whatever else it is morphologically), the tr. of Old SBE and Ge whereby Agni bestows the *prāśasti* (e.g., Ge “du legst Wert auf die Kühe, auf die Hölzer”) seem incorrect to me, esp. with the semantic bleaching of *prāśasti* to ‘worth, value’ (Old ‘excellence’). Although the phrase is distinctly odd, I think the point of “you receive/acquire a laud among cows and firewood” is that both the butter oblations represented by the cows and the firewood make noise when in contact with fire, and this noise can be interpreted as an audible expression of praise. For another instance of *prá* \sqrt{sams} in Parāśara’s oeuvre, see I.73.2.

I.70.9–10: See Proferes (pp. 48–49) on these contrastive verses. Note the complementary *bhāranta* / *bharanta* beginning 9c and ending 10d respectively. Their relationship and their semantic contrast is emphasized by the *vī(...)*s: *bhāranta vī(śve)...* *vī ... bharanta*.

I.70.10: Neither of these hemistichs produces two proper Dvipadā Virāj pādas. The first divides into 4 / 6 and presents as a Triṣṭubh lacking a syllable; the second has 11 syllables and is simply a Triṣṭubh, though with an irregular break.

I.70.11: What referent to supply with the adjectives *sādhúḥ* and *gr̥dhnúḥ* isn’t entirely clear. I follow Ge with ‘horse’, because *sādhú-* several times modifies horses (see Ge’s cited parallels), though Re’s ‘warrior’ is equally plausible contextually.

As disc. in the art. cit., I do not believe, with Old (SBE, Noten) and others, that this verse is a later addition. Rather it is a summary verse of the whole three-hymn Vaiśvānara sequence, or even of all of Parāśara’s Dvipadā Virāj hymns to Agni, and describes the Vaiśvānara as the ideal warrior and leader for the united clans embarking on a joint enterprise.

I.71 Agni

I.71.1: The meter of this first verse almost serves as a transition from Parāśara’s Dvipadā Virāj hymns that precede it to his Triṣṭubh ones beginning here (–I.73), as all four pādas (as well as 2a) have openings of 5 (as if in Dvipadā Virāj) and the first two are syntactic units. The hymn then settles down into a pattern of mostly 4-syllable openings.

The underlying fem. subject of this verse is universally taken to be the fingers of the priest producing fire by friction from the kindling sticks. The qualifier *sānīlāḥ* can be

read with both the simile and the frame: the fingers belong to the same hand as the co-wives do to the same household. So Ge, etc. The sexual innuendo fits the friction context well, in addition to setting the stage for the incest theme to come.

The object phrase *śyāvīm āruṣīm* “the dusky and the ruddy [fem.]” is generally taken to refer to night and dawn (although Old [SBE and Noten] wishes to emend the text to fem. nom. pls. modifying the sisters, a generally bad idea). The identification with night and dawn is certainly supported by III.55.11, adduced by Ge, etc., with the same vocabulary. However, it would essentially duplicate the simile of d (“they delighted in night and dawn, like cows in dawn”), a clumsiness that seems uncharacteristic of Parāśara, and one also wonders why the fingers would care about night and dawn. I think, instead, that this is another of Parāśara’s tricks, using color terms associated with the two time periods to pick out another referent entirely, namely the *arāṇi-* (fem.) ‘kindling sticks’, which the fingers *should* care about, since they are manipulating them. The color differentiation is a little odd, but I don’t think it’s entirely out of the question. In X.184.3 the kindling sticks are called ‘golden’ (*hiranyayī*), and one can imagine that as the fire begins to catch hold, the upper stick might glow red, while the lower one would be wreathed in dark smoke.

I.71.3: A difficult verse with a discouragingly large number of competing interpretations. In outline, though not in detail, I follow Ge’s interpretation: pāda a concerns the production of poetry and the poetic vision by our side, in contrast to the poetic visions of the stranger, our rival, in b. After the stranger’s attempts are gotten rid of, the topic returns in cd to our poetic products, which have success. (WG basically follow Ge, while Old [SBE] and Re take b as coreferential with cd.)

The first hemistich, esp. its first pāda, is highly alliterative and rhyming: *dādhan ṛtām dhanāyann asya dhītīm, ād id aryó didhiṣvò víbhrtāḥ*. The two parallel 3rd pl. verbs *dādhan* and *dhanāyan* technically do not match in mood, since *dādhan* should be a subjunctive (the 3rd pl. injunctive to this redupl. pres. should be either **dadhat* or *dadhur*), and the subjunctive of the latter verb should be *dhanāyān*; see Hoffmann 1967: 271 n. 13, who produces a tr. with subjunctive contrasting with preterite. However, in this context I think *dādhan* was created as a nonce injunctive to match the two *an* sequences in *dhanāyan*. The subjects of these verbs are simultaneously the Aṅgirasas and the current poet-ritualists; the injunctive conveniently elides the difference between past and present action.

The beginning of b, *ād id*, generally has temporal value (“just after that”) and is so tr. in the publ. tr. But Parāśara uses the expression in causal value in I.67.8 and I.68.3, and a causal value is possible in the next verse (71.4); such an interpretation works better here, and I would therefore change the tr. to “because of that ...” The launching of their own poetic vision by the Aṅgirasas / our side scatters the visions of the opponents. The sentiment, but not most of the vocabulary, echoes that in I.70.1, where the *arī-* is also the opponent.

The desid. adj. *didhiṣú-* to *√dhā* is based on the middle value of that root (‘acquire’); so Heenen p. 165, though I do not subscribe to the additional semantic baggage Heenen attaches to the stem. Although this desid. *u*-adj. comes to be specialized in the sense ‘wooer’ (see, e.g., VI.55.5, X.18.8, and comm. ad X.26.6), it can have the

simple morphologically additive sense ‘desirous to acquire’, hence ‘greedy, voracious’. With most tr. I assume a pl. of *dhītī-* as the referent.

Just as the injunctives of pāda a can have either presential or preterital value, the lack of verb in b allows the temporal value to be set by the preceding clause, hence applicable both to the current ritual situation and its mythological model. The publ. tr. might be changed to “are/were dispersed.” There is no agreement on what *vībhṛta-* means here, but *vī*√*bhr* generally means ‘disperse, pull apart, carry away’, and the form also needs to be considered in conjunction with *vībhṛtaḥ* in the next vs.

The “unthirsting” *dhītī-* belonging to us/the Aṅgirases are implicitly contrasted with the voracious ones of the *arī-*, as Ge, etc., point out.

With Gr, Old, Re, I take *apāsah* as a nom. pl. fem.; Ge (/WG) rather as a gen. sg. masc. referring to the singer/priest. This is certainly possible and would provide a neat contrast to the gen. sg. *aryāḥ* of b. I would prefer, however, to keep the possible reference to the Aṅgirases alive.

I would prefer not to take *devān* in d as a truncated (or archaic) gen. pl. construed with *jánma* (or as a second acc. with *vardháyantīḥ* “strengthening the gods, their race”); therefore, despite the pāda boundary, in the publ. tr. I take it with *áchā*, which frequently governs *devān* (so, apparently, also Re); cf. esp. I.132.5 (=139.1) *devāṁ áchā ná dhītáyah*, which is our underlying phrase. However, since the apparent gen. pl. *devān* in this phrase *devān jánman-* in VI.11.3 and X.64.14 (see also VI.51.2) is harder to explain away, I suggest the alternative interpr. “... go to the race of the gods, strengthening (it) ...” The presence of *devānām jánma* in the adjacent hymn (I.70.6) supports that view. For further disc. and reff. to sec. lit. see comm. ad X.64.14.

I.71.4: Another difficult verse, though it is clear that it alludes to the theft of fire by Mātariśvan in the first hemistich. This theft is expressed through word play: the verse begins *máthīt*, which can mean either ‘churn, rub’ (to produce fire) or ‘steal’. In this Agni context, esp. given vs. 1, which concerns the churning of fire, ‘churn’ would be the most likely reading – and so it is tr. by Ge, Old (SBE), and Proferes (2007: 31). But the name Mātariśvan ends the pāda, and this mythological allusion would tip the balance towards ‘steal’ (so Re, WG).

The real problem comes in the middle of that pāda: the ppl. *vībhṛtaḥ*. This form should mean ‘dispersed’ or ‘carried away’, and grammatically it should modify *mātariśvā*. However, sense would require it instead to qualify fire, the underlying direct object in the clause; fire is often carried away and dispersed in various locations. Cf. *vī ... bharanta* in the preceding hymn I.70.10 and discussion there, as well as the passages adduced by Old SBE, n. to vs. 4. There is no solution that satisfies both sense and syntax. Ge suggests it’s a transferred epithet, from Agni to Mātariśvan; this seems a description of the problem, not a solution. Old suggests simply displacing it rightward to read it with the assumed subj. of pāda b, namely Agni (“When Mātariśvan had produced him by attrition, he ..., who was brought to many places, has come to every house”), and WG apparently follow. But this kind of extraction from one clause and insertion in another is not syntactically possible in my opinion, esp. given that in its clause it is placed between the acc. referring to Agni (*īm*) and the nom. *mātariśvā*, so that its grammatical affiliation is emphasized. Narten reports a clever suggestion of Hoffmann’s, that the *vī-* is really ‘bird’, and the form means ‘carried by a bird’ (“Das vedische Verbum *math*,” n. 38

[=KISch p. 23 n. 38]), but Mātariśvan should no more be carried by a bird than be dispersed. In the end the least jarring rendering is Re’s “s’étant transporté çà et là,” presumably referring to Mātariśvan’s journey. My “borne away” reflects a similar notion, and I also toyed with the possibility that “carried away” may have the same extended meaning as the English idiom, namely, “overcome with excitement.” No doubt Parāśara recognized the trap he was setting, forcing the audience to find a way to interpret *vibhṛtaḥ* with Mātariśvan rather than with the far more natural Agni.

As noted above, the subject of the next pāda must be Agni, established “in every house” (cf. V.11.4, X.91.2). Because of the accent on *bhūt*, the clause must be parallel to pāda a and is not the main clause, which is introduced by *ād īm* in c.

On the second half of the verse see Proferes 2007: 30–31. Agni’s role as messenger is of course well known: he travels between gods and men, heaven and earth. This regular route may be prefigured here by Mātariśvan’s theft in a, for elsewhere it is clear that M. stole fire from heaven (e.g., I.93.6). It is also said that M. bestowed the stolen fire on Bhṛgu (see nearby I.60.1), and so the epithet *bhṛgavāna-*, whatever its morphology, is apposite. What is unfamiliar is the simile, in which Agni serves as messenger as if for a more powerful king. According to Proferes, Agni is here “depicted ... as the symbol of the presence of a leader’s authority within each household.” I’m not sure, because Agni’s *dūtā* role involves traveling, not staying put. I am inclined to think the simile was generated simply from *dūtyām* and is not meant to apply directly to Agni and his relationship to royal power.

I.71.5: This vivid account of the incestuous attack of Father Heaven on his own daughter (elsewhere Dawn) comes as a surprise in this hymn. The connection must be the fact that this incest led to the birth of the Aṅgirasas, who were the subject of vs. 2 (and possibly vs. 3); this birth is mentioned in the other incest verse, vs. 8cd, though without naming the Aṅgirasas. The other connection is that Agni, unnamed, is the avenger in this verse, shooting Heaven as he released his semen into his daughter. Although the avenger is usually identified as Rudra on the basis of post-RVic passages (see Ge n. to vs. 5, Re, WG), I have demonstrated (Hyenas, 288–97) that the original avenger was Agni. Note that *āstā* ‘archer’ is used of Agni in the last verse of the immediately preceding hymn (I.71.11). I also take Agni as the subj. of pāda b: like a hunter on his prey, he creeps up on the pair, having noticed the caresses (*prśanyāḥ*) Heaven was bestowing on his daughter.

In addition I consider Agni to be the subject of pāda a (with most tr.), but the action there is harder to explain: how and why does Agni make the sap=semen for Heaven if he disapproves of Heaven’s sexual designs on his daughter and in fact punishes him for the rape? For one thing, fire is unlikely to produce anything we might consider sap; in a naturalistic sense, making *rāsa* for heaven would seem to be storing up rain. However, our notions of nature and Vedic India’s are often at odds. That the same semen (or possibly its delivery agent, the penis) is called *tvīṣi-* ‘spark, flare’ in pāda d and, even more telling, is referred to as “blazing semen” (*śūci rétaḥ*) in 8b, brings it into fire’s conceptual sphere. It may be that the flaring up of fire produces Heaven’s semen. But what is Agni’s motivation? I’m afraid this remains mysterious; perhaps it was involuntary, produced by the flaring up just suggested.

I.71.6: This verse returns us to the ritual here-and-now and is considerably easier to interpret than the scraps of mythology in the previous two verses. Still, there are a few puzzles.

The verb *vī bhāti* ‘radiates widely’ is surprising, since its subject must be the mortal worshiper, even though Agni (or occasionally Dawn) is ordinarily the subject of this common verb. Old (SBE, repeated in Noten) suggests emending it to *vī dhāti* ‘worships’ (in Old’s tr.). (I sometimes get the feeling that in the Noten Old felt the need to stick with emendations he’d suggested in his far more free-wheeling SBE tr., even though in his later years he was otherwise very reluctant to emend.) But a metaphorical sense of ‘radiate’ works fine in the passage, as Ge points out, citing parallels like VI.5.5, also of a mortal worshiper. And this would be an instance like *vībhṛtaḥ* in 4 in which the most natural referent of a word is not the grammatically supported one.

Old (SBE and Noten) also proposes to read dat. *uśaté* in b, or rather suggests that the underlying form in sandhi was a dat. *uśatá*, since the spellings *uśató ánu* and *uśaté ánu* “belong to the inventions of Vedic grammarians” (SBE n. 2 to vs. 6). This is certainly possible, but a gen. form *uśató* would reflect what we might call the “proleptic” use of the genitive for dative to express indirect object: the reverence was offered to you and so it is now yours. This colonization of the dative by the genitive is very common both in Vedic and in Classical Sanskrit, and already here it may reflect the weakening of the dative case that led to its disappearance in MIA. I certainly see no reason to take the transmitted *uśató* as acc. pl. with *dyūn*, as Old (Noten) and Ge (n. to 6b) tentatively suggest.

I.71.7: The second hemistich consists of two contrasting halves: in c the speaker complains that his (“our”) vitality (*váyah*), the same vitality that Agni was said to increase in 6c, is not to be seen throughout his kinsmen; this leaves Agni as the sole figure who will find solicitude (*prámati-*) for him among the gods. Put thus, the passage does not make much sense in English. It relies on the close relationship between ‘solicitude’ and kinship (see esp. I.31.9-10, I.108.1, X.23.7, also adduced by Ge) in the RV. The word *prámati-* denotes the kind of care and concern a father shows for his children (or sons) and is regularly associated with, and indeed identified with, the *pitár-* ‘father’ (see, e.g., I.31.9, 10, 14, 16) and secondarily with the kin-group; cf. X.23.7 *vidmā hí te prámatim deva jānīvát* “for we know your (fatherly) solicitude, o god, like that of kin.” Since in our passage the *jānī-* has proved disappointing, the poet turns to Agni for satisfaction. The question then is what is the relationship between vitality and solicitude, which seem conceptually distant. This is less clear, but the connection is also found in the *prámati*-heavy I.31 already cited; cf. I.31.10ab *tvám agne prámatis tvám pitāsi nas, tvám vayaskṛt táva jāmayo vayám* “You, Agni, are (fatherly) solicitude, you a father to us. You are creator of vitality; we are your kin.” In the immediately preceding verse (I.31.9) Agni is also called *tanūkṛt-* ‘body-creator’. The balanced pairing of *tanūkṛt-* and *vayaskṛt-* in a paternal context suggests that in producing children the father creates both the physical body and the intangible essence of life that together make up a living being – ‘life-force’ might be a reasonable rendering of *váyas* – and the father’s *prámati-* seems to be the catalyst that brings them together. Moreover, at least on the evidence of our passage, *váyas-* seems to be something that can be shared by the kin-group, but in this case is not, and in such circumstances if one cannot rely on the shared vitality of his relatives, he

must look only to his father and his father's solicitude. For another association of vitality and the father in Parāśara's work, see I.73.1.

The publ. tr. does not convey this very well. In c I would replace "is not widely perceptible" with "is not widely evident" or "does not appear throughout." I also question my supplying an object (vitality) with *cikivān*; I now think this simply characterizes Agni as the perceptive one or indicates that he perceives the situation as a whole. The same word *cikivān* does seem to take an object in 5b, however.

Against the Pp. I prefer to take *vidā* as a lengthened 2nd sg. imperative rather than subj. *vidās*, though there are no real implications either way.

I.71.8: The incest myth treated in vs. 5 returns here with no more clarity. The various alternative treatments are too numerous to discuss here, so I will present only my own version, some of whose details I have adopted from others. The first hemistich describes again Agni as the avenger, loosing his weapon at Heaven in the midst of the latter's sexual encounter with his daughter. In pāda a the *téjaḥ*, the sharp point of the arrow, reaches the lord of men (=Agni, in my view), so that he can shoot it. I do not understand why his preparation for shooting should be described thus, and in a phrase *ānaḥ* + ACC we might expect the acc. to express the target of the arrow. Nonetheless, Heaven is not otherwise called *nṛpāti*-, and it would be odd to give him this positive epithet in this situation. For Agni as an archer whose arrow has a *téjas*- see VI.3.5 *sá íd āsteva prāti dhād asiṣyāñ, chíśīta téjò 'yasā ná dhārām* "He, just like an archer, has aimed (his arrow), about to shoot. He has whetted its point like a blade of copper." I take *iṣé* in this pāda as an infinitive to *√iṣ* 'impel, send' (others interpret it as 'to enjoy'); I then supply a form of this same verb in the next pāda, which otherwise lacks one.

Note that the product of this incest, the young troop (*śárdham ... yúvānam*), is characterized as both 'faultless' (*anavadyām*) and 'well-intentioned' (*svādhyām*), asserting their goodness despite the circumstances of their birth.

I.71.9: As mentioned in the publ. intro., the reason for including this verse, containing the Sun and Mitra and Varuṇa but no mention of Agni, isn't clear. However, it may be that Mitra and Varuṇa, the guardians of the moral and ethical order, and their all-seeing eye, the Sun, who observes all behavior, are brought in as witnesses of the shocking incest of the last verse and the appropriate punishment inflicted by Agni.

I.71.10: Another apparent non sequitur. I have nothing to say about the morphology of the famous crux *vidúḥ*, which occurs also in VII.18.2 in the same phrase with the same irregular sandhi (*abhí vidúṣ kavíḥ sán*). I do consider it a nom. sg., not acc. pl. For further disc. see comm. at VII.18.2.

I.72 Agni

In the published intro., the sentence "and their ritual service to him in vs. 3 allow them to acquire their own ritually worthy names and to make their own bodies also worthy of ritual service in vs. 4" should be corrected to "vs. 3ab ... vs. 3cd."

I.72.1: The lexeme *ní√kr*, literally 'make/do down', idiomatically means to surpass one's opponent with regard to some quality by "putting" or "bringing" [them] "down." Indeed

the English idiom “put down” is very close, but I chose not to use it because it doesn’t convey quite the right sense with the right case frame. The verb generally takes an acc. of the quality in question; the person who is outdone can be either in the acc. (X.49.8), hence a double acc., or gen. (II.23.12), and there is some disagreement among tr. about which construction we have here, since *vedhāsaḥ śāsṡvataḥ* can be either gen. sg. or acc. pl. Ge opts for the acc. pl. in the tr., but offers the gen. sg. as alternative in his n.; Old, Re, WG choose the sg., as I have done, though for no principled reason.

The *nāryā* ‘manly powers’ in b contrasts both with *kāvya* in a and *amṡtāni* in d. The first contrast would be between, roughly, warrior skills and verbal skills, the second between human (though of course *nṡ-* can often be used of gods, too) and divine. For the latter pairing note that the two acc. pls. are construed with similar verbs: middle participles to reduplicated formations, *dādhānaḥ* and *cakrāṇāḥ*.

I.72.2: After the general proclamation of Agni’s universal powers in vs. 1, the hymn turns to the myth of the disappearance and recovery of Agni.

The immortals’ inability to find Agni “among us” (*asmé*) is contrasted with the success of the mortal who finds him “on the highest track,” presumably in the realm of the immortals, in vs. 4.

The acc. phrase *vatsām pári śántam* is ambiguous, since the participle can either modify *vatsām* (“the calf enclosing ...”) or take *vatsām* as object (“enclosing the calf”). Ge (WG) interpret it as the latter, Old, Re the former. Ge is surely correct: *pári śántam* elsewhere (IV.1.15, VI.17.5, adduced by Ge) qualifies the rock that is the Vala cave and takes “cows” as its object; cf. VI.17.5c ... *ādrim pári gāḥ ... śántam* “... the rock enclosing the cows.” Although in the usual myth of the disappearance of Agni, he is hidden not in a rock but in the waters, this transference of Vala phraseology is enabled here because Agni is called a calf, and cattle were enclosed in the Vala cave.

There is a slight phonological play in the phrase *amṡtā āmūrāḥ*. Also note *visṡve amṡtāḥ* “all the immortals,” a variant of *visṡve devāḥ*. The use of this phrase is telling because in Parāśara’s Vaiśvānara series (I.68–70) *visṡve* is reserved to evoke “all (men).” See discussion esp. in I.68 and in Jamison Klein Fs. 2016. I.68.8 also contains a pāda-final *āmūrāḥ*, there referring to men.

Although the perfect of $\sqrt{sthā}$ without preverb is almost always presential (see Kü p. 580), in this mythological narrative it must be preterital (or at least so tr. into English), like the injunctive *vindan* in pāda a; perhaps we can think of it as a sort of “honorary” injunctive, whose temporal value is determined by context.

The form *cāru* (so Pp.; Saṃhitā *cārv*) is taken as a locative by Sāy. (*cāru cāruṇi śobhane*). This unlikely analysis is followed explicitly by Ge and Old (SBE, more doubtfully Noten) and implicitly by Re and WG. (Gr. takes it as an adverb.) I take it rather as the neut. acc. it appears to be and an alternative locational expression to the adjacent loc. *padé paramé*, supplying *nāma* ‘name’ on the basis of *nāmāni* in the next verse (3c) and the frequency of the collocation *cāru nāma*. It’s worth noting that *cāru nāma* can be hidden or secret (e.g., II.35.11, IX.96.16), and so it would be appropriate to this tale of the hidden Agni. What exactly it would mean to take their stand at his name is not clear, perhaps at the place where Agni’s name is invoked in ritual performance. This would fit with the following verse. It’s also possible that if Agni’s dear name is what’s at

issue, then the *padé paramé* might be the highest word, as well as or instead of the highest track. (See 6ab below.)

I.72.3: For my interpr. of the purport of this verse in a Tānunāptra context, see publ. intro.

The identity of the subjects in this verse is disputed: Ge “die Erzväter,” Sāy the Maruts, Re the gods. I consider this vs. a continuation (of sorts) of vs. 2 with *visve amṛtāḥ* still the subject. I have no explanation for the “three autumns.”

The interpretation of the verb form *saparyān* is quite problematic. It certainly appears to be a subjunctive, and contrasts with the 3rd pl. injunctive *saparyan* that Parāśara places in the same pāda-final position in I.70.10. But a subjunctive does not sit comfortably in the dependent clause whose main clause contains a preterital perfect (*dadhire*) and an augmented imperfect (*āsūdayanta*). Ge (also Re) compares *vārdhān* in I.70.7 (which I take differently) and calls it the subjunctive “bei Zeitangabe” (n. to I.70.7ab), whatever that means. He tr. it as a preterite. Hoffmann calls it a “Konjunktiv in präterital Sachverhalt” (p. 244). Re “ont honoré et honoreront encore,” attributing what seems to me a unique interpretation to the subjunctive. I consider the form a straight preterital and have an admittedly quite ad hoc way to account for the apparent subjunctive. The present participle to this stem, *saparyānt-*, is found 7x pāda-final as nom. sg. masc. *saparyān*; I suggest that in order to make it clear that the form here is not that pres. participle, the final vowel was lengthened, perhaps redactionally. This lengthening has no metrical consequences, of course. The lengthening did not happen in *saparyan* in I.70.10 because it was unaccented and couldn’t be mistaken for a participle. I am quite unhappy with this explanation but even more unhappy with the idea of a subjunctive in this context.

I.72.4: I consider *rodasī* a word play. It is of course a dual, referring to the two world halves, but it also evokes *rodasī*, the consort of the Maruts. Properly speaking she should be in the acc. sg., hence a putative *rodasīm*, but that form is not attested. In I.167.4 we find *rodasī* in acc. usage: the singular consort has simply been grammatically assimilated to the dual world halves in all her appearances.

The intensive part. *vévidānāḥ* could technically belong either to √*vid* ‘know’ or √*vid* ‘find’, whose middle generally means ‘acquire’, and it is somewhat difficult to know which root is supposed to be represented in Ge’s “Gehör finden bei” and Re’s “trouvant-accueil près de.” With Old and Schaeffer (p. 183–85) I take it with ‘find, acquire’, though I am somewhat puzzled by what the intensive part is supposed to contribute – perhaps the sense of constantly keeping their acquisition close by; this would work better for the consort than the two worlds. Schaeffer’s tr. (p. 185) “nachdem sie die beiden hohen Rodasī gefunden haben” has no intensive nuance, and she indeed suggests that the form does not really belong to the intensive, but is a substitute for the perfect participle (**vividānāḥ*) on metrical grounds, hence her preterital tr. I find this substitution hypothesis unlikely, given that the intensive is quite a marked formation and the accent patterns of the two formations are different.

The Pp. reads *rudrīyā* (neut. pl.), not *-āḥ* with most tr. As Ge and Old (Noten) point out, the Pp. reading is not impossible, but the masc. pl. works better. If the first pāda makes reference to Rodasī, a nom. pl. referring to the Maruts makes better sense.

Tr. differ on the interpretation of *nemádhītā*; I render it as close to my interpr. of its other three occurrences, ‘when facing the other side’, used of battle arrays (VI.33.4, VII.27.1, X.93.13). That it refers to men and gods being divided (so Ge, WG) seems farfetched and ignores the evidence of the other identical occurrences and inserts a referent (men and gods) that is simply not there. I do not understand why the accent of the first member *nemá-* differs from that of its simplex (*néma-*).

The last pāda echoes 2d, except it is Agni standing on the highest track, not his pursuers.

I.72.5: On this verse as an expression of the Tānunāptra ritual see Proferes 2007: 59.

The verse begins with a form of the resonant idiom *sám √jñā* ‘come to an agreement, act in harmony’ that was so important in Parāśara’s Vaiśvānara cycle (see I.68.8, 69.9 and disc. there and in Jamison Fs. Klein 2016). Here it expresses the unity not of all men, as in the Vaiśvānara cycle, but of the gods, even including their wives. Or so I interpret it; Ge and Re thinks the group includes both gods and men. This seems unlikely to me, in part because *pātnīvant-* only qualifies gods (except for pressed soma drinks in VIII.93.22). As I have discussed elsewhere, I do not think that the Sacrificer’s Wife later called *pātnī* was yet established in the RV; she was only being introduced (and this introduction contentious) in the latest strata of the text.

Most tr. take *rīrikvāmsas tanvāḥ kṛṇvata svāḥ* to mean “having abandoned their former bodies, they took on their own (new bodies),” but this is somewhat incoherent: were their old bodies any less “their own” than the putative new ones? Proferes’s tr. (p. 59) seems self-contradictory, “Having yielded their bodies, they made [their bodies] their own,” but his explanation makes sense of this: they “overcome their atomization by relinquishing their ‘bodies’ in the course of a fire rite; they thus make their own (*svāḥ*) the collectivity of their own individual bodies, which is to say that each individual within the group identifies with the ‘bodies’ of all the others.” By taking *kṛṇvata* as reciprocal, as I do, rather than just reflexive, this sense can be found in the passage directly.

I.72.6: The Pp. reads unaccented *avidan*, but accented *ávidan* should be extracted from the ambiguous sequence *padāvidan*.

As often with RVic numerology, the identity of the three times seven secret *padā* is not clear. Ge tr. *padā* as *Wörter* (sim. Re), which is certainly possible and has parallels (see Ge’s disc. in n. to 6ab), but the *padé paramé* that figured significantly earlier in the hymn (2d, 4d) should be kept in mind. Moreover, in the next vs. Agni is said to be “inwardly knowing the roads (*ádhvanaḥ*) leading to the gods” (7c), and since the *padā* were found *in* Agni here, it may be that these *padā* are tracks and identical to the *ádhvanaḥ* that he inwardly knows. As I argued in the publ. intro., I think the *padā* are the “tracks” of the ritual.

What *amṛitam* refers to is also unclear; it could be, as Sāy suggests, Agni, or simply “immortality, the immortal principle” (so Re). It unfortunately cannot be the body, which is fem. Note the “way towards immortality” (*amṛtatvāya gātúm*) in 9b below.

The phrase *sthātṛn carátham ca* with its number mismatch shows Parāśara’s fondness for this merism (I.66.9, 68.1, 70.3, 7) and the grammatical anomaly found in most of its occurrences in his oeuvre; see disc. ad locc. Since we would expect **sthātúr*

carátham ca, as in I.68.1 and I.70.7, I wonder if **sthātúr* has been adjusted to *sthāṭṛn* to match the number of preceding *paśūn*. The meter would not be affected. If *sthāṭṛn* here is secondarily generated in context, the only form really belonging to this stem would be *sthātúr*, which has both gen. sg. and nom./acc. readings, the latter of which is of course problematic for an *r*-stem (see disc. ad I.58.5). MW's suggestion (see I.58.5) that *sthātúr* has been reinterpr. as indeclinable on the basis of passages where its case form is ambiguous makes sense.

I.72.7: The referent of “for them” in the tr. of b is the “settled peoples” of a.

On the possible relationship between the *ádhvanaḥ* here and the *padā* of 6b, see disc. there.

I.72.8: The first pāda lacks an overt verb, but it is easy to read *ví ... ajānan* from b (with most tr.), rather than supplying an entirely different verb as Ge does (“brachten”). The identity of the subject is likewise not given, but, with Ge, it is quite likely the Āṅgirasas. The qualifier *svādhī-* ‘very attentive’ is a signature word of Parāśara’s (I.67.2, 70.4, 71.8); the occurrence in 71.8 is applied to the troop, presumably the Āṅgirasas, that Agni begets in punishing Heaven’s incest.

The “seven youthful ones of heaven” are the heavenly rivers; note the corresponding phrase in the previous hymn, I.71.7 (though in a simile) *sravātaḥ saptaḥ yāhvīḥ* “the seven youthful streams,” and for *divó yāhvī-* III.1.6, 9, VII.70.3. The position of *ā* between *divāḥ* and *saptā yāhvīḥ* does give one pause, however, since postposed *ā* with abl. can mean ‘from’. Perhaps this is a mixed construction: “from heaven they discerned the ... maidens of heaven.” I do not know what the seven maidens of heaven are doing here.

The VP “discerned the doors of wealth” (*rāyó dúro ví ... ajānan*) is a variant of “opened the doors (of wealth)” found twice earlier in the Parāśara collection: I.69.10 *ví rāyá aurnod dúraḥ ...* and I.70.10 *duró vy ṇvan*.

I.72.9: This verse is the most baffling in the hymn, both for its contents and for its connection to the rest of the hymn. Ge has a very busy interpretation (followed by WG) that involves the Āṅgirasas and the Ādityas separating themselves from the earth and contending to reach heaven. His interpr. rests on scraps of later mythology, and it is very difficult for me to see where he finds contending parties in the passage, much less the signs that would identify them as Āṅgirasas and Ādityas. It also requires an unlikely reading of *ví√sthā* as ‘separate’, rather than the usual ‘spread out’ (as Re points out). All in all, the interpretation requires a superstructure that the verse cannot support, and examining the passage without the presuppositions Ge brings to it yields a very different picture. Unfortunately, however, the picture isn’t appreciably clearer.

I think that the verse continues the theme of the original discovery of the hidden “tracks” of ritual performance: having discovered them (see 6ab), the subjects of 9ab, the gods most likely, perform the required ritual actions, which lead both to offspring and to “immortality.” The second hemistich is considerably more difficult, but I tentatively suggest that it also depicts a primal sacrifice. The “stretching” of the ritual ground in an ordinary sacrifice, that is, the laying out of its boundaries and the positioning of the offering fire, is here expressed in cosmic terms: the earth herself spreads out to provide

the ritual ground; she does this through the actions of her sons, the ritual participants. And she then “suckles the bird.” Most take the bird as Agni, whatever else they do with the verse, and the suckling, that is, the tending of the ritual fire with wood and oblations, would work fine in this scenario. Re thinks rather the sun, and again the sun as cosmic representative of the ritual fire is thinkable.

I will now treat some of the elements of the verse in more detail. Although *svapatyá-* can be substantivized to mean “good descendants,” it is originally and more commonly an adjective, and even when a head noun is absent, it can be supplied. In this case I interpret the word in the same way as VII.91.3c *vísṣvén nárah svapatyāni cakruḥ* “The men have done all (ritual actions) bringing good descendants.” Here the governing verb is “mount” (*ā ... tasthuḥ*), which I take as metaphorical for ‘embark on’. With the journey theme of pāda b, the (actions of) the sacrifice can be conceived of as a chariot, as so often in the RV.

The *yé* of ab is picked up by the “great sons” of cd (*mahádbhiḥ ... putráḥ*). These can be the offspring produced by the ritual in pāda a or, more likely in my opinion, the performers of those actions – the gods or, perhaps more narrowly, the Ādityas – who are responsible for the cosmic sacrifice in which their mother, the earth herself, spreads out as the ritual ground. I would slightly alter the publ. tr. to “by means of her sons ... the earth ...” Keep in mind that the gods are the sons of Heaven and Earth (cf. the bahuvrīhi in the dual *devá-putre* ‘having the gods as sons’), so Earth is their mother. I am inclined against restricting the subject to the Ādityas. I think rather that mother Earth is called Aditi because Aditi is an archetypal mother, but her sons are all the gods, not just the Ādityas. The next verse (10b) simply refers to the immortals, in what seems to be a continuation of this narrative, and the default subject throughout seems to be the gods in general.

Note that “to suckle the bird” (*dhāyase véḥ*) is a paradox that would be recognized by any reasonably alert observer of nature (as the Vedic people certainly were), in that birds aren’t mammals and don’t suckle. The sense of *dhāyase* can of course be bleached to something like Old’s (SBE) “for the refreshment of the bird,” but I prefer to think this paradox was meant to be savored, along with the paradox of the sons bringing about the action of their mother.

I.72.10: The first half of the verse may return to the Tānunāptra theme. Although I would prefer a middle verb rather than active *ní dadhuḥ*, the first pāda could depict the joint deposit of their shared *śrī* in the ritual fire (cf. the echo of *nīhitā* in 6b), while the second pāda continues the cosmogonic theme of the previous verse. I confess, however, that the very parallel I.73.4c *ádhi dyumnám ní dadhur bhūry asmín* gives me pause. Either I need to interpret that as also a Tānunāptra passage or delete the reflexive implication here. Because of the active verb, I am inclined to change my Tānunāptra interpretation and tr. simply “they deposited dear splendor in him,” although since *cāru-* can have a quasi-reflexive sense ‘own dear’, it may be possible to interpret the two passages differently.

As for the second hemistich, the rivers of pāda c are most likely the oblations poured into the fire. The referent of the fem. pl. *nīcīḥ ... áruṣīḥ* is less clear, and in fact most tr. (Ge, Old SBE, Re, WG) take the two feminines separately, with one nom., the other the acc. object of *prá ... ajānan*. I think rather that the two words belong together as subj. and refer again to the oblations. The lexeme *prá √ jñā* does not otherwise take an

object, but just means ‘know the way, think ahead’. As underlying referent of the feminine adjectives I would supply *dhāṛā* ‘stream’ vel sim.; ‘downward facing’ certainly applies to the oblations, though ‘ruddy’ is more difficult. However, fem. *āruṣṭī-* can be used of cows; since the ghee poured into the fire is a product of cows, it can be so described, even though ghee is of course not ruddy itself.

I.73 Agni

I.73.1: For the complex relationship between ‘vitality’ (*vāyaḥ*) and the father, see disc. ad I.71.7. The “wealth acquired from one’s father” also reminds us of I.70.10, where the sons divide and carry away the property of their aged father.

Agni’s traversing of the (sacrificial) seat (*sādma ... ví tāṛīt*) in my opinion refers to the removal of what is later called the Āhavanīya fire from the Gārhapatya fire at the west end of the ritual ground and its ceremonial placement at the east end. See 2d.

I.73.2: Pāda a is more literally “who, like Savitar, possesses realized thoughts,” but I have adjusted the English to avoid awkwardness.

In c most tr. take *satyāḥ* as the shared term in the simile *amátir ná* (Ge “wahr wie ein Bildnis”) or as modifying *amátih* in the simile (WG “wie eine verwirklichte Erscheinung”). The latter is impossible because *amāti-* is feminine. The former does not convey much sense. The purport of the simile of course depends on the meaning of *amāti-*, which I consider to be more concrete and specific than the usual glosses ‘appearance, form, picture’. An *amāti-* can be golden (III.38.8), broad and wide (V.62.5, VII.38.2, 45.2); it is associated with lordship (V.69.1 *amátim kṣatríyasya*), can be displayed on a chariot box (I.64.9), and is unloosed or unfurled (V.45.2, VII.45.3). All of this suggests that it is a pennant or ensign or other flag-like object. On the basis of its association with lordship, I suggest that it can be a royal emblem and that that is the basis for the simile here. As discussed ad I.70.9 and in my 2007 *Rig Veda between Two Worlds*, *prá √ śams* ‘proclaim, laud’ is a lexeme particularly appropriate to kings, and here Agni is lauded by many like the royal emblem, which is the symbol of the king. This interpretation leaves pāda-final *satyāḥ* somewhat stranded, and I read it with the following pāda. Perhaps it was stationed in the c pāda because of *satyá(manmā)* in almost the same position in the a pāda. Alternatively it can simply be another qualifier of Agni in b, independent of the simile: “lauded by many like a (royal) emblem, real ...”

Most tr. give a rather vague and general rendering of the morphologically elaborate desiderative gerundive *didhiṣāyyaḥ*, “desirable to hold/win”. I think it has a more technical ritual sense, referring to the installation of the fire (so also in the other occurrence of this form in II.4.1). This would reflect the same sense of *√ dhā* as the adjective *puróhita-*, of the fire ‘placed/installed in front/to the east’ and the later ritual complex the Agnyādhya ‘establishment of the fire(s)’. If my interpr. of 1d is correct, namely that the offering fire has been taken from west to east, then the next step would be its installation in the east.

I.73.3: For the first three pādas, cf. III.55.21.

The construction of this verse is more complex than the two preceding ones and, in my opinion, displays some tricky relationships with Parāśara’s phraseology elsewhere.

To begin with, the first simile as it stands is pleonastic at best: Agni should not be “like a god,” since he *is* a god. Nor should he be “like a god who dwells on earth,” since in fact Agni is the only god, or (counting Soma) the primary god, who dwells on earth. I suggest tentatively that the opening *devó ná* is there to match *ná rájā* at the end of the hemistich. Even more tentatively I suggest that what is really being compared is *pr̥thivīm viśvādhāyā(h)*. Note first that in the preceding hymn (10cd) mother earth spread out “to suckle the bird [probably =Agni]” (*dhāyase véh*) and elsewhere earth is called “all-nourishing” (II.17.5 *pr̥thivīm viśvādhāyasam*). I think here that Parāśara is covertly comparing Agni to the earth with regard to this well-known trait of hers, but does so playfully and allusively by stationing acc. *pr̥thivīm* next to nom. *viśvādhāyā(h)* (in the same metrical position as II.17.5 though in Triṣṭubh not Jagatī cadence) and by the intertextual associations evoked by his stating that earth suckled Agni in I.72.9. So the, or an, underlying meaning of pāda a is “the god who, all-nourishing like the earth, ...,” though both the position of the simile marker and the case of ‘earth’ disallow this as a surface meaning. (Let me make clear that I am *not* suggesting emending the text to **pr̥thivī*.)

The two compounds *hitā(mitra-)* (b) and *purāḥ(sādaḥ)* may make implicit reference to the word I suggested is to be associated with *didhiṣāyyaḥ* in 2d, namely *puró-hita*, as a descriptor of the installed ritual fire. The second, *purāḥsād-*, is essentially a synonym of *puróhita-*.

Although I try to avoid explanations like “attraction,” I am afraid I must follow Ge in taking the common term of the similes in c and d as “attracted” to the comparandum: *purāḥsadaḥ* to the pl. *vīrāḥ* from putative sg. **purāḥsad*, *anavadyā* to the fem. *nārī* from putative masc. **anavadyāḥ*. Although it would be possible to avoid the attraction analysis by reading both terms as part of the simile proper (“like heroes stationed in front and stationed for protection, like an irreproachable wife pleasing to her husband,” so WG), this puts the simile marker one element too far to the right and it also submerges the common term. This would be particularly unfortunate in the first simile, since there is a play on two slightly different senses of *-sād-* there. (In I.65.5 a similar gender mismatch is found, explained by Re as attraction, an explanation I rejected. But there it does not involve a misplaced simile marker.)

I.73.4: As noted at I.72.10 our c is almost identical to pāda a there. The publ. tr. treats the first as a Tānunāptra passage (“deposited their own *śrī*”) but not this one, and the two should probably be brought into harmony. I now favor taking neither one as a Tānunāptra expression, but see disc. ad I.72.10. In this case the deposit of ‘heavenly brilliance’ (*dyumnā-*) may be what allows Agni to become the foundation of riches.

I.73.5: The verb *vī ... aśyuh* should be read with both pādas, but, in my opinion, with slightly different senses. In pāda a *pr̥kṣaḥ* is a straight acc. object to the lexeme in the meaning ‘reach, attain’; in pāda b *viśvam āyuh* may be one too (“attain a whole lifetime”) as most take it, but it may also be an acc. of extent of time (“reach through a whole lifetime”). The meaning is almost the same, but it would be like Parāśara to put the constructions slightly off-balance, and the compound *viśvāyuh* is something of a signature word for Parāśara (see the immediately preceding vs. 4d, plus I.67.6, 10, 68.5)

as an adverb expressing extent of time (“lifelong,” etc.). Note the phonetic echoes, pāda a: *ví ... aśyur*, b: *ví ... āyuh*; the first of these distracted sequences also evokes *viśvāyuh*.

Pāda c *sanéma ... aryó* is reminiscent of I.70.1a *vanéma ... aryó* ...

The phrase *bhāgām devēsu ... dādhanāḥ* is almost a paraphrase of I.68.4a *bhājanta ... devatvām*. I would therefore change the publ. tr. “a portion among the gods” to “a share in the gods.”

I.73.6: The referents of the “cows of truth” (ab) and the rivers (cd) are unclear, nor is it clear whether they refer to the same thing. But I think they must be evaluated in the context of this hymn, in which men (vs. 4), patrons (vs. 5), and gods (vs. 7) all serve Agni in one way or another and seek rewards from him; the cows and the rivers then must be another set of devotees and aspirants to his favor, esp. since the same phrase *sumatīm bhīkṣamāṇā(h)* “seeking a portion of favor” is used of the rivers (6c) and the worship-worthy (gods) (7a). I would tentatively suggest a twofold interpretation: 1) A naturalistic one: the swelling cows are the rains, “apportioned by heaven,” with their bellowing the thunder and the udders the clouds. The rains both *are* the (heavenly) rivers and feed the (earthly) rivers. Recall the seven heavenly rivers of I.71.7 and 72.8. Thus, the natural world pays heed to Agni, along with men and gods. 2) A ritual one: as Ge points out, these can be the milk and the water needed for the soma sacrifice, though I confess I would prefer ritual substances more associated with Agni. See I.72.10 where I suggested that the rivers were streams of ghee. I do not believe that we need to see a reference to the Vala and Vṛtra myths here, as Ge suggests.

I do not think that the rivers flow *through* the rock, *pace* Ge, etc., but rather over. There are three passages in IX with *samáyā* and *vá*+VERB OF MOTION, all dealing with soma going across the fleece (IX.75.4, 85.5, 97.56; cf. IX.85.5 *vy āvyáyam samáyā vāram arṣasi* “You rush across the sheep’s fleece all at once.”). So I think the rivers are flowing across or over the rock, but it would help tremendously if I had any idea what the rock represents.

I.73.7: The voc. *agne* was inadvertently omitted from the publ. tr., so “o Agni” should be inserted after “in you.”

The second pāda could also mean “they acquired fame in heaven.” The phrase should be read with 5d *bhāgām devēsu śrávase dādhanāḥ* and 10c *ádhi śrávo devābhaktaṁ dādhanāḥ*. The latter passage, especially, suggests that ‘acquire’ is the better rendering.

The accented *cakrūḥ* in c can be explained, following Klein (DGRV I.176–77), as triggered by the “rhetorically complementary nature of pādas c and d.” There is no need to take the *ca* in c as a subordinator, particularly because subordinating *ca* introduces conditional clauses. Note the contrast between *ví(rūpe)* and *sām (dhuḥ)*, a common rhetorical pairing.

I.73.9: Note the echo of I.70.1, with optatives to the same (synchronic) root and a likely identical case frame. See disc. ad I.70.1.

The second hemistich reprises material from earlier in the hymn: “wealth acquired from their fathers” is exactly the same phrase, though in a different case, as the simile that begins the hymn (I.73.1a); the patrons with their long lives were encountered in 5b.

I.73.10: Ge's interpr. of pāda c is persuasive. II.5.1 *śakéma vājino yāmam* (also III.27.3, VIII.24.22) contains the missing horses supplied here. I take *sudhúraḥ* as proleptic.

For pāda d cf. 5d and 7b; for *devābhakta-* cf. *dyúbhakta-* in 6b.

I.74 Agni

Several verses in this hymn are linked in relative cl. / main cl. structures: 1/2, 4/5. Vs. 6 may also be connected to 4/5. See disc. below.

I.74.2: This interpr. of *sn̥hitiṣu* rests on a metaphorical use of the original sense of *√snih* 'snow'. On this root as warrior slang, see Hoffmann MSS 18 (1965) = Aufs. 447ff.

I.74.4: The second pāda contains two forms of *√vī* 'pursue', which by most tr. get reduced to one, with the finite *veḥ* seemingly playing merely a modal or auxiliary role: Ge "du ... die Opferspenden entgegenzunehmen wünschst"; Re "tu vas pour agréer ses oblations"; Old (SBE) "to whose sacrificial food thou eagerly comest for feasting." The doubling is, however, captured by WG: "der du (die Götter) aufspürst, damit sie die Opfergaben aufspüren," resting on observations of Scar (498–99). I am in independent agreement with WG on this construction. The root *√vī* regularly takes both gods and oblation(s) as object; here the oblations are overt, but the gods are the missing first object – the initial goal of Agni's pursuit, to cause them in turn to pursue the mortal worshiper's oblations as underlying subject of the infinitive *vītáye*. Cf. I.77.2 (also a Gotama hymn) *agnír yád vér mártāya devān* "When Agni, for the sake of the mortal, pursues the gods," where the gods are surface object of *véḥ* and the benefit for the mortal worshiper is emphasized. In our own hymn vs. 6 has a full surface realization of the structure presumed here, with the gods as subj. of the infinitive and the oblations its object, though with a different main verb: *ā ca vāhāsi tām̐ ihá, devān ... / havyā ... vītáye* "You will convey the gods here to pursue the oblations."

I.74.5: I recast the acc. to nom. in English, in order to be able to preserve verse structure.

I.74.6: There is no obvious reason for the accent on the verb *vāhāsi*. Ge (/WG), Re, Klein (I.243–44) take it as triggered by a subordinating *ca*, as does, somewhat tentatively, Old (ZDMG 60: 733 = Kl Sch 208). But this verse does not work very well as a conditional clause for vs. 7, and in fact Re recognizes this semantic disconnect by ending his tr. of vs. 6 with suspension dots. If vs. 6 is subordinated to anything, it would be better to connect it with vs. 5, repeating the message of vs. 4, which is likewise subordinated to 5. I would simply call attention to several passages with this same conjunction of elements with an accented verb and no clear motivation for the accent: III.43.4 *ā ca ... vāhātaḥ*, X.110.1 *ā ca vāha ...* We may be dealing with a catchphrase or with spread of the accent redactionally from a passage in which it was correct to superficially similar phrases.

On the *vītáye* construction, see disc. ad vs. 4.

I.75 Agni

I.75.1–2: Note the play between the two final words of these verses: *āsāni* / *sānasī*. The two verses also contain four superlatives in *-tama-*, each to a stem ending in *-as*.

I.75.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., only the first of the questions in vs. 3 is answered in vs. 4, though the latter *appears* to be structured as the replies.

I.75.5: The three pādas contain three 2nd sg. verb forms belonging to √*yaj*, two pres. imperatives *yājā* (a, b) and a so-called “*si*-imperative” *yākṣi* (c). Though “*si*-imperatives” do often function as imperatives, they are haplogized *-s*-aorist subjunctives by most accounts. I so tr. *yākṣi* here, since the poet could easily have repeated *yājā* in this context; it would have been metrically fine and in fact would have produced a more iambic pattern. It is accented because it follows an extrasentential voc. For another *si*-imperative that is better rendered as a subjunctive see *ní ... satsi* in I.76.4 in the next hymn.

I.76–77: These two Triṣṭubh hymns are out of sequence, in that they both contain five verses. The preceding hymn I.75 in Gāyatrī also contains five verses, and among hymns of the same number of verses to the same divinity, those in the longer meter (in this case Triṣṭubh) should precede. Curiously, Old does not remark on this. The proper sequencing is restored with I.78, five verses in Gāyatrī.

I.76 Agni

I.76.1: As often, *vā* ‘or’ doesn’t present two balanced choices, but could be paraphrased as “or, to put it another way...” That is, it rephrases and varies (often substantially) a previous statement or question.

The first and last pādas contain forms of *mānas-*, which I have tr. differently. The first, in the phrase *mānaso vārāya*, is idiomatic in English as “heart’s desire,” not “mind’s desire/choice/wish.” The expression in the last pāda, *kéna ... mānasā*, might better be rendered “in what spirit,” though I’ve chosen to stick closer to the ‘mind’ sense.

The pf. of √*āp* can be used presentially (so also Kü, though not with ref. to this passage), and that value works best here: the focus in all four clauses is what we can do to best serve Agni, not what someone has done in the past.

I.76.3: The accent on *dhākṣi* is unmotivated. WG label it as antithetical accent, but that is only found in sequences that are more tightly bound rhetorically than this one. (If all imperatives in sequence received “antithetical accent,” there would be many more of them, beginning with *ní śīda* and *bhavā* in 2ab.)

Ge and Re both assert that the referent of *asmai* in d, the recipient of the guest reception (*ātithyām*), is Agni. This seems perverse to me, though grammatically possible. Agni is urged to bring Indra (“the lord of soma”) to the ritual ground; the guest reception is surely for this new arrival and will consist of the usual ritual offerings given to Indra, including soma. It is of course true that Agni is regularly called ‘guest’ (*ātithi-*), but that doesn’t seem relevant here.

The two hemistichs end with two unusual *-van-* forms: (*abhiśasti-*)*pāvan-* and (*su-*)*dāvan-*. Though parallel in formation, they are in different cases (nom. and dat. respectively), which somewhat conceals their morphological match. They are near

hapaxes: the first is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VII.11.3) in a similarly constructed pāda, the latter only here.

I.76.4: Although the contents of this verse are pretty straightforward, the syntax is particularly nasty.

The major problem comes in the first hemistich, with *huvé*, whose identity and function are not clear. Or rather what it appears to be is not easily compatible with the context. The form *huvé* and its unaccented counterpart are extremely common and always 1st sg. mid. to $\sqrt{h\bar{u}} / hvā$ ‘call’, with the sense “I call / invoke X.” If we take it in this sense and construe it with the nominative of pāda a, *váhnih* ‘conveyor’, there is semantic mismatch. The most likely referent of the expression *váhnir āsā* “the conveyor by mouth” is Agni, who carries the oblations to the gods in or with his mouth; see *havyā júhvāna āsāni* in the previous hymn (I.75.1) and the next and final verse of this hymn where he performs sacrifice *juhvā* “with his tongue.” He should properly be the object of *huvé*. Old and Ge (WG) interpret the *váhnir āsā* instead as the human poet, who brings the god(s) to the ritual by mouth, that is, by his hymns. This is a clever idea and does allow the 1st ps. interpretation. The problem then is the accent of *huvé*, though it could be classified with the problematic accent in *ā ca váhāsi* in Gotama’s first hymn (I.74.6), which shares the opening *ā ca*. Re does not want to give up the identification of the *váhnir āsā* with Agni (nor do I), and attributes the syntax to anacoluthon: the first pāda is a nominative expression describing Agni, which breaks off and gives way to an abrupt imperative “je (I’)appelle.” The verbal accent remains a problem. I have another equally ad hoc solution: that *huvé* is an infinitive (built like *bhuvé* to $\sqrt{bh\bar{u}}$) and used predicatively, as *huvādhyai* can be. This would solve the problem of accent, but the drawback is inventing an otherwise unattested form that is homonymous with the extremely well-attested 1st sg. mid.

Note the sequence (*vā*)*casā ...āsā (ā) ca ... ca sa(tsī)*.

The other syntactic issue in the verse is the predicated vocative phrase in d: *bodhī prayantar janitar vāsūnām*. My tr. fails to render the predication; others (e.g., Ge) fail to render the voc. There is no good way to do this in English (or German). Note that *vāsūnām* is accented, although oblique cases that are part of voc. phrases often are not (type *sūno sahasaḥ* “o son of strength”).

I.76.5: The comp. *satyatara* is, predictably, rendered as “truer / more truthful” by most, but I think it rather refers to the comparative “reality” of Agni, who is a physical presence at the ritual, against the notional presence of the other gods. Hence my “most truly present,” which should be corrected to “more truly present (than the other gods).” Re’s “plus réel (que tout autre)” is close. See also nearby I.79.1.

I.77 Agni

I.77.1: All tr. take the *kṛṇóti* in d as if it were *ā kṛṇóti* as in 2b, with the meaning “attract the gods hither.” But the *ā√kṛ* idiom in vs. 2 is medial, and there is no *ā* here. I prefer to take *kṛṇóti* as a dummy verb, standing for *yájati*, extracted from *yájiṣṭhaḥ* ‘best sacrificer’. Hence “does so,” that is “sacrifices.” This also helps account for the *íd*.

I.77.2: On the basis of VI.49.6 I most likely want to rethink my interpr. of *tám ... ā kṛṇudhvam* from “attract him here” to “make him your own.” See comm. VI.49.6. Among other things, since “him” is Agni and Agni as ritual fire is already here, we need not attract him here.

The injunc. *véḥ* (*vér* in sandhi) is by most analyses a 3rd sg. to the root pres. to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, despite the -s ending. The same form with the same 3rd ps. value is found in II.5.3 and IV.7.7; see comm. ad locc. I would now be inclined to alter the tr. to “when Agni ... pursues,” to avoid the appearance of an aoristic interpr.

The verse contains yet another example in Gotama’s collection of anomalously accented verbs, here *bódhati* in the sequence *sá cā bódhati*. Cf. *ā ca váhāsi* (I.74.6), *ā ca huvé* (I.76.4), as well as *dhákṣi* (I.76.3). Although it would be desirable to have a uniform treatment of these verbs, esp. those following *X ca*, a unitary account does not come to mind, and I have explained them in separate ways. Here I suggest that we read the adverb *sácā* at the beginning of d and group it with c (“... pursued the gods altogether”). Lubotsky gives only two examples of lengthened *cā*, this one and III.57.5, out of over a thousand occurrences of *ca*, so, as Old (Noten) points out, the form is suspect. Old also considers but rejects a reading *sácā*, though without giving reasons (beyond “kaum wahrscheinlich”). If *sácā* goes with the preceding pāda, *bódhāti* begins a new clause and its accent is correct. Note that in the previous hemistich (2ab), *yáh ..., hótā tám ū ... ā kṛṇudhvam*, the second pāda begins with a nom. *hótā* that likewise belongs to the previous pāda, and a new clause begins with the second word *tám*, whose clause-initial status is emphasized by following *ū*.

I.77.3: Note the verbal play in ... *ná bhūd ádbhut(asya)* ...

I.77.4: There are a number of interconnected difficulties in this verse, mostly focused on what is happening in cd and the relation of this hemistich with the first one. I take ... *ca yé maghāvānaḥ* ... as the second part of an “X and which Y” construction with *naḥ* in pāda a in Wackernagel’s Position: “... for us and (for those) who, our benefactors ...” Old (SBE), Re, and WG (if I am reading this last correctly) also consider “us” and our benefactors to be the conjoined terms, though with differences in detail. Ge, however, takes the benefactors as conjoined with Agni, and they should also $\sqrt{vī}$ our hymns and thought along with Agni. The frequency with which *maghāvānaḥ* (and also *sūrāyaḥ* ‘patrons’) are conjoined with forms of the 1st pl. favors the non-Ge interpr.

Another issue is the identity of the verb *iṣáyanta* in d. Ge seems to take it with the fairly well-established stem *iṣáyati* ‘prosper, derives benefit’ (“... soll günstig aufnehmen”), similarly Re (“jouissent”) and WG (“sich ... erquicken”). With Old (SBE) I take it as meaning ‘send, propel’ and ultimately a deverbal formation from *iṣnāti*, via **iṣāyāti*, of the type *gr̥bhñāti*, *gr̥bhāyāti*, *gr̥bháyati*.

The final problem is the form *tánā*. Ge (/WG) and Re take it as an instr. of accompaniment “along with their offspring/descendents.” This is not impossible, but this meaning is ordinarily found in the collocation *tanvā tánā ca* (e.g., VI.49.13). By itself *tánā* occurs several times with *girā* (e.g., I.38.13, II.2.1) “with song at length,” and I take it that way here as well, semantically construable with *mánma* ‘prayers’ at the end of the hemistich.

I.78 Agni

See the publ. intro. for the structure of this rather dull hymn. Not only is the third and final pāda identical in the first four (of five) verses, but in these same verses the opening of the first pāda is also rigidly structured: *abhī tvā* (vs. 1), *tām u tvā* (vss. 2-4). The remainder of the first pāda of these verses consists of two variant pairs: *gótamā girā* (vs. 1), *gótamo girā* (vs. 2); *vājasātamam* (vs. 3), *vṛtrahāntamam*. It is thus only the second pāda of each verse that contains fully independent material. The *tvā* in the various a-pādas has a slightly different syntactic status in this seemingly rigid schema. In vs. 1 it serves as the goal of the verb in pāda c, with doubling of the preverb *abhī* (a, c). (Alternatively one can supply a verb in ab and an object in c, as Ge (/WG) do, but this seems uneconomical.) In the following two verses it is governed by a verb in pāda b (2 *duvasyati*, 3 *havāmahe*), leaving *nonumaḥ* in c without an expressed object. In vs. 4 it is again the goal of the verb in c, with an apparent embedded relative clause in b.

I.78.4: The use of the epithet *vṛtrahān-*, esp. in the superlative, for Agni is of course striking since this is overwhelmingly an Indra descriptor. The name *agnī-* hasn't yet figured in the hymn, but *jātvavedaḥ* in vs. 1 clearly announces him as the recipient of this praise.

As noted above, the second pāda is technically an embedded relative (assuming that *nonumaḥ* in c governs *tvā* in a).

I.78.5: As noted in the publ. intro., this final verse breaks the pattern of the rest of the hymn, although it maintains the refrain. The aorist *āvocāma* “we have spoken” marks this as a typical summary verse, referring to the activity in the rest of the hymn.

I.79 Agni

See the publ. intro. for the structure of this hymn (or rather the four hymns collected here) and for an analysis of the first three verses.

I.79.1: As Ge notes, the identifications of Agni with sun (a), lightning (b), and fire (cd) are Ludwig's.

Most comm. take *rājasah* as a subjective genitive with *visāré* (most clearly in Ge's “wenn der Raum sich weitert,” referring to morning in his view). I take it rather to refer to the light of the sun's rays (his golden hair) spreading through the midspace at dawn.

The third pāda refers to the blazing up of the ritual fire at dawn. The fourth pāda consists only of a simile, couched entirely in the feminine plural. The referent of these feminine adjectives and the point of comparison with Agni are both unclear. Ge supplies Frauen; Re suggests waters; Old (SBE) waters or dawns. The dawns seem most likely (so also WG), since a sg. dawn already appears in c and dawns make sense in this ritual context. Dawns are called *apāsas* ‘busy’ in I.92.3, also a Gotama hymn, and Uṣas is *yāsasvatī* in X.11.3. If the feminines are the dawns, the point of comparison may be *śúcibhrājāḥ* ‘having bright blazing’, since the dawns are also bright. If instead it is one of the adjectives in pāda d (‘glorious’ *yāsasvatīḥ*, ‘busy’ *apasyúvaḥ*, or ‘actually present’ *satyāḥ*), we must assume that an original masc. sg. adj. has been attracted into the fem. pl. in the simile – not a problematic assumption.

I.79.2: Again, the interpretation of the image in pāda a depends on what the referent is. Most (Ge, Re, WG) take *suparṇā(h)* as referring to Agni's flames as birds. These flames transform themselves (*ā ... aminanta*) into storm clouds. As indicated in the publ. intro., I instead think this verse develops the image of Agni as lightning found in 1b. The *suparṇāh* are then the lightning flashes. This entails a somewhat bold interpretation of the verb (though I would say no bolder than 'transform themselves', for which no parallels are cited), from 'change, exchange, alternate' to the physical image 'zigzag', from 'change/alternate back and forth'. The middle of $\sqrt{m\bar{r}}$ is several times used of night and dawn swapping their colors back and forth (I.96.5, 113.2), which can be conceived of as an alternating pattern like zigzags. Against the flickering light of the lightning there appears the black bull, that is, the thunder cloud, in b.

The nonce perfect *nonāva*, backformed to the intensive (see the repeated *nonumaḥ* of the immed. preceding hymn I.78), I take as presential, with Narten (1981 "Vedisch *lelāya*," p. 2 with nn. 7, 8, = KISch. p. 234), against most comm., although no harm would come of taking it as a preterite.

The pāda-final tag *yādīmām* is curious. It cannot be part of what precedes, since *nonāva* is unaccented. The same phrase is found at IV.5.11, where I tr. "if it is here." I interpret it in the same fashion here, but in addition assume an enjambement with the following pāda. Others keep it within its half verse (which I would prefer), but in their interpretation the phrase seems like mere filler (e.g., Ge's "wenn dies (so ist)").

The smiling females of c must be the lightning flashes (so also Ge, Re); cf. V.52.6 *vidyútaḥ ... jājjhatīr iva* "lightning flashes like giggling (girls)." Old (SBE): rain showers, WG (tentatively): dawns. The "he," subject of *āgāt* is the black bull of b, the thundercloud as roaring fire.

For the semantic connection between these parts of the thunderstorm and the aspects of fire see the publ. intro.

I.79.3: I take ab as a parallel and paraphrase of 2c, with Agni/the thunder cloud leading (*nāyan*) the lightning flashes, while himself swollen with rain. Others supply different objects, and a radical (and in my view misguided) view of the passage makes *nāyan* a 3rd pl. finite verb with Agni as its object – quite awkward because he is in the nominative in pāda a (*pīyānaḥ*). Those who hold that view resolve the syntactic problem in ad hoc ways, by emendation (**pīyānaṃ* Old [SBE], subsequently rejected in Noten) or by taking *ṛtāsya pāyasā pīyānaḥ* as a parenthetical (Re).

It is unclear whether *pārijmā* is meant as an epithet of Varuṇa or a separate entity. Arguments can be made either way: in VII.40.6 the adjective qualifies wind and is associated with rain, and having Wind (Vāta) involved in this thunderstorm context would be understandable. On the other hand, a fourth god would break up the unity of the standard Āditya triad. The same pāda is found in X.93.4, but in the context of a longer list of gods.

Ge, Re take the "skin" as that of the earth, but I think it is rather the clouds in the lower atmosphere. So, more or less, Old (SBE) and WG. Cf. nearby I.62.5 (attributed to a Gautama) *divó rāja ūparam astabhāyaḥ* "you propped up the nearer realm of heaven."

I.79.5: The irregular sandhi of *vāṣuṣ kavīḥ* may be based on that in nearby *vidúṣ kavīḥ* in I.71.10, though the hymns are attributed to different poets. On this sandhi phenomenon in general, see comm. ad VII.18.2.

I.79.6: I take the point of the double *utá* construction (probably, with Klein DGRV 359, a nonce based on *ca ... ca*) to be the contrast of the two time periods: at night Agni must burn against the demons by himself (*tmánā*), but when Dawn comes, her light helps him out.

I.79.7: Since this is the first verse of a hymn in Gāyatrī (vss. 7-9), I take *gāyatrasya* as a reference to a composition in that meter, rather than just a song.

On the basis of X.4.1 *vándyo no háveṣu*, I construe the loc. in c with the gerundive.

I.79.9: I supply *bhara* from 8a; giving the matching verse openings, *ā no*, and the same object *rāyīm*, this seems the correct choice (so also Ge, Re, WG). It would also be possible to make *rāyīm* here the object of *dhehi* (so Old [SBE]). There are no consequences either way.

I.79.10: The middle voice of the impv. *bhārasva* is correlated with the self-addressed of the poet. See Jamison 2007: 104; 2009 [Skjaervo Fs.], esp. p. 70, and VII.88.1.

I.79.11: The unusual post-verbal, pāda-final *sāḥ* is a nice match for the initial *yāḥ* that it picks up.

I.80 Indra

I.80.1: Old takes *śasā(h)* to $\sqrt{śā}$ ‘sharpen’ rather than $\sqrt{śās}$ ‘order’ (as does Re, judging from his portmanteau and barely comprehensible tr. “as-chassé-comme-en-aiguissant”), but there seems no advantage in this. Neither root is found elsewhere with *nīḥ*, but a literal additive tr. of *nīḥ* $\sqrt{śās}$ works well here. And $\sqrt{śā}$ does not have a reduplicated form of this shape, whereas $\sqrt{śās}$ has a pf. *śasāsa* (etc.), to which this can be a (plupf.) injunctive. So Kü (521), as well as Gr, etc. The *nīḥ* found in vss. 2 and 4 (also 10), also of the expulsion of Vṛtra, may account for the use of this preverb here: it seems to be a signature word of this hymn.

I.80.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse represents a quoted example of the “cheering on” alluded to in the refrain.

I.80.4: Ge suggests that the waters are “accompanied by the Maruts” (*marútvatīḥ*) because the waters here are storm-rains. Although in a Marut context this would seem reasonable, in this Vṛtra-smashing context the waters should not be rain but the rivers confined by Vṛtra, and this interpretation is in fact possible here. Note that Sarasvatī, the river par excellence, is called both *marútvatī* (II.30.8) and *marútsakhā* (VII.96.2); this association must be a mediated one: the river is accompanied by or the companion of the Maruts because their storm-rains swell the rivers.

I.80.5–6: I don’t see any real difference between *áva jighnate* (5) and *ní jighnate* (6) that could account for difference in case frame: acc. in 5, loc. in 6.

I.80.7: In c I supply a preterital form of the redupl. *jighnate* of the last two verses (**ájighnathāḥ*, though no forms with sec. endings exist to the stem), because the main clause verb is the suppletive aorist to \sqrt{han} , *avadhīḥ*.

I.80.8: On pl. *vájṛāsah* see publ. intro.

I.80.9: With Re I take the numbers to refer to the people producing the songs, rather than the songs or song-types themselves (as in the interpretation of Ge [/WG]). The problem is that *vimśatīḥ* is undeniably nominative, so the tr. “zu zwanzig” (and parallel “zu tausend”) (Ge, [/WG]) misrepresents the grammar.

I.80.12: Ge tr. *vépasā* as “durch seinen Wortschwall,” with the verbal (“Wort-“) component presumably on the basis of *vípra-* ‘inspired poet’. But near-adjacent *vépete* in 11b, which refers only to physical trembling with no verbal component, is surely the word against which to interpret it.

Augmented *āyata* is one of the few clear occurrences of a thematic med. pres. to \sqrt{i} .

I.80.13: The expression in ab is striking, with Indra presiding over a fight between *Vṛtra* and his (=Indra’s) missile, but such is the usage of *yodháyati*, as opposed to *yúdhyati* ‘attacks’ (see Jamison 1983: 151)

I.80.14: The phrase *yát sthā jágac ca* is curiously formed, though the meaning is clear. Because the verb *rejate* is unaccented, the *yád* cannot mark a “real” subordinate clause. I wonder if it does not involve the imposition of an “X and which Y” construction on an indivisible merism. In other words, with an “X and which Y” we might expect **sthā yác ca jágat* “the still and what is moving”; cf. X.88.4 (also adduced by Ge) *sthā jágad yád* with a similarly pleonastic and apparently misplaced *yád*. But *sthā jágat* is a fixed expression and nothing can be inserted into it.

Note the repetition of *cít táva manyáve* from 11a, again with a verb of trembling (*vépete* 11b, *vevijyáte* 14d) and an instr. of fear (*bhiyāsā* 11b, *bhiyā* 14d).

I.80.15: *ná ... káḥ* must be read as a negative indefinite (“no one”) despite the absence of an indefinitizing particle like *cít*.

I.80.16: Although the first hemistich begins with a rel. pron. (*yām*) and the second with a form of *sá / tám (tásmīn)*, this is not a rel. cl. / main cl. structure, as the difference in gender between *yām* and *tásmīn* shows. The latter has Indra as referent, and the former, which modifies *dhíyam* ‘poetic vision’ in b, is loosely picked up by *bráhmāni ... ukthā* “sacred formulations and hymns” in the main clause. In fact, I think the referent slippage is deliberate, with *bráhmāni* being the culminating product in our day of the age-old *dhí*

of ab, attributed to legendary priest-poets. Recall that this verse is in ring-compositional relationship with vs. 1, where a *brahmán-* creates poetry in the new style.

I.81 Indra

I.81.2: see vs. 6 below.

I.81.3: Note the alliteration in b: *dhṛṣṇáve dhīyate dhánā*, a phrase that also contains an example of neut. pl. with sg. verb (*dhīyate dhánā*).

I.81.6: This verse paraphrases and expands vs. 2. The nominal expression in 2b *ási bhūri parādadiḥ* is turned into the verb *parādádāti* in 6b; *śikṣasi* in 2d is echoed by *śikṣatu* in 6c; the phrase *bhūri te vāsu* is repeated verbatim (2e, 6d); and the dative beneficiaries in 2 (*yájamānāya* 2d, *suvaté* 2e) are replaced by *dāsúṣe* (6b) and, more tellingly, *asmábhyam* (6c). The source of the wealth that Indra distributes is also made clear: it belonged to the stranger and is presumably plunder.

I.81.7: Most tr. render ab in the 3rd ps., but there is no 3rd ps. verb here, and the phrase is surrounded by 2nd ps. constructions (*táva* 6e, 2nd ps. impv. *grbhāya* 7c). Nothing forbids an underlying *tvám* in ab.

Ge supplies “us” with *śísīhi*, but, although this collocation does occur, I don’t feel it’s necessary in this context.

I.81.9: On *antár√khyā* see disc. ad V.30.9. I suggest there that ‘detect’ is a semantic development of ‘look within’, but also that a diff. tr., ‘distinguish between’ might be a worthwhile alternative: Indra would be distinguishing between the possessions of the unworthy, which he should bring to us, and those of the deserving.

I.82 Indra

I.82.1: *artháyāse* owes its accent to *íd*.

I.82.2: Most tr. take the two verbs *ákṣann amīmadanta* as parallel (e.g., Ge “Sie haben ja geschmaust, gezecht”), but the position of the *hí* after the second verb strongly suggests that the second verb belongs to a separate clause that provides the causal grounds for another clause. My translation reflects this: “for they have brought themselves to exhilaration” explains what “they have eaten” actually refers to: the consumption of soma or soma plus food-offerings. Then in b, as a consequence of their having received nourishment from us, they repay us with goods.

Most tr. take *priyā(h)* in b as nom. pl. masc. referring to the Maruts; this requires supplying an object for *adhūṣata* (e.g., Re “des biens”). I take it rather as an acc. pl. fem., implicitly referring to a fem. noun like *īṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’; cf. X.134.3 *áva tyā brhatīr īṣaḥ ... dhūnuhi* “shake down these lofty refreshments,” with the same VP.

With Old, etc., *vīprā* must be a fem. instr. sg. modifying *matī*.

I.82.3: The exact sense of the hapax *pūrṇāvandhura-* ‘having a full chariot box’ is not entirely clear. Ge suggests that it is full either because Indra has drunk so much or because he is taking Opfergabe home with him; Re goes for the latter: “plein (de biens).” This seems unlikely, since Indra is supposed to *bring* goods to distribute to us, not take them away with him like party favors. Moreover the *vandhúra-* appears to be the place where the charioteer stands (cf. the cmpd *vandhureṣṭhā-*, as well as I.139.4, III.14.3), not a container for cargo. Although a jocular interpretation like Ge’s is possible, I wonder if a “full chariot box” is simply one that has the driver in it; in other words, Indra has mounted the chariot and is ready to go. In any case, *pūrṇá-* here has to be read in the context of the same word in the next verse.

I.82.4: I am puzzled by the reference here. The referent of *cd*, the one who makes sure Indra’s cup is full, should be the sacrificer, but the sacrificer should not be mounting Indra’s chariot. We might entertain the possibility that Indra is actually the referent (and is looking out for his own interests by making sure the cup is full), but, though switch between persons is very common in the RV, referring to the same referent in both 2nd and 3rd persons in the same clause does not happen, as far as I know – and there’s a voc. *indra* in the 3rd ps. *yāh ... cīketati* clause.

I.82.6: With *dadhiṣé* we can supply either ‘reins’ or (as sometimes elsewhere with √*dhā* and a loc. of ‘hand’) the *vájra-* (cf., e.g., VI.45.18 *dhiṣvá vājraṃ gābhastyoh*). The presence of voc. *vajrin* in d might support the latter interpr.

The Pp. reads *amadaḥ* in d. This causes interpretational difficulties: Indra was ordered to leave the ritual ground and drive off to his wife in the immediately preceding verse; he is still here in this verse, so how can he have already become exhilarated in the company of his wife? Re must have recognized the problem, given his tr. “tu t’es (tousjours) enivré avec ta femme,” but this doesn’t work very well. However, nothing prevents us from reading *pátnyā madaḥ*, with an injunctive, not an augmented form. It is true that injunctive forms are quite rare to this stem, but this does not seem to me a decisive argument. (I now see that WG also take it as an injunctive, independently.)

I.83 Indra

I.83.1: Most tr. take *vícetas-* as ‘perceptive’ vel sim. (Ge “die verständigen (?) Gewässer,” Re “les eaux discernantes”), but in this context it makes more sense to use the intransitive sense of the root √*cit* ‘be perceptible, appear’ rather than the I/T ‘perceive’; hence, with *ví*, ‘widely perceptible, conspicuous’. The point of the simile is surely that the goods with which Indra supplies the worshiper are abundant enough to be easily visible, like the sparkling waters filling a river. Note the case disharmony: logically the waters are compared not to Indra, but to the goods he bestows.

I.83.2: This verse presents a number of small problems of interpretation, and it helps first to determine what the verse is about in general. It seems to involve the gods’ ritual approach to the place of the soma-pressing. They are compared to the goddess waters in *pāda* a because waters are brought at the soma-pressing to mix with the pressed soma (cf. IX.69.4, e.g.). The identity of “the one who seeks the gods” (*devayú-*) in c is not entirely

clear, but my assumption is that it is soma. I also assume that the acc. in d does not refer to the soma, but rather to the priest-poet, though it is not impossible that the two accusatives have the same referent, most likely in that case the priest-poet.

In b (with Ge [/WG]) I take the shared term of the simile to be *vítatam* ‘extended, extensive’. Both Ge and WG supply “Opfer” in the frame, but I would suggest that it is, more specifically, the soma-filter, which is elsewhere so qualified. Cf. IX.83.2 *tápoṣ pavítram vítatam divás padé*, where the filter has cosmic dimensions, as it would here.

In d *brahmaprī-* is universally taken as ‘loving the formulation’, and this interpr. would match that of well-attested *brahma-dvís-* ‘hating the formulation’. However, both here and in its other occurrence in I.152.6 I take it instead as ‘pleasing [someone] with the formulation’ with the transitive value of act. *prīṇāti*, etc. In this passage it makes more sense that the gods would delight in someone attempting to please them, rather than someone who is himself deriving pleasure from something else. The passage in I.152.6 invites a similar interpr. See also *yajña-prī-* in X.122.6 and comm. thereon.

I.83.3: With Ge (/WG) I take the two as the Hotar and Adhvaryu priests, with pāda a appropriate to the former and b to the latter. Although it is something of a surprise to find the charged word *mithunā*, which is usually used of a sexual pairing, applied to two males, it is presumably because the two priests have complementary duties. I do not think that it refers to the sacrificer and his wife, contra Old (flg. Benfey). As I have argued at length elsewhere (Jamison 2011, 2016 [2007 UTexas Vedic conf.], and 2018 [2006 World Skt. Conf. Edinburgh]), I consider the ritual Patnī to be a ritual role introduced only in the late RV and very controversial at that time, and I doubt that she would be so casually alluded to here.

I.83.4: Assuming a thematic stem *āṅgira-* here is unavoidable, next to the far more common *s-stem āṅgiras-*.

In order to give *ād* its usual temporal reading (“just after that”), I follow Old in assuming that pāda b provides the grounds for the *Āṅgiras*’ acquisition of life-force.

The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take *prathamām ... váyaḥ* as a syntagm (“first youth,” vel sim.), whereas I take *prathamām* as an adverb. Their evidence is VII.97.1 *prathamām váyaś ca*, but there the position of *ca* favors separation of *prathamām* and *váyāḥ*. See comm. ad loc.

Ge and Re supply a verb in d, but this seems unnecessary; the accusatives here can simply expand on *bhójanam* in c.

I.83.5: This verse seems to jumble together a lot of primal mythology that does not seem to be connected (or, rather, whose connection eludes me). As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 4–5 describe the first institution of the sacrifice and touch on a number of the primordial players. It is esp. noteworthy (but I don’t quite know what to do with it) that vs. 4 contains the *Āṅgiras*es and vs. 5 *Atharvan*, reminding us of the old designation for the *Atharva Veda*, *atharvāṅgirasah* (see, e.g., Bloomfield, Intro. to *Hymns of the Atharvarveda* [SBE 42, 1897]).

The form *tate* is a pseudo-perfect to \sqrt{tan} ; at this period we would expect **tatne* (which we in fact get at X.130.2). The light root-syllable is metrically guaranteed. Kü (210) points out that it is formed as if to a root $\sqrt{tā}$, and such a root morpheme could have

been extracted from the passive *tāyāte*. I would add that, as with many aberrant forms, the context invites this form: note the immediately following word, opening the next pāda, *tātaḥ* (recall also *vītatam* in 2b).

Note the chaining of *ājani* (b) ... *ājat* (c) ... *jātām* (d), with the middle term belonging to a different root (\sqrt{aj}) from the first and last (\sqrt{jan}).

I.83.6: The relation between the three subordinate clauses (abc) and the main clause is irregular in that *tāsya* in d does not pick up a relative pronominal referent. I take it as referring to the sacrificer who has been regularly present in the hymn (the present-time vss. 1-3). Ge and Re may well be right that the *kārū-* ‘bard’ of c, which is identified with the pressing stone, is its logical referent.

I.84 Indra

See the publ. intro. for the structure of this composite hymn.

I.84.1: Unlike the standard tr., WG take *rājāḥ* ‘Raum’ with the frame, not the simile: “... soll dich (und) den Raum erfüllen, wie die Sonne ...” I assume this is because the simile particle *ná*, which usually follows the first word of a simile, here follows the second word, by most interpretations (*rājāḥ sūryo ná raśmībhiḥ*). This does not seem to me sufficient reason to split apart this cosmological image. I attribute the position of *ná* to the particularly close association of *sūrya-* and *raśmībhiḥ*, which are frequently adjacent (cf. esp. the identical simile but without a third term ... *sūryo ná raśmībhiḥ* in VIII.43.32, IX.41.5).

I.84.2: Note the chiasmic structure of cd: [*īśīṇām* (GEN.) *ca stutīḥ* (ACC.)] *úpa* [*yajñām* (ACC.) *ca mānuṣānām* (GEN.)]. This could have been sketched in tr. by “up to the seers’ praises and the sacrifice of the sons of Manu.”

I.84.7–9: Bloomfield (RR, ad I.7.8) suggests that each of these three verses reads like a brahmodya, with the last two words (the four-syllable tag *índro aṅgá*, which he considers to be prose “quite out of the metre”) serving as the answer. This analysis works best for vs. 7, but his separation of the two-word tag from the rest of the verse is clearly correct for all three verses -- though I do not think we need to consider *índro aṅgá* “simple prose.”

I.84.7: I take *índro aṅgá* as the main clause corresponding to the rel. cl. introduced by *yáḥ*.

I.84.8: The hapax *kṣúmpa-* is universally rendered by modern tr. as ‘mushroom’, though there is no unanimity in earlier interpretations (cf., e.g., Gr: Staude [perennial plant]). There is some etymological support for ‘mushroom’ from modern languages (see EWA s.v.), and ‘mushroom’ works well in the simile, since kicking many varieties of mushroom demolishes them, whereas a perennial plant is generally a sturdier entity. I might go so far as to suggest specifically a puffball, since kicking puffballs releases a satisfying cloud of dust (easily viewed on various YouTube videos), and puffballs do appear to be found in the appropriate geographical area.

I.84.9: A broken construction. The subject of the 3rd ps. verb in c (*patyate*) must be Indra, though he is represented by 2nd ps. *tvā* in the apparent rel. cl. of ab. (The parallel in III.36.4b *ugrām śávaḥ patyate dhṛṣṇv ójaḥ*, where Indra is undeniably the subject, makes it clear that the mortal soma-presser of our ab cannot be the subject of *patyate*.) The *yá*-clause of ab thus has no direct grammatical connection with what ought to be its main clause in c, and I therefore take *yás cid* as the functional equivalent of the indefinite *kás cid*.

I.84.10-12: See publ. intro. for the structure of this *trca* and its relation to I.80. The subjects of all three verses are feminine (*gauryàḥ*, *yāḥ* ... *sayāvarīḥ* 10; *tā(h)* ... *prśnayaḥ*, ... *dhenávaḥ* 11; *tā(h)* 12; *vāsvīḥ* 10-12), but, in my opinion, the hidden referent of all three verses is the Maruts. See also comm. on vs. 16.

I.84.10: Ge (followed by Re, WG) takes the feminine plurals as referring to the milk streams, mixing with the soma, here called honey. This of course accords well with the feminine gender, and I agree that this is the first layer of reference. But both the refrain, echoing the refrain of I.80, which has the Maruts as one set of subjects, and *sayāvarīḥ* ‘fellow travellers, driving along with’ point to the Maruts as a second layer. The adj. *sayāvan-* is used 3x (out of 6) with the instr. pl. of *devá-*, once (X.113.2) quite clearly of the Maruts along with Indra. Moreover, the root *√subh* (here in the dat. *śobháse*) is characteristic Marut vocabulary. Why would the hyper-masculine Maruts be referred to with feminines? I think the point is to conflate two of the sources of Indra’s mastery: the soma-milk mixture animatized as cows, which enhances his physical strength, and the Maruts, who provide verbal encouragement and moral support.

I construe instr. *vṛṣṇā* with *sayāvarīḥ* rather than with *mádanti* as most tr. do. The latter is of course possible.

I.84.11: This verse contains another clue that the Maruts are the underlying referent. The fem. subjects are identified as *prśnayaḥ* ‘dappled’, but *prśni-* is also the name of the Maruts’ mother. They would be called *Prśnis* here, just as they are regularly called *Rudras*, after their father *Rudra*.

Note the phonetic figure *prśanāyúvaḥ* ... *prśnayaḥ*.

I.84.13: The use of the bones of *Dadhyañc* as a vajra-substitute is a particularly puzzling part of this puzzling version of the *Dadhyañc* myth. The appearance of this motif in the JB and MBh versions (see Ge n. on vss. 13–15) seems to me an after-the-fact rationalization of the verse here.

I.84.14: The syntax of this verse is somewhat unclear. I take ab as a rel. clause with the pres. part. *ichán* functioning as the main verb and an unusual, indeed disturbing, position of the rel. pron. *yád* (we might expect **ichán yád áśvasya* ...), which is then picked up by *tád* in the main clause of c. Most other tr. take *ichán* as part of the main clause and the *yád* as the marker of an embedded rel. cl.: roughly “seeking the head of the horse, which was set away in the mountains, he found it...” But not only would I prefer not to allow

embedded relatives in the RV, but the position of *yád* makes this interpretation difficult, too (expect **ichánn áśvasya śírah yád ...?*).

I.84.15: I confess myself to be entirely baffled by this verse, though the grammar is straightforward. Ge's reconstruction of the mythology (n. to vs. 15) is not entirely compelling, nor is that found in WG.

I.84.16: The consensus of modern tr. is that the objects that the subject is struggling to yoke are the priests (see esp. Ge), but I find this unlikely. The violent adjectival descriptors seem uncharacteristic for priests, but quite suitable for the Maruts, to whom the poet of this hymn (now drawing to a close) will dedicate the next four hymns. Note esp. that both *śímivant-* and *mayobhū-* are used of the Maruts, once in the same hymn (VIII.20.3 and 24 respectively; for *mayobhū-* see also I.166.3, V.58.2). I therefore take the Maruts as referents of the acc. pls. and also suggest that this verse is the pivot for the Marut reference found also (in my interpretation) in vss. 10–12. In that *ṛca* the Maruts are referred to in the guise of clearly feminine bovine figures; here the cattle (*gāh*) are the first acc. object we encounter. Because *gó-* has fluctuating gender, this form can of course be feminine (as the bovines were in 10–12), but the immediate following adjectives establish it decisively as masculine. If both 10–12 and this verse refer to the Maruts, this verse returns them to their proper grammatical gender. Lüders (*Varuṇa* II.455) also thinks the Maruts are the referents.

ṛtásya can be construed with either *dhurí* or *gāh*, and tr. divide on which they choose. I attach it to the chariot pole in part because *ṛtásya* is often construed with a place (e.g., frequent *ṛtásya yóni-*), but the other is not impossible: cf. I.73.6 *ṛtásya ... dhenávaḥ*.

I.84.17: Contra the interpretation of *ibha-* as 'elephant' in Vedic (so Ge), see EWA s.v.

I.84.18: *yajātai* is, as far as I can tell, the only RVic examples of a medial 3rd sg. subjunctive in *-tai*, the form that takes over beginning with the AV, spreading from the 1st sg. As such it may be a sign that at least this part of this last hymn in the Indra group is late.

Pāda c presents a problem that has been glossed over by most modern tr.: the active of *ā́ vah* should take an acc. of what is being conveyed, but it is distinctly odd to say that the gods are bringing the oblation here. Ge (Re, WG) avoid the difficulty by interpreting the verb as intrans. 'fahren' ('arriver-en-char'), a usage associated with the middle, with *hóma* an acc. of goal. Old, however, disapproves of this makeshift (as do I), setting out the arguments very clearly. Though he agrees that "der Gedanke befremdet," he sticks to the expected syntax (as do I) and cites a number of passages in which gods do bring oblations. The closest is V.41.7 in which Night and Dawn bring the sacrifice to the mortal (V.41.7d *ā́ hā vahato mártiāya yajñám*). I suggest that the role-switch in this verse (gods bring the oblation, rather than coming to our oblation to take it away) is also found in the next verse, where the god praises the mortal.

I.84.19: As in the last verse the usual ritual roles of god and mortal are reversed, with Indra producing a *praśasti* of a mortal. I do not understand why, but, unlike 18c, there is

no way to wriggle out of the undeniable purport of this verb phrase – thus supporting the “gods convey the oblation” interpretation of 18c.

tvám aṅgá reprises the tag of vss. 7–9, *índro aṅgá*, with of course the same referent.

I follow Ge (/WG) in taking vs. 20 as the quoted *vācaḥ* of pāda d, though it would be equally possible to interpret *vācaḥ* as referring to what precedes, indeed even to the whole of the hymn.

I.84.20: It is tempting to take *dabhan* as related to or contextually assimilated to *dabhrá-* ‘paltry, few’ in the meaning ‘come up short’, though the *asmān* would be more difficult to construe.

I.85 Maruts

On the concatenative repetition in this hymn, see publ. intro.

I.85.1: Because of the frequent association of the root $\sqrt{su(m)bh}$ with verbs of motion, esp. $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive’ (cf., e.g., nearby I.88.2 *śubhé kām yānti* and cmpds *śubham-yā(van-)*), I interpret *prā ... śumbhante* more dynamically than most tr. (e.g., Ge “Die sich wie Frauen schön machen...”), esp. given *yāman* in the same clause.

The connection of the relative clause in pāda a with its presumed main clause in d is interrupted by the *hí* clause in c. Ge convincingly suggests that the *hí* clause gives an explanation or exemplification of the “wondrous power” attributed to them in the last word of b, *sudāmsasaḥ*, and he is followed by most tr. including me.

This clause contains a periphrastic causative *cakrīré vṛdhé* with a medial perfect as its base (see Zehnder, *Das periphrastische Kausativ im Vedischen*, pp. 23, 50–51). Although there is no doubt that the construction is a periphrasis, the reason for its use is unclear. As Zehnder points out (pp. 23, 51), the imperfect of the well-attested morphological causative occurs with just this object in VIII.12.7 *yāt ... ródasī ávardhayat*. The context here, which contains two present indicatives (*śumbhante* a, *mādanti* d), does not call for a perfect. I suspect (but cannot demonstrate) that the use of this periphrasis with the perfect has something to do with the middle voice of *cakrīré*, which is also apparently unmotivated in the periphrastic construction, and that there is an underlying pun -- on *rodasī*, the consort of the Maruts -- namely “the Maruts made the two worlds/*Rodasī their own” (*ródasī ... cakrīré*), which would require a medial form. Since, as I demonstrated long ago (“Voice Fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd Plural -*anta* in Active Paradigms” *IJJ* 21 [1979]), 3rd pl. medial secondary forms in -*anta* to -*āya*-formations are almost universally interpretable as re-marked actives in -*an*, using **avardhayanta* here would not allow the proposed double reading, with a true medial value in the pun. A different pun is also possibly latent here, involving a reflexive reading of the middle: “they made *themselves* grow strong” (*cakrīré vṛdhé*). This interpretation would feed naturally into the beginning of verse 2: *tá ukṣitāsaḥ* “once grown,” and 7a *té ‘vardhanta svátavaso mahitvanā* “Those self-powerful ones strengthened themselves in their greatness” would echo this reflexive interpretation. In both of these suggested puns, one of the words in the pāda has to be ignored (*vṛdhé* in the first, *ródasī* in the second), but the suggestive if partial phraseology in both cases would resonate with the audience.

It is also worth noting (though I don't quite know what to do with this fact) that of the fifteen occurrences of *cakiré / cakrire* in the RV, four of them are found in this hymn (vss. 2, 7, 10 in addition to this one), a strikingly large percentage. And that the three finite verbs in vs. 2 are all medial 3rd pl. with strong subject involvement: pāda a *mahimānam āśata* “obtained (their own) greatness,” b *cakrire sādah* “made (their own) seat,” and c *ādhi śrīyo dadhire* “put on (their own) splendours.”

I.85.2: On the verbs in this verse, see final comments on vs. 1.

I.85.3: The pf. *dadhire* of b is not in harmony with the three pres. forms, *śubháyante* a, *bādhante* b, *rīyate* c; in particular, the tenses of the subordinate-main clause dyad in ab clash: “when they beautify themselves ..., they have put on ...” (The tr. avoids the clash by using simply ‘put’, ambiguous between present and past in English, but the Sanskrit is not so amenable.) It is difficult to wring a stative/resulative meaning (“they have put on and now have on ...”) out of *dadhire*, esp. given the identical form in preterital use in 2d. It may be best to assume that *dadhire* here just echoes the form in 2d, though it might be worth noting that the 3rd pl. mid. present indicative to the redupl. pres., *dádhate*, which we might expect here, is quite rare. However, there is another possible solution to this clash. The pres. *śubháyante* in the *yád* clause in pāda a appears before vowel-initial *añjībhīḥ* in the cadence, with, as is usual, the final -e scanning short in hiatus (that is, probably as *-a’). It is possible that the underlying form of the verb was actually the injunctive **śubháyanta* and that the primary ending -*ante* was substituted editorially to prevent the redactional contraction that might have resulted (**śubháyantāñjībhīḥ*). This would allow a past-time reading of the first hemistich, “When they beautified themselves ..., they put on ...”

I.85.4: This verse contains no main clause, just two different subordinate clauses introduced by *yé* (ab) and *yád* (cd) respectively, with the first couched in the 3rd ps., the second in the 2nd ps. Although such switches of person in the middle of a verse are far from rare in the RV (see in fact vs. 5), in this case it seems best to consider the first half of this verse a pendant to vs. 3 (also in the 3rd ps.) and the second half an anticipation of vs. 5 (also in the 2nd ps.), esp. since 5a is an abbreviated duplicate of 4cd.

The adj. *manojúvaḥ* ‘mind-swift’ could equally well be a nom. pl. masc. modifying the Maruts or an acc. pl. fem. modifying *pr̥ṣatīḥ*. Most tr. opt for the latter, I think correctly on thematic grounds, but grammatically and semantically either is possible. Gr and Macd (Vedic Reader) take it as a nominative; certainly its position right before *marutaḥ* in pāda a, with *pr̥ṣatīḥ* appearing only in the middle of the second pāda, suggests that the initial audience interpretation would be as a modifier of the Maruts.

I.85.4–5: Verse 5 is an intrusive Triṣṭubh in this Jagatī hymn. (The final verse is also in Triṣṭubh, but meter change is more usual in concluding verses.) The transition between the meters is cleverly managed here (as Old already pointed out): the final word of 4d (in Jagatī) and 5a (in Triṣṭubh) is *áyugdhvam*. The ending has the distracted reading -*dh^hvam* in 4d, but is simply -*dhvam* in 5a. The reason for the change in meter is unclear to me.

I.85.5: As noted ad vs. 4, the person changes from 2nd to 3rd in the middle of this verse. But this is not the only disruption: the main clause of 5cd begins with *utá*, which has nothing to conjoin. Klein (DGRV I: 451) is puzzled and suggests, somewhat desperately, that the *utá* “focuses on and emphasizes the second action of the Maruts.” This seems to open the usage of *utá* unacceptably wide. It is possible instead to see it as an example of “inverse *utá*,” conjoining the actions of the two clauses of cd, with the parallel verbs *vī syanti* and *vy undanti* (so also explicitly Macd, Reader). Or it may be signaling the resumption of 3rd ps. discourse after the 2nd ps. intrusions of 4cd–5ab.

The inundation of the skin in pāda 4 presumably refers to the wetting of hides in the tanning process (so Ge).

I.85.6: In vs. 1 the Maruts were themselves called *sáptayah* ‘spans’, but here that image is “repaired” by separating the Maruts from the spans of draught animals that bring them here.

The two *raghu*- cmpds. pick up *raṁháyantaḥ* in 5b.

The phrase *urú vah sádas kṛtām* could technically be in apposition to *barhīḥ* and hence accusative -- “Sit on the barhis, the broad seat made for you” -- but none of the standard tr. so render it. The position of the *vah* favors, but does not impose, this nominal sentence interpretation. For another reason supporting a separation into two clauses see comm. ad I.85.7.

The seat made for the Maruts on the ritual ground is here contrasted with the one they made for themselves in heaven in 2b (*diví ... ádhi cakrire sádaḥ*), which event is then repeated in the next verse, 7b *urú cakrire sádaḥ*, though there the seat is in/on/above the “vault” (*nākam*).

I.85.7: I tr. *avardhanta* as reflexive, rather than (with most tr.) intransitive ‘grew strong’, in part because *svátavas*- suggests that their power comes by their own efforts and in part because of its resonance with one interpretation of 1c, for which see above.

On pāda b see comments ad 6c and the similar phrase in 2b. The accent of the apparent main verb *tasthúḥ* is surprising. Macd (Reader) invokes the principle that the first of two antithetical verbs is accented, but this seems a feeble explanation of this particular situation. Ordinarily such antithetical verbs are adjacent to each other and the semantic antithesis is clearer: “they mounted” and “they made” do not seem particularly antithetical. I see two possible explanations: either the *ā ... tasthúḥ* clause should be taken as an unmarked subordinate clause (“[when] they mounted the vault, they made ...”) or the “antithetical” explanation is correct, but the verb to which it is antithetical is not the following *cakrire*. Instead it is found in 6c, whose two clauses are in patterned contrast to 7b:

6c	<i>sīdatā barhīr</i>	<i>urú vah sádas kṛtām</i>
7c	<i>ā nākam tasthūr</i>	<i>urú cakrire sádaḥ</i>

The second part of both pādas contains *urú sádaḥ* √ *kṛ*, the first parts contain the preverb *ā*, main verbs built to the semantically oppositional roots √ *sad* ‘sit’ (*sīdata*) and √ *sthā* ‘stand’ (*tasthúḥ*), and an acc. of goal, again oppositional, in that the *barhīḥ* of 6c is on the earthly ritual ground and the *nākam* is in heaven. I therefore think it likely that the accent on *tasthúḥ* is meant to signal the contrastive relationship between the two pādas.

The Pp. analyses *dhāvad* as *ha āvat*, and most tr. follow this interpretation, as containing an imperfect of *√av* ‘help’ (Ge “Als Viṣṇu dem ... Bullen ... beistand...”; Re “eut aidé”; Macd “helped”). (An injunctive *āvat* would also be possible.) However, we are likely dealing with a double, or even a triple, word play here, for *dhāvat* can also simply be the 3rd sg. injunctive belonging to the root (or rather roots) *√dhāv* ‘rinse’ and ‘run’. This is recognized by WG, who translate with the second, “Als Viṣṇu zu dem vom Rausch bewegten Stier läuft...,” but in the notes also raise the possibility of ‘rinse’, referring to Gotō (*Präsensklasse* p. 186 n. 333), who in turn refers to Pirart (*III* 27 [1984] 102ff.).

I think that the two primary readings are “rinsed” and “aided” and that the acc. object *vīṣaṇaṃ madacyūtam* has different referents depending on the interpretation of the verb, namely soma and Indra respectively. This ambiguity is made possible by the fact that *vīṣan-* ‘bull’ is very commonly used of both Indra and soma. The modifying cmpd. *madacyūt-* also has two different interpretations, enabled by the functional ambiguity of root noun compounds like this. Root noun second members regularly have transitive force, governing their first members, hence here “arousing exhilaration.” And in fact this compound is common in this sense, modifying soma (IX.12.3, etc.). But passive value of the root noun with an instrumental or other oblique sense of the 1st member is also possible, hence here “roused by the exhilarating drink / roused to exhilaration.” For general disc. see Scarlatta pp. 128–29. In this second sense Indra would be the obvious referent, as he is elsewhere (e.g., I.51.2).

While ‘rinse’ may strike the casual reader as an odd choice of words, in fact rinsing is one of the standard steps in the preparation of soma. For Viṣṇu’s participation in this process, see VI.17.11cd *pūṣā vīṣṇus trīṇi sārāṃsi dhāvan, vṛtrahānam madīram aṃśūm asmai* “Pūṣan, Viṣṇu (and the others) rinse the exhilarating Vṛtra-smashing plant, three lakes (full), for him [=Indra].” In the ‘aided’ interpretation, Indra is the referent of the accusative and the allusion is to Viṣṇu’s help given to him in various exploits including the Vṛtra-smashing. In the “ran to” reading, which strikes me as the least interesting, presumably Indra is also the referent of the accusative, though WG don’t make this exactly clear.

I.85.9: The array of tenses in this verse requires comment. The subordinate–main clause dyad of ab/c contains an imperfect *āvartayat* in the *yād* clause and a present *dhatté* (*dhattá* in sandhi) in the main clause. Pāda d, which describes actions that necessarily follow the one in pāda c, then has two imperfects (*āhan* and *aubjāt*). I consider the imperfect / present combination in the first sentence to be a makeshift attempt to convey anteriority in a language without a semantic pluperfect. That is, there is no structural means in Rigvedic Sanskrit to convey past anterior action (“when he had X-ed, he Y-ed”) via a finite verb (though see recent work by IH with a contrary opinion), since the “pluperfect” is simply the past tense to presential perfects. In later Sanskrit the gerund serves as a non-finite way to express the value (“having X-ed, he Y-ed”), but the gerund barely exists in the RV. In the RV the perfect participle does serve this function, in contrast to finite forms of the perfect system. Here the relative tense values are conveyed by the imperfect followed by the present, since the imperfect does express action prior to that of the present tense. The imperfects in pāda d then re-establish the past-time context. I therefore tr. the imperfect and present of abc with the English pluperfect and preterite.

On *náry ápāmsi* see disc. ad VIII.96.19.

I.85.11: Old suggests a clever, but ultimately unsatisfactory, reading in pāda a: rather than *táyā díśā* with the Pp., he divides *tá(y) ādíśā*, with the instr. of *ādíś-* and the older sandhi form of *té* ‘they’. This would make the end of the pāda more parallel to 10a ... *tá ójasā*. He thinks that the Maruts performed the action in 10a with brute force, but that in 11a “durch klugen Anschlag.” Although I am drawn to this idea because of the persistent parallelisms in this hymn, I cannot accept it in the end. For one thing *ādíś-* does not occur in the instr., and it generally means ‘aim, intention’, which does not fit here. Old’s proposed reading also involves altering the accent from *díśā* to *ādíśā*, so that it is not merely a matter of redividing the Saṃhitā text. There is also the serious question of why *táj* would be preserved in one prevocalic environment but not in another, in adjacent vss.

The sequence *ā gachantīm* in c appears to contain the 3rd pl. pres. *gachanti* + *īm*; this is certainly the default interpretation. However, as with *vidántīm* in I.67.4 and *várdhantīm* in I.65.4, I now think it should be analyzed as *gachant* + *īm*, an injunctive with the inherited **-ant* ending preserved because it was early misanalyzed the primary ending fused with the enclitic pronoun *īm*. Vs. 11 relates how the Maruts brought rain to “thirsting Gotama”; the first two pādas contain preterities (pf. *nunudre*, impf. *ásiñcan*; note also vs. 10, devoted to the same theme, with 3 pfs. *nunudre*, *bibhiduḥ*, *cakrire*), while pāda d has the functionally ambiguous injunc. *tarpayanta*. Only present *gachanti* intrudes. The publ. tr. moves from past to present in vs. 11 (allowing for a presential reading of *tarpayanta*): “They *pushed* the well aslant in this way. They *poured* out the wellspring for the thirsting Gotama. / They *come* hither to him with help -- they of bright radiance. They *satisfy* the desire of the inspired poet through their own essential qualities.” But the narrative sequence would flow better with “they came ... they satisfied,” and I would emend the published translation accordingly. For this and other such passages (esp. I.65.4 and I.85.11), see my 2019 “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verb Endings in the Rig Veda” in Fs.. Kazuhiko Yoshida.

I.86 Maruts

On the structure of this hymn and its syntactic patterns, see publ. intro.

I.86.1: I do not understand the function of *hí* here, which is doubly unusual in occurring both in a relative clause and in the initial clause of a hymn. Hettrich (*Hypotaxe*, p. 181) also finds it puzzling. Finding *hí* in the opening pāda of a hymn is not unprecedented (cf., e.g., IV.1.1, VI.1.1, VI.2.1), but the relative clause is a further complication.

The abl. *diváh* is construed by Ge and Re with the voc. *vimahasah* (Ge “ihr ausgezeichneten (Mannen) des Himmels”), but we might expect *diváh* to lose its accent in the vocative phrase, like *dívo narah* (II.36.2, V.54.10) and *dívo duhitar* (IV.51.10, etc.). It is better taken with *√pā* ‘protect’, which is elsewhere found with the ablative (e.g., X.158.1 *sūryo no divás pātu*), indicating the location of the protector and hence the direction from which the protection comes. So also WG.

I.86.2–3: As discussed in the publ. intro., the syntax of these two verses is to be interpreted in the template provided by vs. 1, namely a relative clause (or clauses) expressing the beneficiary of the Maruts’ favor with the genitive *yásya* and a main clause

assigning a reward to him. The full structure is seen in 1ab (rel. cl. with *yásya*) / 1c main clause with coreferential *sá*. Verses 2 and 3ab serve as the relative clauses to the main clause of 3c, also beginning *sá*. However, the relative pronoun is suppressed until 3a and the structure of parallel relative clauses is only conveyed by the repeated *vā* ‘or’ (2a, 2b, 3a). Indeed, though 2b contains a genitive of the human beneficiary (*víprasya*), 2a lacks even that: we must infer a *yásya* to limit the *yajñāñh*, as well as a verb to construe with that instrumental. I would diagram the structure as follows, with what is to be supplied in parentheses:

template, vs. 1:
yásya ... pāthā (2nd ps. pl. verb) (1ab) / *sá*
 for whom ... you Maruts perform benevolent action (1c) / he is (rewarded)

complex variation, vss. 2-3
(yásya) yajñāñh vā (2nd ps. verb) (2a)
 or by (whose) sacrifices (you were attracted?)

(yásya) víprasya vā ... śṛṇutā (2bc)
 or of (which) poet ... you heard

utā vā yásya vājīnaḥ ... átakṣata (3ab) / *sá*
 or of which prize-seeker ... you fashioned / he is (rewarded)

This interpretation differs significantly from that of other tr. In particular, vs. 2 is generally taken as an independent sentence that does not parallel the *yásya* structures of vss. 1 and 3 and that has *śṛṇutā* as the verb of a main clause, not of a subordinate clause, as I take it. (By that account *śṛṇutā* is accented because it follows the extra-clausal vocative that opens the pāda.) Although my interpretation requires several elements to be supplied, esp. in vs. 2, most other tr. also supply a verb with 2ab, and they fail to capture the structural parallelism that allows the ellipses to be filled in a principled fashion.

I.86.2: My interpretation requires *matīnām* to be construed with *hávam* “the call of the thoughts”; for this expression see, e.g., VI.69.4 *hāvanā matīnām*.

I.86.3: As noted in the publ. intro., I take the *vājín-* here to be the patron, for whom the Maruts create a worthy poet.

I take *gántā* as a periphrastic future. VII.32.10 *gāmat sá gómatí vrajé* is entirely parallel, save for having a subjunctive (*gāmat*) in place of the agent noun here, which suggests a future sense for the latter.

I.86.4–5: As indicated in the publ. intro., the genitive of the human worshiper is continued in these verses, though with the demonstrative, not relative pronoun.

I.86.5: The condensed expression of the earlier part of the hymn continues here, and there is no consensus on how to construe pāda c, which has no overtly signaled connection with the rest of the verse. For example, Ge takes it as a simile, marked by *cīd*, with its

comparandum in pāda b (roughly, “who dominates the peoples like the flowing nourishments the sun”). But even if *cīd* could mark similes (and I don’t think it can), the simile doesn’t make sense. I will not rehash here the various possibilities floated by other interpretations. My own generally follows Renou’s in supplying *asyā* from 1a as the oblique predicate of a possessive nominal sentence: “(his) are ...” It would also be possible to take the perfect participle *sasrúṣīḥ* as the predicate: so WG “Sogar zur Sonne sind (seine) Nahrungen gelaufen (erreicht),” but the exact value of such a predicated perfect participle eludes me.

I.86.6: There is an abrupt shift from the unidentified 3rd sg. worshiper rewarded for his work who dominated vss. 1–5 to the 1st ps. plural, but the rhetorical structure invites the audience to identify the “us” of vs. 6 with the 3rd sg. of the earlier verse. The *dadāśimā* ‘we have done pious work’, combined with the causal *hī* ‘for’, seems to offer a summary of the activities of the previous verses. The repetition of the pl. *carṣanī-* in 5b and 6c also supports this identification: he who “dominated” the *carṣanī-* in 5b can be the same as the “we” who accomplished what we have done with the help of the *carṣanī-* in 6c. This lexical chaining should have been signaled in the translation, where instead the two words are rendered differently: “bordered domains” (5b), “separate peoples” (6c). I would now use “separate peoples” also for 5b.

I.86.7: The 3rd sg. protagonist and the syntactic structure of vss. 1–5 return here, but with the syntax reversed: *sá ... yásya*.

I.86.8: I take the *vā* here as inverse, connecting the two double gen. phrases *śaśamānāsya ... svédasya* and *kāmasya vénataḥ*, though it appears after the first word of the first gen. phrase (*śaśamānāsya vā ... svédasya ...*). Klein (DGRV II: 205) also thinks an inverse reading is possible (though he doesn’t use the term), but he also suggests *vā* here might be equivalent to *vaí*. This seems unnecessary, and the inverse interpretation gets some support from the inversion of the syntax in vs. 7.

Note the chiasmic structure of the two genitive phrases: in the first the personal participle *śaśamānāsya* depends on the material *svédasya*, while the likewise personal participle *vénataḥ* depends on *kāmasya*.

I.86.9: The first two pādas show a nice syntactic conversion: the 2nd member *śávas-* of the voc. bahuvrīhi *satya-śavas-* ‘having real strength’ (unaccented, but would be *satyá-śavas-*) is implicitly extracted from the compound and represented by *tát*, object of *āviṣ karta*.

The third pāda has a striking phonetic figure *vídhyatā vidyútā*, which was already anticipated by pāda-initial *vidā* in 8c.

I.86.10: Another phonetic figure in a: *gūhatā guhyām*, whose *-atā* also echoes *vídhyatā*.

In the publ. tr. *guhyām* would have been better rendered as “to be concealed” than “concealable,” since the concealment is not merely possible but desirable.

I.87 Maruts

I.87.1: Ge tr. *usrā(h)* as “Sternbilder (?)” because he considers the interpretation with dawns as “kein naturwahres Bild.” But at early dawn stars are still visible.

I.87.2: On *upahvarā-* see disc. ad I.62.6.

I.87.4: As noted in the publ. intro., in contradistinction to all standard tr. I take the *gaṇāḥ* of d to refer to the poet Gautama, whose patronymic is Rāhūgaṇa, and consider the 2nd sg. reference of the 2nd hemistich as Gautama’s self-address. The other tr. assume that the flock of Maruts is being addressed.

All standard tr. also take pāda d as a single clause (e.g., Ge “darum ist die bullenhafte Schar ein Gönner dieser Dichtung”). But this interpretation fails to account for the medial position of *āthā*, which is otherwise almost invariably initial. (Klein, *DGR* VII: 70–71, notes the anomalous position here but follows the standard tr.) I take *āthā* as clause initial, proclaiming Gotama’s identification with the Marut flock on the basis of the shared qualities stated previously.

I.87.5: See the publ. intro. for discussion of the contents of this verse.

It may not be too farfetched to note, in connection with pāda d, where the Maruts acquire “their names worthy of worship” (*nāmāni yajñīyāni*), that in 1d they were explicitly unidentified and undifferentiated (*ké cid* “whoever they are”). The acquisition of these names follows their “reaching” (*āśata*) Indra, presumably to render him moral support in the Vṛtra battle with their chants (*īk-*) (pāda c). In other treatments of the aftermath of this battle they successfully negotiate with Indra for a share in the soma sacrifice (see I.165, etc.), and the expression “acquired names worthy of worship / sacrificial names” may be a way of expressing this incorporation of them into the dedicands of the soma sacrifice. Note that in VI.48.21 the Maruts assume *Indra*’s sacrificial name (*dadhire nāma yajñīyam*), also in connection with the Vṛtra battle.

I.87.6: It is odd that the Maruts, just called *īkvan-* themselves (5c), here join themselves with *īkvabhiḥ*. Ge suggests either that they have an “Anhängerschaft” of singers or have gone among singers themselves; Re that it’s an instrumental of identification (“en tant que chantres”). Gr invents, for this passage alone, a meaning ‘Glanz, Strahl’ for *īkvan-*. Given the identification of the human poet with the Maruts in the same capacity in vss. 4–5, the singers of 6b may be human singers, although the other instrumental attributes in this verse do not fit this picture. Ge points out that in the first verse of the next hymn, I.88.1b, the Maruts’ chariots are *svarkā-* ‘equipped with lovely chants’, and so the *īkva-* here might refer to their chariots, which are conspicuously absent from the list in pādas a–c. This is the explanation I currently prefer.

The word *īsmín-* is glossed by Gr as ‘eilend, stürmend’ (followed by WG), while Ge and Re take it as ‘possessing arrows’, deriving apparently from a suggestion of Bloomfield (see EWA s.v.), a suggestion emphatically rejected by Mayrhofer (loc. cit.). Certainly a derivation from *īsu-* ‘arrow’ is, to say the least, not without problems. But in two of its other three occurrences, *īsmín-* is found in a weapons context as it is here, and the derivation therefore seems worth attempting. Starting from *īsu-*, the *-in-* possessive would be **īsvín-*. It is possible that the normal distribution of *-vant-* and *-mant-*

possessives, with *-mant-* regularly built to stems in *-u-* (*paśu-mánt-*, etc.), as opposed to *-vant-*, would make **iśvín-* beside *iśu-* appear anomalous, and it was “corrected” to *iśmín-*. Note the regularly formed *iśumant-* (2x).

I.88 Maruts

I.88.3 As indicated in the publ. tr., I take the so-far-unnamed poets (who appear as the Gotamas in the next verse) as the subject of *kṛṇavante*. They are erecting their thoughts like trees for the Maruts to chop down with the axes in pāda a. By contrast, most tr. take the Maruts as subject of *kṛṇavante* (so explicitly Re, implicitly WG; Ge hesitates between the Maruts and the poets).

The simile in pāda b causes some minor grammatical problems. The Pp reads *medhā*, but if this word belongs to *medhā-* (fem.) ‘wise thought’, we should rather read *medhāḥ* (so Ge, Gr.). This is of course possible in this sandhi context, but pāda-final *ūrdhvā* is not amenable to such an analysis: it must be neuter plural and therefore can’t modify a fem. *medhāḥ*. Gr sets up a neut. *medhā-* ‘Schafft’ for just this passage, presumably to deal with the apparent gender disharmony. But it is simpler to assume that *ūrdhva-* has been attracted into the neuter by the *vānā* in the simile (so Old).

The epithet *tuvidyumná-* is otherwise only used of gods, save for IX.98.1, where it modifies the wealth brought by Soma. The only other plural form (V.87.7) modifies the Maruts, but the standard tr. assume that it here qualifies the priests, because the Maruts appear in the dative in pāda c and should therefore not be the subjects of the verb in the same clause. The difficulty disappears if we read c with b, rather than d. I then take the Maruts to be the subject in d, with the epithet appropriate to them, and also take the middle *dhanayante* as intransitive with an acc. of goal, rather than transitive “set the (pressing) stone in motion” with other tr.

I.88.4: For the imagery here, see the publ. intro.

The sequence *páry ā va āgur* with doubled preverb is curious. Ge provides numerous parallels in his n. 4a, but none like this, with the two preverbs separated only by an enclitic pronoun and contained within a preverb (*pári*) – verb sequence. I have no explanation for this, though I would note that of the 8 occurrences of supposed *aguḥ* / *āguḥ*, 7 are pāda-final and are unverbated with the preverb *ā*, as *āguḥ*.

The hapax *vārkār'yām* is of course very obscure. Ge simply takes it as an unanalyzable name of the “Sangeskunst” of the Gotamas. However, it is clearly a compound and the compound members are easily identified: *vār-* ‘water’ and *√kr-* ‘make’, and so it should be susceptible to meaningful analysis. As indicated in the publ. intro. I believe that it has the same underlying referent as *anubhartrī* in 6a, namely the musical instrument, in my view the *vīṇā*, and that the poet was playing with the paradox that the instrument is grammatically feminine but in some forms looks remarkably like male genitalia. I therefore follow Gr’s gloss ‘Wasser ... schaffend’ and assume that it refers to the penis. The problem is what kind of formation it is, and how to get an agentive-like meaning out of *kār'yā-*. First, note that the formation does not have gerundive accent and is therefore not a conventional gerundive despite the *ṽddhi* in the root and the shape of the suffix. Formally it is most likely a verbal abstract ‘water-making, Wasserbeschaffung’, as Old takes it (so also AiG II.2.832 following Old). However,

because it was a *feminine* abstract, I think that it was secondarily available to be identified with the underlying feminine referent, the *vīṇā*, and animatized as a quasi-agent.

Note the phonological play between *vārkār-* (b) and *arkaír* (c).

I.88.5: All standard tr. take *ná* as negating the verb *aceti*. It seems unlikely to me that an annunciatory aorist would be negated (“this very thing has *not* just been seen”), and its clause-internal position, not immediately preceding the verb, also seems unusual for such an interpretation. I take it instead as negating only the following word *yójanam* and expressing the surprise that what has just appeared is very close, not (even) a trek away.

I thus take *yójana-* as a measure of distance, as it generally is, rather than as “Gespann,” with most tr. Rather than *yójanam* I take the referent of *etát tyát* to be the formulation (*bráhma*) that the Gotamas made in the previous verse. This formulation, also referred to as a *dhī-* ‘insight’ in 4b, providentially appears at the same moment as the Maruts approach. In what sense does the formulation “appear”? I interpret this verb to mean that the poem that Gotama created in private (*sasvár* 5b) is now being performed in public (i.e., at the ritual welcoming the Maruts). This interpretation also entails supplying the verb “made” in 5b (echoing *kṛṇvantaḥ* in 4c), rather than “saw” (with most tr., anticipating *pásyan* 5c).

My last departure from the standard tr. in this verse is in taking the acc. pl. masculines in cd, *híraṇyacakrān, áyodaṃṣṭrān ... varāhūn* as comprising two separate but conjoined NPs without overt conjunction (as so often), rather than one single NP, since I find “golden-wheeled boars” an unlikely entity even in the RVic universe of discourse. With ‘golden-wheeled’ in c it is natural to supply ‘chariots’; the “copper-tusked boars” in d can easily be an extravagant characterization of the Maruts.

I.88.6: For detailed disc. of this verse, see my 1981 article, “A Vedic sexual pun: *ástobhayat, anubhartrī*, and RV I.88.6,” *Acta Orientalia* 42 (1981[82]) 55-63. The gist of the article is the interpretation of *anubhartrī*, a feminine agent noun built to *ánu √ bhr-*, a euphemistic idiom that refers to sexual penetration -- e.g., in the cosmic incest myth (X.61.5). The paradox of creating a *feminine* agent noun from this idiom is the trick of the verse and echoes the use of *vārkāryā-* in vs. 4 -- both, in my view, referring to the *vīṇā*, a feminine noun but a musical instrument with a characteristically phallic shape. The hapax causative *ástobhayat* ‘cause to sound’ (beside the simplex *stobhati* in b) has as its implicit subject the (male) player of the instrument and taps into the (probably universal) notion of a man playing a woman like an instrument in sexual encounters, with the added fun of the gender reversal in *anubhartrī*. The instrument both sounds (*práti stobhati*, b) and is caused to sound (*ástobhayat*, c), a reasonable dual view of what a musical instrument does. I take *vīthā āsām*, with its unidentified fem. gen. pl., as referring to all women, who, in male fantasy anyway, all “want it” -- conveyed by my somewhat loose tr. “the way women like it.” Other tr. supply ‘songs’ or ‘chants’ with *āsām*, for which there is no particular support.

I.89 All Gods

I.89.1: The subjunctive of \sqrt{as} plus infinitival *vṛdhé*, lit. “will be for the increasing/strengthening of...,” i.e., “will be (ready/available/amenable) to increase/strengthen” is found also in 5c: 1c *vṛdhé ásan*, 5c *ásad vṛdhé*.

On *áprāyu-* see comm. ad V.80.3.

I.89.2: A form of *devá-* is stationed at the beginning of every pāda, the first three being the gen. pl. *devānām* -- an effect difficult to capture in English without awkwardness.

I.89.4: Ge (/WG) take the repeated *tád*’s of a-c (but not the one in d) as referring to the *mayobhú ... bheṣajám* “the remedy that is joy itself” and supply verbs in pāda bc to support this object. Re by contrast takes the repeated *tád* as adverbial, ‘ainsi’. This is more or less what I arrived at, though ascribing somewhat more meaning to the adverbially used neuter pronoun. I assume it refers to the call embodied in the *nivíd-* of 3a (though *nivíd-* itself is fem.), which call is finally the suppressed object of *tád ... śṛṇutam* “listen to this” in d.

I.89.6: The rigid parallel structure of the four pādas is resolved by the final word of the verse *dadhātu*, which verb must be supplied for the first three pādas. This rigid structure, *svastí naḥ* GOD EPITHET, also allows the metrical irregularity of the first two pādas to be kept under strict control. Under HvN’s interpretation each of those two pādas has a rest after the *s^uvastí naḥ* opening, with the GOD EPITHET phrase taking the rest of the line. Old suggests reading trisyllabic *indrā*, as often, as well as *pūṣā*, with distracted *ū*. The former seems more likely than the latter, but because of the parallelism of a and b in HvN’s reading, I prefer theirs.

I.89.7: The identify of the *mánavaḥ* in c is not clear. I take it as a continuation of the description of the Maruts, though it is the case that *mānu-* and its derivatives do not otherwise characterize the Maruts. Ge (/WG) suggests that it refers to men who have become gods or been assimilated to the gods, like the Ṛbhus, while Re thinks c belongs with d and refers to the All Gods, though this explanation runs into the same problem as the Marut identification.

I.89.9: The publ. tr. takes *āyuh* as obj. of *rīṣata*, but it may be better to take *naḥ* as the obj. of that verb and construe *āyuh* with the inf. *gāntoḥ*. Cf. Krick’s rendering (316): “Schädigt (tötet) uns nicht mittendrin, bevor wir die volle Lebensdauer erreicht haben.” I would differ from Krick in taking *gāntoḥ* as a gen. dependent on *madhyā* “Do not harm us in the middle of our going through our lifetime.” For *madhyā* + gen. inf., cf. *madhyā kártoḥ* I.115.4, II.38.4.

I.89.10: Pāda b is a textbook example of gender attraction of the pronoun in equational clauses. Since the referent of the pronoun is feminine Aditi, we might expect **sā pitā *sā putrah*, but the gender of the predicated noun is transferred to the pronoun.

I.90 All Gods

I.90.2: On the small class of *-āna*-nominals to *-u*-stems (with guṇa of the suffixal vowel), mostly personal names, see AiG II.2.275.

I.90.4: It is unclear from Ge's 'aussuchen' (/WG's 'auswählen') whether they attribute *√ci* to *√ci* 'pile' or *√ci* 'observe', since the proposed meaning would require metaphorical stretching for either root. With Gr (and, judging from his 'dégager', also Re), I take it to the 'pile' root, with the literal sense being 'pile [obstructions, detritus, etc.] apart or away', thus 'clear', of paths. This idiom is found several times elsewhere of paths: IV.37.7, IV.55.4, VI.53.4 (passages collected also by Ge ad IV.55.4).

I.90.6: Supplying 'blow' as the verb of pāda a not only conforms to universal good sense, but is supported by vs. 4a of the previous hymn (I.89) *vātaḥ ... vātu*.

I.91 Soma

I.91.1: The multiple possible meanings of the root(s) *√cit* and the unclear morphological identity of (*prā*) *cikitaḥ* make the interpretation of the first pāda somewhat difficult. I follow Thieme's solution (*Plusq.*), adopted also by Kü (176-77), that it is underlyingly a medial injunctive to the perfect stem (that is, an unaugmented pluperfect), patterning with pf. *cikitē*, etc. But the underspecification of this posited **cikita* caused it to be re-marked with an active ending (like root presents of the type *aduha-t*). It should not be a subjunctive, despite its thematic appearance, because of the zero-grade root syllable, and, *pace* WG, it should not be a trans./caus. reduplicated aorist because of the light reduplicating syllable (expect **cīkitas*) -- although I do have to admit that *acikitat* in VII.80.2 does seem to function like a redupl. aorist. WG supply *panthām*, from b, as object in a, but this seems unnecessary. On a potential ring made by *prā cikitaḥ* here and *prā cikitsā* in the last pāda of the hymn (23d), see publ. intro.

The other question in pāda a is whose inspired thought is at issue. I assume that it is ours (that is, the poets'), in that the priests and poets create the ritual that makes soma manifest.

I.91.2: This verse is structured by a series of etymological figures involving a nom. sg. modifying soma and an instr. pl. specifying his qualities -- a: *krātubhiḥ sukrātuḥ*, b: *dākṣaiḥ sudākṣaḥ*, c: *vṛṣā vṛsatvébhiḥ*, d: *dyumnébhir dyumnī*. It is not a subtle device, but effective. On the first hemistich see further ad vs. 14.

I.91.3: Soma is here identified with the three principal Ādityas. This vs. is identical to IX.88.8, though the two publ. tr. differ in pāda b. I would now alter the tr. here to "yours is his lofty, deep domain, o Soma." See disc. ad IX.88.8.

The (pseudo-)gerundive *dakṣāyya-* has attracted a number of different renderings -- in this passage alone, Ge "zu Gunst geneigt," Re "qu'on doit-servir-efficacement," WG "als Zufriedenzustellender." I prefer to tie it more closely with *dākṣa-* 'skill', as "whose skill is to be sought," despite the awkwardness of the English gloss. In this passage Soma was just credited with skill (2b) and will later dispense it (7c; cf. also 14c), and in both I.129.2 and VII.97.8 the ability of Indra and Bṛhaspati to bring about good things is emphasized. JPB in VII.1.2 prefers "to be skillfully tended," quite close to Re's rendering

above. This latter tr. would work for Agni (II.4.3, VII.1.2), who requires ritual tending, but less well for Indra, Bṛhaspati, and (here) Aryaman.

I.91.4: The perennially difficult *dhāman-*, found also in 3b, is a bit difficult to interpret here as well. In both 3b and 4ab the *dhāman-* appear to be concrete and locatable in space, for which the tr. ‘domain(s)’ fits well (cf. also WG “Stätten”). But then in cd Soma is urged to accept our oblations with them, which seems difficult to do with a place and edges closer to Ge’s “Formen,” a nebulous and all-purpose rendering that I try to avoid with this word. Re’s “structures” doesn’t help either. I must assume that “accept with all your (domains)” is a compressed way of saying “wherever you are, accept.” The same problem is found, to some extent, in vs. 19.

I.91.6: A good example of subordinating *ca*.

On the use of *vānaspāti-* ‘lord of the forest’ for soma, see comm. ad IX.12.7. This usage is found only here and in IX.12.7. Because our phrase *priyástotro vānaspātiḥ* is almost identical to IX.12.7 *nītyastotro vānaspātiḥ*, I am now inclined to translate the bahuvr. ‘who has praise as his own’, not ‘to whom praise is dear’.

I.91.7: As Ge and Re both point out, the dat. *yūne* ‘youth’ in b suggests that the parallel *mahé* in a refers specifically to an adult.

I.91.10: I take the pf. part. *jujuṣānāḥ* as expressing an action anterior to that of the main verb, impv. *upāgahi*. If this is correct, the verse is constructed chiasmically, with *imám yajñám* construed with *upāgahi*, while the call that precedes Soma’s arrival at the sacrifice is nested in between (*idám váco, jujuṣānāḥ*). However, the simpler interpr., with both acc. construed with the part. (“delighting in this sacrifice, this speech, come ...”) is also possible – though perhaps pragmatically less likely. Coming to the sacrifice may be a consequence of having enjoyed the speech inviting the god to it.

I.91.11–12: The two alliterative root noun compounds *vacovíd-* (11b) and *vasuvíd-* (12b) nonetheless contain the two synchronically separate roots, ‘know’ and ‘find’.

I.91.14: Although it is tempting to take *dákṣa-* as adjectival here (so Ge, WG), I am somewhat dubious that this stem can be an adjective, and in any case the emphasis on the skill associated with Soma in this hymn (vss. 2b, 3d, 7c) suggests a nominal reading here. Although the pairing of an abstract quality (skill) with an animate being (poet) might seem awkward, I see it as a variant reprise of 2ab, where *krātu-* (‘intention’) and *dákṣa-* were paired; as discussed ad I.2.7–9, *krātu-* and *dákṣa-* are two of the three qualities required to bring an action about and are regularly associated. Here *kaví-* stands in for *krātu-*. This substitution is enabled by the syntagm “the poet’s *krātu-*, as in the cmpd. *kaví-krātu-*. (Re’s interpr. is similar; see his n.)

I.91.19: Here again, as in vs. 4, the *dhāmāni* of Soma are recipients of the oblation; Ge’s Formen again works more smoothly, but I still consider these to be the locales listed in 4ab, each of which can be a site of sacrifice.

Note the disharmony in number between the neut. pl. subj. (*tā viśvā*) and the sg. pred. nom. (*paribhūḥ*) and verb (*astu*). This could be an example of the inherited construction of neuter pl. with a singular verb, but I think it's more likely just a constructio ad sensum, with "all these" summarizing the plural subjects of the rel. cl. as if in a mass. English "all this" can be similarly used, after a listing of discrete entities. The Sanskrit has just been more punctilious about maintaining number agreement.

Ge, Re, WG all supply 'lifetime' as the implicit object of *pratāraṇaḥ*, rather than my 'us'; they are most likely correct, given how common the idiom *āyus- prā √ tī* is. I might change the publ. tr. to "lengthening (our lifetime)."

I.91.20: Ge (/WG) takes the final phrase of d *yó dādāśad asmai* as expressing the indirect object with *dadāti* in b ("gives [to him,] who ..."), rather than as a qualification of *vīrām* (or even of *pitr-*, as Re almost seems to). I think this is correct, but it is mildly disturbing that there is no overt expression of the datival recipient in the main clause; we would expect *tāsmāi* (see Ge's n. 20d). It may have been gapped because of the *asmai* in the rel. clause. Note that *asmai* cannot be a part of the main clause and refer to the indirect object, the man who does pious service, because it is unaccented; it must be part of the rel. cl. and refer to Soma.

I.91.21: This verse plays a minor syntactic trick. It consists of a string of acc. sg. masc. qualifiers; since the previous vs. also consists largely of an acc. sg. masc. NP headed by *vīrām*, the audience would be likely to assume that the new series of grammatically matching adjectives are also qualifiers of *vīrām*, esp. since this type of syntactic dependence between verses is not uncommon in the RV. It is only when we arrive at the middle of the final pāda that we encounter *tvām* and discover that the accusatives of *this* verse refer to Soma, not to the hero he gives us in 22.

Ge accounts for the curious hapax *bhāreṣu-jā-* 'born at raids' by the fact that soma is especially offered before battle. This is probably correct, though the semantics could be tighter. Scar essentially accepts this explanation and cites III.51.8 (of soma) *jātām ... mahé bhārāya*, though he explores some other possibilities as well.

I.91.23: In the phrase *devéna ... mānasā* we again confront a noun (*devā-*) that seems to be used adjectivally (see vs. 14 above). I have half given in to this temptation, with "god(like)."

The verb *ā tanat* in c poses some difficulties in interpretation. Surprisingly, none of the standard tr. who discuss the phrase notes that the same lexeme (*ā √ tan*) appears in the previous verse (22c) in the same metrical position and in a common, almost clichéd usage. I think that *ā tanat* here is a slangy expression, deliberately contrasting with the high-style cosmic-description usage of *ā tatantha* in 22. I take the subject to be the wealth (or share of wealth) of b, rather than the *mānas-* of a, as Ge (/WG) take it, nor would I follow Re in taking it as an impersonal construction.

It is not entirely clear who the "both" are in d: Ge singers and patrons, Re men and gods.

Ge supplies 'path' with *prā cikitsā* ("sei ... der Pfadfinder") on the basis of IV.47.20. This is possible, and might even be supported by the *panthām* in vs. 1, since *prā cikitsā* seems to form a slight ring with *prā cikitaḥ* in 1a. However, the verb does not need

an object, in my opinion; the desiderative here can express a general intention to be alertly perceptive.

I.92 Dawn

As indicated in the publ. intro., vss. 1–4 and 5–8 appear to be parallel hymns, the first with multiple Dawns, the second with just one.

I.92.1: In pāda a my tr. differs slightly from the standard ones. I suggest that the dawns have transformed themselves into a beacon, while in the standard interpr. they have created/manufactured a beacon for themselves.

In b following Proferes 2003 (JAOS 123, pp. 330–31), I suggest, on the basis of the fuller expression in the parallel verse 5c, that their “beam” is being anointed like the sacrificial post (*svāru-*) at a ritual.

In c the poet exploits the syntactic ambiguity of the middle participle *niṣkṛṇvānā-*. In the frame he takes it as a reflexive, “presenting themselves,” but in the simile it is transitive “presenting arms.” The middle voice is still justified, however, because the weapons belong to the subjects of the participle.

I.92.3: The standard tr. are in agreement that *ārcanti* only means “they sing” here and that the meaning ‘shine’ for this verb stem is dubious. This judgment seems short-sighted and unresponsive to the poetics of this hymn, and even if ‘shine’ is not the normal sense of *ārca-*, the nominal derivatives like *arci(s)-* ‘ray, flame’ (see *arcis-* in 5a) would allow a ‘shine’ sense under the proper circumstances. And these *are* the proper circumstances. This verse-initial verb, following on two verses describing the color, brightness, and beams of the dawns, would most naturally be interpreted with a ‘shine’ sense. The simile that follows, involving women at work, would then cause the audience to rethink this assumption, producing the interpretation ‘sing’, with the women singing work songs at their labors. But ‘sing’ makes little sense for the frame of the passage: do dawns ‘sing’? While ‘shine’ makes little sense for the simile: do working women ‘shine’? As in 1c the poet uses the ambiguity of the verbal pivot to craft two incompatible but verbally impeccable pictures, but this time he relies not on syntactic ambiguity as in 1c but synonymity -- a pun on the verbal root underlying the verb form. The pun may be even cleverer than so far presented. Although the primary sense of *ārcanti* for the dawns should be ‘shine’, it is possible that there is a secondary sense ‘sing’, in that birds begin to sing at dawn [note that the activity of birds at dawn is already metaphorically referred to by *ūd apaptan* in 2b], and the ritual recitation also begins at that time. Similarly, although ‘sing’ should be the primary sense for the women in the simile, they may also be said to shine if they are glistening with sweat from their labors. (Recall the old expression “men sweat, but women ‘glow.’”) It should be noted that Ludwig thought the verb was “doppelsinnig” (see Ge n. 3a).

In terms of the publ. tr. (and other standard tr.), the simile particle *nā* is late, since the simile is assumed to start with *nārīḥ*. However, it is possible that *nārīḥ* characterizes the Dawns, and the simile consists only of *apāso nā viṣṭībhiḥ*. In that case, the chanting workers could be men: an alt. tr. “The ladies chant [/shine] like workers at their labors.” The nom. pl. adj. *apāsah* serves for either masc. or fem.

Pace Gr and Lub, *áha* should be taken not as the particle, but as short neut. pl. to *áhar/ áhan-* ‘day’, with *vísṣvā*, cf. the well-attested expression *áhā vísṣvā*. For another short-vowel pl. *áha* see X.89.13.

I.92.4: *bárjaha-* in b is a hapax, but related to dual *barjahyè* in AV XI.8.14 in a list of body parts, found between the ribs and the sides. Whitney/Lanman tr. ‘nipples’ there. The consensus tr. ‘udder’ seems reasonable, esp. on the assumption that *usrā* ‘ruddy’ designates a cow. However, the purport of the simile is a little unclear. Since cows don’t wear clothes, their udders are not covered to begin with and uncovering is unnecessary. Ge suggests that the simile is proleptic: Dawn’s breast becomes as visible as a cow’s full udder, but this interpretation requires that the verb (‘uncovers’) that should mediate between frame and simile has been semantically elided.

The simile in d is similarly “off,” since cows don’t have the capacity to open their own pens. Macdonell (*Hymns from the Rigveda*, 1922) tr. “as when cows break from their stalls,” which makes more sense, but again misrepresents the pivotal verb.

The apparently wrong sandhi *āvar támaḥ* is, as has long been known, an ex. of degemination in context: *āvar* represents the older 3rd sg. root aor. **āvart*. See Old, Prol. 424 n. 1, AiG I.304–5, 336.

I.92.5: As noted before, vs. 5 seems to match vs. 1 and begin a new hymn parallel to vss. 1-4, but adapted for a single dawn, not the multiples in vs. 1. The return of the words *bhānū-* ‘beam’ and *√añj* ‘anoint’ (1b) is particularly salient, as also *√śri* (2d), *√arc* (3a), and *pésas-* (4a).

The poet produces yet another complication of simile structure in cd. The Daughter of Heaven in d is clearly the subject of the clause, but the simile occupying c has a participle in the masc. nom. sg., *añján*, which cannot modify the grammatical subject. We must here supply a masculine ritual officiant, who is propping up and anointing the sacrificial post, as Dawn props up and anoints her beam. (Note that *bhānūm* served as object of both verbs in the earlier parts of the hymn: 1b *bhānūm añjate*, 2d *bhānūm ... asísrayuḥ*.) The two distinct objects in simile and frame are mediated by the word *pésas-*, which is appropriate to both. Dawn has just donned her own *pésāmsī* in 4a, but *pésas-* can also be used of ritual paraphernalia -- e.g., the pressing stones, which are called *adhvarásya pésaḥ* at VII.42.1.

I.92.6: *vayúnā kṛṇoti* reprises *ákran ... vayúnāni* in 2c.

chāndaḥ is somewhat problematic. Gr takes it as a masc. nom. sg. to a them. adj. *chānda-*, with the developed sense “der Gefallende, Schmeichler oder Buhle,” and this tack is followed by the standard tr. (incl. the publ. one). But the only other supposed occurrence of this stem, in VIII.7.36, I took in the publ. tr. to the much better established *s*-stem neut. *chāndas-* ‘metrical vs.’. However, I have since reconsidered that interpr., primarily because the *s*-stem has decidedly late distrib. (see disc. ad V.52.12 and VIII.7.36), and I am more sympathetic to the standard solution, both there and here. It does not help this interpr. here that Dawn is being compared to a masc. being, esp. since smiling is almost always a feminine action, so I am not completely convinced that the standard solution is correct. See also disc. of *chandāḥ* in VI.11.3.

saumanasāyājīgaḥ yields a bad cadence: — — — x. This could be fixed by emending to unaug. **jīgaḥ* (*saumanasāya* **jīgaḥ*). I’m inclined to do that, though it should be noted that there are no other injunctive forms to this stem.

Redupl. (*a*)*jīgaḥ* must be a transitive redupl. aor. beside *jārayati* ‘causes to awaken’. Cf. I.113.4-6: *uṣā ajīgar bhúvanāni vísvā*. I supply ‘us’ as obj. here, on the basis of the 1st pl. subj. in pāda a.

I.92.7: Note the etymological, though no longer semantic, relationship between *sūnītānām* (a) and *nṛvātaḥ* (c).

I.92.7–8: Contra Gr, *ásva-budhya-* cannot mean ‘durch Rosse bemerkenswerth’ with a gerundive to *√budh*, among other things because of the bahuvrīhi accent. Rather it belongs with *ásva-budhna-* ‘having a foundation of horses’, by way of **-budhnya-*, an analysis that goes back to Aufrecht. All 3 occurrences of this stem (I.92.7–8, 121.14) qualify wealth or prizes. On the related hapax *ásva-budhna-* see comm. ad X.8.3.

I.92.8: ‘Forelock’ for *pravarga-* may seem slightly flippant, but I wanted to capture the ‘twist’ sense of *prá√vrj*, in contrast to the anodyne ‘having slaves at the front’ found in the other tr.

The final *brhántam* of d obviously refers back to the *rayīm* so carefully detailed in ab, but is separated from that phrase by a considerable amount of material, including a rel. cl. Rather than making it a long-delayed part of that NP, in the publ. tr. I took it as a pseudo-goal with *vibhāsi*, with *vāja-prasūtā* giving grounds for that goal. CL suggests taking it directly with *vāja-prasūtā*, hence perhaps “propelled with prizes to lofty (wealth).” It’s appealing to take *vāja-* here almost as an instr. of accompaniment: “propelled to lofty (wealth) along with prizes,” but I think this is probably too radical a construal of the cmpd.

I.92.8–9: *vibhāsi* (8c) and *vī bhāti* (9b) should have been rendered with the same English verb, either “radiate” or “shine.” I would now change the publ. tr., to ‘radiate’ in both cases.

I.92.9: Unfortunately it is not possible to render the three fronted forms of *vísva-* (pādas a, c, d) in non-awkward English.

cákṣuḥ in b can be either nom. or acc. Most tr. take it as the latter, with Dawn facing either the eye(s) of, presumably, humans (so Ge [WG], Re) or the eye of the sun (so Macdonell [*Hymns from the Rígvēda*], Maurer). The latter is unlikely on pragmatic grounds: although the eye of the sun is a standard trope in the RV (see in fact 11d), the sun rises after dawn, and Dawn surely wouldn’t be looking behind her, to the east. The former is certainly possible, but I prefer to take *cákṣuḥ* as nominative, referring to Dawn as an eye, since she has just been said to oversee (*abhicákṣyā*) all creatures.

I’m not entirely sure what pāda d refers to, but perhaps it means that by dawning she has stimulated ritual speech and therefore “finds” it.

I.92.10: Note that the final word of the vs. *āyúḥ* is a near rhyme to (*man*)*āyóḥ* ending vs. 9.

Although *vīj-* (also II.12.5) is ordinarily tr. ‘stake’ vel sim. (see Schindler, Rt Noun s.v., with lit.), in fact if it is the root noun to \sqrt{vij} ‘be agitated’, Gr’s ‘flüchtig’, of the dice, seems more apt. Recall, for the constant movement of the dice, the first vs. of the gambler’s hymn, X.34.1: *prāvepāḥ ... pravātejā́ írine vārṣṭānāḥ* “The quivering (nuts) ..., the ones born in a windy place, constantly whirling in the gaming hollow ...” So perhaps ‘agitated ones’ here.

I.92.12: This last verse of the trimeter portion of the hymn plays more tricks with simile structure. In pāda a *prathānā* functions like *niṣkṛṇvānā* in 1c; that is, it has both reflexive and transitive values. In the frame it is reflexive (“spreading herself”), in my view, though Ge, Re, Macd., Maurer all supply “rays” as the object, on no contextual grounds. (However, Ge does allow for the reflexive possibility in his notes 12a, 1c.) In the simile *paśūn* is the object; the assumed subject might be “cowherd” or the like (so tentatively Re). But the simile is quite appropriate to Dawn for two reasons: first, it is often said that livestock go out to pasture at dawn and return to the fold at night; second, the rays of Dawn are often referred to as cows (see in fact vs. 2 above), and though I don’t think the stem *paśú-* is so used, it inhabits the same semantic space as the more usual terms that participate in this metaphor.

The second simile, *síndhur ná kṣódaḥ* in b, is taken by Ge, Re, Macd., Maurer with the verb of b, *vy āśvait*. Because this verb ‘whitened’ is intransitive, this requires either taking *kṣódaḥ* adverbially (Re “comme le fleuve (en son) remous”) or construing *síndhuḥ ... kṣódaḥ* as a loose compound (Ge “wie die Stromflot”). Although either is possible, the syntactic difficulties disappear if the simile falls within the verbal domain of *prathānā*, “like a river spreading its surge.” Given this poet’s particular delight in manipulating similes, it is entirely in character to end this section of the hymn with a triple play.

WG interpret the similes more or less as I do.

Pāda c is structurally parallel with 11c, using the same verb *mī* ‘diminish, belittle’, though here in the negative (11c *praminatī*, 12c *áminatī*), both playing off *āminānā* in 10c. The relationship between 11c and 12c is particularly close, with the human and the divine playing off each other: 11c *praminatī manuṣyā́ yugāni*, 12c *áminatī daívyāni vratāni*.

I.92.13–15: This *ṭṛca* to Uṣas is unified by two verse-initial vocc. *úṣaḥ* (13, 14) and a verse-final voc. *uṣaḥ* at the end of 15.

I.92.14: The tr. “rich in ... / richly...” implies that there is an etymological connection between *gomatī*, *áśvāvati* and *revát*, which of course there is not. But “possessing cows and horses” seems too flat.

I.92.15: The *hī*+ imperative followed by *áthā*+ imperative is the same structure as I.10.3; see the commentary thereon.

I.92.16: $\sqrt{yā}$ is the usual verb that governs *vártis-* (I.34.4, I.116.18, etc. etc.), and I supply a form of it here.

The publ. tr. implies that *sámanasā* is a vocative, but, by its accent, it's a nominative and would better be tr. "as like-minded ones."

I.92.17: Gautama's penchant for clever exploitation of syntactic possibilities returns in this verse, after a series of unremarkable Uṣṇih verses (13–16). The verb in b, *cakráthuḥ*, by my interpretation takes two different types of predicates and exhibits slightly different root meanings: in pāda a "make your call to heaven," that is, make the call reach heaven; in b "make, i.e., create, light." I am in agreement with the standard tr. of pāda b, but diverge from them in a, where Ge (/WG) supply a separate verb ("erhebt") to govern *ślókam* and interpret *ā divāḥ* temporally ("zu dieser Stunde des Tages"), not spatially. Although *ā divāḥ* is sometimes used temporally (e.g., in the expression *trír ā divāḥ*), I take the *ā* here in the meaning "all the way to" (Gr's "Praep. mit folgendem Abl. ... *bis an, bis hin* (räumlich)"). This usage of *ā* was prepared for in the immediately preceding vs., 16a *asmād ā* "all the way to us" (though in opposite order). For a closely parallel expression, in a Dawn hymn, cf. III.61.4 *āntād* [i.e., *ā antād*] *divāḥ* ... *ā prthivyāḥ* "all the way to the end of heaven and of earth." For the *ślōka*-reaching heaven, cf. I.83.6, 190.4, and for *ślókam* as object of *√kr*, IV.53.3.

I.93 Agni and Soma

I.93.1: The expression in d *bhāvatam ... máyaḥ* echoes the compound in the final verse of the immediately preceding hymn *mahobhūvā* (I.92.18) -- both dual, though applying to different divine pairs, the Ásvins (I.92.18) and Agni and Soma (here). It is possible that this final hymn of the Gautama sequence, with its unique dedication to Agni and Soma (see publ. intro.), was attached just here because of the duplication of phraseology. This connection would be clearer in the publ. tr. if they were tr. in the same way. I would therefore change "become refreshment" to "become joy" in this verse.

I.93.3: On the case frame of *√dās* here, see comm. ad VI.16.31.

I.93.4: As noted in the publ. intro., Bṛsaya, with his very non-Indo-Aryan name, and the destruction of his offspring are found elsewhere only in VI.61.3, a hymn devoted to Sarasvatī. The theft of the provender (*avasá-*) from the niggard (*pañí-*) is also found in that hymn, in vs. 1. The connection between the two hymns to different gods, found in different parts of the Saṃhitā, is not clear to me, but the strong similarity of the passages at least suggests that Bṛsaya is a *pañí-*.

I.93.5: Pāda b contains an inverse *vāyav* *indraś ca* construction: *agníś ca soma*.

I.93.7: The three imperatives in b, *vītām háryatam ... juṣéthām*, all belong to roots that ordinarily take accusatives, yet all must be construed with the fronted gen. *haviṣaḥ prásthitasya* in pāda a. I don't quite understand the case syntax, but assume that these three verbs have been lumped together generically as verbs of consumption and enjoyment, for which gen. complements are often possible.

In c *bhūtām* can be either imperative or injunctive and is taken as injunctive in the published translation (as also by Ge and Re). However, since the immediately preceding

hymn (I.92.15) contains the clausal diptych *hí*+ imperative, followed by *áthā*+ imperative, exactly matching the structure here, I now think it would be better to interpret *bhūtām* as impv. here as well: “Become providers ..., then establish ...” (So WG.) An imperative interpretation also works better with the three abrupt imperatives that precede in b. For further disc. see comm. ad VII.99.3.

I.93.8: *saparyāt* in b echoes *saparyāti* in 2b, but displays the more usual case frame: acc. (god) + instr. (means of service). The instance in 2b takes acc. (means of service) + dat. (god), which is only otherwise found at X.37.1. The occurrence in this verse thus functions as a species of poetic repair.

I.93.9: The purport of the final pāda isn’t clear to me, but it may indirectly comment on the unusual nature of the joint dedication of the hymn to these two gods.

I.93.10: *dāśati* echoes *dāśāt* in 3b.

I.93.10–11: 2nd du. *dīdayatam* (10c) and *juṣatam* (11b) are somewhat problematic forms. They belong to redupl. thematic stems; other forms to these stems are subjunctives to the perfect. However, they have secondary endings, and the act. 2nd and 3rd du. subjunctive endings should be primary. Lub identifies them as impvs. (Gr also *juṣatam*); Kü (35) treats them as “hybrids” -- morphologically belonging to the subjunctive but functioning as imperatives. They differ from some other secondarily thematized pf. impvs. in having full grade of the root syllable, like the subjunctive (versus zero-grade in *pīpyatam* √*pi*, √*vāvrđhāsva* √*vṛdh*, etc. -- but cf. *pīprāyasva* √*prī*). In the publ. tr. they are treated as subjunctives (“you will shine,” “you will enjoy”), but they would might be better rendered as imperatives. For further disc. of such forms, see my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems” in Fs. Lubotsky.

I.94 Agni

I.94.1: BR corrected *sám mahema* to *sám ahema* ‘we would bind together’ to √*nah*, an emendation accepted by Gr, Ge, Old (tentatively), KEWA I.153. Although I also accepted it in Jamison 1983: 87, I now follow Gotō (1987: 243; accepted in EWA s.v.) in seeing it as a form of √*mah* ‘bring about’, etymologically separate from √*mah* ‘magnify’. Although I do not like multiplying entities, Gotō’s etymological connections look reasonable; an interpretation with ‘make great’ is difficult; and a thematic pres. or aor. stem *aha-* to √*nah* does not exist and the zero-grade (<**nh*) that would have to underlie it is not otherwise found to √*nah*.

I.94.2: *yásmai* √*yaj* presents the classic parasmaipada configuration: “sacrifice for someone else,” but *āyājase* is resolutely middle. I do not have a good explanation for this beyond the fact that the functional distinction between act. *yājati* and mid. *yājate* is not well developed in the RV, esp. with preverb *ā*, and also that Agni, the subject, is essentially sacrificing to himself in any case.

Although act. *sādhati* can be transitive (and WG so tr. it), it also has intransitive/absolute uses (cf. the same tag in VI.70.3). Moreover, in this hymn *sādhāyati* (3a, 4c) serves as the transitive counterpart; the poet seems to have constructed an *-ati/-āyati* Grundverb/Kaus. relationship.

I.94.3: A choppy series of clauses, five in the first three pādas, with only the last dependent in any way on another.

I.94.5: *gopā(h)* in pāda a can be either sg. or pl. All the standard tr. take it as the former, referring to Agni, but this makes grammatical difficulties. Ge interprets the following *asya* as a word-haplology for **asy* **asyā*, thereby getting the 2nd sg. copula but gratuitously accenting the pronoun. Old reads **asy* for *asya* and suggests accenting **cāranti*. Re takes *viśām gopā(h)* as a 3rd sg. expression (“Agni est ...”) and seems to leave the following text alone. But all such tr. must introduce an accent on whatever word they think follows the short initial clause, since, as it stands, two unaccented words, *asya caranti*, would open that clause. These difficulties can be avoided by interpreting *gopāḥ* as plural, subject of *caranti* and coreferential with *jantāvaḥ*. Pl. *gopā-* is elsewhere used of Agni’s sidekicks, presumably his flames, in VI.8.7. Though it is true that this same expression *viśām gopā(h)* is found two hymns later (I.96.4) as an undoubted singular referring to Agni, the grammatical complications resulting from taking it as a singular here outweigh that argument for me.

Most tr. take the two-footed and four-footed as appositional to *jantāvaḥ* and therefore as those who roam by night. This is contrary to the usual RVic vision of the creatures settling down at night. Agni’s flames make more sense as the roamers, evoking the flickering firelight that provides nightly illumination. The flames are called “herdsmen” because people and animals gather around the fire then, like a flock. This interpretation does raise the question of how to construe the nom. case of that expression *dvipāc ca yād utā cātuṣpat*. I take it as a definitional relative clause expanding on *viśām* (so also Old). The *ca ... utā* is a mix of two “both ... and” constructions: X *ca* Y *ca* and *utā* X *utā* Y, with the first half of the conjoined NP fronted around the subordinating *yād*. This construction is very similar to 9b *dūrē vā yé ānti vā ké cid*, complete with the fronted first element.

The etymological relationship between *citrāḥ* and *praketāḥ* in c is not easily rendered in English.

I.94.7: On *talīt-* see comm. ad II.23.9. Here we might substitute “hard by.”

I.94.10: All standard tr. take b *vṛṣabhāsyeva te rávaḥ* as the main cl. to the *yād* cl. beginning in a, while I take it as a part of that *yād* cl. There is no way to tell, since the second cl. lacks a verb whose accent or lack thereof would settle the matter. There are also no semantic implications; I weakly prefer mine because of the fairly emphatic *āḍ* ‘then, just after that’ beginning the second hemistich.

All tr. take *vanīnaḥ* as ‘trees’ (lit. ‘possessing wood’). This is doubtless the primary sense here, since this sequence of vss. describes a forest fire, but ‘winners’ is also possible, since the metaphorical context is that of a chariot race; see esp. 10a, 11c.

I.94.11: I supply ‘makes’ on the basis of 9c *sugám kṛdhi*, though strictly speaking “that is an easy way” is perfectly acceptable.

tāvaká-, the vṛddhi derivative of the genitive of the 2nd ps. pronoun, enlarged with *-ka-*, is a striking form, though exactly what special effect it is aiming at is unclear. For the use of *-ka-* in pronominal derivatives, see Jamison 2009 (IIJ 52). As discussed there, the *-ka-* tends to signal a lower register or slangy tone.

I.94.12: Most tr. take Mitra and Varuṇa as the objects of *dhāyase*: approx. “Agni is for the suckling of Mitra and Varuṇa.” But Agni is the one more likely in need of suckling (that is, feeding the fire); cf., e.g., II.5.7. In particular, in the next hymn, I.95.1, Agni is the object of the transitive/causative *dhāpayete*. I therefore take the gen. *mitrásya varuṇasya* as dependent on *hēḷaḥ* in b, parallel to *marútām*. *hēḷa(s)-* is characteristic of Varuṇa (cf. I.24.14, VII.84.2; in VII.62.4 Mitra is included).

avayātām is the problem in the second pāda. Most tr. take it as a 3rd sg. imperative (e.g., Re “qu’il exorcise”), but if so, it must be a *middle* root pres. imperative, and there are no middle forms to this root $\sqrt{yā}$ (as opposed to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘implore’). There is also the problem that the form should not be accented on the stem but on the preverb (**áva yātām*; see Ge n. 12b). Lub appears to take it as a gen. pl. of the act. part. to the root pres., but in the absence of a tr. it is hard to know how he would interpret it in context. Best to follow Old (who follows BR) in emending to **avayātā*, the nom. sg. agent noun. Re is tempted by this reading, save for the fact that with the acc. complement *hēḷaḥ* we should expect the accent *ávayātā*. However, the “rule” about the case of complements to agent nouns is broken so often that this objection is not cogent. The final *-m* could have been acquired from the following *marútām* (so Old), and since $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive’ is a characteristic Marut verb and a genuine example of the gen. pl. part. *yātām* is used of the Maruts in the refrain V.55.1–9, it may have been rhetorically natural to transform the agent noun into this participle.

I.94.13: Both a and b turn on interpreting one word as both an appellative and a proper name: *mitráḥ* in a, *vásuḥ* in b, though they occupy different places in the parallel structures.

I.94.15–16: The meter here changes to Triṣṭubh, and the intra-hymnic refrain is dropped. The 2nd hemistich of vs. 16 contains the first example in the Saṃhitā of the Kutsa refrain.

I.94.15: Contra standard tr., I do not take *anāgástvam* as the obj. of *dádāsaḥ*, since $\sqrt{dās}$ seldom takes an object that is not a god, and when it does, it is a ritual offering. Instead I take it as belonging to a parallel nominal clause, still in the domain of *yásmai*.

The final phrase that is the ostensible main clause, *té syāma* “might we be they,” violates number agreement: pl. *té* cannot properly pick up sg. *yásmai*. This is a variant of a common tag and feels tacked on.

I.94.16: Because *sá* with 2nd ps. reference is restricted by rule to imperatives (see Jamison 1992 [HS 105]), ab must be a single clause, *pace* Ge.

I.95 Agni

I.95.1: Ge suggests that the sun is referred to in c, Agni in d. But it seems more likely that Agni is the referent of both (or at least the first referent: since Agni = Sun is a common identification, there may be secondary association), and the point is simply that fire looks different in the daylight from at night.

I.95.3: The riddles in this verse have given rise to much more speculation than can be covered here. In the first hemistich the major question is whether the three births of pāda a (*trīṇi jānā*) are matched by three birth locations in b or only two. That there are three locatives (*samudré ... diví ... apsú*) might support the first view; that there are only two *ékam*'s the second. Despite their polarized positions in the pāda, I believe that *samudré ... apsú* refer to one place of birth, *diví* to another. X.45.3, where *samudré ... apsú* is one place of kindling (pāda a), *diváh ... ūdhan* a second (b), and a third is referred to in cd, supports the two-locale view. This then allows the third birth to be the ritual kindling described in the first vss. of the hymn, while very tentatively we might identify the birth in waters as that of Apām Napāt and that in heaven as that of the sun. The three births can also refer to the three ritual fires, and that notion is taken up obliquely in the second half of the verse, in my opinion.

The second hemistich describes the carrying of the kindled fire to the east end of the ritual ground, to become the Āhavanīya fire (not so called in the RV, but clearly referred to often in the text). This pacing out of the ritual ground also establishes the other ordered elements in the ritual, hence the VPs of pāda d. Gr and Old both read **pradísam* for *prá díśam*, as also in IV.29.3. I am not certain that that change is necessary here, though interrupting the *pūrvam ānu ... díśam* phrase with the preverb is somewhat disturbing (though note that *prá* immediately follows the caesura).

I.95.4: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. describes the kindling of the fire in typically enigmatic fashion, with multiple referents possible for each entity. (See the various tr. and comm. for disc.) It also contains in pāda b a version of the beloved paradox in which the child gives birth to his parents, though in this particular case I am uncertain what exactly is meant. The *janayata* in 4b picks up the *janayanta* in 2a, but with the subject and object reversed: in 2a the ten (fingers) begat the infant (fire); here the calf (fire) begets his mothers. Note that, while *janayanta* in 2a is a standard, formal -*anta* replacement (see my “Voice fluctuation in the Rīg Veda: Medial 3rd plural -*anta* in active paradigms,” *III* 21 ([1979] 146–69), *janayata* here seems to be a real middle: the mothers Agni begets are his own. For further disc., see comm. on the near-identical expression in IX.95.1. On the basis of the echoing of 2a, I assume that the mothers here are the fingers, though waters are also a popular suggestion -- one that does not fit the ritual context, in my opinion. The hard-working women in c are probably also the fingers, though kindling sticks are also possible, esp. on the basis of 5b.

svadhā(-van)- is a signature word of this part of the hymn: 1c, 4b, 4d.

I.95.5: The hymn began with unnamed dual feminines attending to the young fire; this verse also contains unnamed dual feminines in the same role. But the identities of the two pairs are different: Night and Dawn in 1, the world-halves in 5cd, 6a.

Note the word play of *pratīcī ... prāti*, with slightly different meanings.

I.95.5–6: The middle caus. (*prāti*) *joṣayete* in 5d, 6a literally means “they two cause (him) to take pleasure (in themselves),” but this tr. seems too heavy, esp. in adjacent pādas.

I.95.6: The position of simile-marking *ná* is aberrant, preceding the simile’s noun *méne* and following the verb. Since the full simile is *bhadré ... ná méne*, it seems that this syntagm was distracted in some fashion, with the verb placed in its middle. On *méne* see I.62.7.

The etymological figure in c, *dákṣāṇām dákṣapatiḥ* “skill-lord of skills,” then participates in a phonological figure with semantically distinct *dakṣīnatāḥ* “from the right (/south)” in d.

I.95.7: I take the first half-verse as a description of fire both sending its flames upwards and stretching out horizontally. Most tr. interpret *yatate* in b as transitive (e.g., Ge “er eifert beide Heeresreihen an”), but the medial forms of this pres. stem are intransitive or reflexive. I instead take *ubhé sícau* as an acc. of extent and assume that it refers to the seams between the two world-halves found in vss. 5–6. With these two halves, heaven and earth, meeting at the horizon, as it were, the seams between them would stretch horizontally.

The “new clothes” he leaves for his mothers in d are probably the ashes that fall on the kindling wood as he burns it.

I.95.8: The first three pādas of this verse sounds very somian: the cows [=milk] and the waters of b are the standard ritual substances mixed with soma in the IXth Maṇḍala; the beginning of a, *tveṣám rūpám kṛṇute*, is also found in a soma hymn, IX.71.8; and $\sqrt{mṛj}$ ‘wipe, groom’ in c is a signature soma verb. This may be an example of the covert equation of the two ritual gods, Agni and Soma. Pāda a is easily interpreted in an Agni context; b makes more difficulties: the cows can here be the ghee poured into the fire (which could cause the creation of an “even higher” form in a), but the waters would obviously have a diminishing effect on the fire if it actually “mingles” with them. Ge (n. 8b) suggests that the vedi is being sprinkled with water, but that’s not what the text says. I think better to assume that this is an incompletely adapted somian description.

The final piece of pāda a, *úttaram yāt*, is an izafe-like relative and embedded in the larger sentence, which continues in pāda b. On the type see my forthcoming “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian.”

Pāda c has caused interpretational difficulties, in particular because of the apparent equation of the poet (*kavīḥ*) and the insight (*dhīḥ*), both nominative and both apparent subjects of *marmṛjyate*. Ge takes them as conjoined nouns with suppressed conjunction, “the poet (and) his thought,” which are both tending to the Unterlage of Agni. This is not a bad solution, but it assumes that the *kavī-* is the human poet. Since Agni was identified as a “great poet” (*mahān kavīḥ*) in 4d, it’s desirable to maintain this identification if at all possible. Another solution is to take *dhīḥ* as a separate nominal clause, as Re does (“il est la Vision-poétique”). He takes the referent of both *kavīḥ* and *dhīḥ* to be Agni. WG seem to take *dhīḥ* as the object of the verb, though without comment. This is presumably inspired by the fact that acc. pl. *dhiyāḥ* does elsewhere

serve as object to *marmṛjyáte* (IX.47.4). However, making *dhīh* into an acc. pl. is grammatically difficult (though, I suppose, not impossible).

My solution involves reading the intensive *marmṛjyate* simultaneously in two syntactically different ways, both of which are paralleled elsewhere in the RV. The stem *marmṛjyáte* is one of the new-style -*yáte* intensives, which have medial inflection and passive accent even if they have active semantics and pattern with active stems in their averbo. See, for example, IX.47.4 just cited. (On this type and its origin, see Jamison 1983 [MSS 42: 41–73].) Thus, the poet can be stroking the *budhnám* in this transitive interpretation, like the many active forms of this root including the act. athem. intensive *mármṛj-*. But several instances of medial *marmṛjyá-* have the passive value the morphology implies (e.g., IX.62.13 *marmṛjyámāna āyúbhiḥ*, of soma), and I take *dhīh* as the subject of the verb read this time as a passive. This syntactic pun might be clearer in the publ. tr. if the same word had been used for both readings; better might be “... keeps stroking ... is being stroked,” though ‘groom’ is actually better with the insight as subject.

On the syntax and sense of d, see comm. ad X.11.8.

I.95.9: Ge (/WG) assume that pāda a treats the Paryagnikaraṇa or the ritual act of circling around an object with a firebrand, but *jrāyāḥ* ‘expanse, expansion’ seems to me rather to depict the horizontal spread of the fire out from its original kindling place.

I.95.10: In pāda a *srótaḥ* can be either nominative, as appositive to the underlying subject Agni, or accusative, an object parallel to *gātúm ūrmím*. I chose the second alternative, contra Ge / Re, but either is possible and the meaning is virtually identical.

I.95.11: *revát* in b may be either adverbial (as I’ve taken it) or the object, with supplied noun, of *vī bhāhi* (so, e.g., Ge “Nun strahle ... reiches (Gut) aus”). Again either is possible and the effect is essentially the same.

I.96 Agni

The first verses of this hymn connect Agni with the semi-divine ancestors and culture heroes of the Ārya: Āyu, Manu, Vivasvant (vs. 2), Bharata (vs. 3), Mātariśvan (vs. 4).

I.96.1: Most tr. interpret *mitráṁ ... sādhan* as “they conclude an alliance” (so Re; Ge “Freundschaft”), but since *mitrá-* is so often a descriptor of Agni as the go-between between gods and men, I assume that Agni is the referent here as well. So also Old SBE.

I.96.2: This verse attributes primal creative power to Agni first in the ritual realm (ab), then in the cosmic realm (c). Ge (/WG) supply a different verb in c (“bescheint”), presumably because Agni is not usually credited with cosmogonic powers. But there is no contextual support for a new verb here, and in parallel clauses containing only one verb the default interpretation is to supply the same verb with the second clause. Given how much generative power is ascribed to the Vedic sacrifice, it is not surprising that Agni’s ability to engender Manu’s people, that is, those who sacrifice like Manu, can then be extended to his ability to beget the major cosmic features -- esp. as in this enterprise he is

partially identified with the sun. Note that in 4c he is explicitly named as “the begetter of the two worlds” (*janitā ródasyoh*) as well as “the finder of the sun” (*svarvíd*).

I.96.3: On the Bharata fire as “the focus of worship of multiple *ārya* clans,” see Proferes 2007: 37.

Though *sṛprá-* receives various tr., it must be related to *sarpís-* ‘melted butter’. See EWA s.v. *sarpís-*; it has nothing to do with $\sqrt{sṛp}$ ‘creep’. Its semantic range seems to cover ‘buttery, glossy, sleek’

I.96.4: Contrary to the standard tr., I take pāda a as containing a separate predication: in his capacity as Mātariśvan he ensures prosperity, while as Sun-finder he finds the way.

I.96.7: The full integration of the refrain into the syntactic structure of the verse is signalled by the shift from nominative reference to Agni to accusative, clear first in *kṣām* in b, since *sādanam* in a is neuter and could be in either case -- the common use of a morphologically ambiguous form as pivot.

I.96.8: With the refrain having finally been integrated into the verse in 7, it is abruptly dropped and its final and most salient word, *draviṇodā-* explodes in vs. 8.

Though *sānara-* is a hapax, ‘having superior men’ seems a fairly safe bet, esp. given semantically parallel *vīrávant-* in the next pāda. We might of course prefer **sānara-* given the init. laryngeal of the ‘man’ word, but in a nonce creation the phonological history of the 2nd member would no longer be available.

I.97 Agni

The grammatically incomplete refrain of this hymn (*āpa nah śósucad aghám* “blazing away the bad for us”) is introduced first as the first pāda of this hymn and then repeated as 1c. In that verse, the refrain’s participial construction is integrated into the verse structure, modifying the subject of the main verb *śúsugdhi* in b. This integration is not found again until vs. 6 and continues thereafter till the end of the hymn (vss. 7–8). However, the semantic distance between the verse proper and the refrain narrows as the hymn progresses. In vss. 2-3 there is no explicit mention of Agni, but in vss. 4–5 he appears, as enclitic pronoun + voc. (*te agne*) in 4 and gen. (*agnéh*) in 5, though neither is in the appropriate case to match the refrain.

I.97.1: It does not seem worthwhile to try to replicate the difference between the two reduplicated forms, the intensive participle (*śósucat*) and the perfect imperative (*śúsugdhi*) in tr. — Re’s tr. of the inten. part., “écartant-par-ton-éclat-puissant,” is a cautionary example of why. WG’s “immer wieder wegflammend” is somewhat less clunky but still gets wearisome in repetition.

I.97.3–5: These three middle verses, before the refrain becomes reintegrated into the verse, begin identically: *prá yát*, though the sense of *yád* in 3–4 differs from that in 5.

I.97.3: The referent of *bhāndiṣṭha eṣām* “the most fortunate one of these” is not clear. However, since he is conjoined with “our patrons” and patrons are often conjoined with

“us” (as in the next verse), referring to the poet-performers (explicitly II.2.12 *stotārah ... sūrāyaś ca*), it is likely a singer or poet, perhaps even this very poet, referring to himself in the 3rd ps.

I.98 Agni

I.98.2: As noted in the publ. intro., I take this verse as an allusion to the well-known story of Agni’s disappearance and the gods’ search for him (treated in detail in X.51–53). (So also Old SBE.) However, this mythic allusion must be mediated by reference to the here-and-now, given the hope for Agni’s protection expressed in the final pāda. This mediation is perhaps signaled by pāda b, where Agni’s hiding place is identified. Instead of the waters, where Agni takes refuge in the myth, he has entered “all plants” (*vīśvā ōṣadhīḥ*). Agni’s hidden presence in plants, the quality that allows him to be born from them, is a standard trope in hymns treating the kindling of the ritual fire and is in fact alluded to at the end of a nearby Kutsa hymn, I.95.10d *antār nāvāsu carati prasūṣu* “he roams within the new, fruitful (plants).”

I.99 Agni

The only single-verse hymn in the RV, it closes Kutsa’s Agni cycle. Though attributed to Kaśyapa Mārīca by the Anukramaṇī, it shows clear connections with other parts of Kutsa’s Agni hymns, for which see publ. intro.

I.100 Indra

I.100.2: In c, the presumed main clause to the relative clauses of ab, I have supplied a verb of motion (“should come”), but it might be better, with Ge and Re, simply to take c as the anticipatory qualifier of the subject (*índrah*) of the refrain in d.

The *svébbhiḥ* of c is positioned between two other masc. pl. instr. and could perhaps be taken with both, though I have tr. it only with *évaiḥ* because *svébbhir évaiḥ* appears to be a fixed expression: I.62.8, VIII.8.13, VIII.97.3, X.67.11.

I.100.3: Pāda a with its simile is interpreted variously, with the differences primarily dependent on the construal of the participle *dúghānāḥ*. On the basis of III.31.10 *páyah prathāsya rétaso dúghānāḥ* “milking out the milk of their age-old semen,” I take the participle to be transitive and supply as object acc. *páyah*, on which gen. *rétasah* is dependent. Since these are the only two occurrences of the stem *dúghāna-* (as opposed to *dúhāna-*, etc.) and they share the word *rétas-*, it seems best to interpret them in the same way. Ge, however, though adducing III.31.10, takes *dúghānāḥ* as passive, “wie die gemolkenen (Ströme) des Himmelssamens” (sim. Re). Both Ge and Re also take *divāḥ* as dependent on *rétasah*, while I take it as parallel to *yásya*, both dependent on *pánthāsaḥ*. The parallel expression in vs. 2 *yásya ... sūryasyeva yāmaḥ* “whose course, like that of the sun...” favors my interpr. of *divāḥ*, though the passages adduced by Ge. (V.17.3, IX.74.1) do show that *divāḥ* can also qualify *rétas-*.

Determining the syntactic structure here requires figuring out what image in being depicted. We can begin with the gender paradox that figures prominently in any interpretation: the milk(ing) and the semen. I do not think this can be separated from Indra’s “male powers” (*paúmsyebhiḥ*) in c, and therefore think, contra most other interpr., that it is Indra’s “paths” that are producing the semen-as-milk. Most interpr. avoid this difficult image by taking *dúghānāḥ* entirely as part of the simile (the milked-out [streams]), with the property shared by the frame (Indra’s paths) and the simile only the anodyne verb *yánti* ‘go’. I freely admit that the image produced by my interpr. is, to say the least, not straightforward, but it can be made intelligible and it produces a richer semantics than the alternatives. In vss. 2 and 3 the trajectory of Indra’s journeys is depicted as cosmic: his “course” (*yāmaḥ*) in 2 is like that of the sun, his “paths” (*pánthāsaḥ*) like those of heaven in 3. (See also his ‘routes’ in 4c.) I therefore see these journeys as visually inscribed in the sky, almost like contrails (however anachronistic that image is for the Vedic period). The cosmic equivalent of these paths of Indras are likely the clouds, which produce rain. Now the refrain of this hymn emphasizes Indra’s connection with the Maruts, and the Maruts are, among other things, the gods associated with the thunderstorm and the monsoon and are closely associated with the production of rain. So, Indra’s journey across the sky with the Maruts can also be seen as producing rain, figuratively called semen because of the Indra’s intensely male character. His “paths” on this journey are compared to the clouds, whose visual “paths” as they move across the sky are deeply familiar and which are the quintessential producers of rain.

I.100.4: In b *sán* is one of the (fairly few) examples of the nominative of the pres. part. to \sqrt{as} that is not concessive (expect “although being ...”). The phrase *sákhībhiḥ sákhā sán* is, as Ge points out (n. 4b), structurally identical to I.76.5 *kavíbhīḥ kavīḥ sán*, where the *sán* also lacks concessive force.

I.100.4–5: The pattern of instrumentals set in vs. 4 -- “X with the X-es,” that is, “X among the X-es” -- appears to continue in 5a and c, but the instrumentals there are used differently.

I.100.5: The participial phrase *śravasyāni tūrvan* has a close parallel in VIII.74.10c *yásya śrávāṃsi tūrvatha*. I translate the latter as “whose claims to fame you bring to triumph.” Given the similarities I would change the tr. here to “along with the nest-mates bringing to triumph (deeds) worthy of fame.”

I.100.6: The general opinion is that *samádana-* is simply an extension of *samád-* ‘battle’; Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *samád-*) suggests that it’s a blend of *samád-* and *samáraṇa-* ‘clash, battle’. I consider it rather a blend (with suffixal extension) of *samád-* and *máda-* ‘exhilaration, elation’, hence ‘battle-elation’ or, in Re’s felicitous tr. ‘l’ivresse-du-combat’. In a nicely balanced expression, just as Indra reduces the battle-fury of the enemy (*manyu-mīḥ*) he raises the battle-elation of those fighting with him. This notion is continued in the next verse, where in pāda a the Maruts cause Indra to enjoy the battle.

Ge and Re tr. *sanat* as a modal here (but not the repeated examples in vs. 18). The form of course cannot be a subjunctive, given the augmented thematic forms that belong to this paradigm (*ásanat*, etc.), and though injunctives can sometimes be modal, there is no contextual reason for such an interpretation.

I.100.7: The abstract *ūtí-* ‘help’ is here personified, representing the Maruts. Cf. I.52.9 where the identification of *ūtáyah* and *marútaḥ* is explicit.

karúṇa- is found only here in the RV; neither here nor in its very few other occurrences in early Vedic (AV 1x, TS 1x) does it exhibit any semantic kinship with later *karuṇa-* ‘pitiful’, *karuṇā* ‘pity’, though Mayrhofer (EWA s.v.) makes a valiant effort to connect the meanings.

I.100.8: The apparent 3rd pl. med. verb *apsanta* is difficult. Ge simply refuses to translate. Old suggests a connection with \sqrt{sap} but without conviction. Re and WG (though both without disc.) must take it as a desiderative to $\sqrt{āp}$ ‘reach, obtain’ (“... cherchent à gagner,” “... wollen ... erreichen”). But, though the standard desid. to this root, *īpsati*, is not attested until the AV, the lack of reduplication and the short root vowel make the stem *apsa-* an unlikely desid. (This analysis is also rejected by Ge in n. 8a.) I tentatively suggest that it belongs to the putative root \sqrt{bhas} ‘breathe’, which Thieme (*Gramm. Kat.* 539) suggests underlies the various compounds in *-psu-*, as well as Grk. ψυχή (see EWA s.vv. *psu-* and *bhas*²) and that it means ‘inspire’. It would then be the imperfect of a root pres. (or possibly a root aor.). Though we might expect a weak form of the middle ending, **apsata*, this may well be an *-anta* replacement for act. *-an* of the type identified and described in Jamison 1979 (IJ 21). Old rejects a derivation from \sqrt{bhas} , but presumably referring to the other \sqrt{bhas} ‘bite’.

I.100.9: The standard tr., also Old and Tichy (1995: 42), take *sámgrbhītā* as the nom. sg. of an agentive *-tar-* stem, parallel to *sānitā* in pāda c, a form that should have full-grade in the root syllable, **sámgrabhītā*. I see no reason to reject the past participle it appears to be, in order to assume a wrongly formed alternative. Although RVic poets often make use of morphological parallelism, it is not a compositional requirement; in fact, they often take pleasure in expressing semantically parallel notions in morphologically dissimilar garb (see a nice example in 6a above, not to mention instr. *savyéna*, loc. *dakṣiṇé* in this same hemistich). The verb *yamati* of pāda a can easily be read with b as well, and *sámgrbhītā* also modifies the neut. pl. *kṛtāni* with no grammatical difficulty.

I.100.10: On *grāma-* as ‘horde, roving band’ see comm. ad X.27.19.

I.100.11: The verb *samájāti* lacks an overt object; the standard tr. supply ‘booty’. This lexeme sometimes takes an acc. expressing the prize one wins (e.g., cows in I.33.3), but other times the enemy one defeats (e.g., VII.32.7), and I see no way to decide here.

Note how (*saṃ*)*ájā(ti)* echoes *jā(mibhir)* ... *ájā(mibhir)*.

I.100.12: On a variant of pāda b, see comm. ad X.69.7

The hapax *camrīṣá-* is taken by the standard tr. as a personal name. This tactic may be safe, but it ignores the word’s similarity to several others, particularly the hapax *camrīṣ-* in I.56.1, a word usually rendered as ‘ladle’. Old, ad I.56.1, makes the offhand suggestion that our *camrīṣá-* is related to *camara-* ‘yak’, a word not attested until the grhya sūtras. Although ‘yak’ might work in our passage, the gap in attestation and the morphological differences make this connection quite shaky. More promising are several words found in the RV for soma cup/beaker: *camasá-* and *camū-*, as well as the root *cam* ‘sip, slurp’ (see Gotō 1987: 136). *camrīṣá* (and *camrīṣ-*) may be secondarily built to a **cam-ra-* derived from this root (for the suffixes *-īṣá-* and *-īṣ-* see AiG II.2.462–63 and 364–67 respectively) and thus derivationally parallel to *cam-ū-* and *cam-asá-*. I therefore take *camrīṣá-* as belonging to the same semantic sphere as *camasá-* and *camū-* and as the designation of a large cup or beaker. The problem that then arises is why Indra would be compared to such a thing; this aberrant simile may be responsible for the resistance to connecting *camrīṣá-* with the other *cam-* words. But this is only an apparent problem. The point of comparison is Indra’s vastness (*śávasā*), the capaciousness with which he encompasses the peoples and natural features of the world (see also 14ab). An exactly parallel image is found in I.61.9, where Indra is called “a reverberant tankard” (*svarír ámatraḥ*).

I.100.13: Most tr. take a and b as separate clauses, to avoid direct comparison of the mace (*vájraḥ*) with the bellowing (*raváthaḥ*), but I consider this another example of the condensed and deliberately off-balance syntax of this hymn: the mace that roars is compared directly to the similar sound emanating from heaven; in other words, the verb *krandati* in the frame is transformed into the noun *raváthaḥ* in the simile.

I.100.14: Having described the vastness of Indra’s power throughout the hymn, the poet now implicitly attributes the same vastness to his own hymn (*ukthám*) by juxtaposing it

with Indra's *mānam* 'measure', which encompasses the two worlds. With Old I take *mānam ukthām* as "coordinated and asyndetic."

I.100.17: The first hemistich appears to contain a pun on the patronymic of the poets named in cd, *vārṣāgirāḥ* -- with *vṛṣṇe* in a, corresponding to the 1st compound member, and (*abhī*) *grṇanti* in b, to the root \sqrt{gr} 'sing, greet' found in the 2nd. The pun supports the derivation of *vārṣāgirā-* from **vṛṣā-gír-* 'having a bullish song' (so Gr) rather than from **varṣā-gír-* 'welcoming the rain', as suggested by Scar (112) and endorsed by Mayrhofer (*Personnamen*, 82–83). The semantics of the proposed bull-compound seem superior to the proposed rain-compound, and the pun provides further evidence in its favor.

I.101 Indra

I.101.1: Supply *púraḥ* with fem. *kṛṣṇāgarbhāḥ* in b. So, explicitly, Old, but standard tr. follow.

I.101.2: The adj. *asúṣa-* almost always occurs with *súṣṇa-* (6 of its 7 occurrences: II.14.5, 19.6; IV.16.2; VI.20.4, 31.3, and here) and is a textbook example of a phonological figure. It is generally taken as a derivative of \sqrt{as} 'eat', meaning 'gefrässig' (standard tr., as well as Gr, AiG II.2.491, EWA s.v. *as*) -- hence my 'insatiable', which is meant to produce a similar phonetic figure. I do wonder, though, if it's not a derivative of \sqrt{svas} 'snort, pant', which would make it also an etymological figure with *súṣṇa-*, used proleptically to mean "(wrenched him down) (to become) breathless." The phrase is almost always the object of a verb of violence, as here, and the proleptic adjective fits these contexts. For similar accent on a negated *-a*-stem compound, cf. *akṣára-* 'imperishable', *ajára-* 'unaging', *adābha-* 'undeceptive'. Vs. 5c has a similar proleptic phrase, *dásyūñr ādharān* "(brought) the Dasyus low."

I.101.3: Pāda a lacks a verb. Tr. supply variously: Ge "sich fügen," Re "ont assigné," WG "folgen." I supply a form of $\sqrt{vṛdh}$ 'strengthen, increase' on the basis of formulaically similar VIII.15.8 *táva dyaúr indra paúmṣyam, pṛthivī vardhati śrávaḥ*, and other passages where *paúmṣyam* is obj. of $\sqrt{vṛdh}$ (I.155.3, VIII.6.31).

I.101.4: For the putative root $\sqrt{ār}$ 'recognize' (< 'recognize as an Ārya'?), see comments ad VIII.16.6 as well as Old (Noten) on this vs.

I.101.6: The nonce form *jigyúbhiḥ* to a supposed stem *jigyú-* is surely an attempt at an instr. pl. of the pf. part., which is well attested (*jigīvān, jigyús-*), but whose instr. pl. ought to be the monstrous **jigivádbhiḥ* or (improperly using the prevocalic weak stem) **jigyúrbhiḥ* or **jigyúbhiḥ*.

I.101.7: For the ring that connects this last Jagatī vs. with vs. 1, see publ. intro.

For the buried pun involving *pṛthú jráyaḥ* and the referent of *yósā*, Rodasī, see comm. ad I.168.7.

I.101.8: Ge and Re take *mādāyāse* only with b and supply the copula with a. The strict parallelism of the two clauses favors taking the verb of b with both, as I do, but the question may be whether Indra can reach exhilaration in heaven or can only do so at a human soma offering.

I.101.10: The referent of the dual *dhéne* “two streams” is not clear to me. Ge takes it as ‘lips’ (< ‘the sucking ones’; see ad I.2.3), but in no other passage is ‘lips’ a possibility (though this doesn’t stop Ge). Bloomfield (JAOS 46) suggests it is an elliptical dual, for prayers and libations, expressed by *dhénāḥ* and *dhārāḥ* respectively in III.1.9, but this relies on an outdated interpretation of *dhénā-* (see comm. ad I.2.3). H.-P. Schmidt (Fs. Nyberg) also considers it an elliptical dual, but is himself somewhat elliptical about what the ellipsis would be -- it seems that he considers it both literal (streams of milk) and figurative (streams of song). But RVic poets elsewhere do not resort to the dual to express a literal/metaphorical split. Re takes it as two streams of soma (without identifying which these would be), and WG as two milk-streams (again unidentified). I am inclined to assume that it has been attracted into the dual from the more regular pl. *dhénāḥ* by the immediately preceding *śípre* ‘two lips’, given the strict parallelism in syntax and phonology in the two clauses in this pāda: *ví syasva śípre ví sijasva dhéne*, although the existence of another dual *dhéne* in V.30.9 in an obscure context, may weaken this attraction hypothesis.

I.102 Indra

I.102.1: As indicated in the publ. intro., I interpret the first half-verse very differently from the standard tr. The three major deviations from the ordinary interpretations are the following: 1) I take *te* in pāda a as referring to the poet, who is also the subj. of the 1st ps. verb *prá bhare*. This is the most radical of the departures and requires the most special pleading. 2) Rather than the loc. sg. of neut. *stotrā-* ‘praise song’ (a loc. not found elsewhere in the RV), I take *stotrē* as the dat. sg. of the agent noun *stotár-* ‘praiser’, coreferential with *te* in a. This dat. is very common in the RV. 3) I take the first two words of b (*asyá stotrē*) with the main cl. in a, starting the rel. cl. with *dhīśāṇā*. This accords better with the placement patterns of *yá-* subordinators, which ordinarily do not follow more than one constituent.

As for the first departure, as I have pointed out elsewhere (see comm. on I.70.10), the 2nd sg. middle forms of the impv. (*prá*) *bharasva* *bhārasva* (I.79.10, VII.88.1) are specialized for the self-address of the poet. Here, with the middle *prá bhare* I think the poet is speaking in the 1st ps. but addressing himself in the 2nd. I do have to admit that *prá* √ *bhr* + DAT. otherwise has the divinity in the dative and so the *te* in 2nd position in the verse would immediately be interpreted as referring to Indra -- and, I have to argue, only as the verse unfolded would the referent be reinterpreted as the poet. Despite the complications of my interpretation, it solves the difficulties that arise from the standard interpr. First, that interpr. must take the *mahāḥ* as coreferential with *te* (e.g., Re “à toi (qui es) grand”), but this makes the whole phrase genitival, and, as noted, the *prá* √ *bhr* construction takes a dative (of the many exx., cf. I.143.1 *prá ... dhītúm agnáye, ... bhare*). Then a referent must be supplied for the *asyá* opening pāda b; most supply “the singer.” (Under my interpretation, the genitives *mahāḥ ... asyá* are construed together and refer to

Indra, while *te ... stotré* is the dative phrase.) And the problems I already mentioned, that *stotré* is otherwise only the dative of the agent noun and that *yád* comes too late to govern the whole b pāda, also remain in the standard tr.

But what does it mean, in my interpretation, when the poet says “I present to *you* this thought,” with both “I” and “you” referring to himself. As I suggest in the publ. intro., the poet is announcing that he has finished composing the hymn, which can now be recited to the god at the ritual performance, also by himself (the poet). A slightly attenuated alternative would be to take *te* as referring to a different member of the larger group of ritual performers, who is charged with reciting the hymn that “I” have just composed.

I.102.2: The phrase *dyāvākṣāmā pṛthivī* is striking because *pṛthivī* ‘earth’ either doubles the less common ‘earth’ word *kṣāmā* in the du. dvandva or else serves as the epithet (‘the broad’) it historically was. Indeed because *pṛthivī* is grammatically ambiguous (sg. or du.), it could modify both heaven and earth, or it could stand as a second elliptical du. referring to both. The same phrase is found in III.8.8 and, with *-bhūmī* rather than *kṣāmā*, in X.65.4.

I believe that there is a closer connection between the two halves of the verse than the standard tr. seem to. In my opinion the sun and moon roam alternately in order to provide constant illumination, so that we can see Indra’s “wondrous form lovely to see” (*darśatām vāpuḥ*) and therefore put trust in him, that is, in his existence. Remember that a constant source of worried speculation in the RV is whether Indra exists or not -- a worry that is regularly alleviated by his epiphany on our ritual ground. Here the mere sight of his form will allay our worries and allow us to trust that he exists. Ge attributes the actions of cd just to the fact that Indra is the creator of sun and moon, while Re has us looking at the sky.

I.102.3: Re takes c with d as a single clause, but I follow Ge (/WG) in supplying ‘help’ from ab as the verb of c. Passages like I.176.5 *ājāu ... prāvah... vājīnam* support this latter interpr.

I.102.5: *hāvamānā(h)* is one of the uncommon, but not vanishingly rare examples of a pres. part. functioning as the main verb of a clause. See also 103.4 below.

Given the fronted full pronoun *asmākam* in c and its contrast with the various peoples in ab, more emphasis should have been placed on “our” in the publ. tr.

I.102.6: I tr. *amita-* as ‘matchless’ rather than ‘immeasurable’ because of its etym. connection with *pratimāna-* ‘match’ (6c, 8a), *amātrá-* ‘matchless’ (7c).

The Pp. reads *akalpāḥ* in c, and following this reading has led to very “free” (so Old) tr. of the word and interpr. of the syntax (e.g., Ge “Durch seine Stärke macht Indra ein Gegengewicht unmöglich”; Re is even freer), where “(macht) unmöglich” for *akalpā-* seems distinctly odd and the syntactic relation between it and *pratimānam* is loose at best. The difficulties disappear if we instead read loc. *akalpé*. As Old points out, by accent the word should be a bahuvrīhi. The one example of *kálpa-* in the RV seems to refer to arrangements, ritual or martial (IX.9.7: *ávā kálpeṣu naḥ pumas, támāmsi soma yódhyā* “help us in our arrangements, o male; the shades of darkness must be fought”), and a

bahuvrīhi “without arrangement/order” modifying an underlying ‘battle’-word (perhaps *khaja-* ‘tumult’ extracted from immediately preceding *khajamkarāḥ*) makes perfect sense in context.

This leaves an equational sentence *índrah ... pratimānam ójasā* “by his strength Indra is the match,” and we need only supply the specification of what he is the match for. I sc. ‘all’ on the basis of II.12.9c, also describing Indra: *yó víśvasya pratimānam babhūva*. However, esp. in conjunction with 8ab, it might instead be the earth, or heaven and earth. Cf. I.52.13 (also of Indra) *tvám bhuvaḥ pratimānam pṛthivyāḥ* (also 12); X.111.5 *índro divāḥ pratimānam pṛthivyāḥ*.

I.102.7: As in 2b we find an original epithet of the earth, *mahī* ‘the great one’, which comes to be used as a straight designation of it, doubling a word that may also refer to the earth, *dhiṣāṇā*. This combination also occurs elsewhere (III.31.13, X.96.10); the former passage is an esp. close parallel to this one, in that *mahī ... dhiṣāṇā* sets Indra on the attack. With Kü (224: “Dich ... hat die Dhiṣāṇā entflammt”) I therefore take *títviṣe* here as transitive, though in its other occurrences it is not. For another passage in which the earth aids Indra in his heroic deeds, see IV.16.7b *prāvat te vājram pṛthivī ...*

I.102.8: Contra most tr., I prefer to take ab as separate clauses, rather than as anticipating *bhūvanam* in c.

The difference between *triviṣṭi-dhātu-* and *tri-dhātu-* (used of *bhūma* in IV.42.4) is not clear to me. The stem *triviṣṭi-* on its own (IV.6.4, 15.2) qualifies Agni’s ritual actions as performed “with triple toil” (\sqrt{vis} ‘be active, labor’), but that sense doesn’t work here. As far as I can see, it’s a way of indicating that the divisions each have three divisions of their own, but the semantic pathway to this value is unclear.

I.102.9: The standard tr. take *upamanyú-* as a PN. Mayrhofer (*Personenname*) voices skepticism, however, and I see no reason not to take it as an adjective qualifying the bard (*kārú-*). Though *manyú-* ‘battle fury’ can be a negative quality, it often is not so viewed (esp. when it belongs to the gods), and the passionate energy it implies would be a good trait for a poet.

The impv. *kṛnotu* in d should be read (with the standard tr.) with both c and d, with slightly different values: in c it has a straight “make X Y” sense, while in d it participates in the idiom *purāḥ √kṛ* ‘make (i.e., put) in front’.

I.102.10: On the sense of *ná dhánā rurodhitha*, see comm. ad X.42.9.

In b the singular loc. *ājā* appears to be modified by two loc. plurals *árbeṣu* and *mahátsu* (so Old, Ge, Re); cf. I.81.1 *mahátsu ājísūtém árbhe* with a different imbalance of number. WG take the plurals separate from the singular (“im Wettkampf um kleine (Dinge) und um grosse”) (see their note). This is possible but unnecessary.

I.103 Indra

I.103.1: On the interpr. of this verse, see publ. intro. Although my interpr. generally follows Ge et al., I take the first two pādas as referring disjunctively to the two locations

of Indra's power (not just to the heavenly one), an idea that is more straightforwardly expressed in c, which I consider grammatically connected to ab.

For the notion in d of a *ketú*- linking heaven and earth, see III.55.2 and VII.9.1. Despite its position I take *iva* as marking the following *ketú*- as a simile.

I.103.2: The presence of the shadowy Rauhiṇa here (otherwise only II.12.12) is an intrusion in this Vṛtra-oriented verse. The verb that governs him, *ví*√*bhid* 'split apart', returns in the next verse with 'strongholds' as its object. The distraction of verb and preverb with object in the middle (*ábhīnad rauhiṇám ví*) is almost iconic for the splitting apart. For a potentially similar ex. see V.30.7.

I.103.3: The iconic splitting of verb and preverb in 2c is complemented here in b by the polarized positioning of the NP "Dāsa strongholds," the object of *vibhindán*, at the beginning and end of the pāda: #*púraḥ ... dāsīḥ*#, while the preverb+verb are unverbated in the participle (as against 2c).

Ge (WG) take *śraddádhāna ójaḥ* as transitive-reflexive, "trusting in his own power," but as Old argues, *śrād*√*dhā*, a signature word of this set of hymns, expresses the trust that people have in Indra, and the medial participle should therefore be taken as a passive (so also Re). For the other occurrences of *śrād*√*dhā* that support this interpr., see vs. 5 in this hymn (structurally paired with 3; see publ. intro.), as well as I.102.2, 104.6–7.

I.103.4: The syntax and purport of this verse are somewhat murky, and my interpretation differs from the various other standard ones (though it is closest to Re). I will only present mine here, without cataloguing the differences from the others. First, I take *tád ūcúṣe* as a separate clause, with a new clause beginning in the middle of pāda a with *mānuṣemā yugāni*, which I take as an acc. of extent of time, as it is several times elsewhere (e.g., II.2.2).

The rest of the verse concerns the epithets or "names" Indra has and, in part, how he acquires them: *maghávan*- 'bounteous' in b, *vajrín*- 'mace-bearer' in c, and *sūnúḥ* (*śávasaḥ*) 'son (of strength)' in d. Note that the names are all in the nom., though appositional to acc. *nāma*. For a parallel see, e.g., X.28.12. On Indra's acquisition of a sequence of names, see also VIII.80. I take c as containing the predication of the main clause, with the pres. part. *upaprayán* functioning as the main verb (see I.102.5 above).

The referent of *tád* in the first clause is unclear. Though it may be *nāma*, as most tr. think, I'm inclined to take it as an internal reference to the hymn that the poet is presenting to him.

In d the expected epithet "son of strength" is truncated, lacking the *śávasaḥ*, but the phonologically and derivationally parallel *śrávase* that immediately follows *sūnúḥ* would evoke it.

On this verse as an omphalos, see publ. intr.

I.103.7: For the "deep-structure pun" in pāda b, see the publ. intro. and Jamison 1982/83 and 2007: 110-12. That the action in this clause is not to be taken literally is, I think, signalled by the *iva* in the main clause in pāda a, which introduces the heroic deed (*vīryām*) supposedly depicted in b. My "as it were" renders the *iva*.

In c Ge takes the wives (*pātnīḥ*) as the wives of the gods, but in this Vṛtra context it makes more sense to take them as the (fem.) waters whom Indra had just released. Recall that in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32 (as well as in V.30.5, VIII.97.18), the waters are called *dāsāpatnīḥ* (vs. 11), “whose husband was a dāsa” (that is, Vṛtra). This might be clearer if the publ. tr. read “His wives.”

The interpretation of the final part of this pāda, *vāyaś ca*, is disputed. Ge (/WG) and Re take it as an acc. of *vāyas-* conjoined with *tvā* (“dir ... und deiner Kraft”). However, already Sāy considered it the nom. pl. of *vī-* ‘bird’, which is equally possible grammatically, and I have adopted this interpr. (Old seems tacitly to accept this interpretation, by citing X.80.5, which also contains birds.) Sāy’s suggested referent is the Maruts, which makes good sense. The two groups on site at the Vṛtra battle and able to give encouragement and praise to Indra then were the waters and the Maruts, who, in many accounts of the myth, provided Indra with moral and tactical support.

I.103.8: *kūyava-* ‘bringing bad harvest’ is ordinarily an epithet of Śuṣṇa, and I so take it here even though it is separated from *śuṣṇam* by another PN. I ascribe this position to the fact that *kūyava-* always appears after the caesura. However, in the next hymn (104.3) Kuyava seems to be an independent personage, or rather there is no overt mention of Śuṣṇa -- so perhaps he should be accorded an independent existence here as well (with the standard tr.).

I.104 Indra

I.104.1: As noted in the publ. intro., *s^uvānó nārvā* in b contains a triple pun, since the participle *s^uvānāḥ* can be read in three different ways: 1) as nom. sg. to the adj. *svānā-* ‘sounding’ (\sqrt{svan} ‘sound’)(so Old, Re, WG); 2) as athem. med. part. to $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’, used passively (so Ge); 3) as athem. med. part. to \sqrt{su} ‘press’, also used passively (mentioned by Ge in n. 1b). In this last case the simile would compare Indra seating himself on the ritual ground to soma placed at the soma press. The diction in the rest of this hemistich is quite similar to that found in soma hymns. Cf., e.g., IX.70.7 *ā yónim sómah súkṛtaṁ ní śīdati*, with *yóni-*, a form of \sqrt{kr} characterizing it, and the verb *ní√sad*. In the publ. tr. only the first of these is given, because including a set of bracketed alternatives -- “[/ like a steed having been impelled [/ like (soma) the steed being pressed]” -- seemed disruptive and distracting.

Pāda b contains the word *vāyaḥ*, which raises the same question as in 103.7: is this the plural to *vī-* ‘bird’ or the neuter sg. *s-*stem *vāyas-* ‘vitality, vigor’? Neither of them is an entirely natural object to *vimúcyā* ‘having released’ in this context. Ge (/WG) opt for the latter, Old and Re for the birds. In the publ. tr. I treat it as a pun, but I am not certain what either phrase would represent.

In d *vāhīyasaḥ* is of course a comparative, but, again, so rendering it would be awkward.

I.104.2: Unlike the standard tr. I take the two acc. plurals in b, *tān ... ádhvanah*, separately, with the first referring to the ‘men’ (*nāraḥ*) of pāda a. One might object that since they “have come” (*guh*) to him in that pāda, he has no need to go to them in the next, but, at least in English, “go to for help” is tantamount to “ask for help” and need not

involve any actual travel on the part of the men. And in any case he would need to join them at the place of battle. I.71.9, which contains the phrase *ádhvanaḥ sadhá éti* without *tán*, may support me.

For the pf. opt. *jagamyāt*, see Jamison 2009 (*East and West*); as exhaustively demonstrated there, the pf. opt. has no special “perfect” value and here means simply “should go.”

The publ. tr. reflects the emendation of *ścamnan* to **śamnan*, suggested by Gr and argued for in Jamison 1983: 103 n. 62. I am now less certain about this emendation than I was then, being more sympathetic to Old’s questioning how this corruption could have arisen. On the other hand, the Aves. gerundive *scqθβa-* (V.13.40), adduced by Ge as a cognate to a supposed root $\sqrt{\text{scam}}$, provides no support for a separate etymon of this shape, since it is, with Insler, better attributed to the root **skand* ‘break’, well attested in Avestan and elsewhere in Iranian. For details see Jamison 1983 loc. cit.

I.104.3: For my general interpr. of this verse see publ. intro. I will not discuss the various other interpretations in detail here or repeat what I said in the intro. I *will* point out that most tr. take the subject of both a and b to be the Śiphā river in 4, but this assumes that a and b are essentially repetitions of each other, which would constitute an unartful duplication in a very artful hymn. Since pādas cd contain dual feminines, it makes more sense to take ab as an implicit “the one ... the other” construction, with the two subjects the same as the duals in cd. One problem with this interpr. is that the verb *áva ... bharate* in pāda a lacks an overt object; I suggest in the intro. that it might be defilement or pollution that is also removed ritually by the *avabhṛthá* bath at the end of the classic Vedic sacrifice.

In d we find a periphrastic passive construction: *haté ... syātām* “may the two be smashed.” Though this periphrasis is somewhat unusual, even a stray thought of what the 3rd du. middle opt. of the passive of $\sqrt{\text{han}}$ would be (**hanyeyātām*) may explain the substitution. According to Macdonell (VG), such forms are not attested in Vedic.

I.104.4: Likewise consult the publ. intro. for my interpr. of this verse.

In b *prá ... tirate*, whose regular object is *āyus-* ‘lifetime’ (which I supply here), plays off the name Āyu in the previous pāda. With Old and WG I supply ‘dawns’ with *pūrvābhiḥ*, on the basis of V.48.2, adduced by Old.

I supply Sarasvatī in c, because the only other occurrence of *vīrápatnī* (VI.49.7) refers to Sarasvatī.

I.104.5: Again, consult the publ. intro. As noted there, I think the unidentified female in b is Dawn, who leads the Ārya forces across the river(s) and against the Dasyu. The other standard tr. take her rather as Saramā, Indra’s canine sidekick, on the fragile basis of III.31.6: the only point of contact between the two passages being the rather generic *jānatī gāt* “recognizing, she went.” I see no reason to introduce Saramā here; Dawn has been anticipated by the apparent reference to the dawns in 4b (*pūrvābhiḥ*), and the revealing (*ādarśi* -- a standard item of Uṣas vocabulary) of the Dasyu’s streambed/strategy could easily happen at dawn.

In d *niṣṣapín-* is a hapax, but ‘without care, careless’ ($\sqrt{\text{sap}}$ ‘serve, care for’) makes sense.

I.104.7: The *śrād* √ *dhā* lexeme is repeated here from the immediately preceding pāda (6d; cf. also I.103.3, 5). Curiously the announced “trust” seems to be undercut by *manye* “I think.” The phrase *te asmai* expressing the recipient of the trust requires some comment. Ge seems to take *te* as a dative, parallel to *mahatā indriyāya* in 6d, and *asmai* adverbially (“dafür”). But 6d also contains a *te*, which must be the genitive limiting the dat. phrase, and such an interpretation fits better here, with *te* dependent on *asmai*. What is the referent of *asmai*, whose referent should already be present in the discourse because of the lack of accent on *asmai*? The easiest interpretation is that it simply picks up *indriyāya* of 6d (so Re), but again, as in 3ab, this would seem an unartful duplication. Although my interpr. requires taking into account a longer stretch of discourse, it avoids the repetitive scenario. In I.103.1 Indra is credited with *indriyā-* in two locations, heaven and earth, and I think the dual nature of this *indriyā-* is what is at issue here: the heavenly one in 6d, the one right here (hence the near-deictic *asmai*) in 7a. So although *asmai* picks up the *indriyāya* of 6d, it also refers to a different aspect of this referent.

Hoffmann (1967: 53, followed by WG) tentatively suggests taking cd as a single clause. This avoids the need to supply a verb in a, but the “unprepared womb” (Hoffmann’s “an unbereiteter Stätte”) of c does not seem to have much to do semantically with d.

The object phrase *vāya āsutīm* in d, in conjunction with the dat. part. *kṣūdhyaḍbhyaḥ* ‘hungering’, invites an interpretation of the pair as “food and drink” (Ge “stärkende Speise und Trank”; Hoffmann just “Speise und Trank”; WG “Nahrung und Trank”). But the abstract nature of *vāyas-* should be respected, and I also doubt that *āsutí-* is just any drink, rather than referring to the soma pressing. As for what it all means -- I would suggest that cd be interpreted in the context of the rest of the hymn, particularly the outer framework depicting Indra’s aid to the Ārya in conflict. They are here asking him not to drop them into battle without proper means (“into an unprepared womb”); the d pāda then expresses what they need: vital energy, that is, the physical and mental vigor required for combat, and the soma pressing, that is, the ritual means to attract Indra and secure his aid. Vs. 9 then issues the invitation to the soma drinking.

I.104.8: This verse details various possible bad outcomes if they do not manage to secure his aid. As indicated in the publ. intro., I take the “eggs” (*āṇḍā*) and “cups” (*pātrā*) as slangy references to male and female genitalia, or in the latter case perhaps better ‘wombs’. I tr. *-jānuṣāṇi* loosely ‘contents’, but if the “cups” are wombs, then ‘progeny, offspring, brood’ would work.

I.105 All Gods

For the structure and meaning of the hymn as a whole see the publ. intro. as well as Jamison 2007: 82-85. In what follows here I will comment only on the details of particular verses.

In discussing previous interpretations of the hymn, I misrepresented Bloomfield, who seems to have meant his interpretation of the old poet out of a job only for X.33, which contains our vs. 8 distributed across two vss. (X.33.2, 3).

I.105.1: The waters in which the moon finds itself are probably, with Lü (577–78), the heavenly ones, though I generally resist Lüders’s celestial floods. The waters here may be the same as the heavenly waters in vs. 11, as Lü suggests.

Most tr. take *suparṇāḥ* in b as referring to the moon (*candrāmāḥ*) in a, but in fact when *suparṇā-* refers to a single heavenly body (see vs. 11), it is always the sun. In keeping with the depiction of cosmic and earthly order at the beginning of the hymn, the regular alternation of the journeys of sun and moon opens the verse.

Most tr. take *vidyutaḥ* as referring not to the lightning flashes the word usually denotes, but to stars -- a departure that is simply incomprehensible to me. The point of this verse seems fairly clear: three different sources of light in heaven are mentioned: moon, sun, and lightning. The alternation and the courses of sun and moon are predictable and regular, but that of the lightning is not -- as “they do not find your track” announces.

As stated in the publ. intro., I think the refrain is calling on Heaven and Earth to bear witness to the poet’s musings. The double genitive (or dat.-gen.) *me asyá*, with accented demonstrative, contrasts with *te asmai* in the last hymn (by the same poet), I.104.7a. In that passage I take unaccented *asmai* as picking up a referent already in the discourse, *indriyá-* in 6d (in accord with the usual distribution of the accented and unaccented oblique forms of the demonstrative). Here I take it as referring to a referent not yet in the discourse, the poet’s speech, again in accord with the usual distribution. Ge (/WG) oddly tr. as if it were a loc. (“in solcher Lage” / “in dieser Lage”; sim. Scar). Re takes it as coreferential with *me*: “moi tel (que je suis).” Old (ZDMG 61.826 [KlSch.257]) is closest to my interpr. For a somewhat similar expression see II.32.1ab, also X.10.5 in the Yama/Yamī hymn, in which Yama asserts that Heaven and Earth know “this” about them: *véda nāv asyá prthivī utá dyaúḥ*.

Note the juxtaposed contrastive verbs: *vindanti* (d) to *√vid* ‘find’, *vittám* (e, refrain) to *√vid* ‘know’.

I.105.2: Although pāda a lacks a verb, the parallel VIII.79.5 *arthíno yānti céd ártham* suggests a form of ‘go’.

The rest of the verse depicts sex between a married couple, a particularly important activity in maintaining earthly order and continuity. The mutual action, expressed by the middle dual *tuñjāte*, probably refers to the expressing of semen, as in d, although the sexual juices of both husband and wife might be meant. In d either the husband or the wife may be the subject of *duhe*, depending in part on which root the gerund *paridāya* is assigned to: *√dā* ‘give’ (with *pári* ‘deliver, surrender’) or *√dā* ‘bind’. I favor a pun.

I.105.3: The first half-verse expresses fears about cosmic order, the second about earthly order as maintained by the sacrifice. The verb in b, *áva pādī*, also picks up the sex/procreation theme of 2cd, in that *áva √pad* is an idiom specialized for miscarriage (Jamison, *Hyenas*, 203–4).

I.105.4–6: The questions that the poet asks Agni (in my view, vs. 4) and the gods (vss. 5–6) are reminiscent of the questions the poet (/Zarathustra) regularly directs to Ahura

Mazdā in the Gāthās, esp. Y 44, all of whose vss. except the last (20) begin “This I ask you – tell me straight, o Ahura.”

I.105.4: Most tr. take *avamám* as modifying *yajñám*, but I take it as referring to the addressee, namely Agni (more clearly identified by his messenger role in b, *dūtáḥ*), in the usual double acc. construction with \sqrt{prch} . For Agni as *avamá-* see IV.1.5 *sá tvám no agne 'vamó bhavotí*. The poet asks Agni about the fate of the sacrifice/hymn (the “truth,” *ṛtám*) when it has been offered: where does it go and does anyone get and keep it (in heaven). He wants Agni to answer, because Agni, as the messenger, has access to both worlds.

I.105.5: Just as Agni was located in his realm, as the nearest one, in vs. 4, here the gods’ location is given before they are asked their questions. The poet now worries about what happens to his “truth” once it disappears from his sight and enters the realm of the gods -- is his “truth” theirs? Where did the offering he dispatched to them end up? The opening of the vs., *amī yé*, anticipates the omphalos in vss. 9–10.

The first pāda lacks a syllable. Old suggests reading *devā(h)* as a trisyllable, but particularly since the identical voc. is disyllabic in 3a and nom./voc. pl. thematic endings (-ās) are not normally (/ever?) so resolved, I am not convinced. Rather I think that the metrical disturbance here may deliberately call attention to the opening *amī yé* and thus prepare for the omphalos verses that also begin that way. If the poet had wanted a trisyllabic voc. here he could easily have used the extended *devāsaḥ*.

Note the number discrepancy in *triṣú ... rocané*. Though it is possible to separate the two words (so WG) “in the luminous realm, in the three (worlds),” this seems unnec., esp. in light of expressions like I.102.8 *trīṇi rocanā*, V.69.1 *trī rocanā*. Better to assume a truncated *rocané(ṣu)*. I wonder if this truncation is also meant to complicate the audience’s processing of this vs., as preparation for the omphalos vs.

I.105.6: The formation of the reasonably well-attested adj. *dharmasí-* is unclear; AiG II.237 classifies it as having the almost unparalleled suffix *-así-*, and if it is formed to $\sqrt{dhṛ}$, as seems likely, the intrusive *-n-* is another problem (though cf. RV hapax *dharmī-*). The *-n-* could perhaps be gotten from an extreme reduction of the *-man-*stem(s) *dharmán-* / *dhárman-*, but the rest is hard to generate.

The function of the word in its pāda is also unclear, as there is no obvious neut. for it to modify. (This adj. is otherwise always masc. and generally modifies soma, which does not help here.) I take the two syntactically parallel pādas a and b as each incomplete, to be completed by the other. In other words, I supply neut. *cakṣaṇam* from b in a, and the neut. adj. *dharmasí* from a in b.

The publ. tr. fails to tr. *vaḥ* in a, so modify the tr. to “Is your (vision) of truth steadfast?” This helps solve one of the small puzzles of the verse: given Varuṇa in b and Aryaman in c, we might expect Mitra in a -- but instead we have “you,” as in 5c, referring to the gods in general. As for the larger meaning of the questions, it may be that the poet is asking whether *ṛtá* is always the same (= *pūrvyám ṛtám* of 4c and *pratnā ... āhutiḥ* of 5d) or whether the gods change the rules on us.

I.105.7: I take the force of *purā* + PRES as past progressive / habitual: “was always speaking, used to speak.”

Since the verse contrasts the previous behavior of the speaker (a good ritualist, a hard-working poet) with his current mentally unhinged state, I take *tām mā* as “this (same) me” -- -- identifying the new careworn me with the old unfazed me. However, the nearly rhyming 8a (see below) may have had something to do with the *tām* here.

Note that *ādhīyaḥ* occupies the same metrical position as *dūdhīyaḥ* in 6d.

I.105.8: This vs. breaks the pañkti meter by substituting a 12-syllable pāda for 8 in c. (The vs. is also found distributed across two vss. in X.33.2, 3.) This metrical disturbance may set up the omphalos vss. that immediately follow.

Pāda a is almost a rhyme form with 7c *tām mā viyanti ādhīyaḥ* / 8a *sām mā tapanti abhitaḥ*, and 8c *vī adanti mādīyaḥ* cleverly picks up *vīyanti ādhīyaḥ* of 7c in a different metrical form (post-caesura trimeter, instead of dimeter).

Unlike the standard tr., I take the ribs (*pāśavaḥ*) as a second simile, not marked with a simile particle (unless also covered by the preceding *iva*) because in the hymn in general the poet seems to express a “higher” distress than a backache -- instead a questioning of his previous mode of existence and his religious beliefs. That *prṣṭyāmayī* ‘having a stitch in his side’ in 18d is also in a simile gives further support to the simile interpr. here.

I.105.9–10: As noted in the publ. intro., these verses are the omphalos and are marked, as often, by responsion and numerology. They seem to express the poet’s vision of his connection with his distant ancestor Trita Āptya and also his vision of (somewhat unclear) cosmic phenomena.

I.105.9: Various referents have been suggested for the seven reins. I tentatively take them as the seven seers (note the phonological echo between *raśmāyaḥ* and *īṣayaḥ*), which would allow a connection to be established both with the poetic tradition and, if the seven seers are already equated with the stars in the Big Dipper (in the Great Bear) as they are later, with that astronomical structure. That the next verse also presents what appears to be an astronomical image supports this interpr. Moreover the phrase *tātrā me nābhīr ātatā* “to there my umbilical cord is stretched” recalls the idiom “tie navel to navel” (*sām / ā √dā*), which asserts a family connection between the earthly poet and divine or semi-divine figures and elements in heaven. See comm. ad I.139.1.

The verb ‘rasps’ (*rebhati*) may convey the sound of old man’s voice, as would be appropriate for an ancestor.

I.105.10: I have no idea what the exact referent of the “five oxen” is, but given their stationing in the middle of heaven and their apparent retrograde motion, it seems that an astronomical body (a constellation?) is referred to. Ge (/WG) take *nī vāvṛtuḥ* as “sind ... verschwunden,” but *nī √vṛt* ordinarily means ‘turn back / home’, of bovines, and given that the subject is oxen, albeit metaphorical ones, this idiom works fine in the passage. It also works nicely as a characterization of the 2nd vs. of the omphalos, on which the poem turns, leading back to the step-by-step verses that brought us to the center, but in reverse conceptual order. It is possible that *tasthūḥ* should be tr. “stand still / are standing still”

rather than just “stand” – a frequent usage of $\sqrt{sthā}$ without preverb (see, e.g., the negated *ātiṣṭhant-* ‘not standing still’ of the waters in I.32.10). This moment of stasis would precede the about-face to the return journey.

Ge eliminates the metaphor by rendering *ukṣāṇah* directly as “Sterne” (see his n. 10a) and in his n. 10 simply asserts that the vs. depicts the ending of the night. This oversimplifies the image and blurs the structural position this vs. occupies in the architecture of the hymn.

I.105.11: I am completely baffled about what this verse actually describes, although an astronomical reference is very likely. The many clashing interpretations of the verse do not inspire confidence in any of them. I will simply point out that we seem invited to identify the *suparṇāḥ* here with the *ukṣāṇah* of 10a on the basis of the repetition of the phrase *mādhye (...)* *divāḥ* and the semantic match between *tasthúḥ* “they stand” (10b) and *āsate* “they sit” (11a), though the sg. *suparṇāḥ* in vs. 1 should also be recalled. The waters here are likely to be the same as those in vs. 1; see above.

I.105.12–15: This set of verses forms a small internal ring: 12 and 15 contain *ṛtām* and *nāvya-* / *nāvyaḥ* (though not to the same stem: *nāvya-* in 12, the comparative *nāvya-* in 15, both neut. sg.), while 13–14 contain the responsive *sattó (...)* *manuṣvād ā, devān ... vidūṣtarah*.

I.105.12–13: Each vs. contains a form of *ukthya-*, which probably should have been tr. identically. However, note that the two nouns they modify are quite different: in 12a *ukthyā-* refers to something spoken, probably a hymn; in 13a it refers to friendship, which should be celebrated.

I.105.12: The *supravācanām* in b recalls *pravācyam* in 10c.

Note the contrast of *ṛtām* and *satyām*.

I.105.13–14: I do not know why 13cd and 14ab are virtually identical, save for switch in person (Agni in 2nd ps. in 13, 3rd in 14). Perhaps it shows that the poet/sacrificer can now make the ritual happen. The *yakṣi* of the 13d is a praise of sorts, and then the poet somewhat triumphantly reports that his command worked. Agni, the god on earth and the messenger to the gods in heaven whom the poet questioned in vs. 4 has (re-?)established the ritual links between earth and heaven.

I.105.13: The pāda-final *āpīyam* recalls the likewise pāda-final patronymic *āptīyaḥ* in 9c.

I.105.16: Contains echoes of a number of previous vss. First, the *asaú yāḥ* opening recalls the *amī yé* openings of the two omphalos vss. (9–10), as well as the *amī yé* of 5a, which anticipates the omphalos.

The “Ādityan path” (with one of the very rare instances of *ādityā-* used adjectivally), which is not to be overstepped (*nā ... atikrāme*), recalls exactly 6cd ... *aryamṇāḥ ... pathā, āti krāmema* “Along the path of Aryaman might we pass beyond [step over] ...” The path theme is also found in 11c and later in 18b.

The *pravācyam* of b repeats the proclamation theme that has also been prominent in the hymn: *pravācyam* in 10c (an omphalos vs.), *supravācanam* (12b).

I.105.17: This verse, which provides Ge (and the Sanskrit tradition from which he got it) with his “Trita im Brunnen” interpretation, does not seem to me to fit into the rest of the hymn, though Trita is found in 9cd in a context much more in harmony with the rest. In the next hymn, I.106.6, it’s Kutsa the poet who find himself in the same plight and calls upon Indra for help. The situation fits I.106 much better than I.105, and I wonder if it has been adapted from I.106.

I.105.18: On the destabilizing effect of this verse on the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

The pāda-final position of *hī* in b is quite curious.

I.106 All Gods

I.106.3: *supravācana-*, here used of gods, is found also in the preceding hymn, I.105.12.

I.106.4: The singular part. *vājāyan* in pāda a clashes with the 1st plural verb *īmahe* in b. With Ge (/WG) we can supply a 1st singular verb (“bitte ich”) in the first pāda, but the discordance could be ascribed simply to the loose structure of this hymn.

I.106.5: Ge (/WG) take the 1st member of *mānurhita-* as functionally a dative (“für Manu bestimmt.” Although this fits smoothly into the passage, I think it likely that the standard agentive reading of 1st members of ppl. compounds should stand here. Ge cites I.114.2 as parallel -- *yác chām ca yós ca mánur āyejé* -- but that passage states that it was Manu who won the luck and lifetime by sacrifice. In other words he was the agent, as he would be here in this compound.

I.107 All Gods

I.107.1: I take *ā ... vavṛtyāt* as transitive, with *vah* as object, contra all standard tr. An intransitive tr. is tempting (and see VII.59.4), but this stem is overwhelming transitive elsewhere.

In the phrase *aṃhóḥ ... varivo-vittarā* the abl. *aṃhóḥ* depends on the first member of the cmpd. For a nearly synonymous expression see II.26.4 and comm. thereon.

I.108 Indra and Agni

I.108.1: The image of the chariot looking upon the creatures is a slightly odd one. Elsewhere (VII.61.1, X.85.18) almost identical pādas are used of the sun, and it may be that Indra and Agni’s chariot here is identified with the sun, though such an identification would be unusual for these gods. Bl (RR) thinks rather that the poet “has borrowed and applied with a rather frenzied metaphor” the image of VII.61.1. It is worth quoting his characteristically acerbic comment on the image: “The students of the Rig-Veda are

steeped in the experience of its bold, often grotesque figures of speech, so that even a chariot that looks down from heaven excites no unusual emotion.”

I.108.3: The signature word of this vs. is *sadhryàñc-* / *sadhrīcīnā-* ‘joint(ly), conjoined’, which occurs prominently in the first three pādas. The final pāda is dense with phonological and etymological play: *vṛṣṇaḥ ... vṛṣaṇā vṛṣethām*.

Ge (explicitly) and Re / Klein (DGRV I.373) / WG (all implicitly) take *vṛtrahaṇā* in b as a predicate vocative (so, “you two, conjoined, are Vṛtra-smashers”). I would prefer this interpretation, but think that the lack of accent should be taken seriously. Moreover, given the repetition of *sadhryàñc-* / *sadhrīcīnā-* just noted, it may be that the conjunction of Indra and Agni is what is being highlighted, not their Vṛtra-smashing.

I.108.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., vs. 3 attributes Indra’s characteristic deed (Vṛtra-smashing) to both gods, while vs. 4 attributes Agni’s characteristic ritual behavior to both.

I.108.4: Ge (/WG) construes the instr. phrase of pāda c with *ānājānā* of pāda a (thus, “being anointed with soma”). Since pāda b intervenes, depicting two further ritual actions, I consider the syntactic connection of a and c unlikely, although I am sympathetic to the desire to find something to construe the instr. *tīvrañ sómāḥ páriṣiktebhiḥ* with. I take that phrase rather as a loose circumstantial instrumental, almost equivalent to a loc. absolute.

Another reason not to take this instr. with ‘being anointed’ is that soma is an unlikely anointing medium for Agni, since it is more likely to quench the fire than to make it blaze up. An unexpressed ‘ghee’ is the likely medium in a.

This argument leads indirectly to an issue that all comm. (Ge, Old, Re, WG, Kü [p. 577]) raise: the actions of the first 3 pādas should be performed *for* the two gods, not *by* them. Much energy is expended in these comments in trying to make the gods into recipients, with the unexpressed agents being priests (e.g., Old’s quotation of Benfey’s tr. of pāda b “für welche der Opferlöffel und das Barhis ausgebreitet ist” [my italics]). This energy seems to me misplaced and the grammatical interpretation over-fussy. One of Agni’s standard roles is that of priest, and the actions ascribed to him (and Indra) here fall squarely within this role. Since Indra is identified with Agni, he is just along for the ride, as it were -- just as Agni was in the preceding vs. as Vṛtra-smasher. Though it may seem a bit strange to have the gods already present on the ritual ground, performing the preliminaries to the sacrifice in abc, but, in pāda d, driving to the sacrifice, this merely switches the viewpoint to Indra’s perspective: he always drives to the sacrifice; Agni is always already there. Since the two gods are identified here, we see the characteristic actions of each separately, but ascribed simultaneously to both.

I.108.5: I read *cakrathuḥ* of a also with b, though in a different sense. Ideally for this sense (‘assumed, made your own’) the verb of b would have been med. *cakrāthe*.

The referents of *tébhiḥ* in d are syntactically the neut. *yā(ni)* phrases in abc, but it doesn’t make much sense to “drink with” those particular referents. It would be possible to tr. *tébhiḥ* more heavily as “because of these” or the like, but I think the answer is simpler: rhetorical patterning trumps semantics. The poet is leading up to the loosely

attached refrain of vss. 6–12, whose last pāda is identical to 5d but with *áthā* rather than *tébhiḥ*; the *tébhiḥ* here serves as a transition between the earlier verses, where the d pāda is integrated into the verse and the refrain-marked verses to come. It is grammatically connected to but semantically estranged from the first three pādas of 5.

I.108.6: See the publ. intro. for the place of this vs. in the structure of the hymn.

The “choosing” of pāda a reinforces the priestly roles of Agni (and Indra) in the preceding vs., since the sacrificer’s choosing of the priests is one of the first actions of the sacrifice -- particularly common is choosing Agni as Hotar.

The lexeme *ví√hvā* means ‘vie in invoking’, generally referring to our competition with other sacrificers in attempting to bring the gods, esp. Indra, to our sacrifice. This is precisely the sense that it has here, in my view. With W. E. Hale (*Asuras* 84–85), I take *ásuraiḥ* as referring to other human ‘lords’, in competition with us for the attention of the gods. Given the almost complete absence from the RV of the Asuras as a semi-divine group hostile to the Devas (for which see Hale passim, also Jamison [2016 = Staal Ged.]), and given the standard use of *ví√hvā* for competition between mortals, I cannot follow the near-universal assumption that the later Asuras are present in this passage. The competitors that the poet is thinking of may well be the brahmin and king in 7b and the various named groups in 8ab.

The phrasing of pāda c is unusual, and the interpretation depends crucially on one’s interpretation of *śraddhā*. As I have discussed elsewhere (1996: 176–84), I take this resonant term to mean ‘trust’, particularly the trust between the parties involved in a hospitality relationship (of which the sacrifice is a most important and fraught subtype). Here the trust (*śraddhām*) of the 1st ps. speaker that his choosing will bear fruit and his competitive invocation will be successful comes true (*satyām*) and serves as a concretized goal of the gods’ journey that demonstrates that the trust was not misplaced. *satyā-* is almost a proleptic adjective here. Most of the standard tr. approximate this interpr; Re’s is closest to mine.

The *hí* in the refrain fragment *ā hí yātām* (through vs. 12) is difficult to account for under its usual functional headings. I have tentatively taken it as emphatic (a cop-out, I realize) and tr. it as “yes!” I am not convinced by Hettrich’s treatment (*Hypotaxe* 376, 379–80) ascribing its use to a conditional structure.

I.108.8: For the named peoples in ab as the sacrificers with whom the poet is competing in vs. 6, see comments on that vs.

The two-pāda refrain of the rest of the hymn has finally taken shape here, out of partial phrases found earlier. Note also that the beginning of the c pāda (*ātaḥ*) and that of the d pāda (*áthā*) are phonologically very close.

I.108.9–10: I do not see the purpose of two almost identical vss., but with the relative positions of the various earths reversed. Re calls it a “renversement formulaire, d’un type exceptionnel” (EVP XIV.122).

I.108.11: The locations in pāda a are appropriate to both gods, but those in b are distinctly odd, esp. for Indra. An almost identical pāda is found also in I.91.4, of the domains of soma, where all three terms are fitting, and in I.59.3 of the locations of goods over which

Agni presides. A similar listing but without the mountains is found in III.22.2 of Agni (*yād ōṣadhīṣv apsv ā ...*), which again is apt for Agni. One has the feeling that the poet is trying to multiply the “wherever you are” verses and is not too scrupulous about his sources.

I.109 Indra and Agni

I.109.1: The kinship theme of the first hemistich is continued in pāda c, with *prāmati-* ‘solicitude’, since this abstract noun is regularly identified with the father -- e.g., I.31.10 *tvām agne prāmatis tvām pitāsi naḥ*. See further disc. ad I.71.7.

I.109.1–2: These two vss. are parallel in structure, with an initial *hí* clause with a 1st sg. augmented verb of perception (‘see’, ‘hear’), with kinship terms in the second pāda, and in the last pāda a 1st sg. verb of production (‘fashion’, ‘beget’) with a verbal product as obj. (‘thought’, ‘praise’).

I.109.2: The standard word for son-in-law is simply *jāmātar-*; the *ví-* is presumably a disparaging prefix (see Ge’s n. 2a), here rendered by “no-count.” *syālā-* is found only here in the RV, but is reasonably well attested in later texts and has good MIA correspondents.

I.109.3: The context of this verse is clearly the soma sacrifice, but there is no general agreement on the identity (/ties) of the participants. I am inclined to see the pl. bulls as the pressing stones, which are then renumbered as dual in the last pāda. Pressing stones are called bulls, are yoked, have reins, and are plural in pressing-stone hymns (for all these, see, e.g., X.94, esp. vss. 6–8). But it is also possible that the bulls here are the priests guiding the stones. I find highly unlikely Old’s view that the two stones in d are Indra and Agni.

I.109.4: In the ritual actions depicted in pāda d, *apsú* most naturally goes with *ā dhāvatam* and *mādhunā* with *prīktām*. Old insists that this must be the interpr., and all standard tr. follow him one way or the other. However, both the word order and, more importantly, the accent on *prīktām* make that impossible, if we take the text seriously. The poet must have meant the ritual reversal.

I.109.5: The first hemistich echoes 2ab, with a 1st sg. past tense of *√śru*, a dual pronominal obj. referring to Indra and Agni, of which a compared adjective (comparative / superlative) is predicated. See also Watkins 1995: 187.

In d I read with Old (and the standard tr.) *prācarṣaṇī*, see also Thieme (KlSch 252). This requires no change to the Saṃhitā text, but only to the Pp., which analyses the sequence as two words. The next pāda begins *prā carṣanībhyaḥ*, which definitely consists of two words, which could easily have led to the Pp. separation.

I.109.7: I do not entirely understand the purport of the second half-verse. Ge compares VII.76.4, which shows some similarities and which refers to the forefathers finding the light of the dawn cows in the Vala cave. Much closer by is vs. 12 of the last hymn

(I.108), in which Indra and Agni are urged to become exhilarated at sun rise in the middle of heaven. One way or another this must be a reference to the dawn sacrifice.

I.110 Ṛbhus

I.110.1: As Ge points out, the mention of the All Gods (*viśvādevya-*) marks the ritual reference as the Third Pressing, which is dedicated to the All Gods and in which the Ṛbhus have their share. This suggests that the repeated stretching in pāda a need not refer only to the periodic nature of Vedic sacrifice over the ritual year, but also perhaps to the repeated rites of the Soma pressing day. Since the theme of the “left-over” is prominent in the Third Pressing (see Jamison 1996: 129–32), “being stretched out again” fits this context.

I.110.2: As indicated in the publ. intro., the wandering Ṛbhus seem here to be compared to the poet and his ilk, tramp craftsmen in search of skilled work -- as Ge already suggests. (For more on itinerant priests and poets, esp. the Prātaritvan, see Jamison 1996: 184–89.) This transposition of divinities into a milieu conceived as human may account for the use of *dāśvāms-*, a stem ordinarily used of mortal worshipers, for Savitar – with the god Savitar standing in for a pious man to whom the itinerant poets might offer their services. For more on divine *dāśvāms-*, see comm. ad X.104.6.

In pāda b *āpākāḥ* is universally interpreted as ‘westward’, derived from *āpāñc-*, contrasted with immediately following *prāñcaḥ* ‘facing eastward’. So, e.g., Ge “Als ihr ... westwärts, ostwärts weiter zoget.” Although the direction words frequently co-occur, one might expect the stem formations here to be parallel, that is, using a form of *āpāñc-* rather than a derivative. Cf., e.g., *prāḡ āpāḡ údāk* (III.53.11, VIII.4.1=VIII.65.1). Moreover, the Ṛbhus’ journey seems to be purposeful and directed, given the two *prā* forms (... *prā ... aítana ... prāñcaḥ*) and the fact that they reach a goal. I take *āpāka-* instead as a privative form of *pāka-* ‘callow, simple(ton)’, hence ‘not simple; clever, shrewd’; cf. *āmūra-* ‘not stupid, no fool’ to *mūrā-* ‘stupid’.

The tone of the locution *māma ké cid āpāyaḥ* is somewhat hard to read; it is reminiscent of V.52.12 *té me ké cin ná tāyávaḥ*. The effect seems to be approximative -- “some kind of X,” “more or less like X” -- and slightly slangy. The referent of the *māma* is the 1st ps. speaker of vs. 1, contra Re, who takes the phrase as the direct speech of (one of?) the Ṛbhus.

I.110.3: *āsuva-* ‘impelled’ is of course a pun on Savitar, its subject.

The final pāda is parallel to 2a: ... *prā yád ichánta aítana / ... yác chravayánta aítana*, each with a pres. part. combined with the main verb *aítana*. What exactly is happening in 3d is unclear, since Agohya is a shadowy figure in Ṛbhu mythology. In Ṛbhu hymns they sleep in his house (I.161.11, IV.33.7); the most similar passage to ours is I.161.13, where the Ṛbhus after their sleep ask him *ágohya ká idám no abūbudhat* “O Agohya, who has awakened us here/now?” In our passage the mirror-image action seems to be depicted -- they’re making him heed, that is, waking him up. I do not know what to do with this observation, however.

I.110.4: I do not understand why the Ṛbhus are called *vāghāt*- here, since this term is ordinarily used of ritual officiants (see comm. ad I.3.5) and the Ṛbhus only indirectly participate in ritual. Ge tr. “die fahrende (?) Sānger,” but he provides no support for the itinerant part of the tr.

As Ge points out, *sūra-cakṣas*- is characteristic of gods; in I.89.7 it is used almost as a definition of such. So it may well here be an ancillary indication that the Ṛbhus achieved divine status.

I.110.5: *ūpastutā* in the Saṃhitā text is universally taken, flg. the Pp., as the nom. pl. of the past part., *ūpastutāḥ*. I take it rather as the loc. sg. of *ūpastuti*- ‘praise-invocation’. It doesn’t make sense to me that, after having been praised, they would be “crying in want” and seeking (further?) fame, whereas if they lack praise at the praise invocation, their seeking fame is understandable. Loc. sg. *-ā* to *-ī*-stems is found only interior in the pāda as here, but almost always before consonants. However, AiG III.152 counts 9 occurrences before *-u/-ū-*, as here.

Ge and Re take *upamām* as the obj. of *nādhmānāḥ*, but that stem is never transitive (as Re admits), and it appears in the preceding hymn (I.109.3) in clear intransitive usage. I take the adj. with *śrávaḥ* in d. It would also be possible to take it as an adverb: “in utmost need.” WG construe it with the cup in b; this seems the least likely possibility, since the miraculous deed of the Ṛbhus is depicted only in the first hemistich, quite separately their quest for fame in the second.

I.110.6: The conceptual basis for the common trope of “pouring prayers” is made clear here by the simile “like ghee with a ladle.”

Because of its lack of accent *asya* cannot modify *pítuḥ* and it should have a referent already present in the discourse. The referent is generally taken as the cup of vs. 5 and its father as Tvaṣṭar. I do not have anything better to offer.

Ge’s tr. of c seems very loose and somewhat puzzling: “... die die Pünktlichkeit seines Vaters erreichten ...” He seems to be taking *taraṇitvā* as neut. pl. rather than instr. sg. (like *taraṇitvéna* in 4a) and imposing a meaning “erreichten” on *saściré* that stretches the semantics of that stem. Re makes a good case for the instr. interpretation, and supplies an acc. “(l’exemple)” that allows the usual ‘follow’ sense for the verb. My tr. is similar.

vāja- in d is a low-key pun on the name of one of the Ṛbhus.

I.110.7: In my interpr. the individuation of the Ṛbhus continues in ab, though not with their usual names.

Note the switch in number between the opening of 6d *ṛbhávo vājam* (pl. – sg.) and that of 7b *ṛbhúr vājebhiḥ* (sg. – pl.).

In b the instr. pls. *vājebhir vásubhiḥ* are ordinarily taken as proper names and instr. of accompaniment. I instead take them as defining the quality for which the Ṛbhu gets designated ‘good one’ and ‘giver’. My tr. also assumes a chiasmic structure in *vājebhir vásubhiḥ vásur dadīḥ*, with the first instr. construed with the last nom. sg. and the middle two terms belonging together.

The analysis of *prtsutí*- is debated (see, e.g., Re EVP XIII.108; AiG II.2.640 §473aßA.; III.73, §29b; II.1 Nachtr. 67). On the one hand, it appears to be a compound consisting of the root noun *pít*- and a primary *-ti*-stem, probably to *√sū* ‘impel’ (with

shortening, like *sū-ṣuti* to the other root $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’). On the other, since the root noun *pṛt-* is only attested in the loc. pl. *pṛtsú* (though the root is also found in the derivatives *pṛtanā-*, etc.), *pṛtsutí-* appears to be a secondary *-tí-* stem anomalously built to a case form. This seems to be the current standard view. However, it seems entirely possible to me that we are dealing with a haplology of **pṛtsu-sutí-* (or *-sūtí-*), and my tr. reflects this analysis.

I.110.9: Again the standard tr. take *vájebhiḥ* as a proper name.

I.111 Ṛbhus

I.111.1: *vidmanāpasah* is formally odd, though clear in meaning. Given the independent instr. *vidmánā* in the preceding hymn (I.110.6), we might expect a phrase **vidmánā *apasah* “working with know-how,” with the internally derived *apas-* ‘laboring’ to neut. *apas-* ‘labor’. But though the sandhi would support this interpr., the accents are wrong on both words. For Wackernagel’s somewhat confused treatment of the cmpd., see comm. ad I.31.1. The correct analysis is, in my view, *vidmanā-apas-*, a bahuvrīhi built to the neut. *s-*stem *apas-* ‘labor’, work’, with the instr. to *vidmán-* as 1st member. The 2nd member receives the accent, somewhat unusually for a bahuvrīhi, like some other cmpds. with *-as-*stems as 2nd member.

Ge refuses to tr. *vīṣaṇvasū*, which seems just peevish, given the far more difficult words he’s willing to tr.

I.111.3: On \sqrt{mah} ‘bring to pass’, see comm. ad I.94.1.

I.111.5: Ge takes *bhārāya* as a (quasi-)infinitive with *sātīm* as obj. (“dass wir den Gewinn davontragen”), but the other exx. of dat. *bhārāya* do not show such verbal usage.

I.112 Aśvins

On the structure of the hymn, see the publ. intro. The challenging verses are the first four. I will not comment on the many obscure mythic fragments that constitute the Aśvins’ various rescues, nor attempt to etymologize the many personal names.

I.112.1: *pūrvácittī-* is variously interpreted and much discussed: see the long notes of Ge and Re ad loc., as well as Old, KISch 1152–56 (=NG 1916). The stem always occurs in the dat. and displays (quasi-)infinitival usage. Although it would be possible to take it as “(for me/us) to think first (of them)” and in the first pāda of a hymn this would be easily interpretable as a ritual reference, I consider it to have the opposite value: “(for them) to think first (of me/us).” Kutsa repeatedly calls on Heaven and Earth to be witness to his speech in the refrain of I.105: *vittām me asyá rodasī*. Cf. also X.35.1 *mahī dyāvāprthivī cetatām āpah* “Let great Heaven and Earth take cognizance of (our) work.” For further on *pūrvácittaye* see comm. ad IX.99.5.

The stem *iṣṭí-* is a perennial problem, since it can belong to several different roots: $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘desire, seek’, $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send, impel’, or \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice’. Ge (n. 1b) takes it here to an intransitive *iṣ* ‘rasch, gern willig kommen, eilen’, though his tr. ‘sich beeilen’ might seem to connect it with a reflexive sense of ‘send, impel’. By isolating *iṣṭāye* from the acc.

gharmám, he then needs to supply another verb to govern that acc., namely “(zu kochen).” Old (KISch 282–84 [=ZDMG 62 (1908)]), however, gives good reasons to connect our *iṣṭáye* with ‘seek’, though his interpr. of this pāda differs somewhat from mine. So also Re (see his n.). WG opt for ‘send’.

I.112.2: This verse is very dense and has been subject(ed) to a variety of interpretations, the details of which can’t be laid out here. The first hemistich depicts gifts or some other desirable things mounting the chariot of the Aśvins to be given. The gifts are qualified as *subhārāḥ* ‘easy to carry (away?)’ and ‘inexhaustible’ (*asaścatāḥ*); the latter word generally qualifies ‘streams’, objects that are not ordinarily capable of mounting anything. This already odd image (of gifts [implicitly compared to streams] performing the mounting) is made odder by the simile in b, which compares the chariot to something eloquent (*vacasām*) for thinking (*mántave*). It is of course not unusual for a verbal product (a hymn vel sim.) to be compared to a chariot, but the semantic distance traversed in this hemistich is quite far. This outré simile referring to the chariot may anticipate 4c below.

I wonder if the hapax thematic *vacasá-* (in acc. *vacasām*) is wrongly accented for **vacásam*, which could be an internally derived possessive adj. to the neut. *s*-stem *vācas-* ‘speech’. Although this putative **vacás-* ‘having speech, eloquent’ would likewise be a hapax, it would belong to a standard derivational type. BR (and Monier-Williams) take just this word as a derivative of √*vañc* ‘move waveringly’, which certainly would better fit a chariot. But the following the following *mántave* strongly favors a derivative of √*vac*, given the common conjunction of thought and speech.

The final phrase of c, *kárman iṣṭáye* echoes that of 1b *yāman iṣṭáye*, and the two forms of *iṣṭáye* should therefore be interpreted in the same way. I take *dhíyaḥ* ‘insights’ as the object of the seeking and supply “(us)” as the subject of the infinitive. Others tr., with different interpretations of *iṣṭáye*, have taken different routes.

I.112.3: The phrase *divyásya praśāsane* can be read in (at least) two different ways: either the Aśvins are “in command” of the divine (that is, they command the divine) or “at the command” of the divine (that is, the divine gives them the command). I follow Ge in taking it as the latter; he cleverly suggests that this shows the Aśvins in their proper position between gods and men -- in other words, they are middle management.

I.112.4: As discussed in the publ. intro., this verse seems to display extended double reference between three gods associated with the morning pressing and the Aśvins’ chariot, an association produced by shared epithets, though I must admit that there are many loose ends in this interpretation. See also Re’s n.

In pāda a *párijman-* ‘earth-encircler’ is a standard epithet of their chariot (I.20.3, IV.45.1, X.39.1, X.41.1, IV.3.6)(and, in the dual, of the Aśvins themselves: I.46.14, X.106.3). In a verse in an Aśvin hymn in which this is the first real word, it is hard to imagine that an audience would not first think of their chariot. However, the term also qualifies the Wind (e.g., VII.40.6, II.38.2), and the rest of pāda a, *tánayasya majmánā*, fits a divinity better than a chariot.

In its other three occurrences *dvimātár-* ‘having two mothers’ refers to Agni, as produced by the two kindling sticks. It is somewhat difficult to see how this word could

refer to the chariot, unless the Áśvins are configured as two mothers. On the other hand the phrase *dhūrṣú tarāṇayaḥ*, like our *tūrṣú tarāṇiḥ*, is found in an Áśvin hymn (VII.6.78) qualifying their horses in a verse also containing their chariot. (Cf. also *tarāṇi-* twice in another Áśvin hymn [IV.45.5, 7], but used of a priest, probably Agni.) Note also that *tūrṣú* not only plays on the *dhūrṣú* in the passage just cited, but also phonologically matches the *ū śú* of this hymn's refrain. On the adj. *tarāṇi-* see III.11.3; here I would slightly alter the tr. to “advancing in his advancing,” though that doesn't help very much.

In c *vicakṣanā-* ‘wide-gazing’ is otherwise esp. found as an epithet of Soma, though occasionally of other gods. As a qualifier of a chariot, it could mean ‘conspicuous’ (< ‘widely seen’). What it would mean for either Soma or the chariot to be ‘of triple thought’ (*trimāntu-*) is not clear to me. The word is a hapax, but it should be interpreted along with the *māntave* of 2b, where the word is connected with an image (however attenuated) of a chariot. It's worth keeping in mind that the Áśvins' chariot is characterized as having three of everything in I.34.2, 9, 12, and its three wheels are mentioned elsewhere. As for a potential connection with Soma, the ‘three’ of course suggests the three soma pressings, though exactly what the *-māntu-* would have to do with them isn't clear to me. Perhaps more likely is the three types of ritual speech deployed in the soma sacrifice.

Note that there is an implicit numerical ordering of the subjects of the three pādas: (*pārijman* = 1), *dvimātār-*, *trimāntu-*.

In sum, although the vocabulary of this verse has tantalizing resonances with other passages and although I am fairly certain there is a pervasive double meaning, I do not feel I (or anyone else) has entirely “cracked” this verse. The tack taken by Ge (/WG) of simply taking Parijman, Dvimātār, and Trimāntu as PNs is the easy way out but does not advance the interpretation.

I.112.5: In “rasping Rebha” (*rebhā-*) I have incorporated the gloss into the name. The word occurs in the next hymn (I.113.17) in its lexical meaning.

I.112.6: On *āraṇa-* see comm. on VIII.70.8.

I.112.9: The adjs. *mādhumantam āsaścatam* might better be tr. proleptically: “you revived the river (so that it was) honied and inexhaustible.” Ge (/WG) simply supply a verb in pāda a: “(machtet).”

Note the phonetic echo in *śrutāryaṃ nāryam*.

I.112.10: *atharvī-* as ‘den Weg verfolgend’ from Hoffmann (see EWA I.805 and Scar 496–97). Ge's “pfeilschnelle (?)” is distinctly odd, and I don't know the basis for his interpr.

I.112.11: Kaksīvant is the next poet in the collection after Kutsa. He's explicitly identified as an Auśija in I.18.1 and by implication in I.119.9, 122.4–5. What the merchant (*vaṇij-*) is doing here I have no idea – unless it's just the echo of the unusual suffix *-ij-*.

I.112.15: On the lexeme medial $\sqrt{v}pā$ ‘extract by drinking, separate fluids by drinking’ see disc. ad VII.22.4. Why this lexeme is used here of an ant (or someone so called) isn’t clear. Perhaps it reflects a folk belief or observation about the eating/drinking habits of ants. Popular Science Monthly (of May 1877) reports that “Some species—such, for instance, as the small brown garden ant—ascend bushes in search of aphides. The ant then taps the aphids gently with her antennæ, and the aphids emit a drop of sweet fluid, which the ant drinks.” This could possibly be considered extraction. And a more recent article (Smithsonian.com, Aug. 16, 2012) has photographs of transparent Indian ants whose abdomens change color depending on the color of what they drink. The photographs of the ants’ mouth parts attempting to penetrate drops of colored water could also be viewed as extraction.

I.112.16: Though some of the occurrences of $\acute{s}ayú-$ have been reinterpreted as meaning ‘orphan’ (see comm. ad IV.18.12), given the density of PNs in this set of vss. and the lack of particular “fit” of ‘orphan’, I would keep the PN here, and probably likewise in the other Aśvin catalogue hymns I.116.22, 117.20, 118.8, 119.6.

Śyumarśmi in the publ. tr. is a typo for Śyumaraśmi.

I.112.17: Note the phonological play in $pá\theta harvā\acute{j}á\theta harasya$. Because of its accent, Ge (/WG) take $\acute{j}á\theta hara-$ as an adjectival deriv. of $\acute{j}á\theta hára-$ ‘belly’, hence ‘paunchy’ (supposedly of his wagon). But I think it likely that its accent simply follows its phonological twin $pá\theta harvā$, which immediately precedes (see also Old). The only possible indication of the independent existence of $\acute{j}á\theta hara-$ is $\acute{j}á\theta hala-$ in I.182.6.

I.112.18: The problem of the sg. voc. $an\acute{g}irah$ is treated by Old.

The verb $niranyá\theta ha\acute{h}$ is also problematic; in fact Ge declines to tr. it. Re suggests that it might be a corruption of $*ni(r)-ri\acute{n}\theta ha\acute{h}$ to $nír\sqrt{r}\acute{r}$ ‘let flow, let escape’, but the corruption involved would have to be fairly massive and would be unmotivated. Old sees it as a denom. to a form derived from \sqrt{ran} ‘take pleasure’. WG tr. “ihr ... innerlich Freude habt,” following Gotō 1987: 258 n. 582, who accepts Gr’s connection with \sqrt{ran} ‘take pleasure’, though he attributes the accentuation not to a passive stem $ran\acute{y}á-$ (as Gr does, despite the active ending) but to a shift from the standard pres. stem $rá\acute{n}ya-$ by association with denominatives like $turanyá-$ (or perhaps to its being a denominative itself). This analysis is accepted by Kulikov (Vedic $-ya$ -presents, pp. 605–5), with further discussion. Although a connection with \sqrt{ran} makes more sense than Re’s suggestion, it does not make much sense in context -- or rather, although the tr. is harmless and not jarring, it has nothing to do with the Vala myth treated in the following pāda. It is also the case that \sqrt{ran} does not otherwise occur with $ní$ and forms of this root are also almost always construed with a source from which the pleasure is derived. By contrast, my tr. follows a suggestion of Brereton’s that it is haplologized from $*nirayana-yá-$ ‘seek/find a way out’. Despite the further machinery required, this interpr. makes more sense in the Vala myth context.

I.112.19: The original desid. stem $\acute{s}ikṣa-$ to $\sqrt{s}ak$ ‘be able’ has become essentially independent of its root and is extraordinarily well attested. In my view it means ‘do one’s best / exert oneself’ by way of a more literal ‘seek to show one’s ability’. It is

overwhelmingly construed with a dative of the lucky recipient; cf. a passage chosen almost at random: VI.28.2 *índro yájvane pr̥ṇaté ca śíkṣati* “Indra does his best for the man who sacrifices and delivers in full.” There is no other case complement with the simplex forms. Here, however, we encounter *ā śíkṣa-* (*ā ... āśíkṣatam*) with an acc. (*aruṇīḥ*). Ge tr. “die Rötlichen zu gewinnen (?) suchen”; Pirart (Nāsatya I.150 “vous avez procuré les Aruṇi [...] ...,” without registering the desid. morphology. (Re [EVP XVI.11] suggests rather “gratifier qq’un (de dons),” without further support; for a different interpr. see Klein [DGRV II.193] “ye tried to master(?) the ruddy ones.”) My tr., “did your best to obtain,” is similar to Ge’s. I think that *ā* with *śíkṣa-* functions in the same way as in the idioms *ā√yaj* ‘obtain [i.e., (bring) here] by sacrifice’, *ā√pū* ‘obtain [i.e., (bring) here] by purifying’. There is another disguised ex. of *ā śíkṣa-* in X.48.2 (q.v.). The preverb *úpa* also triggers an acc. complement with *śíkṣa-*; see I.173.10, III.52.6, IX.19.6, X.42.2, X.95.17.

Gr assigns *sudevyām* to a them. stem *sudevyā-* ‘Schar der guten Götter’, and Ge tr. it as “Göttergunst.” However, in his (bottom of the page) n. 1 he offers the alternative “die Sudevī heimführet,” and others have followed the PN interpr.: see Re (EVP XVI.11), Klein (DGRV II.193), Macd./Keith (Ved. Index s.v. Su-dās), somewhat dubiously Remmer (Frauennamen, p. 95) – rejected by Pirart (Les Nāsatyas I, ad loc.). There are two stumbling blocks to this interpr.: 1) the *vr̥kī-*inflectional form to the eponymous *devī-* stem; 2) the same form found in X.35.4, where this interpr. isn’t possible (but see comm. at that passage). As for 1), AiG III.179 cites a few *vr̥kī-*forms to *devī* nouns, and Remmer cites as parallel the *vr̥kī* name *yamī-*. Given the syntactic and lexical parallelism between pādas a and c in this vs., with the verb *√vah*, an acc. obj. (clearly fem. in pāda a), and the dative of a male PN, and given the “wife-bringing” theme of pāda a, I favor the personal name interpr. despite the morphological issue.

I.112.20: The problem in these obscure fragments of tales is to decide which of the words are PNs and which are adjs. In c Ge takes the three fem. acc. as separate names, but I prefer to take *omiyāvatīm* and *subhārām* as proleptic adjectives, since both stems are found earlier in the hymn in full lexical usage (*omyāvantam* 7b, *subhārā(h)* 2a). Sim. Scar (p. 639), Remmer (Frauennamen, p. 85).

I.112.21: Pāda c presents a major disruption of the pattern that has monotonously structured this hymn since vs. 5; this disruption may signal the approaching end of the hymn. Unlike every c-pāda in the hymn (starting indeed with vs. 1) save for the immediately preceding one, the pāda doesn’t begin with *yābhiḥ* (11c doesn’t actually *begin* with *yābhiḥ*, but it is found within the pāda). Moreover the verb *bharathaḥ* is not accented and therefore cannot be in even a notional relative clause, despite the *yád* that immediately follows it. Curiously, most interpr. ignore or explain away these deviations. Ge. tr. as a “wenn” clause and considers *yád* “Attraktion für *yābhiḥ*” (attraction to what he doesn’t say). Old ascribes *yád* for *yābhiḥ* to metrical needs and wishes to accent *bharathaḥ*, because switching to a main clause is “recht unwahrscheinlich.” Since the poet clearly had no problem maintaining his template in verse after verse, I find it impossible to believe that the departures from this structure here are not deliberate -- a kind of putting on the brakes before the end, just as the full template took awhile to take shape at the beginning of the hymn. More recent tr. reflect the verse’s structure better: WG make c

a parenthetical clause (though, oddly, repeating the “attraction” explan. in the n.); Scar (p. 444) also treats the clause as parenthetical.

The formally ambiguous *sarāḍbhyah* is taken by Ge (/WG) as dative, but given real-world knowledge -- bees produce honey and don’t need it brought to them -- it surely makes better sense as an ablative (so also Lü., Scar.), in what looks almost like an izafe construction: *yāt sarāḍbhyah*.

I.112.24: To avoid vegetative confusion, ‘fruitful’ would be better tr. as ‘profitable’ (*āpnasvatīm*). See *āpnaḥ* in the next hymn (I.113.9d).

Ge tr. *adyūtyé* as “wo nicht der Würfel entscheidet”; this is certainly possible, but I think it more likely refers to a situation dire enough that we don’t want to take chances.

I.113 Dawn

I.113.1: Ge suggests, probably correctly, that b concerns Agni.

Though most tr., explicitly or implicitly, take Night as subj. of c as well as d, it makes more sense to me for Dawn and Night to be contrastive subjects of the final two pādas, with Dawn going forth as Night cedes her place. The balanced contrast is brought out strongly in the next two vss.

I.113.4: Ge and Re take *citrā* as the subj. of *vī ... āvaḥ*, not of *āceti*, but the phonological and etymological figure *āceti citrā* and the position of the preverb *vī* in tmesis (surely initial in its syntagm) make this unlikely.

I.113.5: The form *ābhogāya* (thus in sandhi) has been much discussed. With Old I take it as a loc. *ābhogāye* to the same stem (whatever its source) as *ābhogāyam* in a previous Kutsa hymn, I.110.2. I do not think it is a dative, either in infinitival use or as a dat. obj. parallel to *rāyē* of the infinitival *iṣṭāye*.

I.113.6: Ge takes *ārtham iva* as a real simile, containing a pun on *ārtha-* (though he does not call attention to it): “um (an sein Geschäft) wie nach einem Reiseziel zu gehen,” with *ārtha-* ‘business’ in the frame and ‘goal’ in the simile. This is clever and may well be right. In my publ. tr. I take *iva* as a sort of indefinitizer: “whatever his goal.” WG by contrast seem to take it as a definitizer: “um just zum Ziel zu gehen,” which seems an odd use of *iva*.

The standard tr. construe c with d and the phrase *vīsadrśā jīvitā* as object of *abhipracākṣe* (e.g., Re “Afin qu’ils considèrent les (modes d’) existence divers, l’Aurore a éveillé toutes les créatures”). I am skeptical of the syntax, because the d-pāda is a refrain. Although in some refrain hymns, the refrain is sometimes integrated into the verse as a whole, this refrain does not seem to work that way. Moreover, the sense conveyed seems contrary to what preceded it: the creatures in 5–6ab seems single-mindedly intent on their own particular goals, not open to contemplating different “lifestyles.” I therefore take c as an independent clause, summarizing 5–6ab: different people have different aims. This requires taking neut. *jīvitā* as ‘living beings’, rather than ‘modes of living’. I would prefer that it was not neut., but cf. neut. *bhūvanāni* (in the

refrain and often elsewhere) ‘creatures’. *jīvitā-* is found only once elsewhere in the RV in IV.54.2, where it seems to mean ‘lives’.

I.113.7–13: These verses have a surprising density of forms of *ví*√*vas* ‘dawn forth’ (7b, d, 8c, 9b, 10b [2x], 11b, 12d, 13a, b, c), whereas vss. 1–6 lack any such forms -- though there’s a teasing echo in 4b *ví* ... *āvaḥ* ‘She opened, uncovered’, belonging, however, to √*vṛ*. See also comments on vs. 14.

I.113.10: As noted in the publ. intro., this is the most challenging verse of the hymn.

Note the phonetic figure *kíyāti(y) ā yāt samáyā bhāvāti*, which may help account for the unusual lengthening in *kíyāti* (for expected *kíyati*, which is the Pp. reading). The only other occurrence of this loc. (II.30.1) is also followed by *ā*, though the figure stops there. See AiG III.256 for various alternative explanations of the long *ā*.

The crucial term for the interpr. of the verse is the instr. adverbial *samáyā*, which is universally taken as ‘in the middle’ in its various occurrences, presumably from something like “with the same (on both sides).” But this doesn’t really make sense here: since today’s Dawn is precisely in the middle between the former ones and the ones to come, at what point she will be there is *not* a question we need to ask. A different interpr. of the word arises from examining all the occurrences in context. Every passage crucially contains the preverb/particle *ví* (save for VII.66.15, where *visvam* takes its place):

- I.56.6 *ví vṛtrāsya samáyā pāsyārujaḥ*
- I.73.6 *ví síndhavaḥ samáyā sasrur ádrim*
- I.113.10 *kíyāty ā yāt samáyā bhāvāti yā vyūṣúr yās ca nūnām vyuchān*
- I.163.3 *ási sūmena samáyā vípṛktaḥ*
- I.166.9 *ákṣo vaś cakrá samáyā ví vāvṛte*
- VII.66.15 *śīrṣṇāḥ-śīrṣṇo jágatas tasthúṣas pátiṃ samáyā visvam ā rájaḥ*
- IX.75.4 *rómāṇy ávyā samáyā ví dhāvati*
- IX.85.5 *vy ávyáyam samáyā vāram arṣasi*

Since *ví* ‘apart’ and *sám* ‘together’ are oppositional preverbs that frequently work formulaically with each other, *samáyā* seems to partake more in the semantics of *sám* than of *samá-* ‘same’ and to mean ‘altogether’, ‘all at once’, or ‘together with’. I take it in the last meaning here: the question being asked is when the current Dawn will be (re)joined with her sister Dawns, both preceding and following her.

I.113.11: With Gr (et al.) I take *praticákṣyā* as the gerundive; cf. I.124.8.

I.113.12: Pāda b contains complex phonetic echoes: *sumnāvārī sūñṛtā īráyantī*, with repeated *su/ū* as well as mirror-image *ārī/ īrá* mediated by *ṛ*; the *n* in each word and the final *ī* of the first and third could be added.

In c the phrase *bíbhṛatī devāvītim* is somewhat puzzling; *devāvīti-* generally refers to humans’ ‘pursuit of the gods’, that is, the fervent invitation to the gods to partake of our sacrifice. It should not, therefore, be something that Dawn “brings,” as she brings prizes, for example. I therefore take the fem. part. *bíbhṛatī* in its birth sense: she bears / brings to birth our pursuit of the gods by waking us up to initiate this pursuit. Cf. a similar birth context in 19d.

I.113.13: Note that in this verse a single Dawn subsumes the various temporal dawns of the surrounding vss.

I.113.14: This verse plays on the lexeme *ví√vas* that dominated vss. 7-13. The verse begins with the preverb *ví*, setting up the expectation that a form of *√vas* will follow. But instead the pāda ends with *adyaut*, a near synonym. The next pāda does end with *āvaḥ*, which matches (*vy*) *āvaḥ* of 13b but belongs instead to the root *√vr* ‘(un)cover’. The verb is here construed with pāda-initial *āpa*, but the dominant preverb *ví* is implied by the immediate preceding word (*de*)*vī* (*devy āvaḥ*). Cf. also remarks on 4b *ví ... āvaḥ* ‘She opened, uncovered’ above.

I.113.15: Another in the series of *ví* SHINE verbs is found in d *vy āśvait*, whose *ví* is reinforced by the pāda-initial *vi* in *vibhātīnām*.

Note also the chiasmic phonetic figure in b: *citrām ketūm kṛṇute cekitānā*; the distribution of *i* and *u* vowels is also chiasmic, but skips the verb. This is also a triple etymological figure, of course (minus *kṛṇute*).

I.113.17: Ge and Re take the singer, the subject of ab, as the human singer, which in turn requires them to interpret the mid. part. *stāvānaḥ*, which is overwhelmingly passive in value, as having active meaning. I (and independently WG) take the referent in ab to be Agni (so already, tentatively, Old). This not only allows *stāvānaḥ* to be interpreted in its usual fashion, but also fits the rest of the lexicon. Agni is regularly called *vāhni*- in his standard role as conveyor of the oblation, and he is also called ‘hoarse-voiced’ because he crackles (cf. I.127.10, VI.3.6, VI.11.3).

I.113.18: My interpr. of the 2nd hemistich differs in several respects from the standard. In d I take *asvadā(h)* ‘giving horses’ as acc. pl. fem. with the dawns (so also Re, Scar), not nom. sg. masc. with the soma-presser. Although the latter is possible (and *asvadā*- is elsewhere used of mortal patrons), it seems here to belong with the characterizations of the dawns in pāda a: *gōmatīḥ ... sāravāīrā(h)*. Note that Dawn is addressed as *asva-sūnṛte* ‘liberal with horses’ in V.79.1–10.

More radical is my interpr. of pāda c, which is much discussed (see elaborate notes of Old, Ge, and Re; also Scar 66–67, somewhat differently 202, 617). Most take the simile *vāyōr iva* to refer to the surging up of gifts *as swiftly* as the wind; in other words the unexpressed common quality is the speed with which the gifts come. I think rather that the hapax *udarkā*- refers to the ‘raising’ of the litany that accompanies the distribution of the dakṣiṇās at the Morning Pressing. (Cf. *udṛc*- RV 2x “when the chant is raised.”) And this litany is compared to the one accompanying the first offering of the Morning Pressing to Vāyu. Note that personified *sūnṛtā* is closely associated with Vāyu in the two nearby Vāyu hymns I.134.1 and I.135.7. That it is not the physical aspect of wind that is at issue is suggested by the use of *vāyú*- not *vāta*-, as Re points out.

I.114 Rudra

By RVic standards this hymn is almost laughably simple and elementary, very different from Kutsa’s usual products.

There is much repetition and chaining of vocabulary in this hymn: *kṣayādvīra-* is prominent at the beg. (1-3, + 10), with *vīra-* reprised in 3 and 8. See also *śām* 1, 2; *aśyāma* 2-3; *sumatī* 3, 4, 9 + *sumnāyān* 3, *sumnā* 9, 10; *nī hvayāmahe* 4-5 [*havāmahe* 8]; *nāmasā* 2, 5 + *nāmaḥ* 11; *tvēṣam* 4-5; *kapardīn-* 1, 5; *mṛḍā* 2, 6, 10 + *mṛḍayātama* 9; *tokā-tānaya-* 6, 8; *haviḥ* 3, *haviṣmant-* 8; *rāśva* 6, 9; *pitār marūtām* 6, 9; *vṛṇimahe* 4, 9; *āre* 4, 10; *śārma* √*yam* 5, 10). The first 5 vss. are also marked by 1st pl. verbs.

I.114.2: The weak pf. form (*ā*)*yejé* is anomalous in two regards: it does not agree with the standard weak pf. *īj-* and it produces a bad cadence here. The form is found twice elsewhere in the RV: *āyejé* in X.63.7 where *Manu* is also the subj. and the form is in the same (bad) metrical slot – the two passages seem to be connected – and VI.36.2 with the preverbs *ānu prá* and in an acceptable metrical slot. The weak pf. stem *īj* is not found with preceding preverb. The forms are disc. at length by Kü (391–92) with ample citation of previous lit. Schindler considers *īj* the older form, to the laryngeal-initial root (PIE**H₂jaḡ*) with reduplication **Hi-Hiḡ*-, in contrast to **ja*-initial roots, which redupl. **ja-iC*. For Schindler the *yej* forms are metrically driven replacements and serve to avoid the coalescence of the vowel of the preverb + *īj*, esp. in the cadence. (Neither he nor Kü seems to recognize that the *yej* forms produce bad cadences, a problem that undercuts the arguments that both of them use to explain their appearance in this context.) Kü by contrast questions Schindler’s posited distinction in redupl. between initial laryngeal roots **H₂jaC* and glide-initial **jaC*, since the development of super-weak forms of the type *ūcūr* to √*vac* happens to roots without initial laryngeals, only glides. Kü argues that whether or not the root had a preceding initial laryngeal the redupl. to a *(*H*)*il₂uaC* root was originally always *(*H*)*il₂ua-*. The *u/i*-type redupl. developed by analogy to *(*H*)*ail₂u₂C-* roots. Therefore *īj* is an inner-Vedic development, not an archaism per Schindler. Yet – even though he thinks *yej* shows the older reduplication pattern – he still allows the possibility that it’s a new formation nonetheless. Kü’s disc. is ultimately indecisive.

As for the metrical problem, Ludwig and Arnold want to emend to **āyajé*, of somewhat dubious morphological provenance. I very tentatively suggest another possibility, that in this preverb-verb combination the underlying form was **ā (H)i(H)ij-ai*, with the *i*-reduplication becoming a glide between *ā* and the redupl. syllable, which was then originally short: **āyijé*. The drawback to this explanation (or one of them) is that there is no obvious source for the *-ej* that was substituted at some point in the redaction.

I.114.3: Note the cognate acc. in *juhavāma ... haviḥ*.

I.114.4: *vañkū-* is variously interpreted and etymologized; see EWA s.v. In this passage Ge takes it as ‘den fliegenden’ with ?, Re sim. (‘volant’ without ?); WG refuse to tr., but mention the common gloss ‘krumm’ in their n. Assuming (with most) that it belongs to √*vañc* ‘go crookedly, meander’, I take it here as ‘meandering’ → ‘wandering’, characterizing an itinerant poet. See *ā cara* in the previous vs. (3c), which suggests such wandering. For a different specialization of the root meaning, see I.51.11.

I.114.5: Note the rhyming figure *śārma várma chardír*.

I.114.6: With Klein (DGRV I.190) I take *ca* in c as conjoining the two impvs. in polarized position in the hemistich: *#rāśva ca ... mṛḷa#* in an X *ca* ... Y construction.

I.114.7: “wee little one” reflects the suffixation of the (sometimes) diminutive *-kā-* to *ārbha-*, which already means ‘small’.

I.114.8: The bahuvrīhi *āriṣṭa-vīra-* ‘possessing heroes who cannot be harmed’ in 3d is echoed by *vīrān mā ... vadhīḥ* “Don’t smite our heroes,” with the cmpd evoked by *rīriṣaḥ* ‘don’t harm’, which ends the preceding pāda. I suggest that the pattern of pāda-init. *mā* found through all of vs. 7 and the 1st half of 8 is broken here so that *rīriṣaḥ* / *vīrān* can be juxtaposed.

The final pāda of the vs. also recalls vs. 3, in a somewhat sly way: 3d ends *juhavāma te havīḥ* “We will pour you an oblation,” with an etymological figure as noted above. Compare 8d *haviṣmantah ... tvā havāmahe*, also with a form of *havís-* and a 1st pl. verb, which, despite its superficial similarity to *juhavāma*, belongs to the separate root $\sqrt{hū}$, *hvā* ‘call’, which has been amply represented in the hymn by the alternative pres. stem *hvayāmahe* (4b, 5b).

The adv. *sādam* ‘always’ is almost always followed by *id*, which seems to add no special nuance.

I.114.10: The standard tr. supply ‘weapon’ with *goghnām ... pūruṣaghnām*, and this is certainly possible. I supply ‘anger’ (*hēlas-*) because of the similarity of this clause (*āré te goghnām utā pūruṣaghnām* to 4c *āré asmād daívyam hēlo asyatu*.

On neut. *dvibārḥaḥ* see comm. ad VII.24.2; for the phenomenon in general comm. ad II.31.5.

I.115 Sūrya

For a more confident interpr. of the enigmatic verses 4–5 than is found in the publ. tr., see comments on those vss. below.

I.115.2: The image of men stretching their yokes across may refer in part, as Ge suggests, to the beginning of the “Tagewerk des Landmanns.” But as most interpr. mention, it surely also (or, in my opinion, primarily) is a reference to the beginning of the morning sacrifice: the root \sqrt{tan} ‘stretch’ is regularly used of the sacrifice (probably because of the “stretching out” of the sacrificial ground by carrying the offering fire to the east). That the men are characterized as “seeking the gods” (*devayāntaḥ*) supports a sacrificial interpr.

I.115.3: For *étagva-* see comm. on VIII.70.7.

I.115.4–5: As indicated in the publ. intro., although at the time I was not certain what these verses depict, I was (and remain) skeptical of the notion that the two hemistichs refer to the so-called day-sun and night-sun respectively, as Ge (/WG in part) and Re take it. Among other things, I find it unlikely that the unequivocal proclamation of the Sun’s supremacy that begins this verse (*tāt sūryasya devatvām tán mahitvām* “This is the Sun’s divinity, this his greatness”) would pertain to what these scholars see in 4d: the rather

ignominious bundling up of the Sun in Night's garment to sneak him back across the sky to rise again the next day. I now feel I have a much clearer understanding of what is going on in these verses -- I think I have cracked their code -- and it all refers to the rising sun. I will lay it out below.

I.115.4: Pāda b fairly clearly refers to Night interrupting her weaving of darkness and gathering up her work when the Sun hitches up his horses for his morning journey. I take Night to be the subject of *sām jabhāra*, not the Sun (as do Ge, Re, Maurer), based on the similarity to II.38.4 *pūnaḥ sām avyad vītatam vāyanti, madhyā kārta ny ādhāc chākma dhīraḥ* "Once again the weaver has wrapped up what was stretched out; in the middle of his work the mindful (worker) has set down his craft," where the weaver is the one who wraps up his own work.

I would now likely connect c with b, rather than only with d: "in the middle of (her) work (Night) has gathered together what was stretched out, when he (=Sun) has yoked his tawny horses from their seat." This would more clearly explain what the divinity and greatness of the Sun consist of and sketch a cause-and-effect relationship between the sun's beginning his journey and Night's breaking off her work.

This leaves pāda d. As noted above, Ge and Re think Night covers the sun with her dark garment and turns him into the night sun (see Ge's n.: "Die Nacht hüllt jetzt den Sūrya in ihr Gewand, d. h. in Dunkel; sie macht die Tages- zur Nachtsonne.") However, the actual wording of the Sanskrit text doesn't work particularly well in this night-sun scenario: stretching the garment for him is not the same as wrapping him in it. Still, on the surface it works even less well in my scenario in which only the day-sun is depicted in this verse. Others take this pāda as I do, as continuing the depiction of sunrise, but have not produced convincing ways to make the Sanskrit work that way. Maurer tr. "then upon herself Night spreads her garment," with the comment (p. 174) "she puts the garment she has woven upon herself, thus removing it from the world and allowing the light of the sun to take its place." This would solve the problem, but "herself" must render *simāsmāi*, which must be masc. (or neut)., not fem. (though see Ge's suggested way out of this difficulty in his n. 5 to his n. 4d: that *simāsmāi* stands for a reflexive like *ātman-* and is therefore masc.). WG also believe that this verse concerns only the morning sun. See disc. in the notes, though I am puzzled by how the disc. and the tr. relate. Their interpr. of d seems to me to fall short.

In my view Night's stretching her garment for him is in part a gesture of submission: she recognizes the sun's ascendancy (both literally and conceptually) and removes her black garment and spreads it out for him to pass over, to indicate that she yields to his superior power. (Fortunately she doesn't have Clytemnestra tendencies.) But this image also depicts a real-world phenomenon, that of the sun rising through morning mist or dark clouds clustering at the horizon. These can be seen as the remnants of the darkness of Night, the garment she has discarded at the place on the edge of the visible world where the sun first emerges. The pāda begins with *ād* 'just after that' -- namely, just after he has yoked his horses from their seat, the beginning of his journey -- suggesting that this is the first moment of sunrise.

I.115.5: This verse (esp. cd) works better in the day-sun / night-sun model than vs. 4, but I am still skeptical about that interpr. and can provide one that allows the verse to confine

itself to sunrise. I am especially dubious about the version of the day-sun / night-sun model promulgated by Ge (/WG), Re -- that the two surfaces of the sun are Mitra (bright) and Varuṇa (dark) respectively -- since this interpretation is likely anachronistic, as it rests on a later Vedic conception of the two deities. Freed from that model, I take the genitives *mitrásya varuṇasya* of pāda a as dependent not on *rūpām* in b with most tr., but with *abhicākṣe*, following Maurer's rendering of the syntax, hence my "for Mitra and Varuṇa to see." This interpr. may be syntactically problematic, as we would expect a dative subject -- and do find a dative subject with this infinitive, even several times in Kutsa's oeuvre (I.102.2 *asmé sūryācandramāsābhicākṣe* "for us to see the sun and moon"; I.113.6 *dabhrām pásyadbhya urviyā vicākṣe* "for (even) those who see (only) a little to gaze out widely"). The case discrepancy troubles me, but I must assume that, given that infinitives are verbal *nouns*, nominal rection prevailed here. It might better be translated "for the sight /seeing of M+V."

This interpretation fits the verse better conceptually and makes a nice thematic ring with 1b, which contains the common trope of the sun as the eye of Mitra and Varuṇa, using the word *cākṣuḥ*, derivationally related to (*abhi*)-*cākṣe*. The expression in our vs. is ambiguous; it could be turning the notion of sight on its head -- M+V are seeing the sun, not seeing by means of him -- or, more likely, intends the same idea as "the eye of M+V" in 1b, "so that M+V can see (the world)."

The position of *anyád ... anyád* in cd requires that they be definite and in a "the one ... the other" relationship (so all tr.). The gleaming surface of c fits well into my scenario -- it is another image of the bright eye of M+V depicted in ab. I think it is called *anantá*- 'unbounded' to represent the fact that it is not possible (certainly not advisable) to look at the bright sun in the sky and see its outline, its edge. But the complementary black surface of pāda d seems, on first thought, to impose the night-sun image. However, it is easily interpretable within the framework provided by the other troublesome d-pāda, 4d. As I just argued, the garment that Night stretches for the sun in 4d is her discarded black raiment that lingers at the horizon as mist and clouds. When the sun rises through clouds, it can seem almost dark, certainly in comparison to an unclouded sun, and its outline is clearly visible, as opposed to the *anantá*- surface of the bright sun in pāda c. At such an occluded sunrise, individual bright rays can shoot out of the clouds. In our passage these would be the *harítaḥ* 'tawny horses' that are jointly bringing him (*sám bharanti*), the same *harítaḥ* he hitched up in 4c before beginning his journey through the mists of 4d.

Thus we can construct a consistent and convincingly naturalistic interpr. of these two verses as referring only to sunrise, without the dubious baggage of the "night-sun." The second of the two verses, which is the last real verse of the hymn, also forms a ring with vs. 1: not only is the sun identified as the eye/sight of Mitra and Varuṇa (1b, 5a), but the "brilliant face" (*citrám ... ánīkam*) of 1a is reprised by the "gleaming surface" (*rúśat ... pájāḥ*) of 5c.

[I.116–20 JPB]

I.121 Indra or the All Gods

This is a very problematic hymn, and both the publ. tr. and this comm. are tentative and tenuous on many points. There are some quirks that reappear throughout the

hymn: a remarkable no. of pāda-final *góḥ* (2b, 2d, 7b, 9a) – is this some sort of hidden encoding? It’s also part of a pattern of favoring pāda-final monosyllables (*vrām* 2c, *rāt* 3a, *dyūn* 3b, 7c, *dyām* 3d, *vaḥ* 4d, *nṛn* 12a, 13a, *dāt* 12c – and, flg. Hoffmann, *daḥ* 10d). Also a fondness for *pári* and *prá*, the former esp. in opaque contexts.

I.121.1: Ge (/WG) take pāda a as a separate clause and consider *pātram* ‘cup, vessel’ a metaphorical designation of Indra (“Ist er wohl das rechte Gefäß für solch gottergebene Männer?”). With Old I consider this to be an anachronistic application of the much later sense of ‘cup, bowl’ to mean ‘appropriate recipient’. (It is true that Indra is referred to as a ‘tankard’ [I.61.9] and a ‘beaker’ [I.100.12] elsewhere, but in those cases it is his capacious size that is at issue.) Old and Re both avoid the Indra = cup interpretation by supplying a verb (different verbs in each case). I see no reason to supply a verb, since *pātram* can be an acc. goal with *turanyán* (see X.61.11 for another acc. of goal with the same stem), a possibility also allowed by Old.

Although in the publ. tr. I took *nṛn* as gen. pl., flg. Old, Ge, etc. (see in general AiG III.211–12), I now believe that all or almost all instances of this form are actually the acc. pl. they appear to be. In this case I would emend the tr. to “hastening to the men, to the cup of those seeking the gods.” Note the acc. pl. *nṛn* in vs. 12 in similar context. See comm. ad I.146.4, X.29.4.

I.121.2: Ge and Re take *náro* as the nom. sg. of a thematic form of the ‘man’ stem, a nom. sg. that is otherwise not found in the RV (save possibly in *svàrṇara-*) and only very sparingly in the rest of Vedic (see AiG III.212). I follow Gr, Old, and WG in taking it as a gen. sg. of the athematic ‘man’ stem, even though the other two occurrences registered by Gr are better taken as nom. pl. It replaces expected **nur* (cf. Aves. *nərəš*). It is parallel here to *góḥ*, and this gen. expression characterizes the type of *dráviṇa-* that Indra is providing as a prize. Since *dráviṇa-* is a derivative of *√dru* ‘run’, it really is ‘moveable wealth’, and both cattle and men would qualify. The pair *náro góḥ* is echoed by the more conventional expression *cātuṣpade ... dvipāde* in 3d, which also contains the qualifier *náryāya*.

The opening *ṛbhúr vājāya* contains the names of two of the three Ṛbhus, though the words are not so used here.

As indicated in the publ. intro., the second hemistich is much discussed, and I will not treat other interpretations in detail. It depicts a buffalo (*mahiṣá-*) gazing after (and probably longing after) three females, or, in my interpr., one female in three different shapes. These shapes are three standard female roles, arranged chronologically: marriageable girl (according to my interpr. of *vrā-* as ‘chooser’; see comm. VIII.2.6), wife/consort (*ménā-* < ‘exchange token’; see comm. I.62.7), and mother. The *mahiṣá-* is Indra, as often; this word also evokes the term for the chief wife of a king, *māhiṣī-*, thus indirectly adding another female role. I identify the female referent of all three as Dawn. Kakṣīvant calls Dawn “begetter of cows” (*gávām jānitrī*) in nearby I.124.5, like our *mātáram góḥ*, and also compares her to a *vrā-* in I.124.8. Since Dawn is always depicted in motion, “gaze after (a retreating figure)” is an appropriate verb. (Cf. IV.18.3 where Indra *anu* *√cakṣ* his mother who is going away: *parāyatīm mātáram ánv acaṣṭa*.) If the referent is Dawn, then the horse whose consort she is is probably the sun. For Dawn and the horse = sun, see VII.77.3.

The term *svajā-* ‘self-created’ has two applications in the passage. On the one hand, it characterizes the *vrā-* particularly. Since she is a ‘chooser’, the female protagonist of a *svayamvara* (self-choice) marriage, she is ‘self-created’ because she is not being given to someone by someone else, but is doing it herself. If marriage is the equivalent of *upanayana* and second birth for women, then she’s her own parent. On the other hand, it can characterize all the role transformations she undergoes in cd, loosely “(re)creating herself as ...” For further on *vrā-* and this passage in general, see Jamison 2003 (Fs. H.-P. Schmidt) pp. 45–47, also X.111.3.

I.121.3: In the publ. tr. this verse is couched in the English future because I took two of the three verbs in the verse (*nákṣat* and *tastámbhat*) as subjunctives and the third (*tákṣat*) as an injunctive but a rhyme form to *nákṣat*, each of them beginning a hemistich. I considered the verse a continuation of the prospective questions in vs. 1. about Indra’s coming to the sacrifice. I have now accepted the view of Narten (Sig.Aor. 160; see also Hoffmann Injunkt. 144) that *nákṣat* is instead an injunctive to the thematic stem of the enlarged root $\sqrt{nakṣ}$. This then seems to strand *tastámbhat* as a lone subjunctive in this sequence; Kü (575) labels it a subjunctive in preterital context. However, the passage may originally have had the indic. pf. **tastámbha*, and *tasthámbhat* may have picked up a final dental from the initial of the following word: *tastámbhad dyām#* to match preceding *nákṣat* and *tákṣat*. Since *dyām* begins with a cluster, the meter is unaffected by a reading **tastámbha dyām*. The cadence is terrible (four heavy syllables), but the only thing that would improve it is reading **tastabha(d)*, with a zero-grade root syllable appropriate neither to the indicative nor to the subjunctive. On this and similar forms see my “False Segmentations and Resegmentations in the Rigveda: Gemination and Degemination,” to appear in a forthcoming Fs.

Revising my understanding of the morphology requires revising the translation as well. I would now take the whole verse in the past: “The surpassing king *came* through the days to the age-old call of the clans of the *Āṅgirasas* for the ruddy (cows). He *fashioned* the mace, his team-mate; he *propped* up heaven for the sake of the two-footed and four-footed belonging to men.” The verse then provides a reassuring model in the past for Indra’s hoped-for activity in the present. Note that *nákṣat* picks up the aor. *ānaṭ* (approximately) from 1c and *tastámbha(t)* the aor. *stámbhīt* of 2a.

Ge takes *aruṇīḥ* as nom. sg. fem., appositive to *rāt*, which must then be fem. and mean ‘queen’ (“die Morgenröte, die Königin”). Both of these are grammatically possible: *rāt* must be fem. in V.46.8; *aruṇīḥ* must be nom. sg. in IV.1.16, 14.3. But this leaves the apparent masc. nom. sg. adj. *turáh* without a head. I therefore take *aruṇīḥ* as acc. pl., loosely construed with *hávam*. See Old. The ruddy ones are presumably the cows imprisoned in the Vala cave, who reappear (with a different color term, *usríya-*) in vs. 4.

I.121.4: Unlike the standard tr. I take c with ab rather than with d. I also take the subject of that pāda, the referent of *trikakúb* ‘three-humped’, as the herd, not Indra with most tr. The problem is the verb, *nivártat*. On the surface it is the only active form to the quite well-attested them. pres. *vártate*. It could be taken as an oppositional transitive active built (however temporarily) to the intransitive middle. Since $ní\sqrt{vrt}$ generally means ‘turn back’ (of bovines), it could mean ‘(make) turn back’, with Indra as subject (called *trikakúb*). The problem is that this doesn’t make a lot of sense in context. He has just

released them (or so I take ab); why then at their “forward surge” (*prasárgē*) would he make them reverse direction? What I think the pāda depicts is the cows milling around in cow-like fashion and beginning to move, but something stops or confuses them, turning them back (pāda c), and Indra has to step in and show them the way out (pādas ab, d). A (partial) solution to this difficulty was seen by Hoffmann (Aufs. II, 590), who identifies several forms as belonging to an *intransitive root aorist* to \sqrt{vrt} , to which this would be the subjunctive, rather than belonging to the them. pres. stem. Since the forms are intransitive, this solves my valency problem, but the subjunctive causes some difficulties. Hoffman takes pāda c as a purpose clause “Damit er beim Losrennen (der Kühe) als Spitzentier zurückkehre,” but why, again, would Indra turn back? To make it fit my scenario, with the herd as subject, I need to read it as a past prospective. Indra got them on the way to truth when they were going to / would have turned back. I would slightly amend my tr. to “when the three-humped (herd) was going to turn back in its forward surge.”

There is another possible conceptual solution, also utilizing Hoffmann’s intransitive root aorist subjunctive. As already noted, *ní√vrt* means ‘turn back’ of bovines -- see the extraordinary concentration of this lexeme in X.19, a hymn urging the cows to return. If we assume that once the cows trapped in the Vala cave are released, they will *return home* (which would be expressed by *ní√vrt*), then *nivártat* is compatible with *prasárgē*: “so that the three-humped (herd) will return (home) in its forward surge” – a possible alternative tr.

In d I take *ápa ... vaḥ* in two slightly different senses with two different objects: ‘uncover’ with *drúhaḥ* ‘deceits’ and ‘unclose’ (= ‘open’) with *dúraḥ* ‘doors’ (note the phonological similarity of the two objects). Unlike many tr. I therefore do not take *drúhaḥ* as gen. dependent on *dúraḥ*; I also consider *mānuṣasya* as a gen. of benefit rather than construing it with *drúhaḥ* (for both, cf. Re’s “les portes du Mal humain”).

I.121.5: Under this elaborate disguise, the verse is simply about soma and Indra’s possession of it. The parents are, acdg. to most, Heaven and Earth. The second hemistich is also found in X.61.11, which is painfully obscure. See disc. there.

One of the things glossed over in the publ. tr. is the difference in number between the dual parents of ab, who brought the soma to Indra, and the unidentified plural subjects who acquired it through sacrifice in pāda c. In X.61.11, also in the context of the Vala myth, I identify those plural sacrificers as the Navagvas, who are named in the previous vs. (X.61.10). Here I suggest the Aṅgirasas, even more likely actors in a Vala context, who are mentioned in vss. 1 and 3, with their sacrificial activity prominent in vs. 1.

For other shared phraseology between the two vss., esp. *śúci ... rékṇaḥ*, see comm. ad X.61.11.

I.121.6: Another verse about soma.

Note the position of *ná* in the simile, where it is placed after the two-word DET+NOUN phrase (*asyā uśásah*) rather than after the first word. I do not know if this placement is by rule; it might be worth looking for other examples with this configuration. In fact, see I.129.1g with *imām vācam ná*.

The syntax is somewhat clotted in the 2nd hemistich. With Ge I take *yébhiḥ* as standing for **yád ebhiḥ* vel sim., since there is no masc. pl. referent in the main clause.

Ge (/WG) and Re construe the instr. without further verbal support (Ge “mit Hilfe der ihren Schweiss opfernden (Priester)”). I supply ‘being impelled’ to account for the instr.; such expressions are relatively common in soma hymns; cf. IX.30.2 = 107.26 *índur hiyānāḥ sotṛbhīh*, etc. For sweat as an oblation, see Jamison 2015 (“Avestan *xšuuīd*ː A Relic of Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary,” BAI 25).

The *siñcán* of d causes some conceptual problems. Active forms of this very common stem are transitive (‘pour x’), but if the subject remains the drop (*índuh*), a passive ‘being poured’ would seem to make more sense. However, this attribution of agency to the drop -- to pour himself, as it were -- fits with the general tendency to animatize soma and attribute exceptional powers to him.

WG take *jarāṇā* as a nom. sg. fem., an abstract “Langlebigkeit,” conceived of as a goddess, as opposed to its standard interpr. as a neut. pl. adj. modifying *dhāma* and essentially identical to differently accented *jarāṇā*ː ‘old’ (Ge, Re, though not Gr). For WG this goddess is the one who pours with the spoon and reaches the seat. This is clever but runs into difficulties. First, forms to *√jr* generally convey a negative sense of ‘age’ -- not ‘long life’. And it interferes with a standard soma trope, of the pressed soma going to / reaching his “domains,” which is straightforwardly present here as long as *índuh* remains the subject. And as far as I know, there is no other evidence for this goddess.

I.121.7: Another very obscure verse with multiple competing interpretations. I will only discuss my own. As indicated in the publ. intro. I think the larger point of the verse is that Indra’s presence alone is sufficient for an effective sacrifice, even if the standard ritual trappings (like the wood for the fire) are absent. This rests in part on very different interpr. of the individual lexical items from the standard ones, esp. in pāda a.

To start there, the hapax *vanádhitī*ː is interpr. by Ge (/WG), Scar (57), going back to Sāy, as an axe, the Holzmacherin, in part because of the phonological play with a standard word for ‘axe’ *svádhitī*ː. I follow Gr (Old, Re, Schmidt B+I 147) in taking it rather as the pile of wood for the kindling of the ritual fire, formed like *vásu-dhiti*ː ‘treasure chamber, depository of goods’; cf. also *mitrá-dhiti*ː in the adjacent hymn (I.120.9). The verb in this clause, *apasyāt*, is universally considered a subjunctive to a denom. stem *apas-yá*ː ‘be active’ (a stem that would appear only here, though there are related nominal forms); I interpret it rather as the optative of *ápa √as* ‘be’ (hence *apa-syāt*) ‘be away, be distant’. True, this lexeme is not common -- I have found only one other RVic example (X.83.5) -- but it would be easy to create, with additive semantics, and semantically parallel *ápa √bhū* is better established.

There is no agreement on the sense of pāda b or even its syntactic status: because it lacks an overt verb, it is not clear whether it continues the subordinate clause of pāda a or functions as the main clause. (With Ge et al., I assume it is the main clause, since otherwise the verse consists only of subordinate clauses.) It is generally assumed that a finite verb should be supplied with *pári*; I supply the inoffensive ‘go’. My interpr. of the pāda is, on the other hand, rather bold -- there seems no other choice with pādas like these. I take the cowpens (*ródhanā góḥ*) as a reference to the ritual ground or to the vessels containing the milk to be mixed with soma or perhaps to places where animals are kept for sacrifice. The “sun” that goes around them is either Agni performing the *paryagnikarāṇa*, the circling around ritual objects or sacrificial animals (the latter might

make more sense with cowpens), or Soma circling through the purifying filter. Both Agni and Soma are frequently identified with the sun.

But the mediating image for pāda b is the radiant Indra of pāda c. When *Indra* (such is my identification of the subj. of the 2nd sg. *prabhāsi*) shines forth, there is no need of wood for the fire (pāda a). He can stand in for the ritual fire and/or the gleaming soma and bring the sacrifice to a successful conclusion by himself, as it were.

My identification of Indra as the subj. of c makes him unavailable to be the referent of the datives in d, as Ge, Re take them. In my view, the poet Kakṣivānt is a better candidate (see WG, who suggest “Sippenführer,” so at least not a god). For one thing, if the curious hapax compd *ánarviś-* contains the (pseudo-)loc. *ánar-* to *ánas-* ‘cart’, it seems unlikely that this would qualify anyone directly associated with Indra -- the cart is not a warrior’s vehicle -- while on the other hand the Pajras, Kakṣivānt’s clan (cf., e.g., I.116.7, 117.6), are *ánasvant-* ‘possessing carts / wagons’ (or, more accurately, compared to people who are *ánasvant-*) in I.126.5. Although *turá-* was used of Indra in 3b and would here be applied to Kakṣivānt, this poet would surely not mind getting a little reflected divine glory. Note, in passing, the phonetic echo in *ánarvīše pas^u vīše*.

I.121.8: The major puzzle in this verse is the grammatical identity of its first word, *aṣṭā*. Ge takes as the agent noun to $\sqrt{aś}$ ‘attain’, which is not otherwise attested (and for which we should expect full grade **naṣṭár-*), while Old, Re, Scar (602), WG take it as ‘eight’ (which of course requires some clever manoeuvring with its head noun, dual *hárī*). I follow Sāy, Gr in taking it as the ppl. to $\sqrt{(n)aś}$.

On *ādaḥ* see comm. ad II.12.4.

On the sense of *vātāpya-* see comm. ad IX.93.5. The scansion of this stem is unclear: HvN give it as *vātāpyam*, that is, presumably, *vāatāpyam*, Arnold (p. 294) *vaatāpyam* (with short first vowel), but Old *vātaāpyam*. Ad IX.93.5 he also suggests *vātāpiyam* (which wouldn’t work here), pronouncing the scansion favored by HvN the least likely. Gr also goes for *-piya-*.

I.121.9-13: Hoffmann (Inj. 191 and n. 157) transl. and comments on these mythological verses.

I.121.9: The puzzle in this verse is what is happening to the cow (*góḥ*) -- which depends on what case the word is in and on the interpretation of the VP *práti vartayaḥ ... áśmānam*. If the VP is taken as hostile (“turn the stone against X”), *góḥ* is difficult to fit in, since as a gen.-abl. it can’t easily be a target. See the standard tr., plus Hoffmann (Inj. 191), for various attempts to wrestle with this possibility. However, the VP can instead mean “roll the stone back,” with *góḥ* an ablative “from the cow” and the action depicted a friendly and helpful one. I consider this to be a variant of the Vala myth, referring to the opening of the cave. The problem is that the Vala myth does not ordinarily intersect with the Śuṣṇa story, which occupies the 2nd hemistich, but, as indicated in the publ. intro., the two myths are woven together in this part of the hymn. See also X.61.13 where the same intertwining seems to occur.

The publ. tr. omits the dat. *kútsāya*. It should read “when ... vanquishing Śuṣṇa for Kutsa, you kept encircling him [=Śuṣṇa] ...”

Another problem is the present tense *pariyāsi* of d, in a hymn otherwise couched in the mythological past. In conjunction with *anantā-* ‘endless’, I suggest that the present is used here to express a past continuative ‘kept Xing’.

I.121.10: The sequence of tense/mood in this verse is somewhat puzzling, with an impv. in the first hemistich (*asya*, pāda b) followed by a 2nd sg. impf. (*ā-adar*, so Pp.) or injunctive (*ā-dar*, so Hoffmann, Inj. 191). This discrepancy must be why Ge puts the first hemistich in quotation marks, though he doesn’t explain who is speaking.

In my opinion the first hemistich concerns the Vala myth: the word *phaliḡā-* ‘bolt’ is associated with the Vala myth in two of its three other occurrences (I.62.4, IV.50.5), once of the Vṛtra myth (VIII.32.25), never of Śuṣṇa. However, if this is the Vala myth it is somewhat puzzling why the sun is *entering* the dark, since the Vala myth is usually set at dawn. Perhaps this refers to a version in which the sun is also trapped in the Vala cave.

I supply ‘fold’ in the temporal abl. expression in pāda a, since I would expect an acc. of goal, and *pāthas-* ‘fold’ is common with *āpi* √*i* (I.162.2, II.3.9, III.8.9, VII.47.3). On the other hand, perhaps the abl.(/gen.) *tāmasaḥ* is simply by attraction to the abl. infinitive *āpīteḥ*.

As noted earlier, *ādaḥ* is analyzed by Hoffmann as an injunctive in mythological context. Note also that it probably belongs to √*dr* ‘tear’, not √*dā*, despite *ādo* to the latter root in 8a. However, it could technically be underlyingly identical to *ādo*, and that pāda also contains a *divāḥ*. In that case it would mean “you took ...”

I.121.11: Hoffmann (191 n. 157) insists that *ānu ... madatām* must be an impv. This interpr. is of course possible, but I do not see its necessity. He also interprets *siṣvapaḥ* as a subjunctive. This is also possible, esp. because the other two forms to this redupl. aor. are athematic (*siṣvap*). However, again it is not necessary, since redupl. aorists are overwhelmingly thematic, and old athematic ones get thematized (cf. augmented *ādīdharat* beside *dīdhar*).

I have no idea why it’s worth mentioning that Heaven and Earth have no wheels, a seemingly obvious fact, unless to contrast them with Etaśa and the Sun’s wheel in 13b.

In d the easiest thing to do with acc. *varāhum* ‘boar’ is to take it as an appositive to *vṛtrām* (much earlier in the hemistich). But the problem, of course, is that Vṛtra isn’t a boar but a cobra (/serpent). Indra’s boar opponent is Emuṣa, and that may be the referent. (See I.61.6–7, where the Vṛtra and Emuṣa myths are told in two successive verses.) However, given that the Śuṣṇa myth is related here in the two preceding verses (9–10), I think that Śuṣṇa may be the referent. He does, after all, snort (e.g., I.54.5 *śvasanāsya ... śūṣṇasya*).

I.121.12: Pāda a contains two ambiguous forms: *yān*, which can be either acc. pl. masc. of the rel. pronoun or pres. act. part., nom. sg. masc., to the root pres. of √*yā* ‘drive’; *āvaḥ*, which can be either the 2nd sg. injunc. act. of the them. pres. to √*av* ‘help’ or the acc. sg. neut. of *āvas-* ‘aid, help’. If we take *yān* as a rel. pron., there is the problem that there is no referent for it in the main clause (save for the Wind’s horses, which are not likely). Despite the majority of tr., I therefore take it as the participle, with the consequence that *āvaḥ* is a noun, serving as acc. of goal, rather than a finite verb. (Its accent would be a problem in a non-relative clause.) As it turns out, there are no

injunctives to the thematic present of this root: we find either augm. *āvāḥ* (etc.) or subj. *āvāḥ* (etc.); this is an additional, if weak, argument for not taking it as a finite verb.

The adj. *mandīnam* ‘exhilarating’ in c seems semantically far enough from its apparent referent, *vajrām* in d, that Ge supplies a verb “(trink)” to produce a new clause and allow *mandīnam* to qualify the expected soma (see the same adj. in 8c). This is unnecessary. Uśanā Kāvya’s major job is to give Indra the mace (see also V.34.2) and for Indra to reach exhilaration in his company (I.51.11). In our passage it seems as if these are conflated, and the vajra itself is what provides the exhilaration (= the energy to kill Vṛtra bez. Śuṣṇa).

I.121.13: I take *nṛṇ* as a gen. pl. (see 1a) in beneficial sense.

For *nāyām* see comm. on VIII.2.28 and Jamison 2013 (“RV *sá hināyām* (VI.48.2) with a Return Visit to *nāyām* and *nānā*,” Hock Fs.).

In c *rathyāḥ* could simply mean ‘charioteers’, a parallel gift to the prizes (*vājān*). So WG.

I.121.15: The root affiliation of *sām ... varanta* is disputed. Most take it as belonging to \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’ (Ge, Re [apparently, see below], WG); I follow Gr and Lub in assigning it to \sqrt{vr} ‘cover’. Although it is difficult to judge, there are more clear root aor. subjunctive middle forms to ‘cover’ than to ‘choose’ (though cf. I.140.13 where *varanta* does belong to ‘choose’ and takes *īṣam* as object). Moreover, *sām* does not appear to be found with ‘choose’, but is at least marginally attested with ‘cover’ (cf. VIII.17.7 and X.16.7).

The other question about this verb is what is its subject. Ge takes *īṣaḥ* as the acc. pl. obj. and supplies the singers or rich patrons as subj. (sim. WG): “Sie bitten sich alle Genüsse (als Lohn) aus.” Inserting a 3rd ps. subject is a bit awkward in a verse in which the human petitioners are otherwise in the 1st ps. (a *asmāt*, c *naḥ*, d *syāma*). Re takes *īṣaḥ* as the subject, in one of his finer sleights of hand: “Puissent les jouissances-rituelles affluer (-comme-par-choix!),” where the supposed root verb appears only in the parenthesis and the Sanskrit justification for “affluer” is entirely unclear. I take *īṣaḥ* as the subject, with ‘us’ supplied as object: “completely cover (us)” expresses the abundance of refreshments Indra will provide.

I.122 All Gods

I.122.1: On *pāntam* see Old’s lengthy n. ad loc. The stem *pānt(a)-*, generally read with distracted root syllable, occurs 8x in the RV. As Old demonstrates, there are most likely two different stems involved: a them. noun *pānta-* ‘drink’ and the act. part. of the root aor. of $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’. The noun is the more common (6x), while the part. is most likely found only in vs. 4 of this same hymn (du. *pāntā*) and as nom. pl. in IX.98.8 (q.v.). This distribution of forms is found in Lub, with the part. listed under $\sqrt{pā}$ (‘drink’) and the nom. stem *pānta-* separate.

The construction of the second hemistich is much discussed, including the function of the instrumentals. See esp. Old and Re.

In this context “the lord (*āsura-*) of heaven” is most likely Rudra (see also Hale, Asuras, 75), who is also the gapped object of the verb *astoṣi*: his heroes are his sons, the Maruts mentioned in d.

On *iṣudhyā* and the related verb, see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2020 “Vedic *iṣudhyā*- and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Fs. Lamberterie). In light of my reconsideration of the word family of *iṣudhyā*- in that article, I now interpr. this vs. somewhat differently from the publ. tr. Instead of taking *ródasyoḥ* as the target of the aiming expressed by *iṣudhyā* (“as if aiming at the two world-halves”), I now take *iṣudhyā* as an independent instrumental adverb of manner, with a dependent “praise” understood: “... as if by the aiming (of an arrow of praise).” The simile particle *iva*, which here, unusually, does not mark an explicit simile, draws attention to the underlying metaphor of the aiming of praise. This image is especially appropriate for Rudra, a god of course famous as an archer, and the Maruts, who are depicted in I.64.10 *ástāra iṣum dadhire gābhastyoḥ* as “archers taking arrows in their fists.” As for *ródasyoḥ*, I take it as semi-parallel to *diváh* in c, with the two locations positioned at the beginning and end of the hemistich. Just as Rudra is the “lord of heaven” (*diváh ... ásurasya*), the Maruts are associated with the midspace defined by the two world-halves, not to mention their association with their consort Rodasī -- so this is also a pun. I would now tr. the hemistich as “I have praised (him) along with the heroes of the lord of heaven; (I have praised) the Maruts of the two world-halves as if by the aiming (of an arrow of praise).”

I.122.2: The root affiliation of *vyūta-* is disputed. WG (flg. Rau) take it to $\sqrt{vā}$ ‘weave’ and tr. ‘geflochten’; so also Gr. and (ultimately) Re (though he vacillates in his n.). Most other tr. to $\sqrt{vī}$ *vyu* ‘separate’. My ‘cast-off’ comes via ‘separate, i.e., set aside, get rid of’. Re’s “serti (d’étoiles)” (sertir = ‘to set’, of jewels) does not seem to have much to do with ‘weave’, but supplying “with stars” (*stṛbhiḥ*) as a play on *starīḥ* is clever enough to make his interpr. appealing, though I do not in the end accept it. A bejeweled Night does not fit well with her being *starī-* ‘barren’: the contrast is as usual between dazzlingly beautiful Dawn and dreary dark Night. Cf. the black garment Night spreads at the horizon for the Sun in I.115.4. Night does get her chance at ornaments in the one hymn addressed to her, X.127.

I.122.3: The 2nd member of the cmpd *vasarhā* is taken by Gr and Re as *-hān-*, hence ‘striking at dawn’, but a connection with $\sqrt{hā}$ ‘change position, move’ makes more sense (so Ge [WG], tentatively Scar 700). Wind does regularly rise at dawn, but it is hard to conceive that it smites then. This probably requires us to take the underlying form as *-hās*, contra the Pp. The 1st member *vasar-* is only attested here, as a variant to the (likewise secondary) locative *uṣar*. See Lundquist 2014 (25th UCLA IE Conf., Proceedings). The somewhat better attested *vanar-* ‘in the wood’, also found as 1st cmpd member, may have provided the model for the shape of *vasar-*.

Ge (WG) construe *apām* with *vīṣanvān* as “der Fuhrmann [coachman, teamster] der Gewässer,” while I follow Re in tentatively supplying ‘child’ with gen. *apām* on the basis of the next verse, which contains *nāpātam apām*. Note that elsewhere in the hymn (12b / 13a) an incomplete expression (*dāśatayasya*) is repaired by the fuller form (*dāśatayasya dhāśéḥ*). I don’t see how ‘possessing bulls’ would develop to ‘coachman’. In any case, neither of the alternatives makes much sense as a designation of the wind; I do not know why he would be a coachman of the waters, but I also don’t understand why he’d be the child of the waters -- perhaps because of the association of wind with rain or because wind blowing over open water is very perceptible? (For another interpr., see

Keydana, Inf., 315 n. 126 “der Besitzer der Wasserhengste [water-stallions],” which seems to split the difference between the ‘bull[s]/male[s]’ of the nom. and the fem. waters in a way not exactly sanctioned by grammar.)

The curious dual dvandva *indrāparvatā* ‘Indra and Mountain’ is found 3x in the RV (I.132.6, III.53.1 as well as here), always in the voc. I interpret the ‘mountain’ as a reference to Indra’s *vájra*-. For other passages with the *vájra*- as ‘mountain’, see VI.22.6 and VII.104.19, as well as Re, EVP XVI.117 (ad VII.104.19).

I.122.4: The first hemistich is structured like vs. 2, with a nom. subject of a purpose infinitive.

The root \sqrt{svit} is a Dawn word (see I.92.12, 113.15, 124.11, the last in a nearby Kaksīvant hymn); I wonder if *śvetanā-* is feminine because it’s evoking Dawn as the brightener.

Despite their similarity, with most tr. I take *pāntam* in 1a and *pāntā* here as belonging to separate stems, the first to *pānta-* ‘drink’, the second to the act. part. to the root aor. of $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’ (see disc. above ad v. 1). Immediately preceding *vyāntā* can be the clue to its participial identity; for the sequence see I.153.4 (of Mitra and Varuṇa) *vītām pātām páyasā* ...

The second hemistich with *prá vah* ... *kṛṇudhvam* echoes 1ab *prá vah* ... *bharadhvam*, though in vs. 1 the verb is further distanced from the clause opening.

rāspiná- is a hopeless hapax, surely related to the likewise hopeless hapax *rāspirá-* in V.43.14, a passage that also contains a mother (*mātúṣ padé*) and *āyóḥ*, though not in the same configuration or meaning as here. Ge (/WG) wisely fail to tr. Re: ‘fougueux’ (fiery, ardent), or, in his notes, ‘bouillant’ (boiling), though without serious argumentation. (For other possibilities see KEWA s.v.; AiG III.215.) Although it is foolhardy even to sketch derivational possibilities, I will toss out several, with no conviction. My tentative tr. ‘abundant’(?) depends on a possible deformation of reasonably well-attested *virapsín-* ‘id.’ (beside *virapsá-* ‘abundance’) (derived in turn from *vīra-p(a)śu-*, in a well-known and generally accepted etym.). The initial *vī-*, perceived as a preverb, could be lopped off, and the unusual internal cluster *-pś-* metathesized and normalized to *-sp-*, whose order of segments and sibilant type are both more phonologically natural. The apparent vṛddhi might be like that of *māhina-* though they are differently accented. To account for *rāspirá-* we must assume that *rāspiná-* was analyzed as containing a *-ná-* suffix, for which *-rá-* was substituted for no discernible reason. Another even less good possibility, which partly goes back to Bollensen (ZDMG 22; see KEWA s.v., AiG III.215), starts from the fact that in context both *rāspiná-* and *rāspirá-* could use an extra syllable. The first member could be analyzed as a *y*-less genitive **rāás* to *rayí* / *rāy-* ‘wealth’, compounded with a form of \sqrt{pi} ‘swell’. (Note that *rāyás* regularly shows *-s* sandhi in syntagms before *p*: esp. *rāyás póṣam*, but cf. also *rāyás pūrdhi*.) However, our current understanding of the historical morphology of the ‘wealth’ word makes it well-nigh impossible to get such a *-y*-less form (since *rāyás* < **raHj-as*) without a series of arbitrarily constructed analogies. Thus, the second possibility is essentially ruled out, and, insofar as I think it’s worth even thinking about an etymology here, I favor the deformation from *virapsín-*.

I do not know what role *Āyu* is playing here, as is often the case with this figure.

I.122.5: Again the first hemistich has a predicated infinitive, like 2ab, 4ab. In fact the structure is identical to that in 4: *ausíjō huvádhyai*# (4b, 5a). But otherwise the verse is difficult to comprehend (as Ge says in n. 5, “Voll dunkler Beziehungen”), and tr. differ considerably. I will not treat them in detail.

The object(s) of *huvádhyai* should first be sorted out: the two acc. *ruvanyúm* and *sámsam*. Are the two coreferential and what is/are their referent(s)? *ruvanyú-* is a hapax but clearly derived from the denom. (/deverb.?) stem *ruvanya-* (also a hapax) and ultimate from the root \sqrt{ru} ‘bellow, roar’. Ge (/WG) takes *ruvanyúm* as a qualifier of *sámsam*, which he treats as a PN (“den lauten Śaṃsa”), perhaps standing for Nāraśaṃsa. This is not impossible, but given the mysterious *āyóḥ* in 4d and *ausíjāḥ* in both 4b and 5a, I am reminded the phrase *usíjāḥ sámsam āyóḥ* (IV.6.11, V.3.4). In both passages we (SWJ and JPB respectively) take *sámsam āyóḥ* “the laud of Āyu” as a designation of Agni; in both we take the form *usíjāḥ* as the nom. pl. designation of a type of priest, who do homage to Agni under this name. Note also that II.31.6 contains *sámsam usíjām*, with the Āyus featuring in the next verse (II.31.7b) as makers of hymns. I therefore think that *sámsam* in this verse should be combined with the mysterious *āyóḥ* at the end of the previous verse into a putative underlying phrase **sámsam āyóḥ*, referring to Agni, modified by *ruvanyúm*. Incomplete phrases straddling verse divisions are found in vss. 3–4 and 12–13 (though in those instances the complete phrase appears in the 2nd vs.); see comm. above on vs. 3. I would thus change the text of the publ. tr. to “It is for (Kakṣīvant), son of Uśij, to call the bellowing, the ‘Laud (of Āyu)’ [=Agni], for you.” Agni can be characterized as ‘bellowing, roaring’ because of the crackling of his flames. The “you” are the priests (etc.) on whose behalf Kakṣīvant is acting. Agni was ritually presented in the previous hemistich (4c) under a different epithet, and his “mothers” (the kindling sticks) in 4d. A “roaring” Agni would come into being following the kindling about to take place in 4d. An invocation to Agni’s comrades ends this verse (5d). The context thus favors Agni.

The next problem is *ghóseva*. Ge (/WG) takes this as the fem. PN *Ghoṣā*, the erstwhile spinster, found in a nearby Kakṣīvant hymn (I.117.7) where the Áśvins bestowed a husband on her, as well as in the famous sequence of hymns X.39–41 attributed to her (with the patronymic *Kākṣivātī*) and her son. Despite the close connection of Kakṣīvant with this *Ghoṣā*, I doubt that she figures in the strictly liturgical context here, and those who think she does must assume that Arjuna is the name of her acquired husband, for which there is no evidence. I take the form rather as the old instr. *ghóṣā* to the masc. common noun *ghóṣa-* ‘shout, cry’, though I admit the simile seems a bit flat. Re’s grammatical interpr. is the same as mine; his tr. “semblable à une rumeur (de guerre)” is less flat, but even less supported.

námśé occurs twice in the RV, here and in 12b in this hymn, both times preceded by a genitive. There seems no reason not to take it, with Gr etc., as the loc. sg. to a stem *námśa-* ‘at/on the attainment’ construed with the gen. As for *árjunasya*, lit. ‘silver(y)’, I suggest that it refers to soma; cf. *ṛjīśín-* ‘possessing the silvery drink [=soma]’ (so Thieme), with the Caland form *ṛjī-* to this same etymon. Unfortunately *árjuna-* doesn’t elsewhere characterize soma. Nonetheless, the fact that the other occurrence of *námśé* (12b) takes a genitive that also probably refers to soma gives some support to this interpr.

The initial *prá* in c, echoing those in 1a and 4c, suggests that this hemistich has a structure parallel to those two. Hence my “(put him) forward”; other tr. supply other material to complete the clause. The meter of this pāda is deficient, lacking three syllables. Various restorations have been suggested (see Old, Prol. 113 n. 1 [=Engl. tr. 133 n. 3]; HvN metrical notes ad loc.). Old (Prol.) suggests an impv. like *arcata* or *gāyata*, noting the structural similarity to 4c, but in the Noten he suggests that the metrical irregularity of Kakṣivānt’s I.120 might indicate that the text here is correctly transmitted and that the meter must be taken as is. It is certainly difficult to see how a trisyllabic verb form would have simply got dropped here.

I do not understand how Pūṣan comes to be named in this august divine company, and I wonder if the abbreviated meter of this pāda has something to do with the dedicand: the only hymns addressed solely to Pūṣan in the RV, VI.53–58, consist entirely of dimeter hymns save for the last. The 8-syllable pāda here might signal his more humble stature.

vasútāti- is another word that occurs in the RV only here and in vs. 12 of this same hymn. Its formation is of course transparent, but its meaning is less so. Most take it as a true abstract to *vāsu-* ‘good(s)’, but with a slight twist to ‘generosity’ (Freigebigkeit). But the lexeme *ācha* √ *vac* seems to be a technical ritual term for ‘invite’ (cf. *āchokti-* and the later priestly title *acchāvāka-*) with gods as the object. Gr suggests the meaning ‘Schaar der Guten, d.h. der Götter’ for the occurrence in vs. 12 (but not this one), which I have adopted for both instances. It would be equiv. to *devātāti-* ‘assemblage/conclave of gods’. The pāda would then refer to the group of divinities that Agni regularly conveys to the sacrifice.

I.122.6: This last verse before the dānastuti is free of the manifold difficulties that clot the first five verses of the hymn, but it is not devoid of Kakṣivānt’s poetic flourishes. Note first the play on √ *śru* ‘hear’, which reaches a climax in pāda c: *śrótu naḥ śróturatiḥ suśrotuḥ*. What is particularly clever here is that though the pāda contains three forms *śrótu*, the first is completely different from the second two: it is the 3rd sg. act. root aor. impv., while the other two belong to the nominal stem *śrótu-* and are 1st and 2nd compound members respectively. The pāda has only 10 syllables, with a likely rest after *śrótu naḥ*, which would call attention to the phonological identity / morphological difference.

The phrase *viśvátaḥ sīm* occurs 5x in the RV; I have discussed this formula at length elsewhere (“Rigvedic viśvátaḥ sīm, or why syntax needs poetics”, *Mír Curad*, Fs. C. Watkins [edd. J. Jasanoff, H.C. Melchert, and L. Oliver], 1998, pp. 291-300). The two occurrences in Kakṣivānt’s oeuvre (I.116.20 and here) ring changes on the basic formula in his usual deft and unexpected ways. I will not reproduce the entire discussion, but summarize the main points. Four of the five passages (all but this one) concern the theme “surrounding,” marked by *pári* + VERB. In three of these (all but the two Kakṣivānt examples) the object is the two worlds / heaven and earth. In I.116.20 it is the *subject* (the Aśvins), not the object, that is dual. In other words, Kakṣivānt has transformed the underlying formula by transferring the abstract grammatical category DUAL from one of the arguments of the verb to the other.

This analysis of I.116.20 is necessary to understand the more attenuated -- and more radical -- instantiation of the formula found in our verse here. As in I.116.20 the

DUAL that is inherent in the formula surfaces on the subject, here Mitra and Varuṇa, but the “surrounding” motif is not present, except in *viśvātaḥ* ‘on all sides’ itself, which seems to have no semantic connection with the rest of its clause. Why is it here? Because it is crossed with a different formula through surface phonological similarity. Consider the word *sādane* in the same pāda, which has connections with another RVic formula. The phrase “in the seat of Vivasvant” occurs five times in the RV (I.53.1, III.34.7, III.51.3, X.12.7, X.75.1), twice as pāda-final *sādane vivāsvataḥ*## (I.53.1, X.75.1). This provides an almost perfect phonological scrambling of our pāda ending. (In fact, according to Oldenberg [Noten, ad loc.], Ludwig suggested emending *viśvātaḥ* to *vivasvataḥ* [no accent given].)

sādane vivāsvataḥ##

sādane viśvātaḥ sīm##

Thus our phrase may have been employed in order to evoke the other formula, which is a kenning for “der Opferplatz,” so Geldner ad I.53.1. Thus Kakṣīvant deftly marries the grammatical deep structure (the dual) of the *viśvātaḥ sīm* formula with the surface phonology of *sādane vivāsvataḥ* in a way that allows the semantics of both to be alluded to. (Perhaps an appreciation of the formulaic manipulations involved here would have led Bloomfield (RR) to reconsider his assessment of this verse with its “hysterical repetition of the root śru” as “secondary clap-trap.”)

I do not understand why the Sindhu is esp. gifted with hearing.

I.122.7: The transition between the All God portion of the hymn and the dānastuti is eased by verbal repetition: Mitra and Varuṇa, who were the last gods invoked (6ab), are again called on here, though in opposite order and not in a dvandva but in individual vocatives (*varuṇa mitra* versus 6a *mitrāvaruṇā*). Independent *rātīḥ* picks up the 2nd cmpd member in *śrōtu-rātīḥ* (6c) and the PN *śrutāratha-* (7c) also echoes *śrōtu-rātīḥ*.

Accented *stuṣé* I take as a (quasi-)infinitive with passive value, though unaccented *stuṣe* is generally 1st sg. with “active” value.

The locc. *pajré / śrutārathe priyārathe* mark these men as givers, which makes some trouble, since Kakṣīvant’s family seems to be called Pajra (quite possibly in the next verse and in I.126.4–5) and Kakṣīvant himself *pajriyá-* (I.116.7, 117.6, 120.5). Nonetheless, grammar can’t be gainsaid, and they must be patrons here. See Ge’s n. 7bc for attempts to reconcile the discrepancies.

I.122.7–8: The passively used 3rd sg. *stuṣé* (7a), *stuṣe* (8a) contrast in function with the great majority of *stuṣé / stuṣe* forms, which are 1st sg. and “active” in sense (“I [will] praise”). This rare usage may be mediated through the perception of the accented forms as infinitives; see disc. ad X.22.1.

I.122.8: See Old on this vs. I follow him in taking cd as a single rel. cl. hanging off Nahus in b, rather than a rel. cl. / main cl. structure. The uncertainty about the relationships of the various named patrons makes any interpr. tentative. See publ. intro.

I.122.9: This cautionary example of what happens to men who cheat the gods of proper offerings is clearly meant to warn stingy patrons.

Note the echo between the openings of b #*apó* and d #*āpa*, which are entirely distinct grammatically. As for the latter, as Kü also notes, various forms of the perfect of $\sqrt{āp}$ have presential value.

I.122.10: Ge refuses to tr. *dāṃsujūta*-. Re “ayant été mû (comme) par miracle,” clearly connecting it with *dāṃsas*- ‘wondrous power’, etc.; my tr. makes the same connection. The stem *dāṃsu*- is probably also found in *dāṃsu-patni*- (IV.19.7), though this is disputed. WG tr. *dāṃsujūta*- “als Heimkehrer,” with the 1st member the loc. pl. of *dām*- ‘house’ -- so, more literally, ‘in die Häuser eilend’. This is clever, and the two independent uses of *dāṃsu*, both nearby (I.134.4, 141.4), do seem to be that loc. pl. However, *jūta*- means ‘sped, spurred on’ and the fairly numerous compds in which it occurs have a 1st member that provides impetus (cf., e.g., *vāta-jūta*- ‘wind-sped’); ‘sped into the house’ sounds more like an act of cowardice or retreat than of triumph.

bālhasṛtvā in c is even more problematic (though Ge does tr. it: “geht er [*yāti*] festes Ganges”). Independent *sṛtvān*- means ‘running, streaming’; *bālha*- means ‘thick, squeezed’, to \sqrt{bamh} . Although it would of course be possible to attenuate that meaning to ‘firm, powerful’, I think that Kakṣivānt, by using this unusual compound, and esp. the unusual 1st member, had something more precise in mind than a firm stride -- esp. in a *dānastuti*, where slang is most at home. I have therefore used the Engl. idiom ‘pumped up’ (approximating the ‘squeezed, dense’ sense of the Skt.), which is defined by an online dict. (<http://www.thefreedictionary.com>) as “tense with excitement and enthusiasm as from a rush of adrenaline,” with the following example: “we were really pumped up for the race.”

I.122.11: The dual part. *gmāntā* of pāda a does not match the pl. impv. *śrótā* of b nor the pl. voc. *rājānaḥ* in the same pāda. Drawing the distinction did not seem worth it in the publ. tr. -- which would have to be something like “as you two go ..., (do all of you) hear ...” The number discrepancy is generally (see, e.g., Old, Ge)—and in my opinion correctly—interpreted as first a reference to Mitra and Varuṇa and then to the Ādityas as a group. M+V were prominent earlier (vss. 6–7, 9; see also 15c, the final vs.) and in fact in vs. 7 ushered in the *dānastuti*. The plural phrase in b is used precisely of the three principal Ādityas, including explicitly M+V, in X.93.5: *té ghā rājāno amṛtasya mandrā, aryamā mitrō varuṇaḥ* ... In my opinion there is no reason either to emend the text (as Gr does) or to take *gmāntā* (with Lowe, Part. 185 + n. 30) as a “pseudo-absolutive.”

This parallel also shows that Scar’s clever idea (171, followed by WG) to construe *amṛtasya* with the verb *śrótā* cannot be correct.

In c Old takes the hapaxes *nabhojū*- and *niravā*- in full lexical value, rather than as PN, and, at least acdg. to Mayr. (PN, svv.), this remains a live possibility. However, in the *dānastuti* context names are more likely, though they can be speaking names. That -*jū*- echoes -*jūta*- in 10a and -*ravā*- echoes *ruvanyū*- in 5a (assuming an analysis *nī-ravā*- with Old, rather than *nīr-avā*- with Gr) is presumably no accident: puns on personal names are a standard RVic poetic device.

I.122.12: My interpr. differs from most (though it is closest to Old’s). There are two major reasons for the different interpr. in pāda a: 1) most take *dhāma* as part of the rel. cl., but this is impossible because the verb is unaccented; 2) most take *śārdham* as a

reference to the Marut troop. This is, of course, its standard use, but in this hymn it should first be interpreted in conjunction with *śārdhastara-* ‘more forceful’ in 10b, where it qualifies an unnamed patron. Here we want to establish our patron (*sūri-*) as such a force. In my interpr. the rel. cl. is a nominal cl. consisting only of *yāsya sūrēḥ*, in which **vayām* (or **smās[i]*) can be supplied (from the 1st pl. inherent in *dhāma*), as an expression of possession: “of which patron (we) [are],” i.e., “who is (our) patron.” Cf. the type VIII.92.32 *tvām asmākaṃ tāva smasi* “you are ours; we are yours.”

The speakers in b are the poet(s) and priest(s). The gen. *dāśastayasya* ‘tenfold’ must be interpreted in light of the fuller expression *dāśastayasya dhāsēḥ* in 13a “tenfold gush,” probably a kenning for soma, though there is no agreement on its sense. The fact that the fuller expression serves as a complement of the verb *māndāmahe*, a standard soma verb, in 13a supports this identification. The ‘tenfold’ characterization is not clear; Old plausibly suggests that it refers to the number of servings to be divided among that number of priests.

Ge (/WG) and possibly Re take cd as a resumption of the direct speech of pāda a. This is not impossible, but the 3rd persons of c and d have no clear referents in a.

I take *dyumnāni* in c as a fronted object of *sanvantu* in d, more or less following Old. This technically makes *yēṣu ... rārān* appear to be an embedded rel. cl., which I’m afraid I will just have to live with.

As indicated in the comm. to vs. 5, I take *vasūtāti-* here as a reference to the collectivity of good ones, namely gods. I then take the pl. *viśve* opening the next pāda as referring also to the gods. In this Viśve Devāḥ hymn, the poet cleverly makes reference to them here in this off-kilter expression, with *devāḥ* suppressed and anticipated by the sg. *vasūtāti-*. (The full expression is found in 3d.) My only reservation about this interpr. is that in a dānastuti it should be mortals who are doing the winning, and certainly the phrase *prabhṛthēṣu vājam* “the victory prize in the forays” fits a mortal context better. I might then modify my tr. to remove the bracketed “[=gods]” and leave the identity of the subject open. It may in fact be that the two objects *dyumnāni* and *vājam* will be won by gods and mortals respectively, and *viśve* refers to both, hence “let all (the gods) win the brilliant things in which the assemblage of good ones takes pleasure, and let all (the mortals) win the victory prize at the forays.”

I.122.13: On the phrasal repair of 12b *dāśatayasya* by *dāśastayasya dhāsēḥ* see comm. vss. 3, 5, and 12.

The “twice five” in pāda b may be the fingers, as I suggest (almost the default identification in a RVic ritual context), or the number of priests, indirectly conveyed by the tenfold soma of 12b and 13a. Ge (/WG) takes the “twice five” as directly characterizing *ānnā*: the twice five foods.

Ge (/WG) and Re take *iṣṭāśvaḥ* and *iṣṭāraśmiḥ* as PNs of patrons. (Actually Re omits the first, presumably inadvertently.) I also take them as referring to patrons but with full lexical value: the one who has “desirable horses” and “desirable reins” [latter probably a stand-in for “chariots”] to offer. That “those showing mastery” (*iśānāśaḥ*) are patrons is strongly suggested by I.141.3, where that participle modifies *sūrāyaḥ* ‘patrons’. The Saṃhitā text *tāruṣa* is analyzed by the Pp. as *tāruṣaḥ*, which could be a gen. with *iśānāśaḥ* (so Gr, Re, WG) or nom. pl. (so Ge). Old suggests that it could also be read as dat. *tāruṣe*, against the Pp., which is how I take it. I then interpr. *nṛṇ* as referring not to

the singers (so Ge et al.) but to still other patrons with whom they are competing to provide the best recompense to the singers.

I.122.14: As is recognized by all, the flood (*árṇah*) is the herd of gift cows, whose constant turbulent motion must have suggested the metaphor. Accentless *maṇigrīvam* Old considers a “monstrosity” due to faulty transmission. It must be a bahuvrīhi like immediately preceding *híranyakarṇam*, and I now wonder if the phrase *híranyakarṇam maṇigrīvam* actually represents a dvandva consisting of two bahuvrīhis (‘possessing golden ears and ornamented necks’), which could account for the single accent. The geminate *m* across the compound boundary (*-karṇam maṇi-*) might have been redactionally introduced from **-karṇa-maṇi-*). The first members of the two compounds *híranya-* and *maṇi-* are the constituents of the phrase *híranyena maṇínā* in I.33.8, on which see my extensive discussion in “A Golden Amulet in Vedic and Avestan” (2018, Ged. H. P. Schmidt). Against my interpr. of the forms as one cmpd is the fact that cmpds of more than two members are vanishingly rare in the RV.

Pāda b is repeated verbatim from 3d, but because it has an object (the flood) it has a slightly different sense from there.

The reason for the doubled *ā* in c is not clear to me.

cākantu is taken, plausibly, as haplogitized from **cākanantu*. See, most recently, Kü (131).

I.122.15: In the publ. tr., there should be a comma after “victorious.”

What verb to supply in ab seems up to the interpreter.

I do not understand the image in *syūma-gabhasti-* ‘with hands as its guiding rope’.

I.123 Dawn

After the almost impenetrable last two hymns, the Dawn series comes as a welcome relief, though it does not lack puzzles or Kakṣīvant’s characteristic flourishes. Note also the prevalence of āmreḍitas and similar expressions (*grhām-grham*, *divé-dive*, *śásvat*, and *ágram-agram* all in vs. 4; then *ékaikā* in 8 at long remove, *bhadram-bhadram* in 13).

I.123.1: Against the Pp (and standard tr.) I read dat. *dákṣiṇāyāi* rather than gen. *-āyāḥ*. If it’s a gen., it has to be construed with *ráthaḥ* “the chariot of the priestly gift.” The identification of the chariot and the dakṣiṇā in 5d supports neither of these interpr.

I.123.2: The vs. begins and ends with *pūrva-* (*pūrvā ... pūrvá(hūtau)*), a very tight species of ring composition.

punarbhū- here seems to lack its later technical sense (a remarried widow) and have only its literal meaning ‘come into being again’.

I.123.4: The hapax *ahanā* is difficult. Gr connects it with (*áhar/*) *áhan-* ‘day’. Ge tr. ‘unverwüstliche’ (indestructible); he does not comment, but judging from the tr. I assume he takes it from a negated derivative of *√han* ‘smite’. Old tentatively suggests a connection with *√ah* ‘say’, though he doesn’t gloss the result (for perhaps obvious reasons). Re ‘lascive’ with caution, connecting it possibly with *āhanás-* ‘swollen, lusty’

(usually of soma). WG refuse to tr. but suggest in the n. an adverbial derivation of the particle *áha* ‘certainly’. My tr. rests on the possibility that it represents **máhanā*, with the initial *m* lost after the final *m* of the preceding word: *grhám-grham ahanā* ... This would make for better meter; otherwise there are four consecutive light syllables, spanning the (early) caesura, and in addition Arnold (194) deems × – ∼ ∼ an “occasional” (that is, relatively rare) pattern of the trimeter opening. But what would such **mahanā* represent? I suggest that it should be grouped with the trisyllabic form *mah·nā* (IV.2.1, X.6.7 [possibly; see comm. ad loc.]); this appears to be a variant of *mahinā*, the longer version of the instr. sg. to *mahimán-*, whose shorter version is the very common disyllabic *mahnā*. The medial *-a-* here would result from matching the second vowel of *mahánt-*, *mahá-*, *mahás-/máhas-*, as well as the combining form *mahā-*. Or it might actually reflect a different syllabification of the inherited instr. **magH-mn-aH* as **magH-m̃n-aH*, with the suffixal *m* vocalized between two consonants, rather than the preceding laryngeal.

I.123.5: The final phrase *dákṣinayā ráthena* with two instr. identifies the dakṣinā and the chariot, unlike either of the proposed readings in 1a (see comm. there). Gr, followed (perhaps surprisingly) by Old, suggests reading **dákṣināyā(h)* here, with the gen. supposedly found in 1a. Old ascribes the change to attraction to the instr. *ráthena*. The proposed emendation would do no violence to the meter (and would in fact produce a somewhat more common break), but since the text is easily comprehensible as transmitted, I see no reason to emend.

I.123.7: The du. *parikṣitoh* is universally taken (Ge [/WG], Re, Old, Scar [p. 96]) as referring to Heaven and Earth (e.g., Ge “das Dunkel der beiden umgebenden (Welten)”). In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the two other occurrences of the form do refer to H+E (III.7.1, X.65.8). However, I prefer to take it as referring to the pair already in the discourse, Night and Dawn. The cycling and circling movements of these two are highlighted in 7ab (and note *pári yanti* in 8d of the pl. Dawns). I also do not understand what “the darkness of H+E” would refer to, whereas Dawn’s role in hiding the darkness of night is well known. There is also a weak syntactic argument in favor of my interpr. Definite *anyá-* forms ordinarily take 2nd position (see Jamison 1997, Fs. Beekes); note the position of the two *anyád* in pāda a, each after the fronted preverb in its clause. (The *anyāḥ* in 11d belongs to the “(all) the other” construction, which is positioned differently.) If *parikṣitoh* is loosely connected with what follows, *anyā* here follows the first real word of the clause *támaḥ*; otherwise it appears late.

I.123.8: I take *pári yanti* in two different senses, one with each pāda of the hemistich: in c the verb describes the literal circuit of the thirty days whereas in d it is used in the metaphorical sense ‘encompass’, hence ‘achieve’. The two pādas also contrast the series of dawns needed to add up to the thirty-day cycle (c) with what each one of them accomplishes in a single day (d).

I.123.9: I think *ná* in c does double duty: first and primarily as the negative with *mināti*, but also as a simile marker following *yóṣā*. The rest of the simile (*niṣkṛtām ācárantī*) follows in the next pāda. For *yóṣā* explicitly in a similar simile see VI.75.4 *té ācárantī sámaneva yóṣā* “The two ..., like a maiden faring forth to (festive) gatherings.”

I.123.10: On $\sqrt{śad}$ see comm. ad X.120.5.

I.123.11: In the publ. tr. “auspicious one” sounds like a vocative, which it is not. Perhaps better “as the/an auspicious one.”

I.123.12: Likewise “easy to invoke,” which is not a voc. either. Better “as one easy to invoke.”

I.124 Dawn

I.124.2–3: *áminatī* (2a) and *ná ... mināti* (3d) (cf. also *ná mināti* I.123.9) receive different tr. here both because they have different objects and because *áminatī* is contrastively paired with *praminatī* (2b).

I.124.4: My interpr. follows that of Thieme (KZ 79 [1965] -- KISch 214–27), cited also in the publ. intro.; for doubts, esp. about the interpr. of pāda b, see Scar 272–73.

I.124.5: The hapax *aptyá-* is connected by Gr, Old, and, tentatively, EWA (s.v. *ánapta-*) with ‘water’. Ge leaves it untr.; WG as ‘äussere’ without comment. I follow Re’s tentative suggestion ‘inaccessible au vol’ (to \sqrt{pat}), with perhaps more enthusiasm than he shows for it.

I.124.7: On the female figures here, see publ. intro.

The first simile (in pāda a), *abhrāteva puṃsá eti pratīcī* “Like a brotherless (girl) she goes right up to men” (publ. tr.), I take as expressing wanton behavior on the part of a girl who lacks a brother to protect her and/or to identify potential husbands for her and who therefore must seek opportunities herself. However, it is often interpreted as a reference to the institution of the *putrikā* ‘appointed daughter’, the daughter of a sonless father whose offspring will serve as descendants of her father, not her husband’s father and who is therefore a poor marital prospect. See for example P.V. Kane, “Vedic Basis of Hindu Law,” JBBAS 26 [1922] 57–82, at 58–60, who sees it as a forerunner of the provisions in VDS XVII.16 concerning the *putrikā*. (See also YDŚ I.52–53 on not marrying a brotherless girl.) (Ludo Rocher several times cites Kane’s treatment; see *Studies in Hindu Law and Dharmaśāstra*, 47, 64.) Kane’s tr. reflects this interpr.: “As a (woman) without a brother comes back to (her) male (relations).” This view does not seem sufficiently supported.

As for b, though most interpr. (see recently Scar [463], WG) see only a male figure in the simile in b (a charioteer seeking prizes), I find it unlikely that the middle simile of three, the two outer of which depict striking female types, would compare Dawn only to a male. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think it is a double entendre, with not only the prize-seeking male competitor on his chariot seat but also a prostitute displaying herself on a platform or stage for money (or whatever counted for money in that period).

The root noun cmpd *gartārúh-* ‘mounting a seat’ has *gárta-* as first member. It is therefore tempting to interpr. the 2nd member as *ārúh-*, belonging to the lexeme \sqrt{ruh} ‘mount, climb on’ (as in the cmpd. *ārúh-* X.44.6). Scar (463–64) rejects this interpr. on

the grounds that rt. noun cmpds with direct object noun as 1st member do not also contain preverbs, a statement with which I am in agreement; see my disc. in “Vedic *iśudhyá*-... (Lamberterie Fs., 2020: 486) on the gapping of *práti* in such a cmpd. (See now my forthcoming “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian.”) Scar attributes the long *ā* to the effect of the root-initial laryngeal, as in *upārúh*-, etc. This is certainly possible, but I wonder if, in what must have been a nonce formation, the lexeme *ā* √ *ruh* didn’t play a part. On *puru-niṣṣídh*-, see comm. ad I.10.5; on *karmaniṣṭhā*- and *puruniṣṭhā*- see comm. ad X.80.1 and VIII.2.9 respectively; on *viśva-ābhū*- X.50.1. The only true exception (and even it may not be) is *yajña-niṣkīt*- X.66.8; see comm. ad loc.

I.124.7–8: *suvāśā(h)* in 7c is neatly echoed by *svāsā* opening 8a.

I.124.8: As indicated in the publ. intro., I believe that this verse continues the series of female portraits, this time with two vignettes of the *svayamvara* (‘self-choice’) marriage.

On the basis of I.113.1, Ge suggests persuasively that the subj. of pāda a is Night and her older sister is Dawn. Nonetheless, I take the subj. of b to be Dawn, who is going away from Night. The crucial word in b is *praticākṣyā ā* (latter Pp.), which can be either a gerund (-*ā*) or a gerundive (-*ā*). Most (though not Old) take it as the latter, as I do, but with the sense “to be seen again” (e.g., Ge “die man wiedersehen soll”), that is, as one who will return. But this is not the standard meaning of *práti* √ *cakṣ*, which simply means ‘gaze upon’. Here I think “to be gazed upon” represents the display motif of the *svayamvara* marriage: before the girl exercises her choice among the assembled suitors, she enters the arena (vel sim.) and is announced and displayed for all to see (for disc. see esp. Jamison 1999 [Penelope] and for this passage in general Jamison 2003 [Fs. H.-P. Schmidt], pp. 42–44).

The choosing maidens (*vrah̥*) of the same marriage type are the topic of pāda d.

I.124.12: The “one being at home” (*amā sánt*-) may contrast implicitly with the “Early-coming” one (*prātarítvan*-) who forms the subject of the 1st half of the next hymn (I.125). In that hymn the *Prātaritvan* engages in dialogue with a person who is probably a householder, that is, in the words of our verse, one being at home.

This vs. is identical to VI.64.6; for further comm. see there.

I.125 (The Early-coming one) Svayana’s Dānastuti

For a sustained treatment of the “early-coming one” (*prātarítvan*-) see Jamison, Sac.Wife 184–89.

I.125.2: The first three pādas of this verse are in the standard high Rigvedic register and present the unsurprising themes of prosperity and reciprocity, but the fourth pāda violently wrenches the verse in an unexpected direction. The placidly happy relationship between host and guest depicted in vss. 1 and 2abc takes a sinister and coercive turn, but what precisely that turn consists of is partly obscured by the fact that pāda d contains two hapaxes (*muṣṣjā*- and *pādi*-) and a very rare lexeme (*úd* √ *sāl sí*, otherwise only AV VI.112.2–3). What is clear is that the host derives great benefit from the visit of the early-coming one *if* he forces him to stay -- “ties him up” in fact.

A simile adds precision to this picture, or it would if we understood it: *mukṣṭjāyeva pádim* “(binds you up) like a *pádi* with a *mukṣṭjā*.” Ge tr. “wie den Vogel in der Schlinge,” which certainly yields sense though it is essentially contextually inspired guesswork. (In content it is reminiscent of the clearer III.45.1 “Let no one hold you down, as men using snares do a bird.”) I have tried pushing it further, though with no confidence in the correctness of my speculations.

I treated *mukṣṭjā* elsewhere (Ged. Cowgill, 1987, pp. 89–91). I suggested there that the word is a deformation of *muṣká*- ‘testicle’ and that Kakṣīvant is making a play on his own name (which may itself mean ‘having a crotch’), esp. the *-kṣī*, with this deformation -- as he does elsewhere in his oeuvre. Taking this further, the *-jā*- may be the root noun to \sqrt{jani} , a root noun very common as a 2nd compound member (see the numerous exx. in Scar. 132–53). Those compounds are invariably accented on the *-jā*-; I would attribute the accent here to the poet’s play on his name *kakṣīvant*-. But what would this baroque confection *mukṣṭjā*- mean? If it literally means ‘originating from/at the testicles’, it could refer to a loin cloth, a strip of cloth that covers the genitals -- a thong -- and as a long strip of material it could be used to bind or tie up an animal.

My interpr. of *pádi*- rests on even less evidence. I suggest, *very* tentatively, that it comes from a MIA form **pr̥dī*-, related to the Iranian forms borrowed into Greek as *πάρδαλις*, etc., as well as to Skt. *pr̥dāku*-. In earlier lit. this word was said to mean ‘leopard, panther, tiger’ only in lexical texts, while its earlier occurrences mean ‘spotted snake’; see EWA, KEWA s.v. Mayrhofer attributes the later lexical meaning to borrowing from Iranian. But it clearly refers to a large wild feline in AVP II.18.1, since it is parallel to *simha*- ‘lion’ and *vyāghra*- ‘tiger’; see Zehnder, *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2*, p. 59. In keeping with the racy tone in these two hymns, it could also be a pun on $\sqrt{pr̥d}$ ‘fart’ (though this root is not attested in Vedic [see EWA s.v. *pard*], its representation in the younger language and in Iranian, incl. Avestan, suggests that it was known to Vedic speakers), and the desire to make the pun would have led K. to use an otherwise obscure word for wild animal here. Given the discrepancy in morphology (no forms of the shape **pr̥dī*- are attested in any relevant language) and the chronological gap, this gossamer hypothesis probably should be discarded -- but there is nothing stronger to take its place (and it gave me the opportunity to use the English word ‘pard’).

I.125.3: *iṣṭēḥ putrām* “the son of my seeking” picks up the immediately preceding part. *ichán* ‘seeking’ to the same root and means essentially the product of my successful search.

Indra is the likely recipient of the soma in c and the strengthening in d, but the epithet *kṣayādvīra*- (8x) is never applied to Indra, rather usually to Rudra (5x). But Rudra is highly unlikely to be the target here.

I.125.4: The two conjoined phrases *ījānām ca yakṣyāmānam ca* (b) and *pr̥ṇāntam ca pápurim ca* (c) have the same referent, and their syntactic parallelism invites a completely parallel interpretation of their verbal semantics. But the pairs are not morphologically parallel: the first phrase consists of a perfect part. and a future part., the second of a present part. and a reduplicated *-i*-stem adj. In the publ. tr. I render *pápurī*- as preterital (“who ... has granted”), but following Grestenberger (JAOS 113.2 [2013]) I now see such forms as imperfectives, often with habitual or iterative sense; unfortunately in this

context the conjoined phrase then seems almost pleonastic, though perhaps “the one who grants and keeps granting” would work.

I would also slightly alter the tr. of the phrase in b to “the one who has sacrificed and will sacrifice,” to make the parallelism of the two phrases in bc clearer and also to rule out a reading in which the two participles in b have different referents.

I.125.6: The dakṣiṇā (priestly gift, more literally gift-cow) theme comes to the fore here.

I supply ‘bounties’ (*rādhāṃsi*) with *citrā* ‘bright’ on the basis of the cmpd *citrā-rādhas-* and the numerous occurrences of the phrase *citrā-rādhas-*.

I.125.7: I do not entirely understand pāda c, which must contrast with d. I assume the referents of *tēṣāṃ* are the generous patrons of ab, who are distinguished from the *āpr̥ṇantam* ‘non-granter’ of d. This non-granter is to be entirely engulfed (*abhī sám √ i*) by *śókāḥ*. The stem *śoka-* and the various forms of the root to which it belongs (*√ śuc*) otherwise refers to blazing flames in the RV, but in later Skt. it has come to mean ‘pain, affliction’. I think that both senses are present here, hence my portmanteau tr. “flames of pain.” The flames in this pāda may help in interpreting the previous one. One of the uses of *paridhī-* ‘enclosure’ is for the “enclosing sticks” placed around the Āhavanīya fire (already X.90.15 and common in ritual lit.). If the non-giver is being surrounded by flames in d, the givers in c deserve a different and benign enclosure (*anyāḥ ... paridhīḥ ... kās cid*), not the *paridhī-* that ordinarily surrounds the fire. Its nature remains unspecified: both the initial position of *anyā-* and the final *kās cid* mark the referent as indefinite.

I.126 Kakṣīvant’s Dānastuti

I.126.1: Negated *āmanda-* ‘not feeble’ contains the adj. *manda-* ‘stupid, lazy’, which is otherwise not attested until the Up. and epic. The audience’s first interpr. of *āmandān* would be as a form of *√ ma(n)d* ‘exhilarate’, though obviously *manda-* ‘stupid’ must have existed in everyday speech to allow it to be used here. As with *śoka-* in the last verse of the preceding hymn (I.125.7), Kakṣīvant is availing himself of words/meanings belonging to a different register to spice up the discourse. The prominent placing of *āmandān* as the initial word of the hymn calls further attention to this stylistic departure.

I.126.2: The root *√ nādh* ‘(cry/be) in distress’ is often used of people in dire straits (see, e.g., in Kakṣīvant’s I.118.10); here the king’s distress comes not from danger but from want of fame. There may be a touch of humor in this overdramatization of his plight, though see I.110.5 where the Ṛbhus cry out in want at an invocation, likewise seeking fame (*śráva ichámānāḥ*, exactly as in our 1d).

On *ādam* see comm. ad II.12.4.

The patron–poet reciprocal bargain is managed with striking economy here: the king seeks fame in 1d, the poet receives many goods in 2abc, and the desired fame is dispatched to heaven in 2d.

I.126.3: The temporal expression *abhipitvé áhnām* is universally taken as a reference to evening. In the RV dakṣiṇās are distributed at the morning sacrifice (hence their association with Dawn), though in classical śrauta ritual the time has changed to the

midday rite. Perhaps Kakṣīvant knows an alternative practice, or he's slyly indicating that the largesse was so enormous that it took all day to distribute. I favor the latter.

I.126.5: Having employed a no-nonsense style in listing the gifts he acquired in vss. 2–4 (for a similar detour into straightforwardness, see the expression of his desires in I.121.14–15), Kakṣīvant returns to his tricks in the last vss. of this hymn.

Since I discuss this verse at length in Jamison 2003 (Fs. H.-P. Schmidt) pp. 47–51, I will not repeat the details here. The first hemistich is reasonably intelligible and continues the listing of gifts. It's notable that the amount that Kakṣīvant managed to acquire “for you” (*vaḥ*) is a small fraction of his own haul. One question is who the “you” are: I take them as the Pajras, his kin, who cleaned up with him in 4d and are mentioned again in 5d, though in the 3rd ps.

As I point out in the Schmidt Fs., the elaborate simile in cd seems typed as a wedding scene by the telling words *ānasvant-* ‘possessing carts’ and *vrā-* ‘female chooser’. The cart (*ānas-*) is the wedding vehicle par excellence and hardly appears in the RV except in conjunction with females, particularly in marriage context, and, as I argue in that art., *vrā-* is the designation for a girl exercising her choice at a svayamvara marriage. The image presented in the simile is of well-connected young men traveling to svayamvaras in hopes of acquiring a bride (that is, being chosen by a bride) of acceptable family and clan. I therefore take the *vrāḥ* phrase as acc. pl., not nom. with most interpr. and take the simile as beginning with *subāndhavaḥ*.

I.126.6: On the meaning ‘smell’ for the intensive *jāṅgahe* see Lubotsky (JAOS 117 [1997]: 562–63 [rev. of Schaeffer, Intensiv]); Griffiths and Lubotsky (JAOS 119 [1999]: 480–81). The word *kaśīkā-* is found only here. If it refers to a mongoose (or perhaps the related civet cat), the naturalistic description makes sense, as Lubotsky (JAOS 117) argues: squeezed on the back, mongooses release a musky odor. (This is characteristic of both sexes at least of civet cats, though Lubotsky seems to think it is only true of males mongooses.) As I have argued elsewhere (Ged. Cowgill, 1987, p. 89), this hapax may appear in this passage because Kakṣīvant is making another play on his own name (see above, comm. I.125.2).

The second hemistich appears to be a fairly graphic depiction of sexual intercourse and, like other such passages, is difficult to interpret because of the obscurity of the vocabulary and the slangy style. The difficulties here reside primarily in the hapax *yādurī* and the near hapax *yāśu-*. The rest -- *dādāti máhyam ... bhojyā śatā* -- is relatively straightforward: “She gives me 100 ...” I differ from the standard tr. in taking *bhojyā* not as acc. pl. neut. ‘pleasures’, but as a fem. sg. gerundive. Although we would expect the accentuation **bhójyā*, the suffixal accent here may be a redactional change to follow *bhojyā* in nearby I.128.5 after our passage was no longer understood. I take this gerundive as belonging to both roots *√bhuj* ‘enjoy’ and ‘bend, coil’: the woman in question is to be coiled around (in sex) and thus to be enjoyed.

As for *yāśu-* this word appears a few other times in compounds: *budbudáyāśu-* (X.155.4), where it seems to refer to ejaculations (as insubstantial as) bubbles; fem. *suyāśutarā* (X.86.6), where Indrānī boasts about herself -- I tr. “gives better sex” -- and *ayāśú-* (AV VIII.6.15) as an epithet of hideous minor demons tormenting pregnant

women, where Whitney plausibly but tentatively tr. ‘impotent’. I take it to mean something like ‘ejaculation’, which I’ve rendered as ‘spurts’ to avoid a clinical tone.

yādurī- appears to belong to the marginal root $\sqrt{yād}$ ‘unite’ (see EWA s.v. *YĀD*); I render the nominal here by ‘fusing’.

As often, I think the presence of these rare words serves more than one purpose — in this case to produce an encoded pun on the root \sqrt{yabh} ‘fuck’. Note the repetition of *yā*’s, starting with *yā* in b, but taking off in cd: ... (*mah*)*ya yā(durī) yā(sūnām bhojī)yā* ... This repetition of the initial of the root might have the same effect as the English expression “the f-word,” and it also gives the impression of a stutterer saying “*ya ... ya ... ya ...*” while the *bh* eludes him -- until he reaches *bh(ojyā)* and finally achieves the whole word.

I.126.7: This is presumably the speech of the woman whose charms were described in vs. 6. I have tr. it with what I consider appropriate vulgarity.

In pāda a *ūpopa* ‘nearer’ and *pārā* ‘away’ might seem to be preverbs that would cancel each other out, but here their conjunction perhaps invites the interpr. that she’s asking for ever more intimate contact (*ūpopa*) with parts that are usually off limits (*pārā*).

Ge (WG) take *dabhrāṇi manyathāḥ* to mean “think that (my hair) is meager” vel sim., with the hair borrowed from the second hemistich. I think rather that *dabhrā-* \sqrt{man} means ‘belittle, think little of’, but that *dabhrāṇi* should also be read as the object of that compound verb. This latter *dabhrāṇi* I take as a euphemism for her private parts (‘little things’), in the way that *priyā* ‘dear things’ is used by Indrāṇī in X.86.5 to refer to the same. (The contexts -- explicit female boasting about sex -- are similar, not to mention rare.) I thus take *dabhrāṇi* twice.

Although it is clear why a ewe, even a little ewe (*avikā*), would be a fine example of a hairy female, I have no idea why *Gandharī* ewes would be especially hairy. Cold climate, one assumes.

I.127–139 Hymns of Paruchepa Daivodāsi

This sequence of hymns, composed primarily in Atyaṣṭi meter, is one of my favorite collections in the RV. The elaborate meter showcases the patterned repetitions, echoes, and variations that are one of the specialties of Rigvedic poets. The meter is configured as 12 12 8 / 8 8 / 12 8, generally with exact repetition, rhyme, or some kind of controlled variation between pāda b + c and f + g. This series is the only sustained set of Atyaṣṭi hymns in the RV; to Paruchepa’s son (/descendant) Anānata Pāruchepi is attributed the short Soma hymn IX.111.

I.127 Agni

I.127.1: The patterned connections of the 8-syllable pādas to their preceding pādas are detailed in the publ. intro. to this hymn group.

I.127.2: Although “earth-encircling heaven” fits easily into our modern cosmology, I don’t know what is meant by this in a Vedic cosmological context. This problem clearly troubles both Ge and Re, who both supply the sun to do the circling, with heaven as the object (Re: “Lui qui circule autour (de l’aire) comme (le soleil autour du) ciel”).

Although I understand the impetus, these interpr. introduce too much extra machinery into a simple two-word simile.

Agni was compared to a *vípra-* in 1c and then addressed as one in 2b. In 2c we invoke Agni with our own *vípra-s*, with *víprebhiḥ* occupying the same position as *vípram* in 1c. This type of implicit identification between Agni and his mortal worshipers is also found in 2a, where we sacrificers (*yájamānāḥ*) invoke him as best sacrificer (*yájīṣṭham*).

2f is a relative clause that lacks a verb; the verb ([*pra-*]*ávanti* vel sim.) can be supplied from the verb in the 8-syllable tag (2g), which contains the impv. *prāvantu* with the same subj. (*vísah* ‘clans’). The g-pāda also adds an infinitival dat. to this verbal complex, indicating what the clans help Indra to do. Constructing the verb in 2f from the one in 2g is not a matter of simple gapping, because imperatives cannot appear in relative clauses. Ge supplies a different verb in f (huldigen) from that in g (ermutigen), but this ignores the patterned interplay characteristic of the 8-syllable pādas with what precedes them.

I.127.3: This verse is richly studded with problems. One of the lesser ones is the referent and grammatical identity of *purū* in the first pāda. Gr classifies it with singular (presumably NA neut.) forms; Ge. takes it as an adv. ‘gar sehr’; WG as instr. sg. (?) with *ójasā* (“mit ohnehin viel ... Körperkraft”). On the basis of the sequence (3d) *vīlú cid*, (4a) *dṛḥā cid*, (4f) *sthirā cid* (also with *ójasā*), all containing neuters, most plural, I take *purū* as the neut. pl. it appears to be (so also Re: “qui brille en maint endroit”). Each instance of *cid* ‘even’ in this sequence emphasizes the formidable targets Agni is exercising his will upon. Unfortunately this value of *cid* is not so much in evidence in our phrase *purū cid ... dīdyānaḥ* because ‘shining’ (at least as expressed with the root *√dī*) is not ordinarily a forceful or hostile act. I have therefore (reluctantly) not rendered the *cid* here, though I feel I have missed something, since the phrasal parallelism is otherwise so clear. Perhaps *dīdyānaḥ* has something of the sense of similar forms of *√suc* ‘blaze (against)’: so “shining (against) even the many with his radiant might.”

Pāda b and its tag-pāda c contains a śleṣa, whose correct interpretation goes back at least to Benfey (see Ge’s n. 3c). As indicated in the publ. intro. to I.127–1 n39, *druhaṃtarāḥ* has two possible analyses: *druhaṃ-tarā-* ‘overcoming deceit’ or *dru-hantara-* ‘better at striking wood’. The first is appropriate to the first instance of the word, but in c the presence of *paraśúḥ* ‘ax’ forces the ‘wood’ interpr.

The verb of de, *śrúvat*, is the problem in that clause. Wh (Roots) takes it as a (zero-grade) 1st class pres. to *√sru* ‘flow’, but *√sru* has no such zero-gr. formations (and there’s the problem of the initial sibilant of course). Gr puts it with a root *√śru* ‘zerinnen, zergehen’ (separate from *√śru* ‘hear’), but the formations he assigns to said “root” are a hodgepodge (and see Old on the likely nonexistence of the root). Re (flg. Cardona, see Re’s n.) takes it to *√śru* ‘hear’, but this requires *supplying* the verb of destruction (by his interpr. ‘fall’ [tomber]) required by the context, with the perception verb that is actually found in the passage superfluous: “on les entend (tomber) ...” (The same root assignment seems to underlie the WG tr., though with a different overall interpr., which I confess I don’t understand.) Even if the semantics worked better, there are no such stems to *√śru* ‘hear’. Ge attributes it to *√śṛ* ‘crush’, which is reasonable on both semantic and textual grounds; see esp. the parallel he cites X.89.6 *śṛṇāti vīlú rujāti sthirāṇi*, with very similar phraseology. Unfortunately I can see no way to get a stem *śrúva-* from *śṛ*. Old

questioningly suggests a connection with \sqrt{ru} ‘break’, but needless to say the initial \acute{s} can’t simply be omitted. I dare to suggest yet another root: $\sqrt{sr\acute{iv}}$ ‘abort’. Although some forms of this root (caus. *srevayet* [KS], RVic part. *sreváyant-*; aor. *asrāvīt* [JB]; pres. *srīvyati* [AB]) have an initial dental sibilant, others have the palatal: AV *śrīvayāmi*, MS *śrīvayeyuh*, *śrevuka-*. (On the forms, see Narten [Sig.Aor.] 282–83. Jamison [āya-] 145.) Such phonetic fluctuation is not surprising in a root that presumably was at least partially tabooed and was also probably more at home in a lower register, with, perhaps, the MIA neutralization of sibilants. Although a stem *śrúva-* or *srúva-* is not otherwise found to this root, the spotty attestation to this root in general makes its isolation unsurprising. The stem would probably be a zero-grade thematic injunctive (aor. or pres.?), though a root subjunctive can’t be ruled out (though less likely in context). The loss of the \acute{i} / i would follow the same pattern as $\sqrt{d\acute{r}v}$ / $d(y)\acute{u}$, $\sqrt{s\acute{r}v}$ / $s(y)\acute{u}$, via $*sR\acute{i}uH \rightarrow *sRuH$. I do not understand the accent, however. As for ‘abortion’ in this context of destruction, see, inter alia, the use of the caus. part. *sreváyant-* in VII.18.8, the Battle of the Ten Kings; possibly also *áva* \sqrt{sru} in nearby I.129.6.

The final two pādas (fg) of this verse also present their share of difficulties. We can begin with the final word of each pāda, *nāyate* in the Saṃhitā text. The Pp. (followed by HvN) analyses this as *ná ayate*, but this produces a very bad cadence: we should expect a heavy syllable as the first syllable of the verb. This is easily remedied, without emending the Saṃhitā text, by *āyate* (i.e., prev. \acute{a} + *ayate*). This analysis was also tentatively suggested by Gotō (1st cl., 92 n. 10).

Most tr. (and Old) take the point of *yamate nāyate* to be that though Agni is victorious, he doesn’t go further: he stays in his hearth. See, e.g., Re “(Bien que) triomphant, il tient (les rênes), il ne va pas (plus loin).” But the preverb *nā* ‘forth’ (with \sqrt{sah} only here and in the root noun *niṣṣáh-*) seems to presuppose motion (hence my ‘going forth to conquer’), and certainly most treatments of Agni victorious depict him laying waste to his surroundings, as in the immediately preceding two pādas and in the following verse (4). The notion that Agni is suddenly showing self-restraint here seems contrary to the message of the context. I therefore take *yamate* as meaning not ‘hold himself back’, but ‘hold/keep his place’ (against counterattack) and *āyate* (*/ayate*) as a quasi-passive ‘be moved’. Medial forms of \sqrt{i} are rare enough that a consistent meaning to such a stem is hard to determine, and though some forms of *áyate* probably belong to a thematized stem (so Gotō, 92ff.), the parallelism with the root aor. subj. *yamate* here strongly suggests that our form is also a subjunctive (to the root pres. *éti*) and thus further separated from the thematic indicative forms. I therefore think that the somewhat idiosyncratic meaning I have attributed to the form is plausible, esp. as a negated semantic twin to *yamate*.

The final problem in the verse is the compd. instr. sg. *dhanvāsáhā*. This is almost universally (Gr, Old, Ge, Re, Scar 603) interpreted as ‘conquering with a bow’ (*dhánvan-*), which interpr. generally requires an additional personage to be supplied, generally Rudra. Gotō (1st cl., 92, n. 10) seems to favor this interpr., but also suggests the possibility that the first member is *dhánvan-* ‘Land’: “auf dem das Land ersiegenden [Weg],” with the whole pāda meaning that Agni will not go further and burn the land. WG have adopted this latter interpr. (though the ‘bow’ interpr. is referred to in the n.): “Auf dem trockenen Land ersiegenden (Weg) eilt er nicht hierher.” I also am convinced that *dhánvan-* ‘wasteland’ is the correct interpr. of the 1st member. Given that the ‘tree’

theme is prominent in this verse and a ‘bow’ theme lacking, a reference to another landscape feature fits the context better. There is the problem that cmpds with *-sāh-* are ordinarily adjectives modifying animates (see the numerous exx. in Scar.), and my tr. assumes an abstract sense or at the very least an instr. manner adverb (“in/with his wasteland-conquering [manner]”). Despite this slight difficulty, this solution seems more economical than inserting Rudra into a context that has no other allusion to him.

I.127.3-4: In the publ. tr. *ójasā* in 3a and 4f should have been tr. the same, rather than ‘might’ and ‘strength’ respectively.

I.127.4: I generate the subject “(the pious man),” i.e., *dāśvān*, from its verb *dāṣṭi*.

I.127.5: After the respite of vs. 4, this verse returns to puns and word plays in full force. The syntax of this verse is complicated enough without unintended ambiguity in the English. In the pub. tr. “This fortifying power of his might we acquire ...” ‘might’ is a modal verb (“might we acquire”), not an abstract noun (*“his might”).

In my opinion the hapax *dīvātārāt* in bc is a śleṣa somewhat like *druhamtarāḥ* in 3bc, again utilizing the echo pāda (c) to instantiate a 2nd value for a word found in both pādas. Most take the word as a nonce substantivization of the adverb *dīvā* by the addition of the comparative suffix found also in the preceding *sudārśatarāḥ* ‘more beautiful’ (see AiG II.2.608; Re n. ad loc.). I agree that this is one reading, but I also think that *-tara-* can be a thematic nominal to $\sqrt{tṛ}$ ‘cross over’ (cf. *tāra-* etc.), and that the whole compound can mean ‘traversing [the sky] by day’ as a descriptor of the sun. For a similarly formed rhyme word, also referring to the sun, cf. *dīvākarā-* ‘day-maker’ (AV+).

The hapax *āprāyuse* in c also poses difficulties. On the one hand, it is very similar to *āprāyu-* (3x) ‘unremitting, not faltering’, which most deriv from *prá√yu*; Old and Re opt for this analysis (Re “à (l’homme qui veille) infatigable”). However, I am persuaded by Ge’s pointing out (n. 5) the unity of theme provided by *āprāyuse* (c) ... *āyuh* (d) ... *ajārāḥ* (fg), if *āprāyuse* contains the ‘lifetime’ word. However, I do not think either Ge’s “ohne zu altern” or WG’s “zum Nichtverschwinden der Lebenskraft” is the correct analysis. Rather I think the word evokes the common idiom *āyuh pra√tṛ* ‘lengthen lifetime’ and refers to a man whose lifetime has not *yet* been lengthened. Note that the $\sqrt{tṛ}$ part of the idiom can be pulled out of *dīvātara-* (a 3rd sense for this compound). Agni is called *viśvāyu-* ‘providing/affording all lifetimes’ in the next hymn (I.128.8) and is also regularly asked to lengthen (*prá√tṛ*) our lifespan (e.g., I.94.16, VIII.44.30). I now also believe that *āprāyu-* also contains the ‘lifetime’ word (the less well-attested *āyu-* beside *āyus-*); see comm. ad V.80.3.

In the next pāda Agni’s own lifespan (that is, his immortality, more explicit in fg) is a model for our own: it provides a handhold (*grābhāṇavat*) or, as we would say, “a leg up” for the man hoping to have his lifespan extended.

I don’t quite understand *bhaktām ābhaktam vā*. It is probably an implicitly temporal expression: the help that has already been apportioned and the rest that has not yet been apportioned (but will be, we hope).

I.127.6: The verse has an extra pāda (h), which serves as the tag-pāda to g. Given the difficulties in the verse, the extra pāda just provides more occasion for bewilderment.

The hapax *iṣṭāni-* in the paired pādas bc has been variously interpreted. Gr takes it to *(n)is + √stan* ‘thunder’ (‘thunder’ explicitly rejected by Old). Ge does not comment but his tr. ‘sich ausbreitend’ suggests a derivation from *√tan* ‘stretch’; his tr. is echoed by Re (‘s’*étendant*’), though in his n. he suggests that the first element is the zero-grade root noun to *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’, encouraged by Old. The currently prevailing interpr. is probably Hoffmann’s (reported in KEWA, EWA) ‘spreading nourishment’, found in WG. This is certainly possible; however, I favor *√stan* ‘thunder’, despite Old’s disapproval, but with the preverb *vi*. The Saṃhitā text reads ... *urvārāsviṣṭānir* (b) / *ārtanāsviṣṭāniḥi* (c), but both loc. plurals require metrical distraction: *urvārās^uviṣṭānir* (etc.). The Pp. reads *urvārāsu* / *iṣṭāniḥ* (etc.), but nothing prevents reading *urvārāsu* / *viṣṭāniḥ* from the distracted *-s(u)vi-* sequence. Although *vi√stan* is not found until very late, it would not be a difficult idiom to create, esp. given the widespread *vi√dyut* ‘flash forth as lightning’ in the same pragmatic sphere. The thunder would thematically continue the noise of the first pāda and the association with the Maruts, storm gods.

Pāda c contains a 2nd hapax, *ārtanāsu*, which both Ge and WG refuse to tr. (though see WG n. for a different suggestion) and Old, having offered a few suggestions, refuses to analyze. Re tr. “les terres steriles” but without comment (though the tr. probably stems from Gr’s ‘übel, öde, Misernten bringend’). My own suggestion is quite speculative, but in this situation there seems no other choice. The pāda is a syllable short; HvN in fact divide up the first vowel, reading *ā ārtanāsu*, but a stem *ārtanā-* does us no more good than *ārtanā-*. I suggest supplying the syllable *nir* to open the pāda (and the word, hence **nirārtanāsu*); this *nir* can be generated from the final syllable of the preceding pāda (*iṣṭān*)*nir*, or rather we can imagine a haplology: *iṣṭānir*, **nirārtanāsu*. This posited stem **nirārtanā-* would belong to *nir√r*, most prominent in the well-attested *nirṛti-* ‘chaos, disorder, dissolution’. The loc. pl. pairing in bc would then contrast the productive (*āpnasvant-*) fields/meadows with their negative counterpart, disorderly and useless.

Note the alliteration in d: *ādad dhavyāny ādadīr*, followed by *ādha* beginning f (as well as *ād* beginning 5d).

As Ge points out (n. 6d), *ādat* can be the impf. to *√ad* ‘eat’ as well as belonging to *ā√dā* ‘take’ (on which see comm. ad II.12.4), though he doesn’t incorporate this pun into his tr. Agni as the eater of oblations is of course a common trope.

hārṣato hṛṣīvataḥ in f is a nice etymological figure, though in the context of this hymn barely deserving mention.

Most tr. take the *nāraḥ* of h as ordinary, human men, but I think it refers rather to the Maruts. *śubhé* (and *śubh-* in general) is one of their signature words; cf., e.g., I.88.2 *śubhé kām yānti* and, with *nāraḥ* referring to them, V.52.8 ... *té śubhé nāraḥ*. The mention of the Maruts here would form a ring with their appearance in pāda a.

I.127.7: Most take *kīstā-* in pāda as a PN, a further specification of the Bhṛguś, and this is a tempting way to avoid dealing with the word. However, it is more difficult to take it as a PN in its only other appearance in the RV (and indeed anywhere) at VI.67.10. I therefore follow the interpr. going back at least to Sāy, ‘praiser’. EWA has a reasonably plausible scenario for getting it as a hypersanskritization of a MIA form of **kīrtha-*, beside *kīrti-* ‘praise’, etc.

I take *mathnántaḥ* in c as a pun on $\sqrt{\text{math}}$ ‘steal’ (referring to the Bhṛgu’s theft of fire; see Narten, KISch. 23-24) and ‘churn, rub’, a common word for the production of the fire on the ritual ground.

The identity of the “dear coverings” is not clear. Ge suggest, for example, that they are what keep Agni within the kindling sticks, WG that they are everything a fire burning in a field would incorporate in itself. Since Agni is identified as the holder (*dharmī-*) of goods in e, I wonder if the coverings are the enclosure itself -- though what this means physically I’m not sure.

On the isolated precativ *vanīṣṭa* see Narten (SigAor. 236-37), who points out that its object is also a hapax and considers it an “Augenblicksbildung des Dichters.” The “wise one” (*médhira-*) is probably Agni himself, as often, and the med. form of the verb would support this identification.

I.127.8: This verse begins straightforwardly enough but its syntax deteriorates (or gets more convoluted) towards the end.

The three-member cmpd. *satyágirvāhas-* in c is implicitly analyzed by Ge as *satyágir-vāhas-* (“ihn den wahrhafte Reden anziehen”; sim. WG), but, on the one hand, *gírvāhas-* is an established bahuvrīhi (8x; “whose vehicle is songs” -- that is, the god [Indra] who is conveyed to the sacrifice by the songs dedicated to him) and, on the other, *satyá-* never modifies *gír-* as far as I can tell. Old (SBE) tr. “who truly art carried by prayers as by a vehicle,” with the correct internal structure, in my opinion. My “trusty” for *satyá-* may be pushing the term a bit, but the idea is that the song-vehicle is real and so a trustworthy conveyance.

The *ca* in f is generally rendered ‘also’, and it is one of only three examples (out of approx. 1100) of *ca* to which Klein (DGRV I.212-13) attributes that value. None of the examples is strong, and all can be interpreted with functional values more commonly found with *ca*. In this case I think *amī ca víśve amītāsaḥ* is conjoined with a gapped *vayám* ‘we’, as in exx. like VII.88.3 *ā yád ruhāva váruṇas ca nāvam* “When [I] and Varuṇa boarded the boat ...,” though with pl. rather than sg. 1st ps. gapping. The 1st ps. pl. is found in the opening verb of the verse *havāmahe*, and although some pādas intervene, that main verb still has domain over the whole verse (save for the last pāda), with ef a rel. cl. attached to that main clause. True, the verb in this rel. clause must also be supplied. I suggest a medial form of $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$, meaning ‘acquire’; see in fact *dhīmahi* in this meaning in 5a -- all that is needed is an accent. For the identical VP *vāyas-* + med. $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$ in this same hymn cycle, cf. I.136.2 *āthā dadhāte ... vāyaḥ* “then they two [=Mitra and Varuṇa] acquire vigor,” and for a 1st pl. in this collocation (including the instr.) see II.23.10 *tvāyā vayām uttamām dhīmahe vāyaḥ* “Through you might we acquire the utmost vigor.” In nearby I.141.13 (though not a Paruchepa hymn) *amī ca* is overtly conjoined with *vayām*, as I suggest is covertly the case here: *amī ca yé maghāvāno vayām ca* “those who are our patrons and we (ourselves) ...”

As for pāda g, which also lacks a verb, my publ. tr. assumes an active imperativ form of the same root $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$, addressed to Agni. Agni quite regularly participates in such collocations; in this case the verb might well be the imperatively used root aor. injunctive *dhāḥ* or else the redupl. pres. impv. *dhehi*. This short pāda blends two constructions: “set oblations among LOC” and “establish vigor for DAT,” both with $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$. For the first, with Agni as subject, see, e.g., V.14.1 *havyā devēsu no dadhat*, for the

second, likewise with Agni as subject, see, e.g., II.4.9 *smát sūrībhyo gr̥naté tát váyo dhāḥ* “establish this vigor for the singer along with his patrons.” Since in our passage the recipients of the *váyas-* have already been identified in the previous pāda ([us] and all the immortals), the dative recipient with the second construction need not be specified. A more literal tr. of my understanding of this pāda might then be “(place) the oblations among the gods and (establish) vigor,” but this seemed too clotted for the publ. tr.

The trick of this tag-pāda then is that the final *ā váyaḥ* is twice the object of an unexpressed form of the root *√dhā*, but with two different valences. Unusually for tag-pādas, g is not syntactically parallel to f.

I.127.9: The hapax splv. *sāhantama-* does not require the positing (with Gr) of an otherwise unattested *n*-stem *sāhan-*. A nonce derivation from the pres. part. *sāhant-* (with simplification of the cluster *sāhan(t)-tama-*, with AiG II.2.597, etc.) is certainly possible, and the full grade with nasal might have been constructed as a partial match for its parallels *śuśmíntama-* and *dyumníntama-*.

I.127.9-10: The ends of both a-pādas are variants of each other: 9a ... *sāhasā sāhantamaḥ*, 10a ... *sāhasā sāhasvate*, each following a metrical rest.

I.127.10: The first three pādas are an esp. nice example of the syntactic complementarity between the tag-pāda c and what precedes. The subject and the verb are withheld until c (*stómaḥ* and *babhūtu* respectively), with the preverb determining the verbal lexeme (*prā*) and the possessive pronoun limiting the praise (*vaḥ*) found in the first pāda -- and the recipient *agnāye* the only thing held in common between ab and c. Thus neither ab nor c is complete in itself: their elements need to be intermingled to produce the full sense. The name of the recipient is also held until the end of the two-pāda opening, though prepared for by a series of datives.

Schaeffer (Inten. 114) argues persuasively that the intens. *joguve* is “lokaldistributiv” with the loc. phrase *vísṣvāsu kṣāsu* “in all lands.”

I.127.11: The latter part of this verse shows a nice phonological pattern, with the initial words in the pāda being c *mahó*, d *māhi*, f *māhi*, but g *máthūr*. The first three all belong of course to the *mah* (‘great’) family, but the last is a verb form whose apparent near match with the two preceding *māhi* belies its independent grammatical identity.

There is probably also a phonological impetus for the use of *sācanas-* instead of the much more common *sajóṣas-* in b: *sācanās* better matches *sucetúnā*.

In de most tr. (including me) take *māhi ... nas kṛdhi, samcákṣe ...* as an infinitive phrase, “make us regard (something) great.” Keydana (Infin. 342) allows this possibility, but also raises the possibility of an adjunct usage: “make something great for us, for seeing.” Although I recognize that the latter is not excluded, I think the infinitive reading is the more likely -- on the basis of the other dative phrase in e, *bhujé asyaí*. The final position of *asyaí* here is odd, and in fact the use of it at all is odd, given that an unadorned *bhujé* ends 8b and its tag-pāda 8c. I think that we have a demonstrative adj. with *bhujé* in this verse in order to anchor *bhujé* as a noun and to distinguish it from the immediately preceding dative, also built to a root noun, but in infinitival function. In other words, the *asyaí* serves to polarize the grammatical functions of two identically formed nominals.

In *máthīh* I see the same pun on the two roots \sqrt{math} as was found in 7c. Here the plundering sense is appropriate to the simile *ugró ná śávasā* “like a mighty (warrior) with vast power,” while the churn sense is attached to Agni as fire the substance. Although the ritual fire is churned (passively), we can imagine Agni using the same means that produced him (churning) to produce something for us. (So, more or less, Ge.) Narten (KISch 24; followed apparently by WG) feels that *máthīh* here can only have the ‘rob’ sense, because only fire can be the obj. of the ‘churn’ sense, but this opinion displays, at least in my view, the often deficient poetic and imaginative sense of the Erlangen school.

I.128 Agni

I.128.1: The phrase *mānuṣo dhárīmaṇi* is variously rendered. Re takes it as an infinitive (“pour être porté par l’Homme”); Gr and Old (SBE) interpret it in an abstract or ethical fashion (“nach altem Brauch”; “in Manu’s firm law”; sim. Brereton in his survey of *dhárman-*). Hoffmann (Inj. 121, fld by WG) as ‘hands’. But given the emphasis in the verse on the activity on the ritual ground (bc) and indeed the fire’s placement on said ground (fg), Ge’s “im (Feuer)behälter des Manu” seems the most likely interpr. -- rendered by me as “the foundation of Manu,” making reference to the fact that Manu was the first sacrificer and so every subsequent ritual ground can be ascribed to him. See 7a *mānuṣe vrjāne* ‘in the ritual enclosure belonging to Manu’ for another association between Manu and a physical location on the ritual ground.

As usual the line between human priests and Agni as priest is blurred in bc. Agni is regularly identified as an *uśīj-* (I.60.4, etc.) but *uśījah* in the plural are humans.

“In the footprint of refreshment” (*ilās padé*) is a standard kenning for the ritual ground or, more narrowly, the place where oblations are offered; a similar expression is found in Old Avestan, at Y. 50.8.

I.128.2: My interpr. of *ápi* \sqrt{vat} roughly follows Tichy’s (Die Spr. 26 [1980]: 3–5, esp. n. 8 [= KISch 108–10]) ‘mit etw. (Akk.) bekannt, vertaut sein’ (contra Thieme’s Fs. Weller)—though perhaps with a bit more oomph.

I construe *ṛtásya pathā* in b with *yajñasādhām* in a, flg. Lü (Var. 463) -- contra most interpr., who take it as roughly parallel to the other instr. expressions in b. It is true that there is some distance between the two expressions I put together, and Ge also cites two parallels where *ṛtásya pathā* is adjacent to *námasā*. However, in both those instances the two instrumentals are better taken with different parts of the verse, and since Lü’s interpr. yields richer sense, I maintain it here.

I.128.3: The standard tr. (as well as Scar. 110-11) take *-gír-* in *muhurgír* to $\sqrt{gṛ}$ ‘sing’, rather than, with Gr, to $\sqrt{gṛ}$ ‘swallow’. This is certainly possible, though “‘plötzlich, augenblicklich willkommen geheissen’ (?)” (Scar 110; sim. WG) does not have much to do with what proceeds or follows in the verse. I prefer to keep Gr’s ‘auf einmal verschlingend’. The expression completes the description of Agni’s journey in the preceding pāda. The speed of his journey around the world, completed in a single day, is conveyed by the image of “swallowing up” the route instantly -- similar expressions are found in English. EWA (s.vv. *GAR*ⁿ, *GAR*ⁿ) is uncertain of the root affiliation.

I.128.4: The part. *iṣūyānt-* in d is generally tr. ‘shooting arrows’ (though cf. Re’s “qui cherche la jouissance-rituelle”; sim. Old SBE [but not Noten]), but *shooting* arrows seems out of place in this context, even with Ge’s suggestion (n. 4d) that the priest is compared to a shooter because his words are arrows. Although I maintain the connection with ‘arrow’, I think it means simply ‘go (straight) like an arrow’, readily translatable into the English idiom ‘straight-arrow’, namely a person of utmost rectitude.

On *yātaḥ* √ *jan* see comm. ad III.10.6. Here it could also be rendered “as soon as.”

On the interpretational difficulties of *-śrī-* cmpds see comm. ad III.26.5. I am now open to a transitive interpr. such cmpds with ritual items as first members and suggest as alt. here “bringing the ghee to perfection.”

I.128.5: A complex vs., esp. in its earlier parts, with a variety of tr. I will treat only my own. But first a few textual adjustments. In b I read (with most interpr., going back to Ludwig; see Old and Ge’s n. 5b) *agné ráveṇa* rather than Pp. *agnér áveṇa*. Note also that the sandhi between b and c has been wrongly resolved by HvN into *bhojye / a...* rather than *bhojyā / i...* (here Pp. is correct). And the first word of c has the wrong sibilant in the HvN text: it’s correctly *iṣirāya*, not *iśirāya*.

Also in b I take the simile as consisting only of *marútām ná* rather than including *bhojyā*. This genitive modifies *ráveṇa* and is parallel to *agné(r)*. The roaring of Agni is being compared to the roaring of the Maruts, personifications of the thunderstorm. This syntactic distribution is found in Old SBE, but subsequent tr. have not followed him.

I take the *bhojyā* as nominative and the subject of an intrans./passive use of med. *prñcāte*, a usage found elsewhere. However, it is not impossible that this med. form is transitive -- cf. *ā ... prcīmahi* in the next hymn (I.129.7) -- in which case I would supply ‘priests’ as subj.: “(The priests) infuse the (offering-)foods into his forces.”

In pāda a I take *táviṣṭsu* ‘forces’ as a reference to Agni’s flames. Although *táviṣṭ-* ordinarily belong to Indra, see, e.g., III.3.5, 26.4 for *táviṣṭbhiḥ* in conjunction with Agni.

I tentatively take Indra as the referent for *iṣirāya* in c, as he is addressed as *iśira* in the first vs. of the next hymn (I.129.1) and is several times the referent of this stem elsewhere. But I do not insist on this identification.

The *ca* in de is problematic, and this problem is connected with the question of the affiliation of *vásūnām*. Ge (fld. by Klein, DGRV I.234) takes *ca* as a clausal conjunction and supplies a 2nd verb “(beschenkt)” in d, parallel to *ínvati* in c. This requires that *vásūnām* be construed with *majmánā* (“mit einer Fülle von Gütern”). But *majmánā* does not take a genitive of specification but only of possession and in any case its contexts favor ‘might’ over ‘abundance’. Several times it appears parallel with *krátvā* (including nearby I.141.6, 143.2) in the collocation “with resolve and with might,” as it would here, though at some remove (see *krátvā* in pāda a). Forms of *vásu-* regularly occur with forms of √ *dā* ‘give’, however, and so the most natural collocation here would be *dānam ... vásūnām* “the giving of goods.” But what, then, to do with the *ca*? I think the clue is to be found in X.50.7 *vásūnām ca vāsunaś ca dāvāne* “for the giving of goods and of good”; in other words, I think the *vásūnām ca* in our passage is a truncated formula, with *vāsunaś ca* gapped. But the omitted sg. *vásu-* is immediately inserted in the first pāda of the next verse (6a) and the number-neutralized stem occurs three times in vs. 8: *vásudhitim* (8a), *vasūyávaḥ* (8f, g). Note also that a different form of *vásu* appears to be gapped in 6ab. The poet slyly sets the *vásu-* agenda in 5de by introducing it with an off-balance

expression that requires repair. For a similarly problematic *ca* involving (in my opinion) gapping, see the previous hymn, I.127.8 and disc. there.

The phrase *śámsād aghāt* corresponds to the well-attested bahuvrīhi *aghásamsa-* ‘possessing evil speech’, found in the next hymn (I.129.6).

I.128.6: With Ge, Re, and Old I supply an acc. pl. *vásū(ni)* as obj. of *dadhe*, on the basis of IX.18.4 *vásūni hástayor dadhé* (cf. also X.54.5). The gapping of a form of *vásu-* here, accepted by most, corresponds nicely to the gapping of the same stem I suggest for the previous vs. Thieme (Unters.), fld. by WG, instead take *dadhe* as passive: the fire “is taken in the hand” (of the priest, so Th). This seems pragmatically unlikely: although firebrands are ritually carried about under certain circumstances, picking up the entire ritual fire (as *vīhāyāh* and *aratīh* seem to imply) would be risky and painful. Moreover, the rest of the verse depicts the good things that Agni does for people, and taking goods in his hand fits this context.

The rarely attested verbal stem *īṣudhyá-*, here in the part. *īṣudhyaté*, has a counterpart in Old Avestan, *īšūidiāmahi* 3x in the Yasna Haptañhāiti, which exists alongside a noun *īšud-*. The form is carefully discussed by Narten (YH 159-61), who accepts Humbach’s etymology (Gathas 1959, II, ad Y 31.14; repeated 2nd ed. 1991): *īšud-* is a compound of *īš-* ‘nourishment’ and the zero-grade of **√vadh* ‘lead’, to which root noun compound a denom. is built meaning ‘strengthen’. (For a rehearsal of the history of this scholarship, see Scar 63.) I am not convinced. I prefer to see it (couched in Vedic terms for the moment) as a compound of *īṣu-* ‘arrow’ and *√dhā* ‘place’. That lexeme is specialized in the meaning ‘aim’ and is a well-attested metaphor for the “aiming” of a praise-hymn towards the divine recipient; cf. IX.69.1 *īṣur ná dhānvan prāti dhīyate matīh* “Like an arrow on a bow, my thought is aimed.” (For the affinity of *īṣu-* and *√dhā* cf. also I.64.10 *ástāra īṣum dadhire gābhastayoḥ* “The archers have taken their arrows in their fists” and the cmpd. *īṣu-dhī-* ‘quiver’.) Such an analysis works also for the Avestan forms, since Avestan has both the ‘arrow’ word and the verb, and I see no reason why it could not be reconstructed for Indo-Iranian. An ‘arrow’ derivation works extremely well in our passage because *īṣudhyaté* echoes *īṣūyaté* (‘going straight like an arrow’) in vs. 4, likewise ending the d-pāda, likewise a denominative participial dat. of benefit. For extensive and updated disc. see my 2020 “Vedic *īṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *īšud-*, *īšūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Fs. Lamberterie).

The 2nd person of pf. *ōhiṣe* is puzzling in a verse, and a hymn, in which the god is otherwise entirely referred to in the 3rd ps. (see the surrounding verbs in this vs.: *dadhe* (a), *śísraṭhat* (bc), *ṛṇvati* (fg) -- with pāda f esp. entirely parallel to de with 2nd ps. *ōhiṣe*). I think it must be a transposition of the phrase found in VIII.19.1 *devatrā havyām ōhire* “They have carried the oblation among the gods.” The expected 3rd sg. pf. *ōhe* would not fit the meter here.

Though pādas f and g share both a subject (Agni) and a verb (*ṛṇvati*) they seem semantically somewhat at odds. This semantic disparity is, however, ameliorated by the fact that their objects, *vāram* and *dvārā* respectively, are phonologically very close, which similarity was already pointed out by Re.

I.128.7: *jénya-* is of unclear formation (see EWA s.v.), and opinion is generally split between a derivation from *√jan* ‘be born’ (e.g., Gr ‘edel’) and *√ji* ‘win’ (e.g., WG

‘siegreich’), with EWA tentatively opting for the latter. In contrast, I find that a meaning ‘noble’ vel sim. better fits most passages and consider it a pseudo-gerundive to \sqrt{jan} , built to the zero-grade formant $jā-$ (cf. in this hymn $jāyata$ 1a, $ājāyata$ 4f, g), with the semantic development ‘(worthy) to be born, noble, thoroughbred’; its use with inanimate $vāsu$ (e.g., the compd. $jenyā-vasu-$ ‘having noble goods’) is simply an extension comparable to English “noble metals” (vs. base metals).

I.129 Indra

This hymn is particularly studded with indefinite expressions: $pṛtanāsu kāsū cid$ 2a, 4d, $kām cid$ 3b, $kāyasya cid$ 5a; later in the hymn $rātham kām cid$ 10d, $anyām ... kām cid$ 10f.

I.129.1: Pādas de show two different constructions with $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘make’. On the one hand, $abhīṣṭaye kārāḥ$ is a periphrastic caus. “make to prevail,” with $abhīṣṭaye$ parallel to the infinitival $medhāsātaye$ ‘to gain wisdom’ in 1a; on the other hand, $kārāḥ ... vājīnam$ is a predicate adj. construction “make (it=chariot) a prize-winner.” Separating the two constructions is the embedded tag $vāśaś ca$ “if you wish,” with subordinating ca (see Klein DGRV I.250). Though subordinate clauses are almost never embedded, this functions as a parenthetical like later $manye$ ‘methinks’ and it also intervenes between two clauses.

Most tr. supply the chariot as subj. of f, but this makes difficulties with the acc. of g, since, by the conventions of Atyaṣṭi meter, f and g should form a syntactic unity. I assume instead that $sā$ here refers to Indra in the 2nd ps. and an imperative should be supplied to make a classic “sa figé” construction (see Jamison 1992); note that the next vs. begins with a stripped-down version of the same construction: $sā śrudhi$ “Listen!” As to what imperative to supply, I generate it out of the participial voc. $tūtujāna$ ‘o thruster’ to the root \sqrt{tuj} . Alternatively, it could be generated from the verb found in bc $prā(...)$ $nāyasi$, hence “lead forth.”

In g the word order of $imām vācam nā$ makes difficulties. If $imām vācam$ is a simile, then we might expect the order $*imām nā vācam$. However, note I.121.6 $asyā uśāso nā$ discussed above, also with deictic + noun followed by the simile marker, so it may be that the placement is by rule (though this requires more investigation). Note also that in 5b of this hymn the $nā$ follows a clear two-word simile (without deictic), similarly, if I’m correct, 8g and 5g (cf. also 130.2, 9). Another factor that may have helped determine the placement of $nā$ here is that f ends ($tūtujā$) $na vedhāsām$ and g $nā vedhāsām$, so the displacement of the simile particle would facilitate the echo pattern. Alternatively we might separate $imām$ and $vācam$ and take the former as part of the frame “(thrust forward) this one like speech.” If “this one” refers to the chariot, we must then assume gender attraction from $*imām$. WG’s tr. reflects a separation analysis, but with $imām$ also representing $vācam$: “... dieses (Wort) wie das Wort der Vertrauenswürdigten.”

I.129.2: The exact semantic relationship between the noun $dākṣa-$ ‘skill’ and the related (pseudo-)gerundive $dakṣāyya-$ is unclear and may be somewhat fluid. Here ‘besought, approached for skill’ seems to fit the context better than ‘to be skillfully served’ vel sim. (e.g., Re’s “(apte) à être servi-efficacement”). See disc. I.91.3.

The cmpd *bhāra-hūti-*, here tr. as ‘battle cry’, actually contains part of the quoted cry as its first member: “the cry ‘carry (the day)’.” That is, I interpr. *bhāra-* as derived from the impv. *bhāra* with omitted object. For the analytic version of this expression see V.29.8 ... *viśve ahvanta devā, bhāram indrāya yād āhim jaghāna* “all the gods called “*bhara*” to Indra when he smashed the serpent.”

Pādas de show nicely balanced alliteration, *śūraiḥ s^ḍvaḥ sanitā ... viprair vājam*, with responsion between *yāḥ / yó, -aiḥ / -air*, and the final *-itā / -utā*.

The verb *iradhanta* and nearby inf. *irādhyai* (I.134.2) are the only two forms showing the formant *iradh*. I connect them with *√rdh* (*irādh*) ‘succeed, bring to success’, though the morphological details escape me.

In g the simile marker *nā* is superficially positioned as in 1g, after the first two words of the pāda, but in this case the placement is correct, since the simile only begins with the second word, *ātyam*.

I.129.3: What “swell the bullish skin” means isn’t clear. Ge suggests that it refers to Indra giving in abundance. I interpr. it in conjunction with the phrase in the next hymn, I.130.8, *mānave ... tvācam kṛṣṇām arandhayat* “he made the black skin [=barbarians] subject to Manu.” If “black skin” is characteristic of our enemies, I suggest that the successfully swollen “bullish skin” refers to us, primed for battle.

My “(in that)” introducing c follows Ge: some sort of subordination is required to account for the verbal accent on *parivṛṇākṣi*, since otherwise **pāri vṛṇākṣi* would be expected.

The placement of *utā* ‘and’ in d is peculiar, since it precedes a series of concatenated datives lasting through pāda g. See Klein DGRV I.357-58, though he can only describe, not explain, this effect.

I.129.4: Both abc and de are constructed pleonastically. In a(bc) the phrase *uśmasiṣṭāye* (i.e., *uśmasi iṣṭāye*) “we wish to seek” is semantically but not etymologically pleonastic (roots *√vaś* and *√iṣ* respectively), while in cd *ūtāyé, ‘vā* (i.e., *ūtāye, āvā*) “help to help” is both. When in fg we encounter the etymological figure *stárate stṛṇóṣi (... stṛṇóṣi)*, we expect another pleonasm, but here of course the etymologically related words do not duplicate each other functionally because they have different subjects, though they do essentially mean the same thing: “(he) will (not) lay (you) low (whom) you lay low.”

Because of this structural pattern in the verse, I do not follow Ge’s (and others’) attempts to mitigate the pleonasm of abc (e.g., Ge “Wir wünschen, dass ... Indra ... gern komme”).

The *vaḥ* in a is difficult to render in tr. I take it as the usual offhand address to the patrons on whose behalf we, the ritual officiants, perform all our actions. Because of the awkwardness I omitted it in the publ. tr., esp. since the benefit to 1st ps. “us” is so heavily emphasized by fronted full genitive *asmākam* (also in d). These fronted pronouns were also impossible to render in that position without violence to the English.

The positioning of *yām* in g is worth a brief note. In f it appears immediately after the first word of its clause, *stṛṇóṣi*, a standard position. This happens also to be the last word of its clause. In the tag pāda g *stṛṇóṣi yām* takes the same position as in f, but since more material has been added at the front, the *yām* is now out of position.

I.129.5: I borrow *śátru-* ‘rival’ from 4fg to construe with the indefinite *káyasya cid*; cf. VIII.25.15 ... *vanúṣaḥ ... abhímātiṃ káyasya cid* “the arrogance of every zealot.”

The phrase *téjīṣṭhābhir arāṇibhiḥ* “with piercingly hot kindling sticks” appears in Paruchepa’s I.127.4, which suggests that this phrase must constitute the simile and the *ná* is displaced to the right as in 1g. (WG try to avoid this difficulty by construing *téjīṣṭhābhiḥ* first with *ūtībhiḥ*, but the nearby parallel makes that unlikely.)

The relation between d and e is not clear. Ge makes e part of the *yáthā* clause, but *purā* seems to call for a past tense and *mányase* is a present. Moreover, as Old points out, *yáthā purā* is a common self-contained tag. The problem, though, is that *mányase* is accented. Old suggests that it is accented because the clause is by its nature a Nebensatz. The publ. tr. should probably have signaled this by “(in that)” vel sim.

What is going on in f is unclear, since, as Ge points out, Pūru is depicted in a positive light in other nearby Paruchepa passages (I.130.7, 131.4). He suggests supplying *énāṃsi* with *viśvāni*, flg. Sāy, thus “carry away all (the guilts) from Pūru.” But this won’t work with g (as it should in the Atyaṣṭi template), because the guilt would be coming to us. Perhaps the poet is urging Indra to redistribute the goods of the patron (Pūru) to us.

This verse is one of the very few places in the Atyaṣṭi series in which the strict verbal repetition at the end of fg is breached (see also the next vs.). Here *váhniḥ* should be final in the pāda, but has been displaced by *no ácha*. I have no real explanation for this, save for the fact that when *no ácha* are adjacent they go last (I.165.3, III.35.1, IV.34.10), but this hardly seems a sufficient reason.

The g pāda is a syllable too short. I suggest that the simile particle *ná* has been haplologized in the sequence *āsā váhnir *ná no ácha*. The descriptor *āsā váhni-* (X.115.3) or more usually *váhni- āsā* (I.76.4, VI.11.2, VI.19.9) ‘conveyor by mouth’ is otherwise used of Agni, which makes ritual sense; here, without the simile particle, it would have to be applied to Indra, which does not (hence Ge’s diluted “Wortführer”). If I am correct, this is another example of a displaced *ná* simile marker; of course in this case *āsā váhniḥ* would be a quasi-compound ‘conveyor-by-mouth’.

I.129.6: The vs. begins a little oddly with a solemn proclamation to a drop (*índave*), but in my opinion this is actually indirectly evoking the word-play, esp. common in Maṇḍala IX, between *indu-* ‘drop’ and *indra-*, the more natural addressee here. The transition between drop and Indra is effected by the beginning of the next pāda, *hávyo ná*. I take *hávya-* as a pun; though the occurrences of this stem are overwhelmingly associated with the root $\sqrt{hū}$, *hvā* ‘invoke’, hence ‘to be invoked’, it could technically also be built to the root \sqrt{hu} ‘pour’, hence ‘to be poured’ (see the differently accented but identically formed *havyā-* ‘oblation’). I read *hávyaḥ* with both meanings here, with ‘to be invoked’ in the simile and referring to Indra and ‘to be poured’ directly referring to the drop. Both Indra and the drop stimulate the verbal skills of the poet. I see no reason to assume that the referent is Bhaga, *pace* Ge, Re (and tentatively Old). The *rakṣohán-* ‘demon-smasher’ in c may be, as often, soma, but is more likely Indra, given *hantā pāpāsya rakṣásah* and *rakṣohānam*, both of Indra, in vs. 11.

The repeated final verb *rējati* (bc) is nicely echoed in e by (*vadhai*)r *ajeta*.

The compd. *aghā-śamṣa-* finds its analytical parallel in I.128.5 *śāmsād aghāt*.

The lexeme *áva* \sqrt{sru} , lit. ‘flow down’, appears only here (fg) in the RV; I suggest that it may idiomatically mean ‘be miscarried, aborted’, and the *ksudráṃ* ‘speck’ in g is

the embryo/fetus. For abortion in a hostile context in this group of hymns, see I.127.3, at least acdg. to my interpretation; the phonological similarity of the two verbs (in I.127.3 and here) supports this interpr.

Like the last verse, this one, quite unusually, disrupts the strict final repetition of the fg pādas, with *áva sravet* opening f, but distracted to *áva ... sravet* in g. I again have no explanation for this.

I.129.7: The pun on *hávya-* in 6b is continued by the same double meaning in *hótrā-*, a stem that by most accounts does belong both to $\sqrt{hū}$ and \sqrt{hu} . (The standard tr. only render it by ‘oblation’ here, however.)

The fem. *citāntī-*, which looks like a participle to a 6th cl. pres. or (so Wh Rts.) a root aor., is formally isolated and requires metrical distraction. Gr suggests (on no particular basis) emending to **cetáyantyā*, but how would such a corruption arise? WG’s **citáyantyā* is more plausible but perhaps unnecessary. Lowe (*Participles* 289) takes it as a Caland adjective beside *citrā-*, but this also seems unnecessary.

The part. *sántam* in c at first seems pleonastic; it does not have its regular concessive value. But it was most likely included here in order to indicate which noun the adj. *raṇvám* modifies. By itself *raṇvám* could qualify either *rayím* or *survīryam* in b, but *sántam* identifies it as a masc. and therefore belonging to *rayím*, since *survīryam* is neut. (WG’s use of *survīryam* as an adj. with *rayím* in bc is contrary to the usage of this stem elsewhere.)

I.129.8: With the repeated *prá-pra* I supply a form of the copula for the idiom *prá√as* ‘be preeminent’.

Note the common use of instr. pl. adj. (here *sváyaśobhiḥ*) with (apparent) sg. pāda-final *ūtī*. This interpr. seems preferable to WG, who supply “gods” with the pl. adj. and take *ūtī* separately.

As in 4a this clause contains both a full 1st pl. pronoun (*asmé*) and the enclitic 2nd pl. *vah*. As there, I think the 2nd ps. referent is the patrons, in addition to the 1st ps. ritual officiants, but, once again, a tr. “be preeminent among us for you” seems clumsy, and I did not render the *vah* in the publ. tr.

I take the fem. subject of d-g to be personified *durmatī-*, with Ge. Others, going back to Sāy, take it to be the *jūrñi-* of g (see Ge n. 8d), but I think that belongs to a simile.

The opening of d, *svayám sã* echoes that of 6d *svayám só*.

Ge refuses to tr. *vakṣati* and feels that it cannot belong either to \sqrt{vah} or to $\sqrt{vakṣ}$. I take it with $\sqrt{vakṣ}$ / *ukṣ* ‘grow’, as a malformed nonce subjunctive to *úkṣa-* / *ukṣá-* (or preferably a derivationally prior, unattested root formation).

In g I take *ná* as both the simile marker and the negative. (This is rather like the haplology of **ná no* I posited for 5g.) “Like a firebrand ... she will *not* ...” If I am correct this is yet another example of the *ná* simile marker displaced to the right.

I.129.9–10: Note identical openings to these two vss: *tvám na indra rāyā ...*, with the final word of the pādas showing very close phonological patterning: *pārīṇasā / tárūṣasā*.

I.129.9: On the basis of my reeval. of *anehás-* (ad X.61.12), I would now change the tr. in b from “faultless path” to “flawless path,” describing physical rather than moral perfection.

I.129.10: The standard tr. construe e with fg, such that *rátham* of e is the referent of *anyám* in f. But this seriously violates the structure of Atyaṣṭi, where de always constitute a unit. Moreover, “another chariot than us” would be a strange expression; we expect the *anyám* to refer to an animate opponent in such a construction, esp. if it is “intending harm” (*rírikṣantam*). I therefore generate a verbal form ‘help’ from the agent noun voc. *ávitar* that ends d: √av + *rátham* is found elsewhere (I.102.3, 112.12, etc.).

I.129.11: I do not understand the participle *sán* in c. It does not have concessive force, nor does it serve (like *sántam* 7c) to anchor an unclear gender assignment. It may convey something like “since you are a god / in your capacity as god,” though this hardly seems necessary to express of Indra, whose divinity isn’t in question here.

I.130 Indra

I.130.1: After my reconsideration of *nāyám* (see disc. ad VIII.2.28), I would delete “to the landing site” from the publ. tr.

In c the simile marker *iva* seems to be displaced to the right, like *ná* several times in I.129 (1b, 5b, 5g, 8g). Such placement seems to be characteristic of Paruchepa.

I.130.2: *áhā víśveha* in g (repeated in 9g) appears to show the same displaced simile particle found elsewhere in the Paruchepa hymns; see disc. ad I.129.1.

I.130.3: Nice phonetic figure in d *vrajám vajrī (ga)vām iva*. Note esp. the floating *r* in *vrajám vajrī* and the syncopated *ī ā (...)* *vā/a*.

I.130.4: In f the standard tr. take *vanínaḥ* as an acc. pl., the object of *ní vṛścasi* in the frame, parallel to acc. *vṛksám* in the simile. But after all the build-up earlier in the verse towards the smashing of Vṛtra, I find it hard to believe that Indra is just cutting down trees here, and the doubling of ‘tree’ in *vṛksám vanínaḥ* seems flat (“like a carpenter a tree, you cut down wooden things [=trees]”). Instead I take *vanínaḥ* as gen. sg. referring collectively to a forest (the thing that has wood) and supply Vṛtra / the serpent as object in the frame. Both *vṛtrám* and *āhim* are found elsewhere as obj. of *vṛśca-* (though, I admit, not with *ní*, but usually with *vī*).

I.130.5: For *vṛthā* in this context see II.15.3.

For *itá ūtīḥ* see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

I.130.6: Pādas bc show one of the only alterations of syntax and conceptual structure between ab and its tag-pāda c in the Atyaṣṭi corpus. The Āyus fashioned speech *for you* (*te*) in ab, but fashioned *you* (*tvām*) in c. The rest of the verse is then applicable to both speech and you.

One of the rare scramblings of the ends of the fg pādas, which are ordinarily identical. Here the last two words get flipped: f *sātāye dhānā* / g *dhānāni sātāye*. For other such instances (though not so neatly structured) see I.129.5, 6. The flip in g here allows it to match the opening of 7g *viśvā dhānāni* ...

I.130.7: Note in pāda a ... *pūro* ... *pūrāve*# and see I.131.4.

I.130.8: Following Ge, I read *tatṛṣṇām* in both simile and frame. In the simile it is the dried material that feeds the fire; in the frame the thirsty or greedy.

The PN *arśasānām* in g neatly matches *tatṛṣṇām* in the same position in f. On the formation see comm. ad X.99.7. I would now suggest a tr. “Harmer” for the straight PN.

I.130.9: As indicated in the publ. intro., this verse, which treats Indra’s theft of the sun’s wheel and his visit to Uśanā Kāvya, is quite opaque. The first pāda straightforwardly announces the mythical deed at issue, but things disintegrate after that.

The next two pādas (bc) introduce a theft of speech and a figure identified as *aruṇā*- (‘ruddy’) that are not elsewhere associated with the myth. However, since the verb *muṣāyā*- ‘steal’ and the temporal expression *prapitvé* are found in other accounts of the myth (I.175.4, IV.30.4, VI.31.3 and IV.16.12, VI.31.3 respectively), these pādas must contain at least some covert reference to the myth. However, I treat them as parenthetical because pādas de seem to follow directly from a, and the present tense *muṣāyati* does not fit well with the injunctive *prá vṛhat* of a and the plupf. *ájagan* in e.

Pādas de depict Indra’s journey to Uśanā’s dwelling, an incident associated elsewhere with the wheel-theft narrative. First, note that initial *īśānā(h)* in c is echoed by init. *uśānā* in d. I have treated the peculiar morphology of *uśānā* at length (Jamison 2007 Fs. Jasanoff) and concluded that the stem is essentially uninflected and that it is therefore possible to take *uśānā* here, with Ge, as an acc. of goal (or as gen. with a gapped ‘house’), however odd such interpr. may seem at first. Esp. in later Skt. Uśanā is seldom found without his patronymic *kāvya*-, and in the RV even when the patronymic is absent there is often an indirect reference to it. Here that is found in the voc. *kave*, addressed to Indra, which ends pāda e; #*uśānā* and *kave*# thus occupy polarized positions in this two-pāda unit.

I have even less idea of what fg really mean than the rest of the verse. The repeated word *turvāṇiḥ* usually means ‘surpassing, victorious’ -- see nearby I.128.3 -- but this sense does not fit this passage well, esp. with the acc. *sumnāni*. I have therefore taken *turvāṇi*- as expressing a simple motion sense, but have no confidence in the correctness of this interpr. (and in fact fairly strong confidence in its error).

I.131 Indra

The hymn contains a concentration of intensive forms: *ānamnata* 1a, *kārikra* 3f, *carkiran* 5a, *sanīṣṇata* 5fg. This parade of intensives may express the prolonged and continuous struggle of the Ārya to subdue their rivals and gain territory with the constantly sought help of Indra.

I.131.1: A form of *īndra*- is positioned at the beginning of all structurally significant pādas (a, b, d, f) in Atyaṣṭi.

The intens. *ánamnata* in my opinion expresses habitual action. Schaeffer suggests that it is a “Hin- und Her-” or “Auf- und Ab-” motion, but I don’t see the dignified and stately Heaven and Earth bobbing up and down.

I.131.2: Pādas de contain what we would call a mixed metaphor: “we would place you at our chariot-pole like a boat.” In a RVic context this does not seem a solecism, but simply an example of the usual piling of image upon image.

I am uncertain of the value of the part. *citáyantaḥ* in f. In keeping with the zero-grade root syllable it should mean ‘appear’ or ‘perceive’, but the case frame makes these interpr. hard to impose. In the publ. tr. I take it as a double I/T (in the term used in my 1983 book) ‘make (Indra) take notice’, that is, ‘cause to perceive’, but I am disturbed by the mismatch of the formal and the functional: in this meaning it should be full-grade *cetáya-* and there is no easy way to explain a redactional change to zero-grade. (Ge, Re tr. ‘auszeichnen’, ‘distinguent’ respectively, but this doesn’t conform to any standard meaning of *citáya-* or *cetáya-*. WG take it as an intrans., “wir glänzenden Nachkommen des Āyu,” which respects the formal shape but leaves the rest of the pāda without a syntactic skeleton.) Since it has the same value that I ascribe to *īkṣáyat* in the next hymn (I.132.5), it may be that *citáyant-* here adapted the sense of *īkṣáya-*, since they both have apparent zero-grade stems.

Another problem with this final sequence is the function and position of *ná* in f. It should mark *índram* as the compared term in a simile (“... like Indra”), but since Indra should be the target of sacrifice and praise, deflecting him to the simile is unlikely and leaves us without a corresponding term in the frame. I am loosely taking *ná* as having domain over the whole pāda, which implicitly compares *us* (the subject of *dhīmahi* in e) with the Āyus, though this is not how simile marking generally works -- and will also not work if “we” are identical to the Āyus rather than compared to them. The mention of the Āyus in the preceding hymn, I.130.6, and in I.139.3 (also Paruchepa) allows but does not require this identification. In sum, the interpr. of fg is quite uncertain.

I.131.3: Although the general semantic range of the root-noun cmpd *niḥśíjaḥ* in bc is fairly clear -- it refers to the releasing of the cows enclosed in the cowpen -- its grammatical identity is not. It can be either a transitive nom. pl., as I take it in the publ. tr. (so also tentatively Old and, it seems, Re, Narten [SigAor. 266–67]), or a gen. or abl. infinitive (so Scar, WG). In a sense it scarcely matters.

I follow Narten (Sig.Aor. 266–67) in taking *sákṣanta(ḥ)* [-aḥ so Pp., not -e] to \sqrt{sah} ‘conquer, be victorious’ rather than \sqrt{sac} ‘accompany’ (so Gr; Ge’s and Re’s tr. do not easily reflect either root). WG take it as a type of desiderative with -s-formant, but also to \sqrt{sah} . Support for this root affiliation comes from *sāsaḥānāḥ* in the next verse, likewise opening the c-pāda.

Note the paired opposition of the two verbs *ví√taṃs* ‘yank (apart /) back and forth’ and *sám√ūh* ‘shove together’, with complementary subj./obj. pairs: people (yank) Indra / Indra (shoves) people. The point is that the opposing forces fight over having Indra on their side, each trying to pull him to its side, while Indra sets the two sides to fighting by pushing them together.

Again I take the intens. *āvīṣ kárikrat* as expressing habitual or continuous action: Indra is always showing off his mace.

I.131.4: Note the word play across the pāda boundary of a-b: *pūrāvaḥ, pūro*. The same play is found in I.130.7a ... *pūro ... pūrāve*#, though not so neatly juxtaposed.

In d *tām* is somewhat curiously positioned; it may have been displaced to allow the verb *śāsas* to take initial position in order to echo *sāśahānāḥ*, which opens the previous pāda.

I.131.5: I take *kārām √kṛ* in d as an expression from gambling: lit. “to do (the decisive) deed,” “to make ‘game’,” that is, “to win.” See *kārām √hvā* in V.29.8.

I.131.6: I take the final *juṣéta hí* of pāda a as a parenthetical remark, contrary to the standard tr. The rest of the verse (as well as the preceding verse) addresses Indra in the 2nd ps.; moreover, the position of *hí* is most easily explained if *juṣéta* opens the clause, and a gen. complement with *√juṣ*, as suggested by Gr, would be (almost?) unprecedented. The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take *asyā uśásah* as a temporal expression “on/during this dawn here,” but supposed exx. of this usage elsewhere are not convincing. The collocation in fg ... *asyā vedhásah ... śrudhi ...* is structurally identical to *asyā uśásah ... bodhi*, a parallelism that supports my interpr.

If, as I believe, *asyā uśásah* is to be construed with *bodhi* in b, the first term in b, *arkásya*, can serve as transition, since this word means both ‘chant’ and ‘ray’; as ‘ray’ it would group with *uśásah*, as ‘chant’ with *havíṣah* ‘oblation’, linking the coming of dawn with the dawn sacrifice.

I.131.7: The standard tr. take the *yó no aghāyāti* clause as the only obj. of *jahí* in d (“smash [him] who wishes us ill”). This may be correct, but I have opted for the “(X and) which Y” construction.

I.132 Indra

I.132.1: In the publ. tr. I treat the first member of the three-member cmpd *índratvotāḥ* as if it were a voc., since the lit. “aided by you, Indra” seems clumsy.

The verb *ádhi vocā* could also be a 1st sg. subj., but with most tr. I take it as 2nd sg. impv.; “I” am a less likely advocate for the presser than Indra is.

With Ge I consider *ví cayema bháre kṛtām* (f) a gambling expression; for another such expression see the previous hymn, I.131.5d.

I.132.2: Pādas abc consist entirely of four locative expressions (with their genitives); this heavily signposted syntactic pattern allows (/forces) the first word of d, *áhan(n)* to be interpreted as the loc. sg. of *áhar* ‘day’ rather than the 2nd/3rd sg. root impf. of *√han*, which otherwise would be strongly favored in an Indra context. (Note that the identical opening, *áhann índro*, is found at IV.28.3, with the verb.) The locatives in 1d, f also reinforce the loc. reading, esp. *asmín áhani* (1d). I don’t know exactly what to call this poetic trick -- it is aggressively a non-pun.

āprá- in a is a hapax, and there is no consensus on its meaning or derivation; see EWA s.v. I am inclined to follow Ge (etc.)’s connection with *āprī-* (a noun that doesn’t occur in the RV, though the verbal syntagm does) with a meaning ‘propitiator’ vel sim.

This fits its dependence on *vákmani* ‘at the speech’ and may also thematically echo *ádhi vocā* ‘advocate, speak on behalf of’ in 1e. It could indeed refer to the reciter of Āprī hymns. The other leading etymological candidate is *ā√pr* ‘fill’ (so WG; see Old), but “the filler” seems to have less connection with speaking than “the propitiator.”

The way the reflexive adj. *svásmin* works in bc is a little tricky: “of X, at his very own anointing.”

On the basis of I.134.2 I follow Ge in taking *krāñāsya* as passive and referring to the soma. Thus in bc we find the anointing (*āñjasi*) of the two primary ritual substances, fire (b) and soma (c). Alternatively, if it seems desirable to keep the referent the same in the two pādas, one can follow Re, WG in taking *krāñā-* as “active,” referring to Agni.

The use of ‘head’ (*śīras-/śīrṣān-*) to refer to an individual person is not, as far as I know, otherwise found in the RV, though the semantic dev. is obvious and preceded in English.

I.132.3: A very opaque verse, which has received multiple interpretations. I will discuss only my own, very tentative, one here.

I take pāda a as the announcement to Indra of the “pleasurable offering” (*prāyaḥ*) currently set out for him at this sacrifice (*asmín yajñē* 1f); see nearby I.134.1, 135.4 for similar usage of *prāyas-*. This glittering offering reminds the poet of a previous one (*pratnāthā*). I take the next two pādas (bc) as describing this previous one; the relative locative *yásmin yajñē* is a temporal expression that picks up the temporal *pratnāthā*.

The crux in bc is the pair *vāram* (b), *vār* (c). Since the former is an obj. of *ākṛṇvata* and the latter a (possible) subj. of *ási*, an analysis as a masc. (or at least gendered) root noun suggests itself, but such a noun has at best a precarious existence (see Schindler WurNom s.v.). Nonetheless, I think it must be posited here; the other solutions, which include taking the two forms to two separate stems (see, e.g., Gr, Lub) or decomposing them into *vā + a...* (Hoffmann apud Schindler, WG), do too much violence to the patterns of Atyaṣṭi meter. With Ge and Re in their separate ways (“Schirmer(?)” “protecteur”) I take the form to *√vr* ‘cover’ and tr. ‘shield’ (as in X.93.3). In b this noun in the acc. is in apposition to unexpressed *tvā* ‘you’, i.e., Indra -- which is the first obj. to a double acc. *√kr* construction ‘make X into Y’. (For Indra as a home, see 5fg. For *kṣāya-* in a metaphorical sense, see the next hymn, I.133.7a.) In the tag-pāda the construction has been switched from acc. to nom., and the 2nd sg. ref. is now overt (*asi* ‘you are’). A nom. *vār* conforms to this case switch; however, since *kṣāya-* is masc., we should expect **kṣāyaḥ* here. I explain the anomaly by the pressures of Atyaṣṭi, which requires strict identity between the finals of b and c; *kṣāyam* is simply repeated from b or made an honorary neut. for the occasion. It is possible to avoid this problem by assuming that *vār-* has verbal rection (so implicitly Ge “der Schirmer(?) des Hauses”; see also Schindler WurNom), but this introduces further complications, and I prefer the double acc. interpr. anyway.

If bc refers to a time in the distant past when Indra was made into our protector, d may then call for the restatement of this fact at the current ritual (depicted in pāda a by my interpr.) The expression *nū itthā te pūrvāthā ca pravācyam* “Now in the current way and in the earlier one it is to be proclaimed of you” in 4a supports my interpr. of the larger structure of this verse, namely that it concerns the conceptual intersection of the current ritual and the previous one and that what has been said before needs to be restated at the

current sacrifice. Note also that, though the form of \sqrt{vac} , *voceḥ* in this case, now has the preverb *ví*, the sequence *vocer ádha*, with the adv. *ádha*, echoes *ádhi vocā* in 1e.

In e I take *raśmībhiḥ* as a temporal expression “with the rays (of the sun),” identifying the time as dawn, as is very common. The standard tr. take it as an instr. of the means of seeing; this is not impossible, but seems less idiomatic. See further ad I.135.3.

I don’t quite know what to do with *ánu* in f, but given the other difficulties in the verse, this is a minor problem.

I.132.5: For *īkṣáyat* see Jamison 1983: 123. It has the same double I/T value I also ascribe to *citáyanta(h)* in I.131.2f.

In de I take *bādhē* as an infinitive with *tásmai* [=Indra] as subj. and *āyuh prajāvat* as obj. This requires $\sqrt{bādh}$ to have a positive value (‘thrust [s.th. good] towards [s.o.]’), rather than the usual negative ‘thrust away, repel’, but see I.61.2 for a similar positive sense.

I.132.6: The dual dvandva *indrā-parvatā* ‘Indra and Mountain’ raises the question of the identity of ‘Mountain’; as in III.53.1 I think it is a designation of Indra’s mace (*vájra*). That the mace shows up in the instr. in the same pāda as the dual verb that has Indra and Parvata as implicit subj. (c *vājreṇa ... hatam*) does not, I think, rule out this interpr.: as “Mountain” the mace is animatized; in the instrumental it is an inanimate instrument.

The *tām* of pāda a is an anticipatory placeholder for *tām-tam id* in b, c.

Re and WG take *chantsat* (\sqrt{chand}) in d as meaning ‘appear’: “there will appear a *gáhanam* for him ...” -- that is, ‘come into view, take shape’. But though ‘appear’ in modern European lgs. can cover that sense, the ‘appear’ sense of \sqrt{chand} is generally ‘have the appearance of, look like’. Ge’s interpr. is more complex: he takes the *vájra*- to be the underlying subject, which to the fugitive will look like a *gáhanam*. This interpr. represents the sense of \sqrt{chand} better, but at the cost of producing something close to nonsense, at least as I tried to understand it. I instead use the developed sense ‘be pleasing’ of \sqrt{chand} : the point is that once Indra and Parvata start smiting him, even falling into an abyss will be preferable.

I.133 Indra

I.133.1: The popular, Atharvan-like character of the first hymn of this composite (see publ. intro.) (vss. 1–5) is partly signalled by the two *I*-forms in this verse: *abhivlágya* and *vailasthāná-*. Both forms are found only in this hymn. The first belongs to the putative root \sqrt{vlag} , confined to this hymn (this gerund 1c, 2a; nominal *abhivlaṅga-* 4b); the second, in the variants *vailasthānaká-* and *mahāvailastha-*, appears also in 3c, d. Neither has an agreed-upon etymology. For \sqrt{vlag} EWA suggests a connection with \sqrt{vrj} ‘twist’. I see it rather as an *I*-form of \sqrt{vraj} ‘proceed, advance upon’, which in several of its (few) occurrences also appears with *abhí*. The nasal in *abhivlaṅga-* might be a problem, but roots ending in *-j* are prone to secondary nasals (\sqrt{raj} , *rañj* ‘color’, \sqrt{saj} , *sañj* ‘hang’, probably \sqrt{svaj} , *svañj* ‘embrace’).

As for *vaila(-sthana-)*, it also has been subjected to multiple etymologies (see disc. WG ad loc.). I take it as an *I*-form of $\sqrt{vṛddh}$ *vīrā-* ‘hero’; the $\sqrt{vṛddh}$ *r*-form is found

in *vaíra(-deya-)* (V.61.8) ‘(payment) of wergeld’. The ‘place of *vaira-/vaila*’ would be ‘the place of heroes or heroism’, i.e., the battlefield.

Note the juxtaposition across pāda-boundary of *rténa* ‘with truth’ and *drúhaḥ* ‘deceits’. I take *anindrāḥ* as implicitly contrastive with *mahīḥ*: though the lies may be great, they lack Indra and therefore lack ultimate power.

I.133.2: *vaṭūrín-* (*/mahāvaṭūrín-*) in cd is an impossible hapax, and the wisest course (taken by Ge, WG) is not to tr. it. (Re tries out *éperonné* ‘spurred on’, with no indication of where he got it.) Unwisely I tender both a tr. (‘overcoming obstacles’) and an etymology, though more in a spirit of adventure than with any confidence that they are correct. I start with the idiom *vṛtrá-* √ *tṛ* ‘overcome obstacle(s)’, found, e.g., in the fairly well-attested neut. noun *vṛtratūrya-* and adj. *vṛtratúr-*. A hypothetical Middle Indic form to an underlying **vṛtratū/ur-* would be **vaṭṭa-tū/ur-* (since dentals following original **r* often undergo retroflexion: see von Hinüber, *Mittelindisch*² 165). This could then undergo haplology to **vaṭṭū/ur-* and then simplification of the cluster (though we might expect **vāṭṭū/ur-*) to the form to which an *-in-* suffix was affixed. This is more machinery than should be deployed to explain a hapax, but the explanation falls (loosely) within the realm of possibility -- and a MIA source would fit with the other words in the hymn belonging to a lower or aberrant register. Still it would probably be more sensible to follow Kuiper (see EWA s.v.) in taking it as a non-Indo-Aryan word.

Even leaving aside *vaṭūrín-*, the verse doesn’t make a lot of sense: what does it mean for Indra to cut off heads with his *foof*?

I.133.3: In an unpubl. paper Arlo Griffiths argues that *armaká-* means ‘mudflat’.

Note the *-ka-* forms, *vailasthānaká-* and *armaká-* (2x) -- pleonastic *-ka-* often being a sign of colloquial register (see Jamison, *-ka-*). Since diminutivization (or diminishment/belittling) is one of the apparent nuances of the *-ka-* suffix, it is somewhat amusing that we find “diminutivized” *vailasthānaké* beside *mahāvailasthe*.

I.133.4: I have tr. the fem. gen. pl. rel. *yāsām* as ‘when’, to make the structure of subord. cl. (ab) – main cl. (cd) work better. However it is possible (and perhaps preferable) to take the *yāsām* cl. as simply continuing vs. 3: “Smash down the troop of those witches ... of which (witches) you scattered afar thrice fifty.” 4cd would then be an independent sentence.

Who the subject of cd is depends on what the verb *manāyati* means. Ge takes the subj. as a generic, or at least unidentified, “er”: “das merkt er sich fein von dir.” Re thinks the subj. is one of the witches, but like Ge he takes *manāya-* to mean something like ‘pay attention, note, understand’. The verb is an obvious denom. to *manā-*, which is interpr. by some as ‘Andacht’ (prayer, reverence) (see EWA s.v. *MAN*¹), with the verb then meaning ‘andächtig sein’ (be reverent towards)(so WG here, again with a generic subject, “man”). But since I interpret *manā* as ‘zeal’, for me the verb means ‘display zeal’, with the implicit subj. Indra’s deed, represented by the neut. pronouns *tát* (c) and *takát* (d).

Pronominal *-ka-* forms, like *takát*, are an extreme sign of colloquial register -- or rather of the poets overtly signalling their conscious deployment of this register.

I.133.5: This last verse of the colloquially bloodthirsty first hymn of the composite pulls out all the stops with striking interlocking phonetic figures in ab: #*piśāṅga* ... #*piśācim* ... and (*piśāṅg*)*abhṛṣtim ambhṛṇām*# ... (s)*ām mṛṇa*#

The latter sequence helps explain why we have another impossible hapax: *ambhṛṇā*; as often, difficult words appear in contexts that play on their phonological shape. Again, wisdom would suggest leaving it untr. or at least tr. with a vague contextually generated term like ‘monstrous’, but I have had the temerity to suggest another very shaky etymology. I suggest that this is a colloquial deriv. of the lexeme *ānu* √*bhr*, a euphemistic idiom that refers to sexual assault and penetration -- e.g., in the cosmic incest myth (X.61.5). See comm. ad I.88.6 and Jamison 1981 (“A Vedic sexual pun: *āstobhayat*, *anubhartrī*, and RV I.88.6,” *Acta Orientalia* 42 [1981] 55-63). The initial *am* would represent an apocopated form of the preverb *ānu*, a change that fits the register in the rest of the hymn. My ‘ballsy’ is an attempt to capture the slangy irreverence. Since Piśācas are later associated with sexual misconduct towards women -- at least on the basis of the Piśāca “marriage” (e.g., MDŚ III.34), which involves taking advantage of a maiden who is asleep, intoxicated, or disordered -- a sexual interpr. of the adjective qualifying the Piśāci here would be entirely fitting. The same idiom, with an even more MIA cast, may be found in AirĀr *ambhaṇa*- ‘Bauch der Laute’ (belly of the lute); as discussed in my 1981 paper, the *vīṇā* bears some resemblance to male genitalia and jokes about its shape are still current in South Asia.

I.133.6: Although the adverb *avār* ‘downward’ occurs only here, beside more common *avās*, it is probably not the result of secondary alteration of *avās*-, since it has an Old Aves. correspondent *auuarē* (Y. 29.11).

The accent on *dādrhī* must be owing to its juxtaposition with immediately following *śrudhī*.

āpūruṣaghna- is universally taken as ‘not smashing men’, and this is certainly possible. However, since the focus of this composite hymn is on Indra’s destruction of various demonic beings, I think an interpr. ‘smashing non-men’ fits better. The context remains violent, so remarking on Indra’s forbearance towards men would break the martial mood.

I.134 Vāyu

I.134.1: For *makhā*- as ‘bounty’, see disc. ad I.19.8.

I.134.2: *vāyav indavo* somewhat echoes the double voc. construction *vāyav indraś ca*, several exx. of which are found in the next hymn.

I.134.3: In f *prā cakṣaya rōdasī vāsayoṣāsaḥ*, *rōdasī* is most naturally the obj. of *prā cakṣaya* and *uṣāsaḥ* of *vāsaya*, but this seems to leave unaccented *vāsaya* opening its clause. The solution is easily found: in the tag-pāda g the same sequence *vāsayoṣāsaḥ* is preceded in its clause by *śrāvase*. Whether we attribute lack of accent in f to redactional erasure (so Old) or assume that *vāsaya* was originally unaccented because of its repetition in the tag-pāda does not matter much.

I.134.4–6: Fronted forms of the 2nd sg. pronoun begin most of the metrically significant sections in this sequence of vss. (4a, d, 5a, d, 6a).

I.134.4: I take *dám̐su* here and in I.141.4 as the loc. pl. of the root noun *dám̐* ‘house’ (so also WG) rather than as adv. ‘wondrously’ (Gr, Re). Ge refuses to tr.

As with *raśmībhiḥ* in I.132.5 I take *raśmīsu* here as a temporal expr., contrary to the standard tr. The extended phrases in I.135.3, 137.2 support this view.

On *vakṣāṇā* ‘belly’ as a pl. tantum, see comm. ad X.27.16.

I.134.5: Note the plethora of *-an*-forms in abc: *turaṇyávaḥ*, *iṣananta*, *bhurváṇi* (2x).

In b *iṣananta* *bhurváṇi* is echoed by *iṣanta* *bhurváṇi* in the tag-pāda c. WG take *iṣananta* and *iṣanta* to two different verbs (“treiben” and “wünschen” respectively), but as Re remarks, the formal variation is insignificant in Atyaṣṭi (see *duhre*, *duhrate* in 6fg below), and it would be far more disruptive to this structure to change the verb root in the echo. This twinning of *iṣananta* and *iṣanta* here makes it likely that the former has only minimal connections to the other forms belonging to a stem *iṣaṇa-*, otherwise confined to the Indra hymns of IV. See comm. ad IV.16.9.

I take *bhurváṇi* as an adverbial complement to the verb (“set themselves aquiver”)(sim. Old and Re, AiG II.2.900), and therefore in c I am reluctant to construe *apām* with *bhurváṇi* as Ge (and differently WG) do. My solution, which is admittedly ad hoc, is to supply a simile containing **ūrmáyaḥ* (cf., e.g., IX.95.3 *apām ivéd ūrmáyas tāturaṇāṇḥ* for soma drinks [as here] compared to waves of water constantly in motion). On the interpr. of some scholars of *bhurváṇi* as a loc. infinitive, see Keydana (Inf. 190–91), who rightly rejects it.

In its two occurrences (I.151.5, X.91.2) *takva-vī* ‘(in) swooping pursuit’ refers to a bird of prey. In this passage most tr. take *tsārin-* ‘stealthy one’ as a hunter in pursuit of game; this may be correct and is reflected in the publ. tr. However, it’s possible that the stealthy one is the bird of prey, becoming weary as he circles in the air (“in his swooping pursuit” *takva-vīye*). It might seem odd for the bird to “reverently invoke” Indra, but this is hardly beyond the range of RVic discourse.

The verb *pāsi* in fg is universally taken as belonging to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’, and this is morphologically the easier interpretation: it would be a straightforward root present. However, context favors a connection with $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’. As Old points out, *dhármaṇā* is used in IX.25.2, 63.22 to refer to Vāyu’s right to the first drink of soma, and the next verse here, 6abc, spells out this entitlement in almost over-literal detail; it can be considered a species of poetic repair, making it clear that *pāsi* here belongs to ‘drink’. (See also I.135.1de.) Moreover, “protect from every creature” seems an odd expression, since “creatures” are generally positively viewed or at least neutral. The problem with ‘drink’ of course is that this root makes a root *aorist*, not a root present. But at least one other form with primary endings is universally taken to the ‘drink’ root: *pānti* in II.11.14, which in fact describes the same situation as here, Vāyu’s first drink of soma: *prá vāyávaḥ pānti ágraṇītim* “The Winds drink the first offering.” These two primary forms may be nonce presents or subjunctives (in which case the tr. here should be “you will drink ...”), or *pāsi* here could be a nonce *-si* imperative.

I take the two abl. in fg in different senses: *vísvasmād bhúvanāt* as a temporal expression, but *asuryāt* as causal.

I.134.6: For abc as a “repair” of *pāsi* in 5fg, see disc. there.

Most supply barhis as the obj. of the perf. part. *vavarjūṣṭhām*, and this is quite possibly correct. By contrast I take it in the metaphorical sense “twist s.o. towards oneself,” that is, attract to the sacrifice -- though we might prefer a medial form in that sense. And the mention of barhis at the beginning of the next hymn (I.135.1a) may support that standard view. As Kü points out (461 and n. 873), there’s no obvious explanation for the full-grade stem (expect **vavṛjūṣ-*).

I.135 Vāyu

I.135.1–3: The fronted forms of *tvám* (etc.) found in I.134.4–6 continue here, though not as densely: 1d, 2a, d, 3d.

I.135.1: Unaccented *niyutvate* in bc appears to be a voc. to an otherwise unattested *-i-* stem *niyutvati-*, whose formation would be morphologically peculiar (a secondary *-i-* stem built to a *-vant-* stem?!). It must be a nonce manipulation of the standard *-vant-* stem *niyútvant-*. As Re points out, vocatives in *-pate* may have had some influence in producing this rhyme form. Since Vāyu is almost the only referent of *niyútvant-*, it is highly unlikely that the form represents a dative to the *-vant-* stem that lost its accent for some reason.

I.135.2: On *vāha vāyo niyúto yāhy asmayúḥ* see disc. ad VII.90.1.

I.135.3: As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn is divided into ṛcas and each ṛca was probably originally a single hymn. This then is the final verse of 1–3, and it exhibits very heavy ring-composition: 3b ... *úpa yāhi vītāye* reprises 1a *úpa no yāhi vītāye* almost exactly, and 3ab ... *niyúdbhiḥ śatínibhiḥ ... sahasrínibhiḥ ...* echoes 1bc *sahásreṇa niyútā ... śatínibhiḥ*. Note also 3d *távāyám bhāgáḥ ...*, which is identical to the beginning of 2d.

As discussed ad I.134.3, the expression here, *sāraśmīḥ sūrye śacā* “accompanying the reins [=rays] when the sun (rises)” seems to me a fuller version of the temporal expression *raśmīṣu* (*/raśmībhiḥ*) “at/with the reins=rays.” See also I.137.2e *sākām sūryasya raśmībhiḥ* “simultaneous with the reins=rays of the sun.”

I.135.4–6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this ṛca is constructed in parallel to 1–3, but addressed to the two gods Vāyu and Indra rather than Vāyu alone. I will not call attention to the pervasively parallel phraseology: a simple skimming of the two sets of verses will amply demonstrate it.

I.135.4: The *vāyav índraś ca* construction here unfolds over two pādas.

I.135.7: Here the *vāyav índraś ca* construction is stretched from a to c, and in f the sequence *índraś ca yāthaḥ* (lit. “and Indra, you two drive”) presupposes a 2nd ps. sg. to produce the conjoined subject. This latter construction further attenuates the *vāyav índraś ca* construction.

Note the little figure *sasató ... śásvato*.

I.135.8: As indicated in the publ. intro., I have no idea what the figtree represents here. Some of the verse seems anagrammatic for *vāyú-*: the repeated *jāyávo* (bc) and *yávo* (d). The accent on *súvate* in d must result from juxtaposition with *pácyate*.

I.135.9: The references here are also murky, but I am inclined to see the plural referents as both Maruts and soma drinks. In favor of the Maruts: 1) they are called *bāhv-òjas* -in VIII.20.6; 2) they are sometimes called *ukṣán-* (e.g., V.52.3); 3) the non-waning cows of 8ef are also found in the Marut hymn V.55.5 *ná vo dasrā úpa dasyanti dhenávaḥ*; 4) they fly (e.g. V.59.7), and they're associated with the shaking of mountains and the flowing of rivers (flying in the river could be rain); 5) approaching the figtree in 8b might be like V.54.12, where they "shake the gleaming berry (*píppalam*)" -- the pippala is supposed to be a fig.

nadī is one of the rare loc. sg.s to a *vṛkī*-fem.; see *sarasī* in VII.103.2, *gaurī* in IX.12.3, and AiG III.170. I would now consider these forms endingless locatives (rather than the result of contraction of the stem vowel with a loc. sg. ending *-I*, on the basis of TY's disc. of this type; see comm. ad VII.103.2.

I.136 Mitra and Varuṇa

I.136.2: In the publ. tr. I blindly followed Ge and Re in supplying *jyótiṣe* 'light' with *uráve* in a. Although this makes fine sense, neither scholar cites parallel passages. It is certainly true that *jyótiṣ-* is qualified by *urú-* elsewhere (e.g., I.117.21, II.27.14, VI.3.1) and that *jyótiṣmant-* is found twice in the next vs. (I.136.3), but I think I would now be inclined to be more circumspect about what *uráve* refers to.

I.136.3: fg is somewhat hard to construe, in that there are three gods and two occurrences of *yātayáj-janaḥ* 'setting the peoples in order'. Moreover, Varuṇa and Āryaman are directly adjacent to that epithet, but it is Mitra whose stable characteristic it is (cf., e.g., III.59.1 *mitró jánān yātayati ...*). Mine is only one of the ways to handle the 3-into-2 problem.

I.136.4: The punctuation in the publ. tr. may not make it sufficiently clear that it is Soma "who gives shares in the drinking places." On *avapāna-* see comm. ad VII.98.2 and X.43.2.

I.136.6: As noted in the publ. intro. there is abundant evidence of ring composition between this verse, the real final verse of the hymn, and vs. 1: 1a *bṛhán námo* / 6a *námo ... bṛhaté*; 1bc *mṛláyadbhyām* / 6c *sumṛlīkāya*; 1e *úpastutā* / 6d *úpa stuhi*. Cf. also 2d *dyukṣám* / 6e *dyukṣám*, and 2c *bhágasya* / 6e *bhágam*.

I.137 Mītra and Varuṇa

I.137.1–2: *ā yātam* is parenthetical and in 2nd position, breaking up syntactic constituents (*suṣumá ... ádribhiḥ* and *imé ... índavaḥ* respectively), in the initial pādas of both these verses.

I.137.2: For the temporal expression in e, see disc. ad I.135.3.

I.138 Pūṣan

I.138.2: Note *kṛṇvā ṛṇávo* in b.

The rather surprising appearance of the camel in c is best explained as Ge does: the simile is incomplete and should read “as a camel (does) its load.” Still the camel adds a specificity that seems out of keeping with the context.

I.138.3: The syntax of this verse is quite contorted.

The hapax *sārī* is problematic. Flg. Old, I think it must be interpr. in the context of the idiom *vājam* √ *sṛ* ‘run for the prize’; cf. the root noun compd. *vāja-sīt-* and passages like I.62.16 *sómo vājam ivāsarāt*. But what sort of form is *sārī*? Gr takes it as an *-in-* stem, which would be the simplest solution save for the accent, which should fall on the suffix (**sarī*). AiG II.2.328 explicitly rejects this analysis, suggesting instead (p. 407, flg. a brief mention by Old, in turn inspired by Ludwig) that, with following *bhava*, it is an early example of a *cvi* construction. But again, we should expect suffixal accent (see Whitney, Gr. §1093), and moreover the *cvi* construction is at best embryonic at this period (*akhkhalīkṛtya* VII.103.3 being the only fairly certain example in the RV, though see my disc. of *suśāmī abhūvan* in X.28.12). Taking it as a *rathī*-type masc. confronts the same issue with accent. Since an analysis as an *-in-* stem encounters only the accentual problem, not the chronological one of the *cvi* construction, and since *-in-* stems are considerably better attested than *rathī*- masculines, an *-in-* stem analysis with unexplained accent retraction seems the best among the poor choices. As for my tr., since “be a runner after” seemed clumsy, I have substituted “be a contender.”

I.139 All Gods

I.139.1–2: For the sense of these vss., see publ. intro.

I.139.1: The pass. aor. *saṃdāyi* is taken by Gr (etc.) to √ *dā* ‘tie’, surely correctly. But there are several other occurrences of this lexeme *sām* √ *dā* that also appear to express the same idiom, but, with different morphological realizations, are generally assigned to √ *dā* ‘give’ (though see, e.g., Kü 244). The idiom, in its fullest expression, is *sām* √ *dā* *nābhim* [ACC] *nābhā(u)* [LOC] ‘tie navel to navel’, that is, to assert a family connection (often between gods or semidivine figures like seers and us humans). In the passive the first navel is of course in the nom. – a nom. that is gapped in this passage. Another ex. of the idiom is found in IV.44.5, also passive, this time with the loc. gapped (or substituted for by a prn.): *sām yād dadé nābhiḥ pūrvyā vām* “because (our) ancient umbilical tie is attached to you (or, to your [navel]),” of the Aśvins. Instead of *sām* the preverb can be *ā*: see IX.10.8 with the fullest form of the idiom, containing both case forms of ‘navel’: *nābhā nābhim na ā dade* “he has bound his navel to our navel.” Also IX.79.4 *divī te nābhā paramó yā ādadé* “It was in heaven, to its navel, that your highest (navel) was bound.” (This last tr. is different from the publ. one; see comm. ad IX.79.4 for the alteration and the difficulties in the passage.) Another ex. of the idiom is probably found

in the noun *saṃdadī-* in IX.99.7, though the telltale navel is absent. See disc. there. The other occurrence of *saṃdadī-* in II.39.7 even more attenuated, but still expresses the sense of attachment. A variant of the idiom, *ā√tan nābhim* LOC is found in I.105.9; see comm. there.

I.139.2: With Ge (etc.) I supply ‘throne’ with *hiranyāyam* in e on the basis of V.62.8.

I.139.3: The part. *āśrāvāyanta(h)* is best taken as predicated, substituting for a main verb. The standard tr. supply a finite verb (“invite” vel sim.), but this seems unnecessary.

This form also participates in a fine example of case disharmony in a simile (in the sense of Jamison 1982): *śrāvāya-/śravāya-* can mean both “cause to be heard” and “cause to hear.” In the simile (pāda b) it takes *ślókam* as obj. and means “cause to be heard”; in the frame (pāda a) it takes *yuvām* and means “cause to hear,” while in the tag-pāda (c) it likewise takes *yuvām* but also a 2nd acc. *havyā*, with the meaning “cause X to hear (about) Y.” With Ge I supply “of the pressing stone” with *ślókam* on the basis of 10e *ślókam ādreḥ*.

Unlike the standard tr. I supply “chariot” as the obj. of *anuśāsātā* and take *rājāḥ* as an acc. of extent.

I.139.7: On the difficulties of interpr. of this verse, see publ. intro.

In f Ge and Re take *aryamā* as subject of *duhre* and are then at pains to assemble enough other personnel to count, at least conceptually, as a plural with pl. verb *duhre*. (Cf. Re “Aryaman (ainsi que) l’officiant (et autres) l’ont traite-à-fond.”) But not only does this not work grammatically but it does not make sense: since the gods gave the cow to the Aṅgirasas (de), surely *they* are the ones who have milked her dry. Although major syntactic breaks in the middle of pādas are rare, in this case we must take sg. *aryamā* as starting a new sentence (so also WG). Note that pāda a also seems to have a syntactic break after *śṛṇuḥi*, though it is less jarring because the subject of the next clause remains the same.

As for the sense, I am quite baffled. The Aṅgirasas seem to have mistreated the cow, or at least gotten everything they can out of her. But Aryaman also has knowledge, and perhaps use, of her. I suggest very tentatively that since Aryaman is associated with the householder’s fire and with hospitality rites, this may be an early and oblique reference to a division between what will later be known as śrauta rites and grhya rites. But I have no confidence in this.

I.139.8: On *asmād abhī* see comm. ad V.33.3.

The standard tr. supply ‘word’ (*vācaḥ* Ge n. 8a) as the neut. sg. subject with *yád ... citrām ...* in de, but a singular form of *paúṃsya-* in ab is more easily supplied from context, and deeds can easily “resound” by semantic transference.

I interpr. the structure of d–g differently from the standard interpr., which take *tád* as the antecedent both of the *yád* clause in de (*yád ... ghóṣāt ...*) and the one in f, *yác ca duṣṭāram*, echoed by g. By this interpr. the two *yád* clauses are overtly conjoined (*yád ... yác ca*) around the main clause referent (*tád*), with the 2nd embedded in the main cl. before the verb *didhṛtā* in the echo pāda. Klein explicitly accounts for this disruption of structure by asserting that the *yác ca* clause “has been postposed in pāda c because its

required repetition in d provides a coherent punaḥpadam” [he must mean f and g respectively]. This seems like a bit of a cop out to me – it wouldn’t be “required” to be repeated if it hadn’t ended up in that position in the first place, for other reasons. Contrary to this analysis, I take f(g) as containing an “X and which Y” (*tád ... yác ca*) construction of the familiar type, with two different referents. The X is also further specified by the preposed rel. cl. in de (*yád vaḥ ... ámarṭyam*), but the *yád* clause in de and the one in f (echoed by g) are entirely unconnected and have different referents. The placement of the *yác ca* clause and the *ca* seem to me strong evidence for my interpretation.

As for the referent of *yác ca duṣṭáram* (fg), I supply *dyumnám* also from context (b *dyumnāni*); cf. also III.37.10 *dyumnám dadhiṣva duṣṭáram*.

I.139.10: The praīṣa quoted at the beginning of this verse, matching the one opening the hymn, situates this verse in the ritual here and now, and such a context gives clues for the solution of some of the difficulties. Because the context is the soma sacrifice (the praūgaśastra is part of the morning soma pressing; see also the pressing stone in e), I follow Ge in taking *vanínaḥ* as the gen. sg. of ‘wooden’ (rather than as the nom. pl. of a putative *vanín-* ‘winning’, with Re). The ‘wooden’ is the wooden cup and by extension its contents: soma. This interpr. in turn makes it unnec. to take *vanta* as a haplogy of 3rd pl. **vananta* (see Old). The bulls of b are likewise interpretable in a ritual context as the soma drinks.

Pāda f contains an incomprehensible hapax *araríndāni*, which, as so often, may have been stimulated by the phonological context: *ádhārayadararíndāni*. Given the construction of the tag-pāda g it should refer to something compatible with *sádmāni* ‘seats’. My ‘fittings’ is only a placeholder, loosely implying a connection with \sqrt{r} ‘fit together’ (also in *ará-* ‘wheel-spoke’, etc.) and inspired by the (presumably entirely accidental) echo of ἀραρίσκω. What *-ind-* would be under this analysis is utterly unclear.

I.140 Agni

I.140.1: The referent of *dhāśi-* ordinarily ‘wellspring’ (see comm. I.62.3), which is identified here as Agni’s *yóni-* ‘womb’, is unclear. In VIII.43.7, 29 and III.7.3 (also perhaps III.7.1) the *dhāśi-* is the plants (=firewood) to be “eaten,” i.e., burned, by the fire, hence the source (‘wellspring’) of the fire’s growth. Since whatever it is here can be carried (*prá bharā*), firewood makes sense, and this interpr. is supported by the fact that the plants that Agni burns are an important theme in this hymn (vss. 2ab, 6–8). Though in I.122.13, a passage adduced by WG, I render *dhāśi-* as ‘gush’ (developing a different aspect of ‘wellspring, fountain’; cf. also VI.67.6), that sense does not work well here because it must be identified with the *yóni-* and capable of being carried.

I.140.2: I take *trivṛt* as a qualifier of *ánnam* ‘food’ (so also Re, Old [SBE], Sāy, WG); however, I am not sure what tripartition of food is meant. Ge in his n. (2a) suggests wood, ghee, and soma (more or less flg. Sāy), but because the next pāda concerns only the plant food that Agni has eaten and that regenerates in a year, I am reluctant to divide the focus. It is also possible to take *trivṛt* as an adverb, as Ge does (“... eilt dreifältig ...”), but this merely transfers the problem.

In the second hemistich “the one / the other” are easier to identify. Pāda c concerns the ritual fire, while d treats the wildfire, each represented by a characteristic animal: in c the “thoroughbred bull” (*jéṇyo vīṣā*), which, despite its power, is a domesticated beast, while the (wild) elephant (*vāraṇāḥ*) of d rampages in the forest.

I don’t understand the position of *ī ī(m)* and *sīm* generally occupy Wackernagel’s position. In this case it may mark *jagdhām* as a notional relative clause, as in my tr. “what was eaten,” though the following word *púnaḥ* unfortunately must be construed with the main verb *vāṇrdhe*.

In c the initial position of *anyásya* violates my rule (1997, Fs. Beekes) for definite *anyá*-placement, but *anyéna* in d is correctly positioned.

I.140.3: The middle voice of *tarete*, fairly rare for forms of $\sqrt{tṛ}$, is responsible for my “move athwart each other,” against a more standard “hasten towards” or the like. It is also a reasonable representation of the movement of the kindling sticks rubbing against each other.

On the sense of \sqrt{dhvam} s see comm. ad IV.19.7; on the intrans. value of *dhvasáya*- see my *-áya*-Formations pp. 54–55. On the supposed transitive sense of the form in X.73.6 see comm. ad loc.

Both *sácya* and *kúpaya*- are hapaxes, though the likely root affiliation of the former with \sqrt{sac} ‘accompany, attend upon’ makes its interpr. easier. With AiG II.2.793, 798, I take it to be a gerundive to this root. As for *kúpaya*-, I find it hard to separate it from the root \sqrt{kup} ‘quiver, quake’, despite the unclarity of its formation (suffix? accent?), and find the alternative analysis as *ku-paya(s?)*- (most recently, tentatively WG) unlikely.

várdhanam pitúḥ “the increaser of his father” is one of the RVic poet’s beloved paradoxes. The priest generates the ritual fire and is therefore its father, but the well-tended fire in turn produces prosperity and increase for the ritual officiants.

I.140.4: The thrust of this vs. is a pile-up of adjectives describing Agni’s flame-horses, set within a frame consisting of the verb *úpa yujyante* “they are harnessed,” postponed until the final pāda, and a dative of benefit occurring in the first: *mānave mānavasyaté*.

mānavasyaté is found only here, and both its sense and its formation are unclear. It is generally rendered as if it were a denominative (Ge ‘dem Menschenfreundlichen’, Re ‘agissant en homme’), but this would assume a *-yá*-formation built to a $\sqrt{vṛddhi}$ -derivative pseudo-*s*-stem **mānavas*- (beside *mānavá*-, loosely like *mānus*- beside *mānu*-). I instead interpret it as a (pseudo-)future participle in *-syánt*- built to the common $\sqrt{vṛddhi}$ deriv. *mānava*-. The future suffix reinforces the sense of the $\sqrt{vṛddhi}$ deriv. ‘descending from Manu’ by emphasizing the fact that (some of) these descendants are still to come. (If such a derivation seems too radical, it could be mediated by a denom. **mānava-yá*- + *-syánt*-, which underwent haplology.)

asamaná- means lit. something like ‘not together, not gathered’; ‘breaking ranks’ seems a dynamic tr. of the underlying concept (Re ‘allant en sens divers’). (See also VII.5.3.) It thus forms a semantic pair with *mumukṣvāḥ* ‘seeking to break free’ in a. I do not follow Ge (/WG) in their derivation from the extended meaning of *sámana*- as ‘battle’, hence (Ge) ‘ohne Kampf’.

Note the phonetic figure opening the vs.: *mumukṣvò mānave mānavasyaté*.

I.140.5: The vs. contains three “intensive” participles: *kárikrataḥ*, *mármṛśat*, and *nānadat*. All three, in my opinion, express repetitive or repeated action. In particular *kárikrataḥ*, in my tr. ‘making and remaking’, nicely reflects the constantly changing shape of the smoke rising from the raging flames.

I take *mahīm* ‘great’ (fem.) separately from *avānim* and referring to the earth; by this interpr. the whole earth serves as Agni’s course (‘stream bed’).

I.140.6–8: This trio of verses treats the union (by burning) of the hyper-masculine Agni/fire and the plants (feminine). This must be the “der erotische Grundton” of the hymn that Ge mentions in his intro. This sexual union leads to the death of the plants (8b) and their regrowth and transformation into a different form (7cd, 8). Or so is my interpr.; acdg. to some, the flames are sometimes the referents, rather than the plants. This proposed split reference seems to me to break the thematic unity of the verses and the climax in 8 of the death and renewed life of the females who unite with Agni.

I.140.6: The concentration of intensives continues in this verse: *námnate* (a), *róruvat* (b), *davidhāva* (d).

The ‘bending’ of pāda a of course describes the flickering motion of the flames.

Because of the theme mentioned ad vss. 6–8, of the bodily transformation of the plants by burning, I take *tanvās* in c as referring to the bodies of the plants, not, with most tr., that of Agni.

I don’t entirely understand the position of *ca* in c. Klein (DGRV I.222–23, 259–60) suggests that it has been bumped by the participle opening the clause and pāda. It is certainly the case that *ca* could not immediately follow that first word without metrical distress: five-syllable *ojāyāmānaḥ* entirely fills the opening, and since the caesura cannot precede an enclitic, placing *ca* after the participle would result in an opening of 6.

I.140.7: The idiom *punar√vṛdh* ‘grow again’ recurs from 2b, again referring to the plants immolated by the fire (at least in my opinion; others take the subject to be the flames). Here their regeneration is linked with their contact or merger with divinity.

The final pāda is variously interpreted. I take the plants still to be the subject and the form “different from their parents” refers to their burned residue as ash and cinders, as opposed to the branches and leaves that were fed to the fire. But if *pitróḥ* is taken as a loc., the referent may be different; some take it as referring to Heaven and Earth (Sāy, Old [SBE], WG).

I.140.8: Again there is a difference of opinion as to referent. With Old (SBE) I take the plants once again as the subjects of pāda a (so, partly, WG), contra Sāy, Ge, Re, Kü (419), who interpret them as flames.

I.140.9: The hapax *tuviḡrá-* in b is generally interpr. as having a thematized form of $\sqrt{gṛ}$ ‘swallow’ as 2nd member, hence ‘powerfully swallowing’ vel sim. But to a set root we should probably expect **-gira-* (like *-túr-*: *-tira-*; *(-túr-*: *túra-*). I follow instead a suggestion of Insler’s, that it represents a haplologized **tuvi-viḡrá-* ‘powerfully spirited’. See comm. ad II.21.2 on the related hapax *tuviḡrí-*.

With most, I take *śyēnī* as the fem. of the color term *śyetā-*, rather than, with Ge, as the fem. of *śyenā-* ‘falcon’ (Adlerweibchen). Among other things, we would probably expect the fem. of ‘falcon’ to have *vrkṣ-* inflection, like *vrkṣ-* itself and *śimhṣ-* ‘lioness’ to *śimhā-* ‘lion’; it should therefore have suffixal accent, and in this sandhi context the nom. sg. should have come out as **śyēnīḥ*. Moreover there is no obvious role for a female falcon in context. The white trail of ash here contrasts nicely with the black furrows (*kṛṣṇāsītā-*) the fire creates in 4b.

I.140.10: I read pāda b with cd, contrary to the standard tr., which take it as independent. I might now, however, replace the tr. of *ādha* as ‘then’ with ‘and’ or the like.

The first word of c, *avāśya*, is generally taken as the gerund to *áva √as* lit. ‘throw down’. I am dubious about this interpr., since that lexeme is not found elsewhere in the RV or, acdg. to Monier Williams, anywhere else in Sanskrit. I therefore derive it rather from *áva √sā/ si* ‘let loose, unhitch’, despite the formal difficulties. The idiom is used regularly for letting loose horses, to which Agni’s flames are compared here, and see X.61.20, where Agni is the subject of *áva syati*, a verse that contains vocabulary that resonates here: *dvivartanī-* and *śísu-*. The problem is that we should expect *avasāya* with full-grade root and root accent (cf. I.104.1) or possibly **avas’yā* (this zero-gr. form is recorded in Whitney’s Roots). I can only explain the accented long vowel in *avāśya* as arising from confusion produced by augmented forms (cf. *āvāsuh* ‘they unhitched’ I.179.2).

I take the *śísumatīḥ* ‘(females) possessing young’ to be Agni’s flames; they have young because flames beget more flames as they spread.

I take d as a paradox: the fire is in constant circling motion (*parijārbhurāṇaḥ*), but still produces a protective encirclement like armor.

I.140.11: Most take the expression in b to mean “let it be dearer to you than a dear thought”; this seems to me nonsensical or at least rhetorically weak. I suggest that there is a pun on *priyā-*, which can mean both ‘dear’ and ‘own’. Here the poet suggests that his composed thought will be dearer to Agni than anything the god himself might produce.

I.140.12: See publ. intro. for speculation on the “foot” of the boat.

Ge suggests persuasively that “chariot and house” are used metaphorically for (times of) war and peace.

I.140.13: The problem in this verse is to determine which pādas go together. Ge and Re construe ab and cd together, but this leads to a gender problem: the subj. of cd should be fem. pl. *arūṇyāḥ* in d, but c contains a nom. pl. *masc.* part. *yāntaḥ*. (Old [SBE] suggests that this form is corrupt because of the metrical problems in the pāda; he treats these at length in Noten, but does not seem to favor emendation of the participle.) The problem is not entirely solved by taking c with (a)b, as Old (SBE) and I do, but it becomes somewhat attenuated by the variety of possible subjects: Agni (m.), Heaven and Earth (*dyāvā-kṣāmā*, dual dvandva, whose gender is listed by Gr. as fem., but there are no diagnostic passages), the rivers (*sīndhu-*, sometimes fem., sometimes masc. [see common acc. pl. *sīndhūn*]) -- with masc. prevailing either because masc. is the default in such gender clashes or because *sīndhavaḥ* is the closest subject to *yāntaḥ*. WG also take d with

the nominatives of b, by somehow taking *aruṇyāḥ* as a temporal expression “bei den (Morgen)röten,” but one would expect a loc. for this meaning (as opposed to the extent of time in the temporal *dīrghāḥ* “through the long days” of c).

I.141 Agni

See published intro. for discussion of enjambement and other special effects in this hymn.

I.141.1: On *yáto jáni* see comm. ad III.10.6; the phrase could also be rendered here “as soon as he was born.”

Most tr. take the subj. of *úpa hvarate* to be the same as that of *sādhate*, namely the thought (*matíḥ*), and therefore must take the subord. cl. as concessive (more or less “even if / although it moves crookedly, it goes straight ...”). However, I take Agni as the subj. of *úpa hvarate*, which expresses the usual crooked motion of fire, and the *īm* in this clause as standing for *matíḥ*, the subj. of the main clause and the goal of *úpa hvarate*. (*īm* and *sīm* almost always have real accusative reference; see Jamison 2002, Fs. Cardona, and *īm* in 3a and 3c below.) The verbs do of course contrast -- the zigzagging motion of the fire as opposed to the straight path of the poetic thought -- but this is the result of the different natures of their two subjects, which are acting in tandem for the success of the sacrifice. That *hvārā-* is used of Agni in 7b supports taking him as subj. of *hvarate* here. However, see comment in I.142.4 below.

Most tr. take the streams of truth (*ṛtāsya dhénā(h)*) as acc. pl. and the object of *anayanta*, and supply various subjects: e.g., Ge “wise ones” (*dhīrāḥ*), largely on the basis of V.45.10, which has *dhīrāḥ* as subj. of *anayanta*. Since that passage in a Viśve Devāḥ hymn has no other points of contact with ours, I see no reason to supply an otherwise unrepresented subject here and to bump the possible surface subj., fem. pl. *dhénāḥ*, into the acc. I would adduce rather I.148.3 (also Dīrghatamas), where Agni is the obj. of *prá ... nayanta*, as I think he is here. It is true that I.146.4 has *dhīrāsaḥ ... kavāyah* “clever poets,” who guide (*nayanti*) Agni’s step (*padām*), which would give a nearer parallel for the *dhīrāḥ* supplied here by Ge (who oddly doesn’t cite this nearby passage), but the phrase “streams of truth,” that is, true poetic formulations, seems to me just another way to refer to “clever poets” and actually supports taking the fem. pl. expression as the subj. and Agni as obj.

I.141.2: This verse concerns the three forms of Agni, with “form” expressed by neut. *vāpuḥ* in a, which should be supplied with *dvitīyam* in b and *tṛtīyam* in c. (Contra Ge [WG], who take *vāpuḥ* as an adjective and the ordinals as adverbs. Since *vāpuḥ* is clearly nominal in 1a, an adjectival usage in the following vs. would be surprising, esp. as there are, in my opinion, no certain exx. of adjectival *vāpus-*.)

In a I take *prkṣāḥ* as the gen. sg. of *pṛkṣ-*, rather than the nom. sg. of *pṛkṣā-* (so Gr, Old [SBE], Ge, WG) or acc. pl. of *pṛkṣ-* (so Re). It is a descriptive or qualifying gen.: the “wondrous form of nourishment.” It is not entirely clear what this phrase refers to, but I would suggest that it is the plants, which are often said to contain the fire in embryonic form (thus wondrously). In this form he is “abounding in food” both because the plants feed the fire and because plants supply nourishment to the living world. Such a qualifying gen. is also found in *vṛṣabhāsya* in c acdg. to my interpr. (but not those of others). The

root noun *pr̥kṣ-* is probably found also in *pr̥kṣúdh-* in vs. 4 below, qualifying plants (*vīrúdhah*), which supports my interpr. here.

The second wondrous form is the fire in the waters, which has come to be identified with Apām Napāt. The “sevenfold-kindly (*saptásivāsu*) mothers” must be the seven streams. The compound is oddly formed, and Gr, inter alia, suggests reading **saptá* **sivāsu*, an unnecessary emendation, particularly if we maintain the compound reading of *dásapramatim* in d (see immed. below).

The third form of fire, presented in cd, appears to be the ritual fire produced by the kindling sticks wielded by the fingers, which are characterized, as so often, as “young women” (*yóṣaṇah*). The cmpd. *dásapramatim* ‘having ten(fold) forethought’ suffers from the same formational oddity as *saptásivāsu* and has been even more eagerly emended to **dása* **prāmatim* (see, e.g., Old, Noten, who keeps *saptásivāsu* as a cmpd but supports emending the other to two words). The *dása*, liberated from the compound, would qualify the fingers, as often. However, in my opinion we must either keep both compounds or neither, and since the cmpds are the more difficult readings and Dīrghatamas is a tricky poet, I see no reason to emend.

Note that *janayanta* in b rhymes with *anayanta* in 1d in the same metrical position.

I.141.3: This verse describes several mystical and, probably, mythical productions of fire, couched in the present (clear pres. *mathāyāti* in d, which suggests that the injunc. *kránta* in b has the same temporal value). I do not completely understand either of the scenarios, esp. fire’s hiding in the mixing vessel in cd.

Ge’s suggestion that the first hemistich deals with Agni in the waters is supported by the parallel passages he adduces, and so it may continue the theme of 2b.

In d *mathāyāti* is entirely ambiguous between ‘churns, rubs’ (Old [SBE] ‘produces ... by attrition’, Ge ‘ausreibt’) and ‘steals’ (Re, WG), and both are appropriate: ‘churns’ would continue the theme of fire-production, but ‘steals’ would refer to Mātariśvan’s theft of fire from heaven. No doubt both are meant, and there is both a mythical and a ritual application of the passage. Cf. I.148.1 *máthīt ... mātariśvā*.

I.141.4: This vs. concerns the production of fire by the friction of the two kindling sticks.

His “highest father” (*pitúḥ paramāt*) is probably Heaven (Dyaus Pitar), as most take it; it also contrasts with the “depth” (*budhnāt*) that is his source in 3a. The pāda-final *pári* is probably not to be construed with the verb (*prā*) *nīyate*, though *pári* is common with *√nī*, but, as often, governs the abl. (*pitúḥ paramāt*), despite the intercalation of the verb between the abl. phrase and this postposition.

The hapax *pr̥kṣúdh-* in b is variously explained. E.g., Old (Noten) suggests that it is modeled on the immediately following *vīrúdh-* and also *śurúdh-*. In the published tr. I followed Humbach’s explanation (*Gathas* [1st ed. 1958] II.28; accepted by Narten, YH p. 161), which takes *-udh* as a zero-grade root noun belonging to widespread PIE **√yedh* ‘convey’, otherwise unattested in Indo-Aryan. But I now no longer believe that etymology (see my 2020 “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *iṣud-*, *iṣūdiia-*: The Aim of Praise” [Fs. Lamberterie]), and I would now follow Old’s suggestion. Note the progression and phonetic play in the pāda: *ā pr̥kṣudho vīrúdho dáṃsu rohati*. I would also slightly change the published tr. from “nourishment-bringing” to “nourishing.”

On *dāmsu* see I.134.4. As noted there, I take it as a loc. pl. to the root noun *dām-* ‘house’ (so Old [SBE], tentatively Ge, WG), rather than as an adverbial deriv. of *√dams* ‘be wondrous’ (Gr, Re). Here it presumably refers to the domestic fire established in the house(s); since words for ‘house’ in the plural often refer to only a single domestic establishment (presumably because it is made up of several buildings), “in the house” rather than the publ. “in the houses” is also possible.

Pāda c contains a curiously doubled *yád* in a single clause (*ubhā yád asya janúṣaṃ yád ínvataḥ*), which has attracted little attention. Old (SBE) notes it but makes no attempt to explain it, and otherwise the standard tr. (including mine) do not reflect or mention it. The exception is WG, who take the pāda as a kind of stuttering set of false starts: “Wenn die beiden seine Geburt -- wenn (sie überhaupt) -- antreiben.” This seems to be the only way to represent what the text has, since it is impossible to manufacture a separate clause dependent on the second *yád*. But since both clauses in the WG rendering share subject, object, and verb, and the adverbial addition “überhaupt” reflects nothing in the Skt., it may be just as well to pass over the doubling in silence, assuming that the second *yád* comes from the occasional tendency for the relative pronoun to immediately precede a pāda-final verb. Cf., e.g., for this verb stem, I.55.4d *kṣēmeṇa dhénām maghāvā yád ínvati* (also V.28.2c, VIII.13.32c ... *yám ínvasi*).

Pāda d contains an augmented impf. *abhavat*, which contrasts with the presents *nīyáte* (a), *róhati* (b), and *ínvataḥ* (c), esp. since it begins *ā́d íd* “just after that,” which suggests that the past tense action of d should follow the actions of the earlier part of the verse. Most tr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG) take c and d together, separate from ab, which produces a jarring sequence of tense: “when they spur on ..., then he became ...” I connect c rather with ab and indeed with vs. 3 and start a new syntactic sequence with 4d, which is continued by the preterital expressions *ā́d íd + ā́viśat* in 5a, *ví vāṽṛdhe* in 5b, and *áruhat* in 5c. Although this is not a complete solution, in that the *ā́d íd* “just after that” of 4d and 5a begs for a sequentially prior preterite, it keeps the disharmonious sequence of tenses from inhabiting the same sentence. This division is also compatible with the syntactic enjambement characteristic of the hymn.

I.141.5: The mothers (*mā́tṛīḥ*) of pāda a contrast with the father (*pítṛíḥ*) of 4a.

The standard tr. take *ví vāṽṛdhe* in b as the verb of a rel. cl. begun by *yā́su* in a. The problem is that *vāṽṛdhe* is not accented. Ge suggests that it lacks accent because the rel. pronoun is in a different pāda, but this separation does not pose problems elsewhere (cf., simply within this hymn, 3ab *nír yád* ..., ... *kránta*, 3cd *yád* ..., ... *mathāyāti*, 6cd ... *yád* ..., ... *véti*); Old is in favor of emending to *vivāṽṛdhé*. Taking the text as given, I construe the rel. clause with *yā́su* as a nominal locational clause; similarly (but independently) WG with a different distribution of elements. It is true that there are several *yā́su √vṛdh* passages; cf. esp. II.13.1 ... *apāḥ* ... *ā́viśat yā́su vārdhate* “he [=Indra] entered the waters, within whom he grows strong” (cf. V.44.1), but I think we must take the lack of verbal accent more seriously than these few phraseological parallels.

Again, contrary to most, I attach c to ab and take d separately, on the basis of the distribution of verb tenses.

I.141.6: Another instance of *ā́d íd*, which seems, in this hymn, to mark the progress of the ritual.

With *bhágam iva papṛcānāsaḥ* in b compare *bhágam ... papṛcāsi* in 11b. The difference of voice is significant: in 6b the mortal officiants “(en)gorge themselves (med.) with/on good fortune” while in 11 Agni engorges (i.e., swells)(act.) good fortune for us.” The similarity of these striking expressions makes it unlikely that *bhágam* in 6b is primarily the goal/object of *ṛñjate*, as Ge, Re, WG take it.

The phrase *mártam śámsam* may be a de-compounded version of *nárāśámsa-* with lexical substitution. Note that *nárāśámsa-* is found in the next hymn, the Āprī hymn I.142.3. See also *devānām śámsam* in 11d of this hymn. The double object of *véti* -- *devān* and *mártam śámsam* -- is a zeugma of sorts, made possible by the fact that $\sqrt{vī}$ can take both animate and inanimate objects.

I.141.7: I take this entire verse as dependent on vs. 6. It is full of rare and unclear words, but the pile-up of descriptors of the violently moving fire is exhilarating.

In b *hvārā-* (to \sqrt{hvar} ‘move crookedly, twist’; cf. *hvárate* in 1c) is taken by Ge and Re as ‘bird’, but I am persuaded by Roth’s suggestion, enshrined in Gr (and see Old [Noten]), that the referent is a snake -- the creature of “twisting/serpentine motion.” The quality held in common between the *hvārā* and fire is *vákva-*, derived from the root $\sqrt{vañc}$ ‘undulate, curl, meander’, and the image is that of fire winding its way through the dried-up plants that serve as its fuel. From this tr. it is clear that I take *jarāṇā* as *jarāṇāḥ*, with the Pp., and as an acc. pl. fem. ‘old (things = plants)’. Gr. identifies it as an instr. sg., and this interpr. is followed by others (most recently by WG), but the sandhi situation, with *-ā* before *a-* essentially excludes it (though see Old [Noten] who finds it barely possible).

The sense of *ánākṛta-* is likewise unclear, though its formation is transparent. The tr. of Old (SBE “whom it is not possible to drive to a place”; sim. Noten), Ge (“ohne Antrieb”), Re (“sans y avoir été poussé”) seem to reflect a sense of the common idiom \sqrt{kr} ‘bring here’ extended to ‘push/force (here)’, with the ‘here’ elided. However, in his n. 7b, Ge adduces PB XXIII.13.4.5, which concerns wild animals that are *anākṛta-*. Caland tr. ‘unfostered’, but I see another possible extension of ‘brought here’, namely ‘kept here’ → ‘confined’, with its negative then ‘unconfined’. This certainly fits the PB passage and also matches Sāy’s gloss *anivāritaḥ* (Ge’s tr. ‘ungehemmt’).

The second hemistich is entirely couched in the gen., save for the loc. *pátman* ‘flight’ off which all those genitives hang. I construe *pátman* with *ánākṛtaḥ* in b. Although ‘flight’ may seem to support the ‘bird’ interpr. of *hvārā-* in b, note that *hvārā-* is in a simile syntactically independent of the rest of the sentence; moreover, Dīrghatamas hardly feels constrained to confine himself to one image at a time.

dakṣúṣaḥ is a pseudo-perfect-participle, like the pseudo-desiderative-adjective *dákṣu-* (II.4.4) to \sqrt{dah} ‘burn’. Both are hapaxes.

On *-jaṃhas-* see comm. ad VI.12.2 and VI.3.5.

vyādhvan- can contain either *ví* ‘without’ or *ví* ‘through, wide(ly)’ (so also Old [SBE], Re). I have opted for the latter, but others (Ge ‘wegelosen Flug’, WG ‘Wegelosen’) for the former. Either would work, though the phrase *rāja ā* seems to me to express extent of space and to favor my interpr.

I.141.8: What quality of a chariot is expressed by the ppl. *yātā-* to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive’ is unclear. Because of the phrase “made by dexterous (men),” which seems to refer to the chariot as

object rather than to its current situation, I suggest that it's a particular type of chariot, perhaps one made for long journeys. But it is also possible that it refers to the current situation, in which case it could mean "like a driven chariot" (i.e., one that is speeding).

Pāda c is full of difficulties, esp. the unaccented *dakṣi* and the semantically anomalous *sūrāyaḥ* 'patrons'. There is also the question whether the pāda is syntactically independent or forms a clause with d. With Ge (but contra most other interpr.) I take cd together. Otherwise pāda c would be a nominal clause of some sort, but the introductory *ād* (recalling *ād id* of 5a, 6a) seems to call for a dynamic verb. As for the "black patrons" I take this to be, as it were, a two-part phrase: "black" first refers to the plumes of smoke, picking up *kṛṣṇājaṃhas-* 'having black plumage' in 7c; the clouds of smoke surrounding the fire are then implicitly likened to the sacrificial patrons who would gather around the ritual fire.

What then to do with *dakṣi*? Two main solutions are found in the lit.: it is a 2nd sg. impv. (or *si*-imperative) to *√dah* 'burn' as it is in II.1.10 (Re), or it is a voc. of a nominal stem of unclear formation likewise built to *√dah* (Old, WG). Ge refuses to tr. and AiG II.1.408 floats both possibilities. The first (impv.) has the merit of matching an actual existing form, but otherwise has little to recommend it. In particular, if it forms a parenthetical independent clause it should be accented. The second (voc.) does not create syntactic problems but leaves the question of the morphology unresolved. I do not favor either of them, because either one requires 2nd ps. reference, which I think would violate the structure of the hymn. As noted in the publ. intro., the first 8 verses are couched entirely in the 3rd person describing the fire and entirely lack the word *agnī-*; both the 2nd ps. and *agnī-* are forcefully introduced at the beginning of vs. 9 (*tvāyā hy āgne*), and this 2nd ps. address prevails in the next three vss. (9–11). I find it difficult to believe that the wily Dīrghatamas would spoil his schematic division by introducing a muddled 2nd person in vs. 8. Moreover, the *asya* in 8c surely has Agni as its referent, which should probably preclude a 2nd ps. reference to him in the same pāda. Unfortunately I do not have an acceptable solution to *dakṣi*, however. With the others I take it as an unclearly formed nominal derivative of *√dah*, but as the 1st member of a tatpuruṣa with *sūrī-*, hence 'the patron(s) of the burning one', but this is a solution of desperation and carries no conviction.

The grammar of d is scarcely less contorted than that of c. The verb *īṣate* belongs to a clear thematic stem and should therefore of course be 3rd sg., but the apparent subject, *vāyaḥ*, is ordinarily a nom. pl. 'birds' to the stem *vī-*. To make the grammar work, it needs to be interpreted as a neut. s-stem collective in the nom. sg. ('bird flesh, poultry'; cf. Re's 'la gent-ailée'), a formation that is found later (already AV) but not otherwise in the RV. Moreover, if pāda c is to be construed with d, its pl. subj. *kṛṣṇāsaḥ ... sūrāyaḥ* also clashes in number with the verb *īṣate*. My somewhat uneasy solution to this is to assume that *vāyaḥ* here has been reinterpreted as a singular collective and, as the noun closest to the verb, has determined the number of the verb. But since *vāyaḥ* refers to the collectivity of birds, the pl. *kṛṣṇāsaḥ ... sūrāyaḥ* can match it in sense and therefore function as subj. of *īṣate* as well. (Another possible solution is to assume that *īṣate* has been assimilated to the athematic formations of similar shape, *īrte*, *īrate* and, esp., the near rhyme *īṣte*, *īṣate*, with 3rd plural in *-ate*. This does not seem impossible to me, esp. since their 1st sgs. in *-e* would coincide.)

The publ. tr. reflects a double reading of initial *śūrasya* ‘of a champion’ with partial emendation to **śūryasya / śūrah* ‘of the sun’ in its 2nd reading. In my view, the juxtaposition across pāda boundary of *śūrāyaḥ* and *śūrasya* was designed to bring to mind a third term, the sun, sharing its initial with *śūrāyaḥ*, its gen. case with *śūrasya*, and its -*ūr-* with both. Though the patrons might shrink from the attack of a champion, birds are more likely to shrink from the flaring of the sun, either retreating from its heat or avoiding flying too high and therefore too near it. This double reading helps unify the two-part NP of c, the black (plumes) = patrons, and takes us back to the flight of the bird Agni in 7cd.

I.141.9: After the extravagances of the last few vss., this vs. brings us back to earth and opens the last section of the hymn, addressing Agni and praising his benefits.

The morphological and phraseological parallelism of *vibhūḥ* (c) and *paribhūḥ* (d) are difficult to convey in tr. On the basis of the *viśvāthā* ‘everywhere’ with the former and the passages containing *viśvā* (...) *paribhū-* (I.91.19, II.24.11, III.3.10), I have supplied ‘everything’ with the latter (so also Ge, WG; sim. Old [SBE]).

As in I.37.9 I construe *ānu* with preceding *sīm* “following them.”

I.141.10: *dhīmahi* in d is probably has a slight double meaning: we want to acquire Agni like good fortune, but in the technical ritual sense we want to install / establish him. For the technical sense see *dādhānaḥ* in 13b.

There is also a pun on *bhāga-*, both ‘good fortune’ and the name of the god, a pun continued in the next vs.

I.141.11: Ge (also Kü 306) takes pāda a separately from b and supplies ‘give’, but this seems entirely unnecessary.

For *bhāgam* √*prc*, see comments ad 6b. *bhāga-* also participates in a nexus with the previous verse: in 10d it appears in a simile, but here it has been promoted to the “real” object to which other entities are compared. In the first hemistich the common noun usage of the stem is dominant, but in the 2nd it is the god Bhaga.

Contrary to Ge (/WG/Kü) but with Old (SBE) and Re, I take *dāmūnasam* as an adj. with *rayīm* rather than as an independent nominal referring to the master of the house (Ge ‘Hausgebieter’).

Note *devānām śāṃsam* here matching *mārtam śāṃsam* in 6d. As there, the object of the verb *yāmati* here involves a zeugma, of animates (the races of gods and men) and the inanimate laud of the gods.

The last clausal tag in d, *ṛtā ā ca sukrātuḥ* could simply be taken as a nominal sentence with copula to be supplied (“and he is of good resolve in truth” vel sim.). However, I supply a passive form of √*yam* (presumably ppl. *yatāḥ*) corresponding to the act. subj. *yāmati* of c. Cf., for *ṛtā ā*, VI.7.1 *ṛtā ā jātām* “born in truth” and, for *yatā-* + LOC, VIII.92.7 *viśvāsu gīrṣv āyatam* “held in place amidst all your hymns” (also V.44.9). I recognize that this extra material may be unnecessary, however. On the other hand, see comm. on I.144.3 for possible support.

I.141.12: The acc. goals in d, *vāmām suvitām vāsyah*, may be a triplet (with *vāmām* and *suvitām* separate; so Ge, Re, WG); it is not easy to tell and has little effect on sense.

The hapax splv. *nēṣatama-*, to the unattested *a*-stem **nēṣa-*, is generally taken as agentive (‘best leader[s]’; e.g., Ge “mit den besten Führen”), but I see no reason for this. The expression seems parallel to II.23.4 *sunītībhīr nayasī* “you guide with good guidance,” X.63.13 *nāyathā sunītībhīḥ*, where agentive readings are out. (Note that in both passages the abstract is in the plural, as here.) Moreover, since Agni is doing the leading, he would not need additional leaders (though WG suggest that they are the horses in pāda a). In any case note the ring with *anayanta* in 1d.

I.141.13: The *arkaīḥ* of pāda a can refer both to the chants of the ritual participants and to Agni’s flames, though only the first sense is registered by most tr. In the second sense the instr. is not an agentive/instrumental phrase with passive *āstāvi*, but an instr. of accompaniment/description.

The “further forward” (*pratarām*) of b presumably refers to the installation of the new Āhavanīya fire, carried towards the east. The *dādhanāḥ* of this pāda forms a ring with *dhāyī* of 1a.

In cd the mixed 3rd and 1st ps. pl. subject *amī ca yé maghāvāno vayāṃ ca* “both those who are our bounteous (patrons) and we (ourselves)” takes a 3rd pl. verb, *nīṣṭatanyuh*. I take *nīḥ* with the frame (“extend outward”) and *āti* with the simile (“extend beyond”).

I.142 Āprī

I.142.4: *mātīḥ ... vacyāte* “the thought is twisting its way” gives potential support to the interpretation of *ūpa hvarate* in the previous hymn I.141.1 as having *mātīḥ* as its subj. (contrary to my view), but the other considerations raised ad loc. weigh more strongly for me. As for *vacyāte*, the “passive” accentuation of this apparently intrans. verb of motion is treated at length by Kulikov (-*ya*-presents, pp. 218–23), who acknowledges the standard functional interpr. of this pres. but attempts (rather too ingeniously in my view) to take it as originally passive (“is being directed towards you” in his tr.). Since *√vañc* seems to me to express precisely *non-direct(ed)* action, this interpr. does not capture the sense. I do not have a good explanation of the suffix accent, beyond noting that there are other non-passive medial -*yá-* formations, most notably *mriyāte* ‘dies’, that have failed to retract the accent.

I.142.5: Ge (/WG) treat this verse as containing an anacoluthon, with the *plural* pres. part. *strṇānāsaḥ* modifying the 1st *singular* pres. *vṛñjé*: “(We) strewing ..., I twist ...” This seems unnecessary to me. I take the participle as predicated in a main clause, with the *vṛñjé* clause parallel: “They ... are strewing the ritual grass; I twist (the grass) ...” Although predicated present participles are much rarer than their past participle equivalents, they are not non-existent: the commentary so far as identified a fair number of examples that can be so interpr. and whose alternative interpretations are forced.

I.142.7: The part. *bhāndamāne* is the only verbal form of this root outside a small group of passages in III. Our passage is clearly based on III.4.6, also an Āprī hymn. Our *ā bhāndamāne upāke, náктоṣāsā supésāsā* has been expanded into two dimeter pādas from the Truṣṭubh in III.4.6 *ā bhāndamāne uṣāsā upāke*.

Ge takes the two duals *yahvī* ... *mātārā* as signalling two different relationships between Night+Dawn and truth, depending on chronology – both mothers and daughters (supposedly *yahvī*). This interpr. doesn't pass for the repetition of the pāda in X.59.8, where it refers to Heaven and Earth (see comm. ad loc.), though Ge deploys the same tr., and it seems too tricky here.

I.142.10: On *turīpa-*, whose sense is fairly clear but whose etymology is not, see EWA s.v. It is found only in Āprī hymns, this one and III.4.8=VII.2.9.

purú vāram is emended by most to the bahuvrīhi *puruvāram* 'having many choice things', but there seems no reason not to accept the text as given. (The odd Pp. reading *vā āram* can be ignored.)

I.143 Agni

I.143.1: I now find 'seasonal, at its season' a somewhat misleading tr. for *ṛtvīya-* in a ritual context and would substitute 'at the proper time' here; see comm. ad III.29.10, X.28.5.

I.143.2, 4: The two examples of *majmánā* (2c, 4b), both characterizing Agni (in my opinion), should have been rendered in the same way in the publ. tr., rather than as by "might" and "greatness" respectively.

I.143.3: The bahuvrīhi *bhātvakṣasaḥ* in c is generally taken as a gen. sg., modifying Agni, who is amply represented by genitives in b and in the two forms of *asyā* in a. I prefer to take it as a nom. pl. modifying the beams (*bhānāvah*) that remain the subject of the sentence. However, either interpr. is possible.

The rest of pāda c presents other difficulties: it contains two apparent nominatives, sg. *aktúḥ* and pl. *sindhavaḥ*, both apparently part of the same simile. Moreover the prep./prev. *āti* has nothing to govern or construe with. Old allows an emendation to acc. pl. **aktūn*, producing the prep. phrase *āti *aktūn* "across the nights," which produces good sense. Ge refines this by suggesting that there is really a word haplology from **āty aktúm aktúr*, with *aktúr* and *sindhavaḥ* forming what he calls elsewhere a loose karmadhāraya, tr. "gleich dem Farbenspiel der Flüsse" (sim. Re "comme la surface-oïnte (des) fleuves"). Since both also render the haplologized **aktúm /aktūn* as 'night(s)', they are also silently assuming a pun on *aktú-*, both 'night' and a derivative of *√añj* 'anoint, adorn'. My interpr. also assumes a haplology of **aktūn* (or *aktúm*), in order to account for the *āti*, which several times appears with an acc. of a word for 'night' (VI.4.5 ... *āty ety aktūn*; cf. also *āty aktúbhiḥ* with instr. I.36.16; with acc. pl. *kṣapāḥ* VIII.26.3, X.77.2). For *aktúḥ*, however, I suggest very tentatively that we are dealing with a gen. sg. to a (pseudo-)-(t)ar-stem to the 'night' word (see Nomen in idg. Lex. 505 for a few apparent *r*-stem forms elsewhere) -- hence, "the rivers of the night." If this morphological suggestion seems too radical, the "loose karmadhāraya" interpr. of two nominatives might produce the same effect. In any case, the expression is reminiscent of the curious phrase *aktúr apām* "the 'night' of the waters" in II.30.1.

I.143.5: *senā-* can mean either ‘weapon’ or ‘army’. Despite the publ. tr. (and most other tr.), ‘weapon’ might work better with *aśāniḥ* ‘missile’ than ‘army’.

I.143.6: The verb *āvārat* in b is morphologically problematic. Given the context, its root affiliation is surely to \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’ rather than to \sqrt{vr} ‘obstruct, hinder’ (despite nearby *vārāya* [5a] belonging to the latter). But forms to \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’ are overwhelmingly medial -- save for a tiny collection of forms resembling this one, with the preverb *ā*, full-grade of the root, an apparent thematic vowel (which is more likely the subjunctive marker), and act. endings: *āvārah* VIII.13.21, 19.30. In the publ. tr. I render both as “you (will) choose,” but it is possible that “you (will) grant” would be better. The answer depends on what gave rise to these active forms. By one scenario we might view them as contrastive actives generated to the middle, specifically the middle root aorist found in a few forms like (*ā ...*) *av^ari* (IV.55.5). In that case the complementary reciprocal active sense to medial ‘chose’ would be ‘grant’. However, there is another possible pathway to the act. forms, suggested by Dīrghatamas’s own usage. In I.140.13 the final VP is *iṣaṃ vāram ... varanta*, which I tr. “they will choose refreshment as their boon (for us?).” *varanta* is a well-formed 3rd pl. med. subj. to the root aorist; however, because of its *-anta* ending it could have been interpr. as an *-anta* replacement to an active form (**varan*) of the same meaning (for *-anta* replacements see Jamison 1979 [III 21]). On this interpr., further act. forms could have been generated to this supposed act. stem. Although this explanation might work best for the form in this hymn (as opposed to those in VIII) because it is also a Dīrghatamas product, the problem is that our form here pretty clearly means ‘grant’ not ‘choose’, as the scenario would suggest. (Unless of course *varanta* in I.140.13 actually does mean ‘grant’, which is not impossible.) In short, these forms are morphologically puzzling and their meaning(s) not entirely clear.

I.143.8: With most interpr., I take unaccented *iṣṭe* at the end of c, also found at the end of its pāda in VI.8.7, as a voc. to a *-ti*-stem, built to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek’. Although such a form and usage would be unusual, Ge’s suggestion, that it is truncated from **iṣṭébhiḥ* (Ge ‘lieben’), seems less likely. See Old’s scathing criticism of the same emendation ad VI.8.7 in ZDMG 55.296 (=KlSch. 755).

I.144 Agni

I.144.3: This verse contains a number of elements reminiscent of I.140 and I.141. E.g., Agni’s wondrous form (*vāpuḥ*) is found also in 141.1, 2; the repeated transverse movement of the kindling sticks, expressed by the intensive part. *vitāritratā* here, echoes *tarete* in 140.3; and *bhāga-* reprises the numerous exx. of that stem in 141 (6b, 10d, 11b). The opening of c, *ād īm*, reminds us of the ritual-ordering expression *ād īd* in 140 (4d, 5a, 6a; cf. simply *ād* in 8c). The *īm* in our pāda c is functionless; that is, there is no possible acc. role it can fill in its clause, and it may have been substituted for **īd* because of the 2nd position *īm* opening the next two verses (4a *yād īm*, 5a *tām īm*).

I differ from the standard tr. in my interpr. of the rest of cd. The others divide the two clauses at the pāda boundary, with *sām asmād ā* belonging with the rest of c. This would of course be the default syntactic division. However, this assumes that *sām* is construed with *hāvyaḥ* ‘to be invoked’. But $\sqrt{hū}$ is not otherwise combined with *sām*, and

moreover preverbs should be unverbated with gerundives (e.g., *vihāvya*- II.18.7). To my mind, the material beginning with *sām asmād ā* belongs with d, and the *sām* that opens it is repeated right before the verb in d (*sām ayamsta*). This repetition indicates a complicated structure, and, in my opinion, the whole also bears a complicated relationship to 141.11. The repeated *sām* signals two different uses of the verb *sām ayamsta*. The first is transitive, with ‘reins’ as object (*vólhur ná raśmīn* “... (as if) holding firm the reins of a draught-horse”), and it matches the similar expression in 141.11 *raśmīṃr iva yó yāmati* “who will hold [them] fast like reins,” though with a different voice, tense stem, and mood of \sqrt{yam} . The voice difference is crucial, because act. *yāmati* in 141.11 can only be transitive, whereas med. *ayamsta* admits both transitive (as in the simile here) and passive interpretations; for the latter, see nearby I.136.2 *pānthā ṛtāsya sām ayamsta raśmībhiḥ*. And that is what I think is found in the frame of this passage: Agni, who is compared to a chariot-driver actively holding the reins in the simile, is in turn held by us in the frame, with a rare but not unprecedented abl. agent *asmād ā* with the passive sense of *ayamsta*. In other words, this is another example of case disharmony in similes of the type discussed in my 1982 article (IIJ 24). Taking *ayamsta* as passive in the frame also avoids the problem of the lack of second object parallel to ‘reins’, which the various tr. struggle with and mostly deal with by supplying ‘reins’ a second time.

Now recall that in 141.11 I wanted to see a similar passive value in the final tag *ṛtā ā ca sukrātuḥ* “and (who himself), of good resolve, (is held fast) in truth.” To achieve this, I had to supply (that is, invent) a passive form of \sqrt{yam} , namely the ppl. *yatāḥ* to contrast with act. transitive *yāmati*. But in 144.3, because of the dual value of *ayamsta*, both transitive and passive, it is not necessary to supply anything, but simply to read the verb twice, once each with each occurrence of *sām*. I therefore think that 144.3 reinforces my interpr. of 141.11 and that, in turn, 141.11 supports my double reading of 144.3.

Note that Old in SBE follows the syntactic division at pāda boundary in our 3cd, but in the Noten explicitly changes his view, taking *asmād ā* with what follows as I do. I cannot follow his interpr. thereof, however: “Agni lenkt die Fahrt zu uns hin.”

I.144.3–4: The pair *sāvayasā* ‘of the same vigor’ in these two verses have been variously identified: Sāy, Old (SBE, by implication), Hotar and Adhvaryu; Ge, Re, the two arms of the fire churner. I think it rather to be the two kindling sticks. As noted above, the dual participle in *vitāritratā* 3b here reminds us of the dual verb *tarete* in I.140.3, whose subj. is, by consensus, the two kindling sticks. In that same passage they are described as *sakṣītā* ‘sharing the same abode’, which matches *samāné yónā ... sāmokasā* “in the same womb ... sharing the same dwelling” in our 4b.

I.144.4: The phrase *dīvā ná náktam* is universally taken as “by night as by day” (that is, “always,” as Sāy points out), with a very extended sense of the simile marker *ná*. I take *ná* rather as the homonymous negative: “by day, not by night.” This would reflect the simple fact that the ritual fire is kindled only in the morning and draw attention to the oddity of this practice, since in everyday terms fire is more needed and desired at night, for light and warmth. The position of *ná* allows either interpr.: it is in expected 2nd position for a simile, but in my interpr. it immediately precedes the word it negates, which is standard when *ná* is not a sentential negation, but negates a single word in a clause.

I render the verb in this clause as preterital, in keeping with the Pp. reading *yúvā ajani*. However, to match the presential *saparyátaḥ* of pāda a and the generality of the statement about his birth it would be possible to read (without emending the Saṃhitā text) *yúvā jani*, with an injunctive, which could have presential/timeless sense: “he is born ...”

I.144.5: *vríś-* is a hapax, but the generally accepted meaning ‘finger’ seems well supported by context. Though suggested etymological connections do not enforce this sense, they do allow it. See EWA II.597 and lit. referred to there.

In 5d I have followed the Pp. and tr. augmented *adhita*; however, as in 4c the sequence *návādhita* could be read *návā dhita* with injunc., which would have presential/timeless value to match the presents *hinvantī* (a), *havāmahe* (b), and *ṛṇvati* (c). Although no other unaug. *dhita* forms occur, there is no reason it should not exist.

I.144.6: Opinion is divided over whether the two females of cd are Heaven and Earth or Night and Dawn. On the one hand, the heavenly and earthly realms of ab seem to favor the former pair; on the other, Heaven and Earth are not easily movable and would find it difficult to come physically to the ritual ground. (On this issue see Jamison, Staal Mem. Vol., 2016[.]) Night and Dawn might make better sense, in that the kindling of the ritual fire occurs at their temporal intersection and so they might appear to be both present at that moment. For such a sentiment see I.146.3. *vákvarī* ‘surging, undulating’ is also a more likely epithet of Night and Dawn (with their changing light) than of Heaven and Earth. Remember Agni’s beams churning “like the rivers of the night” in the immed. preceding hymn I.143.3.

I.145 Agni

I.145.1: I take the two occurrences of *īyate* in b as passives to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘implore, beseech’ (with putative underlying accent *īyáte*)(so also WG), not to *īyate* ‘speeds’ as most do. This echoes *tám prchata* “ask him!” that opens the verse and the two forms of \sqrt{prch} opening vs. 2.

As recognized by all, *sā nv ...* is difficult. Since a feminine subject is pretty much excluded, I interpr. *sā* as *sá ā* (already floated as a poss. by Old [Noten]). In this clause, repeating immediately preceding *īyate*, *ā* and *nú* add locational and temporal specificity. (The publ. tr. might make this clearer with “he is here and now implored.”)

Although I think the primary sense of *iṣṭáyaḥ* is ‘wishes’ (nicely contrasting with *praśiṣaḥ* ‘commands’), the secondary sense ‘offerings’ (to \sqrt{yaj}) can also be present. Although that sense is rare and usually associated with root-accented *iṣṭi-*, puns often ignore accent, and moreover, since root-accent is secondary in this class and spreading in Vedic (see Lundquist, -*tī*-stems), it is likely that there existed an old (*)*iṣṭi-* ‘offering’ that underwent accent retraction in the course of time.

I.145.2: In b *yád* can be the neut. sg. acc. object of *ágrabhīt* (so most tr.), rather than a subordinating ‘since’ as I take it. Either is possible, and there is little appreciable difference between them. If it is an acc. obj., we must supply a dummy obj. to *prchati* in

the main clause: “he does not ask about (that) which he has grasped ...” As in English (“... ask about what he has grasped ...”) this dummy obj. can be easily gapped.

In d Ge, Re, WG take the subj. to be an unidentified other man (Re “(tout homme)”), not Agni, as Old and I do. The question in part rides on *asyá*. Those favoring a change of subject may have done so in part because they wished to avoid having *asyá* be coreferential with the subject. However, this is a non-issue: there are abundant exx. of such coreferential constructions; a reflexive pronominal/adjective isn’t required. On the other hand, they may be correct in this passage, in that b opens with an overt reflexive expression *svéna ... mánasā* “with his own mind” marking Agni as subj. of the verb in that clause, and so *asyá* might be used contrastively, to mark the referent of the pronoun and the subject of *sacate* as different. On balance, though, I consider Agni still to be the subject, in part because the focus is so relentlessly on him otherwise.

I would, however, change the “resolve” of the publ. tr. to something more in keeping with the rest of the verse, perhaps “intellect, mental force.”

I.145.3: The identity of the ‘mares’ (*árvatīḥ*) is unclear; it should simply be a ritually related entity of fem. gender used in the plural, which leaves the field pretty wide open (hymns, prayers, ghee streams, etc.). It is unlikely to be the ladles (*juhvaḥ*) though they are feminine and plural, because the *tám ... tám* construction invites two different subjects, like the *tásmin ... tásmīn* constr. in 1c.

Apropos of *-praiṣa* in c, Ge (fld by WG) claims that this does not refer to the technical ritual sense of *praiṣa-* found in the later ritual. I would disagree. The word clearly is meant to mean something different from *praśís-*, also ‘command’ (though to a different root entirely), in 1c, and this verse (3) is quite ritual-centric. See further at I.180.6

I.145.4: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. seems meant to illustrate the secret knowledge that we are begging Agni to impart. It clearly concerns (some of) Agni’s actions at the ritual in conjunction with other being(s), but, in the usual fashion of such RVic riddling descriptions, the identity of the referents is left blank and the verbs are not sufficiently precise to define the actions. The publ. tr. gives some tentative identifications, and others are suggested by other tr.; I will not go further here.

I.145.5: As noted in the publ. intro. this vs. forms a ring with vs. 1 (so already Ge n. 5cd). Note also that *vy ábravīd vayúnā ...* “he has declared the (ritual) patterns ...” recalls *vayúnā návādhita* “he has established the new (ritual) patterns” in the preceding hymn (I.144.5).

The *īm* of pāda has no function, that is, no possible accusative reading. See *īm* in I.144.3 (though that had a possible explanation).

Because of the position of *hí* in d, contra the standard tr. I do not think that *agnír vidvān* should be construed with this last part of the verse (*ṛtacíd dhí satyáḥ*), despite the pāda break that seems to put them together. Rather the *hí* clause explains why Agni is knowledgeable and can provide the answers requested so forcefully at the beginning of the hymn.

I.146 Agni

I.146.1: The “three” and “seven” have received various identifications; mostly likely for the “three” in my opinion are the three sacrificial fires, for the “seven” perhaps the priests or, as a generic number, his flames.

Most (explicitly Old [SBE], Re) take Agni’s two parents to be Heaven and Earth, and certainly some cosmic resonance may be secondarily meant. But the repeated focus on the fire-churning sticks in the birth of Agni in Dīrghatamas’s oeuvre (see reff. in publ. intro.) and the fact that the expression *pitróṛ upásthe* is used elsewhere of Agni’s birthplace in the kindling sticks (most clearly III.5.8, VI.7.5) make it likely that they are meant here as well. If so, this provides a solution for the two gen. sg. in c, *cárate dhruváśya*. Instead of supplying yet more cosmic entities here (e.g., Old “and of whatever moves or is firm”), I take the two gen. singulars as specifying the two entities making up the pair in the dual gen. *pitróḥ* “of the two parents [lit. fathers]” in b, with one kindling stick held firm and the other moving across it to produce friction. I take the *asya* in c as referring to Agni; because it is unaccented, it should be used pronominally not adjectivally (despite WG “... dieses Gehenden”), and it should refer to something already in the discourse (as Agni is).

I.146.2: This verse seems to transition from narrow reference to the growth of the kindled fire at the kindling sticks to an enlarged frame involving Heaven and Earth. I take the dual *ene* in pāda a as referring still to the kindling sticks of vs. 1, but as Agni stands up in b, he reaches further -- putting his feet down on the back “of the broad one” (*urvyāḥ*), a clear reference to ‘earth’, and licking the udder, presumably of heaven -- thus filling the intermediate space between them.

I.146.3: This verse has another unidentified dual as subject, here almost surely Night and Dawn (cf. also I.144.6), although a simultaneous reference to the kindling sticks cannot (and should not) be excluded.

The contrastive *saṃcárantī/ ví carataḥ* is hard to capture in tr.

I.146.4: Pāda c is universally taken as a reference to Agni’s flight, his hiding himself in the waters, and the gods’ discovery and recovery of him there. I find this unlikely, but I do not have a better idea.

nṛ̥ṇ at the end of d is problematic. Ge takes it as a truncated gen. pl., hence “the sun of men,” but I would prefer to avoid such grammatical inventions. Sāy takes it as a dat. (*nṛ̥ṇ nṛ̥bhyaḥ*), and Old (SBE and ZDMG 55: 286–88 [=KlSch 745–47]), with a delicate adjustment of that interpr., states that *nṛ̥ṇ* can “stand for” different cases, in this instance the dative, though it is an acc. pl. in form. This interpr. makes it functionally parallel to *ebhyaḥ*, hence Old’s (SBE) “He the Sun became visible to them, to the men.” I would prefer to keep it functionally the acc. pl. it appears to be formally, and I therefore construe it as a goal with *sūryaḥ* “the sun towards men.” The syntax of my interpr. is pretty dubious, however. The same phrase, *sūryo nṛ̥ṇ*, is found in III.14.4, where it is also possible to wring out an acc. pl. interpr.

I.147 Agni

I.147.1: All other tr. take *dadāsúḥ* as preterital (e.g., Ge “... haben ... aufgewartet”), but Kü (243) interprets this pf. stem as having presential meaning with an implication of past action (“präsentische Bedeutung mit Implikation einer vergangen Handlung”), and I take both this verb and injunc. *raṇáyanta* in d as presential, establishing the ritual situation as so often in Dīrghatamas’s hymns. The present moment continues in vs. 2.

I.147.2: Ge (/WG) and Re take *tanvām* in d as a reflexive pronoun and tr. “I extol myself” (e.g., Re “(étant) ton laudateur, (c’est en fait) moi-même (que) je loue.”) Although I accept this as a secondary reading, I think the primary sense of *tanvām* must be ‘body’ here, namely the body of Agni. Such is Sāy’s interpr., followed by Old (SBE). The expression seems just a variant of V.28.4 *ágne vānde táva śríyam* “O Agni, I extol your glory”; moreover, *tanvām* is found in a number of Agni passages referring to ritual procedures done on/to the body of the fire (e.g., III.18.4, VI.11.2, VII.8.5).

I.147.3: In this vs. (which is also repeated as IV.4.13, where it is transparently secondary; see comm. there) the masc. pl. rel. *yé* seems to have a referent in the main cl. expressed by a form of the *sá/tám* prn., as would be expected: acc. *tān sukṛtaḥ* “those of good (ritual) action.” The publ. tr. reflects this apparently transparent relative / antecedent relationship: Agni’s protectors are themselves protected by Agni. However, the problem is that the *sukṛtaḥ* would normally be the sacrificers, not Agni’s protectors (*pāyāvah*), who should be helping Agni to protect the *sukṛtaḥ*. Hence the move by Ge and Re to supply a parenthetical “with them” in the main cl.: “your protectors who guarded ..., (with them) he guarded those of good action.” The instr. pl. *pāyúbhiḥ* is elsewhere used in constr. with an impv. ‘protect!’ addressed to Agni (I.31.12, 95.9, 143.8). In contrast to Ge and Re, Old (Noten) argues for interpreting the syntax as it stands, and the renderings of WG and Kü (412) also do not supply an instr. in the main clause. I am of two minds; on the one hand, a rendering with supplied instr. seems to reflect the usual RVic situation better, but, on the other, syntactically the *yé ... tān* construction is unimpeachable and the poet may have been aiming to express something slightly out of the ordinary. In the end I’ll let the publ. tr. stand, but with some question.

The juxtaposition of impf. *arakṣan* in the rel. cl. and *rarákṣa* in the main cl. is striking and begs for some functional differentiation. Kü (412) tr. “schützten” and “geschützt hat” respectively but doesn’t otherwise discuss. The action of the rel. cl. took place in the (semi-)mythological past while the main cl. may refer to the ritual near-past with present relevance.

I.147.5: On the curious and isolated form *dhāyīḥ* see my disc. in Jamison 1999 (*dheyām*, Ged. Schindler, 174–75), contra Hoffmann (Injunk., 63–64), who takes it as reformed from a passive aor. (**dhāyī*). In brief, I take it instead as a 3rd sg. act. precative that has been “precativized” from a 2nd sg. root aor. opt **dhāyās*. (For details consult the original article.) Although the standard tr. (Ge, Re, KH [Injunk. 63] take the form as 2nd sg., in my view *mā́kis* only has 3rd ps. ref. (see comm. ad X.11.9).

I.148 Agni

I.148.1: As in I.141.3 the homonymous roots \sqrt{math} ‘steal’ and ‘churn’ probably both contribute to this passage, with the former in mythological, the latter in ritual context.

The identity of the second member of the hapax cmpd. *viśvāpsu-* here and in the apparently related *viśvāpsu-* (3x) is disputed. The explanation now current (accepted by Mayrhofer, EWA s.v. *psu-* and reflected in WG’s tr.) is Thieme’s derivation (Gram.Kat. 539) from \sqrt{bhas} ‘breathe’, hence ‘ganz aus Atemhauch bestehend’. However, this sense does not fit the passages very well, and for these compounds I therefore prefer Re’s derivation from *vāsu-* (EVP 3.29, 12.107–8), despite Thieme’s criticisms and the phonological difficulties. Dīrghatamas seems to play with this word: note the scrambling in pāda d *vāpuṣe*, and in his I.162.22 *viśvāpūṣam* ‘all prospering’ seems another variant. Somewhat more tenuous, note that the companion qualifier here, *viśvādevyam* twice elsewhere appears with *pūṣān-*, once also in I.162., vs. 3 (also X.92.13).

I.148.2: Kü (239), WG take *mánma* as the subj. of *dadabhanta* (Kü: “Den Spender werden wirklich nicht schädigen die Gedichte”). This avoids having to invent an unidentified set of beings inimical to Agni, but raises the question of why anyone would think that *mánma*, which are generally benign and positively related to the ritual, would harm Agni. (See, e.g., the *mánma* in I.151.6–8, also a Dīrghatamas hymn.) I don’t think it’s a question of “sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me” - a very non-Vedic sentiment.

I.148.4: The expression in pāda a, “dissolve with his fangs,” sounds odd, but since Agni’s fangs are surely his flames, the image is less contorted than it first seems.

I.148.5: Contra the Pp., Gr, and all standard tr., I read *reṣaṇā* and take it as a cognate instr. with *reṣáyanti*, rather than reading *reṣaṇāḥ* and interpreting it as a nom. pl. The instr. possibility was suggested by Re in a note, though he follows the standard interpr. in his tr. There is no crucial difference between the two interpretations, however.

I.149 Agni

I.149.2: As noted in the publ. intro., the name Agni does not appear in this hymn, and in the earlier verses there is some ambiguity as to who the referent is. E.g. in 1c the stones (*ádrayaḥ*) might suggest Soma. In this vs. also there seems to be dual reference to Agni and Soma, esp. in the compound *jīvāpītasargaḥ* (already unusual for having three members, a rarity in the RV). The middle term *-pīta-* can belong either to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’ or $\sqrt{pyā}$ ‘swell’. In the former case the cmpd means ‘whose surge is drunk by living beings’ vel sim. and should refer to Soma (and most emphatically not to Agni, if ‘drink’ means what it usually does -- though “to ‘drink’ smoke” is an idiom in certain languages); in the latter ‘whose surge is swelled by living beings’ and should refer to Agni, whose flames are fanned by the priests (though Soma would also be possible). Most interpr. (Gr, Old [SBE], Ge, WG) opt only for the ‘drunk’ interpr. without fully explaining how the word can qualify Agni. Old (Noten) has second thoughts and suggests instead ‘swell’, which Re also goes for. I think the poet intended the ambiguity.

Pāda c, however, might seem to tip the referential scales towards Agni: fire can easily be envisioned as running forward (with its spreading flames) while not moving

from its original place of kindling. This is not an appropriate image for soma, which is always on the run after its pressing -- flowing towards the milk it will be mixed with and towards the cups from which it will be drunk. But the “remain fixed” interpr. depends on *śísṛīta* having a root affiliation with \sqrt{sri} ‘prop, fix’. So, inter alia, Gr and Kü (528), who takes it as a pf. mid. opt. to \sqrt{sri} (as do I and WG). However, other interpr. assign it to \sqrt{sri} ‘mix, etc.’ (Old [SBE] ‘has ripened’, Ge ‘gemischt(?) wird’) or an unprecedented verbal form beside root noun *śrī*, hence \sqrt{sri} ‘être beau’ (Re ‘resplendit’). Narten (“Ved. *śrīṇāti* ...,” 281 = KISch 351) is uncertain which root to assign it to, though her tentative tr. (“angelehnt bleiben dürfte”) reflects a \sqrt{sri} affiliation. In any case, if *śísṛīta* could belong to *śrī* ‘mix, prepare’, it could easily apply to Soma (“was mixed/prepared in his womb”), since Soma is regularly the object of forms built to this root. The poet may well have meant this ambiguity, which my publ. tr. does not reflect. I would therefore tentatively emend the tr. to “would still remain fixed [/was prepared] in his womb.”

Note the phonetic figure *sasrāṇāḥ śísṛīta*, with redupl. + *r*-cluster involving two different sibilants, plus *a* .. *ā* matched by *i* ... *ī*

I.149.3: *nārmīṇīm* in pāda a is a hapax. Ge and Re take it as a place name qualifying *púram* ‘stronghold’: Ge “die Burg Nārmiṇī.” This is of course a safe choice, but the fact that the pāda lacks a syllable and that each of the other pādas contains a simile marked by *ná* invite a reading *ná ārmīṇīm* “the/an *ārmīṇī*- like a stronghold.” This possibility was already noted by Old (SBE). I suggested that it is derived from *arma(ká)*- ‘flatland’ (see also Gr s.v. *nārmīn*-); the same deriv. must underlie WG “der wie auf eine verödete Palisade leuchtete,” with the meaning ‘ruined place’ attributed by some to *arma(ká)*-. If such a derivation is accepted, a few questions arise. First, *-in*-stems are always accented on that suffix, as are the *-ī*-stems that serve as their feminines (cf. *garbhīnī*- ‘pregnant’). Hence we should expect *ná *armīṇīm*. This might be easily solved by assuming the second accent was lost when *nārmīṇīm* was re-interpreted as a single word. The second question is why we need a feminine in the first place. There are several possibilities: 1) **armīṇī* refers to something inherently feminine; 2) it has been “attracted” into the fem. by fem. *púr*- in the simile; 3) *púram ná *armīṇīm* is to be interpr. as a single unit (with WG) “illuminated as if (illuminating) an *armīn*- stronghold.” If **armīn*- does mean ‘having flatland, low-lying’ or the like, the third possibility is not likely, because of the discrepancy in meanings (strongholds/fortresses presumably generally have commanding sites) -- though other proposed senses of the word might be more compatible with ‘stronghold’.

Although problems remain with *nārmīṇīm*, like many hapaxes it participates in phonetic play: note b *nārvā*, read *ná ārvā* and 2a *narām ná r*-.

I.149.5: The annunciatory *ayám sá hótā* “here he is, the Hotar ...” opening the verse is a typical final-verse signal of the epiphany of a god. Because Agni is on the ritual ground already, he doesn’t usually have an epiphany, but this phrase may indicate here the first sight of the kindled fire. The effect is particularly noticeable here because vs. 5 repeats some of the key portions of vs. 4: (4 ... *dvijánmā* ..., *vísṽā* ... / *hótā* ...; 5 ... *hótā* ... *dvijánmā*, *vísṽā*).

I.150 Agni

I.150.1: On “the great goad” as the sun, see comm. ad VI.6.6.

I.150.2: This vs. is constructed in opposition to vs. 1. In vs. 1 the poet declares himself under the protection (*śaraṇē*) of Agni (gen.) as if under that of the sun (gen.); vs. 2 contains a number of genitives qualifying a negatively perceived person, who is therefore implicitly contrasted with the genitives of vs. 1. To support this balanced structure I supply “from the protection” (**śaraṇāt*) for the genitives to depend on (sim. WG) and a verb of motion with the preverb of separation *ví* that opens the verse (hence “(I go) away (from ...)”). There are, of course, other ways to supply the supporting structure.

aninásya ‘of the one lacking force’ in pāda a recalls *iná inásya* of I.149.1b.

I.150.3: As Ge (/WG) suggest, the exaggeratedly successful mortal in ab is probably meant to be the speaker himself. I have therefore supplied *voce* from 1a. The lack of a verb in our ab keeps the description from being typed as 3rd ps.; even the *sá* can have 1st ps. ref. (see Jamison “sa figé”).

I.151 Mitra and Varuṇa

The publ. intro. gives a conspectus of the hymn, esp. the difficult first 5 vss.

I.151.1: For the ritual application of the various portions of this vs. see publ. intro. Most tr. take *gósu* and also perhaps *apsú* as the desired objects of battle (e.g., Ge “(im Kampf) um die Rinder”), but these seem to me to refer rather to the accoutrements of the soma sacrifice. The cows and the waters reappear in ritual context (at least in my view) in 4d and 5b respectively.

The standard tr. also supply a verb with pāda d, but this seems unnecessary.

I.151.3: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider the birth described here to be that of Agni (as throughout the rest of Dīrghatamas’s corpus and esp. in vs. 1 of this hymn), not of Mitra and Varuṇa (with the standard tr.). I construe the Wackernagel-positioned *vām* with *dákṣasē* in b. This *dákṣas-* is then the referent of *īm* in c.

I also take c as subordinated to d (with Re), not ab (with the others). That both c and d have 2nd du. pres. verbs (*bhárathaḥ ... vīthaḥ*) is suggestive, and the present in c does not work very well with the mythological past in ab.

I.151.4: The voc. *asura* with short final probably stands for the expected dual *asurā* (so read in the Pp. and accepted by the standard tr. and AiG III.53), though it is barely possible that only Varuṇa (or Mitra) is addressed. The numerous duals (*ítāvānau*, *ghoṣathāḥ*, *yuvām*, *yuñjāthe*) make this unlikely.

I consider the *dákṣam* in c to be Mitra and Varuṇa’s (like the *dákṣas-* of vs. 3) and take *divó brhatáḥ* as an abl. of source: \sqrt{yuj} + abl. ‘yoke from’ is a fairly common idiom.

Re takes *apáh* in d as ‘labor’ (“l’oeuvre (sacrée)”), but the accent is wrong (though see below). Both Old and Ge opt for ‘waters’ (though Ge. suggests the possibility of ‘work’ in his n. 4cd). I also think “waters” is the correct interpr.: as indicated in comm. to vs. 1, the waters here make a pair with the cows of 5b, both as ritual substances.

However, on the likelihood of a secondary neut. *apás-* ‘labor’, see comm. ad I.64.1, so this interpr. is not excluded, as a pun or an alternative.

I.151.5: The standard tr. take *mahī* in pāda a as a loc sg. (Ge ‘auf Erden’). Since loc. sg. *-ī* is extremely rare, I prefer to take it as the du. nom./acc. it appears to be, referring to the two world halves (see *ródasī* in 1c) in an unmarked simile.

In b the root noun *tújah* is grammatically ambiguous; with Gr, Ge, WG, Schindler (RtNoun) I take it as nom. pl., against Re (gen. sg.). (Old considers both nom. and acc. pl., without deciding.) The image, in my view, is of a herd of cows milling around in confusion on the ritual ground, but not raising dust as a real herd would do -- because, after all, the “cows” are really milk.

In cd, following Re’s interpr., I see reference to the times of the three soma pressings. With Re I tr. *uparātāti* as zenith, referring to the sun’s position at the Midday Pressing; *ā nimrúcaḥ* is an abl. with *ā* “until its setting,” referring to the Third (or evening) Pressing. Unlike Re I do not take *uśásaḥ* as ‘à l’aurore’ (as if a loc. sg.), but rather as an acc. of extent of time, “through the dawns,” though an abl. sg. with the preceding *ā* (Ge “(bis) zum Morgen”) might be possible -- in any case, a ref. to the Morning Pressing.

On *takvavī-* see also I.134.5. The stem occurs also in X.91.2, which is perhaps the passage in which the ‘bird’ sense is the clearest. Although ‘swoopingly/swiftly pursuing’ need not have a bird as its referent, and in our passage here the standard tr. take it as simply a pursuer (presumably human; e.g., Ge [WG] Verfolger), I am inclined to take it as a bird of prey rather than simply a hunter, because *taktá* (and other \sqrt{tak} forms) seem to be used esp. of birds and beasts considered to be like them; see comm. ad IX.32.4. In our passage the point of comparison between the cows in the frame and the *takvavī-* has to be the crying out (*svárantī*), which fits the sharp squawking of birds of prey, but not the general behavior of human hunters.

I.151.6: Pāda-final *gātúm árcathaḥ* seems to echo likewise pāda-final *gātúm árcata* in 2c, but in fact, at least according to me and the other standard tr., the similarity is misleading. In our passage *gātúm* is surely the object of du. pres. *árcathaḥ*, but in 2c *gātúm* is better taken as the object of the preceding verb *vidatam*, and *árcata* in sandhi before *utá*, which opens the next pāda, is better taken as having the underlying form *árcate* (so Pp.), the dat. sg. act. participle, rather than du. injunc. *árcataḥ*, which is technically possible. This teasing but false superimposability seems the opposite of “poetic repair” -- “poetic breakage” perhaps?

I.151.7: *vīthó adhvarám* exactly matches *vītho adhvarám* in 3d (save for the accent). Here, unlike the false identity in vs. 6 just discussed, the phrases have identical sense and reference.

In b the nominatives *kavīḥ* and *hótā* seem each appropriate to one part of the rest of the pāda: the poet to *manmasādhanaḥ* and the Hotar-priest to *yājati*. Re’s tr., with his trademark verbosity, makes this division of labor explicit.

I.151.8: I take b with c, rather than with a as do the standard tr., since the NP “the yoking of mind,” whatever it may precisely mean, harmonizes better with the thought, songs, and

mind of the rest of the verse than with the more physical manifestation of the sacrifice in pāda a. As for the meaning of the phrase, I assume that it is part of the larger conceptual complex likening the sacrifice and its various elements to a chariot and its associated elements. The yoking or harnessing of mind refers to embarking on concentrated and deliberate mental effort for the sake of the sacrifice. Cf. Mitra and Varuṇa's yoking of their skill in 4cd.

“Yoking of mind” actually contains the pl. *práyuktiṣu*, but the pl. form is probably the result of a mechanical metrical adjustment: *mānaso ná práyukti* (short-vowel instr.) is found at pāda end in X.30.1 in a Triṣṭubh cadence, and this phrase was converted into a Jagaṭī cadence here by the addition of *-su*. The other two occurrences of the stem *práyukti-* are likewise pāda-final in Triṣṭubh and end in *-ti(h)*. One of these, ... *ná práyuktiḥ*, is found two hymns after this one, in I.153.2, where I (so also Re) take the phrase as abbreviated from **mānaso ná práyukti-*, as here.

I.151.9: The voc. *nārā* in b was carelessly omitted in the publ. tr. Insert “o superior men.”³

In c the phrase *dyāvó 'habhiḥ* is rendered “the days with their daytimes” by all standard tr. However, although there are undeniable instances of pl. *dyāvaḥ* meaning ‘days’ (e.g., VI.24.7, 38.4) and *āhabhiḥ* is suggestive, I prefer ‘heavens’, which is the more common meaning of nom. *dyāvaḥ*. I.130.10 *āhobhir iva dyāuḥ*, with the nom. sg., where ‘heaven’ is the only possible interpr., supports ‘heavens’ here. The context of our passage gives no help either way: *dyāvaḥ* is conjoined with *síndhavaḥ* ‘rivers’, which would not seem to form a natural class either with ‘heavens’ or with ‘days’ (though see Klein, DGRV 2.144 for other exx. of ‘heaven’ conjoined with waters of some sort), and the statements “the heavens have not attained your divinity” and “the days have not attained your divinity” are almost equally puzzling -- though I’d give the edge of sense of the former.

I.152 Mitra and Varuṇa

I.152.1: Ge (/WG) take the “garments of fat” to be rain, though WG consider a reference to a libation also possible. Given the ritual focus of the previous and following hymns, and esp. I.151.8a *yuvāṃ yajñaiḥ prathamā góbhīr añjate* “They anoint you first with sacrifices and with cows,” I take the garments of fat to be the oblations offered to them.

Pāda b is likewise unclear, in part because the sense of *māntu-* is not entirely understood: see comm. ad IX.73.6. Assuming ‘counsels’ is a reasonable rendering, I think the point is that M+V provide us with an unending stream of good advice.

I.152.2: On the basis of *acítam bráhma* in 5c, I tentatively supply *bráhma* as the referent of *etád* here, which is the object of *ví ciketat*, and of *tád* in 3b, the object of *ciketa*. The web of neut. sg. + *√cit* is tight in these vss.; note also that our *bráhma* is touted as the ultimate weapon in the last hemistich of the hymn (7c). Pādas a and b in this verse are implicitly contrastive, so the referent of *etád* should be something that harmonizes with *mántra-*, but it cannot be *mántra-* itself, because that word is masc. Neut. *bráhman-* fills the bill.

The gen. pl. *eṣām* could be dependent on *tvāḥ* ‘many a one’ (so Ge [WG]), rather than on *etād* (Old, Re, me). In either case the referent is not clear. If it limits *etād*, as I think (based partly on *tād vām* 3b; so Old), then it may refer to the gods, esp. Mitra and Varuṇa, or to mortal poets inspired by the gods, in contrast to the hapless ‘scorners of the gods’ (*devanídaḥ*) in d. If it is dependent on *tvāḥ* I assume it refers to the general run of clueless mortals. As argued in the publ. intro., I take ab to mean that, whether or not it is comprehensible to ordinary people, speech properly pronounced by poets comes true.

Whether the four-edged and three-edged weapons have precise referents is not clear. Old and Ge [WG] state that *cáturaśrí-* is used of the *vájra-* in IV.22.2; this is actually conjecture and probably false. The bahuvrīhi *cáturaśrí-* is used without a head noun in IV.22.2a, as the object of the part. *áśyan* ‘hurling’ (or ‘shooting’). The next verse contains a form of *vájra-* (3c), but the context is not a direct restatement of 2a; in other words, the two words need not have anything to do with each other. Closer to the occurrence of *cáturaśrí-* in 2a is *ásman-* ‘stone’ in 1d (i.e., the pāda immediately before). Since stones can be hurled (cf. I.172.2 *ārē ásmā yám ásyatha*), and this is not a standard characteristic of a *vájra* (though see I.130.4, as well as Slaje’s recent assertion [Vájra: *Zur Schleuderwaffe im Rigveda*, 2022] that the *vájra* is a slingshot, specifically the projectile launched thereby), if *cáturaśrí-* has any clear referent in IV.22.2, it is probably the stone, not the mace. It is perhaps worth noting that IV.22.1c contains a string of words referring to ritual speech: *bráhma stómam ... ukthā*, which suggests at least an indirect connection between ritual speech and the four-edged weapon, as here. This leaves the three-edged weapon. Does it have a precise reference (say, a trident associated with non-divinities) or is the poet simply expressing the truism that higher numbers beat lower ones and four edges is better than three?

I.152.3: See the publ. intro. for my view of the structure of this verse. I do not believe that the four pādas need to fit into a consistent cosmological scheme, as other tr. seem to, and in particular I do not think that cd refers to the morning sun or the like.

The accent on *píparti* in d probably results from its being in an antithetical construction with *ní tārīt*, though antithetical accent generally arises when the verbs are directly adjacent.

I.152.4: The description of the Sun’s garments in c uses two technical weaving terms, one of very limited distribution. *ví√tan* describes the stretching out of a piece of (unfinished) cloth on the loom for weaving; the very rare root *√prajj* refers to the ‘abbrechen’, ‘abschliessen’ of the finished garment (EWA s.v. *PRAJJ*, flg. Hoffmann, Fs. Knobloch = Aufs. 813ff.; Rau, Weben, 18), that is, presumably, the removal from the loom and tidying up of the completed fabric. The garments (or fabrics) that the Sun is wearing here are therefore *not* completed. Ge renders *ánavaprṇā* very loosely, as ‘endless’ (“ohne Ende”) and further interprets the garment without end as time (die Zeit); WG’s tr. is scarcely more precise (“nicht abgeschlossen”) and in their n. they follow Ge’s time interpretation. But it is hardly likely that such an outré form to a root confined to technical usage (and found in the RV only here) would be used for such a simple concept, which could easily have been expressed by *anantá-*. Re’s “denués de franges” (without fringe) at least reflects the textile associations of the word (which Ge’s and WG’s do not), but otherwise seems somewhat bizarre. The poet must have something very particular in

mind: the Sun's garment is unfinished, still stretched on the loom. But what visual image corresponds to this bit of weaving lore? I am not certain but suggest that the sun is rising through mist (the garments, or, better, fabric) stretched along the horizon, and the ragged edges of this mist look like the unfinished edges of fabric still on a loom. For a similar image see I.115.4 and my comm. thereon.

This interpretation helps explain the first half of the verse, in which we see the Sun when he is going forth (pāda a: *prayāntam*) but not when he is settling down near (b: *upanipādyamānam*) -- near to the maidens presumably (a: *kanīṇām*), who are, also presumably, the Dawns. I think we need to read these participles in reverse chronological order. The settling down near the maidens happens before the visible rising of the sun, the going forth. The Sun is nestled cozily (and erotically) with the maidens below or at the horizon, and the ragged fabric provides a welcome veil of modesty over their activities.

I.152.5: The first hemistich is taken universally as a reference to the Sun, and my publ. tr. follows this understanding. However, this identification may not be very strong: although, as Ge says, the Sun is sometimes imagined as a horse, sometimes as a chariot, it can scarcely be thought to whinny (*kānikradat*) -- this detail must simply be attached because of the horse image -- and the 'high' or 'arched' back (*ūrdhvāsānu-*) may be appropriate to the path of the sun across the sky but does not fit the round shape of the actual heavenly body. Nonetheless, I don't have a better idea.

In the publ. tr. the rendering of *acīttam* in c should be "(Though it) cannot be comprehended ..." not "(Though it cannot be) comprehended ...," since the negation is plainly there. This should be corrected also in the first line of the intro. I do not understand the unusual accent (rather than expected **ācitta-*). AiG II.1.226 cites a few other examples (e.g., *amīta-*) but gives no explanation.

In the publ. tr. "their ordinance" does not sufficiently make clear that it's the ordinance of Mitra and Varuṇa (as in 4d *mitrāsya varuṇasya dhāma*), not that of the youths.

I.152.6: The son of Mamatā is, of course, Dīrghatamas, our poet.

In my view, the verse is describing the feeding of the fire with streams of ghee, the milk-cows (*dhenāvah*) of pāda a; the "same udder" (*sāsmin ūdhan*) is the fire place. Ge (WG) see the cows instead as the rains and give a more cosmic spin to the whole verse. But pāda c esp. supports a ritual interpr., as does the instr. 'by mouth' (*āsā*) in d, so characteristic of the ritual Agni.

For my transitive interpr. of *brahma-prī-* 'pleasing x with the formulation' (contra 'loving the formulation' or 'friend of the formulation' of all others, including Scar [338]), see comm. on I.83.2. In that passage the transitive value is strongly favored by context; here, given Agni's usual middle-man role as both sacrificer and sacrificed to, it is less clear. I could accept 'loving the formulation, pleased by the formulation' here.

In d the literal sense of *ā-dīti-* 'boundless(ness)' works well with the main verb *uruṣyet* 'he should make broad space'. What, if anything, the goddess Aditi is doing here is unclear to me. Ge suggests that the sense vacillates between the goddess and the abstract noun, with the goddess the obj. of *avivāsan* 'seeking to win' and the abstraction of *uruṣyet*. This seems reasonable: because Agni's mouth is the conduit of the oblations

to the gods, “seeking to win” the goddess “with his mouth” would mean attracting her to the sacrifice to consume the oblation by means of his mouth (/flames), while the abstract sense of the word expresses our own wish for boundlessness or freedom. I would now emend the publ. tr. accordingly to “Seeking to attract Aditi with his mouth, he should make broad space for boundlessness.”

Note that Aditi is identified with a milk-cow in I.153.3 below, a hymn with many verbal and ritual ties to I.151–52. There Aditi the cow herself swells (*pīpāya dhenúr áditiḥ*), while the cows in this passage cause Agni to swell (*pīpayan*).

For a quite different interpr. of the vs., see JPB’s R̥gvedic Ādityas, pp. 200–1.

I.152.7: The first hemistich, inviting Mitra and Varuṇa to come here and partake of our oblation, seems like a fuller and more straightforward version of 6d *āsāvívāsann áditim* just discussed, with the 1st ps. poet substituting for Agni as the enticer of the gods.

In cd the two fronted *asmākam* have somewhat different uses, which are not sufficiently reflected in the published tr. In c the formulation (*bráhma*) is one produced by us -- ‘ours’ in that sense. But in d we should be the recipients of the heavenly rain; we do not produce it. Ge (/WG) and Re convey the difference more clearly. I would slightly emend the publ. tr. of d to “for us should be ...,” supplying a copula with its optative value borrowed from precative *sahyāḥ* in c.

I.153 Mitra and Varuṇa

This brief hymn reprises a number of the ritual tropes found in the preceding two hymns, I.151–52.

I.153.1: In the second hemistich the clause beginning *ádha yád* raises some syntactic/interpretational issues. The standard interpr. (also incl. Klein DGRV II.127) assume that *yád* stands here for *yébhiḥ*, rendering the clause, in Klein’s tr., “and (with) what(ever) they bear among us for you with their (poetic) thoughts, (just) as the Adhvaryu’s (do).” Besides arbitrarily modifying the relative marker, this interpr. also requires supplying a 3rd pl. subj. for *bháranti* different from *adhvaryávaḥ*. I prefer to keep *yád* as a subordinating conjunction and read *ná* as having domain over the whole clause, not just *adhvaryávaḥ*. Although I am unhappy with this stretching of the function of *ná*, the other alternations seem to me more radical. For a similar use of *ná* (in my interpr.), see I.131.2fg and comment thereon. What Adhvaryus bear to a god is soma (II.14.1 *ádhvaryavo bháraténdrāya sómam*; cf. I.135.3).

I do however now note that *bháranti* with unidentified subject is found in I.151.7, where they bring songs (*gírah*) along with thought (*mánmanā*) to the gods. Given the verbal connections among these three hymns (I.151–53), I may need to rethink the interpr. here along the lines of the standard tr: “They bring you (songs) along with insights (*dhítibhiḥ*), as Adhvaryus (do soma).”

I.153.2: As discussed ad I.151.8, I take *ná práyuktiḥ* (-ir in sandhi) as short for *mánaso ná práyukti-*, as in that passage and X.30.1. I would in fact now go further and suggest that the nom. sg. *práyuktir* here is a redactional change for *práyukti*, the short-vowel instr. found at VI.11.1, X.30.1, and I would change the publ. tr. to “as if *with the yoking up (of mind).” The form would have been changed to match the two other nom. sg.s to -ti-

stems in this hemistich, *prástutir* and *suvṛktīḥ* (both given in their sandhi forms), and it would also avoid hiatus over the pāda boundary.

As for *dhāma*, I take it, as I do in I.152.4d, as an accusative of respect: “following/with regard to the ordinance.”

This verse has another reminiscence of the preceding Mitra and Varuṇa hymns in pāda c: the Hotar here anoints (*anākti*) Mitra and Varuṇa as an unidentified plural set of ritual officiants do in I.151.8 (*yuvām ... añjate*), the same verse containing the yoking of mind.

I.153.3: As noted ad I.152.6, that verse contains both milk-cows (*dhenávaḥ*) and Aditi, though not identified with each other as here. In that verse the cows cause swelling, rather than swelling themselves. Nevertheless, I see thematic connections between the passages. *áditi-* ‘boundlessness’ (with one reading of the word in I.152.6d) perhaps qualifies the swelling milk-cow here: she swells without limit for the good sacrificer. Again, an emended tr. might read *“(The milk-cow swells as boundlessness for ...”

All the standard tr. take *ṛtāya* as an adj. qualifying the *jána-* (e.g., Ge “für die rechtwandelnden Mann”), but adjectival uses of *ṛtá-* are rare to non-existent and the conjunction of an abstraction and an animate being is not rare. Cf. in one of the associated hymns, I.151.3 *yád īm ṛtāya bháratho yád árvate*, where the double *yád* shows that two entities are in question (“for truth and for the steed”). Again, in I.151.6a *ā vām ṛtāya keśínīr anūṣata*, where the dat. *ṛtāya* is universally interpr. as the abstract *ṛtá-*.

The standard tr. take d as a continuation of c, whose referent is still the man who gives offerings who was first met in b. Since this man is clearly human, it seems awkward to *compare* him to a human Hotar (*mānuṣo ná hótā*). I take d separately, with the initial *sá* signaling here a new, nominal clause, whose referent is Agni. The simile then makes sense, because Agni, though a god, regularly plays the role of Hotar at the sacrifice (and could in fact be the Hotar in 2c). Agni is elsewhere qualified as *rātāhavya-* (I.31.13, IV.7.7.), as are other gods (V.43.6, VII.35.1, VII.69.6), so this epithet does not require a human referent.

I.153.4: The med. 3rd pl. *pīpayanta* here echoes act. 3rd pl. *pīpayan* in I.152.6b and both are transitive: the form in our vs. is simply an *-anta* replacement/variant of the usual type. Both have cows as (partial) subjects (*dhenávaḥ* and *gāvaḥ* respectively), but in I.152.6 the cows are, in my view, the streams of ghee swelling the fire, while here the cows and waters are the usual additions to the soma drink. Agni is not absent, however, at least in my view: the lord of the house in c is probably Agni, and his position as ‘foremost’ (*pūrvyáḥ*) refers to his placement to the east as the Āhavanīya fire.

In d the naked *vītām* can be fleshed out by comparison with I.151.3 *vītho adhvarām*, despite Ge’s “Bekommet Lust” and Re’s “Goûtez”; WG’s “Verfolgt!” at least reproduces the same verb they use for *vīthaḥ* in I.151.3.

I.154 Viṣṇu

I.154.1: The hymn begins with an almost exact echo of the famous opening pāda of the Indra hymn I.32 *indrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam*. In place of *indrasya* we have *vīṣṇoḥ* and the missing syllable is made up by inserting the fairly functionless particle *kam* after *nú*.

I.154.2: The covert identification with Indra continues in pāda b, which is identical to X.180.2a, where Indra is the referent.

I.154.6: *bhūriśṛṅga-* is tr. by all as ‘many-horned’, but this doesn’t make a lot of sense: each cow should have only two horns, unless Viṣṇu and Indra’s dwelling is a place of fantasy creatures. I have therefore rendered it ‘ample-horned’, meaning that the horns are quite sizeable. ‘Many-horned’ would be possible if the reference is to the whole herd of cattle: each cow has two horns, but the collectivity has many. I still prefer ‘ample’.

I.155 Viṣṇu and Indra

I.155.1: 2nd pl. *vaḥ* is one of those vague oblique references to the ritual personnel, here something like “on your own behalf.” Because such a throw-away Sanskrit word requires such a heavy English tr., I omitted it in the publ. tr.

pāntam here belongs to the nominal stem *pānta-* ‘drink’; see comm. ad I.122.1.

As Ge points out, loc. *sānuni* and instr. *ārvatā* show case disharmony between frame and simile, in this case presumably because instr. *ārvatā* is idiomatic. This is one of the few instances in the RV referring to horseback riding.

I.155.2: The Pp. interprets *sutapā* as *sutapāh*, hence a nom. sg., and this interpr. is accepted by Re and WG. However, Ge argues persuasively for du. *sutapā*, and I follow him. The others must invent a mysterious soma-drinker who gives wide space and freedom to Viṣṇu and Indra; as indicated in the publ. intro. I assume that the clash (*samāraṇam*) in pāda a is what opens up the space.

The stem *uruṣyá-*, the verb ending both b and d, must be read in two different senses (as recognized by all tr.); ‘go wide’ is a useful English idiom for an arrow or other missile missing its target.

I.155.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the sense of these enigmatic paradoxes is not clear, as so often when family relationships and implied incest are in question. The females who “strengthen his great masculine nature” are left unidentified, but in some sense this scarcely matters: the point is that *feminine* beings strengthen his *masculine* nature and shortly thereafter there’s semen in play. The dual *mātārā* can (and probably does) stand for the two parents and is so tr. by all; however, it is more piquant for the two mothers to enjoy the semen presumably of their son, and the mother word contrasts with the father in c. For other contextually appropriate use of the dual parental designations, see Dīrghatamas’s I.159.2–3.

In c it might be better if “names” were in parentheses: although *nāma* in d can be either sg. or pl. (and is the former in conjunction with flg. *trīṣyam*), it can’t be dual, as the pair of adj. *āvaram páram* “lower and higher” might require.

I.155.4: With Ge (/WG) I take the pronominal āmreḍita *tād-tad* as emphatic rather than distributive, despite the identical pāda in X.23.5, where I opt for a distributive sense because of context.

I.155.6: *vyāti-* from **vi-yati-* (*√yam*), flg. Re.

Re takes *vimímānaḥ* in d as reflexive ‘se mesurant’, and Ge’s ‘sich richtend’ is close. Since med. forms of (*vñ*) *√mā* are regularly transitive (cf. *vimamé rájāmsi* in the previous hymn, I.154.1b, sim. I.154.3cd), I would supply an object here. In the publ. tr. I tentatively suggest “the realms,” as in 154.1, but given the contents of this verse I would now supply “the year.”

I.156 Viṣṇu

I.156.3: The Pp. reads *vidá* here, the 2nd pl. act. pf., though *vidé* or indeed *vidáh* would be equally possible in this sandhi situation. Old says we’re not obliged to read *vidé*, and the standard tr. follow the Pp. The cross-pāda sandhi *-a ṛ-* suggested by the Pp is impeccable. As Dieter Gunkel points out to me (pc 11/5/15) “‘underlying’ */-e ṛ-/*, */-a ṛ-/*, and */-as ṛ-/* are all transmitted as *<-a ṛ->* in the saṃhitā text. Where the hemistich boundary intervenes, as here, they are also metrically identical, and therefore identical in the restored text. I gathered examples of */-a ṛ-/* at hemistich boundary from the first four books and found these: 1.15.12ab, 1.68.4ab, 1.116.23b, 1.152.3cd, 2.35.8ab, 3.14.” Nonetheless, against the Pp. I opt for the 3rd sg. mid. *vidé*, which is common in this phrase (*yáthā vidé*).

The standard tr. interpr. *pipartana* in fairly generic ways: Ge “ihn heget,” Re “comblez (le de louanges)” (taking it to *√pṛ* ‘fill’), WG “den ... fördert.” In the context of the birth motif found in pāda c as well as in 2c, I take the verb as more precise and idiomatic: the usual ‘carry (to the far shore)’ narrowed to ‘carry to term’ of birth. The same sense is found in VI.48.5 (a passage adduced by Ge) *gárbham ṛtásya píprati* of Agni’s birth.

nāma in c is ambiguous as to number (sg. or pl.), but is taken by all standard tr., I think correctly, as plural. Given that Viṣṇu is being identified with a number of gods in this hymn, he has multiple names, and this middle verse gives the clue to this trick of the hymn.

I.156.4: The publ. tr. “does ... follows” should be corrected to “follow.”

I don’t know why Varuṇa, the Áśvins, and the Maruts -- gods that don’t usually interact -- appear together as followers of Viṣṇu’s *krātu-*. Syntactically it is mildly interesting that a singular nom. (*váruṇaḥ*) and a dual nom. (*ásvínā*) together form the subject of a plural verb (*sacanta*). By simple addition this is what we would expect, but verb agreement often is governed by more local rules.

I do not understand the second hemistich either. Part of the problem is the cmpd. *ahar-víd-* ‘knowing (or finding) the days’. I interpret it in light of the last verse of the previous hymn, I.155.6, concerning Viṣṇu’s apparent control over the days of the year. Since Viṣṇu is several times in this hymn (including in this vs.) called *védhas-* ‘ritual expert’ (2a, 4b, 5c), the reference may be rather to knowing the ritual day, as in I.2.2. But others see pāda d as depicting the Vala myth, and WG interpr. *aharvíd-* in this Vala context: “das Tageslicht zu finden.”

I.156.5: The lexeme *ā* √ *vī* unusually takes a dat. inf. with dat. subj. as complement (*sacáthāya ... índrāya*), at least by my interpr. Despite the superficial similarity to X.6.2 (*ā yó vivāya sakhyā sakhibhyaḥ*), the two passages have very different syntax.

[I.157–58 JPB]

I.159–60

On the structural near identity of these two hymns see the publ. intro. to I.160.

I.159 Heaven and Earth

Alliteration is especially prominent in this hymn: e.g., 2ab ... *manye ... máno*, *mātúr máhi*; 3a *sūnávaḥ s^dápasah sudámsaso*; 3d *putrásya pāthaḥ padám*; 4c *návyam-navyam tántum ... tanvate*.

I.159.1: *prá* √ *bhūṣ* is found only here (though cf. *úpa-pra* √ *bhūṣ* in III.55.1 and *ánu prá* √ *bhūṣ* in IX.29.1) and the meaning of √ *bhūṣ* in all its manifestations is notoriously slippery. My tr. here is somewhat illegitimate: I generally tr. the lexemes in III.55.1 as ‘tend to’, ‘attend upon’; my ‘tender’ here (a verb that has nothing to do synchronically with ‘(at)tend’) is a pun on the English. Nonetheless, something like it seems called for here: busy oneself with something to present and bring it forward.

I.159.3: The identity of these sons as the gods is clear from *deváputre* in 1c: ‘the two [=Heaven and Earth] having the gods as sons’.

The referent of the son in d is disputed. Sāy (followed by WG) takes it as the sun, on the basis of I.160.1; Ge as “jedes lebende Geschöpf”; Re as the human son. I suggest rather that it is Agni. In 2 of the other 3 occurrences of *advayāvin-* it modifies *hótar-* (III.2.15, VII.56.18), and in at least one (III.2.15) it’s clearly Agni. It’s also the case that Agni is frequently associated with *padá-*. The hemistich may convey that Heaven and Earth protect the general world of reality (c) and the specific world of the ritual (d). I think it esp. unlikely that it is the Sun here, because of the complementary relationship between I.159 and I.160, with the latter being the realm of the Sun. See publ. intro. to I.160.

I.159.5: As Ge notes (n. 5ab), the first hemistich is reminiscent of the Gāyatrī mantra (III.62.10), with our pāda a *tád (rádho adya) savitúr váreṇyam* an expanded version of III.62.10a *tát savitúr váreṇyam* and our b *devásya ... manāmahe* perhaps meant as a partial paraphrase of III.62.10b ... *devásya dhīmahi*, with a misanalysis of *dhīmahi* as belonging to √ *dhī* ‘think’, rather than being the root aor. med. opt. of √ *dhā* ‘place’ — hence the subj. *manāmahe* ‘we will think about’. This may provide significant evidence of the status and interpr. of the Gāyatrī mantra at this early period.

I.160 Heaven and Earth

I.160.1: It is striking that the Sun, by most interpr., is called a poet (*kaví-*).

The fem. stem *dhiṣāṇā-* is a perennial problem, with a distressing number of interpr. and no agreement on etym. (see EWA s.v.). I take it, in part flg. Pinault, as “Holy

Place,” referring esp. both to the Earth and to the ritual ground. Support for this comes, in the first instance, from two sources. On the one hand, a surprising proportion of the attestations of this stem are dual (*dhiśāṇe*) (7, as opposed to 21 sg. and 3 pl.), as here, and a number of these are clearly associated with Heaven and Earth, also as here. See also VI.8.3, 50.3, 70.3; X.44.8. Such usage is reminiscent of the use of pregnant du. *pr̥thivī* for (Heaven and) Earth, as well as of fem. du. *ródasī*. In the sg. *dhiśāṇā* is sometimes qualified by *mah̥*, a regular modifier of Earth (I.102.7, III.31.13, X.96.10). That the *dhiśāṇā* is also conceived of as a goddess follows from the divinity of the Earth. That a word used of Earth would also be applied to the ritual ground is, of course, not surprising, since the ritual ground is conceptually the concentrated essence of the Earth. In some passages the ritual paraphernalia are located “in the lap of the Dhiśāṇā” (I.109.3, X.17.12) or she herself performs ritual activities (e.g., I.102.1, 109.4; IV.34.1; X.30.6). The use of the word in other passages is more attenuated, but the balance of the evidence favors this interpr.

I.160.2: Old suggests emending *sudh̥ṣṭame* ‘boldest’ to **sudṛṣṭame* ‘loveliest to see’, but this not only seems unnecessary but weakens the striking image. The girls, dressed in their best by their father, presumably to attract potential husbands, seem to be on public display -- a very bold move for previously sheltered damsels.

I.160.3: Note the alliteration in ab ... *putráḥ piṭṛóḥ pavítravān, punāti* ...

The standard tr. take *śukráṁ páyaḥ* as two entities, “semen (and) milk,” against my “blazing milk.” I do not know of any passages in the RV where *śukrá-* must mean ‘semen’; it is overwhelmingly adjectival, and I prefer to render it so here. The “blazing milk” that the Sun milks is presumably sunlight. I take the *asya* here as referring to the Sun and thus coreferential with the subject of the sentence. As discussed ad I.145.2, overt reflexive forms are not required in this syntactic situation. By contrast Ge thinks *asya* refers to Heaven and Earth (/the cow and the bull), but conceived of as a single person and hence represented by a singular pronoun. Re takes *asya* as referring only to the bull.

I.160.4: Ge and, apparently, Re (but not WG) take *āṇṛce* not to \sqrt{rc} ‘chant, praise’, but to a different root ‘hold’ (with *sám* ‘hold together’). (See also Old’s disc., though he ultimately opts for ‘praise’.) But as Kü says (106), such recourse to “eine sonst unbekannte Wurzel” is not helpful. Though Ge claims that in context ‘chant, praise’ is excluded, in the context of the whole verse it works fine, as Old points out. That the first verbal form in the next verse is *gr̥ṇāné* ‘being sung’ (though modifying Heaven and Earth, not the Sun) supports this interpr., esp. since *āṇṛce* and *gr̥ṇāne* are near anagrams.

[I.161 JPB]

I.162 Praise of a horse (Aśvastuti)

I.162.1: Although the collection of gods serving as witnesses in ab seems somewhat random, the same set recurs in V.41.2, as Ge points out. The reason for their association there is no clearer than here.

Pāda d, *pravakṣyāmaḥ* (*vidathé*) *vīryāṇi*, is a variant on the famous opening of I.32, the great Indra hymn, *īndrasya nú vīryāṇi prāvocaṃ*. The gen. *īndrasya* of I.32.1 is matched by the long gen. phrase in our c: (*yád*) *vājīno devājātasya sápteḥ* “of the prize-winning, god-born race-horse.” For another variant on this phrase in Dīrghatamas’s oeuvre, see I.154.1. It is striking here that *vīryāṇi* ‘heroic/manly’ deeds are attributed to a horse; the establishment of “personhood” for the horse, discussed in the publ. intro., begins here in the very first verse.

I.162.2: It may not be clear in the publ. tr. that it is the horse that is bedecked (*prāṇvṛtasya*), not the goat.

viśvārūpa- modifying the goat in c is taken by most as a bland color term (Ge/WG ‘allfarbig’, Doniger ‘dappled’), but, esp. because in the next vs. (3b) the goat is called *viśvādevya-*, I think the qualifier is meant to convey more meaning: perhaps to indicate that the goat stands for all the other animals (which, as disc. in the publ. intro., are literally tied up for sacrifice in the later versions of the Aśvamedha), hence my “representing all forms.”

I.162.3: It is appropriate that the goat, if it “represents all forms” (see disc. of the previous vs.), should belong to all the gods. That it should also be “Pūṣan’s portion” (*pūṣṇó bhāgāḥ*, 3b and 4c) probably follows from the fact that Pūṣan “has goats for horses” (*ajāśva-*: 5x, always of Pūṣan) and is generally associated with goats.

As for Tvaṣṭar’s involvement, Ge (sim. WG) simply says that Tvaṣṭar is the creator esp. of animals, but I think there is a tighter connection. Tvaṣṭar is a required presence in the Āprī hymns, the litanies that accompany the animal sacrifice. The verse devoted to him in each hymn occurs immediately before the “Lord of the Forest,” namely the stake to which the sacrificial animal is tied, releases the animal for sacrifice. Just before that, Tvaṣṭar both produces life (e.g., II.3.9, III.4.9-VII.2.9) and assists at the sacrifice (V.5.9), escorting the sacrificial animal to the gods (X.70.9) or at least pointing the way (II.3.9). Most strikingly Tvaṣṭar is once called *viśvārūpa-* (I.13.10) and several times enacts that epithet dramatically: I.188.9 *tvāṣṭā rūpāṇi hí prabhúḥ paśūn viśvān samānájé* “Because preeminent *Tvaṣṭar* anointed all the beasts (with) their forms”; X.110.9 *rūpaír āpiṃśad bhúvanāni viśvā* “he adorned all the creatures with their forms.” In our verse Tvaṣṭar stimulates/quicken the goat immediately before its sacrifice and indeed *for* its sacrifice, and that goat has just been characterized as *viśvārūpa-*. Thus Tvaṣṭar’s constant appearance in the Āprī hymns shows that this god has a defined role in the animal sacrifice, and that role, somewhat paradoxically, involves both giving life and setting the stage for taking it away by sacrifice. This is less of a paradox in the conceptual context of the animal sacrifice: as noted in the publ. intro., a good deal of this hymn is devoted to reconstituting the sacrificed horse and endowing it with life-breath. Tvaṣṭar thus has a role in both, and we see it here first in connection with the goat that represents all creatures. Tvaṣṭar recurs in vs. 19 below.

I.162.5: The list of priests contains the hapax *āvayā(h)*, whose derivation and meaning are unclear. For suggestions and disc. see, e.g., Old, Ge, Re. I tentatively favor a connection with *áva* √*yā* ‘propitiate, expiate’, but the form presents grave difficulties for that analysis. For one thing, we should expect a root-noun compd. (*)*avayā-* with short initial

vowel and accent on the root -- and in fact we get just that form in I.173.12. See detailed disc. by Scar (404–7, with our form treated in n. 565). However, it can be pointed out that this lexeme is mutilated elsewhere -- e.g., in nearby I.165.15 (but Agastya, not Dīrghatamas), where *vayām* is better read ‘*vayām* (i.e., *avayām*), which sandhi form its position after *tanvè* would allow. Thus, the connection with *áva* √ *yā* reflected in the publ. tr. is quite insecure, and it may be best to follow Old in accepting the traditional analysis as *ā-vayas-*, rendering it ‘whose life force is (right) here’. This avoids the formal difficulties, but I don’t see what kind of priest this would be.

There is a mild disconnect between the two hemistichs: the first half is a list entirely in the nominative, but the second contains a 2nd pl. impv. *ā prṇadhvam*, whose 2nd ps. subjects should be the nominatives of ab.

I.162.6: The list of personnel involved in the sacrifice here includes some apparently marginal and humble roles, perhaps to implicate the largest possible group in the potential blood-guilt of the sacrifice.

I render the *utó* in d with ‘also’; this is also Klein’s tr., though his disc. of the passage seems to seek a straight conjunctive role (DGRV I.448–49). See the same expression in 12d.

I.162.7: I analyse *prāgāt* as *pra-ágāt*, rather than Pp. *prá agāt* -- in other words with an accented verb, which is in a non overtly marked subordinate clause, with *adhāyi* in the main clause. I then supply the same verb again in b. This may seem over-tricky, but it avoids taking *smát ... mánma* as a parenthesis and ties together the two ritual actions, the procession of the horse and the production of the poem.

I.162.8: The exact referents of these pieces of horse tackle are not clear.

Pāda d contains a nice ex. of a neut. pl. subj. with sg. verb.

I.162.10: As disc. ad III.29.8, suffix-accented *sukṛtā-* has been substantivized to ‘good (ritual) work, good deed’, but it is hard to incorporate that understanding here. I assume that *sukṛtā* √ *kṛ* has an idiomatic sense here.

I.162.12: I do not believe that *bhikṣā-* has yet developed the later ubiquitous sense ‘alms’ and tr. it here with full desiderative sense, contra Ge (/WG) “ein Fleischalmosen.”

Wack (AiG II.1.31) claims that the gen. *ārvataḥ* depends on the 1st member of the cmpd. *māṃsa-bhikṣā-*, as is not uncommon. Although this analysis is likely, I don’t think it’s excluded that *ārvataḥ* depends on the whole cmpd.

I.162.14: The *-ana*-suffix on the nominals in pāda a marks them as transitive / causative in sense; I take these neut. singulars as referring to the tack that produce the various movements of the horse.

I.162.15: On *abhí vikta* see comm. ad X.27.1.

I.162.16: The placement of *ārvantam* amid the pieces of tackle associated with him seems strange at first, but in fact it can be seen as iconic: these various items *hold* him, and so

he's surrounded by them. It's also clever that the various things are in the neuter, and so it is not till the verb appears (*ā yāmayanti* at the very end of the vs.) that it becomes clear that they are the subjects of the verb and therefore nominative, while *ārvantam* is clearly accusative.

The second hemistich is metrically quite disturbed; I will not attempt a fix, but see Old, Arnold, and metrical comm. of HvN, all ad loc.

I.162.17: The first hemistich is one of the few places in the RV that depicts horses being ridden (see also I.155.1, 163.2 -- though for an alternative for the latter see comm. ad loc. -- 163.9): both *sādé* lit. 'in the seat', here tr. 'in riding', and the mention of goading with a heel require a rider physically on a horse.

I follow the general interpr. of *śūkṛta*- as containing a syllable *śū* used to urge on horses, hence my "come on, come on." Although Google tells me that "chirrup" and "tchick" are so used (in English, or whatever we might call it), I judged that such a tr. would simply sow confusion.

The three disfavored ways of goading a horse -- heel, whip, and excessive *śū*-making -- are not parallel, or rather heel and whip go together and *śū* is something else, and they are therefore summed up with useful vagueness by *sārvā tā* "all these" in d. The vagueness is also useful because none of the three is a particular suitable object for *sūdayāmi* 'I make sweet', even in its most attenuated sense (Ge "... mache ich ... wieder gut").

The neut. pl. *tā* in the simile in c is more mysterious. *hāvis*- 'oblation' is a standard obj. of *sūdāya*-, but it is coopted here by the gen. *hāviṣaḥ*. I have nonetheless supplied 'oblations' as the referent of *tā*. Ge supplies "die Fehler" on grounds of contextual sense only. He also cites Mah. as explaining *tā* as "nur Füllwort" -- an explanation I'd like to be able to use more often!

I.162.18: The preverb *sām* 'together' in *sām eti* may seem an odd choice in a verse concerning cutting the horse *apart*. However, it sets up a contrastive pairing with *vī śasta* 'cut apart / carve up' at the end of the 2nd hemistich, and it also anticipates (or promises) the rejoining of the parts of the horse that ends the hymn.

As it turns out, horses have 36 ribs, not 34. Max Müller noted this in 1875 and got a potential explanation from T. H. Huxley -- that it may be that they're cutting the rib cartilage and they don't cut the last two ribs in order to keep the carcass together: [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Popular_Science_Monthly/Volume_7/June_1875/A_Curious_Question_of_Horses'_Ribs]

I.162.19: In d I didn't tr. *pīṇḍānām* as a partitive gen. because the English got too fussy. Ge thinks that the *pīṇḍa*- are rice balls, but this seems anachronistically to reflect later ritual use of the word.

I.162.20: The caus. redupl. aor. *ā tiṣṭhipat* is tr. by most as 'cause enduring pain' vel sim., which is far from the lit. meaning of the lexeme. The caus. to *ā √sthā* sometimes means 'make stand still', and I think that sense is in play here. The horse is about to go on a journey (*apiyāntam* 'going along' in pāda a; more fully described in 21b), but various mishaps can keep that journey from happening and make the horse stop.

I.162.21: This vs. contains one of two strengthened forms of the root noun *yúj-*, viz. du. *yúnjā*, on which see comm. ad X.102.9. The corresponding unstrengthened form *yújā* is found in II.24.12. Its position in the vs. favors a heavy root syllable: *hārī te yúnjā*. Acdg. to Arnold (188), the fourth syllable of an opening of 5 is overwhelmingly heavy.

I.163 Praise of a horse (Aśvastuti)

Krick translates and comments extensively on this hymn (307–11), though with a particular point of view.

I.163.1: The tr. of *pūrīṣa-* as ‘fertile ground’ is an adaptation of Krick’s (Feuergründung, 101 n. 253). The basic meaning is ‘fullness, fulfillment’, but it can indicate fruitful, loose rich earth, bottom land, as well as overflowing fullness. ‘Fertile ground’ provides a nice semantic bridge between the abstract sense and the younger meaning ‘dung’.

I follow Re in taking pāda c as containing two de-composed bahuvrīhis at least functionally. Though Re generally overuses this explanation, in this case we have almost documentary proof, in that 9a contains both a real bahuvrīhi and a decomposed expression like this one in parallel: *hīraṇyaśṛṅgō ‘yo asya pādā* “having golden horns, his feet copper.” In our pāda c the expressions are technically nominal sentences with possessive value, with the possessive pronoun *te* to be supplied from pāda d: “(your) wings (those) of a falcon, (your) forelegs (those) of an antelope.” But these are tantamount to bahuvrīhis and go more smoothly into English that way.

I.163.2: I do not pretend to understand the myth or myths here; for an attempt see Krick 307 and nn. 794–95. I would point out, however, that stylistically this vs. is reminiscent of the famous vs. in the wedding hymn about the previous bridegrooms of the bride in question. In both, four separate beings act, each segregated in a single pāda, and it has some of the same vocabulary (note *prathamāḥ*, *gandharvāḥ*, and *tritāḥ* / *trītyaḥ* both ‘third’): X.85.40 *sōmaḥ prathamó vivide, gandharvó vivida úttaraḥ* / *trītyo agniṣ te pátiḥ, turīyas te manuṣyajāḥ* “Soma acquired (you) first; the Gandharva acquired (you) next. / Agni was your third husband. The fourth was human-born.” I do not know what, if anything, to do with these similarities.

Krick supplies a chariot for the horse to be yoked to in pāda a and for Indra to mount in b, but see 9d, where Indra clearly mounts the horse.

Note *āyunak* with an unambiguously lengthened augment. For other possible such cases (and non-cases) with *√yuj*, see my comm. ad X.35.6 and Old’s comm. ad V.17.1.

I.163.3: Again, I do not understand the mythology here. It is worth noting, though, that in vs. 2 the various divinities acted on the horse (or such is the likely object, though unexpressed), whereas here the horse (addressed in the voc.) is identified with the (same) divinities. He is here identified with Yama (a) and Trita (b), while in 2a he was given by Yama and yoked by Trita. The third identification is with Āditya (3a), most likely the sun. Of the three remaining characters in vs. 2 (Indra, Gandharva, and the sun), the last is the most likely, and of course Āditya is a later name for the sun.

On the meaning of *samáyā* see comm. ad I.113.10. The abrupt separation from Soma is another puzzling feature, but I suggest that we have here the generally later

identification of Soma with the Moon, found already in the wedding hymn already cited (X.85.1–5), which would make sense (well, some sense) if the horse is being identified with the Sun. Krick (308 and n. 797) very different: “Du bist mit Soma zur Hälfte durchgemischt,” which depends on her view concerning the relationship between soma and the horse. But, inter alia, her tr. depends on what I consider a wrong interpr. of *samáyā*.

From context alone the “three (kinship) bonds in heaven” could be identified with the trio in ab: Yama, Āditya, and Trita. The Sun of course is associated with heaven, and Yama’s realm of the dead is also placed in heaven (see the funeral hymn X.14.8). What Trita’s connection with heaven might be is less clear -- Trita is a shadowy figure in the RV – but consider I.105.9, where the poet’s umbilical tie is stretched apparently to heaven and Trita Āptya vouches for the kinship relationship.

I.163.5–7: Note the *apaśyam* ‘I saw’ in all three verses (5c, 6c, 7a): the poet bears witness to his sight of various mystical visions of the horse.

I.163.5: As in I.162.14 I take the *-ana*-nominals here (*avamāṛjana-* and *nidhāna-*) as having trans./caus. value.

I.163.6: As indicated in the publ. intro. to both I.162 and I.163, I take *ātman-* in these hymns as referring to the lifebreath of the horse, as opposed to his sacrificed body; see I.162.20–21. Although *ātman-* can mean ‘self’ in the RV and sometimes perhaps even ‘body’, the contrast between the horse’s *ātman-* and his *tanū-* (see I.162.20ab) seems to exclude those meanings here, *pace* Ge’s “dein eigenes Selbst” and WG’s “Rumpf.”

I.163.7: There are multiple conflicting interpretations of the personnel and import of this verse; I will not add another.

Pāda d raises several questions: 1) is *ósadhīḥ* to be construed with *grāsiṣṭhaḥ* (so, e.g., Ge, Doniger, and me) or with *ajīgaḥ*, 2) who is the referent of *grāsiṣṭhaḥ*, and 3) what person is *ajīgaḥ*. I take the plants with the splv. (“foremost devourer of plants”). (For acc. rection with *-iṣṭha-* forms, cf., e.g., VI.37.5 *vṛtrām hāniṣṭhaḥ*.) Within the RVic domain of discourse, the greatest devourer of plants is likely fire/Agni, the answer, therefore, to 2). With that identification in place, I take *ajīgaḥ* as 3rd sg. For an opposite interpr. on all 3 counts, cf. Krick’s “... dann wahrlich hast du, der Gefräßigste, die Pflanzen erweckt (verschlungen?).” Acdg. to her the subject is the horse=sun, addressed in the 2nd ps. She takes the verb as suggesting a 2ndary pun on *√gṛ* ‘swallow’, and considers the larger sense to be that the rising sun (in spring) awakes the plant world to new life, and is at the same time their “Fresser.” This builds a lot of superstructure into the vs. In my opinion, the pāda simply expresses the conceit that the kindling of the ritual fire causes the sun to rise; assuming, with Krick et al, that “you” is the horse=sun, it can be the object of *ajīgaḥ*, with Agni as the subj.

I.163.8: The preverb *ānu* is insistently repeated in this verse: twice each in a and b, once each in c and d. The first hemistich lacks a verb, but this can easily be supplied from *īyuh* (*√i* ‘go’) in c; d then varies this pattern with a different verb *mamire* (*√mā* ‘measure’) to be supplied with *ānu*.

I.163.9: On the syntax of pāda a, see comm. on 1c.

Against the Pp (and all standard tr., as well as Krick) I take the sandhi form *ávāra* as standing for loc. sg. *ávare*, not nom. sg. *ávarah*. Although *ávāra*- is a pronominal adjective, and several instances of *ávare* are nom. pl., there are also several that are undeniably loc. sg. (II.9.3, 24.11). Taking it as a nom. sg. requires attributing lesser powers to Indra, which strikes me as pragmatically unlikely (cf., e.g., Old “geringer (an Schnelle) war Indra”). My interpretation identifies the horse/sun-bird with Indra and situates him in a lower realm (the midspace, presumably).

I.163.10: This difficult vs. has been subject to numerous interpretations. Mine is guided by Thieme’s (Gs Nyberg = Kl Schr (II) 829–30), who sees this as a description of the V-shaped formation of geese in flight (of which Google Images supplies many pictures, including bar-headed geese flying to/from their wintering grounds in India). The “nose” is the lead goose and therefore a particularly crucial figure, the *śūra*- ‘champion, hero’ of the cmpd. *śūranas*- ‘having a hero as a nose’ (an analysis that goes back to Bloomfield, RR 150; Bl’s other analyses there are less compelling). *śīlika-madhayama*- has a hapax as first member; if Th’s interpr. (‘hollow space’) and etymological connection (with *śirā*- ‘vein’) are accepted, the cmpd. means ‘having a hollow space in the middle’, which accurately describes the V-formation. The other problematic bahuvrīhi is *īrmānta*-. Th. takes *īrmā*- as ‘foreleg, thigh’, not *īrmā*- ‘quiet, at rest’. The ‘foreleg’ sense is found in the AV (X.10.21), and Aves. *ar(ə)ma*- ‘arm’ appears to be cognate (so EWA s.v.). The sense of the cmpd., ‘having (fore)legs as its edges’, must reflect the fact that, looked at straight on, the V-formation (roughly an isocles triangle) can look like a stick-figure human from the waist down, with the legs being the two equal sides, meeting at the tip, which is equivalent to the waist.

The verb in d, *ākṣisuḥ*, is generally taken as an isolated -*siṣ*-aor. to *√naś* ‘attain’ (so Gr, Narten 160; Wh Roots puts it under *√akṣ* as -*iṣ*-aor., but takes *√akṣ* as a secondary root form from *√aś*). This is certainly possible, but I prefer to analyze it as an isolated (and nonce) -*siṣ*-aor. to *√aj* ‘drive’, which would then take a cognate acc. *ājmam*, hence ‘have driven their drive’.

I.163.11: I take *caranti* as aux. with *jārbhurāṇā(h)*, but it could be an independent verb: “they wander (while) flickering” (e.g., Ge “... bewegen sie sich auf und ab hüpfend”).

I.163.13: The relative expression *paramām yāt sadhāstham* is an izafe-type construction and therefore can be embedded in the main cl. (see my forthcoming “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian”). However, it is not a well-formed one, since we should expect **sadhāstham yāt paramām*. But the syntactic parameters of this construction obviously loosened with time.

I take *jūṣṭatamo hī* as a parenthetical explanatory clause, which would account for the unusual position of the *hī*.

[I.164–65 JPB]

[I.165 Indra and Maruts (misc. comments by SJ to JPB tr.)

This hymn is full of somewhat “off” forms, some of them unique to the hymn -- *yujmahe* (5c), *ūgrá-* (6c, 10c), *cyavam* (10d) -- a few confined to this hymn and one or a few other passages -- *vadhīm* (8a), *kariṣyā* (9d). It is not clear to me whether these are the result of faulty transmission or of the poet’s manipulation of form, though I incline towards the latter explanation, given Agastya’s characteristic self-conscious artfulness. In either case the clustering of these anomalies in a single hymn makes it unlikely in each individual case that they belong to the systematic grammar of Vedic or reflect deep archaisms or old sound changes, as has been suggested for several of them. For further remarks see the individual discussions below.

The trajectory of the hymn might be seen as the battle of the lexicon: words pass back and forth between the two speaking parties, with twists in their usage and with terms that seem to belong to one of the parties appropriated by, or devalued by, the other. Among the most important words are *éka-* ‘alone, only’ and the multiple forms of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘do’. Note esp. the extraordinary concentration of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ in the middle of the hymn: 7a *cakartha*, 7c *kṛṇāvāmā*, 8d *cakara*, 9c *kariṣyā kṛnuhí*, 10b *kṛṇāvai*, 11b *cakrá*, including two of the rarest pf. forms, 1st sg. *cakara* and 2nd pl. *cakrá*.

I.165.1: I’d be inclined to take *samānyā* not as an adv. (‘altogether’) as in the publ. tr., but as a fem. instr. sg. forming part of the phrase *káyā śubhā*, hence “with what joint/common beauty?” -- with the sense “what’s their joint insignia? how shall I recognize them?” Note that *samāná-* is differently formed from the two preceding phonologically similar adjectives *sāvayasah sánílāh*, which do match each other. Note also following *sám m...* The adj. *samāná-* returns in 7b in a charged context.

JPB’s tr. cleverly reads *étāsaḥ* twice, once as the nom. pl. ‘antelopes’, once as the nom. pl. of the ppl. *ā-ita-* ‘come here’.

In d *śúṣmam* may be adverbial as JPB takes it (‘explosively’), but it may be a real obj. of *ārcanti* (“chant their explosive power”). I’m inclined to follow the latter course, because *śúṣma-* must be a real noun in 4b. But in this case I interpr. it as an Inhaltsakk., further specifying the chant (*“chant their chant” → “chant their explosive force”) not the object of their praise as Ge, for example, does: “preisen den Kampfmüt” (sim. WG).

I.165.2: I’m not certain that the 2nd hemistich is an embedded quotation, *pace* JPB.

I.165.4: The act. forms *iyartí*, etc., are usually transitive, but Old cites a few passages with the intrans. value that must also be present here.

Although various tr. (e.g., WG) take *ukthā* as acc. pl. and supply subjects for the pl. verbs *ā śāsate* and *práti haryanti* (men and gods respectively, WG), taking it as nom. pl. not only avoids the need to cast around for unexpressed subjects but also captures Indra’s extreme egotism: even the hymns long for him, or so he thinks.

I.165.5: *yujmahe* is a famous crux: though it should belong to the well-attested root aor. (seen presumably in part. *yujānāḥ* in pāda a), it has a primary ending and therefore looks like a pres. formation. It has received a plethora of explanations. Ge calls it a non-reduplicated perfect (“Perf. ohne Redupl.”); Whitney (Rts.) simply allows for a root pres. for a few forms, incl. this one, in addition to the standard root aor. Probably the currently prevailing interpr. is Hoffmann’s (MSS 2 [1952/1957]: 130–31 = Aufs. II: 366), that it

shows dissimilatory loss of the first nasal from **yuñjmahe* belonging to the nasal-infix pres. Although this explanation has a plausible foundation (as opposed to Ge's motiveless non-redupl. pf.), the coexistence of *yujmahe* with *yujāná-* in the same verse, and the general trickiness of Agastya's poetry, incline me to a nonce, contextual explanation. The oddly placed *nū* 'now' (though see 9a) immediately following the verb form and ending the pāda seems Agastya's signal that he's twisted and tweaked the aorist to his own ends -- a temporary present. Thanks to JL for assembling the relevant lit. and for illuminating disc.

I.165.5–6: Indra seizes the Maruts' assertion of independent power (*svadhā-* 5d) by taxing them with the absence of (their exercise of) that power (6a) at a crucial moment. Another skirmish in the battle of the lexicon.

I.165.6: I do not understand the length in *ūgrá-* here and 10c. Lubotsky (2000 ["Vedic root vr̥ ...," *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik*]: 320 n. 16) attributes it to compensatory lengthening from **hí uHgrás*, after laryngeal metathesis from **hi Hgrás*, but I find the proposed metathesis counterintuitive (despite the other exx. he adduces); one would rather expect the laryngeal to remain where it is as a hiatus-filler. Moreover, assuming that this remained as a synchronic rule in the RV is quite hard to accept.

Indra adroitly manipulates the wording here to contrast his own solitary state with the Maruts' collectivity: ... *mām ékam samádhatta* "... me **alone together** you..."

I.165.7: In vs. 5 the Maruts spoke literally of yoking their teams to bring them for the journey, but in this vs. the same root *√yuj* is used metaphorically, in the gerundive *yújya-*, to indicate the Maruts' powers that were *available* to be yoked/deployed by Indra, though he didn't. Note also the adj. *samāná-* 'common, joint' (repeated from 1b) referring to the powers shared by the Maruts, in contrast to Indra's constant lone state.

The interpretational question in this vs. is *whose krātu-* do the Maruts plan to follow. Acdg. to the JPB tr., it is Indra's, but the tr. can't stand exactly as given for syntactic reasons. Because *marutaḥ* is unaccented, either *krátvā* has to belong to the *yád* clause or *marutaḥ* has to belong to the main cl. But the publ. tr. assigns *marutaḥ* to the dependent cl. and *krátvā* to the main cl: "we shall do many things in accordance with your purpose, o most powerful Indra, when we, o fellow Maruts, shall wish it." Following the two syntactically licensed alternatives above, we must rather tr. either "We shall do many things, o most powerful Indra, when, o Maruts, we shall wish it in accordance with our/your will." Or "We shall do many things, o most powerful Indra, in accordance with your/our will, o Maruts, when we shall wish it." *krátvā* is perfectly placed for maximum ambiguity, between Indra and the Maruts. Taking it with the main cl. (the 2nd alternative tr. just given) favors an interpr. of *Indra's* will; taking it with the subord. cl. (the 1st alternative) favors the *Maruts'* will. That, I think, is the correct interpr. The Maruts contrast Indra's actions, which were performed with the Maruts' standing by on the scene, with their own prospective actions, which will depend on their own intention, not Indra's design or timetable.

The dueling vocatives in d, *índra* and *marutaḥ*, are notable, esp. because they encase the word *krátvā* whose crucial ambiguity we have just discussed. Since we must assume that the 1st-ps. speaker is a Marut or Maruts, the pl. vocative to the group is of

course striking -- though well within the limits of poetic self-address we find elsewhere in the text (see disc. in my "Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra," Fs. Skjaervø, 2009). In this case I imagine a "spokes-Marut" who takes the lead in addressing Indra but also turns to his own group for a chorus of affirmation (of the type, "right, guys?!").

I.165.8: Injunctive 1st sg. *vádhīm* belongs to the root aor. stem of this set root, whose well-attested 2nd and 3rd sg. are (*á*)*vadhīs*, (*á*)*vadhīt*. The 1st sg. should be **vadham*, which is nowhere attested. The -ī- has simply been imported from the 2nd/3rd sg.; *vádhīm* is attested once elsewhere in the RV, in the late hymn X.28.7.

The juxtaposition of *maruta indriyēṇa* recalls the immediately preceding (7d) *índra ... marutaḥ*.

Pāda-final *viśváścandrāḥ* produces an irregular cadence of four heavy syllables; three of the remaining four occurrences of the stem occur in the same position (though once in dimeter vs.) and have the same effect. As is often remarked, the cmpd. would be metrically regular if the 2nd member were the related *-candra*, hence **viśváścandrāḥ* with the light 2nd syllable appropriate to a Triṣṭubh cadence. The same problem afflicts the other cmpds of *-ścandra-* (*ásva-*, *svá-*, *hári-* and *puru-*, *su-*), which either show up in metrically indifferent positions or positions in which a light 2nd syllable would be favored (besides Triṣṭubh cadence, also right after an opening of 4, where a break ~ - - is distinctly bad). There are no forms where the meter is improved by reading *-ścandra-*. Although the obvious solution is simply to read **-candra-*, I am puzzled as to how the *-ścandra-* forms won out. The duplicate pair *ścandrā-* / *candrā-* are for the most part in complementary distribution, with *candrā-* an independent adj. and 1st cmpd member and *ścandrā-* 2nd cmpd member (after vowel); *ścandrā-* appears 3x uncompounded, but in these cases it is in a sequence that functions like a quasi-cmpd (*purú ścandrám* III.31.15, *prthú ścandrám* IV.2.13, and possibly *ádhi ścandrám* VIII.65.11). So *viśvá-ścandra-* has the expected alternant, though in almost all cases a metrically unfavorable one. Must we reckon with a replacement of the originally correct *-ścandra-* by **-candra-*, yielding a metrically usable form, and then redactional restoration of the *-ścandra-*? This hypothesis seems over-complex, but I don't have a better one. In any case the poet seems to be toying with the form: the next pāda (8d) contains the offending sequence *śc*, though split across a word boundary (*apás cakara*), and in 12c a *candrā-* compd., *candrā-varṇā(ḥ)* occupies the same pāda-final slot. Its initial also participates in the *śc* sequence: *marutaś candrā-*, so that the first member is effectively **ścandrā-*.

I.165.9: The form *kariṣyā* is problematic for several reasons. Despite its sandhi position before *k*, it seems best to assume it represents 2nd sg. *kariṣyās* out of sandhi, even though *kariṣyāḥ* would be the proper sandhi form in this context. (The Pp. simply reads *kariṣyā* like the Saṃhitā text, but the standard tr. and comm [e.g., Old, going back to BR] take it as 2nd sg.) Moreover, this form must be a *subjunctive* to the future stem, an unusual morphological combination at best (but see Whitney, Gr. §938). Reading the transmitted *kariṣyā* won't help: that would simply be a 1st sg. subj. to the future, or perhaps a 2nd sg. imperative to the future, neither of which is any better morphologically. The other long-shot possibility is to assume it's an unusual gerundive formation in *-iṣyá-* in the neut.

nom.-acc. pl., yielding “what things are to be done ...” (so Sāy.). AiG II.2.368 mentions this possibility but prefers the subjunctive interpr.

I.165.10: In most tr. the rel. cl. of pāda b seems loosely construed with the main clause of pāda a, with the *yā* referring to an unexpressed acc. of respect in the main cl.: “Let my force be far-reaching with regard to (those things), which I will do ...” However, the vertical parallelism of 9d, 10b, and 10d suggests a different syntactic arrangement

9d	<i>yāni</i> [<i>kari</i>] <i>ṣyā kṛṇuhí</i> ...
10b	<i>yā nū</i> [<i>dadhr</i>] <i>ṣvān kṛṇāvai</i> ...
10d	<i>yāni</i>

Not only do these pādas match phonologically as in the display above, but 9d and 10d show the same syntactic structure: a preposed rel. cl. introduced by an acc. pl. referring to deeds and a verb governing it referring to the doing of the deeds (*yāni* **kariṣyāḥ*, *yāni cyavam*), followed by a main clause where the doer of the rel. clause is also subject: *kṛṇuhí*, *īśē*. I suggest 10b should be interpr. in the same general pattern. Indra says “Which (deeds) (I am) bold (to do), I will do.” In other words, pāda b contains two clauses, not one, and is independent of the preceding pāda.

The 1st sg. *cyavam* is the only non-causative active form to this root. Hoffmann (Injunk. 247–48) takes it as a subjunctive, an ersatz for the unenlarged 1st sg. subj. ending *-ā*. I agree that the form has been tampered with, but would suggest that what really underlies the form may be medial subjunctive 1st sg. **cyavai*, which should have yielded **cyavā* in this sandhi position. The *-m* serves as a pleonastic hiatus filler (perhaps originally *-m̐*). An alternative that would work better phonologically is to assume a 1st sg. indicative **cyave*, not a subjunctive. This would yield **cyava* in sandhi, to which the *-m* could be added without adjusting the vowel length. Since the verb in the main cl., *īśē*, is likewise present indicative (as opposed to impv. *kṛṇuhí* in 9d and subjunctive *kṛṇāvai* in 10b), an indicative in the subord. cl. would match.

I.165.11: The final pāda of this vs. brings the vocabulary into reciprocal alignment and thus signals that harmony has been restored: *sákhye sákhyas tanvè tanūbhiḥ*.

I.165.12: The med. part. *dádhānāḥ* is generally tr. ‘receiving’, as the middle voice of *√dhā* often is, and interpr. to mean that the Maruts also get fame as part of Indra’s reflected glory (see *prāti* ... *rocamānā(h)* in a). But in this charged context of tributes given and received, I think it likely that it is ambiguous. Indra is both graciously yielding the Maruts some glory, but he is also reminding them that they have just produced praise for him (vs. 11) and will presumably continue to do so. In this second sense it could be tr. “setting out praise (for me)” with the middle voice reflecting the mutually intertwined relationship between Indra and the Maruts.

With most interpr. I take *ánedyaḥ* as a nom. sg. m. implicitly modifying an unexpressed *gaṇāḥ* ‘troop’, a construcio ad sensum with the pl. *dádhānāḥ*. I would like to find some way to ally it with *nédīyas* ‘nearer’, as a neut. sg. modifying *śrávaḥ*, but this seems beyond the realm of possibility.

The *saṃcākṣyā* of the Saṃhitā text is read *saṃcakṣya* by the Pp. and taken as a gerund, an interpr. followed by Old inter alia. The meaning would be “having looked upon (me)” vel sim. Gr (fld. by Ge [WG], etc., incl. the publ. tr.) takes it as a gerundive,

whose pausal form would be *saṃcākṣyāḥ*. Both forms are possible. I do not have a strong feeling either way.

On -ś *candrā*- see disc. ad 8c.

Note the pāda-final *nūnām*, reminiscent of *nú* in 5c and 9a.

I.165.13: The reciprocal lexical harmony of *sákhīn ... sakhāyaḥ* recalls that found in 11d *sákhye sakhāyaḥ*, but there is a small mystery: the voc. pl. *sakhāyaḥ* surely refers to the Maruts, but who are the *plural* expressed by *sákhīn*? We would expect a singular referring to Indra. It seems unlikely to be the priests plus/minus Indra because the speaker is a singular (note *me* in d, the sg. inter. prn. *kāḥ* in the rhetorical question in pāda a, and the sg. poet in vs. 14). I take that speaker to be Agastya (contra the publ. tr., which identifies him as the narrator). Perhaps a pl. maiestatis for Indra?

If *nāvedā(h)* belongs to the *s*-stem *nāvedas-*, it should be nom. m. singular here, in disagreement with the plural subj. of *bhūta*. Gr's solution is to set up a them. stem *nāveda-* for just this passage, which would allow a plural interpr. To avoid this ad hoc multiplication of stems, we can assume the same type of constructio ad sensum invoked for *ānedyah* in the immed. preceding vs. (12b)(so Old), with the sg. referring collectively to the Marut troop. Cf. also the parallel passage IV.23.4 *devó bhuvan nāvedā ma ṛtānām*, with a legitimate singular; the post-caesura portions of the pādas are identical. On the origin of *nāvedas-* from a false segmentation of *-tana védas-* see Schindler, Fs. Knobloch, 1985.

I.165.14: The first hemistich of this vs. is quite problematic; see Old's long disc. The problems lie in the verbs (or apparent verbs). The pf. *cakré* in b only makes sense in this context if it is construed with the preverb *ā* in pāda a: *ā√kr* 'make (to come) here, bring here'. By contrast, the verbal stem *duvasyā-* is never otherwise construed with *ā*, even though it appears to be here. Moreover, the recipient of the friendship offered by the verb *duvasyā-* is always in the accusative, not the apparent dat. *duvāse* here. (Note also that the suffix-accented *duvās-* appears only here and in nearby I.168.3. It seems to show the regular possessive sense of *s*-stem adjectives built to *s*-stem neuters by accent shift: hence *dúvas-* 'friendship' → *duvās-* 'possessing friendship, friend'.) The best solution seems to me Roth's suggested emendation of *duvasyād* to **duvasyā*, instr. of an abstract in *-yā*, an emendation endorsed by Old. Hence I would alter the publ. tr. to "When/Since the wisdom of the son of Māna has brought us here with friendship, like a bard to a friend" vel sim. The emendation only requires de-gemination of the *-d d-* and has no effect on the meter; the addition of a *-d* might have been encouraged by the repetitive phonological pattern in a (which I will represent with false word division): *yādduvas yā(d)duvās(e)*. Note also the dental geminate in *vartta* in c, where the double *-tt-* may have been restored etymologically (since *Rtt* and *Rt* generally fall together). Although there is no nominal stem **duvasyā-*, there is the variant *duvoyā-*, showing external sandhi (see AiG I.343), also appearing as in instr. (V.36.6, perhaps not coincidentally in an Indra hymn in a vs. addressed to the Maruts).

I.165.15: As noted in the publ. intro., the tr. assumes underlying *avayām* ('*vayām* in sandhi) 'propitiation'. This does not require emendation to the Saṃhitā text, since the word appears after vowel-final *tanvé*.]

I.166 Maruts

I.166.1: It may not be sufficiently clear in the publ. tr. that “the beacon of the bull” refers to the Maruts themselves. They are presumably Indra’s “beacon” because they are regularly his comrades and they are of glittering appearance -- a little bit like Rudolph the Red-nosed Reindeer.

The pair “kindling” and “battle” in cd may not seem to form a natural class, but they probably represent two aspects of the Maruts’ naturalistic identity as the thunderstorm: the lightning may be the kindling and the thunder the clash of battle.

Note the phonological echoes in *aidhéva...*, *yudhéva...*; similarly *tuviṣvaṇo...* *taviṣāni*.

I.166.3: The simile *hitā iva* is compared by Ge and Re with a similar expression in IV.57.1, with the meaning “good (friends)” (Ge “wie gute (Freunde)”) or, more technically, “like contracted (allies)” (see the bahuvrīhi *hitā-mitra-*). This doesn’t mean much in the context here. WG are somewhat skeptical, but simply tr. literally “wie die Hingesetzten” without explaining what that might mean here. Both the Ge/Re and the WG tr. assume a ppl. to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘set, establish’. I take it rather to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ (as does Gr) and assume that the underlying subject is horses and that the image is of horses led out to piss before contests. See esp. I.64.6 (also a Marut hymn) *ātyaṇ ná mihé ví nayanti vājīnam* “They lead (their horse) out to piss like a prize-seeking steed” (also cf. II.34.13, IX.74.4). This image fits well with the sprinkling here.

I.166.5: I previously (1983: 61) took *nadayanta* as intransitive “they roared and made the mountains stir ...”, but I now accept a transitive value.

I.166.6: *āriṣṭagrāmāḥ* is a bahuvrīhi, but the tr. ‘having an invulnerable band’ seemed too heavy.

On *krīvis-* see comm. to I.30.1, where I suggest a relationship with *kravís-* ‘raw, bloody flesh’ as a re-formed *-i*-stem to the underlying root *krū* < **kruH*. A number of other interpr. have been made.

I supply “(a path)” as obj. of *rādati* because words for ‘path, way’ are frequently obj. of this verb (e.g., VII.87.1 *rādat pathāḥ*; also II.30.2, V.10.1, V.80.3, VI.30.3, VII.47.4, VII.60.4, X.75.2).

In my reading the structure of pāda d is quite complex and intricate, unlike the standard view. Both Ge and Re supply ‘waters’ as the obj. of *riṇāti* in the frame (see also Old), since waters are several times elsewhere the obj. of $\sqrt{rī}$. (WG take *paśváḥ* as obj. of both simile and frame.) I prefer to find the object nearer at hand, namely trees, based on *vānaspati(h)* in the previous vs. (5c). In another passage trees liquefy at the Maruts’ assault: V.58.6 ... *riṇaté vānāni*, and a transitive version of this phrase is found with Agni as subj. at V.41.10 *nī riṇāti vānā* (cf. I.127.4).

As for the simile, Ge takes *barhāṇā* as fem. nom. sg. with *súdhītā* (“wie der beharrliche Eifer ...”), but *barhāṇā*, which is fairly well attested, is otherwise only an instr. sg. used adverbially (so rendered by both Re and WG). Like Re and WG I take *didyūt* (fem.) of c as the referent of *súdhītā* ‘well-placed’, but *didyūt-* in a slightly

different sense: not as a thrown missile but as a sharp-pointed object used as a goad. The verb *riṇāti* is held constant between simile and frame, but again it has different senses in the two structures: in the simile it does not mean ‘liquefy, dissolve, i.e., destroy’, but ‘make to flow, i.e., to cause to move’, a more appropriate meaning with *paśvāḥ* ‘livestock’ as object.

I.166.7: The rendering of *alāṭṛṇā-* as ‘restless’ follows the suggestion of Hoffmann’s (‘unruhig’) registered in KEWA III.807 and EWA s.v., derived from *√rā* ‘be at rest’. The word is found elsewhere only in III.30.10, of Vala. In neither passage does ‘unquiet, restless’ fit the context terribly well, but in neither is it excluded. Kuiper (Aryans, 84–85, in part restating his 1955 Fs. Kirfel views) objects to Hoffmann’s explanation and suggests instead the meaning ‘irresistible’ for our passage and ‘not offering resistance’ for III.30.10. (On a side note, these two meanings, reflecting passive ‘not (to be) resisted’ and active ‘not resisting’ senses respectively, do not seem to me derivationally compatible and should not be found in a single word.) He considers it to be a substrate borrowing and thinks it’s not realistic to expect it to have an etymology. Kuiper has some good points: as was just noted, the meaning produced by the Hoffmann etymology is not a perfect fit contextually and the morphology is somewhat dubious. However, I do not see confidently proposing two incompatible meanings for a single word (with the one suggested for this passage not particularly compelling in context) while forswearing any attempt at etymology. Better to leave it untranslated in that case.

Pādas c and d are in reverse logical order. The contents of the chant that the Maruts chant (c) must be the deeds of Indra, which they are said to know (d); the knowledge logically precedes the verbal expression of it.

I.166.8: As pointed out, e.g., by Ge, *śāṃsāt* in d must stand for **aghāt śāṃsāt* “from evil utterance,” borrowing the *aghāt* of pāda a (and cf. the bahuvrīhi *aghāśāṃsa-* ‘of evil speech’, referring to the utterer thereof). It may well be (with Ge, etc.) that *śāṃsāt* should likewise be supplied in a, but “guard from evil,” without the addition of “utterance,” is also perfectly acceptable.

I.166.9: Ge and Re make *taviṣāṇi* part of the frame, not the simile. This actually does not alter the sense very much, since they still read *mithaspr̥dhyā* with *taviṣāṇi* in an “as if” construction. Given the structure of the hemistich and the need for something for *mithaspr̥dhyā* to modify, I prefer to take it with the simile. My only reservation about putting *taviṣāṇi* in the simile is that the Maruts’ *taviṣāṇi* are mentioned in 1d.

More crucial is the grammatical identity and function of *mithaspr̥dhyā* (so Pp.). Old follows BR in taking this not as a gerundive but as a gerund, but, strikingly, neither suggests a tr. for it. Since a simile consisting of a gerund would be highly unusual (unprecedented, I think, though I haven’t checked the entire RV), a neut. pl. gerundive agreeing with *taviṣāṇi* makes more grammatical sense. But what meaning is being conveyed? I think the point is that there are so many good things on the chariot that one can’t single out just one: like opposing forces (*taviṣāṇi*) they contend with each other as rivals to be the best and most desirable. The sentiment is similar to VII.26.4 *mithastúra ūtāyo yāsya pūrvīḥ* “whose many forms of help compete for the lead,” meaning that they are all eager to be the most helpful.

The loc. sg. *prápatheṣu* is taken by all standard tr. as “on (your) journeys” (vel sim.), agreeing with the endpoint of Gr’s def. ‘in die Ferne führender Weg, Reise in die Ferne, Reise’, which seems to me to follow a slippery path indeed. I interpr. the stem *prápatha-* (4x) rather as lit. ‘the path forward’, but figuratively as ‘vanguard’. The *-in-* stem superlative *prapathíntama-*, found nearby at I.173.7, then means ‘most in the vanguard’ (/ ‘most forward on the path’), used of Indra there and VI.31.5 (the 3rd occurrence, at VIII.1.30, is a PN). Although the difference between ‘journey’ and ‘vanguard’ is not crucial in our passage here, the two non-PN occurrences of *prapathíntama-* both refer to Indra, with I.173.7 specifically to Indra as warrior, and ‘most in the vanguard’ works much better than Re’s “toi qui (vas) les grands chemins par excellence” or WG’s “der am meisten auf dem Weg bist.” Ge’s “der am meisten auf der Kriegsfahrt” seems to recognize this. For *prápatheṣu* here I’d be inclined to emend my publ. tr. to “on the paths forward,” because of the plural.

What is going on in d depends on the interpr. of *samáyā*, for which see comm. ad I.113.10. Most take it to mean ‘in the middle’ vel sim.; this certainly produces an acceptable image, since the axle is between the two wheels. But as discussed ad I.113.10, the totality of passages containing *samáyā* suggest a meaning ‘altogether, all at once, at the same time’, and in all these passages it contrasts with a form of *ví* (as here). The image I see here is somewhat more complex than the standard one, namely that through the action of the axle the wheels, though separate, turn at the same time. This is close to the kind of paradox much loved by RVic poets. This interpr. requires medial *vāṇṛte* to be transitive (rather than intransitive-reflexive, *pace* most tr. and also Kü 464), but the self-involved nature of the action (the axle is turning its own wheels, as it were) makes this unproblematic. Potentially more troubling is that by this interpr. *cakrá* should be dual acc., and the stem *cakrá-* is neuter, whose dual should be (and several times is) *cakré*. However, in at least one passage, VIII.5.29, we have a clear masculine dual: *ubhā cakrá hiraṇyáyā* “both your wheels are golden” (note the ‘both’ *ubhā*), which would match the form here. Alternatively, we could take *cakrá* as neut. plural, assuming four wheels -- and though this would technically require two axles, “the axle” as a mechanical marvel could stand for both. (Rather like saying “the internal-combustion engine powers most of the cars on the highway,” even though every car has its own.)

I.166.10: The adj. *rabhasá-* ordinarily characterizes action (‘violent, frenzied’), but here must have a visual aspect. So also III.31.12. Such synaesthesia is not uncommon in the RV.

In d all standard tr. supply ‘they’ [=Maruts] as subject of (*vy ánu*) *dhire*, with *śríyaḥ* as object (e.g., Ge “... haben sie ihre Herrlichkeiten entfaltet”). This amounts to a change of person, for these same tr. identify the many good things of a-c as ‘yours’ [=Maruts], following similar statements in vs. 9 with *vaḥ* (a, cd). Though there are no overt 2nd ps. pronouns in vs. 10, the voc. *marutaḥ* in pāda shows that 2nd ps. reference continues in this verse. Rather than changing person in d, I see another ex. of case disharmony between frame and simile, which is facilitated by the middle voice of *dhire*. The simile *váyo ná pakṣān* “like birds their wings” uses the middle in transitive but self-involved sense, but, in my reading, in the frame *dhire* is intransitive, with *śríyaḥ* as subject. I must admit, however, that the person switches to 3rd in vs. 11, so that a switch here in the last pāda of 10 is not impossible. I prefer my interpr., with constant 2nd ps. in

vs. 10, both because -- all things being equal -- it's best to keep verses self-contained and, more important, because Agastya likes doing tricky things with similes.

I.166.11: I have not rendered the *yé* in b because in this verb-less string of nominal qualifiers it is difficult to decide where the relative clause ends and the main clause begins. (Both Re and WG take d as the main cl.; Ge seems to take it as cd, insofar as I can interpret his punctuation.) Alternatively, the whole vs. could be a relative clause hanging off vs. 10, or more specifically 10d. This structure would support the change of person in 10d seen by most tr., as opposed to my interpr., for which see immed. above.

I.166.12: This vs. has ties to earlier parts of the hymn. The opening *tád vah ... mahítvanám* "this is your greatness" echoes 1ab *tán nú vocāma ... mahítvám*. There it was their previous (*pūrvam*) greatness; this vs. presumably brings this greatness into the present time.

Pāda b seems a paraphrase of 7a *anavabhrārādhasaḥ* 'whose gifts are not withdrawn'.

The connection between the main clause and the relative clause in cd is somewhat loose: as a correlative to the rel. cl. *jānāya yásmai* "for whatever person" we would expect *tám*, not *tád*, which must refer to the gift, not the recipient of it.

I.166.13: I take cd as a concrete example of the statement in ab, that the Maruts' connection with the older generation arises from their favoring its "laud" (*śámsam* -- note that this positively viewed *śámsa-* contrasts with the evil *śámsa-* of 8d). Manu is of course a member of the older generation, and because of his "insight" (*ayā dhiyā*) the Maruts favor him and show themselves to him with all their wondrous qualities.

I.166.14: The relations among the clauses in this vs. might be problematic, primarily because of an apparent gender mismatch: *pārīṇas-* 'abundance', which in the instr. *pārīṇasā* goes with the rel. *yéna* in the rel. clause occupying ab, would be the most likely referent of both *yád* in the parallel rel. clause of c and *tád* in the main clause of d. And in fact that is how I (and the other standard tr.) take it. However, *pārīṇas-* is said to be masculine and *yád/tád* are of course neuter -- an obstacle that Old for his part considers too large to be overcome. However, the noun is most likely neuter. This is what we'd expect of a stem built with suffix *-nas-*, and the only diagnostic form for a masc. is acc. sg. *pārīṇasam* in III.24.5. Otherwise the forms are singular obliques, esp. in the collocation *rāyā pārīṇasā* "with wealth in profusion" (4x), and hence ambiguous as to gender. The masc. acc. sg. is most probably a nonce form created to match its usual formulaic partner, masc. *rayí-*, in the phrase *rayīm vīrávantam pārīṇasam*. See AiG II.2.738 and EWA s.v. Substantially the same argument is made by Lubotsky ("Avestan *x^varənah-*: The Etymology and Concept, 1998, 483).

abhīṣtim in d is analyzed by the Pp. as *abhī ṣtim*, as might be expected. Since (vanishingly rare) root-accented *ṣti-* is derived from *√yaj* and means 'sacrifice', the standard tr. exert a good deal of effort to introduce this sacrifice into their interpretation, somewhat embarrassingly in a pāda that already contains *ebhūr yajñébbhiḥ* "with these sacrifices." Cf. Re's rather overblown "puissé-je l'obtenir grâce aux sacrifices que voici, pour (que vous soyez présents à mon) oblation" (the "l" in "l'obtenir" is the *pārīṇas-*). I

take it rather to *īṣṭī-* ‘desire’, in a phrase *abhī *īṣṭīm* “to my desire, to my liking’. Either the annealed sandhi form **abhīṣṭīm* lost its 2nd accent redactionally, or the accent retraction that was ultimately to affect all *-ti*-stems (see Lundquist, *-ti*-stems) was already spreading to this stem, producing the occasional *īṣṭī-* ‘desire’.

I.166.15: This signature verse of Agastya’s Indra/Marut hymns appears in I.165.15, 166.15, 167.11, and 168.10, but not in all of his Triṣṭubh hymns even to Indra. The tr. of I.165.15 (JPB) differs somewhat from the others (SWJ). JPB interprets *mānyā-* as a patronymic to a PN *māna-*, while I take it as an adj. ‘respectful’ derived from *māna-* ‘respect’. It is possible that both are meant.

Both tr. follow Old in reading ‘*vayām* ‘propitiation’ (SWJ) / ‘reconciliation’ (JPB) for *vayām*. This requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text, only to the Pp. My tr. should, however, have an asterisk before ‘propitiation’ in all three cases.

I.167 Maruts

I.167.2: What noun to supply with *jyēṣṭhebhīh ... bṛhāddivaiḥ* is an open question. Ge confesses to uncertainty in his n. 2b, but implicitly supplies “help(s)” from pāda a in his tr. However, the disjunctive *vā* ‘or’ would seem to exclude this solution, unless it’s signaling a contrast between the Maruts’ “help(s)” and those stemming from heaven, which seems unlikely. Klein (DGRV II.157) suggest “riches” (a suggestion that goes back to Sāy), in part on the basis of *rayīm ... jyēṣṭham* in VIII.46.19; see also IV.29.5 *bṛhāddivasya rāyah*, adduced by Ge. The fact that “help(s)” and “riches” both appear in vs. 1 (a and c) supports this view.

My tr. of cd differs from the standard ones and follows Jamison 1983: 84. I take *dhanāyanta* as transitive, a straightforward ex. of *-anta* replacement (see Jamison 1979). This involves taking *niyūtaḥ* as accusative, not nominative, pl. and *paramāḥ* as modifying the unexpressed Maruts, subjects of the verb. The standard tr. “when their furthest/highest teams are running ...” is certainly acceptable, however.

I.167.3–7: Hoffmann (Injunk., 194–97) translates and comments on these verses.

I.167.3: For the punning and diametrically opposed, negative and positive, readings of this vs. mediated by *sabhāvatī*, see the publ. intro. Rodasī is depiced both as fit for the sabhā (gaming hall) like a young woman who goes there in secret [=whore], but also fit for the sabhā (assembly) like speech to be publicly uttered there (cf. the *sabhéyo vípraḥ* “the inspired poet appropriate to the sabhā” in II.24.13). For the association between the sabhā and licentious sexual activity, see Falk (Bruderschaft, 90–92).

Ge (/Hoffmann, WG) take *úparā ... ṛṣṭīḥ* as the lower part of the spear and consider the shared characteristic between simile and frame to be *hīraṇyanirṇik* ‘garbed in gold’, presumably referring to the decorated hilt or handle of the spear. But I take *úparā* as meaning ‘nearer, very close’ (so approx. Re) and the point of comparison is how close Rodasī is to the Maruts (“to whom she has been joined, positioned well”: *mimyaḥṣa yéṣu súdhitā*) -- as close as their spear, which is attached to their shoulders: cf. I.64.4 *āmṣeṣv eṣām ní mimṛkṣur ṛṣṭāyah* “On their shoulders spears have rubbed.” (The verbs *mimyaḥṣa* and *mimṛkṣuḥ* belong to different roots, but echo each other phonetically.)

The standard tr. take *mānuṣaḥ* as gen. sg., dependent on *yóṣā*, whereas I see it as acc. pl. Either is of course grammatically possible.

Hoffmann (194–95, fld. by WG) sees *sám vāk* as a new, separate clause (“Dabei ist die Vāc.”). Although I don’t entirely understand the position and function of *sám*, I do not think making these last two words into an abrupt appendage works well.

I.167.4: The polarized positive/negative treatment of Rodasī continues in the first half of this vs., in my interpr. With Hoffmann (/WG) I take pāda a as separate from b and supply a verb of motion with *pārā* ‘away’. In b, in my interpr. only, the fem. instr. *sādhāraṇyā* ‘common’ refers both to the fact that Rodasī is held by them in common and that this type of relationship leaves her open to the charge that she is no better than a whore. (As noted in the publ. intro., even Draupadī in the Mahābhārata sometimes receives this insult because she is the common wife of all the Pāṇḍavas.)

The 2nd hemistich puns on the name Rodasī (once again, this is only my interpr; others see it very differently), providing us with a grammatical problem. The form found in the text, *rodasī*, should by accent be the name of the Maruts’ consort, but as a singular -ī-stem, it should be nominative, a grammatical identity that does not fit the context well. Old takes it as an instr. Ge suggests that the word here is flexionslos, which conveniently allows him to construe it as an acc. with *āpa nudanta* (so also Re, without comment on the morphology). Hoffmann (fld. by WG) suggests it’s an elliptical dual, standing for Rodasī and Vāc. I instead think it is a grammatical compromise that enables a pun -- a compromise between dual **ródasī*, the standard word for the two world halves (so accented) and sg. **rodasīm*, the acc. sg. of the personal name. In other words, the *rodasī* we have in the text is a formal compromise: the right form for the dual worlds but the wrong accent; the right accent for the singular woman but the wrong case form. This is where the pun comes in, depending on a further implied pun on the *ná* that opens the line. On the one hand it is the negative, to be read with the personal name: “did not push Rodasī away” (so most tr.); on the other hand it is the simile marker, to be read with the two worlds: “as they did push apart the two world halves.” This refers to the cosmogonic deed, generally attributed to Indra, of separating the two world halves to create living space between them. The *ná* is of course in the wrong position for the simile marker, but I think Agastya relies on his audience to actualize his plays on words with hints like this. The full version of this very condensed expression would be *ná *ródasī(m) [/ródasī] ná* “not Rodasī like the two world halves.

In the next pāda both Rodasī and the two world halves are then the objects of a (quasi-)infinitival *vṛdham* (again, my interpr. differs from others’). Cf. the similar expression in I.85.1c *ródasī hí marútaś cakrīré vṛdhé* “the Maruts made the two world halves grow strong,” with a clear dative infinitive in periphrastic causative usage. The only other ex. of acc. *vṛdham* in III.16.2 also has infinitival value and even has the Maruts as subj.

I.167.5: This vs. depicts a svayaṃvara (self-choice) marriage likened to the mythological prototype of the svayaṃvara, that of Sūryā. The identification of the two female figures is underlined by the echo between *asur’yā* ‘her ladyship’ (pāda a, referring to Rodasī) and *ā sūr’yā* (opening pāda c, naming Sūryā).

jōṣat is most likely an aor. subjunctive (see comm. ad X.105.8, 158.2). As the first word of the verse, it introduces the “choice” theme. I take *jōṣad yād* as a type of politeness formula “if X will be pleased to ...,” archaic English “an it please ...” Note that dat. *sacādhyai* ‘to accompany’ is complementary to dat. *sakhyāya* ‘for companionship’ in 4d and of course etymologically related. The complementarity extends to the implied subjects: in 4d the Maruts are taking steps to produce companionship; in 5a it is Rodasī who decides to accompany them.

The bahuvrīhi *nṛmāṇas-* usually means ‘manly minded’ and so it is interpr. here by most (Ge [/Hoffmann/WG] ‘mannhaftgesinnt’; Re ‘l’âme virile’). But though she does display a fair amount of gumption, I find this an odd characterization of the very feminine Rodasī. In this context I take it rather as ‘having her mind on (the) men’ (that is, the Maruts, who are regularly called *nṛ-*). See *vṛṣamaṇas-* in 7c.

Pāda c presents the crucial moment in the RV svayaṃvara, the bride’s mounting the chariot of the groom (see Jamison 2001, Fs. Parpola). On a possible preterital tr. of *ā ... gāt* see comm. on the next vs.

I.167.6: The decisive moment of mounting is repeated immediately in this verse, in the causative *āsthāpayanta*. The *-anta* form can be simply an *-anta* replacement of act. *-an* of the usual type (Jamison 1979), but it might also be semantically justified: “They cause(d) her to mount (their own chariot).”

As Hoffmann points out, *āsthāpayanta* need not be read as impf. *ā asthāpayanta* with the Pp., but can be an injunctive *ā sthāpayanta*. The publ. tr. has preterital “caused ... to mount.,” and I still think that is correct, though a general present could provide an easy transition to the here-and-now of the ritual found in cd. My reason for preferring the preterital reading has to do with my view of the structure of the middle section of the hymn: vss. 3-6ab treat the mythological relationship between Rodasī and the Maruts, while 6cd-7 bring Rodasī and the Maruts into the ritual present. I see *vidātheṣu* in 6b as the pivot: on the one hand it echoes *vidathyā* in 3d and provides ring-compositional closure to the mythological section of the hymn; on the other hand it looks forward to the ritual present 6cd. Since the chariot mounting of 6a is part of the mythological past, a preterital (or timeless) tr. fits it better. (It might also be better to tr. the injunc. *ā ... gāt* in 5c in the same preterital fashion.)

In the publ. tr. I take *śubhé* with the preceding pāda: “mount for beauty,” since *śúbh-* is very commonly used in Marut hymns to refer to their journey (cf., e.g., I.88.2 *śubhé kām yānti ...*). However, the juxtaposition of the first two words in III.26.4 *śubhé sāmīślāḥ pṛṣatīr ayukṣata* is suggestive of a connection here between *śubhé* and *nīmiślām* (though in the publ. tr. of III.26.4 *śubhé* is not construed with *sāmīślāḥ* but with *ayukṣata*). Still I remain inclined towards my “mount for beauty,” because I think *nīmiślām* refers to Rodasī’s intimate connection with the Maruts, which was emphasized at the very beginning of the mythological section, 3a *mīmyākṣa yēṣu ...*, hence my “commingling (with them).”

As was just noted, I take 6ab as the end of the little Rodasī myth and 6cd as the beginning of the section treating the current ritual. I therefore (contra the standard tr.) take cd as dependent on 7, not on 6ab.

I.167.7: For my tr. of *vṛṣamaṇas-* see disc. of *nṛmāṇas-* in 5b.

Ge suggests that the greatness of the Maruts (pāda b) is demonstrated by the fact that Rodasī happily brings along their other lovers without jealousy. This seems like an interpretational male fantasy to me (though I realize that our poet is also male and therefore likely prone to the same fantasy). I have a much soberer and less entertaining interpr. based in ritual. In the plural, *jānī-* is regularly used of the wives of the gods, esp. in regard to their attendance at certain rituals. They are ordinarily brought by Tvaṣṭar, but here Rodasī, one of their own, as it were, seems to stand in as their chaperon and cicerone. In the R̥tugraha offerings (the “sequential cups”), in which a fixed order of gods receives oblations, the offering to the Maruts is followed immediately by one to Tvaṣṭar along with the wives of the gods; see I.15.2–3, II.36.2–3 (II.36.3d *tvāṣṭar devébhir jānibhiḥ sumádgaṇaḥ*). Thus, given the temporal proximity of the oblations made to them at this ritual, one might expect to find both the Maruts and the wives of the gods together on the ritual ground.

I do not understand the force of *cid* in d, and in fact I think it’s been automatically imported from the passages containing *sthīrā cid* where the adj. is a neut. pl. and the point is that our hero (whoever it happens to be) has destroyed various items “even though they are firm/hard” (I.127.4, IV.7.10, VIII.20.1). In other words, I do not think it has a function here.

I.167.8: Because the verb in pāda a, *pānti*, is plural, not dual, at least one additional subject is needed in addition to du. *mītrāvāruṇā*. The obvious one to supply is their partner Aryaman, who appears in the next pāda.

In d Old, Ge, Re, and WG identify *dātivāraḥ* ‘wish-granting’ as the mortal sacrificer, although, as they all acknowledge, the other two occurrences of this stem modify the Maruts (III.51.9, V.58.2) and therefore the Maruts should be presumed to be the default referent here as well. I see no reason to contravene this expectation. In V.58.2 the adjective is singular, modifying *gaṇā-* ‘flock’, a regular cover term for the Maruts, and I have supplied *gaṇā-* here as well. I also consider d to be an unsignaled dependent clause “(when),” indicating the circumstances under which the unstirring things stir (c), viz. when the Maruts get strong. The verb would have accent in any case because it is initial in its pāda. I do not, however, understand the *īm* in d, which has no referent, since *vāṇṛdhé* is intransitive (*pace* Gr). Taking the Maruts as the subj. of *vāṇṛdhé* also fits nicely with 9, which treats the “swelling strength” (*śávas-*) of the Maruts.

On the famous cmpd type of *dāti-vāra-* see comm. ad V.58.2.

I.167.10: *ṛbhukṣā* in d may refer to the Maruts collectively, as I’ve taken it, or to Indra, already mentioned in ab. Re suggests both possibilities, though he goes for Indra in his tr. (as do Ge, WG). It is true that singular *ṛbhukṣāḥ* generally refers to Indra, while it is plural *ṛbhukṣānaḥ* that qualifies the Maruts (VIII.7.9, 12, etc.). As in 8d I’m taking interpreting the singular as collective referring to the Marut flock. If the referent is taken as Indra, the tr. should be altered to “the R̥bhu-master of the superior men,” which seems a bit awkward.

I.167.11: See comm. ad I.166.15.

I.168 Maruts

I.168.1: Ge takes b as parenthetical. Although I agree that the 1st sg. subject of cd is also the subj. of pāda a, I think it less awkward to take pāda a as a nominal sentence, given the sheer amount of material that intervenes between it and the verb in d, *vavṛtyām*.

tuturvāṇi- is a hapax, but it can hardly be anything but a pleonastically redupl. form of *turvāṇi-* (8x)(though it should be admitted that this latter stem is used only of gods). The redupl. form is sometimes credited with a desiderative sense ('zu erlangen strebend' versus *turvāṇi-* 'siegreich', etc.: Gr; 'zu gewinnen strebend' versus *turvāṇi-* 'überwältigend': AiG II.2.906, reproduced in EWA s.v. *TŪRV*; 'cherche à l'emporter': Re), but I see no contextual or morphological justification for this. WG's iterative/repetitive "immer wieder überwältigend" is probably closer to the mark, and it would fit with the repetitive ritual actions indicated by the āmreḍita *yajñā-yajñā* and *dhīyam-dhiyam*. I would be inclined to emend the publ. tr. to "(am I) ever victorious" or "continually victorious." I do not understand Ge's 'zuvorkommend'.

The position of *u* in b is somewhat surprising. Klein (DGRV II.10 n. 16) groups it with a set of passages in which *u* appears as the penultimate word (or "word") in its pāda after *-ā* and classifies it here as "expletive," whatever that is meant to convey. Closest in configuration is VII.68.4 ... *devayā u ādriḥ*##.

The standard (and I think correct) interpr. of *devayā(h)* here is that it is fem. pl., agreeing with the implicit plurality of the (sg.) āmreḍita *dhīyam-dhiyam* -- an interesting syntactic constructio ad sensum.

I.168.2: For the image in pāda a see the publ. intro.

The point of the simile in the final pāda is somewhat obscure. The frame -- "to be extolled by the mouth" (*āsā ... vāndyāsah*) -- is unimpeachable, referring to the poet's oral praise, but why would gods be compared to cows and/or oxen for this quality? Surely the Maruts are inherently more praiseworthy than cows! Ge suggests that it's like the praise of bovines at work (like the horses in I.27.1, though this passage does not seem similar); WG tr. "(sie sind) die Kühe mit dem Mund, wie die zu lobenden Jungstiere" and suggest that such cows are esp. sichtbar. This interpr. loses the connection with the poet's praise "by mouth" and, at least to me, doesn't make much sense as a way to refer to particularly visible cows. I suggest that there's an imperfect pun here on *vāndya-*, which is phonologically close to *bāndhya-* 'to be bound' (not found in the RV or, acdg. to Wh Rts, till epic, but easy enough to generate, and the stem occurs in the name of the *anūbandhyā* cow, a fixture in śrauta ritual, already in the BYV Saṃhitās). The simile would then pivot on the verbal pun, not on the visual image, with "by mouth" used in two different senses with *vāndya-* and **bandhya-*. In the latter case, it evokes a halter, the assemblage of straps that go behind the animal's ears, across the jaws, and around the muzzle, to enable it to be led. The "bound" image adds another layer of meaning to the verse, suggesting under the surface that we can exert control over the Maruts, bind them to us, by praising them.

One small issue is whether *gāvah ... ukṣānah* is a single compound NP or two different entities. Ge suggests the possibility of the former in his n. 2d, though his tr. does not reflect it. The position of the simile particle would be slightly better if this were the case, though my tr. doesn't reflect it either, mostly because "bovine oxen" doesn't work well in English -- or probably in Sanskrit.

I.168.3: The first hemistich has a nice chaining of similes, as Ge persuasively shows. The Maruts are compared to soma drinks -- not, probably, for any quality proper to physical soma, but because, like friends, soma drinks are thought to “sit in the heart” (cf., e.g., I.179.5 ... *sómam* ... *hṛtsú pītām* ... and other passages adduced by Ge in n. 3ab). So the Maruts are “like soma drinks” only because soma drinks are themselves “like friends”; the first simile is mediated by the second. Within the first simile is embedded another metaphor describing the soma drinks “whose stalks are satiated” (*ṭṛptāṃśavaḥ*), referring to the originally dry stalks which swell when soaked in water (preparatory to pressing them). The result is a very dense set of nested imagery.

In c Kü (418) takes the *rambhínī* as a person with a crutch and WG as an old man with a cane or staff. Although VIII.45.20 ... *tvā rambhām ná jívrayo, rarabhmā* ... “Like elderly ones a staff, we have grasped onto you” shows that *rambhām* can have such a meaning, the feminine *rambhínī* requires a feminine referent in the simile, and I.167.3 in the preceding hymn, with Rodasī cozying up to the Maruts like their spear (*úparā ná ṛṣṭīḥ*), supplies the thematic parallel. That the spear is found in the two following vss. (4d, 5a) in this hymn also supports supplying it here.

kṛtī- is a hapax, but it is generally agreed that it means ‘dagger, knife’, derived from $\sqrt{kṛt}$ ‘cut’.

I.168.4: I supply ‘horses’ as subj. of a and obj. of b. Ge (/WG) take *codata* in b as intransitive/absolute/reflexive [it is somewhat difficult to tell from the tr.] ‘treibt selbst ... an’, but this verb otherwise takes an obj., and if it were reflexive we might expect middle voice. Re supplies the same obj. as I do.

I interpr. *tmánā* in its full lexical sense ‘with breath’, as sometimes elsewhere (see also 5b). The “breath” of the Maruts would of course be the storm winds. However, it is certainly possible that it simply means ‘by yourselves’, as in the standard interpr. I then take *kásayā* as an implied simile matching *tmánā*, since the whip is not usually associated with the Maruts, but with the Ásvins. However, in I.37.3 *ihéva śṛṇva eṣām, kásā hásteṣu* ..., the Maruts do have a whip, so an alternative tr. could be “spur them on with your own breath as whip” or “spur them on by yourselves with a whip.” The use of *tmánā* with a clearly marked simile in 5b may lend support to my interpr. of *kásayā* as an unmarked simile here.

The qualifier “dustless” (*arēṇavaḥ*), in combination with *codata* ‘spur on’ (b) and *acucyavuh* ‘have made stir’ (c), evokes the common notion that dust gets stirred up by violent activity (see, e.g., I.56.4=IV.17.13, IV.42.5). It is thus a paradox: although the Maruts set many things in motion, they themselves remain unaffected by this movement and therefore dustless.

I.168.5: Another vs. displaying Agastya’s tricky manipulation of double readings.

The standard tr. (but cf. Scar. 127) take *vaḥ* as the obj. of *réjati* (“who sets you atremble?”), but this seems semantically unlikely to me. The Maruts are always the initiators and causers of violent motion, as is esp. emphasized in these vss. (4–6); no one external to them is likely to have the power to make them tremble. (This seems to be implicitly recognized in Re’s supplied modal: “qui (donc pourrait) vous faire trembler au dedans ...?”) I instead construe *vaḥ* with *antár* (“among you”). The question “who among

you?” is a variant on the occasional rhetorical attempt to differentiate among the Maruts. Ge (/WG) and Re take the *antár* as the locus of the Maruts’ trembling (“within”; see Re’s tr. cited above). Rather than taking *vah* as the obj. of the verb, I supply *ḍṛḥāni* ‘fixed places’ from 4d as obj. of *réjati*; *dhánva*, extracted from the cmpd. *dhanvacýútaḥ* in c would be equally possible. Scar’s (127) tr. is similar to mine, but he takes *réjati* as absolute (“Wer aus eurer Mitte ... bewirkt ... das Beben ...”). This is also possible. Scar also takes *tmānā* as “durch seinen Hauch” as I do, contra the standard reflexive interpr.

The simile shows (or implies) a different syntactic configuration from the frame, as Ge also points out (n. 5b), reflected also in Re’s tr. Although the frame has a transitive verb *réjati* (possibly, with Scar, in absolute usage), the simile assumes an intransitive form of the same verb stem; cf., e.g., III.31.3 *agnír jajñe juhvā réjamānaḥ* “Agni was born quivering with his tongue,” with the tongue as here. I read *antár* also with the simile (so also Ge), governing *hánvā*, interpreted as dual (du. also Old, Ge, Re; WG take as instr. sg., which is morphologically more satisfying but produces an image that makes no sense to me).

The third pāda continues Agastya’s crafty syntactic slippage between simile and frame. I take the gen. pl. *iṣām* as parallel to the 1st cmpd member *dhanva-* in *dhanva-cyút-* ‘stirring the wastelands, stirrer of the wastelands’. The simile would then be an analytic (i.e., de-compounded) **iṣām cyút-* ‘stirrer of refreshments’ parallel to the synthetic rt. noun cmpd. *dhanva-cyút-*. ‘Refreshments’ here probably refer to rain. For the root \sqrt{cyu} in this sense, see V.53.6 *diváh kósam ácucyavuh* “The [=Maruts] have stirred the bucket of heaven,” and for *ís-* as rain, e.g., V.68.5 *vrṣṭidyāvā rītyāpā, iśás páti* ... (of Mitra and Varuṇa as lords of rain). This analysis allows the loc. *yāmani* (like more common *yāman*) to refer as usual to the Maruts’ journey. Ge (/WG) and Scar take *yāmani* as part of the simile, resulting in a very unlikely image: Ge “wie bei der Ankunft der Speisen,” with the shaking produced by the Maruts compared to that produced by a herd of cattle or by the wagons bringing in the harvest! (Re’s rendering is close to mine.)

The point of the last pāda is probably that the Maruts set many in motion, just as the Sun (or in this case, his stand-in, the Sun’s horse) sends people to their tasks on his daily appearance. The common property between simile and frame is *purupraīṣa-*. Although in I.145.3 *praīṣa-* in this cmpd seems to have the technical sense ‘ritual command’ common in later Vedic, I do not see that sense here, since neither the Maruts nor Etaśa issues such commands. Re unaccountably takes the second member as passive: “vous qui êtes multiplement incités.”

I.168.6: Ge (/WG) take c with ab, with d independent, while Re configures the vs. as I do. There are no implications either way.

The publ. tr. doesn’t render the *ā* ‘here’ with the verb in the rel. cl. *āyayā*. The point is that they have arrived here despite the vastness of the space in which they were driving, but “in which you have driven here” doesn’t work in English.

The frame and the simile in c do not agree in number: sg. *sámhitam*, pl. *vithurā-iva*. The number difference has a semantic function; the entity that the Maruts are stirring is solid and a unity, hence hard to move, but they make it shake as if it were comprised of a number of small unconnected pieces that are easily set in motion. Although *vithurā-* is a deriv. of \sqrt{vyath} and does not contain the preverb *ví*, its initial syllable plays off the *sám*

in *sámhitam*, in the common contrastive pairing *sám* ‘together’: *ví* ‘apart’. The real preverb *ví* opens the next pāda.

Ge (n. 6d) makes heavier weather of pāda d than seems necessary to me. I think the “turbulent flood” (*tveṣám arṇavám*) is simply the dusky realm (*rājas-*) of pāda a, i.e., the midspace in which the Maruts often find themselves. It is a turbulent flood because of the storms the Maruts are producing. The stone (*ádri-*) need not be a feature of the landscape (Fels, with Ge/WG), but a weapon of some kind, as often.

I.168.7: Ge’s n. 7 summarizes the gist of this verse, that what the Maruts bring is both disruptive and welcome. Their gift is rain (*vṛṣṭí-*, which never surfaces but accounts for the fem. adjectives throughout the verse), but it is accompanied by the violence of the storm. The positive/negative pairings are found in the first hemistich; the second one is only positive and ends by indirectly comparing the gift to the Maruts’ own consort Rodasī.

The curiously formed hapax fem. *pípīṣvatī* is best explained, with Old, as based on the perfect part. to *√pi* ‘swell’, *pīpivāms-*, fem. *pīpyúṣī-*, crossed with a *-vant*-stem to match *āmavati svārvati* in pāda a. Despite the tricky morphological manipulation required, I prefer this to the easier derivation from *√piṣ* ‘crush’, assumed by Ge’s ‘zerschmetternd’ (with ?), fld. by WG., and Re’s ‘pulvérisant’. Gr (flg. BR) takes it as built to a desiderative to *√pi*, but there are no desiderative forms to this root, whereas the pf. part. is quite well attested, esp. in the fem.

The last pāda has formulaic echoes that identify the female referent in the simile as Rodasī. There are only two other occurrences of fem. *asuryā-*, one in VII.96.1 referring to Sarasvatī (wrongly classified by Gr with the neut. noun), one in the hymn immediately preceding this one, I.167.5, where it refers to Rodasī. Similarly the bahuvrīhi *prthujrāyī* ‘possessing broad expanse’ brings to mind another passage adduced by Ge, I.101.7 *rudrébhir yóṣā tanute prthú jrāyaḥ* “Along with the Rudras [=Marut], the maiden [=Rodasī] stretches her broad expanse.” Although it might seem somewhat unflattering to attribute “broad expanse” to a lovely young maiden (esp. to us moderns; the ancients obviously had different canons of beauty), I think this is a buried pun. The two world halves (*ródasī*) do have this quality, and it has simply been transferred from that dual common noun to the fem. sg. *rodasī*.

jánjati has only one relative, *jánjanābhavant-* in VIII.43.8, where it modifies Agni and must mean something like ‘flickering’. On its formation see Hoffmann (IF 60, 1952 = Aufs. p. 40). Here ‘scintillating’ captures the feminine quality better.

I.168.8: The identity of the subj. of *udīráyanti* in b is left undefined. Re takes it as the rivers of pāda a, WG as the Maruts, and Ge leaves it undefined (“diese”). Although my publ. tr. likewise uses a noncommittal pronoun, I am inclined to think it is the rivers, because of the *úd* ‘up’, contrasting with the *áva* ‘down’ qualifying the action of the lightning in c. The noise the rivers make would be the roaring resulting from streams swollen by rainfall, hence the qualifier *abhṛíyam* ‘coming from clouds’ for their speech.

In d I take *yádī* as standing for *yád ī*, with acc. *ī* referring to the earth.

I.168.9: This is the final vs. of the hymn, since vs. 10 is repeated from I.165.15, etc. The *svadhā-* in d forms a slight ring with 2a *svajāḥ svátavaśaḥ*.

I.168.10: As just noted, this vs. is identical to I.165.15, tr. by JPB. See comm. ad I.166.15.

I.169 Indra

I.169.1: A difficult vs. to construe, esp. the first hemistich. In general I follow Old's somewhat bold interpr. He points out that pādas a and b are quite parallel, with pāda a *#mahás cid ... yatáh* matched by b *#mahás cid ... tyájasah*. He then suggests that the parallelism would be furthered if pāda-final *-tár*-stem agent noun *varūtā* (b) were matched by a similar formation at the end of a, which is possible if we read **etā* (agent noun to \sqrt{i} 'go') rather than *etān*. The final *n* of the transmitted form would have been acquired from the pāda-initial nasal *maháh* that immediately follows. Hence my "the one who goes," which should properly be asterisked in the publ. tr. I have supplied "(before)," to allow it to be construed with the abl. phrase beginning *maháh*. Old sim.: "Selbst eines grossen Gehenden Gänger (d.h. Ueberholer oder dgl.) bist du." As for the abl. phrase, I assume the referent is the Marut *gaṇā*- (flock). I also note the bad cadence and tentatively emend *yatáh* 'going' to **yātáh* 'driving', although keeping the transmitted form would not appreciably alter my interpr. semantically. Although Old's (and my) interpr. requires changing the text, the standard interpr. need to supply extra material and/or juggle the supposed pronoun *etān*, which lacks an obvious referent, and since Old's way builds on the parallel structures in the verse, I think the textual alteration is worth it.

What to do with *marútām* in c is the next question. Ge (see n. 1c) construes it with both *vedhah* and *cikitān* ("Du Meister der Marut, der (sie) kennt"), Re and WG with the latter. However, neither *vedhás*- nor *cikivāms*- ordinarily shows up with a complement -- though the passage adduced by Ge, I.156.4 *mārutasya vedhásah* with *vṛddhi* adj., gives me pause, and in the publ. intro. to I.156 I entertain the possibility of a syntagm *vedho marútām* here. Since all three tr. then construe this gen. pl. also with *sumnā*, the only reason to attach it to either or both of the other two words would be its position in the same pāda, which doesn't seem to me sufficient.

None of the standard tr. renders *nah* in c (though see Tichy [-tar-, p. 192], who does), but the sense of the first clause in cd must be "win the Maruts' favors *for us*." This makes the second clause, "for they [=favors] are dearest *to you*," a bit puzzling. Why would Indra, who has been quite disdainful of the Maruts in this hymn cycle, find their favors esp. dear? And if he does, why would he be willing to win them for others? I do not know how to resolve these questions on the basis of the transmitted text, which has verse-final *préṣṭhā*, which must therefore be a neut. pl. (or fem. nom. sg.). I would point out, however, that two hymns before (I.167.10a) we find the phrase *vayám adyéndrasya préṣṭhā*, with *préṣṭhā* pāda-final, but standing for masc. pl. *préṣṭhāḥ* before a voiced sound. It is therefore possible that *préṣṭhā* has been adapted from there, without adjusting the sandhi and that it could therefore mean "for they [=Maruts] are dearest to you." Unfortunately, though this makes *better* sense, it doesn't make complete sense, since Indra and the Maruts are depicted as still at loggerheads in this hymn. Perhaps *préṣṭhā*- here reflects one of the senses of *priyá*-, viz. 'one's own'. The Maruts would be "most your own" because they have been, and will be again, Indra's posse. If *te* in 2a should be

rendered as I take it, “your (Maruts),” this provides support for the “most your own” interpr. here.

I.169.2: Just as the standard tr. do not notice *naḥ* in 1c, they are also silent on *te* in 2a. I tr. “your (Maruts)”; it could also be a dat. with *āyujran* “they have hitched themselves up for you.” But the point is that Indra is a party to the action one way or the other.

The simplest way to construe cd is to take *hāsamānā* as a predicated pres. part. (so Ge), but it is possible with Re to supply a verb (“va,” in his case) or with WG to take it as a nominal clause of possession (“Den Marut gehört Kampfaktion ...”).

I.169.3: Both Ge and Re in different ways separate *ṛṣṭī-* from the well-attested ‘spear’ word and simply invent an otherwise non-existent stem (Ge ‘Hoheit’, Re ‘exploit’). Ge justifies this by saying that ‘spear’ doesn’t make sense in context (never a strong argument in RV interpretation, since so many contexts don’t) and that Indra never otherwise has a spear. (Re’s EVP XVII, where the tr. is found, has no notes, so his reasons are lost to us.) Ge then interprets *ṛṣṭī-* as a *v*-less form of *vṛṣṭī-* in I.52.5, 14 of the same meaning (in his opinion, though not others’). Even if Ge’s derivation were more solidly grounded, the presence of ‘spear’ in the preceding two hymns (I.167.3, I.168.4, 5), once with the same verb as here (I.167.3ab *mimyakṣa ... ṛṣṭīḥ*, 169.3a *āmyak ... ṛṣṭīḥ*), makes a separation from ‘spear’ extremely unlikely (as WG recognize). As to what Indra’s spear might be here, I suggest that “fixing a spear” is like planting a flag: it means staking a claim with a physical symbol of power or authority, and Indra has in this way asserted his claim to the sacrifice, despite the Maruts’ counter-claims, symbolized by the (cloud) mass they are sending this way. Another possibility: although I sternly resist nature-mythology explanations in general (and Indra’s “thunderbolt” in particular), in this context, with the storm-producing Maruts, it may be that a little conceptual flexibility is called for. In I.168.4 the Maruts are credited with lightning as their spears (*ṛṣṭividyaṭaḥ*), and in our vs. it is possible that, while the Maruts speed the clouds in b, Indra wields a spear of lightning.

The precise application of cd to ab is unclear. It seems to present two real-world analogues -- one involving fire, the other (in a simile dependent on the first) water -- to the mythological situation in ab, but what do these analogues contribute to interpreting what precedes? Before tackling that question, we must first decide what cd actually means. Ge and Old both take *dādhati* as a 3rd pl. indic., which requires finding a plural subj. Ge supplies priests and relegates the fire to a simile, presumably marked by *cīd* (which Ge takes as a simile marker on a number of occasions, though I do not think it can function that way). Old tries other strategies. But taking *dādhati* as a short-vowel 3rd sg. subjunctive allows *agnīḥ* to be subject without problem (so also WG). The point of both the fire and the water examples seems to be that these uncontrollable natural substances can produce unexpectedly positive results and that, though both substances ordinarily destroy matter, sometimes they create it. The “waters make an island” image is perhaps the easier one: when waters wash away large amounts of soil and other material upstream, this material often silts up downstream, forming islands in the river’s delta (as in the Bay of Bengal -- not that the RVic geographic horizon extends that far). It is almost a magical process -- dry land created from flowing liquid -- and provides an appealingly striking paradox. As for the fire image, fire burning in brushwood must be implicitly

contrasted here with the normal ritual fire, and the former is potentially destructive. I'm not sure how it makes pleasurable offerings (usually associated with the ritual), perhaps by roasting foodstuffs that happen to be in its path. It's worth noting that in II.4.7 fire "scorching the brushwood" also "sweetens the ground," another positive outcome: *agnīḥ śociṣmāñ atasāni uṣṇān ... asvadayan ná bhūma*.

What does this have to do with Indra and the Maruts? Perhaps in this verse addressed to Indra (note *te* in a), the poet is suggesting to him that despite their unruly natures the Maruts might turn out to have something to contribute to Indra.

I.169.4: The instr. *dākṣiṇayā* seems to be what we might call an instr. of material or specification; it expresses what the abstract 'present' (*rāṭī-*) consists of. Despite the position of the simile marker *iva*, I (and all the standard tr.) take *ōjīṣṭhayā* as belonging in the simile. Such configurations are found elsewhere, in addition to the far more common 2nd position of the simile marker.

As Ge also saw, the frame and the simile pivoting on *pīpayanta* have different syntactic constructions. In the frame *stútaḥ* is the subj. of an intrans. (or possibly reflexive) verb ("the praises swell / swell themselves"), whereas, since *stānam* is masc., it must be the obj. of a trans. use of *pīpayanta* ("[they] make the breast swell"). This clash is an example of the larger phenomenon of case disharmony in similes, treated at length in Jamison 1982 (IIJ 24); this particular passage is discussed pp. 263–64, where the syntactic properties of the verbal stem *pīpaya-* are also noted. I did not identify there the likely subj. of the transitive use in the frame, but flg. a suggestion of Dieter Gunkel's, in the publ. tr. I supply gift-cows, adapted from the sg. *dākṣiṇayā* in b. There is another case disharmony in this same simile, with instr. *vājaiḥ* corresponding roughly to gen. *mādhvaḥ* in the simile.

I.169.5: This vs. expresses the poet's willingness to let Indra supersede the Maruts if he provides sufficient wealth. The Maruts used to be the leaders, but now leadership passes to Indra, by indirection: the poet ascribes the leadership to his riches. (The cynical might think this ascription is not merely metaphorical.) As Ge points out, the poet is essentially apologizing to the Maruts and hoping (pāda c) that they will excuse his defection.

The *iva* in d is unusual in occurring after the verb *gātuyānti*. Ge tr. it more or less as I do. Re seems to ignore it, as do WG (unless this is what their "just" in "die ... just den Weg wiesen," though "just" [precisely] would seem to convey a sense opposite to the approximative *iva*). It might be possible to consider *iva* displaced to the left as sometimes, to be read with *devāḥ* ("like gods"), but this seems unlikely, given that the Maruts *are* gods.

I.169.6: The question in the first hemistich is what to do with *mahāḥ*. Ge must take it as an acc. construed with *yatasva*: "vergleiche dich mit [come to terms with] den Grossen ..." But this pushes the sense and syntax of medial *√yat*, which generally refers to physical placement (an interpr. encouraged by the seat [*sādane*] here) and never otherwise takes an acc. Re takes it as adverbial, while WG maintain Ge's acc. pl. but read it with *nṛṇ* in the previous pāda ("den ... grossen Männern"), starting a new clause with *pārthive*. I take it as gen. sg., referring to the Marut flock, as in 1a. Alternatively it could refer to Agni and the earthly seat could be the ritual ground.

On *pr̥thubudhná-*, lit. ‘broad based’, see Thieme’s brief remarks (Fremdling, p. 63 with n. 1). As he points out, it should not refer to the antelopes’ broad Untergestell (with Ge), since antelopes are not particularly bulky, but rather to the large amount of ground they cover. I take ‘base’ as equivalent to ‘stride’, somewhat like English ‘wheelbase’.

I.169.7: The various gen. pl. adjectives in ab can modify either the antelopes or the Maruts; with Ge I take them all with the Maruts. Despite the placement of *ghorāñām* and *ayāsām* flanking *étānām*, both those adjectives are used of the Maruts in nearby I.167.4 belonging to this same hymn complex.

I do not know what the debtor (*ṛṇāvān-*) is doing here.

I.169.8: The instr. phrase *stāvānebhiḥ ... devaiḥ* can express both agent (as in the publ. tr.) and accompaniment; that is, Indra is praised both *by* the Maruts and *along with* them.

[I.170–71 JPB]

I.172 Maruts

One of the shortest hymns in the RV.

I.172.3: Tṛṇaskanda appears only here in all of Sanskrit, as far as I can tell. The English gloss is a direct calque on the two parts of the name, *tṛṇa-* ‘grass’ and *√skand* ‘spring, leap’.

I.173 Indra

The beginning of the hymn is characterized by pāda-initial injunctives in -*at* (1a *gāyat*, 2a *ārcat*, 3a *nākṣat*, 3b *bhārat*, 3c *krāndat*; note also non-initial *ruvād* 3c and *carat* 3d). It is not surprising that this assemblage attracted the attention of Hoffmann, who tr. the first three vss. (Injunc., 143–44). The function of these forms is of course underdefined; I render them as simple general presents, more or less with Hoffmann (“die generelle Beschreibung eines Opfers”), sim. Ge. By contrast, Re takes them all as modal (“qu’il chante ...,” etc.).

Another verbal pattern is the repetition of forms of the root *√bhr̥*: 2c *bhārate*, 3b *bhārat*, 4b *bharante*, 6d *bhārti*. In this case the poet seems to want to display how many different idiomatic meanings he can find in this root.

I.173.1: IH suggests tr. *gāyat* and *ārcāma* as Engl. progressives: “he is singing .. we are chanting.” He points out that the (implied) presential nature of the nominal cl. of c and the future-referring final clause that depends on it in d support this interpr.

The standard tr. take *véḥ* as a nom. sg. In Ge’s tr., however, the bird seems to be compared to the sāman, not the singer: “Er stimme den Gesang an, der hervorschießt wie ein Vogel.” So also Re, it seems. Hoffmann (/WG) make the more natural (and grammatically acceptable) comparison with the singer, with *véḥ* as a nom. sg. However, although it requires some extra machinery, I prefer to take *véḥ* as gen. sg. I think Ge is on the right track, that the comparison is not the rather banal one between singer and bird, but the quality of “bursting forth” (*nabhanyām*) characteristic of bird song, a natural effusion. If this is the comparison meant, then only a gen. will work, dependent either on

sāma read a second time or on a different word for (bird) song to be supplied. Although there are undeniable exx. of *vés* as nom. sg. (VI.3.5, IX.72.5, X.33.2, possibly III.54.6), in addition to the expected gen. sg. of an ordinary *i*-stem – nom. sg. *vés* being a cornerstone of Schindler’s reconstruction of the IE ablaut pattern of this word and so beloved of Indo-Europeans – not all the *vés* forms listed as nom. sg. by Gr should be so analyzed. Besides the form in this vs., the one in III.54.6 (q.v.) is also possibly gen.

The obj. of *ārcāma* must be neut., which unfortunately excludes the cognate *arká-* (m.). Any neut. word for verbal product will do (*vācas-*, *brāhman-*, etc.).

The pf. part. *vāvṛdhānām* would be better tr. “that has grown strong.” I would thus now tr. ab as “He is singing the *sāman* that is bursting out like (the song of) a bird; we are chanting this (chant) that has grown strong ...”

The syntax of cd is ambiguous; c can be an independent nominal cl., with d dependent on it (so Ge, Re, and me) or the two can be read together as a single subordinate cl. (so Hoffmann [WG]), with the subordinating conjunction *yád* postponed until pāda d. This is not impossible, since pāda c is a single NP, but it seems a bit awkward. I prefer the two-clause solution.

I.173.2: An intricate verse, in which Indra both officiates as a singer at the sacrifice and receives the sacrifice as his due. In pāda a Indra as bull is, by the standard accounts, the subject, chanting along with the hard-laboring human priests (for *svédu-havya-*, see Jamison 2015, BAI 25) and, in his fervor, eager to out-sing (*āti ... juguryāt*) them. This is the only occurrence of *āti* with this root, but it can hardly mean anything else.

The Hotar in pāda c is most likely not Indra, but Agni, as in the next verse. This identification makes it easier to interpret the last pāda, where Indra, here called a “young blood” (*māryah*), supports “the pair,” who are likely (Ge’s parallels are apposite here) the two priests Udgātar (the likely subj. of *gāyat* in 1a) and Hotar (2c).

I.173.3–4: The *-at* injunctive pattern noted above comes to a climax in vs. 3, with 5 such verbs. The next *-at* form, *jújoṣat*, pāda-initial in 4c, is a subjunctive. The change in mood, while keeping the formal expression *-at* the same, is surely deliberate.

I.173.3: As Ge hints (n. 3a), the first pāda depicts the paryagnikarāṇa, a ritual episode that involves carrying a firebrand around various objects. In the animal sacrifice the objects include the animals to be sacrificed. On the basis of passages like IX.97.1cd (... *pāry eti ... mitéva sādma paśumānti hótā* “as the Hotar goes around the fixed seats provided with [sacrificial] animals”), the fixed seats are the places where the sacrificial animals are tied. The fixed seats here (*sādma mitā*) must be the same things, and the circling around is conveyed by *pāri ... yān*, which rather nicely encircles the seats in the word order.

The problematic pāda is the second one. All the standard tr. take *śarād-* as a gen. sg. in the sense of ‘autumn’, not ‘year’, with *gārbha-* metaphorical for ‘fruit, product’; cf., e.g., Ge’s “die herbstliche Frucht der Erde” or Hoffmann’s grammatically more punctilious “die Frucht des Herbstes der Erde.” This echo of a harvest-home festival strikes me as extremely incongruous. Although śrauta ritual does have a “first-fruits” ritual (Āgrayaṇa Iṣṭi, on which see, e.g., Keith, Relig. and Philos., 323–24; Hillebrandt, Rituellit., 119–20), it is a minor, grhya-like rite and quite marginal, and I am not aware of any mention of it in the RV, which tends to confine itself to the far grander Soma

sacrifice. I take *śarādaḥ* as an acc. pl. in the ‘year’ sense, expressing extent of time (“for years”), as it almost always does elsewhere. What then does the pāda refer to? In ritual context *gārbha-* almost always refers to Agni, either when just about to be kindled (and thus still in the womb of the wood) or just kindled -- though occasionally to Soma. The referent here is most likely Agni. The phrase *bhārad gārbham* probably has two senses. On the one hand, it is an idiom meaning ‘be pregnant’, and the acc. extent of time *śarādaḥ* is appropriate to this sense: “(s/he) carried/carries the embryo for years.” Cf. V.2.2 *pūrvīr hī gārbhaḥ śarādo vavārdha* “For the embryo grew for many years,” in a clear pregnancy context. The question then is who is the subject; I suggest the Earth, whose embryo it probably is (see below). On the other, this can refer to a particular ritual moment, when the Āhavanīya fire is taken out of the Gārhapatya and carried to the east to be set down (*purōhita-*) as the offering fire. In this reading the *śarādaḥ* may refer to the regular repetition of the ritual year after year, and the subject would be the priest, perhaps the human Hotar.

What I don’t understand in this pāda are the preverb/adposition/adverb *ā* and the relevance of the earth (gen./abl. *prthivyāḥ*). The most likely explanation of *ā* is that it is simply a preverb with *bhārat*, displaced to a position after the VP because the pattern of -*at* injunctives in this hymn imposes pāda-initial position on *bhārat*. In that case the publ. tr. should be slightly emended to “He bears the embryo ... here ...” This seems to be the solution of Ge and Hoffmann [WG], the latter two with clear “herbei,” though no one comments on it. However it is possible that *ā* should be construed with *śarādaḥ* or even *prthivyāḥ*, though I do not see a way to make that work. As for *prthivyāḥ*, I take it as a gen. with *gārbham* “embryo of the earth,” though Agni is usually called the embryo of the plants or of the waters. Perhaps Agni is the embryo of the earth because the plants in which he is immanent are themselves products of the earth. As noted above, in the pregnancy reading of *bhārad gārbham* I take the unexpressed subj. to be the Earth herself. In the ritual reading “embryo of the earth” may signal the fact that the new Āhavanīya fire is being transported in a clay pot.

In c Ge and Re identify the horse neighing while being led as Agni; this would fit nicely with my hypothesis that b depicts the carrying of the Āhavanīya fire to the east, though neither of them takes b that way. Ge also identifies the bellowing cow of c as the Speech (*vāk*) of d, which seems reasonable.

I.173.4: Old begins his n. on this verse with the cheerful comment “Wohl hoffnungslos,” and it is well to bear this in mind. The difficulties are located in the first pāda, which is seriously deficient in syllables (at best 9, probably 8), has a bad cadence, and contains a hapax *ā/āṣatarā* at which all tr. and comm. throw up their hands. The line is probably corrupt, and my attempts to fix it should be read with skepticism. The meter can be ameliorated by assuming a haplology of acc. pl. *kārma* adjacent to the identical verb, 1st pl. *karma*: *tā <kārma> karma* (or *tā karma <kārma>*). [I now see that a similar haplology is proposed by WG in the n. to this passage.] (For a less dramatic proposed haplology in Agastya’s oeuvre, see comm. ad I.180.3.) If we detach *ā/āṣatarā* from sandhi with the preceding word (contra HvN’s *karmāṣatarā*), the line would have eleven syllables, though it still would have an irreparably bad cadence.

As for *ā/āṣatarā*, the only (more or less) clear thing about it is that it is a comparative in -*tara-*, probably agreeing with *tā*. Ge [WG] refuses to tr. it -- though in

their n. WG render the passage tentatively as “Diese (Opfer)werke haben wir für ihn (gerade) zu den gesprenkelteren (bunter) gemacht.” I do not understand what they are doing with *āṣatarā*, though the rest of the tr. reflects the haplology proposal above. Re tr. “plus forts,” but without a note his reasons for this are lost; in his introduction to AiG I (p. 59) he comments that the word is “sans doute corrompu.” AiG I.239 tr. ‘annehmbarer’ without further explanation and floats the possibility of “nicht rein ai. Ursprungs,” a suggestion that Kuiper takes as fact (Aryans, 25). Mayrhofer refuses to speculate. I suggest, very tentatively, that it may be a dissimilated form of **āṣṭa-tara-* ‘more obtainable’, built to the ppl. *aṣṭa-* to $\sqrt{(n)aś} + \tilde{a}$. The initial long vowel in my reconstruction is contra the Pp., but the preverb *ā* is necessary to account for the initial accent and it is also the case that the ppl. to $\sqrt{(n)aś}$ does not seem to appear uncompounded in Vedic.

If this gossamer suggestion is correct, then the first two pādas outline a two-step strategy: we have first performed the easier ritual requirements in a, but more concentrated attention is needed, and in b those fixated on the gods advance the ritual activities. The second half-verse predicts that Indra will look favorably on these efforts and will come to our ritual.

I.173.5: In its contexts *sátvan-* clearly refers to a successful warrior, but it is of course a possessive *-van-*stem to the neut. pres. part. to \sqrt{as} ‘be’, whose participle, lit. ‘being’, often has the extended sense ‘actually being’ → ‘real’. I take the semantic dev. of *sátvan-* to be a slangy ‘having the real stuff’, ‘the real thing’. Cf. the similar Engl. expression “the right stuff,” the title of a novel by Tom Wolfe (and the movie based on it) about the astronauts in the space program. For another conjunction of *sūra-* and *sánt-* see 7a below.

Where to put *maghāvā* is a minor question, since word order could support grouping it with *sūrah* (Ge, WG), separating it from both *sūrah* and *ratheṣṭhāḥ* (Re), or grouping it with *ratheṣṭhāḥ* (me). What I am now certain of is that making *maghāvā* the primary focus of the rel. cl., with *ratheṣṭhāḥ* an adjunct, as I do in the publ. tr. (“who is a benefactor, standing upon his chariot”), is wrong, since the parallel relative clauses name Indra in various combat roles. I would now change my tr. to “who is a bounteous chariot-fighter” or “who is a chariot-fighter, a benefactor.”

The acc. pl. pf. part. *vavavrúṣaḥ* simply shows perseveration of the redupl. syllable (so also Kü p. 456) for expected **va-vr-uṣ-*. The additional reduplicating syllable may have been added because the root syllable is swallowed up in the weak stem of the participle.

I.173.6: Pāda-final *bhūmā* with long *-ā* must nonetheless be sg., as Old points out.

The athem. root pres. *bhárti* is found only here and in VI.13.3; see disc. there.

I.173.7: For *-ín-*stem superlative *prapathíntama-*, found also in VI.31.5, and *prápatha-* (4x, incl. nearby I.166.9), to which it is built, see comm. ad I.166.9.

Pāda c is problematic. The standard tr. take *kṣonīḥ* as subject, but this is grammatically problematic: *kṣonīḥ* is fem., but the subj. of c is the most likely referent of masc. *yé* in d. The gender disagreement disturbs both Ge and Old; the best solution they can come up with is a constructio ad sensum. I therefore take *kṣonīḥ* as acc. pl. The problem then is the absence of a verb -- a problem also for those who take *kṣonīḥ* as nom.

Ge uses the infinitive *paritaṃsayādhyai* from b, but I am reluctant to assume that kind of enjambement. Both Re and WG seem to do without a verb, allowing pāda c to dribble off unfulfilled into the rel. cl. of d. I supply a verb like ‘direct, send’, with no confidence in its correctness. As for the subj., I take it to be the warriors referred to by *samātsu ...*

satām in pāda a, although Old considers this gekünstelt. If, on the other hand, *kṣonīḥ* is the subj., I would tr. “the battle cries [=opposing sides] (call out) to Indra ...”

Ge takes *sūrīm cid* as a simile, with *cid* as the simile marker. As I’ve said elsewhere, I don’t believe that *cid* ever has that function, a view in which I am joined by Old, I’m happy to say. (See his remarks on this passage.) The point here is rather that the people call upon Indra as a fighter in battle, but also call him a patron when he distributes the prizes won in battle: he fills both roles.

I.173.8: Ge’s assessment that the vs. refers to the mixing of soma with water (a) and milk (b) seems correct. As often in soma contexts, the rhetoric is high-flown and the real-world references indirect.

The *āsú* of b must anticipate the cow(s) of c; it is presumably accented because its referent has not yet appeared in the discourse.

Both Ge and Re endow the gerundive *jóṣyā* with caus. pass. value ‘to be satisfied’ (“Jede zu befriedigende Kuh,” “Toute vache propre à être satisfaite”), but even the “causative” *joṣáyate* doesn’t have this value, but simply means ‘enjoys’. The cows are surely there for Indra to enjoy them, not for him to labor to give them enjoyment.

Note that the idiom *ānu √mad* ‘applaud’ found in *anumádanti* in 7d is broken down into its components, with *mádanti* in our pāda b and *ānu* in c.

My tr. of *dhiṣā* follows that of Pinault given orally at the Vedic Workshop at Univ. Texas, 2007.

I.173.9: The *yáthā* purpose clauses of this vs. are to be roughly construed with the initial *evā* of 8a.

Inspired by Ge, I read instr. *ena* in two different ways, as accompaniment in pāda a and as indirect agent in b.

Note also the decomposed *narām ná śámsaiḥ* (also 10a) recalling *nārā-śámsa-*. For further disc. of these expressions see comm. ad II.34.6 and VI.24.2.

The curious hapax *vandane-ṣṭhā-* ‘standing on praise’ must be a play on the phonologically similar, likewise hapax *vandhure-ṣṭhā-* ‘standing on the chariot box’ (III.43.1), which is modeled on the venerable *rathe-ṣṭhā-* ‘standing on the chariot’, two forms of which appear earlier in this hymn (4d, 5b).

The part. *náyamāna(h)* is identical to the form in 3c, but there the part. is clearly passive, and here such a reading is well-nigh impossible to impose. WG’s tr. has a self-beneficial meaning, “indem er (seine) Preissprüche mit sich führt,” but even that seems contextually difficult -- although I guess any praises Indra “leads” are ultimately for him. For leading song, see *gāthā-nī-* (I.190.1 [also Agastya], VIII.92.2), the latter also of Indra.

I.173.10: The vs. describes the competition between rival sides (either in battle or in ritual or both) to secure Indra for their side. I take it as depicting much the same situation as in vs. 7 (esp. 7b), where Indra is the object of a tug-of-war (*paritaṃsayādhyai*). I

therefore interpr. Indra also as the target. of *madhyāyuvah* ‘seeking (one) in the middle’ in 10d, contra Ge (/WG) for whom Agastya is the middle-man, the mediator.

As elsewhere (see III.52.6, X.42.2, 95.17), *úpa* triggers an acc. complement to *śikṣa-*, whose simplex forms only take the dative. The sense of the lexeme is ‘seek to entice / attract here’.

My interpr. of the vs. requires some rearrangement of the elements, most particularly the phrase *narām ná sámśaiḥ*, which I construe with the simile in c -- parallel to *yajñaiḥ* in the frame in d. Although this displacement may seem radical, neither Ge’s “Im Wetteifer geratend wie durch das Lob der Herren ...” (sim. WG) nor Re’s “(Soyons) en rivalité comme par l’effet des paroles-qualifiantes des seigneurs ...” makes any sense to me.

This passage is one of the comparatively few where a real modal value of the subjunctive might be preferable to the expectant future: “let/may Indra be ours,” rather than the publ. tr. “Indra will be ours.” Perhaps adjusting the English to “shall be ours” will do the trick. The subjunctive may express the speakers’ certainty that their sacrifices will be successful and exercise control over Indra’s actions. This seems to be the point of the next vs.

I.173.11: As indicated in the publ. intr., the syntax of this vs. mimics the meandering attributed to the finally successful sacrifice and the long road that brings a man home. One of the striking features of the word order (at least in my interpr. and Ge’s) is that *índram* behaves almost like a Wackernagel’s Law clitic, in taking modified 2nd position in pāda a, though it is to be construed with *ókah* ... *ā kṛṇoti* in cd. One factor that might impede that interpr. is that, as Old points out, the finite verb *kṛṇoti* in d is not accented, despite the *hí* in pāda a. Old feels that the end of the verse is no longer governed by *hí*. I would suggest rather that the rambling road the vs. has traveled from its beginning, including two complex similes, led the poet to forget or dismiss the *hí* with which he began.

I take *juhurāṇá-* to $\sqrt{hṛ}$ / *hru* ‘go crookedly, go astray’ (with Ge and Re, as well as Gr), rather than with $\sqrt{hṛ}$ ‘be angry’ with Insler (JAOS 88, 1968), apparently followed by WG: “wenn es (das Opfer) auch erzürnt im Denken Umwege macht.” The parallel participle *pariyán* ‘going around, meandering’ supports this identification, and it is somewhat difficult to imagine why/how a sacrifice would be (or make) angry. Agastya uses the same participle in the same sense in I.189.1.

I.173.12: The first pāda, beginning with a *mā* prohibitive, lacks a verb, but something like “(get) us (involved) / (drag) us (into)” is likely. Perhaps Agastya delicately omitted it to avoid insulting Indra too explicitly.

On *avayāḥ* and the verse in general see also Scar’s extensive disc. (404–6, esp. 406).

I.173.13: Pāda b could also be “find the way for us” (so Ge [/WG]). On the multivalence of *vidaḥ* see comm. ad I.42.7–9 and IX.20.3.

I.174 Indra

Agastya indulges in a certain amount of skewed ring composition and verbal echoes in this hymn. See, e.g., 1d / 10c *sahodāḥ*; 1c *nṛ̥n pāhī* (though this syntagm is only apparent; see comm. ad loc.) / 10b *narāṁ nṛ̥pātā*; 1b *asmān* / 10a *asmākam*; 2c / 9b *ṛ̥nór apāḥ*, 2a *mṛ̥dhrāvācaḥ* / 7d *kúyavācam mṛ̥dhī*; 2b *púrah* ... *dart* / 8c *bhinát púrah*; 4a *śéṣan* ... *yónau* / 7d *duryoné śret*, as well as the triple figure with *śūra*-disc. ad vs. 6.

I.174.1: All the standard tr. (also, e.g., Schlerath, *Königtum* 143, Hale *Asura*-70, Oberlies *ReligRV* II.177) construe the rel. cl. *yé ca devā(h)* loosely (very loosely) with *rājā* (e.g., Ge “Du, Indra, bist der König über alle Götter,” which entails not only assuming that *rājā* can govern such a clause, but also ignoring the *ca*). Within the same general interpr. framework WG do try to account for the *ca*: “... der König über (alle), auch die die Götter sind.” This can all be avoided by interpr. the rel. cl. as part of the familiar syntagm “X and which Y,” but in an inverse version with the conjoined rel. cl. first (rather like the inverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction with the *ca* constituent first): *yé ca devāḥ*, ... *nṛ̥n*. Re, fld by Klein (DGRV I.127), does interpret it as an “X and which Y construction,” but supplies a gen. “of mortals” with *rājā*: “... le roi (des hommes) et de (ceux) qui (sont) les dieux.” This is unnec. because *rākṣā* can govern the conjoined NP. It is accented because it opens the pāda. Another intricate “X and which Y” construction is found in vs. 3 (by my interpr.).

WG unaccountably take *rākṣā* absolutely and construe *nṛ̥n* with *pāhī*, which is ungrammatical because *pāhī* is accented; its object (*asmān*) follows. But note that the surface syntagm *nṛ̥n pāhī* is echoed in 10b *narāṁ nṛ̥pātā*.

Acdg. to Hale (70), Indra is referred to as an *āsura*-only 4x in the RV; it is possible that the occurrence here is connected to the elaborate play on *śūra*-, on which see comm. ad vs. 6.

Notice the openings of cd, #*tvām sāt(patir)* ..., #*tvām sat(yó)* ...

I.174.2: The derivation of the 2nd sg. verb *dánaḥ* is unclear. Most (see EWA s.v. *DAM*^f) associate it one way or another with √*dam* ‘tame, subdue’ -- beginning with Sāy.’s gloss *adamayaḥ*. Old and Ge suggest that there is a by-root *dan* beside *dam*; Re (GLV 81) concurs that it belongs to a “fausse racine,” probably generated from athematic forms where the root-final would have been followed by an ending beginning with a dental (type 2nd-3rd sg. *ágan* to √*gam*). Bloomfield (153) suggests it’s a nonce blending of √*dam* and √*han*. I wonder if it is not the detritus of the expected 9th cl. pres. **damnāti*, which would be cognate with nasal presents elsewhere in Indo-European and is the stem underlying attested *damāyá*- (< **d(a)m-n-H-yé/ó*-) and *damanya*-. In our 2nd sg. injunc., expected **damnās*, the interior nasal cluster could have been simplified and the whole remodeled as a thematic form (unfortunately requiring also accent retraction). Better, in fact: **damnāti* might not be the expected form; a reconstructed **dm-ne-H-ti* without restoration of a full-grade root syllable should yield **danāti*, which would have lost its obvious root connection with √*dam* and could without too much difficulty be remodeled to the thematic stem we appear to have. The 9th class *ramṇāti* would have pursued a different remodeling path.

In their n. WG suggest an unlikely deriv. from √*dā* ‘divide’, with an *-*éno*-nominal suffix, hence “Der ist Abtrenner des nachlässig redenden Stammes,” taking the nominals as gen. sg. rather than acc. pl. (as is grammatically possible). The only

advantage I see to this is that it works better with the ostensible 3rd sg. *dārt* in b, but there are other ways to handle that form.

As was just noted, the verb of b, pāda-final *dart* ($\sqrt{dṛ}$), appears to be a 3rd sg., in an otherwise 2nd sg. vs. It also ends in a (more or less) illicit cluster (*-rt*, with non-radical *-t*). With Old I assume that the original form was **daḥ* (< **dar* < **dar-s*). A final *-t* was falsely restored, possibly redactionally, on the basis of the identical pāda in VI.20.10c, where the 3rd sg. is appropriate and the sandhi situation favors the retention of the *-t*. See comm. there.

Note the double phonetic figure in *śárma śáradīr dart*, with *śárma śára-* and *-dīr dart* responding to each other.

Note the phonetic play in *#ṛṇór ... árṇā(h)#*.

Purukutsa is chronologically out of place here. Elsewhere he is a semi-historical figure, the father of Trasadasyu and a contemporary of Sudās, so Vṛtra should be out of his league and his time period. But he does figure in VI.20.10, immediately after the pāda identical to our b: VI.20.10d *hán dāsīḥ purukútsāya śikṣan* “He [=Indra] smote the Dāsa (clans), doing his best for Purukutsa,” where the action described can be contemporary (or in the immediate past) and therefore chronologically possible. I think it likely that Purukutsa has been imported from VI.20.10 to anticipate the more properly mythological Kutsa in vs. 5. These two agreements with VI.20.10 support each other and are good evidence for the dependence of our vs. on that vs.

I.174.3: Ge suggests that the *sūra-* in *sūrapatnīḥ* ‘whose lord is a champion’ is Indra himself, which seems correct. Note that Indra is addressed as *sūra* in vs. 9; see also comm. on *sūrtā-* in vs. 6.

Ge (/WG) takes *vṛtaḥ ... dyām ca* as the conjoined obj. of *ájā* ‘drive’; the two objects are then picked up by *yébhiḥ* (Ge: “Führe die Heere ... und den Himmel, mit denen ...”). The problem (besides the question of whether it’s possible or desirable to drive heaven anywhere) is that *vṛtaḥ* is fem. pl. and *dyām* is masc. sg., and *yébhiḥ* is neither one. I follow Old’s interpr., also adopted by Re, that sees an “X and which Y” constr. -- with the twist that the *ca* does not follow the rel. prn. (as in *yé ca devāḥ* in 1a), but precedes it, with another part of the rel. cl. fronted around it (*dyām ca yébhiḥ*).

By either interpr. the rel. cl. lacks a verb. Old, Re, and I supply ‘gain, conquer’ with heaven as obj. (And in keeping with the constant theme of these Agastya hymns, I assume the referent of *yébhiḥ* is the Maruts; Old simply “die Leute”; Re doesn’t specify.) Ge [/WG] “verbündet bist,” which seems kind of weak.

Initial *rākṣo* in c is Pragṛhya in the Pp., presumably 2nd sg. impv. *rākṣa + u*.

The standard tr. take *aśúṣaṃ tūrvayānam* as two PNs, but I see no reason to. As noted in the comm. ad I.101.2, *aśúṣa-* is otherwise only used of the demon Śuṣṇa, but this strong association surely results from their phonetic similarity. Semantically it fits Agni quite well. As for *tūrvayāna-* it is sometimes a PN (e.g., I.53.10), but its first member must be based on the verb stem *tūrvati* ‘go in triumph’ vel sim., and the literal sense of the compound is appropriate for Agni. See the very similar analytic phrase VI.15.5 *tūrvan ná yāman* “like the one going in triumph on his course,” where Agni is the referent.

There is difference of opinion on how the simile works in d. Flg. Old, Re, and the line of least resistance, I resupply the verb *rākṣa* from c, maintaining Indra as subj., compared to a lion. Ge (/WG) take the subj. as Agni and then must supply another verb,

not available in the context. This seems like too much machinery to me, since the pāda is readily interpretable on the syntactic pattern in c.

I.174.4: Ge takes ab as a direct quote (uttered by unidentified speakers). He presumably does this because of the difference in tense/mood (subjunctive vs. injunctive) and person (2nd vs. 3rd) between ab and cd. But since such switches are common in the RV, the direct speech does not seem necessary or contextually supported.

I.174.5: One of the few “future imperatives” in the RV: *vr̥hatāt* in c, following *vāha* in pāda a. Ge and Re also supply an impv. in b (“lenke,” “attele”), but this pāda makes a fine nominal clause (so also Hoffmann, Inj., 190).

I.174.6: This vs. joins Indra’s overwhelming aggressive power with the moral force of the three principal Ādityas. Those who offend against the strictures of the Ādityas get utterly destroyed by Indra, in a partnership that one might expect to be more prominent in the RV; X.89.9, adduced by Old, shows the same cooperative enterprise in clearer form.

I take the pf. part. *jaghanvān* here as the equivalent of a pluperfect (in the English grammatical sense), a past anterior, since there are no finite forms with that function.

The standard tr. take both *mitréru-* and *codá-* as PNs. This is certainly the easy, and tempting, way out. But both can be (and in my opinion should be) given lexical weight. The easier one is *codá-*, a transparent derivative of \sqrt{cud} ‘bestir, incite’. Gr’s interpr. of the compound (< Roth), that *codá-* ‘inciting, goading’ is used of soma, makes good sense in context, since Indra performs his feats of strength under the influence of soma.

As for *mitréru-*, my interpr. is based on, but modifies, Old’s suggested *mitrā-īru-* “die Mitra (zur Rache ihrer Treulosigkeit) in Bewegung setzen.” He seems to envision the god Mitra being sent to punish the disloyal, but those who send Mitra to effect this punishment should be on the side of good, not subject to Indra’s smiting as here. I take *mitra-* here as the common noun ‘ally’ and the *-īr(u)-* as expressing a hostile dispatching of their erstwhile allies. Both those who dishonor their alliances in this way and those who lack piety (*ádāsūn*, b) violate the norms of Ārya society that are overseen by the Ādityas.

Although of the trio of principal Ādityas only Aryaman is named in this vs., Mitra lurks in the compound just discussed. Varuṇa, unnamed, is present along with Mitra in the dual pronoun *ayóḥ* (in *sácāyóḥ*; see the same sequence in III.54.2). Although the Pp reads *āyóḥ* and Ge accepts this reading (though see his n. 6c), I follow Old’s alternative analysis (so also Re, WG) as gen. du. demon. *ayóḥ* and his identification of the two as Mitra and Varuṇa. I assume that “saw before them Aryaman with those two” implies that the evil-doers have a vision of the three Ādityas sitting in judgment (vel sim.) before Indra destroys them.

śūrtá- is generally taken with *śṛṇāti* ‘crushes’, etc. ($\sqrt{śṛ}$), but the vocalism is surprising; we would expect **śūrtá-*, like AV *śṛṇá-*. Alternatively JC (as yet unpubl. paper on rounding of syllabic liquids in Iir.) suggests (modifying an old idea of Hopkins) that *śūrtá-* is a nonce creation to a pseudo-root $\sqrt{śūr}$, extracted from *śūra-* ‘hero’. The apparent ppl. *śūrtá-* is positioned in this hymn approx. halfway between *śūra-patnīḥ* in 3 and the voc. *śūra* in 9c, another ex. of Agastya’s somewhat skewed ring composition in

this hymn. One can almost see Indra earning his champion-hood: in vs. 3 he is indirectly called a *sūra*-; in our vs. he exercises the *sūr* that (playfully) underlies the designation *sūra*-; in 9 he can therefore be so addressed. Note that this *sūr* phonological figure may be supported by phonetically similar *asura* addressed to Indra in 1b and *sūrah* ‘of the sun’ in 5c. I am persuaded by Clayton’s disc., esp. since this is exactly the sort of thing that Agastya would do. How to render *sūrtá*- in English as a passive is difficult: “they were be-be-championed / overrun by a champion” doesn’t work. JC tentatively tr. ‘were conquered’; I might stick with the publ. tr., though it is misleading about root affiliation.

I.174.7: As often in a mythological context, *kaví*- by itself seems to refer to Uśanā Kāvya. The previous mention (vs. 5) of Kutsa, often associated with UK, supports this assumption.

arkāsātau probably has a double sense. In the ritual context the *arká*- are the chants (see nearby I.176.5), but in the mythological context supplied by vs. 5 (esp. c), it can be the rays of the sun. So VI.26.3, which contains both UK and Kutsa.

“Making earth a pillow” is surely a euphemism for sending him to “his eternal rest,” “putting him to sleep” among other such sayings. The “woeful womb” of d is a similar expression. Both remind us of 4a “they will now lie in the same womb,” clearly also referring to the grave.

Ge tentatively takes the referent of fem. “three” (*tisráḥ*) as rivers, and he is followed by Re and WG. Although this identification handles the gender and the fact that the adj. *dānucitra*- (3x) is once used of waters (V.31.6), it runs into the problem that the canonical number of rivers is seven, not three. It is rather the divisions of the world/earth that are regularly triadic; cf. fem. *tisráḥ pṛthivīḥ* (I.34.8), *tisró bhūmīḥ* (II.27.8). Although “bright with drops” may not be the most natural way of referring to the three worlds, I think the numerology trumps the adjective -- which could, in fact, mean ‘bright with gifts’, not ‘drops’.

Ge takes the loc. *mṛdhí* as parallel to loc. *duryoné* (“in ein böses Nest, in Missachtung”), and as so often he is followed by Re and WG; all of them also take *kúyavācam* as a PN. But given *mṛdhṛāvācaḥ* ‘of scornful speech’ in 2a, it seems better to give *kúyavāc*- lexical value and construe it with *mṛdhí*.

I.174.8: There is much disagreement about the first hemistich because of the uncertain grammatical identity of several forms as well as a sandhi problem in pāda a and a hapax in b. Let us begin with the sandhi problem. The clear neut. pl. *sānā tã* “those old (things [=deeds?])” that opens the verse seems rhetorically paired with *návyā* ‘new’ towards the end of the pāda, but in its sandhi situation, before vowel-initial *āguḥ*, *návyā* should underlyingly end in *-āḥ*, a masc. nom. pl. or fem. nom./acc. pl. (so Pp). Most standard tr. try to reflect this sandhi one way or another: Ge takes the ref. to be *nábhaḥ* in b, which he takes as a fem. pl. root noun *nábh*-. But “These are your old (deeds). New (clouds) have come” is, with all due respect to Ge, absurd. Old takes both *sāhaḥ* and *nábhaḥ* of b (with better semantics than ‘clouds’ -- viz., “neue Siege und Berstungen”) as the referent of *návyā(h)*, though he does show some sympathy with Gr’s suggestion that *návyā* is the neut. pl. we want, in hiatus. Re supplies “hymns” with *návyā(h)* ... *nábhaḥ*, which has no contextual support. Only WG, at least by implication, allow the neut. pl. interpr.: “Alt sind diese deine (Heldentaten), o Indra. Neue sind (gerade) (hinzu)gekommen.” I think

this is the only sensible way to interpret the passage: rhetorical patterning outweighs sandhi. The same hiatus of *návyā* before a vowel is found in V.29.15 *yā ... návyā ákarma*, where two vss. before (V.29.13) *yā ... návyā kṛṇávaḥ* essentially guarantees the neut. pl. interpr.

The fem. pl. interpr. of *návyā(h)* is even less likely if *sáhaḥ* and/or *nábhaḥ* are not taken as fem. pl. root nouns. As already noted, Old does so take them, and Ge has the same analysis of *nábhaḥ*, but not *sáhaḥ*, which he appears to take as a 2nd sg. verb in imperational usage. Re takes *nábhaḥ* as a fem. pl. adj. and *sáhaḥ* as the neut. sg. of the *s*-stem; for WG *sáhaḥ* is a nom. pl. fem. to a root noun and *nábhaḥ* a gen. sg., also to a root noun, dependent on *áviraṇāya*. The lack of agreement on basic grammatical identity almost reminds us of the interpretive chaos created by the Old Avestan Gāthas. For my part I take both *sáhaḥ* and *nábhaḥ* as 2nd sg. injunctives -- *sáhas* as the only act. finite form of the thematic stem *sáha-* (though cf. part. *sáhant-*), which is fairly well attested in the middle; *nábhaḥ* as the act. transitive corresponding to med. intransitive 3rd pl. impv. *nábhantām* “let them burst,” found esp. in the famous Nābhāka refrain (VIII.39-42). The fact that the next two pādas (8c, 8d) open with 2nd sg. injunctives (*bhinát* and *nanámah* respectively) and that I.173 is characterized by pāda-initial 3rd sg. injunctives (see comm. above) supports the verbal interpr.

As for the rest of pāda b, I supply ‘strongholds’ (*púraḥ*) from pāda c with *pūrvīḥ*, as in, e.g., I.63.2, II.14.6. The hapax *áviraṇa-* I take as containing *rāṇa-* ‘joy’ / ‘battle’, with both meanings in play in the cmpd. The form contains both the privative *a-* and what I consider a pleonastic *vī*, both meaning ‘without’. Although these elements might be expected to cancel each other out (“not without joy/battle”), I think the *vī* is included to allow a buried pun on *avīra-*, suggesting “for their unmanning” in addition to “for lack of joy / for non-battle [=end of battle].” The godless are supplied from the 2nd hemistich.

After the travails of ab, the rest of the verse is fairly straightforward. I supply *vísah* ‘clans’ with *ádevīḥ* on the basis of the occurrence of this expression elsewhere (e.g., VI.49.15) and take *bhídaḥ* (which, unlike the two *-ah* forms in b, I do interpr as the acc. pl. of a root noun) as a kind of proleptic cognate acc. with *bhinát*: “split ... into smithereens.” I would in fact now substitute this more colorful expression for the publ. tr. “split into pieces.”

I.174.9: This vs. is identical to VI.20.12. This connection, in addition to the identical pāda I.174.2b=VI.20.10c establishes a relationship between the two hymns that makes the dependence of *dart* in our 2b on the one in VI.20.10c more likely.

The apparent *-sí* impv. betrays its origins as an *s*-aor. subjunctive by appearing here in a subordinate clause, where impvs. are not licit.

I.175 Indra

I.175.1: The simile and frame in 1ab seem on the surface somewhat flat-footed, and the standard tr. try to fix it one way or another. Both Ge and Re take the simile to be *máhaḥ*, *pātrasyeva* (e.g., Re: “telle la grandeur de la coupe-à-boire”), with *mádaḥ* the frame (“A été-juste bu ... le breuvage-d’ivresse ...”). But this requires the simile to straddle the pāda boundary, with the simile marker *iva* in the wrong place. I think it is instead a sort of reverse simile, with the actual object (*mádaḥ* ‘exhilarating drink’) put into the simile and

the element in the frame what one would expect it to be compared to (*māhaḥ* ‘might’) “might has been drunk like an exhilarating drink.” Such a poetic trick should not be utilized too often, but the reversal of expectations is a bracing way to begin the hymn.

I.175.4: As noted in the publ. intro., the poet (*kave*) addressed here is surely Uśanā Kāvya.

I.176 Indra

I.176.1: Pāda b contains a pleasing if elementary figure *īndram indo vṛṣā viśa*.

śātrum opening d is neatly positioned so that it can serve as obj. both to *invasi* and to *vindasi*; note that these verbs rhyme and their root syllables are almost mirror images of each other.

I.176.2: The syntax of the simile in cd is surprisingly intricate. First, though *ānu svadhām* [/svadhām ānu] is a common syntagm (“following / in accord with (one’s) independent will,” e.g., I.33.11, 88.6, 165.5), the two words are not to be construed together here (sim. V.34.1). However, their common association probably accounts for the displacement of the rel. *yām* to the right of *svadhā* even though *ānu* governs *yām*. Further, though *yāvam* ‘grain’ in the simile logically matches *svadhā* in the frame (at least in my interpr.), they are in different cases: nom. and acc. respectively (*yāva-* is masc. and must be acc.). The acc. is due to the fact that *yāva-* is several times obj. of √*kṛṣ* ‘plough’ (I.23.15, VIII.22.6). Thus, though, given the way Sanskrit similes work (with the verb held constant and the nominal elements matched), *yāva-* should be nominative, the presence of the part. *cārṣat* ‘ploughing’ has attracted it into the acc. appropriate to the obj. of that verb. The various tr. treat this difficult construction in various ways, but mostly bleach or manipulate the meaning of the pass. *upyāte* in ways that seem illegitimate to me -- starting with Gr, who glosses *ānu ... upyāte* first as ‘sich jemandem nachwerfen’ but then waters this down to ‘nachgehen, nacheilen’. Ge’s “dem die Svadhā nachzieht” essentially follows Gr’s lead, an interpr. that makes nonsense of the simile (“wie der pflügende Stier der Gerste”), since the animal ploughing does not *follow* the sown grain but necessarily precedes it. (Without a ploughed furrow, there’s no place to sow.) WG give *upyāte* its due lexical value, but this again twists the simile into semantic knots: as with Ge’s interpr. the nom. bull (*vṛṣā*) is made parallel to nom. *svadhā* in syntactically satisfactory fashion, but this means that the bull is being sown, which is not at all *semantically* satisfactory: “dem hinterher die Svadhā gesät wird, wie der Stier der die Gerste pflügt.” Only Re seems to manage both syntax and sense, though his tr. introduces considerable machinery: “lui derrière qui (sa propre) autonomie est semée comme (on fait en) labourant (le champ d’) orge, (lui que est) le dieu mâle.”

What the hemistich is conveying is another issue. I do not understand how *svadhā-* can be strewn. The picture evoked by the simile is of a powerful bull (not the usual plough-animal -- ideally they are more docile) pulling a plough, with lavish amounts of grain being scattered in the resulting furrow. It could be that the *svadhā-* refers to the autonomous power of others, which gives way to (/is strewn down after) the progress of Indra the bull. Or his own *svadhā-* is metaphorically sown to bear fruit in due course. But neither of these explanations do I find convincing.

I.176.3: On the specific nuance of *spāśáyasva*, with the root variant *spāś* (versus *paś*, so common in *pásyati*) and middle voice (again, versus *pásyati*), see Jamison (-áya-, 167).

I.176.4: I take *sūrís cid ohate* as logically concessive, with this value signaled by *cid*, although I would prefer an accented verb.

I.176.5: This vs. has elicited an extraordinary amount of discussion and disagreement, which cannot be fully rehearsed here. I will only sketch my own interpr., which is closest to Old's. I take the *āvaḥ* that opens the verse as the verb of the main clause and the only surface word of that clause. The obj. 'him' (**tám*), referent of the following rel. prn., has been gapped, exactly as in 3c. The cmpd. *sānuśák* in b I analyze as *sānu-śác-* (rather than *sa-ānuśák-* with Gr and others); it is a reference to soma, which famously grows in the mountains. For detailed disc. of the cmpd and the passage see Scar (594), though I cannot follow his suggestion that the 2nd member belongs to *√sañj* 'hang' and refers to a quiver 'hanging on the back'.

In d the publ. tr. "helped him to prizes" goes a little too fluently into English. The loc. *vāḥjeṣu* might better be taken as the usual truncated loc. absol. "when prizes (were at stake)."

Most other tr. take c with ab, with d separate, whereas I attach c to d. There is no way to tell, but I think the contrast set up here is between the ritual (signalled by the loc. *arkéṣu* "at the chants"), where Indra will receive what he wants (soma), and the contest (*ājaú*), where Indra's client will do so.

I.177 Indra

I.177.1, 3, 4: The appearance of two instances of the gerund *yuktvā* and one of *niśádyā* may be a sign of the hymn's lateness since the gerund is quite marginal in the RV.

I.177.3: The hemistich-internal enjambment in ab -- ... *vīṣā te, sutáḥ sómaḥ* ... -- is noteworthy, esp. because b is a repeated pāda (VII.24.2b), and in its other occurrence the pāda is syntactically self-contained. In fact, WG tr. the two pādas separately here, with *vīṣā* in pāda a referring to Indra and *te* a gen. with *rátham*: "Auf deinen stierhaften Streitwagen steige als Stierhafter." This isn't impossible, but the other interpr. (fld. by Ge and Re) seems more natural.

I.177.5: Ge takes *vástoḥ* as dependent on *vidyāma* ("Wir Lobsänger möchten ... den neuen Tag erleben"), but *vástoḥ* is almost always a temporal marker elsewhere (e.g., in nearby I.179.1). I think rather that *vidyāma* simply anticipates the identical verb that opens the refrain pāda. For further disc., see comm. ad VI.24.9, whose pāda c is identical to our c (also X.89.17).

I.178 Indra

I.178.1: The crucial word *śruṣṭi-* is ambiguous: it may refer to the attentive hearing Indra gives to our praises and desires or to the obedience (based on *our* "attentive hearing") that

we have shown towards Indra. The publ. tr. reflects the first possibility, but I think both may be meant, though Indra's role as a hearer in 3b may support the first interpr. The other exx. of *śruṣṭī-* are not clearly diagnostic.

Ge takes "us" (*naḥ*) as the implicit obj. of *mahāyantam* ("der uns gross macht"), but *mahāya-* ordinarily takes a god (indeed ordinarily Indra) as obj., and most tr. so render it.

For the difficult phrase *pāry āpa āyóḥ*, see publ. intro. It is variously rendered in the standard tr.

I.178.2: See publ. intro. for the mismatch in b between the dual subj. *svásārā* and the pl. verb *kṛṇávanta*, with the possible semantic explanations given there (multiple days and nights or multiple fingers on the two hands). It's also worth noting that the verb we expect, the middle 3rd dual athematic subjunctive, may not have been thoroughly anchored in the poets' Sprachgefühl, since relatively few such forms are attested to any stem type. We should expect **kṛṇávaite* (or *-ete*), which is not found, though we once get *kṛṇvaite* (VI.25.4) with the wrong grade of the subjunctive suffix. In the absence of a firmly established form in this slot in the paradigm, the poet may have opted to fall back on a more familiar and easily generated one, the 3rd pl.

Gr assigns *aveṣan* to a separate root $\sqrt{viṣ}$ 'sich ergiessen', not to the well-attested $\sqrt{viṣ}$ 'labor'. This division is tentatively accepted by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *VEṢ*), argued for by Narten (s-aor., 245), and accepted by Gotō (1st class, 299). The tr. of both Ge and WG reflect this analysis, though Re's does not. Since 'labor, toil' works fine for the three forms that Gr assigns to this other root (nearby I.181.6 and VIII.75.11 in addition to this one) and for the one added by Narten (X.114.1), I see no reason to make the separation.

Ge unaccountably tr. *sakhyā váyaś ca* as instr. The reasons he gives (n. 2d) seem insufficient, esp. as a conjoined acc. phrase makes perfect sense.

I.178.3: For the odd position of *ca* see Klein DGRV I.75.

I.179 Agastya and Lopāmudrā

I.179.1: The first hemistich contains a predicated perfect participle *śaśramāṇā*.

I.179.1–2: The final pādas of these two verses depict a neatly contrasting sexual conjunction, with the males serving as subject of the first version and the wives the second. The pādas are almost identical (an effect difficult to convey in English), with only the initial preverb in tmesis and the form of 'bulls' differing, since the form of "wives," though acc. in 1d and nom. in 2d, is the same:

1d *āpy ū nū pátnīr vṛṣaṇo jagamyuḥ*

2d *sám ū nū pátnīr vṛṣabhīr jagamyuḥ*

Both seem to convey a legalistic prescriptive force. See disc. ad X.10.3.

I.179.3: I take the first two of the three 1st du. subjunctives (b *abhy áśnavāva*, c *jáyāva*, d *abhy ájāva*) as hortatory, with the third, in a subordinate clause, as future in value.

Pāda d has been variously interpreted. The major issue is what (if anything) is the object of *abhy ájāva*, a problem made slightly more acute by the fact that *abhí* is not

otherwise found with \sqrt{aj} until the ŚB (see Ge n. 3cd), making it likely that it owes its *abhí* to the parallel verb in 3b, *abhy áśnavāva*. Thieme's solution (Gedichte 76) is the most radical: he makes the duals *samyāñcā mithunaú* the object: "wenn wir die beiden [Heer-]Hälften dem gleichen Ziel entgegenführen," seeing Agastya and Lopāmudrā as leading two different wings of a metaphorical army. This is not impossible, but the fact that the duals are so appropriate to be the dual subject makes assigning them elsewhere seem somewhat perverse. Other tr. suggest other objects: Ge, on the basis of ŚB II.3.3.16, supplies 'ship', Re (and WG) 'chariot' (WG 'Rennwagen'). Re tentatively specifies "le char de la vie?"; I would suggest rather the chariot of the sacrifice, given that that image is extremely common and that Agastya seems to be trying to redirect Lopāmudrā's energy into ritual pursuits. However, I'm not sure that any object needs to be supplied; the publ. tr. reflects an absolute usage 'drive on'. Another small issue is the sense of *mithunaú*. For Insler (Vedic *mith*, 165), it is used contrastively with *samyāñcā*: "if we, who are now opposed, shall race on in harmony." But the standard use of *mithunaú* to refer to the complementary oppositional halves of a pair, esp. a married couple, makes this otherwise appealing reading less likely.

Note the phonetic echo: c *ājím* # / d *ājāva* #.

I.179.4: As noted in the publ. intro., with the Anukramaṇī and Sāyaṇa as well as Thieme, I take Agastya as the speaker of this vs., contra the standard modern assignment to Lopāmudrā (Ge, Re, Doniger, WG). The question is of some importance, because it determines the identity of the "me" whom desire has overcome. I see the verse as expressing Agastya's sudden surrender to his own latent and then aroused sexual desire; others must see Lopāmudrā as continuing to assert her desire as in vss. 1–2 to the chaste Agastya. But in that case I don't see how the sex would have taken place, since Agastya was unwaveringly against it in vs. 3. Certainly assigning it to Agastya makes for a more psychologically complex portrait.

Crucial to the interpr. that assigns the verse to Lopāmudrā is the syntactic function of the gen. phrase *nādasya ... rudhatāḥ* and the meaning of the part. *rudhánt-*. In the Lopāmudrā-speaker view the genitive is an objective genitive: "lust for the *nāda-rudhánt-* has come to me [=Lopāmudrā]." The participle then belongs to \sqrt{rudh} 'obstruct' and refers either to Agastya's ascetic self-control by withholding his semen (Ge flg. Sāy, Doniger) or to his warding off the importunate advances of his wife (WG). In the Agastya-speaker view the genitive is subjective and the participle belongs to \sqrt{rudh} 'grow, mount'. Although Re claims that 'grow' is "faiblement attesté" for *rudh*, "feebly" isn't "not," and in any case the attestation is more robust than Re seems to recognize. With the 'grow, mount' meaning, *nādasya ... rudhatāḥ* is a pun: the mounting bull (*nadā-*) and the growing reed (likewise *nadā-*), with the latter a metaphor for the penis. For a somewhat indecisive disc. of the possible meanings of the phrase see Old.

I.179.5: As Thieme points out, the last pāda, "for of many desires is mortal man," bears the mark of a popular saying, with the *I*-form *pulu-* in place of standard *puru-* 'many' in *pulu-kāmaḥ*. *pulu-* is found only once elsewhere in the RV, in *pulv-aghā-* in the Vṛṣākapi hymn (X.86.22), which also belongs to a more vernacular register.

I.180 Aśvins

I.180.1: Contra Ge (/WG) I supply ‘honey’ as the obj. of *pruṣāyan* on the basis of IV.43.5 ... *mádhu vām pruṣāyan*, etc.; it can be recovered contextually from pāda d.

I.180.2: This is a difficult verse to construe, primarily because of the anomalous *yád* that ends pāda a. It cannot (or should not) mark that pāda as a subordinate clause because the verb *nakṣathaḥ* is unaccented. But if it is taken as marking what immediately follows as a subordinate clause, this is awkward at best, because the gen. phrase of b should simply specify the gen. *átyasya* in a. The Ge (/WG) solution is to supply an acc. goal for *nakṣathaḥ* (“Schnelligkeit”), which is picked up by the *yád* and the following genitive phrase: “reach (the speed) of the steed, which (speed) (is) of the ...” Old suggests that the *yád* that should subordinate pāda d has simply been stuck in early at the end of pāda a for metrical reasons -- an unlikely tyro’s error for a skilled poet like Agastya and an interpretational hypothesis that essentially tells us that all bets are off in Rigvedic syntax. This is not a worthy representative of Old’s usual acumen. Re suggests either the Ge solution or an anticipation of the *yád* of c.

There is a much simpler solution, which avoids these syntactic contortions and also avoids the need to supply an acc. goal with *nakṣathaḥ* or to allow *áva* √*nakṣ* to take a goal in the genitive. The solution is to take *yád* (/yát) as the substantivized neuter NA sg. of the present participle to √*i* ‘go’ (‘going’ → ‘movement’); for a similar interpr. see *āyát* in III.55.8 and also vs. 3c below. It is the goal of the verb, and the genitives of ab are dependent on it; there is then no syntactic break between the pādas. Hence my tr. “You descend to the movement of the steed ...”

Contra Ge, I do not think that the first member of *vípatman-* is *ví-* ‘bird’, but, with Gr, etc., the preverb *ví-*. The lexeme *ví√pat* is found elsewhere, incl. in an Agastya hymn I.168.6.

Ge (sim. Gr, WG) suggests that the referent of the genitives is the Sonnenrosse or Dadhikrāvan. This does not fit spatially with the *áva* ‘down’ of *áva nakṣathaḥ*. I think rather of the ritual fire: Agni is often compared to an *átya-*; ‘of wide flight’ would well describe the movements of the newly kindled fire; although I could not identify an unambiguous example of *nárya-* referring to Agni, ‘belong to men, manly’ is a reasonable description of his role; as is *práyajyu-* ‘foremost at the sacrifice’, which is applied to Agni at III.6.2. Reference to the ritual fire also makes sense in the context of the second hemistich where Dawn escorts the Aśvins to the sacrifice and a ritual officiant (to be supplied) solemnly invokes (*īṭte*) them. The root √*īḍ* is essentially restricted to such ritual situations.

I.180.3: The construction of this vs. is, if anything, even more challenging than the previous one, at least in its second half. As noted in the publ. intro., the first half concerns the favorite paradox of the “cooked” milk coming from the raw cow. My only deviation from the standard tr. is to take account of the odd position of *áva* in b, which I take to signal a transition from a general statement about the paradoxical nature of milk to a particular statement about the ritual situation. I re-supply *adhattam* with *áva*, but here it refers to the deposit of the ritual milk *down* on the ritual ground.

The problems lie in the 2nd hemistich, and the knottiest one is posed by the apparent mismatch between the case of the simile and its supposed correspondent in the

frame. To allow Ge's tr. to represent the standard, he takes *yád* in c as a neut. acc. referring to the milk of the previous hemistich and functioning as obj. to *yájāte* in d (roughly, "which (milk) the oblation-offerer sacrifices to you"). But the milk is also compared to the undoubted nominative phrase *hvāró ná súciḥ* -- a discrepancy he attributes to "Der Nom. statt Akk. im Vergleich," a false explanation that I hope I dispatched for good in my 1982 IJ article on case disharmony in RVic similes (and that Thieme [KISch 79–80 n. 4 = 1951: 8–9] also excoriates him for, though without an adequate alternative solution in my view). Another problem posed by this interpr. (even for those who deal with the simile in another way) is that it requires 'milk' to be the obj. of *yájate* with *vām* then an oblique case, but \sqrt{yaj} (without preverb) almost always takes an acc. of the divinity and an oblique case (generally instr.) of the offering substance. (Gr gives templates with acc. of the offering, but the passages supposedly conforming to them are few and far between.)

Again, a more radical approach to the text can eliminate the problems without compromising the grammar. I suggest that *yájate* in d is not the verb of the rel. clause introduced by *yád* in c, but starts a new cl., consisting only of *yájate havíṣmān* -- a simple statement ending a complex verse. The verb is accented because it opens its clause. What precedes in cd is a nominal clause, with 'milk' as *subject*. It is possible to assume that there is no verb at all but a gapped copula, but I actually think that there is a haplologized present participle **yát* following the rel. prn. *yád* (hence *yád *yád*), again, as in vs. 2a, the neut. N/A pres. participle of \sqrt{i} 'go'. Assuming a haplologized monosyllable here fixes the meter, making a 10-syllable line into a proper Triṣṭubh, with an opening of 5 and a fine break and cadence. Hence, the milk "which (*yád*) is going (**yát*) within (*antár*) the wooden cups (*vanínah*)." With milk as a nominative subject, the nominative simile is grammatically impeccable, without (in the mode of Thieme [/WG]) having to apply it to the *havíṣmān*, which does not work well. I believe that the "blazing twisting" entity is an image of a snake, but refers to the snaking flames of fire, going into the woods. Thus *vanínah* is read with both frame and simile. In the publ. tr. "is (now) going" should be marked with an asterisk.

I.180.4: This vs. also presents a number of difficulties. The easiest to deal with is *avṛṇītam*, the 2nd du. active imperfect, to the 9th class pres. to \sqrt{vr} 'choose', which is otherwise only middle. We should hypothetically expect middle **avṛṇāthām*, but in fact, acdg. to Macdonell, *no* athematic present in Vedic attests such a form, whatever the present class. The 2nd / 3rd ps. middle dual forms seem to have been avoided, and this active nonce form is probably modeled on 3rd *singular medial* impf. *avṛṇīta*, which is fairly common and occurs a number of times in just this metrical position, after an opening of 5 in trimeter verse. Ge (p. 258 n. 3) attributes the active voice to the fact that the Aśvins are choosing on behalf of someone else; this is an ingenious suggestion and merits consideration, but I think the formal problems tipped the balance.

The real crux in this vs. is *eṣé*, which has received almost as many analyses as there are RVic interpreters. For some of the various suggestions see Old ad loc., Ge's n. 4ab, Re ÉVP XVI ad loc., Scar (60–61), Keydana (Inf. 236 n. 135); there is no space (and I have no patience) to discuss them all here. I take it as a dat. inf. to \sqrt{is} 'send' + *ā*, built directly to the root. This root identification may be supported by vs. 6 of the next hymn,

I.181.6b *pūrvīr īśaḥ ... mādḥva iṣṇān* “sending many refreshing drinks of honey,” with similar sense.

I take the simile *apó ná kṣódaḥ* as obj. of this inf., parallel to the gharma drink that the Aśvins are sending here. With Gr, I take *apáḥ* as one of the rare sg. forms of *áp-* ‘water’, preserved here in what is almost a deconstructed compound. For the gen. with *kṣódaḥ* cf. I.112.12 *kṣódasā-udnáḥ* “with a gush of water.”

As for the 2nd hemistich, against the standard interpr. (incl. Old), I take *cd* as a single clause. I supply “refreshing drinks” (*īśaḥ*) as subj. of *prāti yanti* with *mādḥvaḥ* dependent on it (not a nom. pl., per Gr), on the basis of the phrase cited above from I.181.6 with *īśaḥ ... mādḥvaḥ*. The goal of *prāti yanti* is *vām* in pāda c. I take *pásvaiṣṭī* with the simile, despite the pāda break and position of the simile particle: *ráthyeva cakrā* is a fixed phrase with the *iva* firmly planted within (cf. X.10.7–8, 89.2, 117.5). As for the form, the Pp reads nom. sg. *-iṣṭīḥ* (apparently fld by Ge, WG, Scar); Gr suggests rather du. *-iṣṭī*. I also read *-iṣṭī*, but interpr. it as an instr. sg. or even as one of the rare loc. sg. *-ī* to *-i*-stems (see AiG III.155). The parallel stem *gáviṣṭi-* is primarily attested in the loc., though its sg. is the more orthodox *gáviṣṭau* (pl. *gáviṣṭīṣu*).

I.180.5: Yet another near impossible verse.

The standard tr. take *gór óheṇa* as a phrase (e.g., Ge “durch Anpreisung der Kuh(milch)”). This interpr. is favored by the adjacency of the two words and even more by the retroflexion in *óheṇa*, which must be triggered by the final *-r* or *gór* and speaks for a close syntactic bond. Nonetheless, in the publ. tr. I construe *góḥ* with *dānāya* (“for the giving of a cow”), in part because pāda d (in my interpr.) identifies the poet as lacking cattle and in part because “by praise of the cow” doesn’t make much sense as a way to attract the Aśvins. However, the close sandhi of *gór óheṇa* gives me pause, and I might change the publ. tr. to “With a laud of the cow might I turn you here for giving.”

Thieme gives a complex, sensitive, and in many ways appealing treatment of this vs. in KZ 92 (1978): 40–42. In the first hemistich he takes *dānāya* as ambiguous, between “for (our) giving (to you)” and “for (your) giving (to us).” The ambiguity is also reflected in his double reading of *góróheṇa*: with a division *gó róheṇa* (already suggested by Pischel), this can mean “by the rising of the milk” and refer to the boiling up of the milk offered to the Aśvins in the Pravargya ritual. With a division *gór óheṇa* it simply means “mit dem Ruf eines Rinde” and refers to the loud cry with which Bhujyu summoned the Aśvins. Given Agastya’s seemingly limitless verbal trickery, Thieme’s suggested double readings are certainly possible, though I wonder if *gór óheṇa* needs to be confined to the simile, rather than referring to the cry with which we attract the Aśvins.

The second hemistich is more contested. Most tr. take *kṣoṇī* as dual acc, which it of course can be, with the fem. adj. *māhinā* the subject and wanting a referent: e.g., Ge (/WG) ‘help’ (*ūtīḥ*). I instead follow Thieme (and in fact Gr) in taking *kṣoṇī* here as nom. sg., and I read *māhinā* in two ways, as nom. sg. with *kṣoṇī* and dual acc. with *vām* (Thieme only the latter). Thieme also takes all of the 2nd hemistich as referring to the story of Bhujyu, the Aśvins’ client whom they saved from the sea. This allows him to take *apáḥ* as ablative sg.: “a cry from the water,” where Bhujyu was languishing. I believe the Bhujyu reference is confined to pāda b, though Agastya’s extensive treatment of the story in nearby I.182.5–7 gives me pause and might lead me to reconsider. Meanwhile I take *apáḥ* in c as gen. sg., as in 4b. Note the similarity between 4b *apó ná*

kṣódaḥ and 5c *apáh kṣonī*. In my interpr., pāda c is parenthetical, describing the noise that attends the Ásvins' journey, produced both by their quick progress in the chariot and by the cries of us ritualists seeking to bring them to us. I then take d as a return to the 1st sg. speaker of a(b) and supply the verb from pāda a, *ā ... vavṛtīya* "might I turn you here." My interpr. depends crucially on Thieme's ingenious (and to me convincing) analysis of *ákṣu-* as 'without cattle', formed in opposition to *kṣumánt-* 'having cattle', and containing an underlying **p(a)śu-*. (See EWA s.v. *ákṣu-*²; Mayrhofer accepts this analysis.) The standard tr. are founded on *ákṣu-* 'net', found several times in the AV; Thieme allows the possibility of a second reading with the 'net' word, which seems a bit stretched.

I.180.6: As noted in the publ. intro., I take the 2nd hemistich as a punning depiction of the poet's patron, anchored by two adjacent and rhyming verbs that have double readings, *préṣad véṣad*. The former is generally taken as the *s*-aor. subj. to $\sqrt{prī}$ 'please' (Wh Rts, Gr, Narten [176], as well as the standard tr.), but it could also be assigned to *prá √iṣ* 'send forth' (*pace* Re, who explicitly rejects this analysis) and refer to the *praiṣa-* 'ritual prompt', a technical term in the later ritual but already reflected in the RV, at least in my view (cf. *purupraiṣa-* I.145.3 and comm. ad loc.). I think that both readings are present. Those who assign the form to $\sqrt{prī}$ interpret it as an unusual intransitive / reflexive ("becomes pleased, pleases himself"), in contrast to the standard transitive use of the active forms of this root. But this is unnecessary. The subject is the ritual patron (*sūrí-*), whose function is to distribute largesse to the poet and priests. It is used without object here to enable both the $\sqrt{prī}$ and the *prá √iṣ* senses to be actualized. The same goes for the next verb *véṣat*. This latter verb is generally taken also as an *s*-aor. subjunctive, to $\sqrt{vī}$ 'pursue' (e.g., Gr, Narten [246], as well as the standard tr.), and I agree that this is one of its readings. But I would also take it as an injunc. to $\sqrt{viṣ}$ 'toil', two forms of which are found nearby (I.178.2, 181.6). The two injunctive forms "gives the prompt and toils" express activities strictly limited to ritual performance; the two subjunctives "will please and will pursue" remain tied to the ritual but express its larger goals: "will please (the poet and priests) and will pursue (the gods)."

Pāda d expresses the redistribution of goods that characterizes the Vedic ritual system. The patron acquires goods, hence the *ā ... dade* 'has taken'; in this case the *vāja-* 'prize' must be the 'abundance' (*púraṃdhi-*) sent by the Ásvins in b. The gods give these goods in response to the praises produced by the poets. The patron then distributes these acquisitions to his clients, here the ritual functionaries who prompted the gods' gifts in the first place. There are several possible grammatical analyses of *mahé*, but the dominant *mahé* is the dat. sg. to the athematic stem *máh-*. Given the patronage situation depicted, I take it as short for *mahé *rádhase* "for great (generosity)," as in I.139.6, II.41.6=VI.45.27, VIII.2.29, 24.10, 45.24, 64.12, 93.16.

I.180.7: The nonce verbal form *vipanyāmahe* has attracted a remarkable amount of discussion; for a detailed and clear summary see Kulikov (-*ya*-presents, 143–46), though his passive/reciprocal interpr. I cannot follow. Insofar as there has been a standard analysis of it, it has been as a passive to \sqrt{pan} 'admire' (Wh Rts, reflected in Ge's tr.), but other root associations and morphological analyses abound, which I will not discuss further. It belongs with a group of other, better-attested formations: fem. noun *vipanyā-* and adj. *vipanyú-*, which I take as 'admiration' and 'seeking/expressing admiration'

respectively. (This point was made forcefully by Thieme in Fs. Risch [1986: 165–66], though I do not follow his ultimately etymology.) (For a similar system, cf. *vasūyā-(ti)*, *vasūyā-*, *vasūyū-*.) I take *vīpanyāmahe* as a denominative *-yā*-verb associated with these nominal forms, derived from the root $\sqrt{\text{pan}}$ (in my view); it is transitive in value and takes *vām* as object.

With Thieme (an analysis fld. by subsequent interpr. Kulikov WG), I take the last part of pāda b, *vī pañír hitāṁvān*, as a separate nominal clause, but unlike these interpr. I take it as the main clause attached to the causal clause beginning in pāda a. The phonological play of *vīpan(yāmahe) vī pañ(ír)* clearly contributed to the word choice here, as Kulikov also notes. As for the sense of this hemistich, it simply rephrases the purport of vs. 6: because we singers are doing our job in the ritual economy by praising the gods, our patron is being generous to us and cannot be labeled a ‘niggard’.

I.180.7–8: The poet then turns to the Aśvins’ part in this system and in 7cd presents another causal clause, parallel to the one in ab. Note the parallel openings 7a *vayāṁ cid dhí* and 7c *ádhā cid dhí*. This subordinated causal expression continues into vs. 8, with another parallel causal clause occupying 8ab and introduced in a similar way: 8a *yuvāṁ cid dhí*. In my, admittedly complex, interpr. of these verses, the 1st plural singers of 7ab modulate into the single (3rd ps.) singer Agastya in 8cd; this modulation is eased by not naming him until we reach the triumphant main clause of 8cd, where he boasts of the great wealth he has acquired from his poetry -- just like the singers of 7ab. And the transition from 1st ps. singers to 3rd ps. singer is enabled by omitting both subj. and verb in 8ab, where a human ritualist or ritualists should be the agents (see below) but where the ps. and no. of any verb would be problematically telltale.

The series of causal clauses begins by highlighting the Aśvins’ benevolent participation in the ritual system (7cd) and then the complementary activity of the priest in summoning them to the sacrifice and offering to them first (8ab) -- before coming to the logical conclusion in 8cd: that Agastya has achieved his just reward and is himself acclaimed among men.

With the standard tr. I take *anindyā* in 7c as a predicted voc., with c and d separate clauses, as the double *hí* suggests.

I.180.8: Based on my interpr. of the structure of vss. 7–8, I supply Agastya as the subject of 8ab, which not only lacks an overt subject but also an overt verb, for the reasons sketched above. Ge supplies “(opferte er),” WG “(ruft man an)”; I favor something like the latter (my ‘summons’), on the somewhat fragile basis that *yuvāṁ* is fairly frequently the obj. of $\sqrt{\text{hū}}$ ‘call, summon’ (cf., e.g., I.47.4=VIII.5.17 *yuvāṁ havante aśvinā*).

Curiously enough *prá* does not appear with verbal forms of $\sqrt{\text{sru}}$ ‘flow’, but the preverb probably indexes the ritual fact that Aśvins receive their offering at the Morning Pressing, the ritual event that leads off the soma offerings of the day.

vīrudra- is a hapax and difficult (but what is not in this hymn?), but with Ge, etc., I take it as a bahuvrīhi ‘having Rudra (or rather the Rudras=Maruts) away’, referring to soma. As Ge hints (n. 8b), this probably is a reference to the Agastya – Indra – Marut cycle that forms such a dramatic part of Agastya’s oeuvre. It would refer in part simply to the fact that this is the Morning Pressing, and the Maruts receive their soma at the Midday Pressing. But also more specifically to the fact that whether the Maruts should

have any part in the soma sacrifice and whether in particular they should have a share in Indra's part were fraudtly disputed in those hymns. Agastya is in effect pointing out that there was never any question of the Aśvins having to share with the Maruts. (That by some accounts the Aśvins only got included in the soma sacrifice belatedly might make this a question that would exercise them.) The actual form, *vīrudra-*, is reminiscent of the nominal clause *vī pañīḥ* ... "the niggard is away" in 7b.

Pāda c is fairly straightforward, and it is worth noting that *prá √ śams* here is used of a human (though not a king, unfortunately), reflecting what I think is its original domain. There is some debate about the value of *citayat*, which belongs to the functionally malleable stem *citāya-*. But in the absence of anything that could serve as an object, I take it as the intransitive it regularly is, 'appear, be conspicuous'. As for *sahásraiḥ*, everywhere else where it's clear, this instr. pl. refers to cows or other countable forms of wealth (so also WG in n.), and I take it as indicating the reason for Agastya's perceived prominence.

Yet another hapax troubles us: *kāṛādhunī*. Both Ge and WG refuse to tr. it. But given the other intractable problems in this hymn, it seems one of the lesser issues. The 2nd member *-dhuni-* is surely *dhúni-* 'noisy' or probably, substantivized 'noise, tumult'. It also seems reasonably possible to connect *kāṛā-* to *kāṛú-* 'bard' and assign it a tentative meaning 'praise-song' (so also EWA s.v. *kāṛú-*, citing also AiG II.2, etc.). The form in the text (with probable but not certain *-ī* final, so Pp.) can be an instr. sg. The remaining problem is the accent, which should make the cmpd a bahuvrīhi, a grammatical identity at odds with my tr. "with a tumult of praise-songs." AiG II.1.221 simply says it has abnormal accent, and with nothing better to offer, I will simply allow Wackernagel the last word on that subject. I take this simile with what precedes ("proclaimed as if with ...") rather than what follows ("is conspicuous by thousands as if by ..."). Its position would allow either, despite the pāda break.

I.180.9: The phrase *sūrībhya utá vā* is elliptical. Klein (DGRV II.171) suggests supplying 'singers', while I prefer 'us'. Either is possible. Passages like *sūrībhya grṇaté* (II.4.9, VI.4.8) favor Klein, while those like V.16.5 *yé vayāṃ yé ca sūráyaḥ* favor my solution. The explicit 1st pl. in the next pāda (*syāma*) tips the balance in my opinion.

I.180.10: On the thematic and punning ring composition of this vs. with vs. 1, see the publ. intro.

In the finale of b, *suvitāya návyam, návyam* is at least superficially adverbial and works well in that guise. However it's worth noting that *suvitāya návyase* with two datives is found in Jagatī cadence in III.2.13, V.11.1, VI.71.3, IX.82.5, and I imagine that ours is simply adjusted to the demands of Triṣṭubh (though we should of course expect *návyāḥ* if this involved simple truncation).

I.181 Aśvins

I.181.1: The 2nd du (*un*)*ninīthāḥ*, with primary ending, is formally problematic. It is tentatively assigned to a redupl. pres. by Whitney, but there is otherwise no evidence for such a pres., while the pf. is well established. Macdonell (oddly) calls it a pf. subjunctive, but the mood sign of the subjunctive is absent. It can't be an example of simple

avoidance of a paradigmatically shaky form, as in the case of **avṛṇāthām* in the preceding hymn (I.180.4), because the expected pf. indic. *ninyathuḥ* is actually attested, with the same preverb (*úd*) and the Ásvins also as subject (I.116.8, 24). Kü suggests (280–81) that the form is aiming to be an injunctive (that is, I assume, an unaugmented pluperfect) meant to be distinguished from a putative imperative **ninītam* with 2ndary ending, and therefore it takes a primary ending (a solution endorsed by WG). This seems needlessly complex and, *pace* Hoffmann (Injunc., 111), I find the notion that an injunctive would adopt primary endings for this purpose somewhat bizarre, since secondary endings are what *define* the injunctive. A simpler solution is to assume the form is a nonce present generated to ambiguous perfect forms like opt. *ninīyāt* (2x).

How to construe the genitives *iṣām rayīṇām* and *apām* is another problem. I take them as parallel partitive genitives, roughly flg. Old, rather than taking the former pair as dependent on *préṣṭhau* and the latter as a pseudo-ablative as Ge does.

I.181.3: The adjectival descriptor of the chariot *ahampūrvāḥ* is transparently derived from a nominal clause “I am in front / I’m ahead,” however unlikely this may be as the utterance of a chariot.

The second hemistich consists entirely of a nominal relative clause referring to the chariot, with two vocatives, the phrasal *vīṣṇa sthātārā* “you mounters of the bull” in initial position and *dhiṣṇīyā* near the end. The latter is commonly used of the Ásvins (see, e.g., I.182.1c, 2a, in the next hymn). Here the voc. is followed by the rel. pronoun *yāḥ*, which ends the clause. This is a remarkably odd position for a rel. pronoun, and since this supposed rel. cl. consists of nominative qualifiers of the subject of the main clause, *rāthah*, it need not have been a relative clause at all: the whole of the vs. could simply be a main clause. I think the *yāḥ* got stuck pleonastically on the end of this pāda to provide a monosyllable to make a Triṣṭubh cadence. (Cf. VI.63.6, a Triṣṭubh that ends *dhiṣṇīyā vām*, likewise with a final monosyllable.) No harm is done by this last-ditch conversion of the string of epithets in cd into a nominal rel. clause, but it is a metrically driven afterthought in my opinion. It should certainly not be taken as a standard ex. of rel. cl. word order.

The phrase *mánaso jávīyān* is an analytic version of *manojū-* in 2c, there applied to the horses, not the chariot.

I.181.4: Yet another troublesome dual verb form: *avāvasītām*. It is generally agreed (Wh Rts, Ge [more or less], Re, WG, Schaeffer [179–82], Kü [486–88]) that it belongs to the root $\sqrt{vās}$ ‘bellow’. (Gr assigns it to both \sqrt{vas} ‘wish’ and $\sqrt{vās}$ without comment; for reff. to further lit. on this form see Schaeffer 181–82, Kü 487–88.) But forms to that redupl. stem are overwhelmingly middle, while this form is active. Whether it is assigned to the intensive (Schaeff.) or the pluperfect (Kü), we should expect a medial 3rd du. with secondary ending. However, as was already noted with regard to *avṛṇītam* in the immediately preceding hymn (I.180.4), athematic 2nd and 3rd medial duals are simply not attested, and in that case the 2nd du. *active* form was substituted. I think the same thing happened here, and there is therefore no reason to construct specifically active semantics for this form, as do WG.

Ge (fld. by Re and WG) supplies *putráḥ* with c as well as d and also takes *súmakha-* as a PN, hence “(the son) of Sumakha.” These two decisions lead to the

interpretation that one of the Aśvins is of human origin, the other divine. So, most clearly, Re: “Dissociation inattendue des Aśvins, l’un d’origine humaine, l’autre divine.” This is a major and unnecessary interpretive leap, and based on dubious though not impossible analyses of two details: there is no syntactic or rhetorical reason to supply *putráh* in c, and *súmakha-* is ordinarily an epithet of gods; acdg. to Mayrhofer (PN 102) this is the only possible passage in which it would be a personal name and would refer to a human, not a god. Although this vs. does, unusually, distinguish between the two Aśvins, I see no reason to ascribe human origin to one of them on the basis of this passage, which is more naturally interpreted in another fashion. It should be noted that Ge expresses some doubt about his interpr. in his n. 4c.

I.181.5: *nícerú-* is a hapax (though cf. *céru-* VIII.61.7). It almost surely belongs to \sqrt{ci} ‘observe, discern’, with Debrunner (AiG II.860), despite Mayrhofer’s doubts (EWA s.v. *céru-*). The Aśvins are themselves called *nícetar-* in nearby I.184.2.

The 2nd member *rūpa-* in *piśāṅga-rūpa-* seems pleonastic, but it perhaps should have been rendered in tr., ‘whose form is tawny’, vel sim.

Pāda c causes several problems, both in grammar and in interpretation. To start with the latter, *anyāsya* is universally taken as referring to one of the two Aśvins, as the paired *anyāh-*s of 4ab do. However, as noted in the publ. intro., I think the referent of this stem has shifted. Both Aśvins together are referred to in the first hemistich of 5, with the dual pronoun *vām*. They are contrasted with a new “the other” in c, who can only be Indra: the presence of the two fallow bays (*hārī*) guarantees his presence, since these horses are uniquely Indra’s.

The grammatical problem is the apparent number disharmony between the dual *hārī*, if taken as the subject, and the pl. verb *pīpáyanta*; the accent of this verb is also potentially problematic. The standard interpr. construe the pāda in this way (cf. Ge “Die beiden Falben ... sind ... geschwellt”; so also Old, WG). The accent on a main cl. verb is attributed to the *anyá-* (... *anyá-*) construction (so Ge, n. 5), though he expresses some concern that in fact there’s only one *anyá-*. While it is true that the first of two clauses in a double *anyá-* construction generally has an accented verb (e.g., I.164.20, II.40.4-5, VI.68.3), this is not universal (cf., e.g., VI.57.2), and it is not the case with single *anyá-*. But the real problem is that a plural verb should not have a dual subject. Both these difficulties can be avoided if we supply a (dual) form of \sqrt{gam} in c, generated from the precativ *gamyāh* ending b, and start a new clause with *pīpáyanta*, which then owes its accent to its clause-initial position. The plural subject of this verb then includes both Indra’s pair of fallow bays (c) and the Aśvins’ tawny lead horse (a). (Ge [n. 5] somewhat similarly suggests that *pīpáyanta* is pl. because the *kakuhá-* of 5a is also thought of [gedacht wird], but my suggestion allows a grammatical solution, not merely a notional one.)

The adjective opening the next pāda would apply to all three horses and serve as a further plural specification of the group. Although the Pp. reads du. *-ā*, in sandhi it can as well be pl. *-āh*. The stem of this adjective is uncertain. Sāy., followed by Müller, reads *mathnā*; Aufrecht, *mathrā*. This is one of the relatively few variant manuscript readings in the RV; see Müller vol. I, p. 62, Aufr. vol. II, p. iv., and Old ad loc. On the basis of *mathrā* in VIII.46.23, Old opts for *mathrā*. This seems reasonable, though in terms of

sense which suffix we choose matters little, since either form would most likely belong to $\sqrt{\text{manth}}$ ‘churn, stir, shake’; used of horses, I take it to mean ‘agitated, excitable, skittish’.

I supply a participle of a verb of motion with *ví*, which governs *rājāmsi*. The two parts of this phrase are separated by the intrusive voc. *aśvinā*. See 7b below.

I.181.6: This vs. is quite parallel to vs. 5: it begins *prá vām*, with a verb of motion in the 2nd pāda to be construed with *prá* (*gamyāh* and *carati* respectively); the 3rd pādas are identical save for their first word, X *anyāsya pīpáyanta vājaiḥ*. I therefore construe the vs. as I did vs. 5 with “lead horse” the subj. of ab, Indra the referent of *anyāsya* in c, and a new clause beginning with *pīpáyanta*. That the subj. of d is plural gives support to my suggestion that 5d also contains a plural not a dual.

śarādvant- ‘having autumns/years’ in pāda a is a hapax, but presumably means ‘having (many) years’ -- thus ‘experienced’, of the lead horse.

As was noted ad I.178.2, I do not believe that we need a separate root $\sqrt{\text{viṣ}}$ ‘sich ergiessen’ for three passages, including this one; ‘toil, labor’ works for all the passages. My ‘roil’ here, besides conveniently rhyming with ‘toil’, is meant to express the physical motion of the waters at work.

I.181.7: I do not understand why the song would be flowing ‘in three parts’ (/’threefold’; *tredhā*), nor is the meaning and referent of loc. *bālḥé* clear. But comparison with *tribarhīṣi sādasi* “on the seat with three (layers) of barhis” in the next vs., 8b, may help. Assuming *bālḥá*- belongs to $\sqrt{\text{bamh}}$ ‘be/make thick, firm’, we can assign *bālḥá*- the sense ‘thickened, plumped up’ and suggest that *bālḥé* refers to the barhis, which has been plumped up invitingly, like a sofa cushion, for the gods to sit on, with its three layers ensuring a soft seat. As for *tredhā* I now think it qualifies not the song, as in the publ. tr., but the seat, and would now tr. “... flowing to the (ritual grass) plumped up threefold/in three parts.” As in 5d the two parts of this phrase *bālḥé tredhā* are separated by the intrusive voc. *aśvinā*.

I.181.8: The gen. phrase *rúśato vápsasaḥ* is standardly taken as the PN (Ruśant Vapsas) of the singer. As often when a PN explanation is offered, this is a convenient way of evading an unclear word or phrase. But *rúśant*- is a very well-attested adj. with a clear sense ‘gleaming, bright’ and does not otherwise form part of a PN. This leaves *vápsas*-, which I take as ‘wasp’ both here and in VIII.45.5 (*girāvápsa*, which I divide as *girā vápsa*, contra Pp.; see disc. in EWA s.v. *vápsas*-). The resultant “gleaming wasp” is, in my opinion, a description of fire; *rúśant*- is not infrequently a descriptor of fire, and ‘wasp’ would refer to the random movements of flames and/or the “sting” produced by flying sparks hitting skin. At least acdg. to the internet, one of the most common species of wasp in South Asia is *Ropalidia marginata* (often called the Indian wasp), a type of paper wasp that is remarkably flame-red in color, and, in YouTube videos, a cluster of such wasps on top of their nest looks rather like a flickering fire. Its sting is quite painful. Its “song” in this passage would either be the sound of the crackling fire compared to the buzzing of the wasps or else simply the hymn recited at the ritual fire.

The publ. tr. takes *nṛ̥ṇ* as gen. pl., flg. the standard interpr. Since I resist this interpr. in general (see comm. ad I.146.4, X.29.4), I would now take this as parallel to the *mānuṣaḥ* ‘sons of Manu’ favored in pāda d, with loose construction “swells (towards)

men” and emend the tr. accordingly. Although this is not particularly satisfactory syntactically, a multivalent *nīn* seems even worse to me.

The publ. tr. careless omits the *vām*; I would emend the tr. to “this very song ... swells for you ...”

The second hemistich concerns the soma, in my view, though Ge and Re both take the bullish cloud as an image of generosity and WG as morning mist. I take this phrase as referring to the soma swollen with water after its soaking; this image is then given both a real-world and a ritual sense, playing on two senses of *gór ná séke*. In the real-world image the bull is depicted as sexually aroused (swollen) in mating with a cow, lit. “at the insemination of a cow.” The root \sqrt{sic} frequently takes *rétas-* ‘semen’ as obj., and this is a shorthand way of expressing “at the pouring out (of semen) into a cow,” vel sim. But in the ritual image, “at the pouring out of the cow” refers to the pouring of milk and its mixing with the soma, a very common image that is regularly sexualized.

I.181.9: This vs. seems to be trying to aggregate as many divinities into the final summons as possible, and it does so rather awkwardly. On the basis of I.117.19 *áthā yuvām íd ahvayat púramdhiḥ* “P. called upon just you two [=Aśvins],” I take *púramdhiḥ* here as the separate (female) figure, rather than as an qualifier of Pūṣan like Ge. Also on the basis of that passage I supply ‘summoned’ (generatable from *huvé* in c) rather than making this part of the b clause with the verb *jarate* -- though very little depends on one or the other decision.

In c *grṇānāḥ* must be, quite unusually, transitive: it is ordinarily passive. I think the transitive value for this medial participle was induced by its etymological relationship with transitive *jarate* in b, mediated by the medial participle to that pres. stem, which also takes the singer, not the besung, as subj. See the very similar passage VI.62.1 *aśvínā huve járamāṇo arkaḥ* “I call upon the Aśvins, singing with my chants.”

I.182 Aśvins

I.182.1: On $\tilde{a}\sqrt{bhūṣ}$ with *vayúna-* see VIII.66.8

The first hemistich addresses the ritual performers in the plural, as they make final preparations for the sacrifice. Ge (fld. by WG) takes phrase *rátho víṣaṇvān* “the chariot has its bulls” as referring to the Aśvins’ chariot, which is presumably hitched up and on its way. This is certainly possible, but I think the chariot may rather refer to the sacrifice, as so often, and “its bulls” may be the Aśvins, who have arrived and so the sacrifice can be set in motion, or they could be the priests or even the paraphernalia of the prepared sacrifice. However, I have to admit that the next vs. focuses on the Aśvins’ chariot (2cd) and their skill as charioteers (2b), so Ge’s interpr. may be correct.

Ge takes *mádatā* in b as transitive, with the Aśvins, under the guise of the various duals in cd, as obj. But *máda-* is rarely if ever transitive, and it seems best to take cd as containing an annunciatory phrase pointing to the Aśvins’ presence (or soon-to-be presence) at our ritual.

The hapax *viśpālāvasū* is presumably a bahuvrīhi, like *vājínīvasu-* ‘having prize-winning mares as goods’, though Ge tr. as a tatpuruṣa, ‘die Gönner der Viśpalā’. WG’s “mit (der Rennstute) Viśpalā als (ihrem) Gut” reflects the compound type better and may well be correct. However, the cmpd must allude to the story (or wisp of a story), found

mostly in Kakṣivānt's oeuvre, about Viśpalā and the Aśvins: Viśpalā is a mare whose legbone the Aśvins stick back together so she can win a race. The most relevant passage for interpreting this cmpd may be I.112.10 *yābhir viśpālām dhanasām atharvyām sahasramīha ājāv ājinvatam* "with which you revived Viśpalā, to pursue the way, to gain the stakes in the contest with a thousand battle-prizes." (Cf. also I.116.15, 117.11, 188.8; X.39.8.) From these references to Viśpalā it does not appear that she belonged to the Aśvins (was their "Gut"), but rather was benefited -- healed -- by them in order that she could herself *win goods* in the contest. Hence my more convoluted tr. "who provided the goods to (the mare) Viśpalā." The idea in our passage is presumably that they made it possible for her to race and therefore to get the goods, so a lot is concentrated in that single cmpd.

I.182.2–3: The two 2nd dual middles, *vahethe* (2c) and *āsāthe* (3a), would both be better metrically with light 2nd syllables. On this phenomenon, see Arnold 129–30. A number of 2nd and 3rd dual middle forms invite this shortening. I do not understand it historically since Aves. has the *ā* in the athematic forms and the equivalent of *e* in the thematic ones (-*aēte*, -*ōīde*). As disc. at various points above (ad I.104.3, 178.2, 180.4, 181.4), 2nd and 3rd du. middle forms are problematic in general.

I.182.2: Parallel *īndratamā* and *marúttamā*, superlative in form, are generally taken to mean 'most similar to Indra / the Maruts' (Gr, Ge, WG). I suppose that is their ultimate purport, but I think the effect is stronger: the Aśvins are said to possess the qualities of those gods in an even higher degree than those gods themselves do. Idiomatic English would use the comparative: "more Indra than Indra" (or, in a well-known colloquial expression, at least in my childhood, "more Catholic than the Pope").

I.182.3: The sense of pāda a would be better conveyed by "what are you doing *there*?"

The main cl. *kīm āsāthe* lacks an expressed antecedent to *jāno yāh* in the following rel. cl., but it is not difficult to supply.

I.182.4: On *jambhāya*- 'crush', see comm. ad II.23.9 and my *-āya*-Formations, p. 93.

I.182.5: The story of Bhujyu, son of Tugra, is treated in I.116.3–5, also a Kakṣivānt composition. (See also Agastya's mention of it in nearby I.180.5.) Bhujyu was abandoned by his father in the middle of the trackless sea; the Aśvins make a boat for him and bring him home. Just as here, the boat(s) is(/are) described in I.116.3 as *ātmanvānt*- and in I.116.4 as having wings. The former is generally tr. as 'breathing' (atmend, WG) or 'possessing a soul' (beseelt, Gr, Ge). I wonder rather if the 'body, trunk' sense of *ātmán*- is at issue here, and it refers to a boat with a cockpit or hollowed-out well for sitting, rather than a flat raft. The "paunchy" (if that's what it means and if it refers to the boats) in 6c would support this interpr. The wings would then be sails. (The latter is an easy transfer; e.g., in English sailing downwind with the mainsail on one side and the jib on the other is referred to as "wing and wing.") Of course, I am not denying that the Aśvin-made vessel did actually fly (see pāda d), but I do suggest that there's a germ of realia in the description -- and that a boat with a body makes more sense than a boat with a soul.

With most interpr. I take *supaptanī* as an instr. sg. to a fem. nomen act.; see Old's exx. of similar phrases with a verb and *su*-compounded cognate instr. It is perhaps worthy of note that the new-style weak pf. *pet-* coexists here with the old style redupl. *-papt-*.

I.182.6: The construction and meaning of the last two words of pāda c, *jāthalasya jūṣṭā(h)*, are uncertain. Ge (/WG) and Re construe the gen. with *jūṣṭā(h)*, though Re readily admits that *jūṣṭa-* never elsewhere takes a genitive. He does not comment on the meaning or reference of *jāthala-*, but Ge (/WG) takes it as referring to the “bauchig (Wagen)” of the Aśvins; Ge further comments, “Die Schiffe trugen den grossen Wagen der Aśvin oftmals über das Meer.” This conjures up a ridiculous image, of four ships towing a bulbous wagon across the water like a water-skier or a barge -- a wagon that, moreover, we have no evidence for either in this hymn or in the other passages concerning Bhujyu. (In the fullest treatment, I.116.3–5, the Aśvins carry him with their ships [*naubhiḥ*, 3a] after Bhujyu has mounted a ship [*nāvam ātasthivāṃsam*]. There are no wagons, bulbous or otherwise.) And further, not only the case frame with *jūṣṭā* but its sense would be very peculiar; Ge tr. “die des bauchigen (Wagens) gewohnt sind” (not the usual sense of *jūṣṭa-*), WG “die dem bauchigen (Wagen) angenehm sind.” What would it mean for the ships to be “used to” or “agreeable to” a wagon? (Ge tries to get out of this difficulty by setting up a veritable towing service, operating “oftmals.”) This can all be avoided by separating the two words and interpr. *jāthalasya* as a genitive of description, ‘of paunchy (shape)’, applicable to the boats, which, as noted with regard to 5b, would support an interpr. of *ātmanvānt-* there as ‘possessing a body’. The one to whom the ships are *jūṣṭa-* ‘agreeable, welcome’ is then Bhujyu, who had been floundering in the sea and would surely be cheered at the sight of them.

I.182.7: With Gr, etc. (incl. Scar, p. 648) I take *nīṣṭhita-* to $\sqrt{sthā} + nīs$, not *nī*.

Ge seems to take *paryāśasvajat* either as contrary-to-fact in a rhetorical question or as a true anterior pluperfect, but as Kü points out (591–92), the pf. of $\sqrt{sva(ñ)j}$ is presential, so the pluperfect is simply a past tense. The form is anomalous in several respects. First, it has a retroflexed initial, despite following *-a-*, but this is easily accounted for: the verb is always accompanied by the preverb *pāri*, and the retroflexion has simply been carried over into this environment. (This is the only place where the verbal form doesn't immediately follow the preverb.) The root is also otherwise middle in inflection: pres. *pāri śvajate* (5x, beside 1x act. *pāriśvājat* VI.60.10, q.v.), pf. *pāri śasvaje* (4x). But our plupf. is active; it also has apparent thematic inflection (expect **āśasvak*). These two morphological features are highly reminiscent of the *aduhat*-type actives built to old *t*-less middle presents of the type *duhé*, with expected *t*-less imperfect **aduha*, remarked with the act. *-t* ending – so brilliantly analyzed by Wackernagel long ago. It seems that the pf. ending of *śasvaje* was analyzed as (if) a primary ending, with a corresponding secondary *-a*, which then required remarking.

parṇā has a double reading: in the frame ‘leaves’ (of the rescuing tree in ab), in the simile ‘feathers’, as Ge (n. 7c) points out.

The *mṛgá-* seems to be specifically a wild *bird*, like its Avestan cognate *mərəya-*. See comm. ad IX.32.4, X.136.6.

Ge tr. *śrómatāya kām* as “(euch) zum Ruhme”; that is, the Aśvins will accrue fame from their rescue of Bhujyu. This is certainly possible, and the stem *śrómata-* does

mean ‘fame’ once elsewhere (cf. VIII.66.9), though it usually means, by my interpr., ‘attentive hearing’ (VI.19.10, VII.24.5). Here also I take it to mean ‘hearing’: ‘for hearing’, that is, for the story to be heard. WG tr. “zur Gehorsamkeit” and in the n. specify that it is Bhujyu who should be obedient. Since as far as I know Bhujyu hadn’t been disobedient, and certainly not to the Aśvins, I don’t understand the interpr., esp. as *śrómata-* doesn’t elsewhere mean ‘obedience’.

I.183 Aśvins

I.183.2: Given its position, I do not think that *ānu* is a preverb in tmesis with *tīṣṭhathaḥ* (with Gr and apparently Ge [/WG]), since such preverbs usually move to a metrical boundary (or directly after the verb). Re suggests that we should supply *vratāni*, after *ānu vratāni* in 3b, but doesn’t provide a tr. or give any indication of what the whole would mean. However, I think his instinct is correct, that *ānu* implicitly governs an acc. with the meaning “following/according to X.” The X is, in my view, to be found in *krātu-mant-* ‘having resolve’; the construction is a blend of this possessive adj. and an underlying *ānu *krátum* (cf. VIII.63.5, though the phrase is not as common as I’d expected). Pāda-final *prkṣé* is infinitival, like *iṣayādhyai* in 3c.

I.183.4: The first hemistich shows a nice phonological progression (noted also by Re): the zero-grade *vṛk* of the wolf and she-wolf (*vṛko ... vṛkīr*) in pāda a develops into the full-grade *vark* of the etymologically and grammatically unrelated impv. *varktam* in b, which is followed by the rhyming impv. *dhaktam*. In the 2nd hemistich the lexeme *nī √dhā* ‘deposit’ appears both as the verbal adj. ppl. *nīhita(h)* and the noun *nidhī-*.

I.183.5: I agree with Ge that *nā* and *iva* in 5c mark a single simile, not two as WG tr. it.

I.183.6: “We have crossed to the further shore of this darkness” announces the end of the night and the beginning of the early morning ritual, to which the Aśvins come.

Given the well-established idiom *prāti √dhā* ‘aim (a praise-hymn like an arrow)’, I would now slightly change the tr. of b to “a praise-hymn has been aimed at you,” particularly in light of VII.73.1 *prāti stómaṃ devayánto dádhanāḥ* “aiming our praise song as we seek the gods.” The pādas preceding these two expressions, I.183.6a and VII.73.1a, are identical. For further disc. of the ‘aim’ idiom see my 2020 “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Fs. Lamberterie).

I.184 Aśvins

I.184.1: Just as the voc. *aśvinā* breaks up the phrase *rājāṃsi ... ví* in I.181.4 and *bālḥé ... tredhā* in I.181.7, the phrase *dívó nāpātā* referring to the Aśvins breaks up *aryáḥ ... sudāstarāya*, but more radically, since a pāda boundary intervenes.

I.184.2: The form *éṣṭā* is generally taken as the ppl. to *√iṣ* ‘wish, desire’ + *ā* (so Ge [/WG], Re; e.g., Ge ‘herbeigewünscht’). This is not impossible, but it should be noted that *√iṣ* ‘desire’ is not otherwise attested with *ā* in the RV. I prefer the interpr. of Gr, fld.

by Pirart (*Les Nāsatya* I: 385), which assigns it to \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice’. The lexeme \sqrt{yaj} is quite common and means ‘bring here/attract by sacrifice’, which fits the passage well.

I.184.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is rather puzzling. In the first hemistich the simile involving arrow-makers seems to have little to do with the content of the frame regarding the bridal procession of Sūryā. Nonetheless I think the two activities are related and, rather than supplying a verb ‘came’ to govern *vahatúm sūryāyāḥ*, with Ge (/WG), I follow Old’s interpr. (with Re). Old pulls the verb ‘make’ out of the root-noun compd. *īṣu-kṛtā* ‘arrow-makers’ and supplies a transitive form of the root to govern *vahatúm*: “... wie zwei Pfeilverfertiger (den Pfeil zum Glücksschuss zubereiten, bereitet ihr) o zwei Nāsatyas, als Götter die Brautfahrt der Sūryā.” This interpr. is supported by the fact that forms of \sqrt{kr} regularly govern *vahatúm*: VII.1.17 *ubhā kṛṇvānto vahatū* ...; X.17.1 *tvāṣṭā duhitṛé vahatúm kṛṇoti*; X.85.14 *syonám pátye vahatúm kṛṇusva*; cf. also X.32.3 *pumśá id bhadro vahatúḥ páriṣkṛtaḥ* with a ppl. The connection of these two semantically ill-assorted activities, arrow-making and bridal-procession-making, is facilitated by two features of the passage. On the one hand, *īṣu-kṛt-* is reminiscent of *īṣ* \sqrt{kr} ‘make ready, set right’, with the pseudo-preverb *īṣ-*. On the other, *śriyé* can be read in slightly different senses with simile and frame. As Old points out, Pischel already compared X.95.3 *īṣur ná śriyé* with our *śriyé ... īṣukṛtā*. (Though I should point out that I read gen. *śriyaḥ* contra Pp. in X.95.3, the association remains.) In our passage the Aśvins are compared with those who make arrows “for glory” (in battle vel sim.), whereas they ready the bridal procession “for beauty” -- both senses being within the normal range of the multivalent *śrī-*. I would therefore now add to the publ. tr. “... (make ready) the bridal procession of Sūryā for beauty.”

The second hemistich is more problematic. Ge (/WG) takes c and d as separate clauses and in c Ge reads *apsú* twice, once as the location of the action of the verb (“Es schweben ... auf dem Wasser”) and once with *jātāḥ* (“die Wassergeborenen”). Ge (/WG) then takes d as a nominal clause, “Abgenutzt sind die Joche wie die des reichen Varuṇa.” Such a statement seems not only like an utter non sequitur (what do Varuṇa’s worn-out yokes have to do with the Aśvins or their horses?), but also puzzling on its own (what are Varuṇa’s yokes, worn out or otherwise?). Moreover, as Ge, etc., point out, there is evidence from parallel passages that c and d belong together, since *jūrṇá-* appears in an uncannily similar passage about the Aśvins’ journey: I.46.3 *vacyánte vām kakuhāso, jūrṇāyām ádhi viṣṭápi* “Your lead (animals) twist and turn upon the (sea’s) broken surface.” Thieme (rev. of Lüders, *Varuṇa* I [ZDMG 101 (1951): 411 n. 2 = Kl. Sch. 646 n. 2]) produces a tr. that puts the two pādas together: “in Sprüngen gehn eure ... Spitzentiere, die in den Wassern des vielfachen (reichen?) Varuṇa (d.h. im himmlischen Meere) geborenen, über die gleichsam gealtertem (d.h. von Rissen durchfurchten und deshalb unwegsamen) Joche (=d.h. Wegstrecken von der Länge je eines Vorspannes ...).” Though I do not follow it in all regards (he construes *vāruṇasya* with *apsú*), his interpr. is considerably more convincing than the two-clause solution. He takes *yugā* not as ‘yokes’, but as “Wegstrecken von der Länge je eines Vorspannes” (rather like *yójana-*), hence the surface on which the horses *vacyánte*. The ‘worn’ (*jūrṇá-*) surfaces of Varuṇa are then, with Old, the waves of the sea, here called Varuṇa, after the association of that god with water, which is prominent later but already present in the RV.

I.184.4: Unaccented *mādhvī* is of course a dual voc. addressed to the Aśvins, but given its proximity to fem. nom. sg. *rātīḥ* ‘gift’, it seems possible that it was meant to evoke also an accented *mādhvī* modifying this word. (However, Re points out that the fem. of *mādhv-* is generally identical to the masc. in the RV.)

I.185 Heaven and Earth

I.185.2: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider the embryo here to be the sun, but various other identifications have been proposed.

I.185.3: Ge (n. 3ab; see also JPB Ādityas, p. 212)) plausibly suggests on the basis of parallel passages that the “gift of Aditi” is “das Lebenslicht.” On the basis of my rethinking of the adj. *anehās-* (comm. ad X.61.12), now think this gift is ‘without (physical) defect’, not (morally) ‘without fault’.

The them. adj. *anarvā-* is clearly derived from the well-attested bahuvrīhi *-n*-stem *anarvān-* (cf. also the thematized *anarvāṇa-*). The neut. NA to the *n*-stem should be **anarvā*, which is not found. In two instances in which it should modify a neut. acc. (I.37.1, VI.48.15) we find instead the masc. *anarvāṇam*, an adjustment probably meant to make the form more transparent (see comm. on those two passages). As for the supposed them. stem *anarvā-*, in two of the occurrences listed by Gr. the referents are neut. (*cakrām* I.164.2, *dātrām* here). In both passages the neut. NA *anarvām* comes at the end of an odd pāda before an even pāda beginning with a consonant. I think it is at least arguable that the original reading in both cases was **anarvā*, the expected neut. to the *n*-stem, which was redactionally altered to a thematic acc. The alternation has no metrical consequences. As for the other two forms that Gr lists to the them. stem, both (II.40.6, VII.40.4) qualify Aditi in the nom. sg. and have the form *anarvā*. They both most likely actually belong to a fem. *n*-stem (see JPB, Ādityas 210), whose nom. sg. has exactly that form, and though they are fem., they do not exhibit the fem. derivational suffix *-ī* (expect **anarvāṇī-*?).

I.185.4: The lexeme *ānu* √ *as* is fairly uncommon, but Agastya uses it twice elsewhere (I.167.10, I.182.8); the rather more common *ānu* √ *bhū* can mean ‘be devoted to’ (< ‘follow’), and that seems to be the sense here.

Most interpr. take *ātapyamāne* as ‘free from suffering’, but the more literal meaning of √ *tap* ‘be hot, scorch’ seems appropriate in the solar context I see here.

In “the pair among the gods” (*ubhé devānām*), referring to Heaven and Earth, *ubhé* ‘pair’ is dual, while in “along with the pairs among the days” (*ubhāyebhir āhnām*) ‘pairs’ (*ubhāyebhiḥ*) is plural. This is presumably because Heaven and Earth are a unique pair, whereas the two day-halves, Day and Night, are recurrent and can be thought of as multiple pairs -- though the dual can also be used of them, as in *āhanī* in 1d.

I.185.9: Ge (/WG) take *ūtī* as dual nom. (WG “beide Hilfen”), but Ge allows the possibility of an instr. and Re takes it as instr., as do I. I think it likely that Heaven and Earth have resurfaced here, in anticipation of their appearance in vss. 10–11, and they are the subj. of *sacetām*.

I.186 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is knit together by a shifting pattern of repeated initial preverbs and particles: 1a / 2a *ā* (with *āpi* 1c), *ūpa* 4a, which morphs into *utá* 5a, 6a, 7a, 8a -- the last 3 with *utá na īm* -- followed by *prá* 9a, 9b, 10a, 10b (which was anticipated by *pṛ* ... 8c. For the *prá*-s note 9a *prá nú*, 9b *prá yu*(...), 10 *prá ū*, 10b *pra pū*(...). Vs. 11 falls outside the picture. The repeated *utá*-s of vss. 5–8 reinforce the frequent additive quality of Viśve Devāḥ hymns.

I.186.1–3: The c-pādas of all three verses consist of a *yáthā* purpose clause with subjunctive.

I.186.1: This vs. signals the dedicands of the hymn obliquely: *viśvānaraḥ* ‘belonging to all men’ in b evokes its opposite number “all gods,” esp. since the sg. *devāḥ* occurs later in the same pāda. ‘All’ appears again in d, but with a different referent, ‘world’ (*viśvaṃ jagat* ‘the whole moving world’). The gods are presumably the addressees of pāda c, but only under the designation ‘youths’ (*yuvānaḥ*).

The initial *āpi* of c is somewhat puzzling. Ge (/WG) render it ‘auch’, which is harmless. Re takes it “au sense de *abhi*” (on what grounds?), as a perfectivizing preverb (again, on what grounds?). I am inclined to take it as a locational ‘nearby’, construed loosely with *naḥ*, despite the distance between the two words.

In d *manīṣā* can be nom. or instr. I follow Ge in taking it as the former, while Re and WG take it as the latter, with Re taking Savitar as implied subject and WG *viśvaṃ jagat*. There is general agreement that a verb ‘come’ should be supplied in d.

I.186.3: On pāda c see Thieme, *Fremdling*, 36–37, and his revised interpr., *Mitra and Aryaman*, 66, which I follow here. Ge’s “dessen Name in Ehren steht” (sim. Thieme [*Fremdling*], Klein [DGRV I.228], WG) for *sukīrti-* cannot be correct, because *sukīrti-* is otherwise a noun.

I.186.4: The standard tr. make rather heavy weather of pāda b, where the simile *sudúgheva dhenúḥ* is nominative, but *uṣāśānāktā*, the most likely comparandum, makes most sense as the acc. goal of *éṣe* in pāda a. (Note in passing that HvN’s accentless *eṣe* is simply wrong.) The simile “like an easily milked cow” should not apply to the 1st ps. subj. of that verb. To deal with the apparent case mismatch (and to avoid the specious explanation “nominative for accusative in simile”), most interpr. take b as a parenthetical nominal sentence (e.g., Ge “-- Nacht und Morgen sind wie eine gutmelke Kuh --”; so also Re, Janert [*Dhāsi*, 29], Narten [*Yasna H.*, 122], WG). But this seems unnecessary: this is a repeated pāda, found also in VII.2.6, where the dual *uṣāśānāktā* is nominative. Since that form is ambiguous, it can be adapted here to an accusative environment, without bothering to adjust the case of the simile. So Bloomfield (ad I.186.4, anticipated by Old).

In cd note the chiasmic pairs of *sám* ... *ví* / *ví* ... *sá(m)*: *samāné* ... *vimímānaḥ* ..., *viśurūpe* ... *sásmin* ...

I.186.5: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take the root aor. injunc. *kaḥ* as modal (e.g., Ge “soll ... bereiten”); Hoffmann doesn’t treat this passage. Although I do not think that *kaḥ* regularly shows such value, formulaic considerations suggest it does here: the phrase *máyas √kṛ* occurs at the end of a Jagatī pāda as *máyas karat* (subjunctive: I.89.3, V.46.4,

VIII.18.7, X.64.1), once *máyas kṛdhi* (impv.: I.114.2). Truncating it to fit a Triṣṭubh cadence here would yield monosyllabic *kaḥ*, which may maintain modal value because of its association with the true modals in Jagatī cadences.

I.186.6: The end of b, *abhipitvé sajóṣāḥ*, is a sort of mash-up of 1d and 2b, and *ā gantu* echoes *ā ... gamantu* of 2a.

I.186.7: The cmpd. *ásva-yoga-*, bahuvrīhi by accent, is somewhat peculiar; it might be closest to the type *vájra-bāhu-* ‘having an arm that has a mace (in it)’, hence ‘having a yoke that has horses (attached to it)’?

I.186.8: I take *-senā-* here and in 9d as ‘weapon’, not ‘army’ (contra the standard interp.), because I think ‘weapon’ works better in 9d with the simile in 9c. However, ‘army’ (that is, warrior band vel sim.) is certainly not excluded.

Given the sequence *vṛddhásenāḥ ... pṛṣadaśvāso ‘vánayo ná ráthāḥ*, opening with two bahuvrīhis, the last term *avánayo ná ráthāḥ* looks very like a decomposed bahuvrīhi **aváni-ratha-* ‘having chariots (like) streams’. Curiously, though Re is usually quick to suggest such an interpr., he does not mention such a possibility in his notes.

I.186.9: As disc. ad X.33.1 my tr. of *prayújaḥ* as ‘advance teams’ smacks too much of a modern political campaign, and I would now slightly alter that tr. to ‘teams’ or ‘teams in front’.

I.186.10: I take *adveśāḥ* here not as the neut. *s*-stem (as Gr, Lub classify it), but as the nom. sg. masc. of the them. adj. *adveśá-* marginally but clearly attested as du. *adveśé* at IX.68.10=X.45.12. As far as I can see, the them. sg. interpr. is also followed by Ge and Re. On the problematic *s*-stem see disc. ad X.35.9.

I.186.11: The *ḍīdhiti-* ‘visionary hymn’ of this vs. makes a thematic ring with the *manīṣā-* ‘inspired thought’ of 1d.

I.187 Food and Drink

I.187.1: This vs. is classified as Anuṣṭubgarbhā (5 8 / 8 8), the only such vs. in the RV. The first 5 syllables (*pítúm nú stoṣam* “Now I shall praise food”) are almost like a heading or title; without that pāda the vs. would be a straight Gāyatrī like the following one (and also vss. 4, 8–10), though it would lack a verb to govern the acc. in b.

The suffix-accented masc. *dharmán-* is rare and confined to the late RV, as opposed to the common neut. *dhárman-*. Here ‘supporter, upholder’ would be a more accurate tr. than ‘support’.

I take *víparva-* here as proleptic: the result of Trita’s shaking of Vṛtra is that his joints go apart. Gr takes the *ví-* instead as privative (‘gelenklos’), which could make sense for a snake. But the passages adduced by Ge, like VIII.6.13 *ví vṛtrám parvaśó ruján* “breaking V. apart joint by joint,” demonstrate that Vṛtra is conceived of as having joints, which can be parted.

I.187.2: On metrically bad *vavṛmahe*, see Kü (459) and comm. ad VI.4.7.
To reach 8 syllables, *tvā* must be read distracted.

I.187.5: For the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro.

I.187.7: On the idiom *áram* √ *gam* DAT, see comm. ad X.9.3.

I.187.8: *parimśám* is a hapax, and as Mayr. points out, its proximity to phonologically similar *ārisāmahe* suggests that it's an Augenblicksbildung, perhaps as a blend of *pári* and *ámśa*- 'portion'.

I.187.10: My tr. of the hapax *udārathí*- follows a suggestion registered in EWA s.v. *udārā*- for lack of anything better. Ge refuses to tr.; WG 'erregend' takes Sāy.'s gloss into account.

I.188 Āprī

The beginning of this hymn is preoccupied with "thousands" (1b, 2c, 3c, 4b).

I.188.2: *dádhat* is grammatically ambiguous. With most tr. I take it as a masc. nom. sg. act. part. to the redupl. pres., but it could also be a (short-vowel) subjunctive to the same stem (so Old [SBE]). There are no implications either way.

I.188.6–7, 9: These three vss. all contain *hí* in their first clause, which I render as causal, contra the standard tr.

I.188.9: The double acc. *rūpāṇi ... paśūn víśvān* poses some difficulties. Ge construes *rūpāṇi* with *prabhúḥ* ("der die Formen bemeistert"). But I know of no other passages in which *prabhú-* governs an acc., and *prabhvīḥ* in 5a would discourage such an interpr. in any case. X.110, the Āprī hymn most like this one, has in the corresponding vs. *rūpāir āpimśad bhúvanāni víśvā*, with an instr. of *rūpá-*. In both cases I think the *rūpá-* further specifies the primary object, in this case "all the beasts": it is their *forms* he is anointing.

The logical sequence in this vs. is broken in Ge's tr. because of his use of abstract vocab. for concrete notions: "hat ... fertiggemacht" for *samānájé* 'anointed' and "Gedeihen" for *sphātím* 'fat'. Surely the point is that the addressee of c (probably Agni or the Hotar, with Ge) is urged to win the fat that Tvaṣṭar used to anoint the beasts -- however conceptually transformed such fat may be.

I.188.10: "of the gods" in the publ. tr. would be better rendered "for the gods."

I.188.11: As in vs. 9, symbolic anointing, here by means of a chant or song, is still represented as physical: Agni "shines" because of it, presumably gleaming from the conceptual fat. I take *gāyatrēṇa* as referring specifically to the Gāyatrī meter (in which this hymn is composed), though it may merely be 'song', as Ge (/WG) take it.

I.189 Agni

I.189.1: The dat. *rāyē* with $\sqrt{nī}$ may go too easily into English as a goal, “lead to wealth”; ‘for wealth’ might be more faithful to the case form. However, I do not subscribe to WG’s interpr. of *supāthā* as a neut. pl. goal (“zu den Orten, wo gute Wege sind”), which seems awk. and unnec. when an instr. sg. works well and is paralleled elsewhere.

(*vīśvāni*) *vayúnāni vidvān* is a standard phrase, used esp. of Agni (I.72.7, III.5.6, VI.15.10, X.122.2), referring presumably to his deep knowledge of the ritual as the god most enmeshed in ritual.

I take *juhurāṇā-* to $\sqrt{hṛ}$ / *hru* ‘go crookedly, go astray’ (with Ge and Re, as well as Gr), rather than with $\sqrt{hṛ}$ ‘be angry’ with Insler (JAOS 88, 1968), apparently followed by WG (“den zürnenden Frevel”). The contrast between the easy path in pāda a and the *ēnas-* that goes crookedly/astray in c supports this ascription, as does *abhihrūt-* in 6d. Agastya uses the same participle in I.173.11, where its affinity to $\sqrt{hṛ}$ rather than $\sqrt{hṛ}$ is even clearer.

I.189.2: Pāda c provides a fine parallel to “A mighty fortress is our god.” The word order is somewhat unusual, in that we might expect *naḥ* to take Wackernagel’s position in the pāda as a whole; instead it seems to have taken up a version of that position in the post-caesura phrase *bahulā na urvī*, which simply modifies the nom. sg. *pūḥ* that begins the pāda. There might be several reasons for this. For one thing *ca* occupies that position, but this is not a particularly compelling suggestion because the function and positioning of that *ca* are somewhat puzzling. Klein (DGRV I.220 n. 81) suggests that it connects *pūḥ ... bhāvā* with the clause earlier in the vs. whose verb is *pārayā*. I would suggest rather that it is an inverse *ca* conjoining the two predicate nominatives construed with *bhāvā*, i.e., *pūḥ* and *śām yōḥ*. (This would, among other things, eliminate another ex. of supposed sentential or clausal *ca*, ascribing to it its more usual role as conjoiner of nominals.) It may also be that the alliteration in the phrase *pūḥ ... pṛthvī* would stand out more starkly without *naḥ* in between, but that should apply to *ca* as well.

I.189.3: The verb in b, *abhy āmanta*, is accented; though there is no overt subordinator, I take pāda b as a purpose clause dependent on pāda a. That the obj. of *yuyodhi* in a, *āmīvā(h)* ‘afflictions’, forms an etymological figure with the verb in b supports a close relationship between the pādas. *āmanta* is best taken as a subjunctive, to the set root pres. *amīti* and as an *-anta* replacement for act. **-an* of the usual type in this otherwise act. verbal system (Jamison IJ 21 [1979] 150). This avoids imposing an interpr. as a reciprocal middle, as noted as an alternative by WG with ref. to Hoffmann and Dunkel, although the WG tr. does not reflect it.

The 2nd hemistich lacks a verb. I supply *kaḥ*; the idiom *púnar* $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘make new, renew’ is fairly common (see Gr., s.v. *púnar*, 2), and see also Agastya’s I.174.7 *kṣām ... kaḥ*, with the same object as here though with a very different sense. The publ. tr. should signal the lack of verb by a device like “Re(new) ...” or “(Make) new ...”

I.189.4: It is not clear what (if anything) *utá* is conjoining. Klein (DGRV I.371) says there’s an ellipsis of the verb in the 2nd clause, but he doesn’t say what verb. I am reluctant to add semantics to *utá* of the type ‘even’, ‘also’, ‘especially’, as Re and Ge do in their different ways. In the publ. tr. the pf. part. *śúsukvān* is translated (“and when you blaze ...”) as if it contrasted with an unexpressed different activity of Agni’s. I might now

be inclined to take it as an implicitly subordinated circumstantial clause to be construed with the prohibitives of cd: “and when you blaze ..., let not ...” However, the tr. “when you ...” obscures the fact that the verbal notion is expressed by a nom. sg. participle, which should (and does not) modify the subject of the *mā* clause(s) in cd. However, note that Agni *is* the subj. of the *mā* clauses that occupy all of vs. 5.

I.189.7: The *vī* with *vidvān* picks up the *vī* that both opens and closes the preceding verse (*vī ... yaṃsat / viṣpāt*), linking this verse to the apparently different topic that precedes it. This provides a clue for the referent of *tān ... ubhāyān* “those both.” Ge (/WG) take the “” to refer to the two time periods mentioned in this verse, *prapitvé* and *abhipitvé*, but, on the basis of the larger context, with Old (SBE) and Re I think it refers to good and bad men, or more narrowly to sacrificers and non-sacrificers. Agni’s eagerness for the sacrifice is expressed by pāda b, where he pursues (*vēṣi*) the sons of Manu, i.e., the sacrificers, at the earlier mealtime, and his satisfaction as the sacrifice proceeds by the gerundive *śāśyaḥ* ‘to be directed/instructed, tractable’.

In b Ge (/WG) supply ‘nourishment’ (die Nahrung) as object of *vēṣi* with *mānuṣaḥ* as gen. sg., but this seems unnecessary.

There is no consensus about the meaning or etymology of the word *akrā-* (5x), generally a descriptor of Agni; see EWA s.v. Gr glosses ‘Herrzeichen, Banner’, but since it is once called *navajā-* ‘new-born’ (IV.6.3), an animal (or at least a living thing) is more likely. Since several of the contexts refer to the kindling of the fire, it seems likely to be a young animal, an identification that *navajā-* of course favors. And *marmjénya-* ‘to be groomed’ in our passage suggests a horse, since the root \sqrt{mj} generally takes a horse or something so conceived as its object. Hence the tr. ‘foal’.

Despite the position of *ná, uśigbhiḥ* is unlikely to form part of the simile.

I.190 Bṛhaspati

For the hymn as a whole, see H.-P. Schmidt, *Bṛhaspati und Indra* (1968), 72–77 and passim.

I.190.1: The main cl. verb *vardhayā* is entirely ambiguous between 2nd sg. imperative and 1st sg. subjunctive. With Re and Schmidt (B+I) I opt for the 1st sg. subj., while Gr, Ge, and WG take it as 2nd sg. impv. There are no implications either way.

I.190.4: There are a number of syntactic questions and problems in this verse. To begin with, in pāda a the sequence *divīyate* could be resolved as either *divī īyate* (so Gr, Pp.) or *divī īyate*. In the latter case, with accented verb, we could have a subordination without an overt subordinator. I have chosen to interpret it so, contra the standard tr. and interpr. (though with Scar 371 n. 516), because the other likely connections between pādas a and b favor this closer nexus.

The next questions arise because of the opening of pāda b, *átyo ná yaṃsat*. The simile goes semantically most naturally with the preceding pāda, “like a steed, it speeds ...,” but the lack of accent on *yaṃsat* makes that impossible because this verb would then be initial in its clause. The situation is complicated by the fact that *yaṃsat* exactly replicates *yaṃsat* in 3b, where it governs *ślókam* in the accusative, whereas here a nominative *ślókam* is subject of the preceding pāda and in order to get it to be object of

yamsat here, the subject has to change and an unexpressed acc. **ślókam* be supplied. Moreover, the steed in the opening of b is a very likely object of *yamsat*, but is in the wrong case. There are several (ad hoc) ways to handle this problem. The first is simply to interpret the text as given, with the steed compared to the subject of *yamsat*, who is probably Bṛhaspati. This is in fact the interpr. of the standard tr., though each one needs to supply material and adjust interpr. in order to make it work semantically. I do not find these various makeshifts satisfactory. In order to confront the semantic problems noted above, it is possible to assume that the verb in 4b was originally really accented **yámṣat*, which lost its accent redactionally because of *yamsat* in the preceding verse. This would allow the tr. “When his signal-call speeds in heaven and on earth like a steed, he will control it [=signal call/steed],” with the simile taken with pāda a and a new clause beginning with **yámṣat*. This may be the simplest solution, though it is not exactly the one in the publ. tr. Instead there I (more or less) follow the suggestion sketched out by Old and discussed in more detail by Scar (371 and n. 516), whereby *átyo ná* stands for **átyam ná*; Old explains the nom. as attraction to the preceding pāda. Scar seems to endorse Old’s attraction hypothesis, but his tr. is more complex (and essentially identical to mine), in that he reads the simile both as nom. with pāda a and (in brackets) as acc. with pāda b. Although this may seem over-fussy, it addresses both the syntactic and the semantic problems.

The second hemistich presents a more conventional type of double reading, whereby the word *hetáyaḥ* is taken to belong both to the simile and to the frame, which its position in the pāda facilitates. In the frame *hetí-* has its common meaning ‘missile, lance’, a development from the general ‘impel’ meaning of \sqrt{hi} ; there is a further metaphorical development here: the missiles of Bṛhaspati are his words. In the simile, with the gen. *mṛgāṇām*, the *hetí-* are the charges or drives of the wild beasts, using a more abstract or etymological sense of the *-tí-*stem. This double interpr. is found in Old, Re, and Scar; it seems significantly more satisfying that Ge’s notion (fld by WG) that takes *mṛgāṇām* as a dative gen. -- the missiles/weapons for the wild beasts -- which requires that the two genitives *mṛgāṇām* and *bṛhaspáteḥ* be non-parallel.

With Scar I take the *ca* in c as coordinating cd with a.

I do not understand exactly what *yakṣa-bhīt-* in b refers to, nor do I understand why the heavens are *āhimāya-*. For the latter, one can recall that in V.40.6, 8 the *māyāḥ* of Svarbhānu hide the sun and that in my extensive treatment of the Svarbhānu myth (Ravenous Hyenas, 1991) I interpret those *māyāḥ* as the swirling clouds of smoke issuing from Agni. So here the “serpentine wiles” that the heavens possess might be the clouds of smoke from the ritual fire produced at the same time as Bṛhaspati’s ritual signal call (though *āhimāya-* when applied to the gods would have to have a different sense). This further suggests that the wondrous apparitions (*yakṣá-*) that Bṛhaspati brings are other marvelous sights associated with the sacrificial performance. But these are just guesses.

I.190.5: The standard tr. take *pajrāḥ* as a PN, as it can be elsewhere, but there seems no reason to drag in Kakṣīvant’s kin for vilification, and I prefer taking it as a simple descriptor.

The hapax *usriká-* is a nice example of a *-ka-* suffixed form in slangy and deprecatory context. See my article on *-ka-* (IJ 52, 2009).

There is disharmony in number between the two hemistichs: the relative cl. in the plural describing the evil rivals is picked up by dat. singular *dūḍhyè*.

The accent on *cáyase* is probably due to the following *íd*, which does condition verbal accent -- though in fewer passages than listed by Gr (s.v. *íd* 5), since in many of his exx. the verb is pāda-initial. It can also be noted here that the verb immediately follows a pāda-initial voc. and is contrastive with *ānu dadāsi* in c, either of which would also favor verbal accent.

I.190.6: In b the point is presumably that an ally who is constantly solicited by everyone around is likely to change sides without warning.

With Old, Re, and Schmidt (B+I) I supply ‘cows’ with *āpīvṛtā(h)*, while Ge (/WG) opt for ‘doors’. Since they all take the Aṅgirasas as the implied subject, both interpr. refer to the Vala myth.

I.190.7: The bahuvrīhi *ródha-cakra-*, lit. ‘having their banks as wheels’, may seem slightly jarring, and Ge (/WG) attenuate the sense to “die die Ufer entlang rollen.” But *cakrá-* is definitely the noun ‘wheel’ (all the way back into PIE), not a transparent derivative of a verbal root meaning ‘roll’, and I think the cmpd must be taken in its literal sense. (So also Re: “ayant pour roues les hautes-rives.”) The point of comparison must be not the speed or movement of the chariot but its physical configuration, with the wheels defining the outer limits of the vehicle as seen from above or behind and rising above the bottom of its body, just as river banks do the river.

A different watery image is found in the 2nd hemistich. With Ge I take *tārah* here as a ford (like the etymologically related *tīrthá-*, both to *√tṛ* ‘cross, pass,’ etc.) or perhaps more generally a means of crossing (water). Bṛhaspati, likened to a bird of prey, keeps his eye on both the ford and the (deeper) waters -- presumably watching for fish to swim into the shallow water of the ford, so they can be snatched close to the surface. This image is highly reminiscent of the feeding behavior of water birds like cranes, egrets, and herons, whose preternatural stillness and single-minded vigilance as they stand in shallow water waiting for prey, followed by a swift but graceful lunge with their beaks, can only impress the observer and could well provide a model for the “knowing Bṛhaspati” and his sharp eyes depicted here. (For those who haven’t had the pleasure of seeing this in the wild, there are numerous YouTube videos.) Such birds are found in the appropriate geographical areas of NW India/Pakistan, and since *gṛdhra-* lit. means ‘greedy’, it need not specifically designate a vulture, *pace* Ge (/WG), Schmidt (‘Geier’), and Re (‘vautour’).

āpaḥ here must be acc. pl., one of the handful of examples of the spread of the nom. pl. to acc. function in this stem.

I.190.8: The standard tr. take *devāḥ* as a predicate nominative (vel sim.) with *dhāyī* (e.g., Re “... a été installé (comme) dieu”). This may be correct, but it does assume that Bṛhaspati only secondarily came to be considered as, or was made into, a deva (so, e.g., Ge n. 2d). Following H.-P. Schmidt’s hypothesis that *bṛhaspāti-* was originally an epithet of, and aspect of, Indra, it would be possible to interpret this passage as referring to the moment when Bṛhaspati emerged as a deva in his own right; on the other hand, since Indra is most definitely a deva from the beginning, a particular aspect of him should not

require promotion to deva-status. It should be noted that Schmidt explicitly disputes the standard interp. (B+I, 75–77) and tr. *devāḥ* as a simple descriptor: “So wird der grosse, machtgeborene, mächtige B., der Stier, der Gott eingesetzt.” I follow Schmidt.

I.191 Against poisonous animals

Because of the popular character of this hymn and the idiomatic specificity of the entities mentioned, much of the vocabulary is obscure. I will not discuss the supposed real-world identifications or etymological speculations for each lexical item. Reasonably up-to-date treatments of the sec. lit. are available in EWA, s.vv.

I.191.1: I do not understand the double *īti* of pāda c. But I assume that the “two” in this pāda refers to the two differently identified *kāṅkata-* in ab, the one that is not (really) a *kāṅkata* and the one that is a true (*satīna-*) *kāṅkata-*. These are then re-identified as *plūṣi-*.

For the accent of *adṛṣta-* see AiG II.1.226 and Nachtr. p. 66.

I.191.2: The feminine nemesis is not identified. As Ge notes (n. 2), Sāy. suggests it’s the healing plant, Henry both the plant and dawn.

I.191.3: I take *kúśara-* as containing the pejorative *ku-*prefix (as in *kú-yava-* ‘(bringing) bad harvest’) and a play on the preceding word *śarā-*.

The three vṛddhi derivatives, *sairyá-*, *mauñjá-*, and *vairiṇá-*, I interpret flg. Sāy.’s suggestion for the last two, namely that they refer to the *adṛṣta-* bugs found on those particular grasses. Many of the most annoying biting insects lurk in tall grass waiting for their victims to present unshielded ankles and calves -- in the US chiggers, fleas, and ticks come to mind.

I.191.4: This vs. seems an attempt at sympathetic magic: animals, both domestic and wild, and humans (symbolized by their lights, presumably their fires) are all settling down for the night (though the time period is not explicit), and so should the bugs. As anyone who’s ever been outside in a buggy place after dark knows, this magic is not necessarily going to work -- though it’s true that some types of bugs are active at dusk and then stop.

I.191.5: This vs. does seem to refer to such insects, those that become active at twilight when the wind drops. For example, although there are numerous types of mosquitoes and different species have different feeding patterns, it seems (from a quick Google search) that most species feed at dawn and dusk and a few hours into the dark.

I.191.6: It is unclear to me why the bugs are being credited with such a grand pedigree. Perhaps to indicate that they are ubiquitous in the space between earth and heaven?

Sāy. suggests this vs. and the next are addressed to snakes, but there seems no reason why *adṛṣta-* would change its referent. As I noted in the publ. intro., the impulse to demand that a troublesome unswatatable bug settle down long enough to be squashed is likely to be universal.

I.191.8–9: The rising of the sun may reflect the fact, mentioned above, that many bugs feed at twilight (dawn and dusk), and sunrise portends the end of the (pre-)dawn feeding frenzy.

I.191.8: On *jambhāya*- ‘crush’, see comm. ad II.23.9 and my *-āya*-Formations, p. 93.

I.191.10–13: For the irregular meter of these vss. see HvN metrical comm. ad locc. and Arnold (VedMet. p. 163).

I.191.10: As noted in the publ. intro., the second part of the hymn begins here, but it clearly pivots on the sun, which figured in the two preceding vss.

My interpr. of this much discussed vs. is presented in the publ. intro., but in compressed fashion. As noted there, I think this has to do with the separation of noxious liquid from beneficial liquid, a feat ascribed in natural terms to the sun and in mythological terms to Indra. When “I fasten the poison on the sun” (pāda a), I am counting on the purificatory power of the sun to neutralize or banish the poison. This ritualistic action is matched in pāda b by fastening the skin onto the house of the *surā*-possessor. *Surā* is an alcoholic beverage of some sort (generally tr. ‘Branntwein’, ‘brandy’, et sim., though, acdg. to James McHugh [p.c.], it is unlikely that the technology of distilling was known to Vedic India, so probably some sort of beer; see now McHugh’s 2021 “The Ancient Indian Alcoholic Drink Called *Surā*: Vedic Evidence” [JAOS 141.1]) and a universally condemned evil twin to soma, though it gets used in some śrauta rituals, particularly the Sautrāmaṇī. The appearance of the *surā*-possessor (*sūrāvant-*) in b is owing to two factors: on the one hand, as just noted, *surā* is a taboo drink and is therefore equivalent to the poison (*viṣā-*) in pāda a. On the other, the word *sūrā-* is phonologically reminiscent of ‘sun’ *sūrya-* in pāda a.

The natural/ritual action depicted in the first pāda is, in my interpr., matched by the mythological action of the second pāda. I therefore do not take pāda b as a simile (as Ge does), but as a parallel action -- the attachment of a skin (*dṛti-*) full of poison/*surā* on the house of the *surā*-possessor, who, in my view, is Indra, who appears by epithet in pāda e. (Though Ge and others tentatively identify *hariṣṭhā-* as the sun god, the ‘moulder of the fallow bays’ can only be Indra.) Later Vedic has a compd. *surā-dṛti-* ‘*surā*-skin’, found in PB XIV.11.26 and JB III.229. Both passages concern the *vipānam* of a liquid; *vī* √*pā*, lit. ‘drink apart’, is used for the separation of two kinds of liquids that have been mixed together (or separation of a liquid from something containing it); see comm. ad VII.22.4. In the late RV and later, this lexeme is specialized for the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, whose mythological foundation is the healing of Indra by the Aśvins and Sarasvatī, after he had drunk too much soma. They make him drink *surā*, which was mixed with soma (perhaps the soma he had already drunk), and he performs the feat of separating the two liquids. This myth is already present in X.131.4–5 with precisely this detail. When in pāda b here we fasten the skin of poison onto Indra the *surā*-drinker’s house, we are implicitly asking him to perform the same feat for us. The refrain (found in vss. 10–13, pādas c-f) makes it clear that he has succeeded. At least in my interpr., it is said that Indra has put the poison far in the distance (e) and the honeyed (plant?) has made honey (quite possibly soma, as often)(f): the two liquids have been separated and are separate, with the

good one available to us. The result is that the mythological model, Indra, will not die (c) -- nor will we (d) -- and the poison with which we began has been rendered ineffective.

I.191.11: The extraordinary density of *-ka*-suffixed forms begins here and lasts till the end of the hymn. That little birds eat the poison and destroy it may reflect the fact that many birds eat noxious insects without harm to them and with benefit to us. But the insects may no longer be the subject of this part of the hymn.

I.191.12: Sāy. suggests that the “little sparks” (*viṣpulingakā-*) are little sparrows. This makes sense not only because of the birds in vss. 11 and 14, but because of the visual effect of flocks of small birds feeding: esp. when they are in bushes or underbrush they can burst up, out, and around at random almost like sparks. The *viṣ-* of course also recalls *viṣá-* ‘poison’. I do not understand why there are 21 of them, save for the fact that thrice seven is a satisfying number. Similar numbers are found in the next two vss.

I.191.13: The “tormentors” (/harmers, destroyers) of poison, the hapax gen. pl. *rōpuṣṭīṇām*, are feminine. The referent is entirely unclear, but the removers of poison in the next vs. are all feminine as well.

I.191.15–16: The *-ka-* suffix is particularly prominent in these vss, appearing not only on the designation of the bug (*kuṣumbhakāḥ*, 2x), but also on the pronominal adj. *iyattakāḥ* (‘such a one’), the pronoun *takām*, and the participle *pravartamānakāḥ*. The word for ‘scorpion’, *vīścika-* only appears in that form, but appears to contain the *-ka-* suffix as well, very common in words for noxious insects (see my “*-ka*-suffix,” IJ 52 [2009]: 318).

Maṇḍala II

The commentary on II now includes SJ's comments on all the hymns, including those translated by JPB in the publ. tr.

II.1 Agni

For the rhetorical structure of the hymn, see the publ. intro.

II.1.1: The only attestation of the desiderative of √*śuc* is this hapax adj. *āśuśukṣāṇi*- 'eager to blaze here'.

II.1.2: The accent on *āsi* in d presumably results from its contrastive function in the *ca ... ca* construction. Curiously Old does not comment.

Note the two different words for house in *grhāpatiḥ ... dāme*, with the former replacing old *dāmpati*-. On these various terms for house-lord, see my 2019 "The Term *grhastha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder," in *Grhastha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*, ed. Patrick Olivelle, and "The Double Life of *gahapati*" (to appear in a forthcoming Fs.).

II.1.3: HvN suggest the distracted reading *namas'yaḥ* here and in 10a, which produces 12 syllables for the Jagatī line but a very bad cadence (4 light syllables), while reading an undistracted form produces a good Triṣṭubh line. They argue 1) that *namas'ya*- is always otherwise distracted in the RV (though it doesn't otherwise appear in a cadence) and 2) that there are several other similar bad cadences in this hymn (*avidhat* 7d, 9c). These are good arguments, but I would still favor an undistracted *namasyaḥ* in a Triṣṭubh line.

Ge suggests that *vidhartāḥ* in d is a predicate voc. I think rather that it signals the absent middle term, the divinity with which Agni is here identified, namely Bhaga. So Old (SBE). Bhaga is identified as *vidhartār*- in VII.41.2 and is regularly associated with Puramdhi.

II.1.4: On this vs. see Thieme, Mitra and Aryaman, 83–85.

sambhújam in c is analysed by Gr as a 1st sg. subj. or injunc. (his "Co.") to a thematic aorist and is so rendered by Ge ("von dem ich Nutzen haben möchte"), though he expresses doubts in his n. However, this aor. stem does not otherwise exist: the multiple *bhujema* forms, apparent optatives in *mā* prohibitives, are convincingly explained by Hoffmann (Injunk. 95–97) as reanalysed from an expression with the infinitive *bhujé* followed by enclitic 1st ps. pronoun. Moreover, act. forms to this root should mean 'give pleasure', not 'derive pleasure' (cf. *bhuñjati* I.48.5). Old (Noten) already disputed the verbal interpr. of *sambhújam*, and it is now generally taken as a nominal (so Thieme, Mitra and Aryaman, although in Fremdling [16 n. 2, 105] he takes it as a verb; Hoffmann, Injunk. 96 n. 197; Re; Scar 358), though WG tr. it as a verb, allowing for the nominal possibility in their n. Assuming that *sambhújam* is nominal, the problem is how to fill out the defective rel. cl. *yásya sambhújam*. Most supply a verb like "we eat" or "we expect," e.g., Scar "von dem ich Genuss (erwarte, o. ä)." The publ. tr. takes GEN *sambhújam* as a possessive expression: "whose common meal (it is)" → "who has a common meal," further extended to "who offers a common meal." I find this more

satisfying syntactically than the invention of a verb, but it runs into morphological difficulty: by my tr. the meal should be nominative, and if *sambhújam* belongs to a root noun paradigm, it can only be a masc. acc. sg. This forces me into the unhappy position of assuming a root-accented neut. thematic stem *-bhúja-*, which may be unlikely enough morphologically to persuade me to supply a verb to govern the acc.

II.1.5: Pāda a has the acc. and dat. appropriate to an expression of giving, but no verb; pāda c has the verb (*rariṣe*) but no dative of recipient. The accusatives of gift in the two pādas are formed in parallel: *suṽṛīyam* (a), *s^uvásṽyam* (c). The two pādas thus complete each other rhetorically.

In b *gnāvaḥ* is morphologically incoherent. By its ending it should be vocative, but since it occupies non-initial position, its accent should preclude that. Nonetheless, with all the standard interpr. I take it as a voc. An ad hoc explanation could be concocted for its accent -- that the following voc. *mitramahaḥ* induced accent on the preceding one to support the voc. phrase -- but I think too many counter-examples could be adduced. Ge suggests a word haplology, *gnā<h> gnāvaḥ*, but this seems unnecessary and also requires a tr. “you are (the Wives).” It is likely instead that the third term in this pāda is Tvaṣṭar from pāda a, since he is regularly associated with the Wives of the Gods, and in fact the other attestation of this voc. *gnāvaḥ* (I.15.3), correctly accented in pāda-initial position, refers to Tvaṣṭar.

As pointed out by Old (SBE) and Ge, the third term in pāda c is presumably Apām Napāt, who is elsewhere called *āśuhéman-*, including 2x in II. The *āśu-* in that compound echoes the beginning of *āśuśukṣāṇiḥ* in 1a, though that form is most probably formed to the desid. stem of *√śuc* with preverb *ā-*, since the *-ani-* suffix is rather commonly built to desiderative stems and there would be no obvious source of the *-s-* before the suffix otherwise.

II.1.6: I do not understand the cmpd *śaṃgayá-*. Wackernagel (AIG II.1.309) classifies it with cmpds with governing first-member prepositions, but *śám*, though uninflected, does not function like even the improper prepositions/preverbs of the *áram* type. He does recognize its singularity (314–15), but keeps it in this category, in which it seems out of place.

II.1.7: Pāda d has another bad cadence: *te (á)vidhat*, with 4 light syllables, assuming the normal shortening of *-e* before vowel. The same cadence is found in 9c. I would be inclined to follow HvN in seeing this irregular cadence as characteristic of this particular hymn (see also 3b, 10a), save for the fact that *ávidhat* shows a remarkable tendency to position itself in bad cadences: see II.26.4, VIII.23.21, 27.15, 61.9. As IH points out to me, Arnold (p.129, §169.vi) suggests reading *ávidhat* with long augment. Though in all cases the Saṃhitā text transmits either short *á* or deleted abhinihita (*ā*) and the Pp analyzes it as *a* in all cases, this seems a reasonable explanation – despite Old’s dismissive “recht zweifelhaft.” There is a tendency to lengthen vowels before elements beginning with *v*, not only the augment, but preverbs, and 1st cmpd. members, presumably spreading from forms that originally began **Hv*. In most of the other occurrences of *ávidhat* (I.136.5, VI.54.4, IX.114.1) the augment has coalesced with a preceding *a*-vowel and its weight is therefore unrecoverable. Only in X.83.1 do we find

an *ávidhat* that is not improved by a heavy reading: it occurs in the break after an early caesura. But even here *ávidhat* is a possible reading: though ~ ~ – is the most preferred break, – ~ – is the next most common.

II.1.8: Here and in 15a I take *práti* (+/- copula) + ACC. as an expression similar to *pratimāna*- + GEN, meaning ‘be a counterpart to’.

For *ṛñjate* here, see the fuller expression with instr. in the next hymn, II.2.5.

II.1.9: It is tempting to take *iṣṭibhiḥ* as ‘with sacrifices’, parallel to *śámyā* ‘with ritual labor’ in the next pāda. So Old (SBE), though he gave it up reluctantly in the Noten. Unfortunately ‘sacrifice’ is accented *íṣṭi*-, against *iṣṭi*- ‘desire’, and so perhaps the best one can do is suggest a secondary pun (so Scar 455). On the other hand, on the assumption that all *-ti*-stems began with suffixal accent and that the root accent found in some Vedic *-ti*-stems is secondary (see Lundquist 2015, *-ti*-stems), this may be a relic of suffix-accented **iṣṭi*- ‘sacrifice’, which has not yet undergone accent retraction. It is worth noting that root-accented *íṣṭi*- is found only in I and X. I would therefore entertain an alt. tr. “... (do) men (approach) with their sacrifices.”

On the cadence in 9 see remarks on 7b.

II.1.10: On the cadence in pāda a, see comm. ad 3b.

As Old (SBE) already pointed out, the first three pādas refer to the three Ṛbhus and pun on their names: *ṛbhú*- ‘craftsman / Ṛbhu’ in a, *vāja*- ‘prize / Vāja’ in b, and *vī bhāsi* ‘you radiate / Vibhvan’ in c.

In c *dakṣi* is surely a *-si* impv. to *√dah* ‘burn’ and should be separated from the identical form in I.141.8, for which see the comm. ad loc. Ge, however, takes *dakṣi* here to *√dakṣ*.

The form *viśikṣu*- in d is taken by Gr as belonging to the desid. of *√śak* and meaning ‘gerne Gut austheilend’, which seems unacceptably distant from both the root meaning of *√śak* and the function of the desiderative. Moreover, *√śak* is not otherwise attested with *vī* except, supposedly, in the similar form *vī śikṣa* IV.35.3 (for which see below). Ge tr. “du bist der Prüfer,” Re “tu es celui que si met à l’oeuvre diversement”; neither discusses the form or its root affiliation, and one can only assume they follow the assignment to *√śak*, though exactly how is unclear. Old (SBE) suggested an appealing alternative, interpreting it as built to the desid. of the root *√śas* ‘cut’, which is primarily found with *vī*-- an idea I find eminently worthy of revival. This may also be the view of WG, who tr. “Du bist williger Verteiler,” again without disc., so they may in fact simply reproduce Gr’s understanding of the semantics. Old does not sketch out the morphology, but it presumably rests on **śi-śs-su-*, with zero-grade root and simplification of the medial sibilant cluster *śss* arising from the two radical sibilants and the desiderative suffix. The finite verb *vī śikṣa* in IV.35.3 (also a Ṛbhus context) belongs here as well. Heenen (Desid., 232-33) mentions this possibility though without great enthusiasm (“La possibilité ... n’est pas exclue”).

The publ. tr. “seek to carve up and to stretch out the sacrifice” implies that *ātániḥ* is desiderative. This was not meant, and the tr. should perhaps be emended to “seek to carve up the sacrifice, as the one who stretches it out” or “... as you stretch it out.”

II.1.13: The relevant construction in d is probably *tvé ... āhutam* “poured into you,” as it is in the even further distracted identical phrase in 14ab. The tr. of 13d should be corrected to “the gods eat the oblation poured into you.”

II.1.14: The first half-verse is simply a rather crudely exploded version of 13d (also found in I.94.3), with *tvé* moved to front of first pāda and the second pāda otherwise intact. See Bloomfield’s withering scorn.

II.1.15: On *prāti ... asī*, see comm. ad 8d. As far as I can determine, this is the only occurrence of *sām* √ *as* in the RV and, rather than meaning something like ‘be together’, it seems to have an idiomatic meaning like *prati* + ACC, ‘be equal to’ (as if to *samā-* vel sim.).

On the word order in pāda c, see comm. ad VI.15.14.

II.1.16: I do not understand the function or position of *hī*, though the latter question is more tractable.

II.2 Agni

One curious feature of this hymn is that it is the home to the densest cluster of *uṣās-* occurrences in II (vss. 2, 7, 8); the word is otherwise pretty rare in this maṇḍala, and there are no Dawn hymns in it. The focus on Agni’s likeness to the sun probably accounts for this. This likeness is hinted at first in the adj. *svārṇara-* ‘possessing solar glory’ in 1c. This adj. is echoed by three occurrences of the simile *svār ṇā* “like the sun” (7d, 8b, 10d), where the simile particle *ṇā* (with close sandhi retroflexion as always after *svār*), though having nothing to do with the *-ṇa-* in the adjective, reproduces it phonologically.

Another notable feature of the hymn is the fact that the stem *citāya-*, which occurs three times (4c, 5d, 10b), in all three cases must be read doubly, as ‘appear’ in one construction in the passage and as ‘perceive’ in another construction in the same passage.

II.2.2: Ge (/WG) take *nāktīr uṣāsaḥ* as acc. of extent of time, supplying as subj. either prayers or priests. With Old (SBE and Noten) and Re, I take the phrase as subject in the publ. tr. This means that *uṣāsaḥ* must be taken as a nom. (for *uṣāsaḥ*), rather than the acc. it was historically -- but this is common in the RV. Nonetheless, on reflection I wonder if Ge is right: the 2nd hemistich contains two examples of acc. of extent of time (*mānuṣā yugā* and *kṣāpaḥ*), and there is also one in 8a, *uṣāso rāmyāḥ*, that is very similar to the phrasing here. If the phrase is interpr. as acc., the subject to be supplied would presumably be the same as the 2nd pl. addressees of 1ab, namely the priestly officiants. So I suggest an alt. tr. “Through the dawns and the nights they [=priests] bellow towards you ...”

In addition the pf. *vavāśire* might better be rendered as a habitual pres. ‘(constantly) bellow’.

II.2.3: The gerundive *védyā-* in c is universally assigned to √ *vid* ‘know’ (e.g., Ge ‘allbekannt’, Re ‘(re)connaissable’), but surely the Vedic Indians would be more anxious

to acquire a chariot (\sqrt{vid} ‘find, acquire’) than simply to recognize it! Agni is found with the same simile in VIII.84.1.

II.2.4: A difficult vs. with multiple interpretations, which I will not treat in detail. The difficulties of the vs. arise in part from the fact that it can apply to both the ritual fire and the sun. Note that in contrast to the first three vss. the word *agní-* does not appear in this vs., which absence licenses the double reference. This double reference begins, and is least obscure, in the first pāda, where the entity in question (*tām*) grows “in the airy realm (as/and) in his own house”: “his own house” is clearly a reference to Agni as the fire in every house (see also 11c), but “in the airy realm” can refer both to the strengthening of the sun’s light after it rises and to the smoke and flames of fire rising in the air. Note that there is no simile marker here: the fire is not compared to the sun or vice versa; they are identified.

The second pāda uses the technical ritual term $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘establish’ (used of the ceremonial establishment of the ritual fire), but it is also used less technically here for the placement of both fire and sun on their respective paths. Loc. *hvāré* ‘on a meandering (course)’ can refer to the unpredictable motion of fire and its products (smoke/flames). How this word can apply to the sun is less clear, since the sun’s course is certainly not unpredictable. However, derivatives of the root \sqrt{hvr} can refer to curves, and the sun’s trajectory up, across, and down the sky can be seen as a curving path. (This second sense should have been registered in the publ. tr.) I should say that I explicitly do not think that it refers to a snake here (*pace* Old [SBE], WG), although the interpr. is tempting due to the similarity of the lexicon and imagery in this vs. to I.141.7, where *hvārā-* refers to Agni as a twisting snake. Such an identification here would require emendation to acc. **hvārām*, which Old was willing to accept in SBE and still defends in the Noten, but which does not conform to our current restrained attitude towards RVic emendation (in part due to Old). I also do not think that *candrām* in the simile refers to the moon (as Thieme [KISch 78] and WG do).

In c ‘son’ is universally supplied with *patarām* ‘flying, winged’ (e.g., Ge “den geflügelten (Sohn?) der Pr̥śni”). But Pr̥śni’s son(s) are the Maruts; Agni never seems to be so identified. The closest any interpreter can come is X.189.1, where a *gauḥ pr̥śniḥ* ‘dappled cow’ may, or may not, refer to the fire, but there is no parental engagement there. The gen. *pr̥śnyāḥ* (as here; on the ending see comm. ad 7b) is elsewhere construed only with ‘udder’ (*ūdhar-*, II.34.2, 10; cf. also IV.3.10) or ‘milk’ (*pāyaḥ*, VI.48.22); though it is true that the alternative gen. *pr̥śneḥ* is found with ‘sons’ (*pr̥śneḥ putrā(h)*, V.58.5); these are the Maruts, as expected. Since the only other attestations of *pr̥śnyāḥ* in II limit ‘udder’, I supply that word here. Although “the flying (udder) of Pr̥śni” sounds comical, I take it to refer to a rain cloud, as also apparently in II.34. The fire and the sun are thus implicitly compared to this third entity. I read *citāyantam* in two senses, ‘appearing’ and ‘perceiving, observing’ (cf. *citayat* in the immediately following vs.), with the former sense here.

The other sense of *citāyantam* governs the rest of the vs.; the instr. *akṣābhiḥ* ‘with eyes’ signals the ‘perceive’ value, as is reflected in all the standard tr. (although WG take the participle as a double tr. ‘make perceive’, which is not supported by the zero-grade root syllable [expect **cetāyantam*]). We are not home free, however, for the simile, *pāthó ná payúm*, gives trouble. The problem is *pāthāḥ*. If we try to take it to as acc. to neut.

pāthas- ‘pen, fold’, which would work semantically (“observing ... as a protector (does) a fold”), the accent is wrong; if we try to take it as gen. of *pānth-* ‘path’, which also works semantically (“like the protector of a path”), the length of the first vowel is wrong. Lub tries to avoid this Scylla and Charybdis situation by identifying it as a 2nd du. pres. to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’, but this makes more difficulties: who are the two subjects? (perhaps he means the two races, but they are in 3rd ps. ref.), and the placement of the *ná* is badly wrong. In the end I follow the ad hoc solution set out by Old (Noten): a gen. of the ‘path’ word makes most sense, and it may owe its anomalous long vowel to phonological attraction to *pāyúm* in the same syntagm along with some conflation with *pāthas-*.

II.2.5: The apparent fem. loc. pl. *ṛdhasānāsu* to the irregular participial stem *ṛdhasāná-* ‘growing, having grown’ is generally taken as referring to the plants among which the fire is blazing, on the basis of X.92.1 ... *śuṣkāsu hāriṇīṣu jārbbhurat*, with *jārbbhurat* ‘flickering, quivering’ as here. However, plants do not ‘grow’ when they are burned -- quite the contrary -- and I’m not at all sure that $\sqrt{ṛdh}$ ‘grow, increase, strengthen’ is used of plant growth: we may be misled by translation language. Instead on the basis of IV.3.6 *dhīṣnyāsu ṛdhasānó agne* “growing in the holy places [=hearths], o Agni,” I interpret *ṛdhasānāsu* as representing *ṛdhasāná(h) āsu*, with masc. nom. sg. + fem. pronominal loc. and irregular sandhi of *-aḥ ā-*. (See another such ex. in nearby II.6.7.) There are only three occurrences of the stem *ṛdhasāná-*; in addition to IV.3.6 and our example here, the other one, at VI.12.3, is also nom. sg. referring to Agni. One potential problem with this suggestion is that, since the hearths have not been previously mentioned, we might expect accented *āsú*. However, a number of occurrences of unaccented *āsu* lack clear referents in the preceding discourse (e.g., I.95.5, III.55.9, VIII.41.7).

Like *citáyantam* in 4cd, *citayat* in d has two different readings: with the preceding phrase *dyaúr ná stṛbhiḥ* it means ‘appear’, while with the following *ródasī ānu* (echoing *jānasī ubhé ānu* in 4d) it means ‘perceive’. The functional split is clearer in this vs. than in 4cd and could be considered a species of poetic repair, or at least “poetic reinforcement.” See also vs. 10 below.

II.2.6: Note the phonological and morphological parallelism of the infinitival datives, *s(u)vastáye*, *suvitāya*, *vītāye*.

II.2.6–7: 6c and 7c are paraphrases of each other. Each contains a dual referring to the two worlds, an impv. of $\sqrt{kṛ}$, and an indication of directionality.

II.2.7: *sahasrín-* (sg. or pl.) regularly modifies *rayí-* and *vāja-*; *bṛhánt-* has a wider range of referents, but both *rayí-* and *vāja-* are found. Since (sg.) *rayím* occurs in the immediately preceding vs. (6b) and (sg.) *vāja-* in the immediately following pāda (7b), either is available to supply as the referent for the pl. adjectives in pāda a. I opt for *vāja-*, because of the nearer proximity.

If *śrútyā* in the Saṃhitā text represents dat. *śrútyai* (so Pp.) and belongs to a *-ti-* stem, it shows the younger ending (borrowed from the *-ī-* stems) *-yai*, confined to 7 stems mostly limited to Maṇḍala X (Macdonell VG p. 282), rather than the extraordinarily common *-aye*. This younger ending may correlate with the younger accent in this *-ti-* stem: as Lundquist has shown (“On the Accentuation of Vedic *-ti-* Abstracts,” *Indo-*

European Linguistics 3 [2015]), *-ti*-stems undergo accent retraction in the course of Vedic, and root-accented forms are innovations in the late RV. Vs. 4 contains another fem. short *-i*-stem with a younger ending borrowed from long *-ī*-stems, namely gen. *pr̥śnyāḥ*. However, I wonder how secure *śrútyai* is. The use of this dative (quasi-)infinitive here is somewhat unusual, and I take its supposed double (also *śrútyā* in sandhi) in X.111.3 as an ablative. Old (Not.) points out that the gerundive *śrútya-* appears several times modifying *vāja-* (VII.5.9 *vājam śrútyam*, I.36.12 *vājasya śrútyasya*). I am tempted to take our *śrútyā* here as somehow reflecting the gerundive, in a situation where the expected masc. acc. sg. **śrútyam* would produce a bad cadence. But I cannot construct a plausible scenario; Old says that an acc. pl. is not entirely excluded, but that would have to be an acc. pl. neuter or fem., and *vāja-* is masc.

Kü (251) takes *vī didyutaḥ* as intrans., not trans.-caus. (in his terms, “inattentive” not “faktiv”), interpreting *uśasaḥ* as temporal. I am doubtful.

The simile in d *svār nā* “like the sun” is perfectly ambiguous. It can be nominative, compared to Agni, the subject of *vī didyutaḥ*, as an entity that makes the dawns shine. (Given the temporal proximity of dawn and sunrise, this causal connection is perfectly in order.) Or Agni can make the dawns shine forth like the sun, with the simile in the acc. In 8b and 10d the same simile is in the nominative, but I do not think this is a sufficient reason to impose the same analysis here.

II.2.8: Note #*sá idhāná(h)* echoing 1c #*samidhānām* and 6a #*sá ... samidhānāḥ*.

With Old (SBE), Ge, Re, I take *uśaso rāmyā* as parallel in a temporal expression (“dawns and nights”). Hoffmann (Injunk., 121; fld. by WG) rather cleverly separates them, construing only *rāmyā* with *ānu*: “Entflammt alle Morgen, nach den Nächten leuchtet er.” However, because night(s) and dawn(s) are regularly used in parallel (e.g., 2a in this hymn), I am somewhat reluctant to adopt this interpr.

The standard tr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG) take *dīdet* as a modal, but it is simply an injunctive and I see no reason to attribute modal value to it. So also Hoffmann (see his tr. just cited) and Kü (228).

In the second hemistich *agnīḥ* was omitted in the publ. tr., which should read “With the libations of Manu Agni conducts ...”

II.2.9: As Old and Ge point out, *mānuṣā* should not be a fem. nom. sg. with *dhīḥ*, since the fem. stem is well-attested *mānuṣī*. Nonetheless, the standard tr., including Ge though excluding Re, interpret it with *dhīḥ* -- Ge by taking it as shortened from *mānuṣāṇām* at pāda end (some shortening!) and tr. “die menschliche Dichtung” as if it were a simple modifying adjective. I instead take it as neut. pl. and supply ‘lifespans’ (*yugā(ni)*), which is commonly found with this adj., including in our 2c. By my interpr. it expresses extent of time, indicating that poetic inspiration is a constant that will always ensure rewards for men generation after generation. For a similar thought see III.39.2 *sanajā pītryā dhīḥ* the “ancient-born, ancestral hymnic vision.”

Most interpr. take *iṣāni* as a loc. infinitive with the preceding acc. as obj. (For the most recent disc., see Keydana, *Infinitive im Rgveda*, 195–96.) This may well be possible, but given its isolation and the unclarity of its morphological shape (see esp. the disc. by Old, Noten), I take it as a simple locative, construing the accusatives in d as

Inhaltsakk. with *dúhānā* in c. In any case it produces a bad cadence (4 light syllables); I do not see an easy repair strategy.

II.2.10: As in vss. 4 and 5, a form of *citāya-* (here *citayema*) has two different senses in two different constructions, by my interpr. In pāda a it shows a development of the ‘perceive’ sense, here rendered “get in sight of,” that is, “by our efforts get close enough to see.” The means by which we do so is *árvatā* “by steed,” namely warfare or contest. In pāda b *citayema* has a developed sense of ‘be perceived, appear’, namely ‘be distinguished / distinguish ourselves’. Here the means is *bráhmanā* ‘by a sacred formulation’, that is, by ritual or poetic competition. The standard tr. simply supply a verb in pāda a (‘acquire’, vel sim.), but the double usage of the other two forms of *citāya-* in this hymn suggests that this one, too, can be used for both pādas, and it is always preferable to avoid supplying verbs. Both WG and Proferes (68) in different ways take *citayema* with both pādas; Proferes interpr. it as a trans.-caus. in both pādas (“manifest”), WG only for the first (“erscheinen machen,” but “schauen können” in b). As noted above (ad vs. 4), the zero-grade root syllable tells against the trans.-caus. interpr.

II.2.11: With most, I interpr. *iṣáyanta* as ‘derive nourishment’, though Lub lists it with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’ and WG tr. “streben,” presumably assigning it to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’.

The acc. singulars *yám ... yajñám* probably do not belong together, although an interpr. “whom they approach as the sacrifice,” with Agni identified with the sacrifice, is not impossible. Ge considers it attraction from **yásya ... yajñám*, but a loose purpose/goal accusative, almost a pseudo-infinitive “to sacrifice,” seems syntactically acceptable to me.

II.3 Āprī

II.3.2 Pāda a is supposed to contain a lexeme *prāti* $\sqrt{aṇj}$ governing *dhāmāni*, but this would be the only ex. of the verbal idiom in the RV. I therefore take *prāti* as governing *dhāmāni* ‘foundations’, in a parallel expression to *tisró dívaḥ prāti* in b. I supply “of the earth” with *dhāmāni* on the basis of I.22.16 *dhāmabhiḥ pṛthivyāḥ*. The participle *añján* would be used absolutely and anticipate *sám anaktu* in d. The early part of the hymn has a tendency to station present participles at pāda ends, and not always with obj. (1d *árhan*, our 2a, 2c *undán*, 3a *árhan*).

II.3.4: The apparent loc. *védī* (so Pp.) should probably be read *védi* for metrical reasons (see Old: “nur angeblich Pragṛhya” [Noten]; Proleg. 456). AiG III.154–55 is skeptical about a loc. *-ī* to *-i*-stems and suggests that this, the clearest example, is actually to be explained by haplology from **védy[ām] asyām*, which seems highly unlikely, esp. since it would make the cadence metrically irreparable. I think we have to take this form as given and as a locative (not instr.), with a metrically short final vowel, which may result from shortening in hiatus. For a similar ex. see *bhūmī* (/ -i) in IX.61.10 and comm. thereon.

The last pāda contains a mixture of voc. (*devā ādityāḥ*) and nom. (*yajñíyāsaḥ*), with pāda-initial *vísve* ambiguous, since the accent may derive from its position. The tr.

does not reflect this case mixture, since a meticulous separation would be fussy and serve no purpose.

II.3.5: As Old points out, *suprāyaṇā-* is metrically bad here and worse in several other occurrences; it should be read **suprayāṇā-*, which presumably belongs to $\sqrt{yā}$, not \sqrt{i} .

I take the adjectives in d (*yaśásam suvīram*) as proleptic, the result of the purification, though this interpr. isn't strictly necessary.

II.3.6: In b *vayyēva* belongs to a *vṛkī-* type stem *vayī-* 'weaver', here in the dual. Old suggests that it doesn't really matter if we analyze it as *vayīyā iva*, with masc. du., or *vayīye (i)va* with fem. du., but given that the other adjectives in the hemistich, *ukṣité ... raṇvité*, are feminine in form and that *uśāsanāktā* is regularly fem., the latter seems more likely.

The vs. lacks a finite verb and there is no verbal form, finite or participial, to govern *āpāmsī* 'labors' in a. Most tr. supply 'work' vel sim., but I think it's possible that *sādhū* is an adverbial predicate, "on target" in the publ. tr., and that it loosely governs *āpāmsī*.

II.3.7: Re and WG supply 'sacrifice' as the obj. of *sām añjataḥ*, but since acc. *devān* is already available and was the obj. of exactly the same verb in 2d (*sām anaktu devān*), this is unnecessary.

II.3.8: *sādhāya(nti)* in pāda a and *svadhāyā* in c occupy the same metrical position and echo each other.

II.3.9: *subhāra-* here is used in a different sense (or senses) from the same word in 4b, where it referred to the good burden, that is, the seated gods, that the barhis was bearing. Here I think there is a pun: the hero is 'easy to bear', that is, his birth, depicted in pāda b, was easy. But the hero so born provides good support to those who depend on him.

With Re, I tr. *vīsyatu* in two slightly different senses with two different objects: 'unbind' with 'navel' (*nābhim*), referring to the technicalities of the birth process, and 'release' with 'offspring' (*prajāṁ*), referring to the results of birth.

The Tvaṣṭar verse in Āprī hymns generally directly concerns only his participation in the birth process (see I.142.10, III.4.9=VII.2.9, X.110.9, X.142.10; our pādas abc). Releasing the sacrificial animal and escorting it to (the fold/pen of) the gods is properly the province of the post ("Lord of the Forest," *vānaspātiḥ*, 10a), and that expression ("go to [the fold of] the gods") is a euphemism for the animal's death. However, note X.70.9–10, where both Tvaṣṭar and the Lord of the Forest convey the animal to the fold of the gods (*devānām pāthaḥ*). Like X.70.9 our pāda d implies that the journey of the sacrificial animal (that is, its death) occurs under the auspices of Tvaṣṭar, and in fact, given the apparent temporal/logical connector *āthā* beginning pāda d, the implication is that the offspring born in abc is to undertake this journey. This seems rather muddled: our new (human) offspring is not the sacrificial animal. I think the roles of Tvaṣṭar and the Lord of the Forest were quite distinct, but conflation like this could occur because the Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati vss. are always adjacent in Āprī hymns and because the vocabulary is similar: Tvaṣṭar's *vī√sā* 'unbind/release' and Vanaspati's *āva*

√*srj* ‘release/discharge’. The fact that the victim is usually not overly expressed (presumably a euphemistic avoidance) makes confusion all the more likely.

II.3.11: The *-si* form *vakṣi* would be better tr. as an impv. “convey,” rather than a subj. “you will convey” as in the publ. tr.

II.4 Agni

II.4.1: The stem *suvr̥ktī-* generally refers to a hymn and has in fact virtually been substantivized to mean hymn. However, it must be a bahuvr̥hi in origin; I generally tr. ‘having a good twist’, referring to the clever adornments, the turns of phrase, of a skillfully crafted hymn. Here I think it has two senses: first, characterizing Agni himself as ‘having a good twist’, perhaps referring to his swirling smoke and flames, but then, as a sort of secondary or double bahuvr̥hi, ‘having [/receiving] (hymns) with good twists’. In this meaning it is parallel to *suprayásam* ‘having [/receiving] pleasurable offerings’. Note that the two are both final in their pādas. I do not think Ge’s “euren Preis” or Re’s “hymne (incarné)” is either necessary or illuminating.

On the desiderative gerundive *didhiṣāyya-* see comm. ad I.73.2. Although the tr. “desirable to install” is somewhat heavy, the complexity of the formation seems to require a weighty tr.

The last pāda indulges in play with the name Jātavedas: *devá ādeve jáne jātávedāḥ*. The first and last elements, *devá ... vedāḥ*, are virtual mirror images, with the 2nd word *ādeve* reinforcing the first, and *jáne* making an etymological figure with *jātá*.

II.4.2: The combination of honoring Agni “in the seat of the waters” (a) and the Bhṛguṣ “once again” installing him among the clans (b) suggests that this vs. concerns the well-known myth of Agni’s flight and concealment in the waters and the Bhṛguṣ’ discovery, recovery, and reinstallation of Agni as the ritual fire. X.46.2 begins with a pāda identical to our pāda a and then relates the Bhṛguṣ’ finding of the fire *gúhā cátantam* “hiding in secret”: *imám vidhánto apām sadhásthe, ... padaír ánu gman / gúhā cátantam usíjo námobhir, ichánto dhîrā bhígavo ‘vindan* “This one here -- doing honor to him in the seat of the waters, they followed him along his tracks ... / With reverences seeking him who was hiding in secret, the fire-priests, the insightful Bhṛguṣ found him.” (I would now alter the tr. ‘having done honor’ to ‘doing honor’, also in X.46.2; for further disc. see comm. ad X.46.2.) The same myth may be alluded to, in ring compositional fashion, in vs. 9 of our hymn. Note also that the poet to whom this hymn is ascribed is Somāhuti Bhārgava.

II.4.2–3: As IH pointed out to me, *dvitādadhur* in 2b can be read, contra Pp. *adadhur*, as *dvitā dadhur*, with perfect indic. or pres. injunc.; I now favor the unaugmented reading for reasons given below.

The contrast between the verbs in 2ab *imám ... (a)dadhur bhígavaḥ* and 3ab *agnīm devāsaḥ ... dhuḥ* seems to encode the primal installation of Agni by the gods (3) and the recent installation, by men (2). Why the primal installation is expressed by a root aor. injunc. is not clear to me, but I would now alter the publ. tr. to “Agni did the gods install ...,” from “Agni have the gods installed ...,” to reflect the remote past. Note also that the opening of 3b is metrically aberrant, with an opening of 3. HvN suggest a rest in

4th position. It would be possible to restore **dadhuḥ*, which would match the same verb in the same position in 2b, but I think it's more likely that the omission of a syllable is meant to call attention to the difference in verb stems. A rest in 3rd position, producing a syncopated *dhuḥ* might be better. If the two verbs are being directly contrasted, an unaugmented *dadhur* in 2 is more likely than augmented *adadhur* (in order to highlight the difference in stems). Discussion with IH has helped me clarify my interpr.

II.4.3: I tr. *dīdayat ... ūrmyā ā* “shine towards the nights,” rather than “illuminate the nights” with the standard tr., because I could not otherwise account for the *ā*. Narten's tr. (KISch 370 n. 5) is similarly intransitive though with a temporal, rather than goal, acc.: “Er soll die Nächte hindurch leuchten.”

Note *mitrām* √ *dhā* in b reprising the same lexeme in 1c.

On *dakṣāyyaḥ*, whose morphology resembles *didhiṣāyyaḥ* in 1c, see comm. ad I.91.3. As noted there, in this passage it could also or alternatively mean “to be skillfully tended.”

II.4.4: The predicate adj. *raṇvā* qualifies both *puṣṭiḥ* and *sāmdrṣṭiḥ*; for the latter see X.64.11 *raṇvāḥ sāmdrṣṭau*.

I take *dākṣu-* as a pseudo-desid. *u*-participle; also *dhākṣu-* in X.115.4.

Because *dodhavīti* in d is unaccented, it cannot be the verb of the relative clause beginning with *yāḥ* in c, despite the standard tr. Instead the intensive part. *bhāribhṛat* must be predicated in the rel. cl. and *dodhavīti* interpreted as the verb of the main clause.

Because of the equine simile and imagery, the primary reading of *dodhavīti vārān* must be “twitches his tail(-hairs),” but a second reading “shakes out choice things” is also invited.

II.4.5: This vs. describes the changes in color and form of the kindled fire as a sight to be wondered at. My tr. follows Ge's in outline and many details. The first sight is of the shapeless dark cloud of smoke (a), but that transforms into color and bright light (bc). On *ābhva-* see my forthcoming “The Blob in Ancient India” (UCLA CMRS 2015 dragon conf. vol.), and for a parallel passage (also adduced by Ge) VI.4.3 ... *yāsya panāyanty ābhvam, bhāṣāmsi vaste sūryo nā śukrāḥ* “He whose formless mass [=smoke] they [=mortals] marvel at ..., he (then) clothes himself in lights, like the brilliant sun,” which seems to show parallel progress from dark to light and also contains a form of *bhāṣ-* as here.

vanād- ‘wood-eater’ assumes a root noun 1st member *vān-*, preserved in a few forms such as loc. pl. *vāmsu* (see Schindler, Rt. Noun), against the overwhelming number of forms to thematic *vāna-*.

I do not understand the simile in b, *uśigbhyo nā* “as if for the fire-priests.” Perhaps the point is that the fire-tending performed by Uśij-priests would cause the smoke to dissipate and the flames to appear, but that in their absence this change comes about anyway. Note that in X.46.2, quoted above ad vs. 2, the Bhṛguṣ seem to be identified as *uśij*-priests, so the simile here may be referring to ritual behavior in ancestral time. WG tr. “wie den (danach) Verlangenden,” but *uśij-* is elsewhere the designation of a priest (and cf. Old Aves. *usij-*) and is so tr. by them elsewhere (e.g., I.60.4).

For *rāmsu* as adverbial loc. pl. to the root noun *rān-* see Schindler Rt. Noun and EWA, both s.v. *raṇ*. And note *raṇvā-* in the preceding and following vss. (4a, 6c).

The last pāda describes the graying of the ash (“having grown old”) and then the rejuvenation of the flames presumably by the addition of more firewood.

II.4.6: The standard tr. take *bhāti* as the operator of the simile (e.g., Ge “Der nach den Hölzern ausschaut(?) wie der Durstige (nach Wasser)”), but this doesn’t make much sense. From *vanād-* ‘wood-eater’ in the immediately preceding vs. I extract ‘eat’ to govern *vānā* and to be compared to *tāṭṛṣāṇāḥ* ‘thirsting’ in the same semantic realm, hence my “(eating) wood like one athirst.” This leaves *bhāti* free of complements.

My ‘red-hot’ for *tāpuḥ* contrasts nicely with *kṛṣṇādhvā* ‘having a black road’, but is unfortunately not entirely legitimate: it is more literally just ‘hot’; there is no color component.

Act. pf. *ciketa* in c might be expected to mean ‘perceives’, as generally, but it must mean instead ‘appears’; so all the standard tr., and see also Kü (175) on the unusual sense. It is all the more surprising given med. *cikite* in the same meaning in the immediately preceding vs. (5c). But in this case the two forms may have been seen as metrical variants with identical sense, since *ciketa* is always pāda-final, *cikite* always post-caesura, as here.

The unexpressed concept in the simile “like heaven smiling with its clouds” must be lightning, which smiles (I.168.8) or laughs (V.52.6). Lightning is white, like (some) clouds.

II.4.7: The root \sqrt{svad} is generally a ritual technical term: the ritual fire “sweetens,” that is, “ritually prepares” the oblations. Here the forest fire performs the same action on the non-ritual ground. Although this might depict some version of slash-and-burn agriculture (so WG), I think it more likely that the point is merely to give a ritual dimension to the wild and unpredictable actions of the forest fire, in the hope of exerting some control over it. The same ritual overlay is found in I.169.3 *agnís cid dhí śmātasé śusukvān, ... dādhati prāyāmsi* “For even a fire blazing in the brushwood can produce pleasurable offerings.” The position of *ná* after the verb *asvadayat* in our passage suggests that the simile is targeting the verb, an extremely unusual situation in Vedic poetics. Since, as discussed elsewhere (see comm. ad VIII.76.1 and nearby II.11.3), simile-marking *ná* cannot take final position but flips with its target, it would be possible to take the simile to be **bhūma ná*. However, I do not think “ground” is the simile target, but the actual obj. of *asvadayat*, which has no other possible obj. in context.

II.4.8: The phrase *ṭṛtīye vidáthe* “third rite of distribution” probably refers to the Third Pressing (though the two other occurrences of “three *vidáthas*”, at VI.51.2 and VII.66.10, do not seem to). Agni is of course present at all the pressings, but is not especially associated with the Third Pressing; however, *ṭṛtīye sāvane* at III.28.5 is in an Agni context.

II.4.9: In the publ. tr. I supply with *gúhā* a form like *hitám* (cf. I.23.14, II.11.5, IV.5.8, etc.), *cárantam* (III.1.9), or *cátantam* (I.65.1, X.46.2) referring to Agni when he was hiding in the waters, a myth I also think is referred to obliquely in vs. 2 of this hymn (see

above). Our vs. 2 is especially close to X.46.2, which relates this story, and X.46.2c begins *gúhā cátantam* (and continues with a ref. to the *usíj-*; see our 5b). I therefore think my suggestion is justified, though I am usually reluctant to supply extraneous material. The point is -- if the Gr̥tsamadas (re)gain the hidden Agni, just as their ancestors the Bhṛgus did, they will get the upper hand against their enemies. The standard tr. must construe *gúhā* with *vanvántaḥ* ‘gaining in secret’ (e.g., Ge “heimlich überbieten und uüberwinden”). Although this is the obvious way to construe the text as given, the notion that our side would win by stealth and secret means seems antithetic to the Rigvedic ideal of combat, whether on the battlefield or the ritual ground. The adverb *gúhā* is extremely common in the flight-of-Agni myth and in an Agni hymn would likely call to mind the whole story. I would now be inclined to emend the publ. tr. to “(the one hiding) in secret,” not “(... deposited) in secret,” because of its apparent dependence on X.46.2 or a passage like it.

II.5 Agni

The first seven of the eight vss. (the 8th being a summary vs.) name and describe the various priestly roles that Agni assumes in the ritual. In all but vs. 3 the priestly title is given; in 3 the title must be inferred from the description, which unfortunately is somewhat muddled. See extensive disc. below.

II.5.1: On *jénya-* see comm. ad I.128.7.

II.5.2: The priestly subject of this vs. is the Potar, found in the final pāda, but there is a teaser in pāda b, in the form of an agent noun *netár-* ‘leader’ in the expression *yajñāsya netári* “to/in the leader of the sacrifice.” But *netár-* is not a technical priestly role; the real priestly title derived from the root $\sqrt{n\bar{r}}$ is Neṣtar, found in vs. 5 (*neṣtuḥ*).

II.5.3: It is not clear what the disjunctive *vā* is disjoining. Klein (DGRV II.187–88) considers vs. 3 a reformulation of vs. 2, tr. “Or (more precisely) ...” But since vs. 3 most likely concerns a different priestly office than vs. 2 (*brahmán-* by implication, not *pótar-*), this doesn’t work. No other tr. attempts to account for *vā*. Since Agni is the implicit subject of these vss. and the referent of the various priestly offices, I think that “or” is simply introducing a different role that the same Agni performs. If, as I suggest below, the first part of vs. 3 (*dadhanvé ... yád īm ānu* “when he has run after it”) picks up the last part of vs. 2 (*vísvaṃ tád invati* “he sets all this in motion”), the “or” might emphasize the fact that the same Agni who set the sacrifice in motion is now switching roles to run after what he started. The “or” indicates that an alternative Agni-figure is now in question.

The three verbs in ab, *dadhanvé*, *vócat*, and *véḥ*, have been configured in every possible way. Ge takes the first two as parallel in the dependent cl. marked by *yád*, with *véḥ* the main cl. verb (accented because it’s in the initial position of its clause). Acdg. to Re, *dadhanvé* is a main verb, with *vócat* the verb of its associated *yád* cl., while *véḥ* is the verb of an independent main cl. Old (SBE) takes all three as parallel verbs in the *yád* cl., with c as the main cl. Like me, Klein makes *vócat* and *véḥ* parallel main cl. verbs, with *dadhanvé* in the *yád* cl. (In his *Particle u* ... [p. 81] Klein specifically takes *u* not only as indicating that *vócat* and *véḥ* are coordinate but suggests it was syncopated from *utá* in the context ... *u tát*.) And, finally, WG take *dadhanvé* in the dependent cl., *vócat* in the

main cl., and *véḥ* as 2nd sg. direct speech specifying *vócat*. This chaotic diversity shows that we interpreters are uncertain not only about the syntax of the verse but the sense. In what follows I will pursue this sense, with no certainty that what I present is correct.

Ge (/WG) take the subject of *dadhanvé* to be the priest and *īm* as referring to Agni whom the priest pursues, but, as in II.1, Agni is *identified* with the various priestly functions, and I think he must be the subj. of all the verbs here. I don't really understand the function of *dadhanvé*, but it might simply express Agni's pursuit of the priestly role or of the formulations that he then speaks (in which case *īm* is better tr. 'them', as is quite possible). But I would now suggest that there is continuity with the previous vs., and that Agni in his new role is running after "all this" (*visvam tād*, probably the sacrifice or some part of it) that as Potar he set in motion. See above.

The reason that WG interpret *véḥ* as direct speech is to render it as a 2nd sg.; they clearly reject the standard 3rd sg. interpr. But I do not think that a 3rd sg. can be avoided here or in I.77.2 or IV.7.7 (WG render the former as 3rd sg. but the latter as 2nd sg.), although Gr's assignment of the forms to an *s*-aor. to $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$ is most likely incorrect. (Curiously Narten does not discuss *véḥ* in her entry on $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$, even to reject the *s*-aor. analysis.) Instead I would take *véḥ* (underlying *ves*) as the injunctive to the root pres. of $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$, but with the substitution of *-s* for *-t* in the 3rd sg. as if it belonged to an *s*-aor. or a root aor. of the type (*ā*)*var* (2nd/3rd sg.) -- keeping in mind that before voiced sounds *véḥ* appears as *vér* and so an analogy to phonologically similar (*ā*)*var* would not be surprising. There are no 3rd sg. *-t* forms to this stem, unless augmented *ávet* (V.34.8) belongs here. One of the idiomatic uses of the root $\sqrt{v\bar{i}}$ is with an acc. of an office or function (see esp. I.76.4 *véṣi hotrám utá potrám* "You pursue the Hotarship and the Potarship," adduced by Ge), which is the apparent sense here, and so assigning *véḥ* to a different root, such as $\sqrt{viṣ}$, should be avoided.

As noted in the intro. remark above, this vs. is the only one of the seven "priestly role" vss. in which the priestly title is missing. Instead we must infer it from the description of Agni's activity. It is probably no accident that this is the only vs. in the hymn in which the priestly title has to be inferred and supplied, since the priestly role depicted in the vs. involves the clever manipulation of language and the capture, via *bráhmāṇi*, of hidden truths. The poet is in essence making his audience act the role of the *brahmán-* by figuring out what the vs. is getting at. In my opinion the most crucial piece is pāda b, where Agni "speaks sacred formulations" (*vócad bráhmāṇi*). The speaker of formulations (*bráhma-*) is of course the *brahmán*, and this is the title we must derive from this context. That *véḥ* is used of the pursuit of priestly roles (see above) but here appears without overt object also invites us to fill in the blank in this way. Our inference is reinforced by cd *pári visvāni kāvya ... abhavat*, where Agni encompasses "all poetic skills," that is, the ones necessary to produce effective formulations.

This brings us to the problem of *abhavat*. As IH points out to me, the recent past sense I attribute to this verb here ("has encompassed") would be highly unusual for an augmented imperfect, and given the perplexing variety of verbs in the earlier parts of the vs. (pf. *dadhanvé*, injunc. aor. *vócat*, injunc. pres. *véḥ*) and the uncertainty of their syntactic distribution, not to mention the sense of the vs. as a whole, adding to the confusion by attributing an unusual sense to *abhavat* should be avoided if at all possible. It might be possible to read the injunctives *vócat* and *véḥ* not as present/future as in the publ. tr., but as pasts: "... he spoke formulations and pursued ...," which would be

friendly to a simple past interpr. of *abhavat* “he encompassed ...” However, two things speak against this. First, the rest of the hymn presents Agni’s occupation of the various offices in the present/recent past. And second, injunctive forms of *vóca-* almost always have a performative pres.-future sense, as in the famous and stereotyped opening of I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam* “I (will) proclaim the manly deeds of Indra.” Imposing a past interpr. here would contravene the normal usage of this form, esp. since it fits well with the presential focus of the rest of the hymn and nothing else presses a past interpr. My not entirely satisfactory response to this conundrum is to suggest that cd describes Agni’s acquisition of poetic skills in the past – he is elsewhere often called a *kaví-* -- which allows him to assume the role of Formulator now. So I would alter the tr. to “he encompassed all poetic skills ...” Many thanks to IH for extensive discussion of this problematic passage.

II.5.4: The standard tr. construe *śúcīnā* with *krátunā* (e.g., Ge “mit lauterem Sinne”). This is certainly possible -- though *śúci- krātu-* is not a standard collocation -- but not necessary.

The standard tr. also assume a change of subject in cd from Agni (ab) to a priest “who knows (Agni’s) *vratas*” (*vidvāṁ asya vratā dhruvā*). I find this unlikely; *vidvān* modifies Agni in vs. 8 (in my view), as well as twice in the next, closely related, hymn (II.6.7, 8). Moreover, *vidvān* is regularly used absolutely, taking an object much less often. I construe *vratā dhruvā* instead with *ānu*: “according to his *vratās*.” The collocation *ānu vratā-* is quite common; here the *vratā-* would be the rules that govern the natural world (plants and fires). The *asya* refers to Agni, the subj. of the sentence, and is therefore de facto reflexive, but this is not unusual.

II.5.5: On the interpretational difficulties of this vs., see publ. intro.

II.5.6: I take *yádī* as *yád ī*, with pronominal enclitic *ī* standing for ‘him’ = Agni/Adhvaryu. See my “RVic *sīm* and *īm*” (Fs. Cardona, 2002).

Ge’s identifications, flg. Sāy., of the mother as the cow and the sister as the offering ladle or, less likely in my opinion, the ghee offering itself, seem reasonable. He suggests that the pl. *tāsām* of c picks up a collective in the previous clause, presumably ghee. This seems less likely to me; I suggest “the arrival of these (fem.)” refers back to the sisters who came here (*svāsāro yā idām yayúḥ*) in 5d.

II.5.7: The convoluted but rhetorically balanced expression *sváh svāya dhāyase kṛṇutām ṛtvīg ṛtvījam* (“Let him, as Ṛtvij, make himself Ṛtvij, to suckle himself”) makes explicit Agni’s double role in this hymn: he is both a divine version of each priest in turn and represents the corresponding human priest. Here as divine Ṛtvij he makes himself into the human Ṛtvij, whose function is to give nourishment to the ritual fire, that is, to himself -- a kind of closed and reflexive circle. Once the mechanism of the identifications that have run through the hymn has been laid bare, the poet briskly finishes up the hymn, beginning with the summary 2nd hemistich here.

Most tr. struggle to construe *stómaṃ yajñám ca* with the closest verb, *vanéma*. Somewhat against my principles, I instead take *ād áram*, *vanéma* as parenthetical and construe the first NP with *rarimā*. (I have displaced the tr. of the *ād* clause to the right,

because the parenthetical tr. was difficult to parse.) In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the standard tr. require *ād* to be in a highly unusual position, in the middle of its supposed clause. As it happens, WG interpr. the syntax as I do.

II.5.8: Ge (/WG) and Re take the subj. of ab to be the sacrificer, flg. Sāy., but Agni as the priestly mediator makes more sense. As noted above, ad 4c, *vidvān* must modify Agni in the last two vss. of the next hymn, II.6.7–8.

II.6 Agni

II.6.1: The most likely referent to supply with fem. *ayā* is *girā*, given *gīrah* closing the preceding vs. and the 2 forms of this stem in the first pāda of the next vs. (3a; see also 6b). Cf. also II.24.1 *ayā vidhema ... girā*.

II.6.5: The vs. lacks a verb, though one can easily be supplied. The standard tr. supply an imperative: I extract ‘give’ out of *vāsu-dāvan* ‘giving goods’ in 4b, but ‘bring’ (so Ge, Re) works as well. What is clever about the syntax of this vs. is that the only signal of the absent imperative is the presumed 2nd ps. reference of the repeated *sā*, which of course is ordinarily a 3rd ps. pronoun, but is very frequent with 2nd ps. imperatives (see my “sa figé” article, *HS* 1992).

II.6.6: With Ge (/WG) *girā* could be construed with *īlānāya* “reverently invoking with song.”

II.6.7: With Sāy., Ge, Old (SBE), etc., I take *jānyeva* as representing *janya(h) iva*, with double application of sandhi (as in nearby II.2.5), against the Pp. *jānyā*. There are various different interpr. of the sociological situation represented by *jānyeva mītryah*; mine is closest to Old (SBE). See disc. in my 2001 Fs. Parpola article. Although similar phraseology is used of the public solemnization of marriage, I do not think that is the point here (*pace* Ge, etc.). See comm. ad II.39.1.

II.6.8: The undoubted subjunctive (*ā*) *piprayah* seems to anchor the following *yakṣi* and (*ā*) *satsi* as the haplogitized *s*-aor. subjunctives they originally were, rather than in their later imperative function, esp. given the coordination of the first and last terms by *ca ... ca*. However, the two *ca*’s could be more or less independent, with the second one conjoining *yakṣi* and *satsi* more closely.

II.7 Agni

II.7.1: Note ... *bhārata* # (a) / ... *ā bhara* # (b).

II.7.2: On *īśata* in the *mā* prohibitive see comm. ad I.23.9.

II.7.3: The simile marker *iva* is wrongly placed, in that it follows both parts of the simile “watery streams” (*dhārā udanyā*).

The verse contains several tricks involving word order. First, the first word of the vs., *vísṽā(h)*, and the last, *dviṣaḥ*, belong together: “all hatreds.” Their extreme distraction may be iconic of the distance that we must cross to pass beyond them. Notice that they are also near rhyme forms. Further, there is a clever grammatical switch between vss. 2 and 3: 2c ends with (*utā*) *dviṣāḥ* (abl. sg.) / 3c with *dviṣaḥ* (acc.pl.), and 3a begins with *vísṽā(h)* (*utā*). As just noted, this opening *vísṽā(h)* is to be construed with the distant 3c *dviṣaḥ*, not with the *dviṣāḥ* immediately before it -- even though they seem bracketed together, sandwiched in by *utā*’s, with phonologically similar *tásyā* immed. before and *tváyā* immed. after: *tásyā utā dviṣāḥ // vísṽā utā tváyā*.

II.7.5: On the *vaśā* cow, see my Hyenas (258–60), building on H. Falk, “Zur Tiersucht im alten Indien” (IIJ 24: 169–80). Although often tr. “barren cow,” a *vaśā* is one that has been mated but has not yet calved -- so possibly barren, possibly not. My tr. here, “mated cows,” is not fully accurate but far less awkward than accuracy would require.

WG supply “verses” with *aṣṭāpadībhiḥ*, though they allow the possibility of a cow in their n. Although this pun is probably lurking here -- eight-footed verses would of course be pādas with eight syllables -- the primary reading must be some sort of bovine, given the words with which it is parallel. See Old’s comment on this vs. (SBE).

II.7.6: The final word of the vs. (and the hymn) *ādbhutaḥ* echoes the finals of the last two vss., 4c and 5c *āhutaḥ*.

II.8 Agni

II.8.1–4: The *#ya(śástamasya)* that opens 1c anticipates the forms of the relative pronoun *yá-* in the next 3 vss. (2a *#yáḥ*, 3a *#yá(h)*, 3c *#yásya*, with the last, 4a *#ā yáḥ*, no longer in initial position), though of course it is entirely unrelated to the relative. The referent of all those rel. pronouns is Agni, who is also the referent of *yaśástamasya*. Phonology and syntax are thus wedded.

II.8.4–6: As the just-mentioned structural device expires in 4a, another takes its place. An unbroken alliterative string runs from the end of 4b through the beginning of 5: ... *arcíṣa / añjānó ajárait abhí // átrim ánu ...*, and the first words of the most of the remaining pādas also start with *a-* (5b *agním*, 6a *agnér*, 6c *áriṣyantaḥ*, 6d *abhí*). Since *ādhi* is the 2nd word in 5c, only 6b is not part of the chain.

II.8.4–5: On the disguised Svarbhānu myth in these two vss., see publ. intro. Most tr./comm. are puzzled by the appearance of Atri here, and Ge and Old in particular speculate on possible emendations. But the presence of the Svarbhānu formula guarantees that the text is genuine, in my opinion.

II.9-10 Agni

These two six-verse trimeter hymns follow the two six-verse dimeter hymns (II.7–8), though by the normal rules of hymn ordering they should precede them. In his opening n. on II.9 in SBE, Old tentatively suggests that II.9 and 10 should each be

divided into two *tr̥cas*, but in the *Noten* he essentially withdraws this suggestion because he sees signs of unity within the two hymns as transmitted.

II.9 Agni

II.9.1: *vidāna-* is ambiguous: it can belong either to $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’ (Ge [WG], Re, though he registers the ambiguity in n.) or $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’ (Old [SBE]). I assign it to the latter and think it refers to the myth of the discovery and recovery of the fugitive Agni. The word forms a weak ring with *suvidātra-* in the final vs., 6a, assuming the latter word is a derivative of $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$; see comm. ad vs. 6.

ādabdhavratapramati- is an unusual *cmpd* for the RV in having three members, and with its initial accent (on which see AiG II.1.293) the accent falls about as far from word-end as it is possible to be.

II.9.4: There is some difference of opinion about the meaning of *manótar-*. Most take it as some version of ‘deviser, inventor’ (so Gr, Ge, HO [SBE], Re, WG), but Tichy (*Nomen Agentis*, 40 and passim) argues for the sense ‘remind-er, rememberer’. I opt for something in the middle, ‘minder’. That is, I don’t think the term means that Agni creates ritual speech (the standard view), nor that he remembers or reminds the officiants of this speech (the Tichy view), but that he takes account of it, pays attention to it. The English term ‘minder’ (as in childminder) also has the connotation of taking care of someone or something, tending or ministering to it or them, and that sense would fit here as well. See also comm. ad IV.5.10 citing several passages containing the verb stem *manu-* that underlies this unusually formed agent noun with the sense ‘ponder, bring to mind’.

II.9.5: Various suggestions have been made about the two types of goods in *pāda a* (see the nn. of Old [SBE], Ge, Re, and WG), but Re’s suggestion that it’s livestock and offspring seems the most satisfying contextually, given the wishes expressed in *cd*. For disc. of similar phrases see comm. ad VI.19.10.

II.9.6: As noted above, I suggest that *suvidātra-* makes a ring with *vidāna-* in 1a, a suggestion that rests on assigning both words to the root $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’ and on assuming that this root meaning is still apparent in *suvidātra-*. Neither of these assumptions is unchallenged. Gr assigns *-vidatra-* to *dā*¹ ‘give’+ *ví* and glosses it ‘vertheilend’. (That $\sqrt{\text{dā}}$ is not otherwise found with *ví* speaks against this derivation.) In his brief treatment of the word Debrunner (AiG II.2.170) gives its root etymology as $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ with a question mark, glossing it ‘wohlwollend’. Though no doubt other etymological suggestions have been made, I have not to my knowledge encountered them. The standard interpr. of the semantics, however, are like Debrunner’s -- ‘wohlwollend, gnädig, d’accueil favorable’, etc. Whatever the root derivation assumed, this rather vague meaning is far from ‘find’ (or ‘know’ or ‘distribute’) and the semantic pathway to it is unclear. Moreover, a passage like X.15.3 *āhām pitṛṇ suvidātrām avitsi* “I have found the *suvidātra-* forefathers (/forefathers that are easy/good to find)” testifies to at least a secondary connection between the form and the root $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’, as well as enough semantic connection remaining to allow the phrase to function as a linguistic figure. The word is found twice in the Agni hymns of II, once here, once in II.1.8. Both vss. also contain the word *ānīka-*

‘visage, face’ (though in II.1.8 admittedly not in the same clause). Especially in our passage I think the point is that because of Agni’s shining face he is easy to find -- he is the brightest thing around. See also the disc. of *durvidátra-* ad X.35.4, which provides further evidence for a derivation from $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’.

That the next hymn (II.10), which is at least metrically paired with this one (see comm. ad II.9-10), is also characterized by a ring linking the first and last vss. and that the first word of the ring is also formed with a *-tra*-suffix (*johútra-*) lend some support to my speculations about *suvidátra-* here.

II.10 Agni

II.10.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the first word of the hymn, *johútra-*, forms a ring with *johavīmi*, the last word. The connection between them is emphasized by the intensive redupl. in *johútra-*; no other *-tra-* stems show redupl., much less intensive reduplication. Gr (and, it seems, WG, here though not in I.118.9; II.20.3 isn’t clear) take the stem as act. (‘laut rufend’), but a passive value makes better sense in all 3 occurrences (so Old [SBE], Ge, Re). The *-tra-* form in the next vs., *vībhṛtra-* (2d), is likewise passive. My tr. “invoked ... on every side” is based on the possibility that the *-tra-* suffix evokes the *-tra* adverbial locatives (such as *átra* ‘here’), although this may be pushing the limits (likewise my ‘dispersed in many places’ for *vībhṛtra-* in 2d). It does, however, work with the thematics of the first few vss.: vs. 2 urgently begs to hear *my* call (*hávam me*, with the possessive prn. emphatically placed pāda-final), and the two occurrences of *vīcetāḥ* ‘discriminating’ (1c, 2b) suggest that Agni is choosing among the various sacrifices he might attend on the journey described in 2cd.

II.10.2: The urgency of the poet’s desire is conveyed by the isolated precativ *śrūyā(h)*, the only precativ to this root, hence my “may he please hear.” It also provides a phonological template for *śyāvā* opening the next hemistich (2c) and, more distantly, *uttānāyām* and *śirīṇāyām* opening 3a and c respectively.

II.10.3: The fem. sg. loc. *uttānāyām* is generally simply tr. ‘outstretched’ or sim. I think the image is more precise: the two kindling sticks, athwart each other, are likened to a woman in birthing position with her legs stretched out and open (my “agape”).

The rhyming form *śirīṇāyām* opening the 2nd half-vs. is much more difficult. It is a hapax with no clear root affiliation, and the suggested tr. range widely -- ‘night’, ‘chamber’, ‘hiding place’, etc. (See the standard tr., plus KEWA and EWA s.v.) My own very tentative suggestion links it to *sirā* ‘stream’ (I.121.11) and *sirī-* (if that means ‘stream’, as JPB takes it, X.71.9), as well as to later *sirā-* ‘vein’ (also found in MIA). By extension I take it to refer metaphorically to the birth canal, in which Agni remains, unborn, during the night -- though he cannot be kept confined for very long. This would again be a reference to the kindling sticks, in whose attenuated interior he is fancied to be hidden. The variation in sibilant would not be surprising, particularly in a body-part word that could be mediated by Middle Indic. All this is very speculative, however, and it might be wiser to leave the word untranslated.

II.10.4: This vs. describes what happens to the fire after the peaceful creature depicted in pāda b is sprinkled with melted butter (pāda a): he takes on an appearance (*dfśānam*) that is larger and more powerful. Contra Ge, Re, WG (but with Old [SBE]) I construe *ānnaiḥ* with *vyāciṣṭham*, on the basis of III.50.1 *uruvyācāḥ ... ebhír ānnaiḥ*.

II.10.5: The first hemistich of this vs., which repeats the verb of the preceding vs., *jigharmi* ‘I sprinkle’, expresses the hope that this sprinkling, which rendered Agni ‘overpowering, violent’ (*rabhasām*) at the end of the last vs., will not make him hostile and dangerous: he should enjoy the ghee “with an undemonic spirit” (*arakṣāsā mānasā*).

The second hemistich states that no matter how lovely his appearance is, he is not to be touched; the unexpressed reason for this of course is that he will burn whoever or whatever does touch him. The hapax bahuvr. *spṛhayādvarṇa-* is variously interpreted. I think it means not ‘having desirable color’ (so, approx. Re.) nor ‘desiring color’ (so approx. Ge and WG), but rather ‘having questing color’ -- that is, his color (=flames) flickering here and there (*jārbhurāṇaḥ*) look in their random motion as if they are seeking something. In other words, despite their apparent formal match I take *spṛhayādvarṇa-* as a bahuvrīhi based on a karmadhāraya, rather than as a verbal governing cmpd. of the type *dhārayāt-kavi-* ‘upholding poets’.

II.10.6: The first pāda of this vs. continues the theme of trying to set limits on the unpredictably powerful Agni. (In my view; it is not so interpr. by others.) Here he is urged (again with a precative, *jñeyāḥ*) to know or recognize his share. I take this to mean that he should take his share and no more, though his power would allow him to take whatever he wants (*sahasānó vāreṇa*). Agni thus controlled will then help the singer to achieve his goals (pādas bcd).

Note that Manu returns from the 1st vs. — another little ring. The adj. *madhupīcam* ‘mixing with honey’ reminds us of the later Madhuparka drink offered to distinguished visitors, but I doubt that such a reference is found here. Though it would be generally appropriate for Agni the *ātithi-* (‘guest’), this hospitality theme, though common in the RV, is not found in this hymn.

For the pun in the 2nd half vs., see publ. intro. Notice also that *juh^uvā* mimics the phonology of the verb *johavīmi*, thus emphasizing the ring of the latter with the first word of the hymn *johūtra*.

[II.11–24 JPB – comments by SWJ]

II.11 Indra (comments SJ; for a complete translation with my modifications, see end)

The hymn has a remarkable number of predicated tense-stem participles. There are also an unusual number of past anteriors of various sorts.

Another notable feature is the large number of occurrences of the particle *nú*, all in the first pāda of the vs., in short runs of adjacent vss.: 3a, 4a; 6a, 7a; 15a, 16a, 17a. The last vs. of the hymn (21) then begins *nūnām*, as if in summary.

Other signature words recur through the hymn: forms of $\sqrt{vṛdh}$ (esp. *vardhāya-*): 1c, 2d, 4a, 4c, 8c, 11c, 13b, 15d, 20b; \sqrt{mand} (esp. *mandasānā-*): 3c, 11b (2x), 14c, 15a, 17a, 20a.

There is also a certain amount of chaining, though it is not applied systematically: 3d/4a *śubhrā-*, 6d/7a *hārī-*, 7d/8a *pārvata-*, 9d/10a *vīṣṇo asya vājra-*, 10d/11a *√pā-*, 12d/13a *syāma*, 13d/14a *rāsi-*, 15d/16a *bṛhāt-*, 19d/20a *tritā-*.

On the unusual meter of this hymn see Old Prol. 87–90, who also remarks on its unusual vocab., which, taken together, gives the hymn a “Sonderstellung” among the surrounding hymns (87 n. 1). See also Ge’s intro. for remarks on its stylistic features.

II.11.2: The pf. part. *vāvṛdhānāḥ* would better be rendered as an anterior: “when you had become strong ...”

II.11.3 There are several syntactic problems in this verse. The easiest to deal with is the apparently misplaced *ca* in b. All the standard tr. as well as the publ. tr. take *rudrīyeṣu* as a modifier of *stómeṣu*, with the whole loc. phrase *#ukthēṣu ..., stómeṣu ... rudrīyeṣu ca* then interpreted as “in the hymns and in the Rudriyan praises,” with the *ca* following the 2nd word of a bipartite NP and at a considerable distance from the 1st. (We would expect **stómeṣu ca (...)* *rudrīyeṣu*.) Klein (DGRV I.54) calls this “the most anomalous position of *ca* within adjective plus noun syntagms.” This difficulty disappears if we take *rudrīyeṣu* not as an adjective with *stómeṣu*, but as a third term in the conjoined phrase: “in the hymns, in the praises, and in the Rudriyans.” The *ca* is then correctly positioned in an X Y Z *ca* construction (on which see Klein DGRV I.86–91). The Rudriyans in question are the Maruts. It is important to note that the adj. *rudrīya-* is almost never used of anyone or anything but the Maruts, and in the plural never of anything but the Maruts. It is also never used of hymns or praises. It is true that my interpr. produces disharmony in semantic class: two types of verbal products and a group of gods, but Indra does indeed get pleasure and strengthening both from human praises and from the Maruts, who stood by him at the Vṛtra battle (and who also praise him: see, e.g., comm. ad V.52 and my 2006 “Poetic Repair”). My interpr. both solves the *ca* placement problem and also allows *rudrīya-* to refer to its accustomed referent.

A more intractable problem is how to interpr. the loc. relative pronouns in pādas a and c. The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) seem to take them (it’s a little hard to tell) as embedded relatives with the loc. nouns (*ukthēṣu*, etc.) belonging to the main clause whose predicate takes shape in pāda d. The publ. tr. (JPB) takes ab as a separate sentence, supplying an impv. “delight!” as the main cl. verb, governing *ukthēṣu ... rudrīyeṣu ca* and generated from the injunctive pf. *cākān* of the rel. cl. This still leaves the *yāsu* cl. embedded, since the main clause in cd must include *túbhyéd* that begins c, parallel to *vāyāve* in d. Another wrinkle is the fact that the verbal predicate of this 2nd rel. clause is not finite, but a predicated middle participle (whatever its exact derivational path) *mandasānāḥ* (on which see comm. ad IV.3.6). In favor of the JPB solution is the fact that the *yāsu* rel. prn. has a clear antecedent in the main clause of cd: nom. pl. *etā(h)*, but it is not clear whether masc. *yēṣu* does. If we take the nominal loc. pls. *ukthēṣu*, etc., as belonging to the main clause, then it does. This seems to be the solution of the standard tr. (e.g., Re’s tentative “parmi (?) les hymnes en lesquels tu te complais et parmi (?) les corps-de-louange rudriens ...”).

The rel. cl. problem is compounded by several other factors: 1) that the referent of the fem. nom. pl. *etāḥ* in c is disputed. Ge (n. 3c) suggests either waters or, with Sāy., praise songs. Old also goes for waters, as does the publ. tr. and, apparently, WG. By

contrast, Re: soma drinks; 2) the simile marker *ná* in d is not positioned to mark a simile, and so its contribution to the whole is unclear.

The 2nd issue is, again, easy to deal with. As disc. elsewhere (see comm. ad VIII.76.1) and noted already by Ge, simile-marking *ná* cannot be pāda final. If it would be, it flips with its target. Therefore in this case we can assume an underlying **śubhrā ná* and a conventional simile. As for the 1st, the fem. referent should be something Indra takes pleasure in. Although waters, being feminine and already present in the discourse (2ab), are perhaps the obvious choice, in this type of ritual context waters are not something Indra craves. Re's soma drinks fit this criterion much better: Old points to three other examples of *mandasānā-* in this hymn (14c, 15a, 17a); in the latter two Indra is subject and it is soma drinks that he enjoys. But no standard word, or synonym, for soma is fem.

Having given this more thought than it perhaps deserves, I think I've found a solution to all these various syntactic and referential problems. An imperfect one, but better (in my opinion) than any of the rest. I take the first hemistich as a self-contained rel. cl. – no parts of it belong to the main cl. and there is no embedding. The main cl. is cd; the referent of rel. cl. *yéṣu* in the main clause is *etāḥ*, with gender switch – but with semantically the same referent as the *ukthéṣu ... stómeṣu* of ab, namely hymns / praise songs, a word for which should be supplied with *etāḥ*. This is the Sāy. solution alluded to above: Sāy. supplies fem. *stutīḥ*; I prefer *gírah*, which is much more common in the RV. For the phrase *etāḥ ... gírah* see I.25.18. In order to indicate that *yéṣu* and *etāḥ* are coreferential despite the gender switch, the poet inserts after the fem. *etāḥ* a relative clause *yāsu mandasānāḥ* “in which you are finding exhilaration” that has the same structure as *yéṣu cākān* “in which you delight” in pāda a. The *yāsu* clause is embedded in the main cl. unfortunately, but the fact that the predicate is a participle, not a finite verb makes the violation less serious. (See my 2022 “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe.”) Why switch the gender, however? I think it is to accommodate the simile at the end of the vs. There I do think that *śubhrāḥ* refers to waters or rivers – the free-flowing hymns are compared to them, but a masc. in the frame would put the simile off balance. The stem *śubhrá-* is elsewhere used of rivers and waters, and waters serve as subj. to *prá ... sísrata* in nearby II.17.3, as Old points out. Unlike all the standard tr., I do not think *vāyáve* belongs in the simile; rather he is parallel (if a bit of an afterthought) to *túbhya*.

Putting all this together, I suggest a much-emended translation of the whole vs. (leaving out the vocc. for clarity of structure): “In which hymns, praises, and Rudryan (Maruts) you delight – those (songs), in which you are finding exhilaration, flow forth esp. to you, and to Vāyu, like resplendent (waters/rivers).”

II.11.4: *śubhrá-*, the last word of vs. 3, becomes the signature word of this vs., found initial in each of the first 3 pādas.

The first two pādas contain two exx. of predicated pres. participles, *vardháyantah* and *dádhanāḥ*, but unfortunately it's not clear what they are predicated of. Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. supply “we,” which is a reasonable default, WG “diese Lobreden” (their tr. of *ukthá-*) from 3a, which would entail another gender switch. Since *ukthá-* is neut., the masc. participles would have to refer to masc. *stóma-* in 3b, skipping the fem. in 3c.

“We” seems a better choice. In any case, the referents of these participles are not directly reflected in the rest of the verse (save perhaps for *asmé* ‘for us / among us’ in c).

JPB takes c as an independent nominal clause, with ab implicitly subordinated to it. By contrast, all the standard tr. take c with d, with the pf. part. *vāṛdhānāḥ* expressing anteriority and notional dependence: “... having become strengthened, you should overwhelm ...” Although this alt. is certainly possible, rhetorically c is tightly connected to ab. In ab the unidentified subjects confer *śubhrá-* features on Indra and strengthen him; in c Indra has become *śubhrá-* himself, having become strengthened, with the same root $\sqrt{vṛdh}$. And if the first hemistich has implicit 1st pl. subjects, *asmé* in c refers back to them. So I favor some version of the publ. tr.

II.11.5: Pāda c is oddly conceived. The problem is the double object of the pf. part. *tastabhvāṁsam*, namely *apó dyām* “the waters (and) heaven.” The first, in a putative VP *apāḥ* \sqrt{stambh} , is perfectly fine, and indeed perfectly fine as a description of Vṛtra. Although \sqrt{stambh} ordinarily means ‘prop up, make fast’, in the latter sense it can come to mean ‘stay, block’, with rivers (bzw. waters) as obj. Cf. III.53.9 *ástabhnāt síndhum arṇavām* “he stayed the river in flood,” depicting Viśvāmitra’s feat in stopping the rivers to allow Sudās’s forces to cross, presented at length in the famous hymn III.33. Also, with \sqrt{stambh} in the passive, in VIII.96.18 *tvām síndhūṁ asṛjas tastabhānān* “you released the rivers, which had been blocked/stayed,” exactly of Indra’s freeing the waters after smiting Vṛtra, as here. But \sqrt{stambh} is far more common with *dyām* as object; this VP means “prop up heaven” and is regularly used of one of Indra’s signature cosmogonic deeds – including in this sequence of Indra hymns. Cf. in the next (very famous) hymn, II.12.2 *yó dyām ástabhnāt sá janāsa índraḥ* “who propped up heaven, that, o peoples, is Indra”; II.15.2 *dyām astabhāyad bṛhántam* “he propped up lofty heaven”; II.17.5 *ástabhnān māyāyā dyām avasrásah* “with his craft he propped up heaven (to keep it) from falling.” It is very strange to assign Indra’s deed and its formulaic expression to Vṛtra. To rescue the phrase, Ge suggests that “heaven” stands for “heaven’s light”; neither Old nor Re (whose tr. in EVP XVII of course lacks notes) comments, nor Klein (DGRV 335), who tr. “the one blocking the waters (and) heaven.” WG tr. “der dazu Wasser und Himmel befestigt hat,” with further glosses in the n.: “mehrdeutig: der Wasser und Himmel gespreizt / zur Festung gemacht / festgebunden / paralysiert hat” – none of which helps with the anomaly of *dyām* \sqrt{stambh} in this context. I find it difficult to imagine that the audience (more alert than us Western commentators), hearing *dyām tastabhvāṁsam*, esp. in an Indra hymn, would not immediately associate it with the standard Indra formula and find the attribution of such a deed to Vṛtra (whom Indra will smash in the next pāda) disturbing—twisting the perfectly acceptable *apāḥ* \sqrt{stambh} phrase in a disconcerting direction. But I don’t quite know what to do with this. I would certainly not suggest that they then interpreted this participial phrase to refer to Indra – more that they were forced to rescue it by a semantic reconfiguration, perhaps like the one Ge suggests – though nowhere else that I’m aware of is Vṛtra credited with blocking the light of heaven.

In any case, against the publ. tr., I would take the pf. part. as expressing anteriority – “having blocked / who had blocked the waters and heaven.”

II.11.6: It seems strange to begin pādas a, c, and d with 1st sg. *stāvā*, but b with the 1st plural *stāvāma*, which is also not initial. There is some phonetic play between a and b: *stāvā (n)ú ta v. utá stavā(ma)*, with *nūtanā* figuring later in b. The mirror-image openings of the two pādas might at least account for the position of *stavāma*.

II.11.7: The three augmented aorists in this vs. are striking, esp. because two of them are extremely marginal in the grammar: the *s*-aor. seen in *asvārṣtām* (√*svar*) is found otherwise in the RV only as 3rd sg. *ásvār* in late X.148.5; *áramsta* is the only form of this *s*-aor. in the RV. Both have well-attested 1st cl. present stems with the same meaning, and it is, at first, surprising in this narrative context that we don't find imperfects. But as IH suggested to me, if we follow the interpr. of the hymn in the publ. intro. and in Brereton 1985, whereby the apparent events of the mythic past—the spreading out of the earth, the coming to rest of the mountain—actually refer to the ritual here-and-now, esp. the establishment of the fire, then the augmented aorists will force an immediate past interpr. and therefore reveal the poet's intent behind the apparent recital of mythic events.

What it means for a cry to be dripping with ghee and why it's the horses' cry are unclear to me.

I would be inclined to take *cíd* with *sariṣyān*, rather than with *párvataḥ*, hence “the mountain, though about to run, came to rest,” rather than “even the mountain ...” Note the use of the future participle to express past prospective value in subordination to a preterital main verb and see comm. ad 10b below.

II.11.8: After the three augmented aorists in the previous vs. and with *akrān* in pāda b, the injunctive *sādi* in pāda a is a little surprising, esp. since this pāda seems to describe the same action as 7d. I wonder whether the poet is playing a trick: the negated participle *áprayuchan* almost seems to have the augment we expect in **asādi* but transposed to the next word (and of course etymologically and functionally quite distinct). Note that *áprayuchan* occupies the same metrical position as the aor. *áprathiṣṭa* in 7c (the immediately preceding hemistich) and shares the same first two syllables.

The *s*-aor. *akrān* in b should be tr. “has roared” to match the other augmented aorists in the immediate context.

The lexeme *ní√prath* occurs only here in the RV and, at least according to Mon.-Wms., in all of Sanskrit. This isolation makes it all the more difficult to figure out what is going on in pāda d, since the reference of the almost equally isolated *dhamāni*- is unclear. (But see below.) Note the placement of the preverb *ní* after the verb *paprathan* at the end of the verse, an almost mirror image of the opening of the vs. *ní párvataḥ*. This vs.-final *paprathan ní* is also echoed by the end of the 1st hemistich in the next vs. *asphuran níḥ*. Both verbs precede their preverbs, but despite having apparently identical endings, *-an*, the first is a real 3rd pl. *-an*, where *asphuran* represents 3rd sg. *asphurat* in sandhi.

The 2nd hemistich is quite baffling. It bears a superficial resemblance to X.49.6cd and is adduced with regard to that passage by Old ad X.49.6. However, the two passages do not illuminate each other; see comm. ad X.49.6. More helpful is III.30.10, adduced by Ge. That passage has to do with the opening of the Vala cave; its last pāda reads *prāvan vāṇīḥ puruhūtám dhāmantiḥ* “The choir (of Aṅgirases) aided the much-invoked one [=Indra], blowing (on their instruments),” containing both *vāṇī-* and a form of √*dham* ‘blow’, like *vāṇī-* and the mysterious noun *dhamāni*- here. This poorly attested noun (RV

1x; more common in AV; in general see EWA s.v. *DHAM*) seems to mean ‘tube, (blood) vessel’ in the AV, but this is most likely a semantic extension based on physical shape. The noun, derived from \sqrt{dham} ‘blow’, was, in the first instance, a nom. act., as *-áni-* nouns generally are (e.g., *vártani-* ‘turning’ → ‘track/course’; AiG II.2.207), with the sense ‘blowing’, but then could have been concretized to a (musical) pipe or primitive flute into which the performer blows, to whose shape a vein or tube could be likened. The abstract sense is still found in our passage; as in III.30.10, it’s used in reference to the (musical) noise the Aṅgirasas made to open the Vala cave. I would now render cd “Amplifying their voice to the furthest distance [i.e., making themselves heard that far], they [=Aṅgirasas] spread the blast that was impelled by Indra.” I substitute ‘blast’ for ‘blowing’ because the latter makes no sense in that English sentence, though unfortunately ‘blast’ is not all that much better – it’s meant to evoke noise. I also fail to tr. *ní*, since it also makes for semantic complications. As I said above, I think vs.-final *ní* may be here to match vs.-init. *ní* in a phonetic figure with *par-/pra-*. If it does have semantic content, it may mean that the Aṅgirasas directed their noise down into the cave. Since the cows are always elsewhere depicted as being driven up out of the cave (see, e.g., nearby II.14.3 *yó gā udājad āpa hí valām váh*), presumably the cave is below ground. Because the hemistich seems to concern the Vala myth, I supply the Aṅgirasas as subj. – against the Maruts, favored by most of the standard tr. Although most of the mythological material in this hymn is concerned with the Vṛtra battle (though for Vala see 20d), it is very difficult to fit this vs. into that paradigm; the Vala myth works much better.

II.11.9–10: The final pāda of 9 is almost identical to the first one in 10: the case of *vájra-* is different, and there are two different intensive forms, to different roots, with different morphological identities (gen. part. *kánikradataḥ*, impf. *ároravīt*), and different subjects (bull / mace) – but the intensives are essentially synonymous and the effect is the same. This is an extreme example of the chaining found off and on in the hymn (see above).

II.11.10: It is unusual to find a subjunctive *nijūrvāt* in a subord. clause whose main cl. has an imperfect intensive (*ároravīt*). The publ. tr. renders it as “was about to grind down” -- this seems pretty close to target, though I’d probably substitute rather “was going to” -- a past prospective. Sāy. simply glosses with a desiderative *jighāṃsatīty arthaḥ*. Of course, the *-āt* isn’t metrically guaranteed and could have been introduced from *vájrat* at the end of 9d, so it is possible that the form was simply injunc. **nijūrvat*. Nonetheless, though the usage of the subjunctive here is unusual, I think it can be reconciled with the function of the subjunctive more generally. Note that its function is very much parallel to that of the future participle *sariṣyán* in 7d.

Both *nijūrvāt* and *papivān* are means of indicating anteriority here.

II.11.11: On *kukṣí-* as ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see comm. ad X.28.2, etc.

In d JPB takes *paurá* as *pauré* out of sandhi, as a PN – contra the Pp and the standard tr. In VIII.61.6 I take it as ‘multiplier’ (of Indra) in a pun with *purukṣt-*. In VIII.50.5 a clear loc. shows the sense that JPB wants. In V.74.4 there are three exx., one apparently a PN, the other also apparently a pun on *puru-* (JPB tr. ‘muchness’). I’d be inclined here to take it in non-PN fashion, either as loc. “in its muchness” or modifying soma: “soma, multiplied” (to *puru*) or perhaps more likely, given *prṇántaḥ* in c, ‘filling’

or ‘in its fullness’. In our passage Ge tr. “Füller,” Re “fait pour beaucoup (d’exploits),” WG as “Paura” (with several different interpr. possibilities registered in the notes) – all as nom.

II.11.12: I would tr. “have abided in you,” not “by.”

I would tr. *dhīmahī* in c as ‘acquire’ -- the idea being that we want to get a *prāsasti-* from our actions performed with Indra’s help. Against the standard interpr. as root aor. opt. to $\sqrt{dhā}$, WG seem to assign the verb to $\sqrt{dhī}$ (“... erblicken wir unsere Preislieder”), but there is no such root formation to $\sqrt{dhī}$, whereas *dhīmahī* to $\sqrt{dhā}$ is remarkably well attested.

Pāda d is a variant of 1d, as pointed out by Ge.

II.11.13: Pāda a is syntactically very fussy: *syāma té ta indra yé ta ūtī*, with two nominal clauses each with its own enclitic *te*, a predicative instr. in the rel. cl., and the “may we be those who ...” construction that defies fluent Engl. tr. If the Engl. seems awk, blame it on the Skt!

Pāda b contains another predicated pres. participle, *vardháyantaḥ*.

The splv. *śuṣmīntamam* responds to *śúṣma-* in 4a, while *yām cākānāma* echoes *yéṣu cākān* in 3a. Although the publ. tr. treats cd as if *yām cākānāma* were embedded, it’s a perfectly standard preposed rel. cl., though awk. to render: “in which most explosive (thing) we will take delight – (that) wealth consisting of heroic men grant to us.”

II.11.14: The *rāsi* of 13d is not only chained with *rāsi* in 14a, but repeated twice more in the hemistich, always clause initial.

The affiliation and reference of the nominal rel. cl. in c are disputed. Let us begin with the fact that this pāda contains yet another predicated pres. part., *mandasānāḥ*. It cannot belong with the main cl. verb in d, *pānti*, because it modifies a rel. prn. *yé*, and *pānti* is unaccented. The question is whether c is a preposed definitional cl. of the type “(Those) who (c) ..., they (d) ...” The *ca* would then be a clausal conjunction, loosely connecting c with the first hemistich. This is how the publ. tr. takes it, as do Re and JSK (DGRV I.224). However, c could also be more strongly connected to pāda b and participate in an “X [acc.] and which Y ...” construction, where the referents of *yé* would be a conjoined obj. with *śārdhaḥ ... mārutam* of *rāsi*: “Grant us the Marutian warrior band and (those) who are jointly finding exhilaration” – whatever the referents of *yé*. This is Ge’s interpr. As for the referent of *yé*, he sneaks in an “alle” (“und alle, die einträchtig (mit dir) sich berauschen”) and in n. 14c says that *yé* includes the Vāyus (but is not limited to them?). I confess I prefer this syntactic analysis, among other things because it keeps *ca* as a subclausal conjunction. Ge’s “all” is illegitimate, but his suggestion that the *yé* clause refers to the Vāyus is certainly worth considering (see below). (The WG tr. seems more or less of the first type, but takes *ca* as conjoining the adj. *śajōṣasaḥ* and *mandasānāḥ* and also seems to take the antecedent of *yé* as the Maruts [number disagreement, though that wouldn’t be fatal], but *yé* as the subj. of *pānti*, which is fatal, syntactically. In other words, their tr. is a mess.)

The pl. of *vāyú-* is puzzling. The functional distribution of the two words for ‘wind’, *vāyú-* and *vāta-*, is generally pretty clearcut: Vāyu is the god, *vāta-* usually the natural phenomenon. There are over 100 singular forms of *vāyú-*, but only six plurals. (I

explain the supposed acc. pl. *vāyūn* in IX.97.14 differently from Gr/Lub [see comm. ad loc.]; Gr's nom. pl. interpr. of *vāyáva* in sandhi in VII.92.4 is really the dat. *vāyáve*.) Besides the form here, there is one other nom. pl. (X.46.7, a difficult passage; see comm. ad loc.) and four instr. pl. *vāyúbhiḥ* (IX.84.4 and three times in the same hymn, VIII.7.3, 4, 17). All these pl. forms in context refer to the natural phenomenon, lower-case 'wind'. Our passage is different, though, and conceptually problematic. Pāda d depicts a very familiar ritual situation: the god Vāyu receives the first drink of soma at the morning pressing; this is unequivocally signaled here by *pānti ágraṇītim* (whatever the problems with *pānti*; see below). But in a ritual setting, there should be only singular Vāyu – there is elsewhere no corporate group of Vāyus (like Ādityas or Vasus); the ritual scenario in d is quite anomalous. I don't have a full solution to this conundrum, but I can point the way towards one. The hymn containing the three instr. pl. (that is, half of the occurrences of pl. *vāyú-*) is a Marut hymn. In it the Maruts perform various actions "along with the winds." In our passage I think the referent of *yé* in c is the winds, the natural phenomena, who act along with – and presumably take pleasure along with – the Maruts, who are the object of pāda b and with whom the *yé* in c is conjoined. But the vs. segues into the ritual in the final pāda and the poet allows the paradoxical plural to stand, an uneasy compromise between the natural winds and the ritual Wind. (Recall that sg. *vāyáve* was a ritual recipient in 3d.)

The primary ending on *pānti* is disturbing: the context requires a connection with $\sqrt{pā}$ 'drink', but that root forms a root *aorist*. For another such form see I.134.5 and comm. ad loc. As noted there, these anomalous forms could be root aor. subjunctives; this could then mean "will drink."

I would now emend the tr. of bcd to "Grant us the Marutian warrior band, o Indra, and (those [=Winds]) who are jointly finding exhilaration (with them=Maruts). The Winds (will) drink the first offering."

II.11.15–17: These three vss. all begin X *ín nú*, strongly emphasizing the X.

II.11.15: And another -- or rather the same *mandasānāḥ* -- in the nominal rel. clause introduced by *yéṣu*. See 3c and 14c, as well as 17a. Given this insistent repetition, all these forms should have the same tr., and I would change "becoming exhilarated" here to "finding exhilaration." I would also change "among whom" to "in which."

Though there is no overt chaining between 14d and 15a, the phrase *yé ca mandasānāḥ* in 14c is almost exactly repeated in 15a *yéṣu mandasānāḥ*. I also wonder if *vyántu* (unfortunately probably not distracted, though Gr marks it so) doesn't slightly echo *vāyávaḥ* in 14d.

There are several missing, and therefore, disputed referents in this pāda, namely the subj. and goal of *vyántu*. I think JPB, flg. Ge, is correct that the subj. is soma drinks (so also Re) and the goal is you (=Indra). Sāy. and WG differ.

On the hapax *drahyát* see EWA s.v. *DARH*.

Pāda c lacks a verb. JPB supplies "be" and Re "come"; I'm inclined to follow Old, Ge (WG) in supplying a form of $\sqrt{vṛdh}$ 'strengthen', generated from *āvardhayaḥ* beginning d. Ge suggests the impv. *vardhaya* (as opposed to the pret. of Old and WG). I prefer the impv. because it seems more likely that we're asking for Indra's strengthening than describing past occurrence of it. But it would be possible simply to read *āvardhayaḥ*

with both pādas: “you strengthened us in battles (and) strengthened heaven ...” I would in any case change “have strengthened” to “strengthened,” since the impf. doesn’t usually have that sense and the strengthening of heaven should have happened quite awhile ago.

The emended tr. of cd: “(Strengthen) us in battles, surpassing one – you strengthened heaven ...”

II.11.16: In order to avoid a lengthy embedded rel. cl., starting with *yé* in pāda a and lasting through c as the publ. tr. has it, I would reconfigure the publ. tr.: either by taking *brhanta in nú* as a predicated nom. cl. on which the *yé* clause is dependent, or by taking all of abc as the rel. cl. signaled by *yé*. The two alt. would be “Just they are lofty who ...” and “Which lofty ones ...” I prefer the former because of the emphatic *íd*, and it is tr. this way by Ge, Re, WG, and JSK (DGRV II.166). The d pāda is then a separate clause.

Pādas bc also have an “inverse” *vā*, i.e., a construction X *vā* ... Y – but with the added twist that X and Y are not syntactically parallel: X is a bare instr. (*ukthébhiḥ* “by hymns”), while Y is a complex participle phrase that occupies the whole of pāda c: *strṇānāso barhīḥ pastyāvat*. Ge simply fails to render the *vā* (or rather vaguely renders it as “etwa”), but the other tr. capture the *vā* one way or another.

Emended tr. “Just they are lofty who seek to win your favor either through hymns or (by) strewing the ritual grass that provides (you) a dwelling place. Aided by you, they have come to the prize, Indra.”

II.11.17: The fourth and final occurrence of *mandasānā-*. Again I would change the tr. to “finding exhilaration in ...”

II.11.18: The subtle differences in accent: although both *avābhīnat* (init. in b) and *āpāvṛnoḥ* (init. in c) are 2nd sg. aug. impfs. with Indra as subj., only the first belongs in the rel. cl. introduced by *yéna*, because it is accented on the verb; the second begins a new main cl., because it is accented on the preverb. All the standard tr. correctly represent this.

I would slightly alter the tr. of *ní ... sādī* from the “aoristic” “has been set down” to “was set down / sank down,” since the action seems to be in the same chronological and conceptual realm as the other deeds of Indra presented in the imperfect in b and c. Note esp. the standard polarization between *ārya-* (c) and *dāsyu-* (d), which is found again in the next vs. (19b). See *ní ... sādī* in 8a, though – where the action is both mythical and (possibly, per JPB) ritual and might be properly rendered, with JPB, as “has been set down” (though I’m somewhat dubious)

II.11.19: As Old also notes, the first pāda is a reworking and fleshing out of 13a *syāma (té ta indra) yé te ūtī* – here *sānema yé ta ūtībhis (tārantah)*, with both the main cl. and the rel. cl. provided with more content. Note yet another predicated pres. part. (*tārantah*) – unless we accept Ge’s configuration of the vs., whereby all of ab is a rel. cl. and *sānema* is within its domain, the main cl. being cd: “(We) who might win, overcoming with your help ..., to us ...” (I think WG also follow this route, but with some twists.) Because of the rhetorical echo of 13a, I prefer the syntactic analysis of the publ. tr. (also Re).

The publ. tr. “overcoming all rivals, (all) Dasyus along with the Ārya” is misleading, since it sounds like the Ārya is included in the group we are overcoming.

Instead we are doing this with the help of the Ārya: rephrase as “we who by your help, along with the Ārya, (are) overcoming ...”

In c “it was for us that you ...” rather than “that was for us: that you ...” sounds more idiomatic.

The vṛddhi deriv. *sākhya-* is found only here in the RV, and it is also isolated syntactically in its clause – a gen. with nothing obvious to govern it. JPB’s ‘one of your circle of companions’ is more or less a direct tr. of Re’s “(qui appartient à) notre cercle d’amis.” Ge by contrast supplies a genitive of Tvaṣṭar, dependent on *viśvarūpam*, who is then qualified as being friendly with Indra (or so I understand Ge; see his bottom-of-the-page n. 1) – so, transformed into dubious English: “... Tvāṣṭarian Viśvarūpa, (son) of companionable (Tvaṣṭar).” This seems over-complex, and the companionship of Indra and Tvaṣṭar is not standard fare. Although the Re interpr. seems to me to fudge the case relation between Trita and this gen., it may be the best we can do, though “circle of friends/companions” is misleadingly specific. Perhaps better “Trita of (our) comradely (band).”

II.11.20: On the gen. with √*vṛdh*, see Old. In our passage gen. complements of verbs of consumption (“drink,” etc.) may have played a part. The first three genitives in pāda a refer to the soma, the last (*tritāsya*) to Trita as the presser of soma; see Old on this as well. The long gen. phrase in the publ. tr. is somewhat hard to parse; I might substitute “having grown strong on this exhilarating pressing of Trita’s.”

What’s going on in pāda c is unclear; see Ge’s n. 20c. JPB takes it as referring to a different episode in Indra’s heroic biography: making Namuci’s head roll like a wheel, found in passages like V.30.7 ... *nāmuceḥ śīraḥ ... āvartayaḥ*, with the same verb. Although it’s certainly possible that this pāda is a glancing allusion to that myth – and since the next pāda is about a different myth entirely, skipping from Arbuda to Namuci wouldn’t be surprising – it still lacks both Namuci and his head. Given the presence of the sun and the wheel, this could also be an allusion to the episode when Indra tears off the wheel of the Sun’s chariot, as in I.130.9 *sūras cakram prā vṛhat*, but the verb is different and *sūryaḥ* in our passage is stubbornly nom. On the whole I think it’s best to supply as little as possible here and would tr. (with Ge, Re) “he made (it) roll like the Sun its wheel” or, possibly, with WG, “he made the wheel roll like the sun.” I would further point out that the hymn has numerous occurrences of *vardhāya-*, starting in vs. 1, along with other forms of √*vṛdh*, including in pāda b, and *vartāya-* may be a bit of phonological play and ring composition.

II.11.21: On remarked medial opt. *duhīya+t*, see comm. ad IV.41.5.

II.11 complete (incorporating my modifications)

1. Hear our summons, Indra! Intend us no harm! We would be those to be given good things by you.

For these nourishments, like flowing rivers, strengthen you in their quest for good things.

2. You let loose the great (waters), Indra, which you swelled—the many (waters) surrounded by the serpent [=Vṛtra], o warrior.

You cut down the Dāsa [=Vṛtra], even though he thought he was deathless, when you had become strong through the hymns.

3. In which hymns, praises, and Rudryan (Maruts) you delight, o warrior Indra – those (songs), in which you are finding exhilaration, flow forth especially to you, and to Vāyu, like resplendent (waters/rivers).

4. Now (that we) are strengthening your resplendent explosiveness, are placing in your arms your resplendent mace,
resplendent are you, Indra, as you have become strong among us. Along with the sun, you should overcome the Dāsa clans.

5. The one placed in hiding, the hidden one hiding amid the waters, the crafty one dwelling under cover,
and the one who had blocked the waters and heaven—(that) serpent you smashed, o warrior, through your heroism.

6. Now I shall praise your ancient, great deeds, Indra, and we shall praise your present deeds.

I shall praise the eager mace in your arms. I shall praise your fallow bays, twin beacons of the sun.

7. Now your two fallow bays, competing for the prize, Indra, have cried out their cry, dripping with ghee.

The land has spread out equally in all directions. The mountain, though about to run, has come to rest.

8. The mountain, never faltering, has been set down. Bellowing with its mothers, it has roared.

Amplifying their voice to the furthest distance [i.e., making themselves heard that far], they [=Aṅgirasas] spread the blast that was impelled by Indra.

9. Indra kicked away crafty Vṛtra, who was lying upon the great river.

The two worlds trembled in fear before the mace of him, the bull roaring and roaring again.

10. The mace of him, the bull, bellowed again and again when (Indra), the ally of Manu, was going to grind down (Vṛtra), the enemy of Manu.

He brought low the crafts of the crafty son of Dānu, when he had drunk of the pressed soma.

11. Drink and drink the soma, o warrior Indra! May the exhilarating soma-pressings exhilarate you.

As they fill your cheeks, let them strengthen you. When properly pressed in its fullness, (the soma) has helped Indra.

12. We inspired poets have abided in you, Indra. Serving according to the truth, we would gain insight.

Seeking your help, we would acquire a proclamation of your praise. On this very day, we would be those to be given wealth by you.

13. Indra, we would belong to you as those who are with your help, since, seeking your help, we are making your nourishment strong.

That most explosive (thing) in which we will take delight, o god—that wealth consisting of heroic men grant to us.

14. Grant us peaceful dwelling. Grant us alliance. Grant us the Marutian warrior band, o Indra,

and (those [=Winds]) who are jointly finding exhilaration (with them=Maruts). The Winds (will) drink the first offering.

15. Now let just those (soma juices) pursue (you)—those in which (you) are finding exhilaration. Steadfastly drink soma to your satisfaction, Indra.

(Strengthen) us in battles, surpassing one. You strengthened heaven through lofty chants.

16. Just they are lofty who seek to win your favor either through hymns or (by) strewing the ritual grass that provides (you) a dwelling place. Aided by you, they have come to the prize, Indra.

17. Now, finding exhilaration in just these powerful (soma drops), o warrior, drink the soma among the Trikadrakas, Indra,

again and again shaking out (the soma) in your beard, becoming pleased. Travel to the soma drinking with your two fallow bays.

18. Take to yourself the vast power, o warrior, by which you cut down Vṛtra, the son of Dānu, that son of a spider!

You uncovered the light for the Ārya; the Dasyu sank down to the left, Indra.

19. We would win! — we who by your help, along with the Ārya, (are) overcoming all rivals, (all) Dasyus..

It was for us that you made Viśvarūpa, son of Tvaṣṭar, submit to Trita, one of (our) comrades (band).

20. Having grown strong on this exhilarating pressing of Trita's, he laid low Arbuda. He made (it) roll like the Sun its wheel. Together with the Aṅgirasas, Indra split the Vala-cave.

21. Now should the generous priestly gift yield your boon for the singer as its milk, Indra.

Exert yourself for the praise singers. Let fortune not pass us by. -- May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes.

II.12–15 Indra [SJ on JPB]

The first three of these hymns can be usefully read together as different ways to handle a templatic structure. II.12 is the most tightly structured, with a brief, repeated refrain preceded by definitional relative clauses. II.13 explores ways of varying a fairly fixed refrain, while II.14 uses the definitional rel. clauses of II.12 in conjunction with widely different ways of realizing a semantically fixed, but lexically and syntactically fluid, refrain. The hymns are stylistically richer when read together, and one cannot help thinking that the poet(s) saw these as interrelated experiments in structure. II.15 also has a refrain: it is fixed and occupies the entire last pāda and shows none of the intricate connections to the rest of the vs. nor the variations found in II.12–14.

II.12 Indra [SJ on JPB]

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is one of the most famous and most translated hymns of the RV, esp. outside of the “philosophical” hymns. Even more notable than its collection of Indra's great deeds and powers is the tight structure in which they are corralled. Each vs. but the last (15) ends with the post-caesura nominal-clause refrain *sá janāsa índrah* “he, o peoples, is Indra” (or, as I'm always tempted to render it, in Looney Tunes style, “that, folks, is Indra”). Preceding the refrain in each vs.

is a series of definitional relative clauses, in which the relative pronoun, in whatever case (usually nom., occasionally gen., acc., instr., or abl.) always refers to Indra and the clause reads like an (easily solved) riddle. Although not particularly notable syntactically, this structure – defining rel. cl, identifying main cl. – seems to be a stylistic feature of archaic Indo-European literature; see my disc. in “Draupadī on the Walls of Troy” (1994, Classical Antiquity 13), also *RV between Two Worlds*, 68–69; RV Guide, 146–49. On the breaking up of this pattern towards the end of the hymn, see comm. ad vs. 15 below.

Esp. at the beginning of the hymn, the deeds are narrated with augmented imperfects, alternating with perfects. See esp. the string of imperfects *paryābhūṣat* (1b), *abhyasetām* (1c), *ādṛmhat* (2a), *āraṇṇāt* (2b), *āstabhnāt* (2d), *āriṇāt* (3a), *udājat* (3b), all but one 3rd sg. act., near-rhymes *-at* and *āt*.

II.12.1: Interestingly, this is the only occurrence of *mānasvant-* in the RV. The tr. ‘thinker’ for me conjures up a more intellectual and contemplative figure than quite suits Indra, but I’m not sure what to substitute. I think the idea is that even when just born he had a functioning mind.

On the hapax verb *ābhyasetām*, see EWA II.246 and Gotō (1st class, 224–25). Gotō plausibly suggests that because the dual impf. to the standard 1st class pres. to \sqrt{bh} , **ābhayetām*, would not fit the cadence, this nonce form was created, based on the archaic *s*-stem *bh(i)yās-* -- though the derivational pathway from *s*-stem noun to simple thematic present built to a pseudo-root \sqrt{bhyas} isn’t straightforward.

II.12.2: Notice the ever-levitating sequence of objects: earth, mountains, midspace, heaven, from lowest to highest.

On *dyām āstabhnāt* see comm. ad II.11.5.

II.12.3: The hapax *apadhā* is probably, flg. Old (and accepted by most; see Scar 250), an instr. of a root noun. As Old also points out, *āpa* $\sqrt{dhā}$ must here be a formulaic variant of *āpa* \sqrt{vr} ‘uncover’, a signature verb of the Vala myth. Old tellingly adduces nearby II.14.3 *yó gā udājad āpa hí valām váh.*, whose pre-caesura clause is identical to ours here. The alternative lexeme may have been used here because a root noun to \sqrt{vr} , *vr̥t-* with empty *-t* as always with roots ending in short resonants, risks being mistaken for a root noun to \sqrt{vrt} . Note that the phrase *apadhā valāsya* illustrates the constraint on root-noun compounding that I have discussed in the forthcoming article “Limits on Root-noun Compounding in Indo-Iranian,” whereby a root noun can be compounded with a preverb or a nominal but not both, and so the nominal must form a syntagm with the PREV- $\sqrt{\text{NOUN}}$, as here.

Because starting fires with stones is not the standard method in the RV -- it usually involves fire *sticks* -- I think the “between the two stones” (*ásmanor antár*) probably refers to the two world halves between which fire would appear, perhaps in addition to stones struck against each other to produce sparks. If I am correct that this is a reference to the world-halves, it would provide some support to the claim that the meaning ‘heaven’ for this etymon, attested in both branches of Old Iranian (*asman-* in both YAvs and OP), was pan-Indo-Iranian, a contested claim (see EWA s.v. *ásman-*, esp. p. 138).

On *sam* √ *vṛj* see comm. ad VIII.75.12, X.61.17 and Scar 504, as well as Th, *Gedichte* 24 n. 5.

Note *sam* √ *vṛk* *samātsu sa* ...

II.12.4: After the dominance of augmented imperfects in vss. 1–3 (see hymn intro. above), with a sprinkling of perfects (*vimamé* 2c, *jajāna* 3c), this vs. switches to augmented aorists: *ākah* in b and the re-marked medial root aorist *āda-t* in c, as well as a predicated past part. *kṛtāni* in pāda a. In my view pāda a summarizes the cosmogonic and mythological deeds depicted in the first three vss. before turning to activities closer to home, and I would render *kṛtāni* as “were done.” JPB takes pāda a as prefiguring what follows in the vs. (hence the colon, flg. Th *Gedicht*.) and tr. *kṛtāni* as “have been done.” (Either interpr. of *kṛtā-* is possible in principle.) As I see it, after the summary of pāda a, the next two pādas move to deeds Indra performed in the human sphere and therefore in more recent times, making the switch to the aorist appropriate. This shift to the recent past in turn provides the transition to the treatment of Indra’s current help in the next vss.

cyāvana- is ordinarily agentive, ‘rousing, rouser’, but there is no escaping the sense ‘exploit, deed’ here (like its fellow derivative *cyautná-*). Perhaps the semantic development is by way of “stirring (deed)” or sim.

I find the tr. “has put ... below and hidden away” somewhat awk, and would rephrase as the slightly less awk. “who has made the Dāsa color/tribe hidden below.”

As is well known, the apparent thematic active *ādat* is a pseudo-activization of the medial idiom *ā√dā* ‘take, acquire’. On two possible pathways of formation, see comm. ad V.32.8. Once the 3rd sg. *ādat* was established (4x, incl. X.68.6 not registered by Gr, but so identified in Lub), other paradigmatic forms could be built: 1st sg. *ādam* (1x), 2nd sg. *ādas* (1x), 1st pl. *ādāma* (1x).

II.12.4–5: The phrases *aryāḥ puṣṭāni* (4d) and *aryāḥ puṣṭīḥ* (5c) with, respectively, ppl. and fem. abstract to √ *puṣ*, both in the plural, do not seem to differ from each other semantically or functionally. The only possible (but weak) motivations I can see for the use of different stems are 1) metrical (neut. pl. *puṣṭāni* would not fit in 5c; however, the shorter neut. pl. form *puṣṭā* would), and 2) gender matching between simile and frame. We don’t know the gender of the root noun pl. *vījah* ‘stakes’, but it is clearly not neut. If it is underlyingly fem., *puṣṭīḥ* would be a better match. For *aryāḥ puṣṭā-*, see loc. pl. *aryāḥ puṣṭēsu* in the Vṛṣākapi hymn, X.86.1. That the ppl. is used in this phrase elsewhere suggests that the ppl. is the more idiomatic form in this phrase.

II.12.5: This vs. breaks the strict patterning of the hymn in several ways. Although it begins as expected with a rel. clause, with the rel. referring to Indra, the rest of the vs. exits the rel. construction, first with pāda b uneasily paralleling pāda a (see immed. below) and more radically with a declarative main-cl. statement about Indra in c and, even worse, a kind of breaking of the fourth wall in d, with an impv. addressed to the audience (*śrād asmai dhatta* “put your trust in him”). Besides the voc. *janāsaḥ* in the refrain, this is the only intrusion of the 2nd ps. until the final vs. 15. See also 13ab for another evasion of the rel.

Pādas a and b are structured identically (save for one significant feature: see below). They both have an embedded *īti*-marked quotation:

kúha sá íti / naísó asti íti

in a clause beginning and ending with a discontinuous acc. phrase:

yám ... ghorám / īm ... enam

governed by a 3rd pl. verb with unspecified subj.:

prchánti / āhuḥ

However the two pādas are syntactically non-parallel in a crucial way: the first is a relative clause with accented verb, the second is non-relative with an unaccented verb. However, they are conjoined by *utá*, which is ordinarily a co-ordinating conjunction. Klein (DGRV I.372–73) says *utá* here shows uncharacteristically “weak nexus” in transition from rel. clause to main cl – a statement that describes, but does not explain. I think the strict formal parallelism of a and b is meant to be in tension with their syntactic mismatch and also prepares the way for the more serious breaches in cd. (PS also suggests that this kind of loose reversion to a main clause might be characteristic of oral style, which the embedded quotes also mark.)

Although in answer to the question in pāda a *kúha sá* “where is he?” we might expect *naísó asti* to mean “he is not (here),” I prefer the existential “he does not exist” of the publ. tr. (as do all the standard tr.) for two reasons. In main clauses the pres. copula *asti* is almost always existential, and, furthermore, doubts about Indra’s existence are expressed elsewhere in the RV. See the answer to this in vs. 15 below. The *śrād ... dhatta* of d implicitly answers this existential doubt. This makes pāda c something of an intrusion, and it also essentially repeats/rephrases 4cd.

Pāda c meter: the transmitted text has a 12-syl. line with a Triṣṭubh cadence. Arnold and Oldenberg read *só ’ryáḥ*, with a triple-light break *víja i(vā)*. HvN instead apherisize *iva* to *’va* as is common in MIA and sometimes found in the RV. Either of these produces an acceptable Triṣṭubh line. There is another possibility, which is sort of a version of Arnold/Old.: to read *sáryáḥ*, with coalescence of *sá* with following *a-*, rather like *séti* in pāda a < *sá + í-*. Transmitted *só aryáḥ* would be a redactional restoration. I favor this third way.

II.12.6: This vs. firmly reestablishes the rel. pattern, with four occurrences of nom. sg. *yáḥ*, though the one in pāda c is (playfully?) syncopated, occurring immediately after the caesura rather than initial in the pāda.

It is uncertain whether there are two figures being invigorated in b, the formulator and the weak one needing help, or whether the fomulator is himself in need. JPB seems to favor the two-figure interpr.; most standard tr. the single figure. I am more or less indifferent, though weakly favor the single figure. In any case, b transitions from pāda a, which depicts unfortunate figures (“the enfeebled,” “the starving,” matching “the weak one needing help”), to cd with its ritual performers: the one with the yoked pressing stone and pressed soma, who pick up the formulator of b.

On the sense of *kīrī-* see comm. ad V.52.12.

Because *yuktá-grāṇṇaḥ* (c) and *sutá-somasya* (d) are identically formed, I would prefer a parallel rendering: “of the one who has yoked the pressing stone, who has pressed the soma.”

II.12.7: This vs. is even more insistent on the rel. structure than 6, containing seven rel. prns., two each in a, b, c, and an additional one in d (see vs. 14 for identical distrib.). The

first hemistich lacks a verb or verb substitute; it is governed by the loc. construction *yásya ... pradísī* “under whose direction.”

Since c reverts to cosmogonic deeds, I would tr. *jajāna* as “gave birth.”

II.12.8: For *krándas-* as ‘war-cry’ and du. *krándasī* referring to the opposing sides in battle producing war-cries, see Th, KZ 92 (1978).

Note *saṃyatī vihvayete*, picked up, at least conceptually, but *samānām ... nānā*.

For *nānā* see my disc. in the Hock Fs. “RV *sá hināyām* (VI.48.2) with a Return Visit to *nāyām* and *nānā*,” in *Grammatica et Verba, Glamor and Verve: Studies in South Asian, Historical, and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Hans Henrich Hock*, ed. Shu-Fen Chen and Benjamin Slade, 2013. I follow Th’s 1949 explanation of the form as an āmreḍita involving the expected nom. sg. of *nī-* ‘man’, otherwise unattested in Vedic. For reasons given in my article I prefer this account to Klein’s (2004) derivation from a pronominal āmreḍita **anā-anā* → **anānā* “in this way (here), in that way (there)” (Jared S. Klein, “Nominal and adverbial āmreḍitas and the etymology of R̥gvedic *nānā*,” in *The Vedas: Text, Language & Ritual. Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002*, ed. Arlo Griffiths and Jan E. M. Houben, 251-60). A sense “every man for himself” would be quite appropriate here.

II.12.9: Note the repetitive phonological figure in *acyut-acyút-*, which contravenes the morphological boundaries (*a-cyuta-cyút-*).

II.12.9–11: Note the phonological sequence, with several different interlocking repetitions:

9c *yó víśvasya*

10a *yáh śaśvato ... śar^uvā*

10c *yáh śardhate ... śrdhyām*

11a *yáh śambaram ... śarādī*

II.12.10: I would suggest an alt. tr. for ab, mostly relexicalized: “who has struck with his missile the heedless ones, each and every one, who commit great offense.”

The hapax *śrdhyām* is generally taken as the acc. sg. of a stem *śrdhya-*, and this is perfectly plausible both morphologically and contextually. However, it might rather be taken as the loc. sg. of a *devī*-type *-ī*-stem *śrdhī-* “does not yield to the vaunter in his vaunting.” This makes somewhat more sense.

II.12.11: After the focus on present-day and recent-past events in the center of the hymn, we return to the mythological and distant past. Note that *jaghāna* in c must have distant past value, but the same form in 10b seems to refer to contemporary / recent past.

The part. *śāyānam* has two (indeed three) possible interpr., both simultaneously operative and supported by the formulaics of the Vṛtra myth elsewhere. On the one hand, with the publ. tr., it can mean “lying (dead),” proleptically depicting the result of the action of the main verb *jaghāna*. See the multiple occurrences of the root *śī* in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, expressing just that (I.32.5, 7, 8, 9). On the other, it can refer to Vṛtra lying on or around the waters, as in V.30.6. As a possible third, it can simply refer to the snake as lying (on the ground) as snakes do, as Th suggests.

II.12.12: In order to reflect the structure, I would tr. the beginning of the vs. as “Who — the mighty seven-reined bull — let loose ...” Both Ge and Th point out that the “seven reins” correspond to the seven rivers.

Pāda b is strongly alliterative: (*avā*)*sr̥jat sártave saptá síndhūn*.

II.12.13: This is the first ab hemistich that entirely lacks a relative prn. However, as R. Kluender pointed out, vs.-initial (*d*)*yāvā* phonologically mimics a rel. Instead of the rel. prn. referring to Indra, we have the enclitic demonstratives *asmai* (a) and *asya* (b), while the rel. prn. returns in cd. For a somewhat similar breaking of the pattern, see vs. 5 above.

We seem to be wrapping up this hymn with a bit of tricky ring composition. In 1c we have *yásya śúṣmād ródasī ábhyasetān*; in our pāda a the *ródasī* return as *dyāvā ... pṛthivī* with a different verb, while in b we have *śúṣmāt* and *√bhī*, but a different subject.

Pāda b provides a good example of *cid* taking Wackernagel’s position even though the word it should limit occurs later in the vs. line. In the first pāda *cid* correctly follows the word it limits, or rather the first part of the dual dvandva *dyāvā cid ... pṛthivī* “even Heaven and Earth bow to him.” But in b *cid* follows the abl. *śúṣmāt*, while the geographical feature corresponding to H+E in a, namely *párvata(h)* ‘mountains’, is postponed. But surely the clause means “even the mountains fear his explosiveness” (as in the publ. tr.), not “the mountains fear even his explosiveness.”

In order to reflect the structure and, esp., to show that the rel. structure has been reestablished, I would rearrange the tr. of cd to “who is renowned as the soma-drinker having the mace in his arm, who (is renowned) as having the mace in his hand.”

II.12.14: As in vss. 6–7, after the breach in the rel. structure in 13ab this vs. insists upon it, with seven rel. pronouns, two each in a, b, c, and a seventh one in d. Given this, the second hemistich might be slightly altered to “whose is the strengthening formulation, whose is the soma, whose is this gift.”

II.12.15: As often, a pattern well established through most of a hymn gets broken, or shaken up, at the end (see also 13ab). Here the 3rd sg. reference to Indra in the first fourteen vss. changes to 2nd sg. address, but this change isn’t immediately signaled: the vs. begins with a rel. pronoun *yáh* that apparently matches the monotonously regular occurrence of the rel. with 3rd ps. ref. in the rest of the hymn. Only the verb *dárdarṣi* in b, the last word in its clause, shows that the pattern has been broken. The repetition of the participles *sunvánt-* and *pácant-* from 14a provides continuity in the midst of the referential shake-up.

The sandhi form *dudhrá* is ambiguous: it can reflect either a nom. sg. *dudhráh* with the Pp. or a loc. sg. *dudhré*. The publ. tr. opts for the latter, a possibility floated by both Ge (n. 15a) and Old, who does not decide; Re chooses the loc. The loc. interpr. has the advantage of accommodating the oddly placed *ā cid*, which would represent *ā* as “Praep. mit vorhergehendem Loc.” (Gr. 169) plus ‘even’ emphasizing that loc. Ge’s tr. follows the nom. of the Pp, and there are arguments in favor of this interpr. -- *dudhrá* elsewhere modifies Indra (I.56.3, VI.22.4 [2 out of 5 total occurrences]), and introducing a new personage in this vs. seems unnecessary. Like Old I can’t decide, though would probably favor a nom. sg. and tr. “You who, headstrong, rip free ...”

The main clause *sá kīlāsi satyāḥ* “you are certainly real” is an implicit answer to the doubt expressed in 5b *utém āhur naīṣó astīti enam* “And they say about him, ‘he does not exist.’”

The 2nd ps. reference of *sá* in the just quoted expression is contrary to my rules (“Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?” *HS* 105 [1992]) of such reference with this pronoun -- that 2nd ps. *sá* (etc.) is only found with imperatives and verbs so used. But the whole structure of this hymn, with the refrain *sá janāsa índraḥ* in the same metrical slot as this declaration, imposes the need for a *sá* here as well. Note that this phrase is an exact metrical match for the refrain.

Though *viśváha* is rendered in the publ. tr. as “throughout all the days,” the *-ha* is not, of course, the ‘day’ word, but the adverbial *-ha* of *ihá*; the tr. should be corrected to “everywhere/always.”

The final pāda, *suvīrāso vidátham á vadema*, is a variant of the standard Gr̥tsamāda Triṣṭubh refrain *bṛhád vadema vidáthe suvīrāḥ*. The refrain pāda here is found twice elsewhere (I.117.25, VIII.48.14), neither of them in Maṇḍala II or in a Gr̥tsamāda hymn. The reason for this variation isn’t clear, since the standard refrain would fit here unproblematically. Perhaps to mark the specialness of this particular hymn?

II.13 Indra [SJ on JPB]

This hymn is extremely challenging, with a discouraging number of puzzles and no clear overall theme -- though Indra’s cosmogonic activities and his help to particular clients dominate the latter part of the hymn. The first four vss. are devoted to the ritual preparation of soma, with Indra a side issue.

Like the immediately preceding hymn, this one is structured by a refrain, but a somewhat shifting one. The first vs. ends *prathamám tád ukth’yam*; this is more or less matched by vss. 2–4 *prathamám sās’y ukth’yah*, but the substitution of *sāsi* for *tád* has repositioned the refrain: after an opening of four, not (as in vs. 1) five. This shift backwards is somewhat disconcerting. The gender has also shifted, and in all three vss. the main cl. *sās’y ukth’yah* is preceded by the rel. cl. *yás tákrṇoḥ prathamám* matching the rel./main cl. structure that dominated II.12. In the next vss. (5–8) the refrain is reduced to *sās’y ukth’yah*, preceded by a variety of forms. *sās’y ukth’yah* is also found in vss. 9–10, preceded in both instances by *abhavaḥ*. Vs. 11 breaks the pattern by expanding the refrain but with a phonologically close match: *sá ... (vī)śvās’y ukth’yah*. *sās’y ukth’yah* makes a final appearance in vs. 12, and vs. 13 is in a different meter and contains the Gr̥tsamāda refrain rather than the one proper to his hymn.

The 2nd ps. reference of *sá* in *sāsi* is, of course, contrary to my rules (see disc. just above ad II.12.15), but our hymn seems to take off from the structure of II.12.15.

A complete retranslation of the hymn is given at the end.

II.13.1: This vs. concerns soma and its preparation, though soma is not overtly mentioned. The first word, *ṛtúḥ* ‘season, proper time’, is, I think, to be read in two ways. On the one hand, it can refer to season of the year when the soma plant grows – here, presumably the rains and their aftermath: the growing season, which is the begetter (*jānitṛī*) of the soma *plant*. But in the RV *ṛtú-* more frequently refers to the proper *ritual* time—esp. in the set of sequential offerings known (later) as the *ṛtugrahas* ‘sequential cups’, treated in this maṇḍala in the two hymns II.36–37 (q.v.). In this sense the ritual

sequence is the begetter of the soma *drink*, and the rest of the vs. (starting in the middle of pāda a) concerns the preparation of the drink: esp. the swelling of the soma plant with water.

The standard tr. (incl. JPB; see also Gr col. 785, IV.3 s.v. *pári*) seem to assume that *pári* serves as a postposition with *tásyā(h)*, but the interposition of *apáh* and, esp., the close sandhi of *apás pári* pose problems – though not insuperable ones (see below). JL suggested that *apáh* might have a double reading, both as a rare singular form of *áp-* ‘water’, an ablative to be read with *tásyā(h)*, and as the more usual acc. pl., with which the pl. rel. *yāsu* agrees. Thus “just born from this water he has entered the waters in which he grows strong.” But although this is clever and appealing, the most likely referent of *tásyā(h)* is the immediately preceding *jānitṛī*, which refers to the season (see above), so an abl. of water is unlikely. That *pári* might form a lexeme with *āviśat* could be suggested by 8c *āpariviśtam*, but I now find this unlikely: that form most likely belongs to $\sqrt{viś}$, not $\sqrt{viś}$, and the *pári* here is not in a standard position for a preverb in tmesis.

On the other hand, it is possible to rescue the postpositional account of *tásyāh ... pári*. Given that forms of the *sá/ tám* pronoun regularly take first position in their clause, it would not be surprising if the pronoun had been moved to clause-init. position from an underlying **(apás) tásyās pári*, with close sandhi between abl. *tásyās* and the postposition. The problem then is the close sandhi of the rearranged *apás pári*. This should indicate a close syntagmatic connection between the two – which we have in any case just rejected. In general, as shown by Hale (1990, “... Sandhi and Syntax,” 81–86), when the caesura doesn’t intervene, *pári* shows close sandhi effects with a preceding ablative that it governs (e.g., I.47.6 [etc. etc.] *divás pári* “from heaven”). There are numerous such examples. If it is the syntactic relation that produces this effect, we should expect that a word ending in underlying *-s* that has no syntactic relationship to a following *pári* would surface as visarga, even without intervening caesura. Such sequences are rarer, but there are a sufficient number to show that the syntactic distribution holds. See, e.g., for post-caesura position I.162.1 [cf. VII.93.8] (*mā ...*) ... *marútaḥ pári khyan* “(let not) the Maruts disregard us” (also III.3.9, 15.6; IV.43.6; V.15.3, 81.4, VII.103.8, IX.69.5, 85.1, 86.32, 107.2). For pre-caesura position V.53.9 *mā vah pári śthāt* “let (the Sarayu river) not hem you around” (also VII.36.7; IX.71.9, 93.1). And for dimeter vs. (with no caesura) VIII.41.3 *sá kṣāpāḥ pári sasvaje* “he holds the nights in his embrace” (also V.65.6; VI.51.16; IX.12.5, 62.23; X.85.13). (There are a few functionally ambiguous cases and a very few counterexx.) In almost all cases with *-h* outcome, the *pári* serves as a preverb, usually with the verb immediately following, as in the exx. just given. Its primary syntactic connection is then with the verb not an adjacent noun. In this passage, given that there is no clear relationship between *pári* and the main verb *āviśat* in the middle of the next pāda and given that the underlying syntagm is ABL *pári* “from her,” though the abl. has been displaced, I suggest that the *-s* of the syntagm has been, as it were, transferred to the *apás* that has taken the place of abl. *tásyās*. This is essentially Old’s solution, expressed much more succinctly. I would therefore slightly alter the tr. of the first hemistich to “From her, as soon as he was born, he [=soma] entered the waters,” eliminating the “throughout” that vaguely represented *pári*.

Note the alliteration in cd: *pipyúṣī páyo ... pīyūṣam prathamām*, with the first terms of each pair echoing each other.

JL suggests that *ámśóḥ pīyūṣam prathamám* is in apposition to the *páyah* phrase, rather than being, with most tr. incl. JPB's, a nominative expressing the subject of *ukthyám*, anticipating *tád*. This would allow the refrain to be a separate clause, as it overwhelmingly is in the rest of the hymn.

II.13.2–4: It is notable that these vss., whose refrain pāda contains the rel. cl. *yás tákṛnoḥ prathamám* “you [=Indra] who did these things first,” makes no mention of Indra's deeds, which only start being catalogued in vs. 5, which has dropped the rel. cl.

II.13.2: The ritual preparation and offering of soma remain the focus of this vs., but Indra is obliquely introduced.

Pāda a contains another occurrence of *pári* that is hard to construe. Although Old, Re, and WG take it with the pres. part. *bíbhratīḥ* immed. flg. (e.g., Old “Milch herumführend”), this is highly unlikely. There is no reason why a preverb+participle adjacent to each other, in the right order, and not even divided by a caesura would not univervate to **paribíbhratīḥ* (see *prabhávantam* in the same position in 4b). It is also worth noting that this extremely well-attested redupl. stem is never attested with preverbs and that the close parallel to our passage adduced by Ge, X.30.13 *páyāṃsi bíbhratīḥ*, lacks *pári*. Instead I take *pári* with *ā yanti* – preverbs in tmesis often immediately follow their verbs – with *sādhṛīm ā* contrasting with *pári*: as often in Maṇḍala IX the liquids circle around (the filter, the cups, etc.) but ultimately reach their goal.

The Pp. reads *sadhṛī īm*, accepted by Old and (implicitly) by WG. (Ge and Re are unclear.) This is possible, but not, in my opinion, necessary – and in any case would hardly affect the tr. I would now change the tr. of pāda a to “They [=the waters] go circling towards the same goal, carrying the milk” – again eliminating functionless “throughout.”

The pres. part. to the redupl. pres. *bíbhratīḥ* in pāda a seems to contrast functionally with the finite injunc. (*prá*) *bharanta* in b, with the former expressing the regular, repetitive action of the waters bringing milk, while the latter expresses a one-time or at least notably separate action.

The publ. tr. “bring forth” for *prá bharanta* is somewhat misleading, since it sounds as if they are giving birth. I would prefer ‘present’, but it loses the connection with *bíbhratīḥ* -- perhaps ‘bring forward’.

On *viśvāpsnya*- see comm. ad VIII.97.15. That the waters bring milk to Indra who is himself “the distillate of mother's milk” for us is a nice conceit. Assuming the referent is Indra, this is the first allusion to him in the hymn (unless we follow the Pp. analysis of *sadhṛīm* and take *īm* as referring to Indra).

After this rather low-key introduction of Indra, he reappears in the rather abrupt refrain of d – even though no deeds have actually been attributed to him as yet – nor will they be in vs. 3, which contains the same refrain.

II.13.3: The soma preparation continues. The identification of Hotar (pāda a) and Adhvaryu (b) are Sāy.'s and seem plausible.

Pāda a is syntactically disturbing, in that it seems to have a clear embedded rel. cl.: *ánv éko vadati yád dádati tád*, with *tád* the referent in the main cl. corresponding to *yád* in the dependent cl. (“... that which he gives” -- so the standard tr. incl. JPB's). Since

such constructions seem strongly disallowed in RV, such a bald example would be striking and in fact begs for a different interpr. The interpr. of this pāda is made more difficult by the fact that the lexeme *ānu* √ *vad* is found only here in the RV and it is not entirely clear what action is being performed. If Sāy/Ge (et al.) are correct in identifying the first *ékaḥ* as the Hotar and the second as the Adhvaryu, a possible solution emerges. The Hotar should not in fact be “giving” anything; his job is to recite in accompaniment (an activity well conveyed by *ānu* √ *vad*) to the ritual actions. It is the Adhvaryu who gives, that is, who actually makes the physical offering. Assuming that this division of labor already obtains in the RV, it seems likely to me that *yád dādāti* begins a new sentence and is a *preposed* dependent cl with the main cl. being ... *éka īyate*. I would tr. the hemistich “One follows along with this speech; the (other) one hastens when he gives that [=soma/oblation], changing its forms, having that as his work.” If *yád* is rather taken as the neut. rel. pron., the tr. can be modified to “What he gives, he hastens to that, having that as his work ...” My working assumption is that the independent *tád* is coreferential with the *tád* in the cmpd *tád-apas-*.

On *titikṣate* see comm. ad III.30.1. With Ge I take c as primarily depicting the soma plant being beaten by the pressing stone(s), but the graphic description of this ritual action (“endures the blows ...”) begins the transition to the deeds of Indra. I would not, with Re, take Indra as the subj. here, however – Indra doesn’t withstand blows; he gives them!

II.13.4: Contra the standard tr. (incl. JPB’s) I wonder if *vibhājanta āsate* has √ *ās* ‘sit’ in auxiliary function as later: “keep Xing” (in this case “keep distributing”) rather than having the literal sense “they sit, distributing.”

The sense of this first hemistich, esp. pāda b, is baffling and has given rise to much, not very helpful, disc., which I will not treat and to which I will contribute little. One of the technical questions on which the various interpr. turn is whether the accusatives (*puṣṭīm ... rayīm ... prṣṭhām prabhāvantam*) are coreferential, parallel, or to be construed separately, and in particular what ‘wealth’ (*rayīm* ‘va’) is being compared to. My own very tentative interpr. separates the accusatives of pādas a and b, taking the former (*puṣṭīm*) as obj. of *vibhājantaḥ* and the latter (*prṣṭhām* & Co.) as the goal of the dat. part. *āyaté*, which is itself parallel to *prajābhyaḥ* opening the hemistich. I further take *prṣṭhām* as referring to the back of heaven (*divās prṣṭhá-*) as often. To paraphrase my interpr.: the priests are distributing “prosperity” to their offspring, the fires – that is, they are offering ghee to them. The pl. “fires” of pāda a are then summed up by the sg. *āyaté* ‘(the fire) coming here’ (that is, growing from the butter oblations). The goal of this fire is to reach the back of heaven (a common trope for the ritual fire reaching upwards). This “back” is prominent / projecting (*prabhāvantam*) and compared in its prominence to wealth. My tentative tr. of ab is then “They [=priests] keep distributing prosperity to their offspring [fires], to the one (fire) coming toward the back (of heaven), (which is) prominent like weath.” Among the many shaky parts of this rendering the one that concerns me most is that *āyaté* has the preverb *ā* and should mean ‘coming here’, not going yonder to heaven.

In any case, it is generally agreed that a single fire is the subject of c.

The tr. of *bhójanam* should be changed from ‘food’ to ‘sustenance’, to match the same word in 2b and 6a.

II.13.5: The transition from the ritually focused vss. 1–4 to Indra and his deeds is effected by an echo: the opening of 5a *ádihākṛṇoḥ* picks up *yás tákṛṇoḥ* of the refrain of 2d, 3d, 4d. In those vss. there was no mention of actual deeds of Indra's; this is about to change. The first unambiguous identification of Indra in the hymn is the voc. *ahihan* 'smasher of the serpent' in b.

In the periphrastic causative infinitival phrase *akṛṇoḥ pṛthivīm samdṛśe divé*, Re and WG take dat. heaven as subj. and acc. earth as obj. of the dat. infinitive, in contrast to the publ. tr. and Ge. Since the usual obj. of the infinitive *dṛśe* is the sun, the Ge/JPB interpr. seems more likely, in that it also involves looking heavenward. (This would also somewhat match my interpr. of 4b, where fire is going to heaven.) Note also that in 8ab the datives *pṛkṣāya* and *dāsāveśāya* are objects of the dative infin. *nīhantave*, with the same syntactic pattern as is suggested here. There is also an occurrence of the same stem *samdṛś-* in the acc. pl. in 10c, but this seems to have no clear relationship to the dative here and is, in any case, quite opaque.

The use of *√ric* 'leave (behind)' → 'clear' vel sim. is somewhat puzzling, but there is a little clutch of such passages in the Indra hymns of II: besides this one, see II.15.8 and II.19.5. Perhaps by way of "give leave to / give free rein to."

Ge (n. 5cd) finds *ajanan* "they begot" jarring and suggests emendation to *ajunan* "they sped," for which there is no need. Surely the transmitted text reflects the standard trope of, as it were, creating a god by ritual performance. The odd thing here is that the action is credited to the gods, not mortals – perhaps as the primal institution of the sacrifice. The other puzzling part is the simile, "like a horse with waters." Although this may just mean something like "revive" a weary horse by sprinkling it with waters, I have a nagging sense that there is a belief (expressed somewhere in Vedic prose?) that horses are born from/in water, but I haven't tracked this down. Or it could be a somewhat perverse reference to the horse sacrifice – with the priests sprinkling the sacrificial horse with lustral waters and creating, as it were, a better (=dead) horse.

II.13.6: With Klein (DGRV I.135, etc.), I take the double *ca* as conjoining morphologically parallel *bhójanam* and *várdhanam*, despite the preposed position of the 2nd *ca*. This preposing would be supported by 7a where a correctly positioned second *ca* in a double *ca* construction is found in the same metrical position and before an almost rhyming final word, *dhármanā*.

Because of the accent on *dudóhitha*, pāda b must continue the relative cl. of pāda a, rather than serving as its main cl. as in the publ. tr., which should be corrected to "You who distribute ... and who have milked ..., / you have hidden ..." I would probably also substitute "you milked" and "you deposited" as tr. for the pfs. in b and c, though their functions are not entirely clear.

If the identifications of the acc. and abl. in 6b are correct, this is a sort of rephrasing of 1a.

The rule-breaking use of *sá* with non-impvs. continues here, with *sá ... ní dadhiṣe*.

I'm inclined to take the loc. *vívásvatī* here as "bei/chez Vivasvant" rather than "in Vivasvant" as in the publ. tr. That is, Indra set down a treasure in the vicinity of Vivasvant, presumably as a reward for V's sacrifice, rather than within his body.

JL points out the complex mirror-image figure that straddles the pāda break in cd: #*sá ... dadhiṣe vivásvati, víśvasyaíka íśiṣe sá ...* The two interior elements, *vivásvati* and *víśvasyaíka(h)*, are phonologically similar and isosyllabic; they are flanked by 2nd sg. mid. perfects with rhyming ending *-iṣe*, and the pronoun *sá* with 2nd sg. reference provides an outer ring.

II.13.7: This vs. consists only of rel. clauses, until the refrain (unlike 6, with rel. cl. in ab, but main cl. in c.). The refrain therefore could function as the main cl.

dāna- in b is almost universally taken as ‘pasture’ (Weide) or ‘earth’ (Re ‘sur terre’), a meaning attributed to *dāna-* only in this passage. The interpr. goes back, one way or the other, to Sāy: *upalūyante sasyāny atreti dānaṃ kṣetram*. His remark “grain is cut there” implies a connection with $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘reap, mow’ (EWA’s $D\bar{A}^2$). His gloss ‘field’ (*dānaṃ kṣetram*) is repeated thereafter, most influentially in BR, though they seem to derive the word from $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘divide’ (EWA’s $D\bar{A}^4$); subsequent adoptors of the gloss do not bother to comment on the etymology. Sāy’s implied derivation from $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘reap’ is appealing. There are several clear exx. of the root pres. of this root in the RV (grouped under Gr’s 2. *dā*), as well as nominal derivatives (see EWA s.v. $D\bar{A}^2$). The reference in this vs. to the establishment of flowering and fruitful plants would have helped preserve a lexical item specific to agriculture, even though it is homonymous with the more common *dāna-* ‘gift’ (and see differently accented *dānāya* ‘to give, for giving’ in 13a).

I wonder, however, about the concrete locational sense that Sāy gives it; it might make more sense as an abstract ‘in their reaping’. The vs. seems to depict Indra as the orderer of the cosmos, with the solemn etymological figure *dhármaṇā ... ádhārayaḥ* “you established by your establishment” (or without English cognate expression, “you established by your ordinance”). (I would not follow JPB’s attribution of the *dhárman-* to the plants: “according to the foundation (of each).”) Most of the hemistich would then show Indra creating the various plants in their crucial function, to be harvested. (The presence of *ádhi* might be counter-evidence to my interpr., in that it generally has a locational sense, but I’m not certain that this is enough to derail it.)

I further think that the last bit of the hemistich, *vy àvánīr ádhārayaḥ*, is a somewhat separate expression. That is, I read *ádhārayaḥ* without preverb with the “plants” segment in pāda a / first part of b (thus not flg. JPB’s “established separately the flowering and fruitful (plants)”), and restrict *ví ... ádhārayaḥ* to the streams of the end of b; its position after the caesura in b favors this syntactic separation. Note also the use of the agent noun *vidhartár-* only with rivers in II.28.4. If this interpr. is correct, the problematic *dāne* may require further analysis, for in addition to ‘in their reaping’ for the first part of the hemistich (to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘reap’) it could also be taken as a derivative of $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘divide’, as JPB does: ‘in their division’. It is ideally positioned to be read with both.

I would thus tr. the hemistich “You who established by your ordinance the flowering and fruitful (plants) in their reaping (and) established the (various) streams separately in their division.” Indra’s division of undifferentiated water into separate streams would be part of his fructifying project -- bringing life-giving water to the various terrestrial regions.

Having created the relevant features of the earth -- plants and streams -- in ab, Indra then turns to a particular heavenly feature, the *didyút*-s. What exactly is meant here isn’t clear. The stem *didyút-*, like its near-twin *didyú-*, generally means ‘missile, dart’,

but often a missile sent flying from heaven by a god (cf., e.g., VII.46.3 [Rudra] *yā te didyúd āvasṛṣṭā divās pári* “which missile of yours shot downward from heaven ...”). As Mayrhofer points out (EWA s.v. *didyú-*), *didyút-* has probably been remodeled after \sqrt{dyot} or *vidyút-* ‘lightning’ (I’d favor the latter). And often it seems to have a naturalistic aspect, as lightning (or the dreaded ‘thunderbolt’ of old-fashioned Vedic exegesis). Here the naturalistic reading seems esp. prominent, and I suggest that *ásama-* ‘unequalled’ may also have the sense ‘unequal’ -- that is, jagged and asymmetrical, zigzagging like lightning.

The last difficulty of this challenging verse is the first part of d, *urúr ūrvāṁ abhítaḥ*. Ge (WG) and the publ. tr. take this as an independent nominal clause (e.g., JPB: “you, the wide one surrounding the containers”). Given the cosmogonic cast of the rest of the vs., I would follow Re, who takes *ūrvāṁ* as a 2nd object of *ájanaḥ* in c: “(qui,) vaste (toi-même, as engendré) les mers tout autours.” Although *ūrvá-*, lit. ‘container’, generally refers to cow-pens and the like in the RV, Re’s ‘seas’ (as particularly large containers) seems correct here; cf. the same usage, also in Maṇḍala II, in II.35.3, where the rivers all fill “the same *ūrvá-*” (*samānām ūrvām nadyàḥ prṇanti*). I would thus tr. cd “and who begot the unequal(led) flashing missiles of heaven (and) the ‘containers’ [=seas] all about, (you) the wide one.” The juxtaposition *urúr ūrvāṁ* is a play on words; the two are not etymologically related, at least by most lights.

What is striking about this vs. is that, unlike the usual cosmogonic vss., which refer to large generic parts of creation (heaven, earth, etc.), this one highlights particular idiosyncratic aspects of the grand cosmic divisions.

II.13.8: The PN *dāsáveśa-* presumably means ‘having Dāsas (/a Dāsa) as neighbor(s)’; on *veśá-* see comm. ad X.49.5.

To avoid the need to supply additional unsupported material (JPB’s “would do likewise”) to the brief beginning of pāda d *utaívādyá purukṛt*, I interpr. *purukṛt* as a predicated voc. (“and even today (you are) a much-doer”), with most tr. This brief nominal phrase seems to function like a main cl., though the *utá* should connect it with the preceding rel.

II.13.9: The syntax of the 1st hemistich is intricate and hard to parse. The first rel. cl. (... *yásya* ...) extends through *ékasya śruṣṭaú*, with *yásya* coreferential with *ékasya*. This clause is in turn dependent on the short *yád* clause *yád dha codám āvitha*, with *codám* the referent of *yásya*. The standard tr. take *codá-* as a personal name, but this is not necessary, as Mayrhofer (PN s.v.) points out -- and in fact it would be better not to have another name for Dabhīti (c), who is the ultimate referent of both *yásya* (a) and *codám* (b). After the rel. complications in ab, c presents us with a definite main cl.

Note that *ādiya(h)* at the end of b matches *āsīyam* at end of 8c as well as echoing the (undistracted) (*utaív*)*ādyá* beg. 9d.

In d *suprāvyaḥ* is ascribed to a thematic stem by Gr and taken as a nom. sg (so apparently by JPB), but that stem does not exist. Of the two forms listed under this stem the one here can be a gen. sg. to the root-noun cmpd *suprāvī-* and the supposed thematic loc. in I.34.4 is actually a dat. to the root-noun stem. See comm. ad I.34.4. To make this clear I’d tr. “and (so) you became for the one who pursues his ritual duties well.” Sim. Ge, WG.

II.13.10: Although *viśved ... rodhanā(h)* must belong together semantically, it is difficult to make this work grammatically: *rodhanā* in this sandhi pos. can't be neut. -ā, but must stand for -ā(h) -- so Pp. -- (or, far less likely, -ai). It therefore can't properly be modified by a *viśvā* extracted from *viśvéd*. Old sees the problem, but Gr simply lists the form as neut. -ā, Ge [/WG], Re don't mention and tr. as a phrase. The sandhi of either *viśvéd* or *rodhanā asya* has to be tampered with to harmonize the two words; I have no opinion on how to make this work., but I also don't think it's worth trying to separate the words syntactically. That the hymn shows the irreg. sandhi *sāsi* throughout its refrain suggests that we need not be too punctilious here. The only other RVic occurrence of the noun is differently accented: *ródhanā*, a neut. pl. (I.121.7); AiG II.2.190 considers our form a fem. stem *rodhanā-* beside root-accented neut. *ródhana-*, acdg. to an existing pattern.

The awkward doubling of *asya ... asmai* should be noted in the tr.: "... have conceded his manliness to him," with both pronouns referring to Indra. Perhaps the *asya* is there because most exx. of *ānu √ dā* 'concede' involve the subject conceding some quality of its/his own to a third party, so the fact that the *paúmsya-* is Indra's to begin with needs to be emphasized.

I do not have a clear idea what the second hemistich is about, except that it obviously involves some cosmogonic activity and the *viśtirah* and the *samḍśah* are implicitly contrasted. Ge's idea (n. 10c) that the two refer to the six spaces and the five directions is appealing, even though *samḍś-* does not ordinarily mean 'direction' – incl. in the dat. inf. *samḍśe* in 5a. Contra JPB (and Re), but with Ge (/WG), I'd take the two acc. pls in c as parallel objects of *astabhñāḥ* and construe *pāri paró abhavaḥ* in d separately: "You propped up the six far-flung (spaces) and the five 'sights' [=visible regions], (and) you encompassed (even what is) beyond."

II.13.11: The first pāda, *supravācanām táva vīra vīryām*, is a nominalization of the famous opening of I.32 (found in various forms elsewhere): *indrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam*. In that hymn this opening is followed by the account of an undoubted heroic deed, the slaying of Vṛtra. Here the specification in b, introduced by *yád* (as often in such proclamations) followed by a promisingly heroic *ékena krátunā* "by your resolve alone," turns out to be something of an anticlimax: you find goods. This lack of drama is somewhat repaired by d, which sketches a larger world of great deeds. But d poses problems of its own (see below).

The publ. tr. of c is a bit awk; I'd substitute "Of (you), steadfast by nature and mighty, the vigor (is) preeminent."

Unfortunately the syntax of d is disturbed and disturbing, partly as a result of introducing a variation on the refrain (see hymn intro. above). The standard abbreviated refrain *sāś'y ukth'yah* has been distracted, with *sá* separated from *asi ukthyāḥ* by a vocative (*indra*) and the introduction of *viśvā*, which, combining with *asi*, gives (*vi*)śvāś'y *ukthyāḥ*, a near phonological match for the usual *sāś'y ukthyāḥ*, as was noted above. It's also worth noting that the beginning of pāda d, *yā cakārtha* is a variant of the beginning of the full refrain in vss. 2–4, *yás tākṛnoḥ*. In other words, our d, *yā cakārtha séndra viśvāś'y ukthyāḥ*, is a ring-compositional variant of the first instantiation of the refrain (since vs. 1 has something slightly different): *yás tākṛnoḥ prathamām sāś'y ukthyāḥ*. This

manipulation of the refrain may help account for the problematic syntax, but we still need to address that problem.

The rel. cl. of d is universally tr. (incl. by JPB; only Old explicitly recognizes the difficulty) “all the things you have done,” but “all” (*viśvā*) is not part of the rel. cl. (*yā cakārtha*). It has instead been stuck in the main cl. of the refrain, which, only in this verse, has been altered from *sāsy ukthyāḥ* (2-10d, 12d) to *sēndra viśvāsy ukthyāḥ*. Dropping a piece of a rel. cl. into the middle of a main cl. is simply impossible in the RV. It is possible to interpr. *viśvā* as a real part of the main cl., an acc. of respect: “What (deeds) you have done, you are worthy of hymns with regard to all of them.” But somehow I doubt that’s what the poet intended -- though what his intentions were, esp. given the deliberate alteration of the refrain, are opaque to me. I think his focus was on the phonological trick.

Another possible wrinkle in d is that *yā* need not be the neut. pl. of the rel., illegally anticipating the *viśvā* intruding in the refrain. It could be an instr. sg. picking up *vāyah* in the preceding pāda: “... the vigor by which you have done ...” But since *yā cakārtha* seems a rewrite of *yās tākṛnoḥ* in vss. 2–4, this seems unlikely.

II.13.12: *sārapasaḥ* is a hapax. JPB’s interpr. of it as a river name Sarapas, suggested by the rivers Sarayu and Sarasvant, is plausible. He takes it as a gen. dependent on *srutīm* (sim. WG), in contrast to Ge and Re, who take it as an acc. pl., obj. of *āramayaḥ*, which requires them to supply another verb to govern *srutīm*.

The use of the secondarily shortened stem *śravāya-* here instead of inherited *śrāvāya-* may have been favored by the similarly short-root-vowel *āramayaḥ* at the beginning of this vs. (which stem comes by its short root vowel honestly) and by the denom. *śravasyā-* in the next vs. More problematic is what *prā ... śravāyan* is conveying here. One might think that what the blind and the lame want is not fame but healing. Some such consideration must have led Gr to assign this form (and *prāśrāvayam* X.49.8) to a different root *śru* and a different idiom *prā √ śru* ‘vorwärts bringen’. I see no justification for such a separation. It is possible that the causative here means (as it can elsewhere) ‘make hear/heed’ rather than ‘make heard/famed’, though this wouldn’t appreciably improve the situation of the blind and lame. Or that in the idiom *prā √ śru*, the *prā* came to dominate, with a sense ‘further, favor (through fame)’. See Ge’s n. 12d for further disc.

II.13.13: The last puzzle in the hymn is found in pāda c and also involves fame. We have just urged Indra to give us a *rādhah* (‘gift, benefit’) in the first hemistich. In c we find the phrase *yāc citrām śravasyā(h)*. Since *citrā-* very frequently modifies *rādhah*, it seems natural to supply the recently mentioned *rādhah* here. But then what is Indra doing? *yāc citrām* appears to be the obj. of *śravasyā(h)*. But this denom. doesn’t otherwise take an object (IV.42.2 cited by Gr is to be otherwise interpr.), and even if it did, the phrase would have to mean “which bright (gift) you will seek as fame,” which doesn’t seem to make sense. Ge essentially tr. it this way (“... eine ansehnliche (Lohngabe) ... in der du ... deinen Ruhm suchen”), but I don’t see why Indra would be looking for his fame in that direction. JPB avoids the syntactic difficulty by tr. as if *yāc citrām* were an instr.: “the bright gift *through which* you will seek fame” (my italics), but this still requires the gift to be something that would provide Indra with fame. Re’s tendency to supply masses of

material to smoothe over the rough places is on full display here: “ce qui est éclatant, veuille le donner-par-désir de-renom” (so hyphenated). WG seem to have arrived at a novel solution, apparently separating *citrām* from its usual formulaic partner *rādhās* and supplying *śrāvas-* ‘fame’ -- or so I interpret “damit du ... deinen ansehnlichen Ruhm suchen mögest.” However, as far as I can tell, *śrāvas-* is never modified by *citrā-*, and context favors *rādhās-* as referent. I have no good solution. The least unsatisfactory may be to assume that, in our self-serving way, we are telling Indra that giving us a good gift will bring him fame (better than heroic deeds? see 11ab) -- and in some sense it will, since we celebrate his generosity with hymns providing lasting *śrāvas-*. Syntactically I suggest that there is a clause boundary between *citrām* and *śravasyāḥ*, which then owes its accent to being initial in its clause. The phrase *yāc citrām* is then an afterthought nominal izafe specifying *rādhāḥ* in pāda a. I would then tr. the relevant parts “Make your aim to give that gift to us ... / the bright (gift), o Indra. You will (thus) seek fame throughout the days.” If we can render *śravasyāḥ* as “you will find fame,” it would be even better.

Given the numerous large and small changes I’ve suggested for the tr. of this hymn, I insert a full emended one here.

II.13 complete (incorporating my modifications)

1. His mother is the season. From her, as soon as he was born, he [=soma] entered the waters, among which he grows strong.

Then he became a voluptuous woman, swelling with milk, the plant’s first beestings. -- That one is worthy of hymns.

2. They [=the waters] go circling towards the same goal, bearing the milk. They bring forward sustenance for him [=Indra?] who is all mother’s milk (for us).

The downward sloping (watercourses) share the same road to flow along. -- You who did these things first are worthy of hymns.

3. One follows along with this speech; the (other) one hastens when he gives that [=soma/oblation], changing its forms, having that as his work.

He [=soma] withstands all the blows of another [=the pressing stone]. -- You who did these things first are worthy of hymns.

4. They [=priests] keep distributing prosperity to their offspring [=fires], to the one (fire) coming toward the back (of heaven), (which is) prominent like weath.

Insatiable, he [=the fire] eats the sustenance of his father [=the priest] with his teeth. -- You who did these things first are worthy of hymns.

5. Then you made the earth to see heaven, you, o smasher of the serpent, who cleared the paths of the streams.

The gods gave birth to you, the god, with their praise songs, like a winning horse with waters. -- You are worthy of hymns.

6. You who distribute sustenance and increase and milked the dry [=the soma plant] together with its honey [=the soma] out of the wet [=rain],

You hid a treasure nearby Vivasvat. You alone are the master of everything. -- You are worthy of hymns.

7. You who established by your ordinance the flowering and fruitful (plants) in their reaping (and) established the (various) streams separately in their division, who begot the unequal(led) flashing missiles of heaven (and) the “containers:e [=seas] all about, (you) the wide one -- You are worthy of hymns.
8. You who, in order to strike down *Prkṣa* and *Dāsaveśa*, conveyed the son of *Nṛmara* together with his goods to the impregnable mouth of the *Ūrjayantī* (River), and even today you are a doer of many (deeds) -- You are worthy of hymns.
9. Or when you helped him, the hard-driving—at whose obedience (to you), though he was alone, you bound his hundred times ten (enemies) all at once—you tied up the *Dasyus* for *Dabhīti* in that which has no ropes, and (so) you became for the one who pursues his ritual duties well. -- You are worthy of hymns.
10. All things that obstruct have conceded his manliness to him. They have set themselves as the stakes for the successful gambler. You propped up the six far-flung (spaces) and the five “sights” [=visible regions], (and) you encompassed (even what is) beyond. -- You are worthy of hymns.
11. Your heroism, o hero, is good to proclaim: that by your resolve alone you take possession of goods. Of (you), steadfast by nature and mighty the vigor (is) preeminent. -- What (deeds) you have done, with regard to all of them, o *Indra*, you are worthy of hymns.
12. You halted the course of the *Sarapas* (River) for *Turvīti* and *Vayya* to cross. You led him up who was sunk down and shunned, making famed the blind one and the lame. You are worthy of hymns.
13. Make your aim to give that gift to us, o good one—your store of goods is great—the bright (gift), o *Indra*. You will (thus) seek/find fame throughout the days. -- May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes.

II.14 *Indra* [SJ on JPB]

Although the publ. intro. characterizes this hymn as “surprisingly straightforward,” a closer analysis suggests “surprisingly *unstraightforward*” as a more accurate description.

The most obvious structural feature of this hymn is the voc. *ádhvaryavaḥ* “o *Adhvaryus*” that opens each vs. but the last, which begins *asmábyam* “to us.” But there is more to be observed than this superficial exact repetition. The hymn follows the template of II.12, but is not so tightly structured. Like II.12, much of the hymn (vss. 2–7, with a return in 11) presents in the earlier parts of each vs. a series of definitional relative clauses referring to *Indra* and his deeds. The main clause, occupying cd or only d, then urges the priests to offer soma to *Indra*. Unlike II.12 this main clause structure is not a strictly repeated refrain but a series of variants, often involving the dat. *tásmāi* -- but the offering of soma is always part of it. Part of the pleasure of this hymn is seeing how the poet will realize this refrain in verse after verse.

II.14.1: As often, the first vs. doesn’t directly participate in the structure that is established thereafter (in this hymn in vs. 2), but what will be the repetitive message of the main clauses in that structure is announced in the first pāda of the hymn: *bhāraténdrāya sómam* “bring soma to *Indra*.”

On *asya pītīm* see comm. on vs. 2 immed. below.

Note that in d HvN's *eśā* is an error for *eṣā*.

In order to connect 1d with 2c (see below), I would substitute “desires” for “wishes.”

II.14.2: This vs. inaugurates the rel. cl. / main cl. structure noted above, with Indra's signature deed, the smiting of Vṛtra (ab), as the rel. cl.; the main clauses of cd contain variants of vs. 1.

The publ. tr. of ab is somewhat awkwardly arranged. It might be better as “who struck Vṛtra, who had enclosed the waters – (struck him) like a tree with a spear.”

The resumptive pronoun corresponding to *yāḥ* in pāda a is *tásmai* opening c. Most of this clause, *tásmai etám bharata*, is simply a repetition of 1a *bhāratēndrāya sómam*, with pronouns substituting for the nouns. The dat. *tadvaśāya* at the end qualifies *tásmai* while also recapitulating the final cl. of 1d *tád id eṣā vaṣṭi*. To capture the syntactic structure of c and the lexical connection to 1d I might slightly emend the tr. to “to him bring this (soma) – (to him) who has desire for it.”

Pāda d consists of a second main clause, whose final *pītīm asya* simply flips *asya pītīm* of 1c. Given this repetition and the tight connection between vss. 1 and 2, I would render the two phrases the same, with the same referent (soma) for *asya*. (JPB takes *asya* in 1c as referring to Indra, but in 2d to soma.) 1c: “... ever desirous of the drinking of it” / 2d “deserves the drinking of it.”

II.14.3: Drbhīka is not otherwise known, but pāda b of course treats the other signature deed of Indra's, the Vala myth.

As in vs. 2, the second hemistich contains two main clauses, one (c) with a pronoun resuming the relatives of ab, one independent. Both of these clauses exhibit some syntactic/conceptual tension.

The opening of c *tásmai etám* is identical to 2c and strongly invites us to supply *bharata* as in 2c (and see 1a; also II.37.1, which seems closely modeled on our vss. 1–2). But the simile *antárikṣe ná vātam* doesn't work very well in that scenario: “bring (soma) like wind in the midspace”? Various strategies have been tried to deal with this conceptual mismatch. Ge supplies a new verb (a form of \sqrt{srj} ; see his n. 3a) to govern both frame and simile, but this willfully ignores the pattern established in vss. 1–2. Both Re and JPB maintain the pattern of vss. 1 and 2 by supplying *bharata*, but then supply (from nowhere) something to account for the simile. JPB supplies “rushing swiftly”; Re's solution is more egregious; “comme (le dieu a mis) le vent dans l'espace-médian.” WG also supply *bharata* and then cut the clause there, taking the simile with d – but this solves nothing. They must then construe it with the verb *órṇuta* ‘cover’ and they supply “with rains” – but does wind get covered with rain? As for my take: given the pattern, I think we must supply *bharata* here. Since the simile doesn't work well with d either, I think we have to keep it with c – and make the best of it. It's possible that *bharata* would be used in two different senses with frame and simile, but I can't pinpoint what the latter would be. Perhaps “bring the wind” simply means “start up the wind / make the wind rise” (/“bring on the wind!”). But none of this is very satisfactory.

The tension in d is even worse because it's syntactic. Here we have “cover Indra (*índram*) with soma juices (*sómaiḥ*),” a nice variant on “bring Indra the soma” and an

illustration of the poet's elaboration on the underlying refrain. The simile has an instr. *vástraiḥ* "with blankets / clothes," but what should be the equivalent of acc. *índram* is *jūḥ*. This should be a nominative sg., and is so taken by the standard tr. (incl. JPB); see also Schindler (Rt. nouns), EWA s.v. *jūr* ("offenbar Nom.Sg"). Old (fld. by Re, JPB) assumes that the active transitive construction of the frame has been underlyingly passivized with this nom.: "cover Indra ... as a fast horse (is covered)," with the often-claimed reversion of similes to the nominative (explicitly here in Ge's n. 3d), a notion I hope I demolished for good in my long ago simile article. I would rather assume *jūḥ* to be an acc. pl. to a nonce fem. stem, though I realize this is pretty shaky – tr. "cover Indra with soma juices, like fast mares with blankets."

I would now (unsatisfactorily) emend the tr. of cd to "Bring him this (soma), like wind in the midspace; cover Indra with soma juices like fast mares with blankets."

II.14.4: The pf. *jaghāna* should be tr. like the other three occurrences of the same form in 2b, 3a, 5a (also the part. *jaghanvān* in 7b) – so either change 'smashed' to 'struck' here or change the other three to 'smashed' – or change them all to 'smote'.

An Uraṇa is not known from elsewhere; Mayr (PN s.v. *úraṇam*) considers *úraṇam* here to be a "false reinterpretation" of the acc. of *úran-* 'lamb' (though he was considerably more skeptical about their connection in EWA [I.226, s.v. *úran-*]). The reinterpretation would have to be thoroughgoing, since lambs don't have 99 limbs.

On the hapax *cakhvāṃsam* see EWA I.451 (s.v. *khā-*) somewhat unsatisfactorily. Since nothing further is known about Uraṇ(a) and his 99 arms, determining what action he performed on them is difficult – but stretching them out is a reasonable possibility.

The conceptual refrain occupies pāda d, with the first three pādas devoted to the rel. clauses. The refrain is another elaboration on the model – here with the root \sqrt{bhr} represented by the loc. *bhr̥thé*, with *sómasya bhr̥thé* "at the bringing of soma" a nominalization of *sómam bharata*.

II.14.5: The rel. cl. portion of the vs. contains five occurrences of *yáh*.

I would substitute "Devourer" for the PB *Aśna*, as in II.20.5.

The refrain returns to the dat. recipient (*tásmā índrāya*) and a 2nd pl. impv, but relexicalizes the rest, with *ándhas-* for *sóma-* (but see 1b) and *juhota* for *bharata* (but see 1d).

II.14.6: The "warriors" supplied in c is based on VII.99.5 *śatām varcīnaḥ sahásraṃ ca ... vīrān*. I would be inclined to substitute "heroes" here, esp. given *vīrān* in 7c.

The refrain, which occupies only the post-caesura portion of d, reverts to the model: *bháratā sómam asmai*.

II.14.7: This is the last vs. in the series that fits the II.12-type rel. cl. / refrain template, and it exactly repeats the structure of vs. 6, with a verb still belonging to the rel. cl. portion opening d and the refrain, identical to that of 6, occupying the post-caesura position.

I would substitute 'wrenched down' for 'slung down', since the root is \sqrt{vrj} 'twist, wring'.

II.14.8: The transition away from the rel. cl. / refrain model is gradual in this vs. Like all the vss. 2–7 there’s a form of *yá-* immediately after the initial voc. *ádhvaryavaḥ*, but it is *yád*, not *yáh* -- and the corresponding main cl. is found in b. But two versions of the refrain are found in cd. Pāda c contains the signature verb *bharata* with relexicalized acc. and dat. for the soma and Indra respectively; in pāda d we have the originals, *sómam* and *índrāya*, with *juhota* substituting for *bharata* (as in 5d, also 1d).

II.14.9: This vs. scraps the rel. clause structure entirely, but repeats the refrain of 8d almost verbatim.

II.14.10: The structure becomes even looser, but the conceptual refrain remains – here transferred to pāda b: “fill Indra with soma juices” (*sómebhiḥ ... pṛṇatā ... índram*), a structure identical to 3d *índram sómair órṇuta* “cover Indra with soma juices”). Like the phrase in c, this one has an associated simile, here found in pāda a.

In the identical pāda VI.23.9 I tr. *bhójam* as ‘benefactor’.

II.14.11: The last vs. (before the vs. repeated from II.13.13) reestablishes the rel. cl. / main cl. structure, with two *yáh* clauses referring to Indra and a variant on the refrain in c and the first half of d, scrambled from 10b: *tám ... pṛṇatā ..., índram sómebhiḥ*.

II.15 Indra [SJ on JPB]

Another hymn with a refrain, which runs from vs. 2 through vs. 9, occupying the whole d pāda. It does not vary, nor is it linked to the rest of the vs. in any interesting way. The hymn is the epitome of a well-made hymn, a catalogue of Indra’s deeds, with each deed generally occupying a pāda, expressed with Indra in the 3rd sg. (until vs. 9, which switches to 2nd sg.), almost entirely in augmented imperfects and occasional perfects (with some injunctives surfacing towards the end). It’s very regimented and mostly straightforward.

II.15.1: This vs. is a variant on the opening of the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn, I.32 *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam* --- with *prá ghā nú ... vocam* framing the first hemistich, an expanded gen. phrase (but without explicit mention of Indra: *asya maható ... satyásya*) and *káraṇāni* for *vīryāṇi* – along with two etymological figures: *maható mahāni*, *satyā satyásya*. Pāda c is an exact repetition of I.32.3b. The final pāda encapsulates the myth, and then our hymn is finished with it and moves on to other deeds – in contrast to the obsessive attention to it in I.32.

II.15.2: The last pāda of vs. 1 is converted into the more generic refrain that continues through the rest of the hymn: *sómasya ... máde* substitutes for *asyá máde* and the all-purpose verb *cakāra* for *jaghāna*.

II.15.3: What to supply with *prācaḥ* is a question; see Ge’s n. 3a for a consideration of the possibilities. The publ. tr. follows Sāy. in supplying “rivers”; similar is Ge’s “Bahnen” (for [water] courses), on the basis of *pathíbhiḥ* in c (so also Kü 367–68). Old (fld. by Re) instead “mountains” on the basis of II.17.5 *prācīnān párvatān*. WG “die Welt,” taking *prācaḥ* not as acc. pl. but abl. sg. (with Gr). Since the rest of the vs. concerns the release

of the waters, “rivers” or “(water)courses” is probably the best choice. I prefer the latter, since rivers are not in fact “fixed,” but moving.

mimāya mānaiḥ is a pseudo etymological figure, since *mimāya* belongs to √*mi* ‘fix’, not √*mā* ‘measure’, *pace* Re and WG, who tr. as if an etymological figure. For √*mi* used of cosmogonic deeds, see IV.56.1, III.31.12, and for √*mi* with ‘seats’ see X.18.13. I would substitute “like (ritual) seats he fixed apart the eastward (water courses)”; in other words he established separate beds for the various rivers.

Exactly what action “drill with his mace” depicts isn’t clear to me – the mace used as a sort of battering ram?

In c for JPB’s “at his choice” I would substitute “at (their) will,” like Re’s “à leur gré,” referring to the waters, not Indra. *vīthā* is several times used of entities that move wherever they want (I.140.5, 168.4), and it occurs in just this context in I.139.5 *tvām vīthā nadyā indra sártave ... asṛjaḥ*, which I tr. “You, Indra, released the rivers to flow at will.” It would seem odd to attribute just this action to Indra’s choice/will, since presumably all these deeds are done under that condition.

II.15.4: The relatively rare lexeme *prā* √*vah* generally means ‘carry away’, sometimes benignly (as in the Wedding Hymn, X.85.26), sometimes not, as here. For the publ. tr. “the raiders against Dabhīti,” I would substitute “the abductors of Dabhīti.”

The *s*-aor. *adhāk* is a surprisingly intrusion in this long sequence of augmented imperfects, plus perfects and some pres. injunctives. I do not know why the aor. was used here, esp. since the them. pres. stem *dāha-* is well established and *adahat* would have been available. Evoking metrical reasons is not sufficient, but I do not think *adhāk* has a specifically aoristic nuance here. For another aor. see 7c.

II.15.5: On the story behind this vs., see publ. intro.

II.15.6: Who the “unswift” and the “swift” are is completely unclear; see speculation in Ge’s n. 6c and WG’s n. At least the swift ones (*javínibhiḥ*) have to be fem. I would suggest ‘mares’ (like the swift mares [acc. pl. *jūḥ*]) I see in II.14.3d), except I don’t see how they could be instruments of hewing apart.

II.15.7: The publ. tr. is misleading, in that it indicates, or at least implies, that the subj. of pāda a is the same as that in b, namely Indra. This is surely incorrect; instead the distribution has to be as Old already saw: the subj. of pāda a is Indra, but that in b is the ‘shunned’ one. Pāda b and c recapitulate, in the active voice, nearby II.13.12cd, where the shunned one, the lame, and the blind were the objects of Indra’s attention: *nīcā sántam úd anayaḥ parāvījam, prāndhām śroṇām śravāyan* “You led him up who was sunk down and shunned, making famed the blind one and the lame.” Here the same figures indicated by the same lexical items (save for *anāk* for *andhā-* ‘blind’) are found—but in the nom.; Indra’s helpful intervention is implied but not stated: they perform the actions themselves. As for Indra’s knowledge in pāda a: the “concealment of the maidens” (subjective gen.) surely represents, as Old suggests, unmarried girls concealing infants born out of wedlock (see IV.30.16, also containing *parāvīj-*). Knowing that the shunned one has been hidden away, Indra arranges for him to reappear. I would therefore emend the tr. to “He (Indra) knowing the concealment of the maidens ...: the shunned one,

become visible, stood up; the lame one stood firm, the blind one gazed widely.” I am also quite dubious about the speculation in the publ. intro. that this vs. has to do with Indra’s “bringing forth the soma.” The ritual references in this hymn are muted to non-existent, whereas Indra’s deeds are front and center.

This vs. contains the only syntactic trick in the hymn. Everywhere else the ubiquitous nom. sg. subject is Indra, though he is not named except in the refrain. But here we must switch subjects from Indra in pāda a to the various unfortunates in b and c. This subject switch was prepared for in vs. 5, where in pāda c there was a switch to a 3rd plural subject, but there there was no chance of ambiguity. The trick here is esp. nasty, because pāda a has no finite verb, and this lack invites us to take the subj. of pāda a as subj. of the verb in b.

In c we have another aorist (see also *adhāk* in 4b), this time an injunctive, *prāti ... sthāt*, which immediately follows the imperfect *úd atiṣṭhat* in b. I do not know what, if any, contrast is meant here, esp. since the following parallel verb *acaṣṭa* is again an augmented imperfect.

II.15.8: On the curious use of *√ric* in this group of hymns, see comm. ad II.13.5.

II.15.9: A shift to 2nd ps. address after the unbroken 3rd ps. reference of the rest of the hymn.

I am inclined not to ignore the case frame in pāda a and therefore to tr. “having strewn C and Dh with sleep.”

As is universally agreed, *rambhín-* refers to an elderly person with a cane or staff; this is nicely illustrated (far more clearly than the RV usually offers) by VIII.45.20 *ā tvā rambhám ná jívrayo rarabhmā* “As elderly men grasp a staff, we have grasped hold of you.”

II.15.10 = II.11.21.

II.16 Indra [SJ on JPB]

II.16.1–2: The poet plays with several different senses of *√bhr* in these two vss. In 1ab *prā ... bhare* has slightly different nuances in frame and simile, with the personal dative *jyēṣṭhamāya* and the loc. of substance *agnaú* being essentially parallel. In 2b *sámbhṛtā* means ‘brought together, collected’, while the four loc./acc. pairs in 2cd are all complements of *bhárati* ‘carries, bears’. Note also the phonological echo in *bṛhatáḥ* (2a). The root returns in 4b.

In 2d *bhárati* is accented presumably because it participates in a series of contrastive predicates.

II.16.1: As often *vah* (“for/of you”) refers generally to the ritual participants on whose behalf the 1st ps. speaker is acting.

Note the two paradoxical pairs in cd, one of which is also an etymological figure: *ajuryám jaráyantam* “unaging but causing to age” and *sanád yúvānam* “a youth from of old.”

II.16.3: A new sentence should probably not be started with pāda c, since d is more appropriate to ab, esp. b, than to c.

II.16.4: On *krátum* construed with both *bharanti* and *sásate* see Ge's n. 4b (though neither Re nor WG so construes it).

Ge (n. 4c) successfully defends taking Indra as subj. of *yajasva*, against Sāy.'s priest and Old's Agni. He also takes *yajasva* as "active" in sense ("sacrifice") rather than passive, a possibility floated but rejected by Old but accepted by WG ("sei ... verehrt").

II.16.4–6: The rather tedious identification of all salient entities as bulls – or, as Ge (n. 4–6) characterizes it: "die beliebte Spielerei mit *vṛṣan*." See how this trope gets twisted in vs. 8.

II.16.7: I'd change "travel among the soma pressings" to "drive to the soma pressings" – the point, I think, is that the poet's speech is a conveyance in both pādas: in pāda a it's compared to a boat; in pāda b the formulation is implicitly identified with a chariot. Cf., e.g., VII.75.6 *yāti ... ráthena*.

I'm inclined to slightly change the tr. of *sicāmahe* from 'draw upon' to the more concrete 'dip/scoop out', since esp. in X.101.5–7 it's clear that \sqrt{sic} refers to hauling/dipping water out of a well rather than pouring it out (impossible manoeuvre with a well!).

II.16.8: As pointed out in the publ. intro., Indra is now likened to a cow, indeed a tender mother cow (b), after the focus on bulls in vss. 4–6. But *we* have now become bulls (cd), virile ones, who sexually unite with Indra's favors as if with their wives – in language very reminiscent of Lopāmudrā's exhortation to Agastya in I.179.1–2.

The publ. intro. suggests that Indra's transformation into a cow in this vs. "sets up the final verse (9)," with its mention of the dakṣinā. This may be the case, but it should be remembered that vs. 9 is repeated from II.11.21 and serves as the final vs. for II.15–20.

II.17 Indra [SJ on JPB]

II.17.1: For *ḍṛṇhitāny aīrayat* Gr suggests reading *ḍṛṇhitā vyāīrayat*, a change endorsed by Old.

II.17.2: Although Ge (see esp. n. 2a) and Re take *dhāyase* as belonging to $\sqrt{dhā}$ 'place, establish', all clear instances of *dhāyas-*, esp. in its abundant cmpds., belong to $\sqrt{dhā}$ 'suckle'. See comm. ad III.50.3, etc., as well as *viśvā-dhāyas-* in our vs. 5, which both Ge and Re take as 'all-nourishing'.

I do not understand what *mahimānam ātirat* means, though I rather doubt it means "crossed beyond greatness," as in the publ. tr. The lexeme $\tilde{ā} \sqrt{tī}$ is rather rare, but seems otherwise, when construed with an acc., mostly to mean 'overcome' (III.34.1, VII.82.6, X.54.1), though also maybe 'pass over' (IV.30.3, 7). But neither sense works well here. I can find no passages in which it appears to mean 'pass beyond', and it's hard to know what that would mean here in context, as well as how $\tilde{ā}$ would contribute to that sense. It's also possible that *mahimānam* is a second object to *mīmāṇaḥ* ("showing the measure

of his power and greatness”) and *ātirat* should be differently construed, possibly with the dative *prathamāya dhāyase*. In that case the relevant parts of the hemistich could be tr. “... who, showing the measure of his power and greatness, attained to the foremost sustenance.” I rather prefer this.

The 2nd hemistich is reminiscent of the more explicit I.173.6 *sām vivya índro vṛjānaṃ ná bhūmā, bharti svadhāvām̐ opaśám iva dyām* “Indra has enwrapped himself in the earth, like a circlet. The autonomous one wears heaven like a headdress” and seems to refer to Indra’s “suiting up” in cosmic garb.

II.17.3–5: Note the vs./hemistich openings 3a *ádḥā*, 4a *ádḥā*, 4c *ād*, 5a *ádḥārayat*.

II.17.3: The referent and governing nominal of *asya* are unclear. The publ. tr. (also Old, WG) takes it as dependent on *ágre* with the referent apparently the deed, but this enclitic is in Wackernagel’s position and need not be governed by the immed. flg. noun. Semantically I prefer Sāy.’s suggestion (adopted by Ge and Re), that it refers to the singer and limits *bráhmanā* – so “when at the beginning you roused your explosive power by his [=singer’s] formulation.” However, this runs into the problem that the singer is nowhere in the discourse, and *asya* should have an already existing referent (or, if we were to read **asyá* against the Pp., it should be adjectival). Still I prefer this interpr. to the one in the publ. tr.

II.17.4: Because *abhí* appears in both pāda a and pāda b, I would separate the two pādas and supply the verb “sur(mount)” in the first pāda, on the basis of the parallel IX.110.9 adduced by Ge (n. 4a). The lexeme *abhí√vṛdh* appears in a limited no. of passages (e.g., III.44.2, V.44.5, probl. IX.47.1) with the acc., meaning something like “wax strong over,” and so the publ. tr. is possible, but I’d prefer “Then he who sur(mounted) all the worlds by his greatness, acting as their master, and, projecting his youthful vitality, waxed strong.”

The verb in c could technically be *ā-átanot* with accent on the verb, not the preverb, and still be part of the rel. cl. of ab (as in I.32.4), but since the “light” of c and the “darkness” of d are thematically linked, they may better be interpr., as in the publ. tr., as two main clauses. I would, however, connect them more closely, by deleting the semicolon and joining them by “and”: “just after that, (as a) draught horse, he spanned the two world-halves with light, and sewing up the bilious darknesses, he wrapped them all together.”

II.17.5: I would delete the comma after “power.”

Note the non-etymological play in b: *apām āpaḥ* “the work of the waters.”

II.17.6: This vs. is a little riddle, whose solution – *vájra* – is postponed till the first word of the final pāda.

The interpr. of *védasaḥ* in b is about evenly divided between ‘possessions’ (Ge [though see his n. 6b], JPB) and ‘knowledge’ (Old, Re, WG). The stem *védas-* ordinarily means ‘possessions, property’, but I can see that in this passage ‘knowledge’ is somewhat more appealing.

On the always problematic *krívi-*, see the despairing comm. ad I.30.1 and V.44.5. Since our hemistich almost certainly describes the smiting of Vṛtra (on the basis of *vájreṇa hatvī*, the verb *ní ... ávṛṇak* [see *ní ... āvṛṇak* in the Vṛtra passage V.32.8], and *śayādhyai*, which recalls the numerous exx. of *√śi* ‘lie’ in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32), it would be nice to rescue JPB’s ‘worm’, against the PN Krivi in the standard tr. This is just barely possible: the ‘worm’ word (AV+) is found both as *kṛmi-* and *krími-* (see AiG I.33 and, esp. Nachtr. 19 [31, 4], on the variation in AV and YV mss. between the two). In MIA intervocalic *m* can become *v* or nasalized *ṽ* (see Pischel, Pkr. Gr. §251, von Hinüber, *Überblick*² §§208–11). Via such manipulations we can get *krívi-* here to be a MIA form of *kṛmi-* ‘worm’ – ‘worm’ being of course a deprecatory way to refer to a snake.

II.17.7: The publ. tr. doesn’t make sufficiently clear the relevance of the simile to the larger context, which turns on two slightly different senses of *bhága-*. The *amājúr-* is an unmarried female (hence ‘maiden’ probably better than ‘woman’) who “grows old at home” with her parents because of her unmarried state; she begs for *bhága-* in the particular sense of good fortune in love (see Ge’s n. 7ab), while in the frame *bhága-* has the more general sense of good fortune / luck. This is well brought out in the perhaps overly specific tr. of Scar (163): “Wie eine, die zu Hause alt wird ... [den Bhaga um Liebesglück anfleht], so flehe ich dich um Glück an.” The phrase beginning pāda b, *samānād ā sādasaḥ*, should be common to both simile and frame, as Ge and Scar take it (not merely with the latter as JPB, Re, and WG do). In the simile it refers to the house the luckless maiden (reluctantly) shares with her parents, in the frame to the ritual “seat” (=ritual ground) shared by the ritual participants. I would therefore tr. ab “As (a maiden) growing old at home, being with her parents, (begs) from their common seat for luck in love, from our common (ritual) seat I beg you for good fortune.” On the connection between *amājúr-* and *bhága-* see X.39.3 (the Ghōṣā hymn), adduced by Ge.

The verb *īye* in b belongs to *√yā* ‘beg, beseech’, not *√yā* ‘drive’, pace WG.

It is difficult to know how to construe pāda d. To begin with, *tanvāḥ* can belong either to the main cl. or the rel. cl., since *yéna* could be taking 2nd position in the rel. cl., as often. Then, it can either be gen. (/abl.) sg. or acc. pl., and it can mean ‘self’ or ‘body’; if ‘self’, it could have either 1st or 2nd ps. reference (myself v. yourself). The standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG, Kü [354], JPB) all situate *tanvāḥ* in the main cl., mostly as an awk. substitute for an indirect obj. “to me” – so JPB “to me myself,” Re “à moi-même.” This seems to me an unlikely use of *tanū-*. WG, by contrast, take it as body (“gib uns den Teil des Leibes”), which is syntactically better, but what would be its sense in context? (In a note they suggest alternatively “deiner selbst” with 2nd ps. ref., which makes more sense than the 1st ps. of the other tr.; this is also the solution of Kü [354].) Scar (163) takes *tanvāḥ* with the rel. cl. and gives it 2nd ps. ref.: “verschaff einen Anteil, durch den du [etwas] von dir selbst gespendet haben wirst,” with an unjustified “future perfect” interpr. of the pf. subj. *māmāhaḥ*, but a reasonably plausible interpr. of *tanvāḥ* as a partitive with 2nd ps. ref.

The interpr. is further complicated by the not-always-certain semantics of the root *√maṇh*, for which see the disc. in my *-āya-Formations* (130–31). I argue there that the root originally meant ‘be ready’, a meaning still found in some passages (like VIII.12.6), but that long association with *dānāya* ‘for giving, to give’ transferred the ‘give’ meaning

to the root: ‘be ready to give, be liberal’. In addition to the pres. stems *māmha-* and *maṁhāya-*, the pf. *māmah-* belongs to this root (and should be dissociated with \sqrt{mah} , with which it is classified by Gr; see correct affiliation in Lub). The form here, *māmāhaḥ*, is the only active form to this pf. and must be a subjunctive. That its root syl. is weak (expected act. subj. stem in principle **māmamha-*) shows that it is a nonce activization of the weak middle pf. stem *māmah-*, which builds a subj. *māmahanta* as well as imperatives based on such an apparent thematic stem, *māmahasva* and *māmahantām* (for which see disc. in my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems” (Fs. Lubotsky).

Putting all this together, I would now take *tanvāḥ* with the main cl. (like most tr., though sympathetic to Scar’s alt. interpr.), but with the 2nd ps. reference suggested by Kü and as an alternative by WG: “Give (us) a share of yourself, by which you will display your liberality.” This tr. is almost identical to Kü’s: “Gib einen Anteil an dir selbst, mit dem du dich grosszügig ziegen wirst.”

II.17.7–8: Note the progression *bhāgam* (7b), *bhāgām* (7d), *bhojām* (8a).

II.17.8: I prefer ‘benefactor’ for *bhojā-*, or, as in nearby II.14.10, ‘provider’.

The accented voc. *vīṣann* in HvN’s ed. is (fortunately) a typographical error.

I would change “make us better” to “make us better off.” Such wishes have to do with material, not moral, improvement.

II.17.9: Once again the repeated final vs.

II.18 Indra [SJ on JPB]

The hymn is filled [/afflicted] with a fair amount of numerology. Although much ingenuity has been devoted to identifying the referents of the various numbered entities, beginning with Sāy., from my point of view identifying the referent is less important than noting the esoteric play with numbers. For speculations on some of the identifications see publ. intro.

II.18.1: Since pāda a has only 10 syllables, it is possible that we might read **ayoji* (so tentatively Old and Arnold), though there are other possibilities (e.g., HvN’s rest at 5). If **ayoji*, it should be tr. ‘has been yoked up’, though ‘is yoked up’ for the injunctive might match the *bhūt* in d.

Because of the *sá* opening d, I would link c to ab, and start a new clause with d (so also Ge, Re, WG). This would also allow the last numerological term (*dāsāritraḥ* in c) to be part of the clause containing the others: “Early in the morning a new, winning chariot has been / is yoked up ..., having 10 oars, sun-winning, belong to the sons of Manu; it is / has become ...”

The simple adj. ‘swift’ misrepresents the gerundive morphology of *raṁhyà-*, and it also fails to give the instr. their proper reading as agents of the gerundive. I’d tr. the VP *raṁhyò bhūt* as “is to be hastened” or more awkwardly “has become one to be hastened,” with the instr. “by our desires and thoughts.”

II.18.2: The opening *sāsmā āram* matches that of II.17.6a in the immediately preceding hymn and should be tr. in the same general way. The ordinal numbers here must be adverbial (“the first time,” etc.), since the masc. referent of *sā* is the Hotar found at the end of the hemistich. Here the temporal adverbs must refer to kindling of the three ritual fires. WG (see the n.) think instead of the three soma pressings, but the rest of the vs. is resolutely Agnaic.

The 2nd hemistich is notable for having three forms of *anyā-*, two initial in their clauses, one in 2nd position. In keeping with my rules, the initial ones should be indefinite but also contrastive with each other; the non-initial one definite. This is more or less how JPB tr. it, but I would refine it to “the embryo of one (fem. [=kindling stick]) -- others [=priests] beget him. He keeps company with the others [=ritual fires] ...”

On *jénya-* see comm. ad I.128.7.

II.18.3: *yojam*, isolated in its averbo, is universally tr. as if it were a subjunctive, though it appears to be a 1st sg. root aor. injunctive (see KH, Injunct. 253). Hoffmann argues that the 1st sg. injunc. and subj. are functionally almost identical, and he cf.s the clear 1st sg. subj. in I.82.1–5 *yóḡā nv indra te hārī* “I shall now yoke your two fallow bays, o Indra” with our scrambled but almost identical *hārī nū kaṃ rátha índrasya yojam*. I wonder, however, if *yojam* here actually stands for the subjunctive **yojā*, with the final *-m* originally a hiatus-filler before *āyaí* opening the next pāda. The two passages would then be morphologically identical. In any case, it’s worth noting that these two 1st sg. forms are almost the only active root-aor. forms to *√yuj* (besides *sám yujyāva* in VIII.62.11).

Given its position, I’d take *anyé* as def. “the other sacrificers.”

II.18.4–6: The next three vss. attribute ever-proliferating horses to Indra, from two (4a) to 100 (6b). Most pādas in this sequence, through 6b (only exception 4d), start with *ā* followed by a number in the instr. Each vs. also contains the impv. *yāhi* in the 1st pāda. The reason for this equine explosion is unclear --- much less if there are any referents meant besides the horses (though see publ. intro. for speculation).

Śunahotra is the name of a priestly family (see Mayr PN).

II.18.7: I would rearrange the tr. to reflect the fronted non-enclitic *māma* (see also 7d and 8b): “To *my* poetic formulation drive here.”

The first pāda of this vs. ends *yāhy áchā*, echoing *yāhy arvān*, which ends 5a and 6a, and *yāhi*, which ends 4a, so there is a transition from the horse-numbering vss. to this one.

In b Indra is urged to attach every pair of fallow bays to the yokepole of his chariot; given vss. 4–6 this would amount to at least fifty pairs.

Flg. IH, I’d take *babhūtha* not as expressing change of state, but rather as a habitual; in IH’s full periphrasis: “you have (typically) been (on various discrete occasions) ...” and so “you are known to be ...” I would emend the tr. to “for you are one to be competitively summoned ...” I would also ital. “In *this* soma pressing ...,” corresponding to the ital. *my* representing *māma*, which opens the vs. Further, I would connect c with d (changing the tr. to “Since you are one ...”) and treat b as an independent cl., as Ge and Re do.

II.18.8: The question in pāda a is whether *sakhyām* is subject (Gr, Ge, Re, WG) or object (JPB) of *víyoṣat*. Despite the heavy favoring of the subject role, there is good evidence that favors the object. The lexeme *ví√yu*, esp. common in the *s*-aorist, is generally transitive, with an acc. + instr.: “separate ACC from INSTR” (with the well-known instr. of separation). Several of these passages contain *sakhyā-*, though in the instr. See, e.g., II.32.2 *mā no víyauḥ sakhyā* “Do not keep us away from partnership (with you)”; sim. IV.16.20. VIII.86.1, X.23.7, all with instr. *sakhyā*, see also V.2.5 with *víyavanta* and a different instr. than *sakhyā-*. The only intransitive exx. are IV.2.9 “stay distant from X” (with instr. *rāyā*) and X.85.42 reciprocal “go apart” with no instr. Both of these have personal animate subjects, not an abstract like *sakhyā-*. The formulaic evidence (*ví√yu* with *sakhyā-*) thus favors a transitive interpr. Though *sakhyā-* in our passage is not in the instr., that seems an allowable variation. The problem then is who or what is the subject? Given the focus on competing sacrificers in this hymn (see 3cd and 7c), I suggest it is an unspecified representative of this threatening group, here tr. as “no one.” The opening of the next pāda again gives contrastive emphasis to *us* with the full pronominal form *asmábhyam*. I would slightly alter the tr. of b to “*To us* should the priestly gift yield its milk,” with fronting and ital. – to match the *māma* in 7a and *asmín ... sāvane* in 7d.

As suggested by IH, I’d render d as “might we emerge victorious in our every advance.”

II.18.9: Repeated vs.

II.19 Indra [SJ on JPB]

The hymn begins by announcing that soma has been drunk, probably referring simultaneously to the ritual situation and to Indra’s drinking of soma in the mythic past – which enabled him to perform the deeds recounted in the narrative portion of the hymn, vss. 2–6. Besides the final vs. (9), which serves as the refrain for II.11, 15–20, the hymn ends with two summary vss. (7–8), each beginning with the summary introducer *evā* ‘so, in just this way’.

II.19.1: The hymn begins strikingly with the passive aor. *āpāyi*, apparently in impersonal usage (so Gr), or rather with an oblique subj. in the gen., corresponding to the pseudo-partitive gen. obj. with transitive forms of *√pā* and other verbs of consumption. JPB tr. “the drinking ... has begun.” Although, acdg. to IH, such an ingressive sense is possible for an aorist, I see no evidence in the rest of the hymn that the drinking continues, but rather that the drinking was an event that gave Indra the power to perform the deeds about to be depicted. So I prefer a less limiting tr. like “it has been drunk – this plant ...,” though this does lose the pseudo-partitive construction. Or, “(a drink) has been drunk of this plant ...”

In b I would render *suvānāśya* as the participle it is, not as JPB’s “soma pressing”; it modifies *āndhasaḥ* in pāda a. Moreover, *prāyas-* is a noun (‘pleasure, pleasurable offering’), not an adj. (‘delightful’). See the neut. pl. in 2d.

Putting this together, I would substitute this tr. of ab: “It has been drunk for exhilaration – (drunk) of this plant that has been pressed as delight, o you (priests) of inspired thought.

In pāda a *asyāṇdhaso* is analyzed by the Pp. as *asyā āndhasaḥ*, while HvN read unaccented *asya*. The standard tr. (incl. this one) follow the Pp. with the accented *asyā* adjectival as is standard; if we read *asya* instead, it would have to be pronominal, referring to Indra, and be a gen. agent. Although Indra has not yet been mentioned in the hymn, he is obviously present in the ritual context, which would allow this pronominal interpr. An alt. tr. based on unaccented *asya* would be “it has been drunk by him – this plant having been pressed ...” But the Pp. *asyā* seems the better reading, esp. given #*asyā* ... *mādhvaḥ* opening the next vs.

In cd I would substitute “on which ...” (construing with *vāṇṛdhānāḥ*) or (preferably) “in which ...” (construing with *óko dadhé*); JPB’s “at which” doesn’t work with either.

II.19.2–6: As noted above, these vss. depict a series of deeds performed by Indra in the exhilaration of the soma introduced in vs. 1. These deeds occurred in the mythic past, but are still repeated – or repeatable – in the present, as is made clear [well, maybe not *clear*] in vs. 4, which is the central (omphalos) vs. of the narrative.

II.19.2: The pf. part. *mandānāḥ* should have its usual anterior sense, “having become exhilarated.”

There is some uncertainty about the morphological identity and therefore the function of (*prá ...*) *cákramanta*. Is it an injunc. with a preterital sense (“such that they launched themselves forth”) or a subjunctive with prospective value (“so that they would launch themselves forth”)? See disc. by Kü (147–48). JPB opts for the latter, with Re, while Ge, WG, and JSK (DGRV I.224) choose the former. Kü offers both without deciding. I am inclined towards the preterital interpr.

This issue is in part intertwined with another: the apparently functionless *ca* in d. This *ca* causes Old a certain amount of distress: see the various explanatory possibilities he offers, without conviction. It is treated variously in the tr. WG simply ignore it, as apparently does JPB. Re supplies another noun with which *práyāmsi* can be conjoined as double subject of *cákramanta*: “en sorte que (les forces) et les réconforts ... pussent marcher” – “les forces” invented out of whole cloth. Instead of supplying a nominal, Ge supplies a verb parallel to *ví vṛscat* on which the *yád* clause can depend; this invented verb would be conjoined by the much displaced *ca* (“an unrechter Stelle” says Ge, n. 2d): “... zerhieb Indra ... und (machte), dass ...” JSK’s (DGRV I.224) “... hewed apart ... and (brought about) that ...” seems directly based on Ge. JSK explains (225) the position of *ca* as “the result of the preposed simile of pāda c), but this seems weak: the simile doesn’t occupy that whole pāda. The Ge/JSK approach seems the least plausible of the solutions offered. I am more sympathetic towards Re’s solution, despite his conjuring the other nominal out of thin air. Two of the fourteen occurrences of *práyāmsi* are followed by a *ca* (III.12.8, IX.107.25) and are conjoined with preceding nouns, so there’s at least some syntactic template our occurrence can fit. But there’s no standard noun with which *práyas-* forms a pair that could easily be supplied here, and the two *práyāmsi ca* passages are pāda-final. The best I can do is suggest that *práyāmsi ca* was adapted from such passages and slotted in here without function – which is, I’m afraid, tantamount to the WG/JPB strategy of ignoring the *ca*. I would tr. “... hewed apart the serpent, such that the rivers’ delightful offerings (of water) charged forth ...”

II.19.3: The first hemistich is a loose paraphrase of vs. 2: *ahihā* encapsulates 2b *ahīm ... ví vṛscat*; *árno apām praírayat* picks up the *arno* in *arṇovṛtam* in 2b and paraphrases *prá ... práyāmsi ... nadīnām cákramanta* of 2cd.

The point of pāda d is presumably that by interposing night between days Indra draws temporal boundaries that produce the alternating patterns of day and night – showing the usual Vedic horror at the prospect of an undifferentiated mass of anything.

II.19.4: As noted above, this is the central vs. of the narrative vss. 2–6, and it contains a shock. Embedded in the midst of the augmented and injunctive forms that carry the narrative, we find an undeniable present-tense form, and it depicts the most iconic of Indra’s deed in the mythic past: *hánti vṛtrám* “he smashes Vṛtra” – ordinarily expressed by a preterital verb, commonly the impf. *áhan* (see I.32.5, 56.5, etc.). What is going on here? I think the interpenetration of past and present alluded to above is brought to the surface in this omphalos vs. Like JPB I think there’s a parenthetical insertion here, but unlike him I think it is not the nominal phrase in pāda a, but rather the opening of pāda b *índro dāśad dāśúṣe* (sim. Re). The phrase in pāda a, *apratīni mánave purūṇi*, is, in my view, one object of *hánti* in b. The adj. *apratīni* ‘unopposable’ almost always modifies *vṛtrā(ṇi)* (e.g., I.53.6, IV.17.19, etc.); given this and given the fact that *vṛtrám* is also found in the same hemistich, pl. *vṛtrā(ṇi)* ‘obstacles’ should surely be supplied here (as indeed JPB does) – and the pres. *hánti* can then be read both backwards with this pl. phrase, indicating Indra’s continuing efforts to remove obstacles for us, and forwards with the sg. referring to the arch-Obstacle that provides the model for the present-day action. In between, the brief clause *índro dāśad dāśúṣe* parenthetically characterizes this action of Indra’s as his “pious work”; see X.138.5 *dāśad vṛtrahā* “the Vṛtra-smasher, doing his pious work ...” Pace Gr, Ge, and WG, the NP in pāda a is almost certainly not the obj. of *dāśat*, which takes the acc. only under special circumstances; see comm. ad IV.31.20, 31. See also Old’s disc.; he aims at the same general interpr. as mine, but does so by emending *dāśat* to accented participle *dāśat*; however, as Ge points out (n. 1 to n. 4ab), the accent on *hánti* complicates Old’s solution. Acdg. to my interpr. the verb *hánti* is accented because it immediately follows the parenthetical interjection. I would now tr. this hemistich “He (smashes) the many unopposable (obstacles) for Manu – Indra does pious work for the pious – he smashes Vṛtra (/the Obstacle).”

On *atasāyyo bhūt* see the almost identical phrase in I.63.6 and the comm. thereon. In I.63.6 the referent is Indra’s help, also in the contest for the sun. In my view the gerundive means literally ‘not to be tugged (back and forth)’, hence ‘unshakeable’. Here the literal meaning fits well, with the dative agent referring to the humans contending with each other. I would tr. the 2nd hemistich, somewhat colloquially, “Who at once came to be one who couldn’t be jerked around by the men contending with each other in the battle for the sun.”

II.19.5: On the curious use of *√ric* in this group of hymns, see comm. ad II.13.5.

On the problematic *stavān* see comm. ad VI.24.8, where I suggest that it was built with the possessive “Hoffmann suffix.”

The mythological situation (or situations) depicted here is/are unclear to me. Also the simile *ámśam ná*, which is equally opaque in III.45.4 (see comm. there).

II.19.6: Despite the identical tr. in vss. 4 and 6 “in a single day” in the publ. tr., these render two different forms: 4c *sadyáh* and 6a *sadívaḥ*; the latter is a hapax. It might be better as ‘on the same day’.

A small change from “the charioteer Kutsa” to “his charioteer K.” might better represent *sāṛathi-*, since Kutsa and Indra go on their expeditions on the same chariot.

vy airat in d recalls *prárayat* in 3b and almost forms a ring that brings the narrative portion to a close.

II.19.7–8: As noted above, the hymn proper ends with these two summary vss., each introduced by *evā*, each announcing (7a, 8ab) the hymn just created and dispatched to Indra and in the rest of the vs. expressing what we hope to gain – with vs. 7 more vivid and 8 more generic. In both vss. I would prefer a more explicit recognition of the function of *evā* – “in just this way” or sim.

II.19.7: Though the standard tr. take b with a, this requires supplying considerable machinery; best, with the publ. tr., to attach b to c.

Ge renders *sāptam* as “Freundschaft,” flg. Sāy.’s condensed interpr., with *sāpta-* standing for ‘having seven steps’, referring to the ritual seven steps that seal a friendship. But Ge’s n. 7c seems to recognize the over-elaboration of this explanation and seems to favor the more plausible interpr. of a heptad of gifts, with seven representing a conventional number – the interpr. found one way or the other in the other standard tr.

II.19.8: The standard tr. take the simile in b as including both preceding nom. and flg. acc. (e.g., Re “comme (les gens) cherchant assistance (façonnent) les règles-rituelles”). Better, with the publ. tr., to limit it to the nom., and take *vayúnāni* as parallel to *mánma* in the frame. The simile is still a bit puzzling, but less so.

brahmanyántaḥ in c forms a ring with the same form in 1d and should have been rendered identically (publ. tr. 1d “creating the poetic formulations” versus 8c “creating the formulations” – either one will do).

II.19.9: Repeated vs.

II.20 Indra [SJ on JPB]

On the metrical issues in this hymn see Old and the publ. intro.

II.20.1–2: Besides several forms of the standard 2nd sg. prn., these vss. play with several derivatives: *tʷvā-vant-* (1d), *tʷvā-yánt-* (2b), and the thematic adj. *tʷvā-* (2a), the only form to this stem in the RV.

II.20.1: Note the phonological play of *vayám te váya(h)*.

The parenthetical *viddhí sú naḥ* would work better in context as “know [=recognize] us!” or “know [=recognize] (this) of ours!” – though ‘recognize’ is usually the province of *√jñā*.

The standard interp. take *nṛṇ* as a gen. sg. (On alt. morphological analyses of this form see comm. ad X.29.4.) Preferable is JPB’s interpr., which takes it as the acc. pl. it

appears to be, as a second obj. of *īyakṣantaḥ*, reading *tvāvataḥ* twice, once as gen. sg. dependent on *sumnām* (“the good favor of one such as you”) and once as acc. pl. modifying *nṛ̥n* (“men such as you”). The acc. pl. reading is reinforced by the parallel acc. pl. *tvāyatāḥ* in 2b.

II.20.2: The analysis of *abhiṣṭipāsi* as a rt-noun cmpd *abhiṣṭi+pa-* with a double sandhi contraction of *-pā(s) + asi*, as set out in the publ. intro., is endorsed by Old (though the cmpd is not treated by Scar). It is hard to see what else it could be: if read as Gr suggests, **abhiṣṭī pāsi*, the accent is problematic – needing to be retracted on the nominal and erased on the verb. However, I do think Gr is right that *abhiṣṭi-* has instr. function in the compd., as JPB properly represents it “protector by dominance.”

Note that the desid. *īyakṣantaḥ* ‘desiring to obtain’ in vs. 1 finds its fulfillment in 2d *nākṣati* ‘obtains’. To reflect this connection, the two forms should be rendered either both with ‘attain(s)’ or with ‘obtain(s)’.

II.20.3: In b *narām astu pātā* seems almost a paraphrase / repair of *abhiṣṭipāsi jānān* in 2b.

II.20.4: The subjects of the two 3rd pl. pfs. *vāṇrdhūḥ* and *śāśadūḥ* are left unspecified. They could be the “men” of 3b. But given the contrast between *purā* ‘previously’ (4b) and *nūtana-* ‘current’ (4d), I think it’s likely the pl. Āyus, contrasting with the Āyu of today in d.

Although in a hymn with so much metrical disturbance, this won’t carry much weight – but if we read subjunctive **pīparāt*, it would improve the cadence.

II.20.5: On *tūtōt* in b, as well as 7d, see the extensive disc. ad X.50.5. To summarize briefly, I take these two forms as well as *tūtōs* (VI.26.4) and *tūtuma* (X.50.5) as belonging to a redupl. aor. (not to the pf. system) with transitive value.

The instr. *sūryeṇa* can be either an actual instrument (“[he did it] by/with the sun”) or an instr. of accompaniment (“along with the sun”). JPB opts for the former, along with WG, but I find this interpr. quite unlikely, since it would seem to make reference to an unknown myth in which Indra uses the sun as a weapon against the dawns. But esp. given the presence of the Aṅgirasas in pāda a, this vs. probably refers to the Vala myth (see Ge’s n. 5c). Indra “robs” the dawns, that is, he robs the Pāṇi of the cows / dawns imprisoned in the cave. For the full expression with both the *paṇi-* and the cows in the acc., see I.93.4, sim. X.67.6. By this interpr. the sun was also a beneficiary of Indra’s action (so Ge, probably also Re, though his “avec” is unclear), having also been stolen / freed. I would therefore change the tr. to “stealing the dawns along with the sun.”

I would also change “has pierced” to “pierced.”

On *stavān* see comm. ad VI.24.8 and the occurrence in the immed. preceding hymn, II.19.5.

II.20.6: On the formation of *arśasānā-* and the indirect connection between the occurrence here and X.99.7 see comm. ad loc. As noted there, the phrase *ūrdhvó bhuvāt* here corresponds to the pseudo-part. *ūrdhvasānā-* in X.99.7. I now would substitute “Harmer” for the PN here.

I would also substitute “having prevailed” for “able.”

On *áva* √ *bhr* see comm. ad VIII.93.23, X.171.2 and the very similar phraseology in the latter passage. Here I would emend “carried away” to “brought down” or “pulled off.”

The whole 2nd hemistich should then read “Having prevailed, the autonomous one pulled off the own dear head of the Dāsa, the Harmer.”

II.20.7: From *puramdarāḥ* can be extracted *púrah*, to be supplied with acc. pl. fem. *kṛṣṇāyonīḥ ... dāsīḥ*.

tūtót in d reprises the same form in 5b, where it is fairly clearly preterital. JPB renders the injunctive as a present here (“he makes ... powerful”), contra the standard tr. I think it could be either (or both), but given the preterital and mythological content of the rest of the vs., I favor the preterital interpr.

II.20.8: Given its etymological connection with *tūtót* ‘made powerful’ (in vss. 5 and 7), I’d render *tavasyām* as ‘power’.

II.20.9: Repeated vs.

II.21 Indra [SJ on JPB]

The first four vss. of this hymn have an excessively nominal style, with a string of descriptors of Indra, barely marshalled into minimalist clauses, which are confined to the final pāda of the vs. (or in vs. 1, the last word of c).

II.21.1: This opening vs. is striking, with its nine straight root-noun cmpds in *-jít-* in the dat. *-jíte*.

II.21.2: The 2nd vs. continues the dative sequence, with ten in a row, though with more varied morphology than the repeated *-jíte* of vs. 1. There are smaller patterns within the sequence: the vs. begins with two *abhi-bh...* forms; pāda b has the etym. contrastive figure *āṣāḥhāya sāhamānāya*, with √ *sah* reappearing in d *satrāsāhe*, which also resonates with *satrājíte* beginning 1b.

HvN’s unaccented *vanvate* (extracted from Saṃhitā *vanvaté* ‘*ṣāḥhāya*’) should of course be read *vanvaté*, with the Pp.

The hapax *i*-stem *tuvi-grí-* is interpr. by Gr. as having a form of √ *gṛ* ‘swallow’ as 2nd member, like (in his interpr.) *tuvi-grá-* (I.140.9); he glosses ‘viel verschlingend’ (also WG; sim. Re “puissant-dévoreur”) This analysis is accepted by Wackernagel (AiG I.94, II.1.174, 224) and Debrunner (AiG II.2.72), but is not universally held, even by Wackernagel in the same AiG vol. Ge tr. ‘lautrufend’, as does Wackernagel (AiG II.1.98), deriving it from the homonymous root √ *gṛ* ‘sing’. Scar (112) considers both possibilities without deciding. Better is the suggestion of Insler’s that both *tuvi-grá-* and *tuvi-grí-* result from haplogy of **tuvi-vigrá-*, a cmpd of *vigrá-* ~ *vígra-* ‘lively, spirited’ (2x, √ *vij* ‘be agitated’). See comm. ad I.140.9.

II.21.2–3: Nominal forms of the root √ *sah* ‘overcome’ dominate these two vss.: *āṣāḥhāya sāhamānāya* (2b), *satrāsāhe* (2d), *satrāsāhāḥ ... janamsahāḥ* (3a), *sāhuriḥ* (3c)

II.21.3: After the string of the descriptive datives of vss. 1–2, this vs. presents a similar string of nominatives characterizing Indra in pādas a–c – though this string is introduced with a little trick. The first item is *satrāsāhāḥ*, at first glance built to the same stem as the dat. *satrāsāhe* opening pāda d of the preceding vs., hence a genitive. But it does not belong to that athematic stem (as the accent shows) but to a thematic one, and it initiates the sequence of nominatives, most of them also thematic stems.

Gr glosses *jana-bhakṣā-* as a bahuvr., ‘Menschen als Antheil oder Besitz habend’, and this interpr. is appealing, because, though the noun *bhakṣā-* ‘portion’ is fairly well established, there is no verbal root $\sqrt{bhakṣ}$ ‘apportion’ at this period. The single verbal form *abhakṣayam* in the very late X.167.3 (the stem also several times in the AV) is an obvious denom.; see my *āya*-formations (p. 73). However, the accent makes a bahuvrīhi interpr. of this cmpd. difficult. The standard tr. properly render it as a tatp., but with an almost random choice of gloss for the 2nd element: Ge “Menschen vertilgend,” Re “mangeur d’hommes” (most likely influenced by his interpr. of *tuvigrī-* in the preceding vs.), WG “über Menschen gebietende,” JPB “consuming the peoples.” AiG doesn’t treat it. I do not have a good solution, but think that the semantics of the 2nd member must come from \sqrt{bhaj} , mediated through its reasonably well-attested *s*-aor. (see Narten, 179–80) and the noun *bhakṣā-*. The *s*-aor. is generally middle in the RV, in the sense ‘share in, take/acquire a share’. I would tentatively tr. ‘taking his share of the people’, which is in fact rather close functionally to Gr’s b.v. interpr.

Ge, Re, and WG obviously take the 2nd member of *vṛtamcayā-* as belonging to \sqrt{ci} ‘pile, assemble’, judging from their tr. “Herrsammler,” “qui rassemble les armées,” and “der das Gewählte sammelt,” respectively. (WG also must take *vṛtam* as derived from $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘choose’, not $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘obstruct, oppose’.) But *-cayā-* more likely belongs with *ṛmam-cayā-* PN (lit. ‘requiting a debt’), *cetār-* (VII.60.5) ‘avenger’, etc. See EWA s.v. *CAY*³, Gotō (1st cl., 132–33, who does not treat this cmpd there). JPB’s ‘punishing the opposition’ is, in my opinion, correct.

On *āritā-* see comm. ad VIII.16.6.

The nominative string of abc describing Indra is picked up by the gen. *īndrasya* opening d. Ge (n. 3) calls this anacoluthon, which seems a little backwards to me. In fact, pāda d is a minor interruption of the nominatives describing Indra that continue in vs. 4.

II.21.4: JPB must take *anānudā-* as derived from \sqrt{nud} ‘push’, which, however, does not occur with *ā* in the RV. It rather belongs to *ānu* $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘yield, concede’ (so already Gr); on the long *ā* see AiG II.1.71. The tr. should be changed to “Unyielding bull ...”

The publ. tr. seems to take *dódhataḥ* as an acc. pl. part. (“against those raging”), but it must be a gen. sg.; among other things *vadhā-* always takes a gen. Emend the tr. to “the deadly blow for the one who rages.”

The injunc. *janat* can express Indra’s habitual re-creation of the world in the present time or his mythological cosmogonic acts in the past. JPB opted for the former; the standard tr. the latter. I am on the fence.

II.21.5: This vs. represents an abrupt thematic and stylistic break from the ponderous and restrictive nominal style of the first four vss.. Indra is not mentioned until pāda d, and there is activity rather than the stasis of 1–4: verbal forms with objects, a variety of case forms, and a series of actions accomplished. The effect is freeing.

The rendering of the two root-noun instr. in c, *abhisvárā niśádā*, could be sharpened. I think Ge is quite right (n. 1, bottom of the page) that they refer to the sacrifice, specifically to the verbal performance and the installation on the ritual ground – but I’m not sure that the publ. tr. “by their cry and assembly” conveys that. I’d prefer “by their recitation and ritual installation.”

JPB re-supplies *dhíyah* as obj. of *hinvānāḥ* in d, on the basis of the same phrase in b (so also Sāy.; see Ge’s n. 5d). This is possible, of course, but seems compositionally clumsy. It is more likely that the poet meant the 2nd *hinvānā-* to be taken differently. Ge’s “sich anspornend” seems rhetorically better; the med. part. *hinvānā-* has both transitive and passive (or, in this case, better reflexive) uses: see the separate groups in Gr. I would therefore re-tr. d as “spurring themselves on, they obtained goods at Indra(‘s hands),” with loc. *indre* expressing the locus (as it were) of the goods obtained – so essentially both Ge and Re. In order to bring the two occurrences of *hinvānāḥ* into harmony, I would also change the tr. of the form in b to “spurring on their insights.”

II.22 Indra [SJ on JPB]

On the unusual and complex meter see Old, Proleg. 115. It essentially consists of 12-syllable lines (i.e., Jagatī pādas) alternating with 4-syllable lines, with a refrain in the first three vss. consisting of two 8-syllable (Gāyatrī) pādas (*pace* Old, who analyses the refrain as also 12 + 4, though he admits it’s artificial; such a division doesn’t match the syntactic and phonological patterning). The fourth vs. differs from the first three and its structure is somewhat disputed.

The meter seems to encourage alliterative pairs: esp. the refrain (1gh = 2fg = 3fg), which consists of four such pairs (the last two intermingled) *saīnaṃ saścat devó devám, satyám índraṃ satyá índuḥ*. But see also *mamāda máhi kárma kártave* (1e), *vṛddhó vīryaiḥ* (3c), *táva tyán nāryaṃ nṛto* (4a), *prathamám pūrvyám* (4b). The four-syllable pādas also to some extent pattern together, esp. 1d + 2b, 2d + 3b. See further below.

In general, the publ. tr. could have reflected the interaction of rhetoric and meter somewhat better, and I will make suggestions about reconfiguring the tr., even when it accurately reflects content.

II.22.1: The VP of the first four pādas is parcelled out in bits, with the verb (*apibat*) only appearing in c and the object phrase *yāvāśīram ... sómam ... víṣṇunā sutám* sprinkled across pādas a and c. This is not easily represented in tr. However, I think the two four-syllable pādas, b and d, should be marked off from the rest, likewise in the second major clause in e and f. I would substitute

“Among the Trikadrakas, the buffalo -- snorting mightily --
drank to his satisfaction the barley-mixed soma pressed by Viṣṇu -- just as he wished.

It exhilarated him -- the great and broad one -- to do his great deed.”

As for the refrain (1gh = 2fg = 3fg), I’d suggest a slight change: “He attended upon him – the god upon the god -- the real Indu upon the real Indra.”

The verb in the refrain, *saścat*, is injunctive and therefore ambiguous between a present/habitual sense and a preterital one. Given that the rest of the first three vss. are mythological in content I’d favor the latter.

II.22.2: This vs. lacks alliteration, save in the refrain. But the second word, *tvīṣīmān*, phonologically echoes *tuviśúṣmaḥ* in 1b.

On *krívi-* as ‘worm’ see comm. ad II.17.6.

Since the VP in 2ab is identical to 4f, with a different victim substituted (see comm. ad vs. 4), the two passages should be tr. identically. I would change this one to “overcame the worm with his power in battle.”

The four-syllable pāda of b cannot be separated from pāda a in tr.: the preverb *abhí* forms a lexeme with *abhavat*. However, phonologically *yudhābhavat* pairs with 1d *yáthāvaśat*.

I would separate the four-syllable pāda of d, *prá vāvṛdhe*, by deleting the “and”: “By his greatness, he filled the two world-halves. He grew stronger.”

Pāda e has a very cute trick. It contains a single form of *anyá-*, in 2nd position -- so, by my rules, definite. This is universally taken (I think correctly) as representing an *anyá- ... anyá-* (“the one ... the other”) construction, with the overt *anyám* referring to soma (“he took *anyám* [=soma] into his belly”). But the question is – who is “the other”? There are two candidates, both possible, both possibly meant. Given the refrain pointedly contrasting Indra and soma, the gapped *anyá-* could refer to Indra: “(the one) took the other into this belly.” However, the short clause immediately following in the same pāda, *prém aricyata*, suggests a different distribution: the *anyám* in the first clause refers to one portion of soma; the other is subject of the second cl. This is the interpr. of the standard tr. (though JPB’s take on it is not entirely clear); see, e.g., Re’s “il prit en son ventre un(e) portion du soma, (l’autre) reste-en-surplus ...” By omitting one of the *anyá-*s the poet leaves both possibilities not only open but simultaneously operative. I would tr. “(The one [=Indra]) took the other [=soma] into his belly; it/he projected beyond him/it.” “He [=Indra] took the one [=portion of soma] into his belly; (the other) was left over.”

In the case of the second alt., the *īm* would be one of the rare occurrences of this form without acc. reference; in the case of the first it would be construed with *prá ... aricyata*, though we should expect an ablative.

II.22.3: The adv. *sākām* occurs three times in pādas a and c; *ójasā* (a) reaches back to 2a and forward to 4f.

The four-syllable pāda b, *vavakṣitha*, is semantically equivalent to the same in 2d, *prá vāvṛdhe*. (On the absence of accent on *vavakṣitha* see Old [Noten].) Because of its metrical independence and its echoing of 2d, I would not, with the standard tr., construe this pf. with *sākām ójasā* (e.g., WG “... zugleich wuchst du mit Stärke”), but rather, more or less with the publ. tr., independently, and allowing the *sākām* expressions in a and c to be taken together. “Born at once with resolve, at once with power -- you increased—at once grown strong with heroic powers, overpowering the scorners – you, the boundless.”

II.22.4: As noted above, the meter of this vs. diverges from the patterns of the first three. It begins with an eight-syllable (Gāyatrī) pāda, a unit otherwise found only in the refrain. And pāda c seems to contain six syllables, a structure unknown to Vedic metrics; Old, however, suggests zapping the semantically pleonastic *kṛtām*, which would leave a more appropriate four syllables.

The expression *prāṇinā ásum*, immediately followed by *riṇānn apāḥ*, with verbal forms to the same root ($\sqrt{rī}$) + acc. obj., is striking and a bit baffling. Ge (n. 4c) plausibly

suggests that “you let life(-force) flow forth” indicates that “durch die Befreiung der Gewässer gab es neues Leben” – and this appears to be the interpr. of the standard tr. However, Ge also suggests, flg. Sāy., that it could refer to the flowing out of Vṛtra’s life-force. (See, e.g., I.182.3 *paṇér ásum* for the *ásum*- of a demonic individual.) That it is a word play seems likely, and so I would add an alt. to the tr.: “you let (new) life-force flow forth / you let (Vṛtra’s) life-force flow away.”

Note *ápah* ‘work’ in b and *apáh* ‘waters’ in e.

Pāda f, *bhúvad víśvam abhy ādevam ójasā* is a scrambled reprise of 2ab *abhi ójasā krivím ... abhavat*, but with a more generalizing force. Instead of a particular target (*krivím*) we have “every godless one.” The verb in 4f *bhúvat* is of course multiply ambiguous – it can be an injunctive (and thereby have preterital or present/habitual sense) or a subjunctive. That it is followed by two undoubted subjunctives, the repeated *vidāt*, a subjunctive interpr. is appealing (so JPB “he will overcome”), but it could also be a generalizing present: “he overcomes.” The tr. of *ójasā* should match that in 2a (esp.) as well as 3a. Altogether: “He will overcome / overcomes every godless one with his power.”

II.23–24 Bṛhaspati / Brahmanaspati [SJ on JPB]

These two hymns are implicitly contrasted, with II.23 withholding any mythological references until the final vs. (before the summary vs.), 18, where the Vala myth is boiled down to its essence. II.24, by contrast, starts with a discursive treatment of the same myth. For further details, see below.

II.23 Bṛhaspati [SJ on JPB]

The whole hymn is tr. by HPS (B+I 104–9, with comm. –112).

The vocatives *bráhmanas pate* and *bṛhaspate* alternate throughout the hymn, with a single example in each vs.: *brahmanas pate* generally (but not always) pāda final, *bṛhaspate* always pāda initial: *brahmanas pate* (1c, 5d, 9a, 11c, 19a [initial]) / *bṛhaspate* (2b, 3c, 4d, 6c, 7c, 8c, 10b, 12c, 14d, 15a, 16d, 18d). The only vss. lacking such a voc. have instead a nom. sg.: *bṛhaspátih* (13d), *bráhmanas pátih* (17c).

There is considerable lexical concatenation between adjacent vss., as noted below *passim*.

The hymn has a very unusual structure. For the first 17 vss. of its (considerable) length, it strings together fairly generic descriptions of Bṛhaspati’s powers and activities, alternating between the pain and punishment he inflicts or will inflict on evildoers and the aid he provides to his right-acting devotees. There is no mention of any particular acts in the past, any mythology – until the real final vs. of the hymn (18, since 19 is a meta-summary vs.) – where without warning the Vala myth is boiled down and encapsulated in a single vs. In detailing the powers and qualities that made Bṛhaspati the right god for that job, the whole rest of the hymn turns out to be a discursive preamble to this brief explosive burst of mythology. (The only possible foreshadowing is the compd in 3d *gotrabhíd*- ‘cowpen-splitting’, but that modifies Bṛhaspati’s chariot.)

II.23.1–2: These first two vss. contain overlapping definitions of the name of the divine dedicand Brahmanaspati / Bṛhaspati: 1c *jyeṣṭharājāṃ bráhmanām* “the preeminent king of sacred formulations” and 2d *víśveṣām íj janitā bráhmanām asi* “you are the very

begetter of all formulations.” It’s worth noting that *bráhman-* does not appear again in the hymn (save ubiquitously in the god’s name) except in the cmpd *brahma-dvís-* ‘hating the formulation’ (4c).

II.23.1: As Re points out, *bráhmanām* may be construed with preceding *jyeṣṭharājam*, but it formulaically belongs also with following *brahmaṇaspate*, exactly like *gaṇānām ... gaṇāpatim* in pāda a.

II.23.2: On *usrāḥ* as gen. sg., see comm. ad VI.3.6 and AiG III.213. All the standard tr. take it as gen. sg. here.

Give the definitional value of pāda d and its connection with 1c, it would be better to substitute “all sacred formulations.”

II.23.3: As HPS points out (105), *parirāḥ* is semantically opposed to *ṛtasya* and *tāmāṃsi* to *jyōtiṣmantam*.

II.23.4: All the standard tr. (incl. JPB) except WG attach *yás túbhyaṃ dāśāt* to *jānam*. Although this is not syntactically excluded, pāda b conforms to a common pattern with a preposed generalizing rel. cl. describing proper ritual behavior (“who[ever] does / will do X”) and a main cl. stating the reward. For this pattern, often involving subjunctives in both rel. and main. cl., see, e.g., IV.2.6–7 and disc. in my “perfect subjunctive” article (Fs. J. L. García Ramón). In subsequent vss. (6cd, 7abc, also 9cd, 12abc) we find similar preposed rel. cl. with their results expressed in the main cl. (though in those cases both the actions and the result are negative). I would here substitute “You protect the people. Who(ever) will perform ritual service for you, distress will not reach him.”

II.23.5: This vs. contains paraphrase and expansion of 3a (in 5c) and 4b (in 5ab), with the paraphrase signaled by *ví√bādh* (3a *vibādhya*, 4c *ví bādhase*) and *ná tám ámhah* (4b, 5a).

II.23.6: More chaining: *gopāḥ* in pāda a repeating the same word in 5d. In c *hvārah* appears to pick up *dhvarás-* in 5c – though they differ by accent, etymology, and semantics; *hāras(vant)-* in d also echoes *hvārah* in the preceding pāda. On the various senses of *hāras-* see comm. ad X.16.7.

The purport of b would be clearer if rephrased as “we awaken for your commandment with our thoughts.”

II.23.7: Chaining continues with *pathāḥ* (c) extracted from *pathi-kṛt-* (6a)

The meaning of the hapax *sānuká-* is much disputed – or, perhaps better, despaired of. See, e.g., Old’s detailed consideration and rejection of multiple possibilities. Ge (fld. by Th [Fremdling 44] and HPS) refuses to tr. it; Gr takes it to *√san* ‘win, gain’ and glosses ‘beutegierig’; Re follows one of Old’s more favored (/least unfavored) suggestions, that it’s connected with *sanutár* ‘far away’ and tr. “dont on cherche-à-s’eloigner.” The most plausible and appealing suggestion is WG’s “aufgeplustert” (fluffed up / ruffled up). This would be a *-ka-*deriv. of *sānu-* ‘back’, probably of a lower linguistic register because of the *-ka-*suffix (see my 2009 “Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register,” IJ 52), and would refer to

the raised hackles of a wolf about to attack or showing dominance (see photos on the internet), with a lit. meaning something like “back-y” (reflecting an exclamation like “look at that back on him!”). I’d tr. “a hostile mortal (or) a wolf with hackles raised” (since “back-y” gets us nowhere), or, if a single-world tr. is desired, “a bristling wolf.”

II.23.8: *trātār-* in pāda a picks up *trāyase* in 4a. To signal the connection I’d tr. “protector of our bodies” (as I suggested “you protect the people” in 4). This hemistich is notable for the occurrence of three *-tār-*stem agent nouns. I would substitute “advocate” for “defender” for *adhivaktār-*, to capture the speech aspect of this lexeme derived from √ *vac* ‘speak’.

On *naśan* functioning as an injunctive aor. after *mā* (rather than the root aor. subjunctive it appears to be), see KH, Injunkt. 240 and ref. there. Here, to capture the *úd* in the verbal lexeme *ún naśan* and in the adj. *úttaram*, I would slightly emend the tr. to “Let those of evil ways not reach up to higher favor.” Re’s “higher favor (than ours)” might even be better.

II.23.9–10: These vss. are paired, at least in their first hemistichs: #*tvayā vayám ... dadīmahi / dhīmahe*, though with verbs to different roots and T/A stems. These paired vss. are in the approx. center of the hymn, though there are no other significant omphalos features.

The pairing of these verbs is somewhat puzzling: the first is a 1st pl. middle opt. to the redupl. pres. of √ *dā* ‘give’, whose middle (usually with *ā*) regularly means ‘take’. The 2nd is an anomalous form: it’s also a 1st pl. middle, but to √ *dhā* ‘put, establish’, whose middle also can mean ‘take, acquire, assume’. It is built to the root aorist stem (as opposed to the redupl. pres. of *dadīmahi*), and it is clearly meant also to be an optative (with opt. suffix *-ī-*), but it has the primary ending *-mahe* though optatives take only secondary endings (expect, and regularly get, *dhīmahi*). (Lub lists it immed. flg. *dhīmahi*, with the parenthetic addition “(nonce)”; Re explains it as “contamination” between *dhāmahe* and *dhīmahi*, at best a description not an explanation.) The easiest way to account for the primary ending is metrically: the Jagatī cadence requires a heavy syllable in that position (... *dhīmahe váyah* #); **dhīmahi* would have given three light syllables in a row (– ~ ~ ~ ×). Although I’m wary of metrical explanations, this seems to be the best solution. But there still remains the fact that the poet seems deliberately to have set up an equivalence between two forms to different T/A stems of different roots – almost forcing them to be taken as synonymous, given the parallelism of the clauses in which they’re found. What is he trying to tell us? As I have disc. elsewhere, I do not think there’s a functional difference between modal forms to different T/A stems, so that is not an issue here (in my view); more interesting is the discrepancy in roots, whose semantic differences seem however to be neutralized in these forms. As for other tr., Ge tr. them differently (“möchten wir ... empfangen / erlangen” respectively); sim. Re (“recevoir / obtenir”), HPS (“erhalten / erlangen”), WG (“erwerben / erlangen”). These all seem to me distinctions with difference, but if I were to follow the same path, I’d probably do “take / acquire.”

II.23.9: Chaining or pseudo-chaining: *spārhā* (b) and *ávaspartar* (8b), though there are two roots \sqrt{spr} , ‘win’ and ‘rescue’, which are at least synchronically distinct. See EWA s.v. *SPAR*.

I’d prefer “take” or “acquire” to “receive” for *dadīmahī*, as reflecting more activity on our part.

The curiously formed *tadīt-* has no clear etymology (see EWA s.v.), but in its two RVic occurrences, here and I.94.7, it is contrasted with *dūrē* and must mean, more or less, ‘nearby’ – though I would prefer a jazzier rendering for this jazzy formation, “hard by” isn’t bad. Although they are not a lexical match, perhaps the slangy “in your face.”

As disc. in my *-āya*-Formations (p. 93), *jambhāya-* belongs to a separate root ‘crush’, distinct from ‘snap at’ found in the aor. *jambhīṣat*, and has an Aves. cognate *zəmbaiia-*. See EWA s.v. *JAMBH*². The tr. should therefore be emended to “crush these” (certainly a more satisfactory fate than ‘snap at’ for the hostile forces!).

The adj. *anapnāsaḥ* is proleptic.

II.23.10: Again, “take” or “acquire” rather than “receive.” The question is whether we should attempt to draw a distinction in tr. between the two verbs (whose differences were laid out above, ad 9–10) or tr. them identically, since they appear in almost identical contexts. As noted there, the standard tr. render them differently, but I’m not at all sure that’s the right call.

Given *uttaram sumnām* “higher favor” in 8d (see comm. there), I would render *uttamām ... vāyaḥ* as “highest vigor.” Note the figure *vayām ... vāyaḥ*, as in II.20.1.

On *pāpri-* see comm. ad I.52.3. The tr. of this instr. phrase would be somewhat less awk. as “with (you,) provider and winner, as yokemate.”

In the 2nd hemistich *duḥśāmsaḥ* (c) and *suśāmsāḥ* (d) are obviously contrasted.

II.23.10–11: The chaining between these two vss. is morphological, not lexical, with two redupl. *i*-stems in each vs., as Re points out: *pāpri-*, *sāsni-* (10b); *jāgmi-* (11a), *sāsaḥi-* (11b) (though note accent discrepancy).

II.23.11: On *anānudā-* see comm. ad II.21.4. Since the stem is derived from *ānu* $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘concede’, not \sqrt{nud} ‘push’, “unable to be pushed aside” should be changed to “unyielding.”

Because the verb *āsī* only opens the 2nd hemistich, I would postpone “you are” to that position (as Ge, Re, HPS do, contra WG and JPB), with the first hemistich a suite of nominals: “Unyielding bull, going towards a challenge, scorcher of the rival, overwhelming in battles – you are the real requiter of debts ...”

The publ. tr. does not make clear that *vīluharṣīṇaḥ* is a gen. modifying “the powerful one” (*ugrāsya*) – perhaps better, “even of the powerful one who exults in his staunchness” (against the publ. tr. “excited to tough resistance,” whose structure I don’t understand).

II.23.12: Chaining with *ugrā-* (11d, 12 b), with repetition also of *manyú-* (d) from 4c and *duréva-* (d) from 8d.

As already pointed out by Old, Gr’s supposed fem. nom. ag. *sāsā-* ‘Tadler, Schmäher’ is unlikely to exist; the other supposed occurrence (besides *sāsām* here),

which Gr gives as acc. pl. *śāsāḥ* out of sandhi (VII.48.3), is better read as instr. sg. *śāsā* there. The form here, *śāsām*, is then gen. pl., to be (loosely) construed with *ugrā*-. I would slightly emend the pub. tr. “powerful in his commands” to “powerful over commands,” as well as eliminating “us” (or at least putting it in parens.), since there is no *naḥ* in this hemistich.

JPB takes injunc. *nī karma* in d as the positive continuation of the negative impv. in c (sim. Re, WG). This is an appealing interpr., but, before accepting it, I would like further evidence that the modal force of neg, *mā* + injunc. can carry over to a following clause with injunctive but no *mā*. It is perfectly possible to take the verb as general / presential (so Ge, HPS, and see esp. KH, Injunc. 255) – hence “we put down / thwart ...”

II.23.13: No chaining from the adjacent vs., but *abhidipsú*- returns from 10c.

On *vī√vṛh* see comm. ad X.10.7.

II.23.14: Again the lexical repetition is distant: *parirāpaḥ* (d and 3a).

The bahuvrīhi *dr̥ṣṭā-vīrya*- ‘of manifest heroism, whose heroism is visible’ in b is further developed in c: *āvis tāt kṛṣva* “make that manifest.” The ref. of *tāt* is then most likely *vīryām*. In order to bring out the conceptual connection, I suggest an alt. tr. of bc: “... who put you, whose heroism is visible (/easy to see), to scorn. Make manifest that (heroism), so that it will be worthy of a hymn for you.” The *yād* with subj. *āsāt* here seems to express purpose (sim. Re). The point is that latent *vīryā*- is not enough to attract praise; it has to be revealed and deployed.

II.23.15: *aryāḥ* in pāda a picks up the same in 13c.

Given that *vibhāti* in b is found in a series of dependent cl., with subjunctives preceding and following (*ārhat* [a], *dīdayat* [c]), it may be subjunctive as well (so in fact Old), though it does not have a distracted reading. The publ. tr. seems to take it so.

II.23.16: No obvious chaining.

The pf. *jāgrdhūḥ* is the only pf. form to this root in early Vedic, and it is quite possible / likely that it’s stative in value: “are greedy” (see Kü 160–61). I would therefore emend JPB’s “have become greedy,” and also substitute “food” for “supplies,” since food is a resonant symbol throughout Vedic texts: “are greedy for our food.”

The 2nd hemistich is difficult. Pāda c contains the hapax *vrāyas*-, built to the rare root *√vlī* (/vrī), on which see EWA s.v. *VLAY*¹. The root probably means ‘crush’, vel sim., with the *s*-stem meaning something like ‘crushing power’ (exactly contra Ge’s “Schwäche”). The pāda is also oddly constructed, with init. preverb *ā* fld. by *vī* later in the vs., and the accented verb *ohate* in between. Though it is possible to take c as a further extension of the rel. cl. of ab, thus accounting for the accent, it is appealing to follow Ge’s structural analysis (n. 16c), fld. by WG and JPB (sort of) and also (sort of) reflected by Old, whereby *ā* and *vī* mark separate contrastive clauses, both with *ohate* to be understood as verb. This would account for the accent on the verb (and remove the necessity of reading it as a continuation of the rel. cl., as JPB does – though Old still thinks the *yé* is operative). WG’s interpr., with *ā√ūh* expressing a positive sense and *vī√ūh* a negative one, is plausible: “Sie erkennen laut die Übermacht der Götter an, missachten sie aber im Herzen.” Based on this interpr., I would substitute “they laud the

crushing power of the gods (in public), but denigrate it in their heart.” There is another related possibility, however. The slippery verb *ohate* (see disc. V.52.10, X.65.10) is sometimes reflexive; it could be that the first reading of the verb, with *ā*, has this reflexive sense, and the second, with *vi*, is transitive, resulting in “they vaunt themselves (and) denigrate the crushing power of the gods.” The position of *devānām* may speak against this, however.

The final pāda is also puzzling. Assuming the subject remains the thieves and cheats of the rest of the vs., it might seem to declare that they know only the inferior ritual utterance type, the *sāman*, not the superior *brāhman*. This was the view of Hilldebrandt (see HPS). But the next vs, esp. 17b, makes that unlikely, at least in its strong form. Old, Re, and HPS by contrast think that “beyond the *sāman*” means they know nothing better, that is, more effective than the *sāman* wielded by Bṛhaspati: they are defenseless. It may be possible to rescue the first interpr., however; it may mean that they know the tunes, the singing, of the *sāman*, but do not know how to combine this with the *brāhman*, whose more effective verbal power is controlled by Bṛhas-/Brahmaṇas-pati.

II.23.17: The crucial word *sāman*- is repeated from 16d as well as *drūh*- from 16a. In addition *ṛṇayā*- reappears from 11c, and *ṛtā*- (here explicitly contrasted with *drūh*-) from 3b, 15c).

I would prefer ‘poet’ or ‘sage-poet’ for ‘sage’, esp. since verbal formulation is at issue.

In light of the disc. of 16d above, the fact that Brahmanaspati is born from every *sāman* (or from *sāman* after *sāman*) might indicate that he is a higher, more perfected, being than his source. On this basis I would slightly rearrange the tr. of pāda c. I think the point is that he is born as Brahmanaspati: “he is Brahmanaspati, the collector of debts, the requiter of debts ...” Like vss. 1–2 at the beginning of the hymn, this vs. at the very end provides a definition of or, better, a historical derivation of the god.

The 2nd hemistich either switches persons (ab: “gave birth to you” / cd: “he is ...”), or *sā* in c has 2nd ps. ref. (there are no verbs that would allow us to distinguish). I prefer the former, since cd does not fit the usual pattern for 2nd sg. *sā*, namely the presence of an impv. I would slightly alter the tr. to “... gave birth to you ... from each *sāman*-chant ..., he ...”

II.23.18: On this vs. as the unexpected mythological climax of a resolutely non-mythological hymn, see disc. in the intro. above. Note that Bṛhaspati is addressed as Aṅgiras, an oblique reference to the Aṅgirasas, who assist in the opening of the Vala cave. And Indra, Bṛhaspati’s alloform, is introduced in pāda c. These are the first two names found in the hymn, besides the monotonous verse-by-verse foregrounding of Bṛhaspati / Brahmanaspati.

I do not understand JPB’s “for (their) glory to be yours” tr. *tāva śriyē*; I would substitute simply “for your glory.”

Though Ge (n. 18cd) thinks that the second hemistich depicts the Vṛtra myth, I am in agreement with HPS that Bṛhaspati elsewhere has nothing to do with the latter and the Vala myth is still the subject. As often, the two myths are conflated, with waters standing in for cows and dawns.

Note *gávāṃ gotrām*, echoing the only previous allusion to the myth, *gotra-bhíd-* in 3d.

II.23.19: Like many final vss., this one makes meta-reference to the hymn just produced (*asyá ... sūktāsya*, ab).

II.24 Br̥haspati [SJ on JPB]

In sharp contrast to the immediately preceding hymn (see intro. to II.23 above), this hymn is stuffed with mythological references and an extended treatment of the Vala myth (vss. 2–7, returning in 14). Another clear distinction is in the use of vocatives. As noted, all but two vss. in II.23 contain a voc. *bṛhaspate* or *brahmaṇas pate*; The first vs. of II.24 has pāda-initial *bṛhaspate*, like most of the vss. of II.23; the last two vss. (15, 16) begin with the voc. *bráhmaṇas pate*. But the interior of the hymn has neither one, save for the dual dvandva *indrābrahmaṇapatī* in 12c – but a number of non-voc. case forms of each.

The hymn is tr. by HPS (B+I, 230–35, with comm. –237).

II.24.1: This vs. has an intricately interwoven structure. Pāda a consists of a main cl. followed by a rel. cl. The main cl. is conjoined with another main cl. in d by the conjunction *utá* (in a somewhat unusual position – see JSK, DGRV I.381–82). The main cl. in d is preceded by an associated purpose cl. occupying c (pace WG, who attach c to b). And there is an independent, parenthetical cl. in b. The main clause skeleton is clearly signaled by the repeated *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. in pādas a and d: *#sá ... avidḍhi ... sīṣadhaḥ sótá ...*, despite the three intervening clauses.

As I long ago established (1992 “Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?” *HS* 105), 2nd ps. ref. for the *sá / tám* pronoun is found only with imperatives or forms so used. With the *sá* pair here, the first appears with an undoubted impv. *avidḍhi*, while the formal injunc. *sīṣadhaḥ* must have impv. function, as is implicitly recognized by all standard tr.

I would be inclined to render the *yá-* clause in pāda a as a real rel., not a causal.

I think the *prābhṛti-* here refers to the song (*gīr-*) explicitly mentioned in b, both modified by forms of the near-deictic *ayám*.

Although I am convinced, flg. Th and KH, that the root *√vidh* has been secondarily extracted from the lexeme *ví √dhā* ‘distribute’ (for details and reff. see my *dheyām* article [Ged. Schindler 1999: 168–70]), in many of its occurrences it has lost the “distribution” feature and means simply ‘honor’ – as is, I think, the case here.

Putting this all together, I would slightly retranslate ab as “Help this (ritual) presentation, you who are its master – with this great new song we would do honor.”

A tr. truer to the clause order can be contrived for cd by pulling out *utá* from d: “And – so that your comrade who grants us rewards [=Indra] will be praised – bring our thought to success, o Br̥haspati.”

II.24.2: The entry into the mythological realm, which will dominate most of the rest of the hymn, is signaled by the augmented imperfects in each pāda: *ánamat*, *ádardar* (impf. to intens.), *prācyāvayat*, *áviśat*.

The neut. pl. *śámbarāṇi* to the otherwise masc. *śámbara-*, the name of a demon, is striking, though easily interpr. Old plausibly attributes it to the influence of *vṛtrāṇi*. We might otherwise have expected a vrddhi deriv.

The tr. of c might be more elegant as “Brahmaṇaspati set the immovable in motion” than “he moved the immovable forward.”

The accented verb *áviśat* in d is problematic, esp. if we follow the Pp. and analyze *prācyāvayat* in c as *prá + acyāvayat* with unaccented verb, as the standard tr. do. This makes c a main cl. (to the two rel. clauses in ab), and the *ca* in d would seem to conjoin *ā ... áviśat* to this main cl. – but with accented verb. Various solutions to this conundrum have been suggested. Old takes all four verbs as accented, thus contravening the Pp. in c. This would make the whole vs. loosely dependent on either the preceding or the following vs. This is perhaps the simplest solution. Ge tr. *ca* as a (very low key) subordinator, but when *ca* has this function, it ordinarily means ‘if’, which is contextually excluded here. He alternatively suggests (n. 2d) that *áviśat* should be read twice in the pāda, separately with the two preverbs *ā* and *ví* – like the construction of *óhate* in the immed. preceding hymn II.23.16. This is explicitly accepted by JSK (DGRV I.123) and is essentially reflected in the publ. tr. “he entered into and throughout the mountain ...” Although this interpr. is in principle appealing and would account for the verbal accent, the awkwardness of the resulting translation speaks for itself, and furthermore *ví* is otherwise not found with *√vis*. Ge’s final suggestion (n. 1 [bottom of pg.] to n. 2d) is that a different root should be supplied with *ví*, and again contrastive accent could be invoked. This proposal (scornfully rejected by HPS) has the merit of better accounting for the *ví* by supplying a verb with which it is regularly associated, like *ví√bhid* ‘split apart’, *ví√vṛ* ‘pry apart’ – as in the phrases I.85.10 ... *bibhidur ví párvatam*# (ending exactly like our pāda) or V.32.1 ... *párvatam ví yád váḥ*. I am somewhat reluctant to supply verbs out of nowhere. However, *ví√dr* ‘split apart’, found in b, might be a candidate, and it is the case that *√bhid* occurs in the next vs. (3c *ābhinat*). I will suggest yet another possible explanation for the accent: misunderstanding. Because the preverb *ā* is in tmesis in this pāda, the sequence *cāviśat* must be analyzed as *ca + áviśat*. However, unaccented *aviśat* combined with *ā* into *āviśat* is found several times (I.141.5 and incl. nearby II.13.1), and it might be that **cāviśat* was analyzed as *ca + āviśat* (i.e., *ā-aviśat*) and redactionally accented. Nonetheless, after considering all these competing explanations, I find the one that supplies a 2nd verb with *ví*, taken from context, the least problematic, and I would substitute “and he entered the mountain full of goods (and split) it apart.” If this seems too radical, an acceptable alt. is Old’s interpr. of the vs. as entirely subordinated, containing four accented verbs.

II.24.3: Continuing in the mythic past, this vs. contains six augmented imperfects: b: *áśrathnan ... ávradata* [pulled out of sandhi, but metrically guaranteed], c: *úd ... ājad ābhinat*, d: *ágūhat ... vy ācakṣayati*, all in brief asyndetic clauses.

II.24.4: I would prefer ‘well’ to ‘cistern’ for *avatá-*.

II.24.5: This is a very difficult vs., with a variety of clashing interpr. See, inter alia, Old’s detailed disc., as well as the treatments in the standard tr. Its interpr. is all the more problematic because the logical connection between the two hemistichs is not at all clear.

To begin with ab, the first thing to notice is that the poet uses the *-t^uva-* gerundive that he deployed in vss. 2 and 3 (*nánt^uva-* 2c, *kárt^uva-* 3a), here *bhávīt^uva-* ‘to be come to be / to come into being’. Old plausibly suggests that “the beings of long ago” (*sánā.. bhúvanā*) are those imprisoned in the Vala cave. “Coming into being” would refer to their emerging from the cave into light and freedom. Most tr. take *bhávīt^uvā* as the predicate: “these beings of long ago are to come into being (again)” (so in slightly different ways Old, Re, HPS, WG, and JPB; Ge’s “Diese Geschöpfe müssen teilweise alt sein” is a bizarre outlier.)

It is pāda b that presents the real problem: there are (roughly) two entirely opposite interpr. of the pāda, though both center around the opening (or not) of the Vala cave (or its present-day equivalent). To show my hand immediately, I do not think it’s necessary to choose between them; both can be simultaneously operative by virtue of the poet’s ingenuity. The verb in b is *varanta*, which can be a subjunctive or an injunctive to the aorist of the root *√vr̥* ‘cover, close, obstruct’. (Although originally a root-aor. subjunctive, the *vara-* stem is subsequently reinterpr. as a thematic indicative; see, for example, the doubly characterized subj. *varāte* [2x]. *varanta* would then be a injunctive to that stem.) The signature lexeme for the opening of the Vala cave is *vī√vr̥* ‘unclose, open’, with the preverb *vī* reversing the sense of the root. But *vī* is not found in this pāda, and so the clause as it stands means (as in JPB’s tr.) “Through months and years [lit. ‘autumns’] they obstruct(ed) the doors for you” (or “the doors obstruct(ed) you”). This is the standard interpr., championed by Old and found in all the standard tr. (Ge, Re, HPS, WG, JPB). The verb in this interpr. is presumably injunc., with both preterital and present-general senses (hence my rendering “obstruct(ed)”).

However, this pāda lacks a syllable. Gr suggests supplying *vī*, producing a post-caesura sequence **vī dúro varanta vaḥ*. Old roundly rejects this suggestion (and it obviously did not affect the tr. of others), though Arnold (Ved. Met. 298) tentatively accepts it and is fld. by HvN (metrical comm.). I find this suggestion appealing not only because of the metrical gap, but more because of the slightly puzzling emphasis on *vī* earlier in the hymn. (And in fact I came up with this interpr. independently on that basis before I saw Gr’s suggestion.) In addition to *vī acakṣayat* in 3d, vs. 2 ends its first hemistich with pāda-final *vī* (in tmesis with preceding *adardar*), though pāda- and hemistich-final preverbs are relatively rare, and pāda d has the apparently pleonastic *vī* that causes such interpretational difficulty in that pāda: see comm. above; also the problematic *vī* in 14c. It is almost as if the poet supplies an extra *vī* there and then withholds it here, signaling its ghostly presence by the missing syllable. Supplying *vī* allows an interpr. “After months and years they will open the doors for you / the doors will open for you,” with *varanta* as subjunctive. This refers to the ultimate “coming into being” predicted in pāda a.

As I said, I think both interpr. are simultaneously operative – depicting both the long darkness and confinement the beings endured and their ultimate return to the light, and making the connection between mythic past and ritual present that is so common in RVic discourse. An emended transl. should therefore read

Through months and years the doors obstruct(ed) you. /

After months and years the doors will *open for you.

We now turn to cd. The second hemistich and the duals therein set up an intractable grammatical clash: the negated pres. part. *áyatantā* (or apparent part.; see

below) can only be dual nom./acc. masculine and is likely the subj. of *carataḥ*, but the āmreḍita *anyád-anyad* with dual reference is neuter. The gender clash makes a straightforward identification of the two duos difficult. Further, the rel. cl. in d, which should have a referent in c, has what appears to be a neut. plural obj. *yā ... vayúnā*, although there are no plurals in c for pl. *yā* to be dependent on.

Old identifies the duals as the sun and the moon, which he takes as implicated in the obstruction depicted in pāda b but now, thanks to Bṛhaspati's actions, behaving in a better regulated fashion. Old's sun and moon are the majority opinion (Re, HPS, WG, JPB), though Ge favors the gods and the Pitars (see n. 5cd) and Sāy. Heaven and Earth. Since the standard dual dvandvas for Sun and Moon (*sūryā-candramās-*, *sūryā-mās-*) are masc., they can be modified by *āyatantā*. But then *anyád-anyad* should have another referent and not double the subject. The general solution has been to take *anyád-anyad* as the goal of *carataḥ*, with the referent being *vayúna-* (neut.); see, e.g., WG "... wandeln die beiden, jeder in einer anderen (Bahn), welche Bahnen (*vayúna-*) Brahmanaspati geschaffen hat." This does the job, but it seems contrived – and I find "Bahn" for *vayúna-* unsatisfactory. (Re's similar interpr. indirectly conveys the contrived nature of the solution with an efflorescence of parenthetical additions.)

My own interpr. may also seem contrived, but it has more textual support. Since *āyatantā* requires a dual masculine, I accept the widespread sun+moon interpr., but I think *anyád-anyad* doubles that subject with a conceptually similar neuter pair, night and day, or the day-halves (du. *áhanī*), in other words the time periods marked by the sun and moon. Important here is I.123.7 *ápānyád éty abhy anyád eti, víśūrūpe áhanī sám carete* "The one goes away; the other approaches: having distinct forms, the two day-halves proceed in tandem," with the day-halves represented by *anyád ... anyád* and subject of the dual verb *carete*, which recalls *carataḥ* in our passage. I would tr. c as "(Sun and moon), without aligning themselves, proceed (as the day-halves) one after the other." *āyatantā* indicates that the two do not line up next to each other, but follow in order.

As for the form, Lowe argues persuasively (Participles in RV, 277–78) that the form is not synchronically simply a negated participle to *yátati*, *-te*, because act. forms of that stem are otherwise transitive.

Now, as for d. I do not take *yā ... vayúnā* as a neut. pl. syntagm, but suggest rather that *yā* is masc. du., whose antecedent is the masc. du. Sun and Moon. (It is also possible that *yā* is neut. pl., by attraction to *vayúnā* in an equational syntagm (as often). IH also suggests that it evokes the *tā* of pāda a, the beings that are to come to be again. Then neut. pl. *vayúnā* is the second acc. in a "make X (into) Y" construction with *cakāra*: "which (two) Brahmanaspati has made into the *vayúnā*" (sim. HPS). As I have disc. elsewhere (see esp. II.34.4), I think *vayúna-* refers to repetitive patterns, often visual, incl. the patterns made by light and shade – and, by extension here, by the alternation of the dark and light halves of the day. This is expressed in a nearby passage II.19.3 *aktúnāhnām vayúnāni sādhat* "He perfected the patterns of the days through the night." As I comment there, by interposing night between days Indra draws temporal boundaries that produce the alternating patterns of day and night. Our passage seems to depict the same thing.

What then does the 2nd hemistich have to do with the first? In my opinion, the ultimate freeing of the dawns from the Vala cave reestablishes the vital alternation between light and dark that defines Vedic life.

To put the vs. all together, I'd tr.

All those beings of long ago, whoever they be, are to come to be (again).
Through months and years the doors obstruct(ed) you. /
After months and years the doors (will) *open for you.

(Sun and moon), without aligning themselves, proceed (as the day-halves)
one after the other, which (two day-halves) Brahmanaspati has made into the
(daily) patterns.

For my interpr. of *mādbhís* (to *mās-*) see my 1991 “A Cart, an Ox, and the Perfect Participle” (MSS 52: 80–81), though this has recently been disputed by Zachary Rothstein-Dowden.

II.24.6–7: These vss. are twinned, esp. 6cd and 7ab, with *praticákṣyāñṛtā púnaḥ* repeated in the post-caesura portion of 6c and 7a, preceded by nom. pl.s of similar meaning. The flg. pāda in both instances opens with an ablative phrase (6d *yātaḥ* “from which” / 7b *āta ā* “from there”) fld. by a 3rd pl. verb. The paired vss. do not seem to define an omphalos, however.

II.24.6: The first pāda contains a duplication of the verbal lexeme *abhí√naś / nakṣ*, since *√nakṣ* is, by most accounts (see EWA s.v. *NAŚ*^d), an *s*-enlarged form of the former. Although there is normally no obviously semantic difference between forms of *naś* and *nakṣ*, here the part. *abhi náḁsantaḥ* seems to have some desid. (vel sim.) nuance; otherwise its duplication by *abhí ... ānaśuḥ* is kind of flatfooted, as in the publ. tr. “upon reaching (there), they reached ...” Better “approaching (/aiming to reach), they reached.”

Ge (n. 6c) asks whether *púnar* in both this hemistich and 7ab belongs with the first pāda (as the pāda boundary indicates) or the second, where it fits better semantically. I am inclined to entertain the second poss. at least as an alt. “... having observed the untruths, they went up again ...,” though the other is by no means excluded – esp. since we don’t exactly know what’s going on in these vss.

Whether or not we read *púnar* with d, the purport of this pāda is puzzling: it implies that the subjects are going to enter a place they have already come from. Some have suggested that this refers to an earlier, failed expedition to the Vala cave (see, e.g., HPS B+I, 232 and 236), but this is not an episode in the standard myth. However, 7d lends some support to this idea. It might be possible to interpr. *yāta u āyan* as “because of which they had come,” but this seems quite artificial. HPS suggests (236) that it has to do with the reenactment of the myth in the current ritual, but although the boundary between the mythic past and the ritual present is permeable in this hymn, I don’t think “they went up to enter that from which they had come” is how this would be expressed

Syntactically it should be noted that the 2nd hemistich has a short dependent cl. embedded within the main cl.: *yāta u āyan*, which opens d – the subj. of the main cl. occupying pāda c and the main verb *úd īyuh* following the *yātaḥ* cl. This embedding is contrary to the standard practice overwhelmingly observed in the RV, but it seems to be a quirk of this hymn: see 8b and 8c and disc. below.

II.24.7: Note the clear contrast between *ṛtāvanaḥ* and *āñṛtā*.

For how to interpr. *púnar* see comm. immed. above.

The doubling of *ā* is worthy of note: *āta ā* (i.e., *ā-ātaḥ / ā*). The first *ā* must be the preverb with *tasthuḥ*, while the second one is the particle that often follows ablatives (or

ablative elements, like this adv.). Although *átah* generally stands alone, in some passages it seems to be followed by the *ā* ablative-marking particle; see esp. IV.50.3 *áta ā ta ṛtasprśo ní seduḥ*, where, because of its position, *ā* is unlikely to belong with *ní√sad* (though that's not excluded).

The NP *maháh patháh* could technically be an abl. sg., construed with *áta ā*, rather than an acc. pl. But the latter is the universal interpr., no doubt correctly.

In c JPB supplies “mounted” (on the basis of *ā ... tasthuḥ* in b), but this makes no sense [it would be a very bad idea to ‘mount’ a fire!] and has no parallel in the myth. Better, with Ge, to supply “found.”

As noted in the comm. above ad 6b, the last pāda of d supports the suggestion that this expedition is a repeat of an earlier, unsuccessful one. See HPS p. 236.

II.24.8: The account of the Vala myth ends in vs. 7, and the rest of the hymn treats the god's powers more generally, esp. as displayed in battle and contests.

As noted above (ad 6d), this vs. has two short embedded dependent clauses: b: *yātra vāṣṭi*, enfolded within the instr. NP *#ṛtájyena kṣipréṇa ... dhánvanā #*; c: *yābhir ásyati*, enfolded within the nom. NP *sādhvîr íṣavaḥ ... kárṇayonayaḥ*. Although highly unusual for the RV, these examples cannot be explained away, and the fact that we find several exx. of the same type – brief two-word clauses immediately adjoining their referent – densely packed here suggests a self-conscious poetic choice to transgress syntactic norms.

The adj. *nṛcákṣasaḥ* can be gen. sg., modifying *tásya* (so Gr, Re) or nom. pl., modifying the arrows (the other standard tr.). Given its proximity to the dat. inf. *dṛśaye*, the latter seems more likely, with the publ. tr.

For the bow, the bowstring, the arrows, and the ear see VI.75.3 (the weapon hymn), already adduced by Ge.

II.24.9: The four occurrences of *sá* punctuating the nominal descriptors of Brahmanaspati should, in my view, be represented in tr. So, “He, set in front, is the one who leads together, he the one who leads apart; he is well-praised; in battle he is the Lord of the Formulation.”

The first word of c, *cākṣmáh*, is a hapax. Ge refuses to tr. it, and it receives a variety of interpr. in the other tr. (I do not know what the publ. tr.'s ‘penetrating’ is based on.) In addition to the various tr., see HPS (B+I, p. 33, where he also disc. Wüst's treatment of the word). The word seems to be a vṛddhi deriv. of a posited **cakṣ-man-*, which has cognates in Old Iranian: OA, YA, and OP *cašman-* ‘eye’ (see EWA s.v. *cákṣus-*). Wüst suggests a meaning “zum Himmelsauge in Beziehung stehend” (see EWA with further reff), and the logical connection between this pāda and the blazing sun in d supports some such interpr. — though HPS (p. 33) rejects it in its strong form and himself tr. it as “der Schauende.” Since there are dozens of ways of saying “schauend” in Vedic, the use of this hapax with a complex derivation makes it likely that some more specialized sense is intended, and I favor some form of the Wüst interpr., also connecting it to the restoration of light achieved by opening the Vala cave (see esp. my interpr. of 5cd).

What somewhat impedes a Vala interpr. is the predicate “... bears away the prize and the stakes” (*vājaṃ bharate matī dhánā*), since battles and contests are not a normal

feature of the Vala myth. But the means he deploys to bear away the prize is his (formulated) thought (*matī*), that is, a verbal tool that is associated with this god, and it is by verbal means that the Vala cave was opened. That our passage deals with a verbal contest is strongly suggested by the near-identical phrase in 13b *sabhéyo vípro bharate matī dhánā*, where Brahmaṇaspati is identified with a poet in an assembly prevailing with his thought. The phrasal expansion in 13 can be considered poetic repair of the phrase here. (Another variant of this phrase is found in nearby II.26.3 *vājaṃ bharate dhánā*; in this case the subject is a mortal who ritually serves the god, not the god himself, but still in a ritual setting.) I would tentatively tr. the hemistich “When he, with his relation to the (heavenly) “eye,” bears away the prize and the stake with his (formulated) thought, just after that the sun – the blazing one – blazes at will.”

II.24.10: In I.9.5 the pair *vibhú prabhú* modifies *rādhah* ‘benefit, bounty’; I tr. the phrase “farmost and foremost,” which I prefer to JPB’s “far-going and fore-going” because I don’t think there is motion involved. We both are aiming to capture the PREV-*bhú*-contrast in a somewhat artificial way. I would tr. that pāda “farmost and foremost is the preeminent (bounty) of the one who streams abundance.”

Note the interlocking phonetic/etymological figures *vibhú prabhú prathamám*

On *suvidātra*- see comm. ad II.9.6. The adj. occurs twice elsewhere in Maṇḍala II (II.1.8, 9.6), both times of Agni, and in context it means ‘easy to find’, on account of Agni’s brightness. This sense is also found in the publ. tr., but I would otherwise not follow the distribution of subj. and pred. there. Rather, with Ge and Re, I would take the neut. pl. adjs. in b as modifiers of *imā sātāni* in c.

The gerundive *rādhya-* also requires some comment: although I have supplied *rādhah* in pāda a on the basis of I.9.5, this *s*-stem noun and the root, and esp. the gerundive, to which it’s related, have gone in somewhat different directions semantically. The *s*-stem means ‘bounty, benefit’ and the like, often modified by *citrá-* ‘bright’. The gerundive usually modifies a verbal product (like *ukthá-* IV.11.3) or the thought that produced it (*mānas-* VIII.92.28) and means ‘to be realized, brought to light’; the finite forms of the root generally have a similar usage. (It is possible that in the common NP *citrām rādhah* “bright benefit” [I.44.1, etc.], the *citrá-* has absorbed the ‘bring to light’ sense of the root.) The sense I attribute to the root works well with the parallel adj. *suvidātra-*. I would tr. bc as “good to acquire, to be brought to light are these winnings of Bṛhaspati, of the prize-winner worth tracking.” On *venyá-* see comm. ad VI.44.8.

In d I consider *visāḥ*, a further specification of *jānā ubháye* (with Ge and Re), not a separate entity (with JPB and WG); I’d emend to “both races [=gods and humans], (all) their clans ...” Pace HPS, *visāḥ* cannot be obj. to *bhuñjaté* because medial forms of this root are always intrans.

II.24.11: An alliterative vs., at least in its odd pādas: a: ... (*á*)vare *vṛjāne vísvathā vibhūḥ*; c: ... *devó devān prāti paprathe prthú*.

The masc. *vibhū-* picks up *vibhú* in 10a, though here I’d give it a less idiomatically driven tr., “extending everywhere ...”

The first word of b, *mahām*, is morphologically problematic; see Old’s extensive discussion. Although generally rendered as a nom. sg. masc. to *mahānt-* modifying Bṛhaspati (Ge, Re, JPB), in this sandhi context we should expect *mahām̐*. That the form is

coreferential with *raṇvā-* is indirectly supported by VI.29.1 with the (apparent) acc. sg. phrase *mahām u raṇvām*, but *mahām* is problematic there too, as an acc. It could also be a grammatically impeccable gen. pl. to *māh-*. This is suggested as an alt. by Old as well as Ge (n. 11b) and adopted by Lub and WG. In this case it would presumably anticipate the pl. “gods” in c. The problem then would be how to construe it; Ge casually suggests that it goes either with *raṇvā-* or with *śávasā*, but the former doesn’t take the gen. and surely the point of *śávasā* in this context is that it’s Bṛhaspati’s, not the property of other gods. WG construe it loosely and independently: “unter den Mächtigen,” and this may be the best way.

The publ. tr. renders *vaváḁsitha* as a main cl. verb, but since it’s accented, it must belong in the *yáh* clause starting in pāda a. The main cl. of cd switches from 2nd ps. ref. to 3rd (*paprathe*), but this mild anacoluthon is very common in the RV.

Putting this all together, I’d retranslate ab as “You who, extending everywhere within the lower settlement, joy-bringing, among the great ones have increased by your vast power ...”

II.24.12: This vs. is couched in the 2nd dual and introduces a second divine figure besides Brahmanaspati, namely Indra, in the dual dvandva voc. *indrā-brahmanaspatī*(c), found only here (though *indrā-bṛhaspatī* occurs six times in IV.49). As disc. extensively elsewhere, Bṛhaspati/Brahmanaspati began as an epithet of Indra in his role in the Vala myth and was only gradually distinguished as a separate figure. This vs. seems a stab in that direction, but the remaining vss. in the hymn revert to the singular.

I would change the tr. of pāda a to “everything of yours comes true, o you two bounteous ones.”

maghāvan- is of course a standing epithet of Indra; it is found in the dual (as here) only a few times, several times of the Aśvins, once of Indra and Soma (IV.28.5). The singular is never, as far as I know, applied to Bṛhaspati by himself, so the introduction of Indra here has brought his epithet in its train.

Pāda b appears to be one of the only passages in which *caná* has negative force by itself, not borrowed from a larger negative context. See the various disc. listed in the Lexical Index, esp. X.49.5. The negative sense here cannot be denied – the formula *ná (prá) mināti / minānti* is quite common – and there are no other negatives in this vs. or adjacent vss. It is not surprising, given the overwhelming use of *caná* in contexts with other negatives and the apparent negative in its 2nd syllable, that *caná* could ultimately carry a negative sense on its own.

II.24.13: The *utá* opening this vs. seems functionless. JSK (DGRV I.393) classifies it in a large group that act “as a mere facilitator of transition from one stanza to another,” which vague usage seems esp. odd when the previous vs. is the only one in the hymn with a dual subject, while vs. 13 returns to the sg.

With all other tr. (but JPB), I would supply “him” with *ánu śṛṇvanti*: “obey (him).” Otherwise the pāda is even less well integrated into the vs. than it appears.

In b the identification between the god and the poet should be made explicit; “(As) an inspired poet in the assembly, he ...” On the predicate here, see the nearly identical phrase in 9c and comm. thereon; also II.26.3.

Contra Gr, Re, HPS, and JPB, who take *vīlu-dvēṣas-* as a tatp. ‘hating the hard’, I think it more likely a bahuvr. ‘whose hatred is staunch/firm’, despite the accent. So also Ge, WG. Bahuvrīhis with *vīlu-* as first member show variable accent: 2nd-member accent in *vīlu-pavī-* ‘with firm wheel-rims’, *vīlu-pāñi-* ‘with hard hooves’ (1x, I.38.11, versus *vīlū-pāñi* 2x) versus 1st-member accent in *vīlū-jambha-* ‘with firm jaws’ (1x), *vīlv-āṅga-* ‘firm-limbed’ (3x). I attribute the forms with 2nd-member accent to the influence of *puru-* and *bahu-* bahuvrīhis with 2nd-member accent, even though, unlike them, *vīlu-* has a heavy init. syllable. Unfortunately Wackernagel doesn’t disc. *vīlū-* cmpds in AiG II.1.

On *ānu vāsarṇām* see Old. He would resolve it as *vāsā* and considers it a neut. pl., with crossover to the neut. flg. *ānu vratā*.

I would alter the 2nd hemistich to “He whose hatred is staunch, collecting the debt according to his will, he is the prizewinner in the clash: Brahmanaspati.”

II.24.14: As in 12a I would render *abhavat ... satyāḥ* as “came true,” or in this instance “came to realization.” I also think that the temporal value of the future part. *kariṣyatāḥ* is governed by the tense of the main verb *abhavat*, so “was going to do,” rather than “will do.” For a syntactic parallel see II.11.7. I’d emend the tr. of the 1st hemistich to “The battle fury of the lord of the formulation came to realization according to his will, as he was going to do the great deed.”

The final long vowel of *kārmā* must be, as Gr suggests, metrical; it is read short by the Pp. But the lengthening must have been facilitated by the fact that *n*-stem neut. plurals can have long or short vowels (type *nāmā*), and so the short vowel proper to the singular can be secondarily lengthened.

Pāda c is syntactically anomalous. Although at first glance it seems to contain a simple rel. cl. / main cl. structure (*yāḥ ... sā*), this structure is undercut by the *ca* seeming to connect the two clauses. One solution is to enjamb the *yāḥ* clause across the hemistich boundary, and start a new structure with pāda-medial *sā*. So Ge and JSK (DGRV I.261) (type “... of him about to do the great deed – (him) who drove up the cows. He ...”). This is, however, an awkward solution. Nonetheless I reject a simple “who ..., he ...” interpr. like that of the publ. tr., even though it has Old’s imprimatur. In ZDMG 1906: 737 (cited again in Noten), he adduces this passage as an example of the poets’ tendency to concatenate subordinate and main clauses, but I know of no such tendency. I think we *can* find a relative-correlative structure in pāda c, but it requires noticing and dealing with several anomalies in the *sā* clause: 1) there’s nothing for *divé* to do; *pace* JPB this dat. should not be rendered “in heaven”; 2) both the preverb *vī* and the *ca* are wrongly placed to conjoin this clause with the preceding *yā-* clause (even if we were willing to do so). In fact ... *vī cābhajat* looks like it should be conjoining this cl. with a clause consisting of *sā divé*. Here I adopt a solution suggested by Ge (n. 14c), though not reflected in his tr. – that we resupply *ūd ājat* from the rel. cl. and construe it with *divé*, here in the sense ‘day’ or ‘daylight’ usually found only in the āmreḍita *divé-dive* ‘every day, day by day’. The point is the one made also earlier in the hymn, that the cows are sent out of the Vala cave into the light. I’d tr. “Who drove up the cows, he (drove them up) for daylight and distributed them.” Although this may seem artificial, it deals with the various syntactic problems in the pāda. Note also that we have yet another problematic *vī*, as in 2d, where it also interacted with a problematic *ca* and a verb with the wrong accent.

Note that the rel. cl. replicates the (non-rel.) phrase beginning 3c.

II.24.15: Since Brahmanaspati is, literally, the lord of the *brāhman-*, it should be *his* formulation, not mine, at issue (though, since *kṛtābrahman-* ‘having created formulations’ is used of a mortal ritualist in the 1st vs. of the next hymn [II.25.1] the interpr. of the publ. tr. is not excluded). I would substitute “being master through your formulation.” Note that *yád īśānaḥ* ring-compositionally responds to *yá īśiṣe* in the first pāda of the hymn.

II.24.16 = II.23.19

II.25 Brahmanaspati

II.25.1: In c I take the phrase *jāténa jātām* as expressing an essentially hostile relationship between adversaries: he extends beyond the offspring (of his competitor) with his own offspring. This interpr. would match the similar configuration of etymological figures in 2a *vīrēbhir vīrān vanavad vanuṣyatāḥ* “With his heroes he will win against the heroes who seek to win,” which in turn expands the etymological figure in *vanavad vanuṣyatāḥ* in 1a. The standard tr. take both elements in *jāténa jātām* as referring to the offspring of the subject: “he will extend beyond his offspring with (more) offspring” or “offspring after offspring.” However, the strong parallel in 2a makes this less likely in my opinion.

II.25.2: Ge, Re, HPS (B+I 113) take pres. act. part. *vanuṣyatāḥ* here as gen. sg. dependent on acc. pl. *vīrān* (e.g., Schmidt “... die Mannen des Angreifenden”). I find this extremely unlikely, given that the same word in the same etymological figure in 1a and in the following hymn, II.26.1a, must be acc. pl. The acc. pl. *ṛghāyatāḥ* at the end of 3a with the same morphological structure also supports this analysis.

As Re points out, “la séquence *tmán : toká : tánaya* forme un tout cohérent.”

II.25.5: Since it is difficult to see how the rivers would provide “unbroken shelters,” I would now take *dadhire* as passive, with Re (and Sāy.; see Ge n. 5b), contra the standard: “(for him) many unbroken shelters have been established.” Alternatively, with WG, supply “the gods” vel sim., as subj., though this requires more machinery, and there are other passive usages of the med. pf. to *√dhā*; see Re’s n. and Kü 273–74.

II.26 Brahmanaspati

II.26.1: With Ge, Re, and WG, I take *ṛjúr íc chámsaḥ* as a decomposed bahuvrīhi, like *nārā ca śámsam* (IX.96.42, cf. X.64.3), with accent and case ending adjusted. For a similar formation, still compounded, see V.44.5 *ṛjugātha* ‘o you whose song is straight on target’. It would be possible, however, to take the text as given and make a “straight laud” the subject, as a sort of metonymy; so Schmidt (B+I 115).

For *ví√bhaj* see also nearby II.24.14.

II.26.2: The impv. *vihi*, with short root vowel (also III.21.5, IV.48.1, and possibly VI.48.17), must belong to the root pres. of *√vī* ‘pursue’, whose properly formed 2nd sg.

impv. is *vīhi* (7x). The easiest way to explain its short vowel is by analogy to *ihī* belonging to the root pres. to \sqrt{i} ‘go’, with pres. indic. *émi*, *éši*, *éti*, and impv. *étu*, all strikingly well attested, which match *vémi*, *véši*, *véti*, and *vétu*. And ‘pursue!’ and ‘go!’ are in the same semantic domain. The presence of a form of \sqrt{v} here, flg. *suprāvīh* in 1c, supports the current etym. of *prāvī-* as derived from \sqrt{v} . See comm. ad I.34.4.

The object of *vīhi*, *manāyatāh*, is semantically ambiguous and for that reason its referent is not clear. Its base *manā-* means something like ‘zeal’, a meaning found also in other derivatives to it, but zeal can be positively or negatively viewed; for a negative occurrence see nearby II.33.5. In our passage Gr, Re, and Ge [WG] take it positively, referring to gods (Gr, Re) or priests (Ge), while HPS (B+I 115), flg. Ludwig, negatively, referring to enemies. My tr. is meant to be neutral, since I think both are simultaneously possible.

I would now tr. b somewhat more literally, as “make your mind favorable to the smahing of obstacles.”

II.26.3: The phrase *vājam bharate dhānā* is quite similar to wording in nearby II.24.9, 13, where, however, the subj. is Brahmanaspati himself, not his worshiper.

On *śraddhā-* as trust specifically in ritual and hospitality, see comm. ad VI.26.6.

II.26.4: On the apparent bad cadence produced by *avidhat* see comm. ad II.1.7.

The curious long final of *rākṣatī* is not remarked on by the standard tr./comm.; the Pp simply reads it short. In my view it represents *rākṣati + ī*, the latter the enclitic acc. pronoun related to *īm*, which latter follows the first, parallel verb in the pāda, *uruṣyāti + īm*. They would show a phonologically motivated distribution here, with *īm* before vowel and *ī* before consonant, and would be positioned identically, immediately after a clause-initial verb and before an ablative.

Wh (Gr. §1316) considers *aṃhóh ... uru-cákri-* “creating a wide place from narrow straits” (also V.67.4, VIII.18.5) an example of a case form (abl. *aṃhóh*) dependent on the first member of a compound. This seems reasonable, though the fact that the phrase is a paraphrase of *uruṣyāti ... aṃhasaḥ* in the preceding pāda no doubt contributed to the creation of the phrase. Cf. also I.107.1 *aṃhóh ... varivo-vittarā* “better finder of wide space from narrow straits.” For further on this phenomenon see my “Limits on Indo-Iranian Compounding” (in prep.).

II.27 Ādityas [SJ on JPB]

This hymn is very name-heavy, esp. in the first half. The stem *ādityá-* appears in each of the first six vss., generally along with the names of several of the principal members of this group; in vs. 7 we find instead of *ādityá-* the mother *āditi-* (also 14), with *ādityá-* returning in 8 (11, 13). Only vss. 9 and 12 lack *ādityá-* or individual names of Ādityas. And only in vs. 10 is the focus on a single Āditya, Varuṇa. With all those names occupying space, there is relatively little left for content, which is, as Re puts it, banal. There is a fair amount of lexical recycling.

II.27.1–2: The first two vss. begin with the near-deictic, *imā gírah* “these hymns here” / *imám stómam* “this praise-song here,” anchoring the hymn in the ritual here-and-now. To

make this clear, I would front the phrase in vs. 2: “This praise-song of mine do they enjoy.”

II.27.1: Since *juhū-* is both ‘tongue’ and ‘offering ladle’, *juhva-* here refers to both and represents the common trope of verbal praise as oblation (“pouring prayers”), a conflation also found in “ghee-backed (*ghṛtāsnūḥ*) hymns” in pāda a.

II.27.2: I would tr. *juṣanta* as “enjoy,” not “will enjoy,” since it is not subjunctive.

dhāra-pūta- has the standard structure of the common cmpd type *devā-kṛta-* ‘made by gods’, *sōma-śīta-* ‘sharpened by soma’, with a ppl. as 2nd member and an agentive/instrumental first member. However, the cmpd. is not usually interpr. as ‘purified by a stream (of soma)’, but rather as a kind of equational simile: Gr “wie Ströme hell,” JPB “pure as a stream (of soma).” I think that this interpretational instinct is more or less correct, but the interpretation should be mediated through the use of the instr. *dhārayā* in free syntagms. It is extraordinarily common with the middle impv. *pāvasva* ‘purify yourself’, addressed to Soma, starting with the first vs. of the Soma maṇḍala, IX.1.1 (etc. etc.) *pāvasva soma dhārayā*. The instr. expresses the physical form that the purified soma will take, generally rendered in Engl. as “in a stream,” perhaps better “as a stream.” I think this cmpd. represents this syntagm (rather roughly). The standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) of *dhāra-pūta-* reflect this sense correctly. As is usual in such cmpds, the first member has instr. value – but the independent instr. *dhārayā* has an idiomatic sense that is (somewhat loosely) incorporated into this cmpd. The first member, *dhāra-*, is an apparent short *a*-stem here, though the well-attested independent noun is only a long *ā*-stem, *dhārā-*. Though I am leery of metrical justifications for morphological facts, I’d point out that **dhārāpūtāḥ* would not fit this Triṣṭubh cadence.

Re (ÉVP VII.89) suggests that pāda d reflects the Three Functions, which is clever – though the first two (“free of crookedness (and) disgrace” *āvṛjinā anavadyāḥ*) both seem like First Function to me.

II.27.3: Note the polarized pair beginning and ending cd: #*antāḥ* ... *ānti* #.

II.27.6: I would attach the first hemistich to 5d, rather than to the second hemistich in this vs. Despite the *tēna* beginning c, there is no logical connection (at least that I can see) between the easy path of ab and the Ādityas’ speech in c, whereas the easy path fits well with the metaphorical avoidance of earth-clefts in 5d.

The key to pāda c is to be found in VIII.67.6, another Āditya hymn, adduced by Re. There the c pāda is almost identical to ours, *tēnā no ādhi vocata*, but it is preceded by *yād vaḥ ... vārūtham āsti yāc chardīḥ*, with the whole meaning “What is your shield, your shelter, with that intercede for us.” In our passage the flg. pāda asks the Ādityas to extend *śārma*, a word almost synonymous with *chardīs-*. I think the *tēna* in c anticipates the *śārma* of d, and I would emend the tr. to “With that (shelter) intercede for us – extend (that) shelter to us that is hard to smash on every side.” I would also end vs. 5 with a dash (... earth —) and end 6b with a period (... straight.)

On the meaning and etym. of *anṛkṣarā-* see I.22.15.

II.27.7: This vs. reprises both the easy path of 6a and the *śárma* of 6d, as well as *árisṭāḥ* from 2d.

II.27.8–9: Act. 3rd pl. *dhārayan* 8a reprises med. *dhārayante* in 4a, which is based on an -*anta* replacement of my type, and the difference in voice is merely formal. The -*anta* form itself is found in 9a, which is a close paraphrase of 8a.

II.27.8: As an alt. I would tr. cd as “... is your greatness great, is it dear,” with most tr.

II.27.9: In b *śúcayo dhārapūtāḥ* is repeated from 2c.

The bahuvr. *uruśáṃsa-*, lit. ‘having broad pronouncement’, has several distinct usages, partly because of the functional flexibility of bahuvrīhis, which can mean either strictly ‘having XY’ or more expansively ‘providing XY’ (via ‘having XY [to give]’), and partly because *śáṃsa-* can mean ‘pronouncement, proclamation’ or more narrowly ‘laud’ (proclamation of praise). In some passages modifying gods (e.g., IV.16.18 of Indra) it seems to mean ‘widely proclaimed’, that is, ‘having/receiving wide proclamations of praise’. But in several passages it modifies a singer (I.31.14 *vāghát-*; II.38.11 *jaritár-*), where the most natural interpr. is ‘providing wide proclamation / praise’, ‘whose recitations extend widely’. Although the former sense might be in order here, since the adj. modifies the Ādityas (hence JPB’s “widely proclaimed”), I think in this case it may refer to the fact that the Ādityas’ pronouncements are widely authoritative (so, it seems, also Ge and WG) and hold esp. for the morally steadfast mortal. I would suggest an alt. “(they) whose pronouncements hold broadly for the mortal who aims straight.” Sim. in the next hymn, II.28.3, where Ge’s “dessen Worte weithin reichen” is even clearer than here.

II.27.10: As noted above, this is the only vs. in the hymn devoted to a single Āditya – Varuṇa, not surprisingly. For the mirror image, see comm. ad II.28.3.

Note in b the juxtaposition *devā asura*, also remarked on by Re.

II.27.11: The med. pf. *ví cikite* is interpr. by all standard tr. as 1st sg. with “act.” sense (“I see”), though the middle pf. to this root is ordinarily passive / intransitive ‘is seen, appears’ (see Kü [176], who doesn’t treat this passage). Nonetheless, I do not see any alt. to the standard understanding of this form.

Note that *ví cikite* essentially paraphrases the datival inf. *vicákṣe* in 10b.

I don’t understand the force of the double *cīd*. If it’s taken in its common meaning ‘even’, it could define the extremes of human mental states – “*even* in naiveté ... *even* in wisdom (not to mention the vast territory in between).” Or in its common usage ‘also’, a double *cīd* could be the equivalent of “both ... and” or “now X, now Y.” This is the sense it seems to have in IV.10.5 *idā cīd āhna idā cīd aktóḥ* “now by day, now by night.”

Pāda d is essentially 14c. Since they contain identical verbs (*aśyām*) the tr. should be harmonized: substitute ‘reach’ for ‘attain’ here, and keep ‘reach’ in 14c and for the subjunctive *naśat* in 14d.

II.27.12: On the short vowel in the dat. pl. *ṛta-nībhyaḥ* of the root-noun cmpd *ṛta-nī* see Scar 287. He explains it as taken over from the *i*-stems, though this doesn’t make a lot of

sense, since *i*-stems don't have *-ī-* anywhere in their paradigm that could give rise to such an alternation. AiG III.187 (see also Ge n. 12a) cites a few further exx. in later Vedic of *X-nibhyaḥ*, without venturing an explanation. It's worth pointing out that the syllable is metrically heavy in any case.

I would give *dadāśa* the presential meaning 'serves', which also fits better with parallel *vardháyanti* in b. On the value of this pf. see Kü (242–43), acdg. to whom it is presential but with the implication of action in the past. In some passages (e.g., I.86.6, VI.3.2) it does have past reference in context, but here and in I.36.4 a presential interpr. is better. The fluctuation in usage may be the result of association with the apparently truncated pf. part., lexicalized *dāśváms-*, which has the presential stative value "pious" < "doing ritual service."

The position of *ca* makes for difficulties in interpr. pāda b. There are three basic possibilities: 1) the *ca* conjoins the two relative clauses in a and b despite its delayed position (so Re, JSK, DGRV I.256), and it should be tr. (per JSK) "who has worshipped the kings ... and whom the lasting prosperities strengthen ..."; 2) the *ca* signals a third rel. cl., whose subject is the nom. *puṣṭáyaḥ ... nityāḥ* (so Ge, WG, somewhat differently Scar 287 [but see n. 404]), and should be tr. (more or less) as "... whom they [=kings] strengthen and (whom) prosperities (accrue to, vel sim.)"; 3) the *ca* conjoins a 2nd subject phrase with the unexpressed subj. [=kings of pāda a] of *vardháyanti* (JPB) ("whom they and the prosperities strengthen"). Of the three I prefer the third, found in the publ. tr., as best accounting for the position and usual subclausal function of *ca* and requiring the least extra machinery.

II.27.14: As noted above pāda c is essentially 11d.

II.27.15: It is not clear to me what *sādhū* is meant to express, and tr. vary. But "both sides are straightforward for him" in the publ. tr. is opaque to me. I think it more likely that it means "both sides have him as their goal" – that is, they are focused on him.

II.27.16: For the isolated prec. 1st sg. *yeṣam* (to $\sqrt{yā}$) see my 1999 "Vedic type *dheyām*" p. 171 and n. 24, with the lit. cited there – esp. KH, "Der vedische Prekativetyp *yeṣam*, *jeṣma*," MSS 20 (1967) = Aufs. 465–74.

II.28 Varuṇa [SJ on JPB]

II.28.1: The stem *yajátha-* in its ten occurrences is only found as the dat. *yajáthāya*, and it always has (quasi-)infinitival value, "to sacrifice / to be sacrificed (to)." The other occurrences are construed with Agni as subj. and thus have the active sense; here a passive value is more appropriate. I would substitute "the god exceedingly delightful to sacrifice to."

II.28.2: The pl. *subhágāsaḥ* looks back to *subhágah* in II.27.15.

The structure of the publ. tr of this vs. is a bit fuzzy, and in particular the affiliation of pāda c is unclear. Since it refers to the advent of dawn, the time when the action of pāda d should take place, I'd slightly alter the tr. to "Might we be possessed of good fortune under your commandment -- we who have praised you very attentively, o

Varuṇa -- / at the approach of the cattle-rich dawns awakening [/singing] like fires throughout the days.”

The med. thematic pres. *járate* belongs to two different roots \sqrt{gr} / $\sqrt{gṛ}$ ‘awake’ / ‘sing’ (see, inter alia, Gotō, 1st cl. 150–51, 153–56). Though the standard tr. (incl. JPB and in fact WG) take it only to ‘awake’ here, both meanings are applicable: fires “awaken” when they are kindled at the dawn sacrifice, but they “sing” by virtue of their crackling and hissing. For a clear ex. of *járate* ‘sings’ used of Agni at dawn, see I.127.10 cited by Gr.

II.28.2–3: The initial pādas of these two vss. have parallel structure, beginning with *táva*, containing the opt. *syāma*, as well as a loc. on which *táva* depends. The order of the two latter elements is scrambled, however.

II.28.3: In addition to its relationship to 2a, pāda a rephrases II.28.7cd from the last hymn: ... *śárma, úpa syāma puruvîrāḥ* ..., but there *puruvîrāḥ* modified the subject of *syāma* (“we”), while here it modifies Varuṇa. This interchange illustrates the productive ambiguity of *bahuvrīhi*s, which can mean both “have (to give)” (of gods) and “have (received)” of mortals (see disc. ad II.27.9 above about *urusāṃsa*-). And as was established there, *urusāṃsa*- in this context seems to mean ‘whose pronouncements hold broadly’, and I would substitute that meaning here. The double sense of *urusāṃsa*- is recognized by Re in his n., but not reflected in his tr.

Just as in II.27 a single vs. (II.27.10) addressed to Varuṇa interrupted the otherwise unbroken focus on the Ādityas, so here a hemistich (cd) addressed to the Ādityas interrupts the sole focus on Varuṇa.

The lexeme *abhí√kṣam* ‘be indulgent’ occurs only in this limited group of hymns: II.29.2, II.33.1, 7, as well as here. Since it otherwise doesn’t take a verbal complement, I would slightly rephrase the publ. tr. “indulge us to be yoked (with you)” to “be indulgent to us, for yoke-fellowship.”

II.28.4: On *ví√dhr* with rivers, see II.13.7 and comm. thereon.

On the usage of *paptúḥ* here see Kü 293 and n. 474. To bring out the particular nuance of this form, “have been flying” (as suggested by IH) might be better.

II.28.5–7: These middle vss. contain the poet’s direct appeal to Varuṇa, mostly to avert bad consequences of his own actions or of Varuṇa’s caprice.

II.28.6: As in IX.19.6, the transmitted *bhiyásam* should be read *bhyásam*. Further, the HvN display, with *mát* opening pāda b, should be corrected: *mát* ends pāda a (which conforms much better with the syntax as well as the meter), and b begins with *sámrañ*.

The publ. tr. of pāda d, “I cannot be away from you even for the blink of an eye,” conforms to that of Ge, Re, WG, and comes easily into English, with “blink of an eye” a measure of time. However, it does not represent the Sanskrit. As Re points out in his n. (despite his tr.), it would be the only ex. of $\sqrt{īś}$ meaning “pourvoir (demeurer physiquement).” The root $\sqrt{īś}$ generally takes a gen. and means ‘be master of, be capable of’, so gen. *nimíṣaḥ* should be construed with *īśe*. More faithful to the text, flg. Thieme (M+A 69; so also Scar 386), “for at a distance from you I am not capable even of

blinking.” Presumably meaning that I am not able to perform even the smallest and most automatic action – though there is interference from the notion that gods themselves don’t blink and see all, as in the immed. preceding hymn II.27.9 *animiṣāḥ* ‘unwinking’.

II.28.7: The first prohibitive cl. (pāda a) lacks a verb, though *vadhīḥ* is easily supplied on the basis of the etymologically related *vadhaiḥ* and passages like I.104.8 *mā no vadhīḥ* -- although for drama’s sake the incomplete “Don’t with deadly weapons” might be enough (see KH 48 and 102).

All the standard tr. (incl. JPB) construe *iṣṭaú* not only with gen. *te*, but also with the acc. phrase *énaḥ kṛṇvántam*, which is then only secondarily the obj. of *bhrīṇánti*; see, e.g., Ge “die bei deiner Suche nach dem Sündigen ... (diesen) versehren.” But no other occurrences of loc. *iṣṭaú* take an acc.; it is only the infinitival dat. *iṣṭāye* that governs objects. Since there is a transitive verb available to govern the acc. here, I would tr. *te iṣṭaú* simply as “at your instigation” (if the multivalent *iṣṭi-* belongs to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’) or “in your quest” (if to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek’).

The transmitted form *bhrīṇánti* is the only form attested to this IXth Cl. pres. belonging to the root $\sqrt{bhrī}$. As already noted by Old (Proleg. 477–78) and so represented in HvN, it must be read **bhrīṇánti*, the historical justification for which had to wait until the development of the laryngeal theory and its account of the IXth Cl. presents. See EWA s.v. *BHRĪ*. The only other verb form attested to this root in Sanskrit is the *s*-aor. subj. *bhreṣate* in VII.20.6 (q.v.), though it is well represented in Iranian (see Cheung, *Etym. Dict. Iranian Verb*, s.v. *braiH).

II.28.9: The standard tr. take *sāvīḥ* as imperatival, I think correctly. Although KH (Injunk. 264) ascribes this usage simply to the lack of 2nd sg. impvs. to *iṣ*-aorists, I think in this case the fact that it is the positive counterpart to a *mā* prohibitive in pāda b also favors the use of the injunctive aor.

Contra the standard tr., JPB takes *mátḥkṛtāni* as parallel to but independent of *ṛṇā* “my debts ... and (other) things done by me,” clearly because of the unusual mid-pāda position of *ádha*. Although I am sympathetic to this arg., because of the contrastive *anyákṛta-* in b it might be better to follow the consensus: “the debts made [=contracted] by me.”

On *mā ... bhojam* see KH, Injunk. 96.

Although *no jīvān* is the direct object of *ā ... śādhi*, the lit. tr. is awk. I would substitute with the impersonal “so direct it for us to be alive at them [=dawns].”

II.29 All Gods

Although the Anukramaṇī assigns this hymn to the All Gods, thematically it continues the Āditya sequence of II.27–28, as is clear from the 1st vs., with addresses to the Ādityas and to Varuṇa and Mitra – though both generic gods (1c, etc.) and specific ones outside the Ādityan orbit (Indra and the Maruts, 3d) also figure. Nonetheless, the stress on offenses committed by the speaker (1, 5) and the mercy and forgiveness sought are of a piece with the preceding hymns, esp. II.28.

II.29.2: The sequence in pāda c, *abhikṣattāro abhí ca kṣámadhvam*, invites interpr. as an etymological figure, but the agent noun, as it stands, must belong to $\sqrt{kṣad}$ ‘mete out,

apportion.’ Old tentatively suggests an emendation to *abhikṣantār-* ($\sqrt{kṣam}$), though he also allows that the transmitted reading may be correct and the poet is playing with Gleichklang. This seems the better course, esp. given that the stem is found once elsewhere (VII.21.8), though *abhí* is not otherwise attested with this root. It’s worth noting that *abhí* $\sqrt{kṣam}$ is found only in this little group of hymns (II.28.3, II.33.1, 7, in addition to this).

The three *ca*’s in cd signal two different types of conjunction. The first, in the preverb + verb sequence *abhí ca kṣámadhvam*, conjoins this impv. with *mṛṣáyata* in d, in an inverse *ca* construction (X *ca* ... Y); the 2nd two, in d, conjoin the temporal expressions *adyā ca* ... *aparām ca*. This is Klein’s view as well (DGRV I.188, 190, 155; cf. II.39).

The reason for the accent on the main verbs (*abhí* ...) *kṣámadhvam* ... *mṛṣáyata* is not entirely clear, since neither begins its clause or pāda and they are not subordinated. They must be implicitly contrasted in some way, but, impressionistically, other such sequences are not accented. Klein (*Verbal Accentuation in the RV* [1992] 43–44) attributes the accentuation to the inverse *ca* construction.

II.29.3: As Ge and Re point out, the unexpressed conditional clause with the first hemistich should be something like “if you’re not going to help us *now*, what’s the use of friendship in the past or in the future.”

II.29.4: Pāda c presents interpretational difficulties, particularly if *ṛté* is taken as the loc. sg. of *ṛtá-* ‘truth’ with most interpr. The problem in that case is not merely *ṛté* but also how it relates to *madhyamaváh-*. None of the suggested tr. seems satisfactory to me, and though Old discusses the passage at some length, he ultimately suggests with some despair that *madhyama-váh-* is an unknown technical term in Fahrkunst. Given the unconvincing solutions suggested by others, I am inclined towards Re’s quite different interpr.: he takes *ṛté* as the postposition/adv. ‘without’ and construes it with *vah*. Old had already argued against the “without” interpr., on the grounds that there is no ablative and that *ṛté bhūt* occurs also at pāda end in VI.67.8 (where, however, I interpr. it as I do here). And, though *vah* is not technically an ablative enclitic [since no such form exists], it is fairly all-purpose in terms of case. Its distance from *ṛté* can be attributed to its taking Wackernagel’s position. With a “without” interpr. the rest of the pāda falls out: we do not wish for our chariot to be without you; *madhyama-váh-* then specifies where the chariot is traveling, possibly “in the middle of its journey” or “in the middle of a battle.” (Though I enthusiastically adopt Re’s analysis of *ṛté*, I am not at all convinced by his interpr. of this compound: he thinks *madhyama-* refers to a middling number of draft animals.) If the *vah* ... *ṛté* interpr. is rejected, the negative concept that prompts the *mā* prohibitive must rest in the cmpd. *madhyama-váh-* and specifically in the 1st member *madhyama-*. Old lays out some possibilities, crisply summarized by Scar (475). (Notably KH does not treat this pāda, though he does treat the immediately flg. 4d.) I would assume in this case that ‘middle’ refers to a middling or less than full effort or a position in the middle, rather than at the forefront. So I would consider an alternative (and in my view less preferable) translation “let your chariot not be traveling in a middling way / in the middle (of the pack) with regard to truth.” Although most X-*váh-* cmpds mean ‘drawing/conveying X’

(e.g., the lexicalized *anaḍvāh*- ‘ox’ < ‘pulling a wagon’; *indra-vāh*- ‘conveying Indra’), I don’t see how to get a direct obj. interpr. out of *madhyama*-.

II.29.5: In b we expect the simile “like a father his son”; instead we get the father, but a gambler in the place of the son. We must infer the filial relationship. (The distress of his family, including his father, over the fall of their gambler kin is depicted in X.34.4. Nonetheless the pairing here is peculiar.)

The expected son then appears in d. The purport of this pāda is clear -- the speaker asks that only he be punished for his offenses, not his son -- until we get to the simile. Why does the poet liken himself to a bird, and what can be supplied in the simile to match *putrē*? The standard tr. conclude, reasonably enough, that the comparison involves baby birds (or maybe eggs?) (e.g., Re “Ne me saisissez pas en (la personne de mon) fils, comme (on saisisit) un oiseau (en s’emparant de ses petits).”). But is this meant to imply that bird parents get more upset by the loss of their offspring than other animal parents do? or that robbing birds’ nests was a particularly prominent behavior? I am baffled. (MLW suggests that raiding birds’ nests for eggs might have been a common practice, which would have provoked strong reactions in the bird parents.) It is possible that the simile only has domain over the acc. *mā*, with no involvement of the loc. *putrē*: “do not seize me like a bird” -- expressing the trapping/snaring techniques of bird-catching. But this doesn’t make much sense either.

II.29.6: Technically speaking, pāda d has two ablatives: “rescue us from falling, from the pit.”

On the hapax *nijūr*- see Scar (165).

II.30 Indra and other divinities

This hymn has at least three, possibly four modern ling. features: conditional (*ābhariṣyat* vs. 2), future impv. (*kr̥nutāt* vs. 5 [though the fut. impv. appears to be inherited, it is fairly rare in the RV and generally seems to belong to a more colloquial speech level]), gerund (*abhikhyāya*, *hatvī* vss. 9, 10), and mid. subj. in *-ai* (*naśāmahai* vs. 11).

II.30.1: The ceaseless movement of the waters is clearly expressed in the first hemistich, and the question posed in the last pāda is a leading one, at least in my view. It asks at what (temporal) distance, i.e., how long ago, did the waters first start this movement. The implicit answer is “when they were released from Vṛtra’s hold,” which prepares for the account of the Indra-Vṛtra battle in the next vss. (On the unexpected long vowel in *kīyāti*, see comm. ad I.143.3.)

The problematic pāda is c, and this is in great part because of the uncertain interpr. of *aktūh*. Ordinarily this word means ‘night’, but since “the night of the waters” is a curious expression, most comm. instead implicitly derive it from $\sqrt{añj}$ and tr. ‘color’ vel sim. (e.g., Ge “das Farbenspiel der Gewässer”). With Old I take the word in its usual meaning ‘night’, contrasted with the āmreḍita *āhar-ahar* “day after day.” However, I think the expression “night of the waters” is used metaphorically and perhaps has oppositional semantics. The waters are often, esp. in treatments of the Vala myth, identified with the dawns. Here, perhaps, “night” is meant to evoke its opposite, “dawn” (a poetic device

we've seen elsewhere, e.g., I.103.7; see publ. intro. to I.103 and comm. ad loc.) and the whole expresses the fact that just as the waters keep flowing, so also do the dawns keep dawning. This interpr. may be too radical, however, and the point of the image may simply be how dark waters can look compared to the sky at dawn (or dusk) -- the "night of the waters" would capture this dark appearance under certain lighting conditions. This perception may be reflected in a passage in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā: MS IV.5.1 *apó vai rátrir dívā bhūtē prāviśati tasmād āpo dívā kṛṣṇā apó 'har náktam tasmād āpo náktam śuklāḥ* "Truly night enters the waters when it becomes day; therefore waters by day are black. Day (enters) the waters by night; therefore waters at night are bright." (MLW comments that the Germanic cognates of the *u*-stem do mean 'dawn' [Go. *uhtwo*, etc.])

II.30.2: The first hemistich of this vs. is desperately obscure. It is unclear what is being done to or for Vṛtra in pāda a, much less who is doing it, and the identity of the feminine subject in b is likewise left open. The function of *ābharīsyat*, the only conditional in the RV, is uncertain, and also, though this is the least of our problems, whether the verb is *ā* + *ābharīsyat* or is simply an augmented form without preverb (latter Pp.). The unclear meaning of the rare word *sīna*- simply adds to the difficulties.

Let us start with the last one first: the stem *sīna*- occurs twice in the RV (here and III.62.1, also as object of *√bhr* with dat. complement), as well as in the compd. *tāt-sīna*- (I.61.4) and the deriv. *sīnavant*- (X.102.11). As indicated in EWA s.v., its root affiliation depends on what we think it means, and what we think it means depends to some extent on what root we ascribe it to. I will not rehearse the various suggestions; suffice it to say that I think it belongs with *√sā* 'bind, tie' and refers to material tied down on a wagon vel sim., a load -- equipment and the like -- hence my 'gear'. (For a similar semantic development of a derivative of a different root meaning 'tie', see my "Sanskrit pāriṇāhya 'household goods': Semantic evolution in cultural context," Fs. E. Hamp [ed. D.Q. Adams], 1997, pp. 139-145.) In this I follow Old.

I also follow Old in my interp. of the rest of the pāda. Someone *was going to bring* equipment for Vṛtra (hence the conditional, as a contrary-to-fact), but was impeded by the action of the main clause in b: a female, identified as a genetrix (*jānitrī*) foils the plot by announcing it to a wise or knowing one (*vidūṣe*). That *ābharīsyat* is the only conditional form attested before the Brāhmaṇas (so Whitney) must mean that it carries a very particular force, one that could not be easily expressed by more standard parts of the verbal system.

The potential identities of these actors take us yet another step into the speculative wilderness. I *very tentatively* suggest that the potential accomplice of Vṛtra is Sūrya. There are two, rather shaky reasons for this suggestion: There is some evidence in the Rig Veda for enmity between Indra and Sūrya, particularly in the (alas fragmentary) myth where Indra in conjunction with Kutsa steals the wheel of the sun. This hostility is also found, more developed, in the Mahābhārata, as is well known. And within the vs. itself there is a possible reference to Sūrya in pāda c, in the phrase *pathó rādantīḥ ... asmai* "excavating the paths for him." Elsewhere in the RV Sūrya is the beneficiary of similar actions: VII.60.4 [*sūryaḥ* ...] *yásmā ādityā ádhvano rādanti*, VII.87.1 *rādat pathó váruṇaḥ sūryāya*. Although I know of no other evidence for Sūrya attempting an intervention on Vṛtra's behalf, I nonetheless tentatively supply him as subject of pāda a. The mother figure described as *jānitrī* in b could be the Earth, as sometimes (I.185.6, III.31.2), or

Indra's own mother (as in III.48.2, X.134.1). I have more confidence in Indra as the referent of *vidúṣe* 'knowing'.

As just noted, I think Sūrya may be the referent of *asmai* in pāda c -- or rather one referent, for I think the pāda is deliberately ambiguous. If I am right that Sūrya is the covert subject of pāda a, then the phraseological parallels to the "excavating paths" expression that have Sūrya as beneficiary would suggest him as referent of *asmai*. The feminine pl. agents could be the dawns, who make the path for the rising sun. But in the context of the Vṛtra battle that forms the subject of the first vss. of this hymn, this pāda may refer to the paths dug out by the waters when they were released from Vṛtra, with *asmai* referring to Indra. Both dawns and waters are potential subjects: the phraseology of pāda d would fit either (or both). Both waters and dawns go to their goal (cf. I.158.6 for waters, III.61.3 for dawns). Although *dhūni-* 'boisterous' seems more suitable for waters than dawns (cf. *dhūnimant-* 2x of waters, *dhunayanta* once with rivers as subj.), the emphasis on dailiness (*divé-dive*) might point rather to the dawns. In short, at least the second half-vs. seems deliberately ambiguous, with potentially double referents both for the female subject and the masc. beneficiary.

I have no confidence that my interpr. of this vs. is correct, but I find the other published attempts even less convincing. However, IH has suggested an alternative interpr. to me (p.c.) that is definitely worth considering. In this scenario the *sīnam* 'equipment' is Indra's mace, his '(fighting) gear' (so IH), brought to him (=Indra) *against* Vṛtra. Dat. *vṛtrāya* here would be a dative of malefit, as it were, exactly as it is in the next vs., 3b. The bringer of the *sīnam* could be Tvaṣṭar or even Uśanā Kāvya, two regular suppliers of the mace to Indra. In b the *jānitṛī* could be Vṛtra's mother, whom we memorably meet in I.32.9, and the knowing one (*vidúṣe*) Vṛtra himself, with the participle possibly proleptic.

The potential drawback to this interpr. is that we know that Indra *did* get the mace and smash Vṛtra, so the hypothetical value of the conditional isn't accommodated. But since we don't actually know what the value of the conditional was in the RV, this should not deter us. Alternatively there may have been a previous episode in the myth in which Indra's first attempt was thwarted when Vṛtra was tipped off. A revised tr. of the hemistich acdg. to this scenario would be "The one [=Tvaṣṭar? / UK?] who was going to carry the gear here for [=against] Vṛtra -- the mother [Vṛtra's mother] announced him to the knowing one [=Vṛtra?]." I would not substitute this tr. for mine, but simply offer it as an alternative.

On *divé-dive* see comm. ad 11 below.

II.30.3: This vs. is a fairly straightforward account of the Indra-Vṛtra battle, though Indra's name doesn't appear until the last word.

I don't quite understand the function of *hī* in pāda a. If it is causal (a value I always try to impose on *hī*), it may take up 2b: we know (at least in one interpr. of vs. 2) that Indra already knew (2b *vidúṣe*) about the trickery before the mother's announcement, because he had already taken his position in the midspace. But this may be over-thinking *hī*. The *hī* in c is even harder to account for, and I wonder if it isn't there to provide a mirror-image figure: *mīham ... hīm á(dudrot)* and to serve as hiatus breaker between *úpa* and *īm*. IH offers an alternative explanation for the two *hī*'s. In IH's account of RVic verbal function, aorists in subordinate clauses express anteriority. Here the *hī* would be a

fine expression of post hoc, ergo propter hoc, with sequential events acquiring a causal cast: “because he had taken his stand, he bore down his weapon” and “because he had run up to him, he conquered ...”

In b *vṛtrāya* ACC *prá √ bhr̥* echoes 2a *vṛtrāya* ACC *√ bhr̥*. In my interpr. these expressions are contrastive and have different subjects and different intents (though see IH’s interpr. above): in 2a the dat. *vṛtrāya* is a dative of benefit, in 3b a dative of, as it were, malefit. The same *vajrāya* WEAPON *prá √ bhr̥* as 3b is found in I.61.12. The *prá √ bhr̥* expression may be slyly alluded to even in our vs. 2, where *prá* opens pāda b and is therefore adjacent to *ābhariṣyat* pāda-final in a, even though it is construed with *uvāca* at the end of b.

In c *Vṛtra* must be the subj., even though it breaks the pattern: Indra is the unexpressed subj. of a and b and postposed subj. of d. However, *Vṛtra* has a penchant for mist (e.g., I.32.13, V.32.4), and in this context it would uniquely identify him.

II.30.4: The vs. is nicely framed with vocc., *#bṛhaspate ... indra#*, thus inviting their identification.

Ge (/WG) take *vṛkadvaras-* as a PN, but Wackernagel’s explan. (KISchr. 325–26), adducing Aves. *duuar*, a daevic way of moving, is quite convincing.

ardhām √ kr̥ ‘go halves’ (also VI.44.18) strikes me as an idiomatic or slangy expression, which may fit with the rare (and also possibly lower-register) future impv. *kr̥nutāt*.

II.30.6: WG tr. *radhrāsyā ... yājāmānasya* as “des ermatteten Opferers” and further explain that sacrificing under the hot South Asian sun is exhausting. But surely the point is rather that even a resolute enemy gets slammed down by Indra and Soma (pāda a), while even a weakling gets pepped up if he performs sacrifice to them.

II.30.7: *tandran* is, of course, a curious form. The Pp., not surprisingly, reads *tandrat* (with *-t → -n* before *nā*). Gr emends this to **tandat*; Whitney (Rts) list the form thus, though with ?; and Old allows it as a possibility, without exactly endorsing it. IH suggests following the Saṃhitā reading and interpreting it as a 3rd pl. med. root aor., with ending *-ran*. The only other verbal form to this root, *tandate*, is medial. If this is correct, there would seem to be a change of no. in the subj. from the impersonal 3rd sgs. of the standard tr. to an unspecified 3rd pl.: “It will not tire nor weary me, and they will not flag.” Who the plural subject might be is unclear -- perhaps the 1st plural that is found in the next pāda. And in fact all three verbs could be 3rd pl.: the Pp. 3rd sgs. *tamat* and *śramat* also appear immediately before *n-*, with Saṃhitā *-an*. Under this interpretation the forms would not be impersonal but have unspecified plural subj.: “they will/do not tire or weary me nor do they flag.” If we prefer to accept the emendation to **tandat*, the *-r-* can be explained, with Gr., as adopted from the nominal derivatives (*á-*)*tandra-* and *tandra(yú-)* (cf. also AV *tandr̥-*).

II.30.8: Note that pāda a is modeled exactly on 6c.

II.30.9: Ge (/WG) supply a verb as the 1st member of the disjunctive *utá vā* constr., contrasting with *jighatnúḥ* (“Wenn uns ein Unbekannter (nachstellt), oder töten will ...”),

invoking VI.5.4 with *yó naḥ sánutyā abhidāsat* ... But more salient in VI.5.4 is the contrastive pair *yāḥ ... sánutyāḥ ... yó ántaraḥ* ... Therefore, flg. Schmidt (B+I 81; also Klein DGRV II.171), I supply *yó ántaraḥ* as the 2nd part of the disjunctive phrase. Re actually proposes a clever variation on the “distant ... near” contrast, pairing *abhikhāya*, which he renders “(regandant) en face,” with *sánutyāḥ*. This avoids the need to supply additional material, but employing the rare gerund simply as a polar term with ‘distant’ seems unlikely.

As Gr points out, the idiomatic sense ‘hand over, deliver’ is characteristic of *pári √ dā*, not *pári √ dhā*, which generally means ‘clothe, surround’. He suggests that this sense of *pári √ dhā* is attributable to “Verwechslung mit dā.” In a quick scan of the Gr’s conspectus of *dhā* forms, I found only one example of *pári √ dhā* ‘deliver’, namely our *pári dhehi*. I wonder if *dhehi* for **dehi* is a nonce hypercorrection, for a form that might have appeared to have undergone Grassmann’s Law because of the *-hi* ending.

II.30.10: The literal meaning of *ánudhūpita-* is fairly clear, ‘besmoked’, but there is disagreement about its sense. Gr suggests that it means ‘puffed up, arrogant’, while Ge (/WG) think it refers to besieging enemy strongholds with fire and smoke. (If this were the case, one would think “a long time” was the wrong qualifier: smoke and fire should do the trick fairly quickly or not at all, I would think.) I am more in favor of Re’s equivalence with *mohita-* ‘bewildered’, a negative mental state. In my view, ‘besmoked’ means either that their minds have been darkened and led astray to evil ways *or* that they have become confused / befuddled by our constant threats and attacks and it is time for us to administer the coup de grâce.

II.30.11: On the ring between 1c #*áhar-ahar* and 11d *divé-dive*#, see publ. intro. What I failed to note there (as IH pointed out to me) is that the *áhar-ahar* of vs. 1 was “repaired” by *divé-dive* in 2d, and the *divé-dive* here is responsive to both of them.

II.31 All Gods

Ge (/WG) follows Windisch (Fs. Roth) in seeing this hymn as an allegory, with *rátha-* ‘chariot’ = *stóma-* ‘praise’ and the solution provided only in the last vs. I find this interpr. overblown. The equation of the hymn / sacrifice with a chariot is a trite trope in the RV; I don’t see that this hymn treats the theme in a special way, but perhaps I’m missing something.

II.31.1: As pointed out in the publ. intro., the last word of the vs., *vanarśád-* ‘sitting in/on the wood(s)’, applies both to the simile -- the birds sitting in the trees -- and the frame -- the charioteers sitting on the wooden chariot. The same qualifier could also characterize other aspects of the sacrifice -- the ritual fires sitting on the firewood, the soma drinks in the wooden cups (for both of which see X.46.7). It is more difficult to apply it to the priests, who are presumably the underlying referents of the plural subject here.

II.31.5: The root noun cmpd *apījū-* is somewhat puzzling, in that the 1st member *api-* (*apī-* with lengthening at cmpd seam; for possible explan. see Scar 169 nn. 223, 224) seems to contribute nothing. In fact, the standard tr. simply ignore it. Scar is on the right track, I

think, in taking it as only loosely compounded and meaning something like “also speeders,” perhaps, in order to preserve some compd sense, “speeders in addition.”

On *nāvyaśā vácaḥ* see comm. ad VIII.39.2.

Pāda d in itself and in its syntactic relation to c is also problematic. Perhaps the first, and possibly the easiest, issue is the apparently untethered *ca*. Klein (DGRV I.226–27) takes it as conjoining the two pādas c and d, but this requires supplying a verb (*kr̥nve*, flg. Ge) that has no support. I think rather that it signals a standard syntagm that has been split across the vs.: “the still and the moving” (gen. *sthātúr jágataś ca* VII.60.2, X.63.8, plus other examples with *ca*-less phrases and lexical substitutions) is a common merism for “everything earthly.” In this verse pl. *jāgatām* is found in b, where Night and Dawn are the speeders of moving things; here its formulaic partner, the still (in the sg.), is about to receive an underlayer of vigor. The *ca* simply reminds us that b and d are implicitly contrasted: moving things are impelled to even more movement, whereas still things are about to acquire a solid base. To draw attention to the pairing it might be worthwhile to begin the tr. of d with “and as for the still (world) ...”

Another of the questions is the grammatical identity of *trīvayāḥ*: is this bahuvrīhi *s*-stem a nom. sg. masc., as it appears to be, or a nom./acc. neut., modifying *vāyaḥ*? Although the latter interpr. might seem ungrammatical, Wackernagel (AiG III.288) tentatively allows neut. *-s*-stem nom./acc. in *-āḥ*, though the number of exx. he cites is small (see Lanman, Noun Infl. 560, for a longer but less reliable list) and it is possible that they could all be explained in other ways. Nonetheless, in VII.24.2 (see comm. ad loc.) I do take *dvibárhā(h)* as a neut.; in IV.11.3 and X.80.4 *vīrápeśā(h)* must have a neut. sg. reading, sim. *devávyacā(h)* in III.4.4; and a neut. interpr. is the standard one for *trīvayāḥ* here (e.g., Re “la vigueur tri-vigorante”). By contrast I take it in the publ. tr. as a nom. sg. masc., modifying the 1st sg. subject of *stuśé*, hence “I possessing triple vigor ...” I still think this is quite possible, but I do not consider the alternative (“... to strew triple vigorous vigor as the underlayer ...”) out of the question.

The last question is who is doing the strewing. In my publ. tr. it is “I,” and again I still consider this possible. But I think it’s also possible that I praise Heaven and Earth so that *they* will provide the underlayer. This is esp. likely if *trīvayāḥ* is taken as neut.: “I praise you two ... (for you) to strew triple-vigorous vigor ...” The pair, or at least Earth, makes sense as the cosmic entity that would provide a base for the still, whereas Night and Dawn, in constant motion, make sense as the speeders of the moving things.

II.31.6: The first hemistich begins and ends with *utá*. The pāda-final *utá* of 6b puts a cap on the series of verse-initial *utá*’s that began in 3a (3a, 4a, 5a, 6a). This is perhaps fitting because vs. 6 ends the capacious list of gods of every sort (from mighty Indra to shadowy Aja Ekapad) who have been strung together additively.

The vs., or rather pādas a and d, plays on *ś*: *śáṃsam uśijām ... śmasi / āśuhémā ... śámi*. This may be in part to showcase the unusual truncated verb *śmasi* ending pāda a; note that verse-final *śámi* is a virtual anagram of this verb. This *śámi* is also echoed by hemistich-final *sám* in 7b (in an unusual position). There are also echoes from earlier in the hymn: *āśu*-picks up *āśávaḥ* (2a) as *ékapād* does *pádyābhiḥ* (likewise 2a). IH cleverly points out that the position of *śmasi* after (*i*)*va* ([*ī*] *va śmasi*) hints at the root $\sqrt{vaś}$. See *vaśmi* in the next vs.

The Uśij-priests are credited with the production of a particular *śáṃsa*- elsewhere, the *āyóḥ śáṃsa*- (IV.6.11, V.3.4). For further see comm. ad II.32.2.

For echoes of this vs. in X.92.12, see comm. ad loc.

II.31.7: The 1st sg. *vaśmi* may be seen as a type of poetic repair, anchoring the truncated *(u)śmasi* of 6a.

II.32 Various Gods

II.32.1: The first hemistich here, with the skeleton *asyá me dyāvāprthivī ... bhūtám avitrī vácasaḥ* ... “become helpers of this speech of mine, o Heaven and Earth” is somewhat reminiscent of the famous refrain in I.105 *vittám me asyá rodasī* “take heed of this (speech) of mine, you two world halves,” though with aid rather than mere attention asked of Heaven and Earth. The different ordering of the two genitives *asyá* and *me* in the two passages conforms to our expectations of the positioning of enclitics.

The syntax of the second hemistich is rather stiff and clotted, with an oblique nominal relative clause (“of which two there is extensive lifetime”) picked up by a long main clause beginning in the middle of pāda c with the 3rd ps. du. prn. *té*. It is only after some time that we discover that *té* is an accusative, the object of verse-final *dadhe*, and that it is doubled by du. enclitic *vām*, which switches the reference to 2nd ps. The enclitic *vām* is very oddly placed, smack in the middle of pāda d, not leaning on any of its adjacent elements semantically, as far as I can see. Moreover, *puráh ... dadhe* seems to be a phrasal verb, but with the two parts of the phrase distant from each other and separated by extraneous material.

II.32.2: The first pāda of this vs. is esp. puzzling. As usual in the RV, Āyu sows confusion, and here, since it is not clear who/what Āyu represents, it is also unclear with what to construe the gen. *āyóḥ*. The standard interpr. take it with *rípaḥ* ‘swindles, tricks’, while I attach it to *áhan* ‘day’ (with no confidence in its correctness; Old explicitly rejects it). The problem is that Āyu is generally viewed positively, including in Maṇḍala II, as in II.2.8 where the ritual fire is “the guest dear to Āyu” and II.4.2 where the Bhṛgu deposit the ritual fire “among the clans of Āyu.” If Āyu is positive in value, then the “swindles of Āyu” must be those directed against him, as Old points out. But as he also points out, the more natural reading of this gen. would be subjective (“swindles perpetrated by Āyu”), not objective. It must be admitted that once in this maṇḍala (II.14.7), Āyu *is* viewed negatively: Indra strikes down the heroes of Āyu along with those of Kutsa and Atithigva, a trio that is subject to Indra’s violence elsewhere, though also individually named as Indra’s comrades in still other passages. More to the point, in my opinion, is the apparent formula VERB *uśíjaḥ śáṃsam āyóḥ* “The Uśij-priests X-ED the Laud of Āyu” (IV.6.11, V.3.4). In the immediately preceding hymn, II.31, we find in 6a the expression *śáṃsam uśíjām* “the Laud of the Uśij-priests,” and in the next vs., 7b, the Āyu-s (pl.) figure as fashioners of ritual speech. This suggestive juxtaposition and echo of the fuller expression “Laud of Āyu” found in the preceding closely related hymn suggest that Āyu here is viewed positively and is related to the ritual; I therefore think that “the day of Āyu” is a way of referring to the day of the sacrifice.

Most forms belonging to the thematic stem *dābha-* must be root aor. subjunctives, but here the *mā* requires an injunctive. Formally the root aor. injunctive should have a zero-grade root, **dbhan*, but obviously such a form is not viable. With full-grade restored, the injunctive is identical to the subjunctive. On these forms see Hoffman (Injunk. 242–43), who suggests that a new injunc. *dabhur* was created to avoid this functional coincidence.

sakhyā occurs several times with *vívyu* ‘keep away’. Narten (Sig. Aor. 214) states that the *s*-aor. to this root is intrans., and Ge (/WG) render it thus here: “Nicht soll sich unserer Freundschaft lösen,” presumably with neut. pl. *sakhyā* as subj. of the sg. verb. However, VIII.86.1 *mā no ví yausṭam sakhyā*, with dual verb seems to me decisive for a transitive interpr. of this idiom. In the publ. tr. (“Do not keep us far away from your companionship”) I take *sakhyā* as an instr. (sg.) of separation. However, it is also possible that it is an acc. pl., with the tr. “Do not keep your companionship(s) far away from us.” See IV.16.20.

The phrase *viddhí tāsya naḥ* (“know this (speech?) of ours” in the publ. tr) resonates with I.105 *vittám me asyá* “take heed of this (speech?) of mine, which I adduced above in regard to *asyá me* ... opening our 1a. It might better have been tr. with “take heed.”

II.32.3: The priests’ *sumnāyatā mānasā* “with a mind seeking favor” is, hopefully, matched by the god’s *āheḥatā mānasā* “with a mind without anger.”

As in the previous hymn, II.31.2, *pádyābhiḥ* is directly adjacent to a form of *āśú-* ‘swift’. Ge (/WG) take *pádyā-* as ‘heels’: “(Wie) en siegesstarkes Rennpferd mit den Fersen.” The image assumed must be from horseback riding, with the rider spurring the horse on by putting pressure on the horse’s flank with his heels. But the evidence for horseback riding in the RV is scant, and, as I understand it, the racing that is done involves chariots. (On the other hand, there may be mention of “a hero on horseback” [*vīró árvati*] in the next hymn, II.33.1, though it probably refers to Rudra.) Not only does this heel-spurring not fit the realia, as far as we know it, but it makes trouble for the verbal structure, because “with the heels” would at best only be appropriate to the simile (“(like) a swift prize-winner”) not the frame (“you”: we are hardly likely to be poking the god in the side with our heels). And finally, although the heel is of course a part of the foot and so *pádyā-/pádyā-* could in theory refer to it, no other occurrences of either of these stems seems so specialized, and we do have a perfectly good inherited word for ‘heel’, *pārṣṇi-*. I therefore think *pádyā-* means ‘pace, footstep’. In the simile, “with paces” would refer either to the training the horse is put through or to the pace of another horse running in front or at its side meant to keep the *vājín-* up to speed. Its use in the frame is more complex. On the one hand, the steps can refer to the movements of the Adhvaryu around the ritual ground; his physical activity is implicitly contrasted with the verbal activity (*vācasā*) of the Hotar (and Udgātar). I also think that *pádyā-* can refer to verses measured in feet, metrical measures. Although Re thinks this unlikely (“tentant, mais trop hardi”), I see nothing against it.

II.32.4: The adj. *śatādāya-* has a more precise meaning than the standard tr. (e.g., Ge “vollwertigen”) and one different from that in the publ. tr. (“having a hundred shares,” flg. Gr). It was long ago established by Roth (ZDMG 41: 672–76) that this has to do with

Wergeld or the worth of a man as measured in cows, hence here ‘(for whom) a hundred (cows) are to be given’; cf. Ge’s n. 4d, Macdonell-Keith Vedic Index s.v. *vaira*, and V.61.8 with comm. ad loc. I would therefore emend the tr. to “a hero worth a hundred (cows) ...”

II.32.8: The divine females named here, including Sinīvālī and Rākā, are all found elsewhere, except for Guṅgū (*guṅgū*). She is presumably connected in some way to the people called Guṅgu (*guṅgú-*) found in X.48.7, to whom Indra restores one Atithigva.

II.33 Rudra

This is a much-anthologized hymn, fully translated by Macdonell in VRS, Doniger, and Maurer. Its popularity is not surprising: it’s lively and varied, but does not pose major difficulties, though it has its share of small knots.

Re EVP XV.157–60.

II.33.1: The only difficult pāda is c, which has received a variety of interpr. The first question is whether *vīró árvati* should be construed together or *árvati* taken with some other part of the clause. With Ge (/WG) I take the two words together in the publ. tr.; most other tr. (Macdonell, Re, Doniger, Maurer) take it with *naḥ* or directly with the verb *abhí ... kṣameta*. Ge (/WG) take the hero to be one of us, a human; this leads Ge to interpr. the verb as passive (“Es möge unser Kriegermann zu Ross verschont blieben”), although all forms of this idiom, med. *abhí√kṣam*, all of which appear in this little group of hymns (II.28.3, 29.2, 33.1, 33.7), have the same meaning, “be indulgent/patient towards” (see esp. vs. 7). With most tr. I instead understand *vīrá-* to be Rudra; it is appropriate to ask for his indulgence or patience. This leads us to the question of whether Rudra is likely to be on horseback. I know of no evidence for or against, but given that Rudra is the Maruts’ father and they are often associated with horses, it is certainly possible. However, the only other occurrence of *árvati* in the RV (VIII.71.12) appears to be an unmarked loc. absolute: we ask Agni for help “when a charger (is at stake).” It is therefore possible that the same usage is found here, and the pāda should mean “The hero should be indulgent to us when a charger (is at stake).” I leave the question open.

II.33.3: This is the only occurrence of sg. *vájra-bāhu-* that doesn’t qualify Indra. (The only non-sg. form is dual *vájra-bāhū* addressed to Indra and Agni in I.109.7.) I do not know why Rudra is thus identified here.

II.33.4: The *sáhūti-*, a joint invocation (with another god or gods), may be a sore subject for Rudra. As pointed out in the publ. intro., he receives only three hymns dedicated to him alone in the RV; otherwise two hymns joint with Soma and incidental mentions in hymns to other gods. He may feel slighted. See also disc. ad VI.49.10.

II.33.5: I am in agreement with most tr. (though not Macd.) that pāda b is the thought of the subject of the rel. cl. in pāda a, namely the over-zealous sacrificer. The verb *áva ... diśīya* belongs not with *√dā* ‘give’ (with Gr), but *√dā* ‘cut, divide’ (so already Wh Roots); see esp. Narten (Sig Aor. 138–40). The idiom *áva√dā* is generally taken, including by Narten, to mean ‘abfinden’ (propitiate, compensate), but I think it has a

more literal meaning here, ‘cut off’. The too-little ritual service of vs. 4 -- poor praise (*dúṣṭuti-*) and shared invocation (*sáhūti-*) -- meets the contrasting fault in vs. 5: the over-eager worshiper who wants Rudra as his own exclusively. This is a dramatic opposite of the *sáhūti-*; not only an invocation directed only to this god, but one not jointly produced by the group of priests and worshippers. Such a private one-on-one human-divine relationship would be quite anomalous in the RVic religious world, where divine service requires cooperation among various ritual personnel. The personal appeals in the Vasiṣṭha-Varuṇa hymns of VII have such a strong impact in part because they deviate so far from ordinary religious practice.

The standard interpr. of the second hemistich makes the main clause rather loosely attached to the rel. cl. of pāda a. The “us” (*naḥ*) of c is supposed to pick up the *yáḥ* of a and the *manā-* of d is supposed to refer rather vaguely to the sentiment expressed in ab: in other words, we don’t want to be the sort of person who might think such a thing or be suspected of thinking such a thing. I think the connection is much simpler. *manā-* is generally ‘zeal’ or ‘enthusiasm’; it is not inherently a negative notion, but becomes negative in the wrong hands (or mind). In my interpr., the “whoever” of the rel. cl. in a is our sacrificial rival, who is trying to cut us out of the deal, as it were, by getting Rudra to himself. We beg Rudra not to make us subject to, subordinate to, his over-zealous action.

The epithet *rdūdára-* ‘tender-hearted’ is a charming phonetic play on Rudra’s name, which is almost always read trisyllabically (*r^udara*) in this hymn.

Another adj. (see 3b above) otherwise used (almost) exclusively of Indra: *suśípra-* ‘well-lipped’ (of Agni V.22.4; in pl. of Ṛbhukṣans VII.37.1).

II.33.6: On *ghīṇī* see Old.

I take ‘favor’ (*sumnám*) as the gapped goal of the verb in c, *aśīya* ‘might I reach’.

II.33.7: In b the *yó ástī ...* clause might appear to be embedded in the main clause, if c resumes the question posed in a. However, c could simply be part of the rel. cl. Even if b is embedded, it is unproblematic, since nominal rel. clauses are an exception to the no-embedding rule, functioning rather like izafe-s. See my “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe” forthcoming in a Fs.

In d *abhī ... cakṣamīthāḥ* reprises 1c *abhī ... kṣameta*. Given that final lengthening in the preverb *abhī* is extremely rare (Lub: 739 *abhī*, 14 *abhī̃*), I am inclined to interpr. the form as *abhī ī*, with the enclitic acc. anticipating the obj. *mā*, esp. given that in vs. 1 in this same idiom *abhī* appears without length. For another ex. of *ī* coalescing with a final short *i*, see *rākṣatī* < *rākṣati* + *ī* in II.26.4.

II.33.8: The verb in c, *namasyā*, can be either 2nd sg. impv. or 1st sg. subj., and translations differ. Because of the surrounding 1st ps. verbs (b: 1st sg. *īrayāmi*, d: 1st pl. *grṇīmāsī*) I opt for the 1st sg. subjunctive, though there are no implications either way.

kalmalīkīn- is obviously a possessive *-īn*-stem built to a *-ka*-suffixed form of *kalmalī-*, found once in the AV (XV.2.1–4) in unclear meaning, as descriptor of a jewel. The *ī*s and the reduplicative rhyming formation (*kal-ma-*) mark it as non-standard and suggest that it is affective in some fashion. My tr. “sparkling one” is similar to those of others, but given the uncertainty of the word and its base, it should have been marked with a question mark.

II.33.9: The tr. should be slight adjusted to “this ... world,” to reflect the adjectival demonst. *asyá*.

II.33.10: Given that the two words for ‘bow’, *dhānus-* and *dhānvan-*, are suppletive in the RV with the former supplying the nom./acc. sg. and the latter the rest of the paradigm (see disc. ad VI.75.2), my tr. of *dhānvā* (and indeed the various tr. of Re, Macd, Doniger, and Maurer; Ge’s “trägst du Pfeile und Bogen” is ambiguous, because Bogen is both sg. and pl.) as singular must be wrong, and Gr’s identification of the form as pl. is correct. In fact, though the Pp reads *dhānva* with short final, in the Saṃhitā text the word spans the pāda boundary and coalesces with the following word as *dhānvārhann* and so could be underlyingly *dhānvā*, with an unambig. pl. ending. In any case I would alter the publ. tr. to “arrows and bows.”

The VP in c, *idām dayase víśvam ābhvam*, is variously rendered: Ge “verfügst du über all diese Gewalt,” Macd “wieldest all this force” (sim. Doniger, Maurer) versus Re “tu détruis tout mal-informe,” WG “... zerstörst du all dieses Unwesen.” I do not think either of these approaches is correct. On the one hand, *ābhva-* does not mean ‘power’, but rather ‘formless(ness)’, often conceived as monstrous (Re’s ‘mal-informe’ [badly shapeless], though odd, seems close). Nor does *dayate*, if belonging to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘cut, divide, distribute’ as Ge et al. seem to take it, mean ‘wield, have control’. As for the other view, Re simply states that *dāyate* can mean ‘destroy’, while WG explicitly adopt Gotō’s view (1st class pres., 172–74) that there are two distinct roots $\sqrt{dā}$ that have *dāyate* as pres., one ‘divide, distribute’, the other ‘destroy’. None of the passages adduced by Gotō for ‘destroy’ requires segregation in a separate root that has little else to support its existence; they can all be seen as metaphorical extensions of ‘divide, cut apart’ (3 of the 5 passages occur with *vī*), an extension well within the bounds of RVic poetic imagination (though perhaps not of all its commentators). My own view is that the action attributed to Rudra here is a cosmogonic one, regularly performed by other Rigvedic gods, namely the division of the formless chaos of the pre-creation universe into what will later be referred to by the expression “name-and-form” (*nāma-rūpa-*) As I have discussed in numerous other places (see, e.g., my someday (?) forthcoming “The Blob in Ancient India”), the Vedic conception of creation involves division into separate entities, with clear boundaries and names, of an originally fuzzy boundary-less mass, which strikes horror in the hearts of Vedic people. In my view, the verb *dayate* here has its standard root meaning, ‘cut, divide, apportion’, and Rudra is engaged in cosmogonic division. In this sense the verb often occurs with the preverb *vī*, which sometimes occurs directly after the verb occupying post-caesura position (e.g. ... *dāyase vī* ... VI.37.4, VII.23.4). Although the preverb is not found here, *víśvam* immediately follows the verb and evokes the preverb. Note a different use of the same root in vs. 5; also note that *nāma* is found in 8d and *-rūpa-* in 9a, evoking the notion “name and form.”

In my publ tr. I did not fully render the *idām*, however. I would substitute “this whole formless void” or perhaps “the whole formless void here.”

II.33.12: Although most tr. (Ge, Re, Doniger, Maurer, but not Macd) take *nānāma* as 1st sg., with nom. *kumārāḥ* relegated to a simile, I follow Kü (278) (and Macd., see also Gr) in taking *nānāma* as 3rd sg. For one thing, *cid* isn’t a simile particle (*pace* Ge), and so this

would have to be an unmarked simile (not, of course, impossible), and for another we might expect (or at least hope for) **nānama* with short root vowel as a 1st sg. pf. The point of the half-vs. must be that even a little boy knows to honor someone more powerful and distinguished than he is, and so I surely know to do the same.

II.33.13: The *śām(tama)*- here makes a ring with *śāmtama*- in 2a.

Note that in HvN the voc. *vr̥ṣaṇo* is wrongly given as accented (*vr̥ṣaṇo*).

II.33.14: As IH pointed out to me, *gāt* in b should have a modal reading, either as an injunc. matching the precative value of the preceding verb *vr̥jyāḥ* or expressing the imperatival value often found in root aor. injunctives; hence either “should go around us” or “let it go around us.”

The mid. impv. (*áva ...*) *tanuṣva* suggests that it is Rudra’s own bows that should be un-strung. Recall that he bore the bow in 10a (*bibharṣi ... dhánva*).

II.33.15: In the publ. tr., the *yáthā* cl. is rendered as a purpose cl. (“... that you do not become angry ...”), but *yáthā* purpose cls. always take the subjunctive, as Macd. already pointed out. It should rather be construed with the vs.-initial *evā*, in the usual “just as ..., so ...” relationship, though with the usual order reversed. Macd. also recognized this, but suggested that *evā* is “to be taken with c, since in the normal syntactical order it should follow *yáthā* in the sense which it has here.” This is a trickier piece of syntax than I think can be justified — hopscotching the *evā* over the whole *yáthā* clause — and the contents of c do not conform to the standard usage of summary *evā*. Instead I think *evā* sums up the successful achievement of the wishes expressed in the preceding vs. (and perhaps in the whole preceding hymn): “even as you are not angry and do not smite, so (it is): the missile has avoided us, the bows are unstrung, etc.” This is somewhat hard to render in Engl., but I would change the publ. tr. to “Just as you are not angry and do not smite, so (it has come to pass).”

II.34 Maruts

A very difficult hymn, whose problems were perhaps not sufficiently signalled in the publ. intro.

II.34.1: Old rejects the cmpd interpr of *dhārāvarā-* and takes *-varā-* as a suffix meaning ‘reich an’; Ge (/WG, the latter explicitly) follow his interpr. But as Re pts. out there is no such secondary suffix in the RV -- *pace* Debrunner (AiG II.2.908), who lists this as the earliest example of the *-vara-* / *-vala-* suffix in the sense of *-vant-*. It is also Deb’s only *r*-form; the remaining examples listed have *-vala-*. (Curiously, early in II.2 [p. 98] he glosses *dhārā-varā-* as ‘Regengüsse liebend’, with the cmpd interpr., so he doesn’t seem to have paid full attention to this hapax.) One of Old’s objections to the cmpd interpr. is that the accent rules out a bahuvr̥hi, but I see no reason why it can’t be a tatpuruṣa with *varā-* ‘wooer’ as 2nd member.

It is notable that “unclosing the cows” (*ápa gā avṛṇata*), the standard culmination of the Vala myth, is here attributed to the Maruts, who ordinarily do not participate in that myth. Of course here “cows” could stand for rain clouds; see the flaming cows in vs. 5.

II.34.2–5: Note the concentration of *pr̥SIB* forms: 2d *pr̥śnīyāḥ*, 3d *pr̥kṣām* ... *pr̥ṣatībhiḥ*, 4a *pr̥kṣé*, 4c *pr̥ṣadaśva* (and scrambled *-śiprā* in 3c, *rapsā-* in 5a).

II.34.2: In pāda a the *-in*-stem *khādīn-* in the frame corresponds functionally to the instr. *stībhiḥ* in the simile. See 4d below.

The 2nd hemistich presents a severe mismatch between semantic/contextual expectations and morphosyntax. As we know, Rudra is the father of the Maruts. This vs. contains a nom. sg. *rudrāḥ* and enclitic 2nd pl. *vaḥ* referring to the Maruts, which can be acc., dat., or gen., and a form of the verb $\sqrt{\text{jan}}$ ‘beget’. All the standard tr. render the expression “Rudra begot you, o Maruts” (vel sim.). The problem is that the verb is *ājani*, a form of the so-called passive aor. Re breezily remarks “seul cas de valeur transitive.” But not only are the other occurrences of this form intrans./pass., but it belongs to a formation (the “passive aorist”) that is strongly typed for this function. Moreover, the medial *-iṣ*-aor. forms loosely associated with this form (*ājaniṣṭa*, etc.) are overwhelmingly intrans./pass. It is inconceivable to me that a Vedic audience would attribute or accept transitive value for *ājani* here, given the robust grammatical support for intrans./passive value.

I therefore think we must interpr. it acdg. to its formal shape, rather than imposing a transitive sense to make the passage easier (or easier by our lights). My way of doing so also requires us to read the sandhi form *śukrā* as nom. sg. *śukrāḥ*, rather than the Pp.’s loc. *śukré*. In this interpr. nom. sg. *vṛṣā* ... *śukrāḥ* is a secondary predicate of *rudrāḥ*: “R. was born *as bullish semen* in the udder of Pṛṣni.” It is this semen that combines with Pṛṣni to produce the Maruts; it can also, in naturalistic terms, be the rain in the thunderclouds that are Pṛṣni’s udder. This gender mingling and loss of distinction between the Maruts’ bull-father (=Rudra) and their mother Pṛṣni in the udder are also found, in somewhat different fashion, in IV.3.10d *vṛṣā śukrām duduhe pṛṣnir ūdhaḥ* “the bull as Pṛṣni milked gleaming (milk/semen) from his (/her) udder” and in VI.66.1d *sakīc chukrām duduhe pṛṣnir ūdhaḥ* “only once did Pṛṣni milk the gleaming (milk/semen) from the udder.” See also VI.48.22 and comm. ad loc., which may also refer to the birth of Rudra/his semen as occurring before the birth(s) of the Maruts.

It is somewhat remarkable that both Griffith and Max Müller (SBE) also take *ājani* seriously (“Rudra ... sprang into life for you in P’s radiant lap” and “as soon as R. ... was born for you ... in the bright lap of P.” respectively; see also von Bradke, Fs. Roth, p. 118). Perhaps the commentators who came later wished to distance themselves from these not-always-reliable role models even when they appear to be right.

II.34.3: My rendering of *nadāsya kārṇaiḥ* “with the ‘ears’ of the reed(-whip)” follows Pischel’s sugg. (Ved. Stud. I.191; see Ge’s n. 3bc and Old) that *nadā-* is here ‘reed’ (cf. I.32.8) (beside *nadā-* ‘id.’) rather than ‘roarer’ and that it refers to a whip or riding crop of some sort. I suggest that the “ears” would be some part of the whip, perhaps knots on the whiplashes or the like. Pischel’s idea has been generally rejected (though Oberlies [Relig. II.247] seems to accept it); see esp. Old’s negative remarks. But the alternative notion, that the Maruts are directing their horses by the ears of a(nother? side?) horse makes no sense to me: how would such direction work? And although Old explicitly states that the number is not an issue, referring to plural (not dual) ears of a single horse (or even

several horses, since pairs of body parts generally are referred to in the dual even when several individuals are in question) seems problematic to me.

In my interpr. the two instr. pls. *kārnaiḥ* and *āśúbhiḥ* are separate. So also Old, Re, though they otherwise accept the lead-ear theory. But Ge (/WG) construe them together (“with swift ears”), which in my view makes a puzzling interpr. even more so.

The next question is how to interpr. the intensive part. *dāvidhvataḥ*. Though the stem is usually transitive, Ge (/WG) take it absolutely (“schüttelnd”), while Re supplies an obj. seemingly at random (“qui secouez-puissamment (le monde)”). I extract ‘lips’ (*śípra-*) from the cmpd. *hīraṇyāśípra-*, since du. *śípre* serves as object to just this participle in X.96.9.

The *prkṣám* of d should not be severed from *prkṣé* beginning 4a, though at least in Ge’s (/WG’s) tr. the connection is not signalled (Re’s rendering does connect them). In general thematic *prkṣá-* refers to a strengthening substance, esp. nourishment. The corresponding root noun *prkṣ-* has the same basic sense (see Schindler, Rt Noun, s.v.), but here in the dat. is used infinitively (so also Schindler, as well as the standard tr.). The phrase *prkṣám yātha* may well be a syntagm, judging from the PN *prkṣá-yāma* in I.122.7 (adduced by Old), and the acc. appears to be a goal, contra Ge’s (/WG) rendering of *prkṣám* as an adverb (“kräftig”).

II.34.4: The two alternatives marked by *vā* ‘or’ (“to fortify all creatures or for alliance”) seem to have little to do with each other. Perhaps we are meant to assume “for alliance with all creatures” for the second alternative, hence my “(with them).”

As in 2a an element found in a free syntagm in the simile has its correspondent in a compound: loc. *vayúneṣu* matches *dhūr-* and both are governed by the cmpd 2nd member *-śád-*, at least in my interpr. (guided by Th., Unters., 23); the other standard tr. do not take *vayúneṣu* with the simile.

The meaning and etym. of the word *vayúna-* are much disputed; see EWA s.v., which lemma consists only of a list of secondary lit. I follow Th’s interpr. (Unters.) to some degree, but consider it more likely a derivative of the (secondary) root $\sqrt{vā}$ ‘weave’ than of $\sqrt{vyā}$ ‘envelop’ and the more likely meaning ‘pattern, tracery’ than ‘Umhüllung’. This literal meaning (arising from the repetitive patterns found in woven material) can then be applied, on the one hand, to similar visual effects (e.g., light and shadow produced by sunlight filtering through trees and bushes) or metaphorically to phenomena that show similarly repetitive patterns, such as ritual procedures. In this particular passage both senses may be at play. In the simile (in my view) the birds are sitting on “the tracteries (of the branches)”: the pattern of light and shade I just alluded to is turned on its head, to refer to the branches that produce those light patterns. But it is also possible to construe it with the frame, where the Maruts sitting at the chariot pole (often a metaphor evoking the chariot of sacrifice; see, e.g., the same cmpd *dhūrśád-* applied to Agni at the sacrifice in the 2nd hymn in this maṇḍala [II.2.1]) could also be sitting among the ritual patterns of the ongoing ceremony. I continue to maintain, however, that *vayúneṣu* here belongs primarily to the simile. I also suggest that *vayúneṣu* subtly evokes the word(s) we might expect in this simile. Birds usually sit in trees, and *vāneṣu* \sqrt{sad} is fairly common; compare esp. *vanarśád-* (with a bird simile) in nearby II.31.1 (and X.132.7 *dhūrśádam vanarśádam* with the same pole-sitting as here). There is also the word *vayā-* ‘twig’, which might be another place birds would be expected to sit (though it does not occur in

the loc., unfortunately). A form of this rarer word is found in the next hymn (II.35.8). I therefore wonder if *vayúna*- here is felt as a nonce blend of *vána*- and *vayā*-, in addition to having its own regular sense.

II.34.5: Despite the almost comic image of the flaming cows, the reference in this half-verse is fairly clear. The cows with their teeming udders must be the thunderclouds; their ‘enflaming’ quality is presumably the lightning. Although the formation of the hapax *índhanvan*- is morphologically peculiar, it can hardly belong with anything but the nasal-infix present to *√idh* ‘kindle’, unless it is corrupt (as Old suggests).

The simile “like geese to good pastures” may initially seem unusual -- we expect *cows* to come to good pastures (see 8c below), not geese. But anyone familiar with Canada geese frequently sees flocks of them in pastures and post-harvest grain fields, and a Google search of “Canada geese in pastures” turns up numerous complaints about their regular mess-producing presence therein, as well as numerous pictures; similar pictures of (Indian) bar headed geese feeding in fields also turn up in a Google search. The image is appropriate to the Maruts, who would fly down in a flock to settle on the ritual ground just as flocks of geese do in fields.

Note the alliterative pāda d: *mádhora mādāya marutaḥ samanyavaḥ*.

II.34.6: The free syntagm *narām (ná) śámsa*- with gen. pl. *narām* is found also in I.173.9–10 and, in reversed order, in VI.24.2 *śámsa narām*. It is obviously a variant of the doubly accented cmpd *nārā-śámsa*-, which also occurs in tmesis without conversion of the 1st member to gen. pl. in *nārā (ca/vā) śámsa*- (IV.86.42 and X.64.3 respectively). It is possible that the final *-m* of *narām* was generated by the initial nasal of *ná* and the accent adjusted to produce a case form from an underlying **nārā ná śámsa*- in the three occurrences of this syntagm that have this order; the meter would be unaffected. However, the example with the opposite order makes this less likely. In any case, this scarcely matters; the problem is to figure out the referent of the phrase here, whose head is nom. sg. and therefore must be compared to the subj. of the impv. *gantana*, namely the Maruts. *Narāśamsa* is a shadowy divine figure or divine epithet (cf. Re, EVP X.76 n. 7: “la Récitation personifiée?”), who has a regular role in Āprī hymns (generally in the 3rd vs.) and is sometimes identified with Agni and less frequently with other gods (see, e.g., Macdonell, Ved. Myth., p. 100). So our vs. may be comparing the Maruts to a divine figure who should be at the sacrifice -- quite possibly Agni. (This interpr. is explicitly rejected by Re. in favor of a common noun “la récitation faite par les officiants,” EVP X.76 n. 7.) Or, in keeping with Re’s view, it may refer to a ritual element, the laud, that should be present at the sacrifice. Alternatively, and in keeping with my interpr. of the expression in VI.24.2 (see comm. there) and the phrase *śámsam āyóḥ* (IV.6.11, V.3.4), it may refer to the gods as being like the embodiment of the praise they receive, in an idiom like English “the toast of the town.” Under this interpr. I would alter the tr. to “like the Laud of Men.” In any case, by most interpr. of the cmpd (and associated syntagms) the ‘men’ (*narām*) are in subject-relation to *śámsa*:- that is, they are producing the laud, not receiving it.

The 2nd pl. act. impv. *pipyata* belongs to the perfect stem, but shows pseudo-thematic inflection (expect **pipita*). On such forms see my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems” (Fs. Lubotsky);

briefly, the act. pseudo-thematic impvs. begin, I think, in the dual act. imperatives (here 2nd du. *pipyatam* 4x, 3rd du. *pipyatām* 1x), which owe their disyllabic desinence to the indic. dual endings *-athus*, *-atus*. Subsequently the *-a*-liaison had a limited spread, here to the phonologically similar 2nd pl.

The phrase *dhíyam ... vājapeśasam* “visionary thought that has prizes as its ornament” is a shorthand way to refer to the standard ritual tit-for-tat, with the gods giving material goods in exchange for praise. But it also probably incorporates another element of that exchange, that the gods themselves inspire or create in the poet the poetic vision that he then shapes into praise of them.

II.34.8: The function of the presumed loc. *bhāge* (*bhāga* in sandhi) is unclear. Ge (/WG) construe it with *sudānavah* (“die im Glück freigegeben”), but this common epithet never elsewhere participates in a syntagm. Re takes it as an expression of purpose, and my tr. also reflects such a function, though the loc. doesn’t ordinarily express purpose. I wonder if this is not a (deliberately) mangled dative. Our supposed loc. (the only loc. to this stem in the RV) is immediately followed by *ā* (*bhāga ā*), which resembles the dat. *bhāgāya* with quantity flip. If this seems too radical, we can simply take it as loc. + *ā* and interpr. it as “in (a state of) good fortune” vel sim.

The simile in c can be viewed as poetic repair for the one in 5c discussed above: “like geese to good pastures” there seemed a bit off (though in fact perfectly compatible with observed realia); here the milk-cow in good pastures provides the expected pairing of cow and fodder.

However, the simile here is off in a different way; it is an example of case disharmony (see my 1982, IJ 24 article), with the cow (nom. *dhénuḥ*) in the simile the subj. of an intrans./reflexive sense of *pínvate*, while in the frame the verb is transitive, with *īṣam* as obj. (The dat. of benefit stays constant in simile and frame.) This is possible because of the complex semantics of ‘swell’ words in the RV, also discussed in the just-cited article. It would be possible to avoid the case-disharmony explanation, by supplying ‘udder’ as obj. in the simile (“as a milk-cow swells her udder...”). Udders figure prominently in this hymn (see esp. 6c *āśvām iva pipyata dhenúm ūdhani* “make the mare, the milk-cow swell in her udder”). However, since this simile is not only intelligible without supplying an object but conforms to case disharmony patterns elsewhere, I see no reason to do so.

Not only is *pínvate* an ambiguous pivot in terms of syntactic valence, but its very morphology is exploited for ambiguity as well, at least in my view. The thematic Class I pres. *pínvati* is of course well established in the RV, but it is of course also historically a thematicization of a Class V *nó/nu* pres. **pinóti / *pinuté*, of which a few relic forms are found (e.g., med. part. *pínvāná-*). The 3rd pl. mid. to this pres. would be *pínvaté* (*pínvate* without accent), exactly the form we have here. So in the simile *pínvate* matches its singular subj. *dhénuḥ* in number, but in the frame it can also match its underlying plural subject, the Maruts, if it’s assigned to an athematic stem.

Note that the caesura splits the bahuvrīhi *rātāhaviṣe*. Though such a split is fairly common with dual dvandvas, it is considerably rarer with more tightly constructed cmpds. (I can’t offhand come up with any other exx., though I haven’t systematically looked.)

II.34.9: The cheating mortal of the rel. cl. has no surface representation in the (first) main clause, the two-word finale of pāda b, but the full clause of c contains *tām* (in unusual final position), which picks up the *yāḥ* of the rel. cl. The publ. tr. supplies a reference in the b-clause in the phrase “from *his* harm,” and this is certainly possible. It might be better, however, to treat “protect us from harm” as parenthetical as Ge does (see his n. 9b), with the real main cl. found only in c.

Re is insistent on taking *tāpus-* only as a noun, not as an adjective with the standard interpr. (incl. Gr), but though he is technically correct that the root accent should mark it as a noun (‘scorching heat’), it seems to have been reinterpr. as an adj., possibly on the basis of its regular participation in *tāpus-X* cmpds (*tāpur-jambha-*, etc.). Though these originally would have meant ‘whose X is searing heat’, it would be easy to slip into ‘having scorching X’. Alternatively MLW suggests that *cakrīyā* is adjectival here: “with the heat of/belonging to the wheel.” However, the fact that the same form *cakrīyā* in vs. 14 seems clearly to mean ‘wheel’ makes this less likely; in fact the other 5 forms of the stem *cakrī-* outside this hymn mean ‘wheel’ not ‘wheel(ed) / associated with the wheel’.

II.34.10: The sense of this vs., or rather its second half, is very uncertain. See esp. Old’s comments. In the first half, the course of the Maruts shows brightly. The intens. 3rd sg. middle with *-t-less* ending, *cékite*, is taken by Schaeffer (Intens., 44, 112) as having the (/an) old stative ending, which she takes in passive sense (“wird immer wieder erkannt”) in all occurrences of this form. The passive interpr. seems unnecessary: numerous formations to \sqrt{cit} mean simply ‘appear (bright)’. In the intens. it can mean ‘appear continuously bright’ or ‘appear ever brighter’, and this sense works well for all 5 occurrences of *cékite*. As for the form, I doubt that we need to reach into deep prehistory for a stative ending; rather it seems likely to me that it is what we might call a “perfecto-intensive,” built alongside med. pf. *cikité* with adjustment of the redupl. vowel.

A different manipulation of the perfect is probably to be seen in the verb of b, *duhúḥ* (also twice elsewhere without accent), which appears to have been generated to the *-t-less* middle root pres. 3rd pl. *duhré* (3rd sg. *duhé*) and has acquired the act. 3rd pl. ending *-úḥ* because those middle forms look like unredupl. pf. forms.

It is not entirely clear who the “friends” are who milk Pṛṣṇi’s udder. The udder itself is presumably, as elsewhere (e.g., 5a above), the rain cloud; milking it causes rain to fall. In nearby II.29.4 the friends (*āpāyaḥ* as here) are the gods, in V.53.2 more narrowly the Maruts. Either would work here, though the 2nd ps. address to the Maruts in pāda a and the 3rd ps. ref. of *āpāyaḥ* in b requires person shift if the referent is the Maruts; nonetheless, Ge and Re opt for the Maruts. It is worth noting that the word participates in a word play with the verb: (*ā*)*pāyo duhúḥ* “milk milk,” with the neut. *s-stem* *pāyas-* ‘milk’ lurking there (cf. VI.48.22 *pṛṣṇyā dugdhām sakṛt pāyaḥ*, with *pāyaḥ* \sqrt{duh} as well as Pṛṣṇi). This pun may have invited the use of the stem *āpí-*. I do not understand the purport of the immediately preceding particle *āpi*, unless it is meant to resonate with *āpāyo*. *āpi* does not otherwise appear with \sqrt{duh} , though Ge unearths an ex. in MS (where it appears to be contextually driven).

The rest of the verse is close to hopeless because, on the one hand, the role of Trita (or “the third one”) cannot be pinned down and, on the other, the syntax is slippery and there is no main verb. The standard tr. think Trita is assuming the role of scapegoat and taking on scorn and old age, to spare us (or others), on the basis of passages like

VIII.47.13. But Trita has other functions in Vedic, including in vs. 14 of this very hymn, where he is responsible for delivering multiple Hotars, and a more positive role for Trita than scapegoat therefore seems likely. He is also associated with the Maruts in V.54.2 as one who bellows when the Maruts come together with lightning (*sám vidyútā dádhati vāśati tritáh*); the presence of a roarer here (*návamānasya*) is reminiscent of that passage. My tr. is provisional; for the main verb I supply a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ on the basis of nearby II.23.14 *yé tvā nidé dadhiré* with *nidé* as here. Although I supplied a 3rd pl. form, continuing the 3rd pl. of b, it could easily be 2nd pl. (so the standard tr.) with Maruts as subject; the voc. phrase *rudriyāḥ ... adābhyāḥ* may support the 2nd pl. Otherwise I frankly admit that my tr. is not based on a firm sense of what the passage is meant to convey. Note that scorn returns in 15b.

II.34.12: The relationship between the Daśagvas and the Maruts is not clear. Re suggests that they are identical, but I find this unlikely. The Daśagvas are a rarely mentioned collectivity, generally grouped together with their slightly more prominent kin the Navagvas and associated with Indra in the opening of the Vala cave. The Maruts, though also in Indra's entourage, are not standard participants in the Vala myth. Here they seem to be implicitly compared to the Daśagvas but not identical to them. The point presumably is to associate the Maruts' thunderstorm activity, including both the fecundity of the rain, here symbolized by cows, and the return of the light after the storm, with the powerful mythic image of the opening of Vala. The move to configure the Maruts' activity as on a par with the opening of Vala was already made in the first vs., with the VP in d *āpa gā avṛṇvata* "They unclosed the cows" (see also *śusūcānāḥ* in 1c, comparable to *śucatā* here). Describing their light as *góarṇas-* 'flooding with cows, whose flood is cows' is esp. telling, since it connects their floods of rain with the cows of the Vala myth. I supply cows as the obj. of *āporṇute* in the frame on the basis of 1d, but it might be better to take *rāmīḥ*, here tr. 'nights', as 'dark (things)', referring to nights in the simile but clouds in the frame. Hence a slightly revised tr. "As Dawn ... uncloses the dark (nights), so did they unclose the dark (clouds) ..."

II.34.13: On this vs. see Thieme KZ 92: 43–44, though his etym. of *rudrá-* (n. 34) as 'tree-breaking' (< *dru-dra-*) is best passed over in near silence. His explanation of *kṣoṇṭ-* as 'cry', here standing for thunder, is convincing. With that interpr., we can see the vs. proceed through thunder, lightning (the ornaments), rain (horse's piss), and post-storm sunshine (or even rainbow).

From the comment just above, it can be seen that I take *méghamāna-* as belonging with \sqrt{mih} 'urinate', with a misanalysis of the final *-h* as a velar, not a palatal, influenced by *meghá-* 'cloud'. For an alternative see Gotō (1st Class), 245–46.

II.34.14: The syntax of this vs. is quite broken: a nom. sg. participle (*iyānāḥ*) in pāda a is followed by a 1st pl. verb (*grṇīmasi*), but cd has a 3rd sg. verb (*āvavártat*) that may (or may not) pick up the sg. subj. of a. The vs. is also notable for the return of Trita (see 10cd above), whose function is no clearer here than there.

With regard to the number/person mismatch of ab, Ge's notion that both the 3rd sg. and the 1st pl. refer to ritual personnel seems convincing. If we take a and b as separate clauses, note that the first one has a predicated pres. participle. Since in the

dependent cl. of cd the rel. prn. (*yān*) has *tān* in a as its antecedent (both referring to the Maruts), it seems reasonable to assume that the same subject is working on both: the poet (supplied) who implores them in pāda a will cause them to turn here in cd, presumably by means of his imploring words.

It is the simile that is puzzling, though its syntax is impeccable: Trita corresponds to the unnamed subj. of *āvavārtat*, the five Hotars to the Maruts expressed by the rel. prn. *yān*. But under what circumstances and for what reason did Trita make the Hotars turn to him, and who were these Hotars? Priests are not usually imported from elsewhere, esp. not from above/heaven (as is implied). I have no solution.

II.35 Apām Napāt

The hymn is much translated; in addition to the standard ones, see Macdonell (VRS), Doniger, Maurer.

II.35.1–4: The first words of each hemistich in this series of vss. echo each other: 1a *ūpem*, 1c *apām*, 2a *imām*, 2c *apām*, 3a *sām*, 3c *tām*, 4a *tām*. Since similar openings are found only in scattered vss. later in the hymn (9a *apām*, 11c *yām*, 12c *sām*) I consider the effect deliberate.

II.35.1: It is somewhat curious that the hymn *begins* with the expression “I have set loose my eloquence,” with the augmented aor. *asṛkṣi*. Such phrases are more usual in the final vss. of hymns, summing up the hymn that has just been produced. Perhaps here the poet means that he has set his eloquence in motion, in preparation for hymn composition. IH suggests it’s a performative “I (have) (hearby) set loose ...”

kuvíd ordinarily appears with accented verb. Gr allows an unaccented verb only when the particle and the verb are in different pāda -- but in other passages where *kuvíd* and the verb are not in the same pāda the verb can nonetheless be accented, e.g., VIII.91.4cd, VIII.103.9, IX.19.5. (In VII.91.1 the verb is accented though it is in a different pāda, but it may also be in a relative clause -- though see comm. ad loc.) It would be possible to take *kuvíd* here as construed only with *āśuhémā* “surely the Child of the Waters is one impelling swift (horses); he will make (the hymns) well-ornamented.” But this seems rather artificial. Perhaps *karati* lost the expected accent because the *hí*-induced accent of *jóṣīsat* was more syntactically prominent. In any case the unaccented verb *vanate* in V.3.10 (cited by Gr) is also difficult not to construe with the *kuvíd* in the previous pāda. Gr’s rule seems to be variable: in addition to the accented verbs in different clauses cited above, there is at least one example of an unaccented verb in the same clause -- V.36.3 *kuvín nú stoṣat* ... (pace Gr’s accented *stóṣan* s.v. *kuvíd*, he gives correct *stoṣat* s.v. *stu*). For further on verbal accentuation with *kuvíd* see Hettrich, Hypotaxe 151–52.

As Ge (and Re) point out, ‘well-ornamented’ (*supéśas-*) of hymns means not only poetically skillful but also receiving adequate recompense from the gods; cf. *vājapeśas-* ‘having prizes as its ornament’ in the preceding hymn (II.34.6), esp. in conjunction with *vājayúh* ‘seeking prizes’ in our pāda a.

II.35.2: *aryáḥ* is morphologically multivalent; I take it as nom. sg. to *aryá-*, with most (Gr, Ge [WG], Macdonell, Thieme [Fremdling], Lubotsky, Maurer). Re instead interpr.

as acc. pl. to *arí-* (“les êtres-privilégiés”), in apposition to *vísṽāni ... bhúvanā*, and it must be admitted that its position between those two words invites it to be construed with them. Doniger seems to follow Re (“all noble creatures”), but I do not understand how she interpr. *aryáḥ* grammatically. It could also be gen. sg. of *arí-* (or nom. pl., though this would not fit syntactically).

II.35.3–4: These two vss. are closely knit together verbally. Both contain an etymological figure, with nom. pl. fem. and acc. sg. masc. derived from the same root: 3c *śúcim śucayo*, 4a *yuvatáyo yúvānam*. The $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$ of 3c recurs in 4c as *śukrēbhīḥ*, which forms a phonetic figure with adjacent *śīkvabhiḥ*. The repeated PREVERB *yānti ...* PREVERB *yanti* of 3a is echoed by PREVERB *yanti* of 4b, while 3d and 4b both end with a formulaic expression in which only the verb varies: 4b ... *pāri tasthur āpaḥ*, 4d ... *pāri yanti āpaḥ*. And finally 3d, 4b, 4d (and 5c) all end with forms of *āp-* ‘water’ (nom. pl., loc. pl.), contrasting with the pāda-initial gen. pl. *apām* when the god is mentioned (1c, 2c, 3d).

II.35.4: The descriptor *ásmera-*, generally taken as a derivative of $\sqrt{\text{smi}}$ ‘smile’, is somewhat curious. It may be simply, as Macd. suggests, that the waters approach their task seriously, not like light-hearted lovers (sim. Doniger). Or (with Maurer) that they are shy. But I somehow think that this hapax is expressing something more particular, though I cannot define it more closely. It may be naturalistic: the circling waters perhaps whirl around without foam, which might be thought of as smiles. Or it may be meant to distinguish these attentive females from other natural phenomena: lightning, especially, is characterized by smiling (see I.168.8) and laughing, and Uṣas also smiles. Though the waters do gleam (see 3c), they are different from those bright celestial females, and the point may be to emphasize the two very different environments in which Apām Napāt finds himself -- the watery and the fiery. Note that in 9b Apām Napāt “clothes himself in the lightning flash” in 9b, but by then his assimilation to Agni/Fire is almost complete.

II.35.5: The identity of the three female goddesses is unclear. They could be, with Sāy., the three who show up in the Āprī hymns (e.g., II.3.8), Iḍā, Sarasvatī, and Bhārati -- though even if so, this does not help much, since the role of those goddesses is not well defined. A (possibly) different set of three females associated with Agni is found in II.5.5, but that passage is too obscure to aid interpretation here. Macd (fld. by Doniger and Maurer) suggests that they are the waters of the three worlds, but I am not aware of a “waters of the three worlds” trope.

A more acute problem in this vs. is *kṛtā* (in sandhi before vowel; Pp *kṛtāḥ*) in c. There is no agreement as to what stem it belongs to or what grammatical form it represents. Some simply refuse (or fail) to tr. it (Ge, Doniger, Schaeffer 198–99); others give it a contextual meaning (Macd ‘breasts’, Re ‘plantes’, Maurer ‘nurses’), without attempting etymological justification. WG suggest ‘Spinnerinnen’ (female spinners, spinsters in fact) with a derivation from $\sqrt{\text{kṛt}}$. What makes the word so difficult is the root accent; it would otherwise be easily interpreted as a past participle to $\sqrt{\text{kṛ}}$. The most sensible disc. of the word is Old’s. He sees it a sexual slang, as in the expression *kanyām* $\sqrt{\text{kṛ}}$, glossing “die Engjungferte” (deflowered girl). Certainly in English “to make” or “to do” a girl/woman is a perennial slangy verb for “have sex with,” and one can also adduce the expression “to make (s.o.) a woman,” for “deflower, have sex with a virgin.” He

justifies the accent retraction from the ppl. *kṛtá-* (or rather fem. *kṛtā-*) on the basis of AiG II.1.19–20, where substantivized adjectives retract their accent. This seems the best hypothesis of a generally bad lot, and it would fit the context, in that pāda d describes Apām Napāt sucking the first milk of females who’ve given birth for the first time (if that’s what *pūrvasū-* means; see Scar 620–21) -- which makes sense if the females just lost their virginity in the preceding pāda. I therefore take the word as an acc. pl. fem. to a substantivized *kṛtā-* from the ppl. to √*kṛ*.

II.35.6: In pāda a the grammatical problem is *svār* (to be read as a monosyllable, [almost] uniquely in the RV). Gr identifies it as an acc., Macd (followed implicitly by Doniger and Maurer) as an endingless loc., sim. Re. However, the phraseology, esp. the accented *asyá* (which identifies *asyá* as an adjectival demon., not a pronoun) and the placement of *ca* (*ásvasyātra jānimāsyá ca svāḥ*, invite, indeed almost impose, a genitive interpr. Ge achieves this by pronouncing *svār* indeclinable (n. 6a). However, it is possible to see it as an archaic genitive with zero-grade ending **-s*, as in Aves. *xuuōng* < **sh₂uēn-s*, but with the *-r* of the nom./acc. leveled into the oblique. See Klein DGRV I.96, WG.

The identity of the two entities born must also be sorted out. It is possible that the horse is just a horse, since origin in the water is an equine characteristic (see, e.g., I.163.1 adduced by Ge). But it seems likely that the carefully balanced *ásvasya ... asyá ca svāḥ* refers to two contrasted entities, quite likely the fire (Agni) and the sun (Sūrya). The obvious way to get that is for the horse to represent fire/Agni and “this sun” the sun, but I wonder if there isn’t a clever reversal: the “horse” is the sun and “this sun here” is Agni.

In b the addressee of the impv. *pāhi* is not identified, though the default assumption would be Apām Napāt. It is striking that this is the only instance of the 2nd ps. in this entire hymn.

The “raw” (*āmā-*) fortifications are convincingly explained by Ge as built from unfired brick. They need not (and in my opinion should not) be further interpreted as cloud citadels (so Macd, fld. by Maurer and, in part, Doniger). Specifying that the fortifications be unfired is a cute reversal if Agni is supposed to be in residence there. It is also possible, if Apām Napāt is at issue, that the reference is to his residence in the waters, would would most definitely be uncooked/unfired. It is also of course difficult in this post-Lévi-Strauss age not to put his conceptual spin on the term “raw,” though exactly how this concept would pertain to this passage is unclear: perhaps it refers to a place and a society so far away (*parāḥ*) from Ārya civilization that it counts as “raw” to Ārya “cooked.”

II.35.7: Note the slight phonological play -- a: #*svá ā dām(e)*, b: #*svadhām*.

II.35.8: Pāda c is a variant on an idea expressed several times elsewhere. that the other fires are mere twigs of Agni, the god Fire. Cf., e.g., I.59.1 *vayā́ id agne agnáyas te anyé*. It seems significant that “the others” are not identified here as fires but as entities, beings (*bhúvanāni*) -- in my view, because the identification of Apām Napāt with Agni that brings the hymn to its climax is only partially complete here, and the poet is being canny about not directly referring to fire, though at the same time using diagnostic vocabulary and phraseology.

Note the etymological figure #*prá jāyante ... prajābhiḥ*##.

II.35.9: This is a transition vs. from the watery to the fiery. “Those sloping/aslant” in b can be the waters flowing downward, but they can also be firewood piled to be kindled (cf. I.95.5, where the same phrase seems to refer to firewood, as I interpret it), and the golden-hued maidens who circle around him can be either waters or flames.

II.35.10: This vs. strenuously develops the “golden” theme that appeared in 9d -- a color more descriptive of the fiery than the watery. An even stronger indication of the transition to Agni proper is the gerund *niśādyā* ‘having sat down’: the lexeme *ní√sad* is closely associated with Agni’s installation on the ritual ground (see, e.g., the next hymn, II.36.4).

II.35.11: See disc. in the publ. intro. on this as the climactic vs. of the hymn -- both introducing unambiguous fire references and identifying Apām Napāt as the secret name of Agni.

II.35.10–11: The ends of the d pādas in these vss. are very similar: 10d ... *ānnam asmai*, 11d ... *ānnam asya*. In 10d “The givers of gold give food to him” implies that his food is gold; 11d further makes clear that the gold(en) food is really gold-colored ghee.

II.35.12: The verb *māṛjmi* is accented because of its juxtaposition with clause-initial *dīdhiṣāmi*.

II.35.13: As Old noted (see also Hoffmann, Injunkt., 121 n. 29), the need for a caesura suggests a reading *vīṣā janayat*, rather than the augmented *ajanayat* of the Pp. (In fact, this suggestion is already found in Gr.) That two pres. indicatives, *dhayati* and *rihanti*, follow this proposed injunctive in the same thematic sequence supports interpreting the form contra the Pp, as Hoffmann points out.

The simile *anyāsyeva ... tanvā* “as if with the body of another” is, in my view, another reference to the distinction between but ultimate identification of Apām Napāt and Agni.

II.35.14: The acc. participial phrases of ab must be construed with *pāri dīyanti* “they fly around (him)” in d, even though the same referent is found in the dat. in *nāptre* in c. The latter participates in a clever word play -- *āpo nāptre* -- which of course evokes *apām nāpāt* even though *āpah* is nom. pl. fem. ‘waters’ and not part of a syntagm with *nāptre*. The elision of the first part of his name may be meant: now that he is identified with Agni, he is no longer the child (only) of the waters. But as noted in the publ. intro., that the waters bring him ghee brings the watery and the fiery into harmony. Note that the waters as his cloak here (if I am correct in this interpr., see below) answers to the ghee-cloak in 4d. In the watery vs. 4 the presence of ghee was somewhat anomalous; similarly here in a mostly fiery environment the cloak of the waters stands out.

The phrase *svayām ātkaiḥ* is also unclear, and indeed whether it is actually a phrase. Ge takes it as referring to Apām Napāt: “und sich selbst mit Gewändern (bekleidet).” He adduces IV.18.5 with *svayām ātkam vāsāna(h)*, but in fact the difference in case between the acc. there and the instr. here speaks against his interpr. The simplex

root pres. always takes the acc. of the garment, while the causative *vāsāya-* takes the instr. Moreover, as Lü points out (*Varuṇa*, 146–47 n. 8), the position of this phrase (far from the masc. acc. sg. in ab, adjacent to the fem. nom. pl. in d) and the “harsh ellipsis” required makes this interpr. unlikely. Lü himself in his tr. (146) implies the waters are bringing the ghee with their cloaks, though in the n. he sees them as “in Schmelzbutter gekleidet.” Acdg. to Re the waters fly around him “avec des vêtements (qu’elles se sont données) elles-mêmes,” an expression I don’t entirely understand. WG appear to separate *svayām* and *ātkaiḥ* but, with Lü, Re, and me, also take the garments as belonging to the waters: “um ihn fliegen die jugendfrischen Wasser von sich selbst mit (ihren) Reisemänteln herum.” The further (and perhaps unjustified) step I take in my tr. is in interpreting *svayām* so closely with *ātkaiḥ*, with the waters themselves becoming cloaks for him.

In b ‘paths’ is to be supplied with *adhvasmābhiḥ* ‘unbesmirched’ on the basis of II.34.5 *adhvasmābhiḥ pathībhiḥ* in the adjacent hymn, at least by my interpr. The standard tr. (Ge [WG, Re, also Lü, 146) supply ‘flames’ instead (though Re in his n. suggests that “chemins” could be supplied). Where exactly he is located (“highest footprint” generally implies high heaven) and which pathways are meant are unclear to me.

II.36 Ṛtugrahas

II.36.1: The first pāda lacks a syllable, which can be restored by reading augmented *avasiṣṭa*. In the position after the final -o of *hinvānó*, the Saṃhitā text could have applied abhinihita sandhi to initial *a* redactionally, but the transmitted text never acquired an avagraha. This solution was already noted by Gr and endorsed by Old; Hoffmann discusses it extensively (Injunk. 147).

II.36.2: The standard tr. construe *añjīṣu* with *priyā utá* (“and dear in your ornaments”), but the position of *utá* is somewhat against this: *utá* is less out of place if *priyāḥ* is all that it’s conjoining. And *añjīṣu* goes better semantically with “resplendent” than “dear”; cf., for a connection with *śubh*, X.78.7 *śubhamyávo nāñjibhir vy āśvitan*, also of the Maruts.

II.36.3: As sometimes elsewhere, *hí* with the first of two imperatives signals that the second action depends on the first.

Despite the masc. gender of *devébhiḥ*, I do not think it identifies a different group from the wives (*jānibhiḥ*), but that the latter further specifies the neutral *devébhiḥ*. In this I follow Re ad VI.50.13, which contains the same phrase (also X.64.10). Tvaṣṭar is strongly associated with the wives of the gods and in all clear cases only with them. It is worth noting that the RV contains no examples of fem. instr. pl. *devībhiḥ* or indeed of any fem. oblique plural.

My tr. of *jujuṣānāḥ* “having delighted (in the call),” with “call” supplied, followed a claim in John Lowe’s Oxford Univ. dissertation (p. 162) that this pf. part. only occurs with “call,” as a prior action to the event time of the matrix verb. But in the book based on his diss. (*Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, 2015) he has revised this view, at least for this passage and allows *jujuṣānāḥ* to be construed with *āndhasaḥ*, with the main verb

mandasva ‘become exhilarated!’ logically following the action of enjoyment (pp. 210–11, 214–15; passage tr. on 215). I would tentatively revise the publ. tr. to “having delighted, become exhilarated on the stalk!” Because of the VP *māndasva ... āndhasaḥ* in the first vs. of the next, closely related hymn (II.36.1) I do not take *āndhasaḥ* with *jujuṣāṇāḥ* here, or at least not primarily.

II.36.4: The lexeme *prāti* √ *vī* expresses a reciprocal notion to √ *vī* ‘pursue’, hence ‘receive’; cf. the nominal form *pratīvī-* ‘(gift-)reception’.

II.36.5: This vs. is generally taken as Indra’s, but as I say in the publ. intro., I think it must be Indra as Bṛhaspati. The Brahman’s cup from which he drinks supports this identification.

II.37 Ṛtugraha

II.37.1: As noted above ad II.36.3 the VP *māndasva ... āndhasaḥ* repeats the same phrase there; our *ānu jóṣam* echoes the part. *jujuṣāṇāḥ* there.

Pāda b and c are similar in phraseology to the Indra hymn II.14.1–2 – most particularly the init. voc. *ādhvaryavaḥ*, the etymological connection between the verb *vaṣṭi* and the cmpd. *tadvaśá-*, and the phrase *tásmāi etám bharata*. See comm. ad loc.

II.37.1–3: The d pādas of the first three vss. have a rigid structure: PRIEST’S CUP *sómaṃ draviṇodaḥ pībartúbhiḥ*. Noteworthy is only that *pība* is accented in all three vss., though there is no obvious reason for this, and the last three vss. (4–6), which also contain imperatives to √ *pā*, though of different form (4d *pībatu*, 5d *pībatam*, 6d *pāyayā*), in syntactically variant constructions, lack such accent. I have no explanation (and it seems not to have attracted any attention) beyond the suggestion that *pībartúbhiḥ* is treated as a detachable refrain, even though what precedes it in the pāda must be construed with it. See now also remarks ad III.32.1.

II.37.2: The nom. *dadīḥ* must be part of the rel. cl., specifying acc. *nāma*. *dadīḥ* is nominative because it is a quotation of the name.

II.37.3: Although the default referent of the voc. *vanaspate* in a ritual context might be assumed to be the sacrificial post (cf. III.8.1, 3, 6, 11), the contents of ab -- both the draught animals of a and *vīḍayasvā* in b -- point rather to the chariot. See VI.47.26 cited by both Ge and Re. Why the chariot is addressed and identified with the wealth-giver is not clear to me, save for the fact that in the later ritual the Ṛtugraha libations take place in the cart shed (see, e.g., Eggeling, SBE 26.319–20). Note that the havirdhāna carts are the subject of the last ṛca of nearby II.41 (vss. 19–21).

II.37.5: For *yayyām* as acc. sg. masculine (beside *yayīm*) see AiG III.131.

Another ex. of *hí* with the first of two imperatives, providing the grounds for the second action. See II.36.3. Note also that although *hí* is found deep in its pāda, it is actually in 2nd position, since a new clause begins with *ā* (... *mádhunā=ā* ...). For the curious behavior of *hí kam* see comm. ad VI.51.14.

II.38 Savitar

The word *vratá-* ‘commandment’ is prominent in this hymn (vss. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9). The point is repeatedly made that all creatures, incl. the gods, follow the *vratá-*s of Savitar. Another persistent verbal theme is the contrast between *sám* and *ví* (4a, 4c, 6a), which can be discerned even when only *ví* is present (1c, 3a, 5b, 6c, 7b, 8d). The hymn also has a pronounced tendency towards augmented 3rd sg. root aorists (+/- preverb) at the ends of pādas, esp. at the ends of hemistichs: 1b *asthāt*, 3d *āgāt*, 4d *āgāt*, 5c *ādhāt*, 6b *abhūt*, 6c *āgāt*, 8c (*ā ...*) *gāt*, 8d *ākāḥ*, 11b *ā gāt* (cf. also opt. *avyāḥ* 10b).

II.38.1: The verb of c, *dhāti* with primary ending, is likely to be a root aorist subjunctive like the other two such forms, though neither Ge nor Re so tr. it -- nor do I. However, WG’s “... soll er ... verteilen” does represent the mood (so also Hettrich, Hyp. 177). I would alter the tr. to “will distribute ...” Unfortunately it does not require trisyllabic scansion, which would have supported the subj. interpr. Moreover, the pāda-final *dhāti rātnam* is reminiscent of the formulaic *dāti vāṛyam / dātivāram* (on which see V.58.2) and may owe its existence to that puzzling set of forms. See my forthcoming article on the *dāti-vāra-* type. Curiously the flg. pāda contains a cmpd generally associated with that type: *vītīhotra-*. Note also that *ví hí* in this pāda is echoed by *vītī-* in that cmpd.

The question then arises how to analyze *ābhajat* in d. The Pp. takes it as *ā bhajat*, with unaccented augment. Under this analysis the verb would not be in the domain of the *hí* in c; otherwise the augment should be accented and the preverb unaccented and univerted. The WG tr. reflects the Pp. by separating the clauses, but Ge, Re, and I (implicitly also Klein DGRV II.74) tr. cd as if they contain conjoined parallel clauses. It would also be possible to analyze *ābhajat* as *ā bhajat*, that is, without augment. An injunctive might fit the syntactic context better, in that it could just continue the modal reading of *dhāti* (“will distribute ... and [will] give a share ...”), but paradoxically this would require the two clauses to be more independent because the verb would be unaccented and therefore could not be conjoined to c with accent-inducing *hí*. In larger interpretational terms the differences among the several possibilities just outlined are fairly minor -- having just given or being about to give actually turn out to be almost identical acts in Rigvedic ritual depiction -- but it is worth noting the multiple ambiguities inherent in an innocent looking form. For two parallel clauses containing first a subjunctive and then an augmented indicative, see 3ab below (*mucāti ... ārīramat*).

The cmpd *vītī-hotra-* (RV 5x) is much discussed, since it has been considered as belonging to the supposed *dāti-vāra-* verbal governing cmpds, assembled and discussed by Wack. in AiG II.1.320–21 and forming a part of Indo-Europeanist discourse ever since. I have demonstrated in my forthcoming article on this type that, except for *dāti-vāra-* (on which see comm. ad V.58.2), none of the forms adduced has the sense attributed to it and therefore such a “type” does not exist. I take *vītī-hotra-* as a bahuvrīhi meaning ‘having oblations worth pursuing’, with *vītī-* serving for the common infinitive *vītāye* ‘to pursue’, which often takes *hāvya-* (synonymous with *hótrā-*) as object. For further, see my as-yet-unpublished article.

II.38.2: The hapax *nīmrga-* must clearly be a derivative of *ní√mrj*, lit. ‘wipe down’, but generally either ‘clasp to oneself’ or idiomatically ‘drag down’ (for the latter see I.140.2,

V.52.17). The context here requires something like ‘submissive’, as all tr. take it. See comm. ad VII.26.3, which suggests that forceful dragging down implies coercion by the agent and, conversely, submission (voluntary or not) of the object. Note also that it has an unetymological velar *g*, presumably extracted from forms where the final palatal *j*, followed by *s*-, yields *-kṣ*-.

The submission of the waters and, especially, the quieting of the wind probably reflect the natural fact that the wind tends to drop at dusk, and this brings about the calming of waves that had been raised by the wind.

II.38.3: The poet seems to get a certain pleasure out of using semi-exotic verb forms that masquerade as something else: in pāda a *yān*, the nom. sg. pres. part. of $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive’, not the acc. pl. m. of the rel. prn.; in c rhyming *ayān* (< *ayān* < **ayān*st), 3rd sg. s-aor. to \sqrt{yam} . There is also the abl. inf. *étoḥ* in b.

The creatures that the hapax *ahyārṣu*- (‘snakes-stickers’, Ge (/WG), Falk ‘Schlangenspiesser’, Re ‘qui picquent les serpents’) refers to cannot be determined for certain. The consensus is that it is some kind of bird of prey; Ge suggests (n. 3c) the Schlangenadler. Indeed, the short-toed snake eagle (*Circaetus gallicus*) is wide-spread in India and feeds mainly on snakes (so Wikipedia). The internet (including You Tube) has some remarkable photos and videos of this bird fighting with, swallowing, and feeding its young with snakes, including cobras. The photos with sizable lengths of snake dribbling out of their mouths and esp. the video of one wolfing down a still wriggling spectacled cobra certainly testify to the greed or avidity of these birds. Whether they stop hunting at evening I have no idea.

II.38.4: Though Sāy., Old, and Re identify the weaver as Night, this seems unlikely, if the hymn really depicts the evening. More likely a real human weaver, finishing her daily work.

Note the unetym. phonetic echoes in *avyat* ... *váyantī*.

On the semantic and functional nuance of the intensive *adardhar*, see Schaeffer (Intens., 140–41). The form should be an impf. (see pres. *dárdharsī*), and Schaeffer notes that the iterative value generally expressed by intensives is not appropriate to an aorist, despite rather insistent aoristic context here. She suggests that *ádardhar* in contrast to the surrounding verbs “bezieht sich nicht auf die unmittelbar vorangegangene Handlung des Gottes, sondern nennt eine Tätigkeit, die er von alters vollbracht hat; die Funktion des Intensivums dürfte eine kontinuierliche sein: ‘sich aufraffend ist er aufgestanden; (fortwährend) hielt er die Jahreszeiten auseinander; bereiten Sinnes ist der Gott Savitr gekommen.’” My ‘always’ is an attempt at reconciling this.

Pāda-initial *arāmatih* ‘Proper Thinking’ echoes pāda-initial *ārīramat* (3b) (see also *ramate* 2d), though they are of course etymologically unrelated. I now think a pun is meant here, with *arāmatī*- analyzed as a privative *a-rāmatī*- and I would emend the tr. to “As Proper Thinking (/unresting) ...”

II.38.5: *vī tiṣṭhate* should be evaluated in conjunction with *vīṣṭhitah* in 6a and *vī tasthuh* in 7b.

Ge (/WG) take a and b as separate clauses (sim. Falk). My rendering is closer to Re’s. I think the idea is that Agni/Fire, though in some ways a single entity, is parcelled

out into separate domestic fires, one per household, and this holds for a man's whole lifetime after he has set up his household fire. The coming of night brings the (re-)kindling of these fires and so they come into visual prominence then.

The blazing up of the home fire is accompanied by the evening meal, rather charmingly depicted here: the mother reserving the best of it for her son; the son with his appetite stimulated by the coming of evening.

II.38.6: The first pāda of this vs. takes up the idiom *ví√sthā* 'disperse' found in 5b and applies it somewhat differently. Here it refers to all those who were dispersed in various directions pursuing their livelihoods -- who all want to come home in the evening. On *jigīṣú-* see Narten (Yasna H., 122); as she makes clear, the desid. of *√ji* in both Vedic and Avestan lacks martial or battle context and is simply about gaining food and so on. See also Heenen (Desid. 120–25).

The verb *samāṇavarti* is taken by Kü (465–66) as a (pseudo-)passive aor. to *√vrt*, with ref. to Hoffmann (Aufs. II.589–92), a form that is attested also after the RV (see Kü n. 884). The lexeme *sām-ā√vrt* is used in the causative of Dawn's cows rolling up the darkness (VII.79.2), so here I think the nuance is the gathering or rolling up together of everything that was dispersed during the day, playing on the common opposition between *ví* and *sām* that is prominent in this hymn.

Although we might expect *vīkṛtam* to mean 'badly/wrongly done', I think the dominant *sām / ví* play in this hymn trumps that, and if *sāmskṛta-* is 'perfected, brought to completion', *vīkṛta-* can mean 'incomplete, not done'.

II.38.7–8: These two vss. have been variously interpr. My interpr. is most influenced by Old (whose views also seems to have been adopted by WG). As noted in the publ. intro., the vss. enumerate the separate spheres assigned to the various categories of creatures by Savitar, as an extension of his ability to bring every creature to its proper resting place at night.

II.38.7: In my view, this vs. divides the world into habitats for fish (etc.), wild beasts, and birds. Not surprisingly the watery creatures are placed in water (pāda a). As head noun with *ápyam* I supply *jánma* from the summary pāda of this two-vs. sequence, 8d.

The problem in 7a is *bhāgám*: it is tempting to tr. "the watery (race) has been placed by you among the waters as their share," but *bhāgám* belongs to a masc. stem and must be acc., which does not accord with the nominal clause in which it would purportedly be found. I therefore construe this last word of pāda a with b, as an appositive to acc. pl. *dhánva* 'wastelands'. Although I would prefer to avoid such enjambment, I see no better choice, and note that a new clause also begins in the middle of pāda c (with *nákiḥ*) and continues to the end of d. Sim. also 9c. Ge's interpr., which keeps *bhāgám* within its pāda by making the whole pāda acc., seems to me to come at too high a cost: he must supply a set of fishermen and a verb 'seek' to govern the acc. ("[Fisherman seek] their watery share.."); these imaginary fishermen are parallel to the "hunters" that he takes *mṛgayásah* to be, dispersed across the dry land (and presumably hunting wild beasts). I see several conceptual problems with this interpr. For one thing this makes the first two pādas non-parallel with c, for there are no bird-catchers there (Vedic Papagenos?), whereas in my interpr. the three pādas describe the habitats of three types of

creatures. Moreover, the hunting has no obvious connection with Savitar, whereas by my interpr. the distribution of habitats is his doing – and is summed up by 8d “Savitar has distributed the races according to their stations.” Nor is the hunting likely to be an activity of night, the other thematic connection it might have to the rest of the hymn: everyone else has gone home, but hunters are out on the plains trying to shoot deer in the dark? For penetrating arguments against the Ge interpr. see Old’s n. 3 ad loc.

Pāda b has its own problem, the anomalous form *mṛgayāsaḥ*. Ge (n. 7ab) declares that *mṛgayās-* can *only* mean ‘hunter’, but gives no evidence for his certainty. Old’s disc. is more to the point (and rather tart about the ‘hunter’ interpr.), though his morphological analysis of it as an *-as-*derivative of the denom. *mṛgay-* seems a little shaky (likewise his alternative explan. as a cmpd. of loc. *mṛgé* + *√as* ‘shoot’, like *hṛtsv-ās-* [see Scar 41], with older sandhi and a meaning ‘auf das Wild schiessend’, which unfortunately smuggles in Ge’s hunters in another guise). On the other hand, I don’t have anything better to offer. It reminds us of a suffix-accented masc. deriv. like *rakṣās-* ‘demon’ next to neut. *rākṣas-* ‘demonic force’, which itself gets personified. But the assumed base **mṛgayas-* (or **mṛgāyas-*) ‘wild-beast-iness’ doesn’t exist and it’s hard to see to what it would be generated. AiG II.2.223 dismisses the word with a ? and a ref. to Old’s disc. In any case, Old’s structural arguments that it must refer to the beasts, not the hunters are sound. A third occurrence of *vī√sthā* is found in this pāda.

The *asya* in pāda c anticipates *devāsya savitūḥ* in d – perhaps better to tr. as Ge does: “... diese seine Gebote, des Gottes Savitar.” This doubling may have arisen because the clause begins in the middle of a pāda and continues over the pāda break.

II.38.8: The general purport of this vs. is clear: it both summarizes Savitar’s distribution of the creatures (esp. in pāda d) and hints (esp. in pāda c) at their return to their own special places at night. But the first half-verse is quite challenging and my interp. is not fully worked out.

On *yādrādhyām* see Old’s disc. My publ. tr. “As far as (Savitar’s) benefit extends” is, I’m afraid, opaque. What it means to convey is that Varuṇa’s presence in his watery womb is at the favor of Savitar, whose distribution of the creatures in their proper places extends even to the gods, or at least one of them. A modern equivalent might be the phrase “to serve at the pleasure of (e.g.) the president.” The dependence of Varuṇa (and other gods) on Savitar’s orders and ordering is stated plainly in the next vs., 9ab. It is esp. striking that Varuṇa follows Savitar’s *vratá-*, since the *vratá-* is primarily Varuṇa’s domain. That Varuṇa is the only god named here is probably meant to emphasize what might almost be seen as Savitar’s usurpation of the power and role of Varuṇa. Savitar’s *rādhās-* recurs in 11b.

This passage shows one of the early examples of what becomes Varuṇa’s principal association, that with water. Again, it may be that Savitar is deliberately relegating him to this restricted role. Varuṇa’s hypervigilance, familiar from other, more standard treatments of Varuṇa in the RV, is undeterred by his watery environment, as pāda b indicates.

Note the phonological play in *āniṣitaṃ nimíṣi*.

The sense of *nimíṣi* is unclear. My tr. “at (every) blink of the eye” takes it as an implicit āmreḍita with the frequenative *járbhurāṇaḥ*; it could also be an indication of the great speed of Varuṇa’s movements, like English “in the blink of an eye.” However it

shouldn't be forgotten that the idiom *ní√miṣ* is associated with the gods and esp. the Āditya—generally in its negation: the gods (or their spies) “never blink” (cf., e.g., IX.73.4, X.10.8, 63.4). For Mitra and Varuṇa or the Ādityas see VII.60.7, 61.3, VII.25.9, and esp. nearby II.27.8 *ásvapnajo animiṣā ádabdhāḥ* “unsleeping, unblinking, undeceivable” (of the Ādityas). Is the blinking here (as opposed to the usual non-blinking) another of Savitar's subtle put-downs of Varuṇa, implying that he does blink after all?

In c *mārtāṇḍá-* is taken by the standard tr. (also Lüders, Varuṇa I.50) as ‘bird’, and this could work well, corresponding to 7c, where the birds are assigned to the forests. However, note that in vs. 7 the other member of the trio of creatures, besides the watery, is the wild beast (7b), whereas here instead of a wild beast we have precisely a domesticated one, the *paśú-*. Its formulaic partner is *mārtāṇḍá-*, lit. ‘stemming from a dead egg’, found otherwise in the RV in the creation hymn X.72.8–9 in the myth of Aditi and the birth of her sons. The last son born (or rather the egg miscarried), *mārtāṇḍá-*, is the ancestor of mortals; for disc. of the word and the myth see Hoffmann 1976 (=1992: 723). That half of this vs. is devoted to Varuṇa and the next vs. has the great trio of Aditi's sons, Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman, provides further evidence that the Mārtāṇḍa of the Aditi birth story is meant. Under this interpr., the domestic herd animal (*paśú-*) is paired with the likewise domesticated human, each in its own pen.

II.38.9: The first hemistich restates 7cd in almost the same words, but instead of the indefinite *nákiḥ* ‘no one’ specified as the non-violator of Savitar's *vratá-*, a selection of the greatest gods serve as subject.

II.38.10: As Ge points out (n. 10a), the three divinized principles in pāda a—Good Fortune, Insight, and Plenitude—are what the poet needs for success.

As the layout of the publ. tr. shows, I take pāda b as a parenthetical insertion in the sentence that includes a, cd. It would be possible to take *vājáyantaḥ* as a predicated pres. part. and a separate cl., though this seems less likely to me.

Although *gnāspāti-* presumably contains the old gen. sg. of *gnā-* (e.g., AiG III.119, 129), I tr. it as a pl., since we usually hear of “*wives* (of the gods)” – though, since I don't exactly know what Narāśaṃsa (=Agni?) is doing here, perhaps there's only one wife. It is also not clear if there are two figures here or if *gnāspātiḥ* characterizes Narāśaṃsa as I have taken it (so also Ge, WG). Re does so in tr., but suggests in his n. that it might identify a separate individual, perhaps Tvaṣṭar, whose association with divine females is well established. I now am inclined in that direction and would provide an alternate tr. “Narāśaṃsa (and) the Husband of the (divine) Wives should help us.” That the verb is singular is not an impediment, since a series of sg. subjects can take a sg. verb.

This verb, *avyāḥ*, is a bit of a problem. It is isolated in the averbo of the root *√av* ‘help’, which is *seṭ* and has a well-attested *iṣ-*aor. (on which see Narten 86–89) beside the even better attested them. pres. Although Narten (86) identifies our *avyāḥ* (also X.139.5) as belonging to an old root aor. (with maintenance of the full grade despite being opt.), there are no other unambig. root aor. forms attested (though forms like *āvīt* could of course belong to a *seṭ* root aor. paradigm and have given rise to the *iṣ-*aor.). I think it's more likely an artificial form, makeshift replacement for the non-existent *iṣ-*aor. opt. (see

my 2009 “Where Are All the Optatives?” pp. 31–32 on the absence of act. sigmatic optatives, flg. Narten), as well as the relative dearth even of 3rd sg. thematic optatives to present stems (like *ávatí*), on which see the same art., pp. 32–34.

As for the point of the pāda: it is possible that the arousing of the three principles in pāda a reminds the poet that he needs the help of the ritual fire (if *Narāśaṃsa* is identified with *Agni* here). Perhaps *gnāspātiḥ* is invoked because two of the three principles are female. But this seems like groping in the dark.

II.38.11: The verb *āgāt* is interpr. by the Pp as injunc *gāt* and so treated in most editions and tr., but it could just as well be augmented *agāt*, a typical aorist in a summary vs.

II.39 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

This hymn bears some resemblance to the difficult-to-impossible Aśvin hymn X.106, which descends into unintelligibility but whose outer verses can be mostly understood. That hymn is also dominated by similes comparing the Aśvins to various pairs of entities, which are often semantically distant. (See comm. ad loc.) Ge calls our hymn “geistlos” and considers the similes “gesucht” (in this case, presumably in the meaning ‘studied, strained, stilted’)—I’m afraid this says more about Ge’s somewhat pedestrian approach to the literary qualities of the text than about the poet’s supposed limitations. WG reproduce Ge’s judgment verbatim, which also seems telling. Note that the Aśvins aren’t named until the last two vss. (7c, 8a), in the metasummary of the creation of the hymn after the simile portion, so that for most of its length the hymn is an extended riddle.

Besides Re’s limited notes (EVP XVI.31–33) it is tr. and comm. by Pirart (*Les Nāsatya*, vol. II), as usual quite idiosyncratically.

II.39.1: The opening of this vs. (and hymn), ... *tād íd ártham jarethe* “you two awaken to just this aim,” is reminiscent of the opening of X.106.1 ... *tād íd arthayete* “you two have just this as your aim,” with the denom. *arthaya-* substituting for the acc. *ártham* in our vs. The notion ‘awaken’ embodied in the finite verb *jarethe* in our vs. is postponed to X.106.1c: *sadhrīcīnā yāṭave prēm ajīgaḥ* “It has awakened you two to drive towards a common goal,” with transitive *ajīgaḥ* corresponding to intrans. *jarethe* here. Although ‘sing’ is also a possible rendering of *jarethe* (see, e.g., comm. ad II.28.2), and it is championed here by Pirart, the parallel in X.106.1 favors ‘awaken’ as at least the primary meaning. The shared theme of awakening between this vs. and X.106.1 also provides evidence against Ge’s (n. 1a) suggested emendation of *jarethe* to **carethe* on the basis of IX.1.5.

Contra the publ. tr. (and Ge), I do not think that pāda b necessarily expresses the “aim” (*ártham*) in pāda a. Rather, b begins the hymn-length suite of semi-independent pāda-length similes. I would replace the colon with a period and delete the parenthetical “(you awaken to go),” replacing the tr. of b with “(You two going) toward the depository (of honey) like vultures to a tree.” On *nidhí-* and its association with honey, see comm. ad X.59.2.

Despite Ge (“Brautwerber”) and Pirart (“paranymphe”), I do not think *jánya-* has the sense ‘suitor, best man’ here (or in II.6.7 adduced by Ge). The only likely attestation of that meaning is in IV.38.6 (*Dadhikrā*); otherwise it appears first in the AV. See Re’s

n., which argues strongly against that meaning here. On the other hand, I do think there is a marriage trope in 2d, unrecognized by them.

The phrase *dūtēva ... jānyā* is matched in X.106.2 by *dūtēva ... jāneṣu*.

II.39.2: On *prātaryāvan-* and *prātarītvān-*, both ‘early-coming’, see the extensive disc. in my *Sacrificed Wife*, 184–89 and passim. It is typically used of the Aśvins (e.g., V.77.1) or their chariot (e.g. X.40.1) because they are among the earliest arrivals at the dawn sacrifice.

Like most tr. but unlike JPB, I’d take *yamā* as part of the simile: “like twin goats” and I’d render *vāram ā sacethe* as “you accompany each other at pleasure” – the pāda depicts the playful companionship of young goats. For more of this see 3ab.

The publ. tr. of the 2nd hemistich seems to me over-heavily repetitive. I would rephrase c as “Beautifying your bodies like women for exchange”; although *śumbhamāne* is fem. and technically modifies *mēne* – and therefore the publ. tr. is technically accurate – the repetition violates the spirit of the simile structure.

On *mēnā*- see comm. ad I.62.7.

With JPB (and no one else), I agree that pāda d treats the marriage ceremony. The passages it most resembles are X.68.2 *jāne mitrō nā dāmpatī anakti* “As the ally among the people [=Agni] anoints the household pair ...,” depicting the public (*jāne*) ceremonial anointing of a couple in marriage, and V.3.2 *añjānti mitrām súdhitam nā góbhīr, yád dāmpatī sámanasā kṛṇósi* “They anoint you [=Agni] with cows [=milk] like a well-placed ally, when you make the household pair of one mind,” where the same ceremony is depicted, but with Agni, the ally, the recipient of anointment. (See disc. of these passages in my Fs. Parpola, p. 312.) The adj. *sámanas-* ‘of one mind’ modifies *dāmpatī* three times (here, VIII.31.5, and X.95.12). I would suggest that *kratuvídā* in our passage is the equivalent, rendered (correctly in my opinion) by JPB as “find[ing] (a common) resolve.” I further suggest that the first member of this root noun cmpd, *kratu-*, stands for *sákratu-* ‘of like resolve’ with the abbreviation common to such cmpds (see my forthcoming “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian” (though it doesn’t treat cmpds of exactly this structure), and it refers to the creation of the mental union of the newly married couple.

Again, in the tr. I would delete the parenthetical “(in the presence of the people)” to avoid heaviness.

II.39.3: The first hemistich contains two similes comparing the Aśvins to animal body parts.

Since *śṛṅga-* is neut., we expect du. *śṛṅge*, which is in fact found elsewhere. The Pp. reads *śṛṅgā*, which should be pl.; Old suggests **śṛṅge iva* with *pragr̥hya* of the dual and aphoresis of the particle to *va* as sometimes elsewhere in RV. This explan. is also nec. for other neut. or fem. exx. below. See Old for details.

The horns here are described as *prathamā-* ‘first, in front’. This description would only be accurate for animals in a butting posture, with head down and horns forward (otherwise it’s obviously the nose that’s in front). Since head-butting is esp. characteristic of goats among domestic animals (see numerous internet images and YouTube videos), this simile seems implicitly to take up 2b.

As for pāda b, I think this is part of the same goat head-butting scenario. In the moment before they actually butt heads, goats rear up on their hind legs and twist their bodies slightly to the side, with their forelegs dangling in space. This could be described as “hooves quivering” (watch the YouTubes), and I would substitute “quivering like two hooves ...”

Note polarized # *cakra-* ... *śakrā* #. This is one of only two applications of *śakrā-* to the Aśvins (the other being X.4.4), an epithet otherwise almost exclusively of Indra.

This is the first mention of the cakravāka bird (ruddy shelduck) in Sanskrit literature, and already here it seems to refer to the most common topos concerning these birds: the reunion of the devoted conjugal pair every morning after their nightly separation.

Du. *usrā* modifies the Aśvins elsewhere (IV.45.5, etc.), but the pāda-final sequence here, *vāstor usrā*, is also reminiscent of the likewise pāda-final phrase *vāsta usrāḥ* / *usrāḥ* “at the break of dawn”; see comm. ad V.49.3, as well as Old’s lengthy discussion of our passage.

Since *arvāk*, *arvāñc-* occurs three times in this hymn (3a, 3d, 5b), it should have a consistent tr. throughout, rather than “toward us” (3a), “this way” (3d), “here this way” (5b). Best, perhaps, “here this way” in all three cases.

II.39.4: The first hemistich is devoted to modes of transport – first boats (assuming the correctness of Old’s emendation of *nāvēva* to **nāveva*), then more and more specialized parts of a chariot, the last three having to do with wheel construction.

Although the simile in c, “allowing no injury to our bodies like two dogs,” is initially puzzling, both Pirart and WG plausibly suggest that this refers to the two dogs of Yama, who act as guardian psychopomps to the next world in the funeral hymn X.14.10–12.

The comparandum *khīgalā* is isolated in the RV; however, its scanty occurrences in the AV (Ś III.9.3=P III.7.4, and fem. *khīgalā*- P I.58.1) strongly favor the sense ‘amulet’. See the useful discussions of Spiers (diss.) ad P III.7.4 and Zehnder, Hellwig, and Leach (2020; online ed. of AVP I) ad P I.58.1. Pirart connects the word with *khargalā*- ‘(female) owl’ — or other night bird: I suggest ‘nightjar’; see comm. ad VII.104.17 – and adduces a YAvestan passage (Yt. 14.34–36) in which a feather of a bird of prey serves as protection against malediction. Ge tr. as ‘armor’. Scar’s tr. of this hemistich (673 and n. 962) seems uncharacteristically off the mark; among other things he overlooks the fact that (on the basis of the whole rest of the hymn) each pāda is an independent simile, and tr. *khīgalā* as an adj. modifying ‘dogs’ (“wie zwei knurrende (?) Wachhunde”), despite the *iva* following each. He connects *khīgala-* with √*kharij*, accepting Gotō’s (1st Cl, 86, 324) assertion that the root is a phonological variant of √*sarj* (both meaning ‘creak’ vel sim.). WG in turn cite Scar, though their tr. does divide the pādas, resulting for d in “wie die beiden knurrenden (?)” Although it’s not clear to me why amulets would be invoked just here, the preponderance of the evidence favors this interpr.

II.39.5: Ge (n. 5a) takes *nadyèva rītīḥ* as “loses Kompos.” (“wie die Flossströmung”; sim. Re), but the two-into-one of JPB’s tr. (also more or less WG) reflects the Skt. better.

Pāda b inaugurates a series of comparisons to body parts, which extends through the first pāda of 7. All of the body parts here naturally occur in pairs (on 6c see below). This set is marked off by a rough sort of ring composition, with ‘hands’ (*hástau* in 5c and 7a).

The publ. tr. “*becoming* the best blessing” for *śámbhaviṣṭha-* is unnec., since the forms of $\sqrt{bhū}$ as 2nd cmpd member with *śám* serve merely to allow the indeclinable *śám* ‘luck, weal’ to be used as modifier. I would substitute “The best luck for the body like two hands.”

II.39.6: Given that all the other body parts in this sequence are natural pairs, *nāsā* is better ‘nostrils’ than ‘noses’. The question is why they are “the guardians of the body.” Ge (n. 6c, repeated by WG) says “Durch den Geruch,” which is no explanation at all. I think rather that it has to do with the vital role of the breaths, which enter and leave the body via the nostrils, which are therefore the de facto gatekeepers of life. Although the full doctrine of the breaths has not yet developed in the RV (though it is in fairly full swing by the AV, judging by the number of occurrences of the dual dvandva *prāṇāpānā-*), the role of breath in life was obviously well recognized.

II.39.7: I take *śakti-* here as a pun, meaning ‘spear’ in the simile and ‘power’ in the frame, and I would therefore erase the parens and alter the tr. to “Clasping power for us, like two hands a spear ...” Although the ‘spear’ sense of this stem is generally found later (cf. EWA s.v. *śakti-*, though he is skeptical about RVic occurrences; however, see comm. ad X.134.6), this is the kind of context in which lower register / common parlance items are likely to appear – and the simile doesn’t make sense without a physical object for the hands to clasp. Lü (238 n. 5) suggests rather “wie zwei Hände, die sich zur Hilfeleitung für uns vereinigen,” which has the merit of taking account of *abhí* (which I confess I have not tried to do, though I think it probably simply adds a further sense of contact: “clasp *onto*”), but ignores the importance of the simile.

As disc. ad I.139.1 and IX.99.7, *saṃdadí-* must belong to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘bind’.

There is no agreement about the sense of pāda b; my interpr. is closest to Ge’s though differing little from JPB’s. I think that the simile is bipartite: *kṣāmeva ... rájāmsi* “like H+E the airy realms [i.e., the midspace].” Unlike JPB and like Ge, I would supply a different obj. in the frame. The lexeme *sám* \sqrt{aj} can take as obj. ‘cows’ (*gās* I.33.3) or their equivalent (V.34.7; see comm. ad loc.): ‘drive together’, hence ‘corral, confine’. H+E, as the spatial limits, confine the midspace – such is the sense of the simile, but the frame is slightly different: we ask the Áśvins to drive together (assemble+confine) some variety of good stuff: Ge “Reichtümer” / me “cows” vel sim. I would slightly alter the tr. to “Like Heaven and Earth the airy realms, corral (good things) for us.”

With the near-deictic *imā* opening the second hemistich, the hymn turns towards the ritual here-and-now and the poet’s summary of the Gṛtsamadas’ efforts. For this reason I would flip the tr. to “These songs here that are seeking you – sharpen them ...”

II.39.8: Again, because of the fronting of *etāni ... vārdhanāni* I would flip the tr. to “these strengthening formulations, (this) praise song, have the Gs made for you.” Most tr. (though not Pirart) keep *vārdhanāni* and *bráhma* as separate items, but VI.23.6 *bráhmāni ... vārdhanāni*, adduced by Ge, favors a syntagm. It scarcely matters, however.

The impv. *yātām* occurs 3x in this hymn: 3d, 5b, and 8c; in the first two instances the publ. tr. has “journey,” but here “drive.” Though I personally prefer “drive,” I’d slightly change the tr. here to “journey,” to match the previous exx.

II.40 Soma and Pūṣan

II.40.1: The publ. tr. does not capture the etymological play between the transitive nominal *jānana-* (3x in ab) and the first word of the 2nd hemistich, intrans.-passive *jātá-*, which could have been tr. ‘begotten’ to reflect this etym. figure. However, this tr. seems a little stiff and would not work with *jāyamānau* in 2a.

It is only in d that it becomes clear that the dual nominal phrases in the first 3 pādas are in the acc. and are the obj. of *akṛṇvan*.

II.40.2: The etym. figure involving \sqrt{jan} noted ad vs. 1 continues here with intrans.-pass. *jāyamānau* (a) and transitive *janat* (d). Another figure involves $\sqrt{juṣ}$ ‘enjoy’, likewise with trans. versus pass. manifestations: *juṣanta* (a), *ájūṣtā* (b), both pāda-final.

This vs. contains three injunctives: *juṣanta* (a), *gūhatām* (b), *janat* (d), the middle one of which could also be an impv. Ge takes all three as preterital, a course I also follow, but Re takes *gūhatām* as impv. (flg. Gr); WG take the first two as presential and the last as preterital. There seems no decisive evidence for or against any of these choices (or the others that could be made). On the one hand *imaú* (2x, ab) and *ābhyām* (c) ‘these two (here)’ would support a here-and-now presential and/or imperatival reading, as perhaps also the pres. part. *jāyamānau* in a. On the other, it seems unlikely that the gods would be *currently* celebrating the birth of Pūṣan (Soma might be another story), and, as for b, inserting an imperative into the mix seems odd to me.

Another ambiguity is posed by *ābhyām ... somāpūṣabhyām* in cd, which can be instr., dat., or abl. dual. Ge takes it as instr.: Indra performed this feat along with the two gods; Re and WG (see also Hoffmann, Injunkt. 124, 193–94) as a dat.: Indra did it for them. I also interpr. the phrase as a dat. -- though not with any strong conviction. On the one hand this deed (putting “raw” milk into “cooked” cows) is almost always attributed to Indra alone, so having Soma and Pūṣan as his accomplices seems somewhat unlikely. But on one occasion (VI.72.4) it’s attributed to Indra and Soma in a dual dvandva *īndrāsomā*. However, that hymn basically lays out Indra’s great deeds and attributes them to Indra and Soma jointly, so there’s no independent evidence of Soma’s involvement in this action. As for how they could benefit from the exploit and thus be in the dative -- Soma would benefit from the creation of milk because he (or the ritual substance bearing his name) is mixed with milk in the Soma Sacrifice (a point also made by WG). But what Pūṣan would gain from it isn’t clear -- unless he likes milk with his habitual food, porridge (*karambhā-*). (We should probably be wary of reading Anglo-American breakfast habits back into Vedic India.)

II.40.3: The referent of this marvellous chariot is disputed. Sāy suggested the year, Lüders (Varuṇa, 690) the sun, Ge the praise-song, the sacrifice, or the wish that the gods bring. As Re points out, a choice does not have to be made; the interpretation is

“volontairement polyvalente.” However, I assume that the primary reading is the sacrifice and its associated verbal expression, as so often.

The surprising descriptor of this chariot is *āviśvaminva-* ‘not speeding/moving everyone’. This word has to be evaluated alongside its positive counterpart, *viśvaminvá-*, used of Pūṣan in 6a. In both that verse and this one Pūṣan (in this vs. along with Soma) is the subj. of *√jinv* ‘quicken’. This oppositional phraseology favors Old’s suggestion that the chariot lacks something required to “move everyone” until Pūṣan (and Soma) provide the enlivening push. However, Ge’s quite different suggestion, that the chariot only carries gods and qualified priests, gets support from the only other occurrence of *āviśvaminva-*, in the riddle hymn, I.164.10, where the gods (probably) speak speech that knows everything but does not move everyone (*viśvavidam vācam āviśvaminvām*), a formulation that probably refers to profound speech that only affects initiates or those with already prepared minds. As with the identity of the chariot itself, probably both interpr. can be simultaneously applied.

In context the root noun cmpd. *viśūvīt-* must contain *√vrt* ‘turn’ (see Scar 511–12), but a homonymous stem based on *√vr* ‘obstruct, ward off’ is found in X.43.3.

In the publ. tr. *vīṣaṇā* appears to be tr. as a voc.; it is not, and the tr. might be clearer as “that do you two bulls quicken.”

II.40.4: The standard assumption (Ge [/WG], Re) is that pāda a refers to Pūṣan and b to Soma, but the opposition between celestial and terrestrial/atmospheric dwelling places doesn’t seem to me to divide so neatly. Pūṣan seems often to be an earthly god, accompanying us on the ragged roads, finding our lost cattle, and Soma certainly has a celestial presence throughout the IXth Maṇḍala. I imagine that this contrastive pairing is meant to be a genuine riddle, which would require its audience to try out different solutions by bringing to mind everything they know about both gods and trying to match those characteristics with the description in this vs.

The two different acc. phrases in cd can both be construed with the verb that lies between them, *vīṣyatām*. There seems no reason to supply a diff. verb to govern the first acc. phrase as Ge and Re do. The slightly diff. renderings “unleash” and “unloose” in the pub. tr. were simply adapted to better fit their objects.

II.40.5: The contrastive *anyāḥ ... anyāḥ* is generally taken to refer to Soma (a) and Pūṣan (b) respectively (Ge [/WG], Re). But the differential characterizations in this vs. seem even less easily assigned than in the preceding vs. “Begetting all creatures” isn’t a standard action attributed to Soma; in fact the same deed is said to be Apām Napāt’s in nearby II.35.2. And Ge can attribute “watching over everything” to Pūṣan only by identifying him with the sun god, while Soma regularly gazes on things, even with the same participle: cf. the very similar IX.57.2 *viśvā cākṣāṇo arṣati* “he [=Soma] rushes gazing on all (things/beings).” Again I think this differentiation is meant to be genuinely puzzling and provoke thought in the audience.

II.40.6: Fem. *anarvā* here (and VII.40.4) is assigned to the thematic stem *anarvā-* by Gr. It is more likely simply the nom. sg. to the well-attested *-n*-stem *anarván-*, serving for the fem. as well as the masc., without the fem. derivational suffix *-ī*. See JPB (Ādityas 218) and abundant discussions noted in the lexical commentary.

II.41 Various gods

II.41.1–3: This *ṛca* is characterized by lexical chaining. The first *pāda* of vs. 2 reprises *niyútvān* from 1c, *vāyo* from (accented) *vāyo* (1a), and *ā gahi* (1b). Vs. 3 is less closely tied to what precedes, but *śukrá-* ‘clear’, which characterizes the first drink of soma, offered to Vāyu, is repeated in 3a from 2b, and *niyútvant-* also recurs from 1c and 2a. The impv. *pībatam* (3c) picks up (*sóma-*)*pītaye* from 1c. More subtly, *ā yātam* repeats the preverb of *ā gahi* (1b, 2a) and also echoes the unrelated verb *ayāmi* of 2b.

II.41.3: The stem *niyútvant-* (3b) is repeated from 1c and 2a, as noted above, but here as an apparent gen. sg. modifying the soma drink (or rather one of them), not a god or gods. Ge (n. 3b) suggests that it is a metrically conditioned “hypallage” for dual *niyútvantā*, which would qualify Indra and Vāyu. This is a clever idea and would restore parallelism to the phraseology of the *ṛca*, though I’m not sure that’s necessary: Rigvedic poets enjoy tweaking parallelism in the syntactic equivalent of a slant rhyme. Old floats a truly oddball idea, unworthy of his usual acuity: that *niyútvant-* should modify an unexpressed *rāthena* but in the absence of a head noun in the proper case it gets sucked [not Old’s term] into the gen. by the “benachbarte” gen. Even if this were a reasonable explanation in principle -- that an untethered adj. could be captured by an adjacent or nearby word in another case -- *niyútvataḥ* is actually in a different *pāda* from the other genitives and is adjacent only to the dual dvandva *índrāvāyū*.

II.41.5: Note the phonological echo across the *pāda* boundary: ... *druhā, dhruvé* ...

II.41.11: The *ca* here is a subordinator (‘if’) and conditions accent on *mṛṣáyāti*. See II.42.1.

There are several nice phonetic sequences: ab: ... *no, ná naḥ*, where the 1st and last words are the same, with *naśat* at the end. And c: *bhadrām bhavāti*.

II.41.12: I am tempted to take *jētā* as a periphr. future, parallel as it is to the subjunctive *karat*. But this is not nec.

II.41.15: On the morphological and semantic structure of *pūṣarātayaḥ*, as well as other aspects of this vs., see the disc. of the identical vs. I.23.8.

II.41.16: Like 15ab, the first two *pādas* of this vs. consist entirely of accented vocatives.

II.42 Omen-bird

II.42.1: Subordinating *ca* as in II.41.11, also with a subjunctive.

The root noun cmpd. *abhibhā-* occurs only here in the RV, but 5x in the AV, which seems only to make it more obscure. Twice in the phrase “let not *abhibhā* or *aśasti* find you” (i.e., parallel to this phrase), but also in conjunction with dogs and jackals once, once *abhibhā*-s can speak, and once in conjunction with diseases. Wh. transl. ‘portent’.

Though not a lit. tr., Engl. “evil-eye” seems to correspond well to the contextual sense of the word; I have adopted it from Klein (DGRV II.240).

Pāda d should be read as a Jagatī, though neither Old nor HvN comment. The cadence is a Jagatī cadence and the proper number of syllables is achieved by reading *vīśv'yā* as a trisyllable (so already Gr, also AiG III.78). The word is otherwise not found in the RV, but such a cluster begs to be distracted, and by Wackernagel’s analysis of it as modeled on *urviyā* (AiG III.78, flg. Brugmann), it would have *-iyā* by nature.

II.42.2: Similarly, pāda c should also be read as a Jagatī, with trisyllabic *pītr'ya-*, as always in the RV

II.42.3: Although the publ. tr. follows Ge (/WG) in rendering *dakṣiṇatāḥ* as ‘to the right’, it is also possible, given 2c *pītryam ānu pradīśam* “in the direction of the fathers [that is, forefathers/ancestors],” that *dakṣiṇatāḥ* should rather be ‘to the south’, since the south is ordinarily the quarter of the Pitars.

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

II.43 Omen-bird

This hymn seems late enough to allow terms like *sāma(n)√gā*, *gāyatrā-*, and *traiṣṭubha-* to have their full technical ritual meanings, and I have so rendered them.

II.43.1: Again as in II.42.3, *pradakṣiṇīt* might refer to ‘south’, rather than ‘right’, though the idiom *prā + dakṣiṇā-* seems more limited to the traditional circumambulation of the fire with the right side facing inward.

Pāda c is somewhat oddly phrased. The vocalizer is identified as a *sāman-singer*, but is said to *speak* (both) *speech(es)*. This raises several questions: does a singer speak? and what are “both speeches”? It is tempting to equate the two speeches with the two entities in pāda d, *gāyatrām* and *traiṣṭubham*, but I am not certain that is correct. I think it’s possible that “both speeches” refers to the words and the melody. As for the question of singing versus speech, I wonder if the simile *sāmagā iva* should go rather with d than with c: “It speaks both speeches. Like a *sāman*-singer it regulates both *Gāyatrī* and *Trīṣṭubh* meters.” Unfortunately this hymn is so isolated in the RV that we have no points of comparison.

II.43.2: As HvN remark in their metrical comm., although the *Anukramaṇī* identifies the meter of this vs. as *Atīśakvarī* or *Aṣṭi*, it appears simply to consist of 5 Jagatī pādas. That the fifth pāda is a simple variant of the fourth makes it likely that the vs. is just a version of Jagatī.

The “son of the formulation” (*brahmaputrā-*) is presumably the formulator (*brahmān-*) himself, as the standard tr. take it.

II.43.3: The provision of sitting silently reminds us of the actions and role of the *Brāhmaṇa* priest in later śrauta ritual: associated (secondarily) with the AV, he silently observes the proceedings for errors and omissions. But that development may be too late for even a late RVic hymn.

Commentary III

The commentary on III now includes SJ's comments on all the hymns, including those translated by JPB in the publ. tr.

[III.1-7 JPB – comments by SWJ]

III.1 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The account(s) of Agni's birth (vss. 3–14) are very difficult to sort out and are riddled with paradoxes and unclear referents.

III.1.1: The JPB tr. of the 1st hemistich is quite different from any of the standard tr., but seems to me more satisfactory than the others, although it is quite tricky. It assumes that Agni is the speaker of the hemistich – all others assume that it is the ritual officiant – but that Agni's speech includes an embedded quotation addressed to Agni (hence the voc. *agne*) by the officiant. It also takes *vákṣi* as the -*si* impv. to *√ vah* (with Gr and Re, but contra Old, Ge, and WG), rather than the 2nd sg. root pres. to *√ vaś*.

By this interpr., Agni says to the priest “you have made me your draught-horse [=oblation-conveyor]” (... *mā ... váhniṃ cakārtha*). This is regularly Agni's role; see, e.g., nearby III.11.4 *agním ... váhniṃ devā akṛṇvata*. The standard tr. require the priest to say the same thing to Agni, with *váhni-* then identifying the priest, but this is far less likely (though for *váhni-* referring to a priest, see III.20.1). The standard tr. also require *tavásam* either to modify the priest (Old, Re, WG) or a different substantive to be supplied (so Ge). But, as Ge points out (n. 1a), *tavás-* only otherwise modifies gods, and further, as Ge does not point out, it is used of Agni twice more in this hymn, including the immediately flg. vs. (2d, 13d). All of this reinforces JPB's interpr. of *sómasya mā tavásam ... váhniṃ* as referring to Agni, not a priest or poet.

The standard tr. also encounter the problem of the accented *vákṣi* (whichever morphological analysis they impose on it), generally explaining it as expressing unsigned subordination. But by JPB's interpr., the parenthetical impv. clause consists only of *vákṣy agne*, and the accent falls out from its clause-init. position. Taking *vákṣi* as an impv. to *√ vah* also connects it both etymologically and thematically with *váhni-*. For a similar connection see nearby III.5.1, 9–10 and comm. ad 9–10.

As for the 2nd hemistich, it constitutes the priest-poet's reply to Agni's speech in ab. All the standard tr. also take the priest-poet to be the speaker here, but then another interpr. difficulty arises: the participial phrase that begins c, *devāṃ áchā dīdyat*, most naturally modifies Agni (see almost identical III.15.5 with the middle part. and Agni as subj.), but the first ps. verbs *yuñjé* and *śamāyé* must have the poet as subj. Old struggles mightily with this, and Re simply reassigns the phrase to the poet. But then, once again, the accentuation of the verb makes trouble – why *yuñjé*? Ge proposes (this was also one of Old's thoughts) that the middle part of the hemistich – *yuñjé ádrim, śamāyé agne* – is parenthetical, and the opening participial phrase is to be construed with *tanvāṃ juṣasva* at the end of the next pāda. This works quite well and accounts for the accented *yuñjé*. And this solution actually reinforces JPB's embedded imperative clause in the first hemistich – both occupy the last four syllables of the odd pāda (and in the case of cd, the beginning of the even) and end with voc. *agne*. The structures are parallel.

Thus, by this interpr. the first vs. matches two individuals: Agni and the poet, each of whom appears both in 1st and 2nd ps.: Agni as 1st ps., addressing the poet in 2nd ps., in ab – but also quoting the poet as addressing Agni in the 2nd ps. The 2nd hemistich is simpler: the poet in 1st ps. addressing Agni in 2nd ps.

III.1.2: The next vs. introduces new sets of actors, now in the plural. The first pāda contains 1st pl. *caṣṛma* (recalling *caṣartha* in 1); this 1st pl. most likely has as subj. the ritual officiants as a group. Pādas b, c, and d all contain 3rd plural verbs: b: *duvasyan*, c: *śaśāsuḥ*, d: *īṣuḥ*. The question is – who are the subjects of these verbs, and are they all the same? Because of the ritual content of b, human priests seem the most likely, and JPB’s interpr. of the 1st pl. of pāda a as a quotation of these priests (hence his quotation marks) allows a way of reconciling the clashing grammatical persons and also fits the tricky interplay of quotations in vs. 1. Re, however, considers the subj. of *duvasyan* to be “les premiers sacrificateurs,” continuing as subjects of the 2nd hemistich – hence distinct from the 1st pl. of pāda a; in a similar way WG (flg. KH Inj. 128) take it as a timeless general statement. And a further wrinkle is introduced by the fact that *duvasyan* reappears at the end of vs. 13, there clearly with the gods as subject. Of these choices I would favor the JPB solution, though it is far from certain.

Who we supply as subjects in cd depends in part on what we do with *divāḥ*. If, with the standard tr., we take it as an abl. loosely construed with the verb (“from heaven they directed ...”) (or, with Ge and Th [Unters. 44], as a gen. with the unnamed subjects of *śaśāsuḥ* “they of heaven”), then the subjects cannot be the humans of pāda a (and maybe b); if, with Old (SBE), we take it as dependent on *kavīṇām*, no such inference has to be drawn. I do not have strong feelings about this, but given the prominent initial position of *divāḥ*, I think it is more likely connected to the verb or its subj. than to the gen. that ends the pāda, and that therefore the subjects are gods vel sim. The fact that the gods are prominent in the next two vss. about Agni’s birth gives some support to this interpr. However, the interpr. is made more difficult because the construction of the verb is somewhat anomalous: $\sqrt{sās}$ without preverb generally takes a personal obj.: “instruct someone,” but here *vidāthā* is the available acc. If the verb can be construed like some occurrences of $\tilde{a}\sqrt{sās}$ (see comm. ad IX.99.5) in the sense ‘direct’ (as is implicitly accepted by the standard tr. of our passage), the pāda may mean that the gods (or similarly heaven-based entities) direct how the goodies should be parceled out to the various human kavis. Pl. *vidātha-* reappears in 18b, though without clear thematic ties to our passage – although it’s worth pointing out that it’s immediately preceded by pf. *sasāda*, which is something of a phonological match to *śaśāsuḥ*, which precedes it here.

In short, the vs. is a bit of an interpretational mess, though the grammar isn’t particularly challenging.

III.1.3: For reasons given ad vs. 5, *pūtādakṣa-* here should be tr. “of purified skill.”

Despite its accent, the loc. *apāsi* in the phrase *apāsi svāsīṇām* (also 11d) must mean ‘labor’ and belong with the other anomalously accented forms of a neut. *apās-* ‘labor’; see comm. ad I.64.1. Here it flirts with its sometime twin *āp-* ‘water(s)’, which appears in the loc. pl. in the parallel phrase in pāda c. Since, as disc. in the publ. intro., the “sisters” may be not only the fingers that operate the kindling apparatus, but also the

rivers or waters that also give birth to Agni mythologically, a secondary sense of “in the water of the sisters” is not excluded here.

III.1.4: I would prefer to take *ásvāḥ* as part of the simile, despite its position: “They came to him newly born like mares to a new-born colt.”

III.1.5: Note the etymological figure between the words opening the two hemistichs: *#śukrēbhiḥ* (a) / *#śocīḥ* (c).

The phrase *krátum punānāḥ* “purifying his resolve” echoes the cmpd *pūtá-dakṣaḥ* in 3b, esp. since *krātu-* and *dákṣa-* are frequently found together (as in the next hymn III.2.3 *krátvā dákṣasya* ...). To register the repetition of the root $\sqrt{pū}$, the tr. in 3b of *pūtá-dakṣaḥ* as “of refined skill” should be changed to “of purified skill.” (Or the participial phrase here should be changed to “refining his resolve.”)

Rather than taking *āyur apām* as a nom. appositive to Agni (with JPB and, apparently, Old SBE), I would follow the other standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) in taking it as an acc. parallel to *śocīḥ* and another obj. to *vásānāḥ*: “clothing himself all around in flame (and) in the life of the waters.”

III.1.6: The tr. of *ánadatīḥ* as “not speaking falsely” rests on an old article of mine, “A Vedic-Avestan Correspondence: RV *ánadant-*: Gathic *nadənt-*” (JAOS 101 [1981] 351–54), in which I argue that this vs. is structured by paired oppositional phrases: *ávasānā ánagnāḥ* “not clothed (yet) not naked”; *sánāḥ ... yuvatáyaḥ* “old (yet) young”; *sáyonīḥ ... saptá vānīḥ* “having one womb (yet constituting) seven voices.” Only the first pair, *ánadatīr ádabdhāḥ*, at least as it is ordinarily interpreted, does not fit this pattern: “not eating (yet) undeceivable” cannot conceivably form an oppositional unity. I further point out that “not eating” is not an appropriate description of rivers, who in fact are sometimes explicitly characterized as eating. I therefore suggest a different segmentation of the negated participle, as *á-nadant-*, not *án-adant-*, and connected *nad* with Old Aves. *nadənt-* in Y. 33.4, which on contextual grounds I interpr. as ‘speaking falsely’. This interpr. yields a more satisfactory oppositional pair “not speaking falsely (yet) undeceivable,” which fits the pattern of the vs. much better.

III.1.7: The hapax stem *saṃhát-* is problematic, in that it looks like an anomalously formed root noun cmpd to \sqrt{han} , with the empty *-t* characteristic of roots ending in short resonants, save for nasals. It is variously interpr.; besides the standard tr., see also Scar’s detailed (but inconclusive) disc. (696). I find JPB’s interpr. persuasive: that it is an oppositional partner to *stūrṇāḥ*, referring to Agni’s flames, which both spread out and bunch together. It would also be possible to take *saṃhátāḥ* as a gen. with *asya*, contrasting the compacted Agni with his spread-out flames, with an alt. tr. “Of him, the compact mass, (the flames) of all colors are spread (out).”

The publ. tr. of d is a bit anticlimactic. I also think that the dual entities indicated there are, with the standard tr., Heaven and Earth, rather than (or rather than only) the two fire-churning sticks, as identified in the publ. tr. Both *mahī* and *samīcī* are regularly used of H+E – the latter, for ex., in III.30.11 – and the statement “the two mothers [/parents] of the wondrous one are the two great, conjoined (H+E)” would pick up and further specify

3b *diváh subándhur janúṣā prthivyāḥ* “who through his birth is the close kin of heaven and of earth.”

III.1.8: This vs. and 10a have the only forms of the pf. (*babhar-* /) *babhr-* in the RV (versus *jabhar-* / *-bhr-*), both medial. See Kü 342. Note also the nominal *babhrí-* in 12a.

The ghee and honey of 7b recur here in c.

III.1.9: “The udder of his father” is a paradox of the type beloved by Vedic poets, esp. in the context of Agni’s birth. As to what it refers to, various suggestions have been advanced – see the publ. intro. and the standard tr. I prefer to stay out of it.

The instr. phrases in c and d, *sákhībhiḥ śivébhiḥ ... yahvībhiḥ*, are instrs. of separation, as Old suggests.

III.1.9–10: The abrupt anacoluthon between 9c and d, with Agni represented by the acc. in c (*cárantam*) but as the nom. subj. of *babhūva* in d, is best accounted for by JPB’s interpr., whereby Agni is also the acc. referent of *gárbham* in 10a, as well as the nom. subj. of *babhre*, which governs *gárbham*. This allows 9d to be a parenthetical remark, as it is represented in the publ. tr. Other interpr. leave 9c hanging.

III.1.10: However it is interpr., pāda a presents another paradox on the subject of Agni’s birth. That Agni is the embryo in question is supported by his suckling in pāda b.

See comm. ad vs. 8 on the *babhr-* forms, also ad 12.

With Ge, Re, and WG, but contra JPB, I would take c as an independent clause, with *ní pāhi* confined to d. The term *sapātnī* ‘cowives’ is used nearby (III.6.4) clearly of Heaven and Earth. Note also that Agni was *sabándhuḥ* of H+E in 3b; the term is a reciprocal one, and so they now receive this same designation. The cosmic pair H+E are then contrasted with the *manuṣyè* pair in d – the two “belonging to / stemming from men,” which here are likely the kindling sticks, as identified in the publ. tr. If pāda c refers to H+E, it might seem presumptuous to command someone (whoever is the subj. of *ní pāhi*) to protect these cosmic entities, whereas the kindling sticks belong to the human realm and are more vulnerable. I would substitute the tr. “The two close kin (of his) [=Heaven and Earth] are cowives for the blazing bull; protect the two belonging to men [= fire-churning sticks].” By identifying H+E both as kin of Agni by birth and his cowives, a new factor – incest – is introduced in this ever-shifting series of paradoxical relationships.

III.1.11: On JPB’s colloquial rendering of *yaśásaḥ sām hí pūrvīḥ* “for glory gets the girls,” see comm. ad X.46.10, where I use his tr. for the same phrase there. A more literal rendering would be “for many (females) (assemble) for one who has glory.” Re takes *yaśásaḥ* as nom. pl., modifying the fem. subj. “waters,” but the repetition in X.46.10 makes this unlikely.

The re-marked impf. *aśayat* (for expected *t*-less medial **aśaya*, next to pres. *śáye*) appears directly before an initial *d-*: *aśayad dāmūnāḥ*, as Re points out. But the ending *-d* is metrically guaranteed.

On *apási svásṛṇām* see comm. ad vs. 3.

III.1.12: On the unclear word *ákra*- see comm. ad I.189.7. If ‘foal’ is the correct interpr. of this word, note that it responds to 4c *śísuṃ ná jātám abhí ārur áśvāḥ* “They came to him newly born like mares to a new-born colt.”

The redupl. nominal *babhrí*- has the same *b*-redupl. as the isolated pf. forms *babhrāṇāḥ* (8a) and *babhre* (10a); unlike the pf., the nominal is found once elsewhere, however (VI.23.4), where it takes an acc. obj. I think it likely that it participates here in the dominant paradox of this part of the hymn, that Agni is both an embryo / new-born and the father / begetter of the same – as is (fairly) clearly expressed in the second hemistich. Since in IV.6.3 *ákra*- is described as “new-born” (*navajāḥ*), with Agni as referent, and since in our 4c we have a new-born colt (*śísuṃ ... jātám*, see immed. above), I think we can fill in this expression as “like a (new-born) foal, bearing (himself as embryo),” with reference esp. to 10a *gárbham ... babhre* “he carried (himself as) embryo.”

The missing contrastive “father” in this hemistich is, I think, implied by pāda b, where the dat. *sūnāve* invites us to supply *pitéva* (as in I.1.9, 26.3; VIII.48.4; X.25.3; see also *mātā sūnāve* II.38.5). I would emend the tr. to “desirable for a son to see (like a father).”

As just indicated, the 2nd hemistich expresses, somewhat more clearly, Agni’s role as both begetter and begotten, with the former role heavily emphasized in c (*jānitā yó jajāna*), though he begets the dawns there, not himself, and the latter in d (*apām gárbhaḥ ... yāhvāḥ*). The vs. ends with *agníḥ*, tying all his roles together.

The fem. pl. *yāhvīḥ* has figured prominently in this set of vss. (4a, 6b, 9d); this is the only time in the hymn that the corresponding masc. *yāhvāḥ* is used.

III.1.13: This vs., which is the penultimate one of the birth sequence, reassembles a number of the terms used earlier in the hymn: *apām gárbham* picks up the same phrase in the nom. from 12d, as well as *gárbham* in 6d, 10a; *darśatām* = the same in 3c; *jajāna* = *jajāna* 12c, as well as the numerous other forms of *√jan*; *subhágā* recalls *subhágam* 4a; *vīrūpam* resembles *viśvarūpāḥ* 7a; *devāsaḥ* also in 3d; *jātám* also 4c; *tavásam* also 1a, 2d; *duvasyan* also 2b. The effect is almost claustrophobic.

Given these repetitions, the tr. of *tavásam* should be corrected to ‘mighty’ to match vss. 1 and 2.

The subj. of *jajāna* is *vānā ... subhágā*. This is universally taken to be a nonce feminization of neut. *vāna*- ‘wood’, on the tacit assumption that a female is the appropriate gender to give birth (though note the immediately preceding masc. *yó jajāna* 12c) and/or that it is a stick of wood assimilated in gender to the *arāṇī*- ‘kindling stick’ (so Re explicitly) (cf. V.9.3 *jāniṣṭārāṇī*). However, MLW suggested to me the appealing alternative that the phrase can be a neut. pl., construed with a singular verb – a fairly rare but nonetheless attested syntactic possibility in the RV, and particularly appropriate for a substance that even in Sanskrit shifts between a mass noun and a count noun. I would slightly change the tr. to “(the pieces of) wood, possessed of good fortune, gave birth ...”

In c I would change “even” to “also.”

III.1.14: The standard tr. (save for Old SBE, but incl. JSK, DGRV I.185) separate the two hemistichs into two distinct sentences, having therefore to supply a verb in cd (mostly *sacanta* from b; see Ge n. 14). I prefer the publ. tr., in which the radiant beams themselves

produce radiant Agni as milk, a process that conforms to the closed loop of birth, whereby the son is the father who gives birth to himself, depicted earlier in this section. The beams are both produced by Agni and produce him in their turn.

The “unbounded container” (*apārā ūrvē*) echoes the “broad and unrestricted (place)” (*uraú ... anibādhē*) in which Agni grew (*vavardha*) in 11a; here the same verb is used (*vṛddhām*).

III.1.15–23: As Ge indicates (in his intro. and by inserting a line space after 14), the hymn takes a decisive turn in vs. 15, reintroducing the poet and focusing on the ritual and Agni’s relation to the ritualists — though the theme of Agni’s birth does not disappear (see vss. 20–21). The text also gets considerably easier to interpr., and there are more repeated pādas (and portions thereof) – see Bl. RR and passim below.

III.1.15: The ritualistic turn is signaled by the very first word, *īle* (repeated at the beginning of b). Rather than introducing the vs. with ‘and’, from the *ca* in pāda a, as the standard tr. do, better to take the *ca* as conjoining the two occurrences of *īle* in an X *ca* Y constr., as JPB does (see JSK DGRV I.185–86).

On the repetition of ... *no dāmyebhir ānīkaiḥ* in III.54.1, see comm. ad loc.

III.1.17–18: The even pādas of these two vss. match each other almost too exactly: 17d and 18b end with *sāadhan*, and 17b and 18d are almost identical: x x *vīśvāni kāvīyāni vidvān*. In addition, *vy ādyaut* returns from 8a. It almost seems that the poet exhausted his ingenuity in the birth section of the hymn and hasn’t much energy left for the ritualistic finale.

III.1.19: The post-caesura portion of pāda a, *sakṭīyébhiḥ śivébhiḥ*, is a variant on 9c *sākhibhiḥ śivébhiḥ*, which fills the same slot (though after an opening of 5, not 4), with the abstract *sakṭīyā*- substituted for the personal *sākhi*-. The whole first hemistich is identical to III.31.18cd.

Note polarized *#asmé ... naḥ#* in the 2nd hemistich.

III.1.20: All the standard tr. (but JPB’s) render *jānmañ-janman* as “in every generation, in generation after generation.” But though this is a possible sense of *jānman*-, in a hymn so fixated on Agni’s births and on the root *√jan*, and in a vs. containing the parallel alternative stem *jāniman*- ‘birth’, a minor morphological variant of *jānman*-, it seems tone-deaf to isolate this āmreḍita semantically. After proclaiming Agni’s older and current births in ab, the poet reprises the pl. *jānimā* with the āmreḍita, which is equivalent to a serial plural. (Note that an āmreḍita to the first stem would be metrically unwieldy: **jānimañ-janiman*, with 6 syllables that would not fit in the opening and whose metrical shape would not work in the cadence.) The point is that every time the ritual fire is kindled (“born”), it is then installed on the ritual ground. I would slightly alter the tr. to reflect that point more clearly: “at his every birth Jātavedas is installed.”

Most of pāda c, ... *vīṣṇe śāvanā kṛtémā*, is also found in III.30.2, an Indra hymn. I therefore think that the referent of *vīṣṇe* here is also Indra (with Ge, n. 20c; contra Re), esp. since soma-pressings are not offered to Agni. I would slightly alter the tr. to “these great soma-pressings have been made for the bull [=Indra].”

III.1.21: Pāda a repeats 20d; see comm. above.

The second hemistich is found verbatim in a number of places, incl. III.59.4. See Bl. ad loc. To match the other occurrences of *bhadré saumanasé* the tr. should be altered to “in his propitious benevolence.”

III.1.22: Pāda d is also found in X.80.7.

III.1.23: This vs. is something of a Viśvāmitra refrain vs. for (most of the) Triṣṭubh Agni hymns in III (III.5.11, etc. – see Bl. for full listing).

Gr, fld. by Re, takes *śaśvattamām* as modifying *sanīm*. However, III.62.2 *śaśvattamām āvase johavīti* (see also X.70.3) supports construing it with *hāvamānāya*, with JPB (Ge, WG).

III.2 Agni Vaiśvānara [SJ on JPB]

III.2.1: Each of the hemistichs in this vs. contains a semantically challenging simile among other problems. In ab, assuming that *dhiśāṇā*- here refers to the ritual ground as Holy Place (see comm. ad I.160.1), that we “give birth” to it (*janāmasi*) and that it’s compared to ghee are both surprising – and no doubt responsible for the various alternative translations of *dhiśāṇām* in this vs.: Ge “Werk” (which he then specifies as Loblied), Re “une offrande-poétique,” WG “ein Fest.” But the usual sense can be maintained here: we generate / give birth to the ritual ground by demarcating it at each ritual. As is well known, Vedic ritual does not have permanent or stable places of worship, but requires a new one to be measured out and sanctified for each performance. The *dvitā* ‘once more, yet again’ opening c may reinforce this begetting anew of the ritual ground, in addition to its application to the 2nd hemistich.

As for the ghee comparison, *ghṛtām ná pūtām* is a fixed simile (also IV.10.6, V.86.6, VIII.12.4) to which very unghee-like entities are compared (the body of Agni, IV.10.6; the praise hymn, VIII.12.4). The point of comparison in all cases is “purified,” not “ghee”: here we purify [/sanctify] the ritual ground in the course of creating it, just as we do the melted-butter oblation. I would therefore slightly alter the tr. to “For Vaiśvānara strong through truth, for Agni, we give birth to the Holy Place [=ritual ground], which is purified like ghee.”

The second hemistich presents a number of problems – among them, what, if anything, is the *ca* conjoining, and how should we construe *mānuṣaḥ ... vāghātāḥ*? how can one “bring together” a chariot with an axe? how is the axe/chariot simile related to the Hotar?

I will tackle the last two questions together. Although both parts – the simile and the frame – translate easily into the foreign languages in question (German, French, English), this ease is deceptive: neither part really makes sense, though the lack of sense has elicited no real comment. First of all, the simile: although axes are of course part of the equipment of a carpenter who would construct a chariot, the axe is not used to “put together” (*sām √ṛ*) the chariot, but to hew the wood that will then be used for this construction. Rather than the preverb *sām*, we might expect its opposite, *ví*, which is in fact found with the only other occurrence of *kúlīśa*- in the RV, I.32.5 *skāndhāṃsīva*

kúliśenā vīvrkṇā “like branches hewn **apart** by an axe.” At best we can see the simile here as telescoping two distinct steps in the making of a chariot: the obtaining and shaping of the separate pieces of wood (which involves a *kúliśa*-) and their putting together, which in the course of things would not. Interpreting the simile takes some mental effort on the part of the audience.

Then, what does it mean to “put together / assemble” the Hotar? A priest should not be subject to assembly from separate parts like a chariot. The expression here, *hótāram ... dhiyā ... sám ṛṇvati*, plays off a more easily interpretable one in the same Agni cycle, III.11.2 *agnīr dhiyā sám ṛṇvati* “Agni through insight assembles (the sacrifice),” though it has to be admitted that the obj. is supplied there. And, as with the simile just disc., I think the poet is challenging us both to recognize that the expression here doesn’t make sense and to dig deeper to find a way to make it do so. As with the simile, this is possible. The referent of *hótāram* is of course Agni, and as the ritual fire, he/it is indeed put together / assembled out of separate pieces of (fire)wood, just as the chariot is. So the simile and the frame have a close conceptual connection, but both have to be interrogated in order to find it.

The whole thing is put even further off balance by the case disharmony between simile and frame: *kúliśa*- should really be in the instr., parallel to *dhiyā*, it is not the axe that does the actual construction, but a carpenter using an axe.

This leaves us with the problematic *ca* in c. The standard tr. (incl. JPB) assume that *mānuṣaḥ* is a gen. sg., dependent on *hótāram* and that *mānuṣaś ca* implicitly conjoins the current Hotar [=ritual fire] with the Hotar/ritual fire of the primal sacrifice; this is most explicit in the publ. tr. “the chanters (bring together) with their insight the Hotar [=Agni], (who was) also (the Hotar) of Manu.” This interpr. is supported by the *dvitā*, which (as was just noted) indicates that the current ritual action is a repetition of one or more in the past. By this interpr. the phrase is quite condensed, from something like **hótāram asmākaṃ (I no) mānuṣaś ca* (or **hótāram nūtanam mānuṣaś ca*). By this interpr. *vāghātaḥ* is a nom. pl. and the subj. of *sám ṛṇvati*; this verb is sg. because it agrees with the simile subj. *kúliśaḥ*, which immed. precedes it. This is likely the correct, or at least the most probable, interpr. However, there are several alternatives, given in order of decreasing likelihood. As Old points out, *mānuṣaḥ* could also be nom. pl. (as in, e.g., I.36.7 and II.2.5); in this case it could be conjoined with *vāghātaḥ* in an X *ca* Y construction: “the sons of Manu and the chanters assemble the Hotar ...” Moreover, *vāghātaḥ* could be gen. sg. and conjoined with *mānuṣaḥ*, again in an X *ca* Y construction (“the Hotar of Manu and of the chanter”). There is also the fact that *mānuṣaś ca* occurs twice elsewhere in III, once in the next hymn III.3.6 *devébhir mānuṣaś ca jantúbhiḥ*, once in III.60.6 *vratā devānām mānuṣaś ca dhārmabhiḥ*. In both instances it is a subpart of a (properly) conjoined phrase involving gods as the other member of the pair. It is possible that our *ca* was improperly borrowed from these phrases (esp. III.3.6, a hymn that has many ties to this one) and has no function here, or that we should supply “gods,” in a phrase “the Hotar (of gods) and of Manu.” (Note also that in that same hymn [III.3.4b] *ca* precedes a form of *vāghāt*- in this same metrical position.) Or, if we make *mānuṣaḥ* a gen. dependent on nom. pl. *vāghātaḥ* and supply nom. ‘gods’, “(the gods) and the chanters of Manu assembled” (see the involvement of the gods in 3b). But I consider these interpr. less likely.

III.2.2–4: These vss. show some lexical chaining: 2a *rocayat* / 3c *rirucānām* // 3d *vājam sanīṣyān* / 4ab *sanīṣyāntaḥ ... vājam*.

III.2.2: With Ge and Re, JPB takes *mātróḥ* as the agent of *īḍyaḥ* “to be invoked by his two parents.” I would prefer not to have a gen.-loc. agent (otherwise the agent is instr. with this stem), and I also wonder about the action: would Heaven and Earth “invoke” Agni? Better, with Old (SBE) and WG, to construe this du. as a gen. with *putrāḥ*: “the son of the two mothers [=kindling sticks and/or H+E], or perhaps as a loc.: “to be praised in the two parents [=H+E].” The loc. of place/occasion is often used with *īḍya-*, though usually with reference to a ritual. So I would emend the tr. to “He, the son of the two mothers, is to be invoked” or “He, the son, is to be invoked in the two mothers [=H+E].” The gdv. *īḍya-* is frequently used without agent.

Here, in vs. 7, and in III.11.2, JPB tr. *cānohita-* as ‘placed for delight’, with a full lexical sense of *-hita-* (sim. but more elaborately Re “mis (en place) pour la satisfaction (des hommes)”). But it is surely simply the passivization (or pseudo-passivization; see below) of the phrasal verb *cānas* √ *dhā* ‘take delight, enjoy’. All 12 of the occurrences of *cānas-* in the RV form a VP with a finite form of √ *dhā*. In 10 of these occurrences *cānas* immed. precedes √ *dhā* and takes an acc.; in the other two *cānas* follows √ *dhā* and takes a loc. For the predominant construction, see, e.g., VIII.19.11 *stómaṃ cāno dadhīta* “he [=Agni] should take delight in the praise song.” Given this construction type, we should expect the entity modified by the past participle cmpd *cānohita-* to be the source of delight (praise song vel sim.)(so, it seems, Ge: “beliebt”). However, in its five occurrences (the three in III and two in IX.75.1, 4), it seems rather to target the one who takes delight, i.e., the subject of the finite phrasal verb: Agni in III, Soma in IX. See esp. IX.75.4 *matībhiś cānohitaḥ* “delighted by our thoughts.” For Agni as subj. of *cānas* √ *dhā*, see VIII.19.11 just quoted, also VI.4.2, 10.6. Although I am puzzled by how the passivization works (or doesn’t), I would therefore emend the tr. to “delighted.” (So, more or less, WG “(uns) geneigt gemacht”).

III.2.3: Different tr. distribute the nominals in pāda a differently from the publ. tr., with *dākṣasya* dependent on *krátvā*. Although *krātu-* and *dākṣa-* are standard formulaic partners, usually appearing in the same case (e.g., IV.37.2 *krátve dākṣāya*), and although the sequence *krátvā dākṣasya* is found also in V.10.2 and IX.16.2, it is not nec. for *dākṣasya* to depend on *krátvā*. See comm. ad IX.16.2, where I keep them separate.

In order to keep 3b *cíttibhiḥ* separate from 1d *dhiyā* in translation, “insights” should here be changed to “thoughts,” as in III.3.3.

The fut. stem *sanīṣyān-* has a strongly desiderative cast, as is recognized by most tr. and Gr.

III.2.4: I would alter the tr. of *āhrayam* from ‘audacious’ to ‘immoderate’; the adj. modifies *rādhas-* ‘bounty, largesse’ 5x, also once *dhāna-* ‘stakes’, and must express not a personal quality of daring or immodesty, but rather an excessive amount – a sense more appropriate for a prize than audacity. See comm. ad X.93.9.

On *uśíjam kavíkratum* see comm. ad III.3.7. I would here slightly change the tr. to “with a poet’s purpose.”

As noted in the publ. intro., *rājantam* can mean both ‘ruling’ and ‘shining’ and both should be registered here: I’d change to “who rules/shines with his heavenly flame.”

III.2.5: This vs. reprises some of the words that participated in the lexical chaining of vss. 2–4 (see above): *vāja-* (b) and *surúcam*.

Note the phonetic fig. (*yatá*)*srucah surúcam*.

The cmpd. *sādhad-īṣṭi-* is problematic. The dominant interpr. is what is found in Gr: a verbal governing cmpd with the 2nd member *īṣṭi-* ‘sacrifice’ (√*yaj*), hence ‘making the sacrifice succeed’ – identical in sense to *yajña-sādh(ana)-*. This analysis is fld. by Old (SBE) – though decisively rejected by him in the Noten – Ge, JPB, and Lowe (Part. 273). One of the issues is the identity of the 2nd member: Old (Noten) suggests it is instead the much better attested *īṣṭi-* ‘desire, quest’, and Re’s interpr. chooses this alternative, while keeping the same cmpd structure (“menant-droit-au-but la quête ...”; sim. Bl RR p. 182). But Old raises a more serious issue than the root affiliation of the 2nd member, namely the accent. Governing cmpds with this shape accent the *-āt-*, no matter where the accent would have fallen in the presumably associated verb stem: type *bharād-vāja-* v. *bhārati*, but this one is accented on the root syllable (a problem also disc. by Lowe). Old, flg. Wh., suggests that it is instead a possessive cmpd. (of a more standard bahuvr. type) – though cannily neither of them translates it. The WG rendering, “dessen Labung ... erfolgreich wird,” rests on this analysis (see their n.). (Unfortunately AiG doesn’t treat it.) Although I find the accent disturbing, with Lowe (173) I am inclined to accept it as “an anomalous alternative strategy” and keep the transitive governing sense found in the publ. tr. (and generally elsewhere). However, I would recognize an alt. interpr., “whose sacrifice succeeds (i.e., having a successful sacrifice) for the (ritual) workers.”

III.2.6: Chaining of *ṛktābarhiṣaḥ* in b with the same in 5b.

The standard tr. (incl. Old SBE), save for JPB and WG, take the whole of the vs., up to *dráviṇam* in d, as a single clause, with *úpāsate* as the main verb. However, Old in the Noten raises the question whether the verb should be accented (**upāsate*, i.e., *upa-āsate*) because of the *hí* in pāda a. He decides not, on the dubious grounds that by the time we get to the verb, the sentence has gone off the rails (“aus dem ursprünglichen Geleise geraten ist”). Better with JPB (and WG) to supply another verb with *kṣáyam pári* in ab and take *úpāsate* (i.e., *upa+āsate*) as a main clause verb. On the basis of the expression in the very next hymn, III.3.2 *kṣáyam ... pári bhūṣati*, I would suggest supplying **bhūṣanti* and tr. “the men ... (attend) upon your dwelling” (rather than the publ. tr. “are all around your dwelling” or WG’s “(sitzen)”).

I would substitute the more ritually focused “they reverently approach him” for “they are drawing near,” for the semi-technical lexeme *úpa* √ *ās*.

Rather than “company” for *dúvaḥ*, I would substitute “friendly service.” On *dúvas-* see comm. ad IX.65.3, where I suggest that *dúvas-* is offered by men to gods. Here it seems that the men both wish to do service to Agni and to receive his friendship. See already Old’s tr. in SBE: “seeking (how to do) honour (to thee) and (desiring) thy friendship.” The use of the word in this vs. should be harmonized with the denom. *duvasyá-* in 8b.

III.2.7: There are two ways to interpr. pāda a, both somewhat problematic. Ge and JPB take “the great sun” (*svār mahāt*) as a ref. to Agni and the nom. subj. of *ā pṛṇat*. In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the standard formula is only “fill the two world-halves” (see the passages cited by Ge in n. 7a), that Agni is often identified with the sun, and that it is hard to see what “fill the great sun (with light)” would mean, given that the sun is already full of light. Against this interpr. is the repetition of the preverb *ā*, which strongly invites an interpr. with *svār* a parallel obj. to *ródasī*. So Old (SBE), Re, and WG. I find this interpr. not only possible, but, given the rhetorical structure, preferable, and suggest the alt. “He filled the two world-halves, filled the great sun (with light).” What this somewhat puzzling expression might mean is that, in keeping with the Vedic view of the ritual as generative of natural phenomena, the kindling of the ritual fire provides the rising sun with light.

As Ge (n. 7c) points out, pāda c seems to refer to the Paryagnikaraṇa, the carrying of a firebrand around an object on the ritual ground.

Note that the caesura falls within the compd. *vāja-l-sātaye*.

On *cānohita*- see comm. ad vs. 2 above; the tr. should be emended to “delighted.”

III.2.8: In 16 of its 17 occurrences *havyā-dāti*- conforms to its grammatical expectations, as an abstract noun meaning ‘the giving of oblations’, but here it seems to be agentive: ‘giving the oblations’ by all standard renderings. Better to consider it an unsignaled bahuvrīhi (since the accent was already on the 1st member) meaning ‘having/controlling the giving of oblations’. On the compd see Scar 219.

“Who makes the rite good” for *svadhvarā*- might impose somewhat too much structure; better perhaps “of good ceremony.”

In b *duvasyāta* harks back to *dúvaḥ* in 6c. I would alter the tr. here to “do friendly service to.”

I would alter the tr. of the final pāda in two ways: “has become” → “became,” since the impf. doesn’t ordinarily have this sense; “placed in front of the gods” → “for the gods.” The publ. tr. makes it sound as if the gods are located behind Agni physically, whereas it must mean that Agni became the ritual fire that is placed in front / to the east, which serves as the fire that receives the offerings made to the gods (what is later [AV+] called the Āhavanīya).

III.2.9: The priestly term *uśīj-* returns from 4c, but here not of Agni but in the pl. of immortal priests of some sort.

Since *mártye* is loc. (the only loc. sg. to this well-attested stem), not dat., I’d tr. “in the mortal (realm),” not “for the mortal”; this tr. fits better with the locational expression in the next pāda.

The two non-earthly kindling sticks are supposed to be the sun and lightning; see Old’s n. in SBE, etc.

I would also tr. *ádadhuh* as “placed,” not “have placed.” As recognized in all the standard tr., the accent on this verb marks the clause as implicitly subordinated to the next.

III.2.10: Again I’d render the impf. *akṛṇvan* as “perfected,” not “have perfected.”

I wonder if, despite the word order, *viśāṃ kavīm viśpátim* contains (or at least evokes) the pleonastic formula *viśāṃ viśpáti-* (so WG “den Seher, den Lagerherrn der Lagerstätten”); cf. III.13.5, VII.7.4, IX.108.10, X.92.1; also *viśāṃ ... páti-* I.127.8, VI.15.1, VIII.95.3 -- although it has to be admitted that the phrase *viśāṃ kavīm viśpátim* is found also in V.4.3, VI.1.8.

Given the travel to distant parts in pāda c, I would tr. *eṣú bhúvaneṣu* “in these worlds” (with Old SBE), not “in these creatures” (with the other tr.) – although 11a might be a counterindication.

III.2.11: The med. 3rd sg. *jinvate* is the only middle form to this well-attested stem (on *jinvé* see comm. ad IV.21.8). Act. forms of *jínva-* are transitive (‘quicken X’); JPB’s “enlivens himself” correctly reflects the medial form, but sounds awk. to me. I’d prefer intrans. ‘quickens’; the modern English use of this verb for the first perceptible movements of a fetus in the uterus matches the usage here almost uncannily. For this reason I’d also delete “his” with “bellies.”

The pf. part. *prajajñivān* is taken by Old (SBE), Ge, Re, Lub as belonging to *prá √jan* ‘propagate’. However, Gr, WG, and JPB assign it to *prá √jñā*, an analysis strenuously argued for by Kü (203). He rightly points out that all weak forms of the perfects of *√jan* and *√jñā* fall together, *except for* the strong stem of the active part., where properly speaking *√jan* should have **jajāvāms-* or **jajanvāms-*. Our form, again properly speaking, can therefore only belong to *√jñā*. His point is well taken but overly rigid. The primary reading of this form may well be to *√jñā*, but it’s hard to deny the possibility that in this birth context *√jan* may also be meant, a conflation encouraged by the homophony of all other weak forms of their perfects. That both roots can occur with *prá* further ties them together. I would allow both senses here.

Putting this all together, I’d tr. the first hemistich “He quickens in the bright bellies, forethoughtful / proliferating further, the bull roaring like a lion.

III.2.12: Chaining of *vaiśvānarāḥ*, 11c, 12a.

I would tr. the aor. *āruhat* in conjunction with the adv. *pratnáthā* as “as of old he has mounted ...”

The post-caesura phrase *bhāndamānaḥ sumānmabhiḥ* is a phonological figure of sorts.

Verbal forms of the root *√bhand* are almost confined to this little clutch of hymns at the beg. of III: III.2.12, 3.4, 4.6; the only form outside this group is dual part. *bhāndamāne* in an Āprī hymn I.142.7 (see comm. there), clearly based on III.4.6, also an Āprī hymn. Nominal forms are more widely distributed.

JPB takes *sumānmabhiḥ* as a noun “with our good thoughts,” contra Gr and all the standard tr. (also Gotō, 1st cl., 223), who take it as a bahuvrīhi “possessing good thoughts.” This latter interpr. must be correct: it is found as a nom. sg. masculine in VII.68.9, and *mānman-* is of course neut. See comm. ad VIII.101.9. The tr. should be changed to “being delighted by those possessing good thoughts.”

It would be nice to capture the etymological figure *janāyan jantāve*, but I can’t think of a non-awk. way. In any case we should interpr. *jantú-* here in light of *mānuṣaḥ ... jantúbhiḥ* “the kin(smen) of Manu” in the next hymn (III.3.6), represented here by JPB’s “for the (human) race.”

III.2.13: Much fuss has been made over *diví kṣáyam*. I think some version of Old's explan. in SBE (which he more or less disavows in the Noten), that it is actually to be read **divi-kṣayám* 'dwelling in heaven' (a form found in V.46.5) or of Ge's (n. 13b) "unfertiges" bahuvrīhi ('having a dwelling in heaven') must be correct. The introduction of a word boundary might have been encouraged by 6a ... *hí kṣáyam*. See also *kṣáyam brhántam* in the next hymn (III.3.2), which must refer to the same heavenly place as the phrase here. Although I admire JPB's principled interpr. that takes the text as transmitted and equates Agni with "the dwelling in heaven," the text alteration required to get a more satisfactory sense is slight enough that I'm willing to make it.

The verb in that rel. cl., *ā ... dadhé*, is variously rendered: e.g., JPB "placed," Ge "an sich nahm," WG "verschafft hat," all of which are possible. But I wonder if some version of the later ritual idiom *ā √ dhā* "establish (the ritual) fire" is meant here: Mātariśvan not only stole fire from heaven but brought it to earth for the purpose of ritual. I would tr. this pāda as "... the one dwelling in heaven whom M. established here."

III.2.14: The opening of the vs., *súciṃ ná yāman* seems like a paraphrase of 13c *citrá-yāmam*, though of course it is not, morphologically or syntactically.

īmahe in d repeats from 13c.

Ge (n. 14d) suggests that *brhát* stands for (/is truncated from) **brhātā* characterizing *námasā*, but there's no reason why it can't be an adverb, as most take it.

III.2.15: This final vs. reunites lexical items from various parts of the hymn: *mandrá-* 4a), *hótar-* (1c, 6b), *súci-* (14a), *ukthyà-* (13a), *citrá-* (11b, 13c), *īmahe* (13c, 14d). Other words are variants of ones found earlier: *dāmūnas-* recalls *dāmya-* (8b), *viśvácarṣaṇi-* recalls *vīcarṣaṇi-* (8c), *rátha-* *rathī-* (8c), *darśatá-* *-dṛś-* (14b), *mánurhita-* the phrase *ā ... dadhe mātariśvā* (13b). Perhaps most strikingly, *ādvayāvinam* is etymologically akin to *dvitā* (1c), forming a sketchy ring.

III.3 Agni Vaiśvānara [SJ on JPB]

This hymn has many resonances with the immediately preceding one, III.2. Re in fact remarks "Suite de préc." Some of the echoes will be noted below.

III.3.1: Echoes of III.2: the opening *vaiśvānarāya prthupājase* is found in the nom. in III.2.11, which vs. also contains *rātnā*, *duvasyā-* is found also in III.2.8, with the noun *dúvas-* in III.2.6.

The form *vīpaḥ* is multiply ambig.: it can be nom. or acc. pl. or perhaps gen. (/abl.) sg.; though we might expect ending accent esp. in the gen. sg. and perhaps the acc. pl., the accentuation of root nouns of unstable function can't be entirely counted upon. Alone of the standard tr. (but in agreement with Sāy. [see Ge's n. 1ab] and Gr), JPB takes it as nom. pl. and the subj. of *vidhanta*. For Old [SBE], Ge, and Re it is an acc. pl., either parallel to *rātnā* or (acd. to Ge) forming an "unfertiges" compound with it. WG take it as a gen. sg. dependent on *rātnā* ("die Schätze der begeisterten (Rede)"). I would favor either the acc. pl. or the gen. sg. (though I am somewhat concerned about the accent of the gen. sg.) and tr. "they [=poets/priests] dedicate inspired words (and/as) treasures (//

dedicate treasures of inspiration).” Note that forms of this word return in vss. 3 (*vīprāsaḥ*), 4 (*vīpaścītām*), and 7 (*vīpām*).

I think Ge is quite correct (n. 1b; see passages cited there) that the point here is that ritual poetry provides the underlying surface (the “Teppich” – carpet) for those moving through the ritual.

On *dúvas-* / *duvasyá-* see comm. ad IX.65.3 and their appearances in the preceding hymn, III.2.6, 8. I would here alter the tr. to “Agni does friendly service to the gods.”

III.3.2: For *kṣáyam ... pári bhūṣati* see III.2.6.

III.3.3: *ketú-* also in III.2.14.

The “tasks and songs” (*ápāṃsi ... gíraḥ*) refer to the physical and verbal portions of the ritual.

The mid. part. *yájamāna-* seems to be used in its developed technical sense of ‘sacrificer’.

Here and in vs. 10 for *ā cake* I’d prefer “delights in” to “desires (to find).” JPB so tr. *cakānāḥ* in nearby III.5.2.

III.3.4: An alliterative first hemistich: ... *vīpāścītām, vimānam ... vayúnam ... vāghátām*.

In c the two worlds (*ródasī*) return from 2a.

√ *bhand* + INSTR. is also found in the preceding hymn, III.2.12, but the instr. there refers to persons, and so the two passages are not fully parallel. Here the interpr. is complicated by the semantic multiplicity of *dhāman-* and the fact that it is not specified whose *dhāman-* are at issue. It is tempting to assume that it picks up the *bhūrivarpaśā* of the preceding pāda and refers to the *dhāman-* of H+E – in this case I would tr. “he is delighted by their domains (i.e., the ones he just entered)” The standard tr. (incl. JPB) take the *dhāman-* to be Agni’s, hence the publ. tr. “through his manifestations,” Ge “um seiner Eigenschaften,” etc. On the whole, this interpr. -- that the *dhāman-* are Agni’s, not the two worlds – is more likely, esp. because of *táva dhāmāni* in vs. 10. But this does not settle the matter, given *dhāman-*’s semantic slipperiness. I would suggest a few additional tr. “by his foundations/emplacements [=hearths]” or “by his ordinances” (sim. WG “an den Satzungen”). I do not see a principled way to decide: the end of the next vs. (4d *devāsa ihā ... dadhuḥ* “The gods placed him here”) might slightly favor “foundations” but *táva dhāmāni* in vs. 10 suggests something less concrete.

III.3.5: The cmpd. *candrāratham* reminds of the simile *rātham ná citrām* in III.2.15. In fact JPB tr. both *citrá-* and *candrá-* in these expressions as ‘shimmering’. In order to keep them separate, I would change the tr. of *candrá-* to ‘gleaming’. And in fact I don’t particularly like ‘shimmering’ for *citrá-* and prefer the more generic ‘bright, brilliant’ for this very common stem.

su^u var-vīdam recalls *s^u var-dīśam* in III.2.14, though they are of course semantically distant. The former is repeated in this hymn in vs. 10.

The hapax *vīgāha-* ‘plunging’ (JPB’s ‘sinking deep’) must pick up the implication of *apsuśād-* ‘sitting in the waters’ in the previous pāda.

I would now render *tūrṇim* as ‘advancing’ rather than “as he moves swiftly”; see comm. ad nearby III.11.5.

Note the rhyme forms *tūrṇim* (c), *bhūrṇim* (d); a singsong effect is avoided by placing them in different metrical positions.

III.3.6: Ge (n. 6a, fld. by WG) wants to supply the ppl. *iṣitāḥ* from 2d to construe with the instr.s, but this seems unnec.: an instr. of accomp. suffices.

Agni’s journey between the two worlds returns here from 2a, with the same idiom *antār īyate*.

Several echoes of III.2: *jantú-* (III.2.12 q.v.), *rathīḥ* (III.2.8), *dāmūnas-* (III.2.15), and most notably *sādhad-iṣṭi-*. On this difficult compd, see comm. ad III.2.5.

III.3.7: The syntagm *jarasva* + LOC here receives a variety of rather awk. tr., incl. the publ. “be awake to a lifetime ...,” which goes easily into Engl. (more easily as “awaken to ...”), but misleadingly. I think it should be interpr. in light of constructions of the pf. impv. *jāgrhi* (etc.) with loc., which I render “be watchful over,” as in IX.61.24 *sóma vratēṣu jāgrhi* “O Soma, be watchful over the commandments” (sim. IX.82.4, I.21.6). I would therefore emend the tr. to “be watchful over our lifetime of good descendents.”

Act. trans. *jīnva* here contrasts with med. *jīnvate* in III.2.1; see comm. there.

The apparent syntagm *váyāṃsi ... brhātás ca* is difficult to interpr. Its structure must be X Y *ca* (Y’), with the head noun of the 2nd constituent gapped. See JSK (DGRV I.127). But the question is what is the identity of Y? Ge (n. 7c) suggests a notional repetition of X, namely *váyāṃsi* (a possibility also floated secondarily by Old, Noten and fld. by WG), simply dismissing the gender mismatch (not to mention the unlikelihood of conjoining identical nouns with each other). His tr., “Errege Kräfte und zwar grosse,” is not compelling. Old suggests *vājān*, which is accepted by JSK; JPB ‘gods’; Re supplies “pouvoirs,” without specifying the Skt. word. All of these are possible, but none has strong support. The best that can be mustered is a passage in this Agni cycle where *vājān* is the obj. of *jīnva* (III.15.6). But *√jinv* does not have a standard masc. object; *brhánt-* does not have a standard masc. pl. noun that it modifies; and *váyas-* is not regularly conjoined with a masc. pl. noun. We must also reckon with the possibility that *brhātāḥ* is not masc. acc. pl. but, as often, gen. sg. (though Old considers this “schwerlich”), and the second constituent is “the Y(s) of the lofty one.” On the whole it seems safer and more honest to leave the possibilities open, as in Old’s (SBE) tr. “Stir up vigour and the great ones” – so, in modern terms, “quicken our vital powers and the lofty ones.”

The priestly term *uśīj-* here and in the flg. vs. (8b) is also found in III.2.4 and (in pl.) III.2.9. In fact, our pāda *uśíg devānām ási sukrátur vipām* seems a partial scrambling of III.2.4c *uśíjam kavíkratum*, with *sukrátur vipām* an analytic version with partial relexification of *kavíkratu-*. I would slightly change the tr. to “you have the good purpose of inspired words.”

All the standard tr. (but JPB) tr. the last pāda as a unity, but then why is *ási* accented? This problem has attracted no comment. JPB’s tr. solves the problem by starting a new cl. with *ási*, which is probably correct, although the association between *uśīj-* and *krátu-* just noted makes it less appealing. It might be possible to argue that the phrases before and after the *ási* are contrastive and therefore condition accent on the verb, but this seems artificial.

III.3.8: Note that this vs. is framed as a Praśasti (*prā śamsanti*).

A number of terms from the preceding hymn are repeated here: *vīspati-* III.2.10, *yahvā-* III.2.9, *ātithi-* III.2.2, *uśīj-* III.2.4, 9, as well as vs. 7 here; *vāghāt-* III.2.1, as well as vs. 4 here.

The standard tr. supply *yajñām* as obj. to the infinitival *vṛdhé*, on the basis of parallels, esp. nearby III.6.6 *yajñām-yajñam ... vṛdhé*, so an alt. tr. might be “(for him) to strengthen (the sacrifice).” In the publ. intro. JPB suggests rather that the obj. is intentionally left ambig.

The abstract *jūti-* ordinarily means ‘speed’ or ‘alacrity’, but in several passages (here, nearby III.12.3, III.34.2, and I.116.2) it has a transitive sense ‘spur’, presumably based on the numerous transitive forms of *junāti*.

III.3.9: Since *surāṇa-* is ordinarily an adj., the tr. “the great delight” should be changed to “very delightful” or “bringing delight.” It is once used as a noun (III.53.6), but is a neuter there.

In c *bhūripośīṇaḥ* is universally taken (starting with Gr) as a gen. sg. modifying *tāsya*, but it could also be nom. pl. modifying *vayām*, to which it is in fact adjacent. I favor reading it with both: “We, prospering abundantly, would attend to the commandments of him, who prospers abundantly.” Obviously our prosperity derives from Agni’s.

III.3.10: The verb *ā cake* from vs. 3 and pl. *dhāman-* from vs. 4 come together here. As in vs. 3 I’d prefer “delight in” rather than “desire” for *ā cake*. As in vs. 4 the exact referents of *dhāmāni* are unclear, but here they enable him to “find the sun.” JPB’s “manifestations” may make the most sense in this context.

svarvíd- returns from vs. 5.

III.3.11: The publ. tr. takes *daṃsánābhyaḥ* and *svapasyáyā* as parallel and implicitly instr.: “By the wondrous powers of Vaiśvānara and by his good work ...,” but the first form is dative or ablative and should not be syntactically assimilated to the latter. I take the former as ablative: the wondrous powers are what enables the “good work.” I would tr. “Because of /from the wondrous powers of V., by his good work ...”

JPB follows Ge (n. 11ab) in what seems to me a very shaky and implausible interpr. of the first hemistich, suppling *rétas-* ‘semen’ as the obj. of *árināt*, and somehow connecting this semen with Agni’s birth. The grounds for such a daring image do not seem to me to have been prepared earlier in the hymn, and there is no formulaic support: *rétas-* is not elsewhere construed with *√ri* ‘flow’ (despite their likely etymological connection) or modified by *bṛhánt-*. Moreover, the two other occurrences of *bhūri-retasā* (VI.70.1, X.92.11) also both modify H+E as here, but have nothing to do with Agni or his birth. Better, with Old (Noten; fld. it seems by Re, and as an alt. by WG), to supply as the object *bhās-* ‘light’, which is regularly modified by *bṛhánt-*; *bhās-* is usually used of Agni’s light, which he “spreads” or “lets loose” (which could be poetically rephrased as “let flow”) and is sometimes compared to the light of the sun. I would also render *ékaḥ ... kavīḥ* as “the poet alone.” Putting this all together: “Because of /from the wondrous powers of V., the poet [=Agni] alone, by his good work, lets flow (his light) aloft.”

By this interpr., what happens in cd is that Agni, once born [=kindled], spreads his light through the two worlds, thus magnifying/exalting them.

The verb *maháya*- returns from vs. 3.

III.4 Āprī [SJ on JPB]

On the allusion to key words by indirection in some vss., see publ. intro.

III.4.1: The stem *sumánas*- is found in pādas a and d, with related *sumatí*- in b.

The dat. *yajáthāya*, the only case form to the stem, is always used in (quasi-)infinitival usage; see comm. ad II.28.1. I would substitute “to sacrifice (to them).”

III.4.2: The publ. tr. renders *yám devāṣah ... āyájante* as “to whom [=Agni] the gods offer sacrifice ...” But *āyaj* means not ‘sacrifice to’, but ‘attract/win by sacrifice’; see comm. ad X.63.7. Ordinarily the obj. is a desirable *thing*; see, e.g., nearby III.1.22 *ágne máhi dráviṇam ā yajasva* “O Agni, win great wealth by sacrifice.” The situation is more complex here, since the object is an animate being, Tanūnapāt – indeed one usually identified as an aspect of Agni, who also figures as part of the subject of the verb. And so the action depicted is an internal loop, a closed circle: the gods bringing one of their own (/one who is a multiform of one of them) by sacrifice to the sacrifice, which he in turn will make successful. The tr. should be changed to “(You) whom the gods – Varuṇa, Mitra, (and) Agni – attract here by sacrifice, three times a day, day after day.” It’s a surprisingly complex and convoluted thought for an Āprī hymn.

III.4.3: The publ. tr. takes *yájadhyai* as absolute, with Agni the Hotar implied as subj.; the other tr. take *hótāram* as obj. of *yájadhyai*, as *vṛṣabhám* is of *vandádhyai* in c. I think this latter interpr. is better, as it continues the closed circle of the previous vs., with Agni both sacrificer and sacrificed to. I would change to “goes forth to sacrifice first to the Hotar ...”

III.4.4: The identity of the two indicated by *vām* is uncertain. Sāy. (fld. by Re and in part by Ge and WG) suggests Agni and the barhis, but this seems a remarkably ill-assorted pair, and the notion that the barhis, meant to be spread on the ground, would have a way created “high above” is somewhat absurd. See Old (Noten) for other possible pairs, none of which he endorses. I am somewhat attracted by Max Müller’s suggestion, rejected by Old, that *vām* stands for *vā*.

On *vā* as a sort of semantic reframing (not his term) of what went before, see JSK, DGRV II.184–85.

For apparent nom. sg. masc. *devávyacā(h)* modifying a neut. sg., see comm. ad II.31.5.

III.4.5: Although not explicitly mentioned in the vs., the subject of ab and also, most likely, cd is the gods, who come to the sacrifice through the “divine doors” (also not mentioned here explicitly; see publ. intro.). Although Old (SBE) takes the doors as subj. in cd, the movement they would be making is out of character for doors (even divine ones). Instead the gods come “through” (*vñ*) them “to” (*abhñ*) the sacrifice. I would slightly change the publ. tr. from “wander” to simply “come” or “proceed”; though *√car*

does often mean ‘wander, roam’, it has a number of nuances, esp. with preverbs, and “wander” is a less purposeful, more unceremonious kind of movement than I would expect of gods arriving at the sacrifice.

In b “return” (*prāti yan*) refers to the gods’ regular attendance (punctuated by departure from) the sacrifice.

I do not know what “having men as their adornment(s)” means. It surely doesn’t refer to figurative art.

The two-word sequence *prá jātā* is surprising; we would expect unverbated *prājātā* when the preverb is adjacent to the participle. Old considers it an archaism, from a time when the connection between preverb and participle “noch loser war”; he explicitly doesn’t think that there’s a functional difference (much less that *prá* is to be construed elsewhere in the clause). I reluctantly concur.

III.4.6: On *bhāndate* see comm. ad III.2.12. As noted there, the only form of this stem outside this group of hymns in III is *bhāndamāne* in I.142.7, in an Āprī hymn and a verse dependent on this one; see comm. ad loc.

I would prefer “close together” rather than “close by”: the point is the close proximity of Dawn and Night to each other, not to us / the ritual ground. I also don’t think it’s the predicate of the clause (publ. tr. “are close by”). Rather, we should supply *sīdete* vel sim. (cf. I.142.7, 188.6; VII.2.6; X.70.6, 110.6). So I would substitute “... Dawn and Night (sit) close together.”

I do not understand why there’s a purpose cl. in cd (*yáthā ... jujoṣat* “so that X will rejoice ...”); it should have as its grounds the presence of Dawn and Night announced in the first hemistich, but I don’t see the logical connection.

The position of *utá vā* in d is quite anomalous; it should really precede *índrah*, or, if it is taking a post-positive position, just after *índrah*. See JSK, DGRV II.153, who merely calls attention to the anomaly.

III.4.7: For the possible identity of the seven in b, see Ge’s long n.

III.4.8–11: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. are identical to their counterparts in the Āprī hymn VII.2.8–11.

III.4.10: On *satyátara-* see comm. ad I.76.5. I would substitute the tr. “more truly present” for “more real,” though the intention is almost the same. Re’s “plus réel (que l’oblatureur humain),” based on Ge’s view (fld also by WG) about paired divine and human Hotars, is, I think, somewhat off-base: the point is rather that the god embodied in the physically present fire is more real / more present than the notional gods who have been brought to the ritual ground.

Another postposed *yáthā* clause whose connection to what precedes is murky (see vs. 6), though this one is not a purpose clause, since its verb is the pf. indic. *véda*.

III.5 Agni [SJ on JPB]

This hymn has an omphalos structure, with vss. 5–6 paired, containing repeated phraseology and enigmas at the center; they are surrounded with framing ring in 3c / 7a // 2ab / 8ab+9 // and possibly 1d / 9d+10d. Since the final vs., 11, is a repeated vs.

(=III.1.23, 6.11, 7.11, 23.5, all in this Agni cycle), vss. 5–6 are in the exact center of the hymn.

III.5.1–3: A notable run of augmented aorists: 1b *ābodhi*, 1d *āvah*, 2d *adyaut*, 3a *ādhāyi*, 3c *asthāt*, 3d *ābhūt*, interrupted only by the pf. *vāvṛdhe* in 2a.

III.5.1: Note the presence of both *viprá-* and *kaví-* in pāda b.

III.5.2: It is difficult to know how to distribute the various instr. pl.s between *vāvṛdhe* and *namasyāḥ*, but it might be worth noting that *namasyā-* doesn't seem otherwise to be construed with an instr. whereas the med. pf. of *√vṛdh* regularly is. So perhaps all the instr. go with *vāvṛdhe*: “through the praises, songs, and recitations ...”

III.5.5–6: On these vss. as the omphalos see intro. above.

III.5.5: Note that *padām véḥ* echoes 1b *padavīḥ*, though they are completely different morphologically and syntactically, only sharing *padá-* ‘track’.

On the mysterious expression *ripó ágram* see the similar expression in IV.5.7 *ágre rupáh*, a passage that has other connections with ours, *rupó ágram* in the flg. vs. IV.5.8, in a pāda otherwise identical to ours, and X.79.3 *ripá upásthe*, along with the comm. on these passages. For reasons given there I tentatively take *rip-/rúp-* to mean ‘mount’ (sim. JPB’s ‘summit’) and tr. the phrase in IV.5.7 as “on the tip of the mount,” suggesting that this refers to the ritual ground. Perhaps here it reprises 3c *sānv asthāt* “he has mounted the back (of the altar).” Beyond that I can’t go.

JPB’s ‘summit’ might better be changed to my ‘mount’, since he also uses ‘summit’ for *várṣman-* in 9b. Although I think it quite possible that the phrase in 9b is meant to “repair” the enigmatic one here, they do not use the same words.

Given *nābhā prthivyāḥ* in 9b, perhaps better “in the navel (of the earth)” rather than “(of the sacrifice).”

III.5.6: This vs. forms a pair with vs. 5, signaled by the repetition of *padām véḥ* (5a, 6c) and the presence of the verb *rakṣati* ‘guards’ in the final pāda of 6, which is a near-synonym of the insistent *pāti* ‘protects’, which opens every pāda in 5. Moreover, like vs. 5 this vs. also has connections with IV.5.7: in particular, the phrase *sasāsyā cárma* is found in IV.5.7c, where I follow Gr in taking it as a reference to the ritual grass strew (see comm. ad loc.).

I would be inclined to take pāda b with cd, rather than what precedes, in that knowledge of the ritual patterns would seem more needed for the esoteric phraseology of c than the fairly straightforward name in a. Thus, “The Ṛbhu ... to be invoked. As the god knowing all the ritual patterns -- the ghee-covered hide of the grain and the track of the bird – just that does Agni guard ...”

The publ. tr. takes *ghṛtávat* as modifying both *cárma* and *padām*, which is not only possible, but perhaps favored by its position between the two NPs. However, since “the track of the bird” appears without that qualifier in the previous vs. and elsewhere (I.164.7, III.7.7, X.5.1), it is perhaps safer to limit it to *cárma*: “the ghee-covered hide of the grain (and) the track of the bird.”

III.5.7: The first pāda, *ā yónim ... asthāt*, reprises 3c *ā ... sānu asthāt*, forming a loose ring around the paired vss. 5–6.

III.5.8: The first hemistich conceptually echoes 2ab, though with the strengthening of the fire effected by physical fuel (plants, ghee), not verbal means (praises, songs, hymns), producing an outer ring around 5–6, in addition to the inner ring in 3+7. Here the two finite verbs, *vavakṣe* and *vārdhanti*, both relate to the single verb in 2ab, pf. *vāvṛdhe*, with *vavakṣe* matching the perfect in form and *vārdhanti* matching the root. I might be inclined to match the tr. of *vavakṣe* to the temporal function of *vāvṛdhe* in 2, though *vavakṣe* can have strictly presential value as the publ. tr. has it. Perhaps rather “Just born, he has grown strong ..., when the fruitful ones strengthen him.”

The opening of b, *yādī*, must be *yād ī* – i.e., ‘when him’ not ‘if’, as not infrequently elsewhere, incl. 10c. (See my “RVic sīm and īm,” Fs. Cardona, 2002.)

III.5.9: This vs. in part participates in the outer ring with 8ab: *adyaut* in pāda a and *dūtāḥ* in d reprise *dūtō adyaut* in 2d. But it also has resonances with other parts of the hymn: *yahvāḥ* in pāda a = 5b; *nābhā* in b = 5c; *mītrāḥ* in c recalls the numerous occurrences earlier (3b, 4bcd); *īdya-* in c = 6a.

It is also possible that *vārṣman divāḥ* “upon the summit of heaven” is meant as a repair or explanatory gloss of *ripō āgram* in 5a (q.v.). This may be suggested by the presence of *nābhā prthivyāḥ* in this pāda, echoing *nābhā* in 5c.

On *yajāthāya* as always infinitival, see comm. ad III.4.1. Here also I would substitute “to sacrifice (to them).”

III.5.9–10: It’s possible to identify one last outer ring: *vāhniḥ* ‘draught-horse (referring to Agni) in 1d may find its counterparts in the more explicit *vakṣat* ‘he will convey’ (9d) and *havya-vāham* ‘oblation-conveyor’ (10d).

III.5.10: I’d replace “has propped up” with “propped up”: this is surely an event in the distant mythological past, given the Mātariśvan clause in c.

As in 8b, *yādī* should be read *yād ī* ‘when him’.

Best to tr., with the standard tr., “as oblation-conveyor.”

There is a difference of opinion on how to interpr. and construe *bhīgubhyaḥ pári*. Ge, fld. by the publ. tr. and WG, take *bhīgubhyaḥ* as an abl., with *pári* the postposition ‘from’, and the whole phrase construed with *gúhā sántam* (“hiding from the Bs”). Others (Old [SBE], Re, HPS [B+I 69–70]) take *bhīgubhyaḥ* as a dative construed with *samidhé* and *pári* as an adv. (“tout autour”): “kindled him, being in hiding, as the oblation-conveyor for the Bh’s.” On the issues, see Ge’s detailed n. 10c. Re argues that Ge’s interpr. cannot be correct, because otherwise we would expect close sandhi *bhīgubhyas pári*, but this is a false arg. As Mark Hale has shown, close sandhi is blocked by the caesura, which in this case falls between these two words. I am of two minds about the interpr. On the one hand, Ge’s interpr. best accounts for the position and use of *pári*. As he says, otherwise *pári* is left “in der Luft hängen.” On the other, Ge himself points to I.60.1 *bharad bhīgave mātariśvā* “M. brought [Agni] to Bhṛgu,” which would favor a dative interpr. here. In the end the *pári* argument sways me to the Ge side – esp. since

√*idh* is not construed with that preverb – but I still think the datival interpr. given above is worth considering.

III.6 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.6.1: As is convincingly argued in the publ. intro., the unidentified fem. referent in this vs. is probably an unsigned pun on *juhū-*, which can mean both sacrificial ladle and tongue, the latter standing in for the poet’s power of eloquent speech. The final pāda esp. favors the former identification as ladle: she bears the oblation and is covered with ghee. But the opening of the vs. invites the verbal reading. The other two occurrences of the part. *vacyámāna-* (√*vañc*, on whose sense see the various reff. in the lexical list) have such referents: *matīḥ* in III.39.1 (in this same maṇḍala) and *stómāḥ* in X.47.7. In both instances the part. depicts an intimate movement of the thought/praise hymn curling itself out of the poet’s heart (III.39.1) or intertwining with his mind (X.47.7). (See comm. ad locc.) Note esp. X.47.7 *mānasā vacyámānāḥ*, which is very similar to our *mananā vacyámānāḥ*. (*mananā* is a hapax.) And of course, though it belongs to a very different root, the root syl. *vac-* evokes √*vac* ‘speak’, an association supported by the voc. *kāravah* “o praise-poets.” The transfer of the action of the participle from the praise-song (in its other two occurrences) to the praise-poet is bold; I think it refers to an almost physical sense of mental spinning or twirling as one tries out different wordings in search of the best formulation (as I’ve just been doing). The physical counterpart of this mental motion is expressed in the next vs., 2d, which helps pin down the sense here.

On *dakṣiṇāvāt* see Scar (474–75).

III.6.2: Pāda b is notable for a pile-up of items that might be in competition for first position and without such competition would have claimed it: the conjunction *utá* (the winner), the preverb *prá*, and the adverbial conjunction *ádha*, which adjoins the caesura and is immediately followed by *nú*, which normally claims 2nd position. With all these little words vying for first place, there’s hardly any space left for content in the pāda, which enjambs with the following pāda c.

Given that Heaven and Earth reappear as agents in the next vs., and are therefore capitalized as animates, I would be inclined to cap them here as well. I assume that JPB left them lower case here because their role here is to be spaces, but I think the distinction is not clear cut in the Vedic worldview.

The draught horses with their tongues are clearly Agni’s flames, and the movement depicted by this form of √*vañc* is surely the twisting, curling motion of flames – which helps define the sense of the verb in 1a.

III.6.3: Once again (see the preceding hymn III.5.8, 10), *yádī* should be read *yád ī* “when it,” with the acc. enclitic *ī* anticipating the NP *śukráṁ arcīḥ*.

Some reminiscences of vs. 1: *devayántīḥ* (cf. 1b) and *práyasvatīḥ* ‘bearing/having pleasing oblations’, which is functionally similar to *havír bhárantī* (1d).

I would substitute “reverently invoke” for “summon” (which sounds peremptory rather than worshipful) to tr. *īlate*.

III.6.4: I prefer ‘seat’ for *sadhástha-* to JPB’s ‘abode, dwelling’; on the connection with \sqrt{sad} (despite the aspirated *dh*) see EWA s.v.

The Pp. reads nom. *dhruvāḥ*, which is so tr. by Ge (/WG). However, Gr lists it as *dhruvé*, and the loc. interpr. is favored by Old, Re, and JPB. Either is possible, and both have support. See Ge’s n. 4a and comm. ad VI.9.4. An alt. would be “... is set down steadfast here in his abode [/seat] ...,” which I weakly favor.

III.6.6: The *vā* in pāda a seems essentially functionless. JSK (DGRV II.189) calls it “a loose interstanzaic concatenator”; Re “explétif (hortatif?)” – though hortatory “or” is not a standard function of this particle. There could be an implicit contrast between 5d and 6ab: you either lead the people *or* you hitch up your horses and bring the gods here. But the contrast is very faint.

The gen. *ṛtāsya* is variously construed: JPB (and Old SBE) take it as dependent on *keśínā*; Re and Lü (454) on *yogyābhiḥ*; Ge and WG on *dhurī*. (Scar [662] tr. the hemistich but fails to render *ṛtāsya*.) Since only Ge cites passages in support of his configuration (n. 6a), I am inclined to follow his interpr. and substitute “place your two long-maned (horses) ... on the yoke-pole of truth.” Acdg. to Ge, this expression refers to the Opfer. The other interpr. are not excluded, however; for *ṛtāsya* dependent on horses, see, e.g., IV.2.3 *róhitā ghṛtāsnū*, *ṛtāsya*, a passage very like ours.

ghṛtasnūvā is problematic. See esp. the disc. by Scar (662–63). Although generally listed as *ghṛtasnū-*, the two forms with this accent more likely belong to a stem in *-snū-*, as Scar points out. This *ghṛta-snū-* exists beside *ghṛtā-snu-* (10x) with first-member accent (save for a single unaccented voc. *ghṛtasno*), generally considered to be a bahuvrīhi with the 2nd member a weak form of *sānu-* ‘back’, hence ‘having a back with ghee, having ghee on its back’ (a *vāja-hasta-* type compound). However, the 2nd-member accented *ghṛta-snū-* is also parallel with *ghṛta-snā-* ‘bathed/bathing in ghee’ (2x), and *ghṛta-snū-* is generally rendered (incl. in the publ. tr. of our passage) like the *-snā-* cmpd: ‘bathing/bathed in ghee’. Scar suggests that *ghṛta-snū-* represents a contamination of *ghṛtā-snu-* and *ghṛta-snā-*, which seems reasonable. There cannot have been a strict semantic separation between *ghṛtā-snu-* and *ghṛta-snū-* because the same referent, du. *keśínā* is modified by *ghṛta-snū-* here and *ghṛtā-snu-* in III.41.9 (see also another dual referring to horses, *átyā* in IV.2.3, modified by *ghṛtā-snu-*). I think both meanings are likely in play here, and would substitute “bathed in ghee [/ghee-backed].”

III.6.7: The *ā* in pāda a must be a postposition, not a preverb in tmesis: \sqrt{ruc} does not appear with *ā*, and the *ā* here does not adjoin a metrical boundary, as preverbs in tmesis generally do. Rather it is to be construed with preceding abl. *divāḥ*, with emphatic *cīd* ‘even’ intervening. It also must have the meaning “(all the way) to” (so Ge, WG, Scar [197], JPB; contra Old [SBE], Re), even though *ā* with preceding abl. generally means ‘from ... to’ (Gr “von ... her”), and it is *ā* with following abl. that means ‘to’ (Gr 169). However, see Gr’s 8) “zu ... hin,” as well as comm. ad I.92.17. Since I think the *ā* is a postposition, I would delete JPB’s “here” in “shine here” and substitute “shine all the way even to heaven.”

The publ. tr. rendering of pāda b, “you become radiant along with the many far-radiant dawns,” misrepresents both the case of “dawns” (acc., not instr.) and the function

of *ānu*. It should be emended to “you become radiant following the ... dawns,” indicating that the ritual fire is kindled just after first light.

The cmpd *usādhak* is quite problematic, although on first glance it looks straightforward enough. It occurs three times, here, III.34.3, and VII.7.2, always in conjunction with *vāna*- wood: *usādhag vāneṣu* (here and III.34.3), *usādhag vānāni* (VII.7.2), always at pāda end. It looks as if it should be a root-noun cmpd. consisting of a zero-grade form derived from \sqrt{vas} ‘desire, want’ and \sqrt{dah} ‘burn’. However, the accent is wrong for a regular root-noun cmpd. Moreover, in this passage the form must be an acc., in the object phrase with *panāyanta*. This brings us to the problem of *apāḥ*, which must also be part of the object phrase. By accent, this form should be the adjectival ‘industrious’, but the standard interpr. (Old [SBE], Ge, Re, WG) simply take it as if it were the neut. noun *āpas*- ‘work’ and finesse the accent somehow. (That *apāsī* in III.1.3 seems to be the noun, not the adj. [see comm. ad loc.], lends some support to this tack.) They then do one of two things with *usādhak*: either take it as a neut. adj. modifying *apāḥ* ‘work’ (Ge: “deiner gierig in den Holzern brennenden (?) Tätigkeit”) or as a modifier of Agni (Old [SBE], Re, WG), despite the fact that it is neither a vocative (note 2nd syl. accent) nor a gen. (Old [SBE n.] cavalierly says it stands for a gen. metri causa – though he alternatively suggests the first solution, as an adj. modifying *apāḥ*. He gives the same two solutions in the Noten, but in opposite order.) The solution found in the publ. tr., as well as in Scar., flips the values of *apāḥ ... usādhak*, taking the latter as a neut. noun and *apās*- in its usual adjectival value: “industrious burning-at-will in the wood.” The substantivization of an old root-noun (adj.) cmpd. **usā-dāh*- ‘burning in the wood’ can account for its accent shift, while the accent of *apāḥ* is correct for its function. Although this interpr. is complex and cumbersome, it seems the best way to account for the various anomalies in this phrase. One consequence, however, is that in the other two occurrences a standard adjectival interpr. of the cmpd., as nom. sg. masc. modifying Agni, which is possible in both, has to be set aside if the form is to be harmonized with its usage here. See comm. ad locc.

III.6.8: The first three pādas begin X *vā yé*; these relative clauses are picked up by *ebhiḥ* at the beginning of the next vs. The question is what to do with pāda d, which lacks the structural signature of the first 3 pādas. JPB takes d as a parenthetical independent clause, but this is impossible because *āyemiré* has an accented verb (flg. a preverb, so it can’t owe its accent to pāda-initial position) and therefore must be subordinated. Is it a fourth, unsigaled rel. clause (“(which) horses ...” or “(whose) horses”) – so Old (SBE and Noten) Ge, JSK (DGRV II.164). Or does the rel. clause beginning in c extend through d? Re takes it so, but by making *rathyāḥ ... āśvāḥ* a bahuvrīhi “defait” with the subject another set of divinities; I would follow WG, flg. Kü (397), in taking the horses themselves as subject: “or the helpers, easy to call, deserving the sacrifice, the chariot horses who were guided here.” My only reservation is that *ūma*- ‘helper’ is ordinarily a descriptor of gods – even though ‘helper’ seems a reasonable role for their horses.

III.6.9: Although the presence of the gods just delivered to the sacrifice invites a transitive interpr. of *mādāyasva*, as in the publ. tr. “make then [*sic*: them] rejoice,” the other occurrences of *mādāya* are reflexive: “invigorate yourself! rejoice!”

III.6.10: On pāda c, see Ge's n. 6c. I think he is correct that dual *adhvarā* is by attraction in the simile; see *prāñcam ... adhvarām* in I.18.8.

Note the presence of both *ṛtā*- and *satyā*- in the final pāda. I might substitute for the somewhat awk. publ. tr. "the truth-possessing (parents) of truth-begotten (Agni), who are really present."

III.7 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the difficulties of the hymn, see publ. intro. I will mostly stay away from deeper interpr. of the contents.

III.7.1: Given the obscurity of the content of this vs., there is some question as to how to deploy the fem. pl. *saptā vāñīḥ* "seven voices." Old (SBE n., Noten) is tempted to make this phrase the subj. of both a and b, but is (rightly) deterred by the masc. rel. prn. *yé* (*yá* in sandhi). Therefore, the standard tr., incl. JPB, take it as acc., parallel to *mātārā*, as obj. / goal of *vivīśuḥ*. Kü (101), fld. by WG, instead take it as nom., but as an appositive to the (masc.) subject: "als die sieben Stimme." Since I have no strong views on the sense of the vs. or the referent of the fem. pl. phrase, I will take no stand, beyond suggesting that the alt. tr. "have entered ..., as the seven voices" could be considered.

The parallel in X.65.8 *parikṣītā pitārā ... dyāvāprthivī* most likely identifies the dual *pitārā* here as Heaven and Earth; the du. *mātārā* in the preceding pāda may also have the same referents, though as JPB points out in the publ. intro. they could also/instead be the fire churning sticks. On *parikṣīt-* see comm. ad X.65.8.

Ge and WG take the intens. *prā sarsrāte* as trans., with *dīrghām āyuh* as obj. ("extend their lifetime long"), but medial forms of *√sṛ* are intrans./reflex. "stretch (oneself) out." See Narten ("Ai. *sṛ*," MSS 26 [1969] = KISch 125–43) and, for the intens., Schaef. (198–99); on this passage specifically, Narten 88–89 = 134–35; Schaef. 199.

On *prayākṣe* see comm. ad III.31.3.

III.7.2: On the derivation and morphology of *divākṣasaḥ* see comm. ad X.65.7, III.30.21 and detailed disc. by Scar (92–93). It is here most likely a gen. sg. modifying *vṛṣṇaḥ*, as most take it, though Sāy. (see Ge n. 2), Gr, and Old (SBE) instead interpr. it as nom. pl. (as it is in X.65.7).

The pl. *āśvā(h)* is universally interpr. as to the fem. stem *āśvā-* 'mare', presumably on the basis of its identification with *dhenāvaḥ* and association with *devīḥ*, and this is probably correct. But the form could also be masculine pl., and the gender bending characteristic of passages like this could be in play. On the other hand, see the females "playing the bull" in 9a. In any case, the pāda is surely a nominal sentence, as in almost all interpr.; Re and WG, however, apparently take pāda a as an acc. phrase and construe it with *ā tasthau*. This interpr. seems excluded by *dhenāvaḥ*; we would expect *dhenūḥ*.

On the basis of the similar phraseology in X.65.6, Ge takes the single cow in d as the offering ladle. I find this plausible, though it must be said that X.65.6 isn't all that clear.

III.7.3: The first hemistich seems to paraphrase 2b: in that pāda an unidentified single being took (his) stand (*ā tasthau*) on a set of plural females; here the same happens, but

the being is discursively identified in b as a male, and the verb *ā ... arohat* substitutes for *ā √ sthā*.

The tr. “lord” might be expanded to “lord / husband,” given that he “mounts” females here, and also given the simile in 4d.

The 2nd hemistich takes up 1a, with compd. COLOR-*pr̥ṣṭhā-* and *dhāseḥ*. Here Agni is presumably destroying the firewood that (notionally) held the flames; the sense would be clearer if “made them depart from the wellspring of the brushwood” were substituted for “made them dwell apart.” The lexeme *prā √ vas* means ‘go / dwell abroad / away from home’.

III.7.4: The subj. of the first hemistich is universally (save for JPB) understood to be “rivers, streams,” but this relies entirely (as far as I can see) on Sāy.’s gloss of *vahātaḥ* as *nadyaḥ*. But *vahāt-* (on which see AiG II.2.159) is a hapax, and the point here surely is that it participates in an etymological figure with the flg. verb *vahanti*. And the larger point then is the paradox created by the conveyors conveying (*vahāto vahanti*) a stationary (*stabhūyāmānam*) entity. I do think that “conveyors ... convey” would be better than “carriers ... carry,” but otherwise think this etymological rendering is much superior to the introduction of ill-supported rivers.

On Agni as the son of Tvaṣṭar, see I.95.2 adduced by Ge.

As noted ad III.6.4, I’d prefer ‘seat’ for ‘abode’.

Strictly speaking, “woman” in d should be in parens.

III.7.6: Ge (n. 6) remarks “Besonders dunkel,” which is saying something in a hymn of such general obscurity. The nub of the problem is how to construe *ānu*. Ge asks whether it goes with *ghóṣam* or *anayanta*. If the latter, it would allow *ghóṣam* to form a phrase with *sūṣām* at the end of the next pāda. Unfortunately, acdg. to our current understanding of tmesis, it cannot be in tmesis with *anayanta*, because it doesn’t appear in any of the standard landing sites for a preverb in tmesis. I was tempted to construe *ānu* with *pravídā*, as Old (Noten, contra his interpr. in SBE) almost breezily suggests: “Warum nicht *pravídā ānu* verstehen ...?” (fld. by Scar, though see his n. 682). Unfortunately the answer is “because *ānu* is never construed with an instr. and is also almost always a preposition, not a postposition.” Which means that we’re stuck with *ānu ghóṣam* and two different noises in a single clause. The publ. tr. does what it can under the circumstances.

Note that *ānu svām dhāma* in d recalls the adverb *anuṣvadhām* in the previous hymn (III.6.9). Also, *dhāma* echoes *dhānam* in the previous pāda, and both resonate with (*praví*)*dānu* in pāda a.

III.7.7: Pāda b recalls III.5.5–6.

III.7.8 = III.4.7, in an Āprī hymn.

III.7.9: The interplay of females and bulls is found also in 2a, while *suyāmāḥ* qualifies females in 3a. However, the immediate referents can’t be the same, because *raśmí-* here is masc.

The opening of c, *déva hotar*, echoes the dual *daívyā hótārā* that begins the borrowed vs. 8; for this reason I’d tr. “o god Hotar,” or even “o divine Hotar.”

Strictly speaking, *mandrá taraḥ* should be “more delighting” or “very delighting”; *cikītvān* recurs from 3b.

III.7.10: In d “the fault ... we have committed” is somewhat misleading, in that the poet admits neither individual not collective guilt: it should simply be “even the fault that has been committed.”

III.7.11 = III.1.23, etc.

III.8 Sacrificial Posts

On the structure of this hymn, see the publ. intro. As was also noted there, though the hymn is an intrusion in the Agni cycle, it is found (/was inserted) at a seam in the cycle: at the end of the 11-verse (III.3–7) trimeter Agni hymns. The next set of hymns have 9 verses and are in varying meters, with mostly 8-syllable pādas (III.9 Bṛhatī, III.10 Uṣṇih, III.11–12 Gāyatrī).

III.8.1: Note the future impv. *dhattāt*, which has the standard (later) function of enjoining an action that will follow another one.

III.8.4: Kane (HDS II.1.269) suggests that the image in this vs. is that of a young boy, well dressed and encircled with his sacred thread (*yúvā suvāsāḥ párivītaḥ*), at his Upanayana, whom they “lead up” (*ún nayanti*), in an idiom close to the *úpa √ nī* of the Upanayana. Acdg. to Kane, several gṛhya sūtras employ this mantra in the Upanayana.

III.8.6: There is number disharmony between the 2nd plural enclitic *vaḥ* (a) and the voc. singular *vānaspate* (b). The simplest way to account for this is to assume that the voc. has simply been repeated from the 1st vs. of the hymn (1b) in this 1st vs. of the 2nd (half of the) hymn, which switches its subject from a singular post to plural posts. Or Lord of the Forest may refer to the forest itself or a single tree that produces multiple posts.

III.8.8: The rarer dual dvandva *dyāvā-kṣāmā* substitutes for the more common *dyāvā-pṛthivī*, with *pṛthivī*, perhaps in its lit. meaning ‘broad one’, pleonastically following the dvandva.

III.8.10: Contrary to the standard tr., I think there is a change of subject in the 2nd half-verse. Rather than calling on the posts to help us, we turn again to the gods, who are the likely subject of *avantu*, just as they were in 8c. The types of help we ask them for are distinct but complementary: help for our sacrifice in 8c, help in battle and competition in 10d, a theme introduced by the *viḥavā-* ‘competing invocation’ in 10c. The *vā* of 10c signals this disjunction and the return of the gods as subject. Although Klein (DGRV II.203) suggests reading *vā* here as if for *vaí*, given that the hymn contains several loosely construed *vā*-s (1d, 6b), this does not seem like a good idea.

[III.9-29 JPB – comm. by SJ]

III.9 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.9.1: Every pāda in this vs. has close parallels elsewhere. Most of pāda a, X X X *tvā vavṛmahe*, is found also in I.187.2 and VIII.19.3. (On metrically bad *vavṛmahe* and the likely restoration **vuvṛmahe*, see Kü [459] and comm. ad VI.4.7.) Pāda b = V.22.3, VIII.11.6, and, extended to a Jagatī, I.144.5. Pāda c = VIII.19.4, with substitution of *ūrjō* for *apām*. Pāda d = I.40.4.

Since Agni's entry into "his mothers, the waters" is depicted in 2b, calling him Apām Napāt here is esp. apt.z

On the basis of my reeval. of the usage of *anehās-* (see comm. ad X.61.12), I would substitute "flawless" for "faultless." The tr. of *subhāgaṃ sudīditim* in pāda c might be harmonized with that of VIII.19.4 "providing good fortune and good light," though this is not strictly necessary – the renditions are close enough.

III.9.2: The first pāda presents interpretational difficulties that have mostly been glossed over. The form *vanā* is generally taken to be a neut. pl. of *vāna-* 'wood', but it is wrongly accented (expect *vānā*), and given the near ubiquity of this stem, and indeed this very morphological form, this anomaly should not be dismissed so easily as it usually is (see a particularly strong statement by Kulikov [*ya*-presents, 329 n. 820]). Old (SBE and, more explicitly, Noten) and Schindler (Root nouns p. 43) instead take it as an instr. to the root noun *vān-*, which better reflects its accent, but appears to cause syntactic difficulty, since the verb with which it's construed supposedly only takes accusatives. However, that verb, the mid. part. *kāyamāna-*, is a hapax; the stem is found nowhere else in Sanskrit. I therefore think that comparing the case frame of stems that are ultimately related to it but superficially quite distinct, esp. the pf. (*ā*) *cake* (see esp. Kulikov 319–20), is of limited utility, and that an instr. is possible with this very distinct stem: "finding pleasure with the wood"; it is even possible that *kāyamāna-* is a pseudo-passive and the phrase should be tr. "(Fire) being enjoyed by the wood," which might provide a reason for Agni's entry into the waters in pāda b – a means of escape.

There are several different ways to interpr. pāda c, depending on who we take as the implicit agent of the infinitive *pramīṣe*. The publ. tr. (also Old SBE) seems to assume that agent to be the ritualists, who should pay sufficient attention to the return of Agni. But most tr. assume instead that Agni is the agent, and he should not forget (with a slightly different, but quite possible sense of *prā* √ *mṛṣ*) to return – with pāda d reminding him that he had made the same cycle before (with "earlier" generally supplied: e.g., Kü 158 "dass du (früher), obwohl du in der Ferne warst, hier erscheinen bist"). I think each interpr. is possible and would allow both alternatives; I would, however, delete the JPB's "therefore," which seems too emphatic for a *tād* not even in 1st position, and substitute "you came to be here" for "you have come to be here," since the latter is not usually the sense of the impf.

III.9.3: I would be inclined to add a "just" (reflecting *evā*) in pāda b: "and now you are just benevolent" – the point being that before he escaped the smoke, there were both positive and negatives aspects of Agni, but now it is only positive.

The standard view of the referents of *anyé ... anyé* is that they are the various priests, and this is supported by *sakhyé* in c, which responds to *sākhāyaḥ* referring to us

ritualists in 1a. But I agree with JPB that another possible referent is the flames, some of which dart out and others stay close to the point of ignition.

The accent on *yánti* presumably results from the contrast of the two short clauses.

III.9.4: The stem *saścát-* (here, I.42.7, and VII.97.4) is generally given an abstract sense (e.g., Old [SBE] hindrance, Ge Mangel, Re déficience), even though both Ge and Re accept a connection with \sqrt{sac} ‘dry up’ (Ge n. 4b, Re n.), contra Gr, who takes it to the other \sqrt{sac} ‘follow, accompany’. The connection with *asaścát-* ‘never drying up, inexhaustible’ provides strong evidence both for the root etymology and for the literal sense. Given the Vedic horror of aridity (as exemplified, e.g., by the Vṛtra myth and the release of the waters), “parched places” seems a reasonable interpr. Moreover, “parched places” provides a nice contrast with the waters in which Agni hides himself (pāda d and 2b). WG take *saścátah* instead as an adj. (“folgende”) modifying *srídhaḥ*, which doesn’t have much to recommend it and doesn’t work for the other passages. In fact WG tr. the same form in I.42.7 as “die trockenstehenden (Orte)” and Gotō (in Dōyama/Gotō) as “die Versiegungen,” so the rejection of ‘dry up’ seems to have been temporary.

The simile in d is somewhat jarring: “resting in the waters like a lion,” since lions don’t generally lie around in water. A different loc. needs to be supplied or assumed (so Ge, Re, WG): “(in his lair / hiding place)” vel sim.

III.9.5: As JPB indicates in the publ. intro. *mathitá-* here can mean either (or rather both) ‘stolen’ and ‘churned’ (used of fire produced by friction). Most tr. choose one or the other (though often with a nod to the other): ‘churned’ (et sim.) Old SBE, Ge; ‘stolen’ Re, WG, Narten (Ved *math*, 133 = KISch. 23), Elizarenkova (Lg. and Style 193). If we allow the ‘churn’ alternative, better to separate *devébhyaḥ* from *mathitám* – rather than “churned from among the gods” as in the publ. intro., “brought him, churned, from the gods.”

WG and Elizarenkova (both flg. Kuiper) take *devébhyaḥ* as dat.: “stolen for the gods”: This is appealing in that it was the gods who pursued him and wanted him back. But this makes *pári* somewhat harder to construe, since *pári* is found with \sqrt{math} only when an abl. is in play (I.93.6, IX.97.2). To save both the abl. and the narrative, we can assume that *mathitám* refers to the original disappearance of Agni: “who (had been) stolen from the gods” and was subsequently recovered by Mātariśvan.

III.9.6: I do not think that *tām tvā* is esp. emphatic; the *tām* merely provides a prop for the enclitic. This pāda opening is quite common, found 69x in the RV; see disc. in my 1992 “sa figé,” esp. pp. 228–30. I’d therefore rephrase “You are he whom ...” to simply “the mortals seized you.”

On the basis of persuasive parallels cited by Old and Ge, *devébhyaḥ* belongs with the immed. flg. voc. *havyavāhana*, rather than with the preceding cl.

Most tr. take cd as a purpose clause, “so that you will guard,” against JPB’s “since you guard ...” Either is possible, esp. since the verb in c, *abhipāsi*, can be either pres. indicative or subjunctive. The purpose cl. interpr. is a viable alternative.

III.9.7: With most interpr., I'd take *tád bhadráṃ* and *daṃsánā* as parallel subjects of *chadayati*, rather than, with the publ. tr., taking *táva ... chadayati* as a parenthetical insertion.

I would also prefer “livestock” or “cattle” to “herd” for *paśávaḥ* in c.

III.9.8: On *śīrā-* see comm. ad VIII.43.31.

Contrary to all the standard interpr., incl. the publ. tr., I'd be inclined to take c with ab, as a continuation of the long acc. phrase begun in pāda a, with d a snappy summary: “serve the god with obedience.” The instr. *śruṣṭī* that begins d seems to me to signal a new beginning.

III.9.9: This vs. is identical to X.52.6, the final vs. of one of the three hymns there (X.51–53) concerning the flight and recovery of Agni, which is also largely treated in our hymn.

III.10 Agni [SJ on JPB]

A hymn made up almost entirely of clichés; in this it is reminiscent of the elementary I.1. The first seven vss. each contain a form of *agní-*, mostly voc. (1a, 2b, 3c, 7a), a feature also reminiscent of I.1.

III.10.3: The publ. tr. mistakenly tr. dat. *jātāvedase* as a voc. It should be corrected to “who will do ritual service for you, the Jātavedas ...”

III.10.5: The part. *bībhrate* appears to belong in the simile, since it immediately precedes the simile marker *ná*. It is so tr. by Old (SBE), Ge, and JPB. However, the sense would be somewhat better if the part. modified Agni, with the simile confined to *vedhāse*: “bringing the lights of inspirations like a ritual master”; it is so tr. by Re and WG. This is in fact syntactically possible, since, as disc. ad VIII.76.1 (etc.), simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position and flips with its target when it would end up there. I would therefore favor the alt. tr. just given.

Note that pāda-final *vedhāse* matches likewise positioned *jātāvedase* in 3b; that one ends a dimeter pāda and one a Jagatī line may mitigate the potential sing-song rhyme effect.

III.10.6: The ablative subordinator *yātaḥ* is tr. as if it were a plural with fem. *gírah* as antecedent (“the songs ... those from which he was born”). But *yātaḥ* √*jan* is a rare idiom meaning “as soon as” (see Gr *yātas* def. 6), presumably from a temporal ablative sense “from (the time) when.” See the passages assembled by Ge (n. 6b): I.128.4 *yātaḥ ... ājāyata*, I.141.1 *yāto jāni*, VII.4.2 *yātaḥ ... ājaniṣṭa*, VII.7.3 *yātaḥ ... jajñiṣé*, and semantically sim. I.25.17 *yātaḥ ... ābhṛtam*. So substitute “... strengthen Agni, as soon as he is born, worthy to be hymned.”

III.10.7: The verb *vī rājasi* recalls the noun *samrājāṃ* in 1b, but it is also presumably a pun: not only “you rule” but “you shine,” as pointed out in the publ. intro.

The phrase *āti śrídhaḥ* is found also in the previous hymn, III.9.4.

III.10.8: Note the pronominal doubling, with *naḥ* (a) anticipating *asmé* (b).

Echoes from earlier in the hymn: *dīdihī* (3a), *suvīryam* (3c).

III.10.9: The verb *sám indhate* forms a trivial ring with 1c *indhate sám*, but this seems less the deployment of a poetic device and more the result of poverty of imagination.

III.11 Agni [SJ on JPB]

This is scarcely less banal than the immediately preceding hymn, save for a complex figure in vss. 3 and 5.

III.11.2: On *cánohita*- see comm. ad III.2.2. The tr. should be corrected here to “delighted.”

“Sacrifice” is almost universally supplied as the obj. of *sám ṛṇvati* (save for Old [SBE], who takes it as intrans. “sets himself in motion”). Supplying ‘sacrifice’ seems reasonable, though there are no clear parallels, and the other occurrence of *sám ṛṇvati*, in nearby III.2.1, is troublesome (see comm. ad loc.).

III.11.3: The vs. begins like 2c, *agnír dhiyā*, and then seems to make a new start with *sá cetatī*. This is generally not registered in the standard tr., though it is, properly, in the publ. tr.

Ge (/WG) takes *cetatī* as transitive (“understands” vel sim.) with pāda c as its obj.: approx. “knows how to reach his goal.” But *cetatī*, even when in the (semi-)transitive value ‘perceives’, does not, I think, have the “know how” construction, and, even more important, the *hī* in c marks this pāda as an independent clause. For detailed disc. of this passage and the problems associated with the object interpr. of c, see Keydana (Inf. 193–94). Far better to take *cetatī* in its common sense ‘appears’, reinforced by the cognate *ketú*- ‘visible beacon’ in b, and keep pāda c as a syntactically separate nominal cl., as done by Re (also see his n.), Keydana, and JPB.

The phrase *ártham hy āsya tarāṇi* is difficult, esp. if we accept that it must be an independent cl. on the grounds given just above. Interpr. it requires us to assess the meaning and function of *tarāṇi*- and to re-assess the same for *tūrṇi*-, found in 5c. I should first justify why I think the latter has any bearing on the former. First, I find it striking that these two fairly rare *-ni*- forms (22x [incl. deriv.] and 8x [incl. compd.] respectively), built to very similar bases, are found within two vss. of each other. This seems to call out for their comparison. Further, *tarāṇi*- here must be construed with *ártham*, one way or the other, and *tūrṇi*- appears in the compd *tūrṇy-ārtha*- (2x). The poet seems to be swapping out related adjectival forms with *ártha*-. However, *tūrṇi*- is usually given a different meaning (‘swift’) from *tarāṇi*-, with a different etymology (\sqrt{tvar} , not $\sqrt{tṛ}$). I will reexamine *tūrṇi*- ad vs. 5, but will here concentrate on *tarāṇi*-. This adj. is generally, and I think quite correctly, derived from $\sqrt{tṛ}$ ‘cross over’, etc. etc. (see, e.g., EWA I.630). It occurs 20 times in the RV (in addition to 2 occurrences of *tarāṇitva*-). In what I consider to be its original, literal sense, it means ‘transiting, crossing’, of the sun (I.50.4, VII.63.4, X.88.16). In these passages the referent has a definite trajectory (across the sky) and a definite goal (the other side of the sky), a fact to which we will return. The form then can be used of forward motion without a necessary trajectory or goal: ‘advancing’, used of fire and its flames (e.g., I.128.6, IV.4.12) or Soma (I.121.6), priests (IV.45.5, 7), etc. And ultimately the sense of forward *movement*, which may involve ‘overtaking’ smtg. else

(maybe III.49.4), can be attenuated simply to its conceptual equivalent, ‘surpassing’ (e.g., Indra VIII.45.28, a successful man VII.32.9, 20, etc.). The influence of comparable forms of the multivalent verb could always have been felt. The occurrence here is the only neut. form; the question is -- what is its relationship to *ártham*? Here a return to the ‘transiting’ passages will help. In VII.63.4 the sun is described as *dūrēarthas tarāṇiḥ* “whose goal is in the far distance as he crosses over (to it),” where a cmpd. with *artha-* is associated with *tarāṇi-*. This suggests that *ártham* here is conceptually the obj./goal of *tarāṇi-*, rather than being directly modified by it. In other words, a rendering like the publ. tr., which represents simple modification, “for his goal is surpassing,” is probably wrong. However, this complicates the syntax: what neut. could *tarāṇi* modify if not *ártham*? And is it just a simple adjective? Here I follow Keydana (194), with the same reluctance he seems to show, in taking *tarāṇi* here as a predicated infinitive (or its functional equivalent): “for his goal is (to be) advanced towards” or, perhaps better “for it is for him to advance to his goal.” In the following vs. Agni is made the conveyor of oblations, and in the verse after that he is a chariot: the purposeful forward motion of Agni is well established.

III.11.5: To return to the relationship between *tarāṇi-* and *tūrṇi-* discussed ad vs. 3, here concentrating on *tūrṇi-*. As I said there, this stem is usually glossed as ‘swift’ (e.g., Gr ‘*rasch, eilend, rasch im Werke*’) and derived from \sqrt{tvar} ‘hasten’ (e.g., EWA I.689, though an alternative connection with $\sqrt{tṛ}$ is admitted there). But none of its occurrences requires, or even encourages, a meaning ‘swift’, while several instead favor ‘crossing, advancing’. Two of the six non-compounded forms occur alongside the root-noun cmpd *ap-tūr-* ‘crossing the waters’ (I.3.8, III.51.2); this association seems significant, and they share the same *u*-root vocalism. In X.88.6 *tūrṇi-* is used of the sun transiting (like *tarāṇi-*; see ad vs. 3 above). A sense ‘advancing’ works for the other non-cmpd forms, in all cases better than ‘swift’ (see comm. ad locc.). Then there are the two occurrences of the cmpd *tūrṇy-artha-* (III.52.5, V.43.2). In the publ. tr. I rendered this cmpd as ‘swift to his/their task’, flg. Gr “*schnell zum Ziele dringend, zum Ziele eilend*,” but how a bahuvrīhi would allow such a sense is now not clear to me. (AiG does not treat the cmpd.) Taking into account the fact that *tarāṇi-* is construed with *ártha-* in our vs. 3c, as an obj./goal (see above), I think we can take *tūrṇy-artha-* in a similar sense, with a pseudo-infinitival 1st member: ‘having a goal to advance to’. In short, *tūrṇi-* is essentially a synonym of *tarāṇi-*, and both are derived from $\sqrt{tṛ}$ and meaning ‘transiting, advancing’ (etc.). It should be noted that this analysis seems to be reflected in both Ge’s and Re’s tr. of the two forms in this Agni cycle (III.3.5, 11.5), “*zielerreichenden*” and “*franchissant (les obstacles)*,” though without comment, as opposed to WG “*schnell, rasch*” in both places.

As for the root vocalism, and esp. the contrast between ppl. *tūrṇá-* and our stem *tūrṇi-*, it’s striking that *tūrṇá-* is actually not found in the RV, save in a single occurrence of negated *átūrṇa-*. In any case, the *tṛ* and *tūr* root syllables of $\sqrt{tṛ}$ are thoroughly confused; though I would like to confine the latter originally to \sqrt{tvar} ‘hasten’, synchronically we must reckon with numerous *tūr* forms to $\sqrt{tṛ}$.

I would alter the tr. to “the advancing chariot, ever new.”

III.11.7: The instr. *vāhasā* is variously interpr. and construed; e.g., Ge considers the gen. *pāvakásociṣaḥ* at the end of the last pāda to be dependent on it; Old (SBE) and WG take it

vāhasā as (somehow, loosely) governing *práyāṃsi*. It's important to consider the usual employment of the stem, incl. in its many cmpds. (see disc. ad X.29.3); the *vāhas-* is ordinarily conceptualized as a verbal product (hymn, vel sim.) that serves as the vehicle to bring / attract the gods to the sacrifice. Here the pious mortal by bringing the gods here with such a vehicle attains to desirable things. Although *práyāṃsi* are ordinarily pleasurable offerings *to* the gods, here I think they must be pleasurable things that the mortal himself wishes to attain; this is supported by the formula that seems to be split across this vs. and the next one (see comm. ad 8a). It also seems to be parallel to *kṣáyam* 'dwelling place' in the last pāda, given *sadhásthāni práyāṃsi ca* "abodes and pleasurable offerings" in the immediately flg. hymn, III.12.8, which also supports the syntactic interpr. reflected in the publ. tr.

III.11.8: Various suggestions have been made for what to supply with *súdhitā*, but Re's, *práyāṃsi*, must be correct, since *práyāṃsi* is found in the immed. preceding vs. (7a) and *práyāṃsi súdhitā(ni)* is a fixed phrase: I.135.4, VI.15.15, VIII.60.4, X.53.2. (*práyāṃsi* also regularly serves as obj. of $\sqrt{dhā}$ [I.169.3, III.30.1, X.91.9].) Here the same verb, *ásyāma*, is found as in vs. 7 (*ásnoti*), also with mortal worshipers as subject. The two vss. seem to be making the point that mortals, too, can attain to *práyāṃsi*. I would add a parenthetic "(pleasing offerings)" to replace "things": "all the well-placed (pleasing offerings)."

III.11.9: Strictly speaking, *érire* should not be 'placed' but 'set in motion' and should be altered accordingly.

III.12 Indra and Agni [SJ on JPB]

A fairly elementary hymn. Every vs. except 3 contains the dual dvandva *índrāgnī*, generally in the voc. (1a, 2a, 5c, 6, 7a, 8a, 9a), always pāda initial. Vs. 4c has the acc. *índrāgnī*, and vs. 3a the independent accs. *índram agnīm*.

III.12.3: As just noted, this is the only vs. in which the two gods are not compounded. I don't know why; it can't be because they're in the acc., because *índrāgnī* is acc. in the next vs., 4c. We fall back on the unsatisfactory explanation of metrical necessity (extra syllable needed).

The meaning of the hapax *kavi-chād-* is uncertain, in part because the root affiliation of *-chād-* cannot be determined. See disc. in Scar (130). The standard view is that the root is \sqrt{chand} 'seem, appear, please', giving the cmpd the sense "appearing as poets" (publ. tr. "who appear as sages"), perhaps more idiomatically "in the guise of poets." However, as Scar points out, the root could instead be \sqrt{chad} 'cover, protect', with the cmpd meaning "protecting poets." Perhaps best to go with the former analysis, with all the standard tr., since this root is more common. While accepting this root affiliation, Gr gives it a transitive sense "taking pleasure in poets" (somewhat similar Sāy.), which is not excluded – nor is the analysis with \sqrt{chad} 'cover'.

Although not so analyzed by the Pp., the sequence *jutyā vṛṇe* may conceal the preverb *ā*, see *ā vṛṇe* in 5c.

III.12.4: On *tośā-* and the root \sqrt{tus} in general, see comm. ad VIII.38.2, where I defend the old gloss 'drip' against Gotō's anodyne replacement, 'hasten'.

III.12.5: On *nīthāvid-* see Scar (485). As he points out, in IV.3.16 *nīthāni* are associated with other verbal tricks of skilled poets.

III.12.8: The neut. pl. *taviṣāni* can be taken in two different ways, either as an adj. modifying the neut. pl.s *sadhāsthāni prāyāmsi ca* in the flg. pāda (so Old SBE [modifying only *sadhāsthāni*], Re, publ. tr.) or as substantivized ‘powers’ (as in I.166.1, 9)(so Gr, Ge, WG). I weakly favor the latter, because neither abodes nor pleasurable offerings are naturally “mighty,” and the nominals modified by adjectival *taviṣā-* are quite different from these benign objects. I would therefore propose an alt. “Yours are the powers, and the seats and pleasing offerings.”

As noted ad III.6.4, I prefer “seats” to “abodes.”

III.13 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The content is fairly straightforward, but there are syncopations and disturbances in syntax and word order, esp. in the earlier vss.

III.13.1: The content of the vs. is entirely banal, but the construction of pāda c seems a bit disordered, with the material we expect to begin pāda / clause, *ā sā naḥ*, instead ending the pāda, preceded by the VP *gāmad devébhiḥ*. (I.5.3 is almost identical, with *vājebhiḥ* instead of *devébhiḥ*). The easiest way to account of this is to assume the whole VP was fronted.

III.13.2: The first hemistich of this vs. is troubled both syntactically and conceptually. To begin with the syntactic: in the vs.-opening configuration *ṛtāvā yāsya* the ordinary interpr. would be that, as is incredibly common, despite its second position *yāsya* marks the whole as a rel. clause, which would contain nom. *ṛtāvā* as its subject (i.e., “of whom/whose [X] the truthful one [does something]”). But this doesn’t work; instead nom. *ṛtāvā* is, as it were, a single-word nominal clause, with *yāsya* coreferent with and dependent on it (i.e., “[he is] the truthful one, of whom/whose ...”). This nom. has no further function; when the referent (Agni) returns in cd, he is in the acc. (*tām ... tām*). Given the ubiquity of relatives clauses with *yā-* in 2nd position, the reading forced on the configuration here, with *ṛtāvā* and *yāsya* in separate clauses, counts as a deliberately misleading trick. However, within this Agni cycle there is a similar syntactic construction that escapes the problem we have here, but provides a model for interpr. our almost identical problematic pāda-opening. III.6.10 begins *sā hótā yāsya ródasī* ... “He is the Hotar of whom the two world-halves ...” The difference is the inclusion of *sā*, which marks *sā hótā* as a full nominal clause and also pushes *yāsya* into third position. This pāda is surely the model for ours, with trisyllabic *ṛtāvā* substituting for disyllabic *hótā* and thereby knocking out the clarifying *sā*.

In the rest of the hemistich the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take *ródasī* and *ūtāyaḥ* as joint subjects of *sācanta*: “whose skill the two world-halves and the helps follow.” Needless to say, this is a wildly ill-assorted pairing. This seems to be what the syntax points to: among other things since *sācanta* is accented, it must be in a dependent clause. But what it means doesn’t bear considering. It’s also important to note that pāda b, *dākṣaṃ sācanta ūtāyaḥ*, is found independently elsewhere, in I.134.2e (a Vāyu hymn),

where it makes reasonable sense (and is subordinated to a *yád* in the preceding pāda). The fact that b is found independently, along with the nonsense that results from cobbling a and b together, is, I think, a good clue that we should de-couple the two pādas.

Bloomfield (RReps, ad I.134.2) finds our hemistich disturbing as it is usually interpr. and devotes considerable space to discussing it. His solution is to take pādas a and b as separate *yásya* clauses (both hanging off *ṛtāvā*): “The righteous (Agni) whose are the two worlds ... (whose) helps attach themselves to solid pious work—him ...” I think this must be the correct way to interpr. the structures and would substitute (with some relexicalization): “(He is) the truthful one, whose are the two world-halves, (whose) skill (his) forms of help accompany.” That it is Agni’s *ūtāyaḥ* is suggested by *devāsya* ... *ūtāyaḥ* in the next hymn (III.14.6).

III.13.3: The vs. contains one suffix-accented *tār*-stem governing the gen. (*yantā ... eṣām ... yajñānām*) and two root-accented ones governing the acc. (*dātā ... vānitā maghām*). It is not clear to me whether the morphological and syntactic difference is meant to signal a functional difference. Although Tichy cites the passage for its use of both stem types (*tar-stems*, 299–300), her attempt to differentiate them functionally (302) seems weak. Of *yantā* + GEN in this passage she says it expresses the god’s “Wirkungen ... zugunsten der Lebewesen,” while *dātā ... vānitā* + ACC describes “bleibende Eigenschaften” of the god. But she does not explain why his role as “controller of sacrifices” is not a permanent characteristic of the god, or, conversely, why his roles as “giver and gainer of bounty” are not actions beneficial to living beings. For her the morphology seems to be the sole driver of interpr., imposing distinctions that don’t seem to be reflected in the actual content of the phrases.

The standard tr. fold *āthā hī sáh* into the rest of pāda b (*sá yajñānām*), despite the apparent new beginning and the doubling of *sá(h)* (e.g., JSK [DGRV II.82] “for he is also (the leader) of the worships,” reproducing Ge). But *āthā hī sáh* has all the hallmarks of a clause-initial sequence, and with the publ. tr. (as well as Tichy [300] and WG) it should be taken as a separate nominal cl. As elsewhere in the hymn, the syntax is syncopated.

As it also is in the next pāda, *agnīm tām vo duvasyata*, where the pāda/clause would ordinarily begin with *tām vaḥ*.

III.13.6: The involvement of the Maruts in strengthening Agni is a bit odd: these gods are not usually associated. But see III.16.2 adduced by Ge: *ímāṃ naro marutaḥ saścata vṛdham* “Follow this one to strengthen him, o superior men, o Maruts,” as well as the Maruts’ presence in the next hymn, along with Mitra and Varuṇa (III.14.4). I almost wonder if the Maruts as winds (as in later Sanskrit) are what’s at issue in the strengthening: fanning the flames.

III.14 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The verbal hero of this hymn seems to be *sáhas*- ‘strength’, with *sáhasas putráḥ* found in 1c, 4c, 6a (latter two as voc.) and voc. *sahasvaḥ* in 2b and 4a.

III.14.1: On *vidáthāni* here, see Th (Unters. 46 n. 1), who tr. “[Stätten der] Verteilungen” and identifies them as the hearths/fireplaces on the ritual ground.

Because of the appearance of the chariot in the final vs., 7c, I'd be inclined to tr. *āsthāt* as "he has mounted," as usual.

I'd be inclined to tr. *satyāḥ* as "really present" and *kavítamaḥ* as "best poet."

The phrase *prthivyām pājo aśret* is found identically in VII.3.4 (except with accented *ásret*), where JPB tr. very differently; see also III.61.5 *diví pājo aśret* and VII.10.1 *prthú pājo aśret*. These passages should be harmonized; I'd here emend the tr. to "has fixed his leading edge on the earth." This refers to the spread of the fire. However, on the basis of *pājasā prthúnā* in the next hymn (III.15.1), perhaps 'countenance' should be retained here.

III.14.3: On *vājāya-* (so accented), see my *-āya-*Formations, pp. 51 and 88. The form here is probably the intrans. "race," but it is possible that it belongs with the transitive "incite" forms, with gapped obj.: "Dawn (and Night) inciting (you)."

On the grammatical form underlying *vandhúreva*, see Old (SBE and Noten) and Re. Since it is likely either du. or pl., the tr. should be altered to "chariot-boxes."

III.14.4: I do not understand the phrase *sumnám arcan* nor the publ. tr. "chant to you your favor"; *sumná-* is ordinarily something attained, or desired to be attained; it is not the object of a verb of speaking. Perhaps what is meant is that the gods chant *their own* favor / benevolent thoughts for Agni, which allows him to rise up in pāda c.

In d I am inclined to go against the clear morphology of *prathāyan* and take *kṣitīḥ* not as obj. of a trans. participle (as in the publ. tr. "spreading out the settlements"), but as goal of *abhi* "spreading to the settlements," depicting the light of the fire spreading across the earth (sim. WG). The phrase *sūryo nṛṇ* is then (in my view) an unmarked simile "(like) the sun (spreading) to men," where *nṛṇ* is the acc. pl. it appears to be (not gen. "the sun of men," as in other tr.), but not a direct object as in the publ. tr. ("spreading out men"). The phrase *sūryo nṛṇ* is also found in I.146.4 (q.v.).

III.14.6: The first syllables of *sahasrīṇam* echo the insistent *sahas-* earlier in the hymn (see comm. in intro. above).

The opening of d, *adroghéna vácasa*, is conceptually reminiscent of the opening of 5d *ásredhatā mánmanā*.

III.14.6–7: Each hemistich begins with a form of the 2nd sg. prn.: *t^uvám* (6c, 7c), *t^uvád* (6a), *túbhyam* (7a).

III.14.7: This vs. is notionally in a weak ring with vs. 1, with *kavikrato* matching *kavítamaḥ* (1b), *adhvaré* corresponding to *vidáthāni* (1a), and *suráthasya* to *vidyúd-ratha-* (1c).

The first hemistich consists of an unresolved rel. cl., or, probably better, one with the rel. prn. and its antecedent flipped. If instead of *yāni imā* at the end of pāda a we had **imā yāni*, an interpr. "these things (are) for you, which we have done" would be possible. This is in fact the way Ge, WG, and JPB take it (also, more or less, Re), and is probably the best way to do it – although I don't know of a rule that flips these pronouns. Otherwise we must read it as a rel. cl. without a main cl.: "which these things we have done ..." (with the further ungrammaticality in Engl. of "which these").

III.15 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.15.1: Curiously, Re does not try to impose a trifunctional interpr. on b, though it's actually quite easy to construct one.

III.15.2: It would be possible to take *tanvā* with the verb, as the standard tr. do, rather than with the voc.: “take pleasure by yourself / take pleasure with your own body”; I would slightly favor this alt. though it is not nec.

III.15.3: The construction of d is uncertain. Ge, Re, and WG take *naḥ ... uśíjaḥ* as a double acc. with *kṛdhí*, with *rāyé* a dat. of purpose – e.g., WG “mach uns zu Uśij, (dass wir) Reichtum (gewinnen).” JPB, like Old (SBE), takes *uśíjaḥ* as an appositive to *naḥ*: “us, the fire-tending priests.” In his n. 3d Ge describes the Uśij, an inherited priestly title with a cognate in Old Avestan, as ancient singers who recaptured the cows and found Agni, and it is certainly the case that in several passages (e.g., IV.1.15=16.6=X.45.11, VII.90.4) the pl. *uśíjaḥ* are identified as or act parallel to the Aṅgirasas in the Vala myth and also take part in the finding of the fugitive Agni (X.46.2). Although by the appositive reading, “we” could just count as modern-day Uśij, the double acc. reading of Ge et al. makes somewhat better sense and also makes better sense of the syntax (“make ACC. DAT.”). I would therefore alter to “make us Uśij/fire-tending priests, for (us to acquire) wealth.”

III.15.4: The gen. (/abl.) *pāyóḥ* in c is somewhat troublesome, but I think it has troubled interpr. more than it should. In the publ. intro. JPB wants to see the phraseology here as showing an indirect identification of Agni with Indra, which seems to me a hypothesis more elaborate than the evidence merits or requires. Old (SBE, but still tentatively held in Noten) wants to emend *pāyóḥ* to voc. *pāyo* or nom. *pāyúḥ*. since Agni is regularly called *pāyú-* (e.g., I.31.13, II.1.7). In the pl. the word often refers to Agni's flames (e.g., I.95.9, IV.4.12–13) as his helpers in providing protection. A singular form not referring to Agni is somewhat surprising, but it should be noted that this is the only form of the stem in Maṇḍala III, and an innovative use of it is quite conceivable. My inclination is to think that “the/your foremost protector” might be a reference to the first or foremost flame of the ritual fire; alternatively, but less likely in my view, it refers to the sacrifice (so Re). It should also be noted that *br̥hatáḥ* in the next pāda does not have to modify *pāyóḥ* but can be independently construed (so Ge, WG), though it can be part of the *pāyóḥ* phrase (so Old, Re, JPB). My suggestion for the 2nd hemistich is “... as the leader of the sacrifice and of your foremost lofty protector [=flame], (leader) of the lofty one, o Jātavedas of good guidance.”

III.15.5: This vs. is a bit disjointed, leading the various interpr. to supply various verbs and combine various NPs. It seems better to follow the fairly barebones interpr. of JPB's publ. tr. I would make only one very slight adjustment: delete “up” in b.

Note that *dīdyānaḥ* (b) picks up *didīhi* in 4a, despite difference in voice and quantity of the redupl. and root syllables.

III.15.6: In c Ge (/WG) supplies ‘come’, which I’d be inclined to follow, since *devébhiḥ* is otherwise left with nothing to do. So, a period at the end of the first hemistich, with c to be rendered as “being aflame with good flame, o god, (come) with the gods.”

III.15.7 = III.1.23 (etc.).

III.16 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.16.1: The last term over which Agni exercises control in this vs. is *vṛtraháthānām*, which is surprising both because this term is in Indra’s domain, not Agni’s, and because the plural number of the form seems rather to pertain to the first cmpd member (“of obstacles”) than to the second (“smashing”) – strictly speaking, this should be tr. “the smashings of obstacle(s).”

III.16.2: On the Maruts strengthening Agni, see comm. ad III.13.6. I would prefer “accompany” to “follow,” for *saścata* without preverb.

On *śévṛdha*- see comm. ad V.87.4.

The pl. referent of the *yé* that is the subject of the second hemistich is not certain: it can be either the riches (*rāyāḥ*) of the immed. preceding pāda or the Maruts of pāda a, since both are masc. pl. The Maruts are favored by Sāy., Old (SBE), Re; the riches by Ge and JPB (with WG unclear). I think it quite likely that both are meant, though the contents of cd fit the Maruts better.

The VP *śátrum ādabhúḥ* is also found in VI.46.10, where I tr. the verb as ‘outwit’, which might be better here, since the subjects are positively viewed entities and “swindle” is not ordinarily a positively viewed action.

III.16.3: Exactly how the long gen. phrase beginning with *rāyāḥ* works with *naḥ ... śísīhi* “sharpen us” is not clear to me. With the publ. tr., it may be best to assume a mediating (gapped) dative “share, portion” with *rāyāḥ ... śūṣmīṇaḥ* a partitive gen (“sharpen us for [a share] of wealth ...”). In the publ. tr. “a share” should be in parens. For the dat. in this construction see VII.18.2 *śísīhi rāyé asmān* “sharpen us for wealth.”

III.16.4: As Ge (n. 4a) remarks and as is reflected in the publ. tr., *viśvā bhúvanā* should be construed both with *cákriḥ* and with *abhí sāsaḥíḥ*, between which it is placed.

In b I might prefer “does friendly service to the gods”; on *dúvaḥ* see comm. ad IX.65.3.

III.16.5: The publ. tr. of *ámati*- ‘lack of thought’ fits well with the two following privative cmpds., *avīratā*- and *agótā*-; however, it is not very specific. In general, *ámati*- means ‘inattention, neglect’; see comm. ad X.42.10.

III.17 Agni [SJ on JPB]

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is dominated by forms of *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’; the insistent repetition is somewhat offset by the fact that the four finite verb forms, all act. 2nd singulars, *áyajaḥ* (2a), *yakṣi* (2c, 3c), and *prá yaja* (5c), are all used somewhat differently. See below.

III.17.2: Though tightly bound in apparently parallel constructions, the 2nd sg. forms of \sqrt{yaj} , *áyajah* (a) and *yakṣi* (c), each with an acc. complement, are used differently: the acc. with the latter has its standard function with \sqrt{yaj} , marking the gods as target/goal of the sacrifice, but the object of *áyajah*, namely *hotrám* ‘office/role of Hotar’, seems to refer to the manner or capacity in which Agni performed sacrifice. This off-balance construction is made harder to interpr. by the contrastive *pṛthivyāḥ ... divāḥ*. Do they express different types of Hotarship (so JPB, as well as Ge, Re, WG) or are they genitives in dative function (“for the earth ... for heaven”; so Old SBE). I am inclined towards the latter, because I don’t understand what “the Hotarship of the earth / of heaven” could mean, whereas the dative genitive could be an oblique object (functionally parallel to *devān* in c), displaced from the acc. slot by the phrasal verb *hotrám* \sqrt{yaj} . I would therefore alter the tr. to “Just as you performed the sacrificial role of Hotar for the Earth ... and just as you observantly (performed it) for Heaven ...” (Of course they could also be ablatives, but that case would be even harder to construe.)

III.17.3: There is no agreement on the sense of the hapax fem. pl. *ājānīḥ*; in particular if it is agent (‘birth-givers’, e.g., Ge / WG “Mütter”; essentially also Re) or an abstract ‘births’ (so Gr, Old SBE). Determining the sense of *ājānīḥ* is essential for the analysis of *uṣāsaḥ*: if the former is an agent, then *uṣāsaḥ* must be a fem. nom. pl. (with substitution of the weak stem for the strong *uṣāsaḥ*, as frequently elsewhere) in an equational nominal clause: “three dawns are your mothers” (or “the dawns are your three mothers”). If *ājānīḥ* is an abstract, then *uṣāsaḥ* should be a sg. oblique (though JPB mixes the two in the publ. tr.: “three dawns are your births”). Both Old (SBE and Noten) and Gr take *uṣāsaḥ* as ablative. I am inclined to follow this latter interpr. – in part because an abstract reading “three births” makes pāda b more parallel to pāda a with its “three lifetimes.” Moreover, though *ā* \sqrt{jan} is a fairly rare idiom, it generally appears with an ablative or ablatival adverb in the sense “born from X”; see, e.g., IV.43.3 *divā ājātā* “born from heaven”; V.31.3 *sāhasa ājaniṣṭa* “he was born from might” (as well as I.179.4, IV.18.1, X.129.6, maybe I.83.5; cf. also VII.3.9 with the oblique gen./loc. du. *mātróḥ*). I would therefore substitute the tr.: “three are your births from Dawn” (most likely the kindling of the three ritual fires at dawn). The fem. *tābhiḥ* that opens the next hemistich would then refer to the births (+/- the lifetimes in the neut. in pāda a).

The third 2nd sg. act. form to \sqrt{yaj} , *yakṣi* in c, is construed with an acc. in yet another sense. The *s*-stem obj. *ávah* ‘help’, is what we want Agni to acquire for us by sacrifice; the usual idiom is *ā* \sqrt{yaj} ‘(bring) here by sacrifice, win by sacrifice’, but the expected preverb is lacking here.

III.17.5: It is surely shocking to end a hymn to Agni by addressing him in order to state that there was a previous Hotar who was better at sacrificing than he, the god currently being addressed, is. The more predictable sentiment is found in V.3.5a, which is identical to our pāda a, save for having *nā* in place of *yāḥ* (“no previous Hotar was a better sacrificer than you”). On these near twin pādas see Bl RR ad III.17.5: “Evidently the poet of the latter stanza [=III.17.5 sj] builds his strange statement upon familiar ideas, and cannot resist the temptation to go the poet of 5.3.5 ‘one better’ by introducing the fable of a yet more primordial and superior sacrificer than Agni himself.” As Old (SBE) suggests,

the “better sacrificer” is most likely a previous instantiation of the ritual fire, so there is at least a genealogical relationship between them.

The relative prn. *yáh* of pāda a is clearly picked up by *tásya* in pāda c; all the standard tr. (also JSK DGRV I.143–44) take pāda b as part of the relative clause describing the previous Hotar, and, given the *yáh ... tásyā* dyad, this would be the default interpr. However, I think pāda b actually anticipates the main cl. of c and refers to the current Agni. The lack of temporal or person reference in b allows it to lean either way, and *dvitā* ‘once more, yet again’ nudges it towards the current Agni, not the previous one. Although JPB’s tr. essentially follows the standard ones, he clearly recognizes the force of *dvitā* and orients the pāda towards the future, even apparently interpr. the agent noun *sāttā* as a periphrastic future (“once again will take his seat”), which seems a bit incoherent, since it predicts that the previous, better sacrificer will fulfill that same role again, even though the currAgni is ordered in the next pāda to perform the sacrifice. The other tr. take b as purely descriptive or else as having past-time reference.

In keeping with my sense that b belongs with c, I would emend the tr. of abc to “He who as previous Hotar was a better sacrificer than you, o Agni – (you), once again taking (his) seat [/place] and being luck itself by your own power -- carry forward the sacrifice according to *his* foundation(s).” Pāda c is in a ring-compositional relationship with 1a: *prathamānu dhármā* “according to the first foundations.” The depiction in our vs. of a better sacrificer than the current Agni is more pointed, but both the 1st vs. and the last point to an original foundation that provided the template for the current sacrifice and sacrificer.

I would also slightly alter the tr. of d to “Then set the rite in place at our pursuit of the gods.”

Vs. 5 also has close connections with vs. 2: *hótā* (5a) picks up *hotrám* (2a), *cikitvah* (5c) *cikivān* (2b), *prá yajā* (5c) *prá tira* (2d). Note also that (*prá*) *yajā*, the fourth finite form of \sqrt{yaj} , is used absolutely, with no acc. complement, unlike the other three (2a, 2c, 3c).

III.18 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.18.1: I don’t understand why the so-called future impv. *dahatāt* is used in d. Though the future sense of this formation is less pronounced in the RV than in Vedic prose acdg. to Wh (Gr. §571), it still is a marked form in contrast to the present impv. *daha*, and one expects the *-tāt* impv. to follow logically upon a previously enjoined action. This vs. does contain a preceding impv., *bhāvā* (pāda a), but its action is not closely tied thematically with *dahatāt*. The future impv. is used in conventional fashion in III.8.1 and III.23.2.

III.18.2: The two *tápo* forms (a, c) should be analyzed as *tápā + u*, though JSK (Ptcl. *u*, 176) is uncertain about the second and suggests that the poet or redactor could have changed *-ā* to *-o* to match the flg. two words, which end in *-o*. Given the undoubted occurrence of one form coalescing with *u* in this passage, it seems more economical to use the same explanation for the 2nd.

The standard tr. all interpr. *cikitānāh* as transitive ‘perceive’, with *acittān* as obj. This is of course very tempting because of the etymological relationship. But medial forms of the pf. *cikitē* are intrans. (see Kü 176) in the sense ‘be perceived, appear, be

conspicuous’, as are the med. forms of the closely related intens. *cékite* – so JPB’s intrans. rendering is more faithful to the morphology.

On the surprising root accent of *acítta*- see AiG II.1.226 (which merely notes it without explanation, though listing a handful of similar anomalies).

III.18.3: As Ge (n. 3c) points out, *bráhmanā* can be read either with *īśe* or with *vāndamānaḥ*, between which it is strategically placed; he provides parallels for both. This double reading is reflected in the publ. tr. (though curiously not in Ge’s).

In d the acc. phrase *imāṃ dhíyam ... devīm* requires a verb to govern it; already Old (Noten, contra SBE) suggests *juhómi* in b, and this is endorsed explicitly by Ge (n. 3d) and WG. A putative phrase **juhómi dhíyam* would express the common trope of “pouring prayers” – but neither Ge nor WG seems to have the courage to so tr. it: Ge / WG “(bringe ich).” By contrast, JPB’s tr. does.

III.18.4: Since *śám yóḥ* appears in the immediately preceding hymn (III.17.3) in the same metrical position, it should be rendered in the same way here if possible. I would substitute “as luck and life, (set) rich (vigor) upon the Vs,” to match III.17.3 “become luck and life.”

III.18.4: For *sṛprā karásnā* see the compd. *sṛprā-karasna-* in VIII.32.10. On *karásna*- ‘forearm’ vel sim., see EWA s.v. *kará-*. “Glossy forearms” are a more likely possession of Agni’s – ghee-drenched flames – than of Indra in VIII.32.10.

III.19 Agni [SJ on JPB]

The hymn has a particular interest in the ritual participation (or at least witnessing) of the gods as a whole: see *devátātā* (1c), *devátātim* (2c, 4c), *śárdhaḥ ... divyám* “divine troop” (JPB publ. tr. “multitude of gods”).

III.19.1: In nearby III.17.5 a “better sacrificer” (*yájīyān*) than (the current) Agni was announced, but here he is back in his customary role as *yájīyān*.

III.19.2: On the formation of (*pra*)*dakṣiṇíd* see comm. ad V.36.4.

All the standard tr. take *urāṇāḥ* as trans., with *devátātim* as object – also in the identical pāda IV.6.3b. However, all other occurrences of this participle are passive, and in this hymn a passive “(Agni) being chosen” complements the opening of the hymn *agnīm hótāraṃ prá vṛṇe* “I choose Agni as Hotar,” in the immediately preceding vs. In a ritual context “choosing” is regularly about the choice of Hotar. For further disc. see comm. ad IV.6.3.

Contra the standard tr. (incl. JPB’s), I think *vásubhiḥ* refers to material goods, not to “good” gods, and would emend to “with gifts and goods.” My interpr. is supported by sg. *vásvaḥ* in the next vs., which certainly doesn’t refer to a divinity.

III.19.3: The grammatical subject changes in this vs., from Agni in 2cd (in my view, against Ge’s opinion that it is the human Hotar) to a human ritual officiant. This change of subject should be signaled in some way in the publ. tr., perhaps by “He [=human priest].” Interpreting 3a is made more difficult by the fact that there is no overt verb or

clear way to construe the instr. phrase *téjīyasā mánasā*, and tr. vary widely. I think JPB is correct to supply a verb based on *sám ... aśret* in 2d, which is also construed with instrumentals. Here the “sharper thought/mind” is the human priest’s contribution to the sacrifice, while Agni in 2d provided gifts and goods.

The fungibility of Agni as priest and human as priest is made clear in pāda b, where the impv *śikṣa* is addressed to Agni, while the human priest is referred to as *śikṣú-* (pace BR’s emendation of *śikṣóḥ* to voc. *śikṣo*, accepted by Old but rejected by Ge, Re, WG, JPB). The ritual contributions of the god and the human are essentially equated.

The *utá* introducing pāda b has non-coordinate value, as JSK (DGRV I.453) notes. He renders it by “therefore” (JPB’s “and so”). Perhaps it’s meant to match immediately preceding *-ūta* ‘helped’ (in sandhi) in the cmpd *l’vóta-*.

The standard tr. take *suṣtutāyaḥ* as “good praise-singers,” but as JSK (DGRV I.55) points out, the well-attested stem *suṣtutí-* otherwise only means ‘praise-song’ (a fact acknowledged by Re, but not reflected in his tr.). JSK plausibly suggests that “(we) and our praise-songs” form a zeugma, an interpr. represented in the publ. tr.

The publ. tr. fails to tr. *te:* emend to “our praises of you.”

The gen. *vásvaḥ* is to be construed with *prábhūtau*, along with *rāyó nṛtamasya*. See, e.g., *vásvo rāyāḥ* in II.2.12; I would therefore change “of the good” to “of goods,” since I think this is a material, not moral desire.

III.19.5: As noted in the publ. intro., 5a forms a ring with 1a *agnīm hótāram ... miyédhe* / 5a *yát tvā hótāram ... miyédhe*, with the ring signaled by the fairly rare word *miyédha-* ‘ritual meal’.

Note *yajáthāya devāḥ* as a variant of *yajáthāya devān* in nearby III.17.1, where the acc. served as obj. to the infinitival *yajáthāya*.

III.20 Agni and the All Gods [SJ on JPB]

III.20.1: JPB’s rendering of *vāvasānāḥ* as “bellowing” follows Kü’s reinterpr. (477–80, 486–88) of all forms of this stem as belonging to $\sqrt{vās}$ ‘bellow’, rather than assigning some of them to \sqrt{vas} ‘want, long for’ (so, e.g., Gr). This wholesale reanalysis seems extreme to me. Certainly in this vs., where the gods are asked to “hear us,” noisy bellowing of their own might interfere. I prefer to follow the standard tr.: “the gods, longing for the rite ...” This sense is supported by *devāvāta-* in the next vs., at least if it means ‘sought by the gods’ (my preference) rather than ‘won by the gods’ (JPB).

Note the phonological echoes of the openings of c and d: *sujoyótiṣo ... sajóṣaso*.

III.20.2: The whole vs. concerns the three ritual fires.

The neut. *vājina-* is a vṛddhi deriv. of *vājín-* ‘prizewinner, competitor, racehorse’ (AiG II.2.350). It is found 5x in the RV, with the other four in Maṇḍala X (X.56.3; 71.5, 10; 103.10). In two of the five passages it is closely linked with *vājín-* (X.56.3 *vājy āsi vājinenā*, X.103.10 *vājínāṃ vājínāni*). As a vṛddhi deriv., it can bear various semantic relationships to its base *vājín-*. In X.56.3 and 103.10 I tr. it as “competitive spirit,” but in X.71.5, 10 it seems more concrete, as “competition.” Neither of these meanings particularly suits the form here, which is isolated from the forms clustered in X; nor do I find JPB’s ‘victorious charges’ (or any of other suggested tr.; see Ge’s n. 2a, Re’s n.)

persuasive. I wonder if it refers to a locale, like parallel *sadhásthā*-, namely ‘place of competition, arena’, indicating the hearths. I would change the tr. to “three are your arenas of competition ...”

As noted ad III.6.4, I prefer ‘seats’ to ‘abodes’.

In b the contrast between “three” and “many” is striking, but I think JPB’s tr. is correct: the “tongues” are flames (as often), and these are first numbered as three, associated with the three fires, but of course each fire has numerous flames.

As noted ad vs. 1, I’d change “won by the gods” to “sought by the gods.”

III.20.3: The cmpd. *pr̥ṣṭa-bandhu*- ‘whose kinship is asked about’ has a contrastive match in *bandhu-pr̥ch*-, used of the Aśvins, in this same maṇḍala, III.54.16 (see disc. ad loc.). The theme of names is also found there. Presumably names are the clues to the web of relationships (/kinship) in which the god has his place.

III.21 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the use of this hymn in the animal sacrifice in śrauta ritual, see publ. intro. In addition to the presence of *médas*- ‘fat’ in every vs. but 3, which was noted in the publ. intro., the word *stoká*- ‘drop’ is found in every vs. and a form of the root $\sqrt{\text{ścut}}$ ‘drip’ in every vs. but 1. The hymn is also notable for using three of the most resonant words for ‘poet, seer’ in short compass: *vípra*- and *īśi*- in vs. 3, both of Agni, and *kaví*- in the cmpd *kaviśastá*- in 4.

III.21.3: On KH’s deriv. of *santya* (always voc., no accent) from **sam-tya*- in the meaning ‘companion’, see EWA s.v.

III.21.4: I would correct “independent” to “never poor” for *adhrigo*. See comm. ad I.61.1, VIII.22.11.

As JPB points out in the publ. intro., *medhira* ‘o wise one’ is a pun on the ubiquitous *médas*- ‘fat’.

III.21.5: On the lexeme *prāti* $\sqrt{\text{vī}}$ see comm. ad VIII.39.5, where I gloss it as “accept,” as the reciprocal action to (*prá*) $\sqrt{\text{vī}}$ ‘pursue’. Here *prāti ... devaśó vihi* plays off *devávītaye* in 2c (and flirts with etymologically unrelated *prāvitā* in 3d).

III.22 Purīṣya Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the later ritual use of this hymn, see the publ. intro.

III.22.1: The syntax of this vs., esp. its 2nd hemistich, is clotted; see Old’s long disc. in Noten, also Ge (n. 1cd).

The first issue is the double loc. *yásmín ... jāthāre* in ab – in particular how to interpr. *yásmín*, which must refer to Agni, a necessity that does not fit easily with the rest of the rel. cl., which depicts the common scene of Indra taking soma into his belly. What is Agni’s role in this? Unlike other oblations, esp. ghee, soma is not poured into the ritual fire – such a liquid would extinguish the fire or at least subdue it – so Agni is not the mediating mouth through which Indra acquires the soma, as he is with ghee and the like. Old (SBE) tr. “with whom,” Ge “durch den,” both more appropriate for an instr. *yéna*;

WG “worin,” JPB “in whom,” which correctly reflect the loc. but leave the purport unexplained. Re’s “chez qui” seems to me the best solution (Ge could have used “bei”): Indra acquires the soma on the ritual ground in the vicinity of the ritual fire. I would slightly emend the tr. to “at which,” which is inelegant but closer to the “chez,” “bei” that English unfortunately lacks.

On *vāvasānāh*, see comm. ad nearby III.20.1. Against all the standard tr., but with Kü’s reanalysis of the stem, JPB renders it as “bellowing,” rather than “longing for.” Although Indra is more likely to bellow than the listening gods of III.20.1, I’m still inclined to tr. “ardently longing for it,” or at least allow this as a second reading.

The problems in the 2nd hemistich start with pāda c, which contains two semantically separate acc. NPs, *sahasrīṇam vājam* “thousandfold prize” and *ātyam ná śāptim* “like a teamed steed,” which beg to be connected – the horse should win the prize – but without syntactic means to make the connection. One or both of these accusative phrases could belong with the only other acc. in the vs. *sómam ... sutám* in ab, but an interpr. “received the pressed soma in his belly as a thousandfold prize / like a teamed steed” is not compelling, esp. the horse simile. Whereas Agni is regularly compared to horses. But Agni in this hemistich (as in the first pāda) is in the nominative, as subj. of the passive *stūyase* “you are praised.” The best alternative of the many disc. by Old and Ge seems to be the one adopted by Ge et al., that the syntax changes horses in midstream as it were – that is, what started out as a construction with an acc. object to a transitive form of *√stu* ‘praise’ (“[we praise Agni] like a steed ...”) switched to the passive (“you [Agni] are praised”) at the last minute.

But this doesn’t solve the problem of the ungoverned “prize,” not account for *sasavān śán* opening d. The nom. part. *sasavān* can modify nom. Agni, of course: “you are praised as one winning, like (one praises) a steed ...,” but what we’d really like to do with this verb form is to make it the link between the acc. steed and the acc. prize in c. A way into a solution is provided by a reexamination of *śán*, whose presence is puzzling (though it has attracted no comment in the standard tr.; only JPB reflects it, presumably in his “since you are”). Nom. forms of the pres. part. to *√as* ‘be’ are almost always concessive, but “*although* winning, you are praised” makes no sense here. My solution is to slightly emend *sasavān śán* to the acc. sg. of the same participle, **sasavāmsam* (see *sasavāmsam* in nearby III.34.8). This requires only converting the *n*’s to anusvāras and erasing the accent on *śán*. It is not difficult to imagine the redactors, confronted with immed. flg. *stūyase*, making a nominative phrase with two participles out of the single acc. part. in an effort to provide the verb with a subject. With my emendation, the steed is now modified by an acc. participle, which then can govern the other acc. phrase, the prize. The mixture of constructions -- acc. in the simile, nom. in the frame – remains, but it is now the only syntactic issue, the troublesome *śán* is gone, and the break between the two constructions is clean. I would now change the tr. to “You are praised (as one praises) a teamed steed *that has won a thousandfold prize.”

III.22.2: As disc. ad III.53.9, *nṛcākas-* can mean either ‘having one’s gaze on men’ or ‘having/drawing the gaze of men’; along with most standard tr. JPB opts for the former, but I think the latter is better in this context, since it modifies “radiance: in a NP that depicts a visual spectacle – how could men fail to look?”

III.22.3: I consider JPB's rendering of *áchā* as "(to) there" somewhat misleading; I think *áchā* is just a directional particle 'to', and I very much doubt that it can be used as a straight locative adverb "there," as the publ. tr. of pāda b "there you have spoken ..." seems to take it.

Pāda b is intrusive, in that the rel. clauses of cd *yāḥ ... yāḥ ... āpah* ("which which waters") must further specify the *árṇam* of pāda a, to which Agni goes.

The pf. *ūciṣe* in b is persuasively taken by Kü (442) as reflexive, belonging to the relatively rare middle of this pf. stem: "hin zu dir hast du die Götter gerufen." This makes better sense than simply depicting Agni as chatting with the gods, and it also allows a directional reading of *áchā* ("to [yourself / the ritual ground]"). I think it also encourages a more specific interpr. of *dhīṣṇyāḥ* in the nominal rel. tag *dhīṣṇyā yé* that is more appropriate to the context. Agni calls to himself the gods "who belong to the holy place," i.e., the ones that should come to the ritual ground. On *dhīṣṇā-* as 'holy place = ritual ground' see comm. ad III.2.1.

As just noted, the rel. clauses of cd are loosely linked with pāda a; most tr. parenthetically resupply *áchā jigāsi*. Given the double rel. prn. *yāḥ ... yāḥ*, the *ca* connecting them, and, especially, the contrastive *parāstāt* (c) / *avāstāt* (d), I think we are dealing with two bodies of waters, only one of which is the sea of heaven (*divó árṇam*) of pāda a. This is not clearly brought out in the publ. tr. (and may in fact not be meant), but most of the standard tr. (also JSK, DGRV I.112) do reflect this view.

Putting this vs. all together, I'd substitute "O Agni, you go to the undulating sea of heaven—you have called to yourself the gods who are associated with the holy place—(you go) to the waters that are in the realm of light beyond the sun and to those that stand nearby beneath (it [=sun])."

III.22.4: On the basis of I.163.1, where I tr. *pūrīṣa-* as 'fertile soil (see comm. ad loc.), contrasting there with *samudrá-* 'sea', I think *pūrīṣyà-* here also has this more specific sense (rather than the abstract 'relating to fullness, overflowing'), esp. because it is contrasted with *prāvaṇá-* 'belonging to *pravaṇá-* 'cascades, torrents'. I would therefore tr. the NP of the first hemistich as "the fires belonging to fertile soil along with those belonging to falling torrents"; what exactly these two sets of fires are escapes me.

With Re, JPB takes *adrúho 'namīvá īṣo mahīḥ* as nom. pl., characterizing the fires, but some or all of these words could in fact be acc. pl., either as further object(s) of *juṣántām* (so Old) or objects of a verb to be supplied (like "grant"; so Ge, WG). Since *adrúh-* generally modifies gods, I'd take it as nom. pl. here, but would make *anamīvá īṣo mahīḥ* an acc. obj. (note that *anamīvá-* several times modifies *īṣ-*, as Ge [n. 4d] points out). Simplest is to make this phrase an obj. of *juṣántām*: "Let (the fires), free of deception, enjoy the sacrifice (and) great refreshments free of disease" – though I recognize that the refreshments might better be things that Agni gives rather than enjoys.

III.22.5 = III.1.23, etc.

III.23 Agni [SJ on JPB]

III.23.1: As noted ad III.6.4, I prefer 'seat' to 'dwelling'.

The first pāda play with aspirated dentals: *nīrmathitaḥ súdhita ā sadhathe*, with the first two words a syncopated rhyme.

For *dadhe*, ‘has acquired’ might be slightly better than ‘has received’.

Old (SBE) suggests (as an alternative) that *amṛtam* might here refer to “the drink of immortality,” namely the ghee offered into the fire, and this suggestion is fld by Ge (/WG). This interpr. cannot be excluded (see Gr’s definition 7: “n., der *Unsterblichkeitstrank* ... häufig auf die ins Feuer gegossene Opferbutter ...”), and Ge’s invocation of nearby III.26.7 is apt, but I think that a double reading (/pun), rather than simply a strict ritual reading, is likely: Agni’s acquisition of “immortality” squares with his “unaging” (*ajāraḥ*) nature in c. So I’d suggest “has acquired immortality / the immortal (ghee-offering).”

III.23.2: The future impv. *abhavatāt* is used in conventional fashion here to enjoin an action that should follow a previous one, as also in III.8.1; see comm. ad III.18.1 for a more puzzling occurrence.

III.23.3: The VP *pūrvyām ... ajījanan* “have begotten the primordial one” is an implicit paradox – one beloved of RVic poets -- that Agni is both ancient and reborn every day, like Dawn.

The phrase *vāra ā pṛthivyāḥ* is found in this maṇḍala at III.53.11, where it also refers to a place of sacrifice.

III.23.4: The verb of pāda a, (*nī*) ... *dadhe*, is multiply ambiguous: it can be the 3rd sg. pf., identical to *dadhe* in 1d (so JPB), or the 1st sg. perfect (so apparently Old SBE, Re), or 1st sg. pres. (so apparently Ge, WG). Any of these interpr. (immed. past “he has /I have installed,” pres. “I install”) is compatible with the impv. in d. I weakly favor a 1st ps., though whether pf. or pres. is indifferent to me.

The sandhi form *mānuṣa* is taken as *mānuṣe* by the Pp., and a loc. interpr. is reflected in the tr. of Ge, Re, and WG. Gr lists the form as *mānuṣas* without registering the Pp. reading, and this nom. interpr. is found in Old SBE and the publ. tr. – though Old in the Noten admits that either form is possible. I weakly favor the Pp. loc. and would substitute “among the descendents of Manu” for “As (the Agni) of Manu.”

III.23.5: Though this vs. is simply the Viśvāmitra Agni refrain (see III.1.23, etc.), in this case it has some connection with what precedes: its first word *īlām* picks up *īlāyās padé* “in the track of the milk-libation” in 4b.

III.24 Agni [SJ on JPB]

As noted in the publ. intro., every vs. begins with the voc. *ágne*, and every vs. has at least one impv. or the equivalent.

III.24.1: The publ. tr. “overwhelm in battles” (see also Old SBE, Re, WG) indirectly reflects the fact that \sqrt{sah} generally occurs with the loc. of the stem, *pṛtanāsu* (I.102.9, VI.68.7, etc.). Only Ge tries to represent the acc. by dint of reinterpr. *pṛtanā-* as “enemy,” not “battle”: “überwaltige die feindlichen Heere” (so also Gr, meaning 2: “feindliches Heer”). On the ubiquity of the loc. *pṛtanāsu* / *pṛtśú* with \sqrt{sah} , see Scar (604–5), who

struggles with the interpr. of the root noun compd *ṛtanā-śāh-*, which he glosses “in den Kämpfen siegreich; die Kämpfe gewinnend (?)” (with both loc. and acc. senses). He suggests that the compd. represents a contamination of two constructions: *ṛtanāsu* (*ṛtsū*) $\sqrt{\text{sah}}$ and *ṛtanās* $\sqrt{\text{jī}}$ (for which see, e.g., II.40.5). Although the latter construction may have played a role, I think the inherent functional ambiguity of 1st compd members in root noun compds was the instigating factor. Although probably the majority of 1st members in such compds serve as direct objects to the root noun final (type *ṛtra-hán-*), a variety of other syntactic relationships are possible. The compd *ṛtanā-śāh-* occurs 9x in the RV, well distributed through the Saṃhitā (see also *ṛtanā-śāhya-* 1x). I think it quite likely that *ṛtanā-* originally had a locative relationship with *śāh-* in this compd, but with the case ending suppressed the direct object reading arose, facilitated by the apparent parallel *ṛtanās* $\sqrt{\text{jī}}$. This root-noun compd *ṛtanā-śāh-* occurs in a nearby Agni hymn (III.29.9), and *ṛtanā-śāhya-* is also found in Maṇḍala III (III.37.1). Our nonce phrase *sāhasva ṛtanāḥ* is, I suggest, based on (a misunderstanding of) the nearby root noun compd. How to render it is a puzzle – perhaps the sleight-of-hand “overwhelm (in) battles.”

III.24.2: Since JPB tr. *īlā-* in the Viśvāmitra Agni refrain (found most recently in III.23.5) and in vs. 4 of the preceding hymn III.23 as “milk-libation,” the rendering here of the instr. to the corresponding root noun *īḍ-* as “ghee-libation” is somewhat jarring – though I realize that it’s easier to kindle a fire by ghee than by milk. It should be changed here to “milk-libation” or to my preference simply ‘refreshment’ or ‘libation’.

The tr. of the notorious compd *vītī-hotra-* should be changed to “whose oblations are worth pursuing.” See comm. ad II.28.1 and my forthcoming art. “Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dāti-vāra-* Compound ‘Type’.”

III.24.3: The first two pādas consist entirely of vocatives, save for instr. *dyumnéna*. Old (SBE) and (it seems) Re construe the instr. with pāda c, but Ge, WG, and JPB with the voc. *jāgrve* ‘wakeful’. I would ordinarily be inclined to follow Old and Re, save for two factors: 1) both b and c are repeated elsewhere, which suggests, but doesn’t require, that they are self-contained; 2) although *jāgrvi-* is not found with a loc. elsewhere, cf. III.37.8 (same maṇḍala, in a hymn with ties to this one [see comm. ad vs. 1]) *dyumnínam ... jāgrvim*, with an *-ín-* stem possessive built to our *dyumná-*.

III.24.4: I think that JPB is correct that *visvebhiḥ* should be read both with *agnibhiḥ* and with *devébhiḥ*.

The stem *cāyú-* is a hapax and has received a range of interpr.: Gr “Ehrfurcht bezeugend,” Old (SBE) “who are respectful,” Ge “die sich ... geehrt fühlen (?),” Re “qui ... sont à l’honneur,” WG “die ... Ehrbietung bezeugen,” JPB “who are the respected (priests),” JSK (DGRV II.23) “who show respect.” Besides an affiliation to $\sqrt{\text{ci}}$ ‘perceive’ (etc.; see EWA s.v. *Ci*¹, where MM tr. the stem “Respekt bezeugend”), there is little to narrow down the possible senses – particularly whether it is active (referents are subjects of $\sqrt{\text{ci}}$) or passive (referents are objects of $\sqrt{\text{ci}}$). However, it should be noted that a gerund with the same root syllable, *nicāyyā*, is found two hymns later (III.26.1), with the likely active sense ‘having noticed, paid attention’ (see the other occurrence of the same form in I.105.18). That our hapax appears so close to that gerund gives us leave (in the absence of other evidence) to interpr. it in that general realm. I therefore think it has

“active” sense and means something like “attentive,” which works well in a ritual context. The rel. *yá u* clause would then be best connected with the voc. *ágne*, as further subjects of *mahayā*. I would tr. “and those who are attentive at the sacrifices.”

III.25 Agni [SJ on JPB]

Note the ring compositional elements in vss. 1 and 5, identified by JPB in the publ. intro.

III.25.1: The vs. contains two forms of \sqrt{cit} characterizing Agni: *práčetāḥ* (a) and *cikitvaḥ* (c). It might be good to tr. them so that the root etymology is captured, but I cannot come up with a non-awkward way to do that.

Pace Gr (s.v. *tānā*) and all the standard tr. (except Re), as well as JSK (DGRV I.345, 348), it is highly unlikely that *tānā* is a nom. sg. fem. (‘Spross’, ‘seed’) appositive to Agni, but rather, with JPB (see also alt. interpr. in Ge n. 1b), an instr. to the root noun *tān-* as elsewhere.

On *īdhak* with \sqrt{yaj} see comm. ad X.105.8, also VI.49.10. My interpr. of the adverb is slightly diff. from JPB’s, though his “one by one” may be a development of my “separately.”

III.25.2: The pf. part. *vidvān* in pāda a picks up *cikitvaḥ* in in 1c.

The rendering “wins heroic deeds” (*sanoti vīryāṇi*) is a bit jarring. Though *vīryā-* does ordinarily refer to deeds (as in the famous opening to I.32), here “heroic powers” would fit better.

The phrase *amṛtāya bhūṣan* occurs nearby in III.34.2, an Indra hymn, where I think *amṛtāya* refers specifically to Indra, rather than to the abstract “immortality” as is likely here.

III.25.4: Strictly speaking *sutāvataḥ* should be “who has pressed soma,” rather than an apparent pres. part. “pressing soma.”

I’d prefer “not negligent” for *āmardhant-*, rather than “never disdaining.” The point is that they exert themselves to come to the sacrifice, rather than that they don’t turn it down. I would take *somapéyāya* as a purpose dative with *yātam* (cf. VII.24.3, X.112.2), rather than construing it directly with *āmardhantā*. So: “... drive here to the sacrifice / to drink the soma, you non-negligent ones.”

III.25.5: As disc. in the publ. tr., Ge (n. 5a) suggests that the gen. pl. *apām* should be construed with a supplied *nāpāt* (“[descendant] of the waters”), on the reasonable grounds that *duroṇá-* in an Agni context always refers to a human dwelling. He could also have pointed to the phrase in the immed. preceding vs. *dāsúṣo duroṇé*, which encourages supplying “of the pious man” here. Re and WG follow Ge, while Old (SBE) and JPB follow Sāy. in construing *apām* with *duroṇé*, the most natural way to construe what’s actually in the pāda (rather than supplying two extra words). Though I see the justice of Ge’s arg., I would still go along with the publ. tr., for a reason so far adduced by no one (as far as I know): *sadhásthāni* ‘abodes, seats’ in c. This word is semantically close to *duroṇá-*, and it also is found three times with *apām* (I.149.4, II.4.2, VI.52.15), the former two in clear Agni context. See esp. I.149.4 *hótā yájiṣṭho apām sadhásthe*. I suggest that

we should understand *apām* with *sadhāsthāni* in c as well, with that phrase expanding on *apām ... duroṇé*: “you were kindled in the house of the waters ... magnifying the seats (of the waters) with your help,” whatever may be meant by these locations.

III.26 Agni Vaiśvānara [SJ on JPB]

On the structure of the hymn and the scholarly disagreement about it, see publ. intro. I think it is possible to reconcile the two views. On the one hand, Old’s observation that the placement of the hymn in the collection suggests that it consists of three separate hymns is hard to counter; on the other, it seems possible that the three hymns were associated from the beginning as constituting a primitive Āgnimāruta śāstra and were therefore placed consecutively here.

III.26.1–3: In this *ṛca* to Agni Vaiśvānara, the epithet *vaiśvānarā-* is found in all three vss. (1a, 2b, 3b) and in fact is the first word of the hymn.

III.26.1: *agnīm* was omitted from the publ. tr., which should read “having discerned with our mind Agni Vaiśvānara.”

The cmpd *anuṣatyā-* is found only here and is variously rendered; Re’s “qui se conforme au réel” is the basis for the publ. tr. It can be interpr. in light of *mānasā ... nicāyya* “having discerned with our mind ...” As Ge points out (n. 1a), this probably means that we see Agni in our mind before the new fire is actually visible; *anuṣatyā-* would then assert that our mental image is in conformity with the reality of the physical fire when it appears.

III.26.2: Although in most cases *devātāt(i)-* seems to be a collective meaning ‘divine assemblage’ (as in JPB’s tr. here), in several passages, esp. in the phrase *mānuṣo devātāt(i)-* (V.29.1, VI.4.1, and here), ‘attendance on the gods’ seems more apposite. I’d therefore change the tr. to “who is Bṛhaspati for Manu’s attendance on the gods.”

Agni is Bṛhaspati here insofar as he controls or is associated with the ritual formulations; see (approx.) Ge (n. 2c) and HPS, B+I 70–71, who points out that we can match Bṛhaspati with *vīprā-* in the flg. pāda (and Mātariśvan with *śrótā-* and Vaiśvānara with *ātithi-* in the same pāda).

III.26.4: With Ge, WG, and JPB (and contra Old [SBE, but see his n. 2 on this vs.], Re, and Scar [62]), *táviṣṭbhiḥ* should be construed with *sámmiślāḥ* in b, on the basis of I.64.10 *sámmiślāsas táviṣṭbhiḥ* and a similar expression in VII.56.6, both also of the Maruts.

On *bṛhad-úkṣ-* see Scar (61–62).

III.26.5: Root-noun cmpds with *-śrī-* as 2nd member are difficult to pin down semantically. See the extensive, and ultimately (legitimately) indecisive, disc. of this group by Scar (545–54). The problem is that the extremely well-attested uncompounded root noun *śrī-* has become semantically independent of the verbal root *√śrī* (pres. *śrīṇāti*). The latter means (acdg. to Narten, KZ 100 [1987]) ‘perfect, make complete’, while the latter has come to mean ‘excellence, splendour, glory, beauty’ (and of course goes on to a glorious career in later Skt). The problem with the root-noun cmpds is to determine

whether the 2nd member maintains its original verbal semantics or shows the developed semantics of the uncmpd root noun. In most such cmpds I have opted for the latter interpr. (perhaps wrongly), but here, given the larger context, I'm inclined to see it as having verbal semantics, governing the object *agni-*, hence 'perfecting the fire' vel sim.. If this *ṛca* concerns the Maruts, as gods of the storm/wind, fanning the flames of the ritual fire (see publ. intro.), such a transitive interpr. fits the context better than simply "with Agni's splendour," and I would change the tr. to "bringing Agni / the fire to perfection." (Oddly, in this particular passage there is almost universal agreement among translators that the cmpd is intrans./passive, despite the larger context.) Other *-śrī-*cmpds with ritual items as first members have profitably been reconsidered as well: *adhvara-śrī-*, *ghṛta-śrī-*, and *yajña-śrī-*; see comm. on the relevant passages.

On *heṣā-* see EWA s.v. *HEṢ*¹.

III.26.6: The second hemistich is presented somewhat misleadingly in the publ. tr.: it is not a gen. phrase hanging off *marútām* in b, but a nominal clause in the nominative: "With their dappled horses, with their unreceding generosity, they (habitually) go to the sacrifice, (as ones) wise at the ritual distributions." Pāda c is identical to II.34.4c in a Marut hymn.

III.26.7: Though JPB identifies the *amṛta-* as soma, on practical grounds it is more likely to be ghee, which is regularly offered in the fire, whereas soma would put the fire out or at least damp it down. See III.23.1.

III.26.8: There are two possibilities for construing the first phrase in b, *hṛdā matīm* – either as a second object NP with *ápūpot* or as first object NP with *ānu prajānán*. JPB follows Re in the second alt.; I somewhat prefer the first, in part because the instr. would be parallel to the instr. phrase in pāda a. Old (SBE) clearly so interpr. it, likewise probably Ge and WG. As an alt. I would then suggest "He purified the chant with the three purifying filters, the thought with his heart, discovering the light."

III.26.9: This vs. would be more easily parsed if the long (three-pāda) acc. phrase came first and was resumed by the *tām* beginning d, fld. by the impv. and the voc., rather than fronting the impv. and postponing its voc. subj. to the end. So, "The inexhaustible well-spring ... in the lap of his parents – o you two world-halves, carry him across, as the one who speaks what is real.

I would render pāda c as "the crackling, the one becoming exhilarating in the lap of his parents," with *mādan-* in its full participial value, not just as adj. 'joyful'.

III.27 Agni [SJ on JPB]

Another hymn in *ṛcas*; on the structure of the hymn see publ. intro. The language is simple, straightforward, and stereotyped for the most part, though there are some puzzles.

III.27.1: Various suggestions for the subj. of *jigāti*: the sacrificer (Sāy., Old [SBE]), the sacrifice or the sacrificial ladle (Ge n. 1a), Agni (Re). It scarcely matters, but it is the case that *sumnāyá-* / *-yú-* often has humans as subject, which would favor the first alt.

III.27.2: On *dhitāvan*- see comm. ad III.40.3.

III.27.9: Old (SBE) takes *ā dadhe* as 1st sg. with Agni as the obj., whereas all subsequent tr. (incl. JPB) take it as 3rd sg. with Agni as subj. (in both cases implicitly). Old's interpr. makes more immediate sense, esp. as *nī tvā dadhe* begins the next vs. and the verb must be 1st sg. with Agni = object "you." The reason for the otherwise universal interpr. as 3rd sg. is based on a repeated passage in the AVŚ: V.25.2=VI.17.1 *yátheyám prthivī mahī bhūtānām gárbham ādadhé*, with the Earth as overt subject. But these are pregnancy charms, with a feminine subject, and that is not the context here. Moreover, Agni is himself called *bhúvanasya gárbha*- (X.45.6)(as Ge points out, n. 9b), which is the object here. I am therefore inclined to follow Old and substitute "I have established (him) as the embryo ..." There is then chaining with *nī tvā dadhe* in the flg. vs. The AV passage will have adapted the phrase to a different context.

III.27.11: The morphologically anomalous *yantúram* is (in my view) a textbook case of a form generated solely by context. Its *-túram* playfully anticipates the following word *aptúram*, a reasonably well-attested root-noun cmpd *ap-túr-* ($\sqrt{tṛ}$) 'crossing the waters' — but *yantúr-* is not a cmpd. but rather a byform (/deformation) of the agent noun *yantár-* 'controller, guider' (\sqrt{yam}), possibly influenced by the gen. *yantúr* (though Wack. is skeptical). See Old (SBE and Noten), AiG III.203–4. From this passage it was adapted to VIII.19.2, where it provides a better cadence than the proper acc. sg. *yantāram*. It must be noted, however, that there are alternative interpr. of the form, particularly Th's analysis (*Studien zur idg. Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte*. 8) as a haplology of **yantu-túr-* "der die Zügelung überholt," which Th further glosses as "so schnell, dass man ihn nicht zügeln kann." I find this semantic interpr. forced in the extreme and know of no other such uses of $\sqrt{tṛ}$; certainly the other cmpds with 2nd-member *-túr-* are quite different in meaning. Moreover, the supposed 1st member *yantu-*, supposedly meaning "Zügelung," is barely attested and not in that sense: once as a dat. inf. *yántave* ('to hold / extend', VIII.15.3), once in the cmpd. *suyántu-* 'easy to control' (V.44.4). Nonetheless, no doubt due to Th's prestige and to a linguistic disinclination towards irregular surface analogy (which, though also a linguist, I do not share), it is the favored explan. in EWA (s.v. *yantúr-*), is weakly favored by Scar (186–87), and has been adopted by WG. (There is also an even less likely analysis owing to Pinault; see EWA, Scar, and WG n. for details.) I firmly hold to the older explan. However, in our passage I would be inclined to tr. "controller," rather than supplying "horses" with "guiding" — though the "yoking" of truth in the next pāda does introduce an equine theme.

vanúṣaḥ is universally taken as a nom. pl. modifying *vīprāḥ* in the next pāda, rather than a gen. with *ṛtásya*. This is no doubt correct: *vanús-* almost always qualifies animate beings. However, I would prefer to tr. it within its own pāda: "eager at (/for) the harnessing of truth." Cf. IV.44.3 *ṛtásya ... vanúṣe* "for (the one?) eager/striving for truth."

III.27.13–15: This *ṛca* is unified by a focus on *vṛṣan-* 'bull', which is the last word of vs. 13, the first of vs. 14, and occurs 3x in the last vs. Note also that 13c and 14a are mere scrambling of each other: the only added element is the particle *u*, assuming that that is the correct analysis of 14a *vṛṣo* is *vṛṣā u* (see JSK [Part. u, 175] for disc.).

III.28 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the ritual application of the hymn see publ. intro. Also correct a small lapse in that intro.: in “tied to a specific parts of the liturgy,” “a” should be deleted.

The impv. *juṣásva* ‘enjoy!’ is found in four of the six vss. (1a, 2c, 4b, 6c).

III.28.5: The *iṣ*-aor. subj. *kāniṣaḥ* has extended grade in its root syllable, like the indic. *akāniṣam* (IV.24.9), rather than expected full-grade **kaniṣaḥ*. See Narten (Sig.Aor. 94), who explains it as directly founded on the indic.

III.29 Agni [SJ on JPB]

On the ritual technicalities in this hymn, see publ. intro. The language is fairly simple and straightforward.

III.29.2: Despite the pl. *garbhínīṣu* lit. ‘[those (fem.)] having embryos’, I do not think this expression refers to multiple pregnant women (JPB’s “within women with child”). Rather, on the basis of very similar X.27.16 (also adduced by Ge) *gárbham ... súdhitam vakṣánāsu* “the embryo well placed in (her) belly,” I think *garbhínīṣu* modifies a gapped *vakṣánāsu* ‘belly’; the stem *vakṣánā-* is ordinarily a pl. tantum (see comm. ad X.27.16). I would emend the tr. to “well placed within a pregnant (belly).”

III.29.3: In a very similar context in II.10.3 I tr. *uttānāyām* as “in her with (legs) agape,” which I would substitute here. See comm. ad loc.

On *áva √ bhr* see comm. ad VIII.93.23.

Though “on this day” is a reasonable, though not entirely accurate, representation of its etymology (better ‘on one day’; see EWA s.v.), *sadyás* generally means ‘immediately’, and that is, I think, the sense here: the fire catches right away. I’d emend to “impregnated immediately.”

The parenthetical *rúṣad asya pājaḥ* is almost a textbook gloss of a bahuvrīhi **rúṣad-pājas-* (cf. *rúṣad-vatsa-* ‘having a bright calf’, etc.), and a nom. sg. m. bahuvrīhi would work well here. Re calls it a “composé « défait ».” Why we don’t get such a compound here is not entirely clear to me, since *pājas-* also forms bahuvrīhis (e.g., *prthu-pājas-*). The same phrase is found, in the same metrical position, in I.115.5, where, however, the syntagm is justified: *pājas* is the grammatical subject. So perhaps it has simply been adapted from that context.

As often, the interpr. of *vayúna-* is difficult (see comm. ad II.34.5, etc.). Here the loc. *vayúne*, rendered in the publ. tr. as “within the ritual pattern,” means, I think, that the fire was engendered at the appropriate time and place in the sacrifice, that is acdg. to its standard pattern. Or perhaps, since the dawn is associated with *vayúna-* (e.g., I.92.2, 6; IV.51.1), this is a shorthand way of saying “at dawn.”

III.29.6: As often, *yádī* should be read *yád ī*, with the enclitic prn. *ī-* hence “when him ...,” not “if ...” See my 2002 “RVic sīm and īm” (Fs. Cardona).

With the majority of tr. (starting with Sāy.) I think “chariot” should be supplied with *citrāḥ* in the simile *citró ná yāman aśvínor ānivrtaḥ*. Old (SBE) suggests the sun; though I think the sun is the ultimate target of the full simile, it is mediated by the chariot

image. The adj. *citrá-* modifies *rátha-* in I.34.10 and III.2.15, with the former referring specifically to the Aśvins' bright chariot.

III.29.8: Note the paired imperatives opening the first two pādas, simplex *śīda*, caus. *sādāya*.

As indicated by Gr (s.vv.) and endorsed by Wack (AiG II.1.20, etc.), *sūkṛta-* is adjectival 'well-done' with accent on the prefix as with other such cmpds. (*súdhita-* 'well-placed', *súpūta-* 'well-purified', etc.), whereas the suffix-accented *sukṛtá-* has been substantivized to 'good work' (generally referring to the sacrifice). The tr. should therefore be emended to "in the womb of good work" (see the same phrase in X.61.6).

III.29.9: Since *dhūmá-* is a masc. noun, the sense of the NP *dhūmām víṣaṇam* should be flipped to "bullish smoke."

On *pṛtanā-ṣāṭ* see comm. ad III.24.1.

III.29.10: I now find 'seasonal, at its season' a somewhat misleading tr. for *ṛtvíya-* in a ritual context and would substitute 'at its proper time' here; see comm. ad X.28.5.

III.29.11: Note the pun between the epithet *mātaríśvan-* and the loc. *mātári*. The connection between Agni's epithets and his stage of birth is not so clear in the other pādas.

III.29.13: On *√srev* 'miscarry, abort' and our form *asremá-* < *-*srev-mán-* see EWA s.v. *srev*, Narten, SigAor. 282–83, and AiG I Nachtr. to 91, 37.

On *taráni-* see comm. ad III.11.3; I would here change 'overwhelming' to 'advancing'.

III.29.14: I would prefer to tr. all three augmented imperfects, *arocata* (a), *ásocat* (b), and *ájāyata* (d) as straight preterites, "he shone ... he blazed ... he was born" -- not as "has shone," etc., more characteristic of aor. or pf.: This creates some problem with the last pāda, if it is taken in conjunction with pāda c with its pres. *ní mīṣati*, since "he doesn't blink ... when/after he has been born" is more natural than "when/after he was born." I suggest that the *yád* clause in d is entirely parallel to the one in b and that c is parenthetical: "From of old he shone forth, when he blazed in the lap of his mother, in her udder – day after day the delightful one does not blink — when he was born from the belly of the lord."

I would substitute "in her udder" for "upon her udder."

The identity of the *ásura-* from whose belly Agni was born is unclear. Old (SBE) tentatively suggests Heaven; this is also Lüders's opinion (*Varuṇa* 390), which is favored by W. E. Hale (*Ásura-*, 45–46). Ge (n. 14d, fld. by WG) suggests Vṛtra, on the basis of X.124.3–4, where, however, I identify the Asura as Dyaus Pitar, not Vṛtra (see the publ. tr., as well as my treatment of this hymn in my 2016 "The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124"). Alternatively, if *āsurá-* in vs. 11 refers to the upper churning stick as JPB suggests, the same referent could be found here as well – neatly contrasted with the "mother" in b, the other churning stick.

Note the play of *surāṇaḥ* (c) and *ásura-* (d), though they are etymologically unrelated.

III.29.15: The presence of two root noun cmpds to roots in long *ā*, ending in *-ās* — *prayāḥ* and *prathamajāḥ* -- complicates the interpr. of the first hemistich, because both forms could be either nom. sg. or nom. pl. They are flanked by clear plural forms: nom. pl. *amitrāyúdhaḥ* and 3rd pl. *viduḥ*, but neither of these is as diagnostic as it might be – the first because it’s in a simile that might involve a constructio ad sensum, the latter because it may belong to a new cl. Nonetheless almost all tr. (incl. JPB) take both forms as pl. The exceptions are Scar (413, 440), who allows both possibilities for the former (“der/die”), though taking the latter as pl., and Old (SBE and Noten), who takes the former as pl. but the latter as sg. and belonging to a separate cl. I am agnostic about *prayāḥ*, though a plural is somewhat easier. But I’m in agreement with Old about *prathamajāḥ* on formulaic grounds. By the pl. interpr., the referent has to be the Kuśikas, the priestly family that is named in the next pāda (c). But it is odd to call them “the first-born of the formulation” or, if *bráhmanaḥ* is to be construed with *víśvam*, simply “the first-born.” But Agni is called *prathamajāḥ ṛtásya* “the first-born of truth” in X.57 and probably I.164.37 and X.61.19, an epithet very like *prathamajāḥ bráhmanaḥ*. Old suggests that *prathamajāḥ bráhmanaḥ* is an independent nominal clause, referring to Agni, with a new clause beginning with *víśvam íd*. This not only makes better sense of the hemistich but accounts better for the position of *íd*. This also allows the first pāda to refer to Agni’s advances, not the Kuśikas’ (see *ayāḥ* [if to $\sqrt{yā}$] and *yāhi* with Agni as subj. in 16c and d). And in b *víśvam íd viduḥ* need not involve the grandiose claim “they know everything,” but rather, with Old, “they know every (fire).” The interpr. of this small clause then connects with pāda d where each Kuśika kindles his own fire. I would emend the tr. of ab to “Battling the enemy, the advances / advance troops (of Agni) are like (those) of the Maruts. (He is) the first born of the formulation. (The Kuśikas) know every (fire).”

I would be inclined to tr. the two verbs in cd as “they have raised” and “they have kindled.”

III.29.16: The here-and-now of the ritual situation is emphasized in the first hemistich of this final vs., by *adyá* and *ihá* – and also by *asmín*. I would slightly alter the tr. to “while this sacrifice was proceeding.”

The standard view of *ayā(h)* in c is that it is a 2nd sg. *s*-aor. to \sqrt{yaj} . See already Gr., and all the standard tr. and interpr. (save for JPB), incl. Old (both SBE and Noten), Narten (Sig.Aor. 200), Lub (1123). I am dubious. In favor of this view is the fact that $\sqrt{śam}$ (here represented by *śamiṣṭhāḥ*) is often concatenated with forms of \sqrt{yaj} (e.g., VI.1.9 *īje śāśamé ca*). But, as is regularly acknowledged, *ayās* is not the expected outcome of 2nd sg. **ayāz-s-s* (better **ayāt* like the 3rd sg.) and has to have been wholly remade, to a form that appears to belong to a different root, $\sqrt{yā}$. Moreover, the (inappropriate) *yāhi* in the next pāda suggests that the poet considered *ayā(h)* a form of $\sqrt{yā}$ that licensed *yāhi*; see also *prayāḥ* in 15a.

The final pāda is identical to III.35.4, an Indra hymn, where it is more appropriately addressed to Indra.

III.30 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is characterized by hapaxes and very rare words, often with affective suffixes, and unusual phonology. These words include *dhāyuh* (7a), *gehyà-* (7b), *kúnāru-* (8b), *píyāru-* (8c), *alāṭṛṇá-* (10a), *yāmakosá-* (15a), *salalūka-* (17c).

III.30.1: The desid. *títikṣante* used to be assigned to \sqrt{tij} ‘sharpen’ (e.g., Wh Rts, Gr), but has for quite awhile been taken to \sqrt{tyaj} ‘abandon’ instead. See EWA s.v. *TEJ* and *TYAJ*, Gotō (1st cl., 165–66 n. 268), and in some detail Heenen (Desid. 59–60 and 147–48). Curiously WG render it here as (if) an intensive to \sqrt{tij} : “Sie schärfen (sich) immer wieder (gegen) ...,” despite Gotō’s own published views to the contrary. (In the WG tr., acdg. to the title pg., Maṇḍala III is Witzel’s responsibility, however, which may account for the discrepancy. It is rendered correctly as “.... hält ... aus” in II.13.3) The desiderative stem has the idiomatic sense ‘endure, support’, and the semantic channel from (putatively) ‘desire to abandon’ to this idiom is not entirely clear. I am not convinced by the suggestions of either Gotō or Heenen (59–60). Instead, I think the middle voice is the key: if we assume a reflexive ‘abandon oneself to’, ‘give oneself over to’, it is not difficult to imagine this development.

The sense of the final pāda depends on the meaning of *praketāḥ*, and like many derivatives of \sqrt{cit} this word is slippery. In my view, it means both ‘sign’ and ‘insight’ (that is, it reflects both the ‘appear’ and ‘perceive’ values of \sqrt{cit}). In this particular passage I take it in the former value; the point is that Indra is showing no sign of his presence or imminent arrival, and so we are subject to abuse from our rivals. For a similar usage cf. II.17.7, where the poet beseeches Indra for good fortune, and then demands *kṛdhí praketām* “make a visible sign,” further asking for him to bring the good fortune here. In X.104.6 Indra is himself called the *adhvarásya praketāḥ* “the visible sign of the ceremony.” Ge interpr. the word as “Losung” (‘motto, watchword, password’), which is, I suppose, possible, but I don’t understand what it would mean here; Re as “le signe-pré(monitoire),” which is somewhat opaque to me, but seems closer to my interpr than Ge’s; Old as “Helle” (light, brightness). WG take it as an agent noun: “Wahrnehmer.”

III.30.2–3: The next two vss. develop the theme sounded in pāda d of vs. 1.: Indra’s absence. In vs. 2 we point out that for Indra nothing is very far away, so he could, and should, easily come here, where the sacrifice is invitingly set out for him. In vs. 3 we provide a flattering description of Indra’s great powers and then plaintively ask where these powers are now.

III.30.3: The 2nd member of *tuvikūrmí-*, an epithet of Indra, is generally now derived from the seṭ root \sqrt{car} , a derivation already found in AiG I.24, 141, 152 -- hence my ‘powerfully ranging’. See EWA s.v. *tuvikūrmí-*. The older deriv. from \sqrt{kr} (e.g., Gr., Wh Rts; explicitly rejected by AiG II.2.776) is nonetheless still reflected in the standard tr.: Ge “der Tatenreiche,” Re (with hesitation) “aux actes (?) puissants,” WG “der mächtig Wirkende” -- even though AiG I (1896) predates all of them by a good margin, well over a century in the case of WG!

There is number incongruence between the neut. sg. *yád* of the rel. clause and neut. pl. *tyā ... vīryāni*. The *yád* is, as it were, an anticipatory collective: “what(ever) you did ... where are those deeds?”

III.30.4: As has often been pointed out, the redupl. pres. to \sqrt{han} , *jíghnate*, almost always takes plural objects, and so, at least in this formation, reduplication seems correlated with repetitive action. This semantic nuance is strengthened here by the syntactic construction, with the redupl. pres. in the participle (*jíghnamānaḥ*) construed with a quasi-auxiliary *cārasī*. (Cf. 14b below.) Although *cārasī* does have lexical meaning (‘you range/roam/wander’), the lexical value is weak enough here that the verb can seem to be a marker of the progressive present: “you go about / keep / are (constantly) smashing.” On the other hand, it is possible that \sqrt{car} in its lexical value may be resonating with *tuvikūrmī*- ‘powerfully ranging’ in 3b (see comm. there). However, it is hard to know whether that root connection would still be perceived by the contemporary audience -- it certainly has escaped most of the modern audience -- given the phonological distance between the two words and the fact that *tuvikūrmī*- is simply an epithet of Indra and its own lexical value may have become attenuated.

There is a faint phonological echo between *vṛtrā* in b and *vratā(ya)* in d, which occupy the same metrical position.

III.30.5: I am not certain how to construe *śrávobhiḥ*. The publ. tr. takes it with the voc. *puruhūta*: “much invoked with acclamations.” But I am not entirely happy about construing a full noun with a voc. that ordinarily stands alone (as in, e.g., 7d, 8a). Ge tr. “rühmlich,” which seems designed to be as untethered to the sentence as possible. Re takes it with the speaking of pāda b: “... seul avec tes renoms tu as parlé (un langage) ferme,” but I don’t understand what that means; WG like Re, except tr. “mit Ruhmes(taten),” which again I don’t follow.

I have given the idiom *dr̥hām* \sqrt{vad} a mildly slangy turn (similarly in X.48.6); the collocation of a verb of speaking and an adverb referring to a physical quality seems to invite it. “Speak firmly” would be a more neutral rendering than “talk tough,” but pāda d, which describes heaven and earth as a mere “handful” for Indra, also seems to belong to a vivid and informal register.

The participial phrase *vṛtrahā sán* contains, unusually, a non-concessive nominative of the pres. part. of \sqrt{as} ‘be’. It seems here to be definitional and to pick up and summarize 4b *éko vṛtrā cārasī jíghnamānaḥ* “you alone range about [/keep] smashing obstacles.” As discussed immed. above, the redupl. pres. part. combined with a quasi-auxiliary depicts this as repetitive, indeed habitual, action -- and the *ékaḥ* indicates that only Indra engages in it. Our phrase here, *vṛtrahā sán*, comes to the appropriate conclusion: since you and you alone keep smashing obstacles, you are The Obstacle-Smasher, par excellence.

III.30.6: Sāy. supplies ‘chariot’ as the subj. of pāda a, and in this he is followed by the standard tr. as well as Old. Although this is perfectly harmless and certainly possible, I do not understand why supplying a subject not found in the context is desirable, much less necessary. I admit that it would allow us to use the *etu* of *prā ... etu* in b as the gapped verb with the *prā* of a, but Rigvedic poetic syntax is flexible enough to allow a 2nd ps.

substitution in such a gapped phrase (*prá ... *ihi*, anticipating *prá ... etu*). The fact that 2b has a similar phrase with Indra as the 2nd sg. supplied subject -- *ā tú prá yāhi ... háribhyām* -- also supports my assumption that the default subject is Indra.

Unfortunately the voc. *indra* in 6a was omitted in the publ. tr. The pāda should read “(Come) forth along an easy slope with your two fallow bays, o Indra.”

III.30.7: *dhāyuh* is a hapax. The stem is generally listed as *dhāyu-* (so Gr) and would therefore have to be a masc. nom. sg. here, but the standard tr. render it as obj. of *ādadhāh*. This interpr. requires it to be a neut. *-us*-stem, which is easily possible (see, e.g., Old). Old suggests that it belongs to $\sqrt{dhā}$ and that *dhāyur ādadhāh* is an etymological figure like *ābhaktam ... bhajate* in b. I prefer the analysis suggested in AiG II.2.470 linking it to $\sqrt{dhā(y)}$ ‘suckle, nourish’, thus a neut. *-us*-stem exactly parallel to neut. *dhāyas-* ‘nourishment’. This analysis seems to be reflected in Re’s “tu as accordé la satisfaction-nourricière,” though Re’s (in)famous hyphenated portmanteaus are capacious enough to include many possibilities.

I am not entirely sure what pāda b is about: is this a legal issue, having to do with what is held in common? or with what hasn’t (yet) been divided by inheritance? Or is it simply that nobody has distributed the goods yet? X.112.10d, adduced by Ge, is similar: *ābhakte cid ā bhajā rāyē asmān*, but that pāda follows one in which Indra is urged to do battle and so the most likely interpr. there is that we are asking for a share in the as-yet-undivided spoils of war. Here, however, the goods are specifically identified as *gehyā-* ‘belonging to the household’. This is the only occurrence of this stem in the RV; it is found in AVP (VI.14.8, VII. 11.3; see Arlo Griffiths ed. and tr.) and later, and *gehá-* ‘house’, from which it is derived, first occurs in VS. The etymology of *gehá-* is somewhat unclear (cf. EWA s.v.), as is its relationship to synonymous *grhá-*. The former is quite widespread in MIA, beginning already in Aśoka, but it cannot be simply a Middle Indic form of *grhá-* at least acdg. to the standard sound laws (*pace* older accounts such as AiG I.39). However, it is quite possible that it has *guṇa* in an adj. derived from MIA *gihi(n)* ‘householder’ (<**grhin-*), whose *i*-reflex of the syllabic **r̥* is probably due vowel assimilation to the *-i-* of the suffix *-in-*. In any event it seems likely that the word was imported into Vedic from MIA and that the use of this unusual stem here signals a particular social or legal institution for which we have no other evidence.

III.30.8: This vs. contains two difficult words, *kūṇāru-* (b) and *pīyāru-* (c). It is surely no accident that they appear pāda-final in successive pādas and are rhyme forms. The former is a hapax (though the vs. is repeated in the VS [Mā XVIII.69, Kā XX.5.2]). It has been glossed ‘lame in the arm’ on the basis of a supposed connection with Ep, Cl *kuṇi-* ‘id.’ (cf., e.g., AiG II.2.288, KEWA s.v. *kuṇih*, EWA s.v. *kuṇāru-*). But the chronological and morphological distance between the two words speaks against this connection, as does the fact that *kuṇi-* is likely a Dravidian borrowing (see KEWA). Moreover, since Vṛtra is a snake and is specifically called ‘handless’ here, it is unlikely that he would have an arm to be lame in. Wiser heads generally take it as a PN (so the standard tr., as well as Mayrhofer PN [though with ?]). However, this cautious course is not very satisfactory either. The enemy is most definitely Vṛtra: his name appears in c, his mother’s (Dānu) in a. Why would he be called by a different name, esp. one that never appears elsewhere? Unfortunately I do not have a strong alternative. However, I would point to *kūṇapa-*,

which means something like ‘carrion, corpse’ (AVŚ XI.9.10, 10.10.4, 8; MS IV.9.19; ≅ *kuṇapá*- TS XI.2.10.2, where human and equine *kuṇapá*-s are distinguished) on which various nasty critters are invited to feed, and to various later forms of (-*t*)*kuṇa*- referring to various bugs (cf. Kuiper [Aryans passim], Turner [CDIAL s.vv. *kúṇapa*-, *kuṇa*-], and Pāli *mankuna*-). On the basis of these shaky parallels I suggest that *kúṇāru*- means something like ‘vermin’ or perhaps even ‘corpse’. It owes its pejorative -*āru*-suffix to *píyāru*-; cf. also *śarāru*- in X.86.9, which I tr. ‘noxious creature’. Of course, *ku*- is a common pejorative prefix as well. Perhaps the word is simply constructed of pejorative affixes with a hiatus-breaking *ṇ*! Or -- a better possibility -- it may represent **ku-nara-āru*- ‘ill-manly’, with haplology and MIA retroflexion of the nasal. My point here is not to claim any of these suggestions as definitive, but to show that this completely opaque word resonates with other words in several different directions and therefore assuming a lexical meaning rather than taking it as a PN is the better course. However, in the publ. tr. ‘vermin’ should be followed by a question mark.

The 2nd difficult word, *píyāru*-, is by comparison much simpler. It must be derived from √*pī* ‘sneer, taunt’, whose pres. *píyati* is attested 3x already in the RV. It contains the same pejorative -*āru*-suffix as *kúṇāru*-, *śarāru*- -- though it should be noted that not all -*āru*-suffixed words are pejorative: *vandāru*- is quite positive, and the mysterious hapax *jábāru*- (IV.5.7) is at worst neutral but probably positive.

III.30.9: The pf. of √*sad* is generally intrans.(/reflex.) ‘sat (oneself) down’, but in several instances must be trans. ‘set down’, as it is here. See Kü 542–43.

There is no agreement on the meaning of the adj. *sāmanā*-, found in the RV only here and in the wedding hymn (X.85.11). Gr ‘gemeinschaftlich’ (fld. by WG), Ge ‘gütige (?)’, Re ‘abondante’ (but in EVP XVI, ad X.85.11, he suggests that in our passage it means ‘attelée-avec’ with which ‘heaven’ should be supplied), AiG II.2.136 ‘reich’. I suggest that it’s a vṛddhi deriv. of *sāmana*- ‘gathering’, meaning ‘related to the gathering/aggregate’, hence ‘whole’. This does not work so well in X.85.11, but there there is a pun on -*sāman*- ‘tune’, and the word seems simply to mean ‘together’ vel sim.

III.30.10: On *alātrṇā*- see comm. ad I.166.7. In this passage though ‘unquiet’ does not seem a normal feature of Vala, it can be applied proleptically, characterizing its opening up in fear of Indra’s blow.

Note the phonetic figure in ab: *alā. vala ... vrajo ... vy āra*, with -*trṇ*- ... -*ndr*- nestled in the 1st pāda; the d pāda also has phonetic rep.: *prāvan vāṇīh*.

The standard tr. all supply the Maruts with *vāṇīh* ‘choir’. But as Schmidt (B+I 141) points out, the Maruts do not ordinarily participate in the Vala myth; it is the Aṅgirasas who are Indra’s back-up band. See III.31.4ff.

III.30.11: Pāda a begins with an elementary numerical figure: *éko dvé* ‘the one the two,’ subject and object of *ā paprau* respectively, both of which are identified in the 2nd pāda. The juxtaposition of the two numbers is responsible for my tr. *éka*- as ‘the one’, rather than ‘alone’ as elsewhere in the hymn (vss. 4, 5).

Because of the voc. *sūra*, at least pāda d (and probably also c) shows a switch to 2nd ps. from the 3rd ps. of ab. Since there are no verbs in cd, at least one needs to be supplied. Most tr. (Ge [/WG], Klein [DGRV I.442], Scar [431]) take c and d as separate

clauses, supplying impvs. “come” and “bring” respectively. This is possible, but I follow Re in taking *cd* as a single clause -- though do not follow his interpr. of *īśāḥ* as a verb (‘envoie’, presumably to $\sqrt{īś}$ ‘send’).

All tr., incl. Re, take *samīké* as “in battle” (or, closer to the root sense in my opinion, Scar “Treffen”). Although this noun generally has the meaning ‘encounter’, it is a straightforward derivative of *samyác-* ‘united, conjoined’, and here I take it to refer to the “join” of Heaven and Earth, which would define the midspace. Note that pāda-final *samīké* matches pāda-final du. *samīcī* in a, referring to Heaven and Earth.

I supply ‘bring’ as the verb of *cd*, with *sayújah ... vājān* as obj. There are several possible interpr of *īśāḥ*. As just noted, Re takes it as a verb. Assuming (with everyone else) that it belongs to the root noun *īś-*, there are two possible analyses, as gen. (/abl.) sg. or nom./acc. pl., although in the latter case we would prefer it to be accented *īśaḥ* (cf. the acc. pl. *īśaḥ* in 18b). Both Klein and Scar take it as acc. pl.; I agree with Ge (/WG) in construing it as gen. sg. with *rathīḥ*.

III.30.12: The grammar of *ab* is so straightforward that it is easy to overlook how odd the statement is. It is not surprising that the sun does not confound the quarters or directions (*dīśaḥ*); after all, the layout of the cosmos is not likely to be altered by the sun as it passes through. But what does it mean that these same *dīśaḥ* are *prasūtāḥ* every day by Indra? The ppl. can only belong either to $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘propel’ or $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’, far more likely the former (pace WG, who seem to take it to the latter): only the former is found with *prā* and in fact 9d contains an exactly parallel expression, *tváyā ... prasūtāḥ* “propelled by you.” Ge tr. “vom Falbenlenker bestimmten,” but ‘determined, fixed, set’ seems the exactly opposite of what *prā* $\sqrt{sū}$ ordinarily means, including in nearby 9d. Such a meaning makes more sense of this vs. but at the expense of arbitrarily assigning a unique meaning to this rather common lexeme. If we take the idiom seriously, the hemistich seems to be saying that while the sun respects the placement of the parts of the cosmos, Indra pushes them around in some fashion, remaking or reconfiguring the cosmos daily. I simply do not understand this; I must be missing something. Perhaps Indra arranges the *dīśaḥ* every day in a slightly new way for the sun’s road?

The sun is presumably the subj. of *ānaḥ*, so the standard tr.

The cmpd *hāryaśvaprasūta-* technically has three members -- that is a 2nd member ppl. (*prasūta-*) whose 1st member is itself a cmpd. This would be somewhat unusual for the RV, where cmpd size is quite limited. But the bv. *hāry-aśva-* is so frozen as an epithet of Indra that it was probably not fully perceived as a cmpd. Cf. the exactly equivalent *indra-prasūta-* (1x).

Ge (/WG) seems to interpr. *ādhvanaḥ* as acc. pl. (“Wenn sie ihre Wege vollendet hat”). Because I am not at all certain that $\sqrt{naś}$ can be used that way with an acc., I take *ādhvanaḥ* as gen. sg., with a supplied ‘end’; cf. V.54.10 *ādhvanaḥ pāram aśnutha* with the same root. So apparently also Re.

āśvaiḥ is an instr. of separation with *vimócanam*.

III.30.14: On *vakṣāṇā-* ‘belly’ (here tr. ‘udder’ perhaps misleadingly) as a pl. tantum, see comm. ad X.27.16.

carati bībhratī is another instance of quasi-auxiliary \sqrt{car} + pres. part. (also to a redupl. pres.); cf. 4b. Here, *carati* seems to have more lexical value than in vs. 4.

III.30.15: The sense of the hapax *yāmakōśā-* is unclear. Ge takes it as traveling trunks: “Die Reisetruhen sind bereit”; sim. Old. But the image of Indra standing by overseeing the loading of his luggage verges on the absurd. Old suggests rather that it is *we* who have come with empty suitcases, hoping Indra will fill them. Re takes *yāma-* to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘beseech’ rather than $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive, travel’, yielding “les vases de la prière.” Since there is no comm. in EVP XVII, we will never know what he meant by that; it is certainly not transparent. My tr. “journey-bucket” is meant as a slangy term for chariot (‘bucket’ can be so used in English for an old or badly maintained car); certainly the use of *kōśā-* ‘bucket, cask’ to refer to (a part of) a chariot is clear from VIII.20.8, 22.9. WG’s “Wagenkörbe” is similar.

I also think that the chariots in question belong to the enemies mentioned in cd; this might account for the slangy designation of their vehicles -- rather like referring to a rival’s car as a jalopy. In any case it would seem odd to command Indra to stand fast and then immediately get on a chariot and go traveling.

III.30.16: The standard tr. all take the *ghōṣa-* to be emanating from the foes, but the instr. *amitraiḥ* with *śṛṇve* should make it an agent of the hearing (“is heard by ...”) not a source of the sound. Ge’s (/WG’s) “von” and Re’s supplied “(faite) d’ennemis” show their need to overrule the syntax. I see no reason why it should not be Indra’s battle-cry, striking fear in all who hear it.

III.30.17: *salalūka-* is yet another peculiar word that brings our interpr. to a standstill. The current standard interpr. is “indulgence, patience” vel sim. (Ge [/WG] “Nachsicht”). I do not understand where such a meaning would come from. Mayrhofer (KEWA s.v.) suggests $\sqrt{sṛ}$ in the meaning ‘sich erstrecken’, but the semantic channel from one to the other seems blocked to me. Although a deriv. from $\sqrt{sṛ}$ seems likely, a more literal sense of that root, ‘run, flow’, provides better sense. (The older interpr. of the word was ‘zerflossen’ or ‘umherschweifend’ [Gr, etc.].) Both the *l*’s and the affective *-ūka-* suffix suggest a slangy or low-register word -- hence my “send scooting.” Gr suggests a preform **salsalūka-*, presumably because *-ūka-* is often added to intensively reduplicated stems (see AiG II.2.498)(cf. *jāgarūka-* III.54.7). This seems possible (though not, of course, necessary), and “send scooting” is also meant to reflect an intensive/iterative sense. Note that *salalūkam* phonologically resembles *sahāmūlam* in pāda a (in almost the same metrical position), which may help account for the presence of *salalūkam* in the vs. and could also have facilitated a dissimilation from **salsalūkam*.

III.30.18: It is difficult to know how to construe the first pāda of this vs. I take it as a nominal main clause expressing the purpose of the subordinate clause in b. Ge (/WG) as a parallel subordinate clause with pāda b, for which a verb (ausziehst ‘set out for’) must be supplied -- all dependent on pāda c. Re as part of a single subord. cl. introduced by *yād* in b, also all dependent on c. Each of these solutions has drawbacks. Mine requires nothing to be supplied (Re’s supplies less than Ge’s), and it also avoids two problems produced by Re’s interpr: a worryingly late position of *yād* and an untethered *ca* in the middle of pāda a. But mine comes with a certain awkwardness of expression and an ill-assorted conjoined pair (“for well-being and with horses”).

However the various interpr. of ab differ, they all agree in taking *āsātsi* as the verb in the subor. cl. introduced by *yād*, thus showing the older non-imperative (that is, subjunctive) value of the so-called “-*si* imperative.”

III.30.19: Gr analyses *dhīmahi* as passive, but this is rightly rejected by all standard tr.: the numerous other examples of this form are all transitive. What then should we supply as object? I take the line of least resistance, importing *bhāgam* from the preceding pāda. I take the b pāda to mean that we hope to take the portion Indra brings us now and put it together with the superfluity of his previous gifts (and those to come) (*deṣṇāsya ... prareké*). Ge (sim. WG) does not construe these two nouns together, but takes *deṣṇāsya* as a partitive genitive, supplying the obj. of *dhīmahi* (“Wir möchten von deiner Gabe etwas auf Vorrat zurücklegen”), while Re takes the verb as reflexive: “puissions nous nous placer ...”

The Pp. and all standard analyses take *ūrvā* as underlying nom. *ūrvāḥ*; I, however, take it as loc. *ūrvé*. Though Ge and Re tr. the word as ‘sea’, it really refers to the container, in this case the sea-basin, and so logically what stretches out is not the container itself but the liquid in the container. (WG tr. Behälter, but keep it as nom.)

III.30.20: The conjoined verbs in ab, *mandayā ... papráthaś ca*, are in different moods, imperative and subjunctive respectively. Or so it seems: in the sandhi context *mandayā góbhiḥ* the apparent impv. *mandayā* could represent subjunctive **mandayās*. However, I don’t think this is necessary; impv. and subj. are both future-oriented moods, and in fact in this passage the pairing functions as a sort of covert conditional: “(if) you invigorate it, it will spread.” Kü (321), fld by WG, construes *candrāvatā rādhasā* with the 2nd verb, but both the accent on *paprāthaḥ* and the position of the *ca* make it clear that *paprāthaḥ* must begin a new clause.

III.30.21: Schaeffer (136) sees no particular repetitive function in the well-attested intensive *dārdar-*; she considers it simply lexicalized. Therefore my “keep breaking open” may impose a semantic nuance that does not belong to this stem. However, at the very least it takes pl. objects here (*gotrā, gāḥ*), so it could be considered “objektsdistributiv” (for which term see Schaeffer 86–87).

On *divākṣāḥ* (per Pp.), which raises both semantic and formal problems, see comm. ad X.65.7. As disc. there, the 2nd member most likely belongs to the root $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘rule’, not $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’, and, further, is quite likely not a root noun, but an -*as*-stem built to the zero-grade of the root (see Scar 92–93). The Pp. reading for our nom. sg., *divākṣāḥ*, is compatible with both a root-noun and an -*as*-stem 2nd member. However, it makes metrical trouble: the Saṃhitā hiatus, *divākṣā asi*, is correct for an underlying final -*ās* in sandhi, but the line then has an extra syllable. A contracted reading **divākṣāsi* would fix the problem, but makes trouble for both root noun and -*as*-stem interpr. Scar floats the possibility of an -*n*-stem (for this occurrence; it won’t work for the other two, which have the form *divākṣasaḥ*). This multiplication of stems is not appealing. A simpler and not-unprecedented explan. is given by HvN in their metrical commentary: “recursive application of sandhi rules.”

III.31 Indra

As indicated in the publ. intro., the hymn presents multiple difficulties, esp. in its first three vss. I will not attempt to represent the many conflicting interpr. of these vss., but simply lay out some parts of my own and point to some of the many puzzles that remain. As also noted in the publ. intro., I think the cosmic incest theme imposed on these vss. by others is faint at best, and also think that the ritual occasion depicted is not the original generation of the ritual fire but the removal of the Āhavanīya fire from the Gārhapatya.

In the publ. intro. I say that Indra is not named in the narrative of the Vala myth until vs. 11, but this is false: the last word of the 1st verse of the Vala treatment, 4d, is *índrah*. He is also named in the last vs. of the Vala section, 11b -- thus producing a satisfying ring.

Vss. 3 to the end are tr. and discussed by H.-P. Schmidt in *Bṛhaspati und Indra* (pp. 166-75).

III.31.1: The female line of descent implied in the 1st pāda, *duhitúr nāptyām* “the (grand)daughter of the daughter,” is striking. As noted already, I believe that this kinship succession refers to the production of the offering fire (Āhavanīya) from the householder’s fire (Gārhapatya) and the removal to the east of the former. Obviously, however, this can’t refer directly to the fires, because *agní-* is masc.; it is rather, I think, a reference to the hearths, which word (*dhiśānā-* in some uses) is fem. The conveyor (*váhniḥ*) who has come (*gāt*) is the fire itself (often called *váhni-*), which has made the journey from the Gārhapatya hearth to the Āhavanīya hearth. The offering is being made there by the father (*pitā*), whom I take as the priest. I do not see allusion to the cosmic incest of Heaven and his daughter, in part because it is difficult to identify who the granddaughter would be. (See Old.) The ritual identifications of *váhni-* = Agni and *pitā* = priest are pretty standard; it is the identity of the females that causes dispute.

On the vs. as possible evidence for the institution of the *putrikā* ‘appointed daughter’, see H-P Schmidt’s (*Women’s Rites and Rights*: 33–37) somewhat skeptical discussion of Yāska’s interpr. of the vs. Schmidt also points out that Vasiṣṭha DS XVII.16 interprets the vs. in the same way, as referring to the *putrikā*.

III.31.2: I do not see sufficient evidence in this vs. for the legalistic interpr. having to do with inheritance rights advanced by Old and Ge (fld. by WG); see also Schmidt (37–38) on Yāska’s interpr. Again, my interpr. involving the two fireplaces is at least thinkable, though there are a number of loose ends (in everyone’s interpr). In the first pāda in my interpr. the fire that has been taken out of the Gārhapatya leaves nothing behind. The two other occurrence of *āraik* have womb as obj. + a dative (as if it were our pāda b): I.113.1 *evā rātry uśāse yónim āraik* “so night has left behind the womb for dawn” and I.124.8, which even has a sister: *svāsā svāsre jyāyasyai yónim āraik* “The (one) sister has left the natal place to her older sister.” In both the idea seems to be that one has vacated the space for the other -- not left as legacy, as the legalistic inheritance interpr. requires. Problematic for my interpr. is the fact that *rikthām* should be the equivalent of the womb itself (the fireplace), not the detritus that the fire might leave in it. Moreover, the two hearths that had been daughter and granddaughter now become sisters -- but a certain fluidity in modeling kinship relations would not be surprising.

In b the site of the new fire, the Āhavanīya, is the womb of this new fire and “the repository of the winner” (the winner being the fire itself).

The second half-verse is fairly clear (for this hymn) in its description of the churning of the fire: the mothers are the fingers, the two good workers are the two kindling sticks. See the fire-churning passage with kindling sticks in nearby III.29.1.

The *yádī* opening the second half-verse is better taken as *yád ī*, with the enclitic pronoun. See 6a below.

III.31.3: In the first pāda the instr. *juhva* can be read simultaneously as “with his tongue,” construed with *rējamānaḥ* and referring to the flame(s) of the fire, and as “by the offering-spoon,” construed with *jaiñe* and indicating that the ghee poured from the spoon “begets” the fire by making it flame up.

The second pāda is likewise ambiguous and initiates the transition to the Indra-Āṅgiras-Vala myth portion of the hymn. The “sons of the great ruddy one” (*mahās putrām aruśasya*) can be the flames of the fire, that is, of Agni himself -- and the infinitival *prayākṣe* ‘to display’ is esp. appropriate to this interpr. But they can also be, as they are identified by most commentators, the Āṅgirasas, the sons of Heaven, who will figure in the Vala myth about to be related, but who are also associated with Agni, who is sometimes called *āṅgīrastama-* (e.g., I.75.2; see Macd, *Vedic Myth*. 143). The “birth of these” (*jātām eṣām*) in c can likewise refer to both the flames and the Āṅgirasas. Indra’s appearance in d strengthens the Āṅgiras reading and provides a transition to the next portion of the hymn.

The lexeme *prā√yakṣ* has been variously interpreted. For ‘display’ see Gotō (1st class, 153 and n. 572), EWA s.v. Curiously WG tr. it as if to *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’, despite Gotō’s own disc. just cited -- though the other possibility is suggested in the n.

III.31.4: Pādas a and c contain feminine plural nom./acc. forms: *jaītrīḥ* and *jānatīḥ* ... *uśāsaḥ* respectively. Although the default assumption would be that they are coreferential and both refer to the Dawns, the familiar plot line of the Vala myth suggests rather that they identify two different subjects: the (unexpressed) Āṅgirasas in ab, the (expressed) Dawns in c. (So Ge, Re, Schmidt [B+I, 167]; Old agrees that the Āṅgirasas should be supplied as subj. in a, but takes *jaītrīḥ* as obj. [presumably alongside clear acc. *spṛdhānām*], while WG take the Dawns as subj. of a, but supply the Āṅgirasas as subj. of b.) The Āṅgirasas are Indra’s back-up band in the Vala myth, as noted above ad III.30.10, and would be expected to accompany him, as pāda a depicts, while the Dawns are still confined within the Vala cave and only in c recognize Indra’s song and come out of the cave. The problem for an Āṅgiras reading of pāda a is of course the fem. gender of *jaītrīḥ*. Here it is probably best to follow Sāy. in supply *viśaḥ* ‘clans’ (so Ge, etc.); cf. I.121.3 *viśām āṅgirasām*. However, note that the Āṅgirasas are referred to by the fem. pl. *vāñīḥ* ‘choir’ in the preceding hymn, III.30.10, and that noun could be supplied here.

The cows of d are surely the dawns, as often; Indra becomes their *pāti-*, a word meaning both ‘lord’ and ‘husband’. On the naming of Indra here, see the intro. remarks above.

III.31.5: The Āṅgirasas, now presumably in the masc. (though both *dhīrāḥ* [a] and *vīprāḥ* [b] are technically ambiguous), remain the implicit subjects of abc, with Indra, also

unnamed, taking this role in d. The cows, also not identified, are represented in pāda a by the fem. pl. part. *satīḥ*. In fact, though these identifications are fairly easy to make for those familiar with the story, they remain covert, and, further, both b and d have unidentified objects as well. In b Ge (/WG) tr. *āhinvan* without object; I have supplied the cows (so apparently also Lü [Varuṇa 510–11], Schmidt [B+I 167]), while Re’s parenthetical “(l’)” in “(l’)incitèrent” presumably refers to Indra.

In d there is an expressed object, but it is merely a 3rd ps. pronoun, which is, furthermore, ambiguous in sandhi: *tā* in *tā nāmasā* can represent either neut. pl. *tā* (or instr. sg. *tā*) or fem. pl. *tāḥ*. The Pp. opts for the former, a decision endorsed by Old. The issue is further complicated by the fact that the form could be construed with either (or both) of two verbal forms, part. *prajānān* or pf. *ā viveśa*. Old takes *tā* to refer vaguely to things that Indra knows and construes it with *prajānān*; sim. Re: “sachant ces choses.” Ge [/WG], contra Pp., restores *tāḥ*, which he takes to refer to pl. *pathyāḥ*, generated from *pathyām* in c. My tr. is closer to Schmidt and to Lü, in restoring *tāḥ* (like Ge), but assuming its referent to be the cows, into whose company Indra enters. With Lü and Schmidt, I also take *prajānān* as having an implicit object inspired by *pathyām* in c, but *prajānān* is generally used absolutely to mean “knowing (the way)” and so a form of *pathyā-* need not be supplied. The publ. tr. should have parentheses: “knowing (the way).”

III.31.6: Ge (/WG) interpret ab as a direct quotation from the gods, for reasons that are unclear to me. Although an immediate past reading might help account for the injunctive aorists *vidāt* (a) and *kaḥ* (b), in fact the second hemistich also contains two injunctives, *nayat* (c) and *gāt* (d), the latter of which is also an aorist. So there is no clear grammatical distinction between the two half-verses, and the subject (Saramā) also remains the same throughout (by most interpr.), with all four pādas focusing on the same narrative. Other interpreters (Re, Lü, Schmidt) ignore this odd decision of Ge’s.

In pāda a *yādī* should be read *yād ī*; see 2c above.

In b *pāthaḥ* ordinarily means ‘fold, pen’, but here refers to the herd confined in the fold: the shift from container to contained is a common one in semantic change.

ākṣarāṇām in c most likely has double reference, both to the cows that are being released from the Vala cave and the syllables of the Aṅgirasas’ song that effects that release.

Ge makes the point (n. 6d) that *rāva-* in this context otherwise only refers to the Aṅgirasas’s song; this leads him to switch the subject to Uṣas, as the first out of the cave, coming in response to the sound of the Aṅgirasas. This seems, on the one hand, over-finicky -- why introduce another female character in the middle of a vs. without signaling it? -- and, on the other, rather deaf to the possibility of multiple meanings that always lurks in RVic discourse. One of the points of the Vala myth in general seems to me the mirroring of sounds: the song that releases the cows and their joyous counter-mooing in response -- an obvious place for a poet to allow a single word to do double duty. This same double reference is found in the preceding pāda in *ākṣarāṇām*. Schmidt (B+I 167) also takes the *rāva-* to be that of Indra and the Aṅgirasas and in fact makes Uṣas the subject of the whole 2nd hemistich. I do not see the need for this.

III.31.7: Note that all pādas begin with 3rd sg. preterite verbs: a *ágachat*, b *ásūdayat*, c *sasāna*, d (modified initial pos.) *áthābhavat* (which most likely represents *átha abhavat*, though *áthā bhavat* is possible). All but the perfect in c are augmented imperfects; this contrasts markedly with vs. 6, which, as was just noted, contains four 3rd sg. injunctives, three of them aorists. Three of the four pādas of vs. 7 also end with nom. sg. masc. pres. participles: a *sakhīyán*, c *makhasyán*, d *árcan*.

Pāda b configures the release of the cows from the Vala cave as a birth, but a birth overlaid with metaphor (“brought to sweetness”).

In c the standard tr. (save for Re and Klein, DGRV II.67) take *makhasyá-* as ‘being generous’ vel sim. But in all three occurrences of this verb stem (here and IX.61.27, 101.5) the ‘do battle’ sense is primary. Since it co-occurs with *sasāna* ‘won’ in this pāda, the ‘battle’ sense seems esp. appropriate. So Re “comportant-en-combattant.” For further on *makhá-* see comm. ad I.18.9.

My tr. of d, *áthābhavad āṅgirasāḥ sadyó árcan*, differs in an important way from the standard. In my opinion it states that Indra became an Āṅgiras as soon as he sang; the others that the Āṅgiras [=Indra] right away became a singer (e.g., Ge “Da ward sogleich der Āṅgiras zum Lobsänger”). On the one hand, I’m not certain that $\sqrt{bhū}$ + pres. part. can yield this sort of predication, esp. with the pres. part. standing in, in effect, for an agent noun. So -- a syntactic argument, though I have not examined the evidence in detail. Another syntactic/lexical argument: *sadyáḥ* + participle is frequently used to indicate the circumstances under which the action of the main verb takes place. This is esp. common with *sadyó jātāḥ* “just born” / *sadyó jajñānāḥ* “having just been born” -- e.g., the next hymn, III.32.9 *sadyó yāj jātó āpibo ha sómam* (\cong 10) “Just born, you drank the soma” (and cf. III.29.3). But the prevailing interpr. here requires the *sadyáḥ* to go with the main verb, despite its position directly before the participle -- e.g., Klein “And then did the Āṅgiras straightway become a singer.” And finally a semantic objection: the proposed tr. seems to me thematically backwards. Indra joins the category of the Āṅgiras because he joins them in song, which is their principal function in this myth; he is not an Āṅgiras by nature who happens to start singing. (This point is made, more or less, by Schmidt [173], despite his contrary tr.)

III.31.7–8: Given the thematic weight the part. *árcan* carries (see comm. immed. above) and given that it occupies pāda-final position in 7d and 8c, it should have been tr. the same way in these two vss. I would emend the publ. tr. to ‘chanting’ in 7d, or else 8c to ‘singing’ and *arkaiḥ* in 9b, 11b to ‘songs’. The instr. *arkaiḥ* reappears in pāda-final position in 11b.

III.31.8: Ge (/WG) take this vs. as a quotation of the Āṅgiras’ praise-song of Indra. I do not see why. The vs. seems to follow easily from the preceding one, and in fact at the end of vs. 7 it’s Indra who’s singing (/chanting), not the Āṅgiras. We might expect such a quotation to be signposted in some way. I do not consider the 1st pl. enclitic *naḥ* in c to be a sufficient signal.

The presence of Śuṣṇa in b is a bit puzzling, since the smiting of Śuṣṇa is not part of the Vala myth. Perhaps, with Schmidt (173), he is mentioned because Indra is uncontestedly Śuṣṇa’s killer, and this extra-mythic (or extra-Vala myth) association makes it clear that the unnamed subject of this vs. must indeed be Indra.

The standard tr. take c as a separate clause from d and supply a verb of motion with *prá* (e.g., Ge “[ging] ... voran”). This is certainly possible, but cd can also be read as a single clause (so Schmidt, 168), since *prá* is frequent with \sqrt{muc} . This interpr. allows, but does not enforce, a coreferential interpr. of *naḥ* (c) and *sákhīn* (d), as in my tr. (flg. Schmidt).

What calumny? Ge (n. 8d) suggests the dishonor because of the loss of the herd.

III.31.9: Ge’s suggestion that this vs. concerns the Aṅgirasas’ Sattrā, a months-long ritual, seems completely convincing. Note the verb *sedur* ‘they sat’ in pāda a and the nominal *sádanam* ‘sitting’ in c. I am less convinced by his interpr. of c (fld. by Re, WG), that this Sattrā is frequently (*bhūri*) repeated now, though I admit that both the hic-et-nunc prn. *idám* and the particle *nú* might support his view. I prefer Lü’s interpr. (Varuṇa, 511, fld. by Schmidt 168), who takes *bhūri* as ‘long’ and the hemistich as a further description of the Aṅgirasas’ Sattrā in the Vala myth.

My interpr. of d (based on Lü and Schmidt) deviates further from Ge (Re, WG). All of the latter take *yéna ... ṛténa* as coreferential and the equivalent of ... **ṛtám, yéna* -- that is, **ṛtám* in the main cl. as antecedent to *yéna*. The main cl. **ṛtám* would be an appositive to *sádanam* “the Session, (that is,) the *ṛtá* by which they ...” However, I separate the two instr. in d and take the antecedent of *yéna* to be *sádanam* (“the Session by which ...”), leaving *ṛténa* to mean ‘by/through truth’ as so often. They also take *māsān* as the obj. of *ásisāsan* (“they sought to win the months”), but this acc. pl. can easily be an acc. of extent of time (again, as so often), and the true object of their desire to win can be supplied as the cows.

III.31.10: What “the milk of the age-old semen” means is unclear to me. Ge suggests that they’re milking their old cows, but the rhetoric seems rather overblown just to express that. Lü (620–21, fld. by Schmidt 168) identifies the semen as *ṛtá-* and the milk as the Kultlied of the Aṅgirasas. This may well be, but nothing imposes this explanation, and Schmidt in fact worries briefly (173) that logically the Aṅgirasas should already have their Kultlied since they should have used it to free these very cows.

On *niṣṭhā-* ‘outstanding’ see Old, Scar (648–49). The word must be derived from *nís* $\sqrt{sthā}$, not *ní* $\sqrt{sthā}$ and in fact goes literally into English as ‘stand out’, with the same idiomatic meaning. In addition to two occurrences of the simplex (this and IX.110.9), it is found in several compounds: *karma-niṣṭhā-* X.80.1 of a hero who stands out through his work, *puruniṣṭhā-* ‘standing out among many’ V.1.6 (of Agni), VIII.2.9 of soma. Ge (unaccountably) takes it as ‘Verteilung’ (fld. by Re, Lü 528–29, Schmidt 168), an interpr. about which Old comments rather acidly. Old’s own interpr. is essentially reproduced here and was also adopted by WG.

Note the partial resposion between *ghóṣa* in c and *góṣu* in d, in the same metrical position.

III.31.11: My interpr. of the first hemistich differs from the standard; I take it as consisting of two separate clauses, each identifying Indra in one of his most important mythic roles -- in the Vṛtra-slaying and in the freeing of the Vala cows -- along with his associates in those enterprises, the Maruts and the Aṅgirasas respectively. It is important to note that this naming of Indra, in conjunction with the first appearance of his name in

4b (see comm. there and in the intro. remarks), frames the treatment of the Vala myth, and, by mentioning Vṛtra, it also sets the stage for the opening out of this hymn to treat other exploits of Indra.

Others take *vṛtrahā* in pāda a simply as an auxiliary epithet of Indra in this account of the Vala myth, but I do not think that Vṛtrahan would be so prominent in a treatment of the Vala myth, and I also cannot otherwise account for the *séd u* in the middle of pāda a without assuming that a new clause begins there. (Lü [517] gets out of this difficulty by accepting Ludwig's emendation to a bahuvrīhi *svéduhavyaiḥ* 'having sweating oblations' [=Aṅgirasas], but though this is ingenious, esp. as sweat figures in the same myth in X.67.6–7 as Ge points out, it requires too much alteration for a sequence that can make sense on its own.) In the first brief clause, *vṛtrahā* is the predicate, and *jātébhiḥ* refers to the Maruts, who are well known for being 'born (together)' (e.g., V.55.3 *sākām jātāḥ*). Ge suggests, but rejects, an emendation here to *sajātébhiḥ* (for transmitted *sá jātébhiḥ*), an idea also of Alsdorf's (see Schmidt 169); I would modify that by proposing haplology from *sá *sajātébhiḥ*. The rest of ab concerns the Vala myth, which has been the subject of the past seven vss. The myth is readily identifiable by the VP *úd usríyā asṛjat* "sent the ruddy (cows) surging up" and by the *arkaḥ*, repeated from 9a. Since the chants in 9a clearly belonged to the Aṅgirasas, there need not be any even oblique reference to the Aṅgirasas here: the bare *arkaḥ* will be enough.

III.31.12: The first pāda contains two datives, *pitré* and the prn. *asmai*. Because of its lack of accent, *asmai* cannot be a demonstr. adj. with *pitré*. Ge gets out of the difficulty by interpr. *pitré* as a simile, which allows *asmai* to be independently construed, but this depends on his frequent assumption that *cid* can be a simile marker, a role I do not think it can have. Instead I give the VP *cakruḥ sádanam* a double reading: acdg. to the first the Aṅgirasas perform a Sattra for their father (see 9c), but in the 2nd they also prepare for him a literal seat. Because *cakruḥ sádanam* participates in two clauses, each can have an independent dative, though in my opinion the datives are coreferential.

It is unclear what the referent of the object in b is, described as *máhi tvíṣīmat* "great and turbulent." Ge, flg. Sāy, takes it as a further reference to the seat, Re the all-purpose "quelque chose," Schmidt the eye of the sun, WG sim. the sun-god. My own candidate is the *pāṭhaḥ* of 6b, also described as *máhi* there. In vs. 6 the word is used to indicate the herd, which is contained in the fold (see comm. there); here I think it is the container, the fold or pen, itself -- representing the cosmic space and also the ritual ground. When they survey it they see that this space needs organizing, which they proceed to do -- by propping apart Heaven and Earth (a deed usually ascribed to Indra) and preparing and propping up a seat for Indra. They thus make the whole cosmos into Indra's ritual ground, and in the next vs. (13ab) Earth herself serves as the emplacement allowing Indra to pierce Vṛtra.

The position of the *hí* is somewhat anomalous: since the whole b pāda forms a single clause, we would expect the *hí* in Wackernagel's position. However, there is a general tendency when a preverb precedes its verb late in the clause for *hí* to intervene between them, as here: ... *ví hí khyāḥ*. More specifically, 1) when there's a *hí* in a clause containing a verbal form of *√khyā*, it always immediately precedes the verb -- sometimes in normal Wack. pos. (e.g., I.81.9), sometimes not (as here and, e.g., VI.15.15). 2) With

one exception, all injunc. forms of $\sqrt{khyā}$ are preceded either by *hí* or by a preverb ending in *-i*, which prob. led to a sense that $\sqrt{khyā}$ should be so preceded. Note also in this passage the phonetic echoes *#máhi ... vi hí khyan#*, which also resonates with *pāda d ... ví minvan#*. It is perhaps worth noting in this connection how many *pādas* in this hymn begin with *máhi* or *mahī*: 3d, 4b, 6b, 12b, 13a, 14a, 14c, 15a (esp. clustered here); cf. also *mahás* 3b, *mahān* 3c, 18d. I assume that a *pāda* opening **máhi hí* would be avoided; in any case there are none in the RV.

In d most tr. take the sun as the referent of the object. I instead supply the seat. The root \sqrt{mi} often takes ‘seat’ as obj.: not our *sádanam* admittedly, but *sádmān*- II.15.3 (with *vī*), X.20.5, I.173.3, IX.97.1, *sádana*- X.18.13. This is a fairly large percentage of the attested forms of the verb, and since ‘seat’ is already present in this vs., it is easily supplied here.

III.31.13: I take *yádi* here as a shortened form of *yád *ī* with enclitic pronoun (as in 2c and 6a), though it unfortunately appears before a word beginning with a single consonant. An “if” makes no sense here, and it is also desirable to have an acc. pron. in this *pāda* to serve as obj. of *dhāt* and subj. of the infinitival *śísínáthe*. This putative **ī* may anticipate and double the heavy acc. phrase of b, assuming that the latter refers to Indra.

As noted just above, Earth herself serves as the foundation from which Indra can launch his attack. Our passage is very similar to I.102.7 ... *tvā dhiṣāṇā titviṣe mahy, ádhā vṛtrāṇi jighnase* ... “The great (Earth), the Holy Place has sparked you So you keep smashing obstacles ...,” with the same *mahī ... dhiṣāṇā* as here and even a form of $\sqrt{tvīṣ}$, like *tvīṣīmat* in 12b; cf. also VI.19.2 *índram evá dhiṣāṇā sātáye dhāt* “The Holy Place positioned just Indra for winning,” with $\sqrt{dhā}$ + inf. as here. The same $\sqrt{dhā}$ + inf. construction is found in 19d below: *svàs ca naḥ ... sātáye dhāḥ* “and set us up to win the sun.”

Although Gr assigns the hapax *śísínáthe* to a them. stem *śísínátha-*, as Old clearly states we expect a dative infinitive here, and so it more likely belongs to an athem. stem *śísínáth-*; cf. *abhiśínáth-*.

Re takes b as describing *Vṛtra*, Schmidt Indra; Ge’s tr. is not clear, though Schmidt (169 n.) claims it’s to *Vṛtra*. I follow Schmidt in assigning the phrase to Indra, though the poet may have intended its referent to be ambiguous, indicating that the opponents are almost evenly balanced.

I follow the current standard view (represented already by Ge and Re) that *ánutta-* is the ppl. to the lexeme *ánu* $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘concede’; Schmidt and WG follow the older deriv. from \sqrt{nud} ‘push’, hence ‘unpushable’ vel sim.

III.31.14: Because *vaśmi* is unaccented, the first *pāda* would be more accurately tr. “I long for your companionship ...” since *vaśmi* cannot begin a clause. I tr. as I did to capture the parallelism of *pādas* a *#máhi ... sakhyām* and c *#máhi stótram*, as well as 15a *máhi kṣétram*.

III.31.15: Ge takes *nṛbhiḥ* as the agent with the part. *ḍḍyānaḥ* (“von den Männern entflammt (?)”), but this participle never elsewhere takes an agent. Better an instr. of accompaniment, with most other tr. That Indra is described as shining may be connected to the fact that three of the four things he generates shine too: the sun, the dawn, and fire.

There is some disagreement about who the men are: the Aṅgirasas or the Maruts. Given the general prominence of the Vala myth earlier in the hymn, but the more recent concentration on the Vṛtra myth, I imagine the ambiguity is intentional and both sets of Indra's helpers are to be thought of.

III.31.16: My interpr. of this vs. differs significantly from the standard, beginning with the disposition of the pādas. Most take abc together, with d as a separate clause, while I divide the vs. into two hemistichs, which express parallel notions. In ab, in mythological time, Indra sends the waters surging; this is the standard happy denouement of the Vṛtra myth. In cd priests (even perhaps the Aṅgirasas) impel another collection of liquid, the streams of soma -- the ritual equivalent of Indra's cosmogonic release of the waters. Although the standard interpr. tacks pāda c onto ab, as describing the waters, it contains vocabulary that is strongly associated with soma: *mádhu*- 'honey, sweet', *√pū* 'purify', and *pavítṛa*- 'filter', and I cannot offhand think of another instance in which *waters* are said to be purified, though they are purifying.

In ab note the return of several lexical items: *vibhū*- (13b) and *sadhryāñc*- (6b). The *cid* 'also' also links this vs. with a previous part of the hymn, namely 11b where Indra sends surging another group of fem. entities (ruddy [cows]): *úd usríyā asṛjad índro arkaśh*.

I do not understand why Indra is called *dámūnāh* 'master of the house'. The word is generally an epithet of Agni (understandably), and there is nothing in this passage that seems to me to link Indra to the domestic sphere.

In c *mádhvaḥ* is taken by most as fem. acc. pl. (by Schmidt as masc. nom. pl.). Several exx. of this form are analyzed by Gr as either masc. nom. pl. or fem. nom./acc. pl. However, none of these supposed examples is convincing, and it is best to take it here as the gen. sg. it usually is. It then needs a head noun. Old adduces nearby III.36.7 *mádhvaḥ punanti dhārayā pavítṛaiḥ* "they purify it in a stream of honey with purifying filters," which is very similar to our pāda c. I therefore supply, with Old, a form of *dhārā*- 'stream' upon which gen. *mádhvaḥ* depends. The precise form I supply is acc. pl. *dhārāḥ*, modified by the (fem. acc.) part. *punānāḥ* and coreferential with *dhānutrīḥ* 'runners' at the end of the vs. The conceit in the phrase *hinvanti ... dhānutrīḥ* is that the priests are spurring on the streams of soma (like) horses. As for the subj. of *hinvanti*, I take it as (the current) priests (as in the sim. passage III.36.7 just quoted; also III.46.5, where Adhvaryus are the subj. of *hinvanti*). It could also be, with Re, the Aṅgirasas, who have been operating as priests in the Sattrā depicted earlier.

Ge (/WG) take *kavībhiḥ* as an adjective with *pavítṛaiḥ* (Ge: "mit geistigen Filtern"), but in my opinion there are no adjectival uses of *kavī*-. Instead it is used as a defining appositive (poets as filters), as I take it, sim. Re, or it is a separate agent with *punānāḥ* ("being purified by poets with filters"), with Schmidt (170). For the same phrase see III.1.5.

III.31.17: As Ge points out, pāda a is very similar to IV.48.3 *ānu kṛṣṇé vásudhitī, yemāte viśvápeśasā* "The two black treasure chambers [=Night and Dawn], with all their ornaments, have directed themselves after each other in turn." Bloomfield (RR ad III.31.17) cleverly comments, "The words *kṛṣṇé* and *vásudhitī* are both dvandva ekaṣa:

‘black (Night) and (Uṣas)’ is a way of saying náктоśāsā; conversely ‘treasure-giving (Morn) and black (Night)’ is uśāsānāktā.”

“The magnanimity of the sun” is a slightly surprising expression. Is it that the sun makes the succession of Night and Dawn possible by his transit across the sky, and this is considered generous on his part? Or is it an indirect reference to the distribution of the dakṣiṇā at dawn. A related, but opposite, sentiment is found in VII.81.4 *uchántī yā kṛṇóṣi maṁhánā mahi, prakhyai devi svār dṛśé* “You who in dawning make through your magnanimity the sun to be visible for seeing,” with the magnanimity credited to Dawn.

The only other occurrence of pl. *ṛjipyá-* (II.34.4) is at least indirectly used of the Maruts; the standard tr. all assume they are the referents of cd, which seems correct. Here they seem to be functioning as priests, attempting to bring Indra to a sacrifice.

III.31.18: Note the alliteration in b (... *viśvāyur vṛṣabhó vayodhāḥ*) and the rather elementary etymological figure in d (*mahān mahībhiḥ*); although *sakhyébhiḥ śivébhiḥ* is neither the one nor the other, it seems to function as a bridge between the two.

III.31.19: Pāda b, *nāvyaṁ kṛṇomi ... purājām* “I make new (the hymn) born of old,” is about as succinct a summary of the RVic poetic enterprise as we can find in the text: the poets’ focus on ever new expressions based on traditional techniques and themes. In this particular case, Ge suggests that *purājā-* refers to the Preislid of the Aṅgirasas, about which we heard in vss. 7–8.

On the $\sqrt{dhā}$ + inf. construction, see vs. 13 above.

III.31.19–20: Note the echo of 19d *#s^uvaś ca naḥ* in 20b *s^uvastí naḥ*.

III.31.20: The mists are probably in part metaphorical -- menacing threats and mental darkness -- but may also refer physically to morning mists, which are clearing as the dawn sacrifice begins. Note also that pāda-initial *mīhaḥ* is a mirror image of *māhí*, which opens so many pādas in this hymn (see comm. ad 12b).

III.31.21: I follow Schaeffer (Intens., 133–34) in taking the medial intens. *dēdiṣṭe* in the meaning ‘display (one’s own X)’ -- hence my different tr. of *ādediṣṭa* (a) ‘has put on display’ and *diśāmānaḥ* ‘allotting’.

I interpr. b as having a more complex construction than the standard interpr. The trouble is the *antár* phrase: when *antár* governs the acc., it is only used with dual (or plurals conceived as duals -- *jātān ubháyān* [IV.2.2], e.g.), but *kṛṣṇān* has no overt partner here. I suggest that it is an elliptical plural-for-dual: “black (nights) and (bright days)”; cf. VIII.41.10 *śvetān ... kṛṣṇān* used for days and nights. The elliptical *kṛṣṇé* used of Night and Dawn in 17a would support this, and in 20a the clearing of the mists at daybreak (if I’m right) might provide the other half of this elliptical duality. If this is correct, Indra comes between (*antāḥ ... gāt*) the nights and days with the entities appearing in the instr. (*aruṣaiḥ dhāmabhiḥ*). *aruṣá-* ‘ruddy’ can of course be used of Dawn and her various associates, esp. her “cows”; *dhāman-* is a frustratingly multivalent word, but here I think it means ‘manifestation’ vel sim, and the phrase refers to the dawns, who of course come temporally between night and full day.

The positioning of *ca* in d is somewhat disturbing, but I see no other way to explain it than Klein's (DGRV I.225, II.102 n. 28): it conjoins the first and second half-verses, but takes Wackernagel's position in the 2nd pāda of the 2nd half-verse "following an intervening participial phrase."

svāḥ 'his own' is in a very prominent position, as the last word in the last real vs. of the hymn (before the refrain, vs. 22). Why it should be emphasized that the doors that Indra opens are his own I do not know, beyond the fact that anything belonging to Indra is highly noteworthy. But I would point out that *svāḥ* may be a pun on *s^uvas* (*s^uvah* in pause) 'sun' initial in 19d (though unfortunately *svāḥ* is not distracted here as it so often is). This pāda is identical to X.120.8d, where it also participates in word play.

III.32 Indra

III.32.1: The impv. *pība* is accented, though it is located mid-clause. There is no obvious reason for this. Old suggests weakly (ZDMG 60: 736) that it is an emphatic accent, but this is of course a circular argument: any verb bearing an unexpected accent can be called emphatic. I find the accent esp. disturbing because the identical phrase, minus the initial voc. *īndra*, is found without accented impv. elsewhere: #*sómam somapate pība*# (V.40.1=VIII.21.3) versus our #*īndra sómam somapate pībemám*#. There are several possible contributing factors. First, three pādas at the beginning of this hymn begin with accented *pībā* (2b, 3d, 5b), and our form may have had its accent added redactionally. However, I think that *pība* has special status and can be accented in positions that strict syntactic rules would not allow. (This is rather like Old's "emphatic" argument, except that I limit the effect to a single verb form.) See esp. I.15.1, II.37.1–3 and comm. there. The unsanctioned accent may arise partly because *pība* 'drink!' is a particularly rousing verb in RVic discourse. It also often occurs in non-initial position when it nonetheless legitimately has accent -- after init. vocatives (e.g. *īndra pība* III.36.2, etc.) or at the beginning of a clause after another short clause (or clauses) (e.g., VIII.4.8 *tūyam éhi drāvā pība* "Come here swiftly! Run! Drink!"), and this may have led to the sense that it can be accented in non-initial position in general. I also note in Lub's conspectus that unaccented *pība* generally occupies either final position in its pāda or second position, while accented *pība*, besides being common and expected in initial position, tends to avoid both those positions except when 2nd position follows an initial voc. (as in III.36.2, etc.) or final position opens a new clause (as in VIII.4.8). Note that if this distribution holds, the "identical" phrases I cite at the beginning of this comment are not the same after all, because unaccented *pība* is pāda-final and our accented *pība* is followed by another element. However, there are a few counterexamples with pāda-final *pība* not beginning a new clause (e.g., VIII.4.3, 65.5). One can speculate on why 2nd and final position would favor the unaccented verb while full medial favors the accented form: namely, that 2nd position is of course Wackernagel's position, where enclitics typically migrate, and, assuming a basic SOV underlying order, absolute final position is the default position for unaccented main-clause verbs. Still, the full medial position where we find accented main-clause *pība* does not otherwise favor or impose accent on other verbs that appear there, so if this hypothesis holds, it is only for this special verb.

Ge rather charmingly suggests that *praprúthya* represents "brr machend" to stop the horses. Although "whoa" would be the equivalent English word/vocal gesture, given

the object ‘lips’ (*śípre*), I wonder if it’s the “horse training voice command” (gleaned on the internet) called “smooching” -- defined as “kissing sound with lips used to ask a horse to move on or up a gait.” I rather like the idea of Indra smooching to his fallow bays.

III.32.4: Ge (and in part Re) take *mádhumat* as referring to speech (“... wurden beredt in süßen (Worten)”), but though *mádhumant-* occurs several times with *vácas-* and the noun *vípra-* ‘inspired poet’ demonstrates that *√ vip* ‘become inspired’ can have a strong verbal component, still the focus of this hymn is soma -- and the default referent of *mádhumant-* ‘honeyed’ is soma. Here the underlying word must be neut. (which *sóma-* of course is not), but the neut. *sávana-* ‘pressing’ is found elsewhere with this adj. (cf. X.112.7 *mádhumattamāni ... sávanā*), and *sávana-* is found three times in the first five vss. of this hymn (1b, 3c, 5a).

Note the insistent repetition of the syllable *ma* in pāda d (*amarmāṇo mányamānasya máрма*), anticipated by *mádhumad* in a and *marútaḥ* in b, and continued by the first word in 5a *manuṣvād*. This phonetic figure may be signaling the Maruts’ name. See also vs. 7.

III.32.5: The rendering of *vavṛtsva* in the publ. tr. (“let yourself be turned hither”), a sort of passive reflexive, now seems over-elaborate to me; I would substitute “be turned.” The other examples of this mid. pf. impv. seem more straightforwardly simply “turn” or “turn yourself,” but if *yajñāḥ* has true instrumental force, a passive rendering is more natural. Possible, however, is Re’s “grâce à (nos) sacrifices.”

The referent of *saranyúbhiḥ* is not totally clear. Sāy. (fld. by Re) suggests the Maruts, while Ge adds horses or waves as possibilities. The other ex. of a plural to this stem (also instr.) in I.62.4 is in a clear Vala context, with the Navagvas and Daśagvas in the same vs., which would suggest the Aṅgirasas -- but, although the Vala myth and the Aṅgirasas were prominent in the preceding hymn III.31, they are not found in this hymn, which is dominated by the Maruts and which mentions only the Vṛtra myth (here and in the following vs.). I therefore think it likely that Sāy. was correct. Note that *saranyú-* ... *sísarṣi* is an etym. figure, continued by *sártavaí* in the next vs. (6b).

The rendering of the phrase *apó áṛṇā* as “the flooding waters” in the publ. tr. assumes an emendation to fem. pl. *áṛṇāḥ*, with Gr and numerous others (see Old), contra the Pp and not reflecting the expected sandhi of such a form, which should be *áṛṇāḥ*. As Old points out, the emendation is not nec.: *áṛṇā* could easily be a neut. pl. to the thematic stem *áṛṇa-*. In this case the tr. would better read “the waters, the floods.”

III.32.6: This vs. appears to have no main clause. I take it as loosely attached to the preceding vs., while Ge attaches it to the next one. Old (fld. by WG) disputes the Nebensatz analysis, pointing first to the odd doubly accented Pp. analysis of *prāśṛjaḥ* as *prā áśṛjaḥ*: if the verb is accented, we would expect univerbation with the preverb and loss of the preverb accent. He instead suggests that *yád* is to be construed with the participial phrase *vṛtrám jaghanvān*, as if it contained the finite verb *jagántha* -- a mixed construction. I am in general reluctant to allow a subordinating conjunction to have domain over a participle, and in this particular case this assumption would further require bits of the main clause and the subordinate clause to be interwoven in a fashion unprecedented (as far as I know) even in RVic syntax: the major part of the subordinate

clause would be plunked down between the object of the main verb, *apāḥ*, and that verb (*prāśrjat*), and the 2nd half verse would consist of NPs modifying the object of the subordinate clause but following the end of the main clause. I do admit that the position of *yād dha* in pāda a suggests a close relation with the participial phrase, but I do not consider that position sufficient to override the arguments against that analysis.

The vs. contains several nice oppositions: *śáyānam ... cáratā* “(him) lying (still) with (your) moving (weapon)” and the etymological *devīr ádevam* “the goddesses, godless ...” In addition note the etymological pun: *vṛtrám ... vavrivāṁsam*.

III.32.7: The *ma-* phonetic figure that dominated 4d returns in this vs.: cd ... *mamátur ...*, ... *mahimānam mamāte*. This figure is reinforced by the first words of pāda a, *yājāma ín námasā*, and the uninterrupted sequence of *-am* acc. singulars in ab: ... *vṛddhām índram, bṛhántam ṛṣvām ajáram yúvānam*. Although a side-effect of the grammar, it is my impression that a skilled RVic poet would break the monotony of such a string -- *unless* it served some other poetic purpose, here to provide the mirror-image *-am* to *ma-* and perhaps to evoke the Maruts.

The two forms of the perfect to $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’ in the 2nd hemistich, act. *mamátuḥ* and med. *mamāte*, share the same subj. and obj., with the 1st clause positive and the second negated. Clearly the poet is playing with two different senses of $\sqrt{mā}$. Gr, Ge, and Old neatly convert the word play to “messen” (‘measure’) versus “ermessen” (‘gauge, grasp, realize’)(or so I understand them). My “measure” / “measure up to” is a similar attempt whose purport is close to Kü (378) and WG: “sich messen.”

III.32.8: On the clash of gender and deixis in *pr̥thivīm dyām utémām*, see comm. ad VIII.40.8.

III.32.9: The juxtaposition of *adroghá-* ‘undeceptive’ and *satyá-* ‘real, true’ is also found in III.14.6 *adroghéṇa vācasā satyām*.

The standard tr. take pādas a and b together, with cd separate. I think it makes more sense to take b with cd, as supplying the reason (Indra’s early soma drinking) that he couldn’t be obstructed.

The standard tr. also take *dyāvah* as ‘days’, whereas the publ. tr. agrees with Hoffmann (Injunk. 242) in tr. ‘heavens’. The problem, as I saw it then, was its co-occurrence with *áhā* likewise ‘days’, which led to awkward duplication. However, I have now rethought this; the series of temporal expressions in this hemistich (*áhā, māsāḥ śaradaḥ*) invites a temporal reading of *dyāvah* as well and makes “heavens” seem out of place. In X.7.4. and 12.4 the two stems also co-occur and I tr. “daytimes and days.” I would now substitute that tr. here as well.

varanta here and in 16b is formally ambiguous; it can be either an injunctive or a subjunctive to the root aor. (see Hoffmann 239–40); Hoffmann takes it as a subjunctive. It does not work terribly well as either one; in both passages I tr. it as a preterital modal (“could obstruct”), but this interpr. is not firmly based in the morphology. I sense that in this vs. and the next the poet is struggling to express a verbal category that isn’t found in the Skt. verbal system, namely anteriority: modal anteriority here, temporal anteriority in 10cd.

III.32.10: As just noted, this vs. contains an apparent attempt to express anteriority: the pluperfect *āvivesīṭh* seems to function like an English pluperfect (rather than the standard Vedic plupf., a past tense to a presential perfect), to express an action that happened before the action of the main verb, an interpr. more or less endorsed by Kü (500).

III.32.11: The standard tr. (save for Hoffmann, Injunk. 100, sim. to my interpr.) take ... *sphigyā kṣām āvasthāḥ* as “you covered/ clothed the earth with your hip,” but the medial root pres. to *√vas* means ‘wear’ and takes an acc. of the garment rather than an acc. of the entity being clothed (the construction found with *vāsāya-*). See the similar ex. at VIII.4.8 and the comm. there, as well as the similar sentiment found in I.173.6, where Indra wears Heaven and Earth as various accessories. The point of course is to emphasize Indra’s vast size by making Earth (and Heaven) seem puny in comparison. A similar point was made in vs. 7d, as well as in the immediately preceding pāda 11c.

III.32.12: *yajñā-* is the focus of this vs., with 5 occurrences of it or a transparent deriv.

I take *vārdhanah* as the predicate of pāda b as well as pāda a (“the meal is also your strengthener”); the standard tr. take b as an independent nominal clause with *priyāḥ* as its predicate (“the meal is dear to you”). There is no way to tell for certain; the absence of *te* in b gives some support to my interpr., but that support is undeniably weak. The difference between the two tr. is also not large and has no effects on the interpr. of the rest of the vs.

The second hemistich expresses the reciprocity of the sacrificial enterprise, neatly shown by the balanced verb forms to the same root *√av* ‘aid, help’: impv. *ava* (c), impf. *āvat* (d). But the reciprocity is curiously indirect: Indra is asked to aid the sacrifice (rather than the sacrificer[s]), and the sacrifice aided Indra’s mace (not Indra himself). In both clauses the direct object is an inanimate entity standing in for an animate one, and in the second clause the subject is inanimate as well. Only Indra is animate and capable of acting.

The nom. sg. pres. part. *sān* ‘being’ is not used concessively (“although being ...”) as it normally is. I think it may have the same force as it does in III.30.5, a “definitional” one: Indra is by definition the one deserving of / derivationally associated with the sacrifice, and therefore he is the one who should aid it.

III.32.13: The reciprocity expressed by complementary verbal forms to *√av* found in the 2nd half of the last vs. is here wrapped up in one word, the instr. *āvasā*, which I tr. twice: I use the aid provided by the sacrifice (cf. 12d) to bring Indra here with his aid (cf. 12c). In Ge’s tr. it is only Indra’s aid, but he allows for the other possibility in n. 13a. Re and WG also associate it only with Indra. Given the balanced expression of 12cd, I think it is *meant* to have a double reading.

III.32.14: The standard tr. (see also Kü 186) take the two verbs *vivēṣa* and *jajāna* as parallel in the *yād* clause, with *mā* obj. of the first and possibly of the 2nd. I prefer to take *vivēṣa* as the main clause verb, followed by the *yād* clause, whose (sole) verb is *jajāna*. *vivēṣa* then owes its accent to its initial position in the pāda. This interpr. allows *mā* to take a more natural place, and it also saves us from positing a personal object to *vivēṣa*, which otherwise is not so construed. (Note that Kü’s second tr. of this passage [p. 502] is

entirely different from his first: he distributes the clauses as I do, but takes *vivēṣa* as *first* sg.) And what does it all mean? In my view the *dhiṣāṇā* ‘holy place’ (on which see comm. ad I.160.1) is here the ritual ground, and she is credited with the “birth” of the poet qua poet. After this birth, the poet can produce the praise of Indra that he is credited with in pāda b, and this in turn leads to the good results in pāda c.

Pāda c contains two different subordinators, *yātra* ‘where, when’ and *yāthā* ‘so that’, with a single verb, subjunctive *pīpārat*. Ge’s explan., that we simply have a doubling of relatives, seems to me the best account; this is reflected, more or less, by Old’s “wo (und) wie ...,” though Old goes on to suggest a complex crossing of two different constructions, which seems over-elaborate. In the publ. tr. I have rendered *yātra* as a temporal adv. (“at that time”) with no subordinating force, since I think *yāthā* expresses purpose and controls the subjunctive.

Rather than taking *āmhasaḥ* as an ablative, with most others, I supply *pārām* ‘far shore’, a word related to *pārya-* in pāda b and to the verb *pīpārat* itself, and found in this context elsewhere; cf. II.33.3 *pārṣi ṇaḥ pārām āmhasaḥ*. Here as well *āmhasaḥ* is then a gen. dependent on **pārām*. Although it unfortunately involves a breach of the pāda boundary, I also take *nāvēva* with the preceding pāda, because this simile is almost entirely limited to passages containing verbal forms to \sqrt{pr} (I.46.7, 97.7, 99.1, V.4.9, 25.9, VIII.16.11, 18.17, IX.70.10). I also find it hard to imagine Indra traveling by boat, even metaphorically.

III.32.15: The agent noun *séktar-*, which forms an etymological figure with *sisice*, presumably refers to a habitual or practiced ‘pourer’. So Tichy (*-tar*-stems, 159, fld. by Kü 570). I have taken *kósam* as the obj. in the simile rather than the frame, contra the standard tr., though it could certainly go in the frame or in both without appreciably affecting the sense.

The pf. form lacks retroflexion on its root initial, as does one of the other two forms of this pf. in the RV (*sisicuḥ* II.24.4), as opposed to expected *sisīcatuḥ* in VIII.33.13. I have no explanation for the lack of retroflexion.

III.32.16: On *varanta* see comm. ad vs. 9.

Ge (fld. by WG) takes *sákhibhyaḥ* as a dat. of benefit, but I think it more likely that it’s an ablative with agentival force. See Re, who simply tr. it as an agent. The mythological episode is surely the Aṅgirasas’ energetic help to Indra in the breaking of Vala.

III.33 Viśvāmitra and the Rivers

In addition to the usual treatments, see Schnaus, *Dialoglieder*, 81–107.

III.33.2: *īndreṣite* echoes *vīṣite* in 1b, though they belong to two different roots: \sqrt{is} ‘impel’ and $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘tie’ respectively. The basis for calling the rivers *īndreṣite* is given in 6ab.

I might now render *prasavám* slightly differently here, with the participial phrase meaning “begging for (the signal) for the forward thrust” (in the mode of Ge and Re), with *prasavá-* here a technical racing term. The situation is muddled by the fact that the

stem *prasavá-* occurs 4x in this hymn (here, 4c [\cong 11c], and 6d) with three somewhat different senses.

In c *ūrmíbhīḥ* can be construed with both participles, *samārāṇé* ‘clashing together’ and *pínvamāne* ‘swelling’, between which it is positioned.

Although by my rule (“Vedic *anyá-* ‘another, the other’ ...”; Fs. Beekes 1997, 111-18), forms of *anyá-* found initial in the pāda should be indefinite (‘another’) not definite as here, the *anyó‘nyam* (“the one ... the other”) construction works differently. This might also be an example of prosodic flip: since enclitic *vām* cannot begin a pāda, a putative order **vām anyānyām* might have flipped *anyā* to initial position.

III.33.4: The reference of the rivers switches from dual to plural here and remains so (save for two singulars in 10cd). There is no obvious reason for this change, though it may reflect the fact that when the two rivers merge into each other they form a third.

The first hemistich may contain two predicated present participles, *pínvamānāḥ ... cārantīḥ* “we (are) swelling ... proceeding,” but it is more likely that the predicate is the instr. adv. *enā* “So we are ...”: the rivers are affirming the truth of what Viśvāmitra and the poet of the hymn have said about them.

III.33.5: It is not clear to me why Viśvāmitra’s speech is somian (*vácase somyāya*). I doubt that it is because it is accompanied by soma (Gr), since Viśvāmitra is probably not performing a soma sacrifice on a river bank. Somewhat more likely, perhaps, is Ge’s soma-like, but probably by a transitive phrasal transformation: ‘speech’ (*vácas-*) is occasionally called ‘honied’ (*mádhumat-*), e.g., I.78.5, VIII.8.11); honey (*mádhu-*) is frequently qualified as *somyá-*. Hence, *somyá-* can be transferred to speech by way of the middle term ‘honey’.

Ge renders voc. *ṛtāvarīḥ* as ‘ihr Immerfliessenden’ without comment. But this is simply the fem. stem to the possessive *ṛtāvan-* ‘possessing *ṛtá-*’, which he elsewhere tr. “gesetzentreuen” (e.g., I.160.1, III.54.4) et sim. Interestingly, this fem. is used of river(s) (Sarasvatī in the sg.) or watery females in several other passages (II.41.18, III.56.5, IV.18.6, VI.61.9); in one of these Ge also inserts the notion of wandering in his tr. (III.56.5 “die rechtwandelnden ...”), though otherwise he conforms to the ‘truthful’ sense. Rivers/waters are probably so-called in part because they are famously noisy. I do not understand the source of Schnaus’s tr “Naturgemäss.”

In 5c *avasyú-* ‘seeking help’ answers the question posed by the rivers in 4c *kimyú-* ‘seeking what?’ and in the same position in the vs.

III.33.6: In this vs. the rivers indirectly respond to Viśvāmitra’s command “Stop!” (*rámadvam*) in the previous vs. (5a), by asserting that they flow because of the efforts of and at the pleasure of the gods: Indra dug their channels and, by smashing Vṛtra, removed the barrier to their movement; Savitar led them and they flow at his impulsion. Without explicitly refusing Viśvāmitra’s request, they make it plain that they won’t comply by stopping.

The stem *prasavá-* ‘forward thrust, impulsion’ occurs here for the third time in this hymn (2a, 4c, 6d; see also 11c) and is here associated with its etymological divinity Savitar, the Impeller. Although I tr. all 3 occurrences with ‘forward thrust’, I now render

this example in keeping with its usual sense when associated with Savitar: “at his impulsion.” See also comm. ad 2a above.

III.33.7: This is the central vs. of the hymn; in it Viśvāmitra practices the kind of praise poetry that the rivers will ask him to reproduce in perpetuity in vs. 8, couched in high formal style. In fact it can be seen as a variant of the opening of the great Indra hymn I.32.1: *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam, yāni cakāra ...* Here we have the gerundive *pravācyam* for *prá vocam*, *vīryam* matching *vīryāṇi*, *índrasya* as in I.32, and the nominalization *kárma* for the pf. *cakāra*. The serpent, the mace, and the signature verb *√han* are then found in the rest of b and in c, as they are in I.32.1 (and note also anticipatory *ápāhan vṛtrám* in 6b). As Watkins points out (Dragon, 309), here the verb *√han* has been displaced from its standard formulaic role, with *áhim* as object, to an adjacent part of the myth that there is “a veritable constellation of inherited words and roots relating to poetry in this passage” (apropos vss. 7–8).

I render *yád* in b as ‘when’; it could also be a neut. loosely construed with *kárma* (“... deed that he hewed apart the serpent”).

Note the etymological and phonetic figure *āyan ... áyanam* in d.

III.33.8: I think it quite likely that *yád* expresses purpose here (substituting for standard *yáthā*), given the subjunctive *ghóṣān*, not to mention the clear desire on the part of the rivers to have their praise remembered in later times. I would therefore slightly emend the publ. tr. to “so that ...”

Though med. *juṣáte* overwhelmingly means ‘enjoy’, the addition of the preverb *práti* sometimes yields a transitive ‘favor in return, in response’ with personal obj. See disc. ad IX.92.1.

The ubiquitous modern greeting *námas te* is found twice in the RV, here and VIII.75.10 (cf. also II.28.8 *námaḥ purā te ...*). Here it anticipates the literal action of bowing, demanded in 9c and performed in 10c.

III.33.9: *ánasā ráthena* – probably, as most translators take it, a reference to both baggage/supply wagon and war chariot.

III.33.10: Although the two rivers refer to themselves collectively in the 1st pl. in ab, the second hemistich consists of two contrasting statements in the 1st sg., each presumably made by one of the rivers. This balanced contrast accounts for the accent on the 2nd verb *śaśvacái*.

The simile involving the *pīpyānā ... yóṣā*, the young woman with breasts “swelling” with milk, has been prepared for by the earlier two occurrences of *páyas* ‘milk’ referring to the water of the rivers (1d, 4a).

III.33.11: As in the immediately preceding hymn III.32.9–10, the poet here seems to be trying to express verbal nuances that are not coded systematically in the Vedic verbal system, in particular another variety of anteriority. Here the sequence of moods is unusual: pres. optative in the subord. cl. (*saṃtáreyuḥ*), pres. subjunctive in the main cl. (*árṣāt*). With the optative he seems to be aiming at a future perfect (“will/would have crossed”) whose prospective action precedes that of the main verb, namely the

subjunctive referring to future time. Although I have not examined the entire RV with this in mind, these experiments in anteriority seem confined to -- or at least especially pronounced in -- the work of this poet. Note also that the poet makes no attempt to generate an opt. to the pf. *tatāra* or to use the already existing pf. opt. *tuturyā-* (RV 5x). This provides further evidence, if more were needed, against Dahl's claim that the pf. opt. denotes "epistemic possibility and anterior aspect" (*Time, Tense and Aspect*, p. 402 and in general pp. 392-402). If this were a stable function of the pf. opt., surely Viśvāmitra would have availed himself of that formation.

The vs. reprises much of the vocabulary from earlier in the hymn: *iṣitā indrajūtaḥ* is an elaboration on *indreṣita-* in 2a; the oft-repeated *prasavā-* returns again in the expression *prasavāḥ sārgataḥ* repeated from 4c.

III.33.12: The prospective action expressed by the opt. *saṃtāreyuḥ* in 11a is announced as completed by the aor. *ātāriṣuḥ ... sām* 'they have crossed', and the poet urges the rivers to flow again with a sequence of imperatives, elaborating on the subj. *ārṣāt* in 11c.

III.33.13: Hoffmann (Injunk, 93 n. 184) thinks the first impv. is concessive: "Mag eure Welle an die śamyās schlagen, die Geschirre lasst frei" -- this may well be, but a little hard to tell given our lack of teamster texts.

III.34 Indra

III.34.1: Gotō (1st class, 173–74) posits a separate root \sqrt{di} 'destroy' to account for 5 occurrences of *dāyate* ordinarily taken to mean 'divide' with the other occurrences of *dāyate*. (The forms in question are found in III.34.1, IV.7.10, VI.6.5, 22.9, and X.80.2.) He is followed by Lub and (at least in this passage and IV.7.10) WG. I see no reason to split the present into two and posit a second root; *vī dayate* 'divide into pieces, fragment' is simply another of the vivid images of destruction that RVic poets gloried in.

III.34.2: The sense of *jūtī-* as 'spur' here (on which see comm. ad III.3.8) is reinforced by *brāhmajūta-* 'spurred on by the sacred formulation' in the preceding vs., c.

I have tr. the nominal phrase *asi ... pūrvayāvā*, which comes out rather stiffly in English ("you are the fore-traveler"), into a smoother verbal expression.

III.34.3: The first two pādas of this vs. are rhetorically parallel, consisting of an etymological figure of augmented verb plus some part of the object (*vṛtrām avṛnot a, māyínām amināt* b), ending with a bv. formed with *-nīti-* 'leading, control'.

This interpr. of *vyāṃsa-* follows Schmidt (KZ 78 [1963]); see EWA s.v. *āṃsa-*.

In the second half-verse the subject takes an odd turn: after mention of Indra's iconic deed (besides the explicit mention of Vṛtra in a, see the echoes of the great Indra hymn I.32 in b *māyínām amināt* [I.32.4 *māyínām āmināḥ prótā māyāḥ*] and c *āhan vyāṃsam* [I.32.5 *āhan ... vyāṃsam*]), there is an abrupt switch to Agni phraseology. The same phrase *usádthag váneṣu* "burning at will in the woods" (?) is found in the Agni hymn III.6.7; cf. also *usádthag vānāni* also of Agni in the Agni hymn VII.7.2. The final pāda concerns the appearance of visible entities from the night, which also better fits an Agni context. For this reason I see a syntactic break in the middle of pāda c and take *usádthag*

vāneṣu with d, contra the standard tr. On the curious and problematic word *uśádhak* see comm. ad III.6.7 as well as Scar (197–99) at length. Both discussions conclude that *uśádhak* in III.6.7 should be a neut. noun, ‘(the) burning-in-the-wood’, rather than a straight root-noun adj. modifying Agni – though the adj. interpr. would work better here and in VII.7.2 – and in both places is, I think, simply a way of referring to Agni. Therefore I would (reluctantly) alter the tr. here to “The burning-at-will in the woods [=Agni] brought to light ...”

On *dhénā*- ‘milk-stream’ see comm. ad I.2.3 and Schmidt (Gs. Nyberg). Schmidt there suggests that the referent in this pāda is the dawns emerging out of the dark of the night. This occurs of course at the same time as the kindling of the ritual fire and would account for the shift in diction to Agni phraseology. This image can then be secondarily applied to Indra bringing the dawn cows out of the nocturnal darkness of the Vala cave.

III.34.4: The phonetic echo of *uśádhag* (3c) in *uśígbbhiḥ* (4b) reinforces both the thematic connection between these two vss. -- Indra’s production of light -- and the superimposition of Agni traits on Indra. As Schmidt (B+I 59) points out, the Uśij-priests, ordinarily associated with Agni, sometimes substitute for the Aṅgirasas in the Vala myth, but we should also note that it is esp. in Maṇḍala III that Agni is himself identified as an Uśij (III.2.4; 3.7,8; 11.2, 27.10); note also the Uśij-priests attending on him in III.2.9, 15.3.

III.34.5: The metaphorical use of *viveśa* ‘entered’ + an action (‘thrusts’) reminds me of the somewhat slangy English “get into” for “become enthusiastic about / energetically do (some action).”

The stem *barhánā*- otherwise only appears as an adverbial instr. ‘mightily’, and I am tempted to take it so here (as WG seem to do), rather than as the acc. pl. assumed in the publ. tr. However, the sandhi context is against this interpr.; note Old’s tart “Gewiss nicht *barhánā* Adverb (Hiatus!).”

As Ge points out, the referent of fem. gen. pl. *āsām* must be *dhíyaḥ* ‘insights’. For insights having bright color or hue, see the passages adduced by him (n. 5d): I.143.7 *śukrávarṇām dhíyam* and III.39.2, where *dhī-* wears silver garments. The *varṇam* here plays off *áryam varṇam* in 9d.

III.34.6: Another etymological figure appears in c: *vṛjána vṛjinān* “... the bent ones [i.e., morally twisted or corrupt] with his band [i.e., his circle of helpers bent around him],” both derived from $\sqrt{vṛj}$ ‘twist’, though the semantic connection is somewhat less obvious than in the etymological figures in 3ab.

There is another, thematic connection between vss. 3 and 6. As there, Indra here achieves his victory first with his comrades (*śárdha*- 3a), then with his tricks (that is, by “out-tricking” [*amināt*] with his shape-shifting abilities, *várpa*- 3b). In such cases his overwhelming strength might be almost superfluous -- hence my parenthetical “(though).” Note that *abhíbhūti*- (*abhí√bhū*) is a different lexical realization of *abhiṣṭi-* in 4b (if to *abhí√as*, as is the common opinion; cf. EWA s.v.).

III.34.8: The intense concentration on the root \sqrt{san} ‘win’ noted in the publ. intro. and the concomitant *s*-alliteration begin here.

On the clash of gender and deixis in *pr̥thivīm dyām utémām*, see comm. ad VIII.40.8.

III.34.9: The slightly awkward tr. “of many benefits” for *purubhójasam*, modifying the cow in d, is meant to capture its etymological relationship with *bhógam* in c.

The contrastive pairing of *dásyu-* and *ārya-* is striking here.

III.34.10: I do not see any semantic/functional difference between the imperfect *asanot* in a and b and the insistent pf. *sasāna* of vss. 8–9, though we might assume that the poet made the choice apurpose. Both Ge and Re render the forms in the same way (as do I); WG tr. *sasāna* as ‘er hat erlangt’ and *asanot* as ‘gewann’. Although I find the idea of rendering the two different grammatical forms differently appealing, I’m not sure that losing the root connection is worth it.

III.35 Indra

III.35.1: The first pāda is somewhat oddly expressed, at least as it is rendered in the publ. tr.: Indra is urged to mount the horses yoked to the chariot, but not only is horseback riding very rare in the RV, but no one is likely to mount a horse being used to pull a vehicle. This must be an awkwardly expanded version of the usual “mount the chariot” (see 4c below). There is an alternative interpr., which can rescue the expression. Patrick Stiles (as relayed to me by MLW) suggests that *tīṣṭhā* is a one-word clause, and the rest of pāda a is a nominal clause with *hārī* as nom. subject. Hence “Mount! the two fallow bays (are) being yoked to the chariot.” This avoids the horse-back-riding scenario and requires no change in the text. I might like the *ā* to be in a different place, but that seems a relatively minor problem.

The *niyūt-* ‘team’ is generally associated with, indeed belongs to, Vāyu, who is regularly called *niyūtvant-* ‘possessing *niyúts*’. However, the word is sometimes used in a reciprocal value: just as Vāyu and Indra drive to us with their *niyúts*, so do our *niyúts*, the ‘teams’ of poetic thoughts, drive in return to the gods, in passages where *niyūt-* is parallel to words for ‘thought, hymn’, etc. Cf., e.g., I.134.2, 135.2, VI.35.3, 47.14, VII.23.4, 90.1, X.26.1. It is therefore not nec., with Bloomfield (RVReps ad loc.) to assume that “*niyúto* is for *niyúdbhiḥ*.”

III.35.2: The most natural reading of *yáthā* in c is as a subordinator in a purpose clause (‘so that’) with the subjunctive *ā vahātaḥ* in d, and this is how the standard tr. take it. But there is a major stumbling block: the verb is unaccented. Old seems willing to emend to an accented verb; Ge suggests that if the unaccented verb is bothersome, assume an ellipsis in c. I have, in somewhat ad hoc fashion, taken *yáthā* as a sort of simile marker with *dravāt*. I am not entirely satisfied with this solution, but it does more or less fit category 4) in Gr’s lemma *yáthā*, and I am quite reluctant to put an unaccented verb into a subordinate clause. A similar phrase in the next hymn, where *yáthā* marks a localized comparison, gives support to the interpr. here; see III.36.6 *prasavāṇ yáthā* “like a shot” (tr. similarly by all standard tr.).

III.35.3: Medial *nayasva* is one of the relatively few middle forms to this pres. stem. It is presumably used here because Indra is leading his own horses.

The crux in this vs. is the hapax cmpd. *tapuṣpā-*. Gr glosses it ‘warmes trinkend’, perhaps referring to the gharma drink; in this he is tentatively fld by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *tāpuṣ-*). But this *-us*-stem, *tāpuṣ-*, refers only to heat, generally menacing scorching heat, and in any case the horses shouldn’t be drinking the gharma drink (or probably any hot drink at all). The word is discussed by Scar (305–6), who offers several possible interpr. The interpr. is made more difficult by the uncertain grammatical identity of the form. It appears in sandhi as *tapuṣpōtém*, is taken by the Pp. as *tapuḥ pā*, and is generally analyzed as a dual, modifying the bullish (horses) -- so Ge, Re, Scar, WG. However, Ge suggests in n. 3a that the form could represent irregular sandhi for *tapuṣpā(h) utá* (that is, a double application of sandhi, first losing the final *-s* before vowel and then coalescing the vowels) and therefore be a nom. sg., modifying Indra. I have adopted this solution; it doesn’t make much sense for the horses themselves to be doing the protecting, but Indra’s protective role would fit with the impv. *ava* ‘help’ in the next pāda.

In the last pāda Indra is urged to eat the roasted grains (*addhi dhānāḥ*). The same grains are prepared for the horses to eat in vs. 7: it seems somewhat surprising that Indra and his horses receive the same fodder, as it were -- though calling the horses Indra’s “comrades in joint revelry” in the next vs. (4b) suggests that they consume the offered meal together. I also don’t understand why the grains should be “of the same appearance every day.” This phrase is essentially repeated in III.52.8, which also contains 5 occurrences of *dhānā-* (or deriv.). Perhaps the point is that we unfailingly make the same offering to Indra daily; he needn’t worry that we will substitute inferior food.

III.35.4: The double etymological figure in pāda a is almost awkwardly heavy: *bráhmaṇā te brahmayújā yunajmi*, an awkwardness necessarily reflected in the tr.

III.35.7: All the clauses in this vs. are nominal sentences with past participle as predicate (*stīrṇám*, *sutáḥ* a, *kṛtāḥ* b, *rātāḥ* d). It is therefore misleading to tr. the last as “are given” (versus “has been strewn,” etc.) as in the publ. tr. I would change to “have been given.”

III.35.8: *prajānán vidvān* repeats 4d. The particular relevance of this phrase in either vs. isn’t clear to me.

III.35.9: Kü (477–80) discusses the stem *vāvas-* at length, rejecting the usual connection with \sqrt{vas} ‘desire, want’ and assigning it instead to $\sqrt{vās}$ ‘bellow’. (WG follow this interpr. in our passage; Lub still assigns this form to \sqrt{vas} .) Kü’s morphological arguments -- lack of *u*-redupl. and of root ablaut -- are strong. However, although I would concede that the form was derivationally original only to $\sqrt{vās}$, I would argue that once a stem *vāvas-*, built to $\sqrt{vās}$ ‘bellow’, became established, it was available to “migrate” to \sqrt{vas} ‘desire’, especially because the shortening of the root syllable in this metrically driven formation makes the form look more like \sqrt{vas} than $\sqrt{vās}$. Although the meanings of the two roots might seem so far apart that it would be hard to confuse one for the other, in fact the usual context of $\sqrt{vās}$ forms narrows the semantic gap considerably: cattle bellow because they want something. Kü allows for the possibility of semantic overlap as well.

III.35.10: The occurrence of 2nd sg. act. pres. impv. *pība* and aor. impv. *pāhi*, both to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’, in a disjunctive *vā* construction should give us a good opportunity to discern the functional distinction between the imperatives to these two tense-aspect stems, esp. since, as far as I can see, both imperatives would fit either of the metrical slots occupied. I have in fact tr. as if there is a functional difference: ‘drink’ versus ‘take a drink’, but I am not at all convinced that this is correct. Cf. the disc. of the positional tendencies of *pība* ad III.32.1 and note that the same pāda opening *indra pība* is found in the next hymn, III.36.2d. However, the same sequence of pres. and aor. to $\sqrt{pā}$ is found in III.36.3, so it may well be meaningful. (The standard tr. render *pība* and *pāhi* identically here.)

I take *prāyatam* in c with *yajñām* in d, contra the standard tr.

III.36 Indra

III.36.1: I confess to being somewhat puzzled by the first half vs., beginning with the identity of the 2nd ps. subject. My assumption is that it is the priest setting out the offering for Indra, not Indra himself, who is the 3rd ps. subject in cd. Pāda b (“being united with help”) would then express the priest’s receiving of Indra’s help, though the expression seems a little odd. The only similar passage I can find is V.42.8 *tāvotībhiḥ śacamānāḥ* ... “being accompanied by your help,” of the ritual patrons. It might instead be possible to take b with cd, modifying Indra “being at one with his (own) help.” The dvandva *śāsvac-chaśvat* in b matching *suté-sute* in c might weakly support such an interpr. (contra the standard tr. as well as my publ. tr.). Unfortunately the pres. *yādate* is not well enough attested to allow us to determine its usual subjects; of its 5 occurrences, 3 involve rivers uniting with the sea (as in 7a in this hymn).

The other question in this half-verse is how exactly to construe *sātāye dhāḥ*. The standard tr. take *prābhṛtim* as the subj. of an active infinitive *sātāye* -- perhaps most clearly in Keydana (Infinitive, 317 n. 132) “Mach, dass diese Darbringung siege,” taking Indra as the subject of *dhāḥ* (contra my identification of the priest as subj.). But I doubt that the *prābhṛti*- itself is the agent of winning. My publ. tr. takes *sātāye* as a passive, with (perhaps) Indra the implied agent: the offering is to be won by him. This interpr. may be supported by 2c *prayamyāmānān prāti sū grbhāya* “Grasp at (the drinks) being offered,” with *prā* \sqrt{yam} expressing the same notion as *prā* $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ in 1a and Indra’s gaining control of them in both passages. It might also be possible that *sātāye* is not being used as a real infinitive, and the phrase should be tr. “set this offering here for (our) gain” -- that is, when Indra takes the offering set out by the priest, there will be general gain for all of us but neither the offering nor Indra is the agent of an infinitival use of this dative. (This seems to be close to the WG interpr.)

III.36.2: *vidānāḥ* is another -- very clear -- example of a tense-stem participle serving as predicate. *Pace* Gr (fld. by Re) it most likely belongs to ‘know’ rather than ‘find’.

III.36.3: Both the pres. and the aor. stems of $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’ occur here, as in III.35.10. The situation is in fact even a bit more complex: as in III.35.10 both stems deploy imperatives here, *pība* opening pāda a, *pāhi* in d, but the latter is also in a complex diptych with the impf. *āpibah* (“just as you drank [*āpibah*] ..., so [take a] drink [*pāhi*] today ...”). As in

III.35.10 I have translated as if there is still an aspectual difference between the two stems, but I am not certain this is the case.

III.36.4: Indra in pāda a is identified with a large drinking vessel, in this vs. that emphasizes his size and capacity.

The b pāda begins and ends with etymologically related words: *ugrām* (adj.) and *ójah* (noun), though each is part of a different NP.

As Kü demonstrates (503–6), the pf. of \sqrt{vyac} is always presential.

III.36.5: The vs. begins with the two words that began the first two pādas of the last vs.: 4ab *mahāṁ ...*, *ugrām*; 5a *mahāṁ ugró*.

Ge (/WG, Scar [209]) take *samācakre* in b as transitive and supply ‘cows’ as object, from c. Although it is true that the middle pf. of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ is generally transitive, in this context, parallel to intrans. *vāṇrdhe* in pāda a, a nonce passive value can be imagined. In fact see (in this same maṇḍala) III.1.8 *vṛṣā yātra vāṇrdhé kāvyaena* “where the bull has grown strong through our poetic craft,” of which this pāda seems to be a variant, with the *vāṇrdhe* there anticipated in our previous pāda. Cf. Re “il s’est empli ... de pourvoir-poétique,” also intransitive. (Ge suggests this possibility in his n. 5b.)

Scar (209–10) makes heavier weather of *vājadā(h)* then seems necessary. He points out that the cows shouldn’t be giving prizes, which is logically true enough, but surely the point is that Indra is so generous that even the prizes he gives, the cows, give prizes of their own (the trickle-down gift economy). Their gifts are presumably, on the one hand, milk products and, on the other, new calves.

III.36.6–8: The next three vss. ring changes on the theme of large bodies of water and large containers of soma.

III.36.6: On *prasavām yāthā* see disc. of *dravād yāthā* ad III.35.2.

In b the problem is the simile *rathyēva* -- more precisely what the nominal in that sequence represents. The Pp. resolves it, not surprisingly, as *rathyā*. Gr takes this as an instr. to *rathī* ‘charioteer’; Ge also takes it as an instr. but to a stem *rathyā-* ‘Fahrstrasse’ (see Old, ZDMG 61 [1907] 831–32 = Kl.Sch.262–63). Old himself (so apparently also Re) favors a nom. pl. *rathyāḥ* with double application of sandhi. This is possible (see similar possible situation in III.35.3), but I wonder if it does not reflect the du. *rathyā* it appears to be. This hemistich reads like a brief reprise of Viśvāmitra and the rivers (III.33). For one thing, the past tenses (impf. *āyan* a, pf. *jagmuḥ* b) don’t make much sense if the point of the half-vs. is simply to serve as the standard of comparison for Indra’s width (pāda c), whereas the past tense does work in a brief re-narration of the situation in III.33. The word *prasavā-* here also echoes III.33, which contains 4 occurrences of that stem. And III.33.2 contains an undoubted example of the dual *rathyā* also marked as a simile in a similar context: *āchā samudrām rathyēva yāthaḥ* “you two drive like two charioteers to the sea,” referring to the two rivers, the Vipāś and the Śutudrī. The mixture of numbers, with pl. rivers in the frame and du. charioteers in the simile, is not surprising; even in III.33 the dual reference to these rivers soon gives way to plural. This mythic snatch having been told, the sea, so filled, is available to be compared, unfavorably, to Indra. Kü (77, 156, fld. by WG) also takes it as du, but as

referring to two chariot horses. If the form is accepted as a dual here, it will have to be detached from *rathyèva* in VII.95.1, which see comm. ad loc.

III.36.7: The standard tr. take pāda a as a simile, with the rivers *compared* to the priests of cd. I instead take the rivers as referring to the soma-purifying waters and consider b the predicate to a, with the pres. part. *bhárantaḥ* substituting for the main verb. At least in the transmitted text their simile would be unmarked, though most interpreters manipulate the text to produce a marker. Bl (RRs ad loc., referring to an earlier art. of his) suggests emending to *samudré ná* as in the otherwise identical pāda VI.19.5, a suggestion seemingly endorsed by Old and fld. by WG. However, the instr. *ūtíbhīḥ* with *yādamānaḥ* in 1b supports the instr. reading of *samudréṇa* here, and in 4 of its 5 occurrences *yādamāna-* is construed with an instr. This suggests that VI.19.5 has altered the formula, rather than vice versa. Ge follows a different path to a simile marker, haplology of *samudréṇa* **ná*. Since the text makes sense as is, I see no reason to change it.

The verse contains two parallel morphological word-plays: *bhárantaḥ* ... *bharítraiḥ* and *punanti* ... *pavítraiḥ*, each containing a neuter *-tra-* instrument noun. The latter, *pavíttra-* lit. ‘instrument for purifying’, is of course very well attested in the RV, referring to the soma-purifying filters, but *bharíttra-* is a hapax, obviously generated to match *pavíttra-*, including the *-i-*liaison vowel appropriate only to the seṭ root $\sqrt{pū}$, not to aniṭ $\sqrt{bhṛ}$. It is tr. ‘arm’ by all (going back to the Naigh.), but milking with the arms doesn’t make sense in either life or metaphor. I think it means rather ‘hand’ and participates in a different word-play within its pāda: an ‘instrument for carrying’ can easily be a hand, and so it is synonymous with *hástā-* ‘hand’ found in the immediately preceding word *hastín-* ‘hand-ed’. There is a further implied verbal twist, at least with my interpr. of ab: the rivers don’t have hands but carry anyway, while the priests do have hands but use their carrying appendages for something else. I’m afraid the publ. tr. needed to be quite heavy-handed to convey the deftness of this little play.

III.36.8: On *kukṣí-* as ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see Jamison 1987 (Ged. Cowgill).

As Ge also comments, the chronological sequence of pāda d seems reversed, assuming (as I generally do) that the perfect participle regularly expresses anteriority: Indra drank the soma before smashing Vṛtra. The primary VP here, *avṛṇīta sómam* is found in the great Indra hymn I.32.3, but with a different opening (*vṛṣāyāmānaḥ*).

III.36.9: Most tr. take Indra as the implied obj. of *mākiḥ* ... *pári ṣṭhāt*, thus displacing *etát* into an adverbial role (Ge/WG ‘dabei’). This is possible, but I take it as anticipating *dátram* in c.

On the form of *dátra-* see comm. ad IV.17.6.

III.36.9–10: Note that the vocabulary of the beginning of the hymn is being turned around reciprocally at the end: *bhara* (9a) and *prá yandhi* (9d, 10a) are imperatives addressed to Indra, urging him to bring/offer things to us, whereas in 1a *prábhṛtim* (at least in my interpr.) and 2c *prayamyāmānān* the same lexical expressions refer to things we offer to Indra. Other ring compositional echoes are the *dhāḥ* + datival infinitive (1a *sātáye dhāḥ* and 10c *jīvāse dhāḥ*) and the stem *śásvat-* (1b, 10d).

III.37 Indra

I have endeavored to preserve in tr. the consistent position of *indra-* in each vs., for which see the publ. intro. Other elements have had to be juggled; as is often the case, it is harder to honor the half-verse division in Gāyatrī than in trimeter.

III.37.1: On the retroflex in *pr̥tanāṣāhya-* see comm. ad IX.88.7. As for the semanto-syntactic structure of the form, see comm. ad III.24.1.

III.37.3–4: As Ge also suggests, Indra’s names (*nāmāni*) in vs. 3 form a complementary pair with his hundred *dhāman-* ‘forms, embodiments’ in 4.

III.37.5: Given *vājeṣu* beginning vs. 6, *vājasātaye* would have better been tr. “to win prizes.”

III.37.6: And here a plural “when the prizes (are set)” would be more accurate.

III.37.7: The vs. contains 5 locatives, 4 of them plural, and so the issue -- though not a particularly pressing one -- is to sort out what goes with what. I have taken them pāda by pāda. Different tr. distribute them slightly differently.

III.37.9: On the *indriyāṇi* dispersed among the five peoples, see Proferes (2007: 65).

III.37.10: Note the alliteration in pāda b: *dyumnām dadhiṣva duṣṭāram*.

The root √*tṛ* contributes two forms here: *duṣṭāram* (b) and *úd ... tirāmasi*. It is difficult to convey their root connection in Engl.

III.38 Indra

In addition to the usual tr., it is worth consulting Re’s alternative tr. in his *Hymnes spéculatifs* (29–31 + nn.), in addition to his later one in EVP XVII.

My interpr. both in detail and in overall outline differs significantly from others, but it is internally consistent and attempts to fit the many puzzling details into an overall schema. That this sometimes requires making interpretive leaps is a price I’m willing to pay. I lay out and support my choices in the comments on individual vss., though I do not chart every deviation from the various other tr. and defend them against those tr.

III.38.1: The 1st sg. pf. *dīdhayā* is taken by all as a straight indicative; the Pp. reads *dīdhaya* with short final vowel. My tr. “I ponder” reflects this analysis (Kü [257–60] having demonstrated that the indic. pf. of this root is always presential). However, I now wonder if this form could be a subjunctive with the unextended 1st sg. subj. ending *-ā*. Although lengthened forms of the indic. pf. ending *-a* do exist (e.g., *védā* 9x), they are relatively uncommon. And a subjunctive “I shall ponder ...” would open this speculative hymn nicely.

The standard tr. take *priyāṇi ... pārāṇi* as coreferential (e.g., Old “die fernsten, lieben (Dinge, Ereignisse)”). I prefer to take the two as contrastive, the nearby familiar things dear to the poet and far-away matters almost beyond his ken -- with the intensive (i.e., frequentative) part. *mármṛśat* conveying the restless activity of his mind. Realizing

that he needs the steadying hand of poetic tradition to help control his racing but fertile thoughts, in d he expresses his desire for poets belonging to that tradition to give a full account of what he is seeing -- though he does not deny that he himself has wisdom.

III.38.2: As I see the movement of the verse, in pāda a the poet sets himself to question the older generations of poets about their creative activity. Pāda b concerns this activity in the past and identifies *mānas-* ‘mind’ as the foundation (\sqrt{dhr}) for the creative act. (I might now alter the tr. to make this clearer, to “making their minds the foundation.”) In cd we turn to the present time and to the poet (*te*) (who addressed himself in a); the *prañī-* in c (on which see further below) are the products or models derived from the creative activity in b. In d it is made clear that these precedents, actively sought by the current poet’s mind, rest on the *dhárman-* ‘foundation’ not only of the mental activity of the former poets but also of his own mind.

The first technical issue in this vs. is whether *prcha* + ACC. here means “ask X” or “ask about X” (in German terms “fragen” vs. “fragen nach”); both uses of the accusative are possible with \sqrt{prch} . Related to this question is what *jānimā* means in this context: ‘births’, ‘generations’, ‘races’? With Ge and Klein (DGRV I.453–54), I take *jānimā kavīnām* to be the personages addressed, not (with Old, Re, Hoffmann [Inj. 225], Scar [276, 288], WG) the topic of the question. The poet is widening his range of interlocutors from the current poets (1d) to the long series of generations, back to the poets who themselves participated in the creation (2b).

With all modern tr./comm, I take *takṣata* as a med. 3rd pl. middle to the athematic present to $\sqrt{takṣ}$, rather than a 2nd pl. act. of the thematic stem, as Gr classifies it. I have added the self-beneficial “for themselves” to the tr. because, though the root $\sqrt{takṣ}$ is abundantly attested, this appears to be the only middle form in the RV. In keeping with my larger interpr. of the hymn as concerning two creations, the second of which was the product of poets conjuring up the differentiated cosmos by their verbal powers, I think the medial *takṣata* here signals the intimate engagement of the poets in the act of creation and the interpenetration of the things created and the creators themselves. Note also that our current poet lays some claim to this primal act by calling himself in 1a a *tāṣṭar-* ‘craftsman, fashioner’, the agent noun to the root $\sqrt{takṣ}$, which supplies the verb of creation in 2b.

The root-noun cmpd. *prañī-* is found only here in the RV, but the lexeme *prá√nī*, lit. ‘lead forth’, is very common as a verb form and in other cmpds. The word here has received a not particularly instructive variety of renderings, which I will not repeat. I think it means ‘precedent’ -- that is, the work of creation engaged in by the kavis of old provides the model for the current poet. This seems a reasonable semantic extension of ‘leading forth’. The precedents keep “growing stronger / increasing” both because the elements of creation keep proliferating and because the current poet becomes more familiar with them and adept at employing them.

In the last pāda these precedents that the poet has sought with his mind take up their position in his mind, ready to serve for his own creative endeavors. The older generations of poets were called “firm in mind, holding their minds firm” (or, see above, “making their minds the foundation”)(*manodhṛt-*) in b; it is fitting that their models, which he “sought with his mind” (*mānovāta-*), should now in turn take up their position on his own mind’s support (*dhármanī*). On the basis of the cmpd. *manodhṛt-* in b I supply

‘mind’ as the possessor of *dhárman-*. Most tr. (Ge, Re [twice], Hoffmann [Inj. 225], Klein DGRV I.453-54) interpr. the loc. *dhármani* as a rather vague adverbial (Ge, Hoff “in rechter Weise,” sim. Klein). I think it needs to be interpr. in full locative sense; Scar (276) and WG in separate ways do give it a locative interpr. but their tr. do not reflect its connection with *manodhṛt-* in b.

III.38.3: Before addressing the question of what pādas a and b have to do with each other thematically, we must first consider the small technical issue of the placement of *utá* at the beginning of pāda b. Since pāda a contains a participle (*dádhanāḥ*) and pāda b a main verb (*sám añjan*), it is unlikely that *utá* is conjoining the two pādas. Instead, with Klein (DGRV I.396–97), I think it is probably conjoining this hemistich with the preceding vs., with *utá* displaced to the beginning of pāda b after the participial phrase in a. This is very reminiscent of III.31.21, in this same Indra series, where the same explanation accounts for a rightward displacement of *ca* into the beginning of the second pāda of the clause.

As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this vs. describes the role of the poets in the second creation. It fleshes out the laconic *takṣata dyām* “They crafted heaven” in 2b. But what are they depositing in pāda a, and why? The first question can be restated as -- what should be supplied with *gúhyā*? The most common nouns appearing with that adjective are *nāman-* ‘name’ and *padá-* ‘traces, track’; either of these could work here because both can be used of the esoteric verbal production of the poets. “Secret names” would refer to the act of creation that involves dividing and naming the inchoate mass of material pre-creation; “secret traces” would refer to the esoteric poetry more generally. Here they seem to have pooled and deployed these secret elements, to use in their poetic ornamentation -- that is, in their detailed elaboration -- of the originally undifferentiated matter of the two worlds. Note that the participle is middle: it is their own names/traces that are in play.

In both Hymnes spéc. (1956) and EVP XVII (1969) Re tr. *sám añjan* as “ont consacré,” as an allusion to royal unction. The dat. *kṣatrāya* ‘for dominion’ makes this a tempting idea, though *sám √ añj* is not a standard technical term in the royal consecration. I certainly think this is a secondary meaning of this pāda, but in keeping with the rest of the hymn, I think the primary meaning must be creation through poetic elaboration. Since royal consecration does in fact make the person in question a new entity, the king, it can be conceptualized as a creation as well.

The 2nd half-verse is more clearly concerned with creation. The root *√ mā* ‘measure’ is of course regularly used in this connection, and as I said in the publ. intro., the separation of the two worlds in d is a standard cosmogonic image. Ge’s interpr. of c is rather aberrant and in part dependent on a passage in the PB, and his interpr. has not become the standard. Because of the accent on *mamiré*, I have supplied ‘when’ with the first half of pāda c, though the accent may simply result from the adjacency of the two verbs *mamiré* and *yemúḥ*.

The verb in d, *antáh ... dhuḥ*, is not a standard expression for ‘separate’ and in fact might be expected to mean ‘place between’. WG tr. in that way, supplying “Luftraum” (*antárikṣa-*): “Zwischen die beiden ... (Welten) setzten sie (den Luftraum) ...” This is a clever solution and it may be the original sense of the lexeme, which, however, I believe has evolved to mean, without an object, ‘place apart’, that is, separate by putting something in between.

I take *dhāyase* as belonging to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘suckle, nourish’, like the rest of the occurrences of this *-as*-stem. Re (EVP), Kü (395), and WG all follow this root assignment, but Ge and Re (Hymnes spéc.) take it to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’: “damit sie (die Herrschaft) ausüben” and “pour qu’ils se tiennent stables,” respectively. The separation of the two worlds is often presented as a boon for humans, so the ‘nourish’ interpr. seems more fitting, and the usual analysis of *dhāyas*- supports it.

III.38.4: As noted in the publ. intro., I believe that this vs. turns to the first creation, before the poets’ intervention that was presented in vss. 2–3. It is appropriate that the entities described here are unidentified, for this is the time before the poets brought their verbal skills to bear. The central figure in this vs. is introduced merely by an acc. participle (*ātīṣṭhantam* ‘mounting’). The form makes it clear that the referent is masculine and singular, but no other information is given; there is not even a pronoun. Likewise the subj. of the verb *pāri ... abhūṣan* ‘they tended’ is given only as *viśve* ‘all’. Again we know the gender (masc.) and the number (pl.), but not the identity: poets (from vs. 2)? gods (the frequent default referent of *viśve*)? Rather than suggesting referents for these two entities as the standard tr. do, I think we should accept that the lack of referential clues is deliberate.

Certainly it continues through the verse, though some details accumulate. In b the ‘mounting’ entity of pāda a is now presumably the subject. He wears beauties (*śrīyo vāsānaḥ*) and is self-luminous (*svārociḥ*); these descriptions begin to narrow the field, but not enough. (The only other occurrence of *svāroci-* modifies the Maruts, who are not likely to be in question here. And a number of different gods acquire *śrī-*.) In c he is identified as both a bull (or bullish one, *vṛṣan-*) and a lord (*āsura-*), neither particularly diagnostic, and the pāda claims to provide us with his “great name” (*mahāt ... nāma*). Indeed d seems at first to give us that name: *viśvārūpaḥ*. But the joke is on us, for not only is *viśvārūpa-* not a name but an epithet, but its literal meaning tells us that the lack of a single identifiable referent in this verse is the point. The word means “having all forms,” and so the entity we’ve been chasing through the vs. is in fact protean and cannot be pinned down to a single identity. He/it is creation before differentiation. (For a similar figure in a similarly mystical hymn in this maṇḍala, see III.56.3, where the androgynous figure is also called both a bull and *viśvārūpa*.)

The final pāda forms a tight ring with the first, in that the verb $\tilde{a}\sqrt{sthā}$ returns, and this time we get some indication of what he is mounting. But even this further specification falls short: it is simply *amṛtāni*, a neut. pl. adjective with multiple possible referents. This repetition makes the unfolding creation seem somewhat circular, but also incremental, in that new details accumulate, if slowly. But what seems to me an important clue has generally been ignored in the standard interpr. I find it impossible to believe that the repetition of $\tilde{a}\sqrt{sthā}$ was not deliberate, but all the standard tr. (save in part for Re, Hymnes spéc, though he fell in line in EVP) render the two occurrences quite differently: the first literally (‘mount’), but the second with the idiomatic meaning ‘assume’, with Ge and WG supplying ‘names’ with the adj. ‘immortal’ (Ge “... hat er unsterbliche (Namen) angenommen”). There are two obvious things wrong with this interpr: 1) the lexeme $\tilde{a}\sqrt{sthā}$ is extremely common and I know of no passage where it means ‘assume’; 2) translating it thus completely ignores the intra-vs. repetition, which at least to me is extraordinarily salient: the first word of the vs. is *ātīṣṭhantam*, the last

tasthau. I therefore assume that the pf. in d also means ‘mount’ and that the referent of the pl. ‘immortal’ is deliberately unspecified, but is something one could stand on -- in this case probably ‘worlds’ or some kind of solid ‘things’. Cf. VIII.52.7 (Vālakh.) *ā tasthāv amṛtaṃ divī* “[it] has mounted to the immortal (world?) in heaven” and (with *adhī* √ *sthā*) I.35.6 *amṛtādhi tasthuḥ* “they have taken their place on his immortal (foundations?).” The specification of a place to stand on enlarges the cosmic picture. Consider also 9c below with *tasthūṣo vīrūpā* “of him surmounting the various forms,” with √ *sthā* and -*rūpa*-.

III.38.5: The unidentified creature in vs. 4, finally identified as a bull or as bullish (*vṛṣan*-4c), returns in this vs., with a slightly different ‘bull’ designation (*vṛṣabhā*-). Here it is depicted as androgynous: though masc. in gender and called a bull, it gives birth (*āsūta*). Androgyny is a powerful signal of the lack of differentiation I have been discussing, since perhaps the fundamental, universal binary contrast is male : female.

The bull’s act of birth results in the desired differentiation that characterizes creation. This is expressed both by ‘many’ (*pūrvīḥ*) in b and, indirectly, by the address to the two sons of heaven (*dīvo napātā*) in cd. These two then seem to establish control over what has been created in the earliest time (*pradīvaḥ* ‘from olden days’) and therefore implicitly preside over time.

I would now be inclined to interpr. pāda b as an expression of possession, “His are these many proliferating riches.” Cf. VI.3.3, also IV.23.8. However, the context is not definitive.

I interpr. and construe *vidāthasya* in c differently from most, who take it with *dhībhīḥ*, with the interpr. further complicated by variant renderings of *vidātha*- (Ge “im Geiste der Weisheit”; Re [EVP] “grâce aux visions-poétiques de la cérémonie”; WG “mit den Einsichten der (Beute-)Verteilung”). None of these makes a lot of sense to me, and therefore, despite the adjacency of *vidāthasya* and *dhībhīḥ*, I construe the former instead with *kṣatráṃ* “dominion of/over the (cosmic) division.” On this sense of *vidātha*- see comm. ad VIII.39.1: though the word generally refers to the ceremonial distribution of wealth and then to the ceremony where this happens, it can also refer to other types of division, including the parts of the cosmos. It may be somewhat more daring to assume that *kṣatrá*- can take a genitive of what is ruled over -- I do not now have parallels -- but keep in mind that the root √ *kṣā* from which *kṣatrá*- is derived regularly takes such a genitive. If my interpr. is correct, the *vidātha*- refers to the cosmic divisions produced by the 1st creation.

As noted in the publ. intro., a number of referents have been suggested for the two sons of heaven, and as I also said there, I think this is missing the point. We remain in the realm of the 1st creation where entities may begin to proliferate but they are still not named. I suggested there that the two may be the two world halves (note that *kṣatrá*- was associated with them in vs. 3b and see 8c below), but it is also quite possible that the focus should be on the “two,” not on who exactly the two are: the first splitting of the primal unity.

III.38.6: The first half of vs. 6 simply expands on vs. 5. The same two kings have as their sphere of activity an increasing number (“three, many, all” *trīṇi ... purūṇi ... víśvāni*) of “seats,” that is (in my opinion), separated places, in the cosmic division (*vidāthe*) also

repeated from vs. 5. Note that the same verb *pāri* √ *bhūṣ* ‘tend to’ returns from 4a, where ‘all’ was the subject, not the object as here.

In the 2nd hemistich the poet, who has been absent since vs. 2, returns, with his mind (*mānasā*), and sees the whole of creation in detail (or so I surmise), down to the wind-haired Gandharvas -- all subject to the commandment of the two kings.

III.38.7: This vs. summarizes both creations. The first is dealt with glancingly in the first pāda. I take the neut. prn. *tād* ‘this’ as a reference to the not-yet-differentiated proto-creation, which belonged to and arose from the androgynous bovine of 5a, here explicitly identified first as masculine (*asya*: since this pronoun is unaccented, it does not modify what follows but functions as an autonomous pronoun), then as both bull (*ṛṣabhāśya*, as in 5a) and milk-cow (*dhenóḥ*). This is the first appearance of any explicit feminine principle in this hymn.

The rest of the vs. concerns the second creation, with the original unitary *tād* divided and fitted out with names and forms. Note the return of the creation verb √ *mā* ‘measure’, with *ā ... mamire* (b) and *ní ... mamire* (d) echoing *sām ... mamire* in 3c. The curious phrase *sákmyam góḥ* has caused some puzzlement among interpr. Although by formation the hapax *sákmya-* appears to be a neut. abstract derived from √ *sac* ‘accompany’, the standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) take the phrase as the equivalent of an animate creature, remarking that the companion of the cow must be the bull. But this not only ignores the abstract nature of *sákmya-* but also assumes that *góḥ* here refers narrowly to a female bovine, though the stem is regularly used as a cover term for bovines of both sexes. I take the phrase as meaning “the fellowship of the cow” (or better, though more awkwardly, “the fellowship of the bovine”) as a poetic description of what was depicted in pāda a, the joint activity of the bull-and-cow and its product. This undifferentiated creation is then measured out into individual parts and equipped with names. The subject of *ā ... mamire* in b is not identified, but I assume it is the same *māyínah* as the subject of *ní ... mamire* in d, whom I take to be the age-old poets we met in vs. 2–3.

Just as pāda b refers to the individual names, so does d refer to forms: the classical pairing of name-and-form (*nāmarūpa*) is thus distributed across the vs., as Ge already pointed out (n. 7b). I take *asmin* here as referring to the creation (it), rather than to a putative ‘him’ (as most tr. do). In the course of their creative activity the poets assume various powers (pāda c) to enable their individualizing work.

III.38.8: As was indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. is in certain ways a rephrasing of vs. 7, but updated, as it were, to the present day. The vs. begins exactly as vs. 7 did: *tād ín nv āśya*, followed by a genitive specifying the identity of the *asya* (*ṛṣabhāśya* 7a, *savitúḥ* 8a), a signal that vs. 8 is a second version of the immediately preceding vs. Hence, by my interpr., *savitár-* is the equivalent of the original creator, the bull-cow of 5a and 7a. I therefore do not think that this refers to the god Savitar, but is rather to be taken in its literal sense as “the impeller.” Or rather, since b = VII.38.1b (a Savitar vs.), the poet is identifying Savitar in his most generic sense with the Ur-creator, the one who “set in motion / impelled” the creation.

The poet disclaims any part in that original creation (*nákir me*), and the firmly fixed golden emblem of b seems to me to represent the static, undifferentiated result of

the first creation. It reminds us of the *hiranyagarbha* of X.121, another image of undifferentiated creation.

But in cd (at least in my view -- the interpretations vary quite a lot) the poet identifies himself with the poets of old (of 7bcd). In c most tr. supply a verb, with the *ródasī* phrase as its object: Ge “(bringe ich)”; Re “(Savitar) a suc(cité)”; while Kü (457) takes cd as a single clause, with #*ā* (c) and #*āpi* (d) both preverbs with *vavre*. I think, by contrast, that this is a nominal sentence with *ródasī* as subject. The two world-halves are credited with a role in the second creation, the same role they may play in 5cd (see comm. there): they set everything in motion. *But* they do so through the stimulus of a *sustutī-*, a ‘good praise-hymn’, and I take this praise-hymn to be the product of the 1st ps. poet, who disavowed a role in the first creation in 8a, but takes credit for contributing to the second creation in 8c. If my interpr. with *ā* as an adverb ‘here’, seems too radical, it would be possible to supply a verb, as others have done – but I suggest *√prā*: a quick glance through Lub shows that the most common verb with *rodasī* and *ā* is *prā* (see in this maṇḍala III.2.7, 3.10, 6.2, 34.1, 54.15 as well as numerous exx. in other maṇḍalas). This would yield an alt. tr. “he has [/ I have] filled the two world-halves ...”

The puzzling pāda to me is d, and my publ. tr. is opaque even to me. I have now rethought it and will propose here a modified tr. and interpr. First, I suggest returning to Gr’s grammatical analysis of *vavre* as a 1st sg., not a 3rd sg. (as all subsequent tr. have taken it, incl. my publ. tr.). I take the pāda now as the current poet’s boast, asserting his place in the poetic lineage. The lexeme *āpi √vr* means ‘swaddle, cover over’, as the simile of the woman and her children (one reading of *jānimāni* here) makes clear. But such a meaning can both be protective and somewhat arrogant or threatening. To understand the sense of the frame here, we need to go back to 2a, where the tremulous poet asked the previous generations (*jānimā*) of poets about their creative acts. I think these same poetic generations are what’s referred to here, but here our newly confident poet “covers” them -- on the one hand, in a protective sense, like the young woman swaddling her children. He protects their legacy by continuing it. But ‘cover over’ can also mean ‘conceal’, and in this sense the poet boasts that he will (or has?) become more skilled than they and cover up their achievements with his own. I would therefore retranslate the pāda as “I have covered over / swaddled the (poetic) generations like a young woman her children.”

III.38.9: As discussed in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as showing both contributors to the second creation -- the two (world-halves) from 8c and the masters of artifice (*mayīnaḥ*) from 7d -- bearing witness to our poet’s new skill. In the first half of the verse the two (world-halves) begin by bringing to success the first creation of “the age-old great one” (*pratnāsya ... mahāḥ*). I supply the equivalent of *tād* in pāda a, picked up by *yād* at the end of the pāda and further specified by *daivī svastīḥ* beginning b. The standard tr. instead take a and b as separate clauses, with *daivī svastīḥ* somewhat loosely construed with b.

In c the sequence *gopājihvasya* is variously interpr. Ge (/WG), Re (Hymnes spéc.), and, at least partially, Old read it as two words, the first nom. *gopā*, the 2nd emended to *jīvāsya* (Ge, WG) or *jagatas* (Re; he gives no accent, but it should be *jāgatas*) -- attaching pāda c to b and taking d as a separate clause. I see no reason in this case to go against the Pp, which considers the form a cmpd, much less to emend the text so

severely. Instead I take the two apparent genitives in c (*gopājihvasya tasthūṣaḥ*) as referring to the current poet: he boasts that his tongue is a herdsman -- that is, it marshals words -- and that he surmounts the various forms (*vīrūpā*) -- that is, he has (verbal) control over the differentiated forms of the second creation. The poet has achieved his vocation. For the tongue, see vs. 3 of the following hymn (III.39.3b), where the poem, the hymnic vision, “mounts the tip of (the poet’s) tongue.” A form of the root $\sqrt{sthā}$ is also found in the same pāda.

III.39 Indra

Though nowhere near as obscure as the previous hymn, the first three vss. of this one also portray poetic craft and, especially, poetic inspiration.

Morphological parallelism and lexical repetitions dominate the rest of the hymn.

III.39.1: $\sqrt{vañc}$ means ‘move crookedly, meander’, but encompasses a number of different types of such motion, including circular or wave-like motion. Here I think it refers, rather charmingly, to a bending, curling movement made in order to come out of a small opening. (English ‘scrunch’ might be accurate, but is also inelegant.) The poet’s heart is thus configured as a smallish container from which his thought must gracefully exit -- a characteristically female gesture perhaps. I very much doubt that she is galloping, à la WG.

The publ. tr. should be altered to “when being recited” to reflect the present participle and to match the identical phrase in 2b.

III.39.2: Ge (/WG), Scar (142) take *divāḥ* as temporal (“noch vor Tag geboren”). This is possible and would fit with the *jāgrviḥ* ‘wakeful’ and, perhaps, with the silvery garments of c (if they refer to dawn). Nonetheless, with Re (see also Ge’s n. 2a, where he suggests that the spatial interpr. is better), I take it as spatial “from heaven.” The vs. contrasts the immediate presence of the *dhī* (*séyām asmé* “this one right here in us”) with her origin as a product of age-old divine and ancestral inspiration (*sanajā pītryā*), and *divás cid ... pūrvyā* seems to me to participate in this balanced contrast.

III.39.3: The first pāda of this vs. is a definitional truism: the cmpd. serving as subject, *yama-sūḥ* ‘twin-bearing’, is split into its component parts in the VP, *yamā ... asūta* ‘bore twins’. The question is who are the twins. Given the context, I find Old’s suggestion (fld. by Re) that this is a metaphor for speech production and that the twins are, perhaps, the verse (*īc-*) and *sāman* more plausible than Ge’s interpr. (flg. Sāy.) that the twins are the Aśvins and the birth-giver is Uṣas. I take the mother to be the *dhī*- who was the subject of the previous vs.; note that *dhīḥ* is the last word of vs. 2.

Since I take the same noun to be subject of b, *pātāt* emerges as a problem, since it is presumably a neut. nom./acc. act. participle but qualifies the action of the proposed fem. subj. Given the tendency for neut. NA forms to be used adverbially, I so interpr. it here (as Re also seems to: “en volant”), rather than (with Ge [/WG]) introducing neut. *mānaḥ* ‘mind’ here for it to modify.

This hemistich echoes some of the vocabulary and themes found in the previous hymn. *asūta* in pāda a matches *āsūta* in III.38.5a, and note that the apparent product of this birth is also a dual in III.38.5c. As noted ad III.38.9c, both the tongue and the

mounting in that pāda are found in our 3b. I do not think the same events and entities are referred to in these passages, but they do seem to have a similar view of the relation between poetic speech and creation.

The standard tr. interpr. c as meaning that the pair just born associate with some kind of generic beauty (Ge “Schönheit,” Re “les formes-de-la-beauté”), but *vápūṃṣi* are esp. associated with Agni in Maṇḍala III, where he assumes or bears these wondrous forms (cf., e.g., III.1.8, 18.5, 55.9, 57.3; though admittedly he is not the only entity that has such forms). I think the *vápūṃṣi* of Agni are at issue here, and the pair -- verse and sāman -- accompany them as the ritual speech being recited when the ritual fire is blazing.

Unfortunately the verse-and-sāman interpr. does not fit as well in pāda d, where we might wish the dual “smashers of darkness” to be endowed with light one way or another. The only other occurrence of this stem modifies Agni, and Agni is several times subj. of the phrase *tāmaḥ √han* (V.14.4, VIII.43.34). This phrase once has a dual subj. (VI.72.1 *viśvā tāmāṃsy ahatam*), but the subj. there is Indra and Soma, whom we surely do not want to introduce here. It is worth noting that the Aśvins, the subjects here acdg. to Ge et al., are not found as subj. of this expression. Since I think there is good support for the verse-and-sāman interpr. in the rest of the vs., I would argue that these forms of ritual speech are called smashers of darkness because of their role in the dawn sacrifice.

III.39.4: The next part of the hymn seems driven by the rhetoric of morphology, both parallelisms and contrasts. In this vs. note the heavy *-i/anā-vant-* forms *māhināvān* and *daṃsānāvān* stationed at the end of successive pādas (c, d), which are followed by *dākṣiṇāvān* at the end of 6d and the neut. *barhāṇavat* at the end of 8d.

Pādas a and c contain what appear to be matching sequences that conceal morphological differences:

#(*nákir*) *eṣām ninditā* ...

#(*índra*) *eṣām dṛṃhitā* ...

The two *-itā* forms are respectively an agent noun (*ninditā*) and a neut. pl. ppl. (*dṛṃhitā*), though the two *eṣām* have the same grammatical identity and referent and the first word in each pāda is the subject.

III.39.5: The interweaving of lexicon and morphology continues in this vs. Pāda a contains two forms of the same stem: *sákhā* ... *sákhībhiḥ*, and the instr. pl. is found four more times in the vs. (adjacent *návagvaiḥ*, b *sátvabhiḥ*, c *daśábhīr dásagvaiḥ* the last pair with their own etymological play). Pāda-final *dásagvaiḥ* also parallels *návagvaiḥ* ending pāda a, and *sátvabhiḥ* of b is more subtly connected with *satyám* beginning c.

On *abhijñú-* see Scar (344–45).

III.39.6: The 2nd hemistich has intensely alliterative (partially) etymological figures: *gúhā hitám gúhyam gūlhám apsú, háste dadhe dākṣiṇe dākṣiṇāvān*. The first half is more restrained but note the morphological pair *padvát* ... *śaphávat* and the repetition of *viveda* from 5d.

The phrase *náme goḥ* is puzzling, and the hapax represented by *náme* has not standard interpr. Gr (s.v. *náma-*, thus a loc. of an *-a*-stem) glosses ‘Weide, Weideplatz (?)’. Ge refuses to tr. *náme*. Old suggests ‘Sichneigen’, which is essentially literal (if to

√*nam* ‘bow, bend’ and not very helpful. Re ‘domaine’, which makes sense but is not clearly related to its supposed etymon; WG “beim Zuteilen der Kuh,” also without accounting for the semantic development. Most likely both Re and WG are assuming a derivation from the probably separate PIE root **nem*, as in Greek νέμω ‘distribute’, though with different semantic devs. Like Old I also take it literally, as the loc. sg. of a thematic noun to √*nam* ‘bend, bow’, but suggest that “the bend of the cow” is some sort of homely spatial metaphor drawn from knowledge of cow anatomy indicating a hidden or protected place. English ‘oxbow’ for a U-shaped configuration of a river is a similar application of pasturage terminology to physical space. Cf. also *ukṣṇó rándhram* (VIII.7.26) “the loins of the ox,” which I also think is a way of referring to the Vala cave. See comm. ad loc. This tentative interpr. of *náme* assumes it is not the equivalent of the equally puzzling OAv *nəmōi* twice in Y 46.1, a form that appears to be a dative, possibly in infinitival use (which would make it a root noun, not an *a*-stem).

Pāda c is found identically in II.11.5 and X.148.2. In the former its referent is Vṛtra; in the latter I also take it as Vṛtra, though others opt for Soma. The referent here is unclear, but with HPS (B+I 142–43) I think the most likely candidate is the *mádhu* of pāda a, and that *mádhu* is the sun/light: “the concentrated honey” of the dawns. Lending support to this interpr. as the sun, see X.72.7 *átrā samudrá ā gūḍhám, ā sūryam ajabhartana* “then you brought here the sun, which was hidden in the sea.”

III.39.7: The IXth class *vṛṇīta* in pāda a is ambiguous: it can be either injunctive or optative; the standard tr. take it as the former, expressing straight past time. I instead interpr. it as optative, primarily because of the parallelism with 8a, where the light chosen in 7a, “should suffuse the two world-halves” with opt. *ānu syāt* (note also *syāma* in 7b, 8b). However, the ambiguity of *vṛṇīta* allows it serve as pivot between the past-time narration of vss. 4–6 and the expressed wishes of 7–8.

The rendering of *purutāmasya* in the publ. tr. makes it seem to qualify the hymns, not the bard. The tr. could be slightly emended to “... of the bard, who is the latest of many.”

III.39.8: Pāda b seems to pose an almost deliberate syntactic challenge. The adverbial *āré* ‘at a distance’ is normally construed with an ablative, as in 7b *āré syāma duriṭāt*, but in 8b we have the same phrase but with the noun in the genitive: *āré syāma duriṭásya bhūreḥ*. Or so it is taken by everyone, including me. But I now wonder if the ambiguous form *bhūreḥ*, which could be genitive or ablative, is in fact the latter and is not modifying *duriṭásya* but rather governing it: “May we be at a distance from an abundance of difficulty.”

III.40 Indra

III.40.1–2: The difference, if any, between *pāhi* (1c) and *pība* (2c) is as usual not clear. See disc. ad III.35.10. If we are looking for ways to distinguish them, *ā vṛṣasva* “drench yourself in it,” immediately following *pība* in 2c, might support a more durative interpr. of the pres. impv., as perhaps would the adj. *tāṭṛpi-* if it has intensive semantics ‘ever satisfying’.

III.40.2: Since $\tilde{a}\sqrt{vr̥s}$ takes genitive objects almost exclusively (see X.116.4), *tātr̥pim* is best construed with *pība*.

III.40.3: The adj. *dhitāvan-* is not entirely clear. It is a possessive -*van*-stem to the ppl. *dhitā-* ($\sqrt{dhā}$); as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.560), it unusually preserves the *dh-* that is found in this ppl. only as 2nd member of a cmpd or under certain sandhi conditions. The final has been lengthened as is normal in these stems: in the RV only *maghāvan-* has a short final vowel before the -*van*-suffix. Cf. also the numerous -*ā-vant*-formations in the previous hymn (III.39.4, 6, 8). But what does it mean? The form occurs only here and in III.27.2, modifying Agni. Gr (flg. BR) glosses it as ‘gabenreich’, Ge “der das Erwartete (?) bringt,” whose connection to $\sqrt{dhā}$ I don’t understand. Both Re’s “pourvu (d’offrandes) présentées” and WG’s “das Vorrat habend” may be closer to the mark; see also Old’s tr. [SBE] of III.27.2 “in whom (manifold wealth) has been laid down.” But what is most characteristically *hitā-* at the sacrifice is the ritual fire, $\tilde{a}\sqrt{dhā}$ being the technical term of establishing that fire, and I therefore suggest that the sacrifice with its fires established is at issue here. Some support for this interpr. may come from the last phrase *stavāna viśpate* “o you who are praised as clan-lord.” The epithet *viśpāti-* is ordinarily used of Agni, so Indra is here being praised as Agni, and it is Agni who both is and oversees the ritual fires.

III.40.5: This is the first vs. that doesn’t begin with voc. *īndra*; the voc. surfaces only in the middle of b, an unprominent position. But its place is somewhat taken by phonologically similar *īndavaḥ* at the end of the vs., and initial *īndra* reappears in 6c.

III.40.7: Contra Old and WG, I agree with Ge and Re that *vanīnaḥ* is the ‘wooden’ word and is not a derivative of \sqrt{van} ‘win’. The focus in this hymn is very narrowly on the ritual situation.

III.40.8: This is the only vs. in the hymn without a form of *īndra-* (7 of the 8 of those forms being vocatives, the lone exception *īndram* in 7b). Here voc. *vṛtrahan* is substituted.

III.40.8–9: On the “magic square” of these vss., see publ. intro. Vs. 9 actually seems to be covering the logical possibility that Indra might not be either far or near but somewhere in between, and in that case the exhortation in vs. 8 to come from nearby or far away might not work.

III.41 Indra

III.41.1: The 1st persons *naḥ* and *madryāk* are somewhat awkwardly doubled. With Ge I take *naḥ*, found in (modified) Wackernagel’s Position in pāda a, with *sómapītaye* in b, and *madryāk* ‘in my direction’ with the verb of motion in c.

III.41.2: I now find ‘seasonal, at its season’ a somewhat misleading tr. for *rtvīya-* in a ritual context and would substitute ‘at the proper time’ here; see comm. ad III.29.10, X.28.5.

III.41.6: It is curious that the impv. *mandasvā* is not accented in this clause, despite the *hí*, nor is it in the identical vs. VI.45.27 or in VI.23.8 also with *sá mandasvā hí* ... I have no explanation; Old notes the lack of accent and gives a ref. to his treatment in ZDMG 60, but in fact there he does nothing more there than note the passages.

III.41.7: The 1st pl. them. *jarāmahe* is perfectly ambiguous between ‘(be) awake’ and ‘sing’, and all other tr. assign it to ‘awake’ -- incl. WG, though Gotō (1st class, 154) assigns it with certainty to ‘sing’. I have also tr. as ‘sing’, though nothing is at stake between the two renderings.

III.41.8: Most take *hári-priya-* as ‘loving the *hári*’ (e.g., Re “qui aime les alezans”); I have reversed the direction of affection: “dear to the fallow bays,” primarily because better attested *puru-priyá-* means ‘dear to many’ not ‘loving many’, though the accent difference between them may signal a difference in meaning. (However, the special accentual behavior of compounded *puru-* muddies the waters.)

III.42 Indra

III.42.1: The relative clause in c is somewhat tricky. The standard tr. (though Ge hesitates in his n. 1c) take the subject to be soma and take *hárībhyām* with ab, starting the rel. cl. with *yáh* in 2nd position (type “come with your fallow bays to our soma, which is for you and seeking us”). I am reluctant to break the pāda in that way -- though given *ukthébhiḥ* at the beginning of 4c, which must go with the preceding pāda, with a new clause beginning *kuvíd*, this is not much of an argument. More importantly, since *tvām asmayúḥ* in the immediately preceding hymn (III.41.7) has Indra as the referent, I am reluctant to have identical *asmayúḥ* modify soma here. (Old cites some passages in IX where this adj. does modify soma, but those cases describe the preparation of soma and his/its journey towards us, the priests, whereas here the soma is stationary and Indra is journeying towards it and, as its preparers, us.) My interpr. leaves *te* as the problem -- where to construe it and whether it can be coreferential with *yáh*. The 2nd question can be answered affirmatively; nothing forbids *yáh* from 2nd ps. reference here. As for the first, I take it with *hárībhyām*, a solution I find somewhat unsatisfying, since possessive genitives are not usually necessary in these situations. But cf. *máma* in 3a below, also in a situation where the possessor doesn’t need to be overt.

III.42.3: Note the alliteration framing the first two pādas: #*índram itthā* ... *iṣitā itáh* #.

III.43 Indra

The publ. tr. attempts to convey the density and distribution of the many words for ‘here’, ‘nearby’, ‘close’.

III.43.1: The standard tr. take *úpa barhīḥ* with the next pāda (“call you to the ritual grass”); Sāy. agrees with my version (see Ge’s n. 1c). There is no principled way to decide, and very little depends on it.

It is not easily possible to register the pun of *havya*(*vāhaḥ*) ‘oblation’ (to *√hu* ‘pour’) and *havante* (to *√hvā* ‘call’).

III.43.4: The reference to Indra changes from 2nd ps. in ab to 3rd in cd. It would be possible to attach ab to the preceding vs., which also has Indra in 2nd ps., and take cd as a new sentence. But the fact that both ab and cd have subjunctives (*vāhātaḥ* and *śṛṇavat*) suggests that the two clauses go together.

Because of the accent on *vāhātaḥ*, the *ca* is likely subordinating, as in fact the standard tr. (and I) take it. However, the sequence *ā ca* (...) *√vah* shows unexpected accent on the verb form elsewhere (I.74.6, X.110.1), so it is possible that ab is a main clause with the verbal accent produced by this curious formulaic usage; see comm. ad I.74.6.

III.43.5: 2nd ps. reference to Indra returns here, in *kuvīd* clauses otherwise parallel to the one in 4cd with 3rd ps. ref.

Ge (fld. by WG and by me) takes the pf. part. *papivāṃsam* as expressing the cause of Indra’s action.

The transmitted Saṃhitā text *ma ṛṣim* must be read contracted, as *mārṣim* (so HvN) to achieve a Triṣṭubh line; the Pp. correctly analyzes this sandhi sequence as *mā ṛṣim*.

III.43.6: The final word of this vs., *mūrāḥ*, is generally taken as distinct from *mūrā-* ‘stupid, foolish’ and as an acc. pl. fem. with *ātāḥ* (e.g., Ge “die verschlossenen (?) Töre”). I follow Old’s final suggestion that it belongs to the normal stem *mūrā-* and refers to the horses; English “dumb beast” is a reasonable analogue.

III.44 Indra

On the extended pun in this hymn, see publ. intro.

III.44.2: The two pāda-final *-āya*-causatives, *arcayaḥ* (a) and *arocayaḥ* (b), are also near phonological matches.

III.44.3: This is the middle vs. of the hymn and (comparatively) more complex than the rest. As in 2ab, the first two pādas end with morphologically parallel formations, the accusatives *hāri-dhāyasam* (a) and *hāri-varpasam*, both with *-s*-stems as 2nd member and *hāri-* as 1st. The standard tr. obscures this parallelism by giving them quite different interpr., with *hāri-* in the first cmpd serving as apparent obj. to *dhāyas-* (Ge “der den Goldigen nährt,” sim. Re and WG; also Gr), while the second cmpd is rendered as a straight bahuvrīhi. By this interpr., in the first cmpd. *hāri-* refers to soma (so Gr, Re) or soma or the sun (Ge [WG]), while the *hāri-* in the 2nd is simply a term of color or material. Given the structure of this vs. and the parallel structure in vs. 2, I think the two cmpds should be interpr. in a similar manner and that the “golden nourishment” of heaven would be the sunlight. However, I do concede that in some other *X-dhāyas-* cmpds the 1st member may be the recipient of the nourishment (e.g., *arí-dhāyas-* ‘having nourishment for the stranger’, *kārú-dhāyas-* ‘having nourishment for the bard’ – though

cf. *viśvá-dhāyas-* ‘affording/deriving all nourishment’), and so I would consider a tr. ‘having nourishment for the golden’, though I think this is the less likely possibility.

In c I assume a clause break after *ādhārayat* and take the rest of cd as a nominal cl. with *bhójanam* as subj. For a similar constr. with *bhójanam* cf. VII.68.5 *citrām ha yád vām bhójanam nv ásti*.

The poet has cleverly managed to gather the root \sqrt{dhr} into the pervasive verbal play of the hymn, by stationing the dual form *hárītoḥ* in a sandhi position where its initial surfaces as *dh*, hence *ādhārayad dhárītor*. This *dh* repetition resonates with (*hári-*)*dhāyas-* in pāda a. Meanwhile in c the double *dh*-alliteration of the first two words is matched by double *bh*-alliteration in *bhūri bhójanam*.

III.44.4: Pāda-final *rócanam* (b) echoes pāda-final *arocayaḥ* (2b) symmetrically around the central vs., as well as rhyming with pāda-final *bhójanam* in 3c.

III.44.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the insistently golden vajra of vs. 4 (*hárītam ... āyudham ... vājram ... hárīm*) is transformed into a silvery one (*árjunam, vājram*), but keeps the *har* phonology in the participle *haryántam* ‘gladdening’, also modifying the vajra. A different color-type term, *śukrá-* ‘gleaming, bright’ is also used of the accoutrements of the weapon; the instr. pl. *śukraīḥ* is again a surprise: we would expect *hárībhiḥ*.

And in fact we get two forms of the latter in the last hemistich. In one of them the poet uses the sandhi trick he employed in 3c to produce an initial *dh*: (*ápāvṛṇod*) *dhárībhiḥ*, which allows the sequence *dhárībhiḥ ádribhiḥ* to read as a virtual anagram.

This last half-verse introduces Vala-myth phraseology (*ápāvṛṇot, úd gāḥ ... ājata*) in a hymn that otherwise lacks any mythic references. This Vala theme seems particularly out of place because the soma and the vajra play little or no role in the Vala myth but are strongly associated with the Vṛtra myth. I am uncertain of the identity of the *hárībhiḥ* who participate in the driving up of the cows in d. Ge and Re confidently supply ‘horses’, and that is of course the default interpr. of this form in an Indra context. But Indra’s horses are not actors in the Vala myth elsewhere, as far as I can remember. His helpers in the Vala myth are the Aṅgirasas, so perhaps they qualify as golden here. Or perhaps it refers to the golden lights of the dawns and is an instr. of accompaniment with *gāḥ* (“drove up the cows along with the golden [dawn lights]”).

III.45 Indra

III.45.1: Although I use the Engl. word ‘gladdening’ here as in the last hymn, the repetition is misleading. The Skt. word here tr. is *mandrá-*, whereas in the last hymn it was *haryatá-*.

The simile concerning the bird and the snare is reminiscent of the much more obscure image in I.125.2, in which an animal of some kind seems to be bound up and captured.

III.45.2: In the string of agentive phrases that entirely make up this vs. the poet manages a certain variety of syntactic patterns: standard tatpuruṣa with 1st member obj. (*vṛtrakhādá-*), tatpuruṣa with accusative 1st member (*valamrujá-* [note that without the

acc. marker it would be a metrically unfavorable four light syllables]), agent noun with genitive (pāda bc, 4x with 3 separate agent noun types: *purāṁ darmá-*, *apāṁ ajá-*, *sthātar-
ráthasya*, *hāryor abhisvará-*), agent noun with acc. (*dṛlḥā ... ārujā-*). The relentless repetition of nom. sg. agent phrases makes it quite certain that the Pp. loc. sg. reading *abhisvaré* should instead be taken as nom. sg. -*aḥ*, with Old. All standard tr. agree. The only argument against this that I can see is that *hāryor abhisvarāḥ* would be the second GEN + simple -*á*-stem agent phrase (after *apāṁ ajāḥ* in b), and if the poet was serious about producing the phraseological variety I have just catalogued he might have avoided a repetition by couching this phrase in the loc. (“at the calling of the two fallow bays”). The only other occurrence of *abhisvará-* is in the loc. (-*e* in sandhi, also pāda-final) and means ‘call’, not ‘caller’ (X.117.8). Still, I do not think this arg. is strong enough to counter-balance the pressure of the nom. sg. sequence.

III.45.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this is the middle vs. of the hymn, and it contains four similes, which are interlocked in interesting ways. In the first half-verse both similes target *krátum* ‘resolve, will’. In the first the term held in common (*gambhirān* ‘deep’) has been attracted in number to the upamāna (*udadhīn* ‘pools’), though the position of the *iva* probably shows that ‘deep’ lies outside the simile proper (*gambhirān udadhīm iva, krátum ...*). This simile is not dependent on the verb, while the second one (*krátum puṣyasi gā iva* “you foster it like cows”) requires the fosterage of the verb *puṣyasi* for the comparison to make sense. That is, Indra’s will is like cows only in that he cultivates it and helps it prosper, whereas it is “deep” regardless of any verb that might govern it.

The second hemistich contains two parallel similes, both bipartite, with a nom. pl. referring to entities that reach an acc. goal: cows / pasturage, brooks / lake. The first, the bovine one, seems generated from the cow simile of pāda b, esp. as the adj. *sugopá-* (c) contains the same *gó-* as *gāḥ* in b. The interesting thing about this half-verse is that the frame, the upameya, is not expressed at all. There is neither an overt nom. of the entity(/ies) in motion nor an acc. goal -- simply the simile marker *iva*. The comparison is wide open. Sāy. suggests that soma drinks are the subj. to be supplied, and he is followed by the standard tr. (and Old). Old suggests that the goal is either “you” (=Indra) or his *krātu-*; Re shares his uncertainty, while Ge (/WG) supply “dich.” Although it is true that *āśata* takes soma drinks as subject in other passages (see Ge’s n. 3cd), this hymn does not otherwise mention soma, and I am wary of supplying it out of nowhere. I prefer to take *krātu-* as subj., either in the pl. (‘resolves’ as in the publ. tr.) or, as Ge. suggests in n. 3cd, as a sg., with the verb attracted to the number of the subjects of the two similes. And I take *āśata* in a different sense in the frame than in the similes -- without expressed goal as “reach fulfillment, achieved (their goal),” although I recognize that the overwhelming number of occurrences of this verb do have expressed goal.

III.45.4: The simile in b is not clear, in great part because *prāti √jñā* appears to be employed in some technical sense that we have no handle on. The lexeme is not common in Vedic and seems to mean ‘greet, welcome’ (or perhaps just ‘recognize, acknowledge’) in the Vāstospati hymn, VII.54.1, and in other texts ‘acknowledge, respond’ vel sim. In post-Vedic Skt. it means ‘promise’ or the like. Since *āmśa-* ‘portion’ may also have a technical or legal sense, this phrase may belong to a stratum of language that we have no access to at this period. My feeling is that it has to do with the acceptance or rejection of

something offered, as *prati* √ *grah* signals acceptance of a properly given gift (see Sac. Wife 199–201). But I cannot get further than that.

III.45.5: The first hemistich contains three forms with *sva*- ‘self’: *svayúh* ... *svarāṭ* ... *sváyaśastaraḥ*, and the second hemistich opens *sá* *v*-, with a scrambling of the phonetic elements. Other patterning is seen in the comparative *sváyaśastaraḥ* ending the first hemistich and the superlative *suśrávastamaḥ* ending the 2nd, both built to -*as*-stems and compounded with the phonological variants *sva*- and *su*-.

smáddiṣṭi- occurs 4x in the RV. It is a cmpd. of *smád*- ‘altogether, together with’ and the -*ti*-abstract of √ *diś* ‘direct, assign, allot’, and as Ge says (n. 5b), it appears to be a technical term in *dānastutis*. In its other three occurrences (VI.63.9, VII.18.23, X.62.10) it modifies the gift, while here it qualifies the giver, Indra. As Old points out, medial √ *diś* is used of the allotting of gifts in V.36.6, and such a sense seems to fit here as well. For further see Old’s detailed disc.

The splv. *suśrávastamaḥ* is rendered by the standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) as ‘best listener’. Since it is built to the noun *śrávas*- ‘fame’ rather than directly to the root √ *śru*, I find this meaning unlikely. In some other passages the word simply means ‘most famous, having the best good fame’ (e.g., VIII.13.2). Here because of the involvement of ‘us’ (*naḥ*), I take it as ‘receiving the best good fame’, i.e., with ‘fame’ being the praises we offer him. In only one passage does ‘best hearer’ seem a likely interpr., and there that meaning is induced by the presence of the verb *śṛṇuṣvā*: I.131.7 *śṛṇuṣvā suśrávastamaḥ* “listen (to us) as the one who listens best.”

III.46 Indra

III.46.1: This vs. is cunningly constructed, in that until the very last word of the third pāda it consists entirely of genitives with nothing to depend on; neut. pl. *vīryāṇi* at the end of c breaks this string and provides the necessary grammatical support -- joined by the matching adj. *mahāni* at the very end of the vs.

III.46.3: All four pādas begin with *prá*; the verb of a, *ririce*, should be supplied with the other three pādas.

Note the phonological plays in a: *prá* (*mā*)*trā*(*bhī*) and *ririce roca*(*mānaḥ*).

III.46.4: The string of untethered accusatives in the first 3 pādas reminds us of the string of genitives in vs. 1. Here the syntactic tension is resolved only by the verb *ā* *viśanti* that ends the verse and allows the accusatives to serve as its goal.

I do not entirely understand the function of *abhí* in pāda a. It matches nearby III.48.4c ... *janúṣābhibhūya*#, where *abhí* is part of gerund. It may also recall *abhibhūtim ugrām* (I.118.9, IV.38.1, sim. VI.19.6), which in turn is a variant of *abhibhūty-ójas*- (cf. nearby III.48.4a, the vs. just cited for the gerund). In any case the *abhí* seems pretty functionless in this passage; my “over(whelmingly)” is an attempt to give it some function.

III.47 Indra

III.47.3: The aor. impv. *pāhi* here implicitly contrasts with the pres. impv. *pība* in 1b, 2b, 4d. As usual, it is difficult to know how much semantic or functional difference to read into this contrast. See disc. ad III.35.10. In this particular case the root noun cmpd. *ṛtupāḥ* may have triggered the immediately following *pā(hi)*.

Re tr. *ṛtupāḥ* as ‘guardien des temps-rituels’, with $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’ rather than $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’. I think it unlikely in a dull little hymn like this that there would be a pun of that sort, and the sequence *ṛtúbhir ṛtupāḥ pāhi*, with the two elements of the cmpd. extracted from it and flanking it, seems to impose etymological identity.

The second hemistich refers to Indra’s allowing the Maruts a share in the soma because of their support in the Vṛtra battle. For a dramatization of this ritual situation, see I.165 and associated hymns.

III.47.5: The first word of this final vs., *marútvantam* echoes the first word of the hymn, *marútvān*.

III.48 Indra

III.48.1: Though Gr classifies *prābhartum* as an infinitive, and Old’s and WG’s tr. seem (indirectly) to reflect this analysis (“dass man ihm darbrachte ...”), the form seems to be simply a -*tu*-abstract (somewhat concretized)(so tr. Ge and Re). As is well known, the -*tum* form that serves as the only infinitive in Classical Sanskrit is hardly found in early Vedic. Macd. (VG §586b) registers only five in the RV (not including this one) and an equal number in the AV. *prābhartu-* here seems more or less equivalent to *prābhṛti-* or *prābharman-*, though the -*u*-stem datives *bhártave* (IX.97.50) and *ápabhartavaí* (X.14.2) are infinitival.

Notice the near rhyming openings to the two half-verses, a: #*sadyó h(a)*, c: #*sādhóḥ*.

III.48.2: It is appropriate that the “beestings” (*pīyūṣa-*), that is, the colostrum or first milk, should be given to the new-born Indra.

The preverb *pári* in pāda a is presumably to be construed with *āśīñcat* in b, a verb with which it is frequently found. I do not understand the position of this *pári*, in the middle of the pāda, right after the caesura but breaking up the NP *mātā ... yósā jānitṛī*.

III.48.3: The 3rd sg. impf. *aiṭṭa* of course belongs to $\sqrt{īḍ}$, it is missing from Gr (as MLW pointed out to me), but registered in Lub.

It is not clear who the “others” (*anyān*) are whom he keeps away, but the medial pf. in the next pāda (*cakre*) implicitly claims that he did the great things (*mahāni*; cf. *vīryāni ... mahāni* in III.36.1cd) by himself, that is, without the help of others.

III.48.3–4: I assume that *purudhā-pratīka-* in 3d refers to Indra’s shape-shifting powers; the cmpd seems to be “unpacked” in 4b “he made this body as he wished” (*yathāvasāṃ tanvām cakra eśāḥ*).

These two vss. are noteworthy for containing 3 gerunds, *upasthāya*, *abhibhūya*, and *āmúsyā*. The quest of the poet(s) of the Indra hymns in III to find a way to express anteriority (see disc. ad III.32.9–10, 33.11) is successful at least in this passage.

III.49 Indra

III.49.1: The first word *śáṃsā* is read *śáṃsa* by the Pp., i.e., as a 2nd sg. impv. This is quite possible, of course, and is the interpr. of Ge (/WG) and Old. With Re I take it as a 1st sg. subjunctive because this is more in keeping with the 1st ps. diction in annunciatory initial praise vss. like I.32.1 *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam*, but nothing depends on the analysis either way.

III.49.2: The 2nd hemistich is universally tr. (save for Scar, 656) as a single rel. clause, but *amināt* is unaccented and so d must be a separate clause.

In c the standard tr. (incl. also Scar) construe the instr. pl. *sūṣaīḥ* with instr. pl. *sátvabhiḥ* (e.g., Ge “mit seinen mutigen Streitern”). This of course would be the default assumption. However, in almost every occurrence of the stem *sūṣá-*, including all the other examples of the instr. pl., it refers to hymns or praises, whether with a limiting noun or not. I therefore separate it from the other instr. in the pāda and take it as having its usual referent. The poet claims that Indra’s strength is at least partially dependent on our strengthening praises.

III.49.4: The ppl. *pr̥ṣṭá-* ‘asked (about)’ is a little odd. Ge tr. ‘gesucht’, which would make it less odd, but I don’t think *√prach* means that. It may be referring to the fact that Indra’s existence and whereabouts are often questioned in the RV.

In b Ge and WG take the simile to be *rátho ná vāyúḥ*. This of course conforms well to the structure of the pāda and of similes in general, but it has the undesirable consequence of requiring *rátha-*, a word whose meaning is about as well known as any in the RV, to stand not for ‘chariot’ but for ‘chariot-warrior’ (vel sim.; cf. Ge’s Wagenheld). I therefore, somewhat reluctantly, follow Re. in taking the simile to be *ūrdhvó, rátho ná* “erect like a chariot.” Re then takes *vāyúḥ* as a (pseudo-)genitive: “(se tenant) droit comme le char (de) Vāyu,” which is unacceptable for this clear nominative. I instead take *vāyúḥ* as the beginning of another, unmarked simile. Cf. IX.88.3 *vāyúr ná yó niyútān*, with simile marker.

III.50 Indra

III.50.2: On *dheyuḥ* and related forms, see my “... *dheyām* revisited” (Ged. Schindler, 1999).

III.50.3: The first hemistich poses some difficulties: the subject is not expressed, and it is not clear what it should be; there is an abundance of acc. sg. masculines, not all of which are coreferential; the root affiliation of *dhāyase* is disputed; the value of *gr̥ṇānāḥ* is unclear.

To begin with the last, which has implication for some of the other questions: the standard tr. take *gr̥ṇānāḥ* as transitive, with Indra as object. But of the over 50 examples of this middle participle, only one other occurrence is transitive, I.181.9, where this value was induced by contextual pressure (see comm. ad loc.). I therefore take it as passive here as well.

If it is passive, then the missing subject must be something capable of being praised. Gr takes the subject to be the horses of vs. 2; since they were the overt subject of a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ in 2c (*dheyuh*) and would be the subj. of another one here (*dadhire*), this makes implicit sense. And it is possible that they might be praised or sung. However, the question is whether the horses can be thought to establish or deposit soma, as 2a requires. Priests would make more sense for this action (so Re), but priests would not ordinarily be praised -- hence the anomalous transitive interpr. of *grṇānāḥ* by most tr. In the end I would opt for the horses, but not very happily -- the contextual arguments pull in opposite directions.

Now, as for the accusatives: *mimikṣúm ... supārām, índram*, I agree with the standard tr. that the first refers to soma, seeking to be mixed with milk, and of course that the last, *índram*, is separate from it. The question is where *supārām* belongs. The standard tr., in different ways, take it with soma. Since in all its singular occurrences the word refers to Indra, I take it with *índram* here as well.

The final question is the root affiliation and value of *dhāyase*. The standard tr. all take it to $\sqrt{dhā}$ 'place', construed with *jyaíṣṭhyāya* and with Indra as implicit subj. (e.g., Ge "dass er [=Indra] die Oberhoheit ausübe"). However, all clear cases of *dhāyas-*, which mostly appears in the dat., belong to $\sqrt{dhā}$ 'suckle, nourish' (incl. at nearby III.38.3 [though see the minority opinion discussed in comm. ad loc.]). I take it as such here, with *índram* as its object (thereby avoiding the necessity to construe this acc. with either *dadhire* or *grṇānāḥ*). The procuring of soma to nourish Indra is a logical progression -- though I'm still concerned that the horses might be the agents.

III.50.4–5: On the sequence of two repeated vss. see publ. intro.

III.51 Indra

III.51.1–2: These two vss. have the same structure: pādas acd are just accusatives qualifying the acc. *índram* in b, and the b pādas are essentially the same, with nom. pl. *gírah* + a verb that governs the accusatives. Though vs. 3 breaks the syntax, Indra still appears first by name in pāda b.

III.51.2: The standard tr. take *aṇavám* as an unmarked simile, serving as goal to the verb in b: "my songs go to Indra, as if to the sea [Ge "(wie) zu dem Meere," Re "(tel) un océan," WG more accurately but less persuasively "(wie) zu wallender Flut"]. The word is therefore only indirectly associated with Indra: they are both goals but need have nothing else in common. But given the parallelism in structure of vss. 1 and 2, I am reluctant to break the pattern of accusatives characterizing Indra by introducing this syntactic disjunction, and further the supposed simile only makes good sense if *aṇavá-* really is a sea or the like, not an undulating flood. I think instead that Indra is directly described as a flood, the flood itself being characterized as *śākín-* 'possessing powers'.

Note the phrase *tūrṇim aptúram*, which I would now render 'advancing, crossing the waters', in line with my reassessment of the meaning and root affiliation of *tūrṇi-* (see comm. ad III.11.5). The connection of the adj. and the root-noun cmpd. is also found in I.3.8.

The water-crossing mentioned here may simply be a reference to Indra's general leadership in crossing rivers and gaining new territory, but it may more specifically point to the famous crossing of King Sudās dramatized in III.33 and referred to again in III.53.9, even though the poet Viśvāmitra, not Indra, is the major actor there. The crossing is mentioned again in 9a.

III.51.3: Although *panasyate* might make more sense if tr. “expresses admiration,” the other occurrences of this denom. stem and the related adj. *panasyú-* all mean ‘attract/invite admiration’. Here the poet is hoping for a good reception from the recipient of his hymns, which he indeed receives in pādas b and c. I have tr. the loc. phrase *ākaré vāsoḥ* as if ablative, to make the sense clearer. It could have been rendered “... seeks admiration at (the hands of) him ...”

I would now change “faultless rhythms” to “flawless rhythms”; see comm. ad X.61.12.

III.51.4: Though this vs. begins a new *tr̥ca* in a different meter, it partially restores the syntactic structure of vss. 1–2: the first pāda presents Indra in the acc., the second one directs praises to him. Note also that *nṛṇām ... nṛitamam* picks up *nāram* of 2a. The structure is somewhat complicated by the fact that both (unnamed) Indra in pāda a and the (unnamed) subjects of the impv. *arcatā* in b are addressed in the 2nd ps. This leads both Ge and Re to separate the two pādas: Ge pronounces pāda a an anacoluthon or ellipsis, while Re supplies “(je te chante).” This fastidiousness seems unnecessary to me: the two referents of the 2nd persons are in different grammatical numbers and unlikely to be confused with each other for other reasons, and in a ritual situation both should be present (“at the seat of Vivasvant,” 3c) and could both be directly addressed. The two instrumentals in pāda a (*gīrbhīr ukthaiḥ*) also go better with the verb in b; cf., e.g., VI.22.1 *īndram tām gīrbhīr abhy àrca ābhīḥ*.

Pāda d consists of two clauses, the nominal *nāmo asya* and the short verbèd clause *pradīva éka īśe*, and so, contra Gr’s suggestion (s.v. *īś*, col. 236, #8), the verb doesn’t take an acc. here. For supposed exx. of *√īś* with the acc., see comm. ad VII.32.18.

III.51.5: The stem *niṣṣīdh-* and related forms are difficult (see, inter alia, Scar 596–97). As Scar points out, there is no obvious direct way to connect it with either *√sādh* ‘succeed’ or *√sidh* ‘repel’, and neither of these roots appears with *nīḥ* in the RV (though the latter does in post-RVic texts, but without relevant meaning; see Gotō, 1st Kl., 328). On the other hand, the semantic range of the word itself in context is relatively clear. It usually refers to something offered by inferiors to superiors. Ge’s *Tribut* (see his brief disc. in n. 5b) works pretty well. If we want to connect it to the root *√sādh* ‘succeed, realize, reach the goal’, it may be seen as the material representation of the fulfillment (this is the *√sādh* part) of an obligation, and the *nīḥ* ‘forth’ may reflect the proffering of these material goods.

I supply ‘streams’ with *jīráyaḥ* on the basis of the other occurrence of this pl. in II.17.3 *prá jīráyaḥ sisrate ...* as well as the well-attested *jīrá-dānu-* ‘possessing lively drops’. There is general agreement in the standard tr. that *jīrí-* refers to flowing water.

III.51.6: Note the chiasmic structure *túbhyam bráhmāṇi gírah ... túbhyam*.

As MLW points out to me, c contains one of the few examples of initial *bodhí*, which, as I've discussed ("Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change," 1997, esp. 69–75) is ordinarily found pāda-internal, as opposed to *bháva*.

Ge persuasively identifies *ávaso nūtanasya* as a genitive of quality.

III.51.7: This vs. contains yet another implicit contrast between the aor. and pres. of $\sqrt{pā}$ 'drink': *pāhi ... yāthā ... āpibaḥ*. See comm. ad III.35.10, 36.3, 40.1–2, and 47.3. It is not clear whether a contrast is also meant between the acc. *sómam* with *pāhi* (also 8a) and the (potentially partitive) genitive *sutásya* with *āpibaḥ* and, if so, whether it is signaling some sort of aspectual distinction.

The verb *ā vivāsanti* lacks an object here, though it usually is construed with one. Ge (/WG) interpret it as 'invite' (presumably supplying 'you'), while Re supplies the gods as object. I think the object slot has been intentionally left blank: with Indra's guidance and in his shelter they hope to win whatever they fancy, hence my somewhat awk. tr. "seek their win." Oberlies (Rel.RV I.403) suggests that this is a poetic contest, but I don't see any evidence of this beyond the plural.

Given the usual rendering of *kaví*- elsewhere in the publ. tr., I would change the tr. here to 'sage poets' or just 'poets'.

III.51.8: The connection between the two hemistichs in this vs. is not clear. The first unambiguously presents the here-and-now of the sacrifice, with an impv. and the adv. *ihá* 'here', while the second harks back to Indra's primordial birth and the gods' attendance on it, expressed by an augmented imperf. (*ābhūṣan*). There is no way to reconcile the temporal disjunction directly, so I have adopted Ge's makeshift: supplying "(wie damals)," though there is no overt representation of my "as" (or his "wie damals"). There does not seem to be much semantic connection between the two halves either, unless we, the pressers and offerers, are being identified with the gods who served Indra at his birth.

III.51.9: The abrupt temporal shifts continue in this vs., exacerbated by shifts in person. The poet first addresses the Maruts in the 2nd ps. and asserts something about Indra in the present time (or so I [and the other standard tr.] take the nominal sentence without overt copula). In pāda b the Maruts are then referred to in the 3rd ps. -- though they are not named in this pāda, the other two occurrences of *dāti-vara*- refer to them, and *ānu* \sqrt{mad} is a signature verb of theirs -- and in the past, in the augmented impf. *āmandan*. (Though the Saṃhitā text transmits '*mandan*', the augment is metrically guaranteed.) This pāda seems an aside, reminding the audience of the Maruts' previous involvement with Indra. The vs. then shifts to the present time again, with the Maruts remaining in the 3rd ps., as potential drinking companions for Indra.

On *dāti-vāra*- see my forthcoming article on it and, supposedly, related compounds.

In 6c Indra was urged to become "a friend of present help"; what that present help was/should be is spelled out here, a friend "at the water-crossing." For water-crossing see comm. ad vs. 2 above. It is presumably *not* directly related to the Maruts' applause in pāda b, for they provide material and moral support at the Vṛtra-smashing, not in crossing waters.

As MLW points out, *své* in the phrase *své sadhásthe* does not refer to the subject, but rather to the immed. preceding gen. *dāsúṣaḥ*.

III.51.9–10. Note that *pibatu* takes an acc. in 9cd, but a gen. in 10c, as with *ápibaḥ* in 7b.

III.51.10: The first two pādas of this vs. are variously translated. The problems are 1) the referent of *idám* and 2) the absence of a verb. My interpr. is closest to Ge's. If the referent of *idám* is the soma, we need only find a synonym for soma that is neuter; *sávanam* fits the bill and is elsewhere modified by *sutá-*, as it can be here. As for the verb, I assume a form of \sqrt{as} : the idiom *ánu \sqrt{as}* means 'be at hand'.

III.51.12: The three body parts to which the soma should reach are in different cases: pāda a contains loc. (or possibly gen., though this seems unlikely) *kukṣyóḥ*, while b and c have acc. *síraḥ* and *bāhū* respectively. The verb -- *prá ásnotu* -- is presumably held constant, though represented only by the preverb in b and c. Since the loc. can express goal just as well as the acc., this is allowable syntactic variation. Thanks to MLW for drawing my attention to the case disagreement.

III.52 Indra

III.52.2: *pacatyà-* occurs only here; it does not seem to have any gerundival sense, nor does its base *pacatá-*, though *-ata-* adjectives often do (*darśatá-* 'sightly', not just 'seen'); see AiG II.2.168. I assume *pacatyà-* is a nonce creation to provide an extra syllable here in the versified recipe. And perhaps *pacatá-* was fashioned as a clearer alternative past participle to *pakvā-*, which can of course also mean 'ripe', though it's quite commonly applied to cooked food.

III.52.3: The accent of *ghásah* is unexpected, but it presumably results from its juxtaposition with immed. following *joṣáyāse*, which can owe its accent to its pāda-initial position. Although *ca* can be subordinating ('if') and induce verbal accent, that doesn't seem to be its function here; instead it coordinate with the *ca* in b to produce a "both ... and" construction. That the *ca* in b is not in 2nd position but follows the obj. *gírah* supports this interpr., since the first *ca* follows the obj. *purolāśam*.

III.52.5: I would now render *túrny-artha-* as 'having a goal to advance to'; see comm. ad III.11.5.

III.52.6: On the acc. complement and sense of the lexeme *úpa síkṣa-* see comm. ad I.112.19, I.173.10

III.52.8: The phrase *vīratama- nṛṇām* 'most virile of men' is a variant of the fairly common formula *nṛṇām nṛtama-* 'most manly of men', an occurrence of which is found in the preceding hymn, III.51.4. This vs. is repeated at IV.32.16.

III.53 Indra, etc.

III.53.1: The curious dual dvandva *indrā-parvatā* ‘o Indra and Mountain’, only in the vocative and therefore unaccented, occurs 3x: I.122.3, 132.6, and here. As discussed ad I.122.3 and 132.6, I believe that the ‘mountain’ is Indra’s *vájra*-.

III.53.2: The verb in pāda b, *yakṣi*, is simply an injunctive 1st sg. *s*-aor. to √*yaj*, but it is rendered as a future/modal in all the standard tr. (including this one). This value seems also found in the identical form in X.52.5, though not in X.4.1. (Gr’s ex. in VI.16.8 is better taken as a 2nd-sg. act. *-si* impv.) I don’t know why this particular form should have this value, save for the general functional flexibility of the injunctive. But perhaps the fact that the formally identical 2nd sg. act. *-si* impv. is so common and (as an old *s*-aor. subjunctive) is used in both imperatival and subjunctive-future value may have allowed that value to spill over onto its formal twin. KH (Inj. 253) suggests that 1st sg. injunctives express the immediate future.

III.53.3: The 1st dual subjunctive (*śāmsāva*) coupled with a sg. voc. (*adhvāryō*) is a rough and ready way to express a 1st ps. inclusive. This type of construction contrasts with the 1st ps. exclusive found in phrases like VII.88.3 *ā yād ruhāva vāruṇas ca nāvam* “When we two, Varuṇa and I, mounted the boat ...” with a nominative explicitly conjoined with *ca* to an implicit *ahám*.

The injunctive *bhūt* in d must also, like *yakṣi* in 2b, be modal/prospective or even imperatival, since the *āthā ca* indicates that it temporally and/or logically follows the impv. *sīda* in c.

III.53.4: The dismissal of Indra and the sending him off home comes rather early in this hymnlet; he just got here (vs. 1) and at that point we urged him to stay put (vs. 2). Vs. 3 seems to depict the sacrifice proper, and the remaining 3 vss. of this portion of the hymn (vss. 4–6) are an extended farewell. In this vs. the poet seems to be reassuring Indra that if he goes home, he still won’t miss out on anything here: we’ll send Agni to fetch him whenever we press soma.

III.53.5: *pārā yāhi* “drive away” comes awfully soon after 2a *mā pārā gāḥ* “don’t go away.”

The genitive phrase *vājīno rāsabhasya* is ambiguous: does it refer to two animals or one? Re opts for the former: “... du (cheval) gagnant-du-prix (et) de l’âne.” But the same phrase in I.34.9 makes it likely that the two words belong together as the designation of a single animal. So Ge (/WG).

III.53.6–7: See the publ. intro. for the thematic and lexical connections between these two vss., despite their belonging to different sections of the hymn. See there also for the connection of vs. 7 with III.31, via the identification of the current poet with the Aṅgirasas, ur-sacrificers and givers of dakṣiṇās (on which see Ge’s n. 7a).

III.53.8: As Schaefer points out (p. 162), the intens. *bobhavīti* construed with an āmreḍita *rūpām-rūpam* must signal repetitive function (“Gestalt um Gestalt”).

In c I read *divāḥ* twice: once as ‘day’ with *trīḥ* in the meaning “three times a day” (cf. nearby III.56.5, 6 *trīr ā divāḥ*, also X.95.5 *trīḥ ... āhnaḥ*), once as ‘heaven’ with

following *pári* “from heaven.” The latter reading, adopted by Sāy., is rejected by Old and Ge (n. 8c) because we should expect the close sandhi *divás pári*. This argument is subject to criticism on two grounds. First, I think the double reading of *diváh* would preclude close sandhi for one of the readings. Moreover, none of the other cited exx. of *divás pári* is broken over the caesura as here. As Mark Hale has discussed at length, close sandhi of NOUN + POSTPOSITION is blocked at the caesura. See “Preliminaries to the Study of the Relationship between Syntax and Sandhi in Rigvedic Sanskrit,” *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 51, pp. 77-96, 1990; this view is cited here after the 1995 draft, *Wackernagel’s Law in the Language of the RV*, pp. 38-50.

The ritual situation in the 2nd hemistich is puzzling for several reasons. First, Indra’s appearance at the sacrifice “three times a day” is what we expect, since there are three soma pressings. Then why is he characterized as *ánrtupāḥ* ‘drinking out of season’? Ge (/WG) gets out of this bind by supplying a parenthetical “(oder)”: he either comes three times a day *or* drinks unseasonably. This works, but the “or” is of course a complete invention. More problematic is the fact that Indra is drinking unseasonably at all. In this same Indra cycle he has been apostrophized as *ṛtupāḥ* (voc., III.47.3). The apparent breaking of the ritual rules here is esp. striking because he is called *ṛtāvan-* ‘possessing the truth, truthful’ at the same time, made more striking because this is the only place in the RV where *ṛtāvan-* qualifies Indra. Lüders (*Varuṇa* II, 547–48) suggests that *ṛtāvan-* is used here only as word play with *ánrtupā-*, since Indra has essentially no connection with *ṛtá-* (“dass er zum Rta so gut wie keine Beziehung hat,” p. 548). But this seems unlikely, esp. given that the unnegated expression *ṛtupā ṛtāvā* in the same metrical position is used of Agni in this same maṇḍala (III.20.4). Some point is being made, that Indra can be *ṛtāvan-* despite his un-rule-governed behavior.

I think the clues to a solution are found in the first half of the verse, where Indra is depicted as constantly shape-shifting and enveloping himself in *māyāḥ*. Perhaps Indra is impersonating other gods through the various *rūpa*-s he assumes, and his unseasonable drinking involves his taking their places in the rota (*rtú-*) of soma-recipients (the *Ṛtugraha* treated in I.15 and II.36–37). What then are “his own mantras” (*svaír mántraiḥ*), which accompany the unseasonable drinking? Lüders (p. 548) suggests that when he drinks outside of the three pressings he has to recite his own mantras. Though this is clever, I do not think it is correct, nor do I follow my own published tr. “by (the power of) his own (magic) spells” -- though I do think the mantras may be semantically linked to *māyāḥ* here. But my current thinking is that the phrase should be tr. “with *their* own mantras,” referring to the mantras appropriate to the gods whose forms he has appropriated and whose turns he takes in the drinking. As to how he can be called *ṛtāvan-* when his behavior seems not to be precisely aboveboard, perhaps he has gained the epithet from the gods whose identities he’s stealing: Agni, Tvaṣṭar, and Mitra and Varuṇa, all called *ṛtāvan-* elsewhere in the RV, all occur in the *Ṛtugraha* sequence (I.15; II.36–37). Or perhaps the epithet alludes to Indra’s most enduring adoption of another identity, that of *Brhaspati*. Though *Brhaspati* is called *ṛtāvan-* only once in the RV as far as I am aware (VI.73.1), the role of *ṛtá-* in association with *Brhaspati* in the Vala myth is very significant; see, e.g., Lüders p. 549. Or perhaps we can simply say that Indra’s “truth” -- his inherent nature -- is his ability to assume other forms and act out of turn and impose his will without following rules.

III.53.9-10: The use of somewhat inappropriate epithets continues in these vss. The subject of 9ab, the “great seer” (*mahām̐ ṛṣiḥ*) is Viśvāmitra, mentioned by name in c. A mortal, he is described as ‘god-begotten’ (*devajā-*) and ‘god-spēd’ (*devājūta-*) but ‘possessing a man’s sight’ (*nṛcākṣas-*); the last is also used of the Kuśikas, Viśvāmitra’s family, in the next vs. Curiously it is the epithet with *nṛ-* ‘man’ that appears to be misapplied, not those with *devā-* ‘god’: the stem *nṛ-cākṣas-* is found approximately 40 times in the RV, and in all other occurrences (with the exception of III.22.2, where it qualifies a divine quality, the radiance of Agni, and the possible exception of the next hymn, III.54.6) it qualifies a god, who either has his (divine) gaze on men or attracts the gaze of men. Thus, the status of Viśvāmitra and his kin is implicitly raised by receiving a descriptor usually used of gods. That the Kuśikas drink soma with the gods in 10cd is a sign of this enhanced status. What the adj. means here is unclear to me: is it that they too attract the gaze (and thus admiration) of other men, or that they, despite possessing only a man’s sight, still manage feats sufficient to match the gods, esp. Viśvāmitra’s stopping the rivers in full flood?

III.53.10: The publ. tr. does not recognize or render the idiom *vī√pā*, found generally in the middle, for which see also comm. ad VII.22.3. As is indicated there, in later Vedic and already in late RV, the idiom is specialized for the separation of *surā* from another liquid in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, but earlier can refer more generally to the extraction (“drinking out”) of a liquid from another source, e.g., by the pressing stones in IV.16.3 and VII.22.3. What the idiom is doing here is less clear to me. Ge (n. 10d / WG) thinks this is a reference to the (much later) notion that *haṃsas* can separate liquids and so it belongs with the Sautrāmaṇī passages -- the *haṃsa* being found in pāda a, though only in a simile unrelated to drinking. I think this unlikely. It may simply be that the pressing stones are involved: the Kuśikas may be “drinking out” the soma by means of the pressing stones found in pāda a (*ādribhiḥ*). However, it is also possible that the *vī* represents the cross-species aspect of the drinking party: the mortal Kuśikas are urged to drink along with the gods, but the gathering may be segregated. So perhaps a tr. “drink apart, along with the gods”; such a notion seems to underlie Re’s “Buvez séparément avec les dieux.” It would contrast with a true symposium expressed by *sām√pā* also in the middle (see IV.35.7, 9) and in fact might allude to that idiom, given the well-known polarization of *vī* and *sām*. Another possibility is Sāy’s *parasparavyatihāreṇa* ‘by mutual interchange, alternately’. I am weakly inclined towards the pressing stone interpretation, though also somewhat drawn to the cross-species one. And I would also point out the resonance of the preverb *vī* with *viśvāmitraḥ* (9c) and *vīprāḥ* (10c).

III.53.11: This vs. is supposed to depict the Aśvamedha of King Sudās, and the releasing of the horse in b and the smiting of obstacles in all directions in c, followed by a sacrifice in d, certainly support this interpr.

cetāyadhvam is variously rendered, but most generally as ‘pay attention’ vel sim. I instead take this middle full-grade -*āya*-formation as a reflexive transitive “make yourselves known” based on the ‘make perceive’ sense of *cetāya-*. Re’s alternative “faites vous remarquer” is closest to mine.

As Watkins points out (Dragon, p. 208), although this form of the intens. of \sqrt{han} has a singular object (somewhat unusually), it is “serially plural,” in that the *vrtrám* is located in one cardinal direction after another; see also Schaeffer 204–5.

III.53.12: The first hemistich, couched in the 1st ps., consists only of a rel. clause, which breaks off. The “I” is clearly Viśvāmitra, whose name opens the hemistich and whose protective *brāhman-* is mentioned there -- making it very likely that pādas ab constitute this *brāhman-*, though it’s not quite clear what is protective about this truncated utterance.

The plupf. *ātuṣṭavam* should not exist, at least in my opinion, since the two forms of the indicative pf. *tuṣṭuvūḥ* (VIII.6.12, 18) also appear to have preterital value. However, the contexts in VIII.6 do not guarantee that value -- it is possible that they are presential “they praise” (see comm. ad VIII.6.12). The existence of a pf. subj. *tuṣṭávat* at VIII.98.16 also suggests that the indicative pf. is, or originally was, presential. The only other pf. forms in the RV, the act. part. *tuṣṭuvāms-* (3x) and mid. part. *tuṣṭuvānā-* (1x) are generally tr. as preterital, but again context does not dictate this rendering.

III.53.13: The tr. of the last pāda might better begin “Just he will make ...” to reflect the *íd*.

III.53.15–16: As indicated in the publ. intro., the subject of these two vss. is the mysterious feminine *sasarparī-*, which has been interpr. as differently as “Kriegstrompete” (BR, fld. by Gr), “Sangesgeweise” of the Viśvāmitras (Ge), and Vāc (Anukramaṇī, Sāy.). The interpr. of these vss. has been further complicated by the later tradition that sees them as concerning the supposed rivalry between Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha, for which I see no evidence at all in the RV.

Although I do not think all the puzzles are ultimately solvable, some clues can get us some distance. First, *sasarparī-* is a *vrkī*-type fem., and as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.369), the major use of this inflectional type is for female beings (human and animal). This lends some credence to the opinion that the *sasarparī-* is a cow of some sort (e.g., Re “La (vache) Sasarparī”). That vs. 14 concerns the ritually worthless cows of the Kīkaṭas would also support a contrast with an eminently worthy cow found among us. Second, these two vss. sound rather like a *dānastuti* (see *jamādagnidatta-* in 15b and *yām me palastijamadagnāyo dadūḥ* in 16d), and since the next part of the hymn goes off in a completely different direction, this could serve as a hymn-capping *dānastuti* for what precedes. Cf. I.126.2, a *dānastuti* hymn, where, after Kakṣīvant is given cows, he stretches the king’s unaging fame to heaven: *divī śrávo ‘jāram ā tatāna*, highly reminiscent of our 2nd hemistich ... *tatāna, śrávo devésv amṛtam ajuryām*.

Even if this sketch of the function of the vss. and of Sasarparī is accepted (a big if), it remains to analyze the word. I consider it a portmanteau pun. On the one hand it is a kind of anagram for the intensive of \sqrt{srp} ‘creep’, found in the RV only as the hapax adj. *sarīsrpā-* (X.162.3), which I tr. ‘squirming’. On the other hand, it is also phonologically reminiscent of *sabar-dúgha-*, *-duh-* ‘sap-yielding’, of milk cows -- two occurrences of which are found in nearby III.55 (vss. 12, 16) qualifying Night and Dawn, one of whom bellows (*mimāya* as here) in vs. 13. (Acdg. to Griffith, Gr associates Sasarparī with Sabardughā, though this is not registered in the dictionary.) Just as the Sasarparī brings fame in 16, so does a *sabardúh-* in VI.48.12–13 “milk out immortal fame” (*śrávo ‘mṛtyu*

dhūkṣata). Another possible association is *sarpís-* ‘melted butter’, adduced by Mayrhofer as a possible relative of *sasarparī-* (EWA s.v. *sarpís-*). My tr. “squirming, sappy (cow called) Sasarparī” reflects my sense that all of these words have contributed to the designation *sasarparī-* and these contributions are positive: *sabardúgha-* and *sarpís-* reflect the fecundity and richness associated with juice and fat, *sarīṣpa-* the uncontrollable vitality of a squirming young animal. Needless to say, this is highly speculative and does not rest on properly chaste etymological principles, but it is difficult to see what could with regard to this maddening but phonologically delectable word.

The next question to ask is why Sasarparī “banishes neglect” (*ámatim bādhamānā*). Again this phrase supports the notion that the referent of *sasarparī-* is a cow. In I.53.4 and X.42.10 *ámati-* is overcome by cows; the word is paired with hunger (*kṣúdh-*) in VIII.66.14, X.42.10, and X.43.3. Hunger and neglect can be combatted with cows and their nourishing products, and one of the combatants is Sasarparī.

III.53.16: Besides the continuing problem of *sasarparī-*, the other difficulty is the hapax *pakṣyā* in c. Gr takes it as ‘aus Monatshälften bestehend’ (flg. BR), Ge (/WG) ‘auf meiner Seite stehend’, Re as ‘ailée’ or ‘prenant parti (pour moi)’. The publ. tr. strikes out on its own (though closest to Re’s first alternative). It involves reading *sāpakṣyā* against the Pp (but involving no change in the Saṃhitā text), to be divided *sā apakṣyā*. The latter would be the instr. of a nominal abstract in *-īyā-* (see AiG II.2.840), a rare but attested type built primarily to *-a-*stems. Here potentially to *apakṣá-* ‘wingless’ (cf. AV XI.5.21), hence ‘winglessness’. What might this bizarre confection have to do with the passage? The rather flimsy connection is via the daughter of the Sun (*sūryasya duhitā* in 15c) and a possible reference to Dawn in 16c: the same phrase *nāvyam āyur dādhanā* is used of Dawn in VII.80.2). (Like) the former, Sasarparī has stretched the Kuśikas’ fame to the gods; (like) the latter, she has brought fame to all the five peoples. These feats might be expected to require special forms of transport, such as wings, if the agent is not a supernatural traveler like Dawn or the Sun’s Daughter. But Sasarparī is a cow, hence wingless.

I realize how fragile -- and potentially ludicrous -- this suggestion is, however, and it might be better to play it safe with something like ‘on my side’.

III.53.17: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse and the rest of this little section are reminiscent of the final vs. of III.33.13, against disaster on a journey, specifically there a river crossing.

The hapax *pātalyè* is entirely unclear, besides being a dual referring to some part of the chariot.

On the thematic medial stem *dāda-* in the sense ‘hold, keep safe’, see Gotō (1st Class, 171–72, flg. Wackernagel).

III.53.19: On *abhī vyayasva* see comm. ad VII.33.4. I assume ‘engird’ refers to the ends of the axle being embedded in the wheel hub.

The loc. *spandané* is generally taken as a third type of wood (besides *khadirá-* and *śimśápā-*), but while the other two words are standard designations of trees, *spandaná-* is ordinarily not, but rather refers to a type of motion -- jerking or kicking. I take it to refer

here to the elasticity or flexibility of *Dalbergia sissoo* (*śimsapā-*), a quality it has (at least acdg. to the internet).

III.53.20: On the problematic *āvasā ā* (Saṃhitā) / *ā ava'saī ā* (Pp.), see detailed disc. by Scar (576–77), who lays out the various phonological and morphological possibilities. As he points out, the reading of Holland van Nooten, *ā āvasā ā*, with accent on the first *a* (possible on the basis of the Saṃhitā text) and deaccentuation of the final *ā* of the noun (contra both Saṃhitā and Pp), makes no sense (and does not conform to the transmitted text). The nominal form between the two *ā*'s is by most accounts a root noun cmpd of $\sqrt{sā} + āva$. The question is what the case form is. I follow Whitney (§971a) and Old in reading *-ās*, contra the Pp., interpreting it (with Whitney and Old) as an irregular abl. sg. to this root noun cmpd. (expect **avasās*) in infinitival usage. The parallelism in the hemistich supports this interpr., but see the other possibilities offered by Scar.

III.53.21–24: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. are traditionally taken as depicting the rivalry between Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha, but I see no sign of this here; certainly Vasiṣṭha is not mentioned. The verbal link is supposed to be VII.104.16 *adhamās padīṣṭa* “let him fall lowest,” a curse uttered in a Vasiṣṭha hymn that echoes our 21c *ādharah sās padīṣṭa*. But in neither case is the opponent named, and there is no reason to assume that Vasiṣṭha directs this at Viśvāmitra or vice versa.

The first vs. of this sequence (21) is quite straightforward; vs. 22 is more complex, but I feel fairly confident in its interpr. But vss. 23–24 are very difficult, and my interpr. is correspondingly quite provisional.

III.53.22: With Old, I reject the interpr. of *cīd* in abc as a simile particle (contra Sāy and Ge); in all three cases the *cīd* can be interpreted in its usual ‘even, even though, just’ sense. However, I differ from Old on the purport of the vs. He thinks it describes concrete events, possibly as a “Beschreibung von Zauberverhandlungen,” while I think it contains two figurative descriptions of the impotence of the enemy -- in this I am closer to Ge’s notion of similes than to Old. I also find myself in the odd position of being in general agreement with Griffith’s interpr. (based on Ludwig’s). Each hemistich describes an action involving great effort and drama that produces trivial and insubstantial results. In ab an ax is thoroughly heated, but this formidable weapon only cuts off the blossom of a silk cotton tree. (That silk cotton tree flowers are a vivid red might remind the audience of the real blood that might have been shed by a blazing hot ax.) In cd a pot, also heated, is boiling (*yéṣantī*), indeed has boiled over (*prāyastā*), but all it produces is foam.

III.53.23: In my opinion, at least the first half of this vs. continues the sentiment of vs. 22: the enemy is powerless, despite bluff and bluster. In pāda a older translations supply an unidentified subject (“he”) for *cikite*, but the medial perfect of \sqrt{cit} is always pass.-intrans. and with Kü (176) I take the verb as an impersonal passive with an oblique subj. in the genitive; cf. I.51.7 *tāva vājraś cikite* with the subject in the more normal nom. The point here is that the opponent’s missile (*sāyaka-*) is so inconsequential as not to attract or deserve notice.

In b the first problem is the hapax *lodhā-*, which is universally taken as a red animal of some sort, a horse (Ge, Re), fox (Gr), or goat (Old, tentatively EWA), as an *l-*

form related to *rudhirá-*, etc. My quite different tr. ‘clod’ assumes (again, very tentatively) an association with a loose set of words for lump, clod, etc.: *lot̥ṭha* (Pkt., etc. = Vedic *loṣṭá-*, perhaps by hypersanskritization) (Turner 11157), **lot̥ṭha* / **loddā* / **loddha* (Tu. 11137), **luṭṭa* (Tu 11077). The point would then be that “they” (whoever they are) lead (to sacrifice?) a lump of earth or the like, thinking that it’s an actual (sacrificial?) beast. This situation reminds us of the chariot race of Mudgala and Mudgalānī (X.102) in which a block of wood is yoked with a bull, and the oddly assorted pair still wins the race (X.102.8–9). It might also remind us of X.28.9 in which an earth clod (*logá-*, not too distant phonologically) splits a stone. The other morphological fact of note in this pāda is that *pásu* is neut. and initially accented (versus the ubiquitous masc. *paśú-*). This may be a deep archaism, matching Lat. *pecu*, Goth. *faihu* (cf. AiG II.1.20, II.2.474), or it may be a nonce attempt to de-animatize the word in this peculiar context.

Like vs. 22 and 23a, 23b describes an undesirable situation exactly contrary to what was aimed at: having mistaken a lump for a sacrificial animal, the actors will surely not get the results they wanted -- although X.102.8–9 and X.28.9 may point to success in unlikely circumstances. But the second hemistich depicts situations in which, though a mistake was possible, it was not made: they don’t set a bad horse (*ávājīn-*) to race with a good one; they don’t put a donkey before the horses. The question is whether the subjects of the three 3rd pl. verbs (*nayanti* b, *hāsayanti* c, *nayanti* again d) are the same, or are the deluded weaklings of ab being contrasted with more clear-headed and successful actors in cd? Common sense suggests the latter, but the morphologically identical sequence of verbs with no overt subject or change of subject the former (as Old points out). I cannot make up my mind, esp. because the following vs. muddies the waters even further.

Given the interpretational difficulties, the grammatical identity of *ásvān* is a minor problem. In the publ. tr. I take it as acc. pl. *ásvān*, but the Pp. interprets it as abl. *ásvāt*, with the final *-n* in sandhi before the nasal of *nayanti*. Either is possible (“lead before the horses” / “lead before the horse”), and given the uncertainty of meaning, there is no obvious way to choose. The abl. is supposed to be construed with *puráh*, but in fact ABL. + *puráh* is not a robust construction.

III.53.24: The good sense / bad sense problem continues, or returns, here. The sons of Bharata are ceremonially presented to us, with the here-and-now deictic *imé*. And we know from vs. 12 that the Bharata people (*bhārata-jāna-*) are our people. But here they (or the subjects of the three 3rd pl. verbs: *cikituḥ* b, *hinvānti* c, *pāriṇayanti* d) seem to make the same bad choices that were visible in vss. 22–23, esp. 23b. The continuation of the 3rd pl. verbs invites us to make the Bharatas subjects also in vs. 22. Is this a jokey anti-dānastuti? Are the “bad choices” I just mentioned meant to show that even if they do stupid things, they will still beat the incompetents depicted in vs. 22? Or that bad choices can still sometimes unaccountably lead to good? I am baffled.

The mealtime *prapitvā-* is well attested in the RV, but *apapitvā-* is found only here. Both Ge and Re take the words in some kind of figurative sense (e.g., Re *apapitvā-* ‘la retraite’, *prapitvā-* ‘l’élán-en-avant’), but since the *-pitvā-* compounds are otherwise only used of meals and the times of day associated with them, it seems best to maintain that sense here; so WG ‘die Nachessenzeit’, ‘die Voressenzeit’. In its contrast with *pra* here, I take *apa* as meaning ‘leaving the meal, post-prandial’ and therefore ‘non-meal’.

My interpr. is influenced by my sense that the lesser choice is the one being made in each case in this vs.

In c the standard tr. take *ná* as a simile marker: “they incite their own horse like an alien one.” But given the paired negative clauses in 23cd and the undoubted negative (or at least undoubted by the standard tr.) in the immediately preceding pāda (24b), where the *ná* takes the same position as in c, the pattern seems to impose another negative here. Under either interpr. the action is not a very smart one: spurring your own horse like an alien one should presumably mean that you don’t spur it at all.

The accentuation of *jyā-* in the bahuvrīhi *jyā-vāja-*, against simplex *jyā-*, is attributed to the shift to initial accent in some other bahuvrīhis: AiG II.1.293 with Nachtr. 81. The standard tr. avoid the problem of the sense of this cmpd by attributing to *-vāja-* a sense it doesn’t otherwise have: Ge (WG; cf. Gr) Schnelligkeit, Re la force. But *vāja-* means ‘prize’ and bahuvrīhis with it as 2nd member ‘having X as prize’. I here assume that winning only a bowstring (minus the bow) would not be a glorious outcome.

III.54 All Gods

III.54.1: All four pādas contain a distracted *-iya-* form immediately after an early caesura.

The expression “listen with his ... faces” is somewhat comic, though clearly domestic and heavenly “faces” refer to Agni’s aspects in those two places. As Bl points out (RR ad III.1.15, which also contains the phrase ... *no dāmyebhīr ānīkaiḥ*), “with his faces belonging to the house” is unexceptionable in III.1.15, where it is construed with the verb *rākṣā*, but “a bolder poet” has adopted it to this less congenial (and therefore more interesting) environment.

III.54.2: With Ge (/WG) I supply “to those two” in b, to provide both a goal for *ichāñ carati* and an antecedent for *yāyoḥ* in c.

III.54.3-4: The co-occurrence of *ṛtā-* and *satyā-* in these two vss. (3a, 4b) is striking. In keeping with my estimation of the difference in meaning between the two, I tr. the first as ‘truth’ and the latter as ‘real(ity)’. In both cases here the sense of *satyā-* is close to the English idiom “come true,” that is, “become real.” In 3a the poet is asking that the cosmic truth(s) associated with Heaven and Earth be realized in our own sphere, that H+E put themselves out, as it were, for our benefit. 4ab also concerns the truth(s) associated with H+E -- hence the adj. *ṛtāvarī* ‘truthful’ -- and the older poets, in finding these two entities that possess their own truth(s), spoke words (presumably about and in praise of H+E) that both reflected the reality of those truths and that also came true (*satyavācaḥ*). This vs. esp. emphasizes the poets’ process of discovery of the truths about H+E.

As Re points out, the vs. contrasts the priests or poets in ab with the warriors in cd.

III.54.5: The first pāda is also found in the famous cosmogonic (or anti-cosmogonic) hymn X.129, as 6a. The final pāda of that hymn, X.129.7d, ends with an incomplete sentence “or if he does not know ...?” (*yādī vā ná véda*). Though all the standard tr. of this vs. here find a way to incorporate our 5d into the syntax of the verse, I by contrast think the same trailing off into uncertainty is found here as in X.129.7. The lower seats of

the gods in heaven can be seen, but not the ones in the higher realms. We can only discover so much. As for grammar, I take the *yā* of d as a neut. pl. referring to *sādāṃsi* in c (so also Re, though with a slightly different interpr. of the rest). Ge (/WG) instead take it as a fem. nom. sg. referring to the *pathyā* in b, with c as parenthetical. I do not entirely understand the *vratéṣu* in d. The hidden commandments may be the laws that govern the further reaches of the cosmos.

III.54.6: On the somewhat anomalous use of *nṛcāksas*- here see comm. ad III.53.9.

The first pāda of this vs. seems to imply that, though the higher seats of the gods are not generally visible (5d), a *kavī*-, despite having only a man's sight, has been able to see (*abhī ... acaṣṭa*) Heaven and Earth whole, and that he is cognizant of the crucial paradox about them --- that they are joined but still distinct -- a paradox treated in the rest of the vs. and the following one (7).

The interpr. of b is hampered by the hapax *vīghṛte*. On the surface it appears to belong to the root $\sqrt{ghṛ}$ 'sprinkle', but it is difficult to make this yield immediate sense. It appears to serve the same function as *vīyute* 'separated' in the next vs. (7a), and it has therefore been suggested that *-ghṛta-* actually belong to the root \sqrt{hr} 'take' or is a byform thereof (see, e.g., KEWA III.578). My publ. tr. reflects a tacit acceptance of such a view (or at least a willingness not to probe it too deeply), but I now wonder (without full conviction) whether in the context of *mādanī* 'becoming exhilarated' a sense that connects *vīghṛte* to $\sqrt{ghṛ}$ 'sprinkle' might be possible: "sprinkled separately but becoming exhilarated (together)." In any event I take it as a dual fem. acc. (with Ge [/WG]), not, with Re, a loc. sg. with *yónā*.

My tr. also depends on assuming that the exhilarating is happening jointly, in contrast to whatever type of separation is indicated by the *vī*-prefixed ppl. -- the same contrast between unity and separation found in cd. The place where this is happening in b, "the womb of truth" (*ṛtāsya yónā*), may refer to two different places, the ritual ground (as so often) and, perhaps, the distant invisible seats referred to in 5d.

The publ. tr. takes *vēḥ* as a nom. sg., parallel to H+E as subject of 'make' -- referring to the bird's nest-building activity. But it could be the more usual genitive: "have made a seat like (that) of a bird."

III.54.7: The *-ūka*-stem *jāgarūka*- in b is found only here in Vedic. I wonder if it owes its *-ka*-suffix to the femininized context of c, where H+E are identified as "sisters and young women" (*svāsārā yuvatī*) despite their oppositely gendered names. On *-ka-* in women's language, see my "Women's Language in the Rig Veda?" (Gd. Elizarenkova, 2008) and "Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register" (IJ 53 [2009]).

Note the virtual mirror image of *vīyute* (a) and *yuvatī* (c).

I do not understand the use of *ād u* here. Ordinarily this old ablative has a fairly strong temporal ("just after that") or logical ("because of that") sense, but since c has a concessive force ("although being ..."), it is difficult to get *ād* to have logical force, and the fact of being sisters but called different names does not seem to have a temporal dimension. It reminds of the *ca ... ād* in 11cd, but there *ād* easily expresses a standard temporal sense. It is possible, but extremely speculative, that the *ād* does reflect some sort of cosmic temporality: H+E, originally joined together, had a single identity and gender,

but after the cosmogonic separation they received different, and genderedly oppositional, names. The monism of the next vs. (8cd) might (barely) support such an idea; note that “the One” there is neut. (*ékam*).

The standard interpr. (see Ge, etc.) of *mithunāni nāma* is that their names are of different genders when they are given separate names, with *dyaúh* generally masc. and *pr̥thivī* fem. But they are also paired sisters, with the fem. du. designation *ródasī*. This seems correct, and the publ. tr. should probably have reflected this sense of *mithuná-* better. I am somewhat puzzled by why the names are in the plural, however.

III.54.8: The notion of the pair of H+E, separate but unified, is, in the 2nd hemistich, replaced by an even starker contrast, the One (*ékam*, neut. as noted in comm. to previous vs.), which controls the Many, with the Many first configured as oppositional pairs in the neuter: the moving and the fixed (*éjad dhruvám*), the walking/roaming and the flying (*cárad patatrī*). *ékam* is found at the end of its pāda, just as it is in the refrain to the next hymn (III.55).

III.54.9: On the meaning of this vs. see publ. intro. It is the final vs. of the hymn-within-the hymn, vss. 2–9 dedicated to Heaven and Earth. The 1st ps. poet reappears here; he is first found in vs. 2, the beginning of this self-contained portion, and has been absent since, though he may be related to the 3rd ps. *kavī-* in vs. 6.

As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this vs. has a double meaning, aided by the double readings of two items in it: *ádhi √i*, which means both ‘go upon’ (literally) and ‘study’ (‘go over’, figuratively), and the unnamed *dyaúh*, present both as the divinity Heaven alluded to in the phrase in b “great father, begetter” (gen. *maháh pitúr janitúh*; for this as a designation of *dyaúh* cf., e.g., I.164.33 *dyaúr me pitā janitā*) and as heaven the place, suggested by the locational adv. *yātra* ‘where’ in c, introducing the place where the gods take their stand. The poet is both studying the ancient cosmic mysteries he has been attempting to understand in the previous vss. (esp. 5–6) and is embarking on the path that leads to the place where the gods are established, beyond the ken of mortals. Recall the question in 5b “What is the pathway that leads to the gods?” (*devāṁ áchā pathyā ká sám eti*), a question followed by the statement that only the lower seats of the gods are visible. Here *purāṇám* in pāda a can qualify ‘path’ -- not the fem. *pathyā* in 5b but the more familiar masc. *pánthā-*, qualified as *purāṇá-* in IV.18.1 (cf. also *purāṇám ókah* ‘ancient home’ in nearby III.58.6, referring to the Aśvins’ dwelling, presumably also heaven). The gods are themselves on a separate path (*pathí vyūte d*) in the same place, at least by my interpr. Despite their different representations in the (written) Saṃhitā text and in the Pp., *vyūta-* here and *vīyuta-* in 7a must be the same form, ppl. to *ví√yu*; in recitation they would be identical. The verb *unoti* to the supposed root *√u* to which *vyūta-* is sometimes referred (see, e.g., Ge n. 9d) is actually also a form of *√yu*, in the sequence *vyūnoti* in V.31.1, also meaning ‘separates’. Cf. EWA II.503.

III.54.10: This vs. forms a sort of ring with vs. 1, enclosing the Heaven and Earth hymnlet of vss. 2–9. Like vs. 1 it begins with *ímám* followed by a word for hymn (1a *ímám ... sūśám*, 10a *ímám stómam*), and with 1cd it contains a verb form of *√śru* ‘hear’ with god(s) as subject (10b).

On *rdūdāra*- see EWA s.v. *ARD*, though he is somewhat cagey about its formation. I assume the 2nd member is *udāra*- ‘belly’, with the literal sense ‘moist-bellied’ being equivalent to our ‘tender-hearted’. This assumes a bahuvrīhi with an adjectival first member of the form *rdu*-, a shape (disyllabic adj. ending in *-i*- or *-u*-) that often triggers (or is at least associated with) 2nd member accent in bahuvrīhis (see AiG II.1.296ff.).

III.54.11: The first hemistich is either a syntactic fragment -- a long NP in the nominative establishing the topic -- or *pātyamānaḥ* is a predicated pres. part. (The publ. tr. takes it as the former.)

In c *ca* appears to be subordinating, given the accent on the verb *ásreḥ*. I would now be inclined to delete the “and” in the publ. tr. and remove the parens. from “when.”

III.54.14: I am not entirely certain why “victorious Bhaga” is brought in here in a simile in this Viṣṇu vs. I suppose that our praises are making a triumphal procession to Viṣṇu, and the mention of Bhaga may suggest our hope that these praises will be met with a satisfactory portion of goods in return. See 21c below.

In cd it is tempting (see, e.g., Old) to make *mardhanti* the verb of the rel. cl. beginning with *yásya*, which otherwise lacks a verb and appears truncated. But *mardhanti* is stubbornly unaccented. Construing *yásya pūrvīḥ* as a relativized expression of possession, we can assume that it asserts that Viṣṇu has a large female entourage; these females are further characterized in the independent clause in d as “genetresses” (*jānitrīḥ*), for which “mothers-to-be” seemed a more acceptable English rendering, who attend on him and do not neglect him. What this is all about escapes me, though Viṣṇu is associated with the wives of the gods in I.156.2.

III.54.15: The standard tr. construe the instr. *vísuvair vīryaiḥ* as the object of *pātyamānaḥ* (“being master of all *vīryá*”), but when *pātya*- takes an object, it is in the acc., including once in this hymn: 8c *patyate vísvam*. In the only other passage in which Gr identifies the verb stem as taking an instr., VI.13.4, I take the instr. as here, as expressing the means by which the subject displays his mastery.

III.54.16: The first half-vs. treats the kinship we share with the Ásvins, a theme occasionally touched on elsewhere (e.g., VIII.73.12 adduced by Ge). The grammatical problem in the hemistich is the (pseudo-)root noun compd. *bandhupīch*-, which has been interpr. both actively (“asking about [their] kinship”: Gr, Ge [WG], Lü 526, Scar 328–29) and passively (“asked about [their] kinship”: Re). I have followed the Re path, on the assumption that it is more likely that humans are asking the Ásvins about it than that the Ásvins are wondering about it themselves. But in general I prefer root noun compounds to have active meaning, and it is possible that the majority position is the correct one. It does not seem to have too much effect on the interpr. of the rest. Another hapax compd, with the same elements in opposite order, is found in this maṇḍala: III.20.3 *prṣṭa-bandhu*-(voc., not accented) ‘whose kinship is asked about’. Names are also at issue in that passage.

III.54.17: There is phraseological connection between the first pāda of this vs. and the previous vs.: *cāru nāma* “dear name” repeats verbatim the end of 16b, and though they are etymologically unrelated, *kavayaḥ* in 17a echoes *ākavaiḥ* in 16d.

The first half of the verse most likely refers to the Ṛbhus, though they are not named until c. The “dear name” of these unnamed subjects is probably “gods,” the predicative voc. *devā(h)* in b. The Ṛbhus were not originally divine, but achieved the status of gods because of their wondrous acts in the sacrifice. So to be addressed as “gods” by Indra is precious to them indeed.

The second half-vs. consists of a pāda (c) with a sg. nom. (*sákhā*) referring to Indra, accompanied by a pl. instr. (*ṛbhúbhiḥ*) and no verb, followed by one (d) with a 2nd pl. impv. (*takṣatā*). It is tempting to construe the two pādas together, with a mixture of constructions: the sg. nom. + instr. serving as the equivalent of a pl. subj. to the verb in d, but I have kept strictly to the grammar, as do the standard tr.

III.54.18: Ge (/WG) takes pl. *yajñíyāsaḥ* as predicated of *aryamā ... áditiḥ* with pāda a simply a nominal clause; this is strictly impossible, since the predicate adj. should be dual. Ge explains the plural on the grounds that the poet is thinking of the other Ādityas. This is possible, but I prefer to take *yajñíyāsaḥ* as a third term referring to an unspecified set of other gods (quite possibly the rest of the Ādityas), and all three terms as the subj. of pl. *yuyóta* in c. (So also Re.) The *naḥ* in pāda a then simply anticipates the same form in c, and b is parenthetical.

III.54.19–20: The call to the gods to hear us, found first in vs. 1, returns here at almost the end of the hymn (19c, 20a, 20c). Note that in 19c the verb is sg. (*śṛṇótu*) with a series of sg. subjects (and one pl., *āpaḥ*, in the middle), while in 20a it is pl. (*śṛṇvantu*) with a grammatically pl. subj. In 20c a sg. nom. with an instr. pl. of accompaniment (rather like the construction I suggested in 17c) takes a sg. verb, which suggests that my suggestion for 17c is incorrect.

III.54.21: The standard tr. take *bhágaḥ* as the subj. of *mṛdhyā(h)* in c; e.g., Ge “Bhaga [das Glück] möge in meiner Freundschaft nicht fehlen, o Agni.” With such a 3rd ps. subj., this requires *mṛdhyāḥ* to be a precative (Re calls it a “pseudo-précatif” for some reason) rather than a straight 2nd sg. opt. This is, of course, not impossible. But the desire expressed here, that Agni make sure that Bhaga does the right thing, does not seem the usual type of prayer addressed to gods in the RV. I take pāda c as consisting of two clauses, the first nominal, the 2nd, addressed to Agni, consisting only of a negative and a verb (cf. for this construction with this verb, *ná mardhanti* in 14d above), with Agni the subj. I take *bhágaḥ* as a common noun in the publ. tr.; alternatively it might mean “(May) Bhaga (be) in partnership with me.”

The final word of the vs., the gen. *purukṣóḥ* ‘consisting in much livestock’, is a bahuvrīhi variant of the phrase *bhūri pasvāḥ* ‘abundance of livestock’, likewise ending its vs. in 15d.

III.54.22: Old is disturbed by *tām* in c and suggests emending *pr̥sú tām* to *pr̥sutā*, loc. sg. of *pr̥sutí*-. Because of the peculiar mid-pāda position of *tān*, I favor this suggestion though it requires erasing one accent.

III.55 All Gods

As noted in the published introduction, this hymn is notable for its refrain, “great is the one and only lordship of the gods” (*mahád devānām asuratvám ékam*), with its juxtaposition of *devá-* and *ásura-*. For a riff on this refrain, see X.55.4.

III.55.1: The perfect in b, *ví jajñe*, is entirely ambiguous between \sqrt{jan} and $\sqrt{jñā}$, and I think it likely that both are meant. In this context there is not too much difference between a syllable being born and being discerned. The “track of the cow” is presumably here the ritual ground, and the reference is to the ritual speech of the dawn sacrifice.

Re astutely notes the juxtaposition of *akṣára-* and *padá-*, reinforcing the speech theme, even though *padá-* has the sense of ‘track, footprint’ here. See *padá-* in the next vs. (2b) for a possible reference to speech.

The standard tr. all supply a first-person subject in c, with a verb like “I proclaim.” No one but Old attempts to justify this addition, and his attempt is half-hearted. I instead take c as continuing b and take the underlying form of *prabhūṣan* to be *prabhūṣat*, neut. nom./acc. sg., before a following nasal, against the Pp. The participle modifies *akṣáram* in b. In my interpr. the “syllable” (that is, the essence of speech) attends to the gods’ commandments, perhaps by giving them imperishable verbal form. I also suggest that the “great syllable” is actually the refrain found in d; note that *mahát* in b takes the same position as it does in the refrain. The refrain may also be the most important of the gods’ vratas; see also 6c.

III.55.2: For *juhuranta* see comm. ad I.43.8; I take the form to \sqrt{hvr} ‘go crookedly’, not \sqrt{hr} ‘anger, be angry’. The point here is that the gods and the ancestors, who themselves know the path/word, should not keep us from following this same ritual cursus. There is no question of anger that I can see.

The standard interpr., that c refers to the beacon of the kindled ritual fire visible between heaven and earth, is surely correct. This kindled fire is referred to more straightforwardly in the next vs., 3c *sámidhe agnau*.

III.55.3: The flying, scattered desires of the poet here and his (re)turn, in a ritual context, to the old ways of doing things reminds us of the opening of III.38, a hymn about the development of a poetic vocation within the age-old tradition, esp. III.38.1cd. In this connection it’s worth noting that our refrain, *mahád devānām asuratvám ékam*, finds an echo in III.38.4c *mahát tát vṛṣṇo ásurasya nāma* “Great is that name of the bull, the lord.” Ge also appositely adduces VI.9.6, also about a poet’s training and his self-conscious assumption of the mantle of tradition, with his inspiration deriving from the ritual fire.

The *ṛtá-* that we wish to speak may again be the refrain that follows immediately.

III.55.4: The *ví ... purutrā* of the preceding vs. (3a) returns here, though with the preverb bound to a ppl. (*víbhṛtaḥ*); the phrase is contrasted with *samānā-* to express the theme of unity and diversity in balance. The “common king” is of course Agni, and the image is both of this single god being found on many different ritual grounds and of the ritual fire on any particular ritual ground being divided into three.

With Ge, I assume that the pair in c is the kindling sticks. Cf. III.31.2d and X.27.14b, esp. *tasthaú māṭā* “the mother stands still,” comparable to our *kṣéti māṭā* “the mother rests peacefully.” The epithet ‘having two mothers’ (*dvimātár-*) used of Agni in 6a and 7a is a reference to the paired kindling sticks.

III.55.5: As is generally acknowledged, the feminine plurals in the first hemistich refer to plants; the idea is the common paradox that fire is covertly present in all plants because overt fire is produced from wood. Here the three types of plants must be 1) ‘older’ (*pūrvā-*) = woody and easily burned, 2) ‘later’ (*āparā-*) = still green and obviously growing and fire grows up with them, 3) tender (*táruṇī-*) = sprouting ones, which are hard to burn, but he’s in them already anyway. Most tr. take *sadyáḥ* with Agni, not the new-born plants -- e.g., Re “est d’un coup au dedans des (plantes) nouvelle(-ment) nées” -- but *sadyáḥ* is strongly associated with forms of \sqrt{jan} , esp. in III (e.g., III.5.8 *sadyó jāṭāḥ*, sim. III.32.9, 10; 48.1), in the sense of “just born.”

The covert presence of fire is the topic of the paradox in c: he is always within the plants (*antárvatīḥ*), which are therefore pregnant in some sense, even though they have not been impregnated (*āpravītāḥ*) sexually. See X.91.6 for a similar passage, though it lacks the paradox found here.

III.55.6: There seems to be a consensus that the phrase *śayúḥ parástāt* in pāda a refers to a form of Agni in the other world, that is, to the sun in some manifestation (see esp. Ge n. 6ab). This seems to me entirely unnecessary and a cosmic intrusion in a sustained description that is otherwise entirely focused on the ritual fire (vss. 1–9). Instead the hemistich seems to contrast the fire that was immanent and motionless (*śayúḥ*) in the plants, as described in vs. 5, released after birth and roaming restlessly, as a newly kindled fire does. The depiction of his resting place as ‘far away’ (*parástāt*) may seem exaggerated if only plants are involved, but conceptually, and to a certain extent physically (since the kindling wood has to have been gathered from somewhere), it seems to me appropriate.

We should also factor in the possible interpr. of *śayú-* as ‘fatherless’; see disc. ad IV.18.12. I consider the word a pun here; on the one hand the fire resting in the plants (as above), on the other, the fatherless fire who yet has two mothers. I would now alter the tr. to “He who was lying down far away / fatherless -- now he who has two mothers ...” For a similarly phrased passage see I.31.2.

III.55.7: Pāda b is an elaboration on and corrective of 6b. It is not the whole fire that wanders untethered, only the top of it (*ágram*), while the base stays put on the hearth. Most tr. take *ágram* as an acc. with *ánu*; I follow Re (who in turn follows Bergaigne) in taking it as the neut. nom. subj.

The accent on *cáratī* is contrastive with the immediately following *kṣéti*, which opens a new clause.

III.55.8: This verse contains quite oblique phraseology. The first half-verse appears to describe the increasingly aggressive ritual fire after it has been kindled. I take *āyāt* as the neut. pres. part. to $\sqrt{i} + \tilde{a}$ ‘come’, substantivized to mean ‘approach, advent’, and I supply a gen. ‘of him’, which is parallel to the gen. simile in pāda a. The growing fire is

compared to a fighter involved in close combat. I have rendered *pratīcīnam*, lit. ‘turned outward, opposite, face to face’, as the slangy ‘right in your face’ to convey the belligerent nearness of the fire’s approach.

The c pāda is likewise hard to interpret. As Ge notes, the lexeme *antár√car* is generally used for the journey between earth and heaven undertaken by Agni, the messenger or “go-between” for the earthly and heavenly realms. This usage is found in fact in the very next vs., 9b, where Agni is clearly the subject and is journeying through the space between heaven and earth -- as well as in numerous other passages (see esp. X.4.2, as well as nearby III.58.1). As Ge also points out, in I.173.3 it is ‘Speech’ (*vā́k*) who plays this role. Similarly, in our passage ‘thought’ (*matí-*) -- i.e., as often, thought that has taken shape as ritual speech -- is the subject and undertakes the role of messenger. As for the tribute of the cow (*niṣṣídham góḥ*), with Ge I take this as referring to the bovine product that serves as oblation, namely ghee. Thus, ritual speech makes the swift journey to the gods in heaven from the ritual ground, bringing the news of the oblation or serving as its envoy. On *niṣṣíd-* see comm. ad III.51.5.

III.55.9: In pāda a the “gray messenger” is Agni, gray because of his ash; I take the fem. pl. *āsu* as referring to the plants (see vs. 5) that provide the fuel that feeds Agni’s flames. The fire “bears down on them” (/ “keeps pursuing them”; *ní vevetí*) as it spreads over the firewood. (A reference to his hearths is also possible, but I think less likely.)

In contrast to the earthly spread of the fire depicted in pāda a, b shows it rising towards heaven in its messenger role. I take *rocanéna* as an instr. of extent of space, rather than referring to Agni’s own luminosity with the standard tr. However, taking it in the latter way would not appreciably alter the sense of the pāda.

The publ. tr. is somewhat misleading, in having ‘bearing’ for both *ní vevetí* in a and *bíbhṛat* in c, though of course English ‘bear’ has entirely different senses in the two idioms.

III.55.10: This verse continues the theme of vss. 8–9, Agni’s role as go-between. Its point is to show us that Agni as messenger reaches to the highest places in heaven, those defined by the endpoint of Viṣṇu’s famous striding. But the introduction of Viṣṇu also initiates the transition from the exclusive focus on Agni and his kindling.

Note the alliteration: (*go*)*pāḥ paramaṃ pāti pāthaḥ, priyā ...*

III.55.11: The *yád* in pāda c has no obvious function. JSK (I.136) interprets the pāda as containing an “X and which Y” construction (“the dusky one and [the one] who is ruddy”), with *yád* instead of *yā* by attraction to the *anyád* of b. Although this is a tempting way to account for the *yád*, in addition to the wrong gender the rel. is wrongly positioned: we should expect **yád/yā ca áruṣī*. Ge’s suggestion, that this contains the izafe-like [not Ge’s term] *yád* that attaches appositives in Vedic prose, is attractive, but not only would this be a reverse example (the *yád* clause always follows in prose), and it would be entirely isolated in the Saṃhitā language. See my forthcoming “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian.”

It’s also worth noting that the structure of c is identical to 12a *mātā ca yātra duhitā ca dhenū*, with two nom. singulars conjoined by double *ca*, a *yá*-subordinator between

them, and a dual nom. at the end of the pāda referring jointly to the two singulars. So it is possible that the *yād* of 11c comes from the model of 12a, where *yātra* has function.

III.55.12: With Ge I interpret this fem. pairing to be Night and Dawn, who in the previous vs. were identified as sisters. They jointly nurse the infant fire at the early morning sacrifice; the reference is probably to twilight, the transition between Night and Dawn. Re prefers to identify them as Heaven and Earth, but this requires him to interpret Heaven as a female (which of course is not unheard of), and it also makes less ritual sense. On the other hand, the same fem. dual *samīcī* is used in vs. 20 of Heaven and Earth.

III.55.13: The pāda-initial position of *anyāsyā(h)* strongly suggests that it is indefinite (‘another’, not ‘the other’), contra the standard tr. Since definite *anyā-* ... *anyā-* (‘the one ... the other’) is correctly positioned in 11b, 15b, and 17ab, I think we should take the contrastive positioning seriously and connect this phraseology with 4c, which also contains initial *anyā-* (*anyā vatsām bhārati kṣēti mātā* ‘Another bears the calf; the mother rests peacefully.’). In that passage the “mother” of the fire, the lower kindling stick, rested, while the upper kindling stick, identified as “another,” carried the infant fire. Here the situation is reversed: the *anyā-* form refers to the mother of the calf/fire, which is now being licked by a different feminine entity -- in this case, in my opinion, the ghee oblation. A second pairing also imposes itself, however: in vs. 12 we had a different feminine duo: Night and Dawn. Their proximity in 12 invites an alternative reading of 13a, underscoring the temporal transition, with Night functioning as the mother of the fire, but Dawn taking over, tending it and bellowing over it. This latter interpr. seems to be continued in the next vs. (14ab).

I confess that I do not entirely understand the purport of pāda b (nor, as far as I can see, does anyone else). The hemistich is found identically also in X.27.14cd, though given the virtual impenetrability of that hymn, this doesn’t help much. Contra Ge (/Gr, etc.), I do not think *bhū-* here is ‘world’, nor that the instr. expression *kāyā bhuvā* means “in welcher Welt” (see Old for objection to this tr.). Instead I take *bhū-* as ‘form’ or (with Old, etc.) ‘existence-form’, with the phrase meaning “in what shape or guise.” I suspect that the pāda asks how the surrogate mother/cow, who took over from the fire’s mother in pāda a, will deliver nourishment (symbolized by her udder) to the infant fire. The answer may be given in pāda c: it is “the milk of truth” (*ṛtāsya ... pāyas-*), which we might further translate into “the milk of correct ritual speech.”

III.55.14: Ge (/WG) takes *pādyā* as merely a locational ‘unten’, contrasting with *ūrdhvā* at the beginning of the next pāda. It seems unlikely that a formation with so much lexical content would be used in so colorless a manner, esp. given the deployment of *padā*-forms elsewhere in the hymn (*padé iva nīhite* beginning the next vs. [15a], *padé góḥ* 1b, *padajñāḥ* 2b). The “feet” of Dawn are presumably, in naturalistic terms, the light of dawn nearest to the horizon; shining through morning mists it will take on various shapes and colors. (Lü [617 n. 3] suggests that the various shapes and forms are vegetation on the earth, which is also worth considering.) But in mytho-ritual terms, if Dawn is the cow nurturing the young fire in 13b (as well as pāda b in this vs.), the “wondrous forms” (*vāpūṃṣi*) she clothes herself in and the “many shapes” she possesses (*pururūpā*) are the forms and colors of the fire over which she stands. That the scene is set on the ritual

ground is suggested by pāda c, where “I” roam across “the seat of truth” (*ṛtāsya sādma*), which I take as a reference to seat of the ritual. Ge (/WG), however, interpret the pāda as simply meaning “I wander ‘im Geiste’” -- I *think* because of the *vidvān* ‘knowing’, though that word usually refers to knowledge of the ritual or to cosmic knowledge related to the religio-ritual system.

With Ge (/WG) I take *pururūpā* as fem. nom. sg.; however, it can equally be neut. acc. pl. (with Gr and Re) modifying *vápūṃṣi*. The choice actually has almost no effect on the sense of the pāda.

III.55.14–15: The publ. tr. is somewhat misleading, in that *vápūṃṣi* in 14a is tr. as “wondrous forms” and *dasmé* in 15a as “the wondrous one.” I might substitute “marvellous forms” for the first, to avoid the impression of an etymological connection.

III.55.15: This vs. seems to continue the theme of Night and Dawn. The *anyád ... anyád* construction of pāda b echoes that in 11b, where Night and Dawn were first introduced, and in fact our pāda b, with one hidden and one visible, paraphrases 11b, with one shining and the other black, and forms a small ring.

Moreover, the two “set down within the wondrous one” echoes 12c *ṛtāsya té sādasy īle antāḥ* “I reverently invoke the two within the seat of truth.” I take *dasmá-* to refer to the ritual fire/ritual ground, and one of the marvels is that two such large entities (Night and Dawn) can fit into something so small.

The vs. also recycles various thematically significant lexical items: *padá-* (see comm. ad 14); *nihité* echoing *ní dadhe* (13b); *antár* (12c and passim: 2c, 5b, 5c, 8c, 9b, 12c; *antár* is in a sense the signature word of this hymn); *anyád ... anyád* 11b. The ‘pathway’ (*pathyā*) takes us back to III.54.5 where a question about “the pathway leading to the gods” (*devāṃś áchā pathyā*) initiated the mysteries that have dogged us ever since.

III.55.16: The miraculous milkers in this vs. are taken by all standard tr. as rain clouds, flg. one of Sāy.’s suggestions (the other being the heavenly regions). In context this interpr. seems perverse. The verse forms part of a tight little section (beginning with vs. 11) concerning Night and Dawn and their nourishing of the infant ritual fire. Our vs. esp. echoes vs. 12: *dhenávaḥ ... sabardúghāḥ ... ápradugdhāḥ* “milk-cows, sap-yielding, not milked out” is the equivalent in the plural of 12ab *dhenū, sabardúghe dhāpayete* “the two milk-cows, sap-yielding, give suck” in the dual. I find it highly unlikely that the vocabulary here repeated from 12 would refer to entirely different entities (clouds), which, moreover, have no connection with the dawn ritual depicted here. Instead, in the course of this section the joint nurturing activity of Night and Dawn (11–12) has given way to the dominance of Dawn over Night (13ab, 14ab), and though both Night and Dawn are present in vs. 15, one of them (Night) is hidden (15b). This trend accords with the natural phenomenon: at dawn, light dissipates darkness. In our vs. 16 the plural cows either represent the Dawns in general -- the plural of Dawn being often interchangeable with the singular -- or the beams of light, the “dawn cows,” of a single Dawn. The expression “becoming new ever again” (pāda c *návyā-navyā yuvatāyo bhāvantiḥ*) might favor the former possibility, since it reminds us of the daily parade of ever-new youthful Dawns. My identification of the cows with the dawns here admittedly leaves the noisiness (“let them be noisy,” *ā ... dhunayantām*) unexplained. I would suggest either

that there is also a reference to the crackling of the fire wood as the ritual fire is kindled at dawn, or that it refers to the general noise attendant on dawn as the various creatures awake, including real cows mooing to be milked. Note that already in vs. 13a Dawn (in my interpr.) ‘lows’ (*mimāya*) over the infant fire. I think we can safely banish the putative rain clouds.

III.55.17: As indicated in the publ. intro. I consider this vs. to be transitional between the fire-kindling vss. and the arrival of Indra at the sacrifice. I therefore think that the reference is ambiguous. In the publ. intro. I suggested a trio of possible referents: Agni, Soma, and Indra. I now think it is only Agni and Indra and that Agni is the sole referent in ab, with transition from Agni to Indra in c.

This opinion is very different from the standard, which takes Parjanya as the subject here (flg. on the supposed rain cloud vs.). The issue is further complicated by the fact that in the next hymn (III.56.3) yet another being, possibly Tvaṣṭar or Tvaṣṭar’s son, is described as *retodhā vṛṣabhāḥ* “a bull, depositor of semen,” which matches our *vṛṣabhāḥ ... ní dadhāti rétaḥ*. Although I must concede that Parjanya is described with the same phrase as III.56.3 in VII.101.6 and is said to deposit semen also in V.83.1, such designations are not exclusive to Parjanya. In I.128.3 it is Agni who is ... *réto vṛṣabhāḥ kánikradad, dádhad rétaḥ kánikradat* “a bull ever-roaring, depositing his semen’ (with $\sqrt{k}rand$, rather than $\sqrt{r}u$, ‘roar’), and I think Agni is the referent here as well. I do not entirely understand the two herds of cows, but suggest that it may have to do with the embryonic doctrine of the cycle of waters that is later developed in the Upaniṣads, whereby rain falls from heaven and causes plants to grow; the plants, as fuel, produce/give birth to the fire, whose smoke goes to heaven and becomes clouds from which the rain falls, and the cycle begins again. Our passage may have an abbreviated form of this: the bull Agni is roaring (that is, crackling as fire) among one set of cows (plants as firewood); the smoke goes to heaven and the rain (his semen) falls to earth and produces plants (the other herd). Note vs. 5 much earlier in the hymn, where it is said of the plants “Having (him) within, (though) unimpregnated they give birth to (him).”

The transition from Agni to Indra occurs in pāda c, in my interpr. Both Agni and Indra can be called *kṣāpāvant-* (*Ikṣapāvant-*) ‘earth-protector’, indeed simultaneously. (See X.29.1 and my “Śleṣa in the Rig Veda?” [Fs. Gerow], 163–64.) Indeed this epithet is even more flexible: as I discussed in the Gerow Fs., the first element may be either *kṣā(m)* ‘earth’ or *kṣāp-* ‘night’. (For the possible morphological analyses, see the loc. cit.) Under the latter analysis, the epithet would be appropriate only for Agni, but under the former to both Agni and Indra, so the first word in c may slip from clear reference to Agni to double reference. The following two words, *bhāga-* and *rājan-*, are also used in the RV of both Agni and Indra, though ‘king’ is more common for Indra than Agni. The transition is complete.

III.55.18: In my interpr. this vs. announces the arrival of Indra with a splendid team of horses. This new topic is signaled by *prā nú vocāma* beginning pāda b. The exact arrangement of the six and five isn’t clear to me. Re suggests that the double *nú* indicates that there are two separate clauses here. He may be right (“now there is an abundance of horses of the hero; we will proclaim (it) now”), though the difference in sense is slight.

III.55.19–21: I’m not sure why Tvaṣṭar appears here. The previous vs., with the arrival of Indra at the sacrifice, may mark the end of the ritualistic vss. that dominated the hymn up till now. The few remaining vss. then celebrate the prosperity and abundance that our good relationship with the gods, via the sacrifice, will produce: teeming life provided by Tvaṣṭar (19), goods filling the two worlds provided by Indra (20), peace provided by Agni (21), and the inanimate earthly supports for all this prosperity, which provide their gifts to Indra (22).

III.55.19: It is striking that pāda a is reused in the famous Yama-Yamī dialogue hymn (X.10.5b), where Yamī claims that Tvaṣṭar made them a married couple in the womb. I do not think there is an echo of that story here; the point of intersection is simply the association of Tvaṣṭar with conception, pregnancy, and birth (cf., e.g., X.184).

Acdg. to the standard interpr. (Ge [/WG], Re; cf. Klein DGRV I.218, Kü 314), *prajāḥ* is to be construed with *pupóṣa*, on the basis of X.170.1 *prajāḥ pupoṣa purudhā* ... This is not impossible, but it seems unnecessary, esp. as the latter hymn is quite late. It also implies that *purudhā* should also be construed with *pupóṣa*, but this is impossible because *jajāna* is unaccented. It is also unlikely that *prajāḥ* and *purudhā* should be separated, given *purudhā prajāvān* in the next hymn (III.56.3b). At best we can take *prajāḥ purudhā* with both verbs: “thrives with regard to offspring in great quantity and has begotten them [=offspring in great quantity]” or perhaps “thrives with regard to offspring and has begotten them [=offspring] in great quantity.” Such an interpr., with an acc. of respect and a fundamentally intransitive verb, follows that of Kü (314). I do not believe that *pupóṣa* here can have the transitive/causative sense that the other tr. ascribe to it (e.g., Re “a fait fleurir les créatures”).

III.55.20: I assume that the subject of this vs. is Indra. One of his standard cosmogonic deeds involves the creation and separation of the two worlds (“the two great bowls” here), the separation here implied by the material crammed between them. Indra is of course commonly identified as a *vīrā-*; he also “finds goods” (e.g., II.13.11, VIII.61.5), though so do other gods as well as mortals.

III.55.21: The first three pādas here are almost identical to I.73.3abc, where Agni is definitely the referent. For disc. of some of the detail, see comm. there.

III.56 All Gods

I will not attempt to further identify the referents in these enigmatic vss. beyond the sketchy suggestions given in the publ. intr. Ample disc. can be found in the standard tr. As in many such mystical hymns, the grammar is mostly quite straightforward; it’s the purport that remains cloaked in obscurity.

III.56.1: The standard tr. take b as obj. of *minanti* in a, which is certainly possible, while I take it as a separate nominal clause. The choice has no real implications.

In c I take *ródasī* as subj. of the infin. *nināme* in d, along with *párvatā(h)*, but the standard tr. (also Thieme, ZDMG 95: 90) supply a different infinitive in c, generated from *minanti* in a. So, e.g., Ge “Weder die Zauberkundigen noch die Weisen schmälern ... / Nicht sind Himmel und Erde ... (zu schmälern) ...” I do not see the need for

supplying additional material. The only possible semantic arguments might be 1) that the two worlds would not be subject to being bowed down (but I don't see why), or 2) that *vedyā-* wouldn't be capable of performing something physical (like bowing down) but only mental/moral (like transgressing), but such an action seems well within normal limits for the Vedic conceptual universe. Another possible way to construe pāda c is to take *ródasī* as another subject of *minantī*: “nor do the two worlds transgress the commandments.” This has the merit of not supplying anything, but makes *vedyābhiḥ* harder to incorporate. Old suggests this possibility as well as supplying *nināme*; he does not suggest supplying a different infinitive in c.

The word *vedyā-* can be either positive or negative depending on context. Here it must be the latter; cf. also VII.21.5.

III.56.2: WG suggest that *átyā(h)* is a hapax related to *ánta-* ‘border, edge’, *ántya-*, tr. ‘Begrenzungen’. Since no other forms show such a putative zero-grade, since *ántya-* is not found in the RV, since the stem *átya-* is well attested, and since there is no metrical advantage to reducing an **antyā(h)* here to *átyā(h)*, this suggestion doesn't merit adopting. In a hymn of this nature, the females might as well be steeds as boundaries. For other attempts to reinterpret *átyā(h)* see those rejected by Old and another given by Ge (n. 2c).

III.56.3: On the basis of *tváṣṭā ... viśvārūpaḥ* in the preceding hymn (III.55.19) I take the subj. here to be Tvaṣṭar. Since Tvaṣṭar has a large role in the shaping and begetting of offspring, the identification makes sense in this context.

As Ge (et al.) points out, the deriv. *pājasyà-* at the beginning of the Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Up. (ŚBM X.6.4.1) in the list of the body parts of the sacrificial horse seems to refer to the underbelly: *dyaúṣ prṣṭhām antárikṣam udáram prthivī pājasyām díśaḥ pārsvé ...* “heaven its back, midspace its belly, earth the underbelly, directions its flanks ...,” which accounts for the standard tr. here ‘having three bellies’. However, here in this passage with polarized gender and a sexual tone, I think it should also contrast explicitly with *tryudhā* (better **tryūdhā*; see Old, who explains the shortening on the basis of following *purudhā*) ‘having three udders’. On a four-legged animal the underbelly would be the part that sags behind the ribcage, where on a female paśu the udder would be. The corresponding male body part located there would be the groin, hence my tr. The image is the common one of the ur-creator as androgynous. See III.38.4–7, a deeply enigmatic hymn in this same maṇḍala, where the creator is also both a bull and *viśvārūpa-*.

In c I suggest that *patyate* may be ambiguous between ‘be master’ and ‘be husband’ (on the basis of *pāti-*, which of course means both) because of the sexual activity in d.

III.56.4: I have no suggestions for the identity of the singular referent of a, cd (though the waters call to mind Indra), nor for the reason of what seems the intrusive b.

Here and sometimes elsewhere the loc. *abhīke* seems to have a temporal sense (“in an instant, in a flash”) rather than a locational one (“in close quarters” vel sim.). See for this passage Ge's “im entscheidenden Augenblick”, Re's “tout d'un coup.” The semantic dev. isn't too hard to see: as quick as a collision.

III.56.5: On this vs. see Thieme, *Untersuchung* 43–44 and 47–48. He is responsible for the second interpr. of *vidátheṣu* in b. See also *vidátha-* in III.38.5–6, a passage already adduced above ad vs. 3, and comm. thereon: ‘cosmic division’ seems the most likely interpr. of the stem there.

The three watery maidens in c may be evaluated in conjunction with II.5.5, also with the three (apparently watery) women who nourish Apām Napāt in II.35.5, and perhaps with the three goddesses of the Āprī hymns (Sarasvatī, Idā, and Bharatī). Who they are here and what they are doing are unclear to me.

In d *pátyamānāḥ* ‘acting the master’ may be a sly joke, since it has females as its subj. and it was just used (3c) for the hyper-virile inseminator.

III.56.6: The emphasis on the day here is striking. Two different ‘day’ words get used: *#trír ā divaḥ ..., divé-dive ... trír no áhnaḥ#*, with the two parallel expressions polarized at the beg. and end of the hemistich. For another poss. passage with both words, cf. IX.86.19 and comm. thereon, where the possible semantic difference between the two words is explored.

III.56.7: Schaefer (196–97) nicely points out that the “intensive” (i.e., frequentative) *soṣavīti* is the verbal equivalent of the āmreḍitas in 6cd (see comm. above) with the simple verb *suva*.

I am not certain what to do with pāda b. The standard tr. take Mitra-Varuṇa as parallel subjects with those in c, with the main verb in d. This is certainly possible, but conceptually it seems a bit odd. Do Mitra and Varuṇa want things from other gods? would they beg for such a gift? Also Savitar is regularly *híraṇyapāṇi-* (as in III.54.11), so the *-pāṇi-* adj. here (*supāṇī*) would associate M+V with him.

III.57 All Gods

III.57.1: The plural agent noun *panitāraḥ* predicated of just two gods, Indra and Agni, assumes other gods are covertly present; cf. III.54.9 in the same VD series, with *devāsaḥ ... panitāraḥ*, after which the expression here may be modeled.

III.57.2: The standard tr. all take Indra and Pūṣan in pāda a as the subj. of *duduhre* in b and as modified by *prītāḥ* in that pāda. There are several difficulties with this interpr. First, pāda a has entirely dual reference: the two divine names *índraḥ* and *pūṣā*, followed by two dual descriptors, *vṛṣaṇā suhástā*, but both the adj. *prītāḥ* and the pf. *duduhre* in b are plural. Although Old suggests that this dual/plural disharmony is similar to (and therefore presumably no more problematic than) the pl. *panitāraḥ* in 1d, I think the cases are different: Indra and Agni have no dual descriptors in 1d and there is a plausible source nearby for the pl. *panitāraḥ*.

Moreover, in 2ab Old and Ge (/WG) take Indra and Pūṣan as agentive milkers, supplying what produces the milk (namely in this case the udder) as the object of *duduhre*. But medial forms of \sqrt{duh} ordinarily take the milk-producer (cow or, by synecdoche here, the supplied udder) as subject; if there is an object it is the milk, either actual or metaphorical. This is exactly the use of the med. 3rd sg. pf. *duduhe* (that is, the identical form to *duduhre* save for number) in 1c. It seems highly unlikely that these two

nearly superimposable forms would be used with entirely different syntax/semantics in near adjacency. The construction that would be reflected by the tr. of Old et al. is generally in the active; cf., e.g., I.64.5 *duhánti ūdhaḥ* “(The Maruts) milk the udder.” (Re bypasses the syntacto-semantic difficulty by taking Indra and Pūṣan as the milk-producers -- “Indra donc, Pūṣan ... ont donné un lait inépuisable” -- but the number disagreement remains.)

To avoid these two problems, I propose taking 2a as a variant pairing continuing 1d -- Indra and Pūṣan are often found together, as are Indra and Agni, and could equally admire the cow. In fact, if 2a continues 1d, the pl. *panitāraḥ* could be accounted for by the addition of Pūṣan in 2a. (Alternatively 2a can be a nominal clause with *suhástā* as predicate: “Indra and Pūṣan, the two bulls, have dexterous hands” or sim.) I then take 2b as a separate clause, with *prītāḥ* a fem. nom. pl. referring to cows, who are “pleased” because they are well-treated and produce milk accordingly; they are the subj. of *duduhre*, and *śaśayām* refers to the milk they produce. In this interpr. the unnamed cows in b stand for the inspired thoughts, the poems, of “me” -- the poet who called his *manīṣā* a milk-cow (*dhenú*-) in 1ab. The productive result of these poems in the sacrificial exchange, their “milk,” is compared to the “(milk) of heaven,” namely, rain. This theme is further developed in cd: when/if the gods take pleasure in her, i.e., the poet’s inspired thought offered at the sacrifice, he hopes to get the reciprocal benefit of the gods’ benevolence. (Note the echo of *asyām* in c and *aśyām* in d, though unfortunately they are in different metrical positions.)

It might be objected that the cow in vss. 1–2 is otherwise singular (*dhenúm* 1b, *yā duduhe* 1c, *asyāḥ* 1d, *asyām* 2c), but the feminine plural dominates vs. 3 (*jāmāyaḥ* 3a, *dhenāvaḥ* 3c), and this may simply anticipate the number shift.

III.57.3: Ge takes *śaktīm* as an infinitive, governing a dat. *vṛṣṇe* (flg. the Pp.): “... dem Bullen einen Dienst zu leisten wünschen.” This somewhat wayward interpr. is not followed by the other standard tr., where *śakti*- receives its usual abstract sense -- though WG do preserve the dative interpr. of the ambig. Saṃhitā *vṛṣṇa* (“die dem Stier das Kraftvermögen wünschen”). The more natural interpr. is Re’s, with underlying gen. *vṛṣṇaḥ*: “qui recherchent la force-active du taureau,” and my tr. reflects that.

As Ge suggests, the “sisters” in ab are the fingers of the officiant that produced the ritual fire with the kindling sticks; the cows in cd may be the ghee-oblations or (supported by vss. 1–2) the hymns accompanying the production of the fire, or both.

III.57.4: The first hemistich faintly echoes 1a, with *manīṣā* (4b) corresponding to *manīṣām* and *vīvakmi* (4a) reminiscent of *vīvikvān*, though they belong to two different roots (\sqrt{vac} and \sqrt{vic} respectively).

Various referents have been proposed for the feminine pl. in cd: dawns (Old), tongues, flames (Ge), flame-tongues (WG). Though Re favors flames in his tr., his comment in his notes is more illuminating: “Type d’ellipse d’un nom fém. pl., notamment dans le cycle d’Agni; plusieurs possibilités concurrentes.” This remark seems esp. apt to this hymn, with its focus on feminine entities. Note also that *ūrdhvā bhavanti* is found in the next hymn, III.58.2, where the subjects are either ritual offerings or wise thoughts (or both).

III.57.5: The two descriptors of Agni's tongue, *mádhumatī* 'possessing honey' and *sumedhā(h)* 'very wise', seem almost to clash in their juxtaposition, but they were probably chosen to reflect two different aspects of the tongue. On the one hand, Agni's tongues of flame flare up when the libations are poured upon them; 'honey' presumably here refers to these libations (rather than to soma, despite the common identification of soma with honey; soma would put the flames out if poured on them). But *real* tongues, the kind that produce speech, can be qualified as 'very wise' because of that speech, and the crackling of the ritual fire often stands for ritual speech.

[III.58–60 JPB]

III.58 Aśvins [SJ on JPB]

III.58.1: Although *pratná-* has a variety of referents in the RV including, often, Agni, supplying "semen" here is supported by a very similar phrase in this same maṇḍala: III.31.10 *páyah pratnásya rétaso dúghānāḥ* "milking out the milk of the age-old semen", as well as VIII.6.30 *ād ít pratnásya rétaso jyótiṣ paśyanti vāsarām* "just after that they see the dawning light of the age-old semen"; in addition, I.100.3 *rétaso dúghānāḥ* "milking out (the milk) of their semen" (see comm. ad locc.). For the possible referents of both the milk and the semen, see publ. intro.

One way or the other, the first three pādas with their unclear referents and actions, apparently all connected with the early morning, are setting the stage for the quite straightforward statement in pāda d.

III.58.2: The vs. is very difficult and lends itself to a range of unsatisfactory syntactic analyses. I'm afraid that I find quite unlikely the publ. tr.'s interpr. of ab, with a parenthetic *ūrdhvā bhavanti* breaking up a single clause that occupies the rest of the hemistich. (Even though this is one of the possibilities that Old entertains.) Although I'm not in principle against explanations via parenthetic interjections – I use this tactic from time to time – this one doesn't reward us with better sense. The interrupted clause especially – "... carry you two like parents back here" – contains a puzzling simile: why would the parents need carrying back? I am also disturbed by the position of *prāti vām*, which by rights should begin a clause – putting it after the verb with which the words are supposedly construed, with the rest of the clause dribbling in towards the end of the next pāda, seem uncharacteristic of RVic syntax. Such an analysis should only be considered if it yields superior sense (which it does not). Ge's interpr. is slightly better, in that he takes a and b as separate clauses, and his deployment of the simile with the parents makes more sense. But he still takes *prāti vām* with the preceding verb. I prefer to take *suyúḡ vahanti* as the minimalist 1st clause with unspecified subject (which may, in the end, be the *medhāḥ* at the end of the hemistich, but does not have to be) and unspecified object (but surely the Aśvins): "In good harness they convey (you two)." A new clause begins (as it should) with *prāti vām*: "by truth the *medhāḥ* stand erect in response to you two, as if (in response to) their parents." The image is of dutiful children standing up to show respect. I don't quite know what to do with *rténa*, but it doesn't work very well in anyone's interpr. Here perhaps it indicates that the gesture of respect is made according to proper procedure, or else it could be a reference to the Kultlied (as Lü often interpr.

ṛtá-, though in this case [p. 453] he thinks *ṛténa* should be construed with *suyúk.*) In any event I think my new interpr. better accounts both for the syntax and the sense.

As for *médhāḥ*, see Old on whether this is the proper reading (to m. *médha-* ‘ritual offering’) or whether, per BR, it should be emended to **medhāḥ* (to f. *medhā-* ‘wisdom, wise thoughts’ (as in I.88.3, which also has *ūrdhvā-*). In fact either (or both) will do: the ritual offerings become erect by being raised up by the flames and smoke after having been offered; the wise thoughts of the poet-ritualists respond to the presence of the Aśvins by standing at attention, as it were. For *ūrdhvā bhavanti* in a sacrificial context, see the immed. preceding hymn, III.57.4; note also that Agni’s tongue [=flame] is described in that hymn as *sumedhā* ‘very wise’ (III.57.5).

Pace Ge and JPB, I very much doubt that *asmát* should be construed with *járethām* as a pseudo-agent: “awaken because of us”; “von uns sollt ihr wachgerufen werden.” Nor, with Old, do I think that *manīṣām* is the obj. of *járethām* ... *ví* in a construction meaning “wake away X” (i.e., cause X to go away by waking). What then to do with *manīṣām*? Perhaps JPB’s interpr. will work – with *manīṣām* the first object of *cakṛma*, here construed with *ví*, meaning ‘put aside, make go away’. In that case I would only alter his tr. by incorporating *asmát*: “Awake! We have put the inspired thought of the miser away from us; we have brought here (*cakṛma* + *ā*) your help.” However, the Ge (/WG) solution of supplying a verb with *ví* – “drive” or sim. – is also possible.

I am somewhat disturbed that a *manīṣā-* would be credited to a *paṇí-*, since *manīṣā-* is ordinarily a very positively presented thought, but I don’t see any way out of that.

III.58.3: The stem *ávartí-* is found 4x in the RV, 3 of them in this same syntagm, I.118.3=III.58.3 *práty ávartim gámiṣṭhā*, V.76.2 *āgamiṣṭhā práty ávartim*, always of the Aśvins. The fourth is found in the famous hymn about Indra’s birth, IV.18, in its final vs. 13, where Indra says of himself *ávartyā súna āṇṛāṇi pece* “because of need I cooked the entrails of a dog.” This brief expression of *āpad* dharma supports the usual interpr. of *ávartí-* as ‘need, want, distress’ rather than JPB’s ‘trouble’. I would slightly emend the tr. to “you are the first to come in response to need.”

III.58.4: The parenthetical remark in b is an implicit explanation of the impvs. in pāda a, with their insistent *ā* ‘here’: everyone everywhere is summoning the Aśvins, but they should think about and come only to us.

It’s not clear to me why the priests giving honey are compared to allies (*mitrāso nā*). Note that the next hymn, X.59, is dedicated to Mitra.

III.58.6: “Your home is old” sounds more like criticism than praise; I would slightly emend the tr. of pāda a to “Ancient is your home, benevolent your companionship.”

III.58.7: The caesura most likely breaks at the compound seam of *tiró-ahnīyam*.

III.58.8: The root-noun compd *madhu-śút-* (3x, one a rep.) has the expected act. sense ‘honey-pressing’ and modifies the pressing stone, but this splv. *madhu-śút-tama-*, modifying soma, appears to have passive value, “best of the honeyed pressings,” per JPB. See Scar (615).

Note the fairly unusual syncopated syntax, with *pāda* a continuing through the first word of b, *sómaḥ*, followed by an abrupt clause break and initial *tām* picking up *sómaḥ* in a different case. The clause break does not coincide with a metrical break.

On *kárikra*t with sg. obj. that is modified by implicitly pl. *bhūri* see Schaef (105).

III.59 Mitra [SJ on JPB]

The hymn is divided into two by meter: vss. 1–5 Triṣṭubh, 6–9 Gāyatrī. The ring composition between vss. 1 and 5 (see below) also supports the view that these were originally separate hymns.

III.59.4: Thieme (M+A 49–50) argues that in this vs. Mitra is identified with the ritual fire, signaled in part by the initial *ayám*. Whether or not this identification is correct, the annuncatory *ayám* should be rendered. I’m slightly emend to “This Mitra here, worthy of reverence ... has been born ...”

III.59.5: This vs. closes the Triṣṭubh portion of the hymn and exhibits ring comp. with vs. 1: 1d: *mitrāya havyám ghṛtāvaj juhota* / 5d *agnau mitrāya havír ā juhota*.

III.59.7–8: The verb *abhí ... babhūva*, which is the scaffold of vs. 7, returns as the nominalized first cmpd member *abhíṣṭi-*, though built to *abhí√as*, not *√bhū*. This connection should have been signaled: I’d alter vs. 7 to “who dominates heaven ...”

III.60 Ṛbhus [SJ on JPB]

On the various deeds of the Ṛbhus, detailed esp. in vs. 2, see Brereton “Gods’ Work: The Ṛbhus in the *Ṛgveda*.” In *Indologica: T. Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume*, Book II, ed. L. Kulikov (2012). Pp. 111–34.

III.60.1: The publ. tr. fails to tr. *vaḥ* in *pāda* a, and its absence makes the tr. harder to interpr. As the publ. intro. says of this hemistich, “the present priests [= *uśíjaḥ* sj] have recovered the skills of the Ṛbhus ...,” but a too hasty reading of the publ. tr. gives the impression that the Ṛbhus are being identified with the Uśij-priests. To make it clearer, I would alter the tr. to “these things of yours.”

The neut. pl. *tāni* is a neutralized placeholder for the various skills, expressed in relative clauses with abstract nouns of different genders and numbers, set out in the next verse and a half: 1c *yābhir māyābhiḥ*, 2a *yābhiḥ śácībhiḥ*, 2b *yáyā dhiyā*, 2c *yéna ... mánasā* -- all summed up by *téna* beginning 2d.

Maṇḍala III contains a surprisingly large proportion of the occurrences of *uśíj-*: about a third, 9 of the 29 (not counting two repeated *pādas*); no other maṇḍala comes close. Most of the occurrences are sg. and refer to Agni, though some refer to legendary priests of one sort or another, as here.

The instr. *védasā* must mean ‘through knowledge’ here, against the standard sense of the homonymous *s*-stem ‘property, possessions’; this is the only passage in the RV that imposes ‘knowledge’. (On VIII.87.2, so interpr. by Gr. and Ge., see comm. ad loc.) Given its isolation, it is likely that an *s*-stem *védas-* ‘knowledge’ was created here to match *mánasā* in the 1st *pāda*. Although it is generally thought that the cmpds *viśvá-vedas-* and *jātá-vedas-* provide support for a simplex *védas-* ‘knowledge’, it is likely that

the 2nd cmpd member in both forms actually belongs with ‘possession, property’. See comm. ad I.44.7.

The bahuvrīhi *prátijūti-varpas-* is opaque; it is not even clear whether its internal structure is *prátijūti-varpas-* or *prāti-jūti-varpas-*. The former is the view of those who make their analysis explicit (Gr, Scar 177), but the lack of a noun **prátijūti-* or of a lexeme *prāti√jū* as well as the existence of a bahuvrīhi *prāti-rūpa-* ‘having a form corresponding (to every form)’ (VI.47.18) at least complicates the matter. Before going further, we should consider whether the *-varpas-* attributed to the Ṛbhus is inherently singular or plural (either being possible in the bv). The publ. tr. opts for singular: “... a (different) form,” suggesting in the publ. intro. that this refers to their new divine form; the other standard tr. (Ge, Re, WG) instead interpr. it as inherently plural: a new form for every occasion (signaled by the *prāti*). Because of the *prāti*, which JPB’s tr. “rapidly adopting a (different) form,” fails to render, I think the shape-shifting, inherently plural, interpr. has to be correct, despite the appeal of taking it to refer to the change from human to divine form. Whatever piece of Ṛbhu mythology this refers to, I would render the compd as “having/acquiring a (different) form in response to (every) spur,” essentially identical to the standard tr. cited above—e.g., Re’s very full “(assumant) une forme-changée à chaque incitation (nouvelle).” As for the structure of the compd, the first analysis, *prátijūti-varpas-*, is the correct one – however, with *prāti-* not as a preverb with *√jū*, but in the function it has in *prāti-rūpa-* cited above.

I would tr. both verbs in this vs., *jagmur abhí* and *ānaśá*, as simple preterites: “they arrived at,” “you attained,” since they both, esp. *ānaśá*, refer to the mythological past. In particular, after the recital of the Ṛbhu’s deeds in vs. 2, the summary ends with *sám ānaśá*, the same verb that ends vs. 1 (and see *sám ānaśur* in 3a) – but rendered differently in the publ. tr.

III.60.3: I would supply *indrasya sakhyám* of pāda a also as the goal of *dadhanvire* in b: “they raced (for it).”

III.60.5: Although Ge and WG supply “your” [=Indra] with *gābhastyoḥ*, in fact in the passages cited by Ge (n. 5b) where *gābhastyoḥ* is associated with soma preparation, the hands belong to the priests, with Re (implicitly) and the publ. tr. I would, however, slightly rearrange the tr. to “sprinkled soma, pressed in the hands (of the priests).”

III.60.6: The instr. *śácyā* is somewhat puzzling, if, as in the publ. tr., it means “along with your [=Indra’s] ability,” which presents “ability” almost as a fellow drinker. Even if it is an instr. of means (simply “with/by your ability”), not accompaniment, it’s odd: no one doubts Indra’s ability to drink soma, an action that requires no special skill. A possible solution is provided by the association of the instrumentals of this stem with the Ṛbhus. In this very hymn, in 2a, they carved the cups “by their ability (/ies)”: *śácībhiḥ*, and in the Ṛbhu hymn IV.35, the first three pādas of verse 5, each one detailing a different feat of the Ṛbhus, all begin with *śácyā* “by (your=Ṛbhus’) ability/skill.” Although *śácī-* is more often associated with Indra, of course, in this localized context the association with the Ṛbhus would come to the fore, and I suggest that this instr. refers to them: either as a functional equivalent of the *-m/vánt-* stems in pāda a: *ṛbhumān vājavān* “along with the Ṛbhus bringing the Prize of Victory [=Vāja]” and therefore an instr. of accompaniment

“along with their ability / skill,” or as the means by which the Ṛbhus accomplished the pressing, “by their ability/ skill.”

The VP *yemire* + DAT is found in the immed. preceding hymn, III.59.8, where the five peoples “submit” to Mitra; cf. also VIII.12.28–30, IX.86.30, etc. I would prefer “submit” or “submit themselves” here as well. Since the idiom is generally *vísṣvā bhúvanāni yemire* “all the worlds submitted (to X)” (VIII.3.6, 12.28–30; IX.86.30; cf. X.56.5), I suggest that “pastures” is a metaphor for “worlds,” rather than referring to the soma rites, per JPB, sim. Ge, Re, HPS (*Vrata*, 91). The “five peoples” (*pāñca ... jánāḥ*) in III.59.8 is a similar totalizing expression for the whole population of the world.

There are several different ways of construing pāda d, which has been much discussed. (In addition to the standard tr. and comm., see HPS *Vrata*, 91, JSK DGRV I.96–97.) Either *vratā* is instr. sg. and parallel to *dhārmabhiḥ* or it is nom. pl. The former view is represented in Ge’s tr., though in n. 6d he acknowledges the possibility of a nom. pl., as well as by WG and JSK, while Old championed the latter view and is fld. by Re and HPS. However we interpr. *vratā*, there is the independent question of the disposition of the genitives, *devānām mānuṣaś ca*. The two genitive can be depend on different nouns: *devānām* on *vratā*, *mānuṣaḥ* on *dhārmabhiḥ*; the *ca* then conjoins those two complex NPs, appearing, appropriately, after the first word of the 2nd NP—but only if both head nouns are in the same case. Hence, with the publ. tr. “according to the commandment of the gods and the (ritual) foundations of Manu.” Or the *ca* can conjoin only the two genitives (“of gods and Manu”) and the resulting phrase can depend either on *vratā* or on *dhārmabhiḥ*. For the former see Re, for the latter HPS. Thus there are several possible deployments:

- [*vratā* (instr. sg.) *devānām*] AND [*dhārmabhir* (instr.) *mānuṣaḥ*]
- [*vratā* (instr. sg. or nom. pl.) *devānām* AND *mānuṣaḥ*] [*dhārmabhiḥ* (instr.)]
- [*vratā* (instr. sg. or nom. pl.)] [*dhārmabhiḥ devānām* AND *mānuṣaḥ*]

And one impossible one (though favored by Old):

- [*vratā* (nom. pl.) *devānām*] AND [*dhārmabhir* (instr.) *mānuṣaḥ*]

Impossible because *ca* should not conjoin two head nouns in separate cases with different syntactic functions in the clause. (Old notes the problem but is undisturbed.)

A nom. pl. interpr. of *vratā* is tempting: the phrase *vratā devānām* with NA pl. *vratā* is found twice in nearby hymns (III.55.1, 56.1; cf. also III.7.7), and in V.63.7 acc. pl. *vratā* is found in a syntagm containing instr. *dhārmanā*, the syntactic configuration we would have here. My concerns are twofold: on the one hand, as was just charted, *devānām* cannot depends on nom. pl. *vratā* if *mānuṣaḥ* depends on instr. pl. *dhārmabhiḥ*; yet the phrase *vratā- devānām*, with only the first gen., is the nearby phrase we are comparing. In addition, the structure the nom. pl. phrase would fit into is uncertain. If is taken with the pl. verb in pāda c, *yemire*, it should mean “the commandments of gods and men submit to you (=Indra).” This is not impossible, given Indra’s hegemony even in the divine world, but it is a bit startling in context – with *dhārmabhiḥ* still to be added: “the commandments of G+M submit to you according to the ordinances/principles” (?). Or, less likely, “the commandments submit to you (=Indra) according to the ordinances/principles of gods and men.” If the verb is not to be borrowed from c, another one has to be supplied (/invented): Re “(ont lieu),” HPS “(werden) ... (erfüllt).” For these reasons, the instr. interpr. of *vratā* seems the better choice, with the submission of the “pastures” to Indra in harmony both with divine vratas and human dharmans.

III.60.7: As noted ad VIII.63.4, *hóman-* can mean either ‘pouring, offering’ (to \sqrt{hu}) or ‘invocation’ (to $\sqrt{hū}$, though **hávīman-* would be better; cf. *hávīman-*). Here, *pace* JPB, I think “at the offering/pouring of the rite” would be slightly better (so WG and seemingly Ge and Re).

III.61 Dawn

III.61.1: In the publ. tr. “with a rich prize” is slightly misleading, since it represents only *vājēna*, but “prize-giver with a prize” sounded flat.

“Young woman from of old” (*purāṇī ... yuvatīḥ*) reflects the usual paradox that Dawn is both new every day and the same every day from the beginning of time. She is “Plenitude” (*púramdhiḥ*) because she distributes the priestly gifts at the dawn sacrifice.

III.61.3: The hapax *caranīyāmāna-* seems an elaborate way to express what might as easily have been simply *cárant-*. Re tr. ‘traçant la marche’ and comments that it has “valeur durative-technique par rapport au simple *cárantī*.” My ‘making progress’ also attempts to differentiate it from the simple pres. to \sqrt{car} and to indicate its denominative origins.

III.61.4: The puzzle in this vs. is the image in pāda a, *áva syūmeva cinvatī*. Some factors that contribute to this puzzle: 1) *áva* \sqrt{ci} is not otherwise found in Vedic. (In epic/classical Skt. it means ‘gather’.) 2) *áva* need not be construed with *cinvatī*, but could go with *yātī* in the next pāda, esp. since tmesis in participles is considerably rarer than in finite verbs. 3) There are several roots \sqrt{ci} . 4) The referent of *syūman-* isn’t clear.

To begin with the last, most interpr. locate *syūman-* in the realm of sewing and garments. Ge tr. “die die Naht auszieht” (“who undoes/rips out a seam”), sim. Old “... die Naht auftrennend,” Re “défaisant le fil.” Old suggest that it is the seam that holds the darkness(es) together. Sāy. goes further, in suggesting that it refers to a garment (*vastram*), which Dawn takes off. WG’s “Wie eine (Frau) den Gurt ablegend” may also reflect this image, though their n. vacillates between sewing and equestrian interpr. The problem with all of these attempts is that, in its few occurrences, *syūman-* is otherwise used of horse tackle, esp. of reins; cf. the PN *syūma-raśmi-* (“*Band-Bridle” Mayrhofer, PersNam s.v.) and the cmpds *syūma-gabhastī-* (I.122.15 ‘with hands as its guiding rope’), *syūma-gṛbh-* (VI.36.2 ‘pulling at the reins’), as well as instr. *syūmanā* (I.113.17), all in horse/chariot contexts. Despite its derivation from $\sqrt{sīv}$ ‘sew’, it therefore seems unlikely that only here in the RV would it refer to garment construction. And, although Dawn as a female might in principle be connected with sewing (if that was Vedic women’s work), in fact she is usually not, whereas her travels are a standard theme; note, e.g., her chariot in 2b, her horses in 2c, and her driving (*yātī*) in this vs.

We must then turn to the verb. If we use the later ‘gather’ sense for *áva* \sqrt{ci} , the simile might mean “gathering up the reins (preparatory to setting out on a journey).” A similar idea, though not related to horses, seems to be reflected in Ge’s alternative given in n. 4a: “Wie (die Hausfrau), die das Halfterband (den Tieren) abnimmt (um sie auf die Weide zu treiben),” relating it thematically to *svásarasya pātnī* “mistress of good pasture” in the next pāda. I prefer to compare the lexeme *áva* \sqrt{tan} ‘unstring, slacken’ of

bowstrings (e.g., AV VI.42.1 *áva jyām iva dhánvano manyúm tanomi te hṛdāḥ* “Like a bowstring from a bow, I make slack the fury from your heart”; RVic exx. similar but without an explicit bowstring). The image is of Dawn letting the reins go slack to give the horses their head. Curiously, Griffith’s tr. is similar, “letting her reins drop downward,” though he thinks it refers to her sending down rays of light. If this interpr. is correct, I assume that it belongs to the root \sqrt{ci} ‘pile’, with a highly developed idiomatic sense. In fact, combinations of \sqrt{ci} + PREVERB tend to show fairly extreme idiomaticity.

Arnold (Ved. Met., 300) suggests reading *uṣā ā yāti* for simple *uṣā yāti*, which would yield an 11-syl. line. Old is tempted but seems to favor the transmitted reading; Re, however, is convinced. HvN reject it without explan. (“a rest at the 5th place seems preferable”). I would follow Arnold and Re, and therefore the publ. tr. should be emended to “drives here.”

Pāda d is taken by Ge and Re (and me) as containing one of the relatively rare RVic occurrences of \tilde{a} + following abl. in the meaning ‘all the way to’. The source of this counterintuitive use of the abl. can be seen in passages like this, where ‘all the way to’ and ‘all the way from’ are essentially identical in sense: the light of dawn stretches throughout the midspace, and the directionality (from/to heaven/earth) is irrelevant.

III.61.5: The standard tr. supply a form of \sqrt{vac} (Ge specifically *vivakmi*, invoking *áchā vivakmi* in nearby III.57.4a) in pāda a, which is then taken as a separate clause: “I (call) to Dawn for you ...” Although I resisted this in the publ. tr., I now see its merits, in accounting for the preverb *áchā*, the double *vaḥ* (pādas a and b), and the acc. case of Dawn. I would therefore emend the tr. to “(I invite) for you the goddess Dawn, radiating widely; proffer your well-twisted (hymn) (to her) with reverence.”

The phrase *pājo aśret* is found in a number of passages; see III.14.1 for details.

The standard tr. (also Lü 73, Kü 430) take *rocanā* as a fem. nom. sg., in order, as Ge says (n. 5d), to allow *prā ... ruruce* to have its expected intrans. sense. But well-attested *rocanā-* is otherwise only neut. (X.189.2 adduced by Ge, etc., as another ex. of a fem. is also a neut. pl.), and in the pl. it regularly refers to the luminous realms. I would prefer not to create a separate stem to apply to a single example, esp. because the default interpr. of the form would be neut. pl. There is a simple solution that allows the neut. pl. analysis to be preserved without imperiling the intransitivity of *ruruce* -- to interpr. the neut. pl. as an acc. of extent, as often. The publ. tr. reflects this.

III.61.6: The phrase *arkaír abodhi* has double sense, since *arká-* can mean both ‘chant’ and ‘ray’ and *abodhi* both ‘has (been) awakened’ and ‘has been perceived’. The ambiguity nicely captures the ritual situation: we ritualists (wish to) believe that the natural world is set in motion and controlled by our ritual activity (in this case chanting that makes Dawn awaken and dawn), but the ritual is itself set in motion by phenomena in the natural world, in this case the appearance of the first light of dawn.

III.61.7: This vs. offers a surprising number of small puzzles. The first is how to construe *uśāsām iṣanyān*. Most take gen. pl. *uśāsām* as the obj. of the participle, despite its unexpected case. (Others, like Pischel and Lü [for details see Lü 596–97], simply label *uśāsām* an acc. -- convenient but unconvincing.) I supply ‘cows’ (*gās*) as obj. on the basis of III.50.3 (in this maṇḍala) *sām ... gā iṣanya* and IX.96.8. That the bull (*vṛṣā*) in the next

pāda is the subject of ‘drive’ invites a bovine object. The cows, as often, can be the rays of the Dawn (the “dawn cows”). They are driven “on the foundation of truth” (*ṛtāsya budhné*), that is, the earth and more specifically the ritual ground.

The bull doing the driving is, in my view, the sun, which follows dawn and could therefore be conceived as driving the rays of dawn before him. His “entering the two world halves” is, of course, his rising above the horizon.

The standard tr. take *candrēva* in d to mean “like gold,” but if the reference is to the precious metal, it should be *candrām iva*, as they all acknowledge. With Gr and Old I instead take it as the fem. nom. sg. it appears to be, referring to Dawn. But who/what is the subj. of the frame? Most tr. take it to be the sun, who spreads his radiance (*bhānūm*) far and wide. This is certainly possible, but it leaves the *māyā* of Mitra and Varuṇa announced in c rather orphaned. I therefore prefer to take *māyā* as the subject of *vī dadhe*, in intransitive usage (“the magic power spreads/is spread”); the syntax of this frame is contrasted with the transitive but self-involved *vī dadhe* in the simile: “as shimmering (Dawn) has spread her own radiance,” with *bhānūm* belonging to the simile. This kind of syntactic disharmony is commonly exploited in similes, as I have discussed at length elsewhere (“Case disharmony in RVic similes”, *III* 24 [1982] 251-71).

III.62 Various gods

III.62.1: For the sense of this complex vs. and its relation to the rest of the hymn, see publ. intro. The point of the verse appears be that our hymns, however frenetic (a), are no longer effective (b), and therefore the activity of Indra and Varuṇa on behalf of their partners [=us] is in abeyance (cd).

With the standard tr. I supply ‘hymns’ with the opening *imā(h)*: the NP *imā girāḥ* is pretty common.

The praise hymns to Indra and Varuṇa appear to be whirlwinds (*bhṛmāyaḥ*) to us, but they cannot be ‘thrust/brandished’ (*nā tūjyā(h)*) by the devotees of the gods -- that is, they have lost their oomph, their energy, and therefore their effectiveness. For the connection between *bhṛmī-* and *√tuj*, cf. IV.32.2 *bhṛmīś cid ghāsi tūtujih* “You are a whirlwind, constantly lunging” of Indra. For the connection of hymns with *√tuj*, cf. V.17.3 *tujā girā*. Despite its position, *nā* in b should be the negative, not the simile marker. See Old.

MLW suggests an alternative interpr.: These hymns have become not to be pushed (away) for the one who has you two? I.e., they can’t be rejected because they are so insistent. So why aren’t you fulfilling them?

On *sīna-* see comm. ad II.30.2.

I take *sma* as indicating habitual action.

III.62.2: In ab the combination of an intensive (*johavīti*) and two superlatives (*purutāmaḥ* and *śaśvattamām*) gets its point across!

III.62.3: The “Shielding Goddesses” (pl.) appear here and in VII.34.22. In both cases they are associated with *śaraṇā-* ‘shelter’. A singular *vārūtrī* also occurs 4x, once (I.22.10) in association with *hótrā bhāratī* as here. Beyond their/her protective role, the *vārūtrī*

appear(s) to be featureless. The corresponding masc. stem *varūtár-* appears 5x as a common noun ‘defender, guardian’.

III.62.5: Ge (/WG) take *ā cake* as 3rd sg. (Ge: “Er liebt unbeugsame Kraft”). This is certainly possible, but Schmidt (B+I, 131) makes good arguments for flg. Sāy and Gr in taking it as 1st sg.; see also Re (EVP XVI, ad loc.).

III.62.5–6: Vs. 6 is entirely couched in the acc. and picks up from 5ab, where the acc. phrase is obj. of *namasyata*; 5c is a parenthetical intrusion.

III.62.7: Ge suggests in his notes that this vs. could be a single clause, essentially “This praise-hymn is recited to you by us,” with *te* (a) and *túbhyam* (c) tautological. This is possible, but it seems rhetorically unlikely.

On the expressed instr. agent with the finite passive, see my 1979 “Expression of Agency with the Passive ...” and “Case of Agent ...”

III.62.8: This vs. is more complex than it first appears, at least in my interpr. The dominant reading is the one given by Ge: the simile in c matches the frame in a, with b parenthetic. Nearby III.52.3bc [=IV.32.16bc] is nearly identical with minor morphological variation in the frame: *joṣáyāse gíráś ca naḥ / vadhūyúr iva yóṣaṇām*. This interpr. is undeniable. However, I think the intervening b pāda can also be seen as a target of the simile, but in a syntactically twisted way. The object of the verb *avā* ‘help’ is the NOUN + PARTICIPLE phrase (in reverse order) *vāyayántam ... dhíyam* “the insight seeking the prize,” which, extracted from its role as object and presented as a simple clause, would represent “the insight (nom.) seeks the prize (acc.),” with subject/object syntactic relations. Thus reconfigured, the phrase in b would match the simile in c: “our insight seeks the prize, as a bride-seeking man (seeks) a maiden.” The syntactic transformation of one of the parts of the structural pair from clause into acc. participial phrase does not disrupt their functional and semantic matching -- it rather shows again the pleasure that RVic poets get from off-kilter correspondences. (See, e.g., the simile/frame pair at the end of the previous hymn, III.61.7d with comm. above.)

This secondary reading presents another twist. In the dominant reading the subj. of the impv. *juṣasva* is a (male) god, the obj. a hymn (*gír-*), a word feminine in gender. These genders match those of the simile: the subj. a bride-seeking male, the obj. a maiden. But when we consider the underlying clause in b, the genders are reversed: the insight (*dhī-*) is feminine; she is the seeker, not the sought, while the prize (*vāja-*) she seeks is a masc. noun.

III.62.9: The usual sharp polarity between the preverbs *ví* and *sám* is emphasized by keeping the verb constant (*páśyati*) and explicitly conjoining the two verb complexes with *ca*. My “looks at all creatures separately and sees them whole” is meant to capture the contrast of the two preverbs in idiomatic Engl.

III.62.10–12: All three vss. in this *ṛca* contain *déva-* (...) *savitár-* (or vice versa).

III.62.10: And here, buried in this not particularly noteworthy hymn, is the Gāyatrī mantra, which is itself not particularly noteworthy on its own terms.

Note the play on *dhīmahi* / *dhíyah* juxtaposed across the hemistich boundary, belonging to different roots.

III.62.11: I take *púramdhyā* as an instr. of accompaniment, not (with Ge [/WG]) an instr. of means.

III.62.17: The sense of the splv. instr. pl. *drāghīsthābhiḥ* is unclear. This is the only occurrence of the superlative in the RV, and neither *dīrghá-* nor the cmpv. *drāghīyas-* occurs in the instr. pl. The standard interpr., that the splv. here is temporal (Gr ‘in längster Dauer’), seems reasonable, but not assured.

Commentary IV

IV.1 Agni

I do not understand the emphasis on Varuṇa in the early parts of the hymn (vss. 2–5; see also 18d), since the Vala myth and the unnamed Aṅgirasas in the later parts of the hymn have no obvious conceptual connection with Varuṇa and the Ādityas (see also Aditi in 20a).

IV.1.1: Hymn-introductory *hí* is difficult to render. It does not have its normal causal sense, though perhaps in this position *hí* is meant to explain why the hymn is recited following a particular ritual action. It is noteworthy that the first hymn of Maṇḍala VI (also, of course, to Agni) opens in exactly the same way: *tvám hí agne*.

With Ge (/WG) I take pādas def as the direct address of the gods to mortals, with the speech introduced by *íti krátvā* in c. (This idea goes back to Bergaigne; see Old SBE ad loc.) Rejecting this interpr., Old labors mightily to explain away the apparent 2nd pl. actives *yajata* and *janata* as voc. and 3rd pl. middle respectively. (In this he follows Sāy.) Re tries in addition to make *yajata* also a 3rd pl. mid. (see also Gonda [*Vedic Literature*, 228], whose tr. renders both forms as 3rd plurals). Although *yajata* could actually be a voc., 3rd pl. middles in *-ata* to thematic stems are morphologically impossible, no matter how metrically unfavorable *-anta* would be. Ge's direct speech interpr. solves these grammatical problems and also makes sense of the *íti* in c.

The poet plays with *ā/a* and the oppositional pair *mártya-* / *devá-* in de, with chiasitic #*ámartyam ... mártyeṣv ā#* in d, and *devám ādevam* opening e. (See also *devāso devám* opening 1b.)

IV.1.2: As Arnold (VedMetre, 300) suggests (so also Old, HvN), deleting *agne* in pāda a and reading *vavṛts"va* (as in 3a) yields a fine Jagatī line.

IV.1.3: The injunc. *vidaḥ* is functionally multivalent, but usually interpr. as an impv. (so Ge, Re, though not WG). On this form see comm. ad I.42.7–9 and IX.20.3. I would now allow an alternative translation as impv.: “find grace ...”

The final pāda (g) is a combination of the opening of c (*asmábhyam dasma*) and the ending of f (*sám kṛdhi*).

IV.1.4: My “may you please placate” is meant to capture the precative (*áva*) *yāsisīṣthāḥ* of the *sīṣ*-aorist to *√yā*. Note the dissimilation (if that's what it is) of the middle sibilant from expected rukified *ṣ* to plain *s*.

Note the phonetic figure straddling the hemistich boundary: b *yāsisīṣthāḥ* / c *yájiṣthāḥ*.

In 4c, likewise 6b, HvN note the caesura after three (4c *yájiṣtho váhñitamaḥ*, 6b *devásya citrátamā*). I wonder if the splv. suffix *-tama-* here is semi-detachable for metrical purposes, yielding an opening of 5 in both cases.

IV.1.5: The idiom *áva √yā* ‘placate, appease’ found in 4b finds a close variant in 5c *áva yakṣva* ‘placate through sacrifice’ to *áva √yaj*. Though belonging to different roots, they are phonologically and semantically similar. Another such variant is found in d *vīhí*

mṛṭkām “pursue his grace,” which echoes 3d *mṛṭkām ... vidah* “you (will) find grace” -- again two different roots (*vī* and *vid*) but phonologically and semantically similar.

IV.1.6: Because of the position of *ná* (*ghṛtām ná taptām*) I follow Ge in taking *súci* as the shared quality between simile and frame and therefore “attracted” to the neut. of the simile, though we would expect a fem. modifying the gapped *samḍś-*.

The distracted reading *ághnī* (*yāyāh*) ‘inviolable [cow]’ at the end of pāda c echoes *agnī-*, the divinity of the hymn.

IV.1.7: I take *santi satyā* here as an etym. figure, a phrasal verb meaning “come into existence” (“come [to be] true”), rather than taking *santi* as copula and *satyā* as a simple adj. with most tr. For one thing, pres. tense forms of *√as* in main clauses are usually existentials, not copulas; for another *trīs* should mean ‘three times’, not ‘three’ or ‘threefold’ as a copular reading seems to require (e.g., Ge “Dreifach sind diese seine höchsten wahren (Geburten) ...”). See also *satyām astu* in 18d. I am not sure which three occasions are being referred to, but possibly to the production of the three ritual fires -- though esp. given the word *paramā-* ‘highest’, it could be a cosmic reference.

I do not know what “enveloped within the limitless” (*ananté antāh párivītaḥ*) refers to. It may be the dense swirling smoke, lacking clear boundaries, that surrounds a fire, or it may be the unborn Agni’s concealment in the kindling sticks -- though it’s hard to see how they would be *anantā-*. It is also possible that this is a reference to the paridhi sticks that surround the ritual fire (see comm. ad IV.3.2 below); they would be “endless” because a circle has no end. Note the phonological play of (*an*)*anté antāh*, despite their different etymological affiliations.

In d the standard tr. take *arīyāḥ* as nom. sg. to the thematic stem *aryá-* (e.g., Ge ‘Herr’). I follow Thieme (Fremdling, 77–78) in interpr. it as gen. sg. to *arī-*. Among other things, as Gr points out, this would be the only ex. of *aryá-* with distraction, while *arī-* does have a few other distracted forms. There is no compelling formulaic evidence either way, but V.34.9 *ketúm aryāḥ* “the beacon for the stranger,” adduced by Thieme, resembles our passage thematically.

IV.1.8: In b the caesura appears to coincide with a compound seam (*#hótā hīraṇyā/ratho ...*), as HvN also note. This is reminiscent of the proposed caesuras in 4c and 6b, before the splv. suffix *-tama*. See also 19b.

The first cmpd member *rāmsu-* is taken by Schindler (Rt Nns, 40) as the loc. pl. to a root noun *rān-* ‘Freude’, an analysis accepted by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *RAṆ*).

IV.1.9: I follow Ge (n. 9a) in giving *mānuṣaḥ* a double reading, acc. pl. obj. of *cetayan* and gen. sg. dependent on *yajñābandhuḥ*. Note that it is neatly positioned between those two words.

I think *yajñābandhuḥ* has a more specific sense than simply ‘Opfergenosse’. Rather, Agni is literally our ‘tie’ (*bāndhu-*) to the primal sacrifice instituted by Manu because he has always been present, always the same, at every sacrifice since then.

The referent of *asya* in c is taken as the mortal (*márta-*) in d by Ge (implicitly also Re), as Agni by WG. Either is possible, both grammatically and contextually. There is no requirement that a possessive coreferential with the subject be expressed by a reflexive

(*svásya* in this case), and though, technically speaking, an unaccented oblique form of *ayám* should have an *antecedent*, the close proximity of *mártasya* and the fact that the subject of the preceding verb (*nayanti*), though pl., is clearly mortal would make *asya* = mortal unproblematic. And given the ritual intimacy of Agni and his worshipper(s), the house belongs to both.

Note the phonological echo in *sāḍhan* (c) and *sadhanitvám* (d), even though they are semantically unconnected. As for the latter, I now favor the alternative deriv. proposed by Scar (291), from a base **sadhaní-* ‘Teilhaber am gemeinsam Schatz, Teilhaber, Genosse’ in turn built to *sa-dhāna-* (ŚB) ‘gemeinsamer Schatz’ -- rather than as a derivative of the [a] root-noun cmpd *sadha-nī-*, with shortening of the root vowel before *-tvā-* (so AiG II.2.715). See *sadhanyām* in X.50.3. In fact some or all of the three forms assigned to the root-noun cmpd by Gr (IV.4.14, VI.51.3, X.93.5) may also belong rather to Gr’s stem *sadhanyā-*. (Both Lub and Scar assign all four forms [that is, incl. X.50.3] to the *sadhanī-* stem, though, as just noted, Scar considers the alternative analysis.) The problem with the root-noun analysis is that the semantic connection between *√nī* ‘lead’ and the apparent sense of the derivative is quite attenuated. It is, however, the case here that two finite forms of *√nī* (*nayanti* 9b, *nayatu* 10a) flank *sadhanitvám*, so there may be at least a secondary connection perceived.

IV.1.10–18: Hoffmann tr. and comments on these vss. in Injunktiv (pp. 175-78).

IV.1.10: In b I follow Hoffmann (Injunkt., 175) in taking the rel. clause as *devābhaktam yád asya*, rather than just *yád asya* with the standard tr. The sense doesn’t differ markedly.

More difficult is the configuration of cd. All the standard interpr. (incl. Hoffmann), save for Old (both SBE and Noten), take final *ukṣan* as the voc. sg. of *ukṣān-* ‘ox’, referring to Agni. I prefer, with Old, to take *ukṣan* as a 3rd pl. injunc. main-clause verb (*√ukṣ* ‘sprinkle’), with the subj. the immortals of c. The image is of the gods first creating the treasure and then bringing it to life like a watered plant. In favor of the majority interpr, I must concede, is the common idiom *satyām √kr* ‘make real’, which would in fact complement my interpr. of *santi satyā* in 7a, but I find a voc. address to Agni in the middle of 3rd ps. reff. to him (10ab, 11, not to mention vss. 6-9) awkward. Re refers to “l’étrangeté d’un tel Voc.,” despite explicitly rejecting Old’s finite verb interpr.

And what is the treasure? A slightly different phrase *rātnam ... dyúbhaktam* (rather than *devābhaktam* as here) returns in vs. 18, where it seems to refer to the light of Dawn in the form of the cows released from the Vala cave; here I think it may be the light of the newly kindled ritual fire -- and of course the lights of Dawn and the fire of the dawn ritual can be superimposed upon and identified with each other. If the light of the new fire is the primary referent in this vs., *ukṣan* ‘sprinkled’ may refer to sprinkling ghee on the fire, which action would cause it to blaze up. The next vs. (11), which describes the birth of Agni, fits this interpr.

IV.1.11: The vs. treats the birth of the ritual fire on earth, with the second hemistich describing the amorphous shape and constant motion of physical fire. That it has neither foot nor head (*apād asīrṣā*) presumably refers to the lack of consistent vertical definition of a flickering fire; “concealing its two ends” (*guhāmāno āntā*) is reminiscent of 7c

“enveloped within the limitless” (*ananté antáh párivītaḥ*), and the explanations suggested there may apply here. In addition, the “two ends” may be the non-existent foot and head just referred to.

IV.1.11–12: The repeated phrase “in the nest of the bull” (*vr̥ṣabhāsya nīlē*, 11d, 12b) is somewhat opaque, but I think Ge is basically right, that the *vr̥ṣabhā-* is Agni (not, with Hoffmann, heaven). His nest is, in my opinion, the ritual ground; its designation also as the “womb of truth” (*ṛtāsya yóni-*, 12b) supports this identification. I find WG’s n. on this phrase incomprehensible, though it seems to follow Hoffmann in part.

IV.1.12: I am in agreement with most of the standard interpr. that the referent of the subj. of ab is the troop of Aṅgirasas, expressed by the neut. *s-*stem *śārdhaḥ* (*pace* Gr, who takes it as a thematic masc. nom. sg., referring to Agni, sim. Schmidt [B+I, 43 n. 21]), though this word generally refers to the Marut troop.

I part company with these interpr. with regard to the referent of c, however. Most take this string of nom. sg. masc. adj. as further descriptors of the Aṅgiras troop, while I think they refer to Agni. Agni and his births are referred to as *spārhā-* earlier in the hymn (6d, 7b); in 8c he is described as *vapuṣyò vibhāvā* exactly as here. The recycling of this characterizing vocabulary seems to me a clue that the subject has changed here from the first half of the vs: it would be perverse to repeat this phraseology with a referent other than the original Agni. Note also that *yúvan-* ‘young’ is regularly used of Agni, and in the context of his birth the word is esp. apt. I take this nominal clause (/subclause) as annunciatory of the gapped object of d.

Ge, Re, and Old (SBE) take *janayanta* in d as intrans. ‘be born’ (e.g., Ge “Dem Bullen wurden die sieben Freunde geboren”), but this medial form is a standard ex. of *-anta* replacement of the undercharacterized act. *-an* and is therefore transitive. See my “Voice fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural *-anta* in active paradigms,” *IIIJ* 21 (1979) 146–69. It is correctly interpr. by Hoffmann (Injunk., 176) and WG. The form is an injunctive, contra the Pp.; so already Gr; see Old (Noten), Hoffmann.

The “seven dear ones” (*saptá priyāsaḥ*) are most likely the Aṅgirasas, here referred to in the plural rather than the collective neut. sg. in pāda a. III.31.5 contains “seven inspired poets” (*saptá víprāḥ*) in a clear Aṅgiras/Vala context. It is also possible that the phrase refers to the Aṅgirasas’ music, since *saptá vāñīḥ* ‘seven voices’ is a common phrase. The adj. *priyāsaḥ* could be either masc. or fem.

IV.1.13: This is the first of the Vala myth vss. As noted in the publ. intro., the actors throughout must be the Aṅgirasas, but they are never named.

The curious phrase *ṛtām āśuṣānāḥ* “panting over the truth” occurs three times in IV.1–2 (also 2.14, 16). It expresses the energy and effort of the Aṅgirasas in singing the true song that opened the Vala cave and freed the cows. See Lü (514–15).

The med. part. *huvānā-* is ordinarily passive in value; *pace* Gr, only VII.30.3 is clearly trans. I therefore take *huvānāḥ* here as fem. acc. pl. modifying *uśasaḥ* in passive sense. The standard interpr. is masc. nom. pl. in trans. value, ‘calling to’. This would of course make just as much sense; my choice is based on the usage of the preponderance of occurrences of the stem.

IV.1.14: Med. *marmṛjata* is most likely reflexive, as I and most other interpr. take it, though Sāy. and Re supply Agni as object. Although the reflex. interpr. seems a little thin -- splitting stone is dirty work, so they had to clean themselves up -- Agni is out of place in this Vala context and there is no other obvious candidate to be object. Moreover, the middle voice suggests a reflexive sense.

The referent of *anyé* in b is not clear to me. By my placement rules (see “Vedic anyá- ‘another, the other’: syntactic disambiguation,” *Sound law and analogy*, Fs. Beekes [ed. A. Lubotsky], 1997, pp. 111-18), it must be definite (“the others”). Most tr. take it as indefinite, though Hoffmann tr. it as definite and implicitly contrastive with the unspecified subject of pāda a: “Die (einen) ... Die anderen von ihnen ...” I think this approach is the correct one, though I don’t think we need or want the group of Aṅgirasas to be split into moieties. Instead, in my view, the contrastive groups are the primordial singers, the Aṅgirasas, and their modern counterparts, the poets and singers of the current ritual. The injunctive *ví vocan* would allow a presential interpr. (“they proclaim ...”) with current singers as subj. instead of or in addition to the preterital one in the publ. tr.

In c we return to the Aṅgirasas, whose singing opens the Vala cave -- hence “they sang the decisive act.” Most tr. take *kārā-* as a victory *song* of some sort (the exception is WG: “... singen sie auf das Schaffen,” where *kārā-* is the topic of the song). But I think the expression is more radical: as so often in the RV, our poet wants to emphasize the power of words to make things happen, the connection between song (the cause) and the act, the splitting of the rock (effect).

The hapax cmpd. *paśváyantra-* is puzzling in formation and sense, although the parts it is based on are relatively clear. The 1st member is *paśu-* ‘livestock’ or a derivative thereof, the 2nd is or contains *yantrá-* ‘binding rope’. The interpr. comes down to deciding which is the lesser of two evils: positing an otherwise unattested extended stem *paśvá-* beside *paśú-* but a relatively conventional bahuvrīhi ‘having binding ropes for the livestock’ or rejecting the extended stem but ending up with an anomalously formed and accented bahuvrīhi. Old argues strenuously for the former, with the rather cumbersome tr. “in ihren Vorrichtungen zum Festhalten ... das Vieh haltend,” and some version of this analysis is followed by Hoffmann and WG. Ge and Re (the latter with some hesitation) opt for the latter, with Ge suggesting a reverse bahuvrīhi (for *ayantra-paśu-*). (He cagily fails to accent it.) In the end I swallow some version of the second analysis, primarily because I find it unlikely that such a common word as *paśú-* would display an unnecessary extended stem in just this place in all of Sanskrit, particularly because there’s little metrical advantage to it here. However, I do not follow Ge’s reverse bahuvrīhi interpr. (roughly, “having livestock loosed from the binding ropes”), but assume that it is the Aṅgirasas who lack *yantra*-s to bind the cattle and do so with song instead. (This interpr. goes back to Bergaigne; see Old SBE ad loc.) That some form of verbal expression could serve as a *yantrá-* is shown by the cmpd. *ślóka-yantra-* (IX.73.6) ‘having *śloka*s as binding ropes’. Unfortunately I do not see how to make this explanation work formally, particularly with regard to accent, esp. as there exists a differently accented privative cmpd. *ayantrá-* in X.46.6. I leave it at this, unsatisfactorily.

In terms of the structure of the vs., I now think the odd pādas (a, c) refer to the Aṅgirasas and the even ones (b, d) to the current singers. I would therefore slightly modify the published tr., which presents pāda d as if it were the direct speech -- the song - of the Aṅgirasas described in c. I now think d is what the other, current poets were said

to proclaim in b.

IV.1.15: The hapax *ḍṛdhṛá-* is plausibly explained by Hoffmann (reported in EWA s.v.) as a crossing of a redupl. nominal **dadhrá-* (\sqrt{dhr}) and the ppl. *ḍṛdha* ($\sqrt{dṛh}$), the latter found in the second hemistich (15c).

IV.1.16: In the publ. tr. *prathamám* in the phrase *té manvata prathamám nāma* is rendered as an adj. with *nāma* (“the first name”). On the basis of VI.1.a *tvám ... prathamó manótā* “you (were) the first minder” I think it possible (but not certain) that *prathamám* here is an adverb: “they first brought to mind the name ...” The agent noun *manótar-* is built to the verb stem *manu-* found in our passage, and *prathamám* may qualify the action of ‘bringing to mind’ rather than the name brought to mind.

A comma should be inserted in the publ. tr. after “(The cows)” in pāda c.

On *vrā-* see comm. ad VIII.2.16 and Jamison 2003 (= “Vedic vrā: evidence for the svayamvara in the Rig Veda?” in *Paitimāna: Essays in Iranian, Indo-European, and Indian Studies in Honor of Hanns-Peter Schmidt*, vols. 1-2 [ed. Siamak Adhami], 2003, pp. 39-56).

Because of its accentuation *yaśásā* should be adjectival; the question is what head noun to supply. Flg. Lü (Varuṇa, 521, also fld. by Hoffmann, WG), I supply ‘name’, which appears in pāda a and appears to be the topic of the rest of the vs. Ge and Old prefer ‘milk’, but this is contextually less likely.

IV.1.17: On *néśat* as a replacement for an original thematic redupl. aor. with radical zero-grade (expected **na-nś-a-*), with the vocalism of the first syllable replaced by that of the weak perfect, see KH, Injunk. 64–65.

On *dúdhita-*, a qualifier of darkness, see EWA s.v., with ref. to Schindler (1967), who separates it from *dudhrá-*, etc., and adduces possible Germanic and Toch. color-term cognates.

IV.1.18: I interpr. the “treasure apportioned by heaven” (*rátnam ... dyúbhaktam*) to be in the first instance cows (as in I.73.6), those released from the Vala cave, but the cows conceived of as dawns and therefore as light, including the light of the newly kindled ritual fire. See vs. 10 above, with *rátnam ... devábhaktam*. This buried “light” motif works well with the houses in pāda c, where the ritual fire is at home (see vss. 9, 11 above), and provides an easy transition to the invocation of Agni in the next vs.

The subj. of *dhārayanta* in b I take as the gods in c (with Old, SBE, Hoffmann, WG), rather than taking c as a separate nominal cl. (Ge, Re). Note the chiasmic morphological figure in c, allowing alliteration between the nom./loc. pairs: *vísve vísvāsu dúryāsu devā(h)*.

In d I supply the treasure (in the form of light) as the subj. of *satyám astu* (so also Hoffmann). This VP should be interpr. in the context of *santi satyā* in 7a. See comm. there.

IV.1.19: In b HvN note a caesura after 3; I wonder instead whether the caesura comes at the compd seam (*#hótāraṃ víśvá/bharasaṃ ...*), a solution they themselves suggest for 8b, where the caesura would otherwise come after 2. See also 4c, 6b.

On the cmpd *viśvā-bharas-* see comm. ad V.54.10.

The general opinion is surely correct, that the “gleaming udder of the cows” (*śúcy ūdhaḥ ... gāvām*) stands for the cows’ milk, which is compared to the soma stalk, itself standing for soma. But I think that the udder also stands for the Vala cave, which contained the cows. The root $\sqrt{tṛd}$ ‘drill’ is used for breaching the Vala cave in VI.17.1, 3, X.74.4. Ge finds the subj. of *atr̥nat* unclear, but surely Agni makes the most sense (not the sacrificer, per Sāy.). In his ritual role, Agni causes the dawn to dawn and therefore opens up the Vala cave on a daily basis. And at the same time he brings the outpouring of ghee (in the sacrifice) and the morning dakṣiṇā and other products of the cow.

The two soma-related terms *aṃśú-* and *ándhas-* are difficult to define and to distinguish from each other, esp. since both can be used in place of soma itself. However, insofar as it’s possible to tell, they seem to refer to (parts of) the physical plant soma, rather than its product, the juice also called soma. This is one of the only passages in which the two terms occur together (see also X.94.8), with gen. *aṃśóḥ* dependent on acc. *ándhaḥ*, which suggests that *ándhas-* is a part of the *aṃśú-*. This surmise supports the interpr. given by EWA s.vv. (with lit.) that the *aṃśú-* is the plant and *ándhas-* is the plant’s stalk. The use of both terms to refer loosely to the soma drink is similar to the use of ‘grape’ or ‘vine’ to refer to wine.

I do not understand the position of *ná*. With the other standard interpr. I tr. it as if it qualifies the verb it immediately follows (“he drilled, seemingly ...”; Ge “er zapfte gleichsam ...,” etc.), but this is simply not a regular RVic usage: similes are always nominal. I would like to connect it with the double usage of *ūdhaḥ* just discussed, but I’m not sure how. I wonder if the 2nd reading of *ūdhaḥ* as equivalent to the Vala cave hints at a simile like *vrajám ... gāvām iva* “like a pen of cows” (I.130.3; cf. I.10.7, IV.20.8, etc.). This would allow us to tr. the phrase “He drilled the gleaming udder of the cows [=milk] like the ‘udder’ [=pen/Vala] of the cows,” which would restore *ná* to its normal function of marking nominal similes. Although the *ná* is not positioned after the *ūdhaḥ* or the cows, this would be the result of the avoidance of pāda-final simile-marking *ná*, which flips with the noun it is marking (see comm. ad VIII.76.1, X.21.1, 111.7). Thus *ūdhaḥ ... ná gāvām #* in this vs. would be essentially equivalent to I.130.3 *vrajám ... gāvām iva #*.

IV.1.20: Within the balanced phrases of the first hemistich -- *viśveṣām áditir yajñíyānām*, *viśveṣām átithir mānuṣānām* -- the nearly identical nominatives *áditir* and *átithir* make rhetorical sense. But why Agni is called, or identified as, Aditi (or boundlessness or innocence, if it is used as a common noun) is unclear. Since Aditi is the archetypal divine mother, perhaps Agni is being credited with a maternal relation to the gods, as a deliberate paradoxical foil to vs. 1, where the gods install Agni and are his de facto parents, and to the other accounts of his birth in this hymn. It is also the case that Agni is closely associated with Varuṇa, a son of Aditi, early in the hymn (vss. 2, 3, 4, 5, also 18), though in vs. 2 it is explicitly stated that Agni is Varuṇa’s younger brother, certainly not his mother. For a different wordplay involving *áditir*- see IV.2.11 in the next hymn. (JPB [Ādityas 226 and n. 44] suggests Agni is called Aditi “because he brings the gods into harmony and kinship with men, but I’m somewhat dubious.)

IV.2 Agni

IV.2.1: There seem to be deliberate echoes in this vs. of the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn (IV.1.1) -- esp. pāda b *devó devēṣu aratír nidhāyi* corresponding to IV.1.1b *devāso devām aratīm nyeriré*; also IV.2.1a ... *mártyeṣv amṛtaḥ* and IV.1.1f *ámartyam ... mártyeṣv ā*. The first pāda is identical to I.77.1c, which continues (I.77.1d) with *hótā yájiṣṭhaḥ* ... as in our pāda c.

On trisyllabic *mahnā* (restored as **mahinā* by HvN, though as **mahanā* by Gr; see also Old Noten), see comm. ad I.123.4.

With Old (Noten, not SBE; also Re; Keydana, *Infinitive im Rgveda*, 54), I take *īrayádhyai* as a causative inf. in passive construction, “to be roused,” rather than Ge’s intransitive “um ... zu fahren” or WG’s transitive reflexive “um sich ... in Bewegung zu setzen.” Note 7b *átithim udīrat* “will raise (you) up (as) guest.”

IV.2.3: The two rhyme words *vr̥dhasnū* and *ghṛtásnū* clearly form a rhetorical pair, though they have different origins and grammatical analyses, as their different accents show. *ghṛtásnu-* is generally taken as a bahuvrīhi with the reduced form of *sānu-* ‘back’ as 2nd member. See Old ad loc. and ad I.16.2, and cf., with a different designation of the same body part, *ghṛtā-pr̥ṣṭha-*. However, this cmpd. has a complex relationship with the differently accented *ghṛtasnū-* as well as *ghṛta-snā-* ‘bathed in ghee’. See Scar (661–62).

As for *vr̥dhasnū-*, Gr takes it as a root-noun cmpd, with *snū-* for *snā*, and glosses ‘Segen triefend’; Scar (662) more or less follows this analysis, though he proposes several different morphological pathways. Debrunner (AiG II.2.930), a bit confusingly, takes it as a “Nachbildung” to *ghṛtásnu-* though containing a suffix *-asnu-* (sim. Old SBE). (Debrunner does not gloss it; Old ‘mighty’.) WG seem to take it as containing the same ‘back’ as *ghṛtā-snu-*, tr. ‘von hochgewachsenem Rücken’. I agree with the general sense that *vr̥dhasnū-* has to have been influenced by *ghṛtásnu-*, hence my parenthetic ‘strong(-backed)’, but it cannot have been formed in direct parallel because of the accent. I think it should be evaluated in the context of another nearby form belonging to √*vr̥dh*, viz. the irregular (pseudo-)participle *vr̥dhasānā-* in IV.3.6, a stem that occurs 3x in the RV. Since that stem was part of our poet’s repertoire, I think it possible that he could create a reduced form of the “suffix” *-sānā-* (intermediately *-*snā-*, just as *-snu-* is reduced from *sānu-*) with further adjustment of the final vowel to match *ghṛtásnu-*.

The instr. *mānasā* must go with *jáviṣṭhā* given the close relationship between the root √*jū* and *mānas-* (cmpds *māno-javas-*, etc.) throughout the RV; the question is only how to construe the instr. with the splv. I take it as an instr. of quality, rather like Re’s “les plus rapides par rapport à la pensée (même).” Flg. Sāy., Ge tr. the phrase as if it were a comparative with an abl.: “... schneller als den Gedanken,” which certainly makes sense but airbrushes the grammar. WG seem to take *mānasā* as a dual acc. (“die beiden schnellsten Denkorgane des R̥ta”), which is grammatically impossible for neut. *mānas-* (expect **mānasī*). Masc. du. *-as-* stems do have the ending *-ā*, but if the word here is meant to be masc., it should either be in a cmpd. (type *su-mānas-*) or show accent shift to a derived poss. adj. **manás-* ‘having mind’, which is not attested. Others (Lü 454, Scar 662) simply detach *mānasā* from *jáviṣṭhā* and tr. it elsewhere in the clause, but the formulaics speak strongly against that.

In the second hemistich the 2nd sg. verb *īyase* and the 2nd pl. acc. prn. *yusmān* comes awkwardly into English (“you [sg.] speed between you [pl.] and ...”), but neatly signals Agni’s natal affiliation with one of the two sides for which he acts as go-between.

See also 1a *mártyeṣv amṛtaḥ*, 10b *devó mártasya*, where Agni's divinity is juxtaposed with his mortal worshiper(s).

Contra Old (SBE and Noten) and Ge, I see no reason to take *mártān* (or, as Old wants to read, **mártām*) here as gen. pl. It is perfectly interpretable as an acc. pl. appositive to *vísah*. However, the same form in 11b is a somewhat harder case; see comm. there, as well as *nṛ̥n* in vs. 15.

IV.2.4: Unaccented gen. pl. *eṣām* must refer back to *yusmán ... devān* “you gods” in 3d; evidently the poet only wants a selection of them to be brought to the sacrifice.

IV.2.5: The qualifier ‘long’ (*dīrgháḥ*) of wealth in d means, of course, ‘long-lasting’ (just as *dīrghám támaḥ* [I.32.10, etc.] refers to “long(-lasting) darkness”). However, since it is implicitly contrasted here with ‘broad’ (*pṛthu-budhná-* ‘having a broad base’), it is clear that the image is one of physical dimensions, not merely temporal ones. And, at least for me, “long darkness” is a more striking verbal formulation than “long-lasting darkness.”

IV.2.6: Having described in the previous vs. what a (properly performed) sacrifice can get us, the poet now tells us what we have to do to perform this sacrifice properly.

On the pf. subjunctives here, see my 2016 “The Vedic Perfect Subjunctive and the Value of Modal Forms to Tense/Aspect Stems” (Fs. J L. García Ramón], with disc. of the pf. subjunctives in this verse as well as the pres. and aor. subjunctives in vss. 7–9. There I specifically dispute Kü's interpr. (340, also 212, 595) of the pf. subj. as functioning “zur Bezeichnung der vollendeten Handlung für den generellen Fall” (i.e., “... gebracht hat,” etc.).

IV.2.7: As he often does, Ge takes *cid* as a simile marker, but I do not think that is a possible function of *cid*, and certainly in this case there is no need to interpret *ánniyate* as a simile: Agni is regularly depicted as a greedy eater.

Contra Gr, all standard modern tr. and comm. take *níśíṣat* (so Pp.; *níśíṣan* is also phonologically possible, though morphologically unlikely) as belonging to $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘sharpen’ (common with *nī*), not $\sqrt{sās}$ ‘instruct’ (not found with *nī*). There are formulaic parallels with clear forms of *nī* $\sqrt{sā}$, see Ge's n. 7b and esp. VII.3.5c. With Old it seems best to emend to **níśíṣat*. He takes it as a short-vowel subj. to the redupl. pres. *śíśāti*. So also Hoffmann (Aufs. II, 445–46 n. 14). This is certainly possible, but it could also be a masc. nom. sg. act. part. to this same redupl. pres. Both a finite 3rd sg. in a rel. cl. and a part. would be accented on the stem (not the preverb) as here, and either form is contextually possible. It can simply belong to the string of subjunctives in this passage that express ritual service. But note pāda a of the previous vs. (6a), which has a subj. and a part. (*jabhārat siṣvidānāḥ*); one could argue that in this sequence of vss. there is no more than one finite verb per pāda, though that is not a particular telling argument.

IV.2.8: Because the loc. phrase *své dáma ā* “in his own house” in c does not seem to fit the equine simile there, in the publ. tr. I took it implicitly with ab. However, cf. I.143.4 *agnīm tám gṛbhír hinuhi svá ā dáme* “urge Agni on with songs here in his own home,” with a form of \sqrt{hi} and the same loc. phrase. If the hapax *hemyā-vant-* is derived from \sqrt{hi} (so Old, SBE and Noten, generally now accepted) and means something like

‘possessing/receiving impulsion, much impelled’, the spurring or impulsion may refer to hymns and be happening in Agni’s own home. So an alternative tr. might be “receiving the spurring (of hymns) in your own house, like a horse you will carry ...” The separation of *hemyāṁvān* from the simile *ásvo ná* invites but does not require reading *hemyāṁvān* primarily with the frame, not the simile.

IV.2.9: *rāyā ... víyoṣat* shows the well-known instr. of separation.

IV.2.10: *rārāṇaḥ* in b is clearly the middle part. to $\sqrt{rā}$ ‘give’. This form appears frequently in this metrical position with just that meaning (e.g., in the preceding hymn IV.1.5c). However, given the 2nd sg. subj. *jújoṣaḥ* ‘you will enjoy’ at the end of the preceding pāda, I think it likely that there is a secondary association with the near synonym \sqrt{ran} ‘enjoy, take pleasure’ and that *rārāṇaḥ* could be loosely interpr. also as a 2nd sg. pf. subj. with irregularly strengthened root syllable and wrong accent (contrasting with the properly formed pf. subj. *rārāṇas*, -at, etc.).

Ge unaccountably interprets *hótrā* in c as the Goddess of the Offering found in the Āprī hymns rather than as a common noun meaning ‘offering’, an interpr. that severs c from the rest of the verse.

Pāda d is a clear relative clause (*yásya*), though both Ge and Re render it as an independent clause. Their tactic is understandable because pāda c, the only main cl. in the vs., has no overt antecedent for the rel. prn. in d. We must supply a ‘his’ with *hótrā* to produce the connection between c and d.

The identity of “we strengtheners” is a bit puzzling. The stem $\sqrt{rdhā}$ - generally refers to a god or gods who strengthen their worshipers. In X.147.3 it is used of *sūrī*-s, human ‘patrons’, but patrons should not be the 1st ps. speakers in Rigvedic discourse -- rather it should be those who receive their patronage, i.e., the poets. I assume here it must refer to the group of ritual officiants, including the poet himself, and the person they are strengthening is the Yajamāna (or what will become the Yajamāna in later Vedic ritual).

IV.2.11: Note the phonetic figure in a, with the repetition of *cí*, followed by *ví*, which is then doubled by *ví(dvān)*: *cíttim ácittim cinavad ví vidvān*.

On *vītá*- see comm. ad IX.97.17.

It is tempting here to take *mártān* here as a short genitive plural (see 3d above), as Ge and Re do. However, in X.89.3 *ví yāḥ pr̥sthéva jánimāni aryá, índraś cikāya* ... “who has distinguished the races of the stranger, like the (straight and crooked) backs (of horses),” the clear acc. pl. *jānimāni* ‘races, peoples’ suggests that semantically similar *mártān* here can be the obj. of *ví√ci*. For Th’s interpr. of *pr̥sthá*- here and in X.89.3 as “Rätselfrage” (to \sqrt{pras} ‘ask’) see disc. ad X.89.3.

I see no reason to supply a verb in c (like Ge); it can be easily construed with d.

The pair *dítim ... áditim* in d recalls the *cíttim ácittim* that opens the vs. The standard interpr. take *dítim áditim* as a positive/negated pair, understandably. But this requires one of the words to be positively valued and one negatively valued (not necessarily corresponding to the privative form). The problem is that each of the verbs that govern these accusatives ($\sqrt{rā}$ ‘give’, *uruṣyá*- ‘make wide space, deliver’) ordinarily takes positively valued objects. Attempts to give *uruṣyá*- a negative sense (e.g., Old SBE “keep off Aditi”) founder on the large number of positive cases. I therefore think that

dítim áditim are not in an etymological relationship but are actually a pun. *díti-* is the ‘giving’ goddess and derived from $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘give’. For this etymological relationship see VII.15.12 *dítis ca dāti vāryam* “And Diti gives a thing of value.” *áditī-* by contrast is both the familiar goddess Aditi and the common noun ‘boundlessness’ (derived from $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘bind’). Each of these is the object of an appropriate verb: a different root meaning ‘give’ for *díti-* ‘giving’, a verb meaning ‘make space’ for *áditī-* ‘boundlessness’. For a different wordplay with *áditī-* see previous hymn, IV.1.20.

IV.2.12: I take *paḍbhīḥ* in this vs. as belonging to a root noun *pás-*, meaning ‘with the eyes’, flg. Oldenberg (SBE [1897]) and Schindler (Wurzelnomen, 31). (However, Oldenberg silently retracted this view in his short piece on *paḍbhīḥ* some ten years later [ZDMG 63 (1909): 300-302 = KISch 316–18].) As Schindler points out, other hapaxes occur in etymological figures like our *paḍbhīḥ paśyeḥ*. All other exx. of *paḍbhīḥ* belong to *pád-* ‘foot’ (not ‘fetter’, as has often been claimed; see Schindler, also EWA s.v. *pāḍbīśa-*), including the one two vss. later (IV.2.14). Although such close proximity of identical forms might appear to weigh against assigning them to two different stems, esp. since one of the stems would be a hapax, their contexts seem designed to disambiguate: vs. 12 contains the etym. fig., while 14 juxtaposes the word with another body part frequently paired with it: *paḍbhír hástebhīḥ* “with feet (and) hands.”

IV.2.14: The vs. modulates from the 1st pl. of the subordinate clause in the first hemistich (*yád vayám ... cakṛmā*) to the 3rd pl. of the main clause of d (*yemuḥ sudhyàḥ*) via the simile in c (*rátham ná krántaḥ*). The simile could belong either to the subord. cl. or the main cl. and is grammatically and semantically appropriate to either the 1st or the 3rd ps. subject of either.

On *ṛtām āśuṣānāḥ* see comm. ad IV.1.13.

IV.2.15: For the third time in this hymn a pāda-final acc. pl. might more comfortably be interpreted as a gen. pl. -- here *nṛṇ*. In the cases of *mártān* in 3d and 11b we saw that the acc. pl. reading was easily possible and an abbreviated (or re-formed) gen. pl. interpr. was unnecessary. Here an acc. pl. interpr. seems more difficult, though perhaps not impossible. If it is a gen. pl. the tr. would be “as the foremost ritual adepts of/among men,” and most interpr. implicitly or explicitly accept this analysis. (See also disc. in AiG III.119 and Old, ZDMG 55: 285–89 [=KISch 744–78], though Old in the Noten favors a *nominative* pl. analysis, also by preference ZDMG 55: 287 [=KISch 746].) Certainly *nṛṇ* appears to be more multivalent in the RV than other acc. pl., and, though reluctant, I cannot entirely rule out a gen. pl. However, I think it is possible that *nṛṇ* is a rough acc. of goal (“born to men”) or respect (“ritual adepts with respect to men”).

Interestingly, here “we” aspire to a complete set of parents: Mother Dawn, Father Heaven. Generally in the RV a single parent will do in any particular rhetorical situation.

IV.2.16: On *ṛtām āśuṣānāḥ* see comm. ad IV.1.13.

This vs. has double temporal reference, to the Aṅgirasas of long ago using sacred speech to split the Vala cave and release the cows and to the current priests, who imitate the speech of the Aṅgirasas in order to release the dawns from darkness. The failure to

realize the double reference to both the opening of Vala and the beginning of the current dawn sacrifice has caused interpretational difficulties.

To begin with, *súci* in c has been puzzled over. Old (SBE) attempted to make it a fem. adj. modifying *ḍḍhitim*, but in the Noten opts rather for an adverbial neut. Most other tr. interpr. it as an abstract ‘Klarheit’ vel sim. (Ge, Re, Scar [530], sim. Schmidt [B+I 43-44]), while WG take it as the modifier of *ṛtām* in the preceding pāda. I do not know of other exx. of *súci*- in abstract value; I interpr. it rather in conjunction with the phrase *súcy ūdhaḥ ... gāvām* “the gleaming/blazing udder of cows” in the preceding hymn (IV.1.19). As noted in the comm. there, I take this as a ref. to the Vala cave. But this “blazing (udder)” can also refer to the current sacrifice, with the newly kindled fire at its focus. The priests approach this with their sacred speech to set the ritual in motion and achieve *ḍḍhitim* ‘visionary power’.

I think pāda c is appropriate for both the ancient Aṅgirasas and the present-day ritualists, and so I would modify the publ. tr. somewhat. The verb *ayan* is a subjunctive to the root present of \sqrt{i} and therefore primarily applicable to the ritualists and the actions they will now perform. But I also think that it’s possible to interpr. it as a backformed injunctive to the same root present. Since augmented imperfects to stems beginning with a vowel always have lengthened augment (here, well-attested 3rd pl. *āyan* ‘they went’), it would be possible to form an injunctive by “subtracting” the augment *a-*, producing *ayan*, rather than the more proper *yan* (found only in III.4.5). By such an interpr. the Aṅgirasas could also be subjects of the verb: they *came* (inj.) to the gleaming/blazing Vala cave (represented by *súci*), and the priests *will come* (subj.) to the gleaming/blazing place of sacrifice.

The Pp. reads *kṣāmā* in d as *kṣāma*, and most interpr. (save for WG) follow the Pp. and take this form as a singular, tr. “splitting the earth” -- as a reference only to the Vala myth (even though it is not the earth that gets split in that myth). But I think we should take the Saṃhitā form seriously, as the elliptical dual it appears to be, extracted from the dual dvandva *dyāvā-kṣāmā*. The phrase “splitting (heaven and) earth” would refer to the visual experience of dawn, when the appearance of the dawn light at the horizon seems to split sky from earth, allowing the light to flood in through the resulting slit.

IV.2.17: And yet again we have a form that would be best interpr. as a genitive pl., but formally is not -- *devā* or *devāḥ* [so Pp.] in *devā jānimā* (cf. *devānām ... jānima* [or *jānimā*] in the next vs., 18b). It would be possible to interpr. *devāḥ* as nominative subj. in the simile (“as the gods do metal”); on the other hand, reading *devā*, some have taken it as a neut. pl. adj. with *jānimā*. Here, however, I think a gen. pl. interpr. is the correct one, but the poet is playing a little trick: the sequence *nā devā* is to be flipped to **devāna* → *devānā(m)*. The occurrence of the expected phrase in the next vs. would be an example of immediate poetic repair (see my 2003 “Poetic ‘Repair’ in the Rig Veda”).

The standard tr. take *sucāntaḥ* as transitive, with *agnīm* as obj., but as most comment, verb forms to this root are otherwise intransitive; see esp. identical *sucāntaḥ* in nearby 15d. It seems better to interpr. *agnīm* as the obj. of *vavṛdhántaḥ* along with *índram*; there is no obstacle to such an interpr.

On the secondary present stem seen in the participle *vavṛdhánt-* here, cf. Kü (471).

IV.2.18: This vs. closes the mythological section of the hymn and is so positioned to seem as if it ought to be the denouement of the Vala myth. But it seems, at least to me, to have no connection with that myth or, indeed, with anything else in this hymn. I remain baffled by it, and my comments here will be only on matters of detail.

Ge (/WG) take the subj. of ab to be the leader of the Aṅgirasas, possibly Br̥haspati. I follow Old (Noten) and Re in taking Agni as 3rd ps. subj., though he is also addressed with the voc. *ugra*. In this vs. the discrepancy in person is the least of our problems. My rather weak reason for preferring Agni as subj. is the fact that the hymn, dedicated to Agni, is drawing to a close, and the final two vss. (19–20) are explicitly Agni vss. I see nothing in the vs. to suggest that any Aṅgiras is involved, save for the herds of livestock that remind us of the Vala myth -- but they are in a simile.

Ge takes *ā* √ *khyā* as meaning ‘count’, but as Re points out, this sense is not found earlier than the ŚB. A parallel passage shows a clear word for ‘watch over, look at’: VII.60.3 *sām yó yūthēva jānimāni cāṣṭe*, which supports ‘watch over’ for the verb here. That passage also suggests that the *jānima* in b is the obj. of *ā* ... *akhyat* and corresponds to *yūthā* in the simile (similar Old, Noten). I therefore take the *yād* in b to be a neut. sg. referring to *jānima* rather than the subordinating conj. (‘when, since’) of the standard tr. - - and I also follow the Pp in taking sg. *jānima* as the underlying form in the sandhi conglomeration *jānimānti*, rather than pl. *jānimā* as assumed by others. (The *jānimā* of 17b does give me pause, however.) With Old I supply ‘pasture’ with *kṣumāti* in pāda, rather than taking it as a personal designation (Viehbesitzer, maître du bétail), though not much depends on it. In my (/Old’s) reading, it would refer to the ritual ground. Old’s paraphrase of the first hemistich in the Noten is “... dass Agni ... vor sich die Götterscharen erblickte wie Viehherden auf der Weides des Opfers.” His interpr. of the passage informed mine.

As to what the “nearby” race of gods consists of, I have no idea -- perhaps the gods that come to the sacrifice. Recall that in vss. 3–4 the poet asked Agni to bring (only) a selection of gods to the sacrifice.

The second half-vs. is even more puzzling than the first, because there seems no reason to introduce Urvaśī and her retinue (pl. *urvaśīḥ*) and her son Āyu. I supply *jānima* with *mārtānām* rather than construing this gen. independently as most others do; the parallelism of the passage supports this.

IV.2.19: The augmented 3rd pl. *avasran* is listed as an aor. to √ *vas* ‘shine’ by Whitney (Rts) and Gr and so tr. by Old (SBE), Re, and (somewhat attenuated) Ge. I take it rather as an impf. to the root pres. of √ *vas* ‘wear’ (so listed by Lub., so interpr., more or less, by Kü, *Stativ*, 97–98); WG take it also to ‘wear’, but as an ingressive aorist. Since the root already has a root *present* and there are no other forms to a root aorist, this seems to multiply entities unnecessarily. What does it mean for the dawns to wear/clothe themselves in truth? Perhaps either that they are greeted by a (truly formulated) hymn that serves as their garment or that by dawning they display the truth of the orderly functioning cosmos as their clothing. Although I think that *avasran* belongs properly to √ *vas* ‘wear’, this of course does not mean that there is not a pun on √ *vas* ‘dawn, shine’.

IV.3 Agni

IV.3.1: I render vs.-final *kṛṇudhvam* twice -- once with vs.-initial *ā* in the meaning ‘make = kindle’, rather than with most tr. ‘bring here’, and once with the quasi-infinitival dat. *āvase*.

It is not entirely clear why Agni is identified as Rudra here. The word is most likely to be construed with the gen. *adhvarasya* as “the Rudra of the/your ceremony,” on the basis of I.114.4 *rudrām yajñasādhām* “Rudra bringing the sacrifice to success” and III.2.5 (also of Agni) *rudrām yajñānām sādhadīṣṭim* “the Rudra of the sacrifices, bringing success to the offerings.” Perhaps the point of comparison is Rudra’s healing powers and, esp. here, his ability to ward off threats of all sorts, in this case the “unexpected thundering” (*tanayitnór acítāt*) of pāda c.

ródasyoḥ can be either gen. (with most tr.) or loc. (so publ. tr.). There is little riding on the choice.

As most interpr. take it, “unexpected thundering” is probably a reference to all sorts of unforeseen dangers, rather than specifically of a sudden storm.

IV.3.2: All the standard tr. take the rel. cl. of pāda a (*caḥmā yām vayām te* “[the womb] which we have made for you”) as the frame for the simile in b, with “we” matching the eager wife (*jāyā ... uśatī*) and “you” (Agni) matching the husband. Old (SBE) goes so far as to supply “marriage-bed” as the match for the womb: “... as a well-dressed loving wife (prepares the marriage-bed) for her husband.” This is one possible reading, but I don’t think it is the only (or even the dominant) one; in fact, I think the simile can be matched to four different entities in the verse.

Let us begin by noting that pāda b, the self-contained simile, is found three times elsewhere (I.124.7 of Dawn, X.71.4 of Vāc, and X.91.13 of praise [*susūtī*]- seeking Agni), in all cases of females or of entities conceived as female. An obvious “entity conceived as female” is found in the nominal main clause of pāda a, *ayām yónih* “here is the womb”: the womb, though grammatically masc., is a female accoutrement and can be matched with the wife in the simile in b. This “womb” (=fireplace) is well prepared (“richly dressed” *suvāsāḥ*) and ready to receive Agni as her husband. For womb = wife, cf. III.53.4 *jāyéd ... sēd u yónih* “The wife -- just she is the womb.”

But *suvāsāḥ* elsewhere occurs in the same pāda with *pārivītaḥ* (found in our pāda c): III.8.4a *yúvā suvāsāḥ pārivīta āgāt* “As a youth, richly dressed, engirded, he has come here.” Although the referent there is the sacrificial post, the vocabulary is also appropriate to Agni. Therefore it could be the Agni of c who is like a wife, eager for her husband identified with the womb in pāda a -- a gender reversal that would appeal to the Rigvedic poets. (Note that the standard reading, where “we” the ritualists match the wife, also requires some gender reversal.)

Finally let us consider pāda d. The subj. of d is fem., expressed by *imā u te ... pratīcīḥ* “these facing you.” Ge (/WG) supply “Frauen,” but in n. 2d Ge suggests *gīraḥ* (inter alia); Re supplies “louanges.” I think *gīraḥ* must be correct: there are a number of *imā u tvāte ... gīraḥ* passages (e.g. VI.45.25, 28, VII.18.3, VIII.3.3), and Ge/Re adduce V.12.1 for *gīr-* as well: *gīram bhare vṛṣabhāya pratīcīm*. As was noted above, in 2 of its 4 occurrences the “eager wife” simile has speech/praise as its comparandum, so in fact that simile in our b works best with the hymns in d: these hymns face towards you, like an eager wife to(wards) her husband.

Bloomfield discusses the simile at length ad I.124.7. He is rather sour about our passage: the construction is “very loose indeed”; “the metaphor limps decidedly.” Contra Bl I consider the deployment of the simile here as an example of the poet’s extreme cleverness, with the simile applicable to every single entity in the vs. To reflect the polyvalent status of the simile, the publ. tr. should probably be changed to “(It is / we are / you are / they are) like ...,” though this would be very clumsy.

As for *párivīta*- ‘enveloped’ in c, the question is what Agni is enveloped in. It could be the paridhi sticks that surround the ritual fire (see, e.g., Ge ad I.128.1, endorsed for that passage by Thieme [Unters. 19]); WG suggest dawn’s light or hymns; Old (SBE) offerings and prayers. It’s useful to note that *párivīta*- occurs twice with the loc. of *yóni*:- once in an Agni hymn X.46.6 *párivīto yónau sīdad antáh* (note \sqrt{sad} here as well) and once in the riddle hymn I.164.32 *sá mātúr yónā párivīto antáh*, so that the two concepts seem to be connected (“enveloped within the womb”). This could fit the paridhi sticks forming a border of the fireplace conceived as a womb. It might also refer to the kindling sticks, within which fire is hidden until he is ignited (/born), hence also his womb. There is another important parallel in nearby IV.1.7 *ananté antáh párivīta āgāt* “enveloped within the limitless, he has come here”; see comm. there. On the multiple meanings of *párivīta*- in Agni context, see Thieme (Unters., 19–20).

Modern tr. (almost) universally take the voc. *svapāka*- as ‘having a lovely backside’ vel sim., related to *āpāñc*- ‘turned backwards’ and here implicitly contrasting with *pratīcīh* ‘turned towards, facing’. The one exception is Old, who in SBE (1897) tr. “O most skilful one,” an interpr. that he swiftly disavowed (ZDMG 55 [1901]: 301 [=KlSch. 760]) as “nicht zu denken” -- without admitting he had in fact thought it previously. Nonetheless, I think this is a more appealing interpr. than the current standard. I take it as built to a negated *á-pāka*- ‘not naïve, not callow’ to *pāka*- ‘naïve, callow, simple’ -- like *ámūra*- ‘not stupid’: *mūrā*- ‘stupid’. *ámūra*- is found three times in the Agni hymns of this maṇḍala (IV.4.12, 6.2, 11.5), always of Agni. The semantically similar *ādīpita*- ‘undistracted’ in the next pāda (3a) supports this interpr. There are two other occurrences of *svapāka*- (VI.11.4, 12.2), both analyzed by the Pp as *sú āpāka*- (both adduced by Old, SBE), both modifying Agni. In neither case does a “having a lovely backside” impose (or even suggest) itself, and I propose to include them under this stem.

IV.3.3: Ge takes the voc. *vedhah* as the poet’s self-address, which is certainly possible; he is commanding himself to recite (*śaṃsa*). This does not solve the question of the person of the verb *īlé* in d. Although this form is universally rendered (incl. in the publ. tr) as a 3rd sg. (and analyzed, because of its accent, as the only perfect form to this root, against root pres. *īle*, *ītte*; see Kü 122), it could of course also be a 1st sg. pf., with *sótā* an appositive to the underlying 1st ps. subj. (“I the presser”). Since the surrounding vss. (2 and 4) have explicit 1st persons (though pl.), I would be inclined to emend the publ. tr. to “whom I, the presser, invoke ...”

Pāda d plays on the standard Rigvedic notion that the soma-pressing stones are very noisy and that their noise is like that of the priestly recitation and singing happening at the same time. The question here is which of the three terms in the phrase *grāveva sôtā madhuśút* belongs to the simile and which to the frame. On the basis of X.64.15 *grāvēvā yātra madhuśúd ucyāte bṛhāt*, I take *grāvā ... madhuśút* “the honey-pressing (pressing) stone” as a discontinuous simile, with the frame represented by *sótā* in between. Ge, Re,

WG, Kü (122), and Scar (615) take the simile to be *grāveva sôtā* and the frame *madhuṣút*; Old (SBE) confines the simile to *grāvā* with the frame *sôtā madhuṣút*. Either of these configurations avoids a discontinuous simile, but such similes are not rare and the phraseology of X.64.15 supports my analysis. Little rests on it, however.

IV.3.4: My “at least” for *cid* follows Ge (“wenigstens”). This somewhat testy note seems to introduce the next part of the hymn, with its anxious or annoyed questions to Agni about his relationship to the sacrificers and how he will represent it to the other gods.

The *śāmī*- and the *rtā*- here presumably refer to the complementary physical and verbal aspects of the sacrifice. On *rtā*- as “Kultlied” in this and similar passages, see Lü (esp. 442–43).

IV.3.5–8: The list of gods to whom Agni will tattle on us follows a certain pattern. Vs. 5 contains the standard great trio of Ādityas, Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, as well as a minor Āditya, Bhaga ‘Fortune’, who is, however, important for our welfare. Although we might have expected the Sun here, because he serves as the Ādityas’ eye, observing our offenses, we have instead Heaven and Earth, which frame the cosmos. In vs. 6 the nearer gods of the midspace, particularly Vāta ‘wind’ and the Aśvins, are featured. Rudra appears in both 6 and 7; I don’t quite understand why, but recall first that Agni was identified as Rudra in vs. 1 and may be also in 10d (see also 14b). Moreover, in 6 the punishing aspect of Rudra is emphasized (‘man-smiting’, *nṛhān*-), while in 7 he is paired and/or contrasted with the benevolent Pūṣan under the ambiguous epithet *sūmakha*-, which means both ‘good combatant’ and ‘very generous’, so his effects on human life are emphasized and he counts as a nearer god, who in fact is the giver of the oblation (*havirdā*-). In the 2nd half of 7 Viṣṇu and his three strides return us to the contemplation of the whole cosmos, and vs. 8 functions ring-compositionally with vs. 5: we have the Sun we expected (and didn’t get) in 5, with Aditi standing in for the Ādityas in 5, and heaven (though probably the place, not the deity) is the final goal.

IV.3.5: The last pāda would be more accurately rendered “What to Aryaman, what to Fortune?”

IV.3.6: Note that all four pādas rhyme: *agne*# (a), *śubhāmye*# (b), *kṣe*# (c), *nṛghné* (d); also 7ab *pūṣṇe*# ... *havirdā*#, an unusual effect in RVic verse.

The so-called “double stem” *vṛdhasānā*- is morphologically anomalous, but belongs to a fairly large group of stems with apparent middle part. in *-asānā*-. See AiG II.2.236–37 on the type. This is not the place to treat the origin of these stems at length, but, with Insler (KZ 82 [1968]), I think the starting point is *sahasānā*- (5x, 4x of Agni) ‘displaying might’, which he takes as a metathesized form of a pf. mid. part. **sasahānā*-, beside *sāsahānā*- (1x) and the younger type *sehānā*- (3x). This metathesis was reinforced by the very common *s*-stem *sāhas*-, and several other *-asānā*-stems have *s*-stems alongside (*śavasānā*:- *śāvas*-, *rabhasānā*:- *rābhas*-, *jrayasānā*:- *jrāyas*-) and fall into the same general semantic field of strength, power, or violent action (though not one of the best attested, *mandasānā*- ‘becoming exhilarated’ nor, e.g., *dhiyasānā*- [2x]). There is unfortunately no neut. *s*-stem **vṛdhas*-, though there is a single attestation of an

infinitival dat. *vr̥dhāse* with suffixal accent. See also disc. of *vr̥dhasnū-* ad IV.2.3 and *arśasānā-* ad X.99.7.

Pāda c is problematic, both metrically (it lacks a syllable) and grammatically: this is the only place in the RV where *nāsatya-* appears in the sg., not the du., and the identity of pāda-final *kṣé* is disputed. The metrical problem and the *kṣé* problem can be easily solved together if we adopt the suggestion of Hoffmann registered in Schindler (Root nouns, s.v. *kṣā-*) that *kṣé* is a haplologized form of dative inf. **yakṣé* ‘to appear’ in the environment (*nāsat*’)*yāya* [*ya*]*kṣé*. (Note that *yakṣám* ‘apparition’ appears in 13a.) This interpr. is also reflected in WG’s rendering, and one way or other it goes back to Ludwig; see Old (SBE, Noten). The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before “to appear.”

As for sg. *nāsatyāya*, although this analysis is emphatically rejected by both Old (Noten) and Debrunner (AiG II.2.136), I have adopted Henry’s old suggestion that the form is a *vr̥ddhi* adj. of appurtenance whose *vr̥ddhi* is invisible because the base already has initial-syllable *vr̥ddhi*. We would of course expect the accent to shift to the final syllable (AiG II.2.133ff.), hence **nāsatyā-*, but the dominance of the initially accented noun could have altered the accent, possibly redactionally. I supply ‘chariot’ in this dat. expression, since the Aśvins’ chariot is esp. prominent and *párijman-* modifies their chariot elsewhere (I.20.3, X.41.1). Cf. esp. I.20.3 *tákṣan nāsatyābhyām párijmanam sukhám rátham* “They fashioned the earth-circling well-naved chariot for the Nāsatyas.”

IV.3.7: On the benevolent Rudra see comm. ad vss. 5–8. It is not clear why or how Rudra is the giver of the oblation. Old (see also WG’s n.) suggests that it is in his capacity as *paśupati-*: he provides the beast for sacrifice. This is possible: though he is not so called in the RV (where the word is not found), this epithet is applied to him in AV (e.g., XI.2.28) and VS (e.g., XXVI.28).

In c *rétaḥ* ‘semen’ is somewhat surprising, esp. if it is to be construed as the object of *brávaḥ* -- so much so that Gr (tr., not Wö.) suggested emendation to *répaḥ* ‘stain’, an emendation accepted by Old (SBE, Noten) and Lü (622) and maintained tentatively by Scar (214). Re keeps the transmitted form but interprets it as a way of referring to negative speech: “Quelle semence (de blâme dirais-tu) ...?” But in a culture so fixated on fertility, semen is basically always a positive concept. Important is the fact noted by Ge (n. 7c) that Viṣṇu is elsewhere the protector of semen (cf., e.g., VII.36.9 *viṣṇum niṣiktapām* “Viṣṇu, protector of the poured-out [semen]”). In his n. (and contra his tr.) Re suggests an alternative interpr. of *rétaḥ* here as a truncated **retodhe* (cf. *retodhā-* 5x) or **retode* (Re does not accent either proposed form). This seems the correct solution, with the *-de* extracted from *havirdé*, which ended the preceding pāda.

In d Re suggests that *śárove bṛhatyái* is the “état pré-compositionnel” of a *bahuvrīhi* **bṛhatśarave* (no accent provided and no application of sandhi), whose referent is Rudra. Although the arrow is surely Rudra’s as all standard interpr. recognize, there is no reason to substitute the god for his symbolic accoutrement. Just as Agni can speak to the chariot of the Aśvins (6c, by my interpr.), he can also speak to Rudra’s arrow.

Ge (n. 7d) points out the contrast between Viṣṇu as creator (c) and Rudra as destroyer (d).

IV.3.8: Although it is tempting to take *ṛtāya* as an adj. modifying *śárdhāya* (so, e.g., Ge “der rechtwandelnden Schar,” sim. WG, Old SBE), the stem *ṛtā-* is overwhelmingly a

neut. noun. It is possible, with Re, to take it as an appositive with the Marut troop: “Ordre (incarné)” or, with Lü (623), as a separate entity to whom Agni’s speech is directed, but I think it more likely that it is a dative of purpose, like (*ya*)*kṣé* in 6d, *havirdé* in 7b: “for truth,” that is, for the Maruts to attain or ascertain the truth.

The masc. (/neut.) *turāya* cannot modify fem. *āditaye* (pace Old SBE). Ge supplies “heaven”; WG suggest the sun. With Re I opt tentatively for Indra, who is frequently modified by this adj. and who is otherwise absent from this fairly comprehensive list of important gods (see Ge n. 8c). Brereton (*Ādityas*, 205–6) instead thinks *turāya* represents an Āditya, probably Varuṇa, and takes *āditaye* not as the name of the goddess but as a common noun ‘innocence’, with the dative phrase meaning “for the mighty one (=Varuṇa) to (ascertain our) innocence.” This assertion of innocence at the end of a series of questions about potential blame would set the stage for the request that Agni make our sacrifice succeed (pāda d). This suggestion is appealing, but I am not convinced that *āditi-* ever means ‘innocence’, and further in this sequence the purpose datives are only pāda-final, which *āditaye* is not.

Pāda d poses some syntactic challenges. The first is that *sādhā*, by all accounts a 2nd sg. act. impv. to √*sādh*, has no expressed obj., though act. forms of this root are fundamentally tr. (but sometimes, esp. in the participle, used in absolute sense “assuring success”; cf. nearby IV.1.9). I supply *dhīyam* ‘thought’ vel sim. as the object, since forms of *dhī-* or other words for thought/prayer are regularly construed with √*sādh*. The other problem is what to construe gen./abl. *divāḥ* with. (It cannot be acc. pl. because of the accent.) The standard solution has been to take it with *cikītvān* (e.g., Ge “der du den Himmel kennst”), but as Re points out, *cikītvān* is never otherwise construed with a gen. His solution is to supply an obj. for *sādhā* on which *divāḥ* is dependent: “Mène droit au but (les affaires) du ciel.” My interpr. requires a slight emendation, from *sādhā divāḥ* to **sādhā divāḥ* -- that is, *sādhā ā divāḥ*, with *ā* + ABL in the meaning “all the way to.” Cf. I.92.17 *yaú ... ślókam ā divāḥ ... cakráthuḥ* “you two who made your signal-call (reach) all the way to heaven”; sim. III.61.4. See comm. ad locc. An asterisk should be inserted before “all the way.”

IV.3.9–12: Each of these vss. begins with the resonant and charged instr. *ṛténa* ‘by truth’, the usual introduction to a truth formulation. Each of the vss. does seem to express a mystical truth about the ritual or its mythic background. There is no obvious connection to the group of vss. that precede (the question vss. of 4cd–8), but if I am correct that we should supply ‘thought’ or ‘thoughts’ in 8cd, where we ask Agni to send them all the way to heaven, it may not be fanciful to think that vss. 9–12 are these very thoughts.

IV.3.9: This vs. expresses the beloved paradox about cows and milk, that the cow is “raw” but her milk “cooked” (that is, ready to consume), and further that a black cow can still give white milk. These paradoxes describe in the first instance the production of the ritual offering, the milk that will produce the ghee to be poured into the ritual fire. But it may also (esp. the 2nd hemistich) characterize the transition from the night (black cow) to dawn (the gleaming milk) at the dawn sacrifice; see Janert (Dhāsi, 29ff.).

The standard interpr. (save for WG) take *ṛténa* as the agent with the ppl. *nīyatam* (e.g., Re “L’Ordre a été fixé par l’Ordre (même)”). Because the flg. 3 vss. also begin with

ṛténa, interpreting the first one outside of the pattern established by the rest seems misguided, esp. given the usual function of initial *ṛténa* (see comm. above on vss. 9–12).

I take the *ṛtām* that I reverently invoke (*īde*) to represent the paradoxes just discussed -- the mystical truth of the cow's nature -- and I interpr. *ā góḥ* as an ablative phrase, referring to the source of this truth. Most take *góḥ* as a gen., but this makes *ā* hard to construe. (The phrase *ā góḥ* occurs 3x elsewhere, always pāda final, twice in this maṇḍala [IV.22.4, 23.6] and once in X [X.100.12]; nowhere is it clear.) At least acdg. to Old (SBE) and Ge, the *ṛtām* is actually a reference to the milk. I am skeptical.

On *dhāśi-* see comm. ad I.62.3, 140.1.

The hapax *jāmarya-* is opaque; see EWA s.v. My tr. follows Janert's analysis (Dhāsi, 33ff.), that it is a secondary derivative to *jām-ara-* "die die Nachkommen Nährende." Ge's suggestion (n. 9d) that it is related to YAvs. *zəmar* 'on/in the earth' (in *zəmar-gūz-*), hence 'earthly' (versus heavenly milk = rain), fits the passage less well.

IV.3.10: This 2nd vs. in the truth-formulation sequence both continues the mystical description of the dawn sacrifice and presents another paradox. With regard to the sacrifice, the milk produced in vs. 9 becomes the butter oblation poured on the sacrificial fire, as Ge discusses. Ge's explanation of the phrase *páyasā pṛṣthyēna* lit. "the milk belonging to the back" is ingenious and (to me) convincing: it is the milk on the top (the image is of a four-legged animal), i.e., the cream, which is made into butter. With the offering of the butter, the fire flames up -- allowing it to go about "conferring vigor" (*vayodhā-*) in c.

Pāda c also inaugurates the paradox that is most clearly expressed in d. Agni is characterized as *āspandamāna-* in c. As Ge points out (n. 10c), *√spand* 'kick, lunge, jerk' is only used in Vedic of cows when they are being milked, so Agni is both bull (*vṛṣabhā-* [a], *vṛṣan-* [d]) and cow. This paradoxical double identity is sharpened in d, where Agni is identified not only as a bull but as Pṛṣni, the cow who is the mother of the Maruts, and he is the subj. of the quintessential "cow" verb *√duh* 'milk' and acts on the quintessential cow body part *ūdhar-* 'udder'. The substance s/he produces from this udder is *śukrām*, a word that can refer not only to 'gleaming' milk, but is also used to refer to semen. A similar gender-bending milking scenario involving Pṛṣni and Rudra, the Maruts' father, is found in II.34.2; see that passage and the comm. thereon. Here Agni may be being identified with Rudra; see the Agni-Rudra equation in vs. 1 and also the focus on Rudra in the "question" vss. (6d, 7b, 7d). There are a number of passages in the Agni hymns of IV that should be brought into the conversation, though unfortunately what they have to say is obscure: see the "gleaming udder" (*śúcy ūdhaḥ*) in IV.1.19 and a neut. entity (quite possibly her udder) belonging to Pṛṣni in IV.5.7, 10.

What -- if anything -- this refers to naturalistically is unclear. The tendency among interpr. has been to take it as a reference to rain (see Ge n. 10d) or to some other celestial phenomenon (Lü 390), but I find Bloomfield's suggestion (RR 213) more appropriate to the passage, that the fire, blazing up, "shoots out his flames from his bright udder; he, a bull, is thereby -- mirabile dictu -- also a pṛṣni, the heavenly, yielding cow, *par excellence*." Bl also suggests that *śukrá-* here mean 'semen', with a zeugma of *duduhe*: "As a bull he hath spurted semen, as a Pṛṣni cow he hath milked his udder."

IV.3.11: The third truth-formulation vs. sets up the Vala myth as the model for the coming of dawn: just as the Aṅgirasas breached the Vala cave and let loose the cows, so the human sacrificers break Dawn out of her confinement by kindling the ritual fire. This is the third step in the depiction of the morning ritual. As noted elsewhere (see esp. the publ. intro to Maṇḍala IV and to IV.1), the Vala myth and the Aṅgirasas play an outsize role in the Agni cycle of IV.

Despite the injunctives of pāda a (*vy āsan*) and c (*pāri śadan*), I am tempted, with Gr, to read *anavanta* in b, to produce 11 syllables. (Consider the augmented impf. in d, *abhavat*.) Old (Noten) considers this restoration possible but not necessary. Hoffmann (Injunk., 209) gives a typical treatment of the vs. in his interpretational system, assuming an injunc. *navanta* in b.

IV.3.12: The ritual application of this final *rténa* vs. is less clear than for the first three. It may simply refer to the waters used at the first soma pressing. Or the ritual aspect may be muted, and the point is to make room for the Vṛtra myth next to the Vala myth in vs. 11. However, the opt. *dadhanyuḥ* seems to reflect a movement from what has happened (the injunctives and preterite indicative of the last few vss.) to what should now happen, which suggests that there *should* be a ritual application.

The athem. mid. part. *-stubbhāná-* is isolated, beside the act. them. 1st cl. pres. *stóbhati*, and it is therefore impossible to determine its exact value -- including whether it is passive (so, e.g., Old [SBE], Ge, Re) or not. Gotō (1st cl., 332 and n. 808) argues against such a value, on the basis of the intrans. sense of the root, and I have followed him in the non-passive assessment. My tr. “beat a tattoo” reflects my sense that *√stubbh* is associated esp. with rhythm. As for *sārga-*, lit. ‘surge, gush’, it can refer to the instant when the surge is released, hence here the start of a race.

IV.3.13: This vs. is very difficult. As I see it, the point of the vs. is to demand that Agni not track down and punish the speaker for the transgressions of others, esp. others who are close to the speaker and could be mistaken for him. In the first hemistich this notion is expressed by GEN *yakṣá-* “the specter/apparition of X,” where *yakṣá-* could perhaps best be rendered as Doppelgänger.

The first problem one encounters is *kásya* and the puzzle of how an interrogative would interact with the prohibitive *mā́*. The standard solution is to treat *kásya* as an indefinite, without the usual particle (*cid*, *canā́*) to mark this value -- e.g., Re “... de qui (que ce soit).” But when the negative *ná* is used, the indefinite ‘no one, nothing’ always has the particle. I propose instead to read **akásya* ‘of (a) nobody’. With an accent like that of *akútra* ‘nowhere’, this interpr. does not require emending the Saṃhitā text (which would read *mākásya*), only the Pp., and the same stem is found three times elsewhere in the same context, at least by my interpr.: V.70.4 *mā́ kásya* (in a passage very similar to this one), *mā́ kásya* in VII.94.8, and I.120.8 *mā́ kásmai*, parallel to *mākútrā* where the Pp. analyzes the first as *mā́ kásmai* but the 2nd as *mā́ akútra*. The apparent presence of *mā́-akútra* in this last passage reinforces my interpr. of *mā́ kásya* / *kásmai* as also containing a privative *a-*. It might be argued that *nákis*, *nákīm* (the former of which is very common) and *mākis*, *mākīm* lack the indefinitizing particle, but all these forms show univerbation and loss of the accent on the 2nd element.

The form *huráh* has been variously analyzed. Old (etc) takes it as an adv., and Ge (etc.) as the gen. of a root noun. (For detailed disc. see Scar [123], who vacillates.) I follow the latter view, but see it not as an abstract but as a personal gen. referring to one of the transgressors. (This seems to be the WG interpr., too.)

On *veśá-* see comm. ad X.49.5.

In d Old suggests emending *dákṣam* to *yakṣám* (matching the same form in pāda a and found elsewhere with *bhujema*), but it is hard to see how this error could have arisen. I think rather that *dákṣa-* is used here ironically or sarcastically.

On *mā* with the apparent opt. *bhujema*, see Hoffmann (Injunk., 95-97), who explains this grammatical anomaly (found several times) as a misinterpr. of expressions with the dat. inf. *bhujé*.

IV.3.14: Once again in this hymn Agni seems to be indirectly identified with Rudra, here by the use of the adj. *súmakha-*, used explicitly of Rudra in 7b. The ambiguity of this word works well here also.

IV.3.15: Vs. 3 also contains forms of both *mánman-* and *śastí-*.

On *sām* √*jṛ* see Gotō (1st cl., 154–55), who considers the two instances of this lexeme (also in the next hymn, IV.4.8) an individual use of this poet, in the meaning ‘be welcome’ [willkommen sein]. In both cases it has a verbal product of the poet as subj. (*śastí-* here, *gír-* IV.4.8). My ‘bring harmony’ is meant to capture the ‘sing’ feature of the root √*jṛ*. Perhaps ‘be harmonious’ would have been better. For further disc. see ad IV.4.8 below.

IV.3.16: On this vs., see publ. intro.

IV.4 Agni the Demon-Smasher

IV.4.1: The repetition of the same word, *prásitim*, in a and c without any obvious difference in usage or sense (Re says they are “légèrement” distinct) seems uncharacteristically clumsy for a Vedic poet, which in turn makes it tempting to identify something that does distinguish them. Although he does not tr. them differently (nor does anyone else), Ge suggests in his n. 1a that *prásiti-* represents the coalescence of two words, one derived from √*sā*, *sí* ‘bind’ (‘Fanggarn’, a hunting net) and the other ‘Laut, Ansturm’, related to *prásita-* (IV.27.4, X.77.5) ‘shot forth’. The latter provides the usual meaning of *prásiti-* ‘onslaught’ vel sim., and the word is now usually considered to belong to PIE **seh₁(j)* ‘loslassen’ (cf. LIV² 1.**seh₁(j)* n. 2; EWA s.v.) and to be related to *sāyaka-* ‘missile’. For disc. of some of the occurrences of *prásiti-* see Hoffmann (Aufs. 417–18 [=MSS 10, 1957]); curiously Hoffmann only notes the second occurrence of the word in this vs., not the first. Ge’s suggestion that the word has two sources opens the possibility of accounting for the poet’s seemingly awkward repetition here, if in fact he’s using two different words *prásiti-* (or, to him, possibly two different senses of one word; for this cf. *sumatí* in 6a, 8a below). That the *prásiti-* in pāda a is ‘broad’ (*pr̥thvī-*), while the *ānu* ‘along’ in c suggests that it is long and thin there might be a clue. I tentatively suggest that the first occurrence refers to a deployed hunting net -- broad so as to trap as many animals as possible (or to make it difficult for any animal to avoid it) and

comparable to an advancing sheet or wall of flame. The second one would then have the usual sense of ‘onslaught, forward dash’. Unfortunately altering the tr. to allow for these two separate meanings would lose the identity of the forms in this suggested pun.

Pace Ge, *ībha-* means ‘entourage, retinue’ not ‘elephant’ in Vedic, a meaning reinforced by the Middle Indic derivatives. See EWA s.v.

On *drūṇāṇá-* as belonging to $\sqrt{drū}$ ‘cut down, mow’ see Hoffmann (Aufs. 414–21) and EWA s.v. *DRAV*.

Pāda c seems to go more naturally with b than with d, as most take it.

IV.4.2: Since $\sqrt{sprś}$ does not otherwise occur with *ānu* in the RV or, per Monier-Williams, in all of Skt., I supply an object with this preposition -- either the flames of pāda a or, perhaps preferably, the *prāsītīm* construed with *ānu* in 1c.

Most interpr. take *patamgān* as an unmarked simile, e.g. Ge “(gleich) Vögeln.” My interpr. requires supplying an unparalleled noun but avoids the need for a simile particle.

IV.4.2–4: Note the preverb chaining: 2d *vī srja*, 3a *prāti ... vī srja*, 4b *prāti*.

IV.4.3: The splv. *tūrṇitama-* is better rendered ‘best at advancing’ vel sim., rather than ‘swiftest’; see comm. ad III.11.5. Such an understanding of *tūrṇi-* may be reflected in the WG tr. “als am besten Durchsetzender,” against the standard “swiftest” tr.

Ge. renders d “keiner soll es wagen, dich irrezuführen,” but *vyáthiḥ* ‘veering course’ is simply a description of the usual behavior of fire, amply described in vss. 1–2.

IV.4.4: As Ge suggests in his n. 4a, *ā tanuṣva* could reflect the common idiom \sqrt{tan} ‘draw/stretch (the bow [*dhānus-*, *dhānvan-*])’. Given that Agni is identified as a ‘shooter’ (*āstā*) in 1c and that bows are the presumed object of a different form of \sqrt{tan} in the next vs. (5c, see there), this seems quite possible, though I think the primary reading is simply the reflexive ‘stretch yourself out’; cf. 1a for Agni’s making himself broad.

IV.4.5: The standard tr. supply ‘powers’ with *daívyāni*, and this certainly could make sense. However, no word meaning ‘power’ occurs with pl. *daívyā-* (I must admit that *sáhas-* occurs several times with the sg.) nor as obj. of *āvíṣ* $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘make manifest’. Since we expect something visual as the obj. of such a verb and since the hymn so far has concerned the shape-shifting of Agni, I tentatively supply ‘forms’ -- though ‘powers’ is not excluded contextually.

The adj. *sthirá-* ‘taut, firm’, esp. when obj. of *āva* \sqrt{tan} , presupposes ‘bows’ as its head noun; cf. the bahuvrīhi *sthirá-dhanvan-* (VII.46.1) and phrases like VIII.20.12 *sthirá dhānvāni*.

The more usual interpr. of cmpds with final root noun is OBJ + TRANS. VERB, and this seems to be the sense of many of the fairly numerous cmpds in *-jū-* (e.g., *vasū-jū-* ‘speeding goods’), though Scar (166–77) hesitates in several cases. However, in *yātu-jū-* the final member must be read passively with agentive 1st member: ‘incited by sorcerers’, as VII.21.5, adduced by both Ge and Scar (173), definitively shows: *ná yātáva indra jūjuvur naḥ* “Sorcerers do not incite us, Indra.”

On the number disharmony in the obj. phrase in d, *jāmīm ājāmim ... śātrūn*, see comm. ad VI.44.17.

IV.4.6: The 2nd hemistich has been variously interpr. Most recently WG take the neut. pls. *viśvāni ... sudīnāni ... dyumnāni* as subjs. of the sg. verb *dyaut*, in the well-known, inherited, but relatively rare constr. of neut. pl. + sg. verb (“Zu ihm strahlen alle ...”). Re takes all of the half-verse through *aryāḥ* as nominal sentences: “que tous (les jours) soient de beaux jours pour lui ...,” and the rest of d as an abrupt command. Ge has Agni shining the various good things through the doors to the fortunate *asmai*. My interpr. is closest to Old (Noten, not SBE) and Ge’s alternative in his n. 6cd. I take *ví dūrah* as referring to the usual opening of the doors, an expression that usually contains a form of the verb \sqrt{vr} ‘(un)cover’ (e.g., IX.45.1 *ví ... dūro vṛdhi*). Here the more dramatic verb *dyaut* has been substituted, blending the lexeme *ví ... dyaut* ‘flashed forth (like lightning)’ with the straightforward *ví√vr* ‘open’ -- hence my “flashed open the doors.” I am not sure why all the standard tr. (except for WG) render the injunctive *dyaut* as a modal (e.g., Ge “... sollst du ... scheinen”).

I supply ‘days’ with *sudīnāni* on the basis of passages like VII.11.2 *āhāny asmai sudīnā bhavanti*.

rāyāḥ can be either acc. pl. (so Old, Ge, Re) or gen. sg. dependent on *viśvāni ... sudīnāni* (so Th [Fremdl. 61] “All die Sonnentage des Reichtums,” WG). In the publ. tr. I took it as acc. pl. but, to my mind, nothing rides on it either way.

IV.4.7: It is not clear whether *nītya*- in this context has already developed its later technical sense of regular, obligatory ritual offering, as opposed to those performed irregularly for special purposes. Or whether it simply means, as Re takes the phrase *nītyena havīṣā*, “une offrande personnelle.”

I have pushed the last phrase *sāśad iṣṭīḥ* to “this desire will be” -- that is, “will come true” -- rather than simply “this will be his desire” (so Ge [WG]), since I otherwise find it difficult to interpr. the subjunctive.

IV.4.8: The word *sumatī*-, found in 6a, is repeated here. There it clearly referred to the benevolence or good will of Agni, which the successful priest/poet comes to know. Here I think it has double meaning. On the one hand, it still refers to Agni’s good will, which the poet praises, but it also refers to the good thought, i.e., the poem, that the poet has produced for Agni. This double reading is enabled not only by the usual double meaning of *sumatī*- and the grammatical ambiguity of the enclitic *te* (gen. in the first interpr., dat. in the 2nd), but also by the double meaning of \sqrt{rc} ‘chant, recite’, which can take as object either the topic/goal of the praise (e.g., V.29.1 *ārcanti tvā marútaḥ* ... “The Maruts chant to/praise you”) or the verbal contents of the recitation (V.30.6 *tubhyéd eté marútaḥ ... ārcanti arkām* “Just for/to you do these Maruts chant the chant”).

ghóṣi (also VI.5.6) is a controversial form. The grammars/lexica generally take it as a 3rd sg. passive aor. to $\sqrt{ghuṣ}$ ‘hear’; it would take a putative *sumatīḥ* as subj. and mean “(the good thought) was/is/will be heard” (Old SBE “it resounded here,” sim. WG). The other instance (in VI.5.6) is taken as a neut. adj. ‘laut ertönend’ by Gr, also Old (Noten, contra SBE). Most tr., however, render it as a 2nd sg. act. impv. “hear!” Though a passive aor. would also be possible in VI.5.6 (*ghóṣi mánma* “the thought is heard”) and

though the pass. aor. interpr. is morphologically impeccable, I think the 2nd sg. act. impv. is the correct interpr., though the morphology is a little troubled. It appears to be a *-śi* imperative, though not built as usual (at least in my view) to an *s*-aor. subjunctive, but rather to, or alongside, the 1st class thematic pres. *ghóṣati*; this analysis also requires that a putative **ghoṣ-śi* has simplified the double sibilant. One of the arguments in favor of a 2nd sg. impv. in VI.6.5 is the relative density of *-śi* impvs. in that context, with two (*śróśi*, *párśi*) in the preceding hymn (VI.4.7, 8) in that tightly knit Agni cycle. The interpr. of the form as a *-śi* impv. is accepted and argued for by Gotō (1st cl., 131–32 and n. 160, with lit.); it is curious that in WG[otō] this interpr. has been abandoned without comment. The form is disc., in typically indecisive fashion, by Baum (Impv., 46 and 27 [where he seems to accept the *-śi* impv. analysis]).

The Vāvātā or ‘Favorite’ wife in later śrauta ritual is one of the wives of the king who has a series of set functions in the various royal rituals (see, e.g., my *Sacrificed Wife* passim). The presence of this figure, or of her prototype, may suggest that the lexeme *sām √jṛ*, found also in the preceding hymn (IV.3.15), may have deeper resonance than simply ‘be welcome, bring harmony’, perhaps something like ‘be in tune with (s.o.)’, referring to perfect harmonious agreement between two people, esp. two people in love. In both IV.3.15 and our passage the feminine song (*gír-*) / chant (*śastí-*) would put herself in tune with the masc. god, as a Favorite wife would to her kingly husband. Note that in IV.3.15 the chant is modified by *devāvātā* ‘favored by the gods’, with the same *-vātā* as here (save for accent). In fact, as Ge points out (for different purposes) our *te vāvātā* is phonologically very close to IV.3.15 *devāvātā*. It might also be that *jara(tām)* would be reminiscent of *jārā-* ‘lover’, to add to the erotic mood.

As Re’s tr. makes clear (“Nous souhaitons t’orner, (dans l’espoir d’obtenir) de bons chevaux, de bons chars”), the two adj. *svásvāḥ ... suráthāḥ* are most likely proleptic: we want to tend the ritual fire in order to get possession of good horses and chariots. This contrasts with the use of *svásva-* in 10a.

IV.4.9: *sumānas-* here recalls the two occurrences of *sumatí-* in 6a and 8a (see disc. there); this word too may have dual value: both ‘benevolent, well-disposed’ and ‘having a good mind’, that is, one capable of producing good thoughts in the form of hymns.

The *dyumnāni* of the *arí-* “the brilliant things of the stranger” that Agni opened up for us in 6d we seem to have thoroughly taken possession of here. The gen. *jánānām* here corresponds to *aryāḥ* in 6d.

IV.4.10: Unlike 8c, where I took *svásva- surátha-* as proleptic with the priestly subject “we,” here the man who is *svásva- suhiranyá-* appears to be already rich, with a chariot full of goods -- and therefore most likely the patron of the sacrifice, who (we hope) will redistribute this wealth to us performers via the sacrifice. This may be the purport of *sákhā* ‘partner’ here. Ge suggests (n. 10ab) that the figure in question is a ruler returning from battle with booty.

IV.4.11: This vs. concerning the poet’s poetic gifts and his lineage, spoken in the 1st ps. sg., seems out of place in this hymn and anticipates the enigmatic hymn IV.5 that follows immediately, which focuses on the mysterious sources of poetic power. Of course, given

the mechanical arrangement of the RVic hymn collections, we cannot assume that the hymns had anything to do with each other originally.

Old (SBE), Re think that the poet's lineage (*bandhūtā*) is with Agni: Old "through my kinship (with thee)." But the next pāda, where the line of descent is traced from his father Gotama, makes that unlikely.

The next question is what to do with *mahāḥ*. Old (SBE) takes it as acc. pl. object of *rujāmi*; Ge (/WG) as gen. sg. with *vācobhiḥ*, referring to the poet's great (father). With Re I prefer to take *mahāḥ* as adverbial. Although this leaves *rujāmi* without an object, an object is easily supplied: the root \sqrt{ruj} is typed for the breaking of the Vala cave, particularly in this group of hymns so dominated by that myth. Cf. IV.2.15 ... *āṅgirasobhavema, ādriṃ rujema* ... "Might we become Aṅgirasas; might we break the rock." On grounds of sense I don't think *mahāḥ* is gen. with *vācobhiḥ* because I think the poet is asserting the power of his own poetic gift: he acquired this gift from his father (pāda b), but he is not using his father's words but his own -- or so I take his proud boast. By casting himself as the subject of the Vala-breaking verb, he is also implicitly asserting his identification with the Aṅgirasas, who broke into Vala with *their* words. Like the speaker(s) of IV.2.15 he seems to be saying "might I become an Aṅgiras."

IV.4.13: Since the *yé* of the rel. clause in ab has no obvious referent in the main clause of cd, it is tempting to connect ab with the preceding verse (12), and start a new sentence with 13cd -- esp. because 13a *yé pāyāvaḥ* matches 12c *té pāyavaḥ* so exactly. But vs. 13 is a repeated vs. (= I.147.3), and so must be interpreted as self-contained. It is also likely, because of the reference to Māmateya, i.e., Dīrghatamas, that I.147, a Dīrghatamas hymn, is its source, and the vs. has been inserted here secondarily because of the match between the two *pāyāvaḥ* phrases (so Bloomfield, RR ad I.147.3). On the relationship between the relative and main clauses in this vs. see comm. ad I.147.3.

IV.5 Agni Vaiśvānara

IV.5.1: Note that the first word of the hymn is *vaiśvānarā-*.

Old (SBE), Ge, and WG all take *bṛhád bhāḥ* as the obj. of *dāśema* with the dat. *agnáye* phrase the indirect obj. (e.g., Old "How may we ... offer mighty light to ... Agni"). I am dubious about this for two reasons, one practical and one grammatical. First, why would we need to confer light on Agni -- does he not already have it? I suppose "lofty light" might refer to the sun and our ability to make the sun rise by kindling the ritual fire, but the phrase refers to Agni's own light elsewhere (e.g., VIII.23.5, X.3.1). Or conferring such light upon him might simply mean kindling him. More telling is the grammatical argument: although there are a few other $\sqrt{dāś}$ passages with acc. of something conferred (though normally a ritual offering of some sort; cf. I.71.6 [*nāmaḥ*], I.93.3 [*havīṣkṛtim*]), the overwhelming number of passages have simply a dative of the honoree sometimes with *instrumental* of what is conferred. Alternatively and considerably less often, the verb can take an acc. of the honoree; cf. the very similar V.41.16 *kathā dāśema nāmasā sudānūn ... marútaḥ* "How might we serve the Maruts of good drops with reverence?" I therefore think $\sqrt{dāś}$ is participating in two syntactic frames here, 1st with dat. *agnáye*, then with acc. *bṛhád bhāḥ*, both as the object of honor and service. Re in his n. suggests that *bṛhád bhāḥ* is a "pré-bahuvrīhi," but in his tr. treats

it as an appositive “Haut éclat” going with the 2nd hemistich and modifying the underlying subj. Agni there.

The usual obj. of \sqrt{stambh} is *dyām* ‘heaven’, which is the obj. expected (and supplied) in the frame. The obj. in the simile, *ródhas-* ‘bulwark’, may have been chosen because it is phonologically reminiscent of *ródasī* ‘two world-halves’, another way to refer to the cosmic masses. This word serves as obj. to \sqrt{stambh} a number of times with the preverb *ví* (‘prop apart’), e.g. VI.8.3 (another Vaiśvānara hymn) with Agni as subj.: *vy āstabhnād ródasī*.

IV.5.3: In the publ. tr. I take *dvibárhāḥ* as the masc. nom. sg. it appears to be, modifying the subj. However, this particular form several times has to be taken as neut. (I.114.2, VII.8.6, 24.2; see comm. ad VII.24.2), and its position here may make it more likely a modifier of neut. *sāma*, as Old (SBE), Ge, and Re take it. Hence, possibly “a great doubly lofty melody ...”

I tr. *padām* twice, as ‘word’ and ‘track’, to bring out the pervasive pun in this hymn.

IV.5.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. characterizes rival poets as capable of producing a “deep word” (*padām ... gabhīrām*) despite their bad characters. Sāy’s interpr. of this phrase as a deep *place*, namely hell, fld. by Old in SBE (but decisively rejected by him in Noten) and in part by Doniger, has little to recommend it, esp. because *padā-* is the signature word of this hymn and has very specific values in the hymn. It would be a very slender basis on which to found Vedic views of the afterlife.

The form of the verb *ajanatā* causes interpretational difficulties. It appears to be the 2nd pl. act. impf. to the 1st cl. pres. stem *jānati* ‘begets’, and so I take it, as do WG (see also Gotō, 1st class, 145 n. 203) and, as a plausible alternative, Old (Noten). See also Narten (Sig. Aor., 117–18 n. 317). But most interpr. want the verb to be 3rd ps., and if possible, 3rd plural. Since the ending *-ata* (*/-atā*) can only be 3rd pl. to an athematic stem, an otherwise unattested root pres. was invented by Gr.; Ge takes it as an 3rd pl. aor.; Re tr. as 3rd pl. but does not comment. As Old points out, lengthening of *-ta* to *-tā* is far more common in the 2nd pl. act. than in 3rd ps. middle forms -- another argument in favor of the 2nd pl. Since unsigned switch between persons is common in RVic discourse, there seems no contextual reason to reject the obvious morphological analysis of *ajanatā*.

It is striking that the two damning similes compare the badly behaved poets to two types of contemptible females.

IV.5.6: This vs. is difficult both to construe and to render into English, and different interpretations of how to construe it lead to very different views of the meaning of the hymn as a whole. In my view, the poet claims that because of his upright behavior, in contrast to that of the likewise skilled but wicked poets in vs. 5, Agni takes some of the burden of the poetic labor upon himself. Other interpr. believe that the poet is complaining that Agni is imposing a further burden on him, the poet, despite his good behavior.

I take the first two words of the vs., *idām me*, as a separate clause, with the referent of *idām* the same as that in the last pāda of the preceding vs., *idām padām ...*

gabhīrām “this profound word.” With *idám me* the poet lays claim to the poetic skill that seems also to characterize the wicked poets.

My view that *kíyate* starts a new clause is supported by the fact that all other exx. of *kíyant-* are pāda-initial. In attempting to render the rest of the vs. into parsable English I have scuttled the interrogative feature of the dat. *kíyate* ‘for how great/small a one?’ An interrogative rendering would be something like “For what such small one (like me) ... have you placed ...?”

With the dat. negated part. *áminate* I supply as obj. *dhāma* (or *dhāmā[ni]*) (with most tr.), in a phrase contrasting with 4c *prá yé minánti várūṇasya dhāma* “those who confound the ordinances of Varuṇa,” which described his rivals and the targets of Agni’s flame.

Given the position of the simile part. *ná*, the simile should consist only of *bhārām* ‘burden’, with *gurúm* ‘heavy’ the quality held in common. But since *mánma* is neut., *gurúm* can only modify m. *bhārām*. This seems to me a minor problem.

The problems of interpr. are esp. acute in the 2nd hemistich and involve esp. the assessment of the referent and meaning of the accusatives in the d pāda. Some tr. (I confess I don’t entirely understand Ge’s) take them as an appositive to *mánma* ‘thought’ in b, referring to the burden that Agni is laying on the poet, with the possibility floated (see Old [SBE], WG n.) that it refers to the later *Prṣṭha* Stotra. But in this type of context the ‘back’ (*prṣṭhá-*) is ordinarily Agni’s (also in cmpds like *ghṛtá-prṣṭha-* ‘ghee-backed’) and the adj. *yahvā-* modifying it is almost entirely limited to Agni. I therefore think that the *prṣṭhám* phrase refers to Agni’s back (so Ge n. 6d) and that it is a second acc. with *dadhātha* ‘you have placed’: $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place sthg (ACC.) on sthg (ACC.)’ (so, possibly, Ge n. 6d). This is, admittedly and unfortunately, not a standard construction with $\sqrt{dhā}$, but, then, the usual case expression with $\sqrt{dhā}$ for the location of what has been placed is the locative, while most tr. take the dative phrase in ab to be that location. I do, again, have to admit that $\sqrt{dhā}$ + DAT. ‘establish sthg (ACC) for s.o. (DAT.)’ is common, and this is doubtless what the other tr. are thinking of. However, the strong likelihood that pāda d refers to Agni’s back and Agni’s back can’t be placed on the poet emboldens me to hold to my interpr. I take the dat. phrase as a dative of benefit.

IV.5.7: The first half of the vs. is fairly straightforward. The poet expresses his hope that his *dhītī-* ‘conception, thought’ will reach *tám* (most likely Agni, though ‘sacrifice’ is also possible). I take the etym. phrase *samanā samānām* as I do in similar phrases in IV.51.8–9 (Dawn), esp. 9ab ... *samanā samanīh ... uṣāśaś caranti* “The Dawns proceed, the same ones in the same way,” referring to the regular repetition of sunrise. Here I think the phrase refers to the repetition of the sacrifice and the ever-renewed Agni; similar is VI.4.1 addressed to Agni *evā no adyā samanā samānān ... yakṣi devān* “even so for us today sacrifice in the same way to the same gods.”

The second hemistich is close to impenetrable; Old (Noten) remarks “Die Dunkelheiten dieses Verses ... sind ein Noli me tangere.” As I indicated in the publ. intro., I think the impossible hapax *jābāru* that ends the vs. is not *meant* to be understood but is “a sort of abracadabra, a mystical expression, and the half verse in which it appears encapsulates the profound and transformative secret of the sacrifice.” The meaning “solar disc” first suggested by Sāy. and followed, for want of anything better, by most since (though not by Old or WG), is, in my opinion, worse than useless, in that such a tr.

obscures the enigmatic intent. Note first that the word rhymes with *cāru* in the preceding pāda and echoes the important word *bhārām* in 6b; it also has unusual phonology -- with internal plain *b* and the impression of slightly skewed reduplication: *jābaru* like *jabhāra*. (Note that this latter pf. shows up several times nearby: IV.7.4 *ā jabhruḥ*, *jabhārat* IV.2.6, 12.2; in fact a surprising percentage of the RVic forms of this pf. are found in IV: *jabhartha* 19.9, *jabhāra* 18.4, 13; 27.2, 4.) It also appears to contain the mysterious suffix *-āru-* mostly found in nonce formations, on which see comm. ad III.30.8. And perhaps most important it's encoded into a repeated phonetic pattern involving *rup*: ... *cāru pṛśner* / *āgre rūpā ā rūpitaṃ jābāru* // *pra* ...

With Gr (s.v. *cārman-*) I interpr. *sasāsya cārman* “on the hide of the grain” as a ref. to the barhis, establishing the ritual ground as the locus of the mystery. See further ad IV.7.7.

As often the mention of *Prśni* brings obscurity in its train. Here one question is what noun to supply in the phrase *cāru pṛśneḥ*, which recurs in 10b *gúhyam cāru pṛśneḥ*. There are two good candidates, ‘name’ and ‘udder’, as Ge also points out. The adj. *gúhya-* in the latter passages suggests ‘name’, since it regularly modifies *nāman-*; cf. also vs. 3c *padām ná gór āpagūḍham* “the word hidden like the track of the cow,” with a form of *√guh* ‘hide’ and a verbal referent, as well as III.5.6 (see below) *cāru nāma*. But nearby IV.3.10 connects *Prśni* with an udder, and IV.7.7 with similar phraseology also has an udder. I do not think an informed choice can be made, and I’m also not sure it matters -- though I weakly favor ‘name’. See comm. ad vs. 10 below.

With most others I take *ārupita-* as a back formation to the *-p*-causative of *√ruh* ‘ascend’ found 1st in the Brāh. See also Schindler (Wurzelnom., s.v. *rúp-*), EWA s.vv. *RODH*, *ROP*.

The root noun *rúp-* is likewise obscure (see, e.g., Schindler, s.v.). I tr. ‘mount’ (sim., e.g., Bloomfield, RR ad III.5.5), deriving it from the same secondary causative formation as gave rise to *-rupita-*. However, this is the merest guess (though coinciding with Bl [see RR ad III.5.5, with ref. to JAOS 27]), and the existence of a parallel phrase *ripó ágram* in III.5.5 with different vocalism (*rip-* vs. *rup-*) adds to the uncertainty. The sequence III.5.5–6 resembles our passage in other ways, esp. in III.5.6c *sasāsya cārma*, identical to the phrase in our 7c, as well as the *cāru nāma* mentioned above. Most important is the fact that III.5.5a is identical to pāda d of our next vs., save for *ripáḥ* vs. *rupáḥ*. The root noun *rúp-* is also found in X.13.3, in an obscure context in an omphalos vs., where it is found, as here, with a form of the root *√ruh* (though without the secondary *-p-*), *aroham*. Further, the variant *ripáḥ* is found in X.79.3, along with a form of *sasá-*.

IV.5.8: Opinion is divided as to whether *pravācyam ... me* means “to be proclaimed to me” or “... by me,” and the dat. enclitic makes either interpr. possible (dative agents being found with gerundives). I take it as the former: the vs. (or at least bc) seems to concern the esoteric education of the poet. The unidentified “they,” subjects of *vadanti* (b) and (*āpa* ...) *vrán* (c), convey these secret teachings. I doubt that we are supposed to know who “they” are, and Re’s impersonal “on” (“On parle ...”) may capture the intent better than a literal tr.

The hapax *nīṇīk* ‘privately, secretly’ is apparently derived from *nīnyá-* ‘secret, private’, though the details are disputed. See EWA s.v. *nīnyá-*.

Both Ge and Re in different ways make heavy weather of *vā̃r* (ein Tor and une ouverture respectively), but there seems no reason not to take it as ‘water’ (as elsewhere), as Old rather scornfully observes (“Warum nicht *vā̃r* ‘Wasser’? ‘Wasser der Kuh’ ist die Milch”). The reference is of course to the Vala myth: they uncover secret teachings as they do the light (here light = water = milk) of the cows enclosed in the Vala cave.

As noted ad vs. 7, pāda d is identical to III.5.5a. Exactly what is meant here is not clear (what a surprise!), but if, as I suggest, “the tip of the mount” (*agrē rupāḥ*) in 7c refers to the ritual ground, perhaps the ritual earthly fire or the top of that fire, it may be that “the track of the bird” (*padām vēḥ*) is the track of the sun, the heavenly fire. See publ. intro. to III.5. If it is a reference to the sun, it would provide a good transition to the next vs.

IV.5.9: This vs. brings us to the familiar ritual situation: dawn and the rising of the sun at the moment of the dawn sacrifice. After the obscurities of recent vss. it comes as a relief.

Flg. Sāy, all the standard tr. (save for Old SBE) take *viveda* as 1st ps. This is certainly possible, but there is nothing in the context that imposes it. Old supplies “he” without identification; I think Dawn is the possible discoverer.

IV.5.10: With Old (Noten, explicitly contra SBE) I take the whole vs. as a single sentence, with the final word *jihvā* an instr. parallel to *āsā* ending pāda a, both referring to Agni’s flame. The other standard tr. take cd as a separate clause, with *jihvā* the nom. subj.

The vs. continues the focus on the kindling of the ritual fire at the dawn sacrifice. The parents in pāda a are the kindling sticks, at least in my opinion (also explicitly Re). For the phrase *gūhyam cāru pṛśneḥ* cf. *cāru pṛśneḥ* in 7c and disc. there. In both cases the phrase seems to encapsulate the mystery of the ritual. The verb *āmanuta* ‘pondered’ or ‘brought to mind’ somewhat favors supplying ‘name’ as the referent of the phrase. Cf. in this Agni cycle IV.1.16a *té manvata prathamām nāma dhenóḥ* “They brought to mind the first name of the milk-cow,” also X.68.7 *bṛhaspátir āmata hí tyád āsām, nāma svarīṇām sādane gūhā yāt* “For Bṛhaspati brought to mind this very name of these who were resounding (with)in the seat -- (the name) which was hidden.” The two locations identified in c, “the furthest track of the mother cow” (*mātúṣ padé paramé ... góḥ*) and “nearby” (*ánti*) suggest that the mysterious hidden substance is both on the ritual ground and in heaven or the equivalent. (See 11cd and 12cd.)

IV.5.11: I tr. injunc. aor. *voce* as an immediate past, because I think the poet is referring to his own poetic production in this very hymn. (The middle voice strengthens the sense of self-reference.) However, the verb could of course express a neutral present, as the standard tr. take it (e.g., Ge “Ich spreche”), or even a future/modal (“I shall proclaim”). I take the referent of *idám* at the end of b to be *ṛtā-*, which begins the vs.: the poet has hope for Agni’s largesse in just the case that his speech is/contains truth. He phrases this as a conditional (“if”), but, with the confidence he has gained in the course of the hymn, one assumes he is certain that his speech is the truth that was revealed to him in the preceding vss.

My suggestion that the locations in 10c are heaven and the ritual ground is supported by the straightforward assertion here that Agni has power over wealth both on earth and in heaven.

IV.5.11-12: The accented demonstr. *asyá* in 11c and in the repeated phrase *no asyá* (12a, c) causes minor interpretational difficulty because on the basis of its accent it should be adjectival. In 11c it anticipates *víśvam* in the izafe-like rel. cl. *yád dha víśvam*, as well as *dráviṇam* in its expansion in d. In 12a the two neut. interrogatives in a row (*kím ... kád*) invite a differential tr., hence my rendering of the first as a question marker rather than a neut. pronominal. But the case disharmony of the phrase *asyá dráviṇam* is curious; it is generally interpr. as an attempt at a partitive expression, which I think is correct -- though I'm not entirely happy with Ge's notion that *dráviṇam* has been "attracted" out of the genitive by *kím*. If *kím* is taken as a neut. prn., the phrase could be tr. "what [=how much] wealth of this (wealth) is ours." For *no asyá* in 12c, see next comm.

IV.5.12: It is difficult to render the construction in 12cd literally without losing its sense, and the publ. tr. has rearranged the structure of the subordinate cl. in favor of parsability. In my view, all of cd is a relative cl. with neut. *yád* as the subordinator. It forms an acc. phrase *paramám yád ... padám* "which highest track/footstep" (see *padé paramé* in 10c). This acc. is limited by the gen. phrase *ádhvanaḥ ... no asyá* "of this road of ours." The acc. phrase is construed as an acc. of (extent of) space with *áganma*: "on/along which track we have gone." So the frame of bcd would read literally "... you have announced to us in secret what highest track of this road of ours we have gone on." ("In secret" [*guhā*] could instead be construed within the rel. clause "the track we have gone on in secret," without damaging the interpr.)

The rel. clause also contains a simile, *réku padám ná nidānāḥ* "like the spurned/scorned on an empty track," with nom./acc. matching the subj. ("we") and acc. goal ("track") of the frame. Because simile and frame share the acc. *padám* it appears only once, displaced to the simile from where we might expect to find it in the frame (and in fact to the wrong part of the simile with *ná* in the wrong place; we should expect **réku ná padám*).

The simile raises another question: why is our progress subject to this negative comparison? The standard response to this is that Agni is supposed to tell us whether we're on the wrong road or not, since the end of it is hidden from us. I think the point is more subtle: the wealth and treasure that we want (and have obtained) from Agni are not material, but rather the secret teachings and poetic enigmas we have learned in the course of the hymn. But to the vulgar and uninitiated, it looks as if we are going down a blind alley, heading to a dry hole with no material goods to show for it. As vs. 14 shows, those who scorn us for the path we have chosen will themselves be scorned for lacking the true poetic gift.

IV.5.13: The theme of the journey in vs. 12 morphs slightly into the image of a race or similar contest.

IV.5.14: With Old and Re I supply *vácasā* (from pāda a) with *āsatā*, rather than taking the latter as 'non-being' vel sim., because that stem is regularly associated with speech.

IV.6 Agni

IV.6.3: The subject must change between pādas a and b, since the subj. of a is fem. and b contains a masc. nom. sg. (*urāṇāḥ*). I supply Agni as the subj. of b, as he clearly is of the repeated pāda III.19.2c. So also Old (SBE); others are less explicit.

The standard tr. take *urāṇāḥ* as transitive, with *devātātim* as obj. (e.g., Ge “die Götterschar sich erwählend”) (also in the identical pāda III.19.2c). But in all clear cases *urāṇā-* is passive (as opposed to trans. *vr̥ṇāná-*), and it seems esp. unlikely that the occurrence here would be transitive when the next vs. (4d) contains the same form in the same metrical position (verse-final) in clear passive usage (cf. also the next hymn IV.7.8c). Moreover it is not entirely clear to me what “choosing” the divine assembly would mean, whereas Agni’s being chosen as a priest is a standard trope. The occurrences of *devātāti-* in vss. 1b and 9d show that the divine assemblage was present at the ritual and that Agni was acting on their behalf. Taking *urāṇāḥ* as the passive it ordinarily leaves the acc. *devātātim* ungoverned grammatically, but in the publ. tr. I construe it loosely with *pradakṣiṇít*. It is possible that it could instead be loosely construed with *urāṇāḥ* “being chosen as priest for the divine assemblage”).

On *akrá-* see comm. ad I.189.7.

It may seem odd that the wooden post “anoints” the sacrificial animal tied to it, and in fact WG dissociate pādas c and d and make Agni the subject of d. But this striking turn of phrase can be explained both as a metaphor and by the principle of ritual transfer. Metaphorically “anoint” can simply mean “make ritually fit for sacrifice,” and this may be in play here: tying the animal to the post is a regular step in the animal sacrifice. But more interesting is the ritual transfer. In the one hymn in the RV devoted to the post (III.8), the post itself is anointed by the priests (III.8.1a *añjānti tvām ... vānaspate*), and later in that hymn the mechanism for that anointing is made clear: the offering ladles have been stretched over the posts (III.8.7b *yatásrucaḥ*). Thus the posts dripping with ghee presumably transfer the ghee to the attached animals, anointing them in their turn. Note that in our vs. the first pāda concerns the outstretched ghee-filled ladle (*yatā ... ghr̥tācī*), and we can assume that the same ritual sequence obtains here: ladle anoints post, which anoints animals.

IV.6.4: The standard tr. take the two loc. phrases in pāda a as real locationals, but I consider it unlikely that the Adhvaryu (who is Agni himself) would stand *on* the barhis, which would unhelpfully go up in smoke. Rather these should be loc. absolutes, as Old (SBE) takes them. In this particular case the loc. absolutes seem to be used, in conjunction with the aor. indic. *ūrdhvāḥ ... asthāt*, to indicate two layers of prior action before the present indicatives indicating the current ongoing ritual action, namely the circumambulation associated with the animal sacrifice (see publ. intro.), here expressed by *eti* in *pāri ... eti* in cd. The two loc. absolutes express the first layer of action: the barhis must be strewn and the fire kindled. Once the fire has been kindled, there comes the second layer of action, resulting directly from the first: the fire stands upright -- that is, catches and flames up. Only then can the firebrand be taken out and the circumambulation (*pāri ... eti*) begun. Thus, the aor. does express its usual sense of immediate past action, but English “has stood upright” does not capture this sense here. It might be better “Once the ritual grass *had* been strewn and the fire kindled, the Adhvaryu *stood* upright ... (Now) Agni circles ...” I thank IH for causing me to think this through more thoroughly.

IV.6.5: The stem *mitá-dru-* (5x) makes formal difficulties. If its 2nd member is a root noun belonging to \sqrt{dru} ‘run’, it should of course have the shape **-drut-*; root-noun cmpds also typically have accent on the root noun. Because of the former problem, Scar (243–44) interprets *-drú-* in *raghu-drú-* as a *-u*-stem deriv. of $\sqrt{drā}$ ‘run’. The context here, however, suggests at least a folk-etymological connection with \sqrt{dru} ‘run’, since pāda c opens with a finite form of that root: *drávanty asya vājīno ná sókāḥ* “His flames run like prize-winners,” which seems like a parallel expression to pāda a *mitádrur eti* “*mitádru* he goes.” (Note that in two of the five *mitádru-* passages the adj. modifies *vājīnaḥ* [VII.38.7, X.64.6].) Several factors may contribute to the anomalous shape of the compound. First, the rhyming *mitá-jñu-* ‘having fixed/firm knees’, where *-jñu-* is not a root noun but the reduced form of *jānu-* ‘knee’. Second, there is of course a noun parallel in formation to *jānu-/jñú-*, namely *dāru-/drú-* ‘wood’. The reduced form is found as 2nd member in at least one cmpd., *su-drú-* ‘(having) good wood’. It is possible that the existence of this homonymous form might have overridden the rule that added *-t-* to root nouns ending in short resonants. It is even possible that *mitá-dru-* actually contains the ‘wood’ word -- or at least that such a pun could be actualized: the cmpd could mean ‘having wood fixed (in it)’ referring to the fire. At least the three singular occurrences of the stem all refer to Agni (at least in my view), though the two plurals do not. Assuming that at least one reading of the cmpd contains a (pseudo-)root noun to \sqrt{dru} , the question then remains what the first member *mitá-* belongs to. The default assumption is \sqrt{mi} ‘fix’ as in *mitájñu-*, but my tr. reflects a deriv. from $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’.

IV.6.6: A rare example of a non-nominative concessive use of the pres. part. of \sqrt{as} ‘be’.

IV.6.7: The first pāda contains three words not otherwise found in the RV: *sātur jānitor āvāri*. Only the first is troublesome: though only occurring here, *āvāri* is clearly the passive aor. to $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘obstruct’ (see *vāranta* in 6c), and the abl. inf. *jānitoḥ* is structurally transparent and is also found post-RV. The hapax *sātuḥ* is a different matter, however. Neither its root affiliation nor its grammatical identity is clear. Gr takes it as a *-tu*-stem to \sqrt{san} ‘win, gain’, with the meaning ‘der empfangende Mutterleib’, but the semantic extension envisioned is quite fantastic, and we should in any event expect a full-grade **sānitu-* (note immed. following *jānitu-* to the rhyming *seṭ* root). Ge tr. “Natur” (with ?) and suggests, rather wildly, that it’s derived from a root $\sqrt{sā} = as$, an idea that must underlie Re’s “l’être,” though he cannily does not comment. Old (SBE) tr. “mother,” but does not venture an etymology. Mayrhofer (KEWA s.v. *sātuḥ*) summarizes the speculation but does not adjudicate. WG have proposed a different solution, that it’s a *-tu*-stem to $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘bind’, and tr. “Von dessen Erzeugung das Anfesseln nicht abgehalten worden ist,” noting that Agni must be controlled after he is born. Although the morphology works better than the other suggestions, the meaning proposed seems rather contorted.

I have a more radical proposal -- that the phonological complex should be divided into *sā + ā/ātur*. The former is the feminine pronoun, picking up fem. *tanū-* found in the loc. *tanvī* in the preceding pāda (6d). Although the pronoun would not be in its standard init. position, it’s worth noting that the position of fem. *sā* is more variable than that of *sā* and also that both the neg. *nā* and the rel. prn. *yāsya* might be expected to be fronted. As

for the proposed second part, there are several possibilities. In my opinion the most likely is that it is the gen. sg. of a *-tar*-stem built to \sqrt{ad} ‘eat’, $*\acute{ad}-tar-$ > $*\acute{at}-tar-$, showing the same reduction of the internal cluster as in ($\acute{at}ri-$) $atrín-$ ‘devouring’ (at least by the etym. I favor). (The reduction would most probably take place in weak forms with the suffixal shape *-tr-* [e.g., instr. $*\acute{ad}-tr-\bar{a}$ > $*\acute{at}-tr-\bar{a}$ > $*\acute{atr}\bar{a}$] and spread to the gen./abl.) For textual support cf. X.79.4 *jāyamāno mātārā gárbho atti* “while being born, the embryo eats his two mothers [=kindling sticks],” a description of Agni’s birth, as here. Less likely, but not completely impossible, is an analysis as the gen. sg. of the Indo-Iranian $*\acute{at}ar-$ ‘fire’ (Aves. *ātar-*) treated as a *-tar*-stem. (By Stanley Insler’s very attractive, and unfortunately unpublished, etymology, the same word is also preserved in *mātaríśvan-*, whose initial *m* is owing to missegmentation.)

I am not entirely sure what pāda b contributes to the meaning -- perhaps the point is that the kindling sticks have kept *seeking* to produce fire and therefore his birth, depicted in pāda a, has taken place without a hitch. Note that this is the only occurrence in the RV of the full dual dvandva *mātārā-pitārā*.

IV.6.8: The part. *saṃvāsānāḥ* is generally ascribed to \sqrt{vas} ‘dwell’, and the standard tr. ‘dwelling together’ makes good sense as a descriptor of fingers. However, forms unambiguously belonging to this root are active, and there is no root pres. or aor. Gotō (1st Class, 295 n. 698) therefore assigns the participle to \sqrt{vas} ‘wear’, which of course has a well-attested medial root pres., and tr. ‘gleichgekleidet’, an interpr. maintained in WG. I find the morphological arg. persuasive, but the meaning somewhat elusive: what do fingers wear when making fire? (I do not think we should assume gloves.) I take it as a pun. In support of ‘dwell’, consider *saṃvāsana-* ‘joint dwelling’ (IX.86.17).

Pāda c contains another hapax, *atharyāḥ*. This is generally taken as the gen. sg. of a fem. *atharī-*, often interpr. as a female animal, whose tooth is the object of comparison with Agni’s flame. See, e.g., Old’s extensive disc. ad VII.1.1 (Noten II, p. 2), where he tentatively opts for a mare. Hoffmann suggests rather (registered in EWA I.805) that it belongs with *atharvī-* ‘following the way’ (*athar-vī*) (I.112.10), with the loss of *v* on metrical grounds, while WG take it simply as a fem. *-ī*-stem to *áthar-*, which they take as a root noun cmpd $*h_2at-h_2ar-ih_2$, and tr. ‘Wegzieherin’. The publ. tr. ‘enveloped in flame’ starts from Hoffmann’s preform with *-vī-*, but deviates in two regards. First it takes *athar-* with *atharyú-* with the meaning ‘flame, flaming’, and second it analyses the 2nd member as the root noun to $\sqrt{vyā}$ ‘envelop’ (cf. *hiranya-vī-* ‘enveloped in gold’, Scar 502). The phrase *atharyò ná dāntam* would then be semantically parallel to the bahuvrīhi *súci-dant-* (2x, of Agni) ‘having blazing teeth’. I am not at all happy with my analysis, however -- primarily because I am dubious about the existence of an *athar-* ‘flame’ and because the loss of *v* suggested by Hoffmann seems difficult to motivate. I would therefore tentatively withdraw the publ. tr., though I have nothing better to substitute. I wonder if the word is not implicated in the same interpretational difficulty as *sātuḥ* discussed above (7a). I doubt that a female animal is at issue.

IV.6.9: These variously colored horses of Agni’s are, of course, his flames. The verb in d, *ah(u)vanta* ‘called’, can refer to the crackling of the flames: actual horses don’t ordinarily ‘call’ anyone. However, I think we’re also dealing with a pun, with \acute{a} ... *ah(u)vanta* a

phonological scrambling of **ā* ... *avahanta* ‘conveyed’. Cf. III.19.4 *sá ā vaha devātātim* ..., VII.1.18 *vakṣi devātātim ācha*, with the same obj.

IV.6.10: This vs. contains yet another hapax, *duvasanāso* in a, but in this case the form seems to have been generated to form a pair with its phonological near match *tuviṣvaṇāso* in b (with its last two syllables also matching preceding *śyenāso*, which it modifies). It is generally connected (see Re ad loc., EWA s.v. *dūrā-*) with *dūrā-* ‘distant’, *dāvīyas-* / *daviṣṭha* ‘further, furthest’, but the exact morphology is unclear. On semantic grounds it seems unlikely to be related to *dúvas-* ‘friendship’. For a similar deformation of this lexical complex, see *duvanyasāt* in IV.40.2, which also owes some of its phonological shape to its formulaic partner.

IV.6.11: Ge and Re interpret pāda b as having three finite verbs: *śáṃsāti*, *yájate*, and *ví ... dhāḥ*, subjunctive, pres. indicative, and injunctive respectively. The first and third go well together (esp. if the injunctive is imperatival, as *dhāḥ* so often is), but the indicative does not sit well between them. By contrast Gr interprets *yájate* as the dat. sg. of the act. pres. part., rather than as a middle 3rd sg. With Old (SBE) and WG, I follow Gr in the morphological analysis, but both Old and WG construe the part. with *vy ū dhāḥ*. I think it belongs rather with *śáṃsati*, both because of the position of the *ū* and because of a nearby parallel passage also in an Agni hymn, IV.16.2 *śáṃsāti ukthám ... cikitúṣe ...* “He will recite his solemn speech to the one who attends to it,” with a dat. participle in this formula. The referent of *yájate* is Agni; note that he is called the superior sacrificer (*yájīyān*) in 1b, so *yájate* forms a ring with that first mention.

It is not clear what obj. to supply with *ví ... dhāḥ* ‘apportion’. It generally takes goods or the like elsewhere, hence my ‘treasures’, though I am tempted by Re’s “tu répartis (les rôles)” -- that is, Agni distributing ritual roles and ritual speech to the various participants.

“Laud of Āyu” (*śáṃsam āyóḥ*; also V.3.4) must refer to Agni, however odd the expression seems to be -- rather like referring to someone as “the toast of the town.” Of course, one of Agni’s standing epithets is the cmpd. *nārā-śáṃsa-*, of which *śáṃsa- āyóḥ* is simply an analytic variant. For further disc. see comm. ad VI.24.2 and II.34.6.

IV.7 Agni

Intro.: The publ. intro. states that Agni’s role as messenger is first mentioned in vs. 3; this should be corrected to vs. 4.

IV.7.1: Aṇavāna appears with the Bhṛguś also in VIII.102.4, but nothing more is known of him (cf. Mayr., Personennamen s.v.). Scar (366–67), though without disc., renders it not as a sg. PN, but as a nom. pl. adj. modifying the Bhṛguś (“die reichen (?) Bhṛguś”), presumably to a stem **āṇavan-*, roughly parallel to *āṇasvant-*. However, the usage in VIII.102.4 makes it clear that at least in that passage it is a PN.

In c *virurucūḥ* gives a bad cadence, and by meaning it could easily belong to the redupl. aor. *arūruca-*. The same pāda-final sequence (save for accent) ... *bhṛgavo ví rurucūḥ* is also found at X.122.5. It is therefore tempting (see Old [Noten], Arnold [Ved. Metre 128] for the temptation) to lengthen the reduplicating vowel. However, the undeniable 3rd pl. pf. ending (aor. should be **rūrucan*) and the existence of other

transitive exx. of *rurucuḥ* in other metrical positions (see Kü 431) temper the temptation. Still, I'd be inclined to read **virūrucuḥ* and assume that the stem has been secondarily incorporated into the pf. For further disc. see comm. ad IV.16.4.

IV.7.2: The point of the abrupt question opening this vs. must be that mortals have established Agni in his ritual role (vs. 1, 2cd), but Agni is not reliably fulfilling this role by manifesting himself at the proper times.

IV.7.3: This vs. continues the syntactic frame of vs. 2, with the nom. pl. subj. ("mortals" of 2d) modified by the pres. part. *páśyantaḥ* and Agni in the acc. sg.

vícetasam in pāda a is a pun, playing on the standard ambiguity of the root \sqrt{cit} , which means both 'perceive' and 'appear'. Referring to Agni's mental qualities, adjacent to *ṛtāvānam* 'truthful', it means 'discriminating', but the simile in b, "like heaven with its stars," actualizes the 'appear' sense.

The "laughter" of Agni is the merry crackling of the fire.

IV.7.4: This vs. also appears to continue the syntax of vs. 3, with another acc. phrase referring to Agni (pāda a), though given the 3rd pl. verb in c (*ājabhruḥ*) that could govern the acc., the vs. can be syntactically self-contained.

IV.7.4cd–5: Together these vss. reprise the first vs. (and the beginning of the 2nd). Agni's association with the Bhrgus of 1c is tightened by the adj. of appurtenance *bhṛgavan-* in 4d, and *viśé-viśé* returns from 1d. In 5a we find *ānuśák* as in 2a. The verb *ní sedire* 'have set down' (5b), though etym. unrelated, is the transitive equivalent in ritual discourse of *dhāyi* (1a) 'has been installed', and its object Agni is identified as *hótāram ... yájiṣṭham*, the words used of him as subject of *dhāyi* in vs. 1 (1b *hótā yájiṣṭhaḥ*). The root $\sqrt{dhā}$, insistent in 1a *dhāyi dhātṛbhiḥ*, is not absent here: see *dhāmabhiḥ* in 5d. Meanwhile the signature root of this section of the hymn is \sqrt{cit} , which appears once in each of the first 5 vss., except for 4: 1d *citrām*, 2b *cétanam*, 3a *vícetasam*, 5b *cikitvāmsam*.

IV.7.6–7: Though vs. 6 belongs metrically and syntactically with what precedes -- it is in Anuṣṭubh like vss. 2–5 and the accusative descriptive phrases hang off vs. 5 -- it belongs thematically with vs. 7, as noted in the publ. intro. Both vss. treat the mystery of the ritual fire, and being at the center of the hymn, they form a sort of omphalos.

IV.7.6: This vs. is structured as a series of paradoxes, one per pāda. The least clear is in pāda a, since there is only one qualifier, the loc. *śáśvatīṣu mātṛṣu* "in ever new mothers," which must be construed with *vītám* 'enveloped' in b. The paradox there is that ordinarily one has only one mother and that mother is not self-renewing. The physical reference must be to the pieces of wood (his mothers) in which fire inheres and from which he flashes out one by one. This physical image is developed in b: the fire is within wood -- therefore apparently in a fixed place -- but is unfixed, in that it is in constant motion in and over the sticks of wood. In c the fire inherent in the wood, therefore hidden, is also bright when it catches. Note another instance of the root \sqrt{cit} , *citrām* (matching the same word in 1d). And finally in d, when the fire catches it's easy to see and therefore to find, but its movements are unpredictable.

IV.7.7: This vs., particularly the first pāda, has been subjected to a variety of interpretations, which I will not pursue in detail here. The vs. is reminiscent of, though far less difficult than, IV.5.7, and in both cases I think it concerns the ritual and the layout of the ritual ground. The loc. phrase *sasāsya ... víyutā* “at the separation of the grain” I take as a reference to the spreading of the barhis, the ritual grass; it seems to correspond to the loc. phrase in IV.5.7c *sasāsya cárman* “on the hide of the grain.” See also V.21.4, where Agni is urged to sit “on the womb of grain” (*sasāsya yónim*). “At the same udder” (*sásminn ūdhan*) is also found in nearby IV.10.8, also with apparent reference to the sacrifice or the ritual ground.

IV.7.7–8: On 3rd sg. *veḥ* (√ *vī*) in 7d, see comm. ad II.5.3. Here the form serves as a pivot, *veḥ* in 8a having the more morphologically orthodox 2nd ps. reference. The near identity of the two adjacent phrases, 7d # *vér adhvarāya* and 8a # *vér adhvarāya (dūtyāni)*, requires us to consider them together. The first is clearly 3rd sg. (with nom. *agnīḥ* in the preceding pāda, nom. *ṛtāvā* in the same pāda). The 2nd ps. ref. of the second only emerges in pāda 8c, with 2nd sg. verb *īyase*. The poet seems to want first to enforce the 3rd ps. reference of the verb (even in 8ab the nom. pf. participles *vidvān* and *cikivān* appear to continue the 3rd ps.) and then require us to construct a paradigm: 2nd sg. *vés* [sandhi *vér*], 3rd sg. *vés* [sandhi *vér*], like 2nd sg. (*ā*)*var*, 3rd sg. (*ā*)*var*, which I invoked ad II.5.3 to explain the anomalous 3rd sg. *vés*. We can see this sequence as a variant on poetic repair.

The near repetition of the VP in 8a also clarifies the construction of the verb in 7d, with gapped object. I take dat. *adhvarāya* (7d) and gen. *adhvarāya* (8a) as filling essentially the same functional role.

IV.7.8: The VP √ *vid āródhanam divāḥ* (a variant of our *vidúṣṭaro divā āródhanāni*) occurs in the next hymn, IV.8.2, 4, assuring that the acc. here is governed by the comparative to the pf. part. *vidúṣṭara-*. With most (though not Gr, WG) I take *āródhana-* as belonging with √ *ruh* ‘climb’ (√ *rudh* ‘grow’), not √ *rudh* ‘obstruct’. On the difficulties in sorting out these roots, see EWA s.v. *RODH*².

IV.7.9: My interpr. of this vs. differs from the standard ones in several ways. First, in b most tr. take *vāpuṣām íd ékam* as a nominal sentence: “(this is) one of the wonders.” In contrast, I take b as describing the moment of the birth of the ritual fire: a single physical flame rising from the wood, though it is well known that Agni has many forms (*vápūṃṣi* e.g., III.1.8, 18.5, 55.9). Thus, *ékam* modifies *arcīḥ*, and the pāda is a single clause.

Pādas bc then sketch a double paradox: the beam of the just-born Agni is single, though he has many forms *and* though a number of mothers conceive him as an embryo (*dádhate ha gárbham*). Pāda c also contains another paradox: his mothers conceive him though they are unimpregnated (*ápravītāḥ*). My interpr. depends on reading pl. *ápravītāḥ* contra the Pp, which has singular *-ā* -- followed by Gr. and by all the standard tr., which also then must take *dádhate* as a thematic 3rd sg. (or perhaps a short-vowel subjunctive). With Old (Noten), I take *dádhate* as the expected indic. 3rd plural mid. to the redupl. pres. to √ *dhā* and *ápravītā* as representing *ápravītāḥ* in sandhi. The same form, in the pl., is found in the very similar passage III.55.5 *antárvatīḥ suvate ápravītā(ḥ)*, which

also describes Agni's "virgin birth": "Having (him) within, (though) unimpregnated they give birth to (him)." Agni's multiple mothers also figure earlier in our own hymn, 6a.

The publ. tr. takes pāda d as a subordinate clause, still under the control of *yád* beginning pāda c, primarily because of the accent on *bhāvasi*. However, it is quite possible that d is a separate main clause ("immediately at birth, you become a messenger") with the verbal accent owing to the immediately following *íd*. Many of the exx. given by Gr (no. 5, s.v. *íd*) of accented verbs followed by *íd* are pāda-initial and therefore non-probative (since they would be accented anyway), but there is a sturdy residue of non-initial apparent main clause verbs with accent.

IV.7.10: An undeniable ex. of a predicated perfect part., *dādṛśānam*.

On the supposed separate root \sqrt{di} 'destroy', see comm. ad III.34.1.

IV.7.11: Rather than supplying a verb to govern *ānnā* (e.g., Ge "die Speisen (verzehrend)"), I allow *trṣúṇā* 'thirsting (for)' to govern the acc.

In b the standard tr. supply 'wind': "he makes the thirsty (wind) his messenger." I resist this because it is Agni who is always the messenger (e.g., in this hymn 4a, 8a, 8c, 9d), and so I think it more likely that in this case Agni is making some part of himself (flame) into that messenger. A small problem is the masc. gender of *trṣúm*: the words for 'flame, blaze' in this hymn are neut. (*arcís*- 9b, *śocís*- 5c, 10b). However, a word like m. *śóka*- is always available, or we could attribute the masc. of *trṣúm* to attraction to *dūtám* or even take it as the modifier of *dūtám* ("he makes [his flame] into a thirsty messenger").

IV.8 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn shares much phraseology with the immediately preceding IV.7.

IV.8.1: The cmpd *viśvá-vedas*- is always at least potentially ambiguous. In general most other tr. interpr. it as 'all-knowing' (lit. 'having all knowledge'); certainly in this passage that is the dominant rendering. However, as an independent noun, *védas*- only means 'possession, property', and I think that in most (maybe all) of its occurrences *viśvá-vedas*- has that value -- though the 'knowledge' interpr. may be a secondary one. In this case Agni's having all property to distribute to us may well be of more practical importance to us than his omniscience. The larger context cuts both ways: the next three vss. all have verbal forms of \sqrt{vid} 'know' (2a *véda*, 3a *veda*, 4c *vidvān*), which might favor the "all knowledge" interpr., but the obj. of 'knows' in the next vs. is the depository of goods (*vásu-dhiti*-), which might favor the "possessions" interpr.; note also his giving of goods in 3c (*dāti ... vásu*).

The anomalous 1st sg. *ṛñjase* (also V.13.6, VI.15.1, 4, X.76.1; possibly VIII.4.17) belongs with other -se 1st sg. forms like *stuṣe* 'I (will) praise'. As the context here shows, despite its likely meaning 'aim/stretch out straight', *ṛñjase* patterns with those other verbs semantically, in expressing an act of praise or reverence -- however they came into being. There is of course abundant literature on the subject; see recently Jasanoff 2016.

IV.8.2: It is quite possible that *vásudhiti*- here is a bahuvrīhi 'having the deposit(ing) of goods' vel sim., as it can be elsewhere. It could then refer to the earth (later, of course,

called *vasudhā*) in contrast to heaven, which is found in the next pāda; the two pādas share the verb *véda*.

IV.8.3: With Lub. I take *dāti* as a contracted root-aor. subjunctive. Unfortunately the root syllable never requires a disyllabic reading. On the formulaic use of a number of the forms of *dāti* / *dāti* (incl. this one), see comm. ad V.58.2 and my forthcoming art. “Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dāti-vāra*-Compound ‘Type’: A Critical Reassessment.”

IV.8.5: In the publ. tr. I tr. the first rel. cl. (in ab) as descriptive, while the 2nd one (in c) is predicative. In part the decision depends on what the temporal value of *dadāśúḥ* in the first clause is -- presential or preterital. Kü (242–45) allows both and in fact tr. other examples of this pf. ambiguously, with awkward parentheses, e.g., II.27.12 “Wer ... auf(ge)wartet (hat).” (He does not tr. this passage.) The publ. tr. takes *dadāśúḥ* as preterital, expressing the past actions that should allow us to thrive now. However, it is possible that the actions of the verbs in the two rel. cl. (*dadāśúḥ* ... *indhaté*) are sequential and both presential and should both be taken as predicated: hence “May we be those who do pious service to Agni ... and, thriving, kindle him.”

Most tr. take *puṣyāntaḥ* as transitive: “cause him to thrive,” but *puṣyāti* only takes Inhaltsakk. or accusatives of respect. Moreover, the point of the *té syāma yé* ... clauses is surely that our pious actions should lead *us* to thrive.

IV.8.8: With Old (Noten) I take the gen. pl. *carṣanīnām* and *mānuṣānām* as dependent on *vīprah*, rather than making them dependent on a supplied object as most tr. do. Either way, some object needs to be supplied with *āti* ... *vidhyati*; I’ve added ‘obstacles’ as a place-holder. The only other occurrence of *āti* √ *vyadh* in the RV has “the backs of the mountains” as obj. (VIII.96.2, the Emuṣa myth), which certainly doesn’t fit here. However, in that passage the backs of the mountains were pierced by an archer, and archery is surely at issue here as well: *kṣiprá-* ‘quick, snapping’ is construed twice with *dhánvan-* ‘bow’ (II.24.8 *kṣipréṇa dhánvanā*, IX.90.3 *kṣiprá-dhanvan-*), once with *iṣu-* ‘arrow’ (VII.46.1 *kṣipréṣu-*).

IV.9 Agni

IV.9.1: For obvious real-world reasons Agni [=fire] would not sit on the ritual grass, because it would go up in flames (cf. comm. ad IV.6.4). But Agni regularly brings the other gods to sit on this grass, and so the mention of his coming here and of the “god-seeking” (*devayú-*) people may have made the action seem appropriate.

IV.9.2: On *prāṇī-* see comm. ad I.34.4.

IV.9.5: On pāda a see comm. ad VI.2.10, which contains the identical pāda.

IV.9.8: The diction in this vs. is somewhat difficult to apply to the chariot that is its subject. What does it mean for a chariot to be “difficult to deceive/trick” (*dūlābha-*, reprised from 2a)? Perhaps it always follows the right route? And the lexeme *pári* √ (*n*)*aś*,

which barely exists (an infinitive in I.54.1), in conjunction with *viśvátaḥ* should mean “reach around/encircle on all sides,” again an odd action to ascribe to a chariot. Given the paint-by-numbers style of the hymn, I attribute these lapses to an inattentive or unskilled poet. Note the careless combustion in vs. 1.

IV.10 Agni

On the unusual meter of this hymn and its interaction with the syntactic and semantic organization, see publ. intro.

IV.10.1: With most interpr., I supply ‘sacrifice’ with *tám* in pāda a, as the object of the verb *ṛdhyāma* in d.

The accent on *ṛdhyāma* is anomalous within Oldenberg’s persuasive characterization of the meter of this hymn, since by this analysis *ṛdhyāma* is the main verb and interior to its Triṣṭubh pāda. I assume it acquired this accent redactionally after the meter was misanalyzed, with a pāda break inserted just before the verb. So also WG.

IV.10.3: Because it begins the second 5-syllable pāda, *bhāvā* is correctly accented.

svār nā jyótiḥ could be taken as a quasi-compound in the Re mode, or it is possible that *svār* indirectly continues an old gen. sg. See comm. ad II.35.6. Or *svār* and *jyótiḥ* can be taken not as a single expression but syntactically separate, as Old (SBE) and WG do in different ways. I weakly favor the gen. interpr.

IV.10.5: Again, the accentuation of voc. *agne* supports the division into 5-syllable pādas.

The etym. figure *rukṃó ná rocate* is difficult to render in tr.

On the double *cīd* see comm. ad II.27.11.

IV.10.6: The referent of *tát* in d is unclear. It cannot be ‘body’, since *tanū-* is feminine. I’ve supplied ‘flame’, but any bright neuter entity would do. Most tr. simply leave the referent blank.

IV.10.7: Contra HvN, *mārtāt* should be read as the first word of pāda d.

IV.10.8: The second pāda should read *sāntu bhrātrāgne*, with coalescence of the *a-* vowels. This also entails reading, out of sandhi, unaccented *agne*, contra Pp and HvN. The impv. *sāntu* is accented because it’s initial in the pāda.

The expression *śivā naḥ sakhyā sāntu ... devēsu yuṣmé* is very similar to VI.18.5 *tán naḥ pratnām sakhyām astu yuṣmé*, which I take as existential. On the basis of that passage and of VII.22.9 (=X.23.7) *asmé te santu sakhyā śivāni*, I think this passage should be harmonized with the others and interpreted as existential: “Let there be a propitious partnership for us among [or, with] you, the gods.” For further disc., incl. of the loc. pronoun, cf. comm. ad VI.18.5.

IV.11 Agni

IV.11.1: The second hemistich is full of phonological and etymological figures: *drśé dadṛśe ... drśé* (the last as *drśá* in sandhi) and (beg. in pāda b) *ā rocate ... rūśad ... ārūkṣitam ... ā rūpé*.

As Ge points out, Agni's 'not coarse' (*ārūkṣita*-) food must be ghee.

IV.11.2: This vs. contains a faint phonological figure: #*ví ś(āhi)* ... #*vís(vebhir)*.

With most interpr. I take *khám* 'opening, aperture' with pāda a. However, I do not think it is equivalent to or compared with *manīṣām* 'inspiration, inspired thought' (as, e.g., Ge "Schliesse ... den ... Gedanken (wie) einen Kanal auf"), but rather it is the opening through which (*vī*) the thought is supposed to be directed. As we all know, sending a stream of liquid (to which the *manīṣā*- is implicitly compared) through a small opening increases its force, and I think that is the image meant.

Both hemistichs express a fine economical formulation of the tight, closed loop of reciprocity envisioned in the RV. Agni and the rest of the gods desire praise *from* men, but they must provide *to* men the inspiration and the thought that takes shape as praise. So in ab Agni is asked to release the *manīṣā* to us even as he is being praised (*stāvānaḥ*), and in cd we ask him to grant us ample thought (*bhūri mánma*), which is exactly what he and the other gods crave (*vāvānaḥ*).

IV.11.3: The sense of the preceding vs., that Agni provides the very thoughts with which we create his praises, is continued in 3ab. In cd and vs. 4 the material rewards that come to the poet who produces these praises are detailed.

The phrase *dráviṇam vīrápeśā(h)* also appears, also pāda-final, at X.80.4, and therefore the apparent nom. sg. masc. *vīrápeśāḥ* must modify the neut. sg. *dráviṇam*. This is a case like *dvibárhas*- (see comm. ad VII.24.2), where an *s*-stem ending in *-āḥ* at the end of the pāda must be interpr. as a neut. See AiG III.288 and comm. ad II.31.5.

IV.11.5: The juxtaposition of complementary opposites -- *devayánto devám* and *mártā amṛta* -- is deft though not particularly noteworthy.

Likewise note the pair *dámūnasam gṛhāpatim*, both referring to Agni's role in domestic arrangements, derivatives of the older and newer words for 'house'.

IV.11.6: I supply a form of the root *√yu* 'keep away' with the accusatives in ab, extracted from the root-noun cmpd in 5c *dveṣoyút*- 'keeping away hatred'.

I am not entirely sure what to do with *cíd* in d. Perhaps the idea is that though you are a god, you are also our companion right here.

IV.12 Agni

IV.12.1: The form *prasákṣat* is implicitly taken as a finite form by Scar (602–3) and WG, presumably as an *s*-aor. subj. In Scar's tr. it is parallel to the impv. *abhy āstu* ("so sei es, an Herrlichkeit(en) überlegen sein [und] vorherrschen"), but the verbal accent makes trouble for this main clause interpr. (It could, I suppose, bear a "contrastive" accent.) WG make it a subordinate cl. without overt marking ("indem er vorwärts siegt"), which would account for the accent. Nonetheless it seems best to take the form as a participle. Gr. identifies it as a neut.; if this is so, it would have to be an example of the neut. used

adverbially. This seems the analysis presupposed by Old's (SBE) tr. 'victoriously'. However, the simplest solution is given in AiG II.2.162 (fld. by Narten, *Sig.Aor.*, 265): it is a *masc. nom. sg.* with the weak participial suffix appropriate to verbal stems that have weak 3rd pl. endings.

The last word of the verse, the perf. part. *cikitvān*, is characteristically used elsewhere of Agni, in absolute value. Indeed, the same pāda ending *jātavedas cikitvān* qualifies Agni in nearby IV.3.8 and IV.5.12 (see also *cikitvān* of Agni in IV.8.4). However, in our vs. grammatically this nom. sg. must modify the worshiper, not Agni (*pace* Re, who manages to attach it to the preceding voc.: "ô Jātavedas, (dieu) qui comprends"). I think rather that the application of this standard epithet of Agni to Agni's devotee shows the same closed loop discussed with regard to the immediately preceding hymn (see comm. ad IV.11.2), where the worshiper shares qualities of the god, which he receives from the god. There may also be a slight pun: 'observant' means one thing for Agni -- he watches over everything -- but another for the mortal who attends on him: 'observant' in English can refer to someone who 'observes', that is, 'faithfully carries out', the prescribed rites.

In the publ. tr. I construe *tāva krátvā* with the preceding pāda: may the man succeed "in accordance with your purpose," but I now wonder if it is not another indication of the closed loop of reciprocity: the mortal worshiper is observant like Agni because it is Agni's will or purpose that he should be. Of course it can be applicable to both pādas.

IV.12.1–2: On the parallel pres. and pf. subjunctives in these vss. see comm. ad IV.2.6 and my 2016 treatment of the pf. subj. referred to there.

IV.12.2: The overlapping identities of Agni and his worshiper are indirectly signaled in this vs. Although the *sá* of c must be correlative with *yāḥ* in a and refer to the human, some of the phraseology used of him in cd matches that used of Agni elsewhere. The common med. part. *idhāná-* is almost always intrans./pass. modifying Agni ('[being] kindled'), but here it must be transitive with the worshiper as subject. (There are a few other undoubted transitive occurrences: I.143.7, VII.9.6.) The combination of this participle and a form of *púṣya-* as here, with Agni as subj., is found in V.26.6 *samidhānāḥ sahasrajid āgne dhārmāṇi puṣyasi*. Similarly *sacate* in d seems to match *sácase* at the end of the last hymn (IV.11.6), but Agni was the subject of that verb. The point here is that, though the second hemistich must in fact refer to the mortal worshiper, some of the phraseology invites a superimposition of Agni.

IV.12.3: Assuming (as I do) that Thieme and Hoffmann are correct in their assessment of \sqrt{vidh} 'honor, serve' as a secondary root derived from $\sqrt{vī}\sqrt{dhā}$ 'apportion' (for reff. see EWA s.v. *VIDH*), the second half-vs. encapsulates an etymological pun: *#dád dhāti ... vidhaté ...*, *#vī ...* This casts considerable doubt on Bloomfield's (RR, ad loc.) characteristically acerbic judgment "The preposition *vī* which limps, with sharp tmesis, behind its verb *dád dhāti ...* impresses me as secondary." Furthermore, the positioning of *vī* directly before *ānuśák* 'in due order' is found elsewhere (cf. I.72.7, VI.5.3). In such phrases the *vī* presumably emphasizes that goods are apportioned to each deserving recipient *separately* and *in order*.

IV.12.4: Though, as indicated in the publ. intro., the 2nd half of this hymn (vss. 4–6) has a very different tone from the first, nonetheless the two halves are bound together. Note, first, that voc. *yaviṣṭha* in 4a matches nom. *yáviṣṭhaḥ* in the same metrical position in 3c. Moreover, the worshiper who was identified as *cikivān* ‘observant’ in 1d is contrasted with humans who have caused offense to Agni by their *ácitti-* ‘lack of observance, heedlessness’ in 4b.

Although *puruṣatrā* has the locational suffix *-trá/ -trā*, it seems less a locational ‘among men’ than an abstract ‘manhood, human nature’. Cf. similar expressions with the abstract suffix *-tā-*: VII.57.4 = X.15.6 *yád va āgaḥ puruṣátā kārāma*.

The use of *áditeḥ* in pāda c is clarified by the more expansive expression in d. On the one hand, *áditi-* is, of course, the name of the goddess and mother of the Ādityas, and the mention of her here ushers in the 2nd half of the hymn, which, as was indicated in the publ. intro., has a distinctly Ādityan tone. On the other, *á-diti-* means literally ‘unbinding’ (< *√dā* ‘bind’), and the lexeme *ví ... √śrath* ‘let loose’ in the VP *vy énāṃsi śísraṭhaḥ* ‘let loose our transgressions’ is synonymous with ‘unbind’.

IV.12.5: Some verb must be supplied with the ablative phrases in ab. I have pulled *√muc* ‘release’ from its occurrences in vs. 6.

Ge takes *ūrvā-* in b as a proper noun referring to the Vala myth, but the word generally just means an ‘enclosure’, here an imprisoning one.

IV.12.6: As noted in the publ. intro., the plural addressees in this vs. are almost surely the Ādityas; the vs. is repeated in X.126.8, where the referents are clearly the Ādityas.

The comparison “just as you released the buffalo-cow bound by the foot” is probably a reference to a well-known myth or legend, but unfortunately it is not known to us. It is reminiscent of X.28.10, a hymn full of untraceable references to animal stories, *niruddhás cin mahiśás tarṣyāvān* “The buffalo also got trapped, when it was thirsty,” but the animal in question there is a *mahiśá-* not a *gaurá-* and is masc. not fem. Other RVic occurrences of *gaurī-* are not helpful.

IV.13–14: As is generally recognized, these two hymns form a pair, and though nominally dedicated to Agni, they are really dawn hymns, with mention of the various divinities appropriate to the dawn sacrifice: Agni, Uṣas, Ásvins, Savitar, Sūrya. The patterning between the hymns gives us one of our rare opportunities to observe how Rigvedic variation-on-a-theme worked in practice, similar to the first few pairs of Vāḷakhilya hymns. See the brief remarks in Bloomfield, RR, p. 13. For a more detailed account of the parallelisms see publ. intro. to IV.14 and comments on individual vss. in 14 below. The hymns are most alike at the beginning and end with the middle a fairly free zone. This pattern is similar to what is found in the paired Vāḷakhilya hymns. See comm. thereon and esp. on VIII.50.

IV.13: Agni or various deities

IV.13.2: In c the other Ādityas, or at least Aryaman, should be supplied, since the verb (*yanti*) is plural and there are only two expressed subjects (*váruṇaḥ ... mitráḥ*).

IV.13.3: I take the Ādityas as the subj. of *ākṛṇvan*, since the Sun is their spy (see pāda d). It could also be, more generally, the gods, as Old (SBE), Ge, and Re take it. In any case it is certainly not the other pl. entity mentioned in cd, the seven golden mares.

IV.13.4: This vs. contains images drawn from the techniques of everyday life: tanning (cd) and sewing (ab). The lexeme *ví√hr* in pāda a with its object *tāntu-* ‘thread, web’ has been differently interpreted, nor surprisingly since we don’t have good evidence for such technical vocabularies. I interpr. it as ‘take apart, unravel’, in part because of *vīpīce* ‘pull apart’ in the previous vs. (Sim. Thieme, Unters., 17.) Others, using different values for *vī*, interpr. the idiom as ‘spread out’ (Old, SBE) or ‘alternate (threads [=the dark threads of night and the bright ones of day])’ (Ge, WG).

IV.13.5: The first hemistich ends with one of the only (perhaps *the* only) pāda-final negative *ná* in the RV: *ánāyato ánibaddhaḥ kathāyām nyàññi uttānó ’va padyate ná*. For disc. see comm. ad X.111.7. Its appearance can be explained by rhetorical patterning within the hemistich: the final *ná* echoes the two negated adjectives that open the hemistich, creating a chiasmic *#án ... án ... ná* (note also *níyāñ* opening the 2nd pāda). Moreover, *ná* poses a negative question and this may also have influenced its positioning.

The question “how does the sun not fall?” is implicitly answered by pāda d: he’s really a fixed pillar, not an unmoored orb in the sky. But this ignores the presupposition to the question in c: “with what power does he journey?” -- since a pillar doesn’t journey. So, despite the apparent reassurance of d, the issues remain unresolved.

IV.14 Agni or various divinities

IV.14.1: The opening of the verse, *práty agnír uśásah*, matches that of 13.1 *práty agnír uśásām*, though the difference in case of the dawn words signals that the verses will veer in slightly different directions. Both also share the verb *akhyat*, but in 13.1 it ends the first pāda, while in 14.1 it opens the 2nd pāda (accented *ákhyat*).

The 2nd half vss. of the two hymns deviate more, though both concern the Aśvins and contain the verb *yātam* (accented *yātám* in 13.1c). Sūrya (13.2d) is absent from 14.1.

IV.14.2: The first pādas of these two vss. are identical, save for the near synonyms *bhānúm* (13.2) and *ketúm* (14.2), which take 2nd position. The rest of the verses go their own ways, though Sūrya appears in the final pādas of both.

IV.14.3: Though both 13.3 and 14.3 contain horse imagery and the verb *√vah* ‘convey’, they are otherwise quite distinct, with Dawn the topic of 14.3.

IV.14.4: The splv. *váhiṣṭha-* in the pl. is found in both 13.4 and 14.4; the verb of motion is *yāsi* in 13.4 and *vahantu* in 14.4.

The referent of the 2nd du. must be the Aśvins (so also Old [SBE], WG, *pace* Re, who supplies Agni and Dawn). Though they are unnamed, the near identity of pāda b with IV.45.2b in an Aśvin hymn makes this identification most likely, esp. since soma and honey are the drinks of choice of the Aśvins.

IV.14.5: Identical to 13.5.

IV.15 Agni

IV.15.1: The usual concessive force of the nom. of the pres. part. to \sqrt{as} ‘be’ is absent here, as far as I can see. Ge suggests that it is marking the phrase as a simile (Re’s tr. suggests that he agrees). Since the vs. seems to concern the *paryagnikaraṇa*, the leading of the sacrificial animal around the fire, the *sán* may signal that Agni is acting in the guise of a horse, “*being* a horse.”

IV.15.4: Ge’s tr. “vor Sṛñjaya Daivavāta” assumes that *puráh* can act as a preposition with a locative. Since there is no other evidence for this, and since the *puráh* is better taken as a reference to Agni’s location on the ritual ground, as regularly seen in the epithet *puróhita*- ‘placed in front’, I take the loc. of the PN as an unmarked loc. abs. (“SD [being there]”) or with Re and WG as a simple locational, which is far easier to convey with French chez or German bei than in English.

IV.15.5: The standard tr. take this vs. to mean “a mortal hero should have mastery over such a fire” vel sim., but given the previous mention of Sṛñjaya Daivavāta, I think the point is that not every mortal deserves a fire like this -- only a *vīrá*- like SD.

IV.15.6: Agni here is compared with soma, though without mention of that word. The comparison is esp. obvious in the verb *marmrjyānte* ‘they keep grooming’, since \sqrt{mrj} is a signature word for soma, and in the descriptive phrase in b. As Old (SBE) points out, soma is often called *aruṣá*- ‘red’ (though it must be admitted that Agni is too), and ‘child of heaven’ (*diváh śísu*-) is also a somyan epithet (IX.33.5, 38.5, though cf. VI.49.2 where it modifies Agni). As discussed in the publ. intro., this covert reference to soma ushers in the Dānastuti for Prince Sāhadevya, whose nickname is Somaka (9c).

IV.15.7: I interpr the apparent injunc. *bódhat* as a modal, rather than in the preterital value favored by most tr. -- and in fact follow Hoffmann (Injunk., 232) in taking it as a root-aor. subjunctive, not a pres. injunc. The poet is playfully reminding his patron that he’s owed a gift, and he couches this as a bit of a joke, using the ‘awaken’ value of \sqrt{budh} : “wake me up with a nice surprise and I’ll come and sing.”

IV.15.8: This next vs. indicates that the reminder had its effect. The grammatical identity of *ādade* is ambiguous: it could be pres. indic. or pf. indic. In fact in my interpr. of this two-verse sequence 7–8 it doesn’t really matter: 8c could be tr. “I take as soon as they are offered” without disturbing the rhetorical sequence. However, I follow most (incl. Kü, 241) in taking it as a preterital pf. rather than as a pres. with Hoffmann (Injunk, 232; so also WG).

IV.15.10: In one way this vs. is simply a more active variant of vs. 9. In 9 it is implied that Sāhadevya will be long-lived because of the Aśvins (somehow or other); in 10 they are ordered to make him so. But there’s a grammatical twist at the end: the impv.

kṛnotana is plural not dual, and so the Ásvins may have helper(s). The shift to the pl. is probably yet another example of the tendency to open out to the larger divine world in final vss., by including unspecified others -- so here “you (two and other gods).” But it’s worth pointing out that no du. impv. of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ would fit this metrical slot. (On the other hand, no RVic poet with even middling skills would have been unable to throw in a particle or the like to make the meter work.)

IV.16 Indra

IV.16.1: As often, *satyá-* ‘real’ seems here to have the sense ‘really present’, expressing the standard hope of every Vedic ritual, that the gods, esp. Indra, should be physically present at the sacrifice, providing a technical epiphany.

IV.16.2: Rather than interpr. *vedhāḥ* as part of the simile (e.g., WG “wie die mündige Uśanā”), I take it as referring to Agni, the officiating Hotar-priest, as often. See further support for this identification in the next vs.

IV.16.3: I take the first hemistich as a continuation of 2cd. Phraseology suggests this connection: the simile *uśāneva* in 2c is matched by the simile beginning 3a *kavír ná*; together they add up to the full name of the mythic figure Uśanā Kāvya. (*kaví-* stands in for his patronymic elsewhere: cf. nearby IV.26.1 *ahám kavír uśānā*.) The participial phrase *vidáthāni sādhan* “bringing the rites to realization” has Agni as its subj. elsewhere (e.g., III.1.18 and the other passages adduced by Ge n. 3a). Agni is also often called a *kaví-*, and I take this word here as referring both to Uśanā Kāvya to whom Agni is compared and to Agni himself.

The subj. of pāda b must be different from that in a; I follow Ge (/WG) in taking it as the pressing stone. The idiom $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘extract/separate by drinking’ favors this identification; see comm. ad VII.22.4, which passage also contains a form of \sqrt{arc} as here as well as an overt occurrence of the ‘stone’ (*ádri-*).

Unlike Ge (/WG) I do not take pāda c as the main clause with b, nor do I think they have the same subject. Rather with Schmidt (B+I, 48–49) I tentatively take Indra as subj. in c (though not, with Schmidt, a and b as well). The Vala myth is quietly introduced in this second half-vs., with Indra’s creation of the poets and then their singing into existence the ritual patterns. With Ge (etc.) it is likely that the seven bards are the Aṅgirases.

There may be a very backgrounded pun in cd: c opens with *divá(h)* ‘of heaven’, to be construed with *saptá kārūn* “seven bards” at the end of the pāda, while d opens with *áhnā* ‘by day’. Despite the different accent and different case form, it might be possible to take *divá* (in sandhi) as a variant of *dívā* ‘by day’, anticipating the instr. *ahnā* in the same position in the next pāda. But I am very uncertain about this.

Note the resposion of verse-final act. transitive *gr̥nāntaḥ* to vs.-final med. passive *gr̥nānāḥ* in 1d.

IV.16.4: The Vala myth takes full hold in this vs.

Instr. *arkaīḥ* is a pun, referring not only to the chants of the singers but also to the rays of the sun itself.

The 3rd pl. *rurucur* has trans./caus. sense here and generally in its other occurrences (see Kü 431), though not VIII.3.20. In several of those passages it's in the cadence and would be better read **rūrucur* (IV.7.1, X.122.5), and here and in the other case (VI.62.2, but not the trans./caus. opt. *rurucyāḥ* VI.35.4) a heavy initial syl. is possible (though not metrically good in VI.62.2). The 3rd sg. act. pf. *ruroca* (1x: IV.5.15) and act. pf. part. (1x: I.149.3) are intransitive by contrast, as are the medial forms. The anomalous trans. *rurucuḥ* forms also have the ending characteristic of the perfect 3rd pl. act., not the *-an* expected for a redupl. aor. (e.g., (á)*jījanan*). Nonetheless I am inclined to believe that these forms originally belonged to a proper redupl. aor. paradigm (á)*rūruca-*, found in *árūrucat* (3x), with the heavy redupl. proper to a redupl. aor., and that the 3rd pl. forms first adopted the *-ur* ending of the pf. and then, quite possibly redactionally, shortened the reduplicating vowel. It should be noted, however, that Old (ZDMG 60: 163) rejects this, an idea originating with Gaedicke.

Because *rurucuḥ* is unaccented, the first part of pāda b must be the main cl., with the following *yād* introducing a nominal cl. -- *pace* Ge, who simply declares it an unaccented subordinate cl. verb (n. 4b).

Note the periphrastic caus. *vicākṣe ... cakāra*, on which see Zehnder (*Periphras. Kausativ*, passim, esp. 51). He suggests that it is parallel to the perfect *rurucuḥ* in b. If agreement in tense stem is really at issue, this would be another arg. against my assumption that *rurucuḥ* is an old redupl. aor.

The opening of 4c *andhā tāmāṃsi* is reminiscent of that of 1c *tāsmā id āndhaḥ*, though they have nothing in common lexically or thematically and they do not seem to demarcate a section. The repetition of *ṛjīṣṭ* in the next vs. (end of pāda a), matching the end of 1a, suggests, however, that some demarcation is happening.

IV.16.5: On *ṛjīṣṭ* see immed. preceding comment.

āmitam must be adverbial, as is recognized by all standard treatments.

I do not see a semantic diff. between the abstracts *mahitvā-* and *mahimān-*; what distinguishes them is their metrical shape. The nom. sg. *mahimā* is obviously excluded from the cadence, but well suited for the break after a 5-syl. opening; instr. sg. *mahitvā-* works nicely in a Triṣṭubh cadence. Curiously enough English does not seem to have two different abstract formations to 'great' (*greatitude, *greatery, *greathood, etc.) despite the usual flexibility of our language, and so I have tr. both Skt. words with 'greatness'.

IV.16.6: See Ge's long note (6b) on the mixture of Vṛtra and Vala themes in this vs.

Ge (/WG) supplies 'deeds' with *nāryāṇi* ("Mannestaten") without indicating what Sanskrit word he is thinking of. It should surely be *āpāṃsi* 'labors', which regularly shows up with some form of *nṛ-* or a derivative thereof (on *nāri āpāṃsi* see comm. ad VIII.96.19). Assuming this is the correct underlying noun, we can identify a buried pun: *apāḥ* (*apó* in sandhi) 'waters' opens the 2nd pāda; it is phonologically reminiscent of *āpaḥ* 'labor'.

IV.16.7: Ge tr. *pārāhan* as a 3rd sg., continuing the 3rd persons of vs. 6, but the rest of vs. 7 has 2nd ps. reference. The verb *ahan*, ambiguous between 2nd and 3rd sg., serves as a modulation form, as often (cf. I.32.3d, 4a, for ex.).

IV.16.7–8: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. tease apart the Vala and Vṛtra myths that have been intertwined in the previous vss., with the Vṛtra myth allotted to vs. 7 and the Vala myth to vs. 8. But even with the clear mention of Vṛtra in 7a and Saramā in 8b, there is some ambiguity, centered on the *apó* beginning 8a. See comm. on vs. 8.

IV.16.8: As was just mentioned, verse-initial *apó* causes some problem. This form matches the two occurrences of *apó* opening 6b and 7a and grammatically should be, with them, the acc. pl. of *áp-* ‘water(s)’. But the problem is that ‘waters’ do not figure in the Vala myth: it is cows/dawns that are freed from the rock. For this reason Old suggests reading **ápo = ápa + u*, with *ápa* a preverb with *dárdar*, and this conjecture is followed by Ge. However, *ápa* is only marginally attested with $\sqrt{dṛ}$ (only RV VI.17.5 and nowhere else in Skt., at least acdg. to MWms). I therefore accept the transmitted *apó* and assume 1) syntactically, that $\sqrt{dṛ}$ takes a double obj. here (“tear open the rock ACC (for) the waters ACC”), and 2) thematically, that because of the interpenetration of the Vala and Vṛtra myths just mentioned the cows/dawns in the Vala myth get assimilated to the waters of the Vṛtra myth. My ‘tore open’ actually assumes that Old’s *ápa-u* is secondarily present, with my ‘open’ representing **ápa*. It is worth noting that forms of the root $\sqrt{dṛ}$ are fairly rare without preverb. Schmidt (B+I 162), Hoffmann (Injunk. 270), and WG also all accept the ‘waters’ reading. Note that the waters here would correspond to the acc. with $\sqrt{dṛ}$ in pāda c: *vājam* ‘prize’. That is, the prize in c is what gets torn out of the rock (waters), while the rock in pāda a is what gets torn apart to get to the prize.

Acgd. to Schaeffer (136), the intens. to $\sqrt{dṛ}$ has become lexicalized and no longer has any discernible frequentative value. However, most forms of this intens. take plural objects, so it could be object-distributive. In our case the pl. *apáh* ‘waters’ might fit this model, though the pl. tantum ‘waters’ really functions as a mass noun, not a set of countable hunks of water. See also *vī dardah* in 13d below.

I take adverbial neut. *pūrvyām* in b as meaning ‘previously, before’, and in conjunction with the injunc. *āvīr bhuvat*, as a somewhat awkward attempt to express anteriority: Saramā appeared to you previously (b), ordering you to $\sqrt{dṛ}$ (*ā darṣi*, c), and then you did so (*dárdar*, a). Schmidt (B+I 162) avoids the anteriority reading by tr. ‘zuerst’, and Hoffmann (Injunk. 270) and WG render it “als erstes,” an interpr. that would seem to me to require an adj. modifying nom. sg. fem. *sarāmā*, not an adverbial neut.

Ge takes the 2nd hemistich as the words of Saramā, an interpr. I accept both because of the *sí-impv.* *ā darṣi* in c and because of the pseudo-anterior construction in b just discussed.

Verse-final *grṇānāḥ* has an exact match at the end of vs. 1, and this bit of ring composition signals that this section of the hymn is finished. In the next section we move on to the Kutsa / Uśanā Kāvya story.

IV.16.9: Although, as noted ad vs. 3, the word *kaví-* often signals a mention of Uśanā Kāvya -- and this personage figures in the myth being recounted here -- in the publ. tr. I was tentatively inclined to follow Ge in taking *kavīm* as a reference to Kutsa, since Kutsa could plausibly be qualified as *nāḍhamāna-* ‘in need’ in this myth and Uśanā Kāvya is unlikely to be. However, since the myth in question involves a trip to UK’s place to seek advice (see next vs., 10a), the phrase *āchā kavīm ... gāḥ* “you came to the *kaví*” in pāda a probably refers to UK, and the *nāḍhamānam*, found only at the end of b, may conceal a

different goal, namely Kutsa. Hence I would emend the publ. tr. to “you came to the poet (=UK) (and) to the one in need (=Kutsa) at the winning of the sun.” In 11d *kavīḥ* also most likely refers to UK.

The phrase *nṛmano ... abhīṣtau* is reminiscent of 4d *nṛtamo abhīṣtau*.

The apparent thematic verbal stem *iṣaṇa-* is almost confined to this group of Indra hymns (in addition to this vs., IV.17.14, 22.10, 23.9, as well as a single outlier I.134.5, for which see comm. ad loc.). Narten’s interpr. of this stem as an aorist generated to the pres. *iṣanyāti* seems reasonable, though it does not account for the limited distribution of our stem: no forms of *iṣanyā-* are even found in the IVth Maṇḍala. (Narten, MSS 1982, cited after Kl. Schr., 266-67; cf. Gotō, 1st class, n. 243.)

In its other two occurrences (I.129.7, VI.26.8) *dyumnāhūti-* ‘invocation to heavenly brilliance’ is a call that we sacrificers make to attract the god(s). I do not understand what it is expressing here. It does not seem to have anything to do with *dyumnaiḥ* in 19c below.

IV.16.10: Pāda b *bhuvát te kútsaḥ sakhyé níkāmaḥ* echoes 6b ... *sákhibhir níkāmaiḥ*. In 6 Indra performs manly deeds “with his eager companions” (either the Maruts of the Vṛtra myth or the Aṅgirasas of the Vala myth); here Kutsa must be transformed into such a sidekick by his association with Indra: “In companionship with you, Kutsa will become eager.”

On the enigmatic theme of the woman trying to tell Indra and Kutsa apart, see the publ. intro. As argued there, it is likely that the Jaiminīya Brāh. version (JB III.199-202), with sexual mischief between Kutsa and Indra’s wife, facilitated by the identical appearance of Indra and Kutsa, is only a secondary attempt to make sense of this tantalizing snippet and no such story underlies our passage. Certainly the woman (*nārī*) in our passage seems entirely upright and eager to distinguish between the two males.

IV.16.11: Although we don’t ordinarily think of Indra as ‘seeking help’ (*avasyú-*) but giving it, in this myth Indra goes to the house of Uśanā Kāvya to receive the mace from him. I therefore think that the ‘help’ Indra is seeking is concretized as the mace. See below on pāda d.

Note that *īśānaḥ* in b echoes *iṣaṇo* in 9c.

In d the two words *áhan pāryāya* have provoked a certain amount of discussion (see Old, Ge n. 11d, Kuiper, IJ 5: 169ff., who is followed by Hoffmann, Injunkt. 189 n. 151, and WG) because of its similarity to the expression *diví pārye* “on the decisive day” (VI.17.14, etc.). The dat. *pāryāya* here is therefore taken by some as a temporal expression with a word for ‘day’ or the like to be supplied (e.g., Old *pāryāya *áhne*). However, the dative expression nearby in IV.25.1 *mahé ‘vase pāryāya* “for great, decisive help” (though see alternative tr. of Ge [WG]) seems the more compelling comparandum, esp. since Indra has come to UK’s seeking help (*avasyúḥ* 1a). By following *áhan* with the stem *pārya-*, the poet may be tricking us into expecting a temporal expression (cf. VI.26.1 *pārye áhan*; also III.32.14), but the case mismatch should alert the audience that our expectation has been thwarted. As indicated in the comm. ad pāda a, I think the “decisive help” that UK gives Indra is the mace he fashioned; it’s important to note that in another telling of this myth in I.121.12 the mace itself is called *pārya-*: I.121.12cd *yám te kāvyá*

uśānā ... dāt, ... pāryam tatakṣa vājram “UK fashioned the decisive mace which he gave to you.” For UK giving Indra the mace, see also V.34.2.

IV.16.12: Note the phonological play in *śúṣṇam aśúṣam* “insatiable Śuṣṇa,” which is found also elsewhere (I.101.2, II.14.5, 19.6, VI.20.4).

With Old (flg. Ge, Ved. St.; see also Hoffmann (Injunk. 189) I interpret the hapax *kutsyá-* ‘Kutsian’ in light of the phrase *vadhām kútsam* (I.175.4) “Kutsa (as) deadly weapon.”

The “future imperative” *vrhatāt* in d follows nicely on the normal impv. *prá mṛṇa* in c.

IV.16.13: Here the intensive of \sqrt{dr} , *ví dardah*, takes a plural obj. *púrah* ‘fortresses’. See disc. above ad 8a.

The simile and frame in d are curiously intermingled, with the object in the frame, *púrah* ‘fortresses’, dropped into the middle of the simile *átkaṃ ná ... jarimā* “like old age a cloak.” I also don’t quite understand the content of the simile. It’s presumably the age of the garment, not of its wearer, that causes the garment to fall apart. WG seem to take *jarimā* not with the simile but the frame: “Wie einen Reisemantel spaltet das Alter die Palisaden auseinander.” This would solve the intermingling problem identified above, but it otherwise doesn’t fit the mythic context. Surely it would be ignominious for Indra if, instead of Indra’s heroically tearing apart these mighty fortresses, they just fell apart from decrepitude and deferred maintenance. The WG n. on the passage calls the simile a Sprichwort and it is not clear to me what function they see *jarimā* as playing.

IV.16.14: As noted in the publ. intro., pāda b seems to resolve the problem of distinguishing between Indra and Kutsa that arose in 10cd. The same lexeme *ví√cit* ‘distinguish’ found in 10d recurs here.

The athematic middle participle *uśāná-* ‘wearing’ here is a hapax stem and is, of course, morphologically anomalous: the full-grade medial root pres. *váste* is matched by a very well-attested full-grade athem. med. part. *vásāna-*. We do not expect a zero-grade formation to this root pres. However, our hapax calls to mind the unnamed hero of this portion of the hymn Uśanā (Kāvya), and the nonce creation of participle *uśāná-* here (as an echo of *uśānā*) seems to me a text-book example of morphological aberrancies arising out of contextual pressures -- all the more striking because the word *uśānā* does not occur in this section of the hymn (but cf. 2c), so the participial echo is echoing something beneath the surface. WG’s characterization of this form as “eine individuelle Fehlbildung des Dichters” itself fails to see the poetic purpose and clever creativity of this form. It is true, however, that it should probably also be evaluated in the context of several other such anomalous participles in this group of Indra hymns, *uśāmāna-* (IV.19.4), *uṣāmāna-* (IV.22.2), and *uśāná-* (IV.23.1).

IV.16.15: The simile in b, *svārmīlhe ná* “as if at (a contest) with the sun as its prize,” provides a transition from the sun-winning myth of Indra and Kutsa, which occupied the previous few vss., and this more general final section of the hymn.

The desires (*kāṃmāḥ*) that are the grammatical subject of this vs. -- namely our desires for Indra’s largesse -- take part in actions that might appear to be more

appropriate to other subjects. On the one hand, they “take pleasure in the pressing” (*sāṁvane cakānāḥ*); we would rather expect the god Indra to do so. On the other, they “perform ritual labor with hymns” (*śaśamānāśa ukthāḥ*), a priestly activity. The desires thus mediate between the two poles of ritual participation.

Pace Oldenberg, *ōkaḥ* in d is most likely not an acc. goal to be construed with *agman* in a (though this might be a possible secondary reading), but a nominative -- on the basis of a web of formulaic associations with *raṇvā-* ‘delightful’. Cf. I.66.3 *ōko nā raṇvāḥ* “(Agni) delightful like a home”; also I.69.4-5 *raṇvó duroṇé* “a joy in the house,” X.64.11 [=I.144.7] *raṇvāḥ ... iva kṣāyāḥ* “delightful ... like a dwelling,” X.33.6 *kṣétram nā raṇvām* “delightful like a dwelling place.” The problem in our passage is that *raṇvā* (the only possible underlying form given its sandhi context) cannot technically modify neut. *ōkaḥ*, despite the formulaics just discussed. The solution, as Ge saw (n. 15d), is that nom. sg. fem. *raṇvā* also participates in the second simile in this pāda, *sudṛṣṭīva puṣṭīḥ* “like prosperity beautiful to see” -- with which *raṇvā-* also has formulaic associations. Cf. I.65.5 *puṣṭīr nā raṇvā* “like thriving that brings delight” (immediately followed by *kṣitīḥ* ‘dwelling place’) and II.4.4 *raṇvā ... iva puṣṭīḥ* ‘id.’. Of course, both similes provide comparisons to the desires that are the ultimate subject, with *raṇvā* as the pivotal tert. comp. in both -- though it does not match *kāmāḥ* in gender or number.

IV.16.16: I take *cid* with the dat. *māṁvate jaritré* since I do not see how to construe it sensibly with *gádhyam*. I cannot explain its displacement to pāda end, however.

On the *gádhyam vājam* see 11c.

IV.16.17: Pāda b is difficult. Ge (/WG) construe the two locatives in b, *kāsmiñ cid* and *muhuké*, together, which would of course be the default interpr. However, this leads Ge to render *muhuká-* as ‘Schlachtgeschrei’, a tr. for which there is no support: its closest etymological relative, adverbial *múhur*, only means ‘suddenly, in an instant’. (WG’s “in irgendeinem plötzlichen Vorfall” at least imposes less content and sticks closer semantically to *múhur* and company.) In the publ. tr. I separate the two locatives, taking *muhuké* as a simple temporal and construing the indefinite *kāsmiñ cid* with the gen. pl. *jānānām*. This interpr. was in part prompted by the need to have something for *antár* to govern: *antár* does not take the genitive, so a direct connection with *jānānām* (“among the peoples”) is out, but it regularly takes the locative. Hence my “among some one of the peoples”: since *jāna-* can refer to a group of persons who make up a people, it doesn’t have to be a single individual, hence my “some one” rather than “someone.” (Cf. also V.74.2 *kāsmiñ ... jāne*.) However, I recognize that this interpr. is both artificial and awkward, and (somewhat in the spirit of WG) I have cast about for an interpr. of *muhuké*, which should literally mean ‘instantaneous’, that both reflects its etymology and yet allows it to refer to a conflict and be plausibly construed with *jānānām*. The Engl. word ‘skirmish’ (“an episode of irregular or unpremeditated conflict”) comes close. I would thus revise my tr. of ab to “If a sharp missile will fly within some sudden skirmish of the peoples, o champion, ...”

IV.16.18: The morphological ambiguity of *bhúvāḥ* (injunctive or subjunctive) allows for several possible interpretations of the first half-vs. Ge takes *bhúvāḥ* as imperatival “sei,” though this is unlikely given the morphology. Hoffmann (Injunk. 262) takes it as a

“generell oder resolutiv konstatierend” injunctive and tr. “du bist” (so also WG). By contrast, I think these two fronted *bhúvaḥ* are subjunctives and questions. There is of course no way to tell. However, the purpose clause with subjunctive in 20cd ... *yáthā ... ásan naḥ ... avitā* “so that he will be our helper,” matching our pāda a *bhúvo ‘vitā*, suggests that *bhúvaḥ* is indeed a subjunctive and that further we are not at this point certain that Indra *will* become what we want him to -- hence a question rather than a statement is more appropriate. As for how *bhúvas*, -at came to be aor. injunctives homonymous with the morphologically more transparent root aor. subjunctives, I find KH’s scenario (56) plausible, that they were secondarily generated to 1st sg. *bhuvam* (e.g., X.48.1; 49.1, 4; 86.5), which is the properly built injunctive to the root aor. (though cf. TS II.5.1.1 *bhūvam*). However, I do not follow KH in taking the motivation for this formation the avoidance of monosyllabic forms, since injunc. *bhūs*, *bhūt* are quite common. (A more likely explan. in the Hoffmannian mode would be that, since *bhūs*, *bhūt* can do double duty as imperative substitutes, *bhuvam*, -at make the injunctive value clearer.) I’d rather suggest a different reason why injunctive *bhúvas*, -at took hold and could exist simultaneously with the subjunctives of the same shape, while putative injunctives *káras*, -at, secondarily built in the same way as *bhúvas*, -at to 1st sg. *karam*, are essentially only subjunctives. Because of the lack of ablaut of $\sqrt{bhū}$, the zero-grade of the root syllable of the subjunctive *bhúvas*, -at doesn’t accord with standard subjunctive formations and must have seemed at best equivocal, whereas *káras*, -at is a perfect specimen of a subjunctive and does not invite other morphological interpretations.

IV.16.19: The standard tr. supply a verb in ab: Ge “rufe ich,” WG “bitten ... wir.” This seems unnecessary: the instr. phrases in ab can be parallel to *dyumnaiḥ* in the simile in c, all controlled by the participial phrase *abhí sántaḥ* “(we) dominating” in c. One of the factors that might support supplying a verb in ab is the otherwise apparently orphaned acc. encl. *tvā* at the end of pāda a, but even as Ge advances this reason for supplying a verb (n. 19a), he also suggests that *tvā* could be dependent on immediately preceding *tvāyúbhiḥ*, an explanation that the close sandhi of the two words (*tvāyúbhiḥ tvā*) might favor.

In b *vísve*, in the phrase *vísva ājaú*, must be a loc., although we might expect the pronominal form *vísvasmin*. It is, however, worth noting that *vísvasmin* is found only twice in the RV, in the same phrase (*vísvasmin bháre*) in adjacent hymns in the Xth Maṇḍala (X.49.1, X.50.4). A nominal-type loc. *vísve* here would also be facilitated by the plural version *vísveṣu ... ājīṣu* in I.130.8 with simple truncation of the -ṣu.

Although Ge construes *dyumnaiḥ* not in the simile but as an attribute of the subject (“we”), the almost identical X.115.7 *dyāvo ná dyumnaír abhí sánti mānuṣān* may (but need not) support keeping it with the simile; Ge separates the two in his tr. of that passage as well.

IV.16.20–21: These two vss. provide a double ending to this hymn. The first (20) begins, as summary vss. often do, with *evā* ‘just in this way’. It announces self-referentially, with the root aor. *akarma* “we have just made,” that the hymn being completed is the *bráhmaṇ*-we have created for Indra. And, as noted above ad vs. 18, the purpose clauses with subjunctive provide reassurance for the worried questions in 18ab. Vs. 21 is repeated as the final verse of the seven hymns IV.17, 19–24, so it serves as a refrain vs. for (some of)

the Vāmadeva Indra hymns. It also announces, with a root aor. (though aor. passive), that the formulation has just been made (*ākāri ... bráhma*). Despite the apparent duplication, we should not necessarily assume that this refrain was tacked onto an already complete hymn, because *gr̥ṇānāḥ* at the end of 21a may form a ring with the same word at the end of vs. 1.

IV.16.20: The standard tr. (Ge [WG]) take *viyóṣat* as intransitive, a view argued for by Narten (Sig. aor. 214), with a neut. pl. subj. (*sakhyā*) of a sg. verb. For my argument for a trans. interpr. of this *s*-aorist, see comm. ad II.32.2. As at II.32.2 I take *sakhyā* here as an instr. sg. of separation, though an acc. pl. obj. (“he will not keep our partnerships far away”) is also possible.

Note that *tanūpāḥ* picks up 7d *tanvò bodhi gopāḥ*.

IV.16.21: The standard tr. (Ge [WG]) as also Kü (300) interpr. *pīpeḥ* as hortative. This is certainly possible (and is reflected in the publ. tr.), but context would also allow “you (have) made swell” or “you make swell” just as easily.

IV.17 Indra

IV.17.1–4: Hoffmann (Injunk. 178–180) treats these four vss. They express the cosmic disruptions attendant on Indra’s birth and the further disruptions caused by his smashing of Vṛtra. On the ring composition that demarcates this section, see comm. on vs. 4 below.

IV.17.1: The pair “earth / heaven” occupy the final slots of the first two pādas: ... *kṣā(h)ḥ* ... *dyaúḥ*ḥ, with a shared 3rd singular verb *ānu ... manyata*. Note that there also exists a dual dvandva containing these stems: *dyāvā-kṣāmā*.

The 2nd hemistich contains two pf. participles expressing action anterior to the main verb (*sr̥jāḥ*): *jaghanvān* ‘having smashed’ and *jagrasānān* ‘having been swallowed’.

IV.17.2: As in vs. 1, the pair heaven and earth are expressed by two singulars (*dyaúḥ*, *bhūmih*), even though, again, there is a dual dvandva available: *dyāvā-bhūmī*.

BR suggest reading *dyaúr éjad* for Pp. *dyaúḥ / réjat*. Although rejected by Old, this reading (which does not require changing the Saṃhitā text) is accepted by Ge, Hoffmann (Injunk. 179, 181), and Gotō (1st class, 271–72), as well as by me. The stem *réja-* is almost entirely medial (see *rejata* in pāda a), while *éja-* is act. It is easy to see how the misparsing could have arisen, due to the presence of immediately preceding *rejata*.

With Ge, I take *tviṣāḥ* as a gen. dependent on *bhiyāsā* in b, thus parallel to *manyóḥ*. It would also be possible to take *tviṣāḥ* as an abl. of cause (so Hoffmann 179, WG).

Note the phonetic figure *táva tviṣāḥ*. Note also that the reflex. adj. *svásya* must reference *táva* and therefore have 2nd ps. value (as well as not referring to the grammatical subj., as is sometimes claimed for reflexives).

IV.17.2–3: *saráyanta āpaḥ* (*sarayánte* out of sandhi) in 2d is reprised by *sárann āpaḥ* in 3d. The two verbs seem semantically identical; the intransitive *-áya*-formation takes the post-(late-)caesura position also favored by metrically identical *janáyanta*. Its medial

ending is an example of *-anta* replacement of the usual type (cf. Jamison 1979: IIIJ 21), though somewhat complicated by the fact that the form out of sandhi is actually primary *-ante*.

IV.17.3: Almost the full panoply of power terms is on display in the first hemistich: *śávas-*, *sáhas-* (in the pseudo-part., on which see comm. ad IV.3.6), and *ójas-*.

The “bull” of the waters is of course Vṛtra.

IV.17.4: This vs. shows a clever twist on ring composition. Like vss. 1 and 2 it contains occurrences of both heaven and earth (here *dyaúḥ* a, *bhūma* d), and in fact pāda a ends exactly as 1b does: *manyata dyaúḥ*. But the two phrases mean very different things: in vs. 1 *manyata* is construed with *ānu* in the lexeme meaning ‘concede’, whereas here there is no preverb and the verb means ‘be considered as’. Moreover, although in the 1st two vss. heaven and earth functioned as a pair, though expressed as two singulars, here they have nothing to do with each other, and indeed earth is found only in a negative simile (*sádaso ná bhūma*, which in Engl. has to be awkwardly rendered by “any more than ...”).

On the tangled paternity here, see publ. intro.

IV.17.5: The break from the themes of the first 4 vss. is signalled by pres. tense forms (*cyāváyati*, *madanti*), after the relentless march of injunctives (and one pf.) in 1–4. (Technically speaking *saráyanta* in 2d is a present out of sandhi [-*ante*], but it patterns like other *-anta* forms of this shape. See disc. ad 2d.) But vs. 5 is also verbally linked to what went before: *bhūma* ending the first pāda matches the same word ending the last pāda of vs. 4, and *ānu ... madanti* in c phonologically recalls *ānu ... manyata* in 1b.

The vs. is thematically structured by one / many. Indra alone (*ékaḥ*) is invoked by many (*puruhūtāḥ*), as (single) king of the separate peoples (*kr̥ṣṭīnām*), whom all (*vísve*) celebrate.

The *satyám* beginning the 2nd hemistich may signal Indra’s real presence on the ritual ground, as I argue it does in IV.16.1. The rest of the half vs. clearly takes place at the sacrifice. So the tr. might be emended to “All celebrate him (who is) really here ...”

The construction of the last pāda is unclear, esp. the morphological identity and referents of *devásya gr̥nató maghónaḥ*. Old takes *rātīm* as the obj. of *gr̥natáḥ* (“singing the gift”) and sees *gr̥natáḥ* and *maghónaḥ* as parallel acc. pl. (“the singers and patrons”). But this phrase is supposed to be coreferential with *nominative vísve* in c: “Alle: die (Priester), welche des Gottes Gabe besingen, und die freigebigen Herren.” This syntactic slippage seems unacceptable to me (and uncharacteristic of Old). Ge takes *gr̥natáḥ* as a gen. sg. dep. on gen. sg. *maghónaḥ*, which is in apposition to *devásya*: “the gift of the god, who is the generous patron of the singer.” This makes good sense, but I have not been able to find other passages with a genitive dependent on *maghávān-*. WG take all three as gen. sg. with the same referent, namely Indra, all dependent on *rātīm*. But since this is not a Vala passage, Indra should not be singing, but receiving the singing of others. My tr. starts from passages like VII.12.2 *asmān gr̥natá utá no maghónaḥ* (cf. also X.22.15), where *gr̥natáḥ* and *maghónaḥ* are overtly conjoined (by *utá*) and refer to humans: “us (who are) singing and our patrons.” In that passage the forms are acc. pl.; in ours here I take them as gen. sg. in dative usage (as often).

IV.17.6: In pāda a the word *visve* was omitted in the publ. tr., which should be emended to “Entirely his were all the soma-drinks.”

The three initial *satrā* (a, b, c) are echoed by *dātre* beginning d. Although there is some dissension on the root etym. of *dātra*- (cf., e.g., Old, who cites Neisser derivation from *dāyate* ‘apportion’ -- an analysis apparently followed by both Ge and WG, judging from their tr. ‘Anteil’), the correct analysis was already sketched by Gr s.v.: it is a -*tra*-deriv. built to the weak stem of the redupl. pres. to *√dā* ‘give’ (*dad-*), hence **dātra*, with simplification of the geminate before *r*, as often. See AiG II.2.703 and the important (if lapidary) correction in the Nachtr. to AiG I: Nachtr. p. 3, to I.5 ll. 30–31.

IV.17.6–7: I take the idiom found in 6d and 7b, LOC. ACC. *adhithāḥ*, as meaning ‘put s.o. in the path/way of s.th. The middle voice of *adhithāḥ* signals that the entity in the loc. belongs to the subject, namely Indra -- in the first case his generosity (just celebrated in 5d), in the second his power of attack. Although Ge recognizes the similarity of these constructions, with identical subjects and objects (see his n. 6d), he renders them quite differently. For *āme* *√dhā* in 7b, see also I.63.1, 67.3.

IV.17.8: The first half of this vs., describing Indra, is couched in the accusative, on which the rel. cl. of *cd* depends. Since both the preceding and following vss. refer to Indra in the nominative, this vs. is syntactically untethered. It seems best to supply an anodyne verb like “I call upon,” even though this cannot be generated from the immediate context.

Note that the *satrā* of vs. 6 has returned, though in a *cmpd.*

IV.17.9–10: This sequence of vss. is marked by initial *ayām* ‘this one here’ (9a, 9c, 10a, 10b; cf. also *asyā* 9d). This near-deictic pronoun may indicate that Indra is currently present at the sacrifice. These vss. are also marked by present tense verbs describing Indra’s characteristic and habitual activities -- in contrast to vs. 11, which opens with an imperfect (*sām ... ajayaṭ*).

IV.17.10: The sense of *ādha* here is somewhat unclear and its position anomalous, as it is generally, though not invariably, clause-initial. Klein (DGRM II.97) notes its medial position but considers it to have the usual sense he assigns to *ādha*, namely ‘therefore’. This passage is reminiscent of VII.34.2 *śṛṇvānty āpo ādha kṣārantīḥ*, where *ādha* likewise appears mid-clause and before a pres. participle (as well as after a form of *√śru*, though act., not pass. as here). My sense is that *ādha* in both passages introduces a participial addition that clarifies or modifies the sense of the main verb, hence a sort of mini-clause.

In pāda b the lexeme *prā kṛṇute* with its middle voice in my opinion encodes a complex thought: in battle Indra brings the (enemies’) cows forward in such a way as to make them his own, that is, to capture them. Med. *kṛṇuté* recurs in the next pāda, where its object is Indra’s own battle-fury (*manyúm*).

IV.17.11: The stem *aśv’yā-* with suffixal accent is ordinarily a PN; the adj. ‘equine’ is regularly *áśv’ya-*. However, as noted by AiG II.2.816 the accent of -*ya*-derivatives is variable, often within the same stem. The initial-accented *áśvya-* in the plural generally modifies *maghā(ni)* or *rādhāṃsi*. Here I am inclined to supply *maghāni* ‘bounties’

suggested by adjacent *maghāvā*; cf. ... *maghāni maghāvā* in 8d and the repeated forms of *maghāvan-* in this portion of the hymn (7d, 8d, 9b, 13b, 13d).

The referent of *pūrvīḥ* isn't clear. Ge (/WG) supplies 'fortresses', which in turn requires supplying a transitive verb: Ge "der viele (Burgen erobert hat)"; WG "der ja viele (Palisaden besiegte)." I would prefer not to supply so much material. Moreover, in this group of hymns *pūrvīḥ* is used in temporal expressions: IV.16.19 *kṣapāḥ ... śarādaś ca pūrvīḥ* "through many nights and autumns," IV.18.4 *sahāsram māsaḥ ... śarādaś ca pūrvīḥ* "for a thousand months and many autumns," IV.19.8 *pūrvīr uśasaḥ śarādaś ca* "through many dawns and autumns." I therefore take it that way here, as a temporal expression in a nominal rel. cl. with *maghāvā* as the predicate.

IV.17.12: The exact sense of *ādhy eti* is not entirely clear. It generally means 'study' from the literal meaning 'go over' (matching the English idiom exactly), but shows various semantic developments: 'give thought to, take cognizance of, be mindful of, trouble oneself with', etc. In all cases, the lexeme *ādhi* √ *i* has a mental sense (though III.54.9 has a secondary literal reading): I.71.10, 80.15; III.54.9; V.44.13; VII.56.15; VIII.83.7, 91.3; IX.67.31, 32; X.32.3, 33.7, 100.4. Here I think we should read the expression in the light of vs. 4, with its apparent uncertainty about Indra's parentage -- esp. given 4a *janitā* and 4c *yāḥ ... jajāna*, matched here by *janitúr yó jajāna*.

I take the rel. cl. of cd with the following vs. The two share the verb *íyarti*, and 12cd can serve as the cause of 13a: when Indra raises a tempest, he destroys the man's peace.

I take *muhukāḥ* as a temporal adverbial instr., expressing how suddenly Indra can erupt -- even though I have revised my view on *muhuké* in the preceding hymn (IV.16.17 -- see comm. there). I do not think "raises his tempest with/by sudden skirmishes" is what is meant here.

IV.17.13: *samóham* is derived by Gr (/MonWms) from *sám* √ *ūh* 'push together'. But √ *ūh* does not have a full-grade *oh* in Vedic and is plausibly related to √ *vah* (see EWA s.v., with lit.). Better to analyze as *sa-móham* and derive it from √ *muh* 'be confused'. The same analysis should probably be applied to the differently accented *samohé* in I.8.6.

IV.17.14: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. and its pendant, the single pāda of vs. 15, are quite unclear, though at least 14ab concerns the Etaśa myth. There are also some formal issues.

The med. part. *sasṛmāṇá-* must belong to the pf. stem, despite its *-māṇá-* suffix appropriate to a thematic stem. This is the only such form, beside conventionally formed pf. part. *sasṛāṇá-* (2x). Narten (1969: 81–82 = KISch 128) explains the aberrancy as a quirk of the poet, who in this and adjacent hymns shows a penchant for *-māna-* participles. Another question is what is its value. Most pf. participles have anterior sense, but the publ. tr. renders it as "as he ran" -- in other words as an action simultaneous with the main verb. And I might be inclined to make this simultaneity more overt by tr. "as he was running." Kü's interpretation (552) as what he calls "resultativ" and I would call anterior is more in line with the perfect form: "wenn er seinen Lauf gemacht hat." But contextually that would be puzzling: what is the point of bringing the horse to a halt if it's already finished running. And on p. 602 he provides a diff. tr., closer to mine: "der sich

im Lauf befindet.” WG seem to take it almost as an inchoative -- “der sich in Lauf gesetzt hat” -- but cite alternative translations in their n. I would suggest that the aberrant shape and the aberrant sense are connected and that the poet created a nonce present-like pf. part. to convey the simultaneous and progressive value he was seeking to express, since regular pf. participles often express anteriority. (This, however, does not explain why the poet didn’t just use a pres. part. built to the redupl. pres. *sísarti*, here **sísratam*; this act. part. is attested once.)

The second hemistich is quite obscure. Old suggests reading *kṛṣṇé* against the Pp. *kṛṣṇáh*, and this has met general acceptance. The apparently parallel loc. *ásikhyām* ‘on the dark (FEM.)’ in 15a supports this reading, and it goes naturally with the locatives in 14d.

Who is the referent? Ge gives no hint of what he might think, but Kü and WG both think the subj. is Indra, who is acting on/against Etaśa. Judging from Kü’s tr. (“er ‘träufelt’ ihn [den Vajra] wütend auf das schwarze (Pferd)”; 602), he thinks the verb ‘sprinkle’ (*jigharti*) is a euphemism for violent action; its unexpressed obj. is Indra’s *vájra*, which Indra ‘sprinkles’ onto the black (horse, namely Etaśa), while WG understand Etaśa himself as the object. For both, the part. *juhurāṇáh* belongs with $\sqrt{hṛ}$ ‘be angry’ (flg. Insler 1968; see EWA s.v. *HAR*), which can capture Indra’s mood in this encounter. (Note that the poet was not tempted here to give the redupl. part. a thematic suffix, *pace* Narten.) By contrast, I accept the traditional association of the part. with $\sqrt{hṛ}$ ‘go crookedly’. I take the referent here to be Agni. Although the Kü / WG view that it is Indra would be the default interpr. in this Indra hymn, the phraseology of pāda d is almost identical to a pāda in an Agni hymn in this maṇḍala: IV.1.11ab *sá jāyata prathamāḥ pastyāsu, mahó budhné rájaso asyá yónau* “He was born first in the dwelling places, at the base of this great realm, (as) his womb....” And ‘moving crookedly’ qualifies Agni very well. The simile comparing the subject here to a Hotar in vs. 15 also supports Agni as referent -- though I suppose it could be argued that since Agni is often identified as a Hotar he need not be compared to one. The part. *juhurāṇáh* ‘going crookedly’ is also appropriate to Agni, describing the unpredictable movements of fire and the flickering movement of its flames.

But what is it that Agni (if he is indeed the subj.) is doing? This may be illuminated (however faintly) by two other verbal forms to $\sqrt{ghṛ}$ in the RV (the adj. *āghṛṇi-* ‘glowing, ardent (?)’ belongs to the etymologically separate root $\sqrt{ghṛ}$ ‘be warm, hot’ found in *gharmá-* ‘heat’, etc. See comm. ad VI.53.3). In X.6.4 Agni sprinkles the gods (*ā jigharti devān*) as Hotar; in V.48.3 Agni (by my interpr.) sprinkles a *vájra*. Although in both passages most interpr. attempt to make the verb mean something other than ‘sprinkle’ (see comm. ad locc.), in fact a naturalistic explanation is not hard to construct using the literal meaning of the verb: Agni “sprinkles” the objects in question with sparks, a literal “baptism by fire.” That Agni is elsewhere the object of $\sqrt{ghṛ}$, being sprinkled with ghee (see II.10.4), makes this the kind of paradoxical reversal that RVic poets so much like. Here notice that Agni performs this action “like a Hotar performing sacrifice” (vs. 15 *yājamāno ná hótā*), as in X.6.4. The image is both of a properly sacrificing priest performing the ritual action of sprinkling (the fire with ghee) and of the ritual fire sending out a stream of sparks, like sprinkled drops, which would be quite visible on the dark background insistently mentioned in this vs. What the object is that he is sprinkling remains obscure to me – but in addition to the possibilities I suggest in the

publ. tr. and those of others mentioned above, it might be Indra's *vájra*, as suggested by Kü (see above), though with a different sense of the verb than Kü suggests. Recall that in V.48.3 Agni sprinkles Indra's *vájra*-with sparks as a sort of ritual sanctification before Indra employs it.

IV.17.15: I supply 'hide' with *ásiknyām* on the basis of *tvácam ásiknīm* in IX.73.5 (so also Ge), though WG supply 'night' instead.

IV.17.16: Ge supplies a verb ("we call") in ab; WG take *ā cyāvayāmaḥ* in d as the verb of both hemistichs, not just the 2nd. My interpr. is similar to WG's, but with a further twist. I take *vājáyantaḥ* in b as a pun. The sense 'seeking prizes' is supported by parallel *gavyántaḥ ... aśvāyántaḥ ... janīyántaḥ* "seeking cows, seeking horses, seeking wives," even though the denom. 'seeking prizes' is ordinarily accented on the denom. suffix as *vājáyá-*. By contrast *vājáyā-* is usually transitive in the meaning 'incite, rouse', and it can be so here, with *índram* as object. On trans. *vājáyā-* see my *-áya*-Formations, p. 89.

IV.17.17: Ge (/WG) take the pf. part. *dádṛṣānaḥ* as a mere attributive adj. with *āpíḥ* ("visible friend"), while I give it a more verbal sense. If my reflexive 'showing yourself' seems too strong, I would still prefer a participial 'being seen as / becoming visible' to a straight adjective. Once again, we are hoping for Indra's epiphany on the ritual ground.

In d in the publ. tr. I take *kártā* independently and construe *ulókam* as obj. of the part. *usaté* ("longing for wide space") against Ge (/WG). I now see that this is wrong, as the parallel expressions with *kártā ... ulókam* show (VI.23.3, VII.20.2). Both of those passages also have a dat. of benefit, *vīráya* and *sudāse* respectively, but neither of those datives is capable of governing an acc. I would therefore emend my tr. to "maker of wide space for the man who longs (for it), conferring vitality." As this emended tr. shows, I still think *ulókam* can be secondarily taken as the obj. of *usaté*. This same part. *usaté* can also serve as dat. of benefit with *vayodhāḥ*. Note the dat. *stuvaté* with *váyo dhāḥ* in the next vs. (18b).

IV.17.18: Though I am in agreement with Ge (/WG) that *cakṛmā* 'we have acted' refers to ritual action, I see no reason to supply an obj. (e.g., Ge "das Opfer").

IV.17.19: Ge's rendering of ab is not grammatically possible: he takes the subordinate clause as beginning with *yád* and continuing till the end of b ("weil er ja allein die vielen Feinde erschlägt"), but *hanti* is unaccented and must therefore belong to the main clause - despite his rather casual dismissal of the problem (n. 19b). My tr. takes *yád dha vṛtrā* as a self-contained subord. clause, with a verb ('smashes') to be supplied. Perhaps better is WG's interpr. of the same sequence as a nominal clause with *vṛtrā* as nominative subj.: "wenn es ja Widerstände gibt." I might emend my tr. to "Indra is praised as the bounteous one; when there are obstacles, he alone smashes (them, though they are) many and unopposable."

IV.18 Indra

For general discussion of my interpr. of this hymn, see publ. intro.

IV.18.1: With Ge and others, I assign this vs. to Indra's mother, not to the poet or a narrator.

Note the precative *janīṣīṣṭa*, on which see Narten (Sig.Aor., 118). Though this is the only prec. form to this stem in the RV, others are found in other Vedic texts.

The periphrastic caus. *pāttave kaḥ* (on which see Zehnder, Periphr.Kaus. 23 and passim) is generally taken as a euphemism for 'cause to die', but the root \sqrt{pad} 'fall' is regularly used of miscarriage (cf. my Hyenas [1991], 202-4), which fits this context well. Of course a miscarriage in ancient India could well also have meant death for the mother.

The root aor. injunc. *kaḥ* is perfectly ambig. between 2nd and 3rd sg. The latter fits the previous pāda, where the fetus Indra is spoken of in the 3rd ps., but 2nd sg. would anticipate the upcoming dialogic context, with Indra speaking of himself in the 1st ps. in vs. 2. Since English forces us to make a choice, I have chosen 2nd sg., contra Ge and most other tr.

IV.18.2: Most tr. render *durgāhā* merely as 'bad passage' vel sim. (Ge "eine übler Durchgang"), but the word is associated with words meaning 'deep' (of water, inter alia, whether it should be derived from \sqrt{gabh} or \sqrt{gah} [on which see EWA s.v. *gāhana*, *GĀH*]). And given that Indra is rejecting vaginal birth, that is, a downward trajectory, in favor of coming out sideways, a more precise tr. seems desirable: a "plunge" down through the birth canal and out is what he seems to want to avoid.

Note the otherwise identical 1st sg. subjunctives *nīr ayā* and *nīr gamāni*, built to root pres. (\sqrt{i}) and root aor. (\sqrt{gam}) respectively. Surely some nuance of tense/aspect is being conveyed here; I wish I knew what. (An English rendering with a pres. progressive versus a straight eventive, "I will not be coming out from there; I will come out crosswise ...," might capture something of the sense, with the progressive expressing deliberative possibilities and the eventive the ultimate choice.)

Although here and in VIII.101.4 and X.69.9 I tr. *sām* \sqrt{prch} with 'negotiate', I now think something less technical and precise is called for, and I would change the tr. to "I will consult with."

IV.18.3: It is generally agreed that pāda b contains another snatch of Indra's speech. The question is how to interpr. the double *nā nā* that opens the pāda. The first *nā* can be taken as an independent assertion -- "No!" -- followed by an amplification of that assertion, *nānu gāni* "I will not follow." In that case the positive statement *ānu nū gamāni* "I will now follow" represents a contradiction of the first and is an indication of the new-born Indra's wavering mind. Such seems the interpr. of WG, for example. However, as Old points out, a double negative can instead express an emphatic positive. Such is the interpr. of Ge, and I follow it here, in part because I think the point is that Indra was decisive from the moment of conception.

Like 2ab, this pāda contains two parallel 1st sg. subjunctives, *ānu gāni* and *ānu .. gamāni*, though in this case they are both built to root aorists, but to two different roots. Again, I don't know what differential semantic nuance is being expressed (if any). Here the poet may simply be striving for euphony: note the pleasing phonological patterning in *nā nānu gāni ānu nū gamāni*.

IV.18.4: As Old discusses, the sequence *sá řdhak* must contain underlying *sā*, not, with Pp., *sāh*.

On *řdhak* √ *kṛ* see VIII.18.11 and comm. ad X.49.7.

IV.18.5: The standard tr. all construe *svayám* with what follows, *átkaṃ vāsāna(h)* -- e.g., Ge “selbst sein Gewand umlegen” -- on the basis of *svayám átkaiḥ* in II.35.14 (which I render differently). But surely what is most remarkable here is that a new-born stood up by himself; the self-swaddling would also be surprising but would simply follow from the first feat.

IV.18.5–6: Though Gr assigns (*ny*)*ṛṣta-* (5b) and *arṣanti* (6a) to different roots, √ *ṛṣ* ‘stossen, stechen’ and √ *arṣ* ‘strömen’ respectively (see also EWA I.123 more cautiously), at least in this context I think they are meant to respond to each other – hence my ‘who overflowed’ for *nyṛṣtam*.

IV.18.6–9: For my interpr. of the speakers in these vss. and the role of the waters in the myth, see publ. intro. Most tr. take the vss. as all spoken by Indra’s mother (Ge [WG], Doniger), whereas I distribute them to a variety of voices: 6 Indra, 7 Indra’s mother, 8 waters, 9 Indra’s mother. As I see it, in 6 Indra prompts his mother to ask the waters questions; in 7 she rather sarcastically and belittlingly asks questions about them, whom she seems to accuse of trying to lay claim to her son. They respond directly to him in 8, reminding him of his mother’s dereliction of maternal duty and suggesting that they are better at mothering him than she is. So that she rather defiantly points out in 9 that subsequent negative things that happened to him were not her fault.

IV.18.6: As suggested in the publ. intro., the (real) waters in the amniotic sac that “break” right before birth and the (mythological) waters confined by Vṛtra and released by Indra are conflated here. Indra may be speaking from within the womb about the waters there battering the womb itself for release, though the waters in the Vṛtra myth would not be far from the audience’s mind. If Indra the fetus is immersed in these amniotic fluids, their sloshing sounds would surround him -- and it would be appropriate to ask his mother what they are saying.

The simile in b, *ṛtāvarī iva saṃkrósamānāḥ* “like truthful women together shouting their witness” may have a quasi-legal resonance. The root √ *kruś* is later used for raising a hue and cry on witnessing a crime (vel sim.), such as a Rākṣasa abduction (see my Sacr.Wife 233). Configuring the waters as truthful and articulate witnesses in this pāda leads directly to the suggestion in the next pāda that they should be asked what they are saying.

Note *vī pṛcha* contrasting with *sām ... pṛchai* in 2d.

IV.18.6–7: The responsive phrases *kīm ... bhananti* (6c) and *kīm ... bhananta* (7a) provide a textbook case of *-anta* replacement. See my 1979 IJ 21 article, *pace* Gotō’s (1st Kl., 222) characterization of *bhananta* as “reziprok.”

IV.18.7: As just noted, I think that this vs. expresses Indra’s mother’s suspicions about the waters’ alienation of Indra’s filial affection for her. In pāda a she interprets the

waters' speech, about which Indra asked her in vs. 6, as invitations to him (to join them and abandon her, presumably). In b the charged word *avadyá-* 'disgrace' recurs from 5a, where the mother considered Indra to be "like a disgrace / somehow a disgrace" and concealed him. Here she suggests that the waters are, in contrast, eager to assume his disgrace. In context this seems almost like an accusation that the waters are so perverse that in their pursuit of him they are willing to assume any evil that attaches to him. In fact, this is probably an allusion to the well-known concept that waters cleanse transgressors of their transgressions (cf., e.g., I.23.22–24). Indra would automatically acquire blood guilt from his killing of Vṛtra (on Indra's *kilbiṣāṇi* 'sins' and resulting impurity, see my Hyenas, 62–68, also vss. 12–13 below). (The interpr. of his 'disgrace' here as arising from his killing of Vṛtra goes back to Sāy. See Ge's n. 7b.)

In any case, in the 2nd hemistich Indra's mother goes on to assert the primacy of her relationship with Indra and thus her indirect role in his glorious deed, the slaying of Vṛtra. The fronted *māma* 'mine' makes this claim esp. strong.

IV.18.8: The waters throw this emphatically fronted *māma* back at her, with four fronted occurrences of *māmat*, which is, as Ge clearly argues, a nonce ablative sg. of the 1st sg. pronoun, a blend of gen. *māma* and abl. *māt*. To interpret it as an adv. (Gr "bald-bald" and see lit. cited by Old) is to ignore the rhetorical responsion in this section of the hymn. Acdg. to Pischel (Pkt Gram. §415–16), the Prakrit grammarians cite an ablative *mamatto* (i.e., *mamat-tas*), which is apparently not (yet?) found in texts.

In my interpr. of the verse each pāda is spoken by a different though undifferentiable representative of the waters. The first two pādas counter Indra's mother's boast in 7cd about her son's great deed with reminders that she, not any of them [=waters], is responsible for transgressing against this same son. Both pādas begin *māmac caná* "not because of *me*." In the second hemistich they take credit for the good treatment Indra received and the way he thrived under it, each beginning *māmac cid* "certainly because of *me*." Putting the vs. in the mouth of Indra's mother, as most interpr. do, creates grave difficulties. Not only do the claims in ab become incoherent, but it also requires that the young woman (*yuvatī*) in pāda a not be identical with Indra's mother (despite 4a, 5a). A way out of that difficulty is possible: pāda a could be in the 1st ps ("I, a young woman, cast you aside" -- the pf. form *parāsa* is compatible with a 1st sg.), but we then confront the problem that she both accepts responsibility for what seems a misdeed and disclaims any reason for or benefit from the action.

Although as disc. elsewhere in the comm. (esp. ad X.49.5) and esp. by Klein (DGRV I.285–92), though *caná* ordinarily appears in negative contexts, it is not itself negative (though see II.24.12). However, in this context, where *māmac caná* contrasts with *māmac cid*, the apparent negative in (*ca*)*ná* has a polarizing effect. For Klein's disc. of such passages see his pp. 289–92. The *caná* occurrences raise another problem: the verbs in 8a and b and 9ab are accented in the *caná* clauses, though *caná* doesn't ordinarily induce accent on its own; the verbs in the *cid* clauses (8c and d) are not accented. One could (loosely) attribute the accent in 8a and b to starkly contrastive statements, but 9ab doesn't contrast with anything. The problem is barely mentioned by Old; it is discussed at some length by Schnaus (Dialoglieder, 122), without a firm conclusion. Nor do I have one.

mamṛdyuh is the only pf. form attested to $\sqrt{mṛd}$ in all of Skt. (save for the grammarians). Because of its isolation, it is difficult to interpr. the optative. Kü (374) suggests it expresses the Potentialis der Vergangenheit. I might suggest rather that has the value of past habitual (like Engl. “would [regularly] X”), though this is not a normal use of the pf. opt in Vedic (on which see my “Where Are All the Optatives,” 2009). But I also think the transmitted form may be signaling something else entirely. The indic. 3rd pl. pf. would be **mamṛduḥ*. Its root syllable should scan long (like **mṛdā-* and **mṛdāya-*, transmitted as *mṛd*) because of compensatory lengthening from **mṛzḍ*. I wonder if the underlying form **mamṛdur* was remade as an optative in order to ensure the necessary heavy syllable in the cadence. (This possibility is summarily rejected by Old.) If it *is* a real optative, however, note that it is spoken by a woman and its subjects are females, demonstrating the association between the pf. opt. and women’s speech that I discussed in the 2009 article.

In d the marvel of Indra’s standing up (right after birth) is repeated from 5c. In 5 this was emphatically not his mother’s doing: she had hidden him away. A watery foster mother seems to be claiming credit, one of those who showed mercy and kindness to the child in the preceding pāda.

IV.18.9: If I am correct that Indra’s mother reclaims speech in this vs., she now indicates that a risky moment in the Vṛtra battle wasn’t her fault. The opening *māmac canā* “not because of me” returns from 8ab, and, so it seems to me, this indicates that she implicitly agrees to the accuracy of the accusations in 8ab -- that she did throw the baby aside and let evil birth swallow him.

In the VP *āpa hānū jaghāna* the jaws are universally taken to be Indra’s (e.g., WG “hat ... deine beide Kinnbähen abgeschlagen.” But I know of no account of the Indra-Vṛtra battle when Indra’s jaws are attacked, and in fact several times it is Vṛtra’s jaws: X.152.3 *vī vṛtrāsya hānū ruja* “break apart the jaws of Vṛtra”; I.52.6 *vṛtrāsya yād ... nijaghānthā hānvor indra tanyatūm* “when you, Indra, struck your thunder down upon the jaws of Vṛtra.” I therefore think that the *hānū* here have to be Vṛtra’s, but with a twist: this is not a proclamation of Indra’s triumphant blow, but rather a dicey moment when Vṛtra was counter-attacking. Vṛtra has ‘pierced down’ Indra (*nivividhvān*) and is presumably coming in for the kill. What kind of kill? The clue, in my view, is the preverb *āpa* ‘aside, away’. I suggest that Vṛtra is smashing his own jaws aside, that is, moving his jaws apart to be able to swallow large prey. Acdg. to various websites (e.g., <http://www.all-creatures.org/articles/ar-snake-myths.html>), snakes’ jaws are not fused together but merely held together by stretchy ligaments, an arrangement that allows them to open their jaws very wide. Just as “Evil Birth” swallowed the baby Indra in 8b, here the arch-snake threatens to do the same. But in the second half-vs. Indra reasserts his mastery and crushes his enemy.

IV.18.10: We return to the primal scene of Indra’s birth again, with a reiteration of his mother’s abandonment of the new-born babe (here expressed as the “unlicked calf” *ārīlham vātsam*, pāda c), forcing him out on his own -- though the description of Indra as a strapping bull in ab makes him seem considerably less vulnerable.

tavāgā- is a problematic form. It probably contains a form of $\sqrt{tū}$ ‘be strong’, but this is of course not the usual combining form. It is extensively disc. by Scarlatta (101–2).

His general conclusion, that the second member is the cow word, and the whole thing means ‘strong bovine’ (with *gām* the regular acc. of *gó-*) seems plausible, though his detour through a nominative syntagm **tavā gauḥ* seems a little farfetched to me.

The second hemistich lacks a main verb to govern the dat. pseudo-infinitive *carāthāya*. Most tr. supply ‘let’ vel sim. I suggest that *sasūva* in pāda a ‘gave birth’ ($\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’) may carry over into cd, as a stand-in for the (non-existent, or at least unattested) pf. to the homonymous root $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’.

IV.18.11: The plot gets a bit murky here. His mother, having sent him off alone in vs. 10, now follows him, with the fear that the gods are abandoning him. This seems to happen much later, just before the Vṛtra battle and long after the birth and her own abandonment of the baby. But, despite her fears about the other gods, Indra finds a companion on his own -- Viṣṇu, who is not usually a party to the Vṛtra battle.

IV.18.12–13: See the publ. intro. for uncertainties about the interpr. of these vss. In some sense they seem to enlarge on the theme of “Indra’s disgrace” (*índrasyāvadyám*) in 7b -- the blood guilt Indra incurs from even sanctioned killing, made far worse by the intra-family slaughter depicted in vs. 12. Which leads to Indra’s extreme loss of status, isolation, and shunning by the other gods in the final vs.

IV.18.12: On the plupf. *acakrat* see Kü (136–37). He takes it as built to the middle *cakre* (**cakra* + *ṭ*), though he doesn’t find the middle well motivated functionally. But Indra is doing this to his own mother!

On the basis of mostly Middle Iranian forms as well as more distant correspondents in Balto-Slavic, *śayú-* is now taken as meaning ‘orphan’ in some of its occurrences, incl. this one – beside homophonous *śayú-* ‘lying (there)’. See EWA II.615. Although the passages generally cited for a reinterpret. to ‘orphan’, the Ásvins catalogue passages I.116.22, 117.20, etc. (see EWA ref.), seem to me to contain only a personal name, there are a few occurrences of *śayú-*, incl. this one, that are amenable to the ‘orphan’ sense, mostly as a pun on ‘lying there’. In most of these cases we should interpret ‘orphan’ more narrowly as ‘fatherless’, since mothers are present: see comm. ad I.31.2 and the similar III.55.6, also X.40.8. In our passage a punning *śayúm* looks both backward and forward. On the one hand, *vidhāvām ... śayúm* makes a nice pair: “Who made your mother a widow and you an orphan?” But pāda-initial *śayú-* also makes a polarized pair with pāda-final *carāntam*: “as you (were) lying there, as you were wandering.” (For a similar configuration see III.55.6 *śayúḥ ... carati*.) And the regular use of \sqrt{si} ‘lie’ in the Vṛtra myth, generally of the vanquished Vṛtra (see esp. densely repeated occurrences in I.32), makes a ‘lie’ interpretation attractive here. I would now emend the tr. to “Who made your mother a widow and you an orphan? Who tried to smash you as you lay, as you wandered?” with separate readings of *śayú-* with the two pādas.

In light of d, which describes Indra’s killing his father, the question in a, “who made your mother a widow,” can only be answered “you did!”

Note *mārdiká-* picking up *mamṛdyuḥ* in 8c.

The final word of the vs. *pādagṛhya* ‘having grasped him by the foot’ is puzzling. It might seem to exclude Vṛtra as the victim (and as Indra’s father) since, as a snake, he

has no feet -- though it might be a way of indicating picking up a snake by its tail. The only other occurrence of this cmpd gerund is in the desperately difficult hymn X.27, vs. 4, where the context is similar and the referent does seem to be Vṛtra.

IV.18.13: Indra gets the last word in this hymn and, having described his situation in the direst of terms, ends with a note of hope and coming triumph: the falcon's arrival with the soma, to be treated (in even more enigmatic terms) in two nearby hymns, IV.26–27. Since in our hymn the new-born Indra drank soma in Tvaṣṭar's house (3c) and presumably had a good dose of it before the Vṛtra battle, the falcon's stolen soma cannot be the primal soma, though it sometimes mythologically seems to parallel the primal stealing of fire in the Prometheus myth.

A dog-cooker (*śvapaca-*) in later texts is a person living outside of societal norms (cf., e.g., MDŚ III.92), grouped with those who have fallen from caste and so forth.

Notice that Indra here finds no one to be merciful to him (*ná ... vivide marḍitāram*), in contrast to the merciful waters when he was a baby (8c). So the answer to the question in 12c "What god was merciful toward you" must have been "no one."

Most take the dishonored wife to be Indra's own, but no wife has intruded on the family drama we've been observing. I assume rather that this is another reference to his mother, who, now that she is a widow, receives slighting treatment.

IV.19. Indra

IV.19.1: As far as I can tell, this is the only ex. of *nír√vṛ* in the RV. In conjunction with *ékam* it must mean something like 'single out', 'pick out from a group'.

IV.19.2: The verb *ávāsrjanta* lacks an overt object. This may be because it is middle, in contrast to the generally transitive active to this stem; so most tr., incl. the publ. tr. ("let go"). However, the *-anta* may be an *-anta* replacement of the usual type (see my 1979 *III* article), and the verb form should be taken as a transitive equivalent to the active, with unexpressed obj. Indra. (This is how Kulikov [-ya-pres., p. 289] takes it, flg. a suggestion of Lubotsky's -- though *-anta* replacement is not mentioned: "The gods abandoned [Indra], like the feeble ones.") I am of two minds. The situation depicted is presumably the gods finking out on Indra when the Vṛtra battle looms; this might suggest that we should supply Indra as object: English "let Indra down" would be an almost exact match. But the simile *jívrayo ná* "like old/feeble (men)" does not fit this scenario as well; it implies that their powers simply failed them. They "let go" -- the stuffing just went out of them, as it were.

The usual problem with *bhúvaḥ* -- injunctive (so apparently Ge, also the publ. tr.) or subjunctive (so apparently WG). I assume that this verb refers to what happened after the event of pāda a: with the gods out of contention, Indra comes into his own as the universal monarch (*samrāj-*) and takes his true and proper place (*satyáyoni-*). The use of *yoni-* here is reminiscent of the passage in a nearby Indra hymn, IV.16.10, where Indra is urged to sit down on his own *yóni-* (*své yónau*) so that he can be recognized.

IV.19.3: The phrase *abudhyám ábudhyamānaṃ suṣupāṇám* "not to be awakened, unawakening, gone to sleep" must be proleptic, expressing the state the serpent will be in

after Indra has done his work on him: ‘put to sleep’ and similar idioms are standard euphemisms for death in Vedic, as in many languages (e.g., modern English). See my “‘Sleep’ in Vedic and Indo-European,” *Zeitschrift für vergl. Sprachforschung (KZ)* 96 (1982/83) 6-16. I do *not* think, *pace* most tr., that this depicts a drowsy Vṛtra whom Indra woke up to fight. For further disc. see I.103.7 and comm. thereon.

The hapax *aparván* at the end of d is picked up by *párvatānām* at the end of 4d. (They are, of course, synchronically unrelated.)

IV.19.4: As noted above ad IV.16.14 this group of Indra hymns contains a set of anomalously built medial participles to the roots \sqrt{vas} ‘desire’ and \sqrt{vas} ‘wear’. Here medial thematic *usāmāna-* is doubly unexpected: this root builds a root pres., with a weak grade *uś*, but it is only active (with an extremely well-attested act. part. *uśánt-*), save for three occurrences of athem. *uśānā-*. And there is no other trace of a 6th class thematic present to account for the *-māna-* suffix. Neither of these anomalies seems to me particularly serious or hard to account for. As for the middle voice, verbs of desiring seem to fall naturally into the semantic realm of the middle voice, so that a transfer of the participle would not be surprising. Moreover, if we take the redupl. part. *vāvasānā-* as belonging to a pf. of this root (contra Kü, who assigns all these forms to $\sqrt{vās}$ ‘bellow’), there is a parallel formation with the same voice and same meaning. As for the thematic suffix, Narten (MSS 16: 82 = KISch 128) suggests that this poet has a penchant for *-māna-*; if this explanation seems insufficient (and it does to me -- what about *uśānā-* in IV.23.1 as well as numerous well-behaved athem. middle participles in his oeuvre) -- one might point to the ambiguous 3rd pl. act. *uśānti* (3x), which is presumably the 3rd pl. of the root pres., but could belong also to a 6th class present. (However, I note that the three 3rd pl. forms are found only in I and X.)

I take *ójah* as an acc. of respect with the part.

Ge sees pāda d as reflecting the Winged Mountains story, but this doesn’t seem evident to me.

IV.19.5: Pāda a presents some interpretational difficulties that I think can be resolved by considering it an example of disharmony in a simile (see my 1982 IIJ article). I take the verb *abhī prá dadruḥ* as belonging to $\sqrt{dṛ}$ ‘split, burst’ (see below for another possibility). In the simile *jánayo ná gárbham* it has transitive value, with the object expressing the contents that has been burst out (not the container), hence “as women (burst out) their embryo.” In the frame I take the mountains that ended the previous pāda (4d) as the subject and the verb as intransitive: “they burst.” (This is also Ge’s and WG’s interpr., as well as Kü’s [230].) Old suggests as another alternative that the verb can be transitive, with mountains as subject and rivers as object, but I would prefer to supply as little as possible. Old suggests yet another possibility, that the verb actually belongs to the root $\sqrt{drā}$ ‘run’. Although this does not make sense for the simile (as Old notes), it could work for the frame -- though in that case ‘rivers’ might be a better subject. In that case we would have a pun separating the simile and frame (“[the rivers] ran [$\sqrt{drā}$], as women burst out [$\sqrt{dṛ}$] their embryo”), rather than a mismatch of usages of a single lexical item. I prefer the single-root solution.

The 2nd pāda also has a somewhat skewed expression. In this context we would expect the entities that “went/drove forth all at once” to be the released waters, who are

certainly the topic of the 2nd hemistich. But instead it is ‘stones’ (*ádrayaḥ*). Now this is probably, on the one hand, a particularly vivid image of the mountains suddenly bursting and sending forth an explosion of stones, a rockslide. But on the other hand, pāda-final *ádrayaḥ* produces a Jagatī cadence in a hymn that is otherwise entirely Triṣṭubh. Old suggests (without great enthusiasm, as far as I can see) an emendation to abl. **ádreḥ* ‘from the stone’, which would fix both the meter and the image. I wonder if *ádrayaḥ* is a poetic trick: we expect the subject **āpaḥ* ‘waters’ -- which would provide both the standard Vṛtra-myth denouement and a good Triṣṭubh cadence -- and instead get a twist of both sense and meter.

IV.19.7: This vs. celebrates the fructifying liquid that Indra released by destroying Vṛtra and depicts its effects on humans (specifically females) (ab), the landscape (c), and livestock (d). The first hemistich is a cleverly constructed echo chamber, because the females being made to swell (that is, get pregnant) there probably stand for the waters, but are also *compared* to waters. In other words the waters are being compared to waters, by way of the intermediate ‘unwed girls’ (*agrúvāḥ*). This is also something of a dig at Vṛtra, who hadn’t managed to make them pregnant though he is sometimes called their husband (cf., e.g., *dāsā-patnī-* ‘having a Dāsa as husband’ in I.32.11, etc.). Indra’s role as their real husband is embodied in the final word of the vs. *dāmsupatnīḥ* (however we interpret the rest of it; see below).

In the simile *nabhanvò ná vákva(h)*, *vákva-* belongs to the root *√vañc* ‘surge, undulate, billow’. The stem *nabhanú-* is found only here and in V.59.7 and is transparently a derivative of the root *√nabh* ‘burst, explode’. Old suggests the verbal meaning ‘sich spalten’ with nominal ‘Spalt’ (‘split, cleft’). However, in both passages I think the nominal form refers not to the aftermath of the verbal action but rather to the process -- the spurts sent forth by the explosion (rather like the stones in 5b). The image is visually arresting (at least to me).

The sense of *dhvasrá-* in b also requires some discussion. The root *√dhvam* is variously glossed (e.g., EWA s.v. ‘zerstieben, zerstäuben, zerbröcklen’), but in my view the ‘spray, scatter’ sense is far less prominent than ‘occlude’ (with smoke, dust, or other concealing substance), a sense also found in derivatives like *dhvasmán-* ‘miasma, (clouds of) smoke’. Thus to my mind the adj. *dhvas(i)rā-* means in the first instance ‘occluded, dusty’ (see X.40.3, VII.83.3); here I have pushed this slightly to ‘parched’, from something like ‘dry as dust’. Ge’s “die dahinschwindenden” (dwindling away) conveys something of the same sense of weakness and lack of fertility, but I don’t know how he arrived at it.

ṛtajñāḥ is identified as a nom. sg. m. modifying Indra by Gr, so also Scar (177). It can just as easily be an acc. pl. fem. modifying the young women / waters, as Ge, WG, and the publ. tr. take it. Given that the waters in the adjacent hymn, IV.18.6, are called *ṛtāvarīḥ*, the latter analysis seems preferable -- although it might be even better to read it with both referents.

The publ. tr. analyzes *dāmsupatnī-* as having a first member *dāmsu-*, an adjective ‘wondrous’ related to *dāmsas-* ‘wondrous power’ (so Gr). However, the prevailing interpr. is that it is either a compd *dām-supatnī-* or a two-word sequence *dām *supatnīḥ*, with, in either case, a form of *dām-* ‘house’ (cf. *dāmpati-*, *pátir dán*). The complex is then to be rendered ‘having a good husband in the house’ vel sim. Alternatively Ge (n. 7d)

suggests that it might be a metathesis of **su-dampatnīh* (given without accent), which seems quite unlikely. Although I think the form plays off *dāmpati-*, I am still inclined towards the ‘wondrous’ interpr., because of the deeds that have just been ascribed to Indra.

IV.19.8: The question in this vs. is what to do with *gūrtā(h)*. The standard tr. take it as modifying the temporal expression *pūrvīr uśasaḥ śarādaś ca* -- hence, e.g., Ge’s “[v]iele gelobte Morgen und Herbst.” This is grammatically fine and perhaps also supported by the fact that the adj. is in the same pāda as the temporal expression. Still, I am somewhat unsatisfied by this interpr. On the one hand, as Klein points out (DGRV I.74), this small group of Vāmadeva Indra hymns contains three similar temporal expressions (IV.16.19, 18.4, and here), and the only adjectives are quantitative ones, so ‘welcomed, besung, praised’ would be an intrusion in the formulaic language. Moreover, *svágūrta-* ‘self-greeted, i.e., gurgling’ is used twice of rivers (I.140.13 *sīndhavaḥ*, X.95.7 *nadyāḥ*), and something like that would fit semantically here. The problem of course is that *sīndhu-* is masc., and so *gūrtāh* cannot modify acc. pl. *sīndhūn* as the publ. tr. implies. It is possible that the expression *sīndhavaś ca svágūrtāh* in I.140.13 was transposed to our passage without adjusting the gender. More likely is that the acc. pl. of another, feminine word for rivers, streams, or waters should be supplied: *nadyāḥ* as in X.95.7, *sīrāḥ* as in pāda c of this vs., or *apāḥ*, the default watery referent in the Vṛtra myth. The tr. should be emended to better reflect this: “... he set loose the welcomed [gurgling] *(waters/streams and) the rivers.” Strikingly *svágūrta-*, which occurs only 4x total in the RV, appears two vss. later (10c) in the same metrical position with the same sandhi form. It there modifies *āpāmsi* ‘labors’. Is it too fanciful to suggest that that phrase, *svágūrtā, āpāmsi*, is meant to invoke *(*svá*)*gūrtā*, **apāḥ* here? For further disc. see also Old ad loc.

IV.19.9: As indicated in the publ. intro., the contents of this vs. and the reason for its inclusion in this hymn are both deeply obscure, though the occurrence of the rare stem *agrū-* ‘unwed girl’ in 7a may have prompted the inclusion of the bizarre anecdote in 9ab. As Ge’s reff. for ab show, the shunned son of a maiden, the blind man, and the lame man are mentioned together in II.13.12, 15.7, I.112.8; also IV.30.16, 19. So, however ill-assorted, this is a set. The unfortunate son of an *agrū* is also mentioned in nearby IV.30.16, though there he is only shunned, not eaten by ants.

On *ukhachíd-* see Scar (131).

Unfortunately I have nothing further to say about the sense of this vs. I have toyed with the possibility that there’s a ritual reference here, to the taking out of the offering fire from the householder’s fire and its removal to the east. But, though there might be rough correspondence -- very rough -- between the first and third parts, the middle part with the blind man and the snake doesn’t work at all, as far as I can see.

IV.19.10: Contra the standard tr. and interpr., I take *āha* as 1st sg. This is the summary vs. of the hymn (with vs. 11 simply the Vāmadeva Indra refrain), and in such vss. the poet often speaks in his own person or that of the group, referring to the hymn that has just been recited. This vs. entirely fits that pattern. I also interpr. the enclitic *te* not only as a

genitive with the deeds, but also as a dative with the part. *vidúṣe*, identifying Indra as the knowing audience. (And who better than Indra to know his own deeds?)

āvidvān is one of the few forms of $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’ cmpded with the preverb *ā* in the RV. It does not seem to have a clear special nuance.

On *svágūrta*- see comm. ad VI.68.4.

IV.20 Indra

The midsection of this hymn (vss. 5–8) has a surprising concentration of *-tar*-stem nominals, both root- and suffix-accented.

IV.20.1: Note the patterned phonological repetition *dūrād ... āsād ... yāsad*, with the 1st two morphologically parallel (ablative sg.) and the last not (subjunctive, 3rd sg.).

To make the tr. clearer, “our” should be inserted before “help.” Otherwise it sounds as if Indra needs to find help for himself.

IV.20.2: Again, “our” should be inserted before “help.”

IV.20.3: As Ge suggests, the imagery in the first hemistich seems to come from chariot racing. Pāda b is identical to V.31.11d (save for the ps. of the verb), a verse concerned with the chariot contest between Indra and the Sun. Putting smthg in front must simply refer to placing it in the lead, but in a ritual context like this one, there is interference between that sense and the ritual action of placing the offering fire to the east, also expressed by *purās* $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$ and regularly represented by the epithet of Agni *puróhita*-. But since Indra is never the agent of that ritual action and since it is the fire, not the sacrifice, that is put in front ritually, the chariot race interpr. must be primary here. In saying this, I find myself in disagreement with Bloomfield, who says “The repeated pāda fits well in 4.20.3, is dubious in 5.31.11,” without commenting on either the fit or the dubiousness.

The Engl. phrase “gain our intention” is somewhat awk. What *sanīsyasi krátum naḥ* means, I think, is that Indra’s action of putting the sacrifice in front will cause him to win the race, which is what we want to happen. But objects of the root $\sqrt{\text{san}}$ are usually concrete (*vājam*, etc., as in *vājasātau* in 2d; cf. also *sanāye dhānānām* “to gain the stakes” in the next pāda) and also things that the grammatical subject desires to win, so my suggested indirect benefit is somewhat anomalous. So it is possible that “our *krātu*” that Indra will win is something he wants -- perhaps our intention or resolve to sacrifice to him, not to other gods.

IV.20.4: The verb *pā(h)* opening the 2nd half-vs. should also be read with (or supplied with) pāda b. Ge supplies “sei” for the first hemistich and construes the gen. phrase in b with *upāké*. This is possible but, given the parallelism of the two genitive phrases referring to soma in b and c, less likely.

Ge and WG take *pr̥ṣṭhyā*- lit. ‘related to the back’ as an adjective of (superior) quality in a spatial metaphor -- the sense of “top” in Cole Porter’s “You’re the top” or the adj. “tip-top.” Cf. WG’s “am erstklassigen Soma-Spross.” I think rather that the adj. is meant literally to refer to the soma plant’s well-known growing place, the back of the mountains (that is, the high slopes). Cf., e.g., V.36.2 *rúhat sómo ná párvatasya pr̥ṣṭhé* “as the soma-plant grows on the back of the mountain.”

IV.20.5: In my opinion, the first half-vs. consists of two separate similes, the second of which, *sṛṇyo ná jētā*, needs to be fleshed out. In the first one Indra with his abundant seers is like a tree with ripe fruit (*vrkṣó ná pakvāḥ*). In the second Indra the winner/conquerer is like a man who *harvests* the fruit with a sickle -- or more likely who harvests grain, the crop having subtly changed, with the *pakvā-* ‘ripened’ held constant. Cf. X.101.3 *nédīya ít sṛṇyāḥ pakvām éyāt* “the ripe (grain) should come even closer to our sickles.” For ripe grain see I.66.3 *yávo ná pakvó jētā jánānām* “Ripe like grain, a conquerer of peoples,” which also contains *jétar-*, though in my view in an independent syntagm.

The simile in the 2nd half-vs. is striking because it casts Indra as a maiden (*yóṣāṃ*), pursued by the poet as a dashing and virile young man (*márya-*, a word sometimes applied to Indra) -- a notable gender reversal.

This vs. contains one of the few finite forms of the secondary root $\sqrt{\text{rapś}}$ ‘teem, abound’, and 2c has an occurrence of the better-attested related possessive adj. *virapśín-*. In the currently favored etym. the “root” $\sqrt{\text{rapś}}$ was extracted ultimately from the nominal *virapśá-* ‘abundance’ (the basis for *virapśín-*), itself constructed from a dvandva of *vīrá-* ‘men’ and *paśú-* ‘beasts’ (see EWA s.v. *virapśá-*). It’s important to note, however, that this etym. is soundly rejected by Kü (417–18), though I still favor it. The two forms of the thematic pres. *rapśa-* (IV.45.1, X.113.2) are both immediately preceded by the preverb *ví*, which (by most lights) has been secondarily extracted from the cmpd. Our perfect form here, *rarapśé*, is also construed with *ví*, but with *yáḥ* intervening, and the other pf. form (VI.18.12) lacks *ví* but appears with *prá* in distant tmesis.

IV.20.6: The publ. tr. reflects the emendation of *vájraṃ* to **vrajám*, in concert with Gr, Ge, Schmidt (B+I, 137), Lub, and, after some resistance, Old. The resulting phrase *ādartā *vrajám* has a close parallel in VI.66.8 *vrajám dārtā*, as Ge points out. Ge takes **vrajám* as part of the simile and supplies Vala as the object in the frame: “... erbricht wie einen festen Pferch (den Vala) ...” But the position of the simile marker *ná* speaks against this. I instead take **vrajám* as a reference to Vala, with the simile portraying the attack of a wild beast (*bhīmáḥ*) on a real pen (thus effectively reading **vrajám* twice and separating *bhīmáḥ* from Indra). For *bhīmá-* as a wild beast see *mṛgó ná bhīmáḥ* (I.154.2, 190.3), *simhó ná bhīmáḥ* (IV.16.4 [nearby], IX.97.28), etc. In their tr. WG keep the transmitted text and tr. “Der Furchtbare ist der die Keule Stiebende (in den) ... prallen (Pferch) ...,” thus silently incorporating a **vrajám* in the final parenthesis (“Pferch”). I am also not certain what the VP “die Keule stieben” would mean nor how (*ā*) $\sqrt{\text{dṛ}}$ can mean ‘stieben’. They acknowledge the generally accepted emendation in their notes. Although I do not see an easy way to avoid this emendation, I do not know how the corruption could have arisen, esp. given *vrajám apavartāsi* in 8b. Still, *vájra-* is considerably more common than *vrajá-* and would always be lurking in an Indra context.

IV.20.7: The rel. prn. *yásya* of the first hemistich serves as a modulation pivot from the 3rd ps. of vs. 6 to the direct 2nd ps. address to Indra of 7cd.

On *udvāvrṣāṇāḥ* see comm. ad VIII.61.7, where I reject the Neisser / Gotō / Kü positing of a 2nd root $\sqrt{\text{varṣ}}$ ‘sich ermannen’, etc. and assign it to $\sqrt{\text{varṣ}}$ ‘rain’, with the specialized meaning ‘boil up and over’, as an expression of irrepressible energy. This

image would work nicely here with the pen “overflowing with goods” (*vásunā nyiṣṭam*) in the preceding vs. (6d).

IV.20.8: For brief and unilluminating remarks on *śikṣānarā-* see comm. ad I.53.2. Here I prefer to read the loc *samithēsu* with it rather than with what follows.

The root noun cmpd. *prahā-* is discussed with care and insight by Scar (698–700). The cmpd. is found in X.42.9 in a clear gambling context. Of the various proposals Scar makes, I find most satisfying the one in which *prahā-* is the stakes/pool/kitty ‘left out in front’. The possessive adj. here would then mean ‘having the jackpot’ and would fit with the gambling imagery in 3d *śvaghnīva ... sanāye dhānānām* “like (a gambler) with the best throw to gain the stakes.” (Scar, however, takes our particular passage in a different and, to me, unconvincing direction, p. 700.) The standard interpr. is ‘take the lead’ (e.g., Ge “den Vorsprung gewinnend”) in a race, but I’m not sure how this meaning would develop from ‘leave’ and ‘forth’.

IV.20.9: Pāda a is a definitional one, with the precise type of ability (*śacī-*) possessed by Indra giving him the designation ‘most able’ (*śaciṣṭha*).

Ge interprets *múhu ká cid* as haplogy for **muhuká ká cid* (so also EWA s.v. *múhur*, WG, and, somewhat differently, Old flg. Ludwig). Cf. nearby IV.16.17 *kásmiñ cid ... muhuké* (also *muhukāñ* IV.17.12). I have come, somewhat reluctantly, to the conclusion that this is correct. However, as noted in disc. ad IV.16.17, I do not accept Ge’s rendering of *muhuká-* as ‘Schlachtgeschrei’, which produces for this passage “... jedwedem Schlachtgeschrei hervorruft.” WG’s “... welches plötzlichen Vorfälle auch immer erledigt” is, however, more plausible. In IV.16.17 I suggest a sense ‘skirmish’, which works contextually there, but is here, I think, too specific. In fact, the published tr., “does everything instantly,” can stand, for a literal Engl. “does every instantaneous thing.”

The lexeme *ví√ci* means literally ‘pull apart’; an exactly parallel usage to this one appears in VI.67.8 *yuvám dāśúṣe ví cayiṣṭam āmhaḥ* (also cited by Ge), and the notion of pulling apart / opening up a narrow place (*āmhaḥ*) is very apposite. It should also be noted, however, that the same lexeme is used in gambling contexts, indeed in the very X.42.9 just cited for *prahāvant-* in 8c. In gambling it means ‘pile apart, pull out (a good hand)’. Although I don’t think that that idiomatic sense is reflected here, I do think that the gambling overtones would resonate with the other gambling vocabulary in this hymn.

IV.20.10: I do not understand the function of the initial *prá* in b. Gr indicates that it belongs with *dātave*, and Keydana (Infinitive, p. 255) explicitly says that it must belong with *dātave* and is therefore in tmesis. Though this is not impossible, I am somewhat reluctant to accept this explanation in part because *prá* is relatively rare with *√dā*. I wonder if it signals the lexeme *prá√as* ‘be present, be prominent’, with the copula gapped. Fortunately, the interpr. chosen has almost no effect on the sense of the pāda.

IV.21 Indra

IV.21.1: As indicated in the publ. tr., this vs. bears some resemblance to the first vs. of the preceding hymn: our first pāda *ā yātu índro ‘vasa úpa naḥ* more or less lexically matches IV.20.1ab *ā na índro ... ávase yāsat*. See also vs. 3 below.

The second hemistich is syntactically problematic; see Old’s extensive n. The problem is that both nom. sg. *vāvṛdhānāḥ* and the gen. sg. rel. prn. *yāsya* appear to refer to Indra. Ge interprets *yāsya* as a reflexive rel. (see n. 1c): “der erstarkt seine vielen Kräfte,” but not only am I not aware of other reflexive uses of the relative, but this tr. requires that the med. participle *vāvṛdhānā-* be transitive, which it is usually not (though, to be fair, a reflexive transitive would probably require middle voice). Although the publ. tr. is syntactically trickier (by cutting the pāda into two syntactic pieces), it avoids both problems by taking the participle as a separate clause (“when he has grown strong”) and the antecedent to *yāsya* in a rel. clause that begins with *táviṣīḥ*. In this interpr. *táviṣīḥ ... pūrvīḥ* is nom., not acc. The relative also has domain over the clause in d, with *yāsya* limiting *kṣatrām*, which is taken as a nom., not acc. as in most tr. Ge’s “wie der Himmel seine überlegene Herrschaft entfalten möge” also violates the standard construction of similes, by making the simile clausal, with the verb *púṣyāt* in the simile seeming to correspond to the participle *vāvṛdhānāḥ* in the frame. (WG’s tr. of d avoids this problem; their rendering is quite similar to the publ. tr.)

IV.21.2: The *nṛ̥n* in pāda b is problematic. It appears to be an acc. pl., and in fact is an acc. in the same phrase *tuvirādhaso nṛ̥n* in V.58.2 (referring to the Maruts). But here the undoubted gen. sg. *tuvidyumnásya* immediately preceding (and morphologically parallel to *tuvirādhasaḥ*) invites a gen. sg. reading also of ambiguous *tuvirādhasaḥ*. This in turn presents us with several choices: 1) to take *nṛ̥n* as a real gen. sg., 2) to assume that the last two words were borrowed from V.58.2 (or based on the formula found therein) and not adjusted morphologically, so that *nṛ̥n* is functionally a gen. sg. but formally an acc. pl., or 3) to detach *nṛ̥n* syntactically from what precedes it. Old opts for option 2 (see disc. in ZDMG 55 [1901]: 745–47 = KISch. 286–88). He assumes that since *tuvirādhasaḥ* can represent either acc. pl. or gen. sg., when the formula in V.58.2 was imported here, *nṛ̥n* could come along for the ride, functioning as a gen. sg. though adopted from an acc. pl. environment. The third tack is taken by Ge, who takes *nṛ̥n* as a complement of gen. sg. *tuvirādhasaḥ* (“des ... gegen die Männer Freigebigen”), and by WG, somewhat differently. The latter take *nṛ̥n* as a second obj. of *stavatha* (besides *vṛ̥ṣṇyāni*), with the two genitives preceding it hanging off it and modifying Indra: “... seine stierhaften (Kräfte) sollt ihr hier preisen, (und) die Männer des ...” (A fourth option, a variant of 3, would be possible: to take *tuvirādhaso nṛ̥n* as the 2nd acc. obj., with only *tuvidyumnásya* a gen.) Presumably the “men” WG have in mind are the Maruts, who do appear with Indra in the very next vs. (*marútvān* 3c) and as just noted are the referents of the undoubted acc. phrase in V.58.2. As for option 1, without endorsing this solution I would point out that a variant of this might be possible. The expected gen. sg. to the root noun **nṛ̥-*, based on comparison with Aves. *nəraš*, should be monosyllabic **núr* (like *pítúr*) (see AiG III.212), **nuḥ* in pausa. Clearly this brief and opaque form didn’t stand much of a chance of preservation as such; but I wonder if, esp. in formulaic phrases like *tuvirādhaso *núḥ*, it wasn’t substituted for by the acc. pl. *nṛ̥n*, the only other (surviving) monosyllabic form in the paradigm, whose affiliation to *nṛ̥-* was much clearer.

In d the verb *abhy ásti* ‘overwhelms’ picks up the nominal *abhíbhūti-* ‘overwhelming(ness)’ in 1d, with the substitution of \sqrt{as} for $\sqrt{bhū}$.

IV.21.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. also recalls the opening vs. of the preceding hymn. There the verb *ā ... yāsat* ‘he will drive here’ is construed with two ablatives of place-from-which (near and far), plus *ávase* ‘for help’ + *naḥ*. Here *ā yātu*, also with *ávase naḥ*, is construed with no fewer than six ablatives of the same type, elaborating on the near/far contrast to provide a universe of choices.

On *pūrīṣa-* see comm. ad I.163.1.

Ge (/WG) take *svàṇṇara-* as a PN, but this interpr. does not fit the pattern of the vs., and moreover *svàṇṇara-* as PN seems to be confined to Maṇḍala VIII. See Mayrhofer (PN, s.v.), who also sees the name only in VIII.

IV.21.4: Ge takes *gómatīṣu* as referring to a particular river basin and WG to “cow-rich (rivers)” -- the latter apparently flg. Gr’s “rinderreicher Ort.” But the mention of Indra’s companion Vāyu here points to a ritual, not battlefield, victory, specifically the morning pressing when Indra and Vāyu receive the first oblations. There are two nouns that are regularly modified by *gómatī-* in the fem. pl.: ‘dawns’ (*uṣāsaḥ*) and ‘refreshments’ (*īśaḥ*). Either of them would work in this context. The publ. tr. supplies the latter, functioning as a loc. absol.: “when (refreshments) consisting of cows [that is, milk and butter] are at stake.” *īś-* does not have an attested loc. pl., and if it did, it would not be pretty or easily recognized: **īkṣū?* *īṭṣū?* It would therefore not be surprising if such a form were gapped, with the final of the adj. (*-īṣu*) gesturing towards it phonologically. However, it is also possible that “at the cow-rich dawns” is meant, given that the ritual in question happens at that time. *uṣās-* also lacks an attested loc. pl., though we should probably expect **uṣātsu* (see my 1991 “Ox, Cart,” 90–91). Again, gapping this awkward form would not be surprising.

IV.21.5: I take *ṛñjasānā-* to be built to the anomalous 1st sg. middle *ṛñjase* (for which see comm. ad IV.8.1), *pace* Jasanoff 2016 (etc.), based in part on the shared constr. *ṛñjas-* GOD (acc.) HYMN (instr.) exemplified, e.g., by IV.8.1 *yájiṣṭham ṛñjase girā* “I aim towards the best sacrificer with a song” (cf. VI.15.1) and our *ṛñjasānāḥ ... uktháih ... índram* “aiming straight at Indra with hymns.” (In fact I would now favor slightly changing the text of the publ. tr. to “aiming straight with his hymns” rather than translating *uktháih* with the following pāda as in the publ. tr.) The creation and maintenance of the stem *ṛñjasānā-* is supported by the other *-asānā-* secondary participles, on which see comm. ad IV.3.6.

IV.21.6–8: As discussed in the publ. intro., the next few vss. are very challenging; they have received multiple interpretations, which can’t be discussed in detail here. The vss. form a unity based on their shared vocab. (e.g., *góhe* 6b, 7c, 8c; *auśijásya* 6b, 7c), their shared syntactic formulae (*yád* *ī 6a, *yád īm* 7a, 7c, and *yád ī* 8d), and their shared metrical irregularity.

IV.21.6: As indicated in the intro., I think vs. 6 simultaneously depicts the gods’ approach to the ritual ground and the Aṅgirasas’ journey to the Vala cave. The rock

(*ádri-*) to which they hasten is the pressing stone in the case of the gods and the Vala cave in the case of the Aṅgirasas.

In pāda a I interpret *yádi* as *yád *ī*, parallel to *yád īm* in 7a and 7c and *yád(#)ī* in 8d. For this phenomenon, see my 2002 "RVic *sīm* and *īm*." With Ge I take *ádrim* as the goal of *saranyān* rather than construing it with *sádantaḥ*, allowing the latter participle to be construed with the loc. *góhe* (a stem found only here, in the three vss. 6–8).

For *dhiṣā* see comm. ad I.173.8 as well as I.3.2. The denom. *dhiṣanyá-* is found only here; I take it as 'seeking a holy place', derived from *dhiṣānā* 'holy place', on which see comm. ad I.3.2.

Note the phonetic echoes in *dhiṣā ya(di) dhiṣanyán(taḥ) (sar)anyān*.

As indicated in the publ. intro. I take *ausíjā-*, the vṛddhi deriv. of *usíj-* 'priest, fire priest', as referring to the collectivity of these priests (see also V.41.5). It seems to be parallel to / contrastive with the vṛddhi deriv. in the next pāda, *pāstyá-*, found only here, 'belonging to the dwelling place'. In my interpr. the *durósāḥ hótā* is Agni, and *pāstyá-* refers to the collectivity that he belongs to or represents, that of the household.

On the problematic *durósāḥ* (here apparently an *-s*-stem, as opposed to the thematic stem found in the two other occurrences), see comm. ad VIII.1.13.

IV.21.7: Another very opaque vs. The only thing we have to hold onto is structure: the *X-ā yád īm* of pādas a and c recalls *X-ā yád *ī* of 6a, and notice *X yád dhi(yé)* in pāda d. The whole vs. is a subordinate clause (or series of them), continued by 8ab, with the main clause in 8c -- and a final *yád(#)ī* clause rounding out the sequence in 8d.

As indicated in the publ. tr., I think vs. 7 depicts the bursting into flames of the ritual fire, whose difficult kindling was (possibly) treated in 6cd. This bursting into flames is expressed by *súṣmaḥ* 'explosive force' in 7b. The gen. *bhārvarásya víṣṇaḥ* 'devouring bull' refers to Agni, in this interpr.; the only two forms to the (pseudo-)root *√bharv* 'devour' have Agni as their subj. (I.143.5, VI.6.2). In the publ. tr. I also tentatively took Agni as the referent of *īm*, but I now think that the *īm* in pāda a refers to the praiser in b, while the *īm* in c refers to the Aṅgirasas. (Remember that number is neutralized in *īm*.) The point is that the *súṣma-* of the kindled fire accompanies each of these in order to allow the desired outcomes expressed in pāda b and d to occur -- the singer to receive his reward and the Aṅgirasas to cause the cows to come out of the Vala cave. (I am tempted to tr. a version of "may the force be with you.") So I would modify the tr. to "When ... the force ... accompanies him [=singer], for the singer to take his reward; when it accompanies them [=Aṅgirasas] to the secret place [=Vala cave], ... for (the cows) to go forth ..." In d I take the three datives (*prá*) *dhiyé* (*prá*) *áyase mādāya* not as triply parallel, but make the first and last further complements to *áyase* 'to go forth'. The two *prá*'s would in some sense structure these two parallel goal expressions: "to go <forth to insight>, <forth to exhilaration>."

Needless to say, it is impossible to be certain about this interpr., but at least it hangs together.

IV.21.8: Note the play in the pāda-initial sequences: *ví yád* (a), *vidád* (c), *yádī* v(...) (d).

As noted in the publ. intro., this last vs. of this obscure three-vs. group is the clearest indication of a Vala-myth subtext in the triad and thus serves as a species of poetic repair. As just noted ad vs. 7, the syntactic construction continues from vs. 7 and

therefore indicates that the verses should be interpreted within the same conceptual framework. The vs. contains clear Vala vocabulary (esp. *vidāt*) but leaves both subject and objects unexpressed, therefore allowing the double reading that I also suggested for vss. 6 and 7, namely that of the Vala myth and of the current ritual.

Although the reference is clearer in this vs., the grammar is another matter. The major problem lies in the two parallel verbs *vṛṇvé* and *jīnvé*. Both appear to be 1st sg. middle presents to the stems 5th cl. *vṛṇóti*, *vṛṇutē** and 1st cl. *jīnvati*, *-te* respectively (so Gr, e.g.). However, Whitney and Macdonell group *jīnvé* instead with the marginally attested 5th cl. pres. (RV 1x *jīnósi* ‘bring to life’ V.84.1), which would account better for the accent -- and a 5th cl. pres. must of course ultimately underlie thematized *jīnvati* (see Gotō, 1st Kl., 76). But 1st singulars do not fit the context at all, nor really do presents. Old tr. them both as 3rd sg. preterites (“er ... enthüllte ... belebte ...”) with, frustratingly, no comment. In this interpr. he seems to be following (or at least be in agreement with) Sāy., and the publ. tr. reflects the same analysis, though with a historical present interpr. because of the apparent primary ending *-é*. Ge and WG take them as reflexive (Ge) / passive (WG), with neut. pl. subjects *vārāṃsi* ... *jāvāṃsi* (e.g., Ge “Wenn sich die Breiten des Berges auftun,” etc.). Like Old, Ge keeps silent about the grammar, but WG identify the two verbs as 3rd sg. statives construed with the neut. pl. as subject. I am torn. On the one hand, it is difficult to wring a standard 3rd sg. of the type I want from the forms in the text. On the other, I am very dubious about the existence of the “stative” -- and even if this had been a separate grammatical category in the prehistory of Vedic, I doubt that it would have surfaced in just these two nonce forms in a single passage. Moreover, there is nothing semantically or functionally “stative” about either of these verbs, “open up” / “quicken,” either in isolation or in this passage; note that even in the passive the WG tr. are overtly eventive: “... aufgeschlossen *werden* ... belebt *werden*” (my italics). I also think that the mythic model found in the passage is against a reflexive or passive interpr. In the other standard depictions of the Vala myth, the opening of the mountain and the flowing out of cows/waters/dawns, are not events that happens spontaneously; the god Indra (/Bṛhaspati) or the Aṅgirasas cause these actions. The 3rd sg. *vidāt* ‘he found’ of 8c, a signature verb in the Vala myth, shows the typical pattern of expression in this myth. I therefore, uncomfortably, stand by the 3rd sg. transitive interpr. of these verbs, without being able to account for their form. They do belong to a little morphological pattern in 5th class presents, where 3rd sg. *-é* is not uncommon: cf. *śṛṇvé*, *sunvé*, *hinvé*. But unfortunately all three of the just cited forms are passive, and, in my reading, *vṛṇvé* and *jīnvé* are not.

The neut. pl. *vārāṃsi* in pāda a I take as a pun. The stem *vāras-* definitely means ‘wide space’ and is of course related to *urú*. However, as the object of *√vr* ‘enclose’ (+ *ví* = ‘unenclose, open’) and coming so soon after *saṃvāraṇeṣu* (6d) ‘in the enclosures’, it is not difficult to imagine that it could temporarily acquire a secondary association with *√vr* -- hence my double tr. “opens out the ... enclosures into wide spaces.”

I supply ‘cows’ as the first obj. of *vidāt* on the basis of the use of this verb with obj. *gāḥ* in the Vala myth elsewhere (e.g., I.62.3=X.68.1, II.19.3; note also the bovine vocab. *gaurāsya gavayāya* in the rest of the pāda), but in keeping with my double reading of this whole passage also supply ‘goods’ as the desired discovery in the ritual context.

The *sudhyāḥ* ‘those of good insight’ are probably, with WG, the Āṅgirasas in the Vala myth, but I would add that this word would also identify the poets/priests at the ritual, in the double reading of this triad of verses that I favor.

IV.21.9: It is with considerable relief that we return to Indra.

In c I tr. *kā te niṣattiḥ* -- lit. “What is this sitting down of yours?” -- more idiomatically, to convey the exasperation of the singer.

The sequence *kīm u nō ... kīm nód-ud u* ... is playful and, probably for that reason, somewhat difficult to parse. The *nō* in the first part of the phrase appears in the Pp. as *no iti*. Although normally a final *-o* of this type, generally found on the end of function words, represents *-ā/a* plus the particle *u* (see Klein, Part. *u*, 168–78), Klein specifically lists this passage (168 n. 3) as a case where the presence of *u* is unlikely because “the syntactic environments within which *u* is found do not appear.” It is easy to see why he came to that judgment, esp. because there’s an *u* almost immediately preceding it and the 2nd *u* would come very late in the syntactic complex. However, it is difficult to see what else to make of it, and the almost mirror image in the next pāda, where there’s a coalescence of *nā* + *úd* into *nód* and an even later *u* following the complex of *kīm* NEG PREV, suggests that the poet is having a bit of fun with *u*. Given the colloquial tone of this hemistich, we may also be seeing a looser deployment of particles and “little” words characteristic of ordinary speech. (And who can resist the lilt of *nód-ud u*?) The multiplication of *u*’s is completed by a form of the notorious *-tavā u* infinitive at the end of d.

IV.21.10: This last vs. before the refrain shows some ring-composition with the beginning of the hymn: *samrāt* (a) and *krátvā* (c) respond to *krātuḥ ... samrāt* in 2c.

In pāda a *satyāḥ* ‘real, really here’ may signal Indra’s epiphany at the sacrifice.

IV.22 Indra

Hoffmann treats and translates the first four vss. of this hymn (Injunk. 186–88) as an ex. of “die erwähnende Beschreibung eines präteritalen Tatbestandes” associated with the general description of a god. He notes the unclear boundaries between past and present in such contexts.

IV.22.1: This vs. propounds a novel version of divine-human interaction: it suggests that what a god wants from us -- the verbal and material offerings we make to him at the sacrifice -- he actually arranges to have available there. There seems no other way to read the *ā√kr* ‘make (to be) here, bring here’ in b (... *karat ... ā*). This model almost reduces the human role to being middlemen in a loop connecting the god with himself, in contrast to the usual reciprocal model in which each side (divine / human) makes its own contribution.

In d *éti* appears to be used as an auxiliary with the participle *bībhrat* (so also Hoffmann, with ref. to Delbrück, AiS 390), though Ge seems to take it as a full lexical verb (“... tragend auszieht”). Engl. “goes on X-ing” captures both the literal sense and the auxiliary function of the verb here.

IV.22.2: The hapax *vṛṣandhi-* has been variously explained. Old rejects the reading as “sinnlos” and suggests an emendation to **trīṣandhi-*, remarking that the vajra is so described in AV XI.10.3, 27. The influence of preceding *vṛṣā* would account for the change. Hoffmann (MSS 8 [1956]: 15 = Aufs. II.395–96) instead suggests it is a haplology of *vṛṣa-saṁdhi-* ‘mit starker Verbindung’, which in his view describes the binding of the head of the vajra, which he thinks was a hammer-like weapon, to the shaft. One of the unexamined assumptions of both Old’s and Hoffmann’s interpretations is that the weapon referred to here is the vajra and that this is identical to the stone (*ásman-*) in 1d. As I argue ad I.152.2 (see comm. thereon), there is no reason to assume here that the stone = vajra or that the unnamed weapon in 2a is identical to both. A form of *vájra-* is found in 3c, but it need not be the same as the weapon(s) referred to in 1d and 2a -- and in fact there is some reason to believe it is not, as the weapon here is being ‘hurled’ (*ásyan*), and to my knowledge the vajra is never thrown while stones regularly are (e.g., I.172.2). In my opinion the weapon in 2a is the stone of 1d and the qualifier *vṛṣandhi-* is a formation like *iṣu-dhí-* ‘repository of arrows, quiver’, *uda-dhí-* ‘repository of water, spring, basin’, *utsa-dhí-* ‘fountainhead’ — hence ‘repository of bullish(ness)’. The difference in accent can be attributed to the influence of immediately preceding *vṛṣā*. The combining form *vṛṣan-*, rather than more common *vṛṣa-*, is also found in *vṛṣaṇvant-* and *vṛṣaṇ-vasu-*.

The anomalous med. them. participle *uṣámāna-* ‘clothing oneself’, as if to an otherwise unattested 6th cl. pres. to *√vas* ‘wear’, belongs with the other unexpected med. participles (both them. and athem.) to *√vas* ‘be eager’ and *√vas* ‘wear’ found in this Indra cycle. See disc. ad IV.16.14 and IV.19.4 and cf. *uṣāná-* in the next hymn (IV.23.1).

The second hemistich is best interpreted in the context of V.52.9, a Marut hymn, where the Maruts *páruṣṇyām, ūṛṇā vasata* “clothe themselves in the wool [=foam] in the Paruṣṇī (River).” Note that in that passage *páruṣṇyām* and *ūṛṇā* are in different cases and numbers (fem. loc. sg. and fem. acc. pl. respectively) unlike here, where both are fem. acc. sg. Their grammatical difference in V.52.9, which imposes a semantic separation, makes it less likely here that *páruṣṇīm* is simply an adj. modifying *ūṛṇām*, as Hoffmann (/WG) take it: “in shaggy wool” (KH: “in zottige (?) Wolle”; WG “in struppige Wolle”). Since *páruṣṇī-* is simply the fem. to *paruṣá-*, which is otherwise a color term (‘gray’), the introduction of ‘shaggy’ would also be puzzling. I therefore essentially follow Ge’s interpr. He takes *páruṣṇīm ... ūṛṇām* as an unmarked simile: “in the Paruṣṇī (River) (like) wool”; I take it rather as a metaphor: “in the Paruṣṇī ‘wool’ [=foam].” The color gray enters this image in two ways. On the one hand, it’s quite possible that the Paruṣṇī River was so called because it appeared gray; on the other, river foam in general is gray-ish (and tufty, like wool), as google images of river foam show (unfortunately mostly of polluted rivers).

The unexpressed connection with the Maruts via the passage just cited is also expressed in pāda d through *sakhyāya* ‘for partnership’, where the partners must be the Maruts.

The word *párvan-* usually refers to a joint or segment; with Ge, I take it in this image to refer to tufts or articulated hunks of foam, like tufts of wool. With Ge I also think there’s a secondary word association between *páruṣṇī-* and *párvan-* (/ *páru(ṣ)-*).

IV.22.3: In the publ. tr. I take the whole vs. as a single sentence, with ab a relative clause to the main cl. in cd. Ge (Hoffmann/WG) take b as the main clause to the rel. cl. in a and take cd separately. This is entirely possible; there is no grammatical marking to determine the structure, since b lacks a finite verb. Since b is a repeated pāda (VI.32.4b), it might indeed be better to take it as an independent unit and follow the Ge interpr.

The distraction of #*dyām ... bhūma*# in d is paralleled by 4b #*dyaúr ... kṣāḥ*#.

IV.22.4: As just noted, polarized #*dyaúr ... kṣāḥ*# in b match the same (conceptual) pair in the same positions in 3d. Here in 4b the disjunction is emphasized by the fact that the two nominatives are subjects of a singular verb (*rejata*). The connection of the 3d and 4b is signaled by the fact that the same root provides the verb in both 3d and 4b: trans.-cause. *rejayat* and intrans. *rejata* respectively (both injunctives), and heaven and earth switch grammatical identity and function from object to subject.

Pāda a sits somewhat uncomfortably between these two complementary pādas. The river banks and beds seem rather paltry natural features next to heaven and earth, which flank them. But they may serve a grammatical purpose: both NPs (*vísṃā ródhāmsi* [neut. pl.] and *pravātaḥ ... pūrvīḥ* [fem. pl.]) are neutral as to case (nom. vs. acc.) and can thus serve as a pivot, available as both acc. objects for *rejayat* in 3d and nom. subjects for *rejata* in 4b. (Of course, although the neuter pl. could be the subject of a sg. verb, technically speaking a feminine pl. should not, but this does not seem a problem to me, as the neut. pl. leads the conjoined NP and would set the syntactic tone -- and they are pretty distant from the verb anyway.)

Pāda c produces problems on several fronts. Who are the mother and father (*mātārā*)? (Old flatly announces he has no intention of trying to find out.) Why is the verb (*bhāratī*) accented? Why are there two instances of *ā*? What is the cow (*gōḥ*) doing grammatically and/or conceptually? The only word that is not problematic (though see below) is *śuṣmī*, which must refer to Indra, as in 1b. I do not have entirely satisfactory answers to the puzzles. Probably the default referent for *mātārā* would be Heaven and Earth, and they have figured prominently just previously. But there is the problem that Heaven and Earth are not particularly mobile, so how is it that Indra “brings them here”?

As for the accent on *bhāratī*, Ge suggests that pāda c is dependent on either ab or c, without overt subordination. Old (ZDMG 60 [1906]: 725–26 = KISch 200–201) places it in the class of “priorischer Nebensatz” (to the main cl. in pāda d), but c doesn’t seem to provide sufficient grounding for d to justify the verbal accent. Hoffmann (Injunk. 187 n. 147) cites Old’s own citation of himself (given above), but also what is the more likely explanation, given by Old in the same art. (708–12, esp. 711 = KISch. 186): that it is implicitly antithetical, participating in two interlocked constructions, what Old (711 = 186) designates pavpα (that is, PREV [x-word] VERB PREV [corresponding x-word]) -- with, in our passage, *ā* as the PREV, *mātārā ... gōḥ* as x and *ā*, and *bhāratī* as accented VERB. In his exx. nothing intervenes between VERB and the repeated PREV, unlike *śuṣmī* here, but I consider this a minor variant in the model. Perhaps more problematic is that *mātārā* and *gōḥ* do not correspond grammatically, but again I would prefer to work with a more flexible model (and see below). In this model the accent on the verb and the doubled *ā* fit under the same explanatory rubric, a desirable situation, all things being equal. (Such an explanation is blocked for Ge, who thinks the two *ā*’s have different functions, the first preverb, the second preposition.)

But what about the cow? One might note that there's a similarly pāda-final *góḥ* in 8d as well as another quite baffling one in the next hymn, IV.23.6. I also wonder if this pile-up of pāda-final *góḥ* is not a sly reference to the impenetrable pāda-final *góhe* in the previous hymn (IV.21.6b, 7c, 8c), which caused so many interpretational difficulties there (though they are not etymologically related, at least by our current understanding of *góhe*). But this doesn't help us at all with the meaning or the function of *góḥ* here. The first thing to consider is what case it is -- gen. or abl. Ge opts for the latter: Indra brings the two mothers *from* the cow ("von dem Rinde"), though in n. 4c he also entertains the possibility of an ellipsis of a nominative with a dependent genitive *góḥ*, "(son) of the cow," namely the bull Indra. As far as I can tell, WG also take it as an abl., but construed with *ā* in the sense of "all the way to" (a marginal, but certainly attested, construction in the RV). There is nothing impossible about either of these interpr., but I do not see what they would mean in context, and neither Ge nor WG give much help in that regard. For me the most appealing attempt to wring sense from this is Hoffmann's (Injunk. 187). As in Ge's alternative, Hoffmann takes *góḥ* as a gen. in an elliptical expression, but with the gapped item a second object to *bhárati*: "Herbei bringt der Kraftschraubende (seine) Eltern, herbei (das) der Kuh." This makes good sense of the structure of the pāda (fitting better with Old's pavpα scheme, since α would now be grammatically parallel to a). So what is the "das" in Hoffmann's tr.? He suggests 'milk' or similar, though not with a great deal of conviction. The publ. tr. supplies 'milk' as a possible metaphor for 'rain', and given the roaring winds of pāda d, I think rain is quite likely the gapped object, since 'cow' can be used of rain-bearing clouds. It also now occurs to me that it might instead be the Maruts ("[those] of the cow"), since they are the sons of the cow Pr̥śni, as noted, e.g., in V.52.16, the same hymn that has the Paruṣṇī River foam passage cited above (vs. 2). The Maruts would also fit with the violent roaring of the wind in d.

IV.22.5–6: These vss. summarizing Indra's great deeds begin identically: *tā tū te* [*ta* in sandhi before vowel in 6]. The vss. appear at the exact center of the hymn and thus may count as an omphalos. Although both pādas have Indra's deeds as subject, neither has a word for 'deed'.

IV.22.6: The b pāda contains one of the RV's beloved gender-bending paradoxes, with the cows coming out "from the udder of a bull" (*vṛṣṇa ūdhnaḥ*). Ge (/WG) interprets this as rainwater coming from the sky (Parjanya or Heaven). I think it more likely that it concerns the Vala myth. Indra's other signature deed, the slaying of Vṛtra, was treated in the immediately preceding, paired verse (5d), and so we might expect mention of his other most prominent feat. In that case the "bull" would be the Vala cave. On the other hand, this might continue the treatment of the Vṛtra myth in 5d (as Ge also suggests, n. 6b), in which case the "bull" would be Vṛtra himself or the mountain in which the waters were confined. The more thorough treatment of the waters in the Vṛtra myth in the following vs. 7 might support this latter view.

IV.22.6–7: Another responsion: 6c *ádḥā ha* / 7a *átrāha*. Later in the pāda 7a *tā u* recalls the openings of 5a and 6a *tā tū*.

IV.22.7: Most tr. take *stavanta* as passive, and this seems the correct interpr. The sisters are likely the rivers or waters released after the killing of Vṛtra. The question is why they would be praised as well as Indra. Ge's suggestion (n. 7ab) is that it is essentially a spill-over effect (not that he uses that term), that Indra's praiseworthy deed that brought the waters release also brought them praise by association.

I don't understand the double *ānu* (pādas c and d), though my surmise is that the first one simply anticipates the second, which is in a semi-fixed expression *dīrghām ānu prāsitim* (cf. X.40.10). Gr takes it as part of a preverb complex with \sqrt{muc} : *ānu prá \sqrt{muc}* 'nacheinander loslassen', and its position might support that assumption. But surely one of points in the Vṛtra myth is that the rivers burst out dramatically all at once. Ge, by contrast, compares the identical sequence *yāt sīm ānu* in I.37.9, I.141.9, but those two passages seem unconnected with ours, with the *ānu* construed with preceding *sīm* 'following them.' (One can also compare IV.38.3 *yām sīm ānu*, but this has yet a different sense.)

IV.22.8: *asmadryāk* opening 8c ushers in the suite of pāda-initial emphatic forms of the 1st pl. pronoun that lasts and intensifies through the real end of the hymn, vs. 10 (vs. 11 being the Vāmadeva Indra refrain): 8c: *asmadryāk*, 9a *asmé*, 9c *asmábhyam*, 10a *asmākam*, 10b *asmábhyam*, 10c *asmábhyam*, 10d *asmākam*.

Kü (310) interpr. *pipīlē* as presential, but there is in fact no way to tell: this is not only the only perfect form to this root attested anywhere but the only verb form to it in the RV (*pīdayati* is added in the AV). I think it works better as an immediate past, although there is in practice little difference between my "has been squeezed" and Kü's "ausgepresst ist."

Ge, flg. Sāy., takes *mādyah* with *āmśúh* and explains the position of *ná* as "wie oft in Pādaausgang vor dem Vergleich." But there seems no reason to ignore the usual structure of the simile, since *mādyah* easily modifies *sindhuh*.

The syntax of bc is somewhat unusual, in that the subject / verb construction is split over the hemistich boundary (b ... *śaktīḥ* c ... *yamyāḥ*), while the object *tvā* is in Wackernagel's position in pāda b. Moreover, at least in the publ. tr. the genitive that limits the subj. *śaktīḥ* is only found in the next pāda: *śusucānāsyā*. Ge (/WG) take the gen. *śāsamānāsyā* in b as dependent on *śaktīḥ*, with *śāmī* an instr. adjunct to that participle: "the skill of the one laboring with labor" -- in contrast to the publ. tr., where *śāsamānāsyā* is dependent on *śāmī*. I now think that the Ge interpr. may be preferable and would emend the publ. tr. to "Might the skill of the one laboring with labor (and) of the bright-blazing one pull ..." The question is whether the two genitives are coreferential, with bright-blazing Agni identified as the one laboring with labor, or whether a (human) priest and Agni are both referred to. I do not think this can be determined, esp. since subjects of \sqrt{sam} elsewhere include both Agni and mortals.

The simile in d and the frame in bc have slightly different senses. In the simile the swift horse is pulling on the reins: it is so eager to reach its goal that it strains against the reins rather than being guided by them. In the frame the *śaktīḥ* of the priest/god is strong enough to pull Indra to us. The difference in the relation of the accusative to the verb results from exploiting different senses of the root \sqrt{yam} .

Despite Old's expressed disbelief, I think Gr and Ludwig are correct in taking *gōh* 'of the cow' to refer to reins made of leather. On pāda-final *gōh* see also disc. ad vs. 4c.

IV.22.9: Ge tr. *ṛmṇāni* as ‘Mannestaten’, which works well as an object of \sqrt{kr} (though parallel *sāhāmsi* ‘powers’ does not). But *ṛmṇā-* ordinarily refers not to deeds but to the abstract powers associated with manliness that allow such deeds to be performed. Hence my ‘activate’ for *kṛṇuhi*.

IV.23 Indra

Thieme tr. and comments on this hymn in *Gedichte* (pp. 30–33).

IV.23.1: Pāda a contains the only finite form of the thematic aor. to \sqrt{vrdh} in the RV, here *avṛdhat* – though the participle, both act. and mid., is reasonably well attested.

Ge (/WG) take pāda b as a complete clause, supplying a main verb (‘kommt’ Ge, ‘geht’ WG). They then take the 2nd hemistich as a syntactically independent declarative sentence. Given the density of questions in the first 6 vss. of this hymn, I think a declarative sentence would be intrusive and therefore take bcd as part of the question begun with *kāsya* in pāda a, with *vavakṣé* in d as the main verb for the whole.

On soma as an udder, see III.48.3 cited by both Old and Ge.

Note the close proximity of *juṣāṇāḥ* (b) and *juṣāmāṇaḥ* (c). The latter is the only occurrence of this participle stem, while *juṣāṇā-* is of course quite common. I don’t see any semantic nuance that would justify using two different stems here. I wonder if *juṣāmāṇa-* is a nonce to create a Behagel effect with the three near-rhyming and semantically similar stems: *juṣāṇó ... uśāṇó juṣāmāṇo*. It should also be evaluated in the context of the other anomalous and phonologically similar middle participles in this Indra cycle, including *uśāṇā-* (IV.16.14), *uśāmāṇa-* (IV.19.4), *uśāmāṇa-* (IV.22.2), and our own middle term *uśāṇāḥ*. (For disc. see esp. comm. ad IV.16.14.) Though *uśāṇā-* is attested twice elsewhere, it is still problematic: though there is a root pres. to \sqrt{vas} ‘be eager’ with a zero-grade *uś*, the stem is otherwise only act. and the act. part. *uśánt-* is extremely well attested (see., e.g., the next hymns, IV.24.6b, 25.1b).

Ge is adamant that the two verse-final datives *śucaté dhánāya* are not to be construed together. By contrast I think they belong together in principle. Of 6 occurrences of *dhánāya* (always pāda-final), 2 are preceded by *mahaté* (I.104.7, IX.97.4), which modifies it. I am just somewhat uncertain what it refers. Although $\sqrt{śuc}$ is generally an Agni root, and cf. *śuśucāṇā-* in the immediately preceding hymn, probably of Agni (IV.22.8), I think that referent is unlikely here. *dhána-* refers to the stakes in play or a prize or spoils, in this case presumably something Indra wants enough to exert himself for it. The verse has made abundantly clear what Indra wants most -- soma (*sómam* b, *āndhaḥ* c) -- and I think it likely that soma is the referent here as well. A deriv. of $\sqrt{śuc}$, the adj. *śúci-*, is regularly used of a type of soma (clear, as opposed to mixed), and the participle here may be expressing the same thing. I would therefore slightly emend the tr. to “for the gleaming stakes [=soma].”

IV.23.2: In b Ge (/WG) and Thieme (*Gedichte* 31) take the instr. *sumatībhiḥ* as the object of *sám ānaṃśa* (e.g., Ge “Wer wurde seiner Gnaden teilhaft?”), but this seems an unlikely use of the instr., even with the presence of the preverb *sám* -- esp. because the verb in b is essentially identical to the verb in a, *āpa*, which takes the acc. Although Gr allows both acc. and instr. with *sám* \sqrt{nas} in the sense ‘erlangen’, a careful perusal of the entry shows

that this is the only instance with a supposed instr.; the others have the acc. I therefore supply the same obj. found in pāda a (*sadhamādam*) and take *sumatībhiḥ* in normal instr. usage.

The second hemistich contains two occurrences of *kād*, the second is taken by all as simply a question marker, but Ge interprets the first one as a full neut. with *citrām*, “welches Wunder?” This is possible, but it seems rhetorically better to take it as parallel in function to the other *kād* (so Th and WG as well as me). I supply ‘course’ on the basis of II.34.10 *citrām tād vo maruto yāma cekite* “This bright course of yours, Maruts, appears ever more brightly,” also adduced by Ge. The notion of a journey is reinforced by the 2nd part of the hemistich. However, a tr. like WG “Ist sein Glanzzeichen bemerkt?” is certainly possible.

IV.23.3: Gr, Ge, et al. take *hūyāmānam* to refer to the call or summons to Indra (e.g., Ge “Wie hört Indra den Ruf?”). Kulikov (-*ya*-presents, 307–8) rejects this interpr., noting that this is the only instance of such a construction: normally the subject of the passive is the deity being invoked. Although he reluctantly admits that it might correspond to the rare transitive type in which what is spoken is the object of the verb (I.17.9), he prefers to derive this form from \sqrt{hu} ‘pour’ and translates “How does Indra hear the (libation) being offered?” -- that is, the sound of the pouring. A different reconsideration is found in WG, who interpr. *hūyāmāna-* in the standard way, as having the deity invoked as its subject -- but they think Indra is listening to the summons to a *different* deity than Indra. Although I recognize that the standard interpr. may have glided too swiftly over the problems with *hūyāmāna-*, the two revisionist versions both seem overelaborate and implausible to me. Since it is undeniable that forms of $\sqrt{hū}$ do sometimes take what is spoken as obj. (see the above-cited I.17.9, as well as juxtaposed occurrences of *hāvya-* in VI.21.1 with comm. there), I think we must allow this rare usage in the passive as well, a point made very economically by Old. My tr. follows that of Thieme (p. 31) “Wie hört Indra den [Ruf], der gerufen wird?”

In b *āvasām* is taken by all modern comm. and tr. as the gen. pl. of *āvas-* ‘help’ that it appears to be. Although this gen. pl. is not otherwise attested (the only pl. cases are nom./acc. and instr.), *āvasām* is what the gen. pl. of this stem would be. Moreover, it can easily be the complement of *veda*, which takes both acc. and gen. Nonetheless I favor Gr’s interpr., that it is the acc. sg. of a root noun cmpd from *āva* $\sqrt{sā}$ ‘unhitch’. There is a major obvious stumbling block: the accent. Root noun cmpds are invariably accented on the final, so we expect **avasām*. However, the other putative ex. of this cmpd at III.53.20 has been mangled in transmission (see disc. by Scar s.v. and comm. ad loc.), and I think it likely that the dominance of the ‘help’ stem, which is remarkably well attested, led to a redactional change in accent. One of the reasons I favor this solution has to do with the *asya*. In the ‘help’ interpr., the *asya* would refer to the mortal who will receive this help (see Ge n. 3b), but this hymn contains a lot of *asya*’s, and they all otherwise refer to Indra: 2a, 2b, 2c, 3c, 5c, 6c, plus *enam* 3d and *asmin* 5d. I very much doubt the poet would break this sequence with a pronoun referring to someone else. The only exception is *asyā(h)* 5a, which is both accented and feminine, and is playing a trick by its patterning with the *asya* in 5c.

For *ūpamāti-* from *ūpa* $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘mete out’, see comm. ad VIII.40.9.

IV.23.4: I take *dīdhyānaḥ* as parallel to *śaśamānāḥ*, referring to the verbal/mental work at the sacrifice as opposed to the physical -- hence my tr. ‘produced insights’. Other tr. seem to me to attenuate the semantics.

IV.23.5–6: The root $\sqrt{juṣ}$ encountered in two different forms in 1bc recurs here in the perfect, subjunctive (4d) and indicative (5b).

IV.23.5: As noted above, fem. *asyā(h)* patterns with the ubiquitous *asya* in this vs.: 5a *kathā kād asyā* / 5c *kathā kād asya*.

IV.23.6: *āḍ* is very rarely not in 1st position. Here the interrog. *kīm* may have displaced it. See *kīm āḍ* at IV.30.7, as Ge also notes, as well as ... *kuvīd āḍ* I.33.1.

Ge (/WG) take the referent of *te* to be Indra (Ge: “Wann dürfen wir wohl von deiner Bruderschaft öffentlich sprechen?”). I very much doubt that. As I noted in the publ. intro., Indra is always referred to in the 3rd ps. in this hymn, except in the final extra-hymnic Vāmadeva refrain (vs. 11), and the thwarting of the poet’s longing for intimacy by the distancing that the insistent 3rd ps. pattern imposes is in many ways the point of the hymn. I think it unlikely that the poet would introduce the intimate 2nd ps. reference through a single monosyllabic enclitic and then revert, in the next pāda, to the 3rd ps. *asya*. This leaves me with the problem of identifying an alternative referent for *te*. My assumption is that it is the poet speaking to himself, while the “we” represents the collectivity of the ritual officiants. Alternatively, it is possible that *te* does refer to Indra and that this pāda represents a wistful wishful thinking about an intimacy not otherwise achieved -- with its 1st ps. / 2nd ps. structure (the only place where a 1st ps. shows up in the hymn, save for the refrain -- though see comm. on pāda d) and the particularly intimate relationship ‘brotherhood’ (*bhrātrām*) that is aimed at

The second hemistich is problematic, primarily because of the form *iṣa* (Pp. *iṣe*) in d. (Ge characterizes it as “das zu den schwierigen Formen des RV. gehört”), a problem compounded by the fact that its first syllable should, ideally, be heavy in this Triṣṭubh cadence. Before tackling it, we should consider the structure of the two pādas. With Old and WG, but not Ge, I take c and d separately, with c a nominal clause equating *sārgāḥ* ‘surges’ with *vāpuḥ* ‘marvel’. In my view the surges consist of soma: *sārga-* is regularly used of soma in Maṇḍala IX. Again with Old and WG, but not Ge, I take *sudṛśaḥ* as nom. pl. with *sārgāḥ*, not gen. sg. -- with *śriyē* construed with this adj.; cf. V.44.2 *śriyē sudṛśīḥ*. As for d, Old interprets *iṣe* as a 1st sg. “setze ich ... in Bewegung,” with *svār nā citrātāmam*, standing for the surges in c, as its object. WG likewise take *iṣe* as a 1st sg. (aor. injunctive), but with the meaning ‘ich suche’, with the same obj. as Old. By contrast I take it as a 3rd sg. (so also Ge, it seems) and in fact would emend it (slightly) to **īṣe* (an asterisk should be inserted in the publ. tr.), belonging to the perfect to the root given as $\sqrt{eṣ}$ ‘suchen’ (etc.) by Kü (126–28). As was just noted, a heavy initial syllable would better fit the cadence; my one concern is that I do not understand why the short *i* was introduced. Though he does not include our form in his conspectus, Kü does list two other 3rd sg. med. occurrences of this shape (*īṣe* X.89.3 and, with unclear root syllable, *upeṣe* I.129.8). He considers the pf. as resultative, and it is possible that my ‘seeks’ should be changed to ‘has sought’. However, neither of his other examples (I.129.8, X.89.3) needs to be preterial, and so ‘seeks’ may as well stay. The same emendation and

semantic interpr. also work for *iṣe* in VI.22.5 and X.20.7; see disc. ad locc. What Indra is seeking here is, in my view, the milk to be mixed with the soma. It is characterized as “very bright like the sun,” and its source as ‘of/from the cow’ (*góḥ* or *ā góḥ*) (*ā* may go with either **iṣe* or *góḥ*). The slight disadvantage to my interpr. is that the two occurrences of *ā góḥ* here and in the preceding hymn (IV.22.3) are construed differently, but given the convoluted structure in IV.22.3, that is probably unavoidable.

IV.23.7-10: The contrast between the ‘lie’ (pāda-initial *drúh-* 7a) and *ṛtá-* (10 pāda-initial and 2 pāda-medial exx. in vss. 8–10) certainly underlines and cements the sense ‘truth’ for this word. Note also that *ṛṇā* ‘debts’, which opens the 2nd hemistich of vs 7, phonologically anticipates the *ṛtá*’s to come.

IV.23.7: The tr. of *tétikte*, ‘sharpens’, may not seem to express its intensive semantics, but plain ‘sharpen’ itself incorporates the iterative, repetitive motions of blade across stone that sharpening involves.

Ge notes the similarity of *ṛṇā cid* to the root noun cmpd *ṛṇa-cít-* ‘collector of debts’ found in the strikingly similar phrase II.23.17 *sá ṛṇacíd ṛṇayā(h)*. But there are no grounds to emend the phrase to a compound, though a deliberate echo seems possible. In fact changing the text here would have the disadvantage of eliminating the obvious object to *babādhé*.

IV.23.8: Ge (/WG) take the deaf ears to be those of Āyu -- with Āyu referring to the Ārya in general, WG suggest. Āyu always poses difficulties, but in this case I think gen. *āyóḥ* should be construed with *ślókaḥ*: the “signal call of Āyu,” referring to Agni and the sound of blazing fire. Elsewhere Agni is referred to as the “laud of Āyu” (*śáṃsa- āyóḥ*, IV.6.11, V.3.4), and this seems a similar expression referring to an audible product. The nom. participles *budhānāḥ śúcāmānāḥ* ‘awakening, blazing’ of course fit Agni very well. And it is not surprising, given his ritual role, that the sound of Agni should be considered to be identical to that of truth. As for the position of *āyóḥ*, at some distance from *ślókaḥ*, note that it rhymes with *ā góḥ* in 6d, likewise stationed at the end of the verse.

IV.23.9: The tr. of *dīrghám* as extent of space, rather than Ge’s extent of time (“lange Zeit”), follows Thieme (p. 32): the nourishments as oblations go from earth to heaven, as rain from heaven to earth.

On irregular full-grade 3rd pl. *viveśuḥ* see Kü (499-500).

IV.24 Indra

IV.24.3: Most depictions of battle in the RV do not frame the risks of entering into battle quite so starkly. Here both *rīrikvāṃsas tanvāḥ* “having given up their bodies” in b and *tyāgám ... āgman* “have come to the abandonment (of their bodies, presumably)” in c seem to refer to a sort of resignation in the face of death and a loss of the sense of self. (Note that this is the only occurrence of *tyāga-* in the RV.) It is esp. telling that they give up their own bodies to gain offspring and a long line of descendants. For the similarity between this passage and the Tānūnaptra ritual, see Proferes (58).

IV.24.4–5: The pile-up of pāda-initial *ā́d ī́d* ‘just then, just after that’, beginning with 4d and marking every pāda in 5, conveys the quick succession of events, but switches abruptly from battlefield to sacrifice. The *néme* constructions of 4d and 5a make it clear, however, that despite the change in venue the same antagonists are in play. Note also the similarity of the predicates of the two *néme* constructions: *indrayante ... indriyám yajante*. This is the only occurrence of the denom. *indrāya-* in the RV and it may have been created to serve as a foil for the second VP.

IV.24.4: The ‘winning of the flood’ (*árṇasātau*) presumably refers, as Ge etc., point out, to the battle to control water resources, esp. dwelling places near water.

Most tr. give a more neutral rendering of *āvavṛtranta*, but my “have rolled together” is meant to convey the deeply entwined, rough-and-tumble quality of pitched battle (and, perhaps, the actual rolling of chariots onto the battlefield).

IV.24.5: The bridge between 4d and 5a has already been noted, as well as the change of scene. However, I think the competition visible in vss. 3–4, as well as in vss. 6–7, continues here by other, sacrificial, means. To get Indra on their side in battle, the men must perform not only a correct sacrifice, but a better sacrifice. One puzzling feature of this vs. is the presence of pf. optatives in pādas b and c. As I have discussed elsewhere (2008 “Women’s Language in the RV” [Ged. Elizarenkova], 2009 “Where Are All the Optatives” [*East and West*]), the pf. opt. has a curious distribution and, to some extent, a particular sociolinguistic profile, and it is not clear what *riricyāt* (b) and *ví paprcyāt* (c) are doing sandwiched between a pres. (*yajante*, a) and a presential perfect (*jujoṣa*, d), esp. because the four pādas are otherwise unified by the opening *ā́d ī́d*. What sets bc off from a,d is the fact that the subjects in b and c are ritual offerings, *paktīḥ* ‘cooked food’ and *sómaḥ* respectively, as opposed to the personal subjects (at least in my interpr.) of a and d. What optative function do these verbs express (and do they express the same one): necessity (‘should’), potentiality -- more certain (‘would’) or less certain (‘might’) -- possibility (‘could’), or desire (also ‘would’)?

My surmise is that the vs. depicts the beginning and end points of the successful sacrifice that one of the groups of competitors mounts. Pāda a contains a general description of the sacrifice and implies its start. In d the unnamed subject, in my opinion Indra, shows that the sacrifice has been successful by enjoying the offered soma (the bull, *vṛṣabhám*). The pādas in between describe the qualities of the better sacrifice that our side performs, in contrast to our opponents, and I interpr. the optatives as expressing near-certain possibility. I therefore take *riricyāt* in b as meaning ‘would leave behind, succeed’ not in a temporal sense (the cooked food is the next course after the offering cake) but in an evaluative one: cooked food is just better than a *puroḷāś-*. (This seems a generally agreed upon interpr.; see esp. Ge’s n. 5b.) (Note however that the *puroḷāś-* was probably not eliminated but supplemented, since the successful sacrificer not only cooks cooked food for Indra in 7b but also roasts grains.)

Even more important is the mere presence of soma in c. The pāda implies that the other side consists of non-pressers (*ásuṣvīn*), who therefore cannot offer soma to Indra. Soma is our trump card and leaves our competitors out in the cold, as it were. (Notice that the non-pressers contrast with the *súṣvi-* in 2d. For *súṣvi-/ásuṣvi-* as well as *paktī*, see also the next hymn IV.25.6–7.)

My tr. of d differs in an important way from Ge (/WG). They take *yájadhyai* as an infinitive complement to *jujoṣa* with *vr̥ṣabhá-* as object, though with two different interpretations. Ge's "dann beliebt man einen Stier zu opfern" (so also Keydana, Inf., p. 289, with disc.) assumes that the *vr̥ṣabhá-* is a sacrificed animal. WG correctly point out that \sqrt{yaj} does not take an acc. of the offering but of the god who receives the offering and therefore take *vr̥ṣabhá-* as referring to Indra. The subj. in either case must be an unidentified priest or the like. In my view, by contrast, Indra is the unnamed subj., who receives pleasure from the 'bull' soma -- note that *vr̥ṣabhá-* is an epithet of soma, as well as of Indra and other gods. The *yájadhyai* is a purpose inf. without object, as it generally is (cf., nearby IV.21.5 *íyarti vācam janáyan yájadhyai* "(who) raises his speech, giving birth to it in order to carry out the sacrifice").

As Old notes, there are 3 forms of \sqrt{ric} in this hymn, all pf.: pf. part. *ririkvāṃsaḥ* (3b), pf. opt. *riricyāt* here, and a plupf. (probably) *arirecīt* (9c). They are all somewhat marked in form and have different contextual meanings. Old remarks "der Dichter liebte dies Verb." Certainly he seems to be making a point with it.

IV.24.6–7: The battle/sacrifice trajectory of vss. 4–5 is wrapped up in vss. 6–7, where it is made clear (esp. in 6d) that if you want Indra's help on the battlefield, you had better perform a good sacrifice, not stinting on the soma.

IV.24.6: The "wide space" theme returns from 2d. The laconic expression of the recipient of wide space in 2d (the dat. *súṣvaye* 'for the presser') is expanded into a dat. pronoun with rel. clause attached: *asmai ... yá itthéndrāya sómam uśaté sunóti*. Since the first part of this hymn ends with vs. 7, vss. 2 and 6 are symmetrical and this echo forms a small internal ring. But there are no other signs of ring composition.

The tradition (as well as modern ed. and tr.) is split on whether to read *ávivenam* (HvN, Müller ed., Sāy., Lub, and AiG I.1.333) or *ávivenan* (Auf. ed., Pp, Gr, Ol, and Ge); see Old's disc.

Quite apart from the actual form is its referent. Old, who accepts the *ávivenan* reading, takes c with d and identifies Indra as the referent of *ávivenan*. Although this fits better with the similar expression in the next hymn (IV.25.3) where gods are (or may be) the subject, here I think Ge is correct that c belongs grammatically with the rel. cl. in ab, and the referent of *ávivenan* is the soma-presser subject of that rel. cl. This nominative is resumed by the appropriate correlative prn. *tām* in the acc. in d.

IV.24.7: The *súṣma-* that Indra confers on the sacrificer is the 'explosive force' that will help him (both Indra and the mortal aided by him) prevail in battle.

IV.24.8–10: For my interpr. of these vss., see publ. intro.

IV.24.8: Both Ge and Old suggest that *íghāvā* should be read as neut. **íghāvad* on the basis of similar (but not identical) X.27.3 *yadāvákhyaṭ samáraṇam íghāvad*. This seems unnec., since nom. sg. *íghāvā* makes fine sense, and, as anyone who has tangled with it knows, X.27 is a very strange hymn. The only factor in favor of the emendation is the fact that *íghāvā* is the only representative of the -van-stem *íghāvan-*; otherwise we find the -vant-stem *íghāvant-* (3x). But -van- and -vant-stems coexist elsewhere -- cf.

maghāvan(t)- -- and eliminating the *-van*-stem here doesn't seem sufficient reason to make the emendation. (Note that WG do not follow Ge and Old, and Ge allows for the possibility of the nom. in his n. 8a.)

Ge suggests that the subjects of a and b might be Indra's wife. Scar (616 and n. 882) has her as the subj. of b but not a. After surveying the various possibilities in his n. he says, with remarkable understatement, "Das Dramolett lässt Raum für verschiedene Interpretationen." I think it likely that Indra is the subj. of the first two pādas both because the word *pātnī* is only introduced in the 3rd pāda and because one wonders whether a woman would be in a position to survey the battlefield.

In d "whetted sharp by the soma pressers" (*nīśitam somasúbhiḥ*) continues the theme of the previous vss., that getting Indra on one's side in battle requires plying him with soma at the sacrifice.

IV.24.9: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. introduces the vocabulary of commerce, which is otherwise little represented in our texts (though see AVŚ III.15, called by Whitney "For success in trade") and therefore difficult to get a handle on. My interpr. differs on some important points from the standard (Old, Ge, WG, Kü [425]). In pāda a most interpr. take *kānīyaḥ* 'lesser' as referring to the price and *bhūyasā* 'greater' as what is being bought. But price is always in the instr.: see in the next vs. 10ab *daśábhiḥ ... dhenúbhiḥ*. Therefore, grammar requires us to conclude that, rather than complaining that the potential purchaser offered too little for that very valuable asset, Indra himself, Indra is protesting that the purchaser went for an inferior product (another god?) with too high an offer. In pādas b and c he further points out that the purchaser failed to take advantage of the chance to buy Indra (who therefore went away 'unsold' *ávikrītaḥ*) and to leave behind (/replace) the poor bargain he made in the first place.

As also indicated in the publ. intro., I take pāda d as an old saying encapsulating the wisdom of not wasting your money on a substandard item. The problem in this pāda is *vāṇām*, which ordinarily means 'voice, music' (see EWA s.v.). However, Ge tr. 'Handel' and suggests (n. 9d) that it is derived from *vaṇij-* 'merchant', which seems very plausible. That it is otherwise unknown in this meaning would not be surprising, given the specialized lexical level it inhabits.

IV.24.10: The big question about this vs. is the identity of the speaker. The standard view is that it is the poet Vāmadeva, who is putting Indra on sale temporarily, with the requirement that he be returned after his obstacle-smashing is done. I find this unlikely. How did Indra come to be possessed by Vāmadeva (*imám ... māméndram* "this Indra of mine")? Who is he hawking Indra to? Why has the scene changed from the domestic one of Indra and his wife to, presumably, the ritual ground? My own suggestion, albeit somewhat tentative, is that the speaker is Indra's wife. Who would have a better right to call him "this Indra of mine"? Moreover, there seems no good reason to introduce his wife as an emphatic actor in vs. 8 and then drop her out of the story. Since the three vss. seem unified in tone and theme, common sense suggests that they should take place in the same location with the same actors.

The standard tr. take c with d, e.g., Ge: "Wenn er die Feinde erschlagen hat, so soll er ihn mir zurückgeben." The problem with this is that it assumes an anterior, specifically future anterior, value "(will) have smashed" for the intensive subjunctive

jānghanat. For this reason I attach it to ab. However, it may make more sense to allow the future anterior and make the *yadā* clause the prior condition for the return in pāda d. In this case the tr. would be “Who buys this Indra of mine with ten cows? When he [=Indra] will have smashed the obstacles, then will he [=buyer] return him [=Indra] to me?”

IV.25 Indra

IV.25.1: On the phraseology of c, see comm. ad IV.16.11. Though Ge (/WG) supply ‘day’ with *pāryāya* there seems no reason not to take it with the two immediately preceding datives.

Pāda d contains two functionally parallel expressions in two formally different guises: the loc. absol. *sāmiddhe agnau* “when his fire has been kindled” and the nom. bahuvrīhi *sutāsomaḥ* “possessing pressed soma / he whose soma has been pressed.” A parallel bahuvrīhi to the first expression is also attested: *iddhāgni-* (2x).

IV.25.2: The last part of d, *kavāye ká ūtī*, is somewhat unclear. Ge, flg. Sāy., identifies the *kavī-* as Indra, but this seems unlikely. If *kāḥ* refers to the mortal worshiper (as seems likely, given the referents of the preceding *kāḥ*’s), he would not ordinarily be supplying help to Indra, and though Indra is sometimes called a *kavī-*, that is comparatively rare (though see the next hymn, IV.26.1) and not found in such a context. Other passages with *ūtī* and an overt or covert form of the copula (vel sim.) generally have the god as subject. Cf. nearby IV.23.2 ... *kād ūtī, vṛdhé bhuvac chaśamānasya* ... “Will he be here with help for the strengthening of the one who has labored” (sim. IV.29.1, 4; 31.1), but as was just noted, changing the referent of *kāḥ* in the middle of this insistent sequence (9 occurrences of *kāḥ* in 3 vss.) is undesirable. My ‘joins together’ is an awkward attempt to avoid that.

IV.25.3: On *āvivenam* / *āvivenan* see comm. ad IV.24.6. Assuming the *-am* form is correct here, it would be an absolutive in *-am*. In IV.24.6 the same expression *mānasāvivenan* / *m* qualified the mortal worshiper (acdg. to most -- see disc. there). Here it seems to qualify the gods. However, it is just possible that as an adverbial absolutive it could refer to the mortal worshiper, represented by *kāsya*: “the pressed soma plant of which (mortal), never losing track in his mind, do ...” The fact that until this sentence the mortal had appeared in the nom. *kāḥ* could contribute to the somewhat mixed construction.

IV.25.5–6: For *suprāvī-* / *duṣprāvī-* see comm. ad I.34.4.

IV.25.6: See Old’s disc. of *kévalā* as neut. pl., in agreement with Gr.

On *prāśu-* / *(śū-)* see comm ad VIII.31.6; 32.2, 16.

IV.25.7: On *sakhyám sám √ gṛ* see IX.86.16.

IV.26–27

These are the famous hymns devoted to the stealing of soma from heaven. Unfortunately they are very obscure in many details, esp. IV.27. The myth and these hymns are treated in detail by U. Schneider, *Der Somarab des Manu* (1971).

IV.26 Indra (1–3), Praise of the falcon (4–7) [=Soma-theft]

As indicated in the publ. intro., I believe the whole hymn is spoken by Indra, against the Anukramaṇī but with Ge (/WG).

IV.26.1: In this vs. Indra identifies himself with the three most resonant RVic words for poet: *īṣi-*, *vīpra-*, *kavi-*. I am not sure why. The named beings in the 2nd hemistich, Kutsa and Uśanā, belong in the same mythic complex, along with Indra; see in this Indra cycle IV.16.10–12. Kakṣīvant is one of the most accomplished RVic poets (I.116–26), and his collection immediately follows that attributed to Kutsa (I.101–15). But again I don't know why he claims identity with Kakṣīvant, esp. because only one hymn of Kakṣīvant's is even possibly dedicated to Indra (the maddening I.121). However, note the borrowing of phraseology from Kakṣīvant in IV.27.4 (see comm. ad loc.). His desire to claim both Manu (first man) and the sun (most prominent heavenly body) is more understandable.

In c I take *ny īṇje* not as a 1st sg. present but as the homophonous 1st sg. injunctive to the 6th cl. pres. *īṇjá-* and therefore as preterital.

IV.26.3: Atithigva is often associated with Kutsa, sometimes with both as enemies of Indra (I.53.10, VI.18.13, VIII.53.2), sometimes, as here, as his clients.

IV.26.4–7: The 3rd sg. act. impf./injunc. of *√bhr* is the “hero” of this, the mythological portion, of the hymn: *bhārat* (4d, 5a), *bharat* (6c), *abharat* (7a).

IV.26.4: The first hemistich sounds like a formal eulogistic opening, though I don't know of any parallels elsewhere (quite possibly for want of looking).

IV.26.5: My interpr. depends on reading (as sometimes elsewhere) *yádi* (‘if’) as *yád *ī* (‘when it’), despite the short *i* before a single consonant. It is possible that *yád *ī* was changed redactionally, to match *yádi* in IV.27.3. A heavy syllable in fourth place in an opening of four is standard (see Arnold 182, 188), and in particular the sequence of four shorts in *√(bhārad) yádi / vír á(to)* seems quite unusual, while a long vowel before the caesura and preceding a break of two shorts is metrically more favorable -- though given the many metrical departures in this hymn (see, e.g., the next vs.), this is not a strong argument.

IV.26.6: Three of the four cadences in this verse are bad (b, c, d).

ījīpín- (2x) must be closely related to better-attested *ījīpyá-* (6x), which also has Iranian cognates, e.g., Aves. *ərəzifīia-*. Werba bei EWA, s.v., suggests that it is a contamination with *ījīśín-*, which seems a promising suggestion.

Goto (1st Kl, 171–72, flg. Wackernagel) argues that the thematic middle *dádate* is synchronically distinct from *√dā* ‘give’ and means ‘keep safe’. My ‘hanging onto’ represents a compromise between such a rendering and ‘take’, the standard sense of medial (*ā*) *√dā* (see 7a *ādāya*).

IV.26.7: The obj. *mūrā(h)* is fem. and presumably matches the gender of the parallel object *ārātīḥ* ‘hostilities’ in the preceding pāda.

IV.27 (323) Falcon (1-4), Falcon or Indra (5) [=Soma theft]

Note the periodic punctuation by *ádha* (1d, 3a, 4d, 5a) -- and some play with that word: *ádhi* 4b, *adhva...* 5c, *ándhah* 5b, maybe *adīyam* 1d; also the preponderance of *a-* init. preverbs, *ánu* 1a, *ápa* 2a, *abhí* 2b, *áva* 3a, 3c.

The perfect *jabhāra* is found in vss. 2 and 4 (cf. the pres. stem forms to \sqrt{bhr} in the preceding hymn, vss. 4–7). It thus frames the central vs. 3, which could then be an omphalos. That vs. is certainly confused enough to qualify and captures the crucial moment of the grabbing of soma. But since vs. 3 consists of a series of subordinate clauses whose main clause is found in vs. 4, it cannot be syntactically isolated into a free-standing omphalos.

IV.27.1: The major problem with this vs. is pāda d, with a nom. *śyenāḥ* and the 1st sg. *nír adīyam*. At first glance this seems to require that the speaker be the falcon, not Soma. The problem, and various previous suggested solutions, are discussed at length by Old. He rejects an emendation to 3rd ps. **adīyat* (rightly in my view) and suggests instead that we must indeed take the speaker to be the falcon. In this he is followed by Ge (/WG). However, this makes problems with pāda c (“a hundred metal fortifications guarded me”), where the 1st ps. speaker should surely be Soma, whose release from captivity in heaven is the subject of the hymn, not the falcon, who flies freely around. Moreover, it seems unlikely that we would care about the long-standing knowledge that the falcon has (ab), whereas again Soma’s knowledge is relevant. A somewhat ad hoc, but still satisfying (to me anyway) solution was suggested by Thieme (Gedichte, 41), who takes *ádha śyenāḥ* as an abrupt nominal clause -- “Then the falcon!” -- expressing the surprise advent of the bird in Soma’s place of captivity. The 1st sg. verb can then have Soma, the speaker, as its subject.

IV.27.2: There is general agreement that Soma speaks this and the following vss.

I read *ápa* twice in pāda a -- first with *jabhāra* ‘he carried away’, but also with *jōṣam* ‘against (my) will’ (despite Old’s rejection of the latter). This phrase would be constructed on the model of *ánu jōṣam* ‘following my will’. That it was not against Soma’s will is explained by the next pāda, where he boasts that he is stronger and braver than the falcon, implying that without Soma’s agreement the falcon could not have borne him away. The standard tr. take *jōṣam* positively -- so that in conjunction with the neg. *ná* the whole is negative: “he did not willingly carry me away.” In this reading it is the falcon’s will or pleasure that is at issue (e.g., WG “Nicht hat der mich ja zu (seinem) Gefallen fortgebracht”). I don’t understand what this would convey: that the falcon was forced on this mission by someone else? that once the falcon saw Soma, he didn’t want to take him? Thieme (Ged.) by contrast takes it as the guard’s will (“mit Zustimmung [des Wächters]”), but we would surely need more signaling than the bare noun *jōṣam* to indicate that the *jōṣa-* belongs to a character we haven’t met yet (presumably Kṛṣānu of 3d). Moreover, it suggests, only to reject, a scenario involving a corrupt prison guard that seems to me out of place.

Pāda c is almost identical to 26.7, with the addition of the adv. *īrmā* ‘still, quiet’ (on which see comm. ad VIII.22.4). It qualifies the left-behind *ārātīḥ* ‘hostilities’; cf.

V.62.2 *īrmā tasthūṣīṭh* ‘standing still’, with the adv. limiting a fem. pl. participle. See Narten’s sim. tr. (Kl Sch. 69).

Since *puraṃdhi-* is fem., and the nom. sg. *śūśuvānaḥ* in d is masc., Puraṃdhi cannot be the subject there -- rather the falcon, as the standard interpr. agree.

IV.27.3: This is a difficult vs. to construe and to interpret. What we have to go on is the syntactic skeleton the poet has provided us: a triple *yád* construction, with *yád* in Wackernagel’s position in the first three pādas, and in the fourth a nominative NP that serves as the subject of the clause introduced in c. The main cl. is then provided by 4ab (so, generally, Old, Ge, WG, Schneider).

Within this structure pādas a and cd are relatively straightforward internally; it is b that causes further problems, esp. in the sequence ... *yád yádi vāta(h)*. First, note the mirror-image phonology of the opening: *ví yád yádi v(...)*. Ge takes *yádi vā* simply as a strengthened ‘or’, and similarly Schneider (16 n. 35) states that *yádi vā* is simply equivalent to *vā*. The tr. of Ge and WG reflect this stripped-down interpr. of the sequence *yád yádi vā*, reducing that complex just to “oder als ...” I find this exceedingly unlikely. The sequence is simply too tricky and too unprecedented to be a long-winded way of saying ‘or’, and anyway RVic poets do not resort to pleonastic expressions to fill out their pādas: 11 syllables is too tight a space as it is. I think we must give *yádi vā* its lexical weight “or if” and assume that the poet is introducing a bit of doubt about some details of the story. This doubt coincides with the switch from 3rd singular reference to the falcon to unidentified 3rd plural: “they carried” (*ūhūḥ*), and these are likely to be connected. The two almost identical statements about Puraṃdhi (26.7c and 27.2c) simply state that she “left behind” hostilities. Neither says she was carried away, much less by whom -- so how Puraṃdhi departed remains unclear, and pāda b seems to be reminding us of that.

The similarity of *vāta(h)* (Pp. *vā átaḥ*) to the word for ‘wind’, just met in *vātān* (2d), has been generally remarked on. Ge (n. 3b) tentatively suggests a haplology: *vāto vātā(h)*, that is, *vā átaḥ vātāḥ* ‘or the winds from there (carried off Puraṃdhi).’ I see the temptation, but I think *vāta(h)* is only a word play and does not conceal a form of ‘wind’. Among other things, the winds in 2d were not carrying anything away; they were overtaken by the falcon, who was.

IV.27.4: The adj. *ījipyá-* = Aves. *ərəzifiia-* (and other Iranian forms). I favor the old notion that it contains a Caland form of ‘straight’ (*ījú-*, etc.) + **pt-ya-*, with a zero-gr. of \sqrt{pat} ‘fly’. See EWA s.v., though Mayrhofer considers the etym. “unsicher.” (The lack of *-iya-* readings, indicating that the root-final laryngeal was lost without leaving a trace, might be problematic, but *-iya-* and *-ya-* adjectives tend to become confused.) Scar. (318) suggests rather a derivation from $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘go’, but the existence of such a root is in question. (On extra-Indo-Iranian cognates and the formulaic status of the word see Watkins, Dragon 170–72.)

If we accept the transmitted *indrāvataḥ*, it would most likely be an acc. pl. and refers to the companions of Indra who will ritually prepare the soma for him to drink. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr. However, the form has been much discussed and much emended (see Old’s detailed disc. and Ge’s n. 4a [“eine alte Crux”]). I understand the urge to emend -- which for me stems less from any problems construing the transmitted form within the frame of the passage than with the ill-formed simile, *ná*

bhujuúm, that ends the pāda. This clearly refers to the Aśvins' rescue of the hapless Bhujyu, whom they pull out of the sea and bring home (e.g., I.116.5 *yád aśvinā ūhāthur bhujuúm ástam*). As the simile is constructed in our vs., the simile particle *ná* precedes the only word in the simile, though ordinarily *ná* follows the first word of the simile. This is in fact less of a problem than I used to think: Ge (n. 4a) attributes this position to what he considers a common transposition of X *ná* to *ná* X at the end of a verse line, and he seems to be correct that the simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position. See comm. ad VIII.76.1, X.21.1, 111..

If we were to read du. **índravantā* (note the short second vowel, found in this stem when the penultimate syllable is heavy), the adj. could identify the Aśvins (they are so called in I.116.21, the hymn just cited with Bhujyu), and we would have a fully formed simile: “as the two companions of Indra [=Aśvins] (did) Bhujyu.” Note that I.116 is a Kakṣīvant hymn, and the poet of these Soma-stealing hymns (IV.26–27) lays claim to the Kakṣīvant mantle in the very first vs. of this sequence (IV.26.1 *ahám kakṣīvām̐ íśir asmi vípraḥ*). The Bhujyu saga figures prominently in the Kakṣīvant cycle (I.116.3–5, 117.14, 119.4). As Old discusses, this emendation has been suggested previously, both as is and via **índra(/ā)vantā+u*. Besides sense and the structure of the simile, another strong factor favoring the emendation is meter: the transmitted text produces a highly irregular break (– – ~), but reading **índravantā* would yield a standard break – ~ –. I therefore am now inclined to alter the publ. tr. to “... brought him from the lofty back (of heaven), just as *the two companions of Indra (the Aśvins) (brought) Bhujyu” – although I remain somewhat uncertain because I don't know how the corruption would have happened. I do not think it was by way of the addition of *u* to the dual ending *-vantā*, since this would be an odd position for *u*. Perhaps it was clumsily altered to match *brható* in the next pāda; Sāy. at least analyses the form as an abl. modifying *brhatāḥ ... snóḥ*. It is also possible that it was modeled after *parāvataḥ* in the corresponding vs. in IV.26, namely 6, which also treats the bringing of the soma from heaven to earth, begins *ṛjīpī śyenāḥ* matching our *ṛjīpyāḥ ... śyenāḥ*, and contains a form of *√bhr̥* (*bharat*, like our *jabhāra*).

The expression *patatrí ... parṇám* “winged feather” strikes me as odd -- it is generally birds that are winged, not their feathers. I therefore propose to read **patatrí(y)asya* ‘of the winged one’ rather than *patatrí asya*. (This actually requires no change to the Saṃhitā text.) Grammatically this is not difficult: *-(i)ya-* adjectives are made regularly to *-a-*stems, including *-trya-* to *-tra-*, like *mitríya/mitrya-* to *mitrá-*, which also has *mitrín-* beside it. There's a *pátatra-* ‘wing’, beside *patatrín-*, so there's no reason why not to have a *patatríya-*. Gen. *patatríyasya* then modifies *véḥ*. It is worth noting that a number of occurrences of *patatrín-* modify *ví-*.

IV.27.5: The first occurrence of *mádāya-* was omitted in the publ. tr., which should read “... Indra will aim it for drinking to exhilaration.”

As noted in the publ. intro., *práti√dhā* is an idiom meaning ‘aim (an arrow)’, and the word play is surely meant here, given the immediately preceding vss. about Kṛṣānu and his arrowshot.

IV.28 Indra, or Indra and Soma

IV.28.1: The construction in b -- *apáh ... sasrútas kah*, lit. “made the waters flowing,” with an acc. pl. adjectival root-noun cmpd. modifying ‘waters’ -- is a little odd. In this type of periphrastic causative context with $\sqrt{kṛ}$, we expect a complement infinitive. In fact compare the completely parallel VII.21.3 *tvám indra srávitavā apás kah*, with an infinitive built to the same root \sqrt{sru} . There is no obvious reason for the different constructions. Perhaps it anticipates the *akṛnoḥ* NOUN-ACC ADJ-ACC constructions in 4cd, where there exist no alternative infinitive possibilities. (The publ. tr. “made the waters flow” rather than “... flowing” is meant to avoid an interpr. that Indra thawed or otherwise liquified something solid. It should, however, be “flow together,” to represent the *sa-*.)

IV.28.2: Ge plausibly suggests that the “great deceit” is Śuṣṇa. See his cited parallels.

IV.28.3: My “house of no exit” is a somewhat loose way of rendering *durgé duroṇé* “house of difficult going.” I think Ge is correct in interpreting this as the grave.

Note b #*purā* c #*purī*.

IV.28.4: On the construction with *akṛnoḥ* see disc. ad vs. 1.

There is a slight syntactic clash between ablative *vísvasmāt*, appropriate to a comparative (“lower than all”), and the superlative *adhamān*, which should have a genitive (“lowest of all”).

The dual verbs of cd (*ábādhethām ámṛṇatam ... ávindethām*) must have Indra and Soma as subjects, as the larger context (vss. 1-2) and the explicit Vāyav Indraś ca construction in 5b show. But the immediate context (vs. 3) falsely suggests Indra and *Agni* on the basis of 3a.

IV.28.5: Note #*indraś ca* here and #*indraś ca(krām)* in 2b. Also, presumably we get a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction here (*indraś ca soma* rather than standard *soma indraś ca*), so that Indra can be pāda-initial, as in 1b, 2b.

There is clear (and fairly unusual) enjambement over the hemistich boundary: ... *ūrvām ásvyam góḥ / ádardṛtam*, with the obj. of the verb in c found in b. There is disagreement about the disposition of the rest of the 2nd hemistich. The publ. tr. takes *ápihitāny ásnā* as obj. of *riricáthuḥ*, with *tatṛdānā* a dual pf. part. with acc. pl. *kṣāḥ* as its obj. As indicated in the publ. intr. I identify those things “covered over by the stone” to be the waters and cows that Indra released (in the Vṛtra and Vala myths respectively). This fits with the use of *ápihita-* in 1d. Ge also takes *ápihitāni* as obj. of *riricáthuḥ*, but the last three words, *kṣāś cit tatṛdānā* as a simile (marked by *cit*, which he considers a possible simile marker, and I don’t). For him *tatṛdānā* is passive and *kṣāḥ* is nom. sg. WG take *ápihitāni* as a second obj. of *ádardṛtam*. The obj. of *riricáthuḥ* is, for them, *kṣāḥ* (acc. pl.), which also serves as obj. of *tatṛdānā*, which they consider dual and transitive, as I do. Their interpr. of cd follows that of Kü (216, 424), and it is certainly grammatically possible. However, I do not understand what it would mean to release the dwelling places (Kü) or the parts of the earth (WG) (e.g., WG “Ihr habt die Erdteile freigelassen”), whereas the release of the pent-up waters after drilling through the earth fits the Indra mythology perfectly.

The cadence of b is bad and would be improved by reading **tāṭṛdānā*, as Arnold suggested and Old seems tentatively to accept.

IV.29 Indra

IV.29.1: I take *mandasānāḥ* in a prospective or purpose sense, like the caus. *mandayádhyai* in 3b, because Indra is surely not getting exhilarated while on his journey.

IV.29.2: The phrase *ābhīrur mānyamānaḥ* is troublesome. The other three occurrences of *ābhīru-* all mean ‘fearless’, but “thinking himself fearless” is an odd thing to say about Indra. For one thing, he’s such a mighty warrior that there seems no need to assert fearlessness about a creature for whom fear would be unthinkable (though recall his flight at the end of I.32, where he’s compared to a “frightened falcon” [*śyenó ná bhītāḥ* I.32.14]). For another, X *mānyate* (*/-yamāna-*) expressions almost always identify the content of the thought as being the wrong idea about oneself or someone else. But surely it’s not that Indra *thinks* he’s fearless but is actually terrified. For this reason I take this *bahuvrīhi* to mean ‘not having -- that is, not producing -- fear’ (in others). This is a sense that Gr allows (‘nicht furchterregend’), though for a different passage. The point here would be that Indra is coming to the sacrifice to have a jolly soma drink-up with the pressers, thinking he’s just a regular guy, not a terror-inspiring deity. Note that he “produces fearlessness” (*kárat ... ābhayam*) for us in the next vs.

IV.29.3: I take *vājayádhyai* not to the denom. *vājayá-* ‘seek prizes’, but the primary *-āya-* formation *vājāya-* ‘rouse’. It shows accent shift in the *-dhyai* infinitive, just as *mandayádhyai* does.

If we maintain the transmitted text, I do not know what to do with *prá* in b, apparently interrupting the expression *júṣṭām ánu ... díśam* (though this interruption is mitigated by its immediately flg. the caesura). *√mand* does appear with *prá*, though not terribly often, so it might go with the infinitive. Or one can supply a verb of motion: “(he goes / send him) forth to make him reach exhilaration.” Ge cites similar *pūrvam ánu prá díśam* in I.95.3 and also suggests that an impv. parallel to *śrāvāya* should be supplied. However, the most likely solution is that endorsed by Old: to read *pradíśam*, a reading already found in Gr.

IV.29.5: Ge (/WG) construe the part. *bhejānāsaḥ* one way or another with *syāma* (Ge: “... möchten wir ... deines himmlischen Reichtums teilhaftig werden”). This is certainly possible. However since this leaves *te* in b somewhat orphaned and since “may we be yours” is a frequent sentiment (e.g., II.11.13), I have separated the participle from *syāma*, respecting the hemistich boundary.

IV.30 Indra

IV.30.2: Ge takes *vísṣvā* with *kṛṣṭáyah*, but in this sandhi situation it would have to represent a corruption of *vísṣvāś*. See Old for disc. of this form. I take it as a neut. acc. pl.

IV.30.3: The neg. scope problem potentially posed by *viśve ... nā* -- “all did not” vs. “not all did” -- can be easily solved. See my 1997 “Vedic anyá- ‘another, the other’: syntactic disambiguation,” where I establish that the independent negative *nā* cooccurs with *viśva*-only with the corporate entity *viśve devāḥ*, enforcing a meaning “all did not.”

As disc. ad X.94.3–4, the sense/function of the rare adverbial instr. *anā* is difficult to pin down. In that disc. I suggest that it has come to mean ‘evidently, clearly’ from situations in which a previous action provides the evidential basis for the statement containing *anā*. In our passage I think *anā* shows a usage from which the later sense has developed: the previous action is here expressed by the *yád* clause in c. On the evidence of this power displayed by Indra in c, all the gods have the sense not to fight him. I will keep the publ. tr. “because of this” for *anā*, though, to bring it in line with the other occurrences of the adv., it could be altered to “Obviously not even all the gods (altogether) attacked you, Indra, since by night you passed over the days ...” (For ‘attacked’ rather than ‘fought’, see comm. ad vs. 5 below.)

Reading **yūyudhuḥ* would provide a better cadence. Old tentatively endorses this.

The sense of pāda c is not entirely clear, but there are several factors that allow us to close in on the meaning. First, it seems to provide the reason why the gods did not fight Indra. Further, *ātiraḥ* recurs in vs. 7, and it seems unlikely that the two identical verbs would have substantially different meanings. Finally, as far as I can tell, all occurrences of *nāktam* are temporal (‘by night’); when poets want to refer to night as an entity or entities they use *rātrī*-, *aktú*-, or *kṣāp*-. (On *uśāsā nāktam* in VIII.27.2, see comm. ad loc.) Therefore tr. like Ge (/WG) that take *āhā nāktam* as parallel objects (e.g., Ge “als du Tage und Nacht abgrenztest”) cannot be correct. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think that this pāda concerns Indra’s destabilization of time when he steals the Sun’s wheel -- a myth that will be glancingly related in the next ṛca. What exactly is going on I don’t know -- it sounds as if Indra fast-forwards or skips over days during the night, perhaps because the Sun can’t make his normal daily circuit and therefore daytime is significantly abbreviated and no longer lasts as long as night?

IV.30.4–6: All three vss. of this ṛca begin with *yātra*. I take them all as subordinated to vs. 3. Ge [/WG] and Klein (DGRV I.432) take the main clause for all three vss. to be 6c, but Indra’s help for Etaśa does not seem sufficiently significant to carry the whole ṛca. Ge (/WG) take all three *yātra* as ‘where’, not ‘when’, but what location they are thinking of I don’t know.

I do not know what to do with the *utā*’s in *yātrotā* in 4 and 6, but assume they are there to indicate the additive nature of the sequence of subordinate clauses. Sim. Klein (DGRV I.431–32). It would be better if the first one were in vs. 5, not vs. 4.

IV.30.4: *√muṣ* takes a double acc.

IV.30.5: It seems curious that in vs. 3 it is emphatically stated that the All Gods did not fight Indra, and yet here he is fighting them -- in what I consider the same circumstances, namely the theft of the Sun’s wheel. This problem clears up if we render both *yuyudhuḥ* in 3b and *āyudhyaḥ* in 5b as ‘attack’. The gods were reluctant to attack him after he showed his power over time and the Sun, but he did not hang back in attacking them though he was alone.

IV.30.6: The Pp reads *prá āvaḥ*, which would make it a main clause verb and pāda c the resolution of the subordinated *yātra* clauses. This reading is followed by Ge (/WG) and Klein. My reasons for rejecting this interpr. were given above, and with Old I interpr. the ambig. *prāvaḥ* as *pra-āvaḥ*, a subordinated verb.

I do not understand what is going on in ab. Who is the mortal who benefits from Indra's deed -- perhaps Kutsa? And what action does *āriṇā(h) ... sūryam* describe. The root $\sqrt{rī}$ means 'flow' (etc.), and the nasal pres. means 'let flow', but in certain contexts, often hostile, it can have the developed meaning 'dissolve' or 'let overflow'. I've tr. 'let slip' here, but without certainty. Does it mean 'let flow' -- that is, let the Sun continue on his way after the incident with the wheel? or is the sense more sinister: the Sun slips away from its usual path? The presence of the Sun's horse Etaśa doesn't help, as Indra gives aid to Etaśa even when he is attacking the sun.

IV.30.7–12: After a ṛca on stealing the Sun's wheel there follow two more on the related myth of Indra's crushing Dawn's cart. The myth is actually confined to vss. 8–11, with the two outer vss. semi-independent. WG (nn. to vss. 10, 11) suggest a radical interpr. of this sequence: that Uṣas here is the name of the female leader of a matriarchal tribe who opposed the territorial expansion of Vāmadeva's group. This seems reductive in the extreme, and since the Uṣas vss. immediately follow the treatment of the stealing of the Sun's wheel, a cosmic rather than local interpr. imposes itself. They must also explain why this local matron is called "daughter of Heaven" (*duhitāram divāḥ*) twice (8d, 9a): acdg. to them, it is her boast, which the poet jeers at. The only advantage of this unlikely interpr. is that it accounts for the localization of her crushed cart at the Vipāś river (acdg. to WG, where she lived), but this hardly seem sufficient.

IV.30.7: In c *ātra* seems to correspond to the three *yātra*'s in the preceding ṛca. The point seems to be that even after all the energy Indra expended in his fight with the sun (and the gods), he still has a lot of *manyú-* left to apply in the Uṣas incident.

The repetition of *ātiraḥ* here was already noted ad vs. 3. Note the similarity of the pādas: 3c (*yád*) *āhā ... ātiraḥ* / 7c (*ātr*) *āha ... ātiraḥ*, though *āhā* 'days' in 3 and the particle *āha* in 7 are unrelated, the echo is surely deliberate.

I supply "lying there" with Dānu, because in two of the four singular passages containing *dānu-* what the Dānu does is 'lie': I.32.9 *dānuḥ śaye*; II.12.11 *dānuḥ śáyānam*. So, although 'overcame' is probably part of the semantics of *ātiraḥ*, the lit. sense 'pass over' fits having the prostrate enemy as the object.

IV.30.8–21: These vss. are tr. by Hoffmann (Injunk., 184–86).

IV.30.8: The juxtaposition of *vīryām ... paúmsyam* "manly and masculine" with *stríyam* "woman" brings the gender polarization into sharp relief. There is certainly no sense that it's unseemly or unsporting to hit a girl!

IV.30.9: The voc. *indra* was omitted in the publ. tr., so "o Indra" should be inserted at the end.

IV.30.12: *vibālī-* is almost universally taken as the name of (another) river, though the name (and indeed the word) shows up nowhere else. By contrast, in the first ed. of the dictionary (1872) MonWms. takes it as an adj. *vibālya-* “passed beyond a state of youth, in full vigor; swollen (said of a river),” though in the 2nd ed. (1899) it is simply the fem. river name *vibālī-*. WG take it not as a toponym but with the sense ‘mit breiter Öffnung’. An attributive adjective would certainly be preferable to an unlocatable placename. Although WG give no explan. of their interpr., it rests on earlier discussions, whose details can be recovered in EWA (s.v.). EWA considers it the name of a river (produced from the confluence of the Vipās and the Śutudrī), but derived from a word with the same (or similar) sense as WG ascribe to it: ‘dessen Ufer weit auseinanderstehen’, an early MIA word with *-bāra-* representing *pārā-* ‘far shore’. See the lit. cited there.

IV.30.16: This son of the unwed maiden appears to be the same one who was being eaten by ants in IV.19.9 (in the same Indra cycle); see comm. there. These tantalizing snippets are all we know about the story.

IV.30.17: WG render *asnātārā* as “ohne dass sie untertauchen,” flg. Tichy (Nom.Ag. 107). It seems to me to be pushing the syntax to render a negated agent noun as the equivalent of negative purpose clause (though in her comment Tichy simply says that it’s “gleichzeitig,” presumably with the time of the main verb), though it is also the case that we don’t know much if anything about swimming in ancient India.

IV.30.19: The blind man and the lame one also figure in IV.19.9, along with the son of the unmarried woman; see vs. 16 above. The blind and the lame form a pair elsewhere in the RV, e.g., I.112.8; II.13.12, 15.7; VIII.79.3.

The infinitival phrase *nā ... āṣṭave* is rendered in the publ. tr. “not to be equalled,” though it lit. means “not to be reached/attained.” The lit. tr. implies that no one can actually receive Indra’s favor, but I think the point is rather that favor such as Indra’s cannot be deployed by anyone else (that is, any other deity) -- hence the adjustment in the English. On this interpr. see Hoffmann (185). Ge supplies “with words” (i.e., “not to be obtained [with words]”), presumably meaning that no poet can describe the extent of Indra’s favor.

IV.30.23: Note the rare future subjunctive *karīṣyā(h)*, otherwise found only in corrupted form in I.165.9; see comm. there, as well as Old on our passage.

IV.30.24: The voc. *ādure* is a hapax, and there is no agreement about whether it is a PN or an attributive adj. and whether it is addressed to a deity (possibly Indra) or a human (possibly a patron). Nor does it seem likely that any definitive answers can be obtained, given the stark paucity of evidence. I have therefore tr. it as a PN as the line of least resistance, and I think it quite unlikely that it is addressed to Indra: would relatively low-level gods be giving things to Indra, and do gods ever receive, rather than give, *vāmā-*? I tentatively assume that it is the name of the/a patron. Although this vs. is not technically a dānastuti, it occupies the position in the hymn where a dānastuti would be found, with mention of the human patron, and in opening out to a range of (mostly minor) gods, the mention of a mortal would not be amiss.

On the hapax *kārūlatī* see EWA s.v.

IV.31 Indra

According to Old the hymn is in *ṛcas*, but Ge asserts that it consists of 3 verse pairs and 3 *ṛcas*. Ge concedes that vss. 1–3 occur as a unit in SV, VS, and AV, but argues that the content and form of the verses speak for a different division: vss. 1–2 are questions, vss. 3–4 both begin with the same word, and vss. 5–6 concern the relation between Indra and Sūrya. After this verse, again on formal and thematic grounds, he considers the rest *ṛcas*. Despite these considerations, Old’s view seems correct. That both 3 and 4 begin with *abhī* (used in two different senses) is scarcely remarkable; note the verbal concatenation between *ṛcas* in the next hymn, IV.32.3–4. Moreover, vs. 3 fits more comfortably with the preceding vss.: The question “with what help?” (*kāyā ... ūtī*) posed in vs. 1 is answered in vs. 3 with the assertion that Indra will be our “helper with help” (*avitā ... ūtibhiḥ*), a satisfying finale to a *ṛca*. Vss. 5–6 do indeed involve Indra and Sūrya, but vs. 4 provides the lead-in to Indra’s journey continued in vs. 5.

IV.31.5: In b I read *āhā* not *ā hā* (a change only in the Pp. not the Saṃhitā text), and analyze this sequence as *ā + āhā*, the neut. pl. of ‘day’ (found also in IV.30.3 and 33.6; cf. also *viśvāhā* in 12a below). This is one of only two supposed exx. of the particle *ha* with long vowel; the other one (V.41.7) also follows *ā* and is susceptible to the same analysis. The *ā*-final version of *ha* is *ghā*, which shows Brugmann’s Law and velar outcome before original **o*, acdg. to Mark Hale. Note that *ha* only once elsewhere occurs after the preverb *ā* (VIII.9.18 *ā hāyām ...*). (In fact an analysis *āhāyām* “this one through the days here ...” is also possible in VIII.9.18, though I did not so analyze it there.) By contrast *ghā* is found fairly commonly after *ā* (I.30.8, I.48.5, etc.).

“Along the slope of your intentions” (*pravātā ... krātūnām*) means that the journey to our sacrifice is an easy one because it is in accord with Indra’s intentions. Why this should be like coming by foot (*padéva*) is not entirely clear: the journey is so easy that it can be undertaken on foot? pleasant pedestrian rambles generally involve taking an easy downward path? Neither of these seems particular applicable to Indra’s travels.

When *sácā* occurs with a loc., it generally lacks lexical value and simply signals a locative absolute -- as in the common expression *suté sácā* “when (the soma) is pressed.” I think that is the intention here, in the phrase *sūrye sácā*: it is a temporal expression, “when the sun (rises)”; cf. I.135.3 and comm. ad loc. I have here included a lexical tr. “in company with” because I think *sácā*, with lexical value, needs to be supplied or understood in the next vs., 6c, for which see disc. below. However, I would now be inclined simply to tr. here “I have taken my share at sun(rise).”

IV.31.6: The purport of this verse is something of a puzzle. I think the point is that the journey undertaken by Indra in vs. 4 has finally brought him here, with both his battle-lust and his equipment on full display, in order to drink soma with the ritualists (including the “I” of the speaker). Cf. nearby IV.29.2, where Indra presents himself in a non-intimidating way (or so he thinks) and “becomes exhilarated along with the heroes who have pressed the soma.” Here his arrival is at sunrise, and “I” have a share in the soma along with Indra at that time. In order to make sense of 6c, we need to understand/supply *ābhakṣi* from 5c (as Ge [WG] do also). Although Klein (DGRV II.129) thinks the two

ádha's in c have different functions, the pointed parallel structure of that short pāda -- *ádha* LOC *ádha* LOC -- makes that conclusion quite unlikely in its strong form -- though I think it is the case that the formal parallelism conceals a functional distinction (different from the one suggested by Klein). The question is how to construe the locatives, and it is here that the *sácā* in 5c comes into play. As I noted apropos of that pāda, the *sácā* there seems just to signal that the loc. *sūrye* is a functional loc. absol. In our pāda c there is no *sácā*, but I think it should be understood. On the one hand, it again (silently) marks *sūrye* as a loc. absol.; however, with *indre* I suggest it has lexical value (as it likely has in the two occurrences of *tvé sácā* in the next hymn [IV.32.3c, 4a]), indicating that "I" take my share in Indra's company. What I am suggesting is that a non-overt *sácā*, supplied on the basis of its occurrence in the previous vs., has two different functions in a single pāda, a pāda whose structure suggests that its parts should be rigidly parallel. This is not sufficiently conveyed by the published tr. -- I am not sure that English is up to conveying it -- which I would now emend to "(I have taken my share) now in (company with) you, now in (company with) the sun (i.e., at sunrise)."

IV.31.7–8: My interpr. of the structural relationship of these two vss. and of the internal structure of vs. 8 differs considerably from the standard. Because of the parallelism of the openings of these vss., both with *utá smā*, I think that there should be two parallel clauses. But vs. 7 is a *hí* clause with accented verb (*āhúh*), whereas the only verb in vs. 8 is *maṃhase* in pāda c. I am also puzzled by the *pári* in 8a, which is difficult to construe with the rest. There is no *pári* √ *maṃh* elsewhere, and *pári* is in any case not situated where we would expect a preverb in tmesis. WG tr. valiantly "du schenkst ... ringsum," which works in a pinch but I find it unsatisfying. I suggest instead that pāda a contains an abbreviated form of a common formula containing both *pári* and *sadyah* and a verb of motion (or equiv.). Cf. in IV: nearby IV.33.1 *pári dyām sadyó apáso babhūvuh*; IV.45.7 *yéna sadyáh pári rájāmsi yātháh*; IV.51.5 *pariprayāthá bhúvanāni sadyáh*. And elsewhere, e.g., I.115.3 *pári dyāvāprthivī yanti sadyáh*; I.123.8 *ékaikā krátum pári yanti sadyáh*; I.128.3 *évena sadyáh páry eti pāṛthivam*; III.58.8 *pári dyāvāprthivī yāti sadyáh*; V.47.4 *divás caranti pári sadyó ántān*; VII.5.7 *vāyúr ná pāthah pári pāsi sadyáh*; VII.75.4 *pāñca kṣitīh pári sadyó jigāti*. Given the remarkable number of such collocations, I find it difficult to believe that our poet is not evoking this formula. Since much of this hymn concerns Indra's journey, it would be contextually appropriate. That vs. 9 asserts that no hindrances can obstruct Indra supports the journey theme. Then, by my interpr., pādas bc constitute the main clause for vss. 7–8.

IV.31.10: The "hundred forms of help" found at the end of the first ṛca (3c) recurs here at the beginning of this ṛca, following the two more challenging ṛcas in between.

IV.31.11: The publ. tr. rather carelessly followed Ge's "zu grossem, glanzvollem Besitz," but *maháh* is of course not a dat. like *rāyē divítmate*. It should either be rendered as a gen./abl. of *māh-*, hence "for the heavenly wealth of/from a/the great one" (so, e.g., tentatively Scar 45), or as the adv. *maháh* (see esp. Old, Kl. Schr. 729–30 [=ZDMG (1901): 270–71] on *mahó rāyē*), hence "greatly for heavenly wealth." As Old points out, this phrase is very similar to V.79.1 *mahé ... rāyē divítmatī*, with a real dative *mahé*. The purport of the two expressions is probably the same. I would now follow Old's adverbial

interpr. Indeed this very phrase is found a number of times: IV.31.11, V.15.5, 43.1, VIII.23.16, X.61.22, 76.2, and in all cases the *mahāh* should be interpr. as adverbial, though the less punctilious “for great wealth” probably captures the intended sense just as well.

The tr. of *divítmate* also needs to be revised. I now tentatively accept the analysis of *divít-* and its deriv. *divítmant-* as *div-ít-*, a root noun cmpd containing the root *√i* ‘go, come’. The word is rendered inconsistently in the publ. tr., as ‘heaven-bound’ in I.26.2, ‘heavenly’ here and X.76.6 (though adjacent *divít-* is tr. ‘heaven-bound’), and ‘heaven-bright’ in V.79.1. This inconsistency reflects the weakness of both standard analyses of this formation, either as an *-ít-* stem with a marginal suffix or as a cmpd. Neither explan. is particularly compelling. For the former, see, e.g., AiG II.2.322, Re EVP 3.78–79 [ad V.79.1]; for the latter, e.g., Thieme (ZDMG 1961.100 = KISch 176), AiG II.2.935 (Nachtr.), EWA s.v. *dyáv-* (p. 750), and extensive disc. by Scar (44–46). The idea goes back at least to Wackernagel (Sb. Berl. 1918; see Re op cit.). In this particular case, since the wealth is presumably coming from heaven, not going there, a lit. tr. would be “greatly for wealth coming from heaven,” but “... for heaven-sent wealth” would be more idiomatic. The *-mant-* suffix seems pleonastic, as AiG II.2.877–78 points out, since the hapax *divít-* and *divítmant-* appear both to be adjectives in the same meaning and are found adjacent to each other in the same case in the one passage in which *divít-* is found (X.76.6). The reason for *-mant-* rather than *-vant-* is likewise unclear (see AiG II.2.882, 891).

IV.32 Indra

IV.32.2: The stem *citrín-* is a hapax, and it is not clear what the fem. pl. referents are. Ge suggests ‘battles’. On the basis of the fem. pl. phrase in 5, *citrābhiḥ ... ūtībhiḥ* I tentatively supply ‘means of help’; note that *ūtībhiḥ* appeared at the end of the previous vs., 1c.

IV.32.3: Ge takes *ójasā* as belonging to the enemy and providing the content of their boast: “der sich mit seiner Stärke grosstut.” But since *ójasā* is almost always pāda-final no matter what part of the vs. it belongs with and since Indra’s *ójas-* is usually what is referred to, I take it as Indra’s.

The comparative *śásīyas-* occurs only twice in the RV, once in a very slangy passages referring to a woman (V.61.6), in a usage that does not illuminate this one. Context in our passage favors the rendering ‘more numerous’ (so also Gr, Ge), given its contrast with *dabhrébhiś cid* “with only a few.” The question is how to get from the positive *śásvant-* ‘each and every, one after another, successive, recurrent, continual’ to a comparative ‘more numerous’. The English expression “they just keep coming, more and more” might be the clue. WG incorporate the literal sense of *śásvant-* but seem not to render the comparative: “die der Reihe nach erscheinenden.”

See disc. of *sacā* ad IV.31.5–6.

IV.32.10: The rel. prn. beginning pāda b, Samhitā *yā*, is ambiguous: it can stand for *yā* (neut. pl. and presumably picking up immed. preceding *vīryā* in the main cl.) or *yāḥ* (so Pp.) (fem. pl. and presumably anticipating *pūro dāsīḥ* in c). Neither is syntactically

satisfying: if it has *vīryā* as its antecedent, as normal syntactic practice would expect, it doesn't make sense in its clause: Indra didn't "break into" his manly deeds. If it refers to the fortresses, it works fine with the verb in its clause but has no direct connection to the main clause. I assume the ambiguity was meant and loose subordination was the reason. I render it as a general subordinator to avoid both bad choices.

IV.32.11: Pāda b is most likely an embedded relative -- a very rare syntactic phenomenon in the RV -- because the most likely reading of c is that the singers sing (a) "at the pressings" (*sutēṣu* c), not that Indra performed his deeds *sutēṣu*. However, it is just possible that *sutēṣu* could mean "in (the exhilaration of) the pressed soma drinks" and therefore continue the rel. cl. in b. In any case in this casually assembled Gāyatrī hymn, a syntactic violation does not seem too critical.

IV.32.13: The use of *śásvant-* here seems unconnected to the comparative *śásītyams-* in 3a. Since vs. 13 is found also in VIII.65.7, it may simply have been imported from elsewhere; the structure of this hymn is very loose and seems to have been cobbled together from standard tropes and formulae.

IV.32.15: The phrase *matīnām ... stómaḥ* "the praise-song of our thoughts" refers to the actual poetic composition that stems from our thoughts. In RVic discourse every step from 'mental inspiration' to 'thought' to 'song/poem' can be used to refer to the composed or formulated praise for a deity. Here we see the progression expressed.

IV.32.16: On the accent of *ghásah* see III.52.3.

IV.32.17: For *vyāti-* (RV 3x), despite Mayrhofer's apparent skepticism (EWA s.v.) I follow Re's deriv. (EVP 15: 37) from *vi√yam* with a presumed development 'hold separate/apart' → 'pair', though Re doesn't deign to indicate what the semantic channel might be.

khāṛī-, 'a measure of capacity', is found only here and much later in the sūtras and Classical Skt, but it appears to be widespread in MIA. See EWA s.v.

IV.32.20: *mā dabhrām* ("not a little!") is a prohibitive lacking a verb, though an aor. injunc. can easily be supplied of course: **dāḥ* matching the impv. *dehī* in the positive expression preceding it. Or alternatively s-aor. **bhāḥ* (i.e., **bhār*) to match flg. *bhara*.

IV.32.22: This very obscure dānastuti begins by presenting itself as an explicit formal praśasti (eulogistic praise), an important genre in later times and, in my opinion, the missing link between Rigvedic praise poetry and Classical kāvya (see Chap. IV in my *Rigveda between Two Worlds*), with the annunciatory verb *prā ... śaṃsāmi*. I think this high-style opening is meant as a deliberate contrast with the bawdy nature of the gift praised.

As noted in the publ. intro. I consider "the two brown ones" (*babhrū*) found in all three vss. of the dānastuti (22–24) to be the breasts of a woman given to the poet as a gift from his patron (a not-uncommon gift).

In c the poet playfully warns the patron not to stint on cows on the grounds that he's already given him something else. The expression is quite condensed. s

IV.32.23: This is the most difficult vs. of the sequence and has given rise to multiple contradictory, not to mention ludicrous, interpr. -- among which my own may be numbered (although I certainly think it's better than eyeballs). Note the two *-ká-* forms (*kanīnaké(va)*, *arbhaké*), indicating slangy, low-register speech and quite possibly associating it with women's language. (For disc. see my 2008 "Women's Language in the RV" and 2009 "Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka-Suffix: A Marker of Colloquial Register.") If the gift is really a woman, then evoking women's language would make sense.

On *vidradhá-* 'undressed, without clothes' see EWA s.v. As for *drupadá-* 'post', AV VI.63.3 *ayasmáye drupadé* "on a metal post" shows that the post need no longer be wooden (despite *dru-*), just as "plastic glasses" does not strike an English speaker as odd or contradictory. As I said in the publ. intro., I think the post refers to the woman's slender body, with two very prominent breasts, an ideal of a woman's body also encountered in Classical Skt. lit. The breasts are personified ("little baby-dolls") and invested with some autonomy as they move about during sex. Crosscultural parallels in sexual slang could surely be found.

[IV.33–37 JPB]

IV.38 Dadhikrā

The middle vss. of this hymn are introduced by repeated *utá sma* (5, 6, 8, 9), varied by *utá syá* in 7. As noted in the publ. intro, this sequence of 'and's adds to the sense of speed.

IV.38.1: Although the Anukramaṇī takes Heaven and Earth to be the deity of this vs., the unidentified duals must rather refer to Mitra and Varuṇa, as also in vs. 2. This is clear from IV.39, where Mitra and Varuṇa give Dadhikrā to the Purus (2cd, 5cd).

The publ. tr. doesn't accurately reflect *sánti* in pāda a. The tr. should read "Since there are earlier gifts ..."

The form *nitośé* is much disputed. Gr identifies it as a 3rd sg. to the thematic pres. *tośate* (otherwise unaccented), but not only is there a perfectly fine *-te* 3rd sg. (*tośate* 4x) while a *t*-less 3rd sg. would be anomalous, but given the full-grade we would expect root accent (**nitośe*). Old vacillates but displays a weak preference for a 3rd sg. unreduplicated perfect, and Ge, who does not comment, appears to follow him ("... ausgeschüttet hat"). Despite this scholarly pedigree, this solution appears to me to have little to recommend it: non-reduplicated perfects are quite rare. Gotō (1st Kl, 167–68) also vacillates: if it's a verb it's a non-redupl. pf. Or it might be the loc. of a noun *nitośá-*; this appears to be the view represented in WG. There does exist a them. noun *tośá-*. Re also tentatively suggests a locative but "à nuance semi-infinitive," tr. "pour être déversées." I find Re's interpr. appealing, though, as often, somewhat cavalier about grammar. I would like to take the form directly as a dative root noun in infinitival usage, but we should probably expect **nituśé*. It may have been adjusted to match the grade of *tośá-*, or the loc. ending -*é* of the them. noun may have been reinterpr. as a purpose dative. One might expect the

hapax *naitośá-* to provide some help, but it is only found in the impenetrable Ásvin hymn X.106.6, which appears to be written in code. In any event, the point of the hemistich seems to be that Mitra and Varuṇa provided gifts to Trasadasyu, who then redistributed them to his subjects the Purus in an appropriately kingly way.

IV.38.2: On *-niṣṣídḥ-* see comm. ad III.51.5 and on *puru-niṣṣídḥ-* comm. ad I.10.5. It is possible here that *-niṣṣídḥ-* ‘tributes’ are owed to Dadhikrā rather than provided by him. Cf. Klein (DGRV I.420) “to whom many tributes are due”; this would fit better with *carkṣtyam aryáh*.

For *pruṣita-psu-* ‘frothing at the mouth’ (< ‘having spraying breath’), see EWA s.v. *psu-*.

IV.38.3: There is sharp difference of opinion about the sense of *medhayú-*: is it built to *medhā-* ‘wisdom’ or *médha-* ‘ritual offering, meal’? The former is the choice of Ge, Re, Mayr (tentatively, EWA, s.v. *medhā-*), while Gr, Scar (188), and I opt for ‘meal’. (WG’s rendering “wie ein Opfertier Verlangender” must also reflect this *médha-* stem.) The ‘meal’ interpr. fits well with *gr̥dhyantam* ‘greedy’, and it also makes more sense to me that a horse would want something to eat rather than wisdom. Moreover, if Dadhikrā represents the sacrificial horse in the Ásvamedha, there is a (sinister) echo of the name of this sacrifice: the horse is unwittingly seeking his own sacrifice. It can, of course, also be a pun.

IV.38.4: This vs. contains a number of puzzles, though the general purport -- the success of Dadhikrā in battles and raids -- is clear.

gádhya- elsewhere (3x) modifies *vāja-* ‘prize’, but that precise word can’t be supplied here, because it is masc. and *gádhyā* must be neut. pl. Nonetheless, battle spoils or the like must be meant. Ge’s rendering of *gádhya-* as “bis an die Wagendecke reichende (Beute)” must rest on the later (sūtra) *gadhā* ‘Verdeck des Lastwagens’ (see EWA s.v.), but given the chronological gap and the fact that EWA considers the etym. of *gadhā* unklar, this seems unnecessary. Ge is consistent: the other occurrences of *gádhya-* he tr. ‘deckenhohe’.

I take *cáratī ... gáchan* as a periphrasis, “keeps going,” though the standard tr. take the two verbal forms separately. There is no way to tell.

The problematic form in this pāda is *sánutaraḥ*, about which there is no consensus even on what part of speech it represents. The uncertainty can be seen acutely in Mayrhofer’s changing approach to it. In KEWA (s.v. *sanutāḥ*) he tentatively decides to follow AiG II.2.596, 608, 698 in taking it as a comparative built to the verb stem *sanóti*, meaning ‘mehr gewinnend’ (an interpr. that goes back, one way or the other, to Sāy.). But in EWA (s.v. *sanutár*) he has changed his mind, attaching it rather to the adv. *sanutár* ‘away’, attributing its aberrant form to reinterpretation by this late poet, and citing Tichy (Nom. agen. 58–59), who suggests it’s a comparative to the adv. Both Ge and Re derive it from √*san* ‘win’, though in different ways: Ge’s tr. (“als bester Gewinner”) seems to reflect the comparative interpr. favored by Sāy. and AiG (though transposed into the superlative); Re (“gagnant”) explicitly suggests that it stands for **sánutra-*, formed like *tárutra-*, an interpr. that Gr also gestures towards. Old favors a connection with the adv. *sanutár*, as do WG (flg. Tichy), tr. “immer ferner wandelt.” My tr. reflects an analysis as

comparative agent noun to \sqrt{san} (“as one better at winning”), but I do not feel strongly about it. In fact, I would probably now emend my tr. to “keeps going further in (the contests for) cows”: the contrast between his hemming in the booty in a and himself going further in b would be thematically nice, and if I am correct about the meaning of d, the expansion of the horse’s wanderings further and further would be appropriate to what is expressed in d. But I am not certain that this question can be decided.

My interpr. of *āvirjīkaḥ* rests on Thieme’s (Unt. p. 40, n. 2): ‘an dem der Schaum hervortritt’. This image responds to *pruṣitāpsum* in 2c.

vidāthā nicīkyat recurs in AV V.20.12.

The last pāda is the most baffling of all. The second part of it, *pāry āpa āyóḥ*, is also found at I.178.1 (q.v.). The major question is the identity of *āpaḥ*: is it a form of $\sqrt{āp}$ ‘reach, acquire’, whether verbal or nominal (so Ge, WG); is it a derivative of *āpas-* ‘work’ (so Gr, Re; dubious EWA s.v. *āpas-*); or is it the nom. pl. of *āp-* ‘water’, used as an acc. (Old, Thieme, WG possibly [in n.]? I follow Thieme’s interpr. (Unters. 40–41), which sees “the waters of Āyu” as an expression referring to land habitable because it is well watered. If this phrase is essentially locational, then one might expect the preceding *tiró aratīm* to be as well: “across the *aratī-*.” Unfortunately, though Thieme’s general interpr. of *aratī-* I find persuasive, his tr. of this phrase “schneller als die Räder [seines Wagens]” is problematic, because I do not see how *tiráḥ* can mean ‘faster’. It is always otherwise a preposition/adverb. I therefore think Dadhikrā is being depicted as crossing the *aratī* and racing around “the waters of Āyu.” These two locational phrases may refer to the ritual ground, as Old suggests: the horse runs across the fire on the ritual ground and around the water vessels used for the sacrifice. Or, my preference, it can refer to the territory of the Ārya, which the horse traverses and thus, as it were, claims for his owner (much as the Ásvamedha horse does in his year-long pre-sacrificial ramble). What *aratī-* would stand for in this scenario isn’t entirely clear to me -- but since *aratī-* can mean ‘spoked wheel, circlet, circle’, I would tentatively suggest that the horse runs *across* a notional circle of land belonging to / claimed by / aspired to by the Ārya and then *around* the periphery of this circle to enclose it as Ārya possession. I would therefore now emend my tr. to “across the circle (of Ārya land), around the waters of Āyu.”

IV.38.5: The lexeme *ānu* $\sqrt{kruś}$ is later a semi-technical term for raising the hue-and-cry, which would be appropriate in this context.

There is a phonological echo of 4c *nicīkyat* in 5c *nīcāyamānam*, although the latter is to be analyzed as *nīcā+āyamānam*. The latter belongs to the marginal thematized pres. *āyate* to \sqrt{i} (see Gotō, 1st Kl., 92–97). There is one other occurrence of this medial part. in the RV, otherwise a few finite forms, some of which are ambiguous between subjunctive to the root pres. and indicative to a them. pres.

IV.38.6: The referent and construction of *āsu* require discussion. Ge (/WG) construe it with *prathamāḥ* (“first among these”) and supply “cows.” But this doesn’t make sense if the meaning is “desiring to run first among these,” because that conjures up a picture of the horse leading a stampede of cattle in a race -- surely not an ancient Indian sporting event or battle array! If the *āsu* is to be construed with the rest of its pāda, it should refer to the ranks of chariots in b (*śréṇibhī ráthānām*): *śréṇi-* is fem. and the image appears to be of Dadhikrā leading a charge of chariots, a far more likely scenario. However, I think

unaccented *āsu* is simply taking (modified) Wackernagel's position in the clause and should be construed with *ní vevetī* in b: the horse is bearing down on the females. (Note that *ní vevetī ... āsu* is found also in III.55.9.) Even so, I would not supply 'cows': although we are (too) accustomed to having (notional) cows as the goal of a hypermasculine animal in the ever-repeated formulae in Maṇḍala IX, where Soma the bull seeks cows in the form of milk, in fact Dadhikrā should be seeking mares, not cows, if this is about his desire to mate. However, if he is not seeking mates, but merely prizes, cows will do. (And note *cáratī góṣu gáchan* in 4b, where the cows are explicit.)

The sexual reading I suggest for ab may be supported by pāda c, where I follow Gr, Re, and WG (in n.) in taking *jánya-* as a member of a wedding party, not merely a man 'belonging to (one's own) people, Landsmann'. For *jánya-* in a wedding context, see AV XI.8.1–2. Here the comparison is presumably between the garland of the winner of the race and that of a suitor or groomsman at a wedding.

Ge and Re (EVP 15.163) render *kirāṇam* as 'rein' (Ge Zügel, Re rêne), flg. Sāy. (*āsyagataṃ khalīnam*), though Re appears to recant in his n. Neither etymology nor the other occurrences of the word (*not* so tr. by Ge, e.g.) support this interpr., and context also favors a version of 'dust' (so WG 'Stäubchen'). Note *kirate reṇúm* "scatters dust" in 7d, where the verb *kirate* echoes *kirāṇa-*.

IV.38.7: On pāda b (=VII.19.2) see comm. on the latter passage. As discussed there, although the standard tr. (here Ge, Re, WG) take *śúśrūṣamāṇaḥ* as a form of $\sqrt{\text{śruṣ}}$ 'obey' and tr. accordingly, it is simply a well-formed desiderative to $\sqrt{\text{śru}}$ 'hear / be heard/famed' (so classified by Gr, Wh [Rts], Heenen), with the mid. meaning 'desiring fame (for oneself), desiring to be(come) famed'.

Pāda c contains another unidentified fem. loc. pl., the pres. part. *yaṭīṣu*. Old, Ge, and Re take the referent to be the ranks of chariots from 6b, WG cows. I again prefer mares (though the other two are possible, depending on how it is construed). I take the *túram*, the acc. sg. of a root noun (see Schindler s.v., though I do not follow his interpr. of this passage), as an adverb. It forms a phrasal verb with $\sqrt{\text{i}}$ 'go hastily' (so approx. Old). In context *túram ya(tīṣu)* is a close match to the immed. following *turáyan*. It would be an even better match if the 2nd participle were *turaṇyán* (two forms of this verbal stem are found in the Dadhikrā hymn IV.40: *turaṇyatáḥ* 3a, *turaṇyati* 4a, and cf. also *turaṇyasát* 2b), and I am tempted to think that the poet had this stem in mind, but opted for phonologically similar *turáyant-* because his preferred form would have produced a bad break. Like *turaṇyasát* in 40.2, our form would be a deliberate deformation of the expected one to fit metrical circumstances, though our *turáyan* makes no morphological difficulties, unlike *turaṇyasát*.

IV.38.9: As Old points out, the contrastive lexemes *sám* $\sqrt{\text{i}}$ and *ví* $\sqrt{\text{i}}$ are juxtaposed in *samithé viyántaḥ*.

IV.38.10: The first hemistich contains a three-termed simile / frame construction, in which all three terms are realized in both simile and frame. This is fairly unusual.

Re nicely points out that the product of d would be what is later called the *madhuparka*, the concoction offered to an honored guest.

IV.39 Dadhikrā

As was noted in the publ. intro., the middle hymn of the small Dadhikrā cycle differs in style and content from the hymns before and after, presenting a formal praśasti-type encomium.

IV.39.1: The hopes expressed for “my” improvement and safety in the 2nd hemistich are presumably in service of my producing a good praise-hymn.

IV.39.2: I take *kratu-prā-* as referring to the poet’s own *krātu-* ‘intention, conception’ -- that is, producing the praise-hymn he has envisioned. So also Re and (partly) WG. Others consider it the *krātu-* of others or of all, and Old suggests an emendation to **kratuprāḥ* (gen.) because he thinks it more applicable to Dadhikrā than the poet. This cmpd seems to play off *kṛṣṭi-prā-* in the last hymn (IV.38.9b) in structure and phonology, but since it is found once elsewhere, as is the derivative *kratu-prāvan-*, both in the same hymn (X.100.12 and 11 respectively), it was not simply created here for the occasion on that model. That both words in X.100 refer to a poet/singer as here undercuts Old’s justification for his emendation.

Maurer (324–25) renders *puruvāra-* as ‘richly tailed’ (*vāra-* ‘tail-hair’ beside *vāra-* ‘favor, choice thing’), an interpr. also given by Scar (332) as an alternative (‘mit den buschigen Schwanzhaaren’). I find this appealing (as a pun, not as the primary reading) -- but ultimately unlikely: unlike the other hymns in this sequence, no other physical attributes or characteristics of Dadhikrā, save his swiftness, are described in this hymn.

In the 2nd hemistich *pūrúbhyah ... táturim* was mistakenly tr. twice in the publ tr. Eliminate the last phrase “as one triumphant for the Pūrus.”

IV.39.3: The interpretive problem in this vs. is caused by the length of a single vowel: *sá* instead of **sā* in d. The most obvious contextual reading of the pāda is that Aditi should act in concert with Mitra and Varuṇa, but of course Aditi is feminine and the pronoun is masc. Sāy. makes Dadhikrā the referent and is followed by Ge, Re, Maurer, and (tentatively, see their n.) WG. (Maurer in fact takes Dadhikrā also as the subj. of *kṛṇotu* in c and interprets *áditiḥ* as a masc. adj. ‘free of bond’.) Old discusses at some length and comes to a solution (in agreement with Hillebrandt) somewhat like Maurer’s: that the subject of both c and d is Dadhikrā in the guise of / identified with Aditi. I find all this unlikely; despite the syntactic problem, I think the subject of d has to be Aditi, who has a close natural connection with her sons Mitra and Varuṇa (unlike Dadhikrā). Masc. *sá* may simply show attraction to the adj. *sajóṣāḥ*, which is ambig. between masc. and fem. Or, in my opinion more likely, the pāda may have been incompletely adapted from one in which the referent of *sá* was Aryaman, the standard third member of this trio. No exact parallel is found in the RV, but cf. passages like I.90.1, I.186.2=VII.60.4 and, with Aditi, VI.51.5 and V.31.5. Another possibility, that the *sá* refers to the mortal poet favored by Aditi in c, was essentially closed off by Old, who persuasively argues that *sajóṣa(s)-* refers almost without exception to the relationship of gods with gods or, less frequently, mortals with mortals -- but not interspecies relationships, as it were.

IV.39.4: There are several ways to configure the syntax of this vs. The first question is whether the genitives in pāda a should be construed with the verb of b. But since

ámanmahi takes an acc. (*nāma*) in b, this seems unlikely (though Maurer does it that way), and the standard tr. (including mine) supply in pāda a a form of $\sqrt{k\bar{r}}$ ‘pay tribute’, which has dominated the hymn so far (1ab, 2a, 3a) and consistently takes the gen. (The aor. *ákārit* in the preceding vs. [3a], or rather the 1st pl. equivalent, seems the obvious form to supply.) The question then arises what the relationship between pādas a and b is. Ge seems to take pāda a as the main cl. and b as dependent on it (“... da wir ...”), presumably subordinated by the *yád* ending pāda a. Re seems to follow this interpr., though with some French curlicues of his own. This type of structure, with one clause ending right before the final monosyllable of a pāda and the next beginning with that monosyllable and continuing through the next pāda, strikes me as an unprecedented, or at least exceedingly rare, clause configuration. If one of these clauses is subordinated to the other, it should be the other way around, with pāda-final *yád* marking what precedes as a subordinate clause and b as the main clause. (Note that although *yád* is preceded by a lot of material, it all belongs to a single NP.) In this account the accent on *ámanmahi* would be due to its pāda-initial position. This is the way WG take it. My interpr. differs from both of these in making both clauses in the first hemistich subordinate to cd, expressing a temporal progression: after we have celebrated (aor.?) and brought to mind (aor.), then we call upon (pres.).

The relationship between the genitives in a, which are simply strung together without internal structure (*dadhikrāvna iṣá ūrjó maháh*), is clarified in the next hymn (IV.40.2d), where it is said that Dadhikrā(van) gave birth to *iṣ-* and *ūrj-*.

IV.39.5: Dadhikrā as *sūdanam mārtyāya* “making sweetness for the mortal” provides a ring with 1c *mām uṣāsaḥ sūdayantu*, though there the sweetening was attributed to the dawns. Since vs. 6 is a summary vs. and in a different meter, the 1/5 ring defines the outer edges of the poem.

IV.40 Dadhikrā

See the publ. intro. for a disc. of the style. The poet likes repetitive figures: 2a *bhariṣó gaviṣó* (b *iṣá[h]*); 2ab *duvanyasác*, (*chravasyád*) ... *turanyasát* (3a *turanyatáh* ... 4a *turanyati*); 2c *dravó dravaráh* (3a *drávatas* ... 3c *dhrajato*); 5 *śuciśád* ... *antarikṣasád* ... *vediśád* ... *duroṇasát* / *nṛśád varasád rṭasád vyomasád*; 5d *abjā gojā rṭajā adriḥjā*; see others noted below. The means he uses to produce these patterns are not always strictly grammatical and there are a number of hapaxes. Orthodox Vedic linguists have not always responded to the exuberant linguistic invention on display and have produced some plodding by-the-book analyses.

IV.40.1: As noted in the publ. intro., vs. 1 stands apart from the rest of this hymn and is a simple variant on 39.1: our pāda a telescopes 39.1ab; our b corresponds to 39.1c; and cd are an afterthought list in the genitive, attached loosely to the first pāda.

IV.40.2: Note pāda-initial *sátvā* (a) and *satyó* (c).

The first hapax we encounter is an easy one to account for (almost as though the poet was breaking us in slowly): *bhariṣá-* ‘seeking plunder’ is modeled on immed. flg. *gaviṣá-*; so Old, flg. AiG II.1.65. I think that *iṣáh* in the next pāda is also felt as part of this series, although it has a different grammatical analysis and function.

The very puzzling rhyming pāda-final *duvanyasāt* (a) and *turanyasāt* (b), also both hapaxes, have to be considered together, and the latter needs first to be put in context with likewise pāda-final *turanyatāh* (gen. sg. part., 3a) and *turanyati* (3rd sg. pres., 4a), both of which also have Dadhikrā as subject. Clearly the poet wanted to position this signature word (see also 38.7c and comm. thereon) in the same place in all 3 pādas, but since our verse is couched in the nom. sg., the grammatical form of the part. would be *turanyān*, which would not fit (and a finite form would be out of place, since the pāda already has a finite verb). He needs another syllable -- a point also made by Scar (565). How exactly does he get it? Unfortunately I don't have an altogether satisfactory answer, but I am tolerably certain that the standard answer given -- that this is a root-noun cmpd with final member from \sqrt{sad} -- is dead wrong. It is true that vs. 5 has an impressive array of *-sād-* compounds, but their first members are actual places, and, in the phrases in which they're embedded, sitting makes sense (e.g., 5b "a Hotar sitting at the vedi"). (For the function of these cmpds in the hymn, see comm. ad vs. 5.) Here the horse is on a dizzying breakneck run -- "sitting" in or among anything is exactly opposite to the spirit of the vs., no matter how attenuated "sit" might have become in the cmpd. And the supposed first member, *turanya-*, is simply not a place to sit. So the various tr. offered -- Gr 'in Raschheit wohnend', Ge 'der unter den Spitzenführern sitzt', Re 'qui siège parmi ceux qui foncent-en-avant', Scar 'unter die Vordringenden, Eifrigen, Eilenden setzend', WG 'der unter den Durchsetzenden Sitzende' -- despite the worthiness of their attempts, simply sound silly *and* significantly slow the onrush of this wonderful verbal picture. My own suggestion begins with the class of *-asānā-* participles or pseudo-participles like *sahasānā-* (on which see comm. ad IV.3.6). I suggest that our poet was familiar with such forms (of which there are quite a few in IV; cf. nearby *mandasānāḥ* IV.34.10, IV.35.6, etc.) and that he created an active participle on the model of these apparent middles: *mandānā-* : *mandasānā-* :: *turanyānt-* → **turanyasānt-*. Note that the accent matches that of the *-asānā-* forms; note also that act. *turanyasāt* fits a Triṣṭubh cadence, while a med. **turanyasānā-* would not. (The *mandasānā-* forms just cited are pāda-final in Jagatī.) Why *-sāt*? I would argue that it is the neuter in adverbial usage; an original nom. sg. masc. in *-sān* may have been readjusted to match the *-sād-* cmpds in vs. 5, but I am certain its origin was verbal.

Now what about *duvanyasāt*? First, it is clear that the *-anyasāt* part is completely dependent on *turanyasāt*. As we just saw, the latter belongs to a tight-knit *turanyā-* set, but there is no **duvanyā-*. The form is almost universally taken as a *-sād-* cmpd. based on *dúvas-* 'friendship', similar to the denon. *duvasyāti* 'offers friendship, gives friendly reception to'. Scar (566) explicitly presents it as a crossing of *duvasyā-* with *turanyā-*, "was bei der Experimentierfreude des Dichters von 4.40 akzeptable scheint." The whole cmpd is then rendered 'der unter den Bevorzugten ... sitzt' (Ge), 'qui siège parmi les privilégiés' (Re), 'unter die, denen Ehrung zuteil wird, setzend' (?) (Scar), 'unter den Huldigenden Sitzende' (WG). Such an interpr. requires pushing the semantics of *dúvas-* and its relatives rather further than seems reasonable, while a more lit. 'sitting among friends/those who offer friendship' would be a somewhat comical description of a racehorse. Further it suffers from the "sit" problem identified also for *turanyasāt*: the horse is galloping at top speed, not sitting in the bleachers with the grandees. I therefore reject the connection with *dúvas-* and take my cue from Gr's (ignored) interpr. 'in der Ferne weilend', 'dessen Wesen es ist, in die Ferne zu dringen' -- in other words to

associate the first member with *dūrā-* ‘far’, with a thematized zero-grade *duv-a-* beside pre-consonantal *dū-rā-* (and pre-vocalic full-grades *dāvīyas-*, *daviṣṭha*). A similar derivation must account for *duvasanāsaḥ* ‘going the distance’, vel sim. (e.g., Re ‘fonçant-au-loin, WG ‘sich ... entfernen’), in IV.6.10 (note, also in Maṇḍala IV), whose connection with *dūrā-*, etc., is generally agreed upon, though its morphology is unclear and also owes something to nearby forms. See comm. ad loc. It should be noted that Re in EVP 13 (1964) in his comm. to IV.6.10 suggests that our *duvanyasāt* contains the ‘far’ word: ‘qui demeure loin (en arrière)’ and is oppositional to *turaṇyasāt* ‘qui (va) rapidement (en avant)’, but in EVP 15 (1966), which contains his tr. and comm. to IV.40, he has substituted the tr. given above.

Pāda c produces a new set of problems, though happily much less intractable than those just discussed. Though *dravā-* is found only here in the RV (but common later), its derivation and meaning are straightforward. The next word, *dravarā-*, is a hapax, but transparently generated to the preceding *dravā-*. It may simply have the suffix *-ara-* (so AiG II.2.215) like semantically similar *patarā-* ‘flying’ (RV 3x), but I wonder, given the missing syllable in this pāda, described by HvN as “a rest at the 5th place” (that is, directly before *dravarā-*), whether *dravarā-* is meant to remind us of an allegro form of a compative in *-tara-*, slurred in rapid speech (though the accent would be wrong). Finally, another hapax, *patamgarā-*, owes its *-rā-* to preceding *dravarā-*, added to the well-established stem *patamgā-* (the aforementioned *patarā-* may also have played a part).

IV.40.3–4: These two vss. revisit the *utā sma* opening that characterized the middle vss. of IV.38.

There is also a concentration of intensives: 3d *tāritrataḥ*, 4c *saṃtāvīt^u vat*, 4d *āpaniphanat* -- appropriate to the ever-increasing speed and the intense repetitive movements of the horse racing to the finish line.

IV.40.3: The imagery of this vs. picks up the ‘flying’ (*patamgarāḥ*) of 2c.

In pāda a *drāvataḥ* both looks back to *dravó dravarāḥ* in 2c (all derived from the same root and with *dravarāḥ* metrically identical to and in the same metrical position as *drāvataḥ*) and forward to *dhṛájataḥ* in 3c (same metrical shape and position, rhyming forms).

Most tr. give *ānu vāti* additive semantics, ‘blows after, blows following’, but elsewhere this lexeme means ‘fan (flames)’ (I.148.4, IV.7.10, VII.3.2, X.142.4). Here I think it’s used figuratively, of the wind ruffling up mane/feathers. The standard tr. (including mine) supply ‘wind’ as the subj.

As both Ge and Old point out, the *parṇām* ‘wing, feather(s)’ in the simile lacks an overt correspondent in the frame, where we’d expect a body part of the horse. Old suggests quick feet or (from Ludwig) the mane. I assume the latter, and in fact I think that *parṇām* can be read with both simile and frame. In the simile *parṇām* is used as a collective for the bird’s feathers, in the frame metaphorically for a horse’s mane. (A Google search of “feathery mane” produces respectable results, including a snatch of John Keats, “the eagle’s feathery mane” [“Hymn to Apollo”], which shows the metaphor going the opposite direction.)

pragardhín- ‘greedy’ is appropriate for both the bird and Dadhikrā, as Ge also points out: cf. IV.38.3 *paḍbhír gṛdhyantam*.

I follow Schaeffer (Intens. 131) in taking *añkasām* as referring to the curving racetrack rather than, with some, as a curvy part of a horse. Since *āñkāṃsi* in the next vs. clearly refers to the racetrack, it's unlikely that a related word would have an entirely different referent in such close proximity.

IV.40.4: *kṣipañí-* is yet another hapax. The standard rendering is 'lash' (Ge: Peitschenhieb, Re: coup-de-fouet), and the publ. tr. simply follows this. WG suggest rather 'in Beschleunigung' (acceleration). Acdg. to their n. they take it as an Inhaltsakk., flg. Gaedicke. This is possible, I suppose: 'rushes a rush' → 'rushes a flinging' ('flinging' → 'acceleration'). But since the similarly formed *kṣipañú-* (IV.58.6) appears to be a physical weapon, a physical object seems likely here. Moreover, this vs. abruptly confronts us with the harsh constraints imposed on the horse by his rider -- "bound" in three places and whipped to frenzied running. The lash is an important part of this picture. Until now Dadhikrā has been presented as an untrammelled autonomous agent, but now the audience must suddenly reassess who's the boss, as it were. For the relationship between *√kṣip* 'fling, hurl' and whips, see V.83.3 *rathīva kāsayaśvān abhikṣipān* "Like a charioteer lashing out at his horses with a whip."

The two pādas of the 2nd half-vs. are nicely balanced, each ending with an intensive participle preceded by a preposition phrase headed by *ānu* 'following' (in the same metrical position). The two *ānu* phrases are contrastive, however: in c what is being followed is mental (*krátum*), in d simply the physical course (*pathām āñkāṃsi*). Given the horse's portrayal in the first half of the vs., we must now wonder whose *krātu-* Dadhikrā is following. For most of this series we would have assumed he follows his own -- he's been shown as an irresistible force of nature -- but 4ab show him under human control, confined in horse tackle and whipped, so we might instead wonder if it is his rider's *krātu-* that he is subject to.

IV.40.5: After the increasingly furious speed and frenzied activity in the last vss., culminating in the three intensives (two in the preceding hemistich, 4c, d), this vs. brings it to a shockingly abrupt stop. Eight cmpds ending in 'sit' (*-śād-*), with a sense exactly opposite to the preceding verbs of motion, decisively halt the movement and impose a state of rest, even inertia. The horse is gone; I explicitly do not think this series of phrases are meant to serve as predicates to an unexpressed Dadhikrā, *pace* Old and WG. Instead I think these are images of tranquility, of beings in their proper places, a vision of cosmic balance that has no need for the frenetic agitation we have just witnessed. The lack of finite verbs and participles -- all verbal notions being expressed by root-nouns in compound -- models this stasis. The *-śād-* cmpds give way in the final pāda to 4 *-jā-* 'X-born' cmpds. I am not entirely sure of their purpose, but I think they sketch (however incomplete) the sources of the entities in the cosmos. And we end with the single word *ṛtām* 'truth', which, perhaps, incorporates it all, beyond which nothing more is needed and no motion required.

IV.41 Indra and Varuṇa

The patterning of the names of the two gods is mildly interesting. It is fairly strict for the first half of the hymn but varies considerably in the 2nd. The first 5 vss. have a discontinuous dual dvandva opening the first pāda, either as voc. *īndrā ... varuṇā* (1a, 4a,

5a) or nom./acc. *īndrā ... vāruṇā* (nom. 3a, acc. 4a). The next vss. break the pattern, but the variation starts slowly: vs. 6 (the central vs. of the hymn) does contain the pāda-initial nom. dual dvandva but postponed until the 2nd hemistich (6c). But then vs. 7 omits the names altogether. The names reappear in vs. 8, but in the final pāda and not as a dual dvandva but as a pāda-initial discontinuous individual sg. acc. phrase: 8d *īndram ... vāruṇam*. The same individual acc. phrase (now continuous but not pāda initial) is found in 9a. Vs. 10 again omits the names. The final vs. returns to a discontinuous pāda-initial voc. phrase, but only in the b pāda and with singulars not dual: *īndra ... varuṇa*. Thus the 2nd half of the hymn appears to treat the gods separately rather than as a unit, but I see no reflection of this separation in the content of the hymn: the two do not display their individual characteristics more in the 2nd half.

IV.41.1–2: Note *āpa* ending 1a matched with *āpī* ending 2a. Also the accumulation of *-vant/-mant-* forms in these 2 vss.: *haviṣmān* 1b, *krátumān* 1c, *námasvān* 1d, *práyasvān* 2b.

IV.41.1: I am unhappy with the preterital value (‘has obtained’) universally assigned (incl. Kü 115) to *āpa* in pāda a, because it ill-fits the subj. *paspárśat* ‘will touch’ in d. My ‘will obtain’ is a wishful thinking, however, at odds with the grammar. I would emend to ‘obtains’, with a presential value that Kü (116) allows for some passages.

IV.41.2: With Re (EVP 7: 75) I take *vā* in d not as the disjunctive ‘or’, but the enclitic dual 2nd ps. prn. (*vā(m)*) before *m-*, though Old rejects this view. AiG III.477 also takes *vā* in this passage as the dual enclitic pronoun, but considers the *-m-*less form historically correct.

IV.41.3: The orphaned *tā* at the end of b is a bit surprising, somewhat reminiscent of the pāda-filling mechanisms engaged in by the epic bards, but not usually resorted to or needed by Rigvedic poets. This hymn is, however, not particularly topnotch work; compare Re’s comment “Banalisation des hymnes joints.”

I am inclined to read *yādī* as **yād ī*, even though the *ī* would not double an object (unless it is the unexpressed reflexive ‘themselves’) but would be pleonastic. The reading would be to avoid *yādī* ‘if’. The standard tr. indeed all render as ‘when’, not ‘if’.

IV.41.4: Re makes the nice point that *vṛkāti-* ‘wolfishness’ and *dabhīti-* ‘deception’ are respectively Indraic and Varuṇian offenses.

IV.41.5: Note the middle opt. *duhīya+t* remarked as act., like the impf. *āduha+t*.

IV.41.6: The first hemistich consists of a series of loc. absol., all depending on *hité* ‘set (as stake)’.

IV.41.7: My tr. departs in two ways from the standard. I take *prābhūtī* as instr. sg. (as it is in IV.54.3), not acc. du., and *gavīṣaḥ* as gen. sg. with *svāpī* (also suggested by Ge in his n.), not nom. pl. The *pāri* is somewhat perplexing. Re construes it with *prābhūtī* (“ô vous

qui dominez tout autour,” wrongly as a voc.); my “pervasive preeminence” is a version of this.

IV.41.8: Vs.-initial *tā* is ambiguous: it can represent either masc. du. *tā* supporting the immed. flg. enclitic *vām* (as so often; see my “Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?” *Historische Sprachforschung* 105 [1992]) or fem. pl. *tāḥ* (so Pp.) modifying *dhíyaḥ*. Or, my preference, both.

Although, strictly speaking, fem. *vājayántīḥ* belongs in the frame, modifying *dhíyaḥ*, in sense it fits better with the simile, since contests are where prizes are won. Moreover, see the next vs. (9d) where fem. ‘fleet mares’ (*raghvīḥ*) seek fame -- so female racehorses would be possible in the simile here.

In c *śrīyé* has double sense, belonging both to *śrī* ‘glory, splendour’ and to *√śrī* ‘mix’, as Ge and Re point out. The latter is appropriate to the simile, the former to the frame.

Acdg. to WG, the *gíraḥ* go to Indra and the *manīṣāḥ* to Varuṇa. Although, as was noted above, this is the first place in the hymn where the two names are singular, not associated as a dual, I think it unlikely that the different vocal products have different divine goals. Note that in the first half of the vs. the *dhíyaḥ* are going to both, and the repeated *manīṣāḥ* in the next vs. go to both as well. That *gíraḥ* immediately follows *índram* in 8d is not significant; In all but one instance (9a) of the two names, something intervenes.

IV.41.9: I read *vásvaḥ* twice, once as the complement of *joṣṭāraḥ* in the simile (“those who enjoy a good thing”) and once in the frame with *bhíkṣamāṇāḥ* (“seeking a share of the goods”). Contra WG, I take *śrávasaḥ* only in the simile, since this part of the hymn seems all about our acquiring possessions, not fame.

IV.41.10: Pāda c has been variously dealt with -- as parenthetical (Ge), as a separate clause (Re, WG), as the obj. of the verb in d (Old). All of these take the two gods as the subj. of the part. *cakrāṇā* (flg. the du. reading of the Pp., *cakrāṇau*), and all of them fail to render the medial sense of the part. Since the med. pf. *cakré* in 2a has clear medial sense (“made X his own”), the voice of this participle should not be ignored. I therefore read it as nom. plural (contra Pp. but compatible with Saṃhitā), modifying the 1st pl. subj. of ab. Again, we want to make the gods our own; this forms a ring with the same usage in 2a.

[IV.42 JPB]

IV.43 Aśvins

IV.43.1: As disc. in the publ. intro., the two forms of *katamá-* ‘which of 3+’ and the pl. *amṛteṣu* make it clear that these questions are applicable to all the gods, not just the Aśvins.

IV.43.2: Again, two occurrences of *katamá-* and one of the pl. *devānām* keep the widest possible range of choices for the answer to these questions.

On “Sūryā chose the chariot” and sim. expressions as an indication of the svayamvara (self-choice) marriage in the RV, see my “The Rigvedic svayamvara? Formulaic evidence” (Fs. Parpola 2001). Although, as just mentioned, the first half-vs. keeps the options open, the mention of Sūryā and the chariot immediately narrows down the choice of answer to the Aśvins (to a contemporary audience).

IV.43.3: This vs. gives the answer to the questions in 1–2: the Aśvins. As was just indicated, this answer was adumbrated by 2cd, but indirectly, via a mention of a chariot that could only belong to the Aśvins. Now we finally have a verse couched in the dual, but note that the name Aśvin (or Nāsatya) is not found; the dual is enough.

Pāda a gives an implicit answer to 2a -- *katamā āgamiṣṭhaḥ* “Which one (will be) the first to come?” -- by asserting that they “come right away” (*makṣū ... gāchathaḥ*). I don’t quite understand *īvato dyūn* “during/through days such as these”; I assume it indicates that even in our time (not merely in the mythological past), they still rush right here.

In b *śaktīm* is a slightly odd goal. Ge takes it as an infinitive, a use of the acc. of the -*tī*-stem I’d rather avoid. I think it means “comes into his ability/power” -- i.e., is immediately able to wield it at the necessary, decisive moment.

Pāda d, with the two forms of $\sqrt{\text{śac}}$ (*śacīnām ... śaciṣṭhā*) echoing *śaktīm* in b, seems to allow the possibility that the Aśvins have comparable, but different, abilities from Indra’s.

IV.43.4: On *ūpamāti-* as belonging to $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$ not $\sqrt{\text{man}}$, see comm. ad VIII.40.9. Note that WG (‘Zumessung’) must also derive it from $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$. The Aśvins’ *ūpamāti-* might be an answer to the question in 3d: which one is their best ability? This stem is also the obvious one to supply with the instr. fem. *kāyā*, which immediately follows.

I construe cd very differently from the standard tr., which take c and d as separate clauses (though Ge and Re both supply a form of the verb of d, *uruṣyā-*, in c). I take *kó vām* as an independent nominal cl., with the next cl. beginning with *mahāḥ* and running to the end (cf. the structure of ab, which also has a clause break in the middle of pāda a, with the 2nd cl. continuing to the end of b). The reason for this choice is that it is difficult to render c as a unity if *abhīke* is taken in its usual sense (hence the attenuations in the other tr.). Moreover, *abhīke* regularly appears with *uruṣyā-* and similar ‘make wide space’ expressions: VII.85.1 *tā no yāmann uruṣyatām abhīke* “Let those two give us wide space in close quarters on our journey,” X.38.4 *yó abhīke varivovít* “who finds wide space in close quarters...,” X.133.1 *abhīke cid ulokakṛt* “a maker of wide space even in close quarters.” Earlier in IV an ablative phrase like our *mahás cit tyájasah* is found adjacent to *abhīke*: IV.12.5 *mahás cid agna énaso abhīke* “(Release us) from even a great offense in close quarters, o Agni.” All of these parallels lead to the conclusion that everything starting with *mahāḥ* should be read with *uruṣyátam* in the next pāda, since *abhīke* patterns with *uruṣyā-* and the abl. phrase is connected with *abhīke*. However, I realize that the phrase in the publ. tr. “even out of great neglect” seems unconnected to the rest and makes little sense. I now feel that we need to interpr. *uruṣyátam* in two different senses. With *abhīke* it has its physical literal meaning ‘make wide space’, but with the abl. *mahás cit tyájasah* it has the extended sense ‘release, free (from)’. I would therefore emend the tr. to “Make wide space for us in close quarters, free us even from

great neglect/abandonment.” WG take *tyājas-* as ‘Lebensopfer’, but this must rest on the later notion of sacrifice as *tyāga-*. This concept is not really a part of the RVic ritual universe -- though see the single occurrence of *tyāgá-* in the RV in IV.24.3, where it refers to the abandonment of one’s body in battle.

IV.43.5: I take pāda b with c rather than a, because I think those two middle pādas depict (somewhat playfully?) the Aśvins’ chariot on an independent journey, coming towards them from the sea and, with the journey originating in a wet place, splashing them. I do not see any other easy way to construe the unusual pāda-final *vām* in b but as the goal of the goal-oriented verb *abhí vārtate* (note similarly pāda-final acc. *vām* in the next hymn, 44.2). As Ge’s parallels (I.139.3, 180.1) suggest, the likely subject of *pruṣāyan* is the chariot’s ‘wheel-rims’ (*pavāyaḥ*).

The verb in d, *bhurájanta*, is a hapax and much disputed. Probably the current standard view is that it is an enlargement of \sqrt{bhr} (see the standard tr., as well as EWA s.v. with further lit.). This view is supported by an apparently parallel passage in V.73.8d *pakvāḥ pṛkṣo bharanta vām* “they bring cooked foods to you” (or “cooked foods are brought to you”), very close to our *yát sīm vām pṛkṣo bhurájanta pakvāḥ*. But it is easy to imagine that a poet, adapting Aśvin phraseology to the simpler dimeter meter and confronting a baffling word like *bhurájanta*, would substitute a word that sounded more or less similar and would work in the passage. Re suggests breezily that *bhuraj-* is the same type of formation as *bhiṣaj-* and *saraj-*, but this seems to me to undercut the explanation because these two formations are so outré; *-aj-* is a pretty salient piece of morphology and wouldn’t, I think, be lightly attached to a normal root (particularly one that should not be showing **bhur-* forms). I therefore favor the older (Gr, etc., incl. also Wackernagel, AiG I, passim) connection with \sqrt{bhrj} ‘roast’. Although this verbal root is found only once in the RV, it is widely attested in Middle and New Indo-Aryan (see Turner, \sqrt{BHRAJ} and, e.g., 9583–86), and there is an underlying nasal-infix pres. **bhr̥nak-ti*, which acdg. to Turner (9586) is presupposed by **bhr̥ñjati* ‘parches’. With some manipulation of MIA phonology, this might give us our form. The relative absence of \sqrt{bhrj} from the RV and other early Vedic texts is not surprising, since it would belong to kitchen vocabulary.

IV.43.6: More sprinkling and splashing. The instr. *rasáyā* is probably an instr. of accompaniment (both the Sindhu and Rasā sprinkle) rather than of means.

With most interpr. I read acc. pl. *ghṛṇā(h)* against Pp. instr. *ghṛṇā*.

yāna- is found only here in the RV. On the basis of the strong association between Sūryā and the chariot, I take it, with Gr, as a vehicle not, with most interpr., as abstract ‘journey’.

IV.43.7: The consensus is that *papr̥kṣé* is a 1st sg., which is certainly appropriate for a final summary vs. A 3rd sg. is not excluded, however; in that case a subj. would have to be identified and supplied.

The āmreḍita *ihéha* and *samanā* seem to be implicitly contrastive: wherever you are, I have nourished you in the same way.

IV.44 Aśvins

IV.44.1: The phrase *sāṃgatiṃ góḥ* “meeting with the cow” refers to a second period in the morning, when the cows are milked. See Ge’s n. 1b.

IV.44.2: There is much disc. in the lit. about what manner of horses *kakuhá-* refers to (see, e.g., WG n. ad loc.). I do not have an opinion, nor do I think it matters contextually.

IV.44.3: The standard tr. take the dative phrase in c, *ṛtásya ... vanúṣe pūrvyāya* as personal (e.g., Ge “für den, der schon früher des rechten Brauches beflissen war”). But since this phrase is parallel to two purpose-activity datives in b (*ūtāye ... sutapēyāya*) and is in fact conjoined with them by *vā*, I think they should be parallel in function. Old sees the problem and suggests that if we interpr. the passage as I do, we might need to read **vānuṣe* -- though he ultimately opts for the personal dative.

IV.44.4: The root noun cmpd. *purubhū-* can, of course, be interpreted in many ways, given its component parts. See disc. in Scar (362). Four of its five occurrences modify the Aśvins (and the fifth may not belong to this stem; see comm. ad IX.94.3); since one of the oft-noted characteristics of the Aśvins is their peripatetic nature, I interpr. it as ‘appearing in many places’. In our passage it strikes the same note as *ihéha* ‘here and there’ in vs. 7 (=43.7). There are two occurrences in VIII.22 (vss. 3, 12), and the Aśvins hymns in VIII often express concern about the many places the Aśvins could be besides here.

IV.44.5: By my rule (see “Vedic anyá- ‘another, the other’: syntactic disambiguation,” Fs. Beekes, 1997), because it is in (modified) 2nd position, *anyé* in c should be definite (‘the others’), not indefinite as Ge (/WG) take it. This makes perfect sense: we are well aware of the other sacrificers who are our rivals.

On *sám ... dadé* and the idiom it expresses see comm. ad I.139.1. Although *dadé* here is usually ascribed to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘give’, the idiom *sám* $\sqrt{dā}$ belong to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘cut’. See Kü 242 for the three forms *dadé* / *dade* that belong to ‘cut’.

IV.45 Aśvins

IV.45.1: Act. *úd iyarti*, esp. in contrast with its med. correspondent *úd īrate* in 2a, should be transitive. With Ge, the pub. tr. renders it as intransitive (‘arises’). WG take it as transitive and supply ‘sun’ as the object. I am now inclined to think that it is transitive (the contrastive verb in 2a has convinced me), but am uncertain what object to supply. The most common object of *iyarti* is ‘speech’ (vel sim.), but curiously for a RVic hymn, there is no mention of speech or praise-song in this hymn (until a cmpd. in the final vs., 7a *dhiyaṃdhā-* ‘setting my insight’). Since the subj. of intrans. *úd īrate* in 2 is chariots and horses, I think the object here should be the chariot whose hitching up is described in the rest of the hemistich. I would therefore emend the tr. to “Now this radiant beam impels (the chariot) upward.” The radiant beam is presumably the ritual fire, though it might be the beam of dawn, an identification that finds support in the mention of dawn in 2b. The chariot being impelled upward may not be the same as the Aśvins’ chariot in the rest of the hemistich, but the complementary “chariot” of the ritual.

For the mild paradox in c, the three who form a pair, see publ. intro. That this refers to the two Aśvins paired with Sūryā was already well recognized by Ge (see his n. 1c).

For *mādhuno ví rapśate* see X.113.2.

IV.45.4: *uhū-* is a hapax, and an onomatopoeic origin seems reasonable (see EWA s.v., citing AiG II.2.492). With sufficient goodwill, one can configure the bar-headed goose cries available for hearing on the internet as “uhu.”

Although Gr analyzes the rt noun cmpd as *mandi-nispīś-*, Scar (668) is surely right to resegment as *mandini* [LOC]-*spīś-*. This is therefore not a counterex. to the rule that rt noun cmpds with direct-object first members do not also use preverbs. See Scar (463) and comm. ad I.124.7.

IV.45.6: *ākenipāsaḥ*: see Old, EWA s.v. *āké*.

Very unusually, pāda b is a verbatim repetition of 2d. Except in refrains, repeated pādas are almost never found in the same hymn. In this particular case the repeated pādas are symmetrical, that is, found in vss. equidistant from the center, but there are no other signs of omphalos structure in this hymn, save for the faint ring-composition between vss. 1 and 7 (see below). Since horses and chariots are the referents in 2d, I supply horses as the subject here. That the sun then hitches up his horses in c may support this.

Although the intens. *dāvidhu-* (also *dódhu-*) ‘shalk’ generally takes an object, it is often an internal one (that is, a body part of the subj., e.g., lips, horns), and in this passage I think it is simply intransitive (though Schaeffer, Intens. 138, supplies lips). Ge (/WG) supply ‘darkness’ as obj. on the basis of IV.13.4 *dāvidhvataḥ ... tāmaḥ*, but if, as seems likely, horses are the subject, I have trouble envisioning them shaking anything with their hooves.

IV.45.7: This final vs. in part reprises vs. 1: *rāthaḥ* begins both b pādas, and *pārijmā* ‘earth-encircling’ of 1b is paraphrased by 7c *yéna sadyāḥ pári rájāmsi yātháḥ* “with which in a day you drive around the dusky realms” -- though *-jman-* and *rájas-* are of course unrelated, there is some phonological similarity. Given this ring-compositional effect between vss. 1 and 7, it is barely possible that we should supply *dhíyam* from cmpd *dhiyaṃdhā-* in 7b as obj. to *úd iyarti* in 1a (see disc. there).

IV.46 Vāyu and Indra

IV.46.1: Since Vāyu has the first drink of soma to himself, it is appropriate that only he is called on in this vs.

IV.46.2: This vs. provides the transition between Vāyu as sole drinker and Vāyu and Indra as joint drinkers. Because the nominatives in b, *niyútvāṃ índrasārathiḥ*, are singular, it seems best, with Ge, Re, to supply a sg. impv. ‘come’ (vel sim.) for ab. The dual verb *tṛmpatam* in c has of course Vāyu and Indra as its subjects; Indra can be extracted from the cmpd. *índrasārathiḥ* in b, and the voc. *vāyo* in c is in effect a truncated Vāyav Indraś ca construction. This construction is nonetheless avoided in the rest of the

hymn: vss. 3–7 all contain the dual dvandva voc. *īndravāyū*. Note that this stem never appears as the more “correct” **īndrā-vāyū* with dual first member. I have no idea why.

IV.46.4: Ge unaccountably tr. the apparent aor. subjunctive *sthāthaḥ* as an impv.; Re suggests that it may have a “nuance injonctive (malgré les désinences primaires).” Neither of these makeshifts seems necessary. Because of the *hī* I take this vs. as the foundation for the next, journey vs. -- first mount, then drive.

IV.47 Vāyu and Indra

As in the preceding hymn, vs. 1 is addressed only to Vāyu, with single voc., but the rest of the vss. address them jointly, in three different ways. In 2a we have a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction *īndraś ca vāyo*, in 3a the same construction in normal order, and in 4d the dual dvandva voc. *īndravāyū* found in 46.3-7.

IV.47.3: Of the two pāda-final qualifiers, *śuśmīnā* (a) and *śavasas patī* (b), the first is nom., the 2nd voc. It is not clear to me why, since, save for the accent, nom. and voc. would be identical.

IV.47.4: The qualifier of the teams, *puruspīhaḥ* ‘craved by many’, reprises 1d *spārhaḥ*, used of Vāyu, again a faint sign of ring composition. For the syntax see comm. ad VI.60.8.

IV.48 Vāyu

IV.48.1: The publ. tr. renders *hótrā(h)* as ‘invocations’. This is possible, but it may also (or in addition) refer to ‘ritual offerings’, perhaps better in a Vāyu context. The problem lies in the ambiguity of both the noun stem *hótrā-* and the VP *hotrá + √ vī*. The noun stem actually represents two homonymous nouns ‘oblation’ (√ *hu*) and ‘invocation’ (√ *hū*), which, needless to say, are often difficult to disambiguate in ritual context. There is also the deified Hotrā found with Bhāratī in the Āprī hymns. (For a fourth sense, developing in the late RV, see comm. ad X.17.11.) Verbal forms of the root √ *vī* ‘pursue’ are construed with unambiguous forms from both roots. The more common object is *hāvya-* ‘oblation’ (I.74.4, III.53.1, VI.60.15, VII.68.1, esp. common with the dative infin. *vītāye* I.74.6, 135.3-4, 142.13; II.2.6; VIII.20.10, 16, 101.7). but cf. II.24.5 *vēṣi me hāvam* “pursue my call,” sim. V.14.5. The clear skewing towards ‘oblation’ in this formula favors substituting ‘oblation’ here, but it is not required.

As noted in the publ. intro., the construction and meaning of the first half of this vs. are disputed. Ge and Re (in diff. ways) take *vīhī hótrā* as an independent clause and construe *āvītā(h)* with pāda b, while Old (ZDMG 54.171–72), WG, and I take *āvītā(h)* as qualifier of *hótrā(h)*, forming an etymological figure with *vīhī*. In pāda b the same verb (‘pursue’), though not imperatival, is to be supplied in the simile, with subj. and obj. ranged around it. The disagreement among Old, WG, and me has to do with the identity of subj. and obj. WG take *vīpaḥ* (“die Geisteserregten”) as subj. and *rāyo aryāḥ* (“die Reichtümer des Sippenherrn”) as obj. This seems quite reasonable, save for the fact that in all clear cases *vīp-* is non-animate ‘inspiration, inspired poems’ vel sim. Old also takes *vīpaḥ* as subj. though in its usual sense, but construes with *aryāḥ* and tr. “die Gebete des

Besitzlosen.” This would be, to say the least, an unusual sense of *aryáh*; moreover, *rāyo aryáh* is a common phrase (note in passing the phonological parallelism). As I said in the publ. intro., on the basis of VI.14.3 I believe that “the riches of the stranger” refers to the Ārya people in general and their poets in particular. In my reading of the simile here, this collectivity of poets is pursuing inspiration as avidly as Vāyu does invocations / libations.

IV.48.2: The poet’s playfulness continues. The qualifier *niyútvan-*, ‘possessing a team’, common in these Vāyu contexts (see in this hymn sequence III.46.2, 47.1, 47.3) opens pāda b; the preceding pāda opens with a near phonological match, *niryuvāpāh* -- a participle to the same verb with a preverb that is only minimally different from *ní*. (The lexeme *nír√yu* is found only here.) It should mean ‘disjoin, disband’. My ‘take out of harness’ is an attempt to convey the play on *niyútvan-*: Vāyu ‘unteams’ the *ásāstīh*, while himself coming with his team.

IV.48.3: The standard tr. assume that Night and Dawn are directing themselves towards Vāyu. I think rather that they are simply following each other in the normal daily succession. Since Vāyu comes at dawn, the transition between the two temporal halves is simultaneous with his journey.

On the “two black treasure chambers” (*kṛṣṇé vásudhītī*), see Bloomfield (RReps ad III.31.17): “The words *kṛṣṇé* and *vásudhītī* are both dvandva ekaśeṣa ‘black (Night) and (Uṣas)’ is a way of saying *náktośāsā*; conversely ‘treasure-giving (Morn) and black (Night)’ is *uṣāsānāktā*. Cf. Berg. i.250.” In other words, *kṛṣṇá-* is applicable to Night, *vásudhīti-* to Day, but the two are conflated into a single dual expression.

IV.49 Indra and Bṛhaspati

As disc. in the publ. intro., this hymn seems to be modeled on the Indra/Vāyu hymns just preceding, esp. since in standard śrauta ritual there is no joint offering of soma to Indra and Bṛhaspati. Like Indra and Vāyu in IV.46.3–7, Indra and Bṛhaspati are consistently addressed with a dual dvandva, *indrābṛhaspātī*, which is found only here. (Note the correct dual 1st member *indrā*, in contrast to *indra-vāyū* discussed ad IV.46.2.) This dvandva is found as an unaccented voc. in every vs., save for 5, where the fully accented form occurs as an acc. In addition, in 3b there is a headless Vāyav Indraś ca construction, *indraś ca*, lacking the voc. **bṛhaspate* -- though the preceding pāda does contain voc. *indrābṛhaspātī*. See further below.

IV.49.3: As noted above, *indraś ca* in b signals a headless Vāyav Indraś ca construction, and indeed the “Vāyav” is apter than might appear at first glance. Pāda b is identical to I.135.7c, which is an Indra and Vāyu hymn. The missing voc. is found there, in pāda a: *vāyo*. Clearly our b was adapted from I.135.7, with the non-conforming god lopped off in this expression. I have not attempted to render the voc. dvandva plus mutilated Vāyav Indraś ca, unlike the standard tr., which supply an extra verb in a and an extra voc. in b.

IV.50 Bṛhaspati

On the divisions of the hymn, see publ. intro. Old and H.-P. Schmidt (cf. esp. B+I 215) consider it to be three separate hymns; I instead see it as a unified composition with three parts. So also Gonda (Vedic Lit., 191) and, implicitly, Ge. The hymn has been

much tr.; besides the usual trio (Ge, Re [EVP 15.63–65], WG) also Macdonell (VRS), Maurer, Schmidt (B+I, vss. 1–6 216ff., 7–9 117, 10–11 96).

IV.50.1–6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this section concerns the unitary figure (Indra-)Bṛhaspati, here insistently identified as Bṛhaspati: there are 7 occurrences of the name in 6 vss., one in each save for two in vs. 2.

IV.50.1: The preverb *vī* is curiously positioned, neither adjacent to its verb nor to a metrical boundary. Perhaps its position is iconic, with ‘earth’ (*jmāh*) between its separated ends (*vī ... āntān*).

As noted in the publ. intro., the VP *purāḥ ... dadhire* “they set in front” marks the appointment of Bṛhaspati in what will be his later role, Purohita.

IV.50.2: The rel. clause of abc (by most interpr. -- c could also go with d) has no main clause correspondent in this vs. As most interpr. take it, the pl. *yé* seems rather to refer to the Ṛṣis in vs. 1 and continue that sentence, forming a transition to the explicit Vala myth.

The acc. *supraketām* in pāda a is taken by some (e.g., Old, Macdonell, Schmidt) as coreferential with the acc. in c, but I consider it too far from the verb and from the other accusatives to be an anticipatory object. Instead I prefer Ge’s solution, to construe it loosely with *mādantaḥ* (cf. IV.33.10 *ukthā mādantaḥ*, also cited by Ge): Ge “jublend unter guten Vorzeichen,” my “exulting at the good sign.” Since Agni is several times called *praketā-* as the sign of the day or the ceremony (e.g., VII.11.1 *mahām asy adhvarāsyā preketāḥ* “you are the great visible sign of the ceremony”), I wonder if this is a temporal reference: dawn when the ritual fire is kindled.

The acc. phrase in c refers to the Vala cave and is the obj. of *abhī ... tatasré* in b. The head-noun *ūrvā-* ‘container, enclosure’ refers to the cave itself, but the three adj. *pṛśantaṃ srprām ādabdhā* “dappled, glossy, uncheatable” are better applicable to its contents, the cows. Note the mirror-image phonetic figure beginning c: *pṛś(antaṃ) srp(rām)*, which contains partial anagrams of Bṛhaspati.

The “future impv.” *rākṣatāt* in d is somewhat surprising, in that it does not follow a previous impv., as is usual. I take it to imply that Bṛhaspati should do his guarding after the Aṅgirasas have breached the cave and released the cows. For another unexpected future impv. see nearby *suvatāt* in IV.54.3

IV.50.3: This vs. also contains phonetic echoes of Bṛhaspati: *ṛtasprś(o)* (b) and *(vi)rapś(ām)* (d). Another phonetic pattern worthy of note, though it doesn’t directly reference Bṛhaspati, is the unbroken sequence of short and long *a*, starting with *yā* in pāda a (right after initial *bṛhaspate*) and continuing into pāda b, till right before *ṛtasprśo*, the echo of the name: *ā a a ā a ā a, a a ā a*.

As Ge’s cited parallels make clear, pāda b concerns the Sattra that the Aṅgirasas performed.

IV.50.4: With Macdonell, I take *mahó jyótiṣaḥ* as a separate abl. phrase, rather than a gen. qualifying *paramé vyòman* with the standard interpr. Since we otherwise know little or nothing about Bṛhaspati’s birth, it is difficult to make an informed choice. I have gone

with the abl. interpr. because the common phrase *paramā- vyòman-* does not seem to be qualified by a gen. phrase elsewhere (though this is not decisive) and because the contrast in this vs. between light and the darkness that Bṛhaspati blows away would be stronger if he were directly born from light.

As usual, numerology is difficult to interpr. I think Ge is correct that the seven in *saptā́sya-* ‘having seven mouths’ must be the Aṅgirasas (see the same word in the next hymn, IV.51.4). What the seven reins (*saptáraśmi-*) are is more difficult. Ge suggests the seven reins of the sacrifice; I prefer the seven seers, who are, in my opinion, the referents of the phrase *saptá raśmáyaḥ* in the enigmatic I.105.9 (see comm. ad loc.). This would provide Bṛhaspati with two different connections to poetic speech, appropriately enough.

IV.50.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this is the final vs. of the 1st section of the hymn and has the standard marks of a hymn-final summary vs. It is the best evidence that vss. 1–6 were a separate composition, only secondarily amalgamated with the following two sections. Nonetheless, I think it simply marks a pause and a transition to the thematically contrastive next section.

IV.50.7–8: These vss. are structured similarly: a main clause (or clauses) referring to the happy results for the king who (now a rel. cl.) properly treats a particular figure. The figure in vs. 6 is Bṛhaspati; filling the same slot in vs. 7 is the *brahmán-* ‘formulator’. We have thus moved from the divine to the human realm, and the identity of Bṛhaspati and *brahmán-* is signaled by their parallel roles in the vs. structure.

IV.50.7: Note the etymological figure in c: *súbhṛtam bibhárti*.

The sense of *pūrvabhāj-* is limited by *pū́rva eti* in 8d and for that reason is presumably not a ritual technical term. (Vāyu would be the god who “receives the first portion” by that measure.)

IV.50.9: The shift from divine to human just noted above in vss. 7–8 comes full circle in this vs. The human Formulator is, it seems, in need of aid from the king (*avasyáve ... brahmáṇe*), but if the king provides this aid he himself receives aid from the gods (*tám avanti devā́ḥ*).

IV.50.9–10: This last section consisting of two vss. introduces Indra by name for the first time in the hymn. The two divine figures are carefully balanced, as the address to them shows: vs. 10 opens with the name Indra in a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction, *índraś ca ... bṛhaspate*, while two independent vocatives open vs. 11, this time with Bṛhaspati first: *bṛhaspata indra*.

IV.50.11: Ge, Re, and Schmidt all attach *sácā* to the preceding pāda (e.g., Ge “Stärket uns gemeinsam”). Despite the position of *sá*, I think *sácā* belongs in the pāda in which it is found. So also WG.

IV.51 Dawn

It is worth noting that the nom. (and voc.) pl. of *uṣás-* is consistently *uṣásah* in this hymn (every vs. but 10), with short suffixal vowel -- the newer form replacing inherited *uṣásah*.

As disc. in the publ. intro., this is an omphalos hymn, with the middle verse 6 posing the central question. This omphalos is surrounded by concentric rings: *divó duhitáro vibhātīḥ* of 1c is answered by the same phrase (in the voc.) in 10a and 11a, while vss. 5 and 7 contain an inner ring with *ṛtá-* (*ṛtayúgbhiḥ* 5a, *ṛtājātasatyāḥ* 7b) and *sadyāḥ* (5b, 7d). There is also much lexical chaining between adjacent vss.

IV.51.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the dawns are so insistently in the plural in this hymn that when a single one is referred to, another word must be used -- in this case *jyótiḥ* ‘light’.

IV.51.2: Note absolute initial root aor. *ásthuḥ* contrasting with absolute final *asthāt* in 1b.

I have taken gen. *támasah* as dep. on gen. *vrajásya* (“of the enclosure of darkness”) with Ge, but *támasah* could be dep. instead on *dvārā*, parallel to *vrajásya* (so Re, WG).

IV.51.3: The multivalent stem *citáya-* is here used in transitive value (see my disc. in the *-áya-* book). The 3rd pl. *citayanta* is simply an *-anta* replacement of the expected active of the usual type (see my 1979 IIJ article).

IV.51.4: The opening of this vs. *kuvít sá* resonates with the opening of 6 *k^ava svid*.

With Ge I take the *yénā* clause of cd to be a third possible course, against the old and new ones offered as possibilities in ab. Since cd presumably refers to the Aṅgirasas’ involvement in the Vala myth, it *is* the case that the Dawns’ course in that instance was an unusual one: they came out of a rock!

IV.51.6: *katamā* ‘which one?’ echoes *purutámam* ‘the latest of many’ in 1a. Note that again when a singular dawn is referred to, the word *uṣás-* is not used.

I do not understand what the Ṛbhus are doing here, nor do I know the exact sense of *ví√dhā* in the etymological figure *vidhānā vidadhúḥ*. A similar etym. figure is found in nearby IV.55.2 *vidhātāro ví ... dadhuḥ*, where I tr. ‘distribute’, which I’ve imported here. However, I am now inclined to think that this has to do with the creative division of an undifferentiated mass (such as the Ṛbhus performed in I.161.2–3 also cited by Ge) and with the regulation of these divisions, possibly of divisions of time. Such “division” contrasts sharply with the lack of distinction among the dawns stated in cd. It is not surprising that a single (unnamed) dawn (pāda a) would be associated with division and distinction (pāda b), as opposed to the plural dawns in the rest of the hymn. For other interpr. of pāda b see the various tr. and comm.

IV.51.7: The opening *tā*, esp. in its emphatic form *tā ghā tā(h)* is echoed by the openings of 8 (*tā ā ...*) and 9 (*tā(h)*).

At the same time *sadyāḥ* makes an interior ring with 5b around the omphalos vs. What’s striking about this little ring is that, though the *sadyāḥ* in 5 and 7 match verbally, the word is in a different temporal setting in the two vss: present in 5 and remote past in

7, and in 6 those two temporal settings are dissolved or confused (as also in a different way in 4).

The cmpd. *ṛtājātasatya-* is unusual not only in having 3 members (quite rare in the RV) but also for containing both *ṛtā-* and *satya-*. Re suggests that *-satya-* functions as a sort of “particle intensive.” Given how charged both words are in the RV, I think this unlikely, although the rendering in the publ. tr. (“who were really born of truth”) is close to Re’s intensive particle interpr; cf. his own tr. (“véritablement nées de l’Ordre”). I think the cmpd requires a more literal and weighty rendering -- “whose reality was born from truth” (which I would substitute for what is found in the publ. tr.) -- meaning that the dawns we see and who come daily to our world and our sacrifice, who are *really* here, arose from the true cosmic patterns that govern the universe of time and space.

IV.51.8–9: The unbroken similarity of the dawns who just keep coming, day after day, is conveyed by the stasis of these two vss., where forms of ‘same’ (8ab *samanā ... sanānātaḥ samanyā*, 9a *samanā samānīḥ*) and the same verb *caranti* (8a, 9b) bring all movement to a halt, even though the dawns are constantly on the move.

IV.52 Dawn

IV.52.1: Although by the time of the composition of this hymn the word play may have long been buried, for Indo-Europeanists the juxtaposition of **-Hner* and **g^wenH* (man and woman) (*sūnārī jānī*) is very cute.

Note the distraction of the usual “daughter of heaven” phrase into a three-termed alliterative phrase *divó adarśi duhitā*.

IV.53 Savitar

IV.53.2: With *urú* we can supply *rājaḥ* from 3a, where *rājāmsi* occurs as the obj. of the same verb *ā √prā*, or *antārikṣam*, the most common noun found with this neut. adj. and found in this phrase at the end of the immediately preceding hymn, IV.52.7b *antārikṣam urú*.

IV.53.3: As Ge’s parallels show, this must be Savitar’s own *ślōka*.

The dat. *svāya dhārmaṇe* would be easier to parse as “for his own support.” Both Ge and Re are rather cavalier about the dat. here. Ge tr. ‘nach’; Re claims it’s no different from the instr., further stating “indecision des cases obliques dans ce type de noms,” which seems like a dangerous interpretive principle to me.

In cd I take *sāvīmāni* with the participles of d. In that pāda *aktúbhiḥ* ‘through the nights’ strictly speaking goes with *niveśāyan* ‘causing to settle down’.

IV.53.6: The participles *niveśāyan prasuvān* are reprised here as agentives *prasavitā niveśanaḥ*.

IV.54 Savitar

IV.54.3: This middle vs. (the final vs., 6, opens out to other gods and is essentially extrahymnic) expresses the particular intercession we want Savitar to make for us and also admits to possible offenses committed by us that make this intercession necessary. The vs. also has a few disharmonies, unlike the smooth vss. that make up most of the rest of the hymn.

The first question is how to interpr. *yád*. If it is taken as a neut. rel. prn. (‘what’), this leaves the main cl. of cd without a referent for this rel. If (with the standard tr.) it is taken as a general subordinating conjunction (‘when, if’), this leaves the verb *caṣṛmā* without an obj. Ge just barrels through, tr. the verb as “gesüdiget haben” without comm.; Re and WG supply parenthetical objects (“une faute,” “ein Vergehen”). Given *ánāgas-* in d and IV.12.3 *yád ... ácittibhiś caṣṛmā kác cid āgaḥ, āgaḥ* would be the appropriate obj. to supply if this syntactic path is chosen. I am therefore inclined now to emend the publ. tr. to “If we have committed an offense ...”

The other question has to do with the verb *suvaṭāt* in d. First, why a future impv.? There is no prior impv. whose action it follows. (For a similarly unsupported fut. impv. see nearby *rākṣatāt* IV.50.2.) Moreover, the VP doesn’t make sense: ... *naḥ ... suvaṭād ánāgasah* should mean (as I tr. it) “impel us to be without offense,” but how would Savitar’s impulsion render us offenseless? The standard tr. simply fudge the verb: Ge “so sollst du ... bestimmen, dass wir daran schuldlos sind”; Re “veuille ... nous en rendre innocents” (which he then further glosses “veuille nous susciter = nous faire sortir (de l’état de péché, en sorte d’apparaître) innocents” [one of Re’s finer parentheses]); WG “... sollst du ... uns daran für schuldlos erklären.” But none of these is a standard (or even non-standard) use of $\sqrt{sū}$, and since forms of this verb are found in vss. 2, 4–6 with its normal sense (at least in my opinion; see below), we can’t simply impose a new interpr. for contextual convenience.

I have two remarks on this. First, it is striking that in what is otherwise a pretty simple hymn, it is in the vs. most significant to the human audience that we encounter little issues in the words themselves. I think this is a sign that the poet wants his audience to slow down, to really pay attention, and the way he gets this accomplished is by tossing little obstacles in our path, requiring us to turn the phrases around in our heads until we get a satisfactory sense. We could generalize this observation to RVic poetry as a whole: one of the (many) reasons it is so difficult is that the poet assumes that an audience that has to do a lot of the work will really engage with the poetry, will get deeper into its meaning. The second remark has to do with what we get if we reflect further on why the poet use a form of $\sqrt{sū}$ here. In this hymn and the last (IV.53), not to mention most other Savitar hymns, Savitar’s control over all the parts of the cosmos and, especially, of the alternating movement and rest of living beings (cf. esp. IV.53.3, 6) is powerfully asserted and associated with the verb ($\sqrt{sū}$) that supplies his name. Impelling us to be without offense is simply a specialized version of this: his special power of $\sqrt{sū}$ enables him to push all the elements (including weak humans) back into cosmic balance.

IV.54.4: The standard tr. supply as subj. of *pramíye* and referent of *tád* the whole *yáthā* cl. of b. But one of the most common objects of (*prá*) $\sqrt{mī}$ is *vratá-*, and in the preceding Savitar hymn his *vratá*-s were much in evidence: 4a *vratāni deváh savitābhí rakṣate*, 4d *dhṛtāvratāḥ*, 5c *tríbhír vratāiḥ*. I therefore think *vratām* should be supplied here; among other things this follows directly on the vs. presenting the offenses we may have

committed against the gods, and it would be appropriate to reaffirm the importance of not offending Savitar in particular.

I then take the *yáthā* clause as a purpose clause. We shouldn't violate Savitar's commandment because we want him to (continue to) support the world. Although we generally expect the subjunctive in such clauses, the future is beginning to supercede the subjunctive in general and would make fine sense here. (Re states that this is the only ex. of *yáthā* with the future.)

IV.54.5: The standard tr. here impose a different sense on $\sqrt{sū}$ than in the previous vs. and one no more aligned with its usual semantics, i.e., 'assign, direct', with the interpr. that Savitar is assigning dwelling places to gods (the high mountains) and to men (*pastyāvataḥ*, interpr. by Ge and Re as watery places, WG just dwellings). Old, however, resists the easy contextual shift and attempts to find an interpr. compatible with lexicon and grammar. (Among other things, he points out that unaccented *ebhyaḥ* should not introduce a new referent, 'men', into the discourse.) He does not settle on an interpr., however. My own interpr. assumes first that *índrajyeṣṭhān* refers to the Maruts, rather than the gods in general. (This stem sometimes modifies one, sometimes the other.) I also take *párvatebhyaḥ* not as dat., but abl. The Maruts tend to haunt the high mountains, but Savitar can dislodge them. He can also impel the clouds on which they (fancifully) dwell -- this is, in my opinion, the referent of *kṣáyān ... pastyāvataḥ*, with *ebhyaḥ* here a dative referring to the previously mentioned Maruts, thus properly unaccented. The 2nd hemistich announces that the famously hyperactive Maruts can be controlled by Savitar: they can fly widely, but they can also be brought to a standstill.

Doubled *yáthā-yathā* occurs 5 times in the RV, but only here with doubled *evaívá*. Interestingly the latter has two accents, but *yáthā-yathā* only one. Doubly accented *evaívá* is also found in X.44.7, without *yáthā*.

IV.55 All Gods

For the structure of the hymn and its parts, see publ. intro. As indicated there, the first 7 vss. (in Triṣṭubh) are concentrically structured, with the agenda set by the questions posed in vs. 1. There are a number of difficulties, and much remains uncertain. The final three vss. (in Gāyatrī) appear to have originally been a separate hymn, as has long been recognized, and are quite straightforward.

IV.55.1: On the anomalous form *trāsīthām* see Old. Whatever its morphological status otherwise, it is clearly a dual, and therefore, strictly speaking, only *dyāvābhūmī* can be its subj., not the additional voc. *adīte*.

Since pāda b is a repetition (=VII.62.4), Ge interprets it as parenthetical, with pāda c continuing pāda a ("who is the protector and defender ... from the stronger mortal") (so also Bloomfield, RReps). This is not impossible, but since the abl. phrase in c can just as easily be construed with the verb in b, I see no reason why the repeated pāda can't have been stitched into the fabric of this vs. (Re and WG both take c with b, as I do.)

With Ge, I take *vaḥ* as a dat. of benefit: the wide space is made for the gods (see also Oberlies, Relig. des RV I.461). Re and WG construe *vaḥ* with *kāḥ* ("which among you?"), and WG specifically indicate that the wide space is made for us by one of the

gods. Although the identical phrase *kó vah* opening pāda a favors this latter interpr., I follow Ge, in part because I think whoever would be acting thus at the ceremony would be a human ritual officiant.

The verb *dhāti* is most likely a root-aor. subj. and is so tr. For such forms see comm. ad IV.8.3.

IV.55.2: My understanding of this difficult and disputed vs. is set forth in the publ. tr. I will not engage here in detail with the various alternative interpr. offered by others. I take the vs. in general as a response to the question posed in 1d (as I understand that question), “who will make wide space at the ceremony for you gods?” The answer is the unnamed priests acting at the dawn sacrifice. It is the priests who chant the ordinances in 2a, at the time when the dawns are “dawning widely” (*ví ... uchān*)(2b), with the notion of “wide space” implicit. The priests return in c, distributing the dakṣiṇās (or perhaps the dawns themselves perform the distribution). Pāda c contains two forms of *ví* (*vidhātāro ví ... dadhuḥ*), echoing the two in b (*ví ... uchān viyotārah*). Though the *ví* forms in c are not directly connected to “wide space,” they continue that theme verbally. Pāda d has the dawns as subject.

In my interpr. of b, with dawns as subj., one could expect a fem. agent noun **vīyotrī-*, but *-tār-* forms can serve for fem. as well, esp. as an attributive (so better tr. “they (the dawns) as discriminators ...”). As pointed out in the publ. tr., the dawns “discriminate” because they separate night and day. Old presents a clever, but I think ultimately incorrect, suggestion that instead of *uchān* we should read **yuchān* to *√yu* ‘separate’, providing an etymological figure *ví ... *yuchān viyotārah*, exactly parallel to *vidhātāro ví ... dadhuḥ* in the flg. pāda. (Old seems also to consider only to reject this idea.)

The grammatical identity of *rurucanta* is unclear. Lub calls it a pf. subjunctive, and Ge and Thieme (Plusq. 46) interpr. it as hortative. But the zero-grade root syllable would be anomalous for a subjunctive. Kü (430–31) takes it rather as an injunctive, although he does not see a clear injunctive context (though generell-erwährende Funktion seems possible). I also interpr. it as injunctive, in the publ. tr. with preterial sense, though presential “shine” would work as well in context.

IV.55.3: In pāda a #*prá ... arkaiḥ*# echoes 2a #*prá ... ārcān*#.

The 2nd hemistich gives some support to my interpr. of vs. 2b, that the dawns are marking the limit between night and day. Here Night and Dawn arrange that both day halves provide protection.

As WG point out, all the divinities here are fem.

IV.55.4: I take *ví ... ceti* to *√ci* ‘pile’; see comm. ad I.90.4. Re assigns it to *√cit* ‘perceive’ (so also Gr); WG to *√ci* ‘perceive’ as an Augenblicksbildung to the aor. stem.

The final word of the vs., *vārūtham*, recalls *varūtā*, the final word of the 1st pāda of the hymn (1a). As indicated in the publ. intro., I consider vss. 3–5 to be a response to the question posed in the hymn’s first pāda.

IV.55.5: The echo of vs. 1 noted at the end of vs. 4 continues here, where *devásya trātúḥ* picks up *trātā* of 1a (as well as *trāsīthām* in 1b). The abl. “(protect) from ...” in 1c *sāhīyasaḥ ... mātāt* recurs in cd *jānyāḍ āmhasaḥ ... mitrīyāt*.

The standard tr. begin a new clause at the beginning of d and take *mitrīyāt* with *uruṣyet*. This is not impossible; nonetheless I prefer to construe *mitró mitrīyāt* with c. The strict parallelism/gapping of the 1st part, plus the pāda-medial *utá naḥ* in d I find too compelling to ignore, since *utá* generally begins new clauses. It is true, however, that *uruṣyá-* is several times found with *āmhasaḥ*. The purport is much the same either way.

The standard tr. take *jānya-* as referring to foreign people (this goes back at least to Gr, meaning 2a). I do not know of any evidence for this interpr., and in fact all clear passages (though see comm. ad X.42.6) indicate that it’s someone/-thing belonging to one’s own people (which would be the default reading of such a deriv., in my view). Here the contrast is between problems internal to the group and those coming from allies (external but contractually connected).

Pāda d revives the question of wide space, here with a god making it for mortals (us), which might give support to the Re / WG interpr. of 1d (see above). Nonetheless, I think the overall structure of the hymn fits better with my interpr.

IV.55.6: This vs. is close to impenetrable. For my view of its function in the hymn, see publ. intro. I am still baffled by the concentration on water in bcd and by the proper disposition of the parts of cd.

The first question to approach is the root identity and referent of *iṣṭá-* in b. The standard view is that it belongs to *√iṣ* ‘desire’ and the phrase *āpyebhir iṣṭāḥ* refers to “desired watery (gods)” (so, more or less, Ge, Re, WG) as an instr. of accompaniment referring to another set of recipients of praise. Although there do seem to be one, at most two, references to watery gods (masc.) -- VI.50.11, maybe VII.35.11 (though that appears to have fem. referents) -- most of the animate beings qualified as *āpya-* are females. I don’t know who the watery gods might be. My interpr. of the phrase is quite diff.: I take *iṣṭá-* to *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’. Although its ppl. *iṣṭá-* is rare and rarely applied to the object sacrificed, there are such examples: compare I.162.15, where it refers to the sacrificed horse, also in the same hymn *sviṣṭa- yajñá-* vs. 5. I then take our *āpya- iṣṭá-* to be equivalent to X.86.12 *āpyam havīḥ* “watery oblation.”

Under this interpr. the water sacrifices are what the unnamed priests have revealed /opened up (*āpa vran*, using language from the Vala myth), and they are implicitly compared with two different entities: the contents of the gharma pot and rivers. In d *gharmāsvarasaḥ*, lit. ‘having the gurgling of the gharma pot’, targets the sound of the watery sacrifices, while *samúdraṃ ná samcāraṇe ... nadyāḥ* “like rivers in their converging on the sea” refers to their movement to their goal (presumably the gods -- cf. X.86.12 *yásyedám havīḥ priyám devēṣu gáchatī*). I have major misgivings about my interpr., however, for several reasons. The parts of the simile just proposed are quite separated, with the first part opening c and the ‘rivers’ only appearing in the middle of d, after the bahuvrīhi referring to the gharma pot. Although some distraction of complex similes is not rare, this seems an extreme example. Moreover, pāda c is identical to I.56.2, where there are no rivers in the context (but where the pāda doesn’t make much sense in context either). On the other hand, rivers converging on the sea is a very common trope in the RV, and so the distraction would not be too challenging to interpret.

I am not particularly convinced by my own construction of this hemistich, but I find the the various other attempts at wringing sense out of it (in addition to the standard tr., cf. Lüders [Var. 190–91]) no more (indeed generally less) persuasive.

IV.55.7: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. in part forms a clear ring with vs. 1 and provides the answer to the question in 1a. Note the recurrence of the gods Aditi, Mitra, and Varuṇa, as well as of the agent noun *trātār-* and a finite form of the root $\sqrt{trā}$ (here *trātā trāyatām*).

The 2nd hemistich is somewhat puzzling, however, and has given rise to a number of competing interpr. (in addition to the standard, see Janert [*Dhāsī*, pp. 6, 43ff., 52], Thieme [ZDMG 95.109], Scar [387], and Lühr 1997 [cited by Scar]). Ge and Re both attempt to give *sānu* a loc. sense (Ge by taking it as a truncation of *sānuni*, a move that Re disallows), but by form it ought to be an object parallel to *dhāsīm*: the *dhāsī* of Mitra and Varuṇa (and) the back of Agni. This is the interpr. of Janert, and I follow him in his syntactic evaluation, though I do not necessarily follow him in seeing the *dhāsī* of M+V as the seat of truth nor the back of Agni as the back of the Sun (as the heavenly Agni). I tentatively suggest that not violating the back of Agni means not failing to provide appropriate oblations (recall that Agni is sometimes called *ghṛtāsnu-* ‘ghee-backed’). Judging from X.30.1, the “wellspring of Mitra and Varuṇa” is in heaven among the gods -- presumably the source of rain. Not violating it may again mean not failing to make the oblations that will travel to heaven and replenish that source of water. Perhaps the “watery sacrifices” in vs. 6 are connected.

IV.56 Heaven and Earth

IV.56.1: As often, *ārka-* can be a pun, both ‘ray’ and ‘chant’.

As Ge (and others) suggest, the bull in d is probably Agni (/Sun), who every morning recreates the two worlds in their separation with his light.

IV.56.2: This vs. contains several puns, including a repetition of *śucāyadbhir ārkaiḥ* from 1d. The final word of the 1st hemistich *ukṣāmāṇe* can belong either to $\sqrt{ukṣ}$ ‘sprinkle’ or to $\sqrt{vakṣ}$ ‘grow’, and both are appropriate. And the preceding negated participle *āminatī* can take different objects and utilize different senses of the root $\sqrt{mī}$. On the one hand, as Re (and others) point out, the other occurrence of *āminatī* (I.92.12=124.2) takes *daívyāni vratāni* “heavenly commandments” as object. However, cf. nearby *āmīta-varṇa-* ‘of immutable color’ (IV.51.9), which supports Ge’s “ohne (ihr Aussehen) zu verändern.”

IV.56.5: The phrase *māhi dyāvī* is very problematic morphologically. It echoes the first two words of the hymn: *mahī dyāvāpṛthivī* “great Heaven and Earth,” but in a very refracted form. I do not have a solution for how it came to take the form it has (for various suggestions, see Old and the standard tr., as well as lit. cit. therein, e.g. AiG III.52, 226). I can get a certain distance, quite speculatively, but no further. I tentatively suggest that we start with an alternative dual dvandva **dyāvā-mahī*, with *mahī* ‘the great (fem.)’ substituting for ‘earth’. I then suggest that something like a Vāyav Indraś ca construction was created to it, with the 2nd member properly providing the first term of the construction (see my “Vāyav Indraś ca Revisited”). The proper voc. sg. of *mahī-*

would be *māhi* (which is indeed attested, though without accent [and not qualifying earth]). In this context it shouldn't have an accent, but that's the least of our problems. Unfortunately that's as far as I can get. We should expect, per my suggestion, the 2nd part of the construction to contain **dyaús ca*, and that's about as far from *dyāvī* as one can be and still belong to the same stem. I can spin a line of analogies: *dyāvī* is a rough-and-ready nominative sg., built from a full-grade form of the stem found in *dyāvā* (found in loc. sg. *dyāvi*) and the fem. -ī. But I can't imagine why anyone would create such a form, particularly to a stem so well known to every RVic poet. If it participated in a phonetic or semantic figure, there might be motivation but I see none.

IV.56.6: In ab *mitháḥ* 'mutually' and *svéna dákṣeṇa* 'by your own skill' seem implicitly to contrast.

On the basis of the parallel in X.65.2 *mithó hinvánā tanvā* "spurring each other on mutually," I think an alternative tr. "purifying each other mutually" (rather than "your own bodies") is possible. It would help if we understood what such purification would involve for H+E.

On *ūhyāthe* see Old and more recently Kü (489–90) and Hoffmann (Aufs. III.776).

IV.57 Agricultural Divinities

IV.57.1: With Ge, Re, Oberlies (RRV I.189), I supply *mitréṇa* with *hiténeva*; WG by contrast take it to √*hi* 'impel' and assume a winning horse.

IV.57.4: *śunám* here and in vs. 8 is an adverbial acc. For the straps and goad see X.102.8.

IV.58 Ghee

IV.58.2: The final pāda, with Soma (as a buffalo) vomiting (*avamī*) ghee, takes one aback, esp. after the high-style extolling that has preceded it. Ge's explanation, that "ghee" is a secret sacred word ("ein sakrales Geheimwort") and Soma reveals it, may be correct. But the bluntness of the verb still surprises, and I am inclined to think something further is going on. There are only two verb forms to √*vam* in the RV, and the other one (*vāman* X.108.8) also has speech as its object, but the evil Paṇis as subj. Note that the Paṇis are found in vs. 4, as hidens of the ghee. Does our passage express some sort of rivalry between the two ritual substances? Or does it have to do with the Sautrāmaṇi ritual, meant to cure Indra after vomiting?

IV.58.3: Clearly no bull found in nature. The numerology here presumably has to do with items in the ritual. For a conspectus of later interpr., see WG n.

IV.58.4: As was just noted, the Paṇis (niggards) may be indirectly implicated in the verb *avamī* in 2d. Here they appear overtly, as the hidens of ghee -- presumably a reference to their stealing of the cows, since the gods find the ghee in the cow in pāda b.

The threefold nature and creation of ghee has been variously interpreted; it again participates in the numerology of the hymn. I do not have a view on it.

IV.58.5–10: Each of these 6 vss. contains the phrase *ghṛtāsya dhārāḥ* (or equiv.: *ūrmāyo ghṛtāsya* in 6c).

IV.58.5: “My” ability to see the ghee streams indirectly attests to my good character, since the cheat cannot see them.

IV.58.6: Pāda c combines *etā arṣanti* from 5a with a variant of the repeated *ghṛtāsya dhārāḥ*, namely *ūrmāyo ghṛtāsya*.

IV.58.7: A difficult verse, primarily because of the two hapaxes, *sūghanāsaḥ* and *vātapramiyaḥ*. The former is taken by Ge as ‘whirlpools, eddies’ (Wirbel) (followed not terribly enthusiastically by Re) on no particular basis, and others have added their own at best weakly supported tr.: e.g., Thieme ‘cow-killing’ [*sū-* < **pśu-*] (KISch. 52), most recently WG ‘die schwellenden Massen’ (presumably with root noun 1st member and later *ghana-* ‘clump, mass’). The interpr. reflected in the publ. tr. is no stronger than these others. It begins with *ghaná-* ‘smiter’ (well represented in the RV), as Th’s also must. But for the 1st member I assume a zero-grade of *āśú-* ‘swift’ (for the uncertainties of the initial of the PIE ‘swift’ words, see EWA s.v.) with lengthening at compound seam. With two such ad hoc assumptions, this interpr. is simply a place-holder.

As for *vātapramiyaḥ*, there is no question about its component parts, merely about how they fit together. *-pramiyaḥ* patterns with the nearby forms IV.54.4 *pramíye* (‘to be violated’) and IV.55.7 *pramíyam* (‘to violate’). It also strongly recalls I.24.6 *ná yé vātasya praminānti ábhvam* “nor those [=the gods] who confound the wind’s formless mass.” As Old points out, this latter passage fixes the interpr. of our cmpd.: the first member must be functionally the object of the 2nd. The problem is the accent; it should be a bahuvrīhi, not a tatpuruṣa. See, however, Scar (388), who suggests a plausible bahuvrīhi interpr. ‘die Schmälerung des Windes habend’, with the first member essentially an objective genitive. The point is that the speed and violence of the streams are stronger than those of the wind, which is thus confounded. Given the bahuvrīhi accent, it does not violate the standard practice of rt noun cmpds with direct object first member, not to include a preverb (see comm. ad I.124.7).

I read *kāṣṭhā(h)* in both simile and frame: in the simile it refers to the wooden barriers of the race-course that the horse splits in his speeding around the course, in the frame to sticks floating in the current of the streams and split (against rocks vel sim.) by the violent speed of that current. (Of course the “frame” here is itself metaphorical, since these are streams of ghee, not actual watercourses.)

IV.58.8: The violence of the movement of the ghee-streams in the preceding vs. is abruptly replaced by the placid and benign approach of these same streams in this vs.

IV.58.11: Re points out the ring composition of 11d *mádhumantaṃ ta ūrmím* and 1a *ūrmír mádhumān*.

Commentary V

[V.1–28 JPB]

V.29 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is punctuated by expressions of soma-drinking, each slightly different and generally found in the 2nd half of an even pāda:

2b ... *papivāṃsaṃ sutāsya*

3b ... *sómasya súṣutasya peyāḥ*

3d ... *papivām índro asya* [rhyming with 2b]

5b ... *somapéyam* [cf. 3b]

[7d *sutám píbat ... sómam*]

8b ... *somyāpāḥ*

11d ... *ápibaḥ sómam asya*

V.29.1: I follow Brereton (Ādityas, 165–66), who in turn followed Thieme (Mitra and Aryaman, 78–77), in taking *aryamā* not as nom. sg. masc. (as it is normally and as taken by the standard tr.), but as acc. pl. neut. construed with *trī* (like *trī rocanā* in the next pāda). Against Thieme’s “three hospitalities,” Brereton plausibly suggests that in this context the three *aryamā* must refer to “what governs the ritual,” perhaps the three soma-pressings or the three fires.

Pāda-initial *trī*, found here in a and b, recurs in 7c, 8a, b (also non-initial in 7b).

In c *pūtā-dakṣa-* (*lpūtā-dakṣa-*) is ordinarily Ādityan vocabulary (though used of the Maruts also in VIII.94.7, 10). Ge (/WG) supply the Ādityas as the subj. of *dhārayanta* in b and of course take Aryaman as the subject of pāda a. By contrast, I think the Maruts are subjects of all three pādas -- but they are identified with the Ādityas throughout, as the use of *pūtādakṣa-*, ordinarily a qualifier of the Ādityas, makes clear.

V.29.2: Ge (/WG) take *abhī yād āhim han* as subordinate to *ādatta vājram* in the same pāda. Although this fits the metrical scheme slightly better, it makes some trouble with the logical sequence of events (“he took the mace when he smashed the serpent,” almost implying that the smashing occurred first). It works better as subordinate to the main clause of d.

The word order *āhim hán* and the lack of augment on the verb scrambles the standard formula, producing almost a syncopated effect, which is repaired in 3d.

V.29.3: Ge (/WG) take *havyām* as the subj. of *āvindat*: “the oblation found the cows for Manu.” This interpr. accounts for the accent on *āvindat*, which would be generated by *hí*. But it is otherwise bizarre: *gāḥ √ vid* ‘find the cows’ is a standard formula in the Vala myth, and the subject of the verb is always Indra or his agent(s)/companion(s) (e.g., Aṅgirasas I.62.2, Saramā V.45.7, 8); for Indra himself cf., e.g., I.101.5, II.19.3, VIII.96.17, and in a variant of the formula in the next hymn V.30.4 *vidó gavām ūrvām*. I know of no passages in which the oblation is credited with finding the cows, and in fact soma plays far less of a role in the successful outcome of the Vala myth than in that of the Vṛtra myth (though see 12a below). I therefore take *tád dhí havyām* as a nominal sentence completing b, with a clause break in the middle of c. I attribute the accent on

āvindat to contrast with the immediately following verb *āhan*, which opens the next pāda. This hymn in fact shows a penchant for pāda-internal clause breaks: cf. in the immediately preceding vs. 2c, as well as 8d, 9d, 11d, 13b, all except the last right after the caesura as here.

V.29.4: For Indra enwrapped in the earth, cf. I.173.6 *sām vivya índro vṛjānaṃ nā bhūma* “Indra has enwrapped himself in the earth like a girth.” Cf. also his wearing the earth III.32.11, VIII.4.8. Although here the enwrapping seems presented as a handicap, esp. given the *cīd*, in the just cited passages the images seem rather to emphasize Indra’s vastness.

As noted also by Ge, Schaeffer, and WG, *jígartim ... apajárgurāṇaḥ* is a word play, but the words presumably belong to different roots. The first is universally assigned to $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘swallow’, but the root affiliation of the second is disputed. Ge and EWA (s.v. *GAR*¹ p. 470) assign it to a $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘hold out’, but I follow Schaeffer (Intens., 116–22) in taking it to $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘greet, extol’, with the negative sense contributed by the preverb *āpa*. So also WG and Oberlies (Relig. I.401). See also nearby *apagūrya* (V.32.6).

The etymological separation of *jígartim* and *apajárgurāṇaḥ* invites further scrutiny of the hapax *jígartim*. As noted above, this word is generally grouped with $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘swallow’ and interpreted as an agent noun ‘swallower’ (my ‘gulper’). However, with *apajárgurāṇaḥ* off the table, there is no particular contextual support for this interpr., though it is certainly semantically acceptable. Far more troubling are the serious formal problems. For one thing, *-ti-* is by no means an agent-noun suffix; it normally of course forms feminine abstracts, though AiG II.2.636–37 does register a number of such stems that have been reanalyzed “zur Bez. der persönlichen Träger des Verbalbegriffs zu verwenden.” Debrunner himself identifies our form as a 3rd sg. verb form inflected as a *-ti-* stem (AiG II.2.638), but this interpr. has nothing to recommend it. Not only is such a morphological transfer not a feature of the RV, but there is also no such verb stem available to be nominalized. The root $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘swallow’ does not have a redupl. pres. or in fact any redupl. stem save for the pf. *jagāra* and the intensive subj. *jalgulas* (I.28.1); the single form of the redupl. aor. *ajīgar* (I.163.7) supposedly belonging to this root (see Gr, and Whit. Roots) actually belongs with the other forms of this stem to the root $\sqrt{g\bar{r}}$ ‘awaken’, and we just discussed intens. part. *járgurāṇa-* above. It is, further, a set root; it’s hard to know what its pre-C full grade should be in a redupl. pres. formation since there are no parallel formations to roots in *-ṛ* that I know of (**jígarīti*? cf. VS *galgalīti* and EWA s.vv. *GAR*², *GAL*), but presumably not simply *gar*. In short, neither the nominal morphology nor the root formation of *jígarti-* is easily accounted for under the standard hypothesis, but I have nothing better to substitute. I therefore retain the rendering in the publ. tr., though with full awareness of its fragility. My thanks to Veronique Kremmer, who drew my attention to *jígarti-* and its many problems and discussed the issues at length with me. See also the illuminating disc. in Vine 2004 “PIE Full Grades in Some Zero-Grade Contexts,” p. 375.

V.29.6: Indra’s two actions in this vs. are expressed by injunctives (*vivṛścāt* b, *bādhata* d), as in the preceding vs. (*kaḥ* 5d), but the middle verb, *ārcanti* in c, is emphatically present. The configuration here, #*ārcantīndram marútaḥ*, matches that of 1c #*ārcanti tvā marútaḥ*. See Hoffmann (Injunk. 165) on this vs., who seems to think the “timeless,

mentioning” function of the injunctive can be so distant from a real preterite that it can drag in present indicatives. I would attribute it rather to the attempt in this hymn to associate the heroic deeds of the past with the activities of the present sacrificers. It is also barely possible that the text originally read **ārcantīndram*, that is, **ārcant īndram* with the underlying 3rd pl. ending *-nt* preserved before vowel, but later reinterpr. as pres. *-nti* after *-nt* regularly became *-nn*. The *-í-* could then have been lengthened, as if a sandhi product of *ārcanti īndram*, with no metrical consequences. The change would have been facilitated by the model of likewise pāda-initial *ārcanti* in 1c, as well as *arcanti* in 12b. Still, on balance I find this unlikely. Other examples of preserved *-nt* because of early misparsing as *-nti* occur before the enclitic pronoun *īm*, and the result in either case would be *-ntīm*. See disc. ad I.67.4, etc.

V.29.7: On neut. pl. *mahiṣā* in conjunction with the numerical expression *trī śatāni* see Old. Note the alternative phrasing with gen. pl. in 8a *trī ... śatā mahiṣāṇām*.

V.29.8: Gr and Ge [/WG] take both *āghaḥ* and *āpāḥ* as 3rd sg. Since *āghas* belongs to the root pres. to *√ghas*, either 2nd or 3rd sg. is grammatically possible. But for *āpāḥ* to be 3rd sg., an *s*-aor. stem *āpās-* has to be posited, for which there is no other support save for a med. *pāsta* in a *mā*-prohibitive in the AV (XII.3.43). Nevertheless, Narten does set up such a stem (Sig.Aor. 168). I see no reason to do so; the presence of nom. sg. *maghāvā*, adduced as evidence by Narten, is not sufficient, since nom. sg. appositives to 2nd sg. subjects are common. Also common is abrupt shifting between 2nd and 3rd ps., found already in this hymn between vss. 1 and 2, 4 and 5, 5 and 6. In our vs. we must assume that a shift happens between the hemistichs, given the 3rd sg. *jaghāna* in 8d, but this is hardly unprecedented -- and note that it returns abruptly to 2nd ps. in vs. 9. I therefore prefer to interpret 8ab as couched in the 2nd sg., as in the publ. tr. But if a 3rd sg. reading of *āpāḥ* is really desirable, I would prefer to consider the *-s* ending a local analogy to the precativ *peyāḥ* at the end of 3b, reinforced by the ambig. parallel *āghaḥ*, rather than setting up an *s*-aorist stem to account for a single form.

I follow Ge in taking both *kārām* and *bhāram* as the direct speech expression of a victory cry. The former is appropriate to gaming contexts, while the latter is at home in battles. Our *ahvanta ... bhāram* has a compositional equivalent *bhāra-hūti-*, for which see comm. ad I.129.2; for *kārām* *√kṛ*, see I.131.5. It may be convenient to assemble here some passages containing both *bhāra-* and *kārā-* (or derivatives): I.112.1 *yābhir [ūtūbhiḥ] bhāre kārām āmśāya jīnvathaḥ*; VIII.66.1 (likewise an Indra hymn): (*īndram ... ūtāye!!*) *huvé bhāram nā kārīṇam*; IX.16.5 *mahé bhārāya kārīṇaḥ*; IX.14.1 *kārām bībhrat puruṣpr̥ham*. See also Wackernagel KISch. 340ff.

V.29.9: On *uśānā* as an indeclinable, see my 2007 “Vedic Uśanā Kāvya and Avestan Kauui Usan: On the Morphology of the Names” (Fs. Jasanoff).

On the basis of other mentions of this myth, 2nd du. *āyātam* must conceal a Vāyav Indraś ca type construction, with the other subject, beside voc. *indra*, being Kutsa. Cf. nearby dual dvandva *indrā-kutsā* (V.31.9). The gapping of Kutsa in the first half of the verse is repaired by cd *sarātham yayātha, kútsena*, with the same root *√yā* as in *āyātam*. I do not understand the change in tense stem.

V.29.10: In the publ. tr. I take *kútsāya* primarily with pāda a, though syntactically and metrically it should go with b. I would now emend the tr. to “the other you made into wide space for Kutsa to drive” or “... for Kutsa for driving.” I’m not sure how a wheel can become a wide space -- what sounds like a kind of highway -- but the addition of Kutsa doesn’t make it any less comprehensible.

I take *anāsaḥ* ‘mouthless’ as proleptic, describing the state of the Dasyus after Indra has finished crushing them (sim. to I.32.6 **anāḥ pipiṣe*), while Ge [/WG] take it as a standing characteristic of the Dasyus (“mouthless Dasyus”). There is no way to tell.

V.29.11: The etym. fig. *pācan paktīḥ* is also a proleptic expression of sorts, “cooking (food, so that it is) cooked,” though since *paktī-* is not an adj./participle, but a noun identifying a type of food, the parallel isn’t exact. For other exx. of *paktī-* √*pac*, see IV.24.7, VII.32.8.

V.29.12: This vs. brings the third repetition of *arcanti* (1c, 6c [or *ārcan(t)*; see above]; cf. *ārcan* 2b).

I don’t quite understand the double *cid* construction in cd, where even one *cid* seems somewhat superfluous. Ge (/WG) take it as concessive and logically to be construed with *apidhānavantam* (“the cowpen, although it had a cover” [Ge: “obwohl verschlossen,” sim. WG]). This is possible, though I don’t like the position of *cid*, and I would also note that #*gāvyaṃ cid ūrvām* is also found in VII.90.4, where a concessive value is harder to wring out.

V.29.13: Gr, Ge (/WG), and Klein (DGRV I.219) interp. *pāri* √*car* as ‘serve’. Although this sense is found in later Vedic, the RVic instances of this lexeme only have the literal meaning ‘go around’ (e.g., III.7.2) with the developed sense ‘encompass’. (I.127.9 comes closest to ‘serve’, but the ‘surround’ sense is dominant.) Interpreting *pāri carāṇi* here as ‘serve’ requires the part. *vidvān* to take an obj. (“knowing your heroic deeds ...”), but pāda-final *vidvān* is almost always used absolutely. Moreover *āparītaḥ* (*pāri* √*i*) in the next vs. continues the thought of conceptual circumscription.

Ge (/WG) and Klein divide the vs. syntactically into ab / cd, with the rel. cl. of c expressing the obj. of d. By contrast I think the lexical parallelism and the conjunction *co* [=ca u] of ... *yā cakārtha / yā co ... kṛṇāvaḥ* of bc mark those relative clauses as tightly conjoined, and I take them as subordinate to pāda a. Further, the last pāda *préd u tā te vidátheṣu bravāma* strikes me as a self-contained (pseudo-)refrain, reminiscent of the Ṛtsamāda refrain in II: *bṛhád vadema vidáthe suvîrāḥ* (II.1.16d etc.).

V.29.14: This vs. is structured somewhat like vs. 13, with (a) *etā víśvā cakṛvān* corresponding to (13b) (*vīryā*) ... *yā cakārtha*, though with pf. participle not rel. cl., and (c) *yā cid nú ... kṛṇāvaḥ* corresponding even more closely to (13c) *yā co nú ... kṛṇāvaḥ*. I would therefore now slightly emend the publ. tr. to reflect this parallelism more closely: “By your nature you cannot be circumscribed in heroism -- you, Indra, (as one) having done all these many (deeds) (as well as) those (deeds) that you will do even now in your daring. There exists no one to obstruct this power of yours.” In other words I take pādas a and c as parallel adjunct expressions, with b as their joint main clause, and d (like 13d)

independent. Note that d has no overt referent for *yā* in c. The English is awkward, but this structure corresponds better to the Skt.

V.29.15: On the sandhi in *nāvyā ākarma* see Old.

V.30 Indra

There are a number of paired repetitions of words and phrases in earlier and later parts of the hymn, but not enough to define an omphalos: e.g., *-senāḥ* 3d / *sénāḥ* 9b; X Y *cakṛṣe* 4a / X Y *cakre* 9a; *yudháye* 4b / 9d; *áśmānam cid* 4c / 8c; *gávām ... usríyānām* 4d / 11d.

V.30.1: Despite the distance between them and the syntagms in between, I take *rāyā* and *ūtī* as parallel polarized instr. to be construed primarily with *gántā*. Ge and WG differently, though also differently from each other.

It is tempting to interpret *gántā* in d as a periphrastic future, a temptation yielded to in the publ. tr.

V.30.1–2: Note the reciprocal ‘seeking’ (*ichán*) of Indra (1c) and his devotee (2b).

V.30.2: WG take *sasvár* as ‘in sleep’, against the standard interpr. ‘in secret’, arguing that the latter does not make sense with *bubudhānāḥ* in d. But pāda d is not directly associated with pāda a, which, with b, compares the poet’s pursuit of Indra to the stealthy tracking behavior of a hunter. Moreover, the other three exx. of *sasvár(tā)* (in a tight knot in VII.58.5, 59.7, 60.10) clearly mean ‘in secret’, as opposed to ‘in the open’ (cf. the contrast in VII.58.5 with *āvīr* ‘openly’). It is true that the standard etymology of *sasvár* takes it from \sqrt{sas} ‘sleep’ (see EWA s.v. *SAS*), but the semantic development to ‘in secret’ isn’t difficult to imagine -- esp. if Skt. \sqrt{sas} , which violates standard root structure constraints, was onomatopoetic for the shushing/hushing verbal gesture (English “shh,” etc.). From “keep quiet” to “keep secret” is a short step. Although \sqrt{sas} is clearly an inherited root, with cognates in Avestan and Anatolian, the onomatopoetic interpr. could be regularly (re-)actualized by association with the (near-universal?) living “shh” interjection.

The position of *anyān* in b should, by my rules, make it definite (“the others”). Though both Ge and WG render it as indefinite, there is no reason why it can’t be definite: the poet consults with his priestly/poetic colleagues or with those “who know” (*vidvāms-*) Their answer, referring to “we men,” suggests that it is a defined group, quite possibly the priests performing the morning ritual. The action that qualifies them for attaining Indra -- waking up (early) -- is surely not simply reflecting a general sentiment like “the early bird gets the worm,” but refers to Indra’s attendance at the morning pressing; cf., e.g., IV.35.7 *prātāḥ sutām apibo haryaśva* “Early in the morning you drank the pressed (soma), you of the fallow bays.”

V.30.3: The syntax in the first hemistich is a little rough. *yā te kṛtāni* in pāda a appears to be an embedded relative clause, a construction that is rare to non-existent in the RV. Its position between the preverb and the verb of the main cl. (*prā ... brāvāma*) makes it difficult to interpret it any other way. The fact that it is a nominal clause, an NP serving

as direct object, may make the embedding seem less of a syntactic violation. See my forthcoming art. on the proto-izafe construction. (Note that Ge simply ignores the rel. prn.) The main verb *brāvāma* is accented because it is effectively in pāda-initial position: the initial accented voc. *īndra* is extra-clausal.

The second rel. clause *yāni no jūjoṣaḥ* “which of ours you will enjoy” appears to be parallel to the embedded NP, but it is a little skewed semantically. Indra should not *enjoy* his deeds, but rather enjoy *hearing* our recital of them (see Ge “die du von uns gern *hören* wirst” [my italics], with ‘hear’ silently supplied). Alternatively it would be possible to assume that the 2nd rel. is (covertly) conjoined to the first and refers to different deeds, “(and) which (deeds) of ours you will enjoy” -- but it is hardly likely that Indra cares about what we do (besides pressing soma), so this interpr. is pragmatically blocked. WG supply “(in) unseren (Worten)” as the antecedent to the second rel. prn., such that what Indra will enjoy is our words, not his deeds (“(in) unseren (Worten), an welchen du Freude hast”); this seems to me to deploy too much machinery to repair what is simply a somewhat loose expression.

It would be technically possible to take the first hemistich as consisting only of relative clauses, with the main clause represented by c with an unexpressed resumptive “(those deeds)”: “Which deeds of yours we shall now proclaim at the pressing, which you will enjoy, (those deeds) he will learn ...” The accent on *brāvāma* would then be because it is in a dependent clause. Although this interpr. would save us from an embedded relative (see above), the rhetoric of the 1st hemistich, with *prā nū vayām ... brāvāma* reminiscent of I.32.1 *īndrasya nū vīryāni prā vocam* and similar passages, strongly suggests an annunciatory declaration rather than a subordination.

V.30.4: Ge (/WG) assume that c, like d, refers to the opening of the Vala cave. They therefore either take *didyuto ví* ‘flashed forth’ as a stand in for ‘broke/split apart’ (Ge, flg. Sāy.’s *vyabhinaḥ*) or disjoin *didyutaḥ* from *ví* and supply another verb with the preverb (or so I understand WG’s “... blitzend, zer(sprengt)”). But c and d do not have to refer to a single feat: a and b do not, and the recital of *kṛtāni* promised in 3ab covers a number of different deeds in the vss. to come. Moreover, though *ásman-* ‘stone’ can refer to the Vala cave, it has a number of other possible referents (see 8c where Namuci’s head is equated/compared with an *ásman-*), including Indra’s own weapon. Cf. IV.22.1 *yó áśmānaṃ śávasā bíbhrad éti* “who [=Indra] keeps bearing the stone with his power,” with the *śávasā* found also here. Since *√dyut* is very commonly found with *ví* (including the common and lexicalized root-noun cmpd. *vidyút-* ‘lightning’) and since one of the sites to which a preverb in tmesis moves is directly after its verb (and here also adjoining a metrical boundary), it seems very likely that preverb and verb belong together -- and have their normal sense. In my interpr. this lexeme incorporates a simile: ‘cause to flash like lightning’ / ‘cause to lightning’ (unfortunately English does not have such a verb). In other words, with his power Indra can make even the dull and homely material stone flash like a lightning bolt.

V.30.5: The Pp. interprets *paramá* as nom. sg. m. *paramāḥ*, and Ge (/WG) follow suit. I prefer the equally possible reading *paramé*, on the basis of several ‘born’ passages with this expression. Cf., e.g., I.143.2 *sá jāyamānaḥ paramé vyòman* (though the subj. is Agni there).

In my view *cid* often takes Wackernagel's Law position, even when it seems to limit a different word in the clause. Hence my "even the gods," though *devā(h)* is at the end of the pāda. Its positioning there may be to take advantage of its adjacency to *viśvā(h)* across the pāda boundary. Although the latter is fem. and must modify acc. pl. *apāḥ* 'waters', its position evokes the common locution "all the gods / the All Gods." In fact, the expression "all the waters" is vanishingly rare — besides this passage I have found only VII.95.1 — and so "all" belongs more naturally with the immediately preceding "gods" than with its grammatical partner.

Note the switch from 2nd ps. ref. to Indra (rel. cl. 5ab) to 3rd ps. ref. (main cl. 5c, new cl. 5d).

V.30.6: Referent shift continues: 2nd ps. in ab, 3rd in cd.

V.30.7: There are several uncertainties in this vs.

As often the function and syntactic affiliation of *januṣā* are unclear. I construe it with *mṛdhaḥ*, but Ge and WG (in different ways) take it with Indra. This is also possible.

The participial phrase *dānam īvan* "stimulating giving" seems oddly embedded in the distracted VP *viśu mṛdhaḥ ... āhan* "you hewed apart the negligent ones." The positioning between the preverb and its verb in tmesis may be a kind of iconic reflection of the separation sense of the preverb ('apart'). For a similar ex. see I.103.2. On the participial phrase see further below.

I have been puzzled by the phrase *gāvā ... saṃcakānāḥ*, though I think I now see a solution (see below). For one thing, $\sqrt{kā}$ [*kan*] is not otherwise found with *sām* (anywhere in Sanskrit, at least judging from Monier-Williams); for another, this root is not construed with the instr. (*pace* Gr, whose supposed exx. should all be interpr. otherwise). And finally I cannot think of a (solitary) cow that figures prominently in Indra mythology, either as a companion (as I took it in the publ. tr.) or as a source of enjoyment. Ge remarks (n. 7a) that Indra gives abundantly as long as he is "im Genuss der erbeuteten Kühe." I suppose this is possible but it assumes a fairly extensive backstory. Like me, Kü (143) takes the cow as comitative: "mit Rindvieh ... dich zusammenwünschend." I was happy to have company in this tr., but I frankly didn't understand what either his or mine is actually meant to express. WG also seem to have a comitative reading, which is similarly opaque: "du erpicht darauf wirst, mit dem Rind beisammen zu sein."

On reconsideration of the passage I now see a possible solution. It is striking that *gāvā* is the only apparent occurrence of the instr. sg. to this stem in the RV. In context it appears directly before *maghavan*. I now think the original form may have been gen. pl. **gāvām*, with simplification of the double *-m m-*. The meter is unaffected, and a gen. pl. would fit the sense much better, as I will now show. This hymn contains four other examples of this very gen. pl. (4d, 11d, 12b, 13b), as well as nom. pl. *gāvaḥ* (10a). The examples in 12 and 13 are in a dānastuti, but the others refer to the cows that Indra freed from the Vala cave (and are in the same metrical position as our form). I see two possible ways to construe my putative **gāvām*. Since forms of $\sqrt{kā}$ can take the genitive as a source of enjoyment (e.g., X.54.16 *drāvīṇasaḥ*), it may go with *saṃcakānāḥ*: "enjoying the cows," referring to Indra's pleasure in his deed and its products. But in vs. 11 Indra, having drunk soma, *pūnar gāvām adadād usrīyāṇām* "gave again of the ruddy cows."

This seems to refer to a redistribution on the ritual ground of the cows that Indra had freed. Bringing together 11d *gāvām adadāt* with 7ab *dānam īnvan ... *gāvām*, I am inclined to think that the cows are the content of the gift and would now alter the tr. to “setting in motion the gift *of cows” vel sim. Under this interpr. *saṃcakānāḥ* is used without complement: “taking pleasure, enjoying yourself” (for a similar absolute use of this participle, see IV.16.15 and Kü 143). Thus the hemistich contains a brief précis of the myth: Indra hews apart those who block his freeing of the cows [I would now probably change my rendering of *mṛdhaḥ* as ‘negligent’ here], which allows him to set in motion the ultimate giving away of the freed cows, and he thoroughly (*sām*) enjoys the whole process. The occurrences of *gāvām* in the dānastuti (esp. 12b *gāvām catvāri dādātāḥ saḥsra*) simply replicate the mythic model provided by Indra’s generous sharing out of the freed cows.

I am not certain what pāda d is conveying. How is it that Indra’s setting Namuci’s head to rolling involves “seeking a way for Manu”? Unfortunately we can glean too little about Namuci from the RV (where he is mentioned only 9x) to know what threat he posed that required Indra to kill him. On the other hand, judging from the usual troubles caused by Dāsas and, particularly, from vs. 9 (see publ. intro.), these foes stand in the way of Ārya movement into new territory. Thus Indra by eliminating Namuci would open the way for Manu and the rest of the advancing Ārya.

V.30.8: Though this vs. follows thematically on vs. 7, it seems disjointed and has given rise to much discussion (see esp. Old and his skepticism about Ge’s interpr.; Bl RR) and incompatible interpretations, which I will not treat in detail further here.

The first question that arises is who is the 1st-ps. speaker in pāda a. Ge suggests that it is Namuci himself, a suggestion rejected by both Old and Bl. I think the root aor. *ākṛthāḥ* is the clue. It is rare that the aorist, esp. the root aorist, is used as a narrative tense, esp. to a root well outfitted with other preterital possibilities. I take pāda a as a parenthetical interruption of the Namuci story, prompted by the last pāda of vs. 7, esp. the mention of Manu. With Old I take “me” as referring to the present-day priest, and in my view he is asserting his ancestral and vocational connection with the primal priest and representative Ārya, Manu. The speaker suggests that Indra’s current partnership with him (“for you have made me your yokemate” with the aorist of the recent past) is evidence of Indra’s active concern for his ancestor Manu in the mythological past. After this interruption *ād īd* functions as a resumptive expression, returning us to and carrying on the story of the myth narrated in 7cd.

In 8c the referent of the “whizzing stone” (*āśmānam ... svaryām*) is disputed. I very much doubt that it is a mountain, despite the occurrence of the same expression in V.56.4, where it definitely is a mountain, and despite Old’s championing of this identification. I think it more likely that the phrase resonates with I.32.2 *vājraṃ svaryām*, where *svaryā-* refers to Indra’s mace. Namuci’s whirling head is being compared to a weapon whirling through the air and making a whizzing sound.

The “rolling, whirling” image is carried further in the next pāda, with the simile “(rolling forth) like two wheels.” The simile makes fine sense with *vārtamāna-*, but what are the two world-halves (*ródasī*) doing there? As it turns out, though it may seem counter-intuitive in real-world terms, the two worlds (under various designations) are regularly associated with the root *√vṛt* (cf., e.g., V.43.2, VI.8.3, VII.80.1, VIII.6.5). In

some of these passages the rolling out of the two worlds is part of a cosmogonic exercise; in some it refers to the visual (re-)appearance of differentiated earth and sky at dawn.

I have no idea what the Maruts are doing here.

V.30.9: For women as weapons see not only I.104.3 mentioned in the publ. intro. but also X.27.10 and disc. ad loc.

For my interpretation of the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. I am tolerably certain about my reading of the first hemistich, but pāda c is more challenging and has given rise to some curious interpretations. Ge tr. “denn er hatte darunter seine zwei Frauenbrüste entdeckt,” commenting (perplexingly, at least to me) “Die beiden Milchbrüste für seine beiden Frauen” (n. 9c). (One would assume there would be four in all, at any rate.) Old thinks the two *dhéne* refer to the two liquids in the Namuci myth and ultimately (see his ref. to his own NGGW 1893 art. [=KISch. 635ff.]) to the Sautrāmaṇī ritual and its two separate oblations, milk and surā. Schmidt (Ged. Nyberg), more or less flg. Bloomfield, suggests that Indra recognizes two streams within himself, songs and libations, but this linkage of the literal and metaphorical through an elliptical dual seems quite unlikely. WG’s “Darunter aber hat er dessen beide Ströme erblickt” is literally close to mine, but they provide no guidance on what they mean by “his two streams.”

My own tr. (“distinguished both his [=Dāsa’s?] streams”) is also not as informative as it might be. One problem is the meaning of the lexeme *antār√khyā*. To *√khyā* ‘see’ *antār* should add the sense of either ‘look within’ or ‘distinguish between’. The similarly formed *antār√paś* seems to have both these meanings: ‘look within’ in I.132.3 and ‘distinguish between’ in II.27.3. (In the latter passage JPB tr. ‘look within’, but I consider that the less likely sense in context.) In the only other occurrence of *antār√khyā*, I.81.9, I tr. ‘detect’ (flg. Ge’s ‘endecken’ for this passage, V.30.9), a sense that can be somewhat tenuously derived from ‘look within a mass of stuff — and visually locate’. It’s also possible in that passage, which concerns the possessions of the impious, which Indra is supposed to bring to us, that he is distinguishing between those possessions and the ones that belong to deserving people and should stay put. In our passage here we might in the first instance think that ‘distinguish between’ would be a promising candidate, given the dual object. But I don’t think Indra is supposed to be seeing a difference between the two streams, but rather perceiving that they are just streams and therefore not formidable weapons -- thus encouraging his advance to fighting in pāda d. I am tempted to emend the publ. tr. to “detected/recognized both of his (weapons) as (just) streams.” Though the weapons (*āyudhāni*) were plural in pāda a, I think that is a general statement about turning women into weapons, whereas pāda c concerns the particular situation Indra confronts, the two barrier rivers -- the same situation as in I.104.3, which also contains two troublesome rivers.

V.30.12, 14: The Anukr. takes *ṛṇamcayā-* as the PN of the king, and the standard interpr. follow this, incl. the publ. tr. I now wonder if it is at least a speaking name – and perhaps not a name at all but a descriptor: “requiting debts.” The royal patron who distributes largesse to poets and priests at a sacrifice is, from the point of view of the ritual economy, requiting his debts to them, who attracted the gods to the sacrifice and entertained them, leading them to grant tangible and intangible rewards to the patron.

V.30.13–14: The two pāda-final sequences *páritakmyāyāḥ* (13d) and *páritakmyā yām̐* (14a) in adjacent pādas are puzzling. The publ. tr. reflects emendations of both forms to loc. sg. *páritakmyāyām*. This loc. occurs 6x, always pāda-final, including in the next hymn, V.31.11 -- by far the most common form to this stem. Moreover, VI.24.9d is identical to 14d, save for having the loc. *páritakmyāyām* -- a variation that BI (RVReps) finds “baffling.” The arguments in favor of emendation are the dominance of the loc. sg. and its appearance both in the next hymn and in the otherwise identical pāda in VI.24.9. However, these arguments cut both ways: it is difficult to understand how these forms would have become mangled – *especially* given the dominance of that same loc. sg. It cannot be claimed that the redactors misunderstood the forms because they had never seen their like. I therefore now feel that we must accept that the forms were in the urtext, deliberately produced by the poet, who was playing games with this well-known pāda-final temporal expression. I still believe that the intent of both forms is the same as the loc., but that the loc. has been deliberately altered, in two different ways, conditioned by the immediate context.

In 13d *aktór vyūṣṭau páritakmyāyāḥ* the form has been given a genitive ending to conform, superficially, to the gen. *aktóḥ*. Gr takes it to an adjectival stem (*páritakmya-*, which doesn’t exist) as a modifier of *aktóḥ*, which, as Old points out, would then have to be fem. here, rather than its normal masc. Old suggests it might be a gen. of time, though he prefers to supply *rātryāḥ* or to have it depend on *vyūṣṭau*. I consider this over-thinking: the poet gives us the loc. form we expect, right up to the very last segment (*-ḥ* rather than *-m*) and then springs the surprise, capitalizing on the superficial resemblance to the gen. sg. *áktōḥ*.

In 14a *aúchat sá rātrī páritakmyā yām̐* the final syllable of the loc. has been truncated and given an accent. The anunāsika can be taken as hiatus-breaking nasalization of a final *-ā* before *r*; this is the standard interpr. (see esp. Old, Noten, with ref. to Prol.). This yields the nom. sg. fem. rel. prn., which allows an interpr. as a nominal rel. clause *páritakmyā yā*, which specifies immediately preceding *sá rātrī*. A pāda-final rel. pronoun and the resulting nominal rel. clause (“... the night, which is *páritakmyā*”) would be highly unusual, but as a poetic trick involving re-segmentation of a well-known form it shows a proto-*śleṣa* sensibility.

The fact that the poet alters the expected form in two different ways in succeeding pādas should alert us to the fact that he is playing verbal tricks, secure in the knowledge that his audience would expect and interpret both as underlyingly locatival. For a different manipulation of the stem, see comm. ad I.31.6. In any case the publ. tr. should have an * before “at its final turn” in both instances.

V.30.14: The primary reading of *ajyámānaḥ* is surely “being driven,” as the standard interpr. have it. But it could also be the passive of *√añj* ‘anoint’ and inhabit the same semantic realm as “well-ornamented with thousands of cows” in 13ab: he would be anointed with prize cows.

V.30.15: The idiom *ā√dā* ‘take’ is ordinarily in the middle, whereas *ādāma* here is active. This active form reflects secondary spread of the apparent act. thematic stem, based on the (pseudo-)active *ādat* ‘took’, for which see comm. ad V.32.8, II.12.4.

V.31 Indra

V.31.1: Against the Pp., which reads *vy ùnoti*, and despite Old's objections, I read *víyunoti*, that is, *víyunoti* 'keeps separate' -- an idea that goes back to Wh's Roots (s.v. *√u*)(see also Old's other reff.) and is accepted by EWA (s.v. *YA V²*); see also Gotō III 31 (1988) -- even though this 5th class pres. is not otherwise attested to this root. Note the same lexeme, *ví√yu*, in the immed. preceding hymn, V.30.10 ... *gāvaḥ ... vatsaír víyutā yád āsan* "since the cows were separated from their calves." This interpr. is, not surprisingly, reflected in WG's tr., but not Ge's 'mustert' (survey, inspect, further glossed in n. 1c as "er wählt den rechten Wagen aus"), whose root affiliation is not clear to me.

This verb seems to work slightly differently in simile and frame. In the simile the herdsman is separating flocks, sorting them on some principle or other (sheep from goats? flock belonging to A from that belong to B? young animals from older? etc.). In the frame I supply *rātham* as object (from 1a) and, as I see it, Indra keeps his chariot separate from the other chariots in the race or chariot drive in order to be first, a position reflected in pāda d. WG slightly different: Indra drives the other, opposing chariots apart.

V.31.2: WG take *písāṅga-* in the cmpd *písāṅga-rāti-* as referring to the color of cows ("Gabe rötlichbraune (Kühe)"), whereas I follow Gr, Ge in taking it as a reference to gold. Either is possible, and it is true that the adj. qualifies other animals -- a dog (VII.55.2), horses (I.88.2, V.57.4) -- though not cows. Nothing rides on the choice.

V.31.3: Ge and WG take *sāhaḥ* as the only subj. of *ājaniṣṭa*, while I take *sāhaḥ* as an appositive qualifying the unexpressed subj. *indraḥ*. Again the difference is minor, but I favor my interpr. because the birth of Indra and the prodigious feats he performs immediately thereafter are frequent topics in the RV.

V.31.5–6: Vs. 5 is syntactically problematic, in that it has two subordinate clauses, one marked by *yád* in pāda a and one marked by *yé* in pāda c, but no obvious main clause. The rel. cl. beginning in c must extend through d, which contains the accented imperfect *āvantanta*, but the extent of the *yád* clause is unclear. It must go as far as the end of pāda a because of the accented subjunctive *ārcān*, but the status of b is in question. Since the vs. otherwise lacks a main clause, Ge and WG make b the nominal main clause, e.g., Ge "..., da waren die Presssteine, die Aditi einverstanden." This is possible, but seems conceptually weak, and both Ge and WG fail to render the subjunctive value of the verb in the *yád* clause -- Ge silently changing it into a preterite ("anstimmten") and WG using a simple pres. ("singen").

But I think the subjunctive should be taken seriously, esp. given its contrast with the impf. *āvantanta* in d. My solution is to assume the main clause is postponed till vs. 6, whose first pāda contains the familiar annunciatory pseudo-subjunctive *prá ... vocam* "I shall proclaim." Thus, vss. 5–6 depict a ritual situation in which the noise of the pressing stones is, as so often, configured as ritual speech (see, e.g., vs. 12c *vādan grāvā* in this same hymn), to which the poet responds in vs. 6. I now think that *vīṣaṇaḥ* in pāda a is not a separate subject ("the bulls and the pressing stones" of the publ. tr.), but instead qualifies the stones ("the bullish pressing stones"; for pressing stones as bulls, see, e.g., III.42.6, VI.44.20), and I would change the tr. to "When for you the bull, o Indra, the

bullish pressing stones will chant a chant ...” Sāy., cited approvingly by Ge in n. 5a, identifies the bulls of pāda a as the Maruts, and WG also accept this identification, but again the subjunctive makes difficulties: the actions of the Maruts should not be prospective, but located in the mythic past (hence, presumably, Ge’s switch to the preterite).

So the skeleton of the sentence spread over two vss. is “When the pressing stones will chant a chant to you, I will proclaim your deeds.”

A few loose ends remain in vs. 5. The presence of Aditi in b at first takes one aback, but as Ge points out (n. 5b), soma is said elsewhere to be prepared “in the lap of Aditi,” so her proximity to the pressing stones is a ritual given. I take *áditiḥ sajóṣāḥ* as a separate mini-constituent, with the nom. sg. of the -s-stem adjective serving for the fem. as well as the masc., as usual. The second hemistich detours into a conceit -- involving an unexpressed comparison of the pressing stones with deadly wheel rims that have crushed the enemy; cf. a similar passage in X.27.6 *ádhy ū nv èṣu vavṛtyuḥ* “The wheel rims should now roll over them.” In part the conceit responds to the chariot-focused theme of this hymn, esp. the chariot conflict depicted in vs. 11; in part it highlights the pressing stones’ demon-killing power, found, e.g., in X.76.4.

The subjunctive *vibhārā(h)* in the *yád* clause is potentially troublesome for my interpr. of *árcān* in 5a, for it seems to refer to past, cosmogonic deed(s) of Indra’s -- the separation of the two world halves and the winning of water for mankind (two events not usually connected). This surprising usage of the subjunctive is noted by Delbrück (AiSyn 322: subjunctive where we expect the indicative of a narrative tense). Old is undisturbed by the subjunctive and points to 5a as similar, which is exactly what I would prefer to point away from; see my explanation of *árcān* above. Hoffmann (244–45) classifies it as “Konjunktiv in präteritalem Sachverhalt” and suggests that the subjunctive in its prospective use can take on a timeless sense (“... einen ausserzeitlichen Sinn annehmen kann”). Ge simply translates it as a preterite (trenntest) without comment, but WG take the subjunctive seriously here (though not in 5a): “... dass du ... trennen und ... gewinnen willst,” without further comment. I do not have an entirely satisfactory answer, but I think the *yád* clause must be evaluated in the context of what precedes: 6ab announces that I will proclaim Indra’s previous deeds (*pūrvāṇi káranāni*) and “the current ones which you have done” (*nūtanā ... yā cakārtha*). This latter expression, which is found identically in VII.98.5, seems temporally incoherent: if they are his current deeds, he should not have already done them; *yā cakārtha* should limit only the first phrase, *pūrvāṇi káranāni*. A fuller expression of this proclamation announcement, with the time of action correctly sorted, is found in nearby V.29.13 *vīryā ... yā cakārtha / yā co nú návyā kṛṇávaḥ* “The heroic deeds that you have done and the new ones that you will do,” with the perfect *cakārtha* qualifying the deeds already done and the subjunctive *kṛṇávaḥ* the new ones. Immediately afterwards it is said *prá ... tā ... bravāma* “we shall proclaim these,” like our *prá ... vocam*. I think we should interpret our 6cd in the light of V.29.13. The rel. clause *yā cakārtha* should, properly speaking, limit only the *pūrvāṇi*, while the *nūtanā* ‘current (deeds)’ are further specified by a single example (or perhaps two), expressed by the *yád* clause in cd using the subjunctive. A problem remains: as noted above, the separation of the two worlds is one of Indra’s standard cosmogonic deeds as is, in the Vṛtra myth, his winning of the waters. We should expect these to be classified among the *pūrvāṇi*. But of course one of the reasons for celebrating older, mythic deeds

is to persuade / compel the god to perform these deeds again in the present for our benefit, and we can interpret the *yád* + SUBJUNCTIVE clause here in that way. The separation of the two world halves is, on a smaller scale, accomplished every morning when dawn reveals the horizon where the darkness had kept earth and sky undifferentiated. And winning waters is something that needs to be repeated at least yearly. The subjunctive here indicates that our focus is on the re-creation of these older deeds, not simply on celebrating their original performance. In this context *mánave* ‘for Manu’ would have the extended sense ‘for mankind’.

V.31.7–8: The recital of Indra’s deeds now reverts to the past tense, to a series of insistently augmented imperfects: 7b *ámimīthāḥ*, 7c *agr̥bhñāḥ*, 7d *asedhaḥ*, 8b *áramayaḥ*, 8c *ayātam*, *ávahaḥ*. (In 8d the Pp. reads unaug. *árantā*, but in its sandhi situation [*uśánārantā*] it could as easily be *árantā*; the accent should be on the augment because it’s in a subordinate cl., but *ā* + *árantā* would come out this way. Either way, it’s not an imperfect, but either a plupf. or a root aor., but this is a minor quibble.) However, note that this series is introduced by 7a *tád ín nú te káranam* “Just this now is your deed,” where the current situation (*nú*) remains in the forefront of the poet’s mind.

With Ge (and contra WG, who suggest Śuṣṇa), I take the strong one (*ugrám*) in c as Uśanā. This is the usual, if wispy, account of Indra and Kutsa’s journey to Uśanā’s house for advice before the Śuṣṇa battle; cf. X.22.6.

The 2nd sg. *ávaho ha kútsam* “you (sg.) conveyed Kutsa,” following immediately on the 2nd du. *ayātam* “you two drove,” seems a quick correction or explanation. The 2nd du. *ayātam* may have seemed to suggest an equality and mutuality between Indra and Kutsa that might have seemed insulting to Indra’s divinity and greater power -- though the return of *vām* in d and the dual dvandva *índrākutsā* and dual verbs of vs. 9 show that the attempt to reestablish hierarchy was momentary.

V.31.8: With Sāy. I was tempted to take *pārā-* in sandhi for loc. *pāré*, against the Pp., since well-attested *pārā-* otherwise just means ‘far shore’ and is common in the loc. But I was persuaded by Ge (n. 8b), who points out that the verb *pārāya-* is used several times in this same myth with Indra as subject, and by Old, who notes that *supārā-* is used several times of Indra (III.50.3, VI.47.7), in the sense ‘providing good passage, deliverance’. I would therefore take the simplex *pārā-* ‘deliverer, transporter’ here as a nonce extraction from the fairly common *supārā-*.

V.31.9: I take this as the direct address of Uśanā to Indra and Kutsa, with his advice and encouragement before they take on Śuṣṇa. In b both Ge and WG have complex and fanciful interpretations of the phrase *ápi kárṇe*. In VIII.97.12 the same expression seems to indicate close, intimate contact -- perhaps close enough to whisper into someone’s ear. In my interpr. Uśanā is recapping their journey to him, suggesting that they should come close enough to hear his intimate counsel.

Although of apparently identical (thematic) formation, *dhámathaḥ* and *varathaḥ* are modally distinct, the first being an indicative present, the second a subjunctive. Although it is tempting to take them both as subjunctives (as WG do), the stem *dháma-* is robustly enough supplied with diagnostic forms (a number of augmented 2nd/3rd sg.) that it would be hard for a poet to mistake the morphology. I therefore assume there is a

reason for the distinction in mood. Perhaps *dhámathaḥ* presents a successful attack on Śuṣṇa as a given (though it has not yet happened), and this success will have the further happy effect stated in d.

V.31.10: Ge supplies a separate verb (“Lenke”) in pāda a, but this seems unnecessary, since the subj. of b, the sage poet (*kavīḥ*) can have gone (*ajagan*) to the horses of a as goal. The identity of the *kavī-* isn’t made clear, but I think the best candidate is Indra. In I.121.12 he is urged to mount (*tīṣṭhā*) the easily yoked (horses) of the wind (*vātasya suyūjah*, as here), while in I.130.9, addressed as *kave*, Indra went (*ajagan*) to Uśanā, just as here. Indra is also said to be ‘seeking help’ (*avasyú-*) in IV.16.11 in connection with the same story, also as here. In other words, all the phraseology points to Indra as subject, with the sly twist that he is called *kavī-*, which evokes the patronymic of one of the other participants, Uśanā Kāvya, who is also on many occasions referred to as *kavī-*.

The plupf. *ajagan* may have anterior sense here. Kü (159) allows a value of “fernere Vergangenheit” in this passage.

V.31.11: The mixture of tenses and moods in this vs. is at first glance bewildering, but I think the uses can be sorted out. We get, in order, a root aor. subj. (*karat* b), a pres. injunc. (*bhārat* c), a pres. indic. (*riṇāti* c), and a future (*sanīsyati* d), as well as a pf. part. (*jūjuvāṃsam* b) and a redupl. pres. part. (*dādhat* d). The vs. seems to be a sort of “color commentary,” recounting the chariot race or contest with vivid immediacy. The first hemistich, as I see it, contains a general prediction of what is going to happen. Since *karat* is a subjunctive expressing prospective action, the perf. part., generally used to express anteriority, does so here, but as a present action/state (“[now] speeding”) anterior to the future expectation of *karat* (rather than a past anterior as is usual). The second hemistich lays out in sequence a past action (*bhārat* ‘bore’), a present action (*sám riṇāti* ‘restores’), and a future one (*sanīsyati* ‘will gain’), with the participial (*puró dādhat* ‘putting in front’) reprising what has gone before. Beyond this I cannot go, as I still do not understand what happens in the Etaśa and sun’s chariot passages. The perplexing nature of this fragmentary myth can be seen in the diametrically opposed translations it receives, with WG exactly reversing the change in position of the chariot in b (from behind to in front, contra Ge and me: from in front to behind). I cannot judge which is right.

Adding to the uncertainty is the lexeme *sám √ri*, which occurs in the RV only here and three times in I.117 (4, 11, 19) of miraculous repairs of the Aśvins. Since *√ri* means ‘let flow, dissolve’, I take *sám* as a preverb that both implicitly reverses that action and expresses unity: ‘put back together’ → ‘restore’.

This is the last vs. before the return to the here-and-now, and the verbal fireworks may mark a poetic climax.

V.32 Indra

As indicated in the publ. intro., although this hymn focuses on the Vṛtra myth, the standard formulaic encapsulation of that myth -- *āhann āhim* “he/you slew the serpent” -- does not appear in it. Instead there are formulaic transformations in the early verses: 1d *āva (dānavām) han* / 2cd *āhim ..., jaghanvān* ... (the closest to the standard formula,

involving only morphological transformation of the verb) / 3b (*mṛgāsya vādhar*) *jaghāna* / 4d *ní jaghāna* (*śúṣṇam*), (*tám ...*) *jaghāna* (6cd).

V.32.1: Old is disturbed by *aramṇāḥ* ‘brought to peace / to a stop’, when we would expect Indra to releasing the waters to flow. I’m not sure this is a problem: since the floods were hard pressed (*badbadhānān*), Indra could be soothing and quieting the tormented waters. Cf. also in the previous hymn V.31.8 *apāḥ ... áramayaḥ* “you brought the waters to rest,” the same sentiment with the same root. However, it could also be an example of alluding to a sub-surface word by the overt use of its opposite, like *bodháya-* for **svāpāya* in I.103.7; see comm. ad loc. In other words, *aramṇāḥ* could be signaling ‘set in motion’ by opposition to its literal sense ‘bring to a stop’. In any case the expected action is expressed later in the vs.: d *śrjó ví dhāṛā(h)* “you set loose the streams,” in a species of poetic repair. See also comm. on vs. 2.

Note the stylistic quirk of post-verbal preverb in *ásrjó* [/śrjó] *ví* OBJ (pādas a, d) versus *ví ... váḥ* (c) and *áva ... han* (d). The latter VP also contains a phonetic figure in *áva dānavám*.

In c the usual placement of the rel. pronoun after at most one constituent is precariously observed (if at all), and in any case the *yád* is descriptively found deep in its clause. However, its placement (almost) conforms to the letter of the law: the voc. *indra* is extraclausal for these purposes, and *mahāntam ... párvatam* though heavy is a single constituent. It’s the *ví* that may tip the balance towards non-compliance. On the other hand, the configuration PREV *yá-* VERB is so standard that this may determine the position of *yád* here.

Technically speaking the opening clause of d may be part of the dependent clause in c (“when you pried apart ... (and) set loose ...”), with *áva dānavám han* the sole main clause, but since in Vṛtra narratives there’s usually a cause-and-effect relationship between opening the mountain and letting the waters flow, I think the publ. tr. is the better choice.

Note the echoing in *áva ... avá(m)* and the abrupt final near-rhyme ... *vám han*. This is the first variant of the basic dragon-slaying formula *áhann áhim*, and the unfamiliar preverb *áva* almost allows *áhan* to emerge: *á(va dānavám) han*.

V.32.2: The first hemistich redeploys vocab. from the 1st vs.: 1) The two members of the NP *útsān ... badbadhānān* in pāda a were both found in 1ab, but not in the same constituent. 2) *áramḥaḥ* ‘you sent speeding’ in b rhymes with *aramṇāḥ* in 1b and is its antonym. This antonymic pairing might support the suggestion floated just above, that *áramṇāḥ* is meant to evoke its semantic opposite.

The function of the instr. *ṛtúbhiḥ* is unclear. I take it as an instr. of extent of time with the part. *badbadhānān* (so approx. also Ge; see his n. 2a, though I doubt that a ref. to menses is involved: *útsa-* is one of the few masculine nouns for water and water sources, so if the poet wanted to make that sort of reference, he could have his pick of fem. nouns). WG take the instr. with the main verb (“sent speeding”), with the sense that after their release the waters now flow regularly (“Du liessest die ... Quellen nach geregelten Zeitabläufen ... auslaufen”). This is certainly possible, though I somewhat favor the former because *ṛtúbhiḥ* is nestled in the middle of the NP *útsān ... badbadhānān*.

The form *ūdhaḥ* is contextually problematic. Formally it is the well-attested nom./acc. *ūdhar*, but I find it difficult to construe an acc. in this sentence. As an acc., it should be the obj. of *āramhaḥ* ‘sent speeding’, but the udder of the mountain should not be subject to such an action, whereas it makes perfect sense as a locative expression. Both Ge and WG tr. as an acc. obj., but don’t explain what they think is actually happening. I am inclined to take the form as a nonce locative, though I recognize the strong arguments against this: 1) *ūdhar* is very well anchored as a nom./acc.; 2) this *r/n* stem has two reasonably well-attested locatives already, *ūdhan* and *ūdhani*. Nonetheless, I wonder if *ūdhar* could have been taken as belonging with the sporadic *-ar* locatives like *vanar* ‘in the wood’, *uṣar* ‘at dawn’ (though the presence of undoubted neut. acc. *vādhar* in the next vs. [3b] might make this harder). It might be worth noting that *ūdhan(i)* is confined to pāda end (except one late Xth book ex.), whereas *ūdhar* here is medial. Alternatively, and on second thought, if we take ‘udder’ as referring to the contents of an udder, namely milk, it *is* possible to interpret it as the acc. it appears to be. For a somewhat similar use of *ūdhaḥ* as ‘milk’, see IV.1.19. I would therefore suggest an alt. tr. by deleting the parenthetical “(in?)” and adding a comma after “seasons”: “you ... sent speeding the wellsprings that had been hard pressed through the seasons, the udder [=milk] of the mountain.”

The ppl. *práyuta-* is variously rendered: Gr ‘achtlos, sorglos’, Ge ‘nachlässig’ (careless, negligent), WG “(alle und alles) verscheuchend” (scaring away). However in all its occurrences it seems to mean ‘spread out, dispersed’. There are four attestations in the RV. Two passages involve cows wandering without a herdsman (III.57.1, X.27.8); in the third (III.55.4) Agni has been dispersed into various hearths and lies spread out at a distance (*śáye ... práyutaḥ*), very much like here (*práyutaṁ śáyānam*). Since this root \sqrt{yu} means ‘separate, keep apart’, my suggested meaning is closer to the root meaning than the suggestion registered above. It is also possible that it does mean ‘scattered, dispersed’ here, if it is interpreted proleptically: after having been smashed, the various parts of the serpent’s body lie spread across some distance. A similar picture is given in I.32.7 *purutrā vṛtró aśayad vyāstaḥ* “Vṛtra lay there, flung apart in many pieces,” with a form of $\sqrt{śi}$ as here. I would then suggest an alternative tr. “having smashed the serpent (so it was) lying dispersed.”

V.32.2–3: An etymological sequence -- *táviṣīm* (2d), *táviṣībhiḥ* (3b), *távyān* (3d) -- that also builds to a climax, from singular ‘(a) power’ to plural ‘powers’ to the comparative ‘more powerful’, all associated with Indra.

The sequence of vs.-init. *t(i)yá- cid* ‘that very one’ discussed in the publ. intro. begins in 3a with *t(i)yásya cid* (and continues with *t(i)yám cid* in 4a, 5a, 6a, 8a). Note that it follows distracted vs.-init. *t(u)vám* in 2a and second-position *cid* in 2c: combining the two produces, by variation, *t(i)yám cid*. That *cid* in 2c follows *āhim* ‘serpent’ provides the referent for the *t(i)yá-* forms to follow. The sequence comes to a temporary close in vs. 6, with *tám cid* opening pāda c a variant of *t(i)yám cid* opening 6a. There is then a brief revival of the phrase in 8a, after skipping a vs.

V.32.3: In c *ékaḥ ... apratīḥ* “alone (and) unopposable” applies to (the unnamed) Vṛtra, but these two words appear elsewhere similarly juxtaposed but applied to opposing referents: IV.17.19 *bhūrīṇy éko apratīni hanti* “alone he smashes the many unopposable

things” and VIII.90.5 *tvám vṛtrāṇi haṁsy apratīṇy éka íd* “You, alone, smash the unopposable obstacles.” This is another example of this hymn taking standard phraseology and turning it on its head. Note that an almost identical phrase, *ékaḥ ... ápratītaḥ* (again with the two words in the same case with the same referent), is applied to Indra in 9b in the triumphant announcement of his universal superiority (see publ. intro.). Though Vṛtra *thought* (*mānyamānaḥ*) he had these qualities in our 3c, Indra possesses them for real -- as shown by the phraseological transfer from the one to the other.

V.32.4: The major problem in this vs. is the identity and syntactic affiliation of the gen. pl. *eṣām*. The standard opinion, found in Ge, Scar (100), and WG, takes it as referring to the gods and construed with *svadháya*. There are several arguments against this. First, the gods are never mentioned or even alluded to elsewhere in the hymn (though goddess(es) are found in 9c and 10a). Second, though *svadháya* √ *mad* is a remarkably common locution (I.64.4, 108.12, 154.4; III.4.7=7.8; VII.47.3; X.14.3, 7, 15.4, 124.8), *svadháya* never has a dependent gen. in those passages. The standard opinion is also hard-pressed to make sense out of the phrase. Ge takes *svadhá-* here as ‘Lebenselement’ and further glosses this as water, but even if “reveling in the Lebenselement/water of the gods” were a possible tr. of this phrase, it is a notion that seems foreign to the Vṛtra myth. Scar and WG have a more reasonable interpr. -- that Vṛtra is reveling in what actually belongs by nature to the gods, that is, as WG say in their n., “Der Dämon usurpiert die Natur der Götter.” But this still requires conjuring up the gods out of thin air and assuming that the audience could do so too, on the basis of an unemphatic, unaccented gen. pl. pronoun. And again the image produced is not a standard part of the Vṛtra myth.

My solution starts, appropriately, by seeking a referent in the context; *dānavásya* in the 2nd hemistich seems a reasonable choice. Although *dānavá-* never appears in the plural in the RV, this stem (related to *dānu-*, the name of Vṛtra’s mother, which I consider a backformation from the demonic ethnonym; see comm. ad I.32.9) names “eine Dämonen-Klasse,” as Mayrhofer remarks (EWA s.v. *dānu-*), and fluctuation between sg. and pl. can happen in such cases (as with the Maruts, plural, versus the Marut flock, singular). The pl. is found in the AV (AVŚ IV.24.2 [with vs. 1 referring to Indra as *vṛtrahán-*], X.6.10; AVP IV.39.3 [≅ AVŚ IV.24.2], VII.12.8, XVI.43.2) and elsewhere in early Vedic as well as later (esp. epic) Skt., and the corresponding Avestan *dānauua-*, also the name of an inimical group, is found in the pl. in Yt. 5.73 and 13.37–38. In the latter it is associated with *vərəθra-* (*vərəθrəm dānunqm*). It therefore seems likely that even in the RV *dānavá-* is not simply a designation of Vṛtra but of the class of beings to which he belongs, and the absence of the plural in the RV is either due to accident or a desire to concentrate on the arch-Dānava, Vṛtra. The gen. here may be construed either with *t(i)yám cid* (“this one of theirs”) or be a free-floating indication of appurtenance, as the publ. tr. takes it. Or indeed, because *eṣām* is in (modified) Wackernagel’s position, it could have originated with any of the descriptors of Vṛtra found later in the verse.

With *svadháya* freed from its supposed genitive dependent, the phrase *svadháya mādantam* now makes sense in a Vṛtra context. He is “drunk on his own power” on the basis of his faulty assessment of this power presented in 3c. The locution recalls a similar one in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, where in 6a Vṛtra is described as *ayoddhéva durmádaḥ* “like a non-warrior badly drunk” (lit. ‘having bad intoxication’), foolishly challenging a far more powerful opponent. (I use ‘drunk’ in both instances, instead of our

more usual ‘exhilarated’, because it better captures in English the state of mind of the one so affected.)

The sense of *vṛṣa-prabharmā* is secured by 5c *prābhṛtā mādasya* “at the proffering of the invigorating (soma)” -- hence, as Gr takes it (sim. WG, Scar, and me), “dem der kräftige (Soma) vorgesetzt ist.” This also makes sense in context -- Indra needs to receive the soma before smashing Vṛtra -- and is reinforced by the usual sense of the lexeme *prā √ bhr̥* ‘bring forward, present’. However, Ge renders it “wie ein Bulle angreifend (?)” and I was tempted somewhat in this direction, to ‘having the bearing/deportment of a bull’; *prā √ bhr̥* can, esp. in the middle, mean ‘display, present oneself’. I think both possibilities are latent in this word, and we can view the anchoring 5c *prābhṛtā mādasya* as another example of poetic repair -- or perhaps a poetic thumb on the scales, pressing the choice of one of the options over the other. It is then itself somewhat undercut by 7c *vājrasya prābhṛtau* “at the proffering of the mace.”

In c note the echo ... *-prabharmā ... bhāmaṃ*.

The last word of this vs. is *śūṣṇam*. Generally, of course, this is the name of a different opponent of Indra’s, and a number of tr. take it so here. But I think it has its etymological sense ‘snorter’ (*√ śvas* ‘snort’; cf. EWA s.v.). Our poet is once again toying with us: withholding the real name of the opponent in this hymn, Vṛtra, he is falsely offering a different possibility here.

V.32.5: Unlike 4a where I separate the identically positioned enclitic gen. from the following instr., I do take *asya* here with *krátubhiḥ*, which, unlike *svadháya*, is frequently found with a gen. With Ge I think the referent is Indra (contra WG, who take it to be Vṛtra-Śuṣṇa).

I take *nīṣattam* as proleptic, depicting Vṛtra’s position after the action of *nī jaghāna* in the immediately preceding pāda (4d). With Ge I consider 5a essentially a continuation of 4d and supply the same verb.

In b I supply ‘thinking himself’ with *amarmāṇaḥ* on the basis of 3c and of the almost identical III.32.4cd ... *viveda, amarmāṇo manyamānasya mārma*. The verb in b, *vidát*, is accented because of the following *íd* (see Gr s.v. *íd* 5, though there are fewer clear examples than he presents, since many of them are also pāda-initial).

The Indra-reference shifts from 3rd to 2nd between the first and second hemistich, but this is scarcely novel.

V.32.6: Though Gr refuses to tr., *katpayám* seems to contain the pejorative *ka-* prefix; see EWA s.v. *ká*¹, p. 285.

For *āpa √ gṛ̥* ‘taunt’ see comm. ad V.29.4. As Oberlies (Relig. I.401) points out, this gerund depicts a pre-battle boasting/insulting match -- trash talk (needless to say, this last is not Oberlies’s formulation), flying.

What to do with *uccāḥ* is unclear. Most take it with the gerund *apagūrya*; so Ge “hoch ausholend,” with his interpr. of the gerund as belonging to a *√ gṛ̥* ‘hold out’; with the assignment to *āpa √ gṛ̥* ‘insult’, Schaeffer “nachdem er laut Schmähreden geführt hat”; Oberlies “nachdem er ihn [zuvor] mit lauter Stimme geschmäht hatte”; WG “indem er ihn von oben herab verspottete.” The Schaeffer / Oberlies interpr. of the adverb as ‘loud’ is appealing, but *uccā* is always positional in the RV. The WG interpr. recognizes this fact, but insulting *from above* seems an odd activity. I take it rather with *jaghāna*. A fatal

blow is more likely to come from above than a taunt, and it is notable how often in the hymn it is emphasized that Vṛtra was smashed *down*: 1d *áva ... han*, 4d *ní jaghāna*, 5a *nīṣattam*, 7d *adhamám*, 8d *ní ... āvṛnak*. To depict Indra as correspondingly acting *above* provides the thematic complement. Note also *úd ... índraḥ ... vādhar yámiṣṭa* (“... held up ...”) in the next hemistich, 7ab.

V.32.7: *vādhar* appears here in the same metrical position as in 3b. There the weapon was Vṛtra’s (which Indra struck away), while here it is Indra’s. Another example of vocab. first used of Vṛtra reassigned to Indra -- like *ékaḥ ... apratīḥ* in 3a and the similar expression in 9a. Indeed, *ápratītam* appears here in b, characterizing Indra’s weapon, which is ‘might’ itself (*sáhaḥ*). The use of *sáhaḥ* as an appositive here supports my view of the same usage of this word in V.31.3 (contra Ge [WG]). There it characterizes Indra himself. It is even possible that *sáho ápratītam* here is nominative and an appositive to *índraḥ*, rather than an acc. and appositive to *vādhar*, though the juxtaposition of the two terms in b makes that unlikely. In any case note the similarity in phrasing: 31.3a # *úd yát sáhaḥ ...* 32.7ab # *úd yád ... sáhaḥ*; the verbs in these clauses are also rhyming: 31.3 *ájaniṣṭa*, 32.7 *yámiṣṭa*. On the injunc. *yámiṣṭa* see also comm. ad V.34.2.

As noted ad vs. 4, the poetic repair effected by *prábhṛtā mādasya* in 5c is somewhat muddled by 7c *vájrasya prábhṛtau*. What exactly this latter phrase means is not clear. I doubt that Ge’s “im Schlag mit der Keule” is correct, since ‘strike’ is not a standard sense of *prá √ bhr* (the closest we get is ‘bear down on’). WG’s “beim Vorführen des Vajra” is similar to my “at the proffering of the mace” (‘proffer’ having been chosen to match the tr. of this lexeme in 4c and 5c). The English idiom “present arms” is a direct correspondent, though the action in the English phrase is a gesture of respect, not (as here) of intimidation. The point of both *úd ... vādhar yámiṣṭa* “held up his weapon” and *vájrasya prábhṛtau* seems to be to show Vṛtra the unbeatable power of the *vájra*-. See also the *mahatā vadhéna* in 8c.

V.32.8: The verb *ādat* ‘took’ is superficially active, though the idiom *ā √ dā* ‘take’ is ordinarily middle. As was seen already by Wackernagel, the form must be a re-marked form of the older 3rd sg. middle root aor. The underlying form would be **āda*, which can represent either an old *-t*-less 3rd sg. mid. ending (as in impf. **āduha* → *āduha+t*) or, more likely, the simplification by degemination of an old **ād+ta* with an originally *-t*-full ending. Of course this preform should have yielded **ātta*, but the fact that all other forms of the root aor. have a single *d*- (*ādāt*, etc.) could have induced the geminate to simplify (in this metrically non-diagnostic position after *ā*) and restore the *d* of the root. (Kü [Stativ 50–51] bases the *-d*-form on 3rd pl. *ādiran**.) In any case the *t*-less **āda* would have been activated like the *t*-less middle imperfects of the *āduhat* type. The resulting “active” stem could spread elsewhere; cf. 1st pl. *ādāma* in nearby V.30.15. For disc. and previous lit. see Kü ref. above. The form is very differently explained by Old, who assigns it to *ā √ dr* ‘tear out’ by way of the sandhi form **ādaḥ* (< 2nd/3rd sg. **ādar*) and what seems to me a somewhat sketchy remarking with *-t* (as if 2nd sg. = **ādas*, so 3rd sg. should = **ādat?*). The morphological machinery required seems too complex for its purpose, to avoid a slightly aberrant use of *ā √ dā*, and since *ā √ dr* doesn’t take personal objects (Old finds one late ex.), its usage here would be aberrant as well. Ge assigns it to *ā √ dā*, as do WG (with ref. to Kü, *Stativ*).

For the third time in the hymn, Vṛtra is described as *śáyānam* ‘lying’, each time in the same pāda-final position (2c, 6a, 8a), and pāda-final *nīṣattam* (5a) ‘sunk, lit. sitting, down’ may be a sort of semantic pun on this positional characterization. In I.32, the Indra-Vṛtra hymn with clear phraseological and thematic parallels to this one, *√śí* ‘lie’ is also Vṛtra’s signature verb, esp. describing his position after his defeat, rather than before, as here.

Ge suggests that *árṇam* is an anticipatory haplology (not his term) for **arṇapám* ‘drinking the flood’, immediately before *madhupám*. He is followed by Scar (313 n. 444) and WG. I see no reason to accept this. The stem *árṇa-* exists; the stem **arṇapá-* (*/-pá-*) does not. More importantly, Vṛtra is known for confining the waters, not drinking them. As was just noted, *√śí* ‘lie’ is a defining verb for Vṛtra in both I.32 and this hymn. In the former he lies there as the released waters stream over him (I.32.8ab ... *amuyā śáyānam*, ... *āti yanty āpaḥ*; cf. also 8d, 10). Here, in complementary fashion, he is depicted as lying over them before his defeat.

Although most take *atrā-* as a PN, I still prefer the older derivation (see, e.g., Gr) from *√ad* ‘eat’ with simplification of the geminate (**at-trā-*), *pace* EWA s.v. *átri-*. It does not have to have anything to do with the seer Atri (*átri-*), but *átrin-* ‘voracious’ is, in my opinion, derivationally connected.

V.32.9: As noted in the publ. intro., the question *káḥ ... varāte* “who can obstruct ...?” covertly introduces Vṛtra, the defeated enemy who remained unnamed in the first 8 vss., by way of the verb built to the root *√vr* ‘obstruct’ that furnishes Vṛtra’s transparent name. The implicit answer is “no one, since Obstacle himself could not.”

V.32.10: The *devī svádhitīḥ* in pāda a is much disputed, and for good reason. The stem *svádhitī-* means ‘axe, hatchet’, but the presence of such an implement here is puzzling. Ge, flg. Sāy., wants to take this instance of the stem as independent and equivalent to *svadhā-* ‘autonomous power’. Given the occurrence of *svadhā-* in 4a and the derived possessive adj. *svadhāvan-* in pāda d of this same vs., it is hard not to suspect some connection. On the other hand, *svádhitī-* ‘axe’ is too well established for that sense not to be the first reading, or at least to intrude, and, furthermore, pāda a is twinned with b, which also contains a thing not a quality (and is also a pun).

I therefore think we are dealing with a pun. On the one hand, even the “heavenly hatchet,” which sounds like a formidable weapon, bows to powerful Indra. The hatchet’s submission to Indra is a measure of his might and may also put this weapon into his hands. There may even be another intertextual reference to I.32, as Teigo Onishi suggested to me. In I.32.5c Vṛtra lies “like branches hewn apart by an axe” (*skándhāmsīva kúlīśenā vívrkṇā*). Though this is a simile, not a direct reference to the narrative, and though a different word for axe, *kúlīśa-*, is used, this imagery may be a common trope in the Vṛtra story. As for the reading “the goddess Autonomous Power,” the phonological similarity and possible identical formation of *svádhitī* and *svadhā-* (with *sva-* looking like a first cmpd member in both, and *-dhi-* resembling *-dhā-*, with connection to *√dhā* at least possible [the etymology of *svádhitī-* is “nicht klar” acdg. to EWA s.v.]) make such a reading very easy in this context.

As just noted, pāda b also seems to contain a pun. The way (*gātú-*) yields to Indra, but, acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, Gātu Ātreya is also the poet of this hymn -- though since

only this one hymn in the RV is attributed to him, the name may have been plucked from this context.

This vs. contains another example of the transfer of vocabulary from Vṛtra to Indra. As we saw, in 4a Vṛtra was intoxicated by (his false assumption about) his autonomous power (*svadhāyā mādantam*), but here it is Indra who possesses autonomous power (*svadhāvan-*) for real. With *svādhitī* in pāda a also (partly) expressing Indra's acquisition of this power, his triumph is complete. This sets the stage for the transition to the last two verses, where the poet announces his own contact with Indra's fame and what that will mean for his own good fortune.

V.32.11: I think that this vs. is structured by the implicit contrast between *jātā-* and *nāviṣṭha-*, both used of Indra, but I seem to be alone in this (though see Gr's lapidary comment s.v. *nāviṣṭha*). Ge (/WG) take *nāviṣṭham* as adverbial (Ge "aufs neue," WG "zum letzten Mal"). This is certainly possible, but if it is taken as modifying Indra, the sense becomes more complex and interesting. In the first hemistich "I" announce the famous stable Indra of myth and authority, born (*jātām*) for these roles and continuously occupying them, but in the second hemistich it is the Indra of the ritual who's the focus -- the Indra who is newly brought to every new ritual and whose epiphany is like a new creation every time, caused by the ritual actions themselves.

V.32.12: I take *maghā* as object of both *yātāyantam* and *dādatam*; it is neatly positioned between the two participles. Ge renders *ṛtuthā yātāyantam* as "dass du pünktlich vergilst" (repay, requite), but this is not a standard meaning of *√yat*. WG's "dass du ... die (verdiente) Stellung verschaffst" is closer to the sense of the root, but lacks the obj. one expects with an *-āya*-transitive. A locution very close to my interpr. is found in IX.39.2 *jānāya yātāyann īṣaḥ* "arranging the refreshments for the people."

Contra Old, who assigns *garhate* to *√grabh*, I take it to *√grh* 'complain'; see EWA s.v. *GARH* and esp. Hoffmann "Vedisch grh 'klagen'" (MSS 14 [1959]: 35–38 = Aufs. 439–41) cited there. There is likely a phonological play between this verb and *jagr̥bhre* in the previous, twinned, verse.

V.33–34: Indra

These two hymns attributed to Saṃvaraṇa Prājāpatya are full of puzzles, many insoluble.

V.33 Indra

Although the general outline of this hymn is pretty straightforward, it is full of interpretational problems and grammatical and syntactic obscurities, and the meter is very messy.

V.33.1: The first hemistich begins and ends with an etymological figure: #*māhi mahé ... tavāse ātavyān*#. The *tavāse* also repeats the same form from the preceding pāda.

I supply *śrāvaḥ* 'praise' with *māhi*, since this is a frequent collocation. Sim. Ge, though Kü (258) and WG take it as adverbial.

With Ge (/WG uncertainly) I reluctantly interpr. pāda-final *nṛ̃n* as a gen. pl. (or standing for a gen. pl.), as is sometimes necessary. Old interpr. it rather as a dat. pl., which I don't understand.

With Ge I construe *itthā* with *tavāse*; I assume it adds strengthening to that repeated word. Kü (258) instead takes it as an expression of the method of praise: “auf diese Weise,” so apparently also WG, though muted (“also”).

In the 2nd hemistich the referent of *asmai* is at issue. The standard view (Ge, Old, WG) is that it refers to the singer, the “not so strong” I. In Ge's interpr. this involves rendering *asmai sumatīm ... cikéta* as “der ... diesem (Sänger) seine Gunst zugedacht hat.” That *sumatī-* could refer to Indra's benevolence is easy, but ‘zudenken’ as an interpr. of *cikéta* is hard. This pf. stem ordinarily means either ‘take note of’ or ‘appear as’ (latter generally middle). WG give the pf. its usual meaning but this leaves *asmai* without much to do in the clause. By contrast, I take Indra as the referent of *asmai*. It is not rare for enclitic forms of this pronoun to refer to the subject: a reflexive is not necessary. Under this interpr. *sumatī-* has its common meaning ‘good thought’ = poem, and Indra takes cognizance of this *sumatī-*, which is “for him.” Cf. VII.31.10 *prācetase prā sumatīm kṛṇudhvam* where the *sumatī-* of the poets is intended for a god (Indra, in fact) in the dative who is characterized as *prā√cit*.

V.33.2: The (pseudo-)participle *dhiyasānā-* clearly patterns with *dīdhīye* in 1a, hence my complementary ‘being conjured up’. I take it to mean that Indra's epiphany at the sacrifice is brought about by our chants (*arkaīh*), that his appearance there is literally “thought up” by our thoughts. This notion is close to what is found in the previous hymn V.32.11 (at least by my interpr.), that every sacrifice brings a “newest Indra,” that the Indra of the sacrificial epiphany is newly created by sacrificial activity every time. The standard interpr. of *dhiyasānā-* by Ge [/WG] is more pedestrian: Indra becomes attentive (“aufmerksam geworden”) through our hymns. The other occurrence of the stem, in X.32.1, in my opinion fits my interpr. (see comm. ad loc.), but, to be honest, neither passage is absolutely clear. As for the stem itself, *dhiyasānā-* does not pattern with the majority of *-asānā-* stems discussed ad IV.3.6, and I do not have a satisfactory account of it.

The *sá tvām* phrase does not conform to my rules for the use of *sá* with 2nd ps. reference (see my “Sá figé”), and I likewise can't account for it.

The *yā(h)* beginning the 2nd hemistich is problematic. If it is a rel. prn. it has to be a fem. pl., and there is no obvious referent in the context (*hārīṇām* in b belongs to a masc. stem *hāri-*). Therefore with Ge (/WG) and, very cautiously, Old, I take it as a verb form, belonging to *√yā* ‘drive’. (Note the past part. *yātāh* in 5b.) Because it is followed by two subjunctives, *vākṣaḥ* and *sakṣi* (the latter a “*si*-imperative” derived from a subjunctive), I take *yā(h)* as subjunctive as well. Indeed, if it is read *yāah*, the extra syllable would fix the meter of this pāda -- but since the hymn is full of metrical disturbances, this is not a strong argument. Neither Ge nor WG indicates how they interpr. the morphology, but both tr. as an imperative, as they do the two following verbs.

Both Ge and WG take *aryāḥ* and *jānān* as parallel acc. pl., while I make *aryāḥ* a gen. sg. dependent on *jānān*. There is no way to tell; Thieme (Fremdl., 11 n. 2) refuses to deal with the passage at all.

V.33.3: The sense of the first hemistich -- that by reciting the (yoking-)formulation we will do our part to ensure that your (Indra's) horses will be yoked -- is fairly clear, but the syntax is messy. First, it's couched as a triple negative construction: "it is *not* that X will *not* happen because of *not*-Y," which already puts it on the edge of parsability. The parsing problem is slightly increased by the fact that the content of the negative "that" clause is expressed through a periphrasis involving a negated participle+copula (*áyuktāsaḥ ... āsan* "will be/remain unyoked"). Then, the position of *yád* is utterly non-standard, being found deep in the clause, after several different constituents, right before the final word. I tried various ways to produce a conforming subordinate clause from the text, but failed. The publ. tr. "if it's for lack of a (yoking) formulation" (as if *abrahmātā yád* were a separate embedded clausette) gives the appearance of (almost) succeeding, but it doesn't accurately represent the text (though I still think it might represent the purport of this odd word order). A more accurate tr. would be "Since these horses ... because of a lack ...," as the dependent clause for the main clause in cd. I remain disturbed by the structure of this dep. cl.

A separate problem is the *abhí asmád* in pāda a. The *abhí* is stranded in the middle of the pāda (though immed. after the caesura) and in any case has no verb from which it could have been separated in tmesis. In the absence of anything else to do with it, the default option seems to be to construe it with *asmád*, and this phrase has long (see Old's reff.) been compared to I.139.8 *asmád abhí*, likewise in the middle of the pāda though in opposite order. The problem is that *abhí* as a preposition seems otherwise only to take the acc. Nonetheless, connecting the two seems the best bet, with a meaning such as "with regard to us" or, better reflecting the ablative, my "because of us." So Old, WG. Cf. also Humbach et al. (*Gāthās... and the Other Old Avestan Texts*, II.118), ad Y 35.5 (Yasna Haptaŋhaiti) *ahmaṭ hiiṭ aibī*, a phrase meaning (in his view) "which is with us," with which he compares both our passage and I.139.8. However, Narten (YH, 271–72), fld. by Hinze (*Zoroastrian Liturgy*, 77–78), interprets this three-word phrase, occurring twice in the YH (Y 35.5, 40.1), as containing a postposition *aibī* governing the neut. acc. *hiiṭ* not the abl. *ahmaṭ*, with the whole meaning "from us towards which," thus "as far as we are concerned" (Hintze, 78).

V.33.4: Another troubled vs., though the first hemistich is more transparent than the second. The first thing to notice is that the accent on *cakārtha* in b indicates that b must still be under the domain of *yád* in pāda a, as parallel dependent clauses. Ge (/WG) attempt to make initial *purū* a single-word main clause on which they both depend ("Viel ist, was ..."). This assumes that *purū* is a neut. sg. here. Although the existence of a neut. sg. in *-ū* is standard doctrine (see Lanman, *Noun Inflec.*, 406–7, AiG III.145, etc.), this grammatical truism rests primarily on Gr's identification of twelve forms of *purū* as sg. (see Lanman and AiG), but in only one instance, the late X.94.5, does this seem the likely interpr. (There is also one form of *urū* and, for Lanmann, two of *míthū*, which is better taken as an adv.) I do not therefore think that *-ū* is a possible neut. sg. ending, except, perhaps, in X.94.5. Here the most obvious way to construe *purū* is with pāda-final neut. pl. *ukthā*, the subject of *sánti*. The attempt to impose a singular interpr. on *purū*, as antecedent for the following relative clause with plural subject, yields the awkward rendering of Ge: "Viel ist, was deine Preislieder sind" with mismatch of number (WG more elaborate, but not less clumsy).

For b the only adjustment is to carry *purū* over from pāda a and supply a term like *kṛtāni* or *kārmāni*, easily generated from *cakārtha*: “many are (the deeds) you have done ...”

The 2nd hemistich is more problematic. The first question is how to relate pāda c and d. Ge takes them as parallel independent clauses with the same verb *tataḥsé*, while WG takes it as a single cl. (also Kü 207). With Ge I take them as two clauses and agree that they share a verb, but think that c is a dependent clause still under the control of *yád* in pāda a and parallel to ab, with d the main clause resuming them all.

A related issue is the apparent change of person from 2nd sg. address to Indra in ab and (supposed) 3rd sg. reference to him in cd. The only evidence for this 3rd ps. reference is the verb *tataḥsé*, which is one of only two medial forms of this pf. in the RV. It has no obvious medial value here, and in fact the presence of a dat. of benefit (*sūryāya*) eliminates one possible way of accounting for the middle form. (Kü [207] suggests a “Bedeutungskomponente” ‘(auch) in seinem eigenen Interesse’, which seems a bit desperate.) The puzzle of the middle is somewhat reduced if we interpret the form as *second* sg. mid. The presumed preform **tataḥs-ṣé* would surely come out as our *tataḥsé*, and it would make sense to substitute this nonce middle form for the non-transparent *active* 2nd sg., which should be **tataḥs-ṭha* → **tataḥṭha* -- whereas the active 3rd sg. *tataḥsa* is non-problematic and indeed well attested. So the supposed change of person and the middle form can be accounted for by the same explanation.

After confronting these formal issues, there remains the very knotty problem of what the hemistich is expressing, and part of this depends on whether the relations between Indra and Sūrya here are friendly or hostile: elsewhere they are sometimes one, sometimes the other. (Here I think they are friendly.) A syntactic question is whether *nāma* is the only object of *tataḥsé* or if the clause in c (if it is a separate clause) has a different object. Ge opts for the former choice, I for the latter, and I also think that the verb is used in different senses in c and d, positive in c, negative in d.

In c I supply *purū* again from pāda a and tentatively supply ‘paths’ as the object, bringing to mind the various passages in which a god (usually Varuṇa) makes or digs out paths for the sun to follow through the sky -- e.g., I.24.8 *urūṃ hī rājā varuṇas cakāra, sūryāya pānthām ānvetaṁ u*, VII.87.1 *rādat pathó varuṇo sūryāya*. In one late passage (X.111.3) it is Indra who is named as *pathikṛt sūryāya* “pathmaker for the sun.” It’s also worth noting that, leaving aside this one, 5 of the other 10 occurrences of the dat. *sūryāya* occur in a path-making context. Though, admittedly, I have no parallels using the root *√takṣ* ‘fashion, carve’, it seems in the right general semantic range. As for *ókasi své* this can refer either to Indra’s or to Sūrya’s “own home,” since both of them inhabit the same celestial realms; I favor the Sun’s.

As for d, as is recognized by all, the similarly phrased X.23.2 *áva kṣnaumi dāsasya nāma cit* must be compared. In that passage Indra says “I whet down even the name of the barbarian,” in my tr. Though this passage is the obvious comparandum, it is hardly transparent in itself or in its bearing on our passage, and in fact I think the two passages are less close semantically than their joint isolation invites us to think. In X.23.2 Indra seems to be boasting about his victory over the Dāsa, which is so complete that even his name is obliterated or at least violently ground down. But *√takṣ* generally refers to creating something by carving off bits or fashioning in some other way. Perhaps here it means that Indra, just by fighting (and presumably defeating) the Dāsa, has still made the

latter's name conspicuous, as if by carving it into a surface. (Or perhaps, closer to X.23.2, Indra has obliterated the Dāsa's name as if by gouging it out of a surface.) But either of these interpr. raises a crucial question: what would it mean literally to carve a *name* into (or gouge it out of) a surface before the existence of writing?!

In any case I think that the contrastive positive/negative use of $\sqrt{takṣ}$ in c and d makes the verb sit uneasily in both and poses special challenges to the audience to decode the metaphor in each pāda.

As should be obvious, I do not consider my interpr. of this vs. or most of its part settled and sure. I also don't understand the sequence of ideas. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think that the first pāda, positing many hymns for Indra, may refer to the existence of competing (Ārya) sacrifices. The second pāda cites his activities as a warrior on earth; the dat. "for the cow" may either mean that Indra has fought in order to obtain cows (for the Ārya warriors he is fighting beside) or that he has won meadows for (the Āryas') cows to graze in -- in either case advancing the Ārya cause. In contrast c sets out his beneficial cosmic activity -- keeping the sun on track (if my interpr. of the details of the pāda is correct), which in turn is beneficial to mankind. In at least the first two cases I think there's an implicit Ārya presence, which contrasts with the explicit Dāsa in d.

V.33.5: What constitutes the predicate in ab is disputed. Flg. Old and the model of VII.30.4, I take ab as constituting an "X and which Y" construction, with doubled "and which Y" (more accurately schematized as "X and which Y and (which) Z"). The predication is simply *te* "of you, yours," an assertion of possession. It is predicated of us (*vayām té*) as well as "which men" (*yé ca nārah*) and "(which) chariots" (... *ca rāthāḥ*) -- literally "we and which men and (which) chariots are yours." Both of the latter two are further characterized in b, the men by a participial phrase (*śārdho jajñānāḥ* "having been born as a troop"), the chariots by a simple participle (*yātāḥ* 'driven, driving'). WG seem to follow this interpr. as well, though with some filigree in the middle that seems over-elaborate. Klein (DGRV I.49 n. 10) sets out the schema as above and tr. sim. (I.196). Ge by contrast takes the predication to be *śārdho jajñānāḥ*, applied to both us and the men, with the chariots left hanging: essentially "we and the man are born as your troop, and the chariots." Besides the syntactic isolation of the chariots in Ge's rendering, it also unduly extends the reference of *śārdho jajñānāḥ*. The "men" of pāda a must be, as often, the Maruts, and it is only they who "have been born as a troop," not also us. The word *gaṇā-* is almost exclusive to the Maruts, and the birth of the Maruts is a common topic (e.g., I.64.2, 4).

The phrase *rātho ná yātāḥ* appears in I.141.8. See comm. there, where I suggest that a *yātā-rātha-* is a particular kind of chariot, perhaps one meant for long journeys, rather than referring to the current state of motion of any specific chariot(s).

The problem with pāda c is the clash between the voc. *ahisūṣma* and the 3rd sg. verb *jagamyāt* with its nom. subj. *sātvā*. The stem *sātvān-* in the sg. is almost always used of Indra, and in this context -- a hymn dedicated to Indra and both praising his powers and begging him to deploy them on our behalf -- it is difficult to imagine that we would then express a wish that some indefinite or at least unidentified warrior should come our way instead (as in Ge's "Uns möge ... ein Krieger kommen"; WG almost identical). Surely Indra is the warrior we want! This would require a shift from 2nd to 3rd ps. ref. between ab and cd, but this is not problematic. What is problematic is the voc., which

should also refer to Indra. Gr solves this by positing a bahuvr. *ahisūṣma-sátvan-* ‘whose warriors have a serpent’s hiss’ (‘dessen Helden wie Schlangen zischen’). Unfortunately the accent is definitively against this interpr. I have no neat solution, but am firm in my belief that the *sátvā* is Indra. For a similar vocative/nominative cross, see *vasavānaḥ* in the next vs. (6a); these two problems may be connected.

I take the simile in d as an elaborate pun, playing on the double sense of the three members, *bhāga-*, *hāvya-*, and *prabhṛthá-*. The first can be both the name of the god Fortune and a common noun ‘portion’; *hāvya-* can belong to $\sqrt{hū}$, *hvā* ‘call’ or \sqrt{hu} ‘pour, offer’; *pra* $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ can refer either to the presentation of arms (and the carrying off of booty) in a hostile situation or to the presentation of offerings at a sacrifice. Cf. the double sense of *prā* $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ in nearby V.32.4–5, 7 and comm. there. The first meanings just given for the three items coalesce into one simile, the second ones in another.

V.33.6: The first question about this vs. is the structure of the first hemistich. The standard interpr. (Ge, WG, also Old, Klein [DGRV I.263–64]; see also Kulikov -*ya-pres.*, 580) takes the two pādas as separate clauses with *ca* conjoining them. There are several problems with this division: 1) *ca* is not comfortably at home as clause-conjoiner and usually conjoins NPs; 2) with *nṛmṇāni* in the domain of the 2nd clause, it must be the obj. of the participle (or pseudo-participle; see below) *nṛtāmānaḥ*, but non-causative forms of $\sqrt{nṛt}$ ‘dance’ are never transitive. Both difficulties disappear if we take *nṛmṇāni* *ca* as conjoined with immediately preceding *ójaḥ* as joint subject of the first clause in the hemistich (so also Lowe, 251; see below). The phonological play between *nṛmṇāni* and *nṛtāmānaḥ* may account for the postponing of *nṛmṇāni* till the second pāda, inserting a pāda break between the two conjoined nouns. This phonologically driven positioning may also help account for the very late position of *hí*. The loc. prn. *tvé* ordinarily takes initial position in its clause/verse line, and *hí* would be expected to follow in Wackernagel’s position. But the whole structure may have been shifted rightwards to allow *nṛmṇāni* to neighbor *nṛtāmānaḥ*.

nṛtāmāna- presents difficulties of its own, even after its supposed object has been eliminated. This participle is the only occurrence of the supposed them. aor. (or 6th cl. pres.) in all of Sanskrit. Although, since all forms of this root are poorly attested in the RV, this is not necessarily problematic on its own, the -*ya*-present (1x in RV) does continue post-RV (see Kulikov, *Vedic -ya-presents*, 578–80), and moreover all other verb forms to this root in Vedic are active. Lowe (*Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, 250–51) suggests that it is an artificial form based on the well-attested splv. *nṛtama-* ‘most manly, most heroic’. This is an attractive hypothesis -- among other things, Indra is frequently called *nṛtama-*; the word regularly appears in immediate post-caesura position, as *nṛtāmānaḥ* does here; and it would be playing not merely phonologically but also etymologically with *nṛmṇāni*. Lowe (p. 152) tr. “being the most heroic,” reflecting its nonce jury-rigged participial form. I do think, however, that the form also consciously references $\sqrt{nṛt}$ ‘dance’. Indra is regularly called a *nṛtú-* ‘dancer, prancer’, and note the pun involving *nṛ-* ‘man’ in VI.63.5 *nārā nṛtū* (of the Aśvins). I would therefore modify the publ. tr. to “As the most manly [/ the prancing] immortal ...”

In c *rayīm* must be fem., as occasionally elsewhere, given the fem. adj. *énīm*.

The stem *vāsavāna-* ‘possessing goods, winning goods’ (?) is attested 5x, once as an unaccented voc. sg. *vasavāna* (X.22.15), otherwise accented and with orthodox -*a-*

stem forms, incl. nom. sg. *vásavānaḥ* (I.174.1). The form here looks of course like a nom. sg. but lacks accent. Gr calls it “fälschlich unbetont”; Lub. gives it an accent and a rightward star (*vásavāno**). This seems the best course; I think an attempt to assign it to different stem (perhaps an aberrant *-as* stem) is too elaborate, esp. in this hymn with numerous “off” forms: see esp. the voc. *ahiśuṣma* for expected nom. in 5c. The publ. tr. pays more attention to the lack of accent and tr. as voc.; it would be equally possible to weigh the nom. sg. ending more heavily and tr. it as an appositive subject: “as winner of goods, give us dappled wealth.” Despite the tr. “winner of goods,” I do not think the stem contains a form of \sqrt{van} but is rather a pseudo-participle (another one, but athematic) built to *vásu-* ‘good(s)’. Elsewhere I render it ‘goods-lord’ and the like.

In d *prā ... stuṣe dānam* “I will start up the praise for the gift” is an analytic expansion of the noun *dānastuti*, which, however, is not attested in Vedic or, it seems, anywhere else in Sanskrit lit., though the term is in common use in Vedic scholarship. The last three (or possibly four) vss. in this hymn constitute such a *dānastuti*, and the poet seems to signalling that it is coming up. In the publ. tr. I identify the *arí- tuvīmaghā-* as Indra; I now would be more circumspect, since I now think the phrase applies both to Indra and to the patrons praised in vss. (7 or) 8–10. See also *aryāḥ* in 9d.

V.33.7: This vs. provides a transition between the praise-hymn proper and the *dānastuti*. On the one hand, it straightforwardly makes requests of Indra, as hymn-final vss. tend to do, and it begins with *evā*, a frequent introducer of the final summary vs., but it also turns its attention in cd to those who facilitate the sacrifice, i.e., the patrons. The participle *dádātāḥ* ‘giving’ that characterizes them is telling. Ge suggests that the *dānastuti* begins with 7c and notes that like 7c the vss. of the *dānastuti* begin with *utá*.

The meter of the first hemistich is badly mangled. Old blames the poet “dessen Formgefühl unzweifelhaft schwach war.” But it may be a good strategy to mark the new section with a metrical jolt. Curiously the vs. is mostly free of the verbal knots that bedevil the earlier parts of the hymn.

Ge suggests plausibly that the “skin of the honey” is the skin on which the soma is prepared.

V.33.8–10: As just noted, 7c begins with *utá* as do vss. 8–10, but those vss. of the *dānastuti* proper are further unified, all beginning *utá tyé mā*.

V.33.8: It is unclear whether the horses in ab and those in c are the same or different. In the publ. tr. they are treated as the same; the standard tr. take them as separate groups. The two occurrences of *mā* (a, c) may support the standard view, in which case *vahantu* needs to be supplied in the first hemistich (so Ge, etc.).

I take *saśce* in pass. sense: “I am followed/accompanied.” Ge (/WG, also Klein I.425) take it to mean “be in agreement with,” but I do not know of other occurrences of \sqrt{sac} with this meaning. (Ge’s overelaborate set of explanatory glosses in n. 8d and n. 2 to that n. may attest to his discomfort with it.) The ‘intentions’ by which I am attended are G’s intentions to give; see the expansion on *krātu-* in 9b. I think the point is not that the poet thinks it’s a good idea for G. to give horses to him (that is, agrees with G), but that G’s intentions to give are the poet’s escorts, as it were. (One is reminded of the curious beings known as *rātiṣāc-* ‘Gift-escort’.) Indeed these “intentions” may be the

actual horses given; see 9b where the “bounties” produced by such intention are also actualized as horses.

V.33.9: In pāda a the publ. tr. reads “And (let) these (convey me)”; the “me” should not be in parens.

The bahuvrīhi *krátvāmagha-* is curiously formed, with instr. *krátvā* as its first member, and the publ. tr. “the bounty of his intentions” oversimplifies its structure in order to avoid impossibly awkward English: a full tr. of b would be “(the horses displaying/constituting) the bounty (produced) by his intention at the time of giving in[of] the ceremony.” In other words, the horses that the poet receives possess (that is, embody) Mārutāśva’s bounty effected by his intention (to give). See 8d.

Ge takes *vidāthasya* as a PN, the patron whose patronymic is Mārutāśva, and Mayrhofer (PN s.v.) seems to agree. But there seems no reason not to interpr. it as an example of the well-attested common noun ‘ceremony (of distribution)’, esp. since it fits this context so well. WG do not follow Ge.

The part. *dādānaḥ* appears to be the predicate of this clause. Though rare, med. forms of $\sqrt{dā}$ without *ā* seem to mean ‘give of oneself / one’s own goods’. See also IX.52.3.

I don’t entirely understand d. *ānūkām* is a hapax, but I follow Old in taking it as an adverbial meaning something like ‘afterwards’; so apparently also WG. Ge, fld. by Klein (I.425), takes it as the obj. of *ārcat*, as ‘last (song)’. See Ge’s n. 9d.

The standard interpr. (Ge [/WG], Old, Klein I.425) take *aryāḥ* as nom. sg., referring to Cyavatāna of c, and Thieme (Fremdl. 85) also thinks it’s probably nom. sg., but declines to discuss the passage because of the obscurity of *ānūkām*. But a patron like Cyavatāna should not be chanting or singing; that is the province of the poet-priests he is patronizing. Moreover, *aryāḥ* echoes gen. sg. *aryāḥ* in 6d, which announced the dānastuti to come, and I think the form should be interpr. in the same way in the absence of evidence to the contrary. In 9d I think that the gift of the *arī-* is still in question (as in 6d). The unnamed poet praised (‘sang’ *ārcat*) his gift for the wonder (*vāpuṣe*) of it -- of its over-the-top munificence.

V.33.10: As in 9a “me” should be removed from parens.

The notion of enclosure in cd puns on the name of the Poet Saṃvaraṇa ‘entirely enclosing’ vel sim.

V.34 Indra

V.34.1: A personified (/divinized) form of Svadhā ‘autonomous power’ is found in this set of hymns; cf. the apparent ref. to her also in V.32.10.

V.34.2: The overall structure of the vs. is the first issue to address. The first hemistich begins with a rel. clause (in a) with accented verb *āpiprata*; the second pāda begins with another accented verb, *āmandata*, which can owe its accent either to its pāda-initial position or to being part of the rel. cl. of pāda a. I choose the former interpr., making b into the main cl. of the vs. (so also Hoffmann, Injunkt., 244). Ge and WG choose the second, with ab containing two parallel rel. clauses. Since the 2nd hemistich consists of a

dep. cl. beginning with *yád* in c, with its accented verb *yámat* in d, this leaves the vs. without a main cl. WG remedy this by providing a main cl. frame “Zur Stelle (war er) ...” This posited main clause consists entirely of the preverb *ā* that begins pāda a (see their n.), a slender reed indeed. Offhand I cannot think of any other examples where a preverb by itself constitutes a clause. This interpr. is esp. unlikely because *ā* is an extremely common preverb with $\sqrt{pr}/prā$ ‘fill’, and its default interpr. here is as a preverb in tmesis with *āpiprata*.

This structural question is connected with the problem of *yámat* in the *yád* cl. of the 2nd hemistich. This form should be a subjunctive to the root aor., but it is difficult to construe it as such, viewed in conjunction with the augmented imperfects of ab. In order to hold onto the subjunctive interpr., Hoffmann (Injunk., 244) takes cd as a purpose cl. (“Der Freigeige ... berauschte sich auf dass ihm ... Uśanā ... die tausendspitzige Waffe reiche”), but Indra doesn’t drink soma *so that* Uśanā will give him a weapon, but does so at the same time and occasion when Uśanā gives him the weapon (see, e.g., I.121.12). WG’s “Zur Stelle (war er)” is obviously designed to provide a better pragmatic foundation for the purpose cl. (see their n.), but I have just treated the weakness of their interpr. I therefore think that *yámat* here has to be a nonce injunctive with preterital value, rather than the subjunctive it appears to be. Two pivotal forms allow this reanalysis – 1st sg. *yamam* and 3rd pl. *yaman*. The latter form is morphologically ambiguous: it could be a subjunctive or an injunctive. Although those forms are normally differentiated by the grade of the root (e.g., subj. *gáman* versus injunc. *gmán*), a zero-grade injunc. **imán* is too radical and would be blocked. In fact, *yaman*, which occurs 4x (once as a rep.), is only found in *mā* prohibitives and therefore must be an injunc. in every case. As for 1st sg. *yamam*, it has to be an injunctive (subjunctive would be **yamā[ni]*). Since both *yamam* and *yaman* could also be injunc. to thematic stems, a 3rd sg. thematic-type injunc. *yámat* can be backformed. It is important to note that *yamam* is found in this very myth of the weapon used to kill Śuṣṇa: cf. X.49.3 ... *vádhar yamam*# (1st sg. subj. = Indra) beside our *vádham yamat*, with Uśanā Kāvya as subj. For a more clearly marked injunctive in this phrase see nearby V.32.7 *vádhar yámiṣṭa* with secondary *-iṣ*-aor.

On them. *āpiprata* see Narten 1969 = Kl. Sch. 108–24, esp. 109, 121–24.

V.34.3: On *ūdhar/ ūdhan*- as ‘cold’, beside the homonym ‘udder’, see comm. ad VIII.2.12. Note the phonological echo at the end of pādas a and c: *ūdhan*# / *ūhat*#.

There is considerably more phonological play in the 2nd hemistich: *tatanúṣṭim ūhati*, *tanūśubhram*, enclosed within unbroken *a*: *āpāpa śakrās ... maghāvā yāḥ kavāsakhāḥ*. This phonological pattern may help account for some of the difficulties of interpr. this hemistich.

Before addressing the three hapaxes in cd, *tatanúṣṭim*, *tanūśubhram*, and *kavāsakhāḥ*, note that the āmreḍited preverb *āpa-apa* (that is, *āpāpa*) superficially reads as a stem ‘not evil’. I doubt if that is accidental, esp. since doubled preverbs are quite rare; we will return to it below.

The first two of the hapaxes form the object of *āpa ... ūhati*. The lexeme *āpa √ūh* means ‘pull away’. It is used of the extended penis in cosmic incest in X.61.5; more to the point, in AV XVIII.2.57 it is used of a garment that is to be removed (... *vāsaḥ ... āpaitād ūha yád ihābibhaḥ purā*). A garment could well be described as *tanūśubhra-*

‘resplendent on the body’; cf. I.85.3 *tanūṣu śubhrāḥ* of the Maruts’ ornaments. I therefore supply ‘garment’ as the obj. here. (For a possible variant of this see disc. below.)

Ge refuses to tr. or discuss *tatanūṣṭi-*; AiG is entirely silent on it; Old is non-committal. Nonetheless, the formation of *tatanūṣṭi-* looks fairly transparent, if quite unprecedented. As WG also suggest, it appears to be a *-ti-* abstract built to the weak grade of the pf. part. to $\sqrt{\text{tan}}$ ‘stretch’. WG gloss ‘die Sich-ausgebreitet-haben-schaft’, which in their interpr. is then also applicable to someone who has this quality. They thus assume a personal object for *āpa ūhati*, a dandy (Geck): “den, der sich ausgebreitet hat ... den Geck.” I’m not sure what a “sich ausgebreitet” person would be, and there are other reasons to prefer supplying ‘garment’ or something similar as the referent of these two acc. First, there is the AV passage just cited, where ‘garment’ is the obj. of *āpa √ ūh*. Second, garments are objects of $\sqrt{\text{tan}}$ elsewhere (I.115.4, 134.4; X.106.1). And third, a personal object requires the meaning of *āpa √ ūh* to be seriously attenuated (WG’s *abschieben*: ‘push away, get rid of’). I therefore take ‘spread-out-ness’ to be a quality attributed to a garment or garment-like object. However, this analysis causes problems of its own. For one thing, why not simply use the pf. part. alone to qualify the underlying ‘garment’? Forming a derivational monstrosity -- a *-ti-*abstract based on a pf. part. -- and then turning this stem into a possessive adj. seem a tremendous amount of bother to go to when the participle by itself would convey the sense. Further, the standard words for garment are neut. (*vāsas-*, *vāstra-*), and *tatanūṣṭim* must be masc. (see the adj. *tanūśubhram* agreeing with it). A proper neut. sg. adj. built to a *-ti-*stem should end in *-ti* (though as far as I can tell, there are no exx. in the RV), so if *tatanūṣṭim* is an adj., it is in the wrong gender for the posited noun it modifies. On the other hand, if we try to take *tatanūṣṭim* simply as the *-ti-*abstract, not an adj. based on it, the masc. gender of the qualifier *tanūśubhram* clashes, since *-ti-*abstracts are fem. I have only an ad hoc answer to these problems: assuming the form is an adj. whose underlying referent is neut., the bare neut. *-ti* ending may have seemed anomalous and a more orthodox looking acc. substituted for it, encouraged also by the fact that the next word begins with a vowel and an inserted *-m* would avoid the hiatus. Meter would be unaffected, and *tanūśubhram* can of course be neut. instead of masc. But I do not find this explanation compelling, and a different possibility is discussed below.

I have discussed the third hapax, *kavāsakhā-*, in some detail in Fs. Jasanoff (2007: 163), reviving the old, but generally now rejected, analysis of the first member as the old nom. sg. of *kavī-* matching the Aves. nom. sg. *kauuā* with its hysterokinetic inflection. That this inflectional type may be preserved here may be signalled by the 2nd member - *sakhāḥ*, whose inflection remains hysterokinetic in Vedic and whose nom. sg. is ordinarily *sākhā*. The current standard interpr. of *kavā-* here assigns it to a stem (*)*kava-* ‘humiliating, degrading’ (see EWA s.v. *kavatnū-*). So, e.g., Ge’s rendering of the cmpd as ‘falsch Freund’, with some semantic weakening.

How one analyses the cmpd. depends on what one thinks is going on in the hemistich in general. The first question is who is the referent of the cmpd.? It is found in a two-word nominal rel. cl. *yāḥ kavāsakhāḥ*. Both Ge and WG take its antecedent to be the obj. of the verb *āpa ... ūhati* (e.g., WG “... den Keck, der die Genossen geringschätzt”), but as was just discussed, it is not at all certain (and in my opinion unlikely) that the object of that verb is a person. Moreover, word order -- an often

helpful, though of course not sturdily reliable guide in the RV -- favors Indra as referent: the verse ends ... *maghāvā yāḥ kavāsakhāḥ*.

If my analysis is correct -- that the cmpd. contains *kaví-* 'poet' and that it characterizes Indra -- how can I fit it together with the rest of the vs.? I think the cmpd. has a double sense. On the one hand, the *kavā* part refers to Uśanā Kāvya, who figures in vs. 2. In fact, note that in 2d *uśānā* appears in its usual position, immediately after the caesura following an opening of 5. If we superimpose 3d over 2d, *kavā-* would immediately follow *uśānā*: [x x x x x / *uśānā kavā(-sakha)*], the composite yielding a simulacrum of his full name. And of course, as vs. 2 shows, Indra and Uśanā are partners and companions. Uśanā is referred to as *kaví-* elsewhere, with *kaví-* a substitute for his patronymic; see, e.g., IV.16.3, 26.1.

But the other sense I see here is more sinister and requires considering vs. 3 in connection with the flg. verse. Vs. 4 is a curious, counter-intuitive, and indeed dispiriting vs.: even if Indra kills all your relatives, he still expects you to continue to offer to him. The usual comforting notion in the RV -- that Indra will do well by you if you do well by him, while the non-offerer will get badly treated -- is overturned here. Indra can act cavalierly and arbitrarily to ruin your life no matter how devotedly you serve him. I think the same unsettling idea is presented in vs. 3. Though the standard interpr. of vs. 3 (see, e.g., Ge's n. 3cd) is that the first hemistich depicts the pious man happily rewarded, while cd shows the impious one getting his just deserts, I take the whole vs. as referring to the ups and downs of the pious soma-presser. First, his labors pay off: he becomes *dyumān* 'heaven-bright'. But in the second half Indra snatches away this brightness, which is spread across him like a garment, "resplendent on his body" (*tanūsubhra-*), an appropriate characterization of such brightness. In this reading *kavāsakhāḥ* is ironic; Indra was indeed a companion and partner of the poet, until he wasn't.

If this interpr. is correct, it may help explain the use of the peculiar formation *tatanūṣṭi-* discussed at length above. In pāda b the lucky soma-presser is *dyu-mánt-*, lit. 'possessing *dyu-*'. And by my analysis, it is this purported *dyu-* that is resplendent on his body. But the well-attested possessive adj. *dyu-mánt-* has become lexically separated from *div-/dyu-* 'heaven'; there is no independent *dyu-* 'brightness' that can become the property of a person. (The root noun *dyút-* is rare without preverb and means yet again something different.) It may be that "spreading-ness" is an attempt to capture the quality of heavenly light without having a firm grammatical base, an identifiable independent noun, to found it on. One of the standard tropes using the root \sqrt{tan} is light or a source of light spreading through heaven and other cosmic realms; cf., e.g., X.88.3 of Sūrya *yó bhānúnā prthivīm dyām utémām, ātatāna ródasī antárikṣam*. And so *tatanūṣṭi-* may embody this whole complex of heavenly light spreading across the man's body as if through heaven. By this analysis the *tatanūṣṭi-* is not a garment, as I first suggested, but *like* a garment.

Another piece of evidence may support my view of cd as expressing the undeserved and capricious reversal of fortune of the soma-presser who was riding high in ab. Remember that cd begins with the double preverb *āpāpa*, which could also be the voc. of an adj. 'not-evil'. I suggest that this is a despairing address to the soma-presser of ab: "o un-evil [/blameless] one, see what can happen to you anyway."

V.34.4: As noted in the publ. intro. and in the disc. of vs. 4 immediately above, the sense of this vs. -- which seems surprisingly clear -- is hard to square with our usual notions of Rigvedic reciprocal responsibilities, for the vs. states that Indra can kill all your relatives and still demand your offerings, with no attempt even to deny or distance himself from what he did. Ge and Old pass over this unsettling doctrine in silence; WG suggest that the vs. shows that Indra doesn't fear a blood feud (Blutrache), but this seems to let Indra off too easily. There is no sign of the reciprocity that "blood feud" implies: the hapless man whose relatives have been slaughtered does not seem to have done anything injurious to Indra, nor did his dead relatives -- at least as far as the vs. allows us to see. The killings appear to be the arbitrary acts of a powerful god just because he *can*. It may be no accident that Indra is called *śakrá-* 'able' here and in 3cd, where he also arbitrarily exerted his power. (Of course, *śakrá-* is a common epithet of Indra in the RV and later, and I would not suggest that it is always used with this nuance -- only that our poet exploited the literal sense of the word.) The fact that the word *kīlbiṣa-* is used of Indra's deed supports the view that what he did was simply wrong; see publ. intro.

I take *práyata-* in its usual sense, referring to offerings or bounties 'held forth' or 'presented'. Cf. nearby V.30.12 *práyatā maghāni*, X.15.12 *práyatā havîṃṣi*, etc. I cannot get anything else out of this sentence than that Indra still wants the aggrieved man to keep making giving him oblations. WG tr. "Darreichungen," but suggest in their n. that it refers to "Reparations-, Satisfaktionszahlungen." But what right would Indra have to seek reparations when he was the one who inflicted the damage?

yataṃkará- is a hapax, and the identity of neither of its parts is as sure as the standard interpr. take them. Gr suggests *yataṃ* belongs to the ppl. of \sqrt{yam} , therefore morphologically identical to the immediately preceding (*prá-*)*yatā*, but this analysis is rejected, rightly in my view, by Ge and WG, who take it (the former implicitly, the latter explicitly) as the acc. sg. of a root noun to \sqrt{yat} , found also in the cmpd *saṃyát-* in 9c. Although the uncompounded root noun is not found elsewhere and it is not mentioned by Schindler in his Root Noun diss. or Scar in his disc. of \sqrt{yat} (403-4), I think this must be the correct analysis, with the noun meaning '(proper) arrangement' or the like. The publ. tr. 'arranger' reflects this analysis of *yataṃ*, while taking 2nd member *-kará-* from $\sqrt{kṛ}$; hence 'make arrangements' → 'arranger'. I now think this interpr. of the 2nd member is wrong. This pāda-final compound matches final *ākarāḥ* of the next pāda, which, construed with preceding *vásvaḥ*, means 'distributor of goods'. This *-kará-* does not belong to $\sqrt{kṛ}$, however, but to $\sqrt{kṛ}$, *kṛ* 'scatter', which occurs with *ā* in just this phrase: cf. IX.81.3 *ā naḥ ... kṛā vāsu* "scatter/distribute goods to us." This strongly suggests that the parallel cmpd *yataṃkará-* contains the same form, which leads to a sense 'scattering the arrangement' -- viz., destroying it, blowing it to smithereens and scattering the resulting particles. This accurately reflects what Indra has done in this vs. -- violating the arrangement between men and gods -- worship and offerings in return for protection, aid, and material goods -- by smiting the family of his devotee, though he still provides goods. I would therefore change the publ. tr. from 'the arranger' to 'scattering/destroying the arrangement'. The lack of the preverb *ā*, found in the lexeme *ā√kṛ*, may be analogous to the gapping of preverbs in root noun cmpds with direct object first members.

V.34.5: The usual arrangement between Indra and mortals is re-established in this vs., where Indra's punishment comes only to the stingy and the non-worshipper, and the pious man gets rewarded.

There is a difference of opinion about the sense of pāda a, because of different interpr. of the acc. inf. *ārābham* and of the numerical expressions. Ge takes *ārābham* as 'sich verbinden' and the expressions of numbers as referring to people or gods -- the sense being that Indra doesn't want to team up with others because he's strong enough on his own. But *ā√rabh* does not have that meaning, but only 'to grasp, grab hold of'. WG also take the numbers as personal: "Nicht wünscht er mit fünf, mit zehn (Leuten) das Erraffen (von Beute)," which I confess I don't understand. Is the intent that he wants to pile up his booty all by himself? By contrast, I take the numbers as referring to the means of grasping the offerings/goods -- either by the number of gifts (=in increments of five or ten) or by handfuls: one (=five fingers) or two (=ten fingers) -- and he doesn't want to acquire the goods in such trifling installments.

In c the question is the function of *amuyā*. I cannot identify a part of the WG tr. that represents *amuyā*. Ge's interpr. is minimalistic: *íd amuyā* "nur so," which Klein (II.160) helpfully expands to "only in that circumstance (viz. when a wealthy person does not have soma pressed for him)." This may well be right. However, I compare X.135.2 *cárantam pāpāyāmuyā* "going along yonder evil way." In our passage this may refer to highway robbery: the offending non-presser gets robbed as he makes his way along the road. Or it may be metaphorical: if the non-presser continues to pursue this behavior he'll be punished.

V.34.6: There is puzzling agreement about the meaning of the hapax *cakramāsajá*-. The standard interpr. run counter to the clear structure of the cmpd: a tatpuruṣa with the first member the acc. sg. of *cakrá*- 'wheel' (the acc. blocking hiatus before a vocalic 2nd member) and the 2nd derived from *ā√sa(ñ)j*. The lexeme *ā√sa(ñ)j* means 'attach, affix, hang' (I.191.10, X.124.7); yet this cmpd is universally interpr. as meaning 'impeding/stopping the wheel' (Gr, Ge, AiG II.1.183, EWA s.v. *SAÑJ*) or, acdg. to WG, 'die Wagen bremsend' with *cakra*- as pars pro toto. I do not understand this consensus that the verbal portion should be given a meaning not found with the verb itself, particularly since the context does not impose it. (Sāy.'s gloss *rathacakrasyāsañjayitā* does not seem to be responsible for it either.) Only WG attempt to trace a semantic pathway to the meaning attributed to *āsajá*-, but it is not persuasive. I suppose all these interpr. are thinking of the myth in which Indra tears the wheel off the sun's chariot, but there is no other indication in context that this myth is at issue -- and tearing off and stopping are quite different actions. Given these objections, I prefer to stick with the standard meaning of *ā√sa(ñ)j* and assume 1) that it refers to the *restoration* of the sun's wheel mentioned in regard to Etaśa in nearby V.31.11, or 2) that it refers to an incident in an unknown story, or 3) that it refers to some pre-battle preparation or battle tactic. I prefer the first.

V.34.7: The lexeme *sám√aj* is used elsewhere of 'driving together' cattle (I.33.3); here the *bhójanam* of the niggard is presumably livestock. Though *pañéh* here is used oppositionally to *dāsúṣe* in b (see Ge's n. 7ab), the word also summons up Indra's opponents, the Paṇis, who stole his cows -- so stealing them back (*muṣé*) is only justice.

The syntax of c is quite challenging. Let us begin with *viśva ā purú*. The phrase *purú viśva-* appears to be an idiom, or at least is found twice in the RV, meaning “all the many”: I.191.9 *purú viśvāni* “all the many (bugs),” VII.62.1 *purú viśvā jānima* “all the many tribes.” Here, however, the words are in opposite order, with the preverb/adposition *ā* intervening, and the referent is singular (*viśva[h] ... jānaḥ*). Nonetheless, I think the locutions are essentially the same, though I tr. “each and every” to capture the singular number.

I do not know what to do with *ā*. It is possible that it is a preverb with *dhriyate*, but 1) though *ā* is found with *√dhr*, it is not common, and 2) preverbs in tmesis generally move to metrical or syntactic boundaries, and *ā* is not so placed here. The standard interpr. do not comment on it. I have no solution.

The last issue is the use of *caná*. Ge (/WG) take it as neg. ‘nicht einmal’ (not even). The sense of the clause, acdg. to them, is that a people that has provoked Indra’s anger can’t hole up for a long time even in a place that’s hard to penetrate. Thus by their interpr. *durgá-* is a desirable, fortress-like location for the offending people, but they can’t hold onto it. But *durgá-* is always otherwise an undesirable place, where no one wants to be -- where we wish Indra to send our enemies (VII.25.2) but from which we want to be rescued. I therefore think that the point of this clause is that Indra’s antagonists get confined to such a place and therefore *caná* does not have a negative sense here. Twice loc. *durgé* is followed by *cid* ‘even’ (VIII.27.18, 93.10), and *durgé caná* here may be a variant of this usage. Although he unfortunately does not discuss this passage, Klein’s general disc. of *caná* (DGRV I.285–92) as essentially borrowing negative value from the negative contexts in which it’s ordinarily found allows for an original underlying positive value ‘even’. For further disc. see comm. ad X.49.5, VIII.1.5, X.56.4. The publ. tr. should be slightly altered to “Even in a (place) ...,” though I’m not sure what sense ‘even’ adds - - perhaps that not only are the people confined but they are confined in a really nasty place.

V.34.8: The identity of the verb *āvet* in b is disputed. Gr takes it as an opt. to *√av* ‘help’; Old rejects that analysis but suggests that either *√vid* ‘know’ or *√vī* ‘pursue’ is possible. Ge and WG (see also Oberlies RdV I.535) opt for *√vid* and take the rest of the ab as indirect discourse controlled by this verb (“when he found out that ...”). This is possible, but I find it hard to integrate subordinate *yád* clause in ab (with plupf.) with the *hí* cl. of c (with root aor.) and the main cl. of d (with pres. indic.). I find that the sequence of tense works better if ab is a separate unit, with subord. *yád* cl. in a and main clause in b (*āvet* accented because pāda-initial). Then c is the causal grounds for the main cl. in d and expresses immed. past.

My analysis requires supplying a verb in pāda a, linked to the preverb *sám* (which by the other interpr. must be construed with *√vid*, a combination not found with ‘know’, though it is with *√vid* ‘find’). A good candidate for a verb to supply is given by *sámṛti-* ‘clash’ in 6a, and verbal forms to this idiom (*sám √ṛ*) are fairly common. Cf. VII.25.1 ... *yát samáranta sénāḥ* “when armies clash together.” My analysis also depends on a different analysis of *āvet*, which I assign to *√vī* ‘pursue’. Note *véti* opening 4c.

The def. *anyám* ‘the one’ in c, referring to one of the two opponents in ab, more or less demands a responsive ‘the other’, as Ge and I supply in d.

Old questions the existence of the stem *pravepanín-*, suggesting that *pravepaní* is an adverbial instr. to a *pravepaní-* (fld. by WG). I don't see that a stem *pravepaní-* is appreciably better than an *-ín-* stem and follow the older analysis.

V.34.9: The sense of *samyát-* 'continuous(ly)', root noun cmpd. to \sqrt{yat} (see *yatam-* in 4c and disc. there), must have developed from 'taking their places together, one after the other'. For further disc. of the stem, see comm. ad IX.86.15.

V.35 Indra

V.35.3: *ābhūbhiḥ* 'ready at hand' lacks an overt referent. I supply '(forms) of help' from context -- *āvas-* is the signature word of this part of the hymn. Ge takes it as a nominalized 'Kräfte', though he suggests the Maruts as an alternative referent in n. 3d; WG personified 'helpers'.

V.35.4: The syntactic boundaries do not coincide with the pāda boundary in ab -- a welcome syncope in this otherwise simple hymn. The hemistich is divided into three clauses: *vīṣā hy āsī / rādhase jajñīṣe / vīṣṇi te śāvaḥ*, but the pāda boundary breaks the second into two one-word halves. It might be possible to fold the third proposed clause into the second ("you were born as bullish strength"), if we were willing to be cavalier about the position of *te* and indeed its presence ("you were born as your bullish strength"?), but the nominal clause in VIII.3.10 *tād indra vīṣṇi te śāvaḥ* supports the analysis as a separate unit, if more support be needed.

On the anomalous form *vīṣṇi* (for expected *vīṣṇ(y)am*), see comm. ad VIII.96.19.

satrāhām is a neut. sg. qualifying *paūṃsyam*. It looks like a them. neut. and is in fact classified under *satrāha-* in Gr and Lub (see also Scar 697). Nonetheless, it belongs with the class of root noun cmpds with *-hán-*. The neut. sg. of such a stem should probably be **-ha* (like *nāma* to *nāman-*, assuming radical *-n-* stems work like, or get assimilated to, derived *-n-* stems). I might tentatively suggest that the final *-m* was first inserted (as *anunāsika*) to avoid the hiatus **satrāhā indra* and then reinterp. as a them. neut. ending (see also Lanman, *Noun inflection* 478, AiG III.239). But it is the case that such nasalizations are rare within pādas and almost always concern long *-ā* (see Old, Prol. 469–72). Moreover, the similarly formed neut. *vītrahām* in VI.48.21 precedes a consonant with the *-m* making position.

V.35.5: Ge takes *adrivaḥ* as 'du Herr des Presssteins', but in context a stone as weapon seems more likely (so WG 'du mit den Schleudersteinen', flg. Gr).

I interpr. *sarvarathā* as an adverbial accompaniment to the victim whom Indra runs over: "(him), chariot and all." It is not clear from Ge's "mit ganz Wagenzug" whose chariot he thinks it is, but WG take it to be Indra's chariot, interpr. *sarva-* in its stronger lexical sense 'hale, healthy': "... so, dass dein Wagen heil bleibt." This purpose-clause reading attributes more, and more unambiguous, structure to this single word than I think it can properly bear, and I also don't understand the intended sense: should Indra endeavor to keep the victim's blood from splashing his wheels or his body from making dents?

V.35.6: Note the phonol. figure *pūrvīṣu pūrv(i)yām*, though the words belong to diff. stems. The referent of fem. *pūrvīṣu* is not clear. Gr suggests *ājīṣu* from 7b, and this seems to have met general acceptance (Ge, with ?; WG; Bloomfield RReps, 256), even though *ājī-* is actually masc., a fact no one remarks on. (Gr cites a single. fem. form, in I.116.15, but nothing in that passage signals that gender.) We could, of course, suggest a different word for ‘battle’ with fem. gender, like *pṛtanā* or *samād-*; there is weak support for both (either) of these because they both are construed in the loc. pl. with *ugrā-*, which is also found here: *ugrām ... samātsu* in an oft-repeated pāda (III.30.22, etc.); VII.56.23 *ugrāḥ pṛtanāsu*, VIII.61.12, 70.4 *ugrām (...) pṛtanāsu*. An entirely different referent is also possible: ‘peoples’ comes to mind, picking up the *jānāsaḥ* of pāda b, with several different possible fem. stems as substitute: *kṣitī-* from 2c or the developed sense of *carṣaṇī-*, extractable from 1c (cf. III.43.2 *pūrvīḥ ... carṣaṇīḥ*) or *vīś-* (cf. VII.31.10 *vīśaḥ pūrvīḥ*).

V.35.7: This vs. has a riddle structure: the accusative qualifiers pile up until their referent, the chariot (*rātham*) is given at the very end, immediately preceded by the verb (*avā*) on which the preceding accusatives depend. It proved difficult to capture this effect in tr.

sayāvan- means ‘drive along with’ (the useful German ‘mitfahren’, for which there is no precise English equivalent). It is ordinarily either construed with an instr. of the fellow traveller or is in the instr. qualifying the fellow traveller(s). Here there is no such overt expression, but we can assume it is Indra.

V.35.8: The structure of ab mimics that of 7, which has (a) *#asmākam ...* / (d) *... avā rātham#*, while 8 has (a) *#asmākam ...* (b) *#rātham avā* Another verbal expression is inserted within this structure in pāda a: *éhi naḥ*. Ge tr. as two separate clauses, silently postponing the *asmākam* to the second one (“komm zu uns, begünstige unseren Wagen”). WG take *éhi naḥ* as an insertion: “Unserem -- Indra, komm her zu uns! -- (unserem) Wagen hilf ...” This interpr. seems possible -- save for the position of the voc. *indra*, which is unaccented and precedes *éhi naḥ* so cannot belong to that phrase. (A slightly altered tr. would be “Ours, Indra -- come to us! -- (our) chariot ...”) By contrast I take *éhi ... avā* as a pseudo-serial verb construction (“come help”), though I admit that the *naḥ* might be problematic for that interpr.

Ge (/WG) take both *diví* as ‘today’, but outside of *diví pāryé* ‘on the decisive day’, a phrase characteristic primarily of VI and VII, *diví* always refers to heaven, as far as I can tell. ‘Heaven’ makes fine sense here, and cf. the similar expression V.13.2 ... *stómam manāmahe ... divispṛśaḥ* “we shall conceive a praise-song (for Agni), who touches the sky.”

V.36 Indra

V.36.1: The publ. tr. takes the phrase *vásūnām ... dāmano rayīṇām* as nested genitives (*vásūnām* and *rayīṇām* depending on *dāmanah*), whose head noun is *dātum*. Both Ge and WG break up the nouns into two phrases (though in different ways), with WG taking the verb *cíketat* in two different ways (pf. subj. / plupf. injunc.) with two different complements: “... der auf das Schenken von Gütern [i.e., *vásūnām ... dātum*] achten soll, weil er sich ja auf die Schenkung von Schätzen [i.e., *dāmano rayīṇām*] versteht.” This is

more elegant than my pile-up of gifts and may well be right, though I'm not sure there's sufficient signalling of the double meaning.

V.36.2: The simile in ab depends on the double meaning of the root \sqrt{ruh} , which means both 'climb, mount' and 'grow'. It also hinges on two different senses of *sóma*-, as the prepared ritual drink and the plant from which it is extracted.

In cd there is mismatch in number between the simile in the singular and the frame in the plural, whose number is emphasized by *vísve* 'all'. The point of the simile is that the person "driving his steeds" would be verbally urging them on to greater speed.

V.36.3: The slightly "off" nature of the similes in this hymn continues here. In ab the point of comparison between the rolling wheel and the poet's mind is the trembling (*vepate*). The cause of the trembling -- fear -- is applicable only to the mind, not the wheel.

As disc. in the publ. intro., *ráthād ádhi* "from the chariot" is a curious phrase, and the standard treatments struggle with it. Both Ge and Old think that the singer is expressing a wish for a chariot, but it is hard to see how to make that work syntactically. WG (in n.) suggest that it's either Indra's chariot or that it represents the poet's hymn, but neither of these fits the context well. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this is a punning allusion to the poet's patron Śruta-ratha (lit. 'having a famous chariot'), praised in the dānastuti in vs. 6. In this scenario the hemistich-initial ablative, referring to the patron, is linked to the hemistich-final word *purūvasuḥ*, referring to the poet. Though Ge (/WG) take this as a PN, giving it its full lexical meaning ('having many goods') makes the verse work better. The singer praises Indra on behalf of his patron Śrutaratha, in order to become "One of many goods" -- from/because of (Śruta)ratha. As Mayrhofer points out (PN, s.v. *purūvasu*-), *purūvasu* is synonymous with Prabhūvasu, the name of the poet acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, so the vs. puns both on the name of the poet and on that of the patron. This might be clearer in the publ. tr. if it were reordered: "Surely the singer will now praise you ... (to become) one possessing many goods from the (Famous-)chariot?"

V.36.4: The semantically complementary expressions referring to giving with the left and right hands have different morphological realizations: instr. *savyéna* and the hapax adv. *dakṣiṇít*. The latter is, of course, anomalously formed; it appears also in the cmpd. *pradakṣiṇít* (6x), which may be the basis here as well -- note immediately preceding *prá*. Thieme (KZ 69 [1951] = KISch 71) suggests that it's a cmpd with the root noun to \sqrt{i} 'go' (with the expected empty *-t* stem final); others that it contains the relic of a PIE instr. ending in *-t/d*. For a full disc. see Scar (42–44). Since the first is not straightforward functionally ("going to the right" is not its sense) and the second depends on a highly dubious morphological reconstruction, I withhold judgment on the source of the form, but see *ubhayāhastí* (or *-ī*) in V.39.1 below. The lack of morphological parallelism in this passage is not surprising, since the hymn tends towards slightly skewed expressions.

V.36.5: I take cd as a single clause (contra Ge [/WG]), because the *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. that opens c is easily explained if it's construed with the imperative 2nd sg. injunctive *dhāḥ* at the end of d, but would otherwise be anomalous. See my "sa figé."

Strictly speaking, *vṛṣakrato* is of course a voc. In the publ. tr. I render it as nom., because of the parallelism *vṛṣā vṛṣarathaḥ ... vṛṣakrato vṛṣā*, with 2 nom. *vṛṣā* adjoining 2 bahuvrīhis with *vṛṣa-* as 1st member.

V.36.6: The sudden intrusion of the Maruts here is somewhat puzzling, but final vss. often open out to a wider set of gods.

V.37 Indra

V.37.1: As was noted in the publ. intro., the first pāda of this first hymn attributed to Atri provides the clue to the solution of the mythical puzzle posed by the narrative in Atri's V.40.5–9 in which Svarbhānu (*svārbhānu-*) pierces the sun with darkness and Atri restores the sun to heaven. The name Svarbhānu means 'having the radiance of the sun', and here Agni aligns himself "with the radiance of the sun" (*bhānúnā ... sūryasya*). As I demonstrated at length in my book *The Ravenous Hyenas and the Wounded Sun*, Svarbhānu is simply an epithet of Agni, who inflicted the wound on the sun for cause (cosmic incest). This pāda signals the underlying connection of Agni and Svarbhānu with a minimum of fuss.

The dawns are 'non-neglectful' (*ámṛdhra-*) because they never fail to appear every morning.

V.37.2: Both Ge and WG take *jarāte* as 'be awake', even though Gotō himself (1st Klasse, 151 and 154) identifies this particular attestation of *jāra-* as ambig. between 'be awake' and 'sing'. Although both meanings are probably present, I think 'sing' is the primary one. The subject's yoked pressing stones speak (*grāvāṇaḥ ... vadanti*) in the next pāda (2c), and throughout the RV there is generally an equivalence between the noise of the pressing stones and the speech/singing of the priests. See in particular in the immediately preceding hymn, V.36.4 *grāveva jaritā ... íyarti vācam* "Like a pressing stone, the singer raises his voice," with the agent noun belonging to the same root.

On the Adhvaryu's trip to the river to fetch water on the morning of the pressing day, see Ge's n. 2c.

V.37.3: See the disc. of this vs. as omphalos and riddle in the publ. intro. As indicated there, I identify the bride as Dawn and the husband as the Sun, while the dominant opinion (see Ge [WG]) is rather Speech and Indra. The latter is certainly not excluded, and the fact that the stem *iṣirā-*, used to qualify the speech of the pressing stones in 2c, also characterizes the wife in 3b may give some support to that view. Cf. also IX.84.4 *vācam iṣirām uṣarbúddham* "the vigorous speech awakening at dawn." Still, the Dawn/Sun interpr. follows naturally from the dawn ritual setting in the first two vss., and the long journey in d would refer to the daily trip across the sky.

As also noted in the publ. intro. *śravasyād ráthaḥ* "the chariot will seek fame" recalls the name of the patron in the immed. preceding hymn, V.36.6, Śrutaratha, which was also punned on in V.36.3.

With Ge I take *purū sahásrā* as a measure of distance and *pári vartayāte* as intrans./reflex., based on its middle form. This is disputed by WG, who take the verb as transitive (but "affektive" [whatever that means], the value that accounts for its middle

form). They supply ‘men’ as the referent of *purū sahāsrā*. The idea is that the noise of Indra’s chariot will cause many thousands of them to turn around and look at it. I suppose this is not impossible, but again it requires supplying much more than is found in the context: a huge crowd of people and the presupposition that “cause to turn” implies “turn to look.”

V.37.4: “Whose comrades are cows” (*gósakhāyam*) modifying soma refers of course to the milk mixture added to soma to make it less unpalatable. (It is somewhat surprising that *sóma-* is also called *tivrā-* ‘sharp’ in the same pāda, since this is usually of unmixed soma.) But the *gó-* ‘cow’ of this cmpd provides a clever transition to the next pāda. Pāda c contains a verb (*ā ...*) *ājati* ‘drives’, which ordinarily takes an object -- and indeed frequently that object is cows: e.g., I.83.5 *ā gā ājat*, V.2.5 *ājāti paśvāḥ*. I therefore supply ‘cows’ as the object in c, extracted from a different use of the ‘cow’ word in b. This then produces a reference to the Vala myth, with the *satvanaīḥ* ‘warriors’ representing the Aṅgirasas as elsewhere (cf. III.39.5, also nearby V.34.8 for association with cattle raiding). Thus pāda c depicts the king protected by Indra as performing a Vala-like deed (*ā satvanaīḥ ājati*) as well as the/a Vṛtra slaying (*hānti vṛtrām*), ascribing (equivalents of) the two signature deeds of Indra to this earthly king. Neither Ge nor WG make much sense of the *ājati* clause.

The accent on *ājati* is contrastive with the adjacent *hānti*.

Both Ge and WG take *kṣitīḥ* with *kṣéti* (“er bleibt in seinen Sitzen” and “weilt sicher in seinem Reich” respectively; see also Oberlies Relig. RV I.441, II.171–72), but $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ without preverb does not otherwise take the acc., whereas \sqrt{pus} ‘prosper, thrive’ can take a personal acc., and so I construe *kṣitīḥ* with *púṣyan*. In my interpr. the poet juxtaposes the cognate words (*kṣéti kṣitīḥ*), but separates them syntactically.

V.37.5: The pāda-framing *#kṣéti ... púṣyan#* of 4d recur adjacent at the beginning of 5a *#púṣyāt kṣéme* in different morphological form; *kṣéme* ‘peace(ful dwelling)’ is also paired with its opposite *yóga-* ‘hitching up, war’, with two contrastive clauses framed by the subjunctives *#pusyāt ... bhavāti#* predicting success in both peace and war. The war theme is further developed in the following pāda. I take *ubhé vṛtau samyatī* as an implicitly subordinated clause with pres. part. as main verb (an interpr. that WG come close to as an alternative considered in their n.). It would be possible to take this phrase as acc. obj. of *sám jayāti* (so Ge, WG, Oberlies [Relig. RV II.172]), but it doesn’t make sense that the king would conquer both clashing forces, when one of them is likely his own. Rather I think the point is that Indra will favor him over the opponent and therefore his side will prevail. See V.34.8, where Indra links himself to one of two opposing troops and helps his clients win.

V.38 Indra

For the general contents, see disc. in publ. intro. WG interpr. it as plea to Indra for rain -- a purpose that I find very hard to discern and that results in farfetched interpr. of details.

V.38.1: The first hemistich is somewhat awk., with (by my interpr. and Ge’s) a genitive phrase *uróḥ ... rādhasaḥ* “of your broad largess” dependent on an almost synonymous

nom. phrase *vibhvī rātīḥ* “extensive giving.” WG apparently take the first not as gen., but as abl., indicating the source of the giving: “Von deiner ... weitreichenden Gunst aus entfaltet sich die Gabe.” This seems like a good idea and mitigates the awkwardness. I would then change the publ. tr. to “Your extensive giving (comes) from your broad generosity.”

V.38.2: As in several instances in the last few hymns, WG impose extra structure on the first hemistich that is not supported by the phraseology. They supply a verb to govern *śravāyyam*, which then forms the foundation for a 2nd subordinate cl. consisting of *īṣam ... dadhiṣé*: “Was du ... Ruhmvolles (zustande gebracht), dass du dir die Labung ... verschafft hast.” In their introduction to the hymn they explain what lies behind this interpr., adding even further unsupported assumptions. The ‘praiseworthy’ thing that Indra accomplished was his action of freeing the life-giving liquid (*īṣ-*), which they presumably take both as the waters imprisoned by Vṛtra and (proto-)rain. But they give no justification for dividing ab into two clauses, separating the apparently parallel objects *śravāyyam* and *īṣam*, and providing a verb to govern the first that cannot be generated from context or formulaics. It is worth pointing out that *śravāyya-* is never used of a deed or action and most often modifies *rayí-* ‘wealth’ or *vāja-* ‘prize’. Although I can’t see any obstacle to qualifying a deed as *śravāyya-*, there are no familiar phrases containing that notion that would come to mind when encountering an undefined *śravāyya-*. Though I confess I can’t identify the referent(s) here, I find the WG interpr. implausible and forced. For further on this vs. see comm. ad V.39.2 below.

V.38.3: The WG interpr. becomes even more forced in this vs., which is summarized in their intro. by “Die Maruts lassen es regnen,” despite the absence of any reference to the Maruts or any verb for ‘rain’ -- the operative word for ‘rain’ is supposed to be the adverbial instr. *mehānā* generally taken as ‘in profusion’. The single word *śúṣmāsaḥ* is supposed to incorporate “Sturm, Drang, Blitz,” and the Maruts are supposed to be the other half of the dual expression *ubhā devāu* “both you gods” -- that is, Indra and the Maruts -- a highly unlikely use of the dual. The distortion of the text to fit the interpretational preconceptions goes much too far.

To stay closer to the actual wording, the question is how to distribute the various pādas in relation to each other. Ge takes ab as the subject of a clause whose object is in c, though with an unexpressed verb: “Deine Kräfte ... (bringen) beide Götter zur Übermacht.” I prefer to take ab as an extension of vs. 2, adding another quality of Indra’s (his tempestuous force) that extends itself along with fame. Then the two gods of c can be the subject of *rājathaḥ* in d, with *abhiṣṭaye* an infinitival complement. A similar interpr. is given by Scar (598), who takes ab as a nominal clause, “Die ungestümen Kräfte, die dir [sind, sind] in Menge [vorhanden] und gehorchen deinem Willen,” and cd more or less as I do.

As for who the other god is, besides Indra -- Old refuses to speculate, saying it’s an unknown ritual situation. Ge suggests Varuṇa, and this seems the likeliest possibility. Dual forms of *√rāj* generally have Varuṇa as one half of the subject, the other usually being Mitra; cf., e.g., in this maṇḍala V.63.2, 7. But VII.83.5, a hymn to *Indra* and Varuṇa, the verb has those two as subject: *yuvām hí vásva ubhāyasya rājathaḥ* “For you two rule over goods of both sorts.”

V.38.4: The brief excursion into the dual in vs. 3 is over, and Indra is the sole subject again.

The first hemistich is again syntactically incomplete. The standard interpr. construe the genitive phrase *asyá kásya cid dáksasya táva* loosely with *ṇṛmṇám* (e.g., Ge “von welcher deiner Geisteskraft es auch sei, ... bring uns Mut”). This is possible, but I prefer to take ab as an extension of 3cd (as 3ab was to 2cd), supplying ‘rule’ to govern the genitives, using slightly different senses of ‘rule’.

V.38.5: I tr. slightly differently from the standard, supplying another form of *syāma* for ab, rather than making the whole vs. into a single cl. The difference is trifling.

Notice that *abhiṣtibhiḥ* echoes *abhiṣṭaye* in 3c.

WG suggest that this vs. is a joke: asking Indra to be in his *śárman* (‘protection, shelter’; German ‘Schirm’) is like asking to be under his umbrella (Regenschirm). This is a joke that may work in German but seems to have little to do with Sanskrit, which, as far as I know, does not have the concept of a rain-repelling umbrella. Shelters of that physical type are more likely used against the sun, and certainly I know of no use of *śárman*- in a rain context.

V.39 Indra

As was noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is twinned with V.38 in Vālahilya fashion, though it does not give as much help as it might in interpreting the previous hymn.

V.39.1: The poet re-uses *mehánā* from V.38.3 and *rādhah* from V.38.1, as well as *adrivah* (though that voc. is quite common in this run of hymns). Because of their commitment to *mehánā* as ‘rain’ in 38.3, WG are forced to insert rain here, though the context is hardly favorable.

The Pp. reads *ubhayāhastí* with short *-í*, which is assigned to an *-i*-stem by Gr, as a neut. modifying *rādhah*, though he also suggests that it might be read *-ī*, as the masc. nom. sg. of an *-ín*-stem. The latter works better morphologically than the former: *hastín*- is well attested and well formed, whereas there is no straight *-i*-stem *hastí*- and no easy mechanism for producing one -- though a nonce back-formation from the well-formed adj. *-hastíya-* might be possible. See esp. *ubhayāhastíyā vásu* in I.81.7. (A neut. to the *-ín*-stem would likewise probably come out as *-í*, and this may be an easier solution). I nonetheless tentatively suggest that *ubhayāhastí* here (if that is the reading) might be compared with the problematic *dakṣiṇít* ‘with the right (hand)’ in nearby V.36.4, which appears in the same kind of context, concerns hands, and has a problematic suffixal short *-i-*, followed there by a morphologically mysterious dental final.

V.39.2: Although this vs. is lexically and syntactically quite distinct from V.38.2, they seem to share a thematic core. First, note that *vāreṇíyam* at the end of pāda a is positioned identically to *śravāyíyam* in 38a, with the same type of formation and roughly the same meaning, and both are introduced by *yád* ‘which’ at the beginning of their pādas. Here the adj. clearly designates some good thing that Indra should bring us; recall that *śravāyíya-* also usually refers to wealth of some sort. In the second half-verse Indra’s

limitless capacity for giving is expressed in a vivid image -- Indra as unbounded ocean -- while in 38.2cd the unidentified praiseworthy thing spreads itself out longest, also an image of unbounded expanse. The means of expressing the concept are quite different, but the concept itself seems the same.

V.39.3: I take ab as nominal rel. clause with a predicated grdv. *prarādhyaṃ*, while Ge (/WG) simply take it as a nom. cl. (“what is your thought...”). My tr. should be modified slightly to make it clear that the *āsti* is accented: “Which thought of yours, famed and lofty, eager to give, is to [should] be realized, with it ...”

In cd both Ge and WG separate the two pādas and supply a second verb (or, as far as I can tell, a 2nd exemplar of the overt verb *ā darṣi* in different usage). I interpr. *ā darṣi* as taking a double acc. in a condensed expression: “split X for (its contents) Y.” The lexeme *ā √ dṛ* can take as obj. either the container or the contained; for a similar double acc. with both see III.30.21 *ā no gotrā dardṛhi ... gāḥ* “Split open the cowpens for the cows.”

V.39.4: Ge [/WG] take the enclitic *vaḥ* exclusively with pāda a where it is located (Ge: “Euren Freigebigsten der Freigebigen...”). In light of the next vs., I think that it refers to the Atris, who strengthen Indra with their words in 5, and that they are the subject of the infinitival dat. *prāsastaye* in c. It has migrated to Wackernagel’s position in the larger clause (as often), which accounts for its distance from *prāsastaye*.

As I have discussed elsewhere (e.g., *Rgveda between Two Worlds*, Chap. 4, esp. 146–48), the genre of *prāsasti*- and the verbal lexeme *prā √ śams* are associated with the praise of kings already in the RV; *prāsasti* is the standard term for royal panegyric in later Sanskrit and MIA. Note that here the term is used for Indra as king (pāda b *rājānām carṣaṇīnām*).

With the standard interpr., I supply a verb of calling in c.

In d Ge takes *pūrvībhiḥ ... gīraḥ* as co-referential, with *gīraḥ* acc. rather than instr. metri causa. This seems too tricky as well as unnec. With most (incl. Gr, Old, and WG) I supply *prāsasti*- with *pūrvībhiḥ* (cf., e.g., VI.45.3 *pūrvīḥ ... prāsastayaḥ*). WG in their n. suggest that *pūrvībhiḥ* is a “predicative instr” to *gīraḥ*, a construction that I don’t understand and that also seems unnec. Why not an instr. of accompaniment -- hymns along with eulogies? If I am correct that *prāsasti* is a specialized verbal product already in the RV, the differentiation between it and *gīr*- here would be perfectly understandable.

V.39.5: The distinction between verbal products continues here, with *kāvyaṃ vācaḥ* ‘poet’s/poetic speech’, *ukthām* ‘solemn word’, *brāhmaṇ-* ‘sacred formulation’, and *gīraḥ* ‘hymns’ all offered to Indra. For the connection between *prāsasti*- (here, 4cd) and *kavī*-, *kāvya*- see *RV between Two Worlds* cited above.

V.40 Indra and Svarbhānu

The hymn given as V.40 consists of two metrically and, more important, thematically ill-assorted pieces, vss. 1–4 and 5–9. The first three vss., in Uṣṇih, are a banal celebration of the word *vṛṣan-* ‘bull’ addressed to Indra. The fourth is in Triṣṭubh and does not contain any form of the word *vṛṣan-* (though see *vṛṣabhā-* in 4a), but the thematic connection is clear and it climaxes with the appearance of Indra at the Midday

Pressing. The second part, vss. 5–9, is the exquisitely crafted account of the Svarbhānu myth, which on its own constitutes a perfectly balanced omphalos hymn. Metrically it consists of two framing vss. in Anuṣṭubh (5, 9), with the three internal vss. (6–8) in Triṣṭubh. Further evidence of the omphalos structure: the two outer vss. are multiforms of each other; the middle verse (7) is the only direct speech; the immediately surrounding vss. (6, 8) both mention Atri in the sg., both deal with the *māyā* of Svarbhānu, and have complementary vocab.: *divāḥ / divī, sūryam / sūryasya, gūḍhām / aghukṣat, brāhmaṇā / brahmā*.

All of the evidence points to a pair of originally independent hymns, which were later redactionally combined, and this hypothesis also fits their position in the maṇḍala. At four vss., the first part (V.40.1–4) would be the appropriate length to follow on the five-vs. V.39 as an independent Indra hymn, in accordance with the usual principles of Saṃhitā arrangement. The Indra cycle of V would come to an end there; the seams between cycles are where later Anhangslieder get inserted, and V.40.5-9 can be such an Anhangslied, with no original connection to 1-4 at all. Although Indra has a bit part in the Svarbhānu saga (see 6ab, possibly 7c), the story is otherwise independent.

The idea that the two parts of V.40 were originally two separate hymns has a long scholarly history, going back at least to Bergaigne and Lanman, who both thought the division was rather 1–3 / 4–9. See Old, Proleg. 198 and, in detail, Noten ad loc. In the Noten Old seriously considers the possibility that the two parts formed an originally unitary hymn, primarily on the basis of V.78, which he sees as having a similar bipartite structure. I think this is unlikely: V.78 falls into three parts, not two, and in our hymn the Svarbhānu portion is far more intricately structured than anything in V.78. Nonetheless, it is possible that the two separate hymns were joined into V.40 on the model of V.78. For a possible reason for the introduction of the Svarbhānu account just here, see below ad vs. 4.

I treated the Svarbhānu portion at great length in my 1991 *Ravenous Hyenas* in conjunction with the brāhmaṇa prose versions of the myth, and I will not repeat all the details found there. In *Hyenas* (264–67) I identify Svarbhānu, the piercer of the Sun, as Agni, who is frequently said to have the *bhānū-* (‘radiance’) of the sun. For support for this identification see disc. there, as well as comm. ad V.37.1 above.

V.40.1–3: In the refrain (1–3cd) the pl. ‘bulls’ (*vṛṣabhiḥ*) accompanying Indra were identified with the Maruts already by Sāyaṇa. Since this section culminates in the Midday Pressing (4d), this identification makes sense, since that pressing is shared by Indra and the Maruts.

V.40.4: In *Hyenas* (pp. 249–51) I suggest that the Svarbhānu section is introduced after this vs., because there are several connections between the Midday Pressing and the Svarbhānu story. In later śrauta ritual a descendant of Atri (an Ātreya) is given gold at the Midday Pressing of the Aśvamedha. The gold is clearly a symbol of the sun (as often), and the Svarbhānu story is often told in brāhmaṇa prose texts to justify this ritual action. There is also a disguised ritual reenactment of the freeing of the sun (also symbolized by gold) at the Midday Pressing. The suggested connection still seems to me reasonable, but I was more inclined in that book to accept V.40 as a unitary hymn, not a secondary composite. I now think that the independent Svarbhānu hymn was slipped in here at the

end of the Indra cycle because of the mention of the Midday Pressing in the final vs. of the originally separate hymn, now V.40.1–4.

V.40.5: On vs. 5 as a variant of vs. 9, see *Hyenas* 140–41.

V.40.6: On the “fourth formulation,” see *Hyenas* 251–60.

The “circling magic spells” (*māyāḥ ... vārtamānāḥ*) of Svarbhānu are the plumes of Agni’s smoke rising to heaven and obscuring the Sun’s light (*Hyenas* 271–73).

āpavratena ‘against commandment’ is generally taken to refer to the darkness deployed by Svarbhānu, but I argue (*Hyenas* 297–300) that it actually refers to the Sun’s original action, incest with his daughter, that led to his punishment by Agni Svarbhānu.

V.40.7: On this speech of the Sun’s, see *Hyenas* 281–88.

This vs. is usually taken as evidence for the “eclipse” theory of the Svarbhānu story, which aligns it with the later Rāhu myth in which Rāhu swallows the sun. But there is no other evidence for this connection in Vedic, and ‘swallow’ can be accounted for by inner-Vedic parallels. See the cited disc. in *Hyenas*.

Although Atri is usually considered the addressee of the entire vs., for reasons having to do with the Vāyav Indraś ca construction in cd, I suggest (*Hyenas* 284–86) that Indra is the referent of the 2nd ps. in c, conjoined with Varuṇa in d.

V.41 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn consists of verses dedicated to a sequence of gods, both major and minor, seemingly unordered. The full list consists of 1 Mitra and Varuṇa / 2 Mitra, Varuṇa, Āyu, Indra, Maruts, Rudra / 3 Aśvins, Rudra / 4 Trita, Wind, Agni, Pūṣan, Bhaga / 5 Maruts / 6 Vāyu / 7 Night and Dawn / 8 Men (Maruts?), Lord of the Dwelling Place, Tvaṣṭar, trees, plants, Holy Place / 9 Mountains, Āptya / 10 Trita, Apām Napāt, Agni / 11 Maruts, Bhaga, waters, plants, woods, mountains / 12 Agni, Waters / 13 Maruts / 14 Indra (maybe) / 15 Shielding Goddess, Rasā / 16 Maruts, Ahi Budhnya / 17 gods / 18 gods, goddess / 19–20 Idā, Urvaśī. The Maruts regularly recur in this sequence, and though, as noted in the publ. intro., there is little Marut imagery (though perhaps more vocab. than I recognized at the time), if there *is* focus in this hymn, it is probably on the Maruts, who dominate much of the rest of the maṇḍala after the All God hymns.

V.41.1: The conjunction *vā* ‘or’ dominates this vs.: there are 4 overt occurrences (twice in b, once each in c and d), as well as covert encodings, beginning with *vā(mitr)āv(aruṇ)āv* (the latter two inverted) in pāda a and ending with the last word of the vs., *vā(jān)*. The end of the 2nd pāda, *vā dé*, with two monosyllables that, inverted, produce *dévā(h)* (though with wrong accent for **devāḥ*), draws further attention to *vā*. As noted in the intro., the prominence of *vā* may establish a theme of choice or alternatives appropriate to the mass of gods mentioned in the rest of the hymn, and *vā* also echoes the last syllable of the phrase *vísve devāḥ* “All Gods,” to whom the hymn is dedicated.

Given the plethora of *vā*-s and the absence of any finite verb, save for intrusive *trāsīthām* in c, it is not surprising that interpretations of the structure and syntax of the vs. are all over the map. In addition to the standard tr. (Ge, Re [EVP IV, V], WG), see also

Old, Lü (Varuṇa 585–86), Schindler (Root nouns, 24–25), Klein (II.203–4), Scar (581), Keydana (Inf. 155 n. 142). I will not rehearse them all here. Like many of these interpr., I take the three *vā*-s of bc as defining a tripartite structure of roughly parallel entities. I then assume that the *vā* of d is situated on a higher level of structure and is contrasting abc with a new clause inaugurated in d. The two clauses (abc and d) are separated by the independent interjection *trāsīthām naḥ* closing c. As Ge points out (n. 1c), *trāsīthām naḥ* has a similar role elsewhere (IV.55.1, VII.71.2); IV.55.1 is especially similar, since it is in the first vs. of an All God hymn that begins *kó vaḥ* (like *kó nú vām* here), with Mitra and Varuṇa as the subjects of *trāsīthām*.

My interpr. of the larger structure rests on taking *dé* at the end of b as an infin. (with many, but not all) and assuming that the poet has exploited the voice neutrality of infinitives to give it passive value in abc (“[is] to be given”) and active value in d (“[is] to give”). This further assumes that *káḥ* refers to the (mortal) recipient in abc and, resupplied in d, to one of the gods. With these assumptions in place, the case relations in the two syntactically distinct parts of the vs. fall into place: the nom. *káḥ ... rtāyán* “who, performing the truth ...” of pāda a is the mortal worshiper and recipient of the gods’ largess; his counterpart in d is the dat. *yajñāyaté*. The *vām* of pāda a is to be interpr. two different ways: in the first part it expresses the divine beneficiaries of the mortal’s service; resupplied in d, it should be construed with likewise resupplied *káḥ* (or better *katarāḥ*) “which of you two?”

The tripartite *vā* structure of bc details the three sources of gifts that may be given to the worshiper: heaven, earth, and the ritual ground. They are subtly unparallel: ‘heaven’ is a straight noun, either in abl. (as in the publ. tr.) or gen.; earth is represented by a deriv. adj. ‘earthly’ in the gen. (*pārthivasya*). It is a partitive gen., and if *diváh ... máhaḥ* is gen., it too is partitive. If it’s an abl., it expresses the source. The third term, “at the seat of truth” (*rtāsya ... sádasī*), expresses the place where the gift is to be given. Scar supplies ‘at the seat’ for all three terms. This is not impossible, but the poet seems to be aiming for slightly skewed and off-balance phraseology, and three different types of expressions for three parallel terms would suit his purposes admirably.

In the new structure of d, with active value of the infinitive *dé*, *vājān* is its object. The last grammatically unparallel functional parallel is *yajñāyaté ... paśuśó ná*. Assuming that it is a gen. sg. (Old and Re take it as acc. pl.), *paśuśáḥ* ‘of one who wins cattle’ is in some sense parallel to *yajñāyaté* ‘for the one who sacrifices’, in that the *vājān* (‘prizes’) come to both. But *paśuśáḥ* is a gen. dependent on *vājān*, while *yajñāyaté* is the indirect object with the infin. *dé*.

V.41.2: After the cat’s cradle of vs. 1, this vs. comes as a welcome relief -- or at least in its first half, which consists of a list of gods in the nom. and a verb they can all serve as subject to. With 6 gods (and an epithet -- or 7 gods if *ṛbhukṣā* is taken separately) to fit into 22 syllables, the poet can’t get into too much trouble.

The 2nd hemistich is slightly more complex. It consists of an elliptical *vā* rel. cl.: “or (in those) who ...,” with the gapped ‘those’ parallel to enclitic *naḥ* in pāda a. The final word *sajóṣāḥ* I take as referring to the gods; the stem(s) *sajóṣa(s)-* is generally used of gods (see *sajóṣāḥ* in 4b), and note that their verb *juṣanta* ends the first hemistich. But, with the standard tr., it may refer to the mortals providing the gods’ praise.

V.41.3: I take the passively used inf. *huvádhyai* with a gapped agent “by the priests” vel sim., to match the implicit 2nd pl. subj. of *prá ... bharadvam* in the 2nd hemistich. The use of a passive inf. in the 1st half, contrasting with an active usage (though not an inf. here) in the 2nd half, recalls the structure of vs. 1. In our vs. there is a switch of 2nd ps. reference from the (two) gods in ab to the (pl.) mortal officiants in cd.

The use of the derived adj. *ráthya*- ‘belonging to the chariot’ rather than its base noun *rátha*- recalls *pārthivasya* in 1c substituting for a form of the noun *prthivî*-.

Ge (flg. Sāy.) identifies the “lord of heaven” (*divó áśura*-) as Rudra, on the basis of parallels (see his n. 3c).

V.41.4: The parade of ill-assorted divinities and semi-divinities continues. The sequence is made more muddled by the fact that Trita is always a shadowy figure, who is probably (but not certainly) the same as Āptya in vs. 9 (Āptya being Trita’s usual patronymic) and Trita in 10 and who is probably (but not certainly) the referent of pāda a here: “the heavenly victor with Kaṇva as Hotar.” If he is the referent of pāda a, it is slightly odd that he is both qualified as ‘heavenly’ (*divyáh*) and said to be ‘from heaven’ (*diváh*, pāda b). It might be best, with Ge (/WG) to take *diváh* as the place-from-which of all the figures mentioned; however, Wind and Agni are normally associated with the midspace and the earth respectively, and Pūṣan and Bhaga are not particularly heavenly deities. It’s worth noting that *divyá*- continues the poet’s habit of using deriv. -*ya*-adjectives in place of (or perhaps here beside) their nominals, and so the doubling *divyá*- / *diváh* might not be so odd after all.

I do not know exactly what to do with *prá* initial in the vs., but it is noteworthy that it fits into a sequence of *prá*-initial expressions, where the preverb is in tmesis, beginning with 3d *prá ... bharadvam* and continuing with 5a *prá ... bharadvam* again and 6a *prá ... kṛṇudhvam* (followed by initial *prá* in 6b and 7b). In our vs. there is no finite verb to construe it with in tmesis, but note the loc. *prabhṛthé* in c. My assumption is that vs.-initial *prá* simply reinforces *prabhṛthé* in a vs. sandwiched between two full *prá ... bharadvam* expressions. It could also be construed with *jagmuḥ* in d, though one might expect a more prominent, metrical-boundary-adjoining *jagmuḥ* in that case.

The loc. *prabhṛthé* and the acc. *ājīm* both serve as goal with *jagmuḥ* -- another ex. of the poet’s penchant for slightly off-balance parallels.

V.41.5: The first hemistich consists of a syntactically “active” 2nd pl. verb (‘present!’ *prá ... bharadvam*, though it is morphologically middle) paired with a passive (‘should be produced’ *dadhīta*) without overt agent, structurally similar to vs. 3 with a passive infinitive (*huvádhyai*) without agent and the same “active” 2nd pl. *prá ... bharadvam*. This structure is further reminiscent of vs. 1 with passive and act. uses of the same infinitive *dé*.

In this vs. it is not altogether clear who the 2nd pl. subject of *prá bharadvam* is. Ge thinks this is about the dakṣiṇā and suggests as subj. either the Opferveranstalter or the Maruts. I don’t see the dakṣiṇā connection, and given the reciprocal relationship between gods and men depicted already in the hymn (vss. 1 and 3), in the next vs. (6) with *dhiyé dhuḥ* playing off *dadhīta dhīḥ* in our 5b, and elsewhere, I think it likely that the 2nd pl. addressees here are the (All) Gods in general, who are asked to provide tangible wealth in exchange for the praise embodied in the *dhī*- ‘visionary thought’

produced by the poets. The use of the exact same verb *prá bharadhvam* in 3 and 5, with opposite but complementary subjects (priest-poets / gods), is a neat reversal.

The standard tr. take *ausíjasya* as a PN and construe it with *hótā*. This is not impossible, but since, as we've seen, the poet is fond of using *-ya*-deriv. adjectives for nouns, I think it more likely that, using a different kind of derivational adjective, the poet used the *ṽddhi* deriv. to stand for *usíj-* '(type of) priest' in the pl. Assuming as usual, that the Hotar is Agni, who mediates between men and gods, it is reasonable that he would be pleased both by the activities of this priestly group and by those of the gods, represented by the Maruts. For the association of Hotar and *ausíjā-* see also IV.21.6–7, though that passage is exceptionally opaque.

The vs. contains several instances of phonological and morphological play. In b the pāda-final phrase *dadhīta dhīh* shows tight phonological similarity though the two words belong to different roots. The same play is found in the next vs. (6d), likewise pāda-final, in *dhiyé dhuḥ* -- same noun *dhī-*, verb to the same root $\sqrt{dhā}$ -- though the phonological relationship is not as tight. In 5b *dadhīta dhīh* yields a very bad Triṣṭubh cadence, whereas 6d *dhiyé dhuḥ* provides a completely orthodox cadence. This may be an example of metrical poetic repair, where the metrical violation of the first calls attention to the phrase, which is satisfactorily resolved in the next vs.

In the second hemistich we find # *(sus)éva éva(ir)* ... # *(y)é va évā*, evoking *(d)eva-* again. Pāda d lacks a syllable. It is tempting to emend the opening to *yé* vā va évā*, given the prominence of *vā* in the hymn -- as Old also suggests. But this emended sequence makes less sense and also disturbs its phonological echo of pāda c. It should also be noted that *yé va évā* is also found in 13a in a different metrical position and cf. also scrambled *evayā* in 16b. If **vā* were to be inserted, the tr. could be changed to "is well disposed because of the ways of the ... Priests or (those) which are the ways of you powerful ones, o Maruts."

V.41.6: There are again a number of ways to construe this vs., and I will concentrate on my own. Given the alternation I see in this hymn between the actions of gods and men, I think (with most) that the 2nd pl. subj. of *prá ... kṛṇudhvam* is back to the mortal ritual officiants (as in 3cd), rather than the gods (as in 5a). I also take *prá kṛṇudhvam* to be the verb of all of abc, reinforced by *prá* opening b. This further means that the nominatives of c (*iṣudhyāva ṛtasāpah*) refer to the mortals and the *púramdhīh* is acc. pl., not nom. as many take it. Crucial to this interpr. is the parallel cited by Old, X.64.7 *prá vo vāyum rathayújam púramdhim, stómaiḥ kṛṇudhvam sakhyāya pūṣānam*. "Set in front with your praises Vāyu, who hitches up the chariot, Plenitude, (and) Pūṣan for partnership," with clear acc. *púramdhim* a parallel obj. with *vāyum rathayújam* (as here) to *prá ... kṛṇudhvam*.

I then take d as displaying the usual reciprocity found elsewhere in the hymn, but with a grammatical twist. The last set of divine beings honored by mortals, the acc. object *púramdhi-* of c, are, in my opinion, the unexpressed subjects of d and participate in a grammatical play. The noun *púramdhi-* is fem., though it is at most the animatization of an abstract 'plenitude, abundance'. Furthermore, it looks synchronically like a cmpd. with a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$, even though that is not the current standard etym. (cf. EWA s.v.). I therefore think that the pl. obj. *púramdhīh* of pāda c, reconfigured as subjects of d, are depicted as explicitly female -- as 'good wives' (*vāsvīh ... pātñīh*) -- and serve as subject

to a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ (*dhuḥ*) folk-etymologically extracted from *púramdhi-*. The unexpressed obj. is then (mis-segmented) **púram* **‘plenty’*. As was discussed ad vs. 5, *dhuḥ* also participates in a figure with *dhiyé* that reverses *dadhīta dhīḥ* in 5d.

I do not entirely understand the position of *ā*, which appears to be a preverb with *dhuḥ* (so Gr), but appears to have been moved in tmesis to a position adjacent neither to a metrical boundary nor to a syntactic one (though this would be easier to argue). It may have been flipped (from a putative **dhiyé ā dhuḥ*) to allow the figure just discussed (*dhiyé dhuḥ* picking up 5b *dadhīta dhīḥ*).

On *īśudhyú-*, see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2020 art. “Vedic *īśudhyá-* and Old Avestan *īśud-*, *īšūidiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Lamberterrie Fs.).

V.41.7: The hymn contains three exx. of *éṣe* (5b, 7a, 8d). Though Lub classifies them all as locc. to the thematic stem *éṣa-*, I follow the standard tr. in taking the one in this vs. as a 1st sg. pres., while the other two are locc. in the phrase *rāyá éṣe* “in the quest for wealth.” The parallel for 7a cited by Ge, I.186.4 *úpa va éṣe ... uṣāśānāktā*, seems to clinch this interpr., and the next vs. (8), beginning *abhí vo arce*, also PREV *vaḥ* 1st-sg. VERB, reinforces it.

In d I read *āhā* not *ā hā* (a change only in the Pp. not the Saṃhitā text), and analyze this sequence as *ā + āhā*, the neut. pl. of ‘day’. This is one of only two supposed exx. of the particle *ha* with long vowel; the other one (IV.31.5) also follows *ā* and is susceptible to the same analysis. See disc. there.

V.41.8: Ge takes *nṛn* as gen. pl. rather than acc., but this is unnec. The stem *nṛ-* is regularly used of gods, esp. the Maruts, so there is no reason that they cannot be addressees here (so Re, WG).

The standard tr. take *dhányā sajóṣā dhiṣāṇā* as nom. sg. and parenthetic; e.g., Ge “—einverstanden ist die reichmachende Dhiṣaṇā—” But the instr. sg. in *-ā* to fem. *-ā-* stems is still quite common in the RV, and that is how I construe the phrase here.

V.41.9: *svaitu-* in b is a hapax. Following a tentative suggestion of Ge’s (n. 9b), I take it as a $\sqrt{vṛddhi}$ form related to Aves. *x^vaētu-* ‘family’, *pace* Narten (YH 266 n. 59), who, however, does not give reasons for her rejection of the association (though it’s true that we should really expect a thematic **svaitava-* or the like). I confess, however, that my rendering of ab is merely a guess (as, it seems, are the other divergent tr.). I don’t know why the mountains should be associated with our production of offspring; the sexual connotation WG suggest in their n., that mountains are felsenhart and knotig, seems farfetched. My own tentative suggestion is that the progeny here belong to the mountains, not to us, and refer to the material goods originating from mountains that we will enjoy: see I.55.3 *párvataṃ ná bhójase* “like a mountain to be enjoyed” and Ge’s parallels adduced there; also passages like VII.37.8 *ā rāyo yantu párvatasya rātaú* “let the riches of the mountain come here at (the time for) giving”; II.24.2 *vásuṃśantam ... párvataṃ* “the goods-filled mountain.” If I am correct, the simile, in which the mountains are said to be *vásavo ná vīrāḥ* “like good heroes” may be a bit of a pun, with *vásavaḥ* actually referring to the material goods of the mountains. To make my interpr. clearer, I might slightly emend the tr. to “to thrust out their progeny for us.”

The alternative etym. of *svaítu-* found in Gr, favored by Narten, and represented in the tr. of Re and WG analyses it as *svá-etu-* ‘having their own going’, which seems singularly inappropriate. It is regularly emphasized that mountains can’t be moved — except when they’re in fear of some greater force (like the Maruts) — so “going” should not be one of their properties. It could refer to the myth of the winged mountains (the wings then clipped by Indra), but this does not seem the context for a reference to this myth. WG attenuate the sense to a figurative “die ein Eigenleben führen,” which avoids the mountain-movement problem, but essentially denies the force of the etymology. By contrast, a reference to ‘family’ fits comfortably with the production of progeny.

I don’t know what Āptya is doing here, either. Again, the sexual connotation suggested in WG’s n. is invisible to me. It does seem likely that he is the same figure as Trita in 10b, since both are associated with the production of praise. Trita in 4b is less clearly tied in.

Note *śámsam náryah*, which reminds of *nārā-śámsa-* (though they don’t belong to the same syntagm here) and also continues the poet’s fondness for *-ya-*derivatives.

V.41.10: WG take Trita as the persona of the 1st ps. speaker of *astosi* (“ich, als Trita ...”), whereas I follow Ge and Re in supplying a 3rd ps. form of *√stu* for b.

The form *etárī* is, of course, problematic, but is most likely a loc. sg.; for disc. see Tichy (-tar-stems, 59–61). Tichy considers such forms locatives to verbal abstracts; though some such forms seem simply to be straight agent-noun locatives (see, e.g., *kartárī* in I.139.7), Tichy’s analysis fits *etárī*. It is found only here and in VI.12.4, in the same pāda-final phrase *etárī ná sūṣaṁh*. In our passage there is some phonetic justification for the form (though not in VI.12.4); note the *nīri* sylls: *gñīté agnir etárī ... / ... ní riṇāti*.

V.41.12: This vs. presents a number of difficulties. The first is the easiest solved: who is the referent of ab? Although this is almost universally taken to be the Wind, I think it is more likely Agni. Only Agni is called *ūrjām páti-* “lord of nourishments” (otherwise only in the voc. *ūrjām pate*), also *ūrjó nāpāt* “child of nourishment.” Given this exclusive identification, it seems unlikely that the audience would assign a different referent, esp. since *ūrjām pátiḥ* is the first epithet encountered and sets the frame of reference; the others only show up in pāda b. Moreover, though *párijman-* ‘earth-circling’ is used of the Wind, it also refers to other entities, including, fairly often, Agni (VI.2.8, VI.13.2, VII.13.3, I.127.2, III.2.9). The other descriptor in b, *iśirá-* ‘vigorous’, is applied to a variety of beings and things, including the Wind, but also Agni (III.2.14, 5.4). The only activity posited of the subject of this hemistich is *nábhas tárīyān* (for which see below), which is also applicable to either.

The pāda-final *sá* in pāda a is quite unusual. A cursory glance through Lub for parallels yields only II.35.1, III.13.3, (VII.86.6 *sā*), IX.71.8, IX.79.3, X.108.4 (a careful search might produce a few more). All of these exx. are either rhetorically contrastive, or *sá* takes its proper position in a new clause. Although it is possible that the *sá* here also begins a new, purely nominal clause with b, this seems clumsy. I have a quite speculative suggestion about it, linking it with the immediately following *nábhas tárīyān*. The standard — and quite persuasive — interpr. of this phrase is “quicker than a cloud,” but this imposes an abl. sg. interpr. on *nábhaḥ*, which should then belong to a root noun *nábh-* ‘cloud’, beside the standard *s-*stem *nábhas-*. This root noun does not otherwise exist: the

supposed root noun *nābh-* (glossed ‘Zerspalter, Zerbrecher’ by Gr) in I.174.8 is more likely a verb (see comm. ad loc.). And in any case we should expect an accent **nabhás*. Re’s suggestion that *nābhas* is simply haplology for **nābhasas* is probably correct, but I suggest that it left a trace of its vanished final *-as* in the pāda-final *sá* immediately preceding — a tangible sign of the effects of speed: the final syllable got cut off and left behind.

The second hemistich is very puzzling and has given rise to very different and incompatible interpr. (WG being esp. distant from the rest). Mine more or less follows Old (or one of his alternatives), who discusses the passage with his customary acuity; I will not discuss other renderings in detail. I am not at all certain that mine (/Old’s) is correct, however. The framework of the passage compares the waters, subjects of the verb, with fortifications (*púrah*), the point of comparison being their resplendant appearance (*śubhrá-*). So far also Ge; Re also follows this structure, but floats the possibility that *púr-* can mean ‘corps’, which would be convenient but is of course unsupported. With Old and Ge (we now lose Re, who takes *d* as a separate clause with the ladles as subj.), the fortifications are those of a mountain (*ádreh*), and this mountain is characterized as *pári ... babṛhāṇá-* ‘enclosing’ (*pári √ bṛh* has this meaning in the Brāh.). Although we would not ordinarily expect tmesis of a participle, esp. a part. in an oblique case, the tmesis here is iconic: the enclosed object is located between preverb and participle. This object is *srúcaḥ* ‘offering ladles’. Now of course in a literal interpr. a mountain enclosing a bunch of ladles sounds very odd, Old cleverly suggests that the ladles stand for cows -- living ladles, as it were, from which ghee comes as it does from the offering ladles. These cows are then the cows trapped within the Vala cave. The hemistich thus starts jointly in the physical world and on the ritual grounds, since the listening waters are probably both “real” natural waters and the waters standing by for the soma sacrifice. It then moves, via the simile, to the natural world (mountain fortifications) and the world of myth (the Vala cave), and back to the ritual ground, with the enclosed ladles. If this interpr. is correct, it is a very condensed and clever expression.

V.41.13: Another opaque vs., whose difficulties begin with the first word *vidā*. This is taken as the 2nd pl. pf. by Gr, Ge, WG. (Re unaccountably takes it as a 1st sg. ‘Je sais ...’, without comment -- presumably a careless error for *véda*.) I follow Old in taking it as the instr. of the root noun to the same root.

The phrase *yé va évā(h)* recurs from 5d though in a different metrical position. Here as there it refers to the “ways” (*évāh*) of the Maruts (so Ge, Re, flg. Sāy., contra Old’s tentative Ādityas) -- the ways which by our knowledge (*vidā*) we are in a position to proclaim (*brāvāma*), presumably in the form of a hymn, for which we expect reward (*vāryam dādhanāḥ* “acquiring what is choice”) -- just as in vs. 5 a visionary thought (*dhīh*) was to be produced in return for wealth (*rāyá éṣe ávase* “for help in the quest for wealth”). The part. *dādhanāḥ* has almost a purpose function, and to make the reciprocal action clearer I might emend the tr. from “as we acquire” to “while acquiring ...” or even “for acquiring.”

The first sticking point in the second hemistich is *caná*. This is universally taken as negative (as *caná* generally is). However, in this case I think that it is simply equivalent to *ca ná* (so also Klein I: 289–91 with n. 8) and that the *ná* here is serving as the simile-marking particle, not the negative. *vāyah* is often used in a simile at the

beginning of a pāda: I count 7 #*vāyo nā* passages, incl. V.59.7 in this maṇḍala, where it's the Maruts who are compared to birds (cf. also I.87.2 #*vāya iva marutaḥ*) — though I do have to admit that 2 #*vāyaś canā* passages (I.24.6, 155.5) contain the negative.

Therefore, contra all the standard tr./interpr., I take the subject of cd not as 'birds' (*vāyaḥ*), but as the Maruts compared to birds (like V.59.7, I.87.2). The adj. *subhū-* 'of good essence' is regularly used of the Maruts in this maṇḍala (V.55.3, 59.3, 87.3) and would identify them as the referent to an alert audience. In this 2nd half-vs. we make good on our promise to proclaim the ways of the Maruts -- this exploit is one of these ways.

Unfortunately exactly what that exploit involves is unclear. That the Maruts should come down like birds is unproblematic: they regularly fly through the midspace and come down to interact with mortals, generally at the ritual. But the target of their descent, expressed in pāda d, has no parallels, as far as I can find. In my interpr. the mortal (*mārtam*) to whom they come is in distress and receives their help. Unlike the standard tr. I take the hapax root noun instr. *kṣubhā* as characterizing the Maruts' movements (fluttering like birds), not the state of the mortal, which is expressed by *ānuṃyātāṃ vadhasnāḥ* "held/controlled by murderous weapons." I assume that he is under attack by hostile forces and requires the Maruts' assistance to free him.

The phonological play with *va/ā* that we noted earlier in the hymn (particularly vss. 1, 5) has returned here: ... *yé va evā, brāvāma ... vāryaṃ ... vāya(h) ... subhvā(h) ... vadhasnāḥ* — which draws attention to the thematic connection between this vs. and vs. 5.

V.41.14: Since Indra is several times called *súmakha-*, I assume he is the referent here -- though nothing much depends on it in this generic vs. and both Ge and Re take it to be the sacrificer or the patron of the sacrifice.

WG suggest that *candrāgrā(h)* modifies both 'days' and 'hymns'; this is a good idea, with 'gold, gleam' used in two slightly different senses. The days begin with the gleaming of the golden sun, while the hymns offered to the gods are metaphorically tipped with the gold given by the gods in response to praise.

In d *udā* is generally taken as the instr. sg. of a root noun 'water' (so, e.g., Gr and all the standard tr., though Ge hesitates), beside the more common oblique *n*-stem instr. *udnā*. However, I follow Schindler (Root nouns, 12–13), who argues that it is better taken as the nom./acc. pl. to the same *-n*-stem.

The somewhat curious expression *abhīṣātā āṛṇāḥ* "conquered floods" finds its formulaic match in nearby V.50.4 *āṛṇā ... sánitā* 'winner of the floods'; this may well be a general reference to the progress of the Ārya into the Punjab, winning territory river by river. Ge cites as parallel I.131.5 *té anyām-anyām nadyām sanīṣnata* "They kept winning one river after another."

V.41.15: The action in pāda a is a positive one: the speaker is assured to make it to old age. See 17de and disc. there, as well as X.59.4 (disc. ad vs. 17 below), 100.12.

The construction in b, which expresses the agent of *ní dhāyí*, is complex. Its underlying model is the "X and which Y" construction, but it is inverted, with the rel. cl. member first: "(by her) who is ... and by the protectors." Moreover, it contains both *vā* and *ca*. As Klein says (II.174–75), "the construction should most likely be viewed as a conjunctive anacoluthon in which the poet begins by intending alternative conjunction

and finishes with an additive sequence. Within each member the conjunction occupies its normal enclitic position: (várūtrī vā śakrā yā) (pāyúbhiś ca).”

On *ṛjuvāniḥ* see Scar 467–68. Note that this form produces a bad cadence.

On the connection between cd and vss. 19–20 see disc. below.

V.41.16: *upamātivāniḥ* in 16e also produces a bad cadence. On this form and on the meter of both -*vāniḥ* forms, see Scar 467. On *úpamāti-* see comm. ad VIII.40.9.

The opening of the vs., *kathā dāśema*, echoes 11a *kathā ... bravāma*. In both cases the object/goal of our action is the Maruts. Another echo is found in *evayā(h)*, which is a scrambling of *yé va évā(h)* of 5d and 13a (though *yé* and *-yā(h)* are completely different grammatically), in both cases of the Maruts. The sequence in our pāda b, *evayā marútaḥ* “the Maruts traveling their ways,” is also matched by the punctuating exclamation *evayāmarut* found in every vs. of the Anhangslied to the Maruts that ends this maṇḍala (V.87.1–9, tr. there “Maruts on the march”).

V.41.17: As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 16–17, in a different meter from what precedes (and follows), seem to provide a summary of the preceding hymn, esp. 17, with its self-conscious internal quote *ítī cin nú* “in just these (words) now.” See Janert (Dhāsi, pp. 16–17), who argues this position in some detail.

All the standard tr. (as well as Janert, 42) agree in taking d and e as separate clauses and supplying a verb for c. All consider the clauses contrastive: in d I hope to be granted a pleasant or benevolent *dhāśi-* for my body, while in e I express the wish that Nirṛti should swallow my old age. But this is directly contrary to what was said in 15ab, where the securing of his old age was an occasion for celebration by the poet. It is true that two different words for ‘old age’ are involved: *jarimán-* in 15, *jarā-* in 17, but these words do not contrast semantically elsewhere as far as I can see (cf. X.32.5, 8, which contains *jarā-* followed by *jarimán-*)—even though Re remarks “noter l’opposition.” An important parallel is provided by X.59.4 *dyúbhir hitó jarimā sú no astu, parātarām sú nīrṛtir jihītām* “Throughout the days let our old age be secured for us. -- Let Dissolution move herself further away.” There old age is ‘secured’ (*hitáḥ*) as it was in our 15a *jarimā ní dhāyi* (both to $\sqrt{dhā}$), and Dissolution (*nīrṛtiḥ*) is urged to move away. (It should be admitted that that pāda is a refrain to the first three vss. of X.59 and so not necessarily as closely tied to the preceding pāda as it might be.) I therefore doubt that in our vs. the poet is hoping that Dissolution will swallow the old age that he (and other poets) elsewhere want to keep safe. Instead I think de is the expression of his fear that if he fails to win the gods (abc) Dissolution will succeed in depriving him of his wished-for old age. I have pushed *ātrā* perhaps a bit too much -- to ‘otherwise’; I would prefer a ‘lest’ (*néd*) clause or even a *mā* clause, but *néd*, which becomes well developed in Vedic prose, barely exists in the RV and the poet may have been casting about for a way to express this modality.

A further piece of evidence in favor of my interpr. is the word *dhāśi*. Although this word often means ‘well-spring’ or ‘source’ (see comm. ad I.62.3, 140.1), in some cases it seems to mean ‘place, depository’ and be associated with (/derived, at least synchronically, from) $\sqrt{dhā}$. Here the *dhāśi-* seems to be the nominalization of *ní dhāyi* in 15 (cf. *hitáḥ* in X.58.4) — that is, the place in which old age is securely held. I therefore take it as coreferential with *jarām* in e.

V.41.18–20: If, as suggested above, 16–17 are the finale of the hymn proper, these 3 vss. (or 2 ¼) were tacked on. They certainly lack the complications of the rest of the hymn. The dominance of female figures is striking.

V.41.18: Despite the word order, I follow Janert (contra the standard tr.) in construing pāda-final *góḥ* with *īṣam*, rather than with immediately preceding *śāsā*, which saves us from determining what the recitation or instruction of the cow is.

V.41.19–20: The single pāda of 20 simply continues vs. 19 thematically and syntactically, as Old points out. They constitute a single vs.

The signature word of the beginning of the hymn, *vā*, returns in force: *urvāśī vā ...urvāśī vā brhaddivā ... ūṛṇvānā*. Note also *urvāśī ... urvāśī ... abhyūrṇvānā ... ūṛjavyāsyā*.

This vs. sequence seems inspired by 15cd. Vs. 15 has a similar focus on female figures, and 15c *#śīṣaktu mātā mahī rasā naḥ* is echoed by 20a *#śīṣaktu naḥ*, whose subject is likewise a female. The ‘mother’ *mātā* of 15c is matched slightly earlier in this vs. sequence, in 19a, and there she is accompanied by rivers (*smān nadībhiḥ* 19b), even as the mother of 15c is identified as the river Rasā.

In fact 19–20 depict a matriarchal lineage of sorts, as Ge points out (n. 19bc). Besides Idā, explicitly “the mother of the flock” (*yūthāsya mātā*) here, there is Urvaśī, twice: 19b and 19c. I am not entirely sure what to make of this doubling. I doubt that two different Urvaśīs are meant, rather the familiar Urvaśī in two different guises (so Ge). In 19b she is associated with rivers. This reminds us of the attendance of her fellow Apsarases and of the rivers on the birth of Urvaśī’s son in X.95.6–7, with Urvaśī herself qualified as ‘watery’ (*āpyā* in X.95.10b) and her son as “born from the water” (*jāniṣṭo apāḥ*, X.95.10c). Urvaśī Brhaddivā (‘of lofty heaven’; on the accent *brhaddivā*—see AiG II.1.109, 120) in 19c may refer to a return to her residence in heaven after breaking with Purūravas (the return not, however, mentioned in X.95, though it is implied in vss. 16–17). In any case, Urvaśī’s son is named Āyu; his paternal grandmother is Idā, the mother of Purūravas (addressed as *aīḍa* in X.95.18), so the title ‘mother’ given to Idā in 19a has another resonance. Because of Urvaśī’s relationship to Āyu, with Ge and Re I supply ‘mother’ in 19d and 20a to govern the various genitives. Thus with Idā, Urvaśī, and Āyu we have a three-generational family.

I am uncertain what to do with *ūravyāsyā* in 20 (PN or not), and I also do not know what *abhyūrṇvānā* in 19d is conveying.

V.42 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., like V.41 this hymn enumerates a number of divine dedicands with no apparent ordering, save for the middle vss. (7–9), where Brhaspati dominates. The list includes 1 Varuṇa, Mitra, Bhaga, Aditi, Aryaman / 2 Aditi, Mitra and Varuṇa / 3 Savitar / 4 Indra / 5 Bhaga, Savitar, Aṃśa, Vāja, and Puraṃdhi / 6 Indra / 7–8 (–9) Brhaspati / 10 Maruts / 11 Rudra / 12 Sarasvatī, Brhaddivā, Rākā / 13 Tvaṣṭar (+ Viśvarūpa?) / 14 Parjanya / 15 Maruts / 16 Earth (etc.) / 17 gods / 18 Aśvins. Note no Agni, unless he’s hidden in 1cd. The hymn is much more straightforward, and less interesting, than V.41, but provides a relaxing interlude in the overheated rhetoric of the All God hymns of V.

V.42.1: As Ge (etc.) point out, *átūrtapanthāḥ* is the clue to the identification of the referent of cd, since this epithet only occurs once elsewhere in the RV, in X.64.5, where it is explicitly used of Aryaman. In that passage he is also qualified as *saptáhotā* ‘having 7 Hotrars’, like *pāñcahotā* here. And of course Aryaman makes sense in this highly Ādityan context. Nonetheless, I think pāda c (*pṛṣadyoniḥ pāñcahotā*) flirts with a different identification -- of Agni -- before sealing that of Aryaman by *átūrtapanthāḥ* in d. Agni could plausibly have a womb of dappled (ghee) (*pṛṣadyoni-*), similar to *ghṛtāyoni-* ‘having a womb of ghee’ used of Agni in V.8.6, as Ge points out (n. 1cd), and of course Agni is both associated with Hotars and is the Hotar par excellence himself. Since, as noted above, Agni is not otherwise found in this hymn, the poet may have gestured towards him covertly in 1c.

V.42.2: This vs. is quite straightforward until we reach pāda d, where the nom. *ahám* ‘I’ demands a verb that isn’t there. Keeping in mind the theme of divine/human reciprocity that runs through the last hymn and the rest of this one and employing our usual method of attempting to supply missing material from context, it seems best to supply a form of *prāti* √ *grabh* complementary to *prāti ... jagṛbhyāt* in a with Aditi as subject. The poet wishes to grasp the *bráhma-* produced by the gods (c) in order to turn it into praise (*stóma-*) for the gods (a). This reciprocal relationship may be signaled by the first word in the vs. *prāti* ‘in return, in response’.

The other question in d is what to do with the untethered locc. *mitré varuṇé*. I have followed Ge in loosely construing them with *mayobhú* ‘joy itself’, even though this stem does not elsewhere take a loc. Ge (n. 2d) cites a series of parallels with locc. *mitré varuṇe* that seem to have similarly loose beneficial value.

V.42.3: Note the distinction in no. between the two 2nd ps. impvs. in ab: sg. *úd īraya* and pl. *unátta*. As commonly, the sg. is probably a self-addressed by the poet to himself; that his object is “the best poet of poets” (*kavítamaṃ kavīnām*) simply emphasizes the closed loop of reciprocity. The pl. impv. is presumably addressed to his fellow celebrants, in this case the priests charged with the physical activity (the Adhvaryu and his helpers, quite possibly). The pl. impv. *unátta* has a strong stem form where we properly expect weak, but the expected form **und-ta* → **untta* → (probably simplified to) **unta* would have been difficult to parse.

V.42.4: Ge thinks it’s *our mánas-* that’s at issue, but context makes it more likely to be Indra’s (so also Re and WG).

Pāda c is a minor variant of 2c and in fact makes clear what the structure of 2c is and where the rel. cl. begins. A minor example of syntactic repair.

V.42.5: In pāda a it is unclear with what noun to construe gen. *rāyāḥ*. Ge and Re take it with *savitā* (Ge: “der Zuweiser ... des Reichtums”), while WG seem to agree with me in taking it with *āmśa(h)*. Since Savitar is a far more defined divine being with a name that, though having the literal sense ‘impeller’, is normally used just as a name, I think *Amśa*, whose animatization is fairly shaky, is more likely to be used in a literal abstract value and construed with a gen. of the same type.

The problematic form in the vs. is *saṃjītaḥ*. Properly speaking, this should either be an abl./gen. sg. or a nom./acc. pl. of the root noun cmpd *saṃjīt-* ‘complete victor’. Gr analyzes it as gen. sg., modifying *vṛtrāsya*, as, apparently, does Re, while Ge and WG take it as nom. pl., presumably applicable to all the gods listed singly before. All construe the gen. pl. *dhānānām* with it (e.g., Ge “die Erbeuter der Schätze”), but this leaves *vṛtrāsya* stranded, since it would be perverse to attribute the victory over Vṛtra to Bhaga, Savitar, and Aṃśa in addition to Indra. Therefore all the standard tr. supply sg. **hantā* (vel sim.) as an appositive to Indra, to govern *vṛtrāsya*. I consider this unnec. Our pāda seems to be based on a much-repeated pāda, couched in the acc. sg., in the Triṣṭubh refrain vs. of the Viśvāmitras’ Indra hymns: III.30.22 (etc.) *ghnāntaṃ vṛtrāṇi saṃjītaṃ dhānānām*. I consider our pāda a nonce adaptation of the orig. pāda, construed as if orig. *saṃjītaṃ* belonged to a them. stem -- in other words *saṃjītaḥ* is a thematic back-formation, nom. singular, that allows the formula to remain metrical. The last part of 7b, with sg. *sanitāraṃ dhānānām*, gives some support to this interpr., and note that Indra alone is called *jīṣṇú-* ‘victor’ in the next vs. (6a). Of course, it must be admitted that in III.30.22 *vṛtrāṇi* is the obj. of a form of \sqrt{han} and so supplying such a form here (as the standard tr. do) also gets some support. But *vṛtrā-* has been transformed from acc. (pl.) to gen. (sg.) in our passage and should be parallel to *dhānānām*.

V.42.7: The splv. *śāmbhaviṣṭha-* recalls *śāmtama-* in 1a. Both stems are reasonably well attested, though *śāmtama-* has the edge. They do not seem to be consistently distinguished in usage, but *śāmtama-* seems more common qualifying inanimates while *śāmbhaviṣṭha-* and its base *śāmbhú-/ũ-* are more common with animates. Such is the case in this hymn, where *śāmtamā* in 1a modifies ‘hymn’ (*gīṭh*) and *śāmbhaviṣṭhaḥ* in 7c modifies Brhaspati. Nonetheless, the tr. of the two forms should be harmonized.

V.42.8: The standard tr. (incl. also Schmidt, B+I 84 and Scar 202) take ab as a separate nominal cl. The difference is trivial.

Less trivial is the difference between my rendering of the last part of d and that of all the others. They take *subhágās tēsu rāyaḥ* as the nominal main clause to the rel. cl. (*yé aśvadāḥ ...*) that occupies the rest of the hemistich. Cf., e.g., Ge “denen gehören die beglückenden Reichtümer.” In contrast I take *subhágāḥ* with the rel. cl., qualifying the givers, and *rāyaḥ* as acc. pl. in the main cl., and in the main cl. I supply a verb ‘confer’ (vel sim.) extracted from *ratnadhéyam* in 7a. In favor of the standard tr. are the facts that by accent *rāyaḥ* is better analyzed as nom. than acc. (though acc. pl. so accented are not rare) and that no verb need be supplied. Although I am usually reluctant to supply material, in this case there are countervailing factors. First, with the exception of one late passage (X.140.5), *subhága-*, which is quite well-attested, is only used of animate beings, not of wealth or the like. Moreover, the standard rendering leaves Brhaspati with little to do. The givers are “accompanied by your help” (*távotībhiḥ*), but otherwise seem to do quite nicely on their own -- whereas we might expect him to be acting on their material behalf by giving to them, just as in the next vs. he is asked to strip the niggardly of their possessions and do worse by other anti-ritualists. By my interpr. the vs. expresses the usual Rigvedic trickle-down theory of material redistribution: the gods give goods to the patrons of the sacrifice (kings, etc.), who then confer them on the priests and poets.

V.42.9: The stilted nominal syntax with dummy verb $\sqrt{kṛ}$ + acc. masc. abstract (*visarmāṇam kṛṇuhi*, lit. “make dissipation”), which together govern a neut. acc. *vittām*, must result from the lack of a transitive pres. to $\sqrt{sṛ}$ ‘flow, run’ -- *pace* Narten (“Ai. *sṛ* ...” 1969: 83 and n. 16 [=KISch 130 and n. 16]), who characterizes several forms of $\sqrt{sṛ}$ as “transitiv,” though the acc. expresses the goal/place-through-which, not a real transitive object.

The expression *prasavé vāṛdhānān* is not entirely clear and is variously rendered — Ge “die im Befehl gross sind,” Re “qui (se croyant) renforcés pour la compétition,” Schmidt (B+I 85) “bei (unserer) Regsamkeit wachsen,” WG “obwohl sie in ihrem Unterfangen erstarkt sind” — differing primarily in what *prasavá-* is taken to mean. By my interpr. these foes, who violate all the norms of Ārya society by refusing to participate in reciprocal exchange, by acting contrary to *vratá-* (the chains of command that structure Ārya society), and by hating the verbal formulations that express the Ārya view of the cosmos and their place in it, nonetheless show their strength on the attack, the forward thrust. All the tr. reflect this notion one way or another: the regrettable strength of the enemies despite their antisocial behavior.

V.42.10: This vs. continues the theme of the impious foe, though the divine ally the poet calls on to destroy the foe has changed from Bṛhaspati to the Maruts. Here (pāda a) the enemy chooses to praise demons (*rakṣāsaḥ*) when gods (*deva-*) are being invited to the ritual and (c) mocks the ritual labor of the devotee. Because of the strong association of sweat with ritual labor in the RV (see my “Avestan *xšuuīd*: A Relic of Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 25 [2011 (2015)], and for \sqrt{sam} ‘labor’ with \sqrt{svid} ‘sweat’ I.86.8), I assume that the enemy himself is engaging in (what we hope will be fruitless) ritual in pāda d, perhaps in service of the demons, not the gods (cf. pāda a). In post-RVic texts the Asuras would probably serve as the polar opposition to the gods, not the Rakṣasas, an indirect piece of evidence for the well-known fact that the Asura-Deva opposition almost entirely postdates the RV.

In the publ. tr. *óhate* in pāda a is tr. as an indicative (‘whoever lauds’), but it should really be a subjunctive (“whoever will laud”), both on the basis of the morphology (it belongs to a root pres., whose 3rd plural is also *óhate*) and of the parallel subjunctives in the passage, cd *yáḥ ... nindāt, ... karate*.

V.42.11: One of the striking passages in which the same divinity, in this case Rudra, is called both *devá-* and *ásura-* (*námobhir devám ásuram duvasya* “with acts of reverence offer friendship to the god, the lord”), strong evidence that the strict division and eternal enmity between Devas and Asuras in later texts has not yet developed.

V.42.12: The grammar of this vs. is quite straightforward; what difficulty it presents lies in the uncertain and permeable boundary between PNs and common noun/adjectives. In b *vibhvataṣṭāḥ*, modifying the rivers, is universally taken as containing the PN Vibhvan, hence ‘fashioned by Vibhvan’. Since the referents of pāda a are the Ṛbhus and Vibhvan is the name of an Ṛbhu, this makes some contextual sense. However, fashioning *a river* seems beyond even the Ṛbhus’ expertise, and, further, in VI.61.13 Sarasvatī, a river after all, is *vibhvāne kṛtā* “made for wide extension / wide ranging.” I think that sense is meant here as well, and there is simply some sly play on the Ṛbhu’s name.

I am less certain about what to do with *br̥haddivā* in c. In the immediately preceding hymn (V.41.19) I take the same form as an attributive adjective with *urvāśī*. *Urvaśī Br̥haddivā* “*Urvaśī of lofty heaven.*” Here it could likewise be attributive to *Sarasvatī* or it could be a separate goddess. See Klein (I.328–29, 337) on this mild dilemma. If *Br̥haddivā* is a distinct entity, she is featureless, so there is little at stake here.

V.42.13: The phrase *nāvyasīm jāyamānam* “the newer (hymn), being born,” with comparative of ‘new’ and the pres. participle seems designed to refer to the current hymn in the process of composition.

Tvaṣṭar is both the possessor and producer of “all forms” (cf. I.13.10 *tvāṣṭāram ... viśvārūpam*) and the father of a being called Viśvarūpa (likewise *viśvārūpa*- ‘possessing all forms’ (cf. II.11.19, X.8.9 *tvāṣṭrá- viśvārūpa*- with the patronymic *tvāṣṭrá*-). In one sense the second hemistich seems to be an attempt to reconcile these two aspects: Tvaṣṭar as a lone creator god, the fashioner of all forms, “(ex)changing his forms” (*rūpā minānāḥ*) as sole agent -- but doing so “bulging (?) in the body of his daughter” (*āhanā duhitūr vakṣānāsu*) (if that’s what it means), which introduces a sexual (indeed incestuous) element that would be appropriate to the fathering of a son. On the one hand, we seem to have a model of primitive embryology, with the fetus changing and developing within its mother’s womb; on the other hand, the half-vs. mirrors the later Sanskrit notion that the father enters the body of the mother and is reborn as the son. Unlike the incest of Dyaus and of Prajāpati, the story of Tvaṣṭar’s incest (if that’s what this is) is otherwise muted and not securely attested elsewhere.

The meaning and etymology of the *s*-stem *āhanās*- are deeply uncertain. In context it seems to mean ‘swollen, bulging, luxuriant, lubricious’. As for the etym. see EWA s.v. and, for a recent etymological attempt, Kulikov in the Lubotsky Fs. (2018). The word has gained a certain notoriety in IEist discourse because it is argued that it preserves the old suffixal accent of *s*-stem bahuvr̥his (see Stüber, *s*-stems [2002] 27, 189). However, it is dangerous to pin the reconstruction of a whole category on a word whose meaning, structure, and etymology are radically uncertain. For disc. of the word, as well as demolition of the accentual theory it is supposed to support, see JL “*αἰνοπαθής*.”

On *vakṣānā*- ‘belly’ as a pl. tantum, see comm. ad X.27.16.

V.42.14–16: This trio of vss. echoes vs. 1 and ring-compositionally seems to bring the hymn to a close, with the single pāda of 17 and the final vs. 18 tacked on (and indeed the 2nd hemistich of 16: see below). The template is *prá* [HYMN, etc.] [GOD] *nūnám aśyāḥ*, realized in 1ab as “May the hymn (*gīṭh*) now reach Varuṇa (etc.).” In 14ab we again have all the elements, while 15ab omits the initial preverb *prá* in favor of *úd* immediately preceding the verb and omits *nūnám* entirely and 16ab reinstates *prá* but still lacks *nūnám*:

1ab *prá ... vāruṇam* (etc.)... *gīṭr ... nūnám aśyāḥ*

14ab *prá suṣṭutīḥ ... ilās pátim ... nūnám aśyāḥ*

15ab *eṣá stómo mārutam śárdhaḥ* (etc.)... *úd aśyāḥ*

16ab *práśá stómaḥ pṛthivīm* (etc.) ... *aśyāḥ*

The impression given by this sequence of syntactic and lexical parallels -- that this is the finale of the hymn -- is supported by the fact that the rest of the hymn, 16cd–18, is repeated as 15cd–17 in the next hymn, V.43.

V.42.14: Despite the position of *prá*, opening a pāda that ends with the part. *ukṣámāṇaḥ*, I take the *prá* not with that participle but with immediately preceding pāda-final *íyartī*. For one thing, *prá* is found elsewhere with *íyar-* while it is not with *√ukṣ*, and in addition tmesis of preverb + participle is fairly uncommon (though certainly not unheard of). Ge and Re seem to follow the other route, taking it as license to interpr. *íyartī* as intrans. or at least objectless (Ge ‘heraufzieht’, Re ‘s’avance’). But *íyar-* is otherwise always transitive, and though we would prefer the two world halves not to be in motion, the point here is that Parjanya’s thunderstorm is powerful enough to shake them. WG’s interpr. is like mine.

V.43 All Gods

This listing impulse so evident in the last two hymns (V.41–42) is less pronounced here, though a variety of gods receive praise -- with Agni especially prominent, as indicated in the publ. intro.: 2 Heaven and Earth, 3 Vāyu, 5 Indra, 6 Aramati, Agni, 7 Gharma pot, 8 Aśvins, 9 Pūṣan and Vāyu, 10 Maruts, 11 Sarasvatī, 12 Bṛhaspati as Agni, 13 Agni?, 14 Agni?, 15 Agni, Earth.

V.43.1: I would now render *tūrṇy-arthā-* as ‘having a goal to advance to’; see comm. ad III.11.5.

On *mahó rāyē* see comm. ad IV.31.11. Again the publ. tr. carelessly follows Ge’s tr., which takes the two forms together, as if they were an adjective-noun syntagm despite the difference in case. I would now take *maháḥ* adverbially with Old. See further ad VI.1.2.

The seven lofty and joy-bringing feminine beings (*bṛhatīḥ sapṭá ... mayobhúvaḥ*) in cd, the target of our invocation, are not further specified. I have supplied ‘cows’ on the basis of ab and IX.86.25, which contains *sapṭá dhenávaḥ*, but this is by no means certain. See other suggestions in Ge’s n. 1. The problem is that there is no reason for the cows to number exactly seven; either ‘seven’ is, as Oberlies (Rel. RV II.74) suggests, simply an indication of totality, or some more standard group of seven, like the rivers, is being referred to (either via the image of cows or directly).

V.43.3: The subject of the impv. in c must also be Vāyu, because he regularly receives the first drink of soma.

V.43.4: In b the agent noun *śamítár-* most naturally belongs with the forms of *√śam* referring to ritual labor. See, e.g., in the preceding hymn V.42.10 *śámīm śaśamānásya* ‘the (ritual) labor of the one laboring.’ However, already in the Aśvamedha hymn of the RV it has acquired the euphemistic meaning ‘queller’, that is, slaughterer, of the sacrificial beast; cf. I.162.9–10, as well as the simile in V.85.1 *ví yó jaghāna śamitéva cárma* ‘who like a butcher a hide split apart ...’ in this maṇḍala. I think it likely that both

senses are meant here; in post-RVic ritual texts Soma is regularly presented as a sacrificial victim.

In the 2nd hemistich Ge and WG (cf. also Old) take c and d as separate clauses, utilizing the verb *duduhe* for both and supplying a priest (Ge: Adhvaryu) as subj. of c. The reason is nom. *sugābhastīḥ* lit. ‘having good fists’, which must otherwise modify *aṃśú-* ‘plant’. With Re, in the publ. tr. I take cd as a single clause with *sugābhastīḥ ... aṃśúḥ* a single NP, assuming that ‘having good fists’ of the soma plant means that the plant has received good handling from the fists of its preparer. (Re, by contrast, tr. “aux beaux rameaux,” with *gābhasti-* referring metaphorically to the growth habits of the plant.) I now think my interpr. pushes the bahuvrīhi further than it should go, so I would now emend the tr. to “(The priest,) having good fists, has milked out the sap of the honey that dwells on the mountain; the plant has milked out its own shimmering, pure (sap).” It is likely that the verb underlying pāda c should be active (perhaps **dudoha*); when middle forms like *duduhe* take an object, the subject is usually a cow or cow-substitute (as here) producing milk from itself.

V.43.7: On the position of this vs. in the hymn and its significance, see publ. intro. If the vs. is an omphalos, it may focus attention on the mysteries of the Pravargya ritual. The vs. is structured as a riddle, with the referent of *yám* (pāda a) withheld till d, with three similes and several technical references to ritual activities in between.

The first simile (pāda a) is oddly structured, in that one expects something to be compared to the unidentified acc. *yám* but there is no overt acc. expressed. Instead we must supply this acc., as the most likely object of the participle *pratháyantaḥ* ‘spreading’ (transitive), which, in default of the acc. obj. itself, carries the simile particle *ná*. The object to be supplied is *barhīḥ* ‘ritual grass’, which at every ritual is spread as a seat for the visiting gods. Generally the verb in the expression “spread (barhis)” is \sqrt{str} ‘strew’, not \sqrt{prath} , but, as Old points out, \sqrt{prath} can also be used, generally for the intransitive sense “(barhis) spreads” (V.5.4, X.70.4, etc.). The object of transitive \sqrt{prath} is generally something much more prominent, like ‘earth’. It may be that \sqrt{prath} was used here to give a cosmic resonance, but it may also be partly ascribed to the alliteration in the vs.: *prathayanto ... víprā, vapāvantam ... tāpantaḥ | pitúr ná putrá upási prāyīṣtha(h)*. The barhis is also sometimes anointed; cf. II.3.4 *barhīḥ ... ghṛténāktám*. Thus, the absent *barhīḥ* is at the intersection of the two ritual verbs ‘spread’ and ‘anoint’, and supplies the missing point of comparison in the simile “They anoint ‘which one’ (*yám*) like X.” The poet is inviting his audience to solve for two variables -- the identity of the focus of the vs. expressed by the rel. prn. *yám* and the object to which it is compared, but he makes the second riddle easier by providing two verbs that could govern it. The overlap of the two produces the answer.

The next simile, in b, targets a different ritual substance to compare with the still unidentified *yám*. This time an accusative does appear on the surface, but it in the form of an associated adjective, *vapāvantam* ‘possessing the/an omentum.’ In classical śrauta ritual the omentum (*vapā*) is the first and probably the most important part of the sacrificial animal to be dealt with; after the death of the animal, the omentum is removed and heated on two different fires, first preliminarily singed on the Śamitar’s fire (NB: see vs. 4 and comm. thereon), then cooked on the Āhavanīya fire (see my Hyenas, pp. 104–5). Here we can assume that what is identified as ‘possessing an omentum’ is the

sacrificial animal (an identification supported by the occurrence of *vapāvantam* in ŚB XIII.7.1.9), which itself is cooked on the fire. Sacrificial animals are also anointed; see IV.6.3 *paśvó anakti* in a hymn that treats the animal sacrifice in some detail. Once again, the incompletely identified target of the simile is at the intersection of two ritual actions: ‘heat’ and ‘anoint’. In this case the similarly unidentified *yám*, the gharma pot, is also subject to both these actions in the Pravargya ritual.

The third simile, in pāda c, is the only one with all its parts, and is also the only one without a ritual reference. It is a version of a standard trope.

V.43.8: The last pāda is difficult, primarily because of *dhúram*. This would ordinarily be the acc. of the root noun *dhúr*- ‘chariot pole’, and indeed that is how I take it. Ge interprets it rather as an acc. infinitive (‘festzuhalten’) to \sqrt{dhr} . But that *aniṭ* root has no *seṭ* forms in *dhur*- (unless *dhúr*- ‘chariot pole’ itself; so Whitney Roots, but see now standard alternative etymology in Schindler, Rt nouns, and EWA, both s.v.). WG’s semantic interpr. (‘zur Sicherung’) is similar to Ge’s, though derivationally distinct: they see it as a secondary abstract(ion) from the ‘chariot pole’ word. Either of these analyses eases the interpr. of the pāda. But given the chariot-part vocab. in the rest of the pāda (*āṇí*- ‘axle-pin, peg’, *nābhi*- ‘wheel-nave’), it seems highly unlikely that a standard word for a part of the chariot would in just this context *not* be so used -- and cf. *sudhúr*- ‘amenable to the chariot pole’ a few vss. back (5c). I think *dhúram* has to be an unmarked simile, an acc. goal parallel to *nidhím*. The Aśvins are asked to go to the *nidhí*- as draft animals come tamely to the *dhúr*-, then to enter it as the pin enters the nave.

I supply ‘honey’ with *nidhím* on the basis of the phrase *nidhí*- *mádhūnām* used twice in Aśvin hymns with sim. vocab.: I.183.4 *ayām vām bhagó nīhita iyām gír, dásrāv imé vām nidháyo mádhūnām* ‘Here is the portion deposited for you, here the hymn, o wondrous ones, and here the deposits of honey for you’ / III.58.5 *éhá yātam pathībhir devayānair, dásrāv imé vām nidháyo mádhūnām* ‘Travel here along the paths leading to the gods. Wondrous ones, these stores of honey belong to you two.’ Since ‘honey’ is thematic in the previous parts of this hymn (1b, 2c, 3a, d, 4c, 6c), supplying it here (esp. in Aśvin context) is easy.

V.43.9: The function of *utá* in the pāda-final phrase *utá tmán* is unclear. Klein (I.347, 349) treats it as an example of an X Y *utá* construction (suggesting several diff. possibilities), but does not consider the positional tendency of *tmán(ā)* or the dossier of rhetorically similar phrases. Both *tmán* and *tmánā* have a distinct preference for pāda-final position, with a word consisting of two light syllables preceding as here -- frequently *iva*, also *úpa*, etc. As a parallel to our passage, cf. esp. IX.88.3 ... *draviṇodā iva tmán*. I’m inclined to think that *utá* is in fact empty here (though perhaps orig. adapted from places where it made sense) and Klein’s piecemeal attempts to make sense of the various passages misplaced. Here the *utá* was perhaps slotted in because *iva* was inappropriate. One can also keep in mind that *-a tmán*- recalls (and replicates metrically) *ātmán*-. Re’s characterization of *utá tmán* as “type de clause inert” seems close to my “empty.”

V.43.10: The instr. pl.s *nāmabhiḥ* and *rūpébhiḥ* identically positioned in pādas a and b seem both to refer to individuated Maruts and also to make reference to the concept later

to be called *nāmarūpa* ‘name and form’ referring to the pairing of words and things differentiating the separate entities of creation. This unusual distinguishing of individual Maruts is then countered by the insistent repetition of *viśve* ‘all’ referring to them as an undifferentiated class in pāda d. In that pāda I take the first *viśve* as voc. pl. with *marutaḥ* (accented because pāda-initial) and the 2nd as a nom. with the verb, but this grammatical separation may not be nec. if the two *viśve*-s are there to match ‘names’ and ‘forms’ respectively. *Viśve Marutaḥ* also semi-equates them with the *Viśve Devāḥ*.

V.43.12: *sādāt-yoni-* belongs to the cmpd type with a verbal-governing 1st member (*sanād-rayi-*, etc.), and given the referent, who was just the object of the caus. phrase *sādane sādadhvam* “make him sit on his seat.” it must mean “sitting on the yoni.” The problem of course is the long vowel in *sādāt-*. This has been taken as a reflex of an old lengthened-grade present or similarly lengthened-g aorist (for reff. see AiG I.2 Nachtr. 88, EWA s.v. *SAD* p. 693). For a contextually driven hapax like this, reaching into deep antiquity seems unnec. and likely wrong. Old suggests we should perhaps read **sadāt*, with the long vowel introduced (redactionally) from the immed. preceeding *sādayadhvam*. I would suggest alternatively that it might indirectly reflect the pres. *śṭṭati*, matching the heavy root syllable of that present, even though marked present stems (outside of *-āya*-formations) seem blocked in this cmpd type.

V.43.13: In d *tridhātu-śṛṅga-* ‘having tripartite horns’ may refer to the three hearths, though see the tripartite cows (*tridhātavaḥ ... gāvah*), probably of Agni, in nearby V.47.4.

V.43.14: On *rāspirā-* see comm. ad I.122.4.

V.43.15: Both Re and WG take pāda a as a separate nominal clause. This is certainly possible, and an alternative tr. of the hemistich could be “to you, the lofty one, there (belongs) lofty vigor, Agni. The ... (priestly) pairs attend upon (you).”

V.44 All Gods

On the manifold difficulties of this hymn and a possible framework in which to interpret them (as a hymn simultaneously applicable to Agni and Soma), see publ. intro.

V.44.1: Save for the fronted pronoun *tām*, this hymn opens with a remarkable series of universalizing adverbs, identically formed with *-(ā-)thā* suffix and linking the current ritual situation (the final one in the series, *imāthā* ‘in this way here’, a hapax) to that of every time and place: *pratnāthā pūrvāthā viśvāthā*. This may give us a foretaste of the poet’s laying bare the underlying identity of the two central ritual substances, fire and soma, and of the service accorded them in the sacrifice.

The poet then, in my opinion, produces a red herring: most of the descriptors found in this vs. could apply to Indra -- esp. *āśúm jāyantam*; cf. *āśúm jētāram* of Indra in VIII.99.7. And most interpreters fall into this trap: as Ge says in his n. 1, “all commentators” identify *tām* as Indra -- incl. Ge himself, Re, and Old (WG forego referents). However, both Agni and Soma receive these or similar descriptors elsewhere. Agni and Soma are both located on the ritual grass (Agni: III.14.2, etc.; Soma: I.16.6, etc.); both are called *svarvíd-* (more often than Indra; Agni: III.3.5, 10, etc.; Soma:

VIII.48.15, etc.), *jyēṣṭha*- (Agni: I.127.2, etc.; Soma: IX.66.16, etc.), and *āśú*- (Agni: IV.7.4, etc.; Soma: IX.56.1, etc.). Soma is qualified as *jáyant*- (I.91.21, etc.), and though Agni is not modified by this participle, he is the subject of verbal forms of \sqrt{j} (e.g., VI.4.4). All of these are, of course, fairly generic characterizations; the point here is that nothing requires us to leap to the conclusion that Indra is the referent.

Another way to approach the question of the referent of *tám* is to consider what referent is appropriate as an obj. to *dohase* ‘you will milk’ -- which first may require us to identify the subj. of this 2nd sg. verb (by most lights: Re takes it as a sigmatic 1st sg., which seems unnec. and doesn’t fit the semantic profile of *-se* 1st singulars). With Sāy. and Ge., I take it as the self-address of the poet, who will perform his milking task ‘with song’ (*girā*). The middle of \sqrt{duh} generally takes milk (either real or metaphorical) as its object, and both Agni and Soma can be conceived of as milk products -- the churning of the fire sticks and the pressing of the soma plant both involve physical actions not unlike milking and what is produced is a fluid or something (fire) that behaves rather like one. Indra is not entirely excluded, however; he could be configured as a cow, “milked” with a praise hymn for him to produce goods. However, as I just said, the milk itself, rather than the cow, is the typical obj. of medial \sqrt{duh} , and so the substances fire and/or soma are more likely referents.

Let us now turn to pāda d. This also contains a 2nd sg. med. present, *várdhase*, in a relative clause whose rel. prn., fem. loc. pl. *yāsu*, has no possible referent in the rest of the vs. Before turning to that problem, I will first say that I do not consider the 2nd sg. subj. of *várdhase* to be the same as that of *dohase*. Instead I think we have switched to the unidentified god/ritual substance referred to by the acc. sg. in the rest of the vs. Although this introduces an interpretational complication, I would point out that in the next vs. (2cd), the god/substance definitely appears in the 2nd person, and note also 8b, which contain a similarly structured rel. cl. ... *yāsu nāma te*#, where the 2nd ps. refers to the god/substance. And, most important, the rel. cl. of 1d shows a closer affinity to Agni and Soma than the generic epithets in the rest of the vs. But first we must identify a possible referent or referents for the fem. *yāsu*. The standard ploy, which I think is basically correct, is to supply a fem. pl. obj. to *jáyantam* ‘winning’ -- generally ‘cows’ (Ge, Re, WG). Old suggests rather ‘waters’, which Ge argues against (n. 1d). Certainly both ‘cows’ and ‘waters’ (both fem. pl.) occur as objects to \sqrt{j} -- and I see no reason to choose between the two; in fact the reason for not specifying either one is to allow both to be understood, under the neutralizing rel. prn. *yāsu*. Both Agni and Soma have connections to both cows and waters: Agni is nourished by the streams of ghee (a milk product) poured into the fire, and in a well-known myth he ran away and entered the waters. Soma is mixed with cows’ milk, as is endlessly emphasized in the IXth Maṇḍala, and before soma is pressed, it is soaked in water to swell the stalks. A third possible fem. pl. referent connected with Agni is plants, in which he is invisible and inherent until kindled. Let us consider some passages whose phraseology resembles our own. In II.13.1 ... *apāḥ* ... *āviśad yāsu vārdhate* Soma, unnamed, “entered the waters among which he grows strong.” (Note the nearly identical rel. cl.) For Agni cf. I.95.5 ... *vārdhate* ... *āsu* “he grows strong among/in them” (here prob. = plants); I.141.5 *ād ín māṭṛ āviśad yāsu* ... *vī vāvṛdhe* “Just after that he entered into his mothers, within whom he grew widely” (again prob. plants; note that *vāvṛdhe*, as transmitted without accent, is not part of the rel. cl. If the transmitted form is correct). The connection of a fem. loc. pl. and a form of

√ *vṛdh* in these passages is striking, and it is Agni and Soma who participate in this phraseology.

Thus, in my opinion, by the end of the vs. the poet has narrowed down the possible referents and set up the rhetorical situation that will dominate the rest of the hymn: an unidentified masc. sg. referent, who can be simultaneously Agni and Soma, and a set of fem. pl. attendants, likewise unidentified, who are connected to the masculine figure.

V.44.2: The first hemistich of this vs. contains those same personnel, again without overt identification, and with the further complication that there is no finite verb until pāda c. Pāda a contains fem. plurals, at least partly in a relative clause (here nom. pl. *yāḥ*, versus loc. *yāsu* in 1d); pāda b has an unidentified masc. sg. as subject. This is the same configuration as 1d. Again I think the duo Agni / Soma is lurking under the masc. sg., and the fem. pl. refers to phenomena associated with each. In addition I take the gen. *kakúbhām* (a fem. cons. stem) in b as the referent of the fem. rel. prn. *yāḥ* in a, rather than attempting to construe it one way or another with *acodāte*, as most interpr. do.

Most take Agni as the referent of the masc. sg.; I think this is correct, but doesn't go far enough. Certainly Agni is an appropriate referent for *virócamānaḥ* 'shining forth', as he is elsewhere (e.g., I.95.2), and the lovely fem. pl. entities of pāda a can easily be his flames (or, in my scenario, the tips [*kakúbh-*] of his flames). Their collectivity can be identified as "the sun of the lower realm" (*úparasya ... svāḥ*). (I see no reason, with Ge [and, at least in tr., with Re] to take *svā* here as gen., referring to Agni.) But the same phraseology can also be applied to Soma. Although nowhere near as commonly as Agni, Soma can also serve as subj. of √ *ruc* (e.g., IX.11.1 *dhārā sutāsya rocate*), and the streams of soma are often compared to the rays of the sun (usually with masc. *raśmī-*, but cf. fem. *tvīṣīḥ ... sūryasya* "the glitterings of the sun" IX.71.9). Moreover, pāda c, whose subj. is most likely the same as that in b, is almost identical to IX.73.8a *ṛtāsya gopā ná dābhāya sukrātuḥ* of Soma, which strongly invites a Soma identification here.

Another problem is *acodāte* in b. This form looks like a dat. sg. to a negated participle, but the accent is wrong (expect **ácodate*), a discrepancy that leads Lowe (Participles in RV, 274 n. 81) to reject this interpr., in favor of a *t*-stem *acodāt-*. I'm not at all sure that in this hymn one can make arguments of the type "can't be X because of some grammatical feature that usually holds," and in any case Lowe does not seem to suggest a different case/no. interpr. or different semantics. For further disc. of the accent see AiG II.1.216 and Old ad loc. Because I construe *kakúbhām* elsewhere, I supply *rādhah* 'largesse' as the obj. of this apparent part., since *rādhas-* is frequently the obj. of √ *cud*. The idea would be that the ritual fire and ritual soma shine for the generous and stingy alike. However, the supplied obj. may not be nec., and the sense would be something like "for the unrousing / unstirring one."

In d I borrow *hitāḥ* from 3d (see also *dhāyī* in 8c), producing "was (set/placed) in truth," but the pāda can certainly be interpr. simply with the pf. *āsa* "was in truth." I take "your name" (*nāma te*) to refer to both Agni and Soma.

V.44.3: Some of the challenges of this vs can be approached by noting the series of phonetic plays it contains: *sacate śac ca dhātu ca / dhātu ca, áriṣtagātuḥ / śá hótā sahobháriḥ / sahobháriḥ ... barhír*.

Let us begin with the first. The curious double *ca* phrase *sác ca dhātu ca* is difficult to render on its own. On the surface it appears to form part of a conjoined NP with the subj. *havíḥ* ‘oblation’, but its ill-assorted nature comes out in tr. like Ge’s “die Opferspende und das Seiende und das Element (?)”. Moreover, though *dhātu-* does not otherwise occur uncompounded in the RV, after the RV it is masc., while this form must be neut, which would be anomalous if it is a noun here. Ge suggests (n. 3a) emending to the bahuvrīhi *saptádhātu* ‘having 7 parts’ (RV 3x), though this is not reflected in his tr. As a bv the neut. gender would be proper, as a modifier of *havís-*. Re suggests rather that *sác ca dhātu* “resolves” an old cmpd. **sad-dhātu*, tr. “et (sa) foundation est réelle.” I am in accord with his rendering but analyze the underlying form differently: I take *sác ca* as a play on MIA *sacca-*, the Middle Indic product of *satyá-*. (That Middle Indic phonological developments are already to be found even in the RV family books needs no further demonstration.) The whole sequence gestures towards a bahuvrīhi **sacca-dhātu-*, whose neut. gender would be appropriate. Note that very similar *satyá-dharman-* (RV 5x) is found at V.51.2 [in this VD seq] and V.63.1, the only attestations in the family books. The putative first member *sacca* here is then provided with an alternative Sanskrit analysis, *sác* [i.e., *sát*] *ca* -- I’m not suggesting an emendation here, but a word play. The second *ca* connects the underlying bahuvrīhi to the noun it modifies, *havíḥ*, hence an underlying sequence *havíḥ ... *saccá-dhātu ca*. I further suggest that this word play is actualized in a different word in the first word of the pāda, *átyam*, which rhymes with *satyá-* (save for accent).

As just noted, pāda b participates in a number of phonetic plays: *-gātuḥ* echoes *dhātu* in pāda; *sá hó(tā)* anticipates immediately following *saho(bháriḥ)*, and *-bháriḥ* is a scrambling of *barhír* in the next pāda. This last is particularly worth noting because *-bhári-* is a Vedic hapax (Whitney, Rts., lists it as RV.C., and its only RV occurrence is here) of somewhat unusual formation (see AiG II.2.295). It is clearly a contextually inspired nonce here and should be given no weight in considering *i*-stem morphology.

The last lexical problem in the vs. is *visrúhā* in d, otherwise found only in VI.7.6. Gr glosses ‘Strom’ and connects it with \sqrt{sru} ‘flow’, which is phonologically impossible (where would the *-h* come from?). Ge tr. ‘Arm’, which is just a contextually inspired rendering, as far as I can see. Re tr. ‘flamme’ (fld. by Kellens, Noms rac. 82–83), though ad VI.7.6 (EVP XIII.127–28) he floats (only to reject) the possibility that it is a variant of *vīrúdh-* (‘sprout, shoot, growth’) on the basis of the similarity between VI.7.6 and II.35.8, which contains a form of *vīrúdh-*. This suggestion fits with Sāy.’s gloss *oṣadhi-* ‘plant’ (for this passage; in VI.7.6 Sāy. glosses the pl. *visruhaḥ* as *nadyaś ca gaṅgādyāḥ* ‘rivers, Gaṅgā, etc.’). The word has received the most attention from Scar, first in his Root noun book (464–65) and then in the n. to V.44.3 in WG (in which Scar is responsible for Maṇḍala V). In the former Scar pronounces *visrúh-* “ganz unklar,” echoed by the somewhat less pessimistic “unklar” in WG, where he tr. “Reisig und Zweigen” and suggests it’s derived from **vi-sr-u-* ‘sich weit erstreckend’, contaminated with *-rúdh-*, *-rúh-*, with the result reminiscent of *vīrúdh-*. I also believe that the word is in the semantic realm of plant growth and that it should be connected with $\sqrt{ru(d)h}$ ‘grow’; this is esp. clear in VI.7.6, which contains a verbal form of that root: *vayā iva ruruhuḥ saptá visrúhaḥ*. However, I do not think that \sqrt{sru} or \sqrt{sr} needs to be brought in, at least directly. Instead I attribute the extraneous *-s-* to a sort of analogical backformation involving the preverbs *ví*, *ní*, and *nís*, starting from the form *vīrúdh-* cited above.

Although the lengthening of the preverb *vī* in that form results from the initial laryngeal of the etymon of \sqrt{rudh} (see EWA s.v. *RODH*), it appears synchronically to result from the sandhi form of a byform **vis* before *r-*, just as there is a *nīs* beside *nī* (with different meanings in that case of course). In particular note the form *nīrohā-* in a TS mantra repeated 3x (III.5.2.5, IV.4.1.3, V.3.6.3 *sañrohò 'sī nīrohò 'sī*), which could be derived either from *nī*+ \sqrt{ruh} (cf. Keith's tr. 'descender') with the same lengthening as in *vīrúdh-* or from *nīs*+*ruh* (so Viśva Bandhu). I therefore explain our *visrúh-* as a learned (and/or playful) but false "restoration" of the putative **vis-* underlying *vīrú(d)h-*. It is here that \sqrt{sru} may have played a part, by facilitating a false segmentation of *vis-rúh-* into *vī-srúh-* (on the basis of the phonological similarity of the roots) and thus blocking the application of morpheme-boundary sandhi between *-s and *r-*. I tr. 'outgrowth'. On a separate but related note, I do not think we need to emend the form to gen. pl. **visrúhām*, an idea that goes back to Sāy., tempted Old inter alia, and is accepted by Scar in WG.

Having dealt with the details of this vs. piecemeal, we should now consider whether it too can be applied to both Agni and Soma, and the answer is yes. *ātya-* is regularly used of both in passages too numerous to cite. Though Hotar is an esp. characteristic role of Agni's, Soma is also compared to a Hotar sometimes (IX.92.2, 6, etc.). Both are called both *vīṣan-* and *śíśu-*. We have already noted their positioning on the barhis ad 1b. Both are called *yúvan-*. The 'outgrowth' can be the flames of Agni and the traces of the spreading of the soma juice on the filter, often depicted on IX. However, it does seem that Soma is never qualified as *ájara-* 'unaging' -- a minor lack. The vs. situates both substances on the ritual ground at the moment of the offering.

V.44.4: My interpr. of both the syntax and the referents of this vs. generally differs from those of others. I will not undertake a detailed disc. of these differences. However, I will note that Ge (n. 4) suggests that both Agni and Soma may be the topic of the vs., in agreement with my general thesis.

In my opinion, a new element enters the ritual scene here, namely ritual speech, referred to by the unidentified *eté* of pāda a. Given the masc. pl. pronoun, the exact referent must be masc. -- perhaps *stómāḥ* 'praises' (cf. nearby V.42.15 *eṣá stómāḥ ...*, 16 *práśá stómāḥ* in the same All God cycle, reminiscent of our *prá va eté ...*). These praises are conceived of as horses, which are easy to yoke (a: *suyújah*) and directed by easily controlled reins (c: *suyántubhiḥ ... abhīśubhiḥ*). As Ge points out (n. 4c with reff.), the reins of priests are their speeches, an association that makes the identification of 'praises' as the subject of pāda a all the more likely. The 2nd ps. enclitic *vaḥ* refers in my view to the priests who are launching/driving the praise-horses. The *prá ... yāman* "forth on the course/journey" invites a verb of motion to be supplied, perhaps a form of \sqrt{sr} , suggested by *prasársrāṇaḥ* beginning the 2nd hemistich of the previous vs. (3c).

The other question confronting us in pāda a is the identity of the dative inf. *iṣṭāye*, which is of course multiply ambiguous: it could belong to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ 'seek, desire', $\sqrt{iṣ}$ 'send', or \sqrt{yaj} 'sacrifice' (on this issue, see Old, ZDMG 62: 473-78 = KISch 282-87). With Old, I take it to the first, but I also think it takes an acc. goal/obj., and that that acc. is the fem. acc. phrase in b, *nīcīḥ ... yamyà ṛtāvṛdhaḥ*. Old also takes this phrase as acc., though he supplies a different verb to govern it; the other interpr. take the phrase as nom. and the subject of an independent nominal clause. With Ge (n. 4b) I take the downward-facing twinned sisters to be both the streams of ghee offered into the ritual fire and the

streams of water with which soma is rinsed (the milk streams with which soma is mixed could also be in play). The praises' seeking of these streams expresses the union of verbal and physical activity in the sacrifice, with the hymns accompanying the pouring of the liquid into/onto the ritual substance. The dat. prn. *amúṣmai* I take as the goal of this pouring: the fire and the soma respectively. The use of the comparatively rare distal deictic *asaú* is noteworthy, since this stem generally refers to the upward or heavenly world or items located there, esp. the sun (for the sun, cf., e.g., I.105.3, 191.9, VIII.12.30). Yet here the streams are going 'downward' towards it. This paradox can be resolved by recalling the phrase in 2a *úparasya ... svàḥ* "the sun of the lower realm," which made reference to well-known conceptions of Agni and of Soma. Agni is frequently considered the earthly counterpart of the heavenly sun, since both blaze brightly and they also make their appearance at the same time (dawn) of the ritual day. Soma, likewise, is often compared to or identified with the sun because of its bright gleam, and there are both a heavenly Soma and his earthly counterpart depicted in the IXth Maṇḍala. Here, in my opinion, *amúṣmai* makes implicit reference to the heavenly Sun [=Fire] and heavenly Soma, while depicting the ritual activity centered on their earthly embodiments, thus erasing the distance between heaven and earth and the distinction between the entities found therein.

Pāda d, which I take as a separate clause, brings its own set of problems, not least with the always enigmatic word *krívi-* (on which see also comm. ad I.30.1). First, however, note the phonological echo of b *amúṣmai* / d *muṣāyati*, though this does not help with the interpr. As for *krívi-*, I take it here as a conflation of two putative stems. On the one hand, at least once (I.30.1) *krívi-* seems to refer to a race horse (there compared with Indra). Since the intertwined Agni/Soma figure in this hymn was just referred to as a steed (*átya-*) in 3a, *krívi-* here seems to be picking up that joint referent. Ge [n. 4d] makes the same identification of *átya-* with *krívi-*, and he also suggests that the pāda expresses the entry of the butter offerings into the fire and/or the streams of water in the soma. I think he is correct as far as he goes, but I think there is a third referent, the poet who is responsible for the praises I suggest are the subject of pāda a. In this case *krívi-* can be seen as a hyper-Sanskritization of *kaví-* (as if from **kṛvi-*) with the *ri* that interchanges with *r* in words like *kṛmi-/krími-* 'worm' (cf. AiG I.33 and Nachtr. 19 [31, 4]), aided of course by the *krívi-* already referring to Agni/Soma. See also disc. ad 9c below.

What does it mean that this *krívi-* "steals (their) names"? Here Old's suggestion is surely correct for the Agni/Soma *krívi-* (for Old, only Soma): that the streams (of ghee/water) lose their identities when they merge into Agni/Soma, and the result is simply called fire/soma. As for the poet, whom I consider the third referent of *krívi-*, he may "steal their names" by using them in his poetry, or perhaps by referring to them but not naming them, as he does in this vs. (and throughout the hymn).

V.44.5: As usual in this hymn, this vs. swarms with difficulties (Re calls it "une suite de *cruces*"), but it continues to depict a relation between a singular masc. entity and a group of feminines. I see this as the thread that leads us through the labyrinth of this hymn. Note also that, as in vs. 3, there are phonetic figures: ab: *saṃjārbhurāṇas tárubhiḥ ... susvárūḥ / su tegṛbham ... cittāgarbhāsu* (with mirror-image *su*).

The instr. *tárubhiḥ* in pāda a is a hapax, obviously built to a stem *táru-*. Both Ge and Re both take it as 'tree', which is tempting given the following *vayākín-* 'twiggy'.

But II.39.3 *jārbhurāṇā tārobhiḥ*, with the instr. pl. to the better-attested *s*-stem built to $\sqrt{tṛ}$ ‘endure, etc.’, suggests that *tāru-* is more likely connected to that root (see on this point EWA I.630). However, I confess that my tr. “quivering with your powers of endurance” conveys little sense. I think the instr. here may do little more than reinforce the intensive (that is, frequentative) value of the participle: the subject keeps quivering with continued force (“staying power”).

As usual, I think the subj. of the participle *saṃjārbhurāṇaḥ* is simultaneously Agni and Soma. Agni is elsewhere subject of this intensive (e.g., II.10.5), clearly with reference to his flickering flames. The semantic connection with Soma is not as strong, and Soma is nowhere the subject of this verb, but the scintillating, undulating waves of soma are a common trope in Maṇḍala IX.

Both these substances are aiming towards the *vayākín-*. The most sensible interpr. of that word is as an *-ín*-possessive built to an unattested diminutive **vayāká-* ‘little branch, twig’ to *vayā-* ‘branch’, hence ‘twiggy’ (see Scar’s n. in WG, referring to his treatment in Rt Noun Cmpds). For Agni this twiggy substance can be brushwood or kindling; the association with Soma is again less straightforward, but it can either refer to the twigs of the soma plant itself or, more likely in my opinion, refer metaphorically to the tufts of wool on the sheep’s fleece filter that catch the impurities in the pressed soma juice. This suggestion is supported by the compd modifying it, *sute-gṛbh-* ‘grasping at the pressing’. If the *vayākín-* is the fleece filter, it most definitely ‘grasps’ the solids that accidentally end up in the pressed juice. For Agni, ‘grasping at the pressing’ is less clear, but the firewood may seem to hold onto the fire burning in it, and the ritual fire burns during the soma pressing.

The rest of the first hemistich consists of *cittāgarbhāsu susváruḥ*. The standard interpr. all analyze the latter word as containing *svāru-* ‘(sacrificial) post’ (though note that Gr does not provide a gloss for it). Although this analysis works formally, it does not fit easily into the vs. semantically. I am inclined instead to take it as containing a form of \sqrt{svar} ‘sound’; cf. *svará-* (2x, unfortunately with different accent), *svarí-*, etc. Ge (n. 5b) in fact suggests an alternate tr. ‘schön tönend’ (vaguely following Sāy.). *-svāru-* would show the same conversion to a *u*-stem as the hapax *tāru-* in pāda a and perhaps follows that word in accent as well. The noise-making capacities of both Agni and Soma are well known.

On *cittāgarbha-* ‘visibly pregnant’ see Ge’s n. 5b and the TB passage cited there. These females would be, in the Agni realm, the pieces of firewood, which are frequently depicted as having an embryonic Agni inside; for Soma most likely the waters in which the soma plant is soaked, swelling him as their embryo, or perhaps the cows whose milk is mixed with him.

I follow Old (ZDMG 62 [=KlSch 284 n.1]) in taking *dhāravākéṣu* as referring to a particular ritual moment, the litanies or recitations when the streams of the oblation are offered, but the equational metaphorical interpr. “recitations (like) streams” found in most tr. is also possible.

The voc. *ṛju-gātha* ‘whose song is straight’ is somewhat puzzling. I think it is best illuminated by II.26.1 *ṛjúr íc chāṃsaḥ*, a phrase I take as a decomposed bahuvrīhi (see comm. ad loc.) meaning ‘whose laud is straight on target’. I would now slightly alter the tr. here to ‘whose song is straight on target’ to make the voc. a little less opaque.

The last pāda is surprisingly straightforward, at least for this hymn. The subject of *vārdhasva* is once again Agni/Soma, who derive their strength from their wives (*pātnī*), the plants/firewood and waters/cows' milk respectively.

V.44.6: As I pointed out in the publ. intro., the first pāda is both a cruel joke -- insisting on the utter transparency of the subject of the hymn -- and a claim on the poet's part that his verbal formulations about the subject are in complete conformity with the underlying reality, however obscure they may at first seem.

My interpr. of the rest of this vs. differs significantly in both syntax and semantics from the standard ones, which I will not treat in detail. I take pāda b as having an unexpressed masc. sg. obj., with *cd* further characterizing that obj. The object is simultaneously Agni and Soma, and it is in this pāda that the identification of the two is most clearly expressed in the hymn (until the last 2 vss.). The unidentified subj. 'they' -- most likely the poets and/or priests -- put together / unite the one (of Agni and Soma) with the other, his counterpart or 'shadow' (*chāyā*). As the two central deified ritual elements, they are mirror images of each other. The union takes place in the waters (*apsū*) for several reasons. Both Soma and Agni have significant presence in the waters -- Soma of course through the ritual use of waters both to swell the dessicated soma plant and to rinse it, Agni in two mythological guises, both as *Apām Napāt* and as the runaway ritual fire that hid in the waters. Moreover, it is also the case that water reflects and was indeed probably the only reflective material readily at hand in this period, so the uniting of one substance and its conceptual equivalent as visual reflections of each other would most naturally take place in water.

The clearest part of pāda c is the cmpd. *uru-śām* 'winning wideness', which I take as a modifier of the unexpressed masc. sg. obj. of b (that is, Agni/Soma). (Since the 2nd member is the rt. noun *śā-*, the cmpd can be masc.) I take the other accusatives in *cd*, *mahīm*, *urú jráyaḥ*, and *sáhaḥ* with its modifiers, as objects of an underlying form of $\sqrt{\text{san}}/\text{sā}$, extracted from *uru-śā-*. For a similar play between a root noun cmpd with 1st member obj. and an independent acc. obj., see VIII.1.2 and comm. thereon. Although this syntactic interpr. may seem over-tricky (to others, not to me), it saves us from positing an extraneous creation myth as Ge and Re do. In my interpr. the various objects won are well within the powers of Agni and Soma to deliver to us. Note that Agni is once called *urujráyas-* (V.8.6, in this maṇḍala) and both Agni (III.5.8, V.24.3 [this maṇḍ.], X.176.4, etc.) and Soma (I.91.15) can be subj. of the verb *uruṣyá-* 'make wideness'.

V.44.7: Again my interpr. differs markedly from those of others. Again I think the unexpressed subj. of the whole vs. is Agni/Soma, not the sun (*sūryaḥ*) with most others. The nom. *sūryaḥ* is instead used to characterize both, since both Agni and Soma can be identified with the sun; that is, each is (equivalent to) the sun in his own way. Cf. "the sun of the lower realm" in 2a with reference to phenomena related to both Agni and Soma.

In pāda a I take the two adj. *ágruḥ* 'unmarried' and *jānivān* 'possessing wife/wives' as expressing two stages in the development of Agni/Soma, rather than as paradoxically simultaneous with Ge and Re (WG interpr. resembles mine). The position of *vaí* supports an interpr. with two clauses. In the first stage Agni/Soma pursues females/wives; cf. VII.96.4 *janīyānto nv ágravaḥ* "bachelors in search of wives." Again

we have unidentified (and here unexpressed) plural females -- in Agni's case I surmise they are the plants that supply firewood and/or the streams of ghee poured in the fire; in Soma's the cows, with whose milk he is mixed, or even the waters that swell him. Once Agni and Soma have "married" these females and are *jānivān* 'possessed of wives', each can use the extra power acquired from these females to best his rivals. In this second clause I supply a second verb, perhaps a form of $\sqrt{t\bar{r}}$, because $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$ does not otherwise occur with *āti*, whereas *tuturyāma+āti* is found in the next hymn (V.45.11).

In cd I take the verb *vanavat* in two senses, negative and positive, both well represented for this stem. With the obj. *ghraṃsām* 'heat', the verb has the sense 'win' = 'vanquish', as in nearby V.29.9 *āvanor ha śuṣṇam* "you combated / vanquished Śuṣṇa"; with the obj. *śārma* 'shelter', 'win' = 'gain'. I take *rākṣantam* as a qualifier of *śārma* (more or less; see below), with the participle itself taking the obj. *gāyam* ("shelter ... protecting our patrimony"). In taking *gāyam* as obj. of *rākṣantam* I am flg. Old, who cites as parallel I.74.2 *āraṁsad dāsūṣe gāyam*, which seems pretty conclusive to me. There are also two passages (VI.71.3/X.66.3) in which *gāyam* is the object of the semantically parallel verb *pāri* $\sqrt{pā}$ 'protect all round' (e.g., X.66.3 ... *pāri pāhi no gāyam*); note *pāri* immed. flg. *rākṣantam* here. By contrast, Ge, Re, WG all take *gāyam* as an immed. object of *vanavat*, modified by *rākṣantam*, which itself governs *ghraṃsām* (cf., e.g., Re "Qu'il nous assure une demeure protégeant de toutes parts de (son) ardeur ..."). This interpr. not only ignores the $\sqrt{rakṣ} + gāyam$ parallel, but also requires a significant attenuation of the meaning of \sqrt{van} (see Re's n. on the pāda), and I also don't know of parallel uses of $\sqrt{rakṣ}$ meaning 'guard against / from'. Against this we must balance one clear defect in my interpr., that *śārman-* is neut. and the part. *rākṣantam* is masc. To account for the gender discrepancy I would suggest that the immediate referent of *rākṣantam* is not *śārma*, but a different, underlying, *masc.* noun to which *śārma* is an appositive -- perhaps *kṣāyam* 'peaceful dwelling', as in I.133.7 *vanóti ... kṣāyam*. Or it might be enough to invoke the distance between *rākṣantam* and *śārma* in the hemistich, which might account for the gender mismatch. (I prefer the former, grammatically blameless, possibility. In this case the tr. might be slightly changed to "will win (peaceful dwelling) as shelter for us, protecting (our) patrimony on all sides.")

V.44.8: Old's stark statement about this vs., "Ich wage keine Erklärung," is somewhat lowering to the spirit. Nonetheless, I think some sense can be wrung from it. As I said in the publ. intro., I think a new figure enters the scene at this, the midpoint of the hymn -- namely the poet, learning and perfecting his craft -- and in my opinion he is the subject of the vs., though Agni and Soma are still very much present.

By my interpr. the unnamed would-be poet "pursues/proceeds towards/practices" (*carati*) "the older (/superior) sonority of the seers" (*jyāyāmsam ... ṛṣisvarām*), that is, he imitates and aspires to the sound of the legendary poet-seers who preceded him. He does so by means of *asyā yatúnasya ketúnā* "by the beacon of this *yatúna*." Unfortunately *yatúna-* is a hapax, and there is no agreement on its meaning or etym. (see, e.g., EWA s.v.). However, we can approach the sense of this phrase from several angles. The most promising of these, in my opinion, is the recognition that the phrase *yajñāsya ketú-* "beacon of the sacrifice" is a very common expression in the RV (I.96.16, I.113.19, etc. etc., incl. in this maṇḍala V.11.1). Moreover, both Agni and Soma are identified as *yajñāsya ketú-*; Agni: the three passages just cited, plus I.1127.6, III.11.3, etc.; Soma:

IX.86.7. I take *yatúna-* as a nonce substitute for *yajñá-*, with vaguely similar phonology, built to \sqrt{yat} ‘arrange’. (This is the root affiliation suggested by most [cf., e.g., AiG II.2.485].) Unfortunately this root does not seem to be generally used in ritual context, but a generalized abstract ‘arrangement’ can stand in for the more specific ‘sacrifice’. This hapax *yatúna-* echoes immed. following instr. *ketúnā* (though obviously the morphology is different) and also reminds us of the two unexpected *-u-*stems in 5: *táru-* and *-sváru-*. Putting all this together, I would claim that the poet is pursuing the model of the previous poets by means of the beacon of the sacrifice (‘arrangement’), and that this beacon is actually the usual amalgam of Agni and Soma, who, as we just saw, can be so called. In other words, the shimmering leaders of the sacrifice, the two ritual substances fire and soma, provide the (en)light(enment) as the poet follows the progress of the sacrifice as it leads him to his poetic goal.

Unlike most interpr. I take the loc. rel. cl. ending b (*yásu nāma te*) as parallel to the one beginning c (*yādrśmin dhāyi*), also with a loc. expression. Both remind us of 2d ... *ṛtā āsa nāma te*; besides the identical final *nāma te*, note the echo between *yásu* and *āsa*. The fem. loc. *yásu* refers to the now familiar mix of fem. plurals -- waters, cows [=milk], streams of ghee -- with the possible addition of fem. words for mental and verbal products: insights, hymns, etc. In any case the poet finds the *jyāyāmsam ... ṛṣisvarām* he is looking for at the place where the names of Agni and Soma have been set -- that is, at the heart of the sacrifice. I take the referent of *tām* to be *ṛṣisvára-* of b. To find it he needs not only the beacon provided by Agni/Soma but also his own industry (*apasyā-*).

The final pāda reiterates that the poet must rely on himself: he must make the journey to poetic mastery by himself, and if he does, he will get it (that is, the poetry) right. The phrasal verb *āraṃ karat* of course reminds us of *alaṃkāra*, the later technical term for poetic ornament. Cf. already in the RV VII.29.3 *kā te asty āraṃkṛtiḥ sūktaiḥ* “what is the proper way to prepare for you with hymns?” for a connection between hymns and proper preparation. (Contrary to the standard tr., I do not think that *yá u svayám váhate* has anything to do with marriage and bringing the bride home.)

V.44.9: In my interpr., the first half of this vs. depicts the offering of ritual oblations, while the second one connects the poet, whom we first met in the previous vs., with this ritual activity.

The fem. phrase *āsām ... agrimā* “the foremost (fem.) of these (fem.)” must refer yet again to the females we’ve met before: waters, cows, streams of ghee, as was just noted above. In pāda a the first such female goes down into the ocean (*samudrām*); this could be the ocean of soma as often or the undulating flames of the ritual fire (see I.71.7 where the offerings entering the fire are compared to streams entering a *samudrá-*). In pāda b the word *sāvana-* ‘pressing’ limits the reference to soma, but throughout the hymn we have seen phraseology that is more appropriate to one of the gods than to the other (generally, in fact, in favor of Agni). That b is a clear soma pāda does not, in my opinion, invalidate the general interpr. of the hymn as applicable simultaneously to the two gods. It is also worth noting in passing that *sāvana-*, which occurs approx. 100x in the RV, is found only once in the IXth (Soma) Maṇḍala.

Why it is necessary to state that the pressing is not harmed when the female enters it is not clear. Perhaps it is meant as understatement: it is not only not harmed, but is

positively benefitted. Or perhaps there is a whiff of the fear of contamination caused by females.

Pāda c brings us another impenetrable hapax, *kravaṇā-*. The first thing to notice, perhaps, is that it rhymes with *sāvana-* (though it does not match it in accent). As with the hapax *yatúna-* in 8a beside *ketúnā*, one of the contributors to the formation of the hapax may be phonological echo. There is, as usual, no consensus on the etym. or sense of the word; Ge and Re (inter alia) take it as a PN -- a convenient strategy, but in a hymn that contains no other PNs (at least in my opinion) an unlikely solution. WG take it as ‘Opferschlächter’, related to *kravís-*, a suggestion mentioned but not endorsed by Old (see also EWA s.v.). My own tentative suggestion has no better support. I consider it, like *krívi-* in 4d, to be another phonologically scrambled encoding of the word *kaví-*, here perhaps crossed with a form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$, hence my tr. ‘working poet’. (A putative participial -*āṇā-* might have been remodeled under pressure from *sāvana-* in b.) Although I will not attempt a spirited defense of this despairing attempt, it does have certain points in its favor. First, if *krívi-* in 4d and *kravaṇā-* here are both deformations of *kaví-*, which itself appears in 7b, we have a little ring of references to the poet in the midsection of this hymn. More important, reference to a poet in 9c fits well with the subordinate clause in 9d. Just at the time when oblation is made and the soma is prepared (9ab), the poet who is not intimidated (“his heart does not tremble”) finds the poetic expression (*matí-*) that connects him to the purified ritual substances soma and fire. (Though *pūtá-* almost always refers to soma and never to fire directly, other forms derived from the root $\sqrt{pū}$, like *pāvaká-*, are standard qualifiers of Agni.) If I am correct that vs. 8 depicts an apprentice or neophyte poet embarking on his journey to poetic mastery, then 9cd shows him achieving his first success at a climactic moment in the sacrifice, which provides inspiration to his undaunted heart.

V.44.10: Ge and Re deal with the difficulties of this vs. by taking all (or almost all) the genitives as PN, a solution going back to Sāy.: (Ge) Kṣatra, Manasa, Yajata, Sadhri, and Avatsāra, to which Re adds Evāvada. (Note that the Anukr. ascribes this hymn to one Avatsāra Kāśyapa, but this is, in my opinion, based on a later misunderstanding of this vs.) Since all of these forms, on the one hand, either are, or bear a strong resemblance to, real words in the language and, on the other, are not used as names elsewhere, the Ge/Re PN strategy seems like an evasion of responsibility. It is to the credit of WG that this makeshift is not resorted to; all these forms are given full lexical weight. And the WG interpr. of ab is not too distant from mine, in that they take the subject to be a/the poet, who has some connection to the *cítī-* of the figures mentioned in the gen. (WG: “Denn er is es [ein Ṛṣi?] durch die Einsichten dessen ...”), though our treatments of the genitives differ.

My interpr. of the relation between *sá* and *cítibhiḥ* calls upon the ‘bond’ (*bāndhanī*) of 9d, where the poet found the thought that binds him to the ritual substances soma and fire. I think 10ab elaborates on this notion, by ascribing the insights to Soma and Agni themselves.

The second set of genitives, *evāvadāsya yajatāsya sádhreḥ* in pāda b, by my interpr. refer to Agni and Soma simultaneously. Both Agni and Soma are elsewhere described as *yajatá-* ‘worthy of the sacrifice’ (Agni, e.g., I.128.8; Soma, e.g., IX.86.14). Assuming that the hapax *evāvadá-* has the sense ‘speaking thus’ it transparently presents,

it can apply to both Agni and Soma because both substances are often said to speak or sound: for Agni cf., e.g., VI.4.4, 13.6; for Soma cf. esp. IX.113.4, 6. As for *sádhreḥ*, the obvious connection with *sadhryàñc-* ‘directed towards the same goal’ is affirmed by Gr, AiG II.2.154, EWA s.v. *sadhrīm*, etc. It is the morphology that is puzzling, made more complex by the fact that it should be trisyllabic with a short penultimate, hence **sádhriyaḥ?* (so approx. Gr). (HvN simply pronounce the pāda as having 11 syllables, but since this would be a metrical irregularity in a Jagatī hymn and since there is no independent stem **sádhri-* to which *sádhreḥ* would obviously belong, it seems better to perform the metrical distraction.) I have no answer for the morphology or for the accent, but given the morphological flexibility in the rest of this hymn, this is not surprising.) The “same goal” that Agni/Soma are aiming at is the eloquence that the poet is also seeking to harness.

I take this second set of genitives, referring to Agni/Soma, as dependent on, not parallel to, the first pair of genitives, *kṣatrásya manasásya*. My “mental lordship” refers to the mastery those two gods have of the poetry and the insights that produce it. The adj. *manasá-* is a hapax, but it fits a common pattern of deriving suffix-accented thematic adjectives to *s-*stems; cf., e.g., *vacasá-* ‘eloquent’ to *vācas-* ‘speech’ and AiG II.2.136.

The second hemistich takes advantage of the double meaning of *rāṇa-* and its derivatives (*rāṇa-* ‘joy / battle’, *raṇvā-* ‘delightful / battle-lusty’, etc.). I take the referent of the pl. *rāṇvabhiḥ* to be poems (or perhaps the ‘insights’ *cítī-* of pāda a). As warriors fighting alongside us they allow us to win the prize (*spṛṇavāma ... vājam*), but as poems they are also delightful or joy-bringing. That winning the prize requires wisdom, not just brute strength, is expressed by *vidúṣā cid árdhyam* “to be brought to success only by the wise,” a signal that it is insights or their products, poems, that are being deployed.

It remains to identify “the stealthy one” (*avatsārā-*), assuming as I do that it is not a PN. As I just noted, not only do Ge and Re (but not WG) take it as a PN, but the Anukramaṇī ascribes this hymn to Avatsāra Kāśyapa, who is also purported to be the Soma hymns IX.53-60, a group of short Gāyatrī hymns with no obvious connection to V.44. It seems obvious to connect the word with the lexeme *áva √ tsar* and the root *√ tsar* ‘creep’ more generally. The root is poorly attested, and *áva √ tsar* only occurs once (I.71.5 in the notorious heavenly incest story). Agni is once the subject of *√ tsar* (I.145.4), and the occurrence of *áva √ tsar* is found in an Agni hymn (though not with Agni as subject). Soma is never subject of this verb, but its rarity makes this unsurprising. Both Agni and Soma can be conceived of as creeping or stealthy because of their slow and gradual movements -- Agni as the fire slowly catches in the kindling, Soma as the juice spreads across the filter.

V.44.11: If it is possible for this hymn to get *more* obscure, it does so in this vs. (Note that Old simply gives up in vss. 11–13.) Nonetheless, I think a consistent interpr. can be constructed and one that fits well with the increasing pace of the depiction of the ritual in the last few vss. The theme that unifies the vs. is that of ritual binding and unbinding -- conveyed by the words *áditi-*, which I take as the abstract ‘unboundedness’ not the name of the goddess, *kakṣyā-* ‘girding’, and *viṣāṇa-* ‘unharnessing’.

The first half of pāda a (*śyená āsām áditiḥ*) refers to the pre-ritual situation. While Soma is still a falcon, swooping about in freedom before the sacrifice begins, he is/represents freedom also for the classes of females we keep encountering: waters, cows,

hymns. Neither the waters nor the cows (=milk) have taken on their ritual roles, and the words have not yet been pressed into service as ritual speech. (It's important to note that Soma himself is often called a *śyená-* in IX; the bird is not simply the conveyor of the stolen soma.)

In the second half of pāda a (*kakṣyò mādah*) Soma has been transformed into the *māda-*, the exhilarating ritual drink, and that change in turn brings about the girding of the female entities in question. They are hitched up in their various ritual roles, and the sacrifice begins. This ritual commencement is both for the benefit of and involves the active participation of the two gods, Soma and Agni. It is thus that I interpret the genitives in pāda b (*viśvāvārasya yajatāsya māyīnah* (note the recurrence of *yajatāsya* from 10b), also referring, in my opinion, to Agni/Soma. (Once again both Ge and Re take all three genitives as PNs; once again WG do not.)

In pāda c I take the priests as the subject of *arthayanti* 'cause to seek as goal'. They are now directing the ritual proceedings. The first object of *arthayanti* is unexpressed, in my view: it is the female ritual elements, waters, milk, hymns. The priests send them to their ritual tasks, the waters and the cows' milk to soma, the hymns to Soma and Agni. The two gods are here represented by the āmreḍita *anyām-anyam* 'the one, the other; one after the other'. So far in the hymn the two gods have been fused into one, verbally speaking; here the āmreḍita is an intermediate step towards separating them, a step that allows for the introduction of a third god, Indra, in the next vs.

In pāda d the priests realize that with the mobilization of all the elements of the ritual performance -- the soma, the ritual fire, the waters, milk, and hymns -- the climax of the sacrifice has been reached. The unharnessing of these elements can take place because all that remains is for the prepared soma to be drunk. This sets the stage for the premier soma-drinker, Indra, to appear on the scene, which he does in the next vs. The parallel forms *viṣāṇam paripānam* are both best taken as *-ana*-nouns to *-ā-*roots, although Gr identifies the first as a root participle. Cf. AiG II.2.193.

V.44.12: As I just said, I think this vs. represents the epiphany of Indra, come to drink the just-prepared soma. Although, in keeping with the practice of the hymn, he is not named, the presence of a new actor in the hymn is strongly signaled by the verb phrase in pāda a: *vī dvīṣo vadhīt*. Indra is almost always the subject of verb forms to the root *√ vadh*. Although the subject of pāda a is also called *yajatā-*, a word used in the two preceding vss. (10b, 11b) of Agni/Soma (in my opinion), 'worthy of the sacrifice' is a generic descriptor of gods, is used elsewhere of Indra (e.g., II.14.10), and can be so applied here. And 'always giving' (*sadāpṛṇa*, though a hapax, is a good description of Indra -- or at least as we wish him to be.

In b Ge and Re take the three words *bāhuvṛktāḥ śrutavīt taryah* as PNs yet again. I think they are all further qualifications of Indra. The first depicts the physical actions of the priest, who by the ritual activities performed by their arms (*bāhú-*), "twist" Indra to the ritual ground. (For the use of *√ vrj* to refer to bringing a god to one's ritual, see VIII.76.1.) There is also a sly echo of the common bahuvrīhi *vṛktā-barhis-* 'having twisted ritual grass', a ritual action that would indeed be performed by the priests' arms. Indra is also easily qualified as *śruta-vīd-* 'finding [/knowing] what is heard (=praise)'. The third term *taryah*, a hapax, is more difficult. It may simply be a *-ya-* deriv. to *√ tṛ* (see WG "der Überwinder [?]", though this isn't terribly satisfying morphologically. I

tentatively take it as a primary comparative to $\sqrt{t\bar{r}}$, with the short suffixal form *-yas-* rather than *-īyas-* (*tārīyas-* 1x in nearby V.41.12); cf. *nāvvyas-* / *nāvīyas-*. In that case it would be an adverbially used neut. (‘surpassingly’) and the predicate is the *vaḥ śacā* ‘(is in) partnership with you.’ For another predicated pāda-final ENC + *śacā* see VIII.92.29 *ádḥā cid indra me śacā* ‘And so, Indra, (you are) in partnership with me.’

The second hemistich begins with an explicitly marked dual *ubhā ... vārā*, separated by a nom. sg. *śá*. Here we have the triad that has just, in this vs., interrupted the fused identification of Agni and Soma. With Indra represented by *śá*, the two other gods are for the first time in the hymn separated into a grammatical pair (though see the forerunner *anyām-anyam* in 11c), rather than sharing grammatically singular descriptors applicable to each. (For *ubhā ... vārā* referring to animate beings, see X.85.9, where the two are the Aśvins -- though in that case *vāra-* means ‘wooer’.) Indra ‘comes in response’ (*práty eti*) to these two, i.e., to the ritual fire where offerings will be made to him and to his own ritual drink. The second verb *bhāti* ‘is radiant’ is not a typical Indraic verb, but pāda d with its reference to the *gaṇá-* ‘troop, throng’ easily brings the rhetoric back to Indra and his close ties with the Maruts, so often identified as a *gaṇá-*. The lexeme *prá√yā*, found here in *suprayāvan-* ‘driving forth easily’, is also particularly associated with the Maruts; cf. III.29.15 *marútām íva prayāḥ*, and verbal instantiations like I.37.14 *prá yāta*, also I.165.13, V.53.12, 58.6. I’ve supplied ‘chariots’ because *rátha-* several times used in a simile with *pra√yā* (IV.19.5, VII.74.6, IX.69.9).

V.44.13: As indicated in the publ. intro., in this last real vs. of the hymn I think the poet, who has been learning his trade, is extravagantly celebrated as the figure on whom the whole sacrifice depends and the representative of various sacrificial personnel and equipment. By contrast, Ge and Re once again opt for a PN, this time Sutambhara whom they consider to be the patron of the sacrifice. I take *sutambhará-* as the transparent cmpd it appears to be, conforming to the model of other *-bhará-* tatpuruṣas (cf., with acc. 1st member, *puṣṭim-bhará-*, *vājam-bhará-*, etc.) For the underlying syntagm see VIII.66.7 *sutám bhara*, where the subject is a priest or similar figure (also IX.6.6 *sutám bhārāya*). I construe the gen. *yājamānasya* with the 1st member *sutam*, though it could also be a gen. of benefit (‘for the sacrificer’) and loosely construed with the whole cmpd. I do not think it is dependent on *sātpatiḥ*, pace Ge, Re, and WG.

The 2nd pāda identifies the poet with the source (the cow’s udder, *ūdhaḥ*) and distributor (the ladle or scoop, *udāñcanaḥ*) of all poetic visions (*viśvāsām ... dhiyām*), which are here equated with ghee oblations. (For *ud√añc* meaning ‘turn / scoop up’, see V.83.8, AV X.29.8, etc.; in AB and ŚB *udañcana-* is a ‘dipping vessel’.) The conflation of poems with liquid offerings we have already met before in this hymn, though it is only here that the *dhī-* is explicitly referred to.

In c the Pp and the standard interpr. take *dhenū* as the sandhi form of nom. sg. *dhenús* before *r-*. This is of course perfectly possible; however, I take the form as given, as the dual nom./acc. of the same stem. By this interpr. the poet who was the subj. of ab remains the subj. here, with the *-bhará-* of the cmpd in pāda a extracted and converted into a finite injunctive *bhārat*. Who are the two milk-cows he bears? It is of course tempting to identify them as Agni and Soma, the pair that has been hiding in this hymn all along. And in part I think that is the correct answer: the poet, whose verbal formulations are the foundation of the sacrifice, thereby supports the two ritual

substances (/gods) that provide the material realization of the sacrifice. Agni and Soma would be called *dhenū* because of the benefits they provide through sacrifice. But dual *dhenū* is several times used of Heaven and Earth (of the other four occurrences, at last III.6.4, IV.23.10), so that the poet through his sacrificial labors may be supporting the whole cosmos. Moreover, the milk of Heaven and Earth has a special connection with poetry. Cf. the curious passage I.22.14 *táyor íd ghṛtávat páyo, víprā rihanti dhītíbhīḥ* “The inspired poets lick the ghee-filled milk of this very pair [=Heaven and Earth; see vs. 13] with their poetic insights,” though the meaning of this vs. is obscure (see comm. ad loc.).

In any case their milk is brought to perfection (*śísriye*) in the rest of the pāda. Contra Narten (1987: 281) and Kümmel (p. 528), who follows her, in the publ. tr. I take this med. pf. as passive, contrasting with the act. trans. *śísrayuḥ* (2x). However, it is possible that the verb is transitive, as they take it, and the poet remains as subj.: “he brings/has brought their milk to perfection.” This might be preferable, in that it emphasizes the poet’s control over the sacrifice and its cosmic resonances.

The final pāda of the vs., and thus of the hymn, brings us back, abruptly and somewhat reductively, to the poet’s training: “pay attention to your teacher; don’t nod off or go wool-gathering.” The lexemes *ānu* √ *brū* and *ādhi* √ *i* belong to pedagogical vocabulary (for the latter see Apālā VIII.91.3 and comm. ad loc.). The final phrase *nā svapán* “not the one who sleeps” provides a transition to the final two responsive verses with their insistently repeated *jāgāra* ‘is/stays awake’.

V.44.14–15: As was just noted, the final *nā svapán* of 13d provides a segue into this two-verse appendix with its 6 occurrences of *jāgāra* ‘is/stays awake’. The two vss. are strictly responsive -- so strictly responsive that the replacement of *yó* in abc by *agnír* produces an awkward set of 12-syllable lines with Triṣṭubh cadence, an awkwardness surely meant to call attention to their tight twinning. The vs. pair is structured as a riddle + solution, though, given what we have just waded through, not a very challenging puzzle. The focus seems to be on Agni, since he is the solution to the riddle; the balance of the two ritual substances found in the rest of the hymn (if I am correct) thus appears to be disturbed. But I do not think that this means that Agni is the sole subject of the hymn, as Scar suggests in his final comment (in WG). Rather the final word is found in the last pāda of both vss., the direct address of Soma to Agni (*tám ayám sóma āha* “to him does this Soma say”): *tāvāhám asmi sakhyé nyòkaḥ* “I am at home in fellowship with you.” It is the fellowship of Agni and Soma, intimately joined here and identified by name, though neither of them was named previously in the hymn, that we are left with and that allows us to revisit the many obscurities that preceded this statement.

V.45 All Gods

On the structure of the hymn and the grammatical patterning that supports that structure, see publ. intro. Note that this patterning imposes presential renderings of the injunctives in the first three vss.

V.45.1: The Pp. interprets *vidā* as *vidāḥ*, and this interpr. is followed by Sāy., Gr, Ge, Re (EVP XVI.107), and WG inter alia. It has the merit of providing a verb form for the opening pāda, but the 2nd sg. subjunctive it appears to be does not fit well in context. I prefer to take it as instr. sg. of the root noun *vid-* (*vidā* against the Pp.), as tentatively

suggested by Old and, in different ways, adopted by Lüders (*Varuṇa* 325), Thieme (rev. of Lüders, ZDMG 101 (1951) 417 [=KISch 652]), Schmidt (B+I 175–76), and Hoffmann (Inj. 173–74). My interp. follows Hoffmann in particular in taking pāda b as parenthetical, with the singular verb appropriate to pāda a postponed until *āpāvṛta* in pāda c. I far prefer this solution to allowing the sg. part. *viśiyān* in pāda a to be construed with the pl. phrase *arcīno guḥ* in b, with Lü et al. The sg. subj. of a, c is most likely the sun.

In b *arcīn-* is interpr. either as ‘having chant, singing’ (by most) or ‘having rays, bright’. Again with Hoffmann, I prefer the latter. Hoffmann (174 n. 125) suggests supplying *ketū-* ‘beam’, regularly associated with the dawns, and this seems contextually appropriate.

Pāda c contains another *-īn*-stem, this time a hapax, *vrajīn-* ‘possessing enclosures’, in the fem. acc. pl. Gr, Ge, Hoffmann, and WG take the referent to be ‘cows’, but the usual obj. of *āpa* √ *vṛ* is the cow-enclosure (often the base of *vrajīn-*, namely *vrajā-*) or the doors thereto, and ‘door’ is also fem. This noun, *dūrah-*, is found in the next pāda as the obj. of the nearly identical lexeme *vī ... āvāḥ*. In taking ‘doors’ as obj. also of *āpāvṛta* I am in agreement with Lü, Thieme, and Schmidt.

With Hoffmann and against the Pp. I take *āpāvṛta* as an injunc. *āpā + vṛta*. The verb of d, *vī ... āvāḥ*, is undeniably augmented, however; I take it as a summary comment on the description found in the rest of the vs. See Hoffmann’s disc. 174–75.

V.45.2: On *āmāti-* see comm. ad I.73.2.

The problematic pāda is c. The rivers who are its subject are not, in my opinion, either real-world rivers (so, it seems, Ge) or the heavenly streams so beloved of Lü. Rather, to fit the context, they must be, metaphorically, the outpourings of light at dawn, which are so intense that they threaten to destabilize the world with their floods -- a threat countered by the solidity of Heaven described in pāda d. The two bahuvrīhis in c, *dhānv-arṇasaḥ ... khādo-arṇāḥ*, have been much discussed. Noteworthy first is the fact that they have (almost) the same final member: if both cmpds are nom. pl. the 2nd members are *-arṇas-* and *-arṇa-* respectively. Thieme rejects the variation in stem, taking both as containing *-arṇas-*, which requires the 2nd form to be nom. singular. In his interpr. the many rivers described by *dhānv-arṇasaḥ* have joined into one, modified by singular *khādoarṇāḥ*. It is a clever solution, but rather over-clever and in fact unnecessary. Both *arṇas-* and *arṇa-* exist independently, and the plural built to a cmpd. with *arṇas-* as final member (that is, *-arṇasaḥ*) would not fit a Triṣṭubh cadence, while one built to the parallel stem *-arṇa-* does nicely, as if truncated from a Jagatī cadence with *-arṇasaḥ* (see such a cadence in I.182.7).

What then do the cmpds mean? Again, a variety of interpr. have been suggested. I take *dhānv-arṇas-* as an equational bv., ‘whose floods are *dhānu-*’. A *dhānu-* appears to be a high flat plain or steppe; two of its five occurrences in the RV are characterized as *brhatī-* ‘lofty’. In our context I think it refers to what we often call a “wall of water,” a mass of oncoming water far above flood stage, perhaps already flooding over the banks and across the adjacent land. As for *khādo-arṇāḥ*, it should mean something like ‘whose floods are a biting/devouring’; in this case, I think Ge (flg. Sāy.) is correct that the rivers are devouring their banks, eating away at the solid ground. The sturdy pillar of heaven in d provides a bulwark against this featureless undulating torrent of light.

V.45.3: This vs. describes dawn as happening in response to and as a result of the hymn recited at this very moment (hence *asmañ*) at the dawn sacrifice. The two heavy dative phrases, polarized at both ends of the first hemistich, *asmā ukthāya* and *janūse pūrvyāya*, have different functions in the clause. The gaping mountain is an allusion to the opening of the Vala cave, metaphorically applied to the advent of dawn from the night darkness.

In the second hemistich, in c “heaven achieves success” must, in my view, allude to the successful emergence of dawn’s light from the heavenly realm. This is contrasted with d, where an unnamed plural subject is desiring to win the earth (*āvīvasantaḥ ... bhūma*) -- in my opinion, this refers to the fact that features on the earth come only slowly to visual definition at dawn, even as the light comes streaming out of the sky. The unknown subjects are probably the poets responsible for “this hymn here” (*asmā ukthāya*) in pāda a; they must continue their verbal efforts, “exhaust themselves” (*dasayanta*), in order to bring the earth into focus. Supplying ‘poets’ as subj. generally follows Hoffmann, who thinks esp. of the Aṅgirasas (174 n. 126), contra Ge, who takes *bhūma* as subj. (sim. Lü). On *dasayanta*, see my *-āya-Formations*, p. 59. Some take the verb rather to *√damś* ‘work wonders’; see esp. Thieme (loc. cit., n. 7), fld. by Schmidt, WG. This cannot be excluded, but I find the ‘exhaust’ meaning more poetically compelling.

V.45.4: The *vaḥ* in Wackernagel’s position can be construed in a number of different ways. I take it as the poet’s address to his colleagues to praise and importune the two gods. Since the next two vss. (5–6) consist of 1st pl. exhortations to proceed with the sacrifice and achieve effective ritual poetry, my interpr. fits the larger context well. Ge also seems to assume the referents are human, but are rather the potential beneficiaries of the poet’s own plea to the gods (sim. WG). By contrast Schmidt (and less clearly Lü) take it as direct address to the gods; Schmidt “... wollen wir jetzt euch, Indra und Agni, zur Hilfe rufen.” Given the number discrepancy between pl. *vaḥ* and the dual dvandva *īndrā ... agnī*, this seems unlikely. Note also that the non-initial accent on *agnī* precludes a voc. interpr. of the dvandva, though that alone would not prevent *vaḥ* from referring to them.

I do not understand the intrusion of the Maruts here. They are not gods of the dawn sacrifice, nor are they associated with the Vala myth or with the Aṅgirasas. Perhaps their prominence elsewhere in the Vth Maṇḍala (esp. V.52–61) is responsible for their brief appearance here, prompted by the mention of Indra. They are presumably not only the objects of *yājanti* but also of *āvīvasantaḥ*: “winning” them would involve persuading them to come to our sacrifice.

V.45.5–6: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. form an omphalos and are structurally parallel, with the poet addressing his priest-poet colleagues with hortatory subjunctives. The immediacy of the vss. and the sacrificial context of the hymn make this a more likely scenario than Sāy.’s suggestion that the Aṅgirasas are speaking these vss. For strenuous arguments against Sāy.’s interpr., see Lü p. 327.

V.45.5: As suggested already by Ge (n. 5b) and, independently, Thieme (ZDMG 95 [1941] 82–83 [=KISch. 7–8]) and accepted by all subsequent tr., a better reading is obtained by segmenting *duchúnām inavāma*, against Pp. *duchúnā minavāma*. This requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text.

V.45.6: Unlike the first hortatory vs., this second one is not entirely tied to the here-and-now; rather it provides three separate historical/mythological models for the effective poetic vision (*dhī-*) that we are aiming to create now (pāda a). The first model (b) appears to be a variant of the Vala myth so prominent in the rest of the hymn, but those in c and d are obscure.

In b the first question is the grammatical identity of *yā*. It is generally taken as nom. sg. fem., but Old suggests that it might alternatively be a (short) instr. sg. fem. In the former case the referent of *yā* would be the *dhī-* of pāda a, which would be the subj. of *ṛṇuta* and identified with the “mother of the cow” (*mātā ... góh*); in the latter it would be parallel to the two instr. sg. fem. *yāyā* opening c and d. I favor the second interpr.; although the former is not impossible, I find the syntactic parallelism a stronger argument, and *yā* could owe its abbreviated form to being displaced from initial position by the preverb *āpa*. If the instr. interpr. is correct, this leaves the subj. of *ṛṇuta* and referent of “mother of the cow” open. Old and Ge both consider it to be Uṣas. Again, this is not impossible, but I think it may be Saramā, whose finding of the cows is treated in vss. 7–8 -- though Dawn as “mother of cows” (*gāvām mātā*) is found in vs. 2 and is also a strong candidate.

Ge remarks apopos of pāda c “sonst unbekannte Sage” (see also Lü, p. 329), and it is likely that we will not get further than that. Ad VII.99.4 Old tentatively suggests that the name of a Dāsa, *ṛṣasīprā*, that occurs in that passage might have something to do with our *viśīśīprā*, but even if so (and it’s certainly possible), this is a deadend, since all we know of *Ṛṣasīpra* is that he’s a Dāsa and killed by Indra and Viṣṇu. Like the Maruts in 4d, the fleeting intrusion of Manu here is unexpected and unexplained.

Even more so the “wandering merchant” (*vaṇīg vaṅkūḥ*) of d. On *vaṅkū-* see comm. ad I.51.11 and, esp., I.114.4. Although the standard rendering is ‘flying’ (see, e.g., Ge, Schmidt), its derivation from *√vañc* ‘move crookedly, meander’ makes ‘meandering, wandering’ more likely. In I.114.4 it modifies *kavī-*. I suggest there that it refers to an itinerant poet, and merchants are at least as likely as poets to be itinerant, following a meandering course as they peddle their goods. But who this particular merchant is meant to be and how and why he needs a *dhī-* to attain his *pūrīṣa*- remain unclear. If I had Dumézilian tendencies, I might suggest a trifunctional interpr.: pāda b = 1st function, c = 2nd function, and d = 3rd function (at least the latter two might work -- 1st-function b is a bit of a stretch). But even if this interpr. were persuasive, it doesn’t explain what the material is doing in this hymn at this point.

V.45.7–8: Here the mythic model of the dawn accompanying the dawn ritual, the opening of the Vala cave through the verbal efforts of the Aṅgirasas, is spelled out.

Note the variant versions of the phrase “Saramā found the cows”: 7c *sarāmā gā avindat*, with augmented imperfect; 8d *sarāmā vidad gāḥ*, with aor. injunctive (per Pp.) or aor. indicative (*sarāmāvidat*, with augmented *avidat* is a possible reading). For Hoffmann’s interpr. of this vs. pair see Injunk. 164–65.

V.45.7: Note that 3 of the 4 verbs are augmented (*ánūnot*, *ārcan*, *avindat*), the 4th a preterital pf. (*cakāra*).

V.45.8: The subordinator *yád* comes quite late (2nd position pāda b) in the subordinate clause presumably occupying the first hemistich, and it is preceded not only by the subj. (*vísve*) but by a heavy temporal loc. expression (*asyā vyúṣi māhināyāḥ*) -- in violation of standard RVic subordinator placement. This anomaly may have led WG to take pāda a as a nominal main clause: “Sie alle (waren) ... (zugegen).” I am sympathetic, but think the clause division is unnecessarily radical. It is possible that b is a conversion into a subordinate clause of IV.3.11b *sām āngiraso navanta góbhiḥ* with pāda a acting as a preposed afterthought.

The 2nd hemistich brings another syntactic problem: in c the Pp. interprets *útsa* (before a vowel) as nom. -*aḥ*, a grammatical ident. that in turn requires that c be an independent clause. The Pp. reading is defended by Old and fld. by many, incl. Ge, Hoffmann (Injunk. 165), WG. With Lü (385 n. 2; fld. by Schmidt p. 177, Janert p. 10) I prefer the loc. *útse*, parallel to *paramé sadhásthe*, and defining the place where Saramā found the cows in d.

V.45.9: The first hemistich is metrically problematic. HvN put the pāda break after *saptāśvaḥ* and distract *sūryo*, *yātu*, and *saptāśvaḥ*; their 2nd pāda, beginning *kṣétram*, has a caesura after 3 (though see their n.). It is also possible to take *kṣétram* as the last word of pāda a (see Schmidt’s layout, p. 178) and to restrict the distraction to a single word, either *sūryaḥ* or *saptāśvaḥ*, though this produces a bad cadence. In that case I would suggest that the 2nd pāda orig. began **yád yád*; reading **yád yád asya* produces an opening of 4 and, with post-caesura *urviyā dīrgayāthé*, makes a fine Triṣṭubh. The 2nd (or 1st) *yád* would be the neut. sg. N/A participle to *√i*.

Even if this possible emendation is not accepted, it is still possible to take *yád* as the neut. participle, not the subordinator: this interpr. is represented in my tr. by “stretching” and by the lack of a relative cl. With double *yád* the tr. would read “to the tract of land which is stretching widely at (the end of) his long course.”

The 2nd hemistich contains a pres. injunctive, *patayat*, and a pf. [redupl. pres.] subjunctive *dīdayat*. In the publ. tr. they are both rendered as imperatives, matching the pattern set by *yātu* in pāda a. I now think that this interpr. lacks refinement and should be altered. The vs. in general concerns the coincidence between the sunrise and the ritual activities of the dawn sacrifice. We hope for the sunrise (hence the impv.), which is in fact realized in the next vs. By contrast, the ritual activities in the 2nd hemistich are under our (=priests’) control and can therefore simply be described. Exactly what the referents of the falcon (c) and the young poet (d) are is disputed (see the various interpr., incl. those that do not consider them ritual referents at all [notably Lü 329–31]). Starting with d, *yúvan- kaví-* is frequently an epithet of Agni and *√dī* is a typical Agni verb, so it seems likely that this is a reference to the kindling of the fire at the dawn ritual. Although “going among the cows” sounds more like soma (mixing with milk), the cows here can be the ghee oblations poured into the fire, which will cause it to flame more brightly. If d refers to Agni, then c is likely to refer to Soma; certainly the *ándhas-* ‘stalk’ is Soma vocabulary, and the falcon is Soma’s vehicle in the Somaraub. What exactly is going on eludes me, however. As for the tense/mood distinction between *patayat* and *dīdayat*, it may be that the distinction is illusory: one of them was simply brought into superficial harmony with the other, so that both end in -*ayat*, though they should be inj. and subj.

respectively. Or it may be that the injunc. is followed by a subj. to indicate that the 2nd action follows the first (“the falcon flies to the stalk; the young poet will shine ...”).

V.45.10: The structure of this vs. matches that of the last one: the first half describes a cosmic event outside of human control; the second ascribes control to the ritualists. What is striking is that the *same* event is treated in both halves: the rising of the sun. In ab the Sun has agency; he yoked his own horses and mounted the sky. But in c it is the priest-poets (“the wise” *dhīrāḥ*) who guide him, through the waters that stand still for this progress, “giving heed” (*āśṛṇvantīḥ*) presumably to the poets’ words. (I owe the germ of this interpr. to Dieter Gunkel [p.c.].)

V.45.11: Most interpr. construe *apsú* with *dadhiṣe* and tr. the latter as ‘you have placed’, hence “you have placed your *dhī* in the waters.” But med. forms of $\sqrt{dhā}$ generally mean ‘acquire, assume’, and furthermore the standard interpr. is either nonsensical or requires a substantial backstory -- such as Old’s “[ein] Zauber für Wiedererscheinen der Sonne nach langen Regengüssen.” I follow Ge in taking *apsú* with *svarṣām* “das ... die Sonne im Wasser gewinnt”; the sun was manifestly in the water(s) in the immediately preceding vs. -- however metaphorically we wish to interpret those waters (I would take them as the floods of dawn light we encountered in vs. 2). Thus “winning the sun in the waters” is simply an expression for causing the sun to rise at dawn. For further disc. on the place of this vs. in the hymn, see publ. intro.

The number discrepancy between 2nd pl. *vaḥ* and 2nd sg. *dadhiṣe* is easily accounted for in the same general manner as the *vaḥ* in vs. 4 (see comm. thereon): *dadhiṣe* is the poet’s self-address to himself, while *vaḥ* is addressed to his colleagues. As in vss. 5–6, these two distinct 2nd ps. references are joined in a joint 1st pl. in cd (*syāma ... tuturyāma*).

V.46 All Gods

On my hypothesis concerning the reason for this hymn, viz., support for the ritual innovation of the Patnī, see publ. intro. Save for the final two vss. devoted to the wives of the gods, there seems no rationale for the deities included or excluded from the enumerative vss. or for the repetition of some and not others.

V.46.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this preliminary vs., preceding the apparently unconnected series of enumerative vss. calling on various gods, esp. female divinities and the wives of the gods, sets up the scenario: in pāda a the poet-sacrificer has yoked himself to the chariot pole (*dhūr-*) along with his wife, the recently introduced ritual Patnī, an image found elsewhere for the same pairing. Since *dhūr-* is feminine, the remaining feminines in this vs. (b *tām ... pratāranīm avasyúvam*, c: *asyāḥ*) can refer both to the chariot pole and to the Patnī. In b the feminine obj. is said to be “furthering (the sacrifice)”; though the default obj. of *prá √ t̥* is *āyus-* ‘lifetime’, *yajñám* can also serve as obj.: cf., e.g., III.17.2 *yajñám prá tira*. (On *avasyúvam* see comm. ad vs. 7 below. One might also note that, while ‘seeking help’ makes sense in context, esp. when read with vs. 7, this word could also be taken as a phonological scrambling of *āyus-*.) In c the speaker asserts that he does not wish to revert to the old ways or be released from the yoked pairing. In other words, he has accepted the ritual innovation of the Patnī.

Most interpr. take *patháh* as gen. sg. with *vidvān*. Since that pf. part. is generally used absolutely (“[as] knowing one”), I take *patháh* rather as acc. pl. extent of space with *néṣati*. For a clear acc. of the path with *néṣa-* see I.91.1 *tvām rájiṣṭham ánu neṣi pánthām*.

V.46.2: Among this group of mainly male divinities we find the Wives (*gnāḥ*, a word only used for the Wives of the Gods in the RV) and Sarasvatī in the 2nd hemistich.

The first pāda consists only of vocatives, each accented since there is no inherently accented word preceding. In b the accent on *māruta* (modifying pāda-initial *śárdhaḥ*) is surprising, however, since it follows the verbal lexeme *prá yanta* with accent on the preverb, and the following voc. *viṣṇo* lacks accent following *utá*.

Notice the coincidence of verbal endings for two different person / number / voice combinations: *yanta* 2nd pl. act. impv. √*yam*; *juṣanta* 3rd pl. med. injunc. √*juṣ*.

V.46.3: The previous vs. consisted of vocatives in ab and nominatives in cd. Here we find accusatives, with the governing verb *huvé* postponed until the beginning of the 2nd hemistich. The first four divinities in vss. 2 and 3 are the same, but the four individual vocc. *ágna índra váruṇa mítra* of 2a are arranged in 3a in two dual dvandvas *indrāgnī* and *mitrāvāruṇā*, in opposite order. The Maruts, Viṣṇu, Pūṣan, and Bhaga (*bhága-*) are also repeated from vs. 2. Otherwise the emphasis is on divinized natural elements. As for female divinities, we find Aditi immediately after her offspring Mitra and Varuṇa, as well as the waters (*apáh*).

Unfortunately the repetition of *bhága-* is obscured in the publ. tr. by its rendering as “Fortune” in 3d, though both 2d and 6c call him Bhaga. “Fortune” in 3 should therefore be changed to “Bhaga.”

V.46.4: In pāda a *asrídhaḥ* is clearly pl., though it occurs in dual context (*utá ... viṣṇur utá vāto asrídhaḥ*). There seem to be 3 possibilities: 1) it also modifies the gods in pāda b, the Treasure-giver (*draviṇodāḥ*) and Soma; 2) it refers to the gods in general, as in I.3.9 *vísve devāso asrídhaḥ*; 3) it refers to goddesses or the trio of goddesses so denominated in I.13.9 *īlā sárasvatī mahī tisró devīr mayobhúvaḥ / ... asrídhaḥ* (note *mayobhúvaḥ* like *máyas karat* in our pāda b). There is no clear way to choose, and it scarcely seems to matter. I would of course prefer the third possibility, since it involves a female presence in this vs., but the support for this possibility is not strong.

The vs. contains the 3rd mention of Viṣṇu and the 2nd of the Aśvins; the other divinities are newly named.

V.46.5: The Maruts recur for the third time (the 2nd time in the corporate entity, the Marutian troop [*mārutam śárdhaḥ*]), as does Pūṣan, with Bṛhaspati substituting for the Brahmanaspati in 3c. Varuṇa and Mitra also make their 3rd appearance, this time with their regular companion Aryaman, rather than the Aditi of 3a.

V.46.6: The mountains of 3b reappear here; the waters, their companions in 3b, are replaced by the rivers (*nadyāḥ*), also feminine of course. Bhaga also recurs from 2d and 3d. It seems significant that Aditi is the last divinity named before the “wives” vss.

V.46.7: The help for which the wives of the gods are insistently entreated (*avantu nah*, *prāvantu nah*) reminds us of the adj. qualifying the chariot pole / Sacrificer's Wife in 1b, *avasyúvam* 'seeking help' and provides a type of ring.

With Ge and WG, I take *tujáye* as referring specifically to the propagation of children, a function appropriate to the wives of the gods, against Re's insistence that it refers to the production of inspiration (though in his long n. he admits that there is "une certaine association entre *túj* et la notion de procréer").

V.46.8: This last vs. is in a diff. meter and also shows some metrical irregularities (see HvN notes). It seems tacked on, to allow an enumeration of the gods' wives in question, most of whom (save for *Indrāṇī*) have a very shadowy existence. It is also not clear whether *aśvínī* and *rāṭī* refer to a single individual or two.

The last phrase, *yá ṛtúr jánīnām* "which is the regular season for women," is somewhat puzzling, made more so by the fact that there is no overt referent in the main clause for the *yáh*, since the verb *vyántu* lacks an object (also in pāda a). I follow Ge (flg. Sāy.) in taking this as a reference to the *patnīsaṃyāja* offering (or its forerunner), and I therefore supply 'offering' as obj. for *vyántu* (*havís*-, etc., is a common, though not invariable, obj. to this root). The rel. cl. is then also a pun: it refers not only to this offering, which is the ritual "time/season" allotted to women, but probably also to their menstrual periods, since *ṛtú*- is regularly so used later. For a similar pun, using the adj. *ṛtvīyāvatī*-, see VIII.12.10, 80.7.

V.47 All Gods

V.47.1: As noted in the publ. intro., I take the subj. of this riddling vs. to be *manīṣā* 'poetic inspiration', but until this word appears (end of pāda c), the vs. both invites an identification of the subject with Dawn and makes that impossible. The nom. sg. participles *prayuñjatī* and *bodhāyantī* are characteristic Dawn vocabulary, but Dawn is also regularly identified as "the daughter of heaven," which phrase is here in the genitive: *diváh ... duhitúh*. It is her "great mother" (*māhī māṭā*) who is the grammatical subj.

My interpr. generally follows that of Old. Others (Ge, Re, WG) seek to make Dawn subj. at least of the first hemistich and are thus forced into awkward interpretations of the phraseology and into division of the vs. into two clauses. Assuming (with Old and me) that *manīṣā* is the subj. of the whole vs., the point would seem to be that the inspiration that produces the poetry of the early morning ritual has the power to beget even Dawn herself -- the usual semi-hubristic boast by the poets that even the cosmos is regulated by the ritual performance and the poetry recited there. The phrase "(coming) from the fathers" (by my interpr.; some others take *pitṛbhyah* as dative) reflects the transmission of the poetic tradition from older generations to younger ones. For *manīṣā* 'constantly calling' (*jóhuvānā*), see VII.24.2 *jóhuvatī manīṣā*, also adduced by Old.

V.47.2: Again I take the vs. as having one referent, while Ge, Re, and WG split it into two sentences with two different subjects. In my view, the intent is again to mislead -- that is, in this riddle hymn, to suggest one referent to the audience and then spring a different one on them towards the end of the verse, in this case the very last word *pánthāh* 'paths'. These are presumably the paths that connect heaven and earth and enable the

gods to come to the sacrifice and the sacrificial offerings to make their way to heaven. Although paths are not ordinarily credited with much agency -- and the descriptions in the first hemistich attribute bustling activity to their referents -- the lively traffic between heaven and earth can spill over onto the paths that bear this traffic.

tādapaḥ is most likely adverbial here (so already Gr), though Ge suggests it is nom. pl. “mit Abfall der Endung,” for which there is no motivation.

The “nave of the immortal one” (*amṛtasya nābhim*) can refer both to the ritual ground and to the height of heaven, again suggesting the connection between those places that is established by the paths.

For *anantā*- see disc. ad vs. 4.

For the formula *viśvātaḥ sīm pári* and the unusual placement of *sīm*, see my “Rigvedic *viśvātaḥ sīm*, Or, Why Syntax Needs Poetics” (1998, Fs. Watkins).

V.47.3: In this riddle vs. the referent is not explicitly named, and in fact an initially bewildering set of incompatible identifications comes pouring out: a bull, the sea, a bird, a stone. But all of them are possible aspects of the sun (for similar vocab. see IX.83.3), and esp. in the 2nd hemistich the position specified (“in the middle of heaven”) and the actions depicted point strongly to the sun -- a referent generally agreed upon by interpreters.

The “womb of the age-old father” (*pūrvasya yónim pitúḥ*) is a gender-bending, though understated, paradox. It is likely that the sun’s age-old father is Heaven (Dyaus Pitā) -- on the parental relationship of Heaven and Earth to Sūrya, see esp. I.160 -- in which case the womb is probably (lower-case) heaven, the place through which the sun travels. In the next pāda he is unambiguously situated there: *mādhye divó nṛhitaḥ*, so at least in this instance one of the side-riddles of the vs. is solved almost as soon as it is posed.

V.47.4: As often elsewhere in the RV, numerology begets obscurity. Nonetheless, the most likely referent here is Agni. As Ge points out, the four and the ten in the 1st hemistich may well refer to the four priests (so already Sāy.) or the four arms of the two main priests, the ten, as often, to the fingers. The “bearing” by the four might refer to the transport of the new Āhavanīya to the east end of the ritual ground and the depositing there (hence the “rest”); the ten (fingers) are making offering into the fire (“giving it suck”), to cause it to flare up. Hence the balanced opposition of rest and motion in ab.

The threefold cows of pāda c are puzzling, but three is of course a number closely associated with Agni: the three ritual fires, his three births (e.g., X.45.1), the three pressings, etc. For Agni’s triads, cf. X.45.2 (right after the three births just referred to) *vidmā te agne tredhā trayāṇi* “we know your threefold triads” (also VIII.39.9 for his three domains). See also *tridhātu-śṛṅga*- ‘having tripartite horns’ of Agni in nearby V.43.13, where it may refer to the three hearths – not candidates for our tripartite cows, I’m afraid. For these threefold cows Sāy. (see Ge n. 4c; so also Re) suggests sun’s rays, WG milk-streams, but ‘threefold’ is not a standard characterization of either set. Note also *tridhātubhir āruṣībhiḥ* “with threefold ruddy (cows)” in IX.111.2, where the phrase refers to accoutrements of Soma, and Soma is a possible, if somewhat unlikely, referent for this vs. as well: the ten (fingers) are a common trope in the soma maṇḍala, referring to the priests pressing and preparing the drink. Pāda a is harder to apply to soma, beyond the

generic notion of four priests. The circling threefold cows could, I suppose, be the streams of the heavenly soma. Still, Agni seems a better, though not perfect, candidate.

Pāda d, with *divāḥ ... ántām*# “the ends of heaven,” echoes 3d *rájasah ... ántau*# “the two ends of the airy realm,” and both contrast with the “endless” (*anantāśah*) paths of 2cd. The dual in 3d points to a straight trajectory from one end to the other, reinforced by the verb *ví cakrame* ‘he strode’ (though it’s not in the same clause with the “ends”): the sun’s journey across the sky from one horizon to the other. The plural in 4d is more diffuse, as is the verb *caranti pári* “they wander/circle around.” The phrase *divó ánta-*[pl.] “the ends of heaven” is quite common, but I am not sure what the plural conveys -- that there are numerous divisions of heaven, each with its own boundaries? that heaven is effectively end-less (like the *anantā-* paths of 2) because there are always more ends? In any case the sun’s purposeful trip from one place to another in vs. 3 seems contrasted with the more comprehensive travels of the subject of *caranti* in 4d. Is that subject the threefold cows of 4c? If so, many of the possible triads suggested above are eliminated. Save for the ‘threefold’ (and, I guess, the cows), Agni’s plumes of smoke would make the most sense in d. But I confess bafflement.

V.47.4–5: Note the parallel openings of 4a *catvāra īm bibhrati ...* and 5c *dvé yád īm bibhrtāḥ ...* But this parallelism gains complexity from the fact that *√bhr* is used in two different senses: in 4 it means ‘carry’, but in 6 it refers to the bearing of children.

V.47.5: The opening *idám vāpur nivācanam* “Here is the wonder, the enigma” announces this vs. as potentially even more obscure than what precedes. Each of the three following pādas is presented as a paradox, but the contents do not seem significantly more enigmatic than the rest of the hymn; in fact, the explicit paradoxes point the way to their solution.

The first -- the rivers move, but the waters stay -- seems unconnected to the themes of the hymn, simply presenting a wonder of the natural world: no matter how much the rivers flow, there is always water in them (see Ge n. 5b). The verb *cāranti* repeats that of 4d (and see *cārase* in 4b), but does not echo its meaning there.

The second hemistich does continue the ritual and cosmic focus of the rest of the hymn (see the parallel openings of 4a and 5c cited just above). It treats the surrogate parentage of an unidentified figure. Ge (n. 5cd) suggests that this figure can be both Agni and the sun, with two different mother-substitutes referred to depending on the original identification of *īm*. In Ge’s view, Sūrya’s “real” mother is Dawn, but the two other females who bear him are Heaven and Earth; for Agni, the kindling stick is the mother, but the two other females are Night and Dawn. In both cases the two have different places of birth, but form a twin pair. Although I am not overwhelmingly convinced by Ge’s identifications, I do not have better ones. Of his two suggestions, Agni seems significantly more likely than the sun. The sole passage he cites as evidence for Dawn as the sun’s mother (VII.63.3) does not seem to me to say that, and of course Dawn is more commonly his lover. The evidence for Night and Dawn as Agni’s surrogate mothers is much more robust; the two passages he cites (I.95.1, 96.5) both depict the two giving suck to Agni using the same verb as found here (4b), though not in this vs.: I.95.1 *anyānyā vatsām úpa dhāpayete*; I.96.5 *náktoṣāṣā ... dhāpāyete śísūm ékam*.

V.47.6: This is the last real vs. of the hymn, preceding the meta-reference to the hymn itself and wishes for its efficacy (vs. 7).

In the first hemistich the subj. of *ví tanvate* appears to me to be the poets/ritualists; I am not sure of the identity of *asmai*, but given its lack of accent, it should be someone already present in the discourse -- probably the *īm* of 5c, which, as was just discussed, can be either/both Agni or/and, less likely, Sūrya. Pāda b continues the motherhood theme of 5cd. With Re, I consider the mothers here to be an unmarked simile: the production of ritual poetry by the poets is implicitly compared to the weaving of baby clothes by mothers.

The “paths of heaven” of vs. 2 return in the phrase *divās pathā* (6d) “along the path of heaven” (note the close sandhi). Who the referents are and what is going on in the 2nd hemistich are unclear, made more so by the grammatical multivalence of the principal actors in the 2nd hemistich: *vṛṣanaḥ* can be nom. pl. or, less likely, acc. pl. (or, even less likely though the solution of most [Ge, Re, WG], gen. sg.: the gen. sg. is otherwise *vṛṣṇas* and, as far as I know, never read trisyllabically); *vadhvāḥ* can be nom. pl. (Ge, Re, WG), acc. pl., or gen. sg.; the part. *módamānāḥ* can be nom. pl. masc. or fem. or acc. pl. fem. Ge in his Nachtr. does confront the morphological problem of *vṛṣanaḥ*, suggesting that it’s an irregular gen. sg., but he also provides an alternative transl., with *vṛṣanaḥ* as nom. pl., that my own tr. follows. In this interpr., acdg. to Ge., the gods are the bulls on their way to unite with their wives, “die Dichtungen der Sänger.” Assuming that the referents of *vadhvāḥ* are the *dhíyaḥ* of pāda a, the sexual union of these thoughts and the gods for whom they’re composed seems plausible (in a RVic universe). The only question is who is going to whom, and the two-way street of Vedic ritual allows movement in either direction: the hymns going to heaven to unite with the gods, or the gods coming from heaven to the ritual ground to unite with the hymns. I have gone for the latter. See disc. of the paths ad vs. 2.

With Old I take *upaprakṣé* as loc. to a them. stem *upaprakṣá-*

If this interpr. of the vs. is correct, it provides the hymn with a thematic ring compositional structure. The first two vss. provide the materials that will return in vs. 6. Vs. 1 introduces the inspired thought coming from heaven and established at the sacrifice, thus linking the divine and human worlds, and vs. 2 sketches the highway linking these two worlds, the encircling paths. In vs. 6 the inspired thought of vs. 1 is represented by the *dhíyaḥ* (insightful thoughts) produced by the unnamed priests (ab), and these thoughts are configured as the new brides of the bullish gods who have utilized the paths of vs. 2 to come to the sacrifice and unite with them. The interior vss. present the sun (vs. 3) but concentrate on the ritual fire (vss. 4–5). Given the emphasis on the ritual and its connection to heaven, I’m not quite sure why the sun intrudes in 3—perhaps its journey across the sky is compared or contrasted with the journey between heaven and earth we find elsewhere in the hymn.

V.48 All Gods

V.48.1: My interpr. follows that of Old in most particulars, but is also informed by my view that the hymn as a whole is a Dawn hymn (see publ. intro.). I therefore think that in the 1st hemistich the dative recipient of the poets’ compositions is Agni, not, per Old, Varuṇa, nor, per Re, Indra. (Ge and WG do not identify the recipient.) Although the

descriptors in b are not strongly typical of Agni, the “own dear foundation” (*priyāya dhām(a)ne*) in pāda a would be appropriate for the establishment of the offering fire at the beginning of the morning sacrifice.

With Old I take the subject of cd, identified as feminine by nom. *māyīnī*, as Dawn, and I also follow him in considering the hapax *āmenyā-* as dissimilated from **āmemyā-*, a thematic nominal deriv. of the intens. to $\sqrt{mī}$ ‘(ex)change’, formed like *vitarturā-*, *ādardirā-*, as he suggests. Modifying *rājas-* ‘(dusky) realm’, it would express the constantly changing color of the sky at dawn, and is comparable to the intens. part. in I.96.5 *náktośāsā várṇam āmém(i)yāne* “Night and Dawn, ever exchanging their color,” as Old also points out. Whatever the etymology of *māyā-* (whose possessive deriv. *māyīnī* closes the vs.) -- I favor Thieme’s connection with $\sqrt{mī}$ ‘(ex)change’, which, however, is rejected by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v.) -- the polarized initial and final words of the hemistich, #*āmenyāsya ... māyīnī*#, provide a phonological and, if Thieme is correct, an etymological frame for the hemistich.

And what happens within that frame? In my view the image is that of dawn in a partly cloudy sky. The conceit is that the rays of Dawn spreading across the cloudy sky look like streams of water -- water that Dawn has appropriated from the cloud (“choosing the waters in the dark cloud” *abhrā ām̐ apó vṛṇānā*). Since the image makes sense with the transmitted *apāh* ‘waters’, I see no reason to follow Old (and partly WG) in assuming it stands for **āpah* ‘work’. The same phrase “choosing the waters” is also found in IX.94.1, though in a very different context. I explain it there as a deliberate poetic deformation of the common expression *apó vasānā-* “clothing oneself in the waters.”

V.48.2: The image in 1cd is repeated with variation in 2ab. The fem. sg. subj. of 1d has been replaced by the fem. pl., easily interpr. as plural Dawns, as often. The verb is held constant, though the root aor. *atnata* substitutes for the pres. *vitanoṭi*. The waters/rays of light that the Dawn spread out in 1cd are now characterized as forming a pattern or tracery across the dusky realm (*vísvam ā rájah*) that also figured in 1cd. The spreading performed by the Dawns is done “along the same course” (*samānyā vṛtáyā*) by my interpretation -- that is, the same course that the successive Dawns follow day after day. I do not understand why their pattern of light is “hero-strengthening” (*vīrá-vakṣaṇa*). Perhaps this is simply a reference to the usual trope that dawn rouses all people to undertake their daily labors.

The adjective may also prepare for the more human-oriented 2nd hemistich, in which the pious man seems to do battle with time itself, embodied by the ever advancing dawns. The interpr. of the hemistich is complicated by the shifting senses of the words *āpara-* and *pūṛva-*. If these have temporal reference here, the sense would have to be that the man repels later dawns, while lengthening his life with earlier ones (so in fact both Ge and Re). But this does not accord with Rigvedic conceptions of time: there is no preventing the dawning of each new day; even a hero cannot contravene the cosmic laws of time. It would also be somewhat odd to say that a man lengthens his life with *past* dawns; this would seem to indicate that he has no future, unless he can fight off the dawns to come. It therefore seems preferable to follow Old (also fld by WG), who takes the two adjectives as spatial: *āpara-* ‘behind, to the west’, *pūṛva-* ‘in front, to the east’. With these values in play, the man sends each new day behind him -- the dawn facing

backwards as she passes from east to west -- and piles up his future with the dawns in front of him, to come.

This vs. is full of alliteration and sound play, esp. in pāda c: a: **tā atnata** **vayúnaṃ** **vīrávakṣaṇaṃ** / c: **ápo ápācīr áparā ápejate** (noted also by Watkins, Dragon 109) / d: **prá pūrvābhis**.

V.48.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is the hardest in the hymn and, as the middle vs., serves as an omphalos. It contains several temporal expressions and thus continues the theme of the passage of time found in the 2nd half of vs. 2, but the rest is rather unclear. My rendering is tentative and also differs considerably from those of others, the details of which cannot be fully covered here.

Already in pāda a the alternation of days and nights is alluded to with the polarized expression *ahanyèbhir aktúbhiḥ*. Although the adjectival form of *ahanyà-* seems to invite an interpr. whereby the word modifies the adjacent instr. pl. *grāṇabhiḥ*, the result, “with the daily pressing stones” (Ge “mit den täglichen Presssteinen”), doesn’t make sense, and I prefer to follow Re in considering it “une variante probable de *āhabhir aktúbhiḥ*.” Cf. *āhobhiḥ ... aktúbhiḥ* X.14.9 and, with lexical substitution, *dyúbhir aktúbhiḥ* (I.34.8, I.112.25, III.31.16).

A more serious problem is figuring out what action is being performed in the first hemistich. In literal terms, the subject, whoever it is, sprinkles the/a superior mace, along with or by means of the pressing stones. Assuming we take the verb *ā jigharti* seriously -- unlike Ge and Re, who tr. contextually (‘schleudert’ and ‘brandit’ respectively), with Ge suggesting a possible derivation from \sqrt{hr} not \sqrt{ghr} -- the action is difficult to interpret, whoever the subject is. Why would one ‘sprinkle’ a mace? Old, flg. Bergaigne, suggests that the mace is really soma, but although we might think this would get us out of the difficulty, in fact the object of (*ā*) \sqrt{ghr} is never the liquid sprinkled, but the object that is sprinkled with it.

Working backward from vss. 4–5, which have pretty clear references to Agni, I take Agni as the subject of *ā jigharti* here. He prepares the mace by “sprinkling” it with his sparks, a sort of final or symbolic forging, while the soma produced by the pressing stones is sprinkled on the weapon at the same time. The two acts of sprinkling make the weapon ritually fit for use. (Agni’s ‘streaming’ *rīt-* is found in 4a—another configuration of Agni as a liquid or as controlling liquid.) Under this interpr. the three apparently anomalous forms of *ā* \sqrt{ghr} in the RV, here and in IV.17.14 and X.6.4, can be given a unified interpr. All three have Agni as subj. (in my view), and in all three Agni “sprinkles” an object with his sparks. See comm. on the two other passages.

The loc. *māyīni* is a separate problem. The standard view is that it refers to an enemy at whom the vajra is wielded, hence tr. like Ge’s “... schleudert er die beste Keule auf den Zauberischen,” which, as we saw, requires the verb *ā jigharti* to be semantically twisted. But the near rhyme *māyīnī* at the end of vs. 1 refers to a positively viewed figure (in my interpr.), the goddess Dawn, and I suggest that *māyīni* here, which occurs in the same prominent hemistich-final position, also identifies a positive figure -- in fact, Indra. Indra is called *māyīn-* in VIII.76.1 and his *māyā-* are often referred to (see the passages listed by Grassmann, s.v., including V.30.6 in this maṇḍala). If it is Indra, the loc. does not have to refer to the goal of a brandished weapon, but can simply be a type of loc. absolute: “when the *māyīn-* (is there),” that is, when Indra attends the sacrifice.

The doubled preverb *ā*, found both at the beginning of the hemistich and directly before the verb, seems to be a case of redundant repetition.

The second hemistich also contains a temporal expression, *saṃvartāyanto ví ca vartayann āhā* “rolling up the days, they unroll them (again).” The idiom *sám/ví√vṛt* is used of rolling up or out hides (*cárma*, VI.8.3, VIII.6.5), and this action is then metaphorically applied to darkness (*támas-*) (cf., e.g., V.31.3). The rolling up and out of darkness is thus a way of expressing the alternations of darkness and light, night and day -- in other words, a more poetic instantiation of the phrase in pāda a *ahanyèbhir aktúbhiḥ*. The problem is how to connect this fairly straightforward expression to pāda c, if it *is* connected. Although it is an easy assumption that cd has a subord. clause / main clause structure (so Ge and Re), it is possible to take c as attached to the first hemistich and d independent (so WG and me). The next question is whether the pl. subject of *pracáran* and that of *ví ca vartayan* are coreferential, and if so, who are they? and whose “own house” (*své dáme*) do they enter? The latter question is easier to answer: (*své*) *dáme* is almost always Agni’s. I therefore think that *yásya* also refers to Agni, and this is indirect evidence for my identification of Agni as subj. of *ā jighartí*. But who enters Agni’s house “by the hundred” (*śatám*) and rolls up and unrolls the days? In the publ. tr. I tentatively identify the subj. as “dawns,” with full awareness that this is grammatically problematic: the pres. part. *vartāyantaḥ* in d is masc., and so the only way to make this work is to assume that dawns are the subj. of c, but the subj. of d reverts to a generic masc. I suggested the dawns as subj. because they are the standard regulators of time (for this see VII.79.2, 80.1 with *sám√vṛt* and *ví√vṛt* respectively). Others (explicitly WG) suggest the gods or some subset thereof, but the gods don’t really have the role of causing the alternation of days and nights. I must leave the identity of the subject uncertain, although I am still inclined to think that it is at least an indirect ref. to the dawns.

I do not understand the function of *vā* in c; JSK does not discuss this passage. As for the *ca* in d, I think it contrastively conjoins the preverbs *saṃ* and *ví*, even though the morphological formations to which these preverbs are attached are not parallel. The *ca* also enables a sort of syncopated phonological figure, with (*pra*)*cáran* in c deconstructed to (*ví*) *ca vartayan*.

V.48.4: This vs. is characterized by words regularly (though not exclusively) associated with Agni: *ánīka-* ‘face’, *várpa-* ‘form’, *rátanam√dhā* ‘establish a treasure’. This vocabulary gives support to my suggestion that Agni is also the subject of vs. 3, esp. since the *asya* in pāda a (and b) should refer to something already present in the discourse.

As for the *tām ... rītīm paraśór íva*, most comm. appositely compare V.7.8 *prá svádhitīva rīyate* “(Agni) streams forth like an axe.” I consider the *rītīm* to continue the liquid imagery of 3b. The abstract *rītí-* in its 4 other occurrences is either construed with the gen. pl. *apām* (VI.13.1, IX.108.10) or implicitly with other liquid vocabulary; cf. also the compd. *rītyāp-* (2x). The attempts by most interpr. to impose a different sense (e.g., Re ‘l’*élan-destructeur*’) on this transparent deriv. of *√ṛ* ‘flow’ seem to stem from discomfort with the image, and esp. the simile of the axe. But the arc of sparks that sprinkle the mace in 3b (by my interpr.) would look like a stream, and anyone who has ever watched a person swing an axe (properly) would recognize the image: the fluent movement in a stream-like curve. (There are numerous You-tube videos.)

For *bhārahūti*- see comm. ad I.129.2, V.29.8.

Ge, flg. Gr., reverses 4cd and 5ab. I do not see the necessity for this. It puts the two forms of *(-)ānīka-* in the same vs. and continues the description of Agni begun in 4ab, but leaving the hemistichs in their transmitted order certainly causes less thematic disruption than most changes of topic in the RV.

V.48.5: Ge emends *vāruṇo* to *āruṇo* ‘the reddish one’, but this seems completely unnecessary. Although putting people in their places (generally *jāna-* √ *yat*) is ordinarily Mitra’s duty not Varuṇa’s, these closely linked gods trade off qualities. That there is no simile marker is not surprising; gods are often equated directly with other gods when they perform the others’ functions. See, e.g., the series of identifications of Agni with other gods in II.1.

On the formula *dāti vāryam* see my forthcoming article on *dātivāra-*. Although *dāti* here looks like an anomalous root present, it is most likely a root-aor. subjunctive, which works very well here.

V.49 All Gods

V.49.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the first hemistich seems to pick up the last one of the previous hymn (48.5cd), where Bhaga and Savitar are identified as the givers of desirable things. Āyu is always a somewhat mysterious figure in the RV, and in this case it is difficult to tell whether the gen. *āyóḥ* dependent on *rátanam* (also in 2d) is in possessive or indirect object use -- that is, are the two gods distributing treasure to Āyu or Āyu’s treasure to others. Ge seems to opt for the former, Re and WG the latter. In this case, the end of the last hymn may be helpful: V.48.5cd *ná tasya vidma ... yáto bhágaḥ savitá dāti vāryam* ‘We do not know that from which Bhaga and Savitar will give what is choice.’ The ablatival *yátaḥ* ‘from which’ indicates the source from which they will acquire what they then distribute. If 49.1 is in some way responsive to this, *āyóḥ* should likewise indicate the source not the recipient of the treasure.

In the 2nd hemistich I tr. the vocc. *narā purubhujā ... aśvinā* as if acc., to avoid extra fuss.

V.49.2: The standard tr. construe *vidvān* with *prayāṇam ásurasya* (e.g., Ge “Der Ausfahrt des Asura gewärtig,” with a slightly odd rendering of *vidvān*, perhaps because he construes it with *práti?*). But pāda-final *vidvān*, which is quite common, is generally used absolutely, without an object (and tmesis would be unusual, though not unprecedented, with a participle). The absolute usage would be reinforced by likewise pāda-final *vijānán* ‘discerning’ in c; the two participles define the subject as a sagacious and perceptive poet/sacrificer.

The referent of the acc. sg. adj. *jyēṣṭham* is entirely ambiguous: it can be neut. and modify *rátanam* or masc. and modify *vibhājantam*. Since *jyēṣṭha-* ‘distinguished, pre-eminent’ is used of both animates and inanimates, there is no way to tell -- and the decision hardly matters. More interesting is the *ca* in d, which must link the phrase *jyēṣṭham ... rátanam vibhājantam āyóḥ*, which refers to Bhaga (see 1b), with a gapped Savitar, who, though present in pāda b and conjoined with Bhaga in 1ab, is not found in the clause in 2cd. See Klein DGRV 127.

V.49.3: The hapax *adatrayā* is universally taken as an adverbial instr. built to a fem. **adatrā*- with the meaning ‘ohne Geschenk empfangen zu haben’ (Gr), ‘ohne ein (Gegen)geschenk zu verlangen’ (Ge), ‘nicht geschenkweise’ (AiG III.76), etc. But the morphology rests on very little (there is no independent fem. -*ā* stem), and, so interpreted, the word is also hard to make sense of. If it means ‘in a non-giving/distributing fashion’, it is immediately contradicted by the statement that the gods do distribute good things (*dayate vāryāni*). To make it work somewhat better, most interpr. sneak in the notion of *counter*-gift: that is, the gods distribute good things without expectation of getting something in return. But this hardly fits the Vedic conceptual universe any better. Gods don’t selflessly hand out “free gifts”; they expect praise and oblations in return. This is, after all, the reciprocal arrangement that the whole RV rests on! I therefore suggest an entirely different analysis of the word, as *adatra-yā*-, a root noun cmpd. with $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘travel, drive’ as 2nd member, hence ‘traveling to those (so far) without gifts’. The accent is correct for such a cmpd. We need a nom. sg. with underlying final -s, but *-*yās* in sandhi would yield the -*yā* found in the passage, so only the Pp. would need emendation. The cmpd. would refer to the standard journey of gods to the sacrifice, bringing goods to distribute to the sacrificers; note the presence of the same root $\sqrt{yā}$ in *prayānam* ‘advance’ in the preceding vs. 2a, referring to the same advent of the god(s) at the sacrifice.

As noted in the publ. intro., the vs. seems to refer to the distribution of dakṣiṇās, a ritual event that in RVic times happened at the dawn sacrifice (as here: *vāsta usrāḥ*), not at the Midday Pressing as in classical śrauta ritual.

This phrase *vāsta usrāḥ* is found 3 other times, all pāda final, with the other three occurrences (IV.25.2, VII.69.5, VIII.46.26; cf. also VI.3.6 *vasta usrāḥ*) containing *usrāḥ*. Although Gr classifies *vāsta* as the 3rd sg. med. pres. of \sqrt{vas} ‘wear’ (that is, pausal form *vāste*; so Pp.), it is clear from the phraseology that it must belong with \sqrt{vas} ‘dawn’, and is most likely a form of the loc. to *vāstu*- ‘dawning’; see AiG III.153–54 with lit. cited there. I do not entirely understand the mechanism that produced the form we have, and in fact several different pathways have been suggested. Wackernagel simply attributes it to shortening of -*ā* in **vāstā usr...* < **vāstāvusr...*, but I find the shortening hard to motivate. Others (e.g., Oldenberg) suggest that it rests on a *u*-stem loc. sg. *-*av* / -*o*, which would yield the sequence directly. Although I was dubious about Old’s suggestion because of the cost of positing an alternative loc. sg. that is not directly attested, I have been persuaded by TY’s view that it continues an IE endingless loc. (in full grade), and this archaism was preserved in a cadential formula that enforces a light syllable in this position.

V.49.4: The standard tr. supply a verb (such as ‘grant’) in pāda a, but this seems unnecessary. The clause can be an equational expression; gods are called upon to be *vārūtham* ‘defense’ elsewhere: cf. I.59.8 *bhāvā vārūtham grṇatē* ... (Agni); sim. VII.32.7 (Indra), VIII.67.3.

V.49.5: There is no overt referent in the main clause (c) for the *yé* in ab, but ‘they’ (namely the poet/sacrificers) are clearly to be the beneficiaries of the good actions in c, who, in d, appear in the 1st ps.

V.50 All Gods

As often, the poet embellishes a fairly simple message by playing with personal reference, cycling through all three persons in very short compass. See the disc. in the publ. intro. as well as more details in the comm. on individual vss. below.

V.50.1: The vs. (and hymn) opens cleverly: the 1st two words are *vísvo devásya*, and until we encounter the genitive ending on the 2nd word, we expect the “every god” that would be appropriate to an All God hymn. Instead, the 2nd pāda opens with the real referent of *vísvaḥ*, namely the polar opposite of ‘god’, *mártah* ‘mortal’.

On *iṣudhyati* see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2021 “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūdiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Fs. Lamberterie). In the course of re-examining the members of this word family, I have somewhat changed my interpr. of this passage. In the publ. tr. I take “wealth” as the target or goal of *iṣudhyati* ‘aims at’; however, insofar as the Vedic and Avestan verbs express the target, it is in the acc. (see VIII.69.2), and it is the divine recipient of praise, not the desired countergift to the praise. The Pp. interpr. *rāyá* as dat. *rāyé*, which is neither the desired case nor the desired goal. It would be possible to read it as acc. pl. *rāyāḥ* ‘riches’, which *could* be an acc. goal (“everyone desires riches”), but since this still deviates from the preferred expression with *iṣudhyá-*, I now prefer to supply “god Leader” as the goal, with dat. *rāyé* expression what we hope for in return: “Everyone aims (praise) (at god Leader) for wealth.”

Pādas b and d both contain a 3rd sg. mid. to \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’, in the same metrical position and with the same metrical shape: root aor. *vr̥ita* and 9th cl. pres. *vr̥ṇita*. The first is clearly an optative, though it has a somewhat unexpected shape and is quite rare (only twice in the RV); its unusual root syllable (*vr̥* < * \underline{ur} H, expect **ur* as in part. *urāná-*) is found elsewhere only in *hotṛ-vūrya-* (2x, with pre-C outcome). The second, *vr̥ṇita*, is formally ambiguous: it can be an optative parallel to *vr̥ita*, as I have taken it (so also at least Re), or simply an injunctive. I would suggest that the poet first deploys the rare but unambiguously optative *vr̥ita* to set the modal tone and then uses the more common *vr̥ṇita* as its morphological parallel. But it would of course be possible to argue that the poet wishes to contrast the two modalities; so I interpr. Ge. IH (diss.) suggests that the poet is deliberately allowing both readings – aorist optative and habitual present – and tr. “(everyone) would choose brilliance – and does so – in order to thrive.”

V.50.2: As discussed in the publ. intro., this vs. effects a transition from the undefined 3rd ps. sg. “every mortal” (*vísvaḥ ... mártah*) of vs. 1 to a 1st ps. pl. referring to us. This has been definitively accomplished by pāda d, which opens with the finite 1st pl. *sācemahi* ‘may we be accompanied’, but earlier in the vs. this plural is carried by the insistent masc. nom. pl. pronominal forms *té ... yé ... té ... té*. These forms invite a 3rd plural reading (“they ... who ... they ... they”): although the *sál tām* pronoun is capable of having both 1st and 2nd ps. reference, 3rd ps. is the default. The first 3 pādas of the vs. cleverly avoid forcing the reference by using predicated dative infinitives (*anúsāse ... āpṛice*), which leave the person unfixed, rather than finite verbs, which would force such a reading of the person. The poet draws attention to his syntactic modulation through the singsong effect of *té te de(va) ..., yé ca ... | té (rāyā) té (hí āpṛ)ce, sāce(mahi) saca(thíyaiḥ)*.

The syntax is further complicated by the parenthetical expression embedded in pāda c, *té hy āpīce*.

The thematic continuity with vs. 1, despite the fancy referential footwork, is emphasized by d *sācemahi sacathyañh*, which echoes *sakhyām* in 1b.

V.50.3: The reference-shifting game continues here and also pulls in some polarized lexical choices. The 1st pl. of vs. 2 becomes the 2nd pl. of the impv. in 3b *daśasyata* ‘[you all,] show favor’, but a trace of the 1st pl. is left in the enclitic *naḥ* ‘our, for us’ in 3a. This is the familiar scenario whereby the poet addresses his fellow officiants in the 2nd pl., urging them to do something on behalf of ‘us’ -- with ‘you’ and ‘us’ coreferential but distinguished pragmatically.

Although the identity of the addressees -- the officiants -- and the recipients of their favor -- the gods and their wives -- is ultimately clear, the lexicon complicates this interpr. The verb *daśasyā-* generally has a god or gods as its subj. and a mortal (vel sim.) as its obj., often *naḥ* (e.g., VI.11.6 *daśasyā naḥ purvañika hotaḥ* “Be favorable to us, o Hotar of many faces [=Agni]”). Here we must reverse the verbal arguments. The 1st object in the 1st pāda, *nñ* is ambiguous: although it of course means ‘man’ (or ‘superior man’), it is frequently used of gods as well as mortals; it would be possible to interpr. *naḥ ... nñ* as ‘us men’, rather than taking *naḥ* as a genitive (as I and the standard interpr. do). What helps clinch the divine reference is the 2nd acc. in that pāda, *ātithīn* ‘guests’. This is the only pl. form of this stem in the RV; the sg. forms are exclusively used of Agni, thus skewing the word towards the divine, and of course the model of the sacrifice as guest-reception for the visiting gods is always conceptually present.

The presence of the gods’ wives, *pātnīḥ*, in b may allude to the shadowy “God Leader” (*devā- netār-*) who opens (vss. 1–2) and closes (vs. 5) this hymn, since an agent noun to the same root $\sqrt{nī}$ ‘lead’, namely *nēṣṭar-*, is the leader of the wives of the gods and, later, of the sacrificer’s wife in classical śrauta ritual.

On *patheṣṭhā-* see comm. ad X.40.13.

V.50.4: This vs. is quite obscure, but seems metaphorically to depict the soma sacrifice. The problems are, as usual, compounded by the fact that the two (or one?) principal actor(s) are not identified. Interpr. of the vs. differ, and I will not discuss them all in detail.

In the first hemistich I take the draft animal (*vāhniḥ ... paśúḥ*) to be soma, as often; the adj. *drónya-* ‘belonging to/seeking the *dróṇa*’ seems to clinch this, since *dróṇa* is always the soma cup. The action depicted is the standard flowing of the soma towards and into the soma vessels, regularly conceived as a (male) animal running (here \sqrt{dru}) to a goal. The verb *dudrāvāt* is a pf. subj.; as I have established elsewhere (García Ramón Fs.), pf. subjunctives are simply subjunctives in value, with a future (not a future perfect) sense.

I take the 2nd hemistich as the main clause construed with the dependent *yátra* clause in ab. Its predicate is the agent noun *sānitā* lit. ‘winner’. Because of the future-value subjunctive in the dep. clause, *sānitā* looks to me like a good prospect for a periphrastic future use of the agent noun (so, it seems, Ge; in contrast cf. Tichy, 229: “Wo sich ... beeilen wird, *gewinnt* ...” [my italics]).

The subject in cd is, in my opinion, Indra. The adj. *nṛmāṇas-* ‘manly minded’ is used most often of him, and of course it is Indra for whom the soma is destined. *vīrā-pastya-* is a hapax, but it seems a bahuvrīhi of the type *vájra-bāhu-* ‘having an arm with a mace in it’, hence ‘having a house with heroes in it’, presumably referring to both divine and mortal warriors that Indra can muster in battle -- his household.

The first two words in the last pāda, *árṇā dhîreva*, are problematic, the 2nd more than the first. For *árṇā* we must assume a neuter substantivization (‘flood[s]’) of the adj. *árṇa-* ‘flooding, undulating’, here in the pl. Given its sandhi position it could in principle instead represent *árṇās*, a feminine substantivization; since *árṇa-* several times modifies fem. *áp-* ‘waters’, this might work better -- but it makes it harder to explain the difficult *dhîrā*, which is most easily taken also as a neut. pl. These floods are surely the floods of soma that are racing in the first half-verse.

As just noted, the simile *dhîreva* [= *dhîrā / iva*] is problematic. It is tempting to take it as *dhîrah* with irregular sandhi (so Roth; see Old), but this is of course not a legitimate interpretational technique. It is also tempting to leave it untranslated, as Ge does. Sāy. takes it as a fem. nom. sg., but who would this wise woman be? Ge considers the possibility of an instr. sg., but not seriously enough to tr. it so. Reluctantly, with a similarly reluctant Old, I take it as a neut. pl., meaning ‘wise (thoughts)’. This is unsatisfying because the adj. *dhîra-* otherwise only refers to animates. There are partial parallels for \sqrt{san} with thoughts/wisdom as obj., e.g., IX.9.9 *sānā medhām*, X.143.3 *sīśāsataṃ dhīyaḥ*, but not with *dhîra-*. A possibly more promising interpr. is suggested by Re, who points out that the only other neut. form of *dhîra-* is found with *janūṃṣi* ‘races’ in VII.86.1; this also seems to underlie Tichy’s “wie verständige (Wesen).” I would now emend the publ. tr. to “... like the wise (races).” This isn’t a great deal better, but it at least deals with the problem of animate/inanimate.

V.50.5: As all comm. remark, the meter in pāda b is flawed. Curiously enough, the other two occurrences of *rāthaspátih* (in the closely related X.64.10, 93.7) are also found in metrically wanting pādas—each missing a syllable—as Old notes. The metrical problem may (or may not) be connected with the morphological anomaly in this cmpd.: the 1st member *rāthas-* to the extremely well-attested thematic stem *rātha-*. We would of course expect **rātha-pāti-*, but the problem with this form emerges immediately on constructing it: 4 light syllables. On this form and similarly anomalous hapax *ṛtas-pāti-* (VIII.26.21; voc., so unaccented) see Wackernagel’s rather elliptical treatment (AiG II.1.241, 246–67), where he classifies the two forms with gen. *pāti-* cmpds, without explaining how he analyzes the *-as* forms morphologically. I would suggest that the putative, metrically difficult form with stem as first member was “fixed” by analogy to the common genitival *-pāti-* cmpds to athematic noun stems (or opaque ones), most esp. *bṛhaspāti-*, which is very common and phonologically similar. However, this does not address the metrical problem. Arnold (101) suggests reading **rāthasas*, which fixes the meter but at the high cost of inventing an *s*-stem to *rātha-*, which makes no sense derivationally (rightly rejected by Old). Old attributes the metrical disturbance to “laxe metrische Praxis,” which is, at best, a description, not an explanation. I do *not* think *rāthas-* represents an archaic gen. form—all the less so since it’s not clear that the form was correctly transmitted. In any case, Old considers the *rāthaspāti-* a divine being of some sort; the “Lord of the Chariot” here joins another very marginal figure, God Leader. *rāthaspāti-* is found with

Bhaga elsewhere (X.64.10, 93.7), and such an association would fit the emphasis on ‘wealth’ (*rayí-*) in b and c.

The forms *īśastútaḥ* and *devastútaḥ* in d and e can either be nom. pl. root noun agentive cmpds or acc. pl. tatpuruṣa action nouns (both with 2nd member *-stú-t-*); see Scar 636–7. Although most interpr. (Ge, Re, WG) opt for the former, I have chosen the latter, on the basis of a number of passages in V where a praise song (vel sim.) is the obj. of *manāmahe*: V.13.2 *agné stómam manāmahe*, V.35.8 *diví stómam manāmahe*, V.66.3 ... *susṭutím ... stómair manāmahe*; also VII.82.10 *devásya ślókaṃ savitúr manāmahe*.

V.51 All Gods

On the structure of this composite hymn, see publ. intro. It is bland and featureless throughout, reminding us that there must have been a lot of mediocre Rigvedic poets and/or ritual occasions that did not require (or pay for) the best of what the poets had to offer.

V.51.1: The eponymous phrase *vísvaiḥ ... devaiḥ* opens successive pādas here (b, c), but the adj. is in fact more narrowly construed with immediately following *ūmebhiḥ*. This is rather like (or, rather, opposite to) the manipulation of the phrase in vs. 1 of the preceding hymn (50.1).

V.51.3: On the basis of VIII.38.7 *prātaryāvabhiḥ ... devébhiḥ* I construe those two instr. most closely together.

V.51.4: On the loc. *camū* see AiG III.188. It belongs to the category of endless locatives discussed by TY; see comm. ad VII.102.3.

V.51.5-10: These next 6 vss. are in Uṣṇih, divided into 3 (vss. 5–7) and 3 (vss. 8–10) by their refrains: *abhí práyaḥ* of 5–7 and the full-pāda *ā yāhy agne atrivát suté raṇa* of 8–10. In fact vss. 8–10 are rigidly -- and boringly -- structured, with each of the first two pādas containing a form of *sajūḥ* ‘jointly’ and as many god-name instrumentals as can be fitted in.

V.51.5: This vs. begins the second hymn in this conglomeration. Note that it repeats pāda-final *havyádātaye* from 1c, and the infinitive at the end of its first pāda, *vītáye*, rhymes with *pītáye* at the end of 1a.

V.51.11–15: Considered by Old to be an Anhang even to this set of appended hymns. Its lexical hero is *svastí-*, a form of which appears in every pāda between 11a and 15a. The poet seems to be trying to show how many different syntactic constructions he can plug *svastí-* into. Unfortunately this is not sufficient to hold our attention.

V.51.11: *anarváṇaḥ* receives far more attention than I think it deserves. See esp. Old. However, now see the abundant references to my own comments on the various *anarvá(n)(a)-* stems in the lexical commentary index. JPB (Ādityas 218–19) has a convincingly scenario for this form as a backformation from *anarváṇam*, which he sees as the proper acc. sg. of a fem. *n*-stem.

V.51.12: My tr. of ab differs from the standard, which take *bhúvanasya yás pátiḥ* as a rel. cl. limiting *sómam*. Since the acc. of the god name seems to correlate with “call upon *for* well-being (*svastáye*),” and the rel. cl. is preceded by *svastí*, which is found as acc. in the “establish/mete out well-being,” I supply “mete out” here and take the rel. cl. as the subject without overt antecedent.

V.51.12: Bṛhaspati’s “whole flock” (bv. *sárva-gaṇa-*) may refer to the Aṅgirasas. In any case note *sárva-* rather than the older *visva-*, esp. notable in a Viśve Devāḥ hymn (though *visve devāḥ* opens the next vs.).

V.52 Maruts

The pattern of the mention of the Maruts’ name in this hymn is worth noting: it might be called a “versified paradigm” (à la I.1) with a hole in it. The various oblique forms of the plural stem *marút-* are densely clustered at the beginning of the hymn: instr. *marúdbhiḥ* (1b), gen. *marútām* (3c), loc. *marútsu* (4a), dat. *marúdbhyaḥ* (5d), and acc. *marútaḥ* (6d) -- each oblique case represented (if abl. is lumped with dat.), each once only. In addition there are three forms of the vṛddhied *mārutam* in the neut. acc. sg. later in the hymn (8a, 13c, 14a). However, though these gods are frequently referred to in the nom. pl. in the hymn, beginning with *yé* in 1c, and once in the voc. (*dhṛṣṇavaḥ* 14c), there are no forms of the nom. *marútaḥ* or the voc. *mārutaḥ* / *marutaḥ*, although these are the most common forms of this stem in the RV. After the paradigm has been established in the early part of the hymn (1–6), there are no further occurrences of the simple stem in the 11 remaining vss. (7–17), only the three vṛddhi forms. I don’t know what, if anything, to make of this, but it does not seem by chance.

On the responsions and ring-compositional structure of vss. 1–5, see the publ. intro. and my “Poetic ‘Repair’ in the Rig Veda” (2006: 133–36), as well as *The Rigveda between Two Worlds* (2007: 112–13). The responsions and the versified paradigm are most likely related; as I argue in “Poetic ‘Repair’” the instr. in the phrase *ārcā marúdbhiḥ* ... in vs. 1 is somewhat anomalous, but it is “repaired” by the substitution of the expected dat. in 5d ... *ārcā marúdbhyaḥ*. To summarize those discussions briefly, in a hymn devoted to the Maruts, beginning with the self-exhortation of the poet “chant forth,” we might expect the Maruts to be the recipients (dat.) of the chant, not, as it seems, fellow-chanters (instr.) with the human poet. But putting them in the instr. emphasizes an important part of their profile, that they are also known to chant, a feature that is alluded to by the hemistich-final adj. *īkvabhiḥ* ‘possessing the chant’. Thus the beginning of the hymn seems concerned with the Maruts’ contrastive and mediating functional roles as expressed by the oblique cases of the paradigm.

V.52.1: On the somewhat anomalous expression in the first hemistich, see reff. given just above.

The 2nd hemistich is also syntactically somewhat compromised. Forms of uncompounded \sqrt{mad} that mean ‘take pleasure in / enjoy’ seldom if ever (possibly VII.49.4) take the acc. (as also noted by Re), in preference to instr., gen., or loc.; yet *mādanti* here seems to take acc. *śrávaḥ* as obj. It might be possible to extract *ānu* from the cmpd *anuṣvadhām* ‘according to their own nature’ and construe it with *mādanti*, since

ānu √ *mad* ‘cheer on’ does take an acc. -- but a personal acc., not the neut. inanimate ‘fame’ that it would govern here. So an unresolvable syntactic tension has been set up. I think the tension reflects the double role of the Maruts already encountered in pāda b. As recipients of Śyāvāśva’s praise chant, they would “take pleasure in their fame,” but as participants in the chanting they would “cheer on” the fame of other(s).

Ge and Re seem to take *adroghám* as an adv., a possibility also mentioned by WG. However, the other apparent adv. form has initial accent (*ádrogham* VIII.60.4), and furthermore the existence of a bahuvrīhi *ádrogha-vāc-* (2x) and the syntagm *adroghá-vācas-* (III.14.6) support a collocation with semantically similar *śrávas-*.

V.52.2: It is not clear why the rel. cl. of ab contains *sánti*, as the clause seems a simple equational one (“since they are comrades”), and such clauses generally lack an overt copula. Ge takes *dhṛṣṇuyā* as a predication with *sánti*, as, it seems, do WG. This is in principle appealing, but given that we get untethered adv. *dhṛṣṇuyā* in the previous and following vss. (1a, 4b) and a similar equational (rel.) cl. in 13ab (*yé ... kaváyaḥ sánti* “who are poets,” it does not seem compelling.

Ge takes *dhṛṣadvínaḥ* as acc. pl. with *śásvataḥ*, but he seems isolated in this interpr., starting from Sāy., who takes it as the nom. pl. that otherwise universally prevails.

V.52.3: As Ge points out, the verb *āti* √ *skand* ‘spring across/beyond’ is reminiscent of *ádhi* √ *skand*, which refers to sexual mounting. He supplies a parenthetical “(auf die Kühe)” in the simile (so also Re), and I would now also do so: “they spring across the nights, as streaming bulls spring (upon cows).”

The meaning ‘night’ for the rare and etymologically unclear (see EWA s.v.; also WG n., with more confidence in the etym.) *śárvarī-* seems established by later Vedic and MIA evidence, but I do not know why the word appears in this passage. A fem. word for night is necessary to make the implicit sexual pun work, but the better attested *rātrī-* is of course also fem. It somewhat responds phonologically to likewise pāda-final *śásvataḥ* in 3b, and it therefore might form a web, along with *syand(rāsaḥ) ... ṣkand(anti)* earlier in the hemistich -- but the phonological connections seem too slight. Maybe Śyāvāśva just likes words that begin with his initial.

I am not certain what image is being conveyed. Ge suggests that the Maruts’ storms calm down at night and then take on renewed energy in the morning, but the two passages he adduces don’t seem to support that interpr. Moreover, ‘spring across/beyond’ seems to me the opposite of what Ge envisions: it’s a vigorous action not a relaxation into tranquility. I tentatively suggest that it refers to the fact that thunderstorms (or, rather, the associated lightning flashes) are especially visible at night and appear to streak across the dark sky.

V.52.5: This is the vs. in which the problematic instr. of 1b is resolved -- “repaired” -- but, as discussed in my 2006 paper, the poet produces a new conundrum, though this one can be, as it were, pre-repaired. The obj. *yajñám* ‘sacrifice’ is unexpected with the verb *prá ... arcā* ‘chant forth’; we expect a verbal product as object. But the *yajñám* here is picking up the conjoined phrase *stómam yajñám ca* of 4b, whose *stómam* would be an appropriate obj. of *prá ... arcā*.

V.52.6: This vs. is in Paṅkti; that is, it contains five 8-syllable pādas rather than the four of Anuṣṭubh, otherwise the meter of the hymn until the end, where the final two vss. are also in Paṅkti. Here the slight shift in meter seems to mark a boundary: on the one hand it brings the versified paradigm to a close, with the acc. *marútaḥ* in d; on the other it announces the advent of the gods with their storms and inaugurates the descriptive passages that dominate the remainder of the hymn.

The first pāda lacks a verb; Ge makes a valiant effort to construe *asṛkṣata* of b with pāda a as well, in two different senses (see his n. 6; ‘... sind ... herangesprengt’ for a, ‘haben ... geschleudert’ for b), but the former would be a unique sense for *ā√sṛj*. Gr also invents a unique sense ‘decorate X with Y’ to allow the two pādas to be construed as a single construction. To avoid such ad hoc contrivances it seems best to follow Old in supplying a verb of motion with the insistent *ā* in pāda a.

The adj. that begins pāda b, *ṛśvā(h)*, can be either acc. pl. fem. modifying *ṛṣṭīḥ* ‘spears’ (so Gr, apparently also WG) or nom. pl. masc. modifying *nāra(h)* ‘men’. The pāda break preceding it might favor the former interpr., but 13a, where the Maruts are definitely called *ṛśvā(h)*, favors the latter, esp. since the Maruts are also *ṛśvā-* elsewhere (e.g., I.64.2). Note that in 13a the adj. is also followed by ‘spear’, but safely bound in a cmpd: *ṛśvā ṛṣṭividyaḥ*; this bahuvrīhi ‘whose spears are lightning flashes’ combines the independent words *ṛṣṭīḥ* and *vidyútaḥ* of our vs. (pādas b and c respectively) and enforces their identity. This resolution in 13a of the ambiguity of 6ab can be seen as another example of “repair.” Partly because the poet seems to be drawing attention to the phrase by resolving it in 13a I am now inclined to take *ṛśvā(h)* in 6b with both of its possible referents and emend the tr. to “the lofty men have launched their spears aloft.” It would be one of the reasonably many examples where a grammatically ambiguous descriptor is positioned exactly between its two possible referents.

The hapax fem. part. *jājḥatīḥ* ‘giggling’ is, of course, phonologically quite striking. As discussed by Hoffmann (Aufs. 306 and n. 3 = KZ 83 [1969]), the form is based on the redupl. pres. to *√has* ‘laugh’ with a Middle Indic (“dialectal”) development of the cluster **gh-s* (rather than the expected *-kṣ-* found in the masc. part. to the same redupl. pres. *jākṣat-* in I.33.7). The use of such a phonologically exotic word is reminiscent of the equally exotic *akḥkhalī-* in the frog hymn (VII.103.3). The latter, as Thieme has convincingly argued, is an importation from pedagogical discourse, conducted for young boys in a preform of Middle Indic. Our form here seems adopted from vernacular “women’s language” and brings a whiff of family life: little girls running after their brothers or parents with little-girl giggles -- a life that would, of course, be conducted in a vernacular (pre-) Middle Indic.

Pāda e has several parallels, given by Ge in his n. 6e. The question in our passage is whether *divāḥ* is gen., as I’ve taken it (so also Ge and somewhat differently Re), or abl. (“The radiance arose ... from heaven”; so WG). The parallels cut both ways: V.25.8 *svānó arta tmānā divaḥ* and VII.34.7 *úd asya súṣmād bhānúr nārta* seem to favor an abl. interpr., but IV.1.17 *úd devyā uṣáso bhānúr arta* a genitive. In the end, I don’t think the choice materially affects the sense of the passage: whether the radiance is ‘of heaven’ or ‘from heaven’ the result is pretty much the same.

V.52.7: This vs. consists of a single rel. cl. (*yé ... yé*) with no main cl. It is most probably preposed to vs. 8 with its correlative the neut. sg. *śárdho mārutam* “the Marut troop,” despite the mismatch in number and gender. The end of vs. 6 has no reference to the Maruts, and, as I noted above, it serves as a boundary vs. The same structure with number disharmony envisaged here across pāda boundary (7a *yé ...*, b *yé ...* // 8a *śárdho mārutam ...*) is found, more clearly, within a vs. in 13: 13a *yé ...* / 13c *tām ... mārutam gaṇám ...*, perhaps another example of repair.

The usual tripartite division of the cosmos (earth, midspace, heaven) is here complicated by the intrusion of a fourth, “the precinct of the rivers” (*vr̥jāna- nadīnām*). Re also notes this, but suggests that c does nothing but “enjoliver” (embellish) a -- that is, that the rivers are a variant of the earth. In a basic sense he is correct, but I would add that what we have here may be the clash of two formulaic expressions of contrastive geographic totality -- the standard tripartite model and one, barely attested, in which a nearer or lower *vr̥jāna-* is contrasted with something more distant. Cf. esp. I.101.8 (with mention of the Maruts) *yád vā marutvaḥ paramé sadhásthe, yád vāvamé vr̥jāne mādayasva*, a bipartite phrase where a seat (*sadhástha-* as here) that is *paramá-* ‘high/distant’ is contrasted with *avamé vr̥jāne* ‘lowest/nearest enclosure’; a *vr̥jāna-* is similarly *ávare* in II.24.11. Thus, though pāda c may refer to the same general geographical location as a, namely earth, it also evokes a paired, rather than tripartite, contrast like that in I.101.8 just cited.

The pf. injunc. 3rd pl. *vāvṛdhānta* (see Kü 471) is attested several times elsewhere and manifestly belongs to a redupl. stem. It is worth noting, however, that the poet seems to be playing with its long reduplication. The *vā* is positioned exactly where we would expect *vā* ‘or’ to be (Wackernagel’s position: #*yé vāvṛdhānta ...*), anticipating the two *vā*’s in pādas c and d, also in Wackernagel’s position. I am not suggesting a re-segmentation as *vā vr̥dhānta*, simply pointing to Śyāvāśva’s penchant for verbal play and for making single forms do double duty. To extend this analysis, note the beginning of pāda b, *ya urāv ...*, with *āv* that could be taken as a metathesis of *vā*.

V.52.8–9: I don’t understand the force of *utá sma*, which opens 8c and 9a, with *utá* opening 9c. Klein (DGRV I.416–17) says that they introduce parallel statements about the Maruts and represent “concatenation across the stanza-boundary,” halfway between intrastanzaic and interstanzaic usage. But the role of *sma*, whatever it may be, seems downplayed in this description.

V.52.8: Ge takes *syandrā(h)* as acc. pl. fem. and supplies antelopes as the obj. of *yujata*. This is not impossible, but *syandrā(h)* was already used of the Maruts in 3a (cf. also V.87.3).

V.52.9: The phrase *páruṣṇyām ūrṇā vasata* is similar to IV.22.2 *páruṣṇīm uśámāṇa ūrṇām*, but while in the latter *páruṣṇīm* modifies ‘wool’, here it must be a loc. sg. The ‘wool’ in both passages is best understood as a metaphor for ‘foam’. The stem *páruṣṇī-* is the fem. corresponding to *paruṣá-* ‘gray’. It is also a river name, presumably so called because it is covered with grayish foam. For disc. see Old, Hoffmann (Aufs. 333–35 [=Die Sprache 1974]). The mediating image in this picture is provided by *sundhyávaḥ*; I follow Thieme (KZ 79 [1965] = Kl Sch. 219ff.) in interpr. this form as ‘preening

[waterbird]’ (to \sqrt{sudh} ‘clean’). As pointed out in the publ. intro., the density of imagery is remarkable: the Maruts swathed in clouds (not explicitly mentioned) are compared to birds in a river covered with foam, with the foam (again not explicit) characterized as wool.

The instr. sg. *pavyā* to the masc. stem *paví-* shows the older *-ā* ending, which becomes limited to fem. *-ī*-stems when the masc./ neut. adopt *-inā*.

V.52.10: The first half-vs. consists of fanciful names of the individual Maruts (never otherwise named), summed up with the instr. phrase *etébhiḥ ... nāmabhiḥ* “with these names” in c. The rest of the second hemistich is unclear, however, primarily because the formal identity and meaning of *ohate* are disputed. The former issue is the easier to solve: though Gr identifies the verb as a 3rd sg. and Re hesitates, it must be a 3rd pl. to the root pres. (of $\sqrt{oh/uh}$) (see EWA s.v. *OH* and esp. Narten [Kl Sch. 98–100 = 1969]). The basis for considering it a 3rd sg. is the Pp’s interpr. of *viṣṭārā* as nom. sg. *viṣṭārāḥ*, but a loc. sg. in *-é* is equally possible. It is highly unlikely that *ohate* would be 3rd singular in 10d but 3rd plural in 11a, b, as Gr, for ex., takes them. The questions then are who is the subj. and how does the verb fit with the rest of the material in the half-verse. Most interpr. take *yajñām* as the obj. and tr. “praise the sacrifice,” with either the Maruts or unidentified priests/poets as subj. This is not impossible, but given the two *ohate* in the next vs., which lack objects (unless *yajñām* is supplied, so, e.g., Gr), I prefer to seek a consistent interpr. of the verb forms. The root is used on a number of occasions as a passive ‘be lauded’ / reflexive ‘vaunt oneself’ (cf., e.g., V.30.6, VIII.5.39). Here I take the Maruts as subject and the names in ab to be the verbal content of the Maruts’ vaunt. (Note that the threefold repetition of *ohate* here is matched by the three occurrences of *vocanta* in vs. 16, also with the Maruts as subj.) Under this interpr. the dat. *māhyam*, which is problematic in most interpr., expresses the verbal recipient of the boast. This leaves *yajñām viṣṭārē*. For most interpr. the latter word characterizes the Maruts as they come to the sacrifice -- e.g., Ge ‘in breiter Schar’. Again, not impossible. However, the root \sqrt{str} ‘strew’ is almost always closely associated with the ritual, esp. with the strewing of the barhis, and I suggest that *viṣṭārē* is a infinitival locative that takes verbal rection, hence “at the bestrewing of the sacrifice.” However, I realize that this interpr. has some problems: *-stārē* is an unlikely infinitival form, and \sqrt{str} doesn’t elsewhere take *yajñām* as object. Moreover, one nominal form of \sqrt{str} , namely *viṣṭārāḥ* in II.13.10, does seem to have spatial force (JPB ‘far-flung’). I don’t have a good solution.

V.52.11: My interpr. of this vs. follows from that of 10 and diverges from those of others. By my interpr. the nom. plurals are further names the Maruts call themselves, shown most clearly by the *īti* ending pāda c. Most interpr. take c with d, syntactically and semantically divorced from ab -- e.g., Klein (DGRV II.102–3, closely flg. Ge) “(And) the men proclaim it (as worthy) and (their) teams proclaim (it so), and wondrous (are their) forms, worthy of being seen, (of whom they say,) “(They are) from the distance.” But the *ādḥā*’s that open pādas a, b, and c impose, or at least beg for, a parallel interpr. of the three pādas, esp. with the *īti* closing the last, and the parenthetical “(of whom they say)” is ad hoc, generated only from the *īti* of c.

One of the problems not mentioned by the standard interpr. is the intrusive *nī* in pāda a. The verb \sqrt{uh} does not otherwise occur with this preverb, and since *ohate* is

surrounded by identical forms without preverb (10d, 11b) it seems unlikely that only the middle one would have the preverb. It might be loosely inspired by the *ní* in *niyúta(h)* in b, but Śyāvāśva does not seem the type of poet to throw in verbal fragments without function. I suggest rather that it continues but varies the naming pattern of 10ab with PREV-*pathi*-, here with the *ní* a very minimalist predication of *nāraḥ* “men down.”

V.52.12: This vs. bristles with difficulties. The first to present itself is the least of them: the root noun cmpd *chandastúbh*-. Thus the transmitted form, but it is analyzed by the Pp and all subsequent treatments as *chandaḥ-stubh*, with the *s*-stem *chāndas*- ‘rhythmic chant’. This makes sense and the phonology is impeccable. However, this *s*-stem has decidedly late distribution (X, 1x Vālah., with the deriv. *chandasyā*- once in late IX), and I now wonder if it contains a thematic stem instead.

The next word, the hapax *kubhanyú*-, is more troublesome. There are several competing interpr. of this word, though Ge refuses to tr. it at all. Re tr. “voués à un rite communiel,” which he derives from Benveniste (BSL 52 [1956] 11–12 [not yet seen by me]), who connected it with Ossetic material: see KEWA III.676; the Ossetic connection was disputed by Szemerényi; see KEWA ref. and EWA s.v., and seems in principle farfetched. Another, going back to Neisser (see EWA s.v.) and followed by Scar (640) and WG, is ‘yelling, shouting’, from \sqrt{bhan} ‘speak’, with the pejorative prefix *ku*-. (Remmer [Frauennamen, p. 48] also follows this basic analysis, but takes the *ku*- in positive sense: “welche Redner!” hence “wortgewaltig.”) More likely is an analysis stemming ultimately from Sāy.’s *udakecchavaḥ* (see Ge’s n. 12a “Wasser wünschend”). Ge cites similarly formed *udanyávaḥ* ‘water seeking’ in nearby V.54.2, 57.1 (latter also has an *útsa*- ‘wellspring’ as here). The Kubhā river also figures in this Marut cycle, in the next hymn V.53.9 in a list of river names. A derived adj. **kubhā-yú*- ‘seeking the Kubhā’ can easily have been formed. Given the common interchange of *-ā-yá/ú*- and *-an-yá/ú*- derivatives (type *vr̥ṣāyá*-, *vr̥ṣanyá*-), **kubhāyú*- could have been reformed as *kubhanyú*-, esp. under the influence of *udanyú*-, see also *iṣanyata* in 14d. Here it can mean either ‘seeking the Kubhā River’ or ‘seeking water’ more generally. Since their goal in the following pāda is a wellspring (*útsam*), seeking some sort of water source makes good sense in the passage.

The meaning of the word *kīrī(n)*- is disputed, with the two leading contenders ‘bard’ and ‘weak, poor’. The former, the only sense given by Gr, seems to be currently in the ascendancy after eclipse -- e.g., KEWA glosses it only as ‘gering, niedrig, arm’, but EWA as ‘Dichter, Lobsänger’, with ‘weak’ banished to the small print -- perhaps because it is easier to etymologize ($\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘celebrate’). But the contexts, esp. the fact that it is regularly followed by *cīd* ‘even’ and often refers to a person receiving divine aid despite his condition, favor the latter. See also my brief disc. in Hyenas (251–52). The sense ‘weak, poor’ fits our context less well, since the Maruts are powerful and outfitted with enough bling to make them rich. But if ‘weak’ can be interpreted as ‘lightweight, light on their feet’, it can work: the Maruts are *dancing* to the wellspring. Another issue is the status of the stem *kīrīn*- to which this form is assigned. The only other forms possibly belonging to this stem are 3 instr. sg. *kīrīṇā* (I.100.9, V.4.10, 40.8), but they can also of course belong to the reasonably well-attested simple *i*-stem *kīrī*-. Mehendale (“Two Vedic Notes: (1) *kīrīn*?” BSOAS 1974: 670–71) attempts to eliminate the *-īn*-stem entirely by analyzing our form as instr. sg. *kīrīṇā* + *u*, with *u* replacing the usual *cīd*, and

this interpr. is tentatively followed by WG. But *u* is hardly equivalent to *cid* and it is highly unlikely to be placed here, in the middle of a pāda and a clause. Our understanding of Rigvedic particle usage has advanced considerably since 1974. If we want to eliminate, or limit, *kīrín-*, it should first be noted that of the three instr. sgs., two are in Maṇḍala V (V.4.10, 40.8), and so it is possible that the poets of V reinterpr. *kīrínā* as belonging to an *-ín*-stem; there are no unambig. exx. of the plain *i*-stem *kīrī-* in V. Certainly there is no possessive sense associated with the putative *kīrín-* forms as far as I can see.

The 2nd hemistich also presents difficulties: how to construe the indefinite expression *ké cid*, why the Maruts are compared to/identified with thieves, and whether *c* and *d* form a single expression or two. These questions have been addressed in various ways in the standard transl.; I will treat only my own. My rendering assumes that *c* and *d* are separate clauses (contra the standard view) depicting a two-step process. For *c* I start with the fact that what thieves mostly do in the RV is hide. I assume that the Maruts are likened to thieves because on their first approach, enveloped in clouds perhaps, they are indistinct and unidentifiable; this is also conveyed by the indefinite *ké cin ná* “like who knows who.” (I do not take *ké cid* directly with *tāyāvaḥ*, but interpr. them as two different ways of referring to the stealthy Maruts, again against most interpr.) In *d* the Maruts suddenly flash out (*āsan dṛśí tvīṣé* “came to glitter in my sight”) as the storm, or specifically the lightning. As they become visible in this way, it also becomes clear that they are ‘helpers’ (*ūmāḥ*); as usual, the assumption behind this is that the storm, though violent, brings fructifying rain -- rain which is previewed in the first hemistich, where the Maruts seek water and prance to the wellspring, while chanting in rhythm, presumably a reference to thunder.

V.52.13: On the phrase *ṛṣvā ṛṣṭívidyutaḥ* see disc. ad vs. 6; for the number disharmony in *yé ... tām* see disc. ad vs. 7; for the seemingly unnecessary copula *sánti* see disc. ad vs. 2 as well as immediately below.

This vs. serves as another boundary. The Maruts of the thunderstorm, dominating the middle of this hymn, are reconfigured as ritualists, appropriate guests and participants at our sacrifice. The ritual context now takes over for the rest of the hymn. This thematic transition may help explain the *sánti*. In pāda *a* the Maruts are still lofty ones with spears of lightning -- untamed forces of nature -- but in *b* they are asserted to be poets and ritual adepts (*kaváyaḥ ... vedhásah*). Perhaps the *sánti* marks the two forms in *b* as predicate nouns in an equational sentence (X IS Y), where X and Y belong to very different domains.

The address or, as seems likely, self-address to the seer (*ṛṣe*) returns us to the very beginning of the hymn, with Śyāvāśva’s clear self-address in 1ab.

V.52.14: The self-address of 13c seems important enough to repeat here in pāda with minimal variation, though the syntactic function of the acc. *mārutam gaṇám* is different and the rest of the vs. much less clear.

The first hemistich lacks a verb; the parameters of what to supply are set by the nominal arguments in *a* -- the seer is commanded (/commands himself) to [DO SOMETHING] to(ward) (*ácha*) the Marut flock -- and further limited by the simile in *b*, with the nom. maiden (*yoṣāṇā*) roughly corresponding to the seer and the acc. friend/ally

(*mitráṃ*) to the Maruts. I have supplied ‘approach’, others ‘invite, address, turn’, etc., all more or less acceptable.

The question then is what the simile in b is conveying. Most of the renderings attribute bolder action to the maiden than I think gently bred Vedic girls would ordinarily undertake (see esp. Klein, DGRV II.183–84: “... like a maiden entices a friend”). My solution is to read *dānā́* twice in two different morphological interpr. First, with the standard interpr., as the instr. sg. of ‘gift’ (on the possible stems, see EWA s.v. *dānā́*). But also as a root aor. mid. participle in the nom. sg. fem. with passive value. Although such a participle is not recognized by the standard grammars, it is exactly the form we would expect and fits the gift-marriage model perfectly. The *mitrá-* to whom she is given is presumably her spouse; on *mitrá-* in a wedding context see X.27.12 and my “The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara” (Fs. Parpola 2001), 309–13.

The final word of b, *yoṣāṇā́*, is anomalously accented (vs. standard *yóṣaṇā́*). See below comm. ad 15b for a possible explanation.

The second hemistich seems to be presented as a disjunctive alternative to the first, introduced by *vā́*. The “or” does not make much sense; it is tempting to follow Re’s judgment: “*vā́* irrationnel.” But Klein (II.184) may have rightly divined the rationale: “the poet first beseeches the Rishi to entice the Maruts to the worship, but then, as an alternative, appeals directly to the Maruts themselves to come.” I would tweak this slightly by suggesting that the action to which 14cd is presented as an alternative is not 14ab, but rather 13cd, of which 14a(b) is a variant. The ṛṣi orders himself to stop the Maruts with a song (13cd) but then suggests to them that they initiate the journey themselves (14cd).

The voc. *dhṛṣṇavaḥ* addressed to the Maruts again reminds us of the beginning of the hymn, with *dhṛṣṇuyā́* (1a, 2b, 4b) and *dhṛṣadvínaḥ* (2c).

V.52.15: This vs. is a variant of 14, with the parts somewhat differently distributed. The phrase *devāṃ áchā́* in b resembles *ácha ... mārutaṃ gaṇám* in 14a, and it therefore seems prudent and economical to supply the same verb as in 14a.

Although in 14ab *dānā́* belonged to the same syntagm as *ácha ... mārutaṃ gaṇám*, here it is construed with a different part of the sentence, with the opt. *saceta* ‘would/might/could keep company’. In 14 the poet was offering a gift to the Maruts; here he “keeps company with a gift” -- that is, receives it -- bestowed by the Maruts. The situation is the standard reciprocal exchange of praise and worship for the gods for material benefits from the gods. The givers are first identified as *sūrī*-s ‘patrons’ (c), and one could think of the human patrons often so called, but pāda d makes it clear that the Maruts are meant, and the identification of the *sūrāyaḥ* with the Maruts is even clearer in 16b.

The two instr. in d are off balance: *yāmaśrutebhiḥ* ‘famed on/by their course/journey’ modifies the Maruts, but, *pace* Gr, Ge, and WG, *añjībhiḥ* should not, because *añjī-* is only a noun ‘unguent, adornment’ (see in the next hymn V.53.4), not the adj. their tr. require. Re recognizes the problem and suggests that it is an “instrumental of identification”: “en tant que (porteurs d’) ornements.” I think rather that *yāma-* and *añjībhiḥ* are functionally parallel, both to be construed with *śrutá-*, but one in a cmpd and one in an independent syntagm. For similar interplay between cmpd member and independent word, see comm. ad VIII.1.2.

The real problem in this vs. is *vakṣāṇā*. In the publ. tr. I follow Ge and Re in taking it as an acc. pl. of *vakṣāṇā* ‘udder’, but of course this stem is fem. and the acc. pl. form here should be *vakṣāṇāḥ*. Ge (n. 15b) casually suggests that it is exceptionally neuter or else a mistake for *vakṣāṇāḥ*, Re that it’s a “nt. insolite.” Others provide different morphological analysis: Gr sets up a special stem *vakṣāṇā* ‘Darbringung’ and must take it as a nom. sg.; Old suggests emending the accent to **vákṣaṇā*, allowing it to belong to the stem *vákṣaṇa-* ‘strengthening’ and takes it as a neut. nom. pl. (“wie zu den Göttern die Stärkungen”); WG maintain the ‘udder’ analysis but take it as a nom. sg.: “Der ... (wendet) sich den göttlichen (Maruts) zu wie ein Schlauch (der gefüllt sein will).” This last is the most ingenious and does the least violence to the morphology / repertoire of stems, but the image is an odd one, to say the least.

My explanation, admittedly rather weak, starts from the similar patterning of vss. 14 and 15: 1) the *ácha* + acc. gods noted above (though *ácha* differently positioned), in each case requiring a verb to be supplied; 2) *dānā* (beg. of 14b/15c); 3) the parallel endings of the b pādas: 14b ... *ná yoṣāṇā* / 15c ... *ná vakṣāṇā*. The final word of each of these pādas is problematic: *yoṣāṇā* has the wrong accent, *vakṣāṇā* has the wrong ending. I suggest that the words were mutually adjusted to each other, either in composition or redactionally. Oldenberg already suggested (in his n. 2) that *yoṣāṇā* might owe its accent to *vakṣāṇā*, but the suggestion was half-hearted since he really wanted to emend the accent of *vakṣāṇā* to **vákṣaṇā*, as I just noted. However, this seems the best explanation of the accent of *yoṣāṇā*, and conversely this allows us also to assume that acc. pl. **vakṣāṇāḥ* lost its *-h* to match *yoṣāṇā*. Although this may seem no different from Ge’s and Re’s arbitrary conferral of neut. gender, my explanation is contextually tied and has some possibility of being correct.

V.52.16: This Pañkti vs. is the last real vs. of the hymn, since 17 (also Pañkti) is a dānastuti. It begins with *prá*, just as vs. 1 did, and continues with the insistent repetition of the verb of speech *vocanta* (pādas b, c, e). The vs. is also reminiscent of repeated *ohate* ‘vaunt themselves’ in 10–11; as there, the recipient of the Maruts’ speech here is “me.” The structure of the vs. would be clearer if the tr. read “Those who proclaimed ... they proclaimed P. their mother, then they proclaimed their father ...”

On *iṣmín-* see comm. ad I.87.6.

V.52.17: By all standard interpr. the Maruts are the subjects of this dānastuti, but it is worth noting that they are not named -- and so it is possible that a set of human patrons, assimilated to the Maruts and thus endowed with their prestige, are the actual donors praised.

Note the etymological chaining between the subj. of 16e *śíkvasaḥ* and 17a *śākínah*, both deriv. from √*śak*. This could be evidence of the identity of the subjects (Maruts both), or it could be another way of conferring Marut qualities on the human patrons.

The unbalanced āmreḍita *ékam-ekā* is curiously formed. AiG III.395 (fld. by Klein, *Āmreḍitas*,” p. 791 [JAOS 123 (2003)]) suggests that the pl. *ekā* has been attracted to the following *śatā*, whose attribute it is. It also seems an attempt, utilizing both sg. *ékam* and pl. *ekā*, to express the awkward distributive, of *one* hundred per each of seven Maruts, producing a total of plural hundreds.

V.53 Maruts

For the complex metrical structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. Despite the numerous different names for the meters, with few meters repeated in adjacent vss., they are all combinations of 8- and 12-syllable pādas, and so the hymns is metrically more harmonious than the long list of meters implies.

V.53.1: Like V.52.14 in the immediately preceding hymn, this vs. contains a *vā* ‘or’ whose disjunctive alternatives do not seem parallel. While it is true that both alternatives are questions beginning with *kāḥ* ‘who’, the questions seem ill-matched. Re’s assessment here is “illogisme de *vā* [*sic* -- he prints it with accent].” Perhaps the point is that if no one knows as far back as the Maruts’ birth, there may still be someone who has had long association with them and their habits.

V.53.2: In b *kathā yayuḥ* could be resolved as *kathā ā yayuḥ* “how did they drive here?” This interpr. might be favored by *āyayūḥ* in 3a, although it is disfavored by *prā yayuḥ* in 12b.

The sandhi form *āpāya* at the end of c is universally interpr. as the nom. pl. *āpāyaḥ*, referring to the Maruts; it could, however, be just as easily dat. sg. *āpāye* and refer to the good giver (*sudāse*) immediately preceding. In fact, I think it should be read as both, as reflected in the publ. tr. This double reading is favored by the way the vs. is structured, a striking pattern discovered by Natalie Operstein (in class, early 2000s). In general in this verse syntactic constituency is alternating and interlocked -- that is, constituents have the pattern X Y X’ Y’, etc. So, pāda a:

ā *rātheṣu*
etān *tasthúṣaḥ*
 with the acc. pl. *etān* ... *tasthúṣaḥ* interrupted by the loc. pl. *rātheṣu*, which is governed by *ā* preceding the acc. pl. The pattern is similar in cd:
kásmai *sudāse* *ídābhir* *sahá*
sasruḥ *ānu* *vṛṣṭáyāḥ*
āpāya

The datives *kásmai* ... *sudāse* form a constituent, interrupted by the 3rd pl. verb *sasruḥ*, whose preverb *ānu* follows the dat. *sudāse* and whose overt subj., nom. pl. *vṛṣṭáyāḥ* itself interrupts the postpositional phrase *ídābhir* ... *sahá*. In this configuration *āpāya* is not definitively paired: it could go with dat. *sudāse*, separated from it by the prev. *ānu*, or with the nom. pl. *vṛṣṭáyāḥ*, likewise separated from it by a single word, instr. *ídābhir*. Note also that it is the final word of a 12-syllable pāda, in a verse whose other pādas are 8-syllables, so it is metrically almost isolated and could almost (not quite -- it’s only 3 syllables) attach itself to d rather than c. Since *āpī-* ‘friend’ is an inherently reciprocal word, its double application is especially appropriate.

V.53.3: The referent of *té* in the opening phrase *té ma āhuḥ* “They say to me” is not entirely clear. It is universally taken as the Maruts, and that is probably correct. Among other things it is reminiscent of the Maruts’ proclamations “to me” in the previous hymn: 52.10 ... *máhyam* ... *ohate* and 52.16 ... *me* ... *vócanta*. However, it is possible that the subj. is instead unidentified human associates of the poet. This would avoid the

awkwardness of having the Maruts refer to themselves in the 3rd ps.: “They say to me, ‘When you see them [expect “us”], praise.’”

In pāda a note the figure *āhur yā āyayūr*.

As Re points out, *yā āyayuh ... mādē* is the implicit answer to *kathā yayuh* in 1b. The two instr. in b *dyúbhir víbhiḥ* have provoked more commentary than they probably deserve. Ge (fld by WG) takes the former as referring to daybreak and the birds are then the birds that start stirring at that time. This is not impossible, but *dyúbhiḥ* (incl. *úpa dyúbhiḥ* VIII.40.8) generally means ‘through the days, day after day’, and that is fine here. The Maruts would then fly “with the birds” because they come through the midspace, where birds are at home.

V.53.4: The vs. consists entirely of a nominal rel. cl. without verb, presumably hanging off vs. 3.

The problematic form is the hapax *śrāyā* (Pp. *śrāyāḥ*). It is generally taken as a nom. pl. thematic deriv. of $\sqrt{\text{śrī}}$, so ‘resting in’, attenuated by some to ‘provided with’ (with loc.). I cannot find particular fault with this analysis, save for its banality and the unclear source of the root-syllable *ā*. I am inclined instead to take it as an instr. sg. (*śrāyā*, equally possible in this sandhi situation) to a derivative of $\sqrt{\text{śrī}}$, parallel to *śriyā*, which is regularly used of the Maruts. But I confess I do not know why *śriyā* wouldn’t have been used instead or exactly what the derivational mechanism would be, incl. again the source of the *vṛddhi*.

V.53.5: The construction of this vs. is very problematic and has been much discussed (see, e.g., Old’s long consideration). In the end my interpr. is closest, but not identical, to Re’s, though perhaps not arrived at by the same means.

To deal with the easiest issue first, *pace* Gr and Ge I do not construe *ānu ... dadhe* together. For one thing *ānu* $\sqrt{\text{dhā}}$ barely exists; moreover a preverb in tmesis is unlikely to move to the end of the preceding pāda (so also Re). Rather, it surely governs preceding immediately *rāthān*, like similarly pāda-final *ródasī ānu* in 6c. It can be further noted that *ānu* is a signature word of this hymn, occurring 6x: 2c, 5a, 6c, 10c, 11c, 16c. With *ānu* otherwise assigned, the simplex verb *dadhe* ‘I take my place’ is then easily construed with the purpose dat. *mudé*.

The real problem in the verse is what to do with pāda c. The easy sense that Ge extracts from it (“die wie die Himmel (Tage) mit Regen kommen”) makes a hash of the grammar. Assuming that he means *dyāvah* to be compared with the chariots, with the point of comparison found in the part. ‘coming’ (*yatīḥ*),

- 1) *dyāvah* must be taken as an acc., which is simply impossible; or
- 2) the alternative to 1) is to assume the whole simile has reverted to the nominative, something that doesn’t happen in RV, as I long ago demonstrated (“Case disharmony...”) though Ge asserts it here (his n. 5c referring to his n. to I.180.3d);
- 3) the fem. part. *yatīḥ* should modify masc. *rāthān* or else, by attraction, *dyāvah*, which latter is only fem. in the meaning ‘heaven’, not ‘day’.

A way to a solution (or partial solution) comes from recognizing that the fem. pl. part. *yatīḥ* regularly modifies ‘waters’; cf. *āpah ná pravātā yatīḥ* VIII.6.34 = 13.8 = IX.24.2, *āpo ādṛśram āyatīḥ* X.30.13, *apām ārtham yatīnām*. It is therefore quite likely, esp. in this rainy context, that ‘waters’ is gapped here, solving the gender problem -- and

also the case problem, because, adding another nominal element to the syntagm allows *dyāvah* to take its expected nominative role and respond to the acc. represented by (*apó*) *yatīh*. Re's tr. reflects this: "comme les cieux (agrément les eaux), qui vont avec la pluie."

The question is then what is the mediating verb? Re's 'agrément' makes sense, but he doesn't explain where he got it. I think it is possible to generate it from the datival *mudé* of b, either by simply switching emphasis from the finite verb *dadhe* to its infinitival complement or, in a trickier move, reading *mudé* a 2nd time, but this time as a 1st sg. mid. to a root present: \sqrt{mud} has a hapax med. root opt. *mudīmahī*, and though it is generally classified as a root aor., a root pres. is certainly not excluded. It is worth noting that this opt. is construed with the preverb *ānu* (VIII.1.14 *ānu stómam mudhīmahī*). Assuming this lexeme in our c would simplify the rendering of the simile. I therefore suggest a slight alteration to the published translation, to "(I delighting/delight) like the heavens (in the waters) when they come with their rain."

See also disc. ad 10c, which in some ways repairs this problematic passage.

V.53.6: As noted by most comm., masc. acc. sg. *yām*, presumably modifying *kósam*, has no referent in the main cl. Such "improper" relativization is not rare in the RV.

ānu at the end of c can also, secondarily, be read with d: *ānu, dhānvanā*.

V.53.7: In c I construe *ādhvanah* as an abl. with *syannā(h)* rather than a gen. with *vimócane*. The effective difference is trivial, but the image seems more dynamic if the horses, unhitched, rush off into the roadside pastures (perhaps in pursuit of the "dappled females," though if the latter are antelopes, this would lead to species crossbreeding).

V.53.8: The abl. *parāvatah* is somewhat odd with *māva sthāta* "don't stay away"; we would expect loc. *parāvāti*, which is quite well-attested. It may be that *parāvatah* has simply been harmonized with the ablatives in ab: *divá(h) ... antárikṣād amāt*. However, it's also possible to take *māva sthāta* in c as a parenthetical exclamation and *parāvatah* as a continuation of the abl. phrase of ab: "Drive hither, Maruts, from heaven, from the midspace, from nearby -- don't stay away! -- and from a distance." This might also explain the unusual pāda-final *utá* of b. I therefore offer this as an alternative to the publ. tr.

There is also the question of what the lexeme *áva* $\sqrt{sthā}$ means here. Generally it means 'descend', often into a river or the like (see Re ad loc.). But that doesn't make sense here: if the Maruts are to come here from heaven or the midspace, as they are invited to in ab, they will *have to* descend. If we take the *áva* seriously, perhaps the idea is that the Maruts shouldn't perform their descent somewhere else than here-- at a distance -- perhaps into the rivers named in the next vs. But this seems overly complex.

V.53.8-9: Note the phonological modulation of #*ā* ... (8a) to #*māva*...(8c) to #*mā vo* (9a) / *mā vah* (9bc). The *vah* then migrates to the end of 9d.

V.53.10: In some ways this vs. is both a variant and a repair of vs. 5. Like that vs. it begins with an acc. phrase referring to the Maruts' chariots. Following (*ānu*) they come the rains: *ānu prā yanti vṛṣṭáyah*, a variant of 5c *vṛṣṭī ... yatīr iva* "(fem. pl.) coming with their rain," where I supplied 'waters' as the referent of the participle. The syntax is

somewhat different, but the elements are there. In this passage the relationship between the metaphor and the natural world is drawn more clearly: the chariots and the flock of Maruts represent thunder and lightning (see below), which are regularly followed by rain.

While a, c may function as repair, the phrase in b, ... *gaṇām mārutam nāvyaśīnām*, introduces a new poetic complication. It is found identically in V.58.1, where it is even more troublesome. The problem is what to supply with gen. pl. fem. *nāvyaśīnām*. Ge and Re, rather bizarrely, choose to supply Maruts -- e.g., Ge “der ... marutische Schar der neuesten (Marut).” This not only contravenes the unmistakable gender of *nāvyaśīnām*, but it produces an awkward and clunky pleonastic expression. It is also unclear to me who the “newer” or “newest” (latter both Ge and Re) Maruts would be: it is generally emphasized that the Maruts are indistinguishable and “there is no last one” (V.58.5). Nonetheless the view that *nāvyaśīnām* refers to the Maruts is well entrenched. There is no masc. gen. pl. comparative attested in Vedic, and both Lanman (Noun Inflec. 515) and Macd (VG 234) state that the fem. form is used instead in these two passages “in agreement with *marūtām*” (Macd, as if gen. pl. *marūtām* were actually in the passage), due to “metrical exigencies” (again Macd, but same view expressed by Lanman). The metrical argument is strikingly weak: although neither a putative masc. gen. pl. **nāvyaśām* nor **nāvīyaśām* built to the alternative comparative stem would fit this exact metrical slot even with distraction of the gen. pl. ending (as here), neither form would have any trouble fitting into other parts of a Vedic metrical line (including the cadence), and it’s difficult to believe that a poet like Śyāvāśva would set his heart on putting a comparative *just here* and then seriously distort the grammar to shove it in. (Sāy., it should be noted, does not supply Maruts, but still ignores the gender of *nāvyaśīnām* by glossing it with the grammatically ambiguous *nūtanānām* and then connecting that gen. pl. with *rāthānām* in pāda a.)

WG have the merit of supplying a fem., namely ‘rains’, borrowed from the *vṛṣṭāyaḥ* of c. But this again seems pleonastic: why would the rains follow the rains, and indeed why would the (temporally unmarked) rains follow the newer rains? I start by considering what is regularly called ‘newer’. To this there is a ready answer: hymns, songs, formulations, thoughts, etc. -- the standard verbal products celebrated in RVic discourse, several of which are fem. In fact, note that in the next vs. (53.11) two such words are prominently positioned at the ends of pādas: *suśastībhiḥ* (11b) ‘good chants’ and *dhītībhiḥ* (11c) ‘poetic thoughts’, both of which are elsewhere modified by *nāvyaśī-*: VIII.5.25 *nāvyaśībhiḥ suśastībhiḥ*; I.143.1 ... *nāvyaśīm dhītīm*. I therefore propose that we should supply such a word with *nāvyaśīnām* in 10b. (In the publ. tr. it is ‘hymns’.) But this produces an odd locution, “the Marut flock of newer (hymns),” with semantically ill-assorted elements joined -- or so it seems at first glance. But remember that the poet is depicting a metaphorical thunderstorm: the rains, undisguised, come last, but I think we have both thunder and lightning earlier in the vs.: the flock is *tveṣām* ‘glittering’ (though, I must admit, the word sometimes just means ‘turbulent’: see *vāta-tviṣ-* ‘turbulent as the wind’ in the next hymn, V.54.3), which can represent the lightning. And the flock also consists of “hymns,” which in this context can be the regular booming of thunder claps.

V.53.11: The Maruts’ thunder-hymns are then met with our reciprocal offered praise hymns.

In pāda a *va eṣām* is taken by all standard tr. as a doubled gen. pl., essentially “of these you,” though not so tr. I think rather that *eṣām* refers to the chariots, and *vaḥ* is the gen. dependent on the whole NP *śārdhaṃ-śardham ... eṣām*, which simply reprises 10a *tām vaḥ śārdhaṃ rāthānām*, with gen. pl. of the chariots.

V.53.12: The question *kāsmāi ... prā yayuḥ* “to whom have they driven” returns us to the questions in vs. 2: *kathā yayuḥ / kāsmāi sasruḥ* “How have they driven? To whom have they flowed?” The referent of *kāsmāi* in 2, the “good giver” (*sudāse*), is further specified here as “one who has given an oblation” (*rātāhavyāya*), though with different roots ‘give’. This ring-compositional reprise brings to a close the descriptive portion of the hymn, and the poet turns to requests.

V.53.13: With the standard tr. I take *yēna* in pāda as referring to *enā yāmena* in the previous vs. (12c).

I tr. *dhānyā*- lit., ‘related to grain (*dhānā*), as ‘granular’, because I think it refers both to the raindrops, shaped like grain, and the actual grain that results from the rain.

I.57.1 *rādhō víśvāyu* suggests that *visvāyu* belongs to what precedes, rather than to *saubhagam* as Ge and Re take it.

V.53.14: The standard tr. take *usrī* as having temporal domain over the whole of pāda c: “when it rains, the waters at dawn are luck, lifetime, and medicine.” I don’t see any way to tell, and in fact I don’t see why dawn should limit any of these predicates.

V.53.16: Unaccented *asya* should not modify *stuvatāḥ* as WG take it. Better the solutions of Ge and Re, esp. the latter, who separate these two genitives, with Re supplying “Marut troop” with *asya*.

V.54 Maruts

V.54.1: The first word of the hymn is *prā*, as it was in V.52, the first of Śyāvāśva’s Marut hymns. It would at first appear to be in tmesis with *anajā* in b (so Gr and see Re’s bizarre tr. “je veux lancer-avec-onction”), but *√añj* does not otherwise appear with *prā*. I think it rather belongs with the last word of the vs., *arcata*. The syntagm *prā √arc* is quite common and, more to the point, began the first hymn in this cycle: V.52.1ab *prā ..., ārcā*. The rest of our vs., from *śārdhāya* to *dyumnāśravase*, is set into this celebratory frame.

anajā is the 1st sg. act. nasal infix pres. subjunctive, as all the standard tr. take it, *pace* its assignment to the pf. by Gr, Wh, Macd.

My tr. of *gharmastúbh-* ‘with the rhythm of the gharma-pot’ sounds like a bahuvrīhi, which it is not. Better would be ‘chanting rhythmically (like) the gharma-pot’ (cf. *chandastúbh-* in nearby V.52.12). The point of comparison, as is noted by most comm., is the regular bubbling of the gharma-pot.

My “sacrificing on the back of heaven” agrees with Ge and Re in taking *divāḥ* as limiting the first member of *pr̥sthayājvane*. Old allows both this and a syntagm *divā ā* “from heaven,” while WG follow Old’s 2nd alternative and suggest that the Maruts are sacrificing on the back of the earth (to be supplied). It is difficult to make a judgment here.

V.54.2: Like the 1st vs. this one begins with *prá*. Also like the first vs. the first hemistich of this one is dense with cmpds, here describing the Maruts' chariots.

The repetition of *párijrayaḥ* at the end of both hemistichs seems a bit clunky and perhaps especially so because, if the forms are nom. plurals (as generally taken), the supposed stem *pári-jri-* is ill-formed: we expect an empty final *-t-* on what looks like a root noun in short resonant. This supposed stem *párijri-* occurs once outside of this hymn, also pāda-final, also as apparent nom. pl. of the Maruts (I.64.5), and the root noun *-jri-* is also supposed to be found in *urujrí-* twice, again as nom./voc. pl. *urujráyāḥ* (accented VIII.70.4, unaccented voc. VII.39.3, the only form not pāda-final). Thus all attested forms of the supposed *-jri-* stem are in the shape *-jrayaḥ* (accented or not). The 2nd cmpd exists beside an *s*-stem bahuvrīhi *urujráyas-* (twice in acc. sg. *-asam*), and a simplex neut. *s*-stem *jráyas-* is well attested (approx. 15x), with Aves. and OP cognates *zraīiaḥ-* and *drayaḥ-* respectively. All of this makes the stem *-jri-* seem very fishy. Debrunner (AiG II.2.44) explains the forms, which, as we saw, all end in *-ayas*, as haplogologies from **-ayasas*, making ref. to Wackernagel's AiG III.80, which presents other possible haplogologies to *-s*-stem **-asas* forms. Though I am leery of systematic haplogologies, I think this has a reasonable chance of being right, esp. in this pāda-final position. However, in our passage I think there is another contributing factor. Ge (n. 2ab) adduces two passages containing *jráyas-*: X.92.5 *pariyánn úru jráyāḥ* (IX.68.2, not cited by Ge, is identical) and I.95.9 *urú te jráyas páry eti*, with *pári* (+ VERB OF MOTION) collocated with the *-s*-stem *jráyas-*. In V.54.2 *párijrayaḥ* seems almost like a univerbation of a prepositional/adverbial phrase *pári *jráyāḥ* "around the (broad) expanse." It is even possible that one of the forms in this vs. is meant to represent the adverbial phrase -- so, possibly, ab "forth (go your chariots) around the expanse," referring to the Maruts' circling the earth or the midspace -- while the other is a nom. pl. (by old haplogology), to be rendered as in the publ. tr.: "the waters swirling in their stream bed." This would alleviate the clunkiness of the repetition, which would then be only apparent.

As Ge. remarks (n. 2c), "Trita's Beziehung zu den Marut ist dunkel." Trita is associated with the Maruts also in II.34.10, 14. In vs. 10 of that hymn Trita seems to be associated with making noise, as here; that is as far as I can get.

V.54.3: Pāda-final *parvatacyút-* returns here (from 1b) but in a different form: nom. pl. *-aḥ* rather than dat. sg. *-e*.

V.54.4: The vs. sets up pairs of antitheses: nights/days (a), midspace/dusky realms (b), with the third only indirectly implied: fields [=dry land]/ *water [via boats] (c).

The *īm* that interrupts the simile *nāvaḥ ... yathā* in c is superficially puzzling, but I think it is related to the implication just noted: it stands for the acc. 'waters' in the full realization of the phrase "like boats (through waters)." It is also worthy of note that the cadences of pādas c and d are phonologically similar, esp. at beginning and end, though they achieve this through very different grammatical means: ... *nāva īm yathā* # ... *nāha riṣyatha* #.

V.54.5: Note the phonetic echoes: (*mahi*)*t(v)anā(m)* ... (*ta*)*tāna* ... (*é*)*tā ná* ... (*áyā*)*tanā*.

I take “greatness” (or “heroism [and] greatness”) to be the unexpressed subj. of *tatāna* in b, rather than *yójanam* with Ge. The latter is an acc. of extent of space, and the phrase #*dīrghām ... yójanam*# is iconically positioned to express the distance traversed.

In the second hemistich contra Ge and Re I take c as a separate nominal main clause, with d a temporal dependent cl. This allows the *yád* to be properly positioned, rather than occurring deep in the dependent cl. (The WG treatment is similar to mine.) The shared characteristic in the simile in c, ‘having ungraspable brilliance’ (*āgrbhītasocis-*), presumably refers to the combination of speed and timidity that characterizes antelopes, deer, and their ilk and makes them hard to catch. If we were to speculate more narrowly, the ‘brilliance’ might refer either to the conspicuous white spots on the coat of the chital deer or the white sides, underbelly, interior legs, and hindquarters of the blackbuck -- both species that seem native to the right location.

The puzzle in d is the phrase *ánaśvadām ... girīm* “the non-horse-giving mountain.” In order to approach it, we might first tackle the verb that governs it, *ny āyātanā*. The lexeme *ní√yā* is generally hostile; cf. nearby V.42.10 (also of the Maruts) *yá óhate rakṣáso devāvītāv / acakrēbhis tám maruto ní yāta* “Who(ever) will laud the demons at the invitation to the gods, run him over/down, Maruts, with your wheel-less (chariots).” In our passage the sense seems to be that the Maruts trample down or overrun a mountain whose behavior deserves it. But what is a non-horse-giving mountain? On the one hand, it may simply refer to a stingy mountain, comparable to a stingy patron, contrasted to *aśvadā-* ‘horse-giving’ used of generous patrons elsewhere. But still, why horses? Mountains can be the source of nourishment and wealth; cf. I.65.5 *gírīr ná bhújma* “a source of benefit like a mountain” (also VIII.50.2 and comm. ad I.55.3). But mountainous terrain is not particularly friendly to horses, which are most at home in open, relatively flat grasslands. I therefore wonder if the operable segmentation of the cmpd is *anaśva-dā-* ‘giving non-horses’ (rather than *an-aśvadā-* ‘not giving horses’). This might then be an oblique reference to the Vala myth and the mountain that yields up cows (that is, non-horses). However, since the Maruts are not generally associated with the Vala myth, this may be farfetched. The safest interpr. is Old’s deflection, that the phrase is “auf unbekannte Erzählung anspielend.”

V.54.6: My interpr. follows that of Narten (Sig.Aor. 195–96), with the first pāda consisting of the *yád* clause, the 2nd the main cl. Both Ge and Re take the first part of pāda a as the main cl., with the dependent clause starting with *yád*. Although *yád* is better positioned in their interpr. than in Narten’s, they must make *arṇasám* an obj. of *móṣathā* (in unconvincing fashion) and the sequence of tense/mood is badly off: aug. aor. *ābhrāji* ... aor. subjunctive *móṣathā*, lit., “it has flashed when you will steal ...” Ge simply renders the subjunctive as a preterite, while Re’s parenthesis in “vous déroba(i)ez” is masterfully evasive even for him.

As I just said, I am not happy with the position of *yád* in Narten’s/my interpr., since it follows both the verb and part of the subject (plus a voc., but that doesn’t count). There is another possibility, that *yád* functions here as a sort of izafe, connecting *śárdhaḥ* and *arṇasám*: “the troop, which is a flood.” In this case *ābhrāji* would be a main-cl. verb, and the two pādas, a and b, would be syntactically unconnected: “The troop that is a flood has flashed; you will plunder ...” *arṇasá-* is a hapax. Narten takes it as an adjectival deriv. of *arṇas-* ‘flood’, but it could have been (re-)substantivized as ‘flood’.

The point of comparison in b between the Maruts and the caterpillar is that violent storms also strip the leaves off trees.

The sequence *vrkṣām kap(anéva)* is oddly reminiscent of *Vṛṣākapi*, the randy monkey in X.86, but this must be accidental.

In the publ. tr. the voc. *sajoṣasaḥ* is not rendered as a voc., since the Engl. would be awkward.

The *s*-aor. subj. *neṣathā* ‘you will lead’ is particularly appropriate to the obj. *arāmati-*, the personified feminine Proper Thinking, since the verb \sqrt{ni} , esp. in sigmatic forms, becomes specialized for leading females in ritual settings; cf. the priestly title *Neṣtar*. Although *neṣtar*- probably owes its *-s-* to crossing of the agent noun *nétar-* with *Tvaṣtar* (*tvāṣtar-*), who is also associated with ritual females (see EWA s.v. *neṣtar-*), its apparent coincidence with the *neṣ* of the *s*-aor. could spread the semantics.

V.54.7: In d the sequence *ṛṣim vā* must have been fronted around the rel. *yām*, since the phrase as a whole *ṛṣim vā yām rājānam vā* does not mean “either the seer or which king” but “which seer or king” -- or even better “which one, whether seer or king.”

I take the thematic stem *sūṣūda-* as ultimately deriving from a pf. subjunctive, despite accent. In this particular form, the 2nd pl. indic. pf. **sūṣūda*, with the rarely occurring 2nd pl. act. pf. ending *-a*, would have simply been extended by the prim. ending.

V.54.8: In the cmpd. *grāmajīt-* the 1st member could have either an acc. or an instr. relationship with the root noun. Both would be possible: ‘conquering roving band’ (so Gr, Ge, Re, Thieme [M+A 81]) or ‘conquering with/in roving bands’. Although in such root noun cmpds an acc. relationship is more common, indeed also among cmpds in *-jīt-*, I follow Scarlatta’s preferred interpr. (156) found also in his tr. (=WG), although the acc. interpr. is hardly excluded. The parallel I.100.10 *grāmebhiḥ sánitā*, cited by Re, is suggestive.

My interpr. of b follows Thieme (M+A 81), esp. of *aryamānaḥ*, which he takes as “hospitable ones (hospitable householders who refresh the stranger).” Others take it as a pregnant pl. referring to “(Mitra, Varuṇa, and) Aryaman.”

The dep. cl. in c, *yád ināso ásvaran*, can be construed either with what precedes or what follows, but sits uneasily with either because of its augmented *ásvaran*, which doesn’t match the pres. indic. *pínvanti* (c) or *undanti* (d). I chose to connect it with d, as thunder before rain.

V.54.9: *dyaúḥ* is clearly fem. here, given the adj. *pravátvatī*, but this gender choice must be conditioned by its standard formulaic partner, fem. *prthivī*, in the preceding pāda, modified by the same adj. in the same position.

The nom. pl. *jīrádānavaḥ* ‘having lively drops’ in d must modify the mountains (*párvatāḥ*), but in the immed. preceding hymn it is found in the voc. of the Maruts (V.53.6, in the same metrical pos.; cf. also I.34.4 a nom. pl. of the Maruts in the same position). There are no grounds for emending the text by deleting the accent and making it into a voc. (which would also entail a switch from 3rd to 2nd ps. ref.); how would it have acquired the accent here? Rather it must be word play: mountains produce torrents of water when it rains.

V.54.10: The *s*-stem adj. *sá-bharas-* (so accented in X.101.3, though it is an accentless voc. here), tr. here ‘of equal gravity’, is a bahuvrīhi with the lit. sense ‘having the same burden / weight’, with the same *-bharas-* as in *viśvá-bharas-* ‘bringing all’, i.e., lit. ‘having/bringing all burdens’ in IV.1.19.

s^uvarṇarāḥ at the end of pāda a picks up *nāraḥ* at the end of 8a and 10b and *asvaran* at the end of 8c.

V.54.12: Note the repetition of *ágrbhīta-śociṣ-* from 5c; this cmpd is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VIII.23.1, of Agni).

The first hemistich is discussed in some detail by Thieme (Fremd. 68–70), whose interpr. I basically follow. I would add that the (heavenly) brilliance that cannot be grasped by the Ārya on earth is shaken down as rain by the Maruts.

There are two basic interpr. of c, depending on what the subject of *sám acyanta* is taken to be. For Ge the subj. is the Maruts, with *vṛjānā* the grammatical obj. referring to their girthbands: they are girding themselves for battle. WG’s interpr. also takes the reference to be to the Maruts, but with *vṛjānā* as the subj. referring to the closing of the ranks (Reihe) of the Maruts, again before some warlike manoeuvre on their part. In both these interpr. the referent of the subj. of *sám acyanta* and *átitviṣanta* is the same: the Maruts. With Re I instead consider the verbs to have different subjects: the subj. of *sám acyanta*, *vṛjānā*, refers to the circles or communities of the Ārya, while the Maruts are the subj. of *átitviṣanta*. I think the two hemistichs contrast the Maruts’ effects on the Ārya communities: in ab the Maruts bring them the welcome rain they cannot get themselves, but in cd they cling together during the violence of the Maruts’ storm. (I cannot decide which strain Kü’s tr. (224) follows, though WG’s paraphrase of it in their n. leans towards the Re/JB side.)

V.54.13: The verb in d, *rāraṇta*, presents difficulties both morphologically and semantically. Formally it has received a variety of analyses: Gr classifies it (impossibly) with \sqrt{radh} ‘subdue’; as Old notes, in context it would best belong to $\sqrt{rā}$ ‘give’, but it is hard to make this work formally. Given the long redupl. characteristic of the pf. to \sqrt{ran} ‘enjoy’, the form most likely belongs there. Lub. classifies it as a med. (3rd sg.) injunc. to that root, but there are no other med. forms to this stem or indeed to the root (*raṇáyanta* being an *-anta* replacement). I think we are therefore stuck with the formally most likely analysis, given by Kü, as 2nd pl. pf. impv., with (as often) irregular full grade (see also Ge n. 13d). This poses problems semantically. It should mean ‘enjoy’, with the Maruts as subject. The gapped obj. is qualified by *sahasrín-* ‘possessing/in thousands’; as Re points out, this is a stable epithet of *rayí-* ‘wealth’. And this is the problem: the Maruts have just given us wealth; we should be the ones enjoying it. Gods never enjoy wealth -- they distribute it. Ge suggests in his n. that the thousandfold wealth they enjoy is “in Gestalt von Opfern,” which is certainly a good try (probably the best available). Old tries to make the verb into what looks like a reflexive causative: “macht [den Reichtum] bei uns sich erfreuen” -- that is, the Maruts should make the wealth be happy to stay by us. WG go one step further in the causativization process: “(An diesem Reichtum) ... macht, dass man sich hier bei uns daran freue ... am tausendfachen.” But these last two attempts to separate the Maruts from the enjoyment are unconvincing, because no other forms to this stem show this causative tendency. I think we probably should stick with the meaning

imposed by parallel forms (so also Re) and deal, perhaps as Ge does, with the Maruts enjoying riches. The possible transitivity of *rārandhi*, built to the same stem, in X.59.5 (q.v.), via reinterpret. as a redupl. aor., is not really available here because *asmé* is not acc. and so the phrase cannot straightforwardly mean “make us enjoy wealth.” However, it might be possible to interpr. it as “make wealth enjoyable to us.”

V.54.14: The problematic wealth of 13d reappears in 14a as the obj. of a gapped verb whose subj. is the Maruts, but in this case we can borrow the verb from the next pāda, *avatha* ‘you aid’. Ge unaccountably supplies a verb (“gewähret”) that matches neither what precedes nor what follows.

The pāda-final words in the first hemistich, ... *spārhāvīran*# and ... *sāmavīpram*# are phonologically similar. This partial match may help explain the odd hapax *sāmavīpra*-. Although my tr. ‘inspired in his melody’ is structurally similar to the other standard renderings (e.g., Re ‘inspiré par la mélodie-sacréé’), the cmpd should not mean that. For one thing the 2nd member *vīpra*- is almost never used adjectivally (*pace* Gr), but almost always as a noun referring to a type of poet. Moreover, the accent strong suggests a bahuvrīhi. A literal rendering of such a bahuvrīhi would be something like ‘whose inspired poet is the melody’ or ‘whose inspired poet has the melody’ (latter like *vājra-bāhu*- ‘having an arm that has a mace (in it)’), which do not work as descriptors of a seer. I wonder if the phonological play just noted didn’t flip the order of the cmpd members, and the underlying form would be **vīpra-sāman*- ‘having the melody of an inspired poet’. Exact parallels are *vīpra-manman*- ‘having the thought of an inspired poet / having inspired thought’ in VI.39.1, where it modifies *kavī*-, and *vīpra-vacas*- ‘having the speech of an inspired poet / having inspired speech’ in VIII.61.8.

V.55 Maruts

V.55.1: The question about *prāyajyu*- is how technically it is meant; I here follow Re.

The first hemistich recalls vs. 11 in the previous hymn, esp. in the bahuvrīhi *rukma-vakṣas*- ‘with brilliants on their breasts’ (lit. ‘having breasts with brilliants on them’, of the *vājra-bāhu*- type), which matches the nominal phrase V.54.11b *vākṣassu rukmā*, but also in *bhrājad-ṛṣti*- ‘having glinting spears’, whose members are distributed differently in 54.11a *āmseṣu ... ṛṣṭāyaḥ* and b *agnībhājasah*.

The idiom *śubham* √ *yā* is used of the Maruts elsewhere, in nearby V.57.2 as well as I.23.11; cf. also the cmpds *śubham-yā(van)*-. My “drove in beauty” is of course a conscious echo of Byron’s “She walks in beauty, like the night.” A different kind of English resonance would be offered by “gone to glory.”

V.55.2: The verb *vī rājatha* can mean either ‘shine forth’ or ‘reign over’; both fit the context and the subject, though given pāda a “you assumed your power,” perhaps ‘rule’ has the edge. The root noun cmpd *virāj-* seems confined to the ‘rule’ sense, when it does not refer to the meter by that name.

V.55.4: I take *ābhūṣēnya*- as a quasi-desiderative gerundive, parallel to *didṛkṣēnya*- ‘desirable to be seen’ -- hence ‘desirable to become’ → ‘to be emulated’. However it may simply mean ‘to be attended upon’.

The *utá* introducing the impv. in c is awkwardly rendered as ‘and’. Klein (DGRV I.454) says it means rather ‘therefore’, which works better in English. However, ‘therefore’ for *utá* does not have much support (3 passages cited by Klein out of over 750) or a clear path of development, and a closer look at the context does not yield a causal “X, therefore Y” interpr. It is possible that the morphologically ambiguous *dadhātana* is not an imperative but an injunctive, which would yield a more acceptable pendant “and you establish us in immortality.” And it is also possible that the *utá* here loosely matches the other 3rd-pāda *utá*-s in 2c, 7c, while anticipating 5a #*úd*.

V.56 Maruts

V.56.1: Ge (/WG) supply “bring,” an impv. addressed to Agni, in the first hemistich. There seems no particularly reason to do so, since the acc. phrase of ab can be construed with *áva hvaye* in c. Perhaps it’s on the basis of the *ā* in pāda a, but this is in the wrong position to be a gapped preverb. I don’t actually know what *ā* is doing, but note that in the ring-compositional expressions in vss. 8–9, the ‘call’ verb is construed with *ā*.

V.56.2: The question in this vs. is who is the 2nd sg. referent of *mānyase* (a), *te* (c), and *vardha* (d). Acdg. to Sāy. it is still Agni, but Ge suggests alternatively that it could be the self-address of the poet, a view shared by Re. (WG think Agni, but with a very peculiar tr. of pāda a). I think poetic self-address is excluded because of the *me* in b: the poet is unlikely to refer to himself as “you (sg.)” and “me” in successive pādas (and then back to “you”), so Agni is the more likely. The point must be that both Agni and the poet want the same thing -- for the Maruts to come to the sacrifice. The identification of you as Agni requires that he possess/produce *hāvana*- ‘calls’ in c. This can refer to the crackling of the fire. Alternatively, flg. Gr, *hāvana*- could belong to *√hu* and mean ‘oblations’, but *pace* Gr none of the occurrences he adduces need to have that meaning.

V.56.3: The gender politics of this vs. would not bear modern scrutiny: the idea seems to be that the Earth enjoys rough sex because she gets nice presents. But it is a powerful image.

The poss. adj. *mīlhuśmant-* occurs twice in the RV; the other form is found in VI.50.12, where it is masc. and seems barely distinct from *mīlhvás-* ‘giving rewards, generous’. Here in this fem. form the possessive value of *-mant-* does have force, assuming the correctness of Ge’s and Re’s interpr. as ‘possessing a generous (man/lord/spouse)’. WG take it rather as ‘Soldatenbraut’, interpr. *mīlhvás-* as ‘one who has *mīlhá-*’ (booty, etc) and further suggesting that the woman in question was part of the spoils of war. This is appealing in some ways, but it does not fit well with the last word of the hymn, *mīlhuś*.

As Ge points out (n. 3a), *pārāhatā* may have two senses -- simply ‘beaten aside’ by the onslaught of the Maruts and ‘(sexually) penetrated’, for which sense he cites ŚB XI.5.1.1 *vaitasēna daṇḍēna hatāt* [*sic*, not Ge’s *hatā*], the ŚB paraphrase of Urvaśī’s ... *mā ... śnathayo vaitasēna* (X.95.5) “you pierced me with your rod.”

V.56.4: *ní√ri* means ‘make flow’, hence ‘liquefy, dissolve’. In I.127.4 the very similar *sthīrā cid ānnā ní riṇāti ójasā* has ‘sturdy foods’ as obj., but since Agni is the subject, the

food is presumably wood of some sort. In nearby V.58.6 a middle intrans. of \sqrt{ri} (though without preverb) takes trees as subj.: *riṇaté vānāni* “the trees dissolve.” I therefore supply them as obj. here.

What then does the simile in b have to do with this? Even unruly oxen are unlikely to dissolve trees. Because the images don’t easily harmonize, I now think that the simile in b should go with the 2nd hemistich: unruly oxen *can* cause the ground to shake. This is somewhat difficult to convey in tr. -- I might rearrange it to “like oxen averse to the yoke / they shake ...”

The phrase *gāvaḥ ... durdhúraḥ* echoes *dudhró gaúḥ* of 3d phonologically, even though the adjectives are entirely unrelated.

As often Ge takes *cīd* in c as a simile marker, a function for which there is no good evidence.

V.56.5: Ge takes the impv. *út tiṣṭha* as another self-address of the poet; again the presence of a 1st ps. sg. in the vs. (*hvaye* in d) makes that unlikely. I think it is directed rather at Agni, like the direct addresses in vss. 1 and 2. For the same impv. cf. IV.4.4 *úd agne tiṣṭha* (sim. VIII.23.5): the ritual fire is blazing up while the Maruts are called to the sacrifice. In this case Agni may be commanded to rise up with praises (*stómaiḥ*) -- praises like his calls in 2c. Alternatively, there may be a clause break after the impv., with a new clause beginning with *nūnām* and continuing to the end of the vs. (This division was suggested by Natalie Operstein in class in the early 2000s.) The praises will then be those produced by the 1st ps. poet who is the subj. of *hvaye* at the end of the vs.

In b *sāmukṣita-* can hardly be separated from nearby V.55.3 *sākām ukṣitāḥ*, and V.57.8 *bṛhád ukṣāmāṇāḥ* also supports the root etym. to $\sqrt{vakṣ}$ /*ukṣ* ‘be(come) strong’, against Gr’s connection with $\sqrt{ukṣ}$ ‘sprinkle’.

V.56.6: As Bl (RVReps) and Ge point out, this vs. appears to have been constructed from textual blocks found in I.14.12 and I.134.3. Our pāda a *yuṅgdhvám hy áruṣī ráthe* is identical to I.14.12a except for the sg. impv. *yukṣvā hí* rather than our pl. *yuṅgdhvám hí*. If our pāda is modeled on I.14.12 (or a similar source) it could explain both the *hí* with no obvious function and the sg. chariot *ráthe* for the plural Maruts; this mismatch in number is repaired in the next pāda *yuṅgdhvám rátheṣu rohítaḥ*. This latter pāda has no close parallels in the RV, though I.14.12b ends with *rohítaḥ*, which is a further obj. to *yukṣvā* in pāda a (I.14.12b *haríto deva rohítaḥ*) and so may be a distant source. Our 2nd hemistich *yuṅgdhvám hári ajirā dhurí vólhave, váhiṣṭhā dhurí vólhave* closely follows I.134.3bc *vāyú ráthe ajirā dhurí vólhave, váhiṣṭhā dhurí vólhave* (whose pāda a contains the ‘yoke’ verb: *vāyúr yunkte ...*). What I don’t understand is why Śyāvāśva has made these clumsy adaptations just to produce a vs. that in context is just treading water -- there’s no need for a yoking vs. here.

Note that *váhiṣṭhā vólhave* “the two best pullers to pull” is an etymological figure, with both words built to \sqrt{vah} , though it is not at all transparent. Perhaps this is what attracted Śyāvāśva.

V.56.7: Whatever the reason for the previous vs., *syá vājy áruṣaḥ* “this reddish race horse here” contrasts with the *áruṣī(h)* ‘reddish (mares)’ in 6a. Although in the publ. tr. I identified the referent as Agni (and I still think he is a possible secondary referent), I now

accept the view of Sāy., Ge, and Re that it is the Beipferd of the Maruts (see the parallels adduced by Ge in n. 7a); otherwise the 2nd half of the vs. makes little sense.

The *mā* prohibitive in c contains what looks like a root aor. subjunctive *karat*. Flg. Wackernagel (Fs. Jacobi), Hoffmann (Injunc. 55–56; see also 92) explains this potentially embarrassing form as the injunctive to a thematized root aor., which thematization began from the ambiguous 1st sg. *ākaram*. He (somewhat disingenuously) notes that outside of *mā* clauses the *kara*- forms are otherwise only subjunctives, and he further suggests that his two exx. are found in idiomatic expressions that belong to the Volkssprache, which could explain the earlier thematization (cf. also Aufs. II.344 n. 2). (His other ex. of *mā* ... *karat* in VIII.2.20 I explain differently, as not belonging to the *mā* clause at all. See comm. ad loc.) Hoffmann’s thematic aor. explan. has been apparently accepted by Lub, who classifies the two forms identified thus by Hoffmann under “A-AOR.inj.” I am generally dubious, because the root aor. of \sqrt{kr} is so well entrenched in the RV and the -a-forms are otherwise found in clear subjunctive usage. However, I am somewhat sympathetic to the “idiomatic” explanation, esp. combined with a metrical observation: the injunc. *kaḥ* expected here is found almost entirely at the end of Triṣṭubh pādas, but would not work here at the end of a Jagatī pāda. Nonce thematization, esp. perhaps in a low-register expression, would be a quick fix.

WG produce a curious hybrid of prohibitive and subjunctive: “Nicht *soll und wird* er ... (euch) langsam *machen*” (my italics). I do not understand the explanation given in the n., or at least do not understand what sort of grammatical category is envisioned: “Uns scheint ein expekativer oder voluntativer Konjunktiv deutlich mitzuschwingen: >(Auf keinen Fall erwarten wir), dass er euch langsam mache< bzw. >Dass er euch ja nicht langsame mache!< This clearly builds on Tichy’s analysis of the function of the subjunctive as “expectation,” but I do not understand how the subjunctive would interact with the *mā*.

V.56.8–9: These two vss. essentially duplicate each other The main verbs of the two vss., *ā huvāmahe* (8b) and *ā huve* (9b) resonate with the verb in the 1st vs. (*ā...*) *āva hvaye*.

The battered-woman Earth who received presents (*mīlhuṣmatī*) in 3ab is balanced here by the glorious Rodasī, standing in apparently equality with the Maruts, dispensing presents herself (8c *surāṇāni bibhratī*, 9d *mīlhuṣṭī*). I see no merit on flg. Ge’s acceptance of Sāy.’s interpr. of *mīlhuṣṭī* as the name of the wife of Rudra.

V.57–58 Maruts

As Old (Proleg. 204–5) points out these two hymns are parallel and share a final vs. He attributes their position at the beginning of the four 8-vs. Marut hymns to this twinning. Otherwise V.58, in Triṣṭubh, should follow V.59, in Jagatī.

V.57 Maruts

V.57.3: After *dyām* in pāda a we expect **pṛthivīm*, but get phonologically similar *párvatān* instead. This disappointed expectation is “repaired” in pāda c, where *pṛthivīm* appears as the obj. of a different but semantically similar verb.

V.57.6: The pf. that ends the vs., *pipiśe*, produces a bad cadence that would be fixed by a heavy redupl. syllable. The metrical problem is not mentioned by Old or Kü; HvN note it but do not suggest a solution. I wonder if it is for intens. **pepiśe*; the act. intens. is found once in the late RV, while the middle begins to be attested in the AV, with a sense not appreciably different from non-intens. forms. Of course, the *t*-less ending *-e* would have to be accounted for, but several 3rd sg. med. intensives have such an ending; see Schaefer 44. Of course, this might all be more trouble than it's worth for a metrical violation.

V.57.7: The sentiment in pāda c is somewhat puzzling, though the grammar is straightforward: *práśastim naḥ kṛṇuta rudriyāsaḥ*. This should mean “make a eulogy for us, o Rudras,” with the VP *práśastim* √ *kṛ*. Though the three other occurrences of this VP, in I.113.19, 181.1, and II.41.16, do conform to expectations, taking it that way here would reverse the sacrificial bargain. As detailed in the first hemistich, the Maruts have given us bountiful riches of all sorts; in return we should be producing a *práśasti*- for them -- not they for us. In fact, of course, it is never the gods' job to produce praise for humans. In order to make sense of the phrase, I have pushed the sense of √ *kṛ* from ‘make’ to ‘make good’ -- that is, act such that the praise we are giving you is true. (You have given us many things; do it again.) Re's “faites nous (aujourd'hui une récompense digne du) panégyrique” is similar, despite the overstuffed parenthesis. There is another, less likely, alternative. As I have argued elsewhere (RV between Two Worlds, pp. 146–48), even in the RV the *práśasti*- was probably a genre of praise appropriate to kings and only secondarily applied to gods. It might be that the poet is asking the Maruts to render his patron and king deserving of his [=poet's] *práśasti*-, either by redistributing the wealth that they showered on the king or by the king's performing some worthy feat. But this seems overly complex and far less likely, and since *práśasti*-s in the RV are often directed at gods, it is unnecessary.

V.57.8: The vs. consists almost entirely of accented vocatives. Only the last phrase *bṛhád ukṣámānāḥ* escapes the voc. and that probably because accent conversion would be tricky.

The juxtaposition (across hemistich boundary) of *ṛta-jñāḥ* and *sátya-śrutāḥ* is striking -- and in my opinion telling with regard to the difference between *ṛtá*- and *sátya*-, both often tr. ‘truth’. Here *ṛtá*- is something one knows, but *sátya*- is something one hears. In my view *ṛtá*- is the immanent truth -- the principles and relations that lie underpin the world as we know it -- while *sátya*- is the realized truth. In some contexts this can be simply palpable reality, but here I think it refers to how *ṛtá*- is realized verbally, in the formulations of poets, available to be heard.

V.58 Maruts

V.58.1: On the phrase ... *gaṇám mārutam návyasīnām* with its problematic fem. gen. pl. *návyasīnām*, see the extensive disc. ad V.53.10.

There is complete fungibility between the collective sg. *gaṇám mārutam* “Marutian flock” and the plural *yé* in the 2nd hemistich referring to the individual Maruts, which picks up *gaṇám mārutam* by sense though not strictly by grammar. The *eṣām* at the end of pāda a seems clumsily pleonastic, however. It must refer also to the pl. Maruts and

depend on the acc. *gaṇám* (“the flock of them”), doubling the vṛddhi deriv. *mārutam*. It should *not* be construed with the fem. *nāvyasīnām*.

āśvāśva- shows phonological play, as well as being a buried etymological pun, if the old connection between *āśú-* and *āśva-* holds. It is also a kind of anagram for the poet’s name *śyāvāśva-*. Note that both words must be distracted to 4 syllables (*āśú-aśva* and *śyāvā-aśva* respectively).

The sequence *utésire* is entirely ambiguous between *utá īsire* and *utá ísire*. The Pp. reads the unaccented verb, but the *utá* suggests that the verb is conjoined with *váhante* and belongs to the rel. cl. and should therefore be accented.

V.58.2: In my opinion the same switch in number happens in this vs. as in the preceding one, exactly in the same way -- with *yé* in c picking up *gaṇám* in the first hemistich. The standard tr. take the rel. cl. of c with d: the pl. *yé* matches the number of its putative antecedent *nṛṇ* in d exactly. Although connecting with c thus appears to be the easier syntactic course, the exact parallelism between 1abc and 2abc makes that structure more appealing, and in addition the pāda-init. impv. *vāndasva* in d seems to be marking a syntactic break.

The first hemistich, which consists entirely of an acc. phrase, obviously simply continues vs. 1, skipping back over the rel. cl. in 1cd to the *gaṇám* phrase in 1ab.

The bv *dhúni-vrata-* ‘possessing a turbulent commandment’ has, at first glance, a curious sense, but the point is that, as the thunderstorm, the Maruts’ job -- their *vratá* -- is to be noisy, boisterous, and tumultuous.

The orig. *s*-stem *māyas-* has become a frozen, synchronically uninflected form in the RV. Therefore, the accent shift that makes possessive adjectives out of many neut. *s*-stems (type *yásas-* ‘glory’ → *yaśás-* ‘glorious’) was probably not an available derivational strategy -- hence the somewhat clumsy cmpd with *bhū-*.

The phrase *mayo(-bhúvah) ... ámitāḥ* appears to be an etymological play but of course is not. Note also *māyínam ... mayo-*.

It’s worthy of note that the vs. contains four nominal forms with 1st member ending in *-i*, with three different explanations: *khādi-hasta-*, *dhúni-vrata-* (both bahuvrīhis with regular *-i*-stem 1st members; for the latter see AiG II.2.296), the somewhat mysteriously formed (see below) *dāti-vāra-*, and *tuvi-rādhās-* (Caland compounding *-i-*). To which we might add *mayínām*, as well as *mahitvā* and the immediately preceding *ámitā(h)* with mirror-image phonology.

The cmpd. *dāti-vāra-* occurs 3x in the RV (and nowhere else): here, I.167.8, and III.58.2, but its repetitions in the Indo-Europeanist literature must number in the thousands. It is there generally taken as a representative of an archaic cmpd type with a verbal governing first member, found also in Greek forms like *βοτρί-άνειρα* ‘nourishing men’. The proposals for the identity of the first member vary wildly, though probably the current favorite, due to the prestige of J. Schindler, who championed it, is a *-ti*-stem nominal. This is not the place to explore the history of this cmpd., but two things are worth noting: 1) the evidence for the other Vedic cmpds that are supposed to belong with it is very weak; see esp. the remarks on *rīty-āp-* and *vṛṣṭi-dyu-* ad IX.106.9; 2) the three occurrences of the cmpd. have to be assessed in the context of apparent syntagms closely connected to it formulaically. The cmpd. always occurs as the final in a Triṣṭubh line; the VP *dāti vāriyam* is found at the end of Jagatī/dimeter lines at VII.15.12, 42.4, with

accented *dāti* at V.48.5, with impv. *dātu* at VII.15.11; with semantically similar obj., *dāti vājam* (Triṣṭubh) at VI.24.2, and non-adjacent with semantically similar obj. *dāti ... vāsu* at IV.8.3. It is hard to know what to make of this assemblage. The *dāti* forms are clearly finite verbs (note the lack of accent on several, as well as the impv. form *dātu*) in the independent syntagm, but they are not standard forms of $\sqrt{dā}$; at best the *dāti* forms are aorist subjunctives. But their appearance in the syntagm, with adjacent VO order, is obviously not independent of the cmpd. It is quite possible that *dāti* was extracted from the cmpd. and reinterpreted as a finite verb, but at the very least this means that the *dāti*- in the cmpd was not synchronically interpr. as a *-tí*-stem nominal. In any case, I am dubious about the antiquity of *dāti-vāra*- itself and even more so about the existence of a “type *dātivāra*,” as I have discussed elsewhere. On *vīti-hotra*- see comm. ad II.38.1, on *rītyāp*- and *vṛṣṭi-dyu*- comm. ad IX.106.9. For further disc. of these issues, see my forthcoming art. “Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dāti-vāra*- Compound ‘Type’: A Critical Reassessment.”

V.58.3: The enclitic 2nd pl. *vaḥ* in pāda a must refer to the assemblage of ritual celebrants and its referent is not the same as the 2nd ps. ref. to the Maruts in the 2nd hemistich (voc. *marutaḥ*, impv. *juṣadhvam*, vocc. *kavayo yuvānaḥ*).

As JL observed, pāda d has only one accented syllable (the first word *etām*). The voc. phrase that ends it, *kavayo yuvānaḥ*, recurs in the final vs., 8c [=V.57.8c], but with voc. accent because it is in a string of such vocc.: *kāvayo yúvānaḥ*. As noted ad V.57.8, that verse consists almost entirely of accented vocc., so the poet seems to be playing with extremes of syntactically driven accent here.

V.58.4: The wrong sandhi in d *yuṣmád sádaśvo* is found in both Aufr. and HvN, but the Max Müller ed. has the correct *yuṣmát*. So, a copying error going back to Aufr., presumably generated from the *yuṣmád* beginning c, as well as immediately following *sád*-.

The two cmpds in c are a little aberrant in their semantic/morphology “interface.” Given the sense of the phrase, it’s possible that we’re dealing with a lower linguistic register with somewhat looser cmpding practices. *muṣṭi-hán*- (3x RV): as a root noun cmpd we might expect the 1st member to have object relationship with 2nd – and mean ‘smiting fist(s)’ like, e.g., *vṛtra-hán*- ‘smiting Vṛtra’. Scarlatta (690) suggests some (not very convincing) ways around this. In *bāhú-jūta*- we might expect agent+passive semantics: ‘sped by the arms’, like *índra-prasūta*- ‘impelled by Indra’ (etc. etc.).

Like 3d, 4b has only one accented syllable: *vibhvataṣṭám janayathā yajatrāḥ* -- though the lack may be less noticeable since the accented syllable comes closer to the middle of the line.

The sense of *írya*- is disputed, and it has no secure etym. (see EWA s.v. *írin*-). Schlerath (Königtum) suggests that it’s a deriv. of *írā*- ‘refreshing drink’, meaning ‘Nass spendend’, and this suggestion has been adopted by Oberlies (RdR II.178). However, this does not work in all passages, nor with *írin*- (V.87.3) if that is related. It seems best to follow the old standard gloss ‘regsam, rührig’, etc., and the posited connection to \sqrt{r} ‘arise’, etc. (see EWA loc. cit.).

There are two approaches to the interpr. of *vibhva-taṣṭá*-. One assumes that the first member is a PN, the name of one of the R̥bhus (so Re, WG). One of the occurrences

of the cmpd is in a Ṛbhu hymn, IV.36.5, in a vs. with both a form of the word *ṛbhú-* and the name of another Ṛbhu, *vāja-*. There the PN interpr. seems correct or at least a pun. However, in the other passages, III.49.1, V.42.12, and this one, all lacking a strong Ṛbhu presence, it seems best to see a more general meaning. Ge seems to follow this course (here and III.49.1, though not V.42.12) but his “vollendeten” doesn’t give much hint as to how he interprets the first member.

The hapax *sád-asva-* appears to be the only RVic cmpd with the first member *sa(n)t-* -- assuming, with most, that *sát-pati-* contains a reduced form of *sádas-* ‘seat’ (see EWA s.v.). I take it as semantically related to the derived adj. *sátvan-*, of warriors ‘the real thing’. So ‘(having) true horses’ in the sense of “good men and true”; English “trusty” works well. We might have expected *s(u)vásva-* ‘having good horses’ parallel to *suvīra-* at the end of the pāda, but perhaps the poet wanted to vary the expression – though the pun on his name in 1c *ās^śvásva-* would suggest differently.

V.58.5–7: Sustained phonetic play, esp. with *p* and *r/ṛ*, in *prá-pra* (5b), *pṛśneḥ putrá(h)* (5c), *prāyāsiṣṭa pṛśatībhiḥ* (6a), *prāthiṣṭa ... pṛthivī* (7a).

V.58.5: Note the phonetic play on initial *a* and final *ā*: *arā ... ācaramā āheva ... ākavā*.

The syntactic break in the middle of pāda a, after *ivéd*, and the enjambment across the pāda boundary, with *āheva* in pāda a the subj. of the verb *prá-pra jāyante* in b, give the sense of unstoppable motion that the similes also provide.

Flg. Hoffmann (Aufs. II.413 [=MSS 10 (1957) 61–62]), WG and Re (though Re rather mutedly) take *ākavā(h)* as meaning that the Maruts do not become reduced in power, and Ge’s rather vague ‘vollkommen’ is in the same realm, though obviously without the benefit of Hoffmann’s disc. I prefer to take the adj. as outer-directed -- ‘not stingy, unstinting’ rather than inner-directed ‘not retracting’.

The VP *sváyā matyā ... sám mimikṣuḥ* “They have equipped themselves with their own poetic thought” seems implicitly to contrast with the opening of the previous hymn, V.57.1 *iyám vo asmát ... matīḥ* “This poetic thought from us for you.” This should remind us that the Maruts are both recipients and producers of praise poetry. See the disc. of the opening of this Marut cycle, V.52, where much is made of this dual role. A number of tr. take *matī-* as the equivalent of ‘will’ or ‘intention’ (van Bradke [Fs. Roth (1893) 119] Will, Ge, Kü [386] Absicht, WG Antrieb), but this stretches the meaning of this word unacceptably. In any case the locution must harmonize with the very similar one in I.165.1 adduced also by Ge: *káyā śubhā ... marútaḥ sám mimikṣuḥ / káyā matī*.

V.58.6: Although the adjacency of *pṛśatībhir ásvaiḥ* might seem to lend credence to the supposed shifting gender of *ásva-* ‘horse’ due to the clear fem. form of the preceding adj., it is better to follow the standard tr. in taking the two words as separate, with the fem. referring to dappled antelopes or simply dappled mares that serve as the horses for the Maruts’ chariot. Note that this type of double ref. to their draught animals is found in the next vs., 7c, where the Maruts yoke “the winds as their horses” to the chariot pole.

Pāda c is cleverly constructed: *āpaḥ* ‘waters’ would be a perfectly acceptable subject of the following verb *riṇaté* ‘flow, dissolve’, but it is “bound” to *kṣódante* with the accent on *riṇaté* making the syntactic break clear. But the *real* subject of *riṇaté*, *vánāni* ‘trees’, is a much less appropriate subj. than what preceded.

VIII.7.26, adduced by Ge, makes it clear that Heaven is roaring with fear, but the roaring must also represent thunder.

V.58.6–7: The final word of vs. 6 is *dyaúḥ*, while *pr̥thivī* appears in the 1st pāda of 7, implicitly linking this standard pair, although they are contextually separate.

V.58.7: The first hemistich has distinct sexual overtones, with the Earth spreading herself to receive the Maruts’ “embryo” -- though it is more decorously phrased than V.56.3.

It is difficult to get a causal reading from *hi* in c. It cannot be connected with the preceding pāda, and the action of c seems irrelevant to d, so connection with the following pāda seems unlikely. I have settled for the craven ‘certainly’.

Note that *dhurī* here was anticipated by injunc. *dhuḥ* at the end of b. Moreover, verse-final *dyaúḥ* in 6d resonates with hemistich-final *dhuḥ* of 7b. One could almost wonder if the primal incest of Heaven and Earth is being subtly alluded to.

V.58.8: See comm. above on the identical vs., V.57.8. Although it is a repeated vs., it fits nicely into this hymn: 1) *ámṛtā ítajñāḥ* has ring-compositional relationship with 1d *amṛtasya svarājaḥ*; note the twisted phonetic relationship between *svārājaḥ* and *ítajñāḥ*. 2) *túvīmaghāso* echoes *tuvirāḍhaso* of 2d; 3) Pāda c: the accented voc. *kávayo yúvānaḥ* repairs the unaccented identical phrase in 3d. Perhaps this internal quotation is responsible for the metrical problem, 10 syls. with rest after caesura.

V.59 Maruts

V.59.1: As was indicated in the publ. intro., the referent of the ‘spy’ (*spátī*) is unclear. Ge suggests a number of possibilities, none compelling; WG take it as the singer. Most bizarrely, Old interprets the word as an interjection. I think it possible that it is the sun. One clue is the repetition of the phrase *suvitāya dāvāne* “to give good faring,” which is used of the Maruts in 4d. I therefore think the ‘spy’ must be a being that can function in the same way as the Maruts and provide the same type of benefit. The sun is elsewhere called a spy (X.35.8), provides light for creatures to move about, and appears before and, more importantly, after a storm.

Part of the solution to the foregoing question depends on another problem in the first pāda, the interpr. of the 3rd sg. verb (*prá ...*) *akran*. It is regularly assigned to \sqrt{kran} ‘roar’ (so, e.g., Gr, Lub), and the standard tr. all interpr. it so. But this interpr. is by no means universal: both Wh (Rts) and Macdonell instead assign it to \sqrt{kram} ‘stride’. (Old, again bizarrely, takes it to $\sqrt{kṛ}$.) Narten sides with the \sqrt{kran} contingent (Sig. Aor. 99 n. 254), though without argument, simply asserting “... kann nicht ... zum Wz.-Aor. von *kram* gestellt werden.” On the one hand, of course, the argument against \sqrt{kram} is obvious: it is a seṭ root -- its 3rd sg. root aor. should be, and in fact is, *ákramīt*. But there are countervailing arguments. \sqrt{kran} is found with the preverb *prá* in the RV only in IX.77.1 and, at least acdg. to MonWms., nowhere else in Skt., whereas *prá* \sqrt{kram} is common. Vs. 4d, containing the other occurrence of *suvitāya dāvāne*, also contains a verb of movement (at least acdg. to me and Ge), *prá bharadhve* ‘press forward’; moreover, *suvitāya* elsewhere in the RV regularly appears with verbs of motion (cf., e.g., nearby V.57.1 *suvitāya gantana*), whereas it does not fit easily with verbs of proclaiming (though

cf. VIII.27.10 *prá naḥ pūrvasmai suvitāya vocata*). As for the morphological problem, from the fairly common (9x) 3rd pl. root aor. (*ā*)*kramuḥ*, an anīṭ-type *kran* could easily be backformed. If the verb does belong with *√kram* and the spy therefore *strides* forth, rather than *roars* forth, an entity like the sun makes good sense.

The pāda-initial *ārcā* exactly matches pāda-init. *ārcā* in the opening vs. of the opening hymn in the Marut cycle, V.52.1. As there, so here, we can read the preverb *prá* with that verb, borrowing it either from the vs. initial form or from the third word in the 2nd pāda. In fact this 2nd *prá* can be read as a preverb in tmesis either with *ārcā* or with final *bhare* (or both), and in the former case, it could be interpr. as having moved to the end of its clause *ārcā divé prá* right before the caesura with an opening of 5, rather than being the first word of the 2nd clause *prá prthivyā ṛtām bhare* right after the caesura with an opening of 4. In other words, *prá* is ambiguously positioned both syntactically and metrically.

Another ambiguous form is *tāruṣanta* (in sandhi) in c, which can be resolved either as finite 3rd pl. med. *tāruṣante* (so Pp, Gr, etc.) or an act. pres. part. masc. pl. *tāruṣantaḥ*. In the first instance it owes its accent to its clause-init. position; in the latter, because it's a participle. Since this stem has exactly 3 forms in all of Skt. -- this one, an active *taruṣema*, and a med. 3rd pl. (-*anta* replacement?) *taruṣanta*, there is no way to tell, though, since *taruṣanta* could also belong to an underlyingly active stem, I'm somewhat inclined towards the act. part.

V.59.2: The publ. interpr. of d follows Thieme (Untersuchungen, p. 39). WG draw attention to Th's revised interpr., in Kl. Sch. II.998–99 (and 834), in which he takes *mahé* as a dual and *vidathé* as a final dative: “sie halten inne, um den Regen zu verteilen,” closely followed by WG “... haben zwischen den zwei Grossen (Himmel und Erde) zur Verteilung (des Regens).” Some of this seems worth adopting. Because of the *antár* a dual interpr. of *mahé* is attractive, but rather than separating *vidáthe* from *mahé* syntactically (the interposition of the caesura, invoked by Thieme and WG, does not seem sufficient reason) and making it a dative (though the stem is otherwise only thematic and a dat. should be excluded), it seems best to return to Old's suggestion that *mahé vidáthe* is a dual acc. phrase, as it is in VIII.39.1. I would then emend the tr. to “the men have taken their places between the two great divisions [=Heaven and Earth].” This is in fact where the Maruts as thunderstorm are positioned -- in the midspace.

V.59.3: The various tr. configure these four similes somewhat differently; I won't comment in detail on these versions. The most puzzling one is the first, in great part because it is not clear what the Maruts' horn would be -- perhaps the superstructure of their helmets? or their lightning bolts? (Sāy. takes it as their turban.) Ge suggests that it has a double meaning, horn and Selbstgefühl, but we still need some physical aspect of the Maruts that could be compared to cowhorns, so the second abstract sense doesn't help much.

Most interpr. take *sūryo ná cákṣuḥ* either as a mistake for gen. *sūrah* (so Gr, e.g.) or as a decomposed bahuvrīhi, both yielding “like the eye of the sun.” I see no reason to adopt either interpr. The suggested phrase, with a proper gen., is found in 5d *sūryasya cákṣuḥ* (and, of course, elsewhere) in the same metrical position. If Śyāvāśva had wanted to say that here, he would have. Instead he must be comparing the Maruts' eye to the sun,

with both in the nom. Since *sūryasya cākṣuḥ* is a fairly common expression, its appearance in vs. 5 can be seen as poetic repair of the double nom. in our vs. In my view the quality held in common by sun and eye is the light emitted in the journey through space, but this depends on one's interpr. of *visárjane*. Ge gives it a later sense not otherwise found in the RV (Aufhören 'stopping', sim. WG Schwinden); Re takes it as 'expansion'. I see it as a variant of *ví√sr* 'stream/run/spread through'. Cf. *rájaso visāré* I.79.1, used of Agni compared to the sun. In fact, we might consider the two phrases to be variants of each other; both are pāda final, with I.79.1 in a dimeter (hence iambic) cadence, while ours provides a Jagatī cadence.

V.59.4: Pāda b succinctly summarizes the special skills of the Maruts, which lie in their ability both to produce praise poetry and to perform hypermasculine feats.

The sandhi of *kás kāvya* is irregular, but connected to similar irregular sandhis before *kaví*-elsewhere. See comm. ad VII.18.2.

V.59.5: The simile in pāda a requires a hidden term of comparison. The "reddish horses" (*ásvāḥ ... aruṣāsaḥ*) must be, covertly, the flames of a fire; that is why they have the same lineage, because they all flare up from the same source. I doubt that the poet was telling us that all red horses have the same bloodlines.

The two middle similes (b, c) seem redundantly phrased, in that in each case one of the terms applied to the subject also provides the verb: *prayúdhaḥ prá ... yuyudhuḥ* (b), *suvírdho vāvrdhuḥ* (c). I do not understand the stylistic point of this redundancy, but since it's repeated in adjacent pādas it must be deliberate.

I also don't understand the *utá* in b, placed between preverb and verb (*prótá yuyudhuḥ*) and with nothing obvious to conjoin. Klein (DGRV I.373–74) takes it as conjoining b with a, but gives no explanation for its position, whose extreme rarity he notes. For another ex. of *utá* between preverb and verb, see X.53.7.

Another anomaly in b is the metrical shape of the verb, in pāda-final position: *yuyudhuḥ* would be far better read **yūyudhuḥ*. Although no forms of this poorly attested perfect are transmitted with long reduplication, it's worth noting the hapax redupl. *i*-stem *yūyudhi*- (X.149.4), a variant of *yūyudhi*- (2x).

V.59.7: This vs. contains several syntactic ambiguities of not much moment. The rel. prn. *yé* in the 1st hemistich can in principle be picked up by either *ásvāsaḥ* 'horses' or *eṣām* 'of them [=Maruts]', and in fact either the horses or the Maruts could easily be compared to birds. I don't see any way to decide, though it's true that the default ref. of any masc. pl. in a Marut hymn is the Maruts.

In b *brhatáḥ* can in principle be acc. pl., gen. sg., or abl. sg., so that it could technically modify any of the three nouns in that pāda: acc. pl. *ántān*, gen. sg. *diváḥ*, or abl. sg. *sānunaḥ*, and it is found with both *diváḥ* and *snóḥ* (alt. form of *sānunaḥ*) elsewhere. With the standard tr., I take it with 'back'. Flg. Ge and Re, I assume that the 'back' is heaven's -- and in fact the gen. *diváḥ* could be read both with *ántān* and with *sānunaḥ*, between which it is positioned. WG suggest rather that it's the back of the earth, namely the mountains, and this is worth considering. If they're coming from the mountain, it may explain why/how they have stirred the *nabhanú*- of the mountain. Still, the clear phrase *diváḥ ... sānu* in the next hymn (V.60.3b) favors 'heaven'.

On *nabhanú*- see comm. ad IV.19.7.

V.59.8: The second clause of pāda a, *áditir vītáye naḥ*, is underspecified and has been variously interpr. Since *vītáye* is frequently used in stereotyped passages of gods ‘pursuing’ the oblation, often with a verb of motion, I supply this context here. For parallels, cf., e.g., VIII.20.10 *havyā no vītáye gata*.

The nom. pl. demon. *eté* is pāda-final, which seems an odd position for such a pronoun. But a glance at Lub’s Concordance shows that *eté* is found in just that place fairly commonly -- e.g., in the next hymn, V.60.5a.

V.60 Maruts

V.60.1: The opening of the hymn, *īle agnīm*, is a flipping of the opening of the first hymn in the RV, I.1.1 *agnīm īle*, but since this phrase, in both orders, is found a number of times in the RV, we should perhaps not make too much of it. However, it’s worth noting that this is the only other place where it opens a hymn.

This is the only occurrence of the ppl. *prasattá-* ‘seated to the fore/in front’, and it here seems a substitute for the standard *puróhita-* ‘placed in front’, of Agni as the offering fire on the ritual ground. If *īle agnīm* is a conscious evocation of RV I.1.1 (or a templatic Agni hymn), then *prasattáḥ* could be evoking the third word of I.1.1 (*agnīm īle*) *puróhitam*.

However, the gambling phrase that follows goes off in a very different direction; as is recognized by all standard tr., the phrase *vī cayat kṛtām* is dicing vocabulary. For the VP see I.132.1 and Falk (1986, *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel*, pp. 126–28).

V.60.2: The parallelism between the two loc. phrases *pr̥ṣatīṣu śrutāsu* (a) and *sukhēṣu ... rátheṣu* (b) seems clear, but this entails that the Maruts are mounted both on their horses and on their chariots. This is a price that most tr. are willing to pay, but Re avoids it at the price of the parallelism, by attaching the dappled females to the chariots: “... qui sont montés sur les chars aisés conduit par les (antilopes) tachetées.” Since the Maruts are clearly astride horses in the next hymn, V.61.3, I think we can have them there here as well.

The person changes between hemistichs from 3rd (ab: *yé tasthúḥ*) in the rel. cl. to 2nd (cd: voc. *ugrāḥ ... vah*) in the main cl.. This is hardly unusual in the RV. The standard tr. register this anacoluthon in various ways, WG most sharply, by supplying a main cl. for ab: “(Sie sind es), die ...” and separating the two hemistichs into two sentences. This seems unnec.

V.60.2–3: Note the concatenation: 2d ... *párvataś cit*# // 3a #*párvataś cit* ... The two vss. also hold the verb *rejatē/rejata* steady (2d, 3b, though in slightly different metrical position, both post-caesura, with one pres. and the other injunc.), but in the first instance it’s earth (*pr̥thivī*) that trembles and in the 2nd (the back of) heaven (*divāḥ*, initial in its pāda like *pr̥thivī*). So the standard pair heaven/earth are contrasted and identically positioned, but they are grammatically non-parallel. There is also a repetition of ‘fear’, though again in different forms -- nominal *bhiyā* in 2c, pf. *bibhāya* in 3c, both pāda-final. This kind of patterned and varied repetition may not reach the heights of poetic art, but it

is a pleasing demonstration of the way a RVic poet infuses freshness into the clichés that are his bread-and-butter.

V.60.4: The “marks of greatness” of the publ. tr. follows Re’s “signes-de-grandeur”; *māhāṃsi* must refer to something that can be visible on their bodies.

On the wooing context of this vs. see comm. ad X.94.10.

V.60.5: The standard tr. (all ultimately deriving from Sāy.) take Rudra and Ṛṣni as the joint subj. of a verb to be supplied (“prepared,” vel sim.), with *sudínā* as obj. (e.g., Ge “Ihr ... Vater ... (und) ... Ṛṣni (haben) den Marut schöne Tage (bereitet)”). This seems unnec. The first part of this hemistich (through *ṛṣniḥ*) seems simply to define the Maruts’ parentage: *pitā ... rudrāḥ* is answered by *ṛṣniḥ*; no ‘mother’ is necessary, because her role as their mother is virtually her only function in the RV and because the bahuvr. *ṛṣni-mātar-* ‘having P. as their mother’, modifying the Maruts, is used three times by Śyāvāśva in this cycle (V.57.2, 3, 59.6). As for *sudínā*, it is used several times in the kind of nominal cl. envisioned in the publ. tr.; cf. IV.4.7 *víśvéd asmai sudínā* ... “All (days) (will be) day-bright for him”; VII.11.2 *āhāny asmai sudínā bhavanti* “for him the days become bright shining,” both with dat. as here.

The epithet *sudúghā* used of Ṛṣni may be somewhat ironically meant. At least in VI.66 it is said that Ṛṣni only once produced milk (vs. 1), that is, she milked out her sons the Maruts, but that she did not give milk to them (vs. 5).

V.60.6: The second hemistich has a few complications. We can start with the *utā vā*: what is it conjoining? Ge and Re seem to take it as conjoining the vocc. *rudrāḥ* and *āgne*, and Klein (DGRV II.170) explicitly follows this interpr., though giving no other exx. of conjoined vocatives. But esp. given the various choices of place given in ab, conjoined by *vā*, the more natural reading is to assume it offers another alternative to *átah* ‘from there’ in c; the most natural of those choices would be “or (from) here.” WG, by contrast, recognize that a choice of locations is what is probably meant, but have to supply the 2nd alternative complete: “von da aus ... oder (von wo ihr euch) auch nun (befindet).” My solution may be too tricky to be acceptable, but I think the ‘here’ is implicit in the *asyalasyā*. First, note that the cross-pāda sandhi ... *asyāgne* ... is compatible with either an unaccented or an accented gen. sg. pronoun. The Pp. takes it as the former, but if it is to be construed with *havíṣaḥ* in the next pāda, as the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it, as an adjective it should be accented (*asyā*). I do think it has an adjectival role with *havíṣaḥ*, but I also think this near-deictic is a substitute for an adverb of place like *ihá* or *itás*, and the possibility of non-accentuation is an indirect indication that it can also be taken independently of *havíṣaḥ* to express the potential location of the Rudras here and now on the ritual ground with Agni. I would slightly adjust the tr. to “from there, o Rudras, or (here and) now, o Agni, be cognizant ...” The awkwardness of folding Agni into the Maruts’ actions is also on view in the next vs.

I do not understand the presence of the future impv. *vittāt*. Perhaps with Sāy. (... *āgacchateti śeṣaḥ*), we should supply a verb of motion that implicitly precedes the action of *vittāt*: “from there (come here and) take cognizance ...” The following hymn, V.61, gives some support to this scenario. In V.61.17 Night is ordered to carry off the speaker’s hymns to his patron, with an ordinary impv. *pārā vaha*, while the flg. vs. contains a future

impv. *vocatāt* (V.61.18) ordering her to speak for him once she gets there. It may also be that the future impv. was used here for convenience because the future impv. neutralizes number (also person, but that's irrelevant here) and thus can be applicable both to the plural Rudras and the singular Agni. It's accented because it follows an extrasentential voc. and therefore counts as being pāda-initial.

The standard tr. take *yád* as the neut. rel. prn. with *havís-* as antecedent (“... the oblation that we sacrifice”), but \sqrt{yaj} never takes the offering as object, but rather the god who is the recipient. I therefore prefer to take *yád* as the subordinating conj.

V.60.7: The first pāda, *agnís ca yán maruto viśvavedasaḥ*, is a particularly complex ex. of a reverse *vāyav índraś ca* construction, with the subordinator *yád* placed, in modified Wackernagel's Position, after the first term and a voc. adj. attached to the second. This sequence of three vss. (6–8) contains three different versions of the awkward pairing of singular and plural entities in a voc. phrase: vs. 6 with its independent non-adjacent vocc. *rudrāḥ ... ágne*, this *vāyav índraś ca* construction, and 8a *ágne marúbhiḥ* with an instr. of accompaniment. Note that the adj. *viśvavedasaḥ*, which, since it's voc., should technically only modify the Maruts, is more commonly applied to Agni in the RV, and so he should probably be included in its domain.

The problematic epithet *riśādas-* has already been discussed; see comm. ad I.2.7. As indicated there, the publ. tr. weakly favors Th's ‘caring for the stranger’ over Hoffmann's ‘fastidious’. The original meaning is difficult to get to, because by either etymology (or any other one) the word would by this time be entirely opaque and, with no synchronic lexical anchoring, it would have been free to float semantically and get attached to other words secondarily. It is often used of the Ādityas, both collectively and individually, for whom ‘caring for the stranger’ is a quite congenial reading. But it is also, as here, often used of the Maruts, where it is not so good a fit. But generally when it is applied to the Maruts, it is either with reference to their benevolent and generous aspect (as here, where they are *viśvavedasaḥ* ‘affording all possessions’ and are urged *vāmám dhatta* “establish a thing of value”) or is found nearby occurrences with the Ādityas (so here and V.61.16, with Mitra and/or Varuṇa V.64.1, 66.1, 67.2; cf. also I.186.8 *riśādaso mitrayújāḥ*) or both (cf. Agni, the Ādityas, and the Maruts all as both *viśvavedasaḥ* and *riśādasah* in VIII.27.4).

V.60.8: The publ. tr. takes *āyúbhiḥ* in c as a PN (as often), thus identifying a separate group of co-soma-drinkers. The standard tr. take the instr. phrase in c as a further characterization of the Maruts, with *āyú-* as ‘langlebig’ (Ge, WG), ‘vigilants’ (Re). I now think this is the better course and would emend the tr. to “along with the pure, lively ones who set all in motion.”

V.61 Maruts

For the structure of this hymn and its place in the series, see publ. intro. Although there is an *itihāsa* in the Bṛhaddevatā (V.50) that supposedly recounts the circumstances of Śyāvāśva's composition, it was clearly constructed secondarily and fancifully on the basis of the Rigvedic text (see both Old and Ge).

V.61.1: Note the doubly marked superlative *śréṣṭhatama-* (also I.113.12), which therefore ought to be rendered as “the most fairest.” It must be nom., not voc., because of its accent, since in a standard voc. phrase it would be unaccented flg. unaccented *naraḥ*.

It is somewhat notable that the Maruts are referred to *éka-ekah* “one by one,” since they are usually not differentiated at all.

V.61.1–2: These two vss. contain a fairly high percentage of the total number of RVic 2nd pl. active pfs., with the poorly characterized ending *-a* on the weak stem: *āyayā* (1b), *śeka*, *yaya* (2b). Macd. (VG p. 358) lists only twelve forms in all of Vedic (some of which have more than one token) of the 2nd pl. act. pf., and one of these (*anāha*) is better interpr. otherwise (see comm. ad VIII.48.5).

V.61.2: *kathā* can be read thus or as *kathā ā*, with the same preverb as in the unverbated *āyayā* in the rel. cl. of 1b. The Pp. does not read the preverb. It is possible that the variation between *kathām* in the first question of the pāda and *kathā* is meant to enable the preverb reading, and the publ. tr. reflects that.

With Ge and Re I assume a gapped *kvā* in c and in 3a. WG simply take them as questions without an explicit interrogative (“Ist ein Sattel auf einem Rücken ...?” etc.). The difference is unimportant rhetorically.

V.61.3: For this vs. see publ. intro.; as pointed out there, the simile in c can either refer to sex or to childbirth.

It is interesting that *sakthāni* is plural. Although there are plural ‘men’ (*nāraḥ*) and therefore twice as many thighs as men, in Classical Sanskrit it is my impression that the dual would ordinarily be used in such a situation, where a number of men each spread their two thighs. RV seems more flexible.

V.61.3–4: The final word of vs. 3 is *jānayaḥ*, while the final word of the 1st hemistich of 4 is (*bhadra-*)*jānayaḥ*, showing the standard distribution of the ‘wife’ word, with simplex *jāni-* and *jāni-* as 2nd cmpd. member. The distrib. here is complicated by the fact that 3c ... *nā jānayaḥ* produces an unusual cadence of four shorts, which **jānayaḥ* would easily repair. But since the long-vowel variant never shows up as a simplex, we should presumably resist the temptation to emend.

V.61.4: The 2nd pl. impv. *etana* shows an unexpected full-grade root syllable in the Saṃhitā text, but is read with metrically problematic but morphologically “correct” zero-grade in the Pp (*itana*). Of course, such full-grade 2nd pl. impvs. are found elsewhere, but in this case I wonder if it’s a secondary extraction from forms cmpded with the preverb *ā*, as in V.87.8, also a Marut hymn, with pāda-final *étana*. See also disc. ad VI.42.2.

V.61.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the standard tr. (now incl. WG) take *sānat* as meaning ‘gave’ (Ge schenkte, Re a donné, WG geschenkt hat), not ‘gained’; Indeed Re claims that the stem *sāna-* means ‘give’ in dānastutis, but provides no parallels. I have found none in any of the occurrences of this stem, but by contrast quite a number of exx. of *sāna-* in dānastutis with the expected meaning ‘gain’ (I.126.3, V.30.14; VIII.25.22, 24; 46.22, 29; 68.17; X.62.11). Note, however, the honorable exception of Klein (DGRV

I.431) “That one *has obtained* [my italics] a herd consisting of horses ...”; Grassmann likewise gives the verb in this passage its standard meaning ‘erlangen’. The only possible reason I can imagine that this array of skilled philologists resolutely turned their backs on the very clear evidence of the semantics of this root is that they couldn’t imagine that a female could have won or gained these prizes -- though, as noted in the publ. intro., it would be just as anomalous for a female to *give* them. If I am right that the woman in question is a favored concubine, or even the Favorite Wife (*Vāvātā*) of later Vedic ritual, of Śyāvāśva’s royal patron, then he may have indulged her with a little gift at the time of the general distribution of bounty. She does, after all, perform services for him, as pāda d shows.

śatāvayam is almost universally interpr. as ‘consisting of a hundred (/hundreds of) sheep’, with the 2nd member derived from *ávi-* (so Gr, Ge, Re, Klein; also AiG II.2.140 and II.1 Nachtr. 34), and certainly sheep fit nicely into a sequence with horses and cows. WG demur, suggesting that such a cmpd should rather be **śatāvya-* and proposing an alternate analysis on the model of *cátur-vaya-* ‘fourfold’ (2x) -- hence “livestock in horses and cows a hundred fold.” However, the *-vaya-* of *cátur-vaya-* is not otherwise found in such cmpds and has no obvious source (see AiG II.2.906), and the long final vowel of the first member *śatā-* would not be quite as easily explained (though stems like *śatāmagha-* and *śatāvant-* also show unetymological long vowels). I do think WG’s point is well-taken that **avaya-* is an unlikely deriv. to *ávi-*, esp. since that stem shows “closed” inflection, but *-vaya-* ‘-fold’ has its own problems. I suggest rather that the cmpd orig. contained the well-attested deriv. *avyáya-* ‘sheep-y, ovine’ (hence **śatāvyaya-*), which has undergone haplology of the first *y*. Note that there’s a lot of phononological play in these vss. (sibilants and *v*’s, with *a*’s), inspired by the poet’s name Śyāva-aśva: 5a *śā áśv’yam* ... b *śatāvayam* ... c *śyāvā-aśva* [or HvN’s *śyāvāś’va*] ... 6a *śāśtyasī* ... b ... *vāsyasī*, which could have contributed to the deformation of the underlying cmpd. I would therefore keep the older meaning, but with a different analysis of the 2nd member.

Note also that the end of c, (*-stut*)*āya yā*, is nearly identical to the ends of 1b *āyayā* and 2b (*kath*)*ā yaya*.

V.61.6–8: As indicated in the publ. tr., I consider these vss. a digression reflecting on the character of women in general, motivated by the introduction of the winning woman in vs. 5.

V.61.6: The comparative *śāśtyas-* is attested only twice in the RV, here and in IV.32.3. Though they have different senses in the two passages (‘more reliable’ here, ‘more numerous’ there, at least by my interpr.), the semantic dev. from the positive *śāśvant-* ‘regularly recurring, in unbroken sequence, each and every’ to the two senses of the comp. is fairly straightforward. Here, regularly recurring > constant > reliable. In VIII.1.34 this development takes a sexual turn, with a *śāśvatī nāṭī* being one who is “ever ready” for sex (in my interpr.), and a sexual nuance is not ruled out in our passage either - though here the emphasis is on her dependable qualities compared to the unsatisfactory man.

V.61.7: The relativization is loose, at least in the Eng. rendering. Literally it should be “More reliable than a man is a woman who discerns the thirsting one ...,” etc.

The lexeme *ví√jñā* means ‘discern, recognize’, and a full rendering of the implication of these VPS would be something like “who recognizes (that a particular man) is famished ...” -- the idea presumably being that, having recognized their plights, she then sees to them, each in his own need. I have folded this two-step process into ‘pay attention to’. If she does see to the needs of each, the third in the series *kāmínam* ‘the desirous / lusting one’ again introduces the sexual: she feeds, clothes, and has sex with the three in turn, at least by my interpr. The standard tr. have a tendency to attenuate the third term -- e.g., Klein (DGRV I.432) “the one desiring (aid)” -- but in this saucy hymn I think sex is never far from the surface. I do have to admit, however, that *kāmín-* is not otherwise used of sexual desire, but has a more general application, incl. to the Maruts in this same cycle (V.53.16).

V.61.8: On *vaíradeya-*, lit. ‘what is to be given for a man/hero’, as Wergeld or blood money, see Roth (ZDMG 41: 672–76) and Macdonell-Keith Vedic Index s.v. *vaira*. Another indirect ref. to the same phenomenon is found in II.32.4 *vīráṃ śatádāyam* “a hero (for whom) a hundred (cows) are to be given.” In our case the person in question is hardly worth the name ‘man’ and would be better off dead than alive, since his relatives would still receive the standard recompense for a *vīrá*, whatever his personal failings had been. It is telling that he is called a *pañí-* ‘niggard’, a reminder to Śyāvāśva’s patron that stinginess is a grave flaw.

V.61.9: On this vs. see publ. intro. As detailed there, I take the vs. as an elaborate pun. On the one hand a young woman (*yuvatīḥ*) is narrating the course of a race (or perhaps the progress of the horses that are to be given to the poet as his prize) to the poet -- thus the word *vartanī-* ‘course, track’ in b and the two chestnut (horses) (*róhitā*) in c. (Note also that *śyāvā-* is not only the short form of the poet’s name but also, more usually, a horse color term.) But a more intimate scene is signalled by her low voice (*√rap* is ordinarily used of murmuring or muttering; see the esp. telling passage in the Yama/Yamī hymn X.10.4, where it is contrasted with *√vad*), her use of a nickname “Dusky” (*śyāvā-*), and esp. the pf. part. *mamandúṣī* ‘having intoxicated, beguiled, seduced’ (I follow Kü [366–67] in taking the pf. as transitive and supplying ‘me’ as its obj.). And the whole vs. can be read as a description of sexual intercourse. The ‘course’ would be the course of the sex act, and the two ruddy ones in c can be any paired female body parts; given the use of the same verb *ví√yam* here as in 3b, where men spread their thighs, they may be thighs, but the labia and breasts are also possible. Both Ge and Re take the dat. *purumīlḥāya* in c as a PN and therefore not coreferential with *śyāvāya* in b. But it makes more sense to interpr. *purumīlḥā-* in its full lexical sense ‘having many rewards’ (so also WG), describing the poet (*vīprāya* in d) who has received his dakṣiṇā from his patron and who is in fact Śyāvāśva -- and implying that part of this dakṣiṇā is the seductive woman in this very vs. On Purumīdha in later Vedic see comm. on the next vs.

As a number of others have noted (e.g., Hoffmann, Injunkt. 150), though the Pp. reads *arapat*, the actual form may be the injunctive *rapat*; the Pp’s augment is not realized metrically or in the transmitted text. This doesn’t affect the interpr. one way or the other. Though Gr lists *prāti* as a preverb with *rapat*, this lexeme is not otherwise found (in all of

Skt., if Mon-Wms is to be believed), and given the distance between the two words and what would be an unusual position for a preverb in tmesis (pāda-initial but in the pāda *after* the verb), I think it unlikely that they are to be construed together. I take *prāti* as adverbial, reinforcing the intimacy of the scene, hence my ‘face to face’.

V.61.10: My interpr. of the *dānastuti* vs. proper differs from the standard, which has in my opinion been unduly affected by the later Vedic rationalization of the passage. Both JB (I.151) and PB (XIII.7.12) briefly narrate a tale in which Purumīḍha and Taranta figure as the two sons of Vaidadaśvi, but as we just saw, *purumīḍhā-* is better taken in its literal sense. I also take *tarantā-* not as a PN but in lexical value. In either case it is likely a thematization of the pres. participle *tārant-* (cf. AiG II.2.211), showing the same accent shift as AV *jīvantā-* from *jīvant-*, and it should mean ‘overcoming, victorious’ → ‘victor’. By contrast I do think *vaidadaśvi-* is a PN, but a speaking name, as the vṛddhi deriv. of **vidād-aśva-* ‘finding / acquiring horses’ (cf. *vidād-vasu-*), an appropriate name for a patron. It is worth noting that both names Śyāvāśva and Vaidadaśvi have Iranian counterparts; see Mayrhofer Personennamen s.vv.

How to distribute *yáh* and *yáthā* and whether to interpr. the latter as a subordinator or a simile marker are the syntactic problems in this vs., and diff. tr. have diff. solutions. I take *yáh* as marking a generalizing rel. cl. (‘whoever ...’) and *yáthā* as a simile marker, with c a nominal cl. functioning as the main clause to ab. The verb in b, *dádat* is a short-vowel subjunctive (“whoever will give ...”) but can also be interpr. as a thematized injunc., which in turn can be read with Vaiśvadaśvi (“as V. did”). If I had had the courage of my convictions, “did” would not be in parens. in the publ. tr.

V.61.11: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. marks the beginning of the second, more conventional hymn in this composite, at least in my analysis.

Technically speaking ‘horses’ should be in parens.

It is not clear if *īm* has its usual acc. function: it could anticipate *mádhu* in b, though that seems somewhat distant and that participial phrase is otherwise fully contained in b; it could function as a reflexive marker (“drive *themselves*”); or it may be one of the rare instances of functionless *īm*.

I have silently depluralized *śrávāmsi*, since ‘fames’ is not English. Perhaps the point here is that each Marut has his own *śrávas*, though, since they are seldom distinguished, this may be overthinking it.

V.61.12: This vs. has produced more consternation than it deserves, because of the reluctance of many interpr. to allow *yéṣām* to be coreferential with the subj. of *vibhrājante*. In these interpr., if the subj. of that verb is the Maruts, then another referent for *yéṣām* must be found; if *yéṣām* refers to the Maruts, then another subj. of the verb must be found. See Old’s lengthy disc., which includes the differing suggestions of numerous scholars (incl. also interpr. *yéṣām* as **yé eṣām*) but doesn’t reach firm conclusions. Of modern interpr., Re takes *yéṣām* as the Maruts and makes *ródasī* the subj. of the verb: “les Deux Mondes brillent au loin”; in a fractured sense this goes back to Max Müller’s tr. in SBE 32, but Müller emended the verb to **bhrājate* and took *ródasī* as sg., whereas Re mentions no such emendation and seems to be taking *ródasī* as dual, which will certainly not work grammatically with a pl. verb. WG seem to have accepted

the **yé eṣām* interpr. Ge, surprisingly, is more relaxed and allows coreference under the rubric of “der reflexive Gebrauch des Relativs,” which seems perfectly plausible to me: they flash with their own splendour.

The “bright ornament” of c is the sun: *rukṃá-* is so used elsewhere in clearer context (VI.51.1, VII.63.4).

V.61.13: I have taken the two negated adjectives at the end of b and c, *ánedyaḥ* and *ápratiṣkutaḥ*, as predicated, in contrast to all the standard tr. There is, of course, no way to tell.

V.61.15: Whose *dhī-* is it? Ge, Re, and WG all assume it is the mortal’s (e.g., Ge “Ihr ... führet den Sterblichen recht nach seinem Sinn”), but the placement of the phrase *itthā dhiyā* right after *praṇetāraḥ* and at some distance from *mārtam* at least weakly suggests that it is the Maruts’s. Since, as I have had occasion to remark many times, the Maruts sometimes have the role of verbal praisers and sometimes are the recipients of the same, I think both readings are possible and the poet may have wanted it to remain ambiguous. Tichy’s tr. (-tar-stems, 300–301) seems to attribute the *dhī-* to the Maruts or at least remains neutral: “Ihr bringt den Menschen vorwärts ... recht mit Bedacht.”

Note that in the compd *yāma-hūti-* it is the Maruts’ journeys (*yāma-*, 1st member) but the mortal’s invocations (*-hūti-*, 2nd member).

V.61.17–19: As noted in the publ. intro., the patron’s name Rathavīti (‘pursuit of the chariot’?) in 18, 19 is punned upon. In 17 (before he is explicitly mentioned, though the patronymic Dārbhya would presumably evoke him) Night is asked to carry the hymns “like a charioteer” (*rathīr iva*); in 18 the 2nd compd. member *-vīti-* is derived from the same root √ *vī* ‘pursue’ that supplies the verb *āpa veti* ‘goes off track’.

V.61.17: I do not understand why the goddess Night acts as the intermediary between the poet and his patron; see Ge’s n. 17–19, which doesn’t seem to me entirely satisfactory.

V.61.18: The Rathavīti phrase is in the loc.; the publ. tr. renders it as if the addressee, which is technically incorrect. It is either a loc. absol. without participle or a “chez/bei” expression: “speak for me thus when R. (is present) / at R’s.” Since the net result is the same, I have kept the easier-to-parse addressee tr.

V.61.19: Ge and Re take *gómatīḥ* as a ref. to the Gomatī river; WG to “cow-rich lands.” I think it’s likely a pun, and I supply *vīśaḥ* ‘clans’ for one half of the pun.

[V.62-78 JPB]

V.79 Dawn

The meter of this hymn is Pañkti, with five 8-syllable pādas. The fifth in all vss. is the refrain, a voc. phrase *sújāte aśvasūṇṛte* “o well-born lady, liberal with horses,” which is essentially detachable. So the hymn comes across as standard Anuṣṭubh, with an appended and superfluous refrain. As indicated in the publ. tr., the contents are for the

most part uninspired, contrary to most Dawn hymns, though closer inspection reveals more intricate patterns than a superficial reading turned up.

V.79.1–3: These three vss. follow the same pattern: Dawn is urged to repeat for us now a previous action she performed in the presence of and for the benefit of a previous patron. The name Satyaśravas Vāyya appears in all three vss. (The Anukr. attributes the hymn to Satyaśravas Ātreya, but as Ge points out [n. 1d] he is surely the patron, not the poet.) Curiously in vss. 1 and 3 Satyaśravas Vāyya is identified as the previous patron, while in vs. 2 he is the current patron and the previous patron has a different name. This chronological slippage is somewhat confusing -- and is emphasized by having identical clauses differing only in the tense/mood of the verb and the demonstrative vs. relative pronoun:

2cd *sā vy ùcha sáhīyasi, satyaśravasi vāyyé*

3cd *yó vyaúchaḥ sáhīyasi, satyaśravasi vāyyé*

The insistence on this generous patron of the past has a purpose: there is a parallel insistence on the patrons of today in the rest of the hymn. Although only Dawn is addressed, the poet is clearly sending a message to the patrons, to generously redistribute the wealth that Dawn will bestow on them, on the model of Satyaśravas.

V.79.1: The phrase *mahé ... rāyé divítmatī* is very reminiscent of IV.31.11 *mahó rāyé divítmate*, with an adverbial *maháḥ* but a dat. *divítmate* modifying *rāyé*. See comm. ad loc. It seems likely that our fem. *divítmatī* is a nonce adaptation to the fem. context. As for *divítmant-*, I now tentatively accept the analysis of *divít-* as containing the root noun -*i-t-* and would alter the tr. to “as one coming from heaven” or “as heaven-sent one.”

V.79.2–3: Is the comparative ‘mightier’ (*sáhīyas-*) used to assert that Satyaśravas Vāyya is mightier than Sunītha Śaucadratha?

The Pp. reads accented *ví* even directly before accented *aúchaḥ* (2b, 3c), where we might expect univertation and loss of accent on the preverb. The Saṃhitā text (*vyaúcho*) is of course ambiguous. I would read the sequence with unaccented and univertated *ví*; the verb *aúchaḥ* owes its accent to its presence in a rel. cl. The Pp. may have accented *ví* on the model of the impv. *ví ucha* (2c, 3b; *vy ùcha* in the Saṃhitā text).

sā with the 2nd ps. impv. *ucha* simply shows the common use of the *sál tám* prn. with 2nd ps. impvs.; see my 1992 “Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?” Elaborate semantic/functional interpr., like Re’s “de la même manière, dans les mêmes conditions (heureuses)” (EVP 3, ad loc.) or WG’s *yā ... sā ...* “welche du ... als solche du” are unnec.

V.79.3: *yó* beginning pāda c represents *yā + u* (note Pp. *yó íti*), but the apparent masc. form causes a momentary stir.

V.79.4: With the standard tr. I take cd as the main cl. corresponding to the rel. cl. in ab, despite the lack of a resumptive pronoun and of a verb. The pattern established in the first 3 vss. of alternating rel. and main clauses makes this interpr. likely, even though the subjects have changed.

Contra Ge, who takes ab as referring to the singers and cd to the patrons, I think both hemistichs refer to the singers. So also Re and WG, an interpr. that goes back to Sāy. (see Ge's n. 4). Here the circulation of wealth appears to be a two-way transaction: the poets praise Dawn and receive bounties. How that happens is laid out in the next few vss., which complicate the two-way model.

V.79.5: The two-party sketch in vs. 4 gives way to a three-party model: when Dawn gives them the go-ahead, as it were, the patrons, who have not yet been mentioned in the hymn as a class, bestow bounties on the poets.

This vs. presents some difficulties, not least the referent(s) of the various plurals and their grammatical identity. With most, I take the *gaṇāḥ* to be the priest/poets who were also the subj. of the preceding vs. and who greeted Dawn with praise in 4ab. The first hemistich of this vs. expresses the potential reciprocity for this praise: Dawn considers its producers worthy to be given bounties, the same bounties referred to in 5c.

I part company with the standard tr. in the 2nd hemistich. Most take the subj. here to be the patrons, who either physically surround the priest/poets (so I read Old) while giving to them or have succeeded (using a sense of *pāri √ dhā* ['conclude' not found till later]) in giving, finished giving to them (Ge, Re, WG). By contrast I consider the subject still to be the priest/poets. They surround the patrons, who are giving to them. *dādātāḥ* is of course grammatically ambiguous: I take it as acc. pl., while the rest interpr. it as nom. pl. The use of the word *gaṇā-* 'throng' to refer to the poets in ab helps explain the surprisingly physical verb 'surround' in cd: the picture is of the over-eager (*vāṣṭi-*) ritual recipients almost ganging up on the patrons.

V.79.6–7: Here the patrons, who have properly compensated the priest/poets, receive their own reward from Dawn. Interestingly it is not material, but rather *yāśas-* 'glory' -- though glory consisting of heroes (*vīrávat*), meaning, narrowly, sons, but also men belonging to our side who will perform well in warfare and acquire battle glory. The emphasis on non-material rewards for the patrons continues in vs. 7 with "lofty brilliance and glory" (*dyumnā bṛhád yāśaḥ*), while the poets receive material gifts, *rādhāṃsi áśvyā gavyā* "benefits consisting of horses and cows." For a similar split between material rewards for the singers and non-material ones for the patrons see V.86.6, where the patrons get "lofty fame" (*śrávo bṛhát*) and the singers get wealth and refreshment (*rayīm ... íṣam*).

V.79.8: The two-party model returns here, with Dawn bringing the gifts directly to the priest/poets.

V.79.9: The last vs. before the summary vs., this one brings the hymn ring-compositionally back to its beginning with its opening impv. *vy ùcha* 'dawn forth', a lexeme found 4x in vss. 2–3 (2b, 2c, 3b, 3c).

As noted in the publ. intro., this prohibition and its striking simile are the most notable features of this hymn. The *mā* clause contains a present injunctive, not an aorist. Hoffmann (79) explains it as an inhibitive, not a prohibitive -- his standard explanation for the use of present injunctives in such contexts. Although IH has demonstrated that this explanation of the use of pres. injunctives with *mā* doesn't hold -- they are generally

used when an aor. injunc. is not available -- in this case, Hoffmann's analysis may be correct. There is a perfectly fine root aor. to \sqrt{tan} and it in fact occurs once with $mā$ (I.91.23), so we may need to seek a functional explanation somewhat in the manner of Hoffmann's. On the other hand and after further thought, I wonder if the pres. stem is used in this context in order to express a *durative* prohibitive, rather than an inhibitive. That is, *starting now*, when you dawn, don't dawdle at your work. She's just been ordered to dawn, which makes the start time now, not in the past, but the poet fears that once she starts she's going to draw it out longer than she should. It shouldn't be inhibitive in KH's sense, because that would mean she's already started the work. On still another hand, however, since this is functionally the final vs., which refers back to the beginning of the hymn, perhaps the poet *is* saying that Dawn has been at work since that beginning and should finish it up.

It is difficult not to take *sūrah* as a nom. sg. to a thematic stem (so, e.g., Ge and Re), although many occurrences of *sūrah* are better interpr. as gen. sg. to *svār-* -- incl. in this same sequence *sūro arcīṣā* in VIII.7.36. WG take it as a gen., but then must identify a different subj. for *tāpātī*, leading them to introduce Varuṇa and a superstructure of explanation that seems over-elaborate. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the point of contact is the assumption that thieves work at night and if the sun rises on them, they will be caught out.

V.79.10: *pramīyase* is variously rendered, but 'diminish' or the like fits both the root and the context. Thieme's principled insistence on 'tauschen, täuschen' (ZDMG 41 [1941] 107–8 = KISch 32–33) produces an unconvincing interpr., requiring further shoring up: "... die du ... nicht getäuscht wirst (= du, deren Absicht zu schenken nicht vereitelt wird)." That Dawn does not diminish in cd harmonizes with the increase in gifts that the poet urges in ab.

The dat. *stoṭṛibhyaḥ* may be construed with *uchāntī* rather than *pramīyase*, thus "dawning for the praisers, you do not diminish" (so Re, Th), but this would have no appreciable effect.

V.80 Dawn

As noted in the publ. intro., every vs. but the first begins with *eṣā* 'she, this one here'.

V.80.1: In contrast to the relentless nominative representation of Dawn in the rest of the hymn, this 1st vs. begins with 3 full pādas of accusative describing her.

V.80.3: I previously accepted the standard view that *āprāyu-* is a root noun compound derived from *prā√yu* (\sqrt{yu} 2 'keep away') and is essentially a variant of *āprayuchant-* (cf., e.g., EWA s.v. *YA V*², p. 404 with lit.). There are, of course, two formal problems with this analysis: the long *ā* of the preverb, which, notably, is not found in *āprayuchant-*, and the lack of the empty *-t-* suffixed to root nouns ending in short resonants (cf. *dveṣo-yú-t-* to this same root). It should also be noted that the Pp. analyzes *āprāyu* as *āpra-āyu* (also in I.89.1); although the Pp. is not always a reliable guide, its evidence should be considered. The issue has recently been discussed in detail by Scar (439–40), who in the end rejects the *prā√yu* interpr. in favor of a bahuvrīhi with *āyu-* 'youth, lifespan', a neut.

noun that is less well-attested than both the neut. *āyus-* ‘id.’ and the derived adj. *āyú-* ‘lively’. The semantics of this cmpd. are a little tricky: Vedic people always pray to have their lifetimes lengthened, using the preverb *prá* (generally with $\sqrt{tṛ}$), so **prāyú-* should mean ‘having a lengthened lifetime’, a good thing, and *āprāyú-* the reverse, hence a bad thing. However, Scar suggests ‘nicht alternd, ewig jung’, a good thing. Although it’s somewhat disturbing that the usually positive collocation of *prá* and *āyú(s)-* remains positive when negated, Scar’s reconstruction of the semantic development seems plausible. A further development from ‘ever young’ → ‘lively’ → ‘not slacking, unremitting’ can be envisioned -- esp. if, as I think likely, the word ceased to be transparent and got partially captured by *prá√yu* and its negated adj. *āprayuchant-* (a scenario also sketched by Scar). Note *āprayuchan* nearby in V.82.8. Though I do not feel that the publ. translations of *āprāyú-* need to be altered, my analysis of the form now starts in a very different place. A somewhat different value is proposed for *āprāyus-* in I.127.5, but starting with the same basic elements; see comm. ad loc.

V.81 Savitar

The hymn falls into three symmetrical sections (vss. 1–2, 3, 4–5) based generally on their verse/pāda-initial elements, but these sections do not correspond to thematic divisions. The first section, vss. 1–2, is marked by *ví*. Though the first pāda of vs. 1 lacks *ví*, the repetition is insistent starting with pāda b *víprā víprasya ... vipāścītaḥ*, followed by hemistich-initial *ví* in 1c *ví*, 2a *vísṣvā*, 2c *ví* along with other, internal *vī*’s: 1c *vayunāvíd*, 2a *kavíḥ* / 2b *prāsāvíd ... dvipāde* / 2d *ví rājatíḥ*. The *ví* may play on the middle syllable of the god’s name *savítár-*, and it also ties him to the *vípra-* he is identified with in 1b. Given that the next hymn (V.82) plays on the first syllable of his name (*su/sav*) and the root from which it’s derived, it may not be farfetched to suggest that this section focuses on the 2nd syllable.

Both hemistichs of the next vs. begin with the rel. prn. (3a *yásya*, 3c *yáḥ*), a relatively low-energy repetition between the *vī*’s of vss. 1–2 and the *utá*’s of 4–5. In these last two vss. the repetition of *utá* explodes: every pāda save for the last (5d) begins with *utá*, seven occurrences in all. Beside these patterns of repetitions, it is striking that the first and last pādas of the hymn do not participate; the last pāda serves as an extra-hymnic summary pāda.

The name Savitar is found once in each vs.

V.81.1: With Ge I take *vipāścītaḥ* as nom. pl. qualifying the (human) *vípra*-s, who attend to the inspiration of “the lofty inspired poet,” namely Savitar (sim., but not ident., WG). By contrast, Gr, Re, Th (Unters. 21) take *vipāścītaḥ* as gen. sg., modifying Savitar. The latter interpr. requires that the gen. phrase *víprasya bṛható vipāścītaḥ* is dependent on *mána utá ... dhíyaḥ* in the previous pāda. In other words, the poets hitch up the mind and insights of Savitar, not their own. This would not be impossible but is less likely in the context of Vedic poetic composition, and the middle voice of *yuñjate* suggests that the objects of the verb are the poets’ own.

The word *páriṣṭutíḥ* is a hapax, and the lexeme *pari√stu* is otherwise only late and rare. I do not know exactly what it refers to, but it is likely a technical ritual term.

V.81.2–3: Just as Savitar follows the lead (*prayāṇam*) of Dawn in 2d, the other gods follow his lead (also *prayāṇam*) in 3a. The masc. rel. prn. *yásya* beginning 3 makes it clear that the referent has changed -- which is not clear from the English.

V.81.3: The publ. tr. takes instr. *ójasā* as belonging to the gods, whereas the standard interpr. assign this *ójas-* to Savitar. Although there is no way to tell from the Skt., I think “with/through his power” is the better choice, esp. given the parallel instr. *mahitvanā* in d, which is definitely Savitar’s. I would so emend the tr.

The second hemistich at first appears quite straightforward syntactically, but the syntax clashes with what we expect the sense to be -- and on further inspection the syntax turns out to be skewed, too. I’m afraid that in the publ. tr. this has produced regrettable incoherence. Looking at the syntax first, we seem to find a textbook case of a relative / correlative construction: *yáḥ ... sá ...*, with an accented verb in the rel. cl. *vimamé*, hence “who measured out the earthly (ones), he ...” But there is a problem, because the direct object of the rel. cl., *pārthivāni*, should be completed by *rājāmsi*, which is technically in the main clause beginning with *sá*. This does not bother Ge or Re, who tr. the two acc. pls. together in the rel. cl. (e.g., Ge “der die irdischen Räume durchmessen hat ...”). WG by contrast do notice the problem and tr. *pārthivāni* in the rel. cl. and *rājāmsi* in the main cl. and supply all the missing parts in each cl.: “(er), der die irdischen (Räume) durchmessen hat, er ist Etaśa, der ... die (irdischen) Räume (durchmessen hat) ...,” which is similar to my publ. tr. -- though a bit more coherent -- but also a bit clumsier. The publ. tr. assumes that the 2nd set of spaces are ‘heavenly’; cf. IV.53.3 *āprā rājāmsi divyāni pārthivā* “(Savitar) has filled the heavenly and earthly spaces.” The semantic problem is posed by the phrase *sá étaśaḥ* smack in the middle and apparently starting the main clause, coreferential with the *yáḥ* in the rel. cl., which we all had good reason to think was referring to Savitar. One solution has been to take *étaśa-* as an adj., ‘dappled’ vel sim (so Sāy.: *etavarṇaḥ śubhraḥ śobhamānaḥ*) or ‘hastening’ (so Gr, though not for this passage). But most take it as the PN Etaśa, the famous, if often enigmatic, horse of the sun. Following that tactic, as far as I can see we must take it as an identification or a simile, with Savitar equivalent to Etaśa -- not as a complete change of subject. There are two ways I can see to do this -- 1) take *sá étaśaḥ* as a parenthetical interjection within the relative clause, which otherwise occupies all of cd: “Who measured out the earthly spaces -- he is Etaśa! -- with his greatness -- god Savitar ...” or 2) to keep the rel./corr. structure but fold *étaśaḥ* in as unmarked identification / simile: “Who measured out the earthly (spaces), he, (like/as) Etaśa, measured out the (heavenly) spaces with his greatness: god Savitar.” I prefer the latter, because it allows us to supply ‘heavenly’ in the main clause, and surely the point of contact between Savitar and Etaśa in this context is that Etaśa crosses the heaven daily, “measuring it out,” as he pulls the sun’s chariot. Etaśa as a measurer of earthly spaces makes little sense. I would therefore emend the publ. tr. to the 2nd alternative. That Savitar is identified with Etaśa in one of his aspects may be supported by the explicit identifications with other figures in the next two vss.: *mitró bhavasi* (4d), *pūṣā bhavasi* (5b).

V.81.4–5: 4b and 5d are entirely parallel in structure:

4b *utá mitró bhavasi deva dhārmabhiḥ*

5d *utá pūṣā bhavasi deva yāmabhiḥ*

This strict parallelism should extend to the two final instr. pls. -- that is, Savitar should become the god in question by virtue of a quality/entity held in common and expressed in the instr. I therefore think it unlikely that *dhármabhiḥ* is the vague “nach deinen Eigenschaften” of Ge or “par (tes) dispositions-naturelles” of Re; it needs to refer to an actual thing, like Pūṣan’s journeys. In the publ. tr. I render it as ‘supports’ (sim. WG “durch deine Unterstützungen”), keeping in mind that Savitar often holds up his arms, which may function as literal supports. But it may rather be something like ‘institutes, ordinances’, referring to the regulation of time and activity that Savitar performs.

V.82 Savitar

As noted in the publ. intro. as well as just above ad V.81, this hymn contains numerous verbal and nominal forms of the root $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’, whose agent noun ‘Impeller’ Savitar is grammatically. Every vs. in the hymn contains a form of the name *savitár-*, but play on the root doesn’t start till vs. 3. There are eight such forms, with a concentration on the impv. in the middle: pres. subj. *suvā́ti* (3b), aor. injunc. *sāvīḥ* (4b), pres. impv. *suva* (4c, 5b, 5c), them. loc. *savé* (6b), them. acc. (*satyá*)*savam* (7c), with a return to the original pres. subj. *suvā́ti* (9c). Starting with vs. 3, only vs. 8 lacks such a form -- but *s^uvā(dhīr)* with distracted *suvā* fits phonologically, though not etymologically. We might also note that the first two vss., which lack the punning root forms, do contain forms that might be considered phonological precursors: 1c *sarva(-dhātāmam)*, 2a *sváyaśastaram*, 2c *svarājyam*. With so much concentration on form in this hymn, we should not be surprised that the content is not particularly stimulating.

V.82.1: As Re points out, this vs. is reminiscent of the Gāyatrī mantra, III.62.10. Putting them side-by-side, it is difficult not to assume that one of them (presumably this one) is a deliberately fractured version of the other:

III.62.10 *tát savitúr váreṇyam, bhárgo devásya dhīmahi*
dhíyo yó naḥ pracodáyāt

V.82.1 *tát savitúr vṛṇīmahe, vayám devásya bhójanam*
śréṣṭham sarvadhātāmam, túram bhágasya dhīmahi

Note esp. the first pādas, whose 1st 2 words are identical and whose last words both belong to $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘choose’. In the 2nd pāda *devásya* is identically positioned, and the phrase *bhārgaḥ ... dhīmahi* is echoed by our pāda d *bhágasya dhīmahi*, but with a diff. noun (*bhāga-*, not *bhārgas-*). The remainders of the vss. diverge, but the tone is certainly set by pāda a and the similarities of b/d. It is difficult to know what to make of this -- whether the Gāyatrī mantra had already achieved some sort of local fame that lent itself to parodic imitation or whether the similarities are just the result of the usual formulaic underlayer (though there are no other vss. that begin *tát savitúr*). It’s also somewhat striking (and could be used as an argument either way) that the vs. in our hymn is not a Gāyatrī but an Anuṣṭubh -- and it is the only Anuṣṭubh in a Gāyatrī hymn. If III.62.10 was already known as the (or a) Gāyatrī mantra, our poet could be slyly tweaking that reputation. Or this can all be my post-hoc invention.

V.82.4: Ge interpr. *sāvīḥ* as modal (“mögest du ... zuweisen”), and KH (Injunc. 264) explicitly takes this injunctive as the substitute for the unattested *iṣ*-aors. impv. to this root. But given the pres. impv. to the same root in the flg. pāda (*pārā ... suva*), as well as

in the next vs. (5b, 5c), I think it more likely to be a contrastive expression of recent past – though I take the other two occurrences of *sāvīṭh* (II.28.9, VI.71.6) as imperatival, for slightly different reasons.

V.82.8: With regard to *āprayuchan* see disc. of *āprāyu-* ad V.80.3.

V.82.8–9: There are no overt main clauses in these last two vss., whose vs.-init. rel. prns. *yāḥ* hang off the accs. in vs. 7, but it is possible that the vs.-final *savitā* (or in 8 *devāḥ savitā*) in both cases constitutes a de facto main cl.

V.82.9: A further question concerns the last clause of 9c, *prā ca suvāti savitā*. Ge (fld. by Klein [DGRV I.248 n. 93, 251]) takes *cā* as subordinating, tr. ‘wenn’, thus producing a dependent clause dependent on another dependent clause “who ..., when he ...” (Re has a fussy interpr. involving an ellipse that I find puzzling.) I see no reason for Ge’s interpr., but take the *ca* as conjoining the two clauses ab and c (or their verbs). The accent on *suvāti* is already accounted for by its presence in a rel. cl., and I think it more likely that the poet would end the hymn with a ringing announcement of what Savitar is going to do rather than a conditional uncertainty about whether he’s going to do it.

The phrase *āsrāvāyati ślókena* is technically an etymological figure, somewhat obscured by the *l*-form of *ślóka-* and its highly lexicalized state.

V.83 Parjanya

V.83.1: The verb *dadhāti* can be read with both *rétaḥ* and *gárbham*, the latter in the idiom *gárbham √ dhā* ‘impregnate’, found again in 7a.

V.83.2: This vs. quickly modulates from the physical to the moral, with Parjanya the scourge not only of the trees but of demons and evil-doers.

V.83.3: We might expect **rathīr iva* here, to the *vrkī-*stem *rathī-*, but the ending *-ī* must belong instead to the *-ín-*stem *rathín-*, which does have an independent existence. See Old ad loc.

I take the whip in the simile to be lightning; both a whip and a lightning flash are slender, fast, unpredictable, and have a non-straight trajectory. The flash of lightning would also do the revealing in pāda b. Note also that thunder is covered in pāda c and rain in b and d, so lightning is what’s otherwise absent.

“Rain-bearing cloud” (*varṣyāṃ nābhaḥ*) in d seems like a quick and a bit half-hearted poetic repair of “rain-bearing messengers” (*dūtān ... varṣyān*) in b. The two pādas hold the verb *kṛṇute* constant.

V.83.5: Note the unusual geminate in *nánnamīti*, dissimilated from **námnamīti*.

In pāda b the question is whether the scene is set during the thunderstorm, with frightened quivering livestock, or afterwards, as they gambol in new growth. Pāda a speaks for the former, c for the latter. Ge (and, it seems, WG) opt for the latter, while I favor the former, though without strong grounds.

The first three pādas of this vs. begin with *yásya*; the fourth does not, but ends with a close phonological match, *yacha*.

V.83.6: The default referent of *ásuraḥ pitā naḥ* ‘the lord, our father’ here is of course Parjanya, since this is a Parjanya hymn and the subject is urged to pour out water (cf., e.g., Hale, *Asura*, 46–47). However, I wonder if this is not rather a reference to Dyaus Pitar, or at least an identification of Parjanya with Dyaus Pitar. For Heaven as *pitár-ásura-*, see X.124.3 as well as disc. and other related passages in my ‘The Divine Revolution of RV X.124’ (Ged. Staal, 2016), 294, and of course Zeus famously ‘rains’ in Greek.

V.83.7–8: These two vss. ring changes in the oppositional pair *úd* ‘up’ and *ní* ‘down’: 7c *níñcam*, 7d *udváto nipādāḥ*, 8a *úd acā ní śiñca*. Note that 7b *udanvātā* might seem to belong with this sequence, but *udan-* there is the ‘water’ word.

V.83.8: Hoffmann’s positing (Aufs. I.164 = KZ 79 [1965]) of a separate root $\sqrt{aṇc}$ ‘scoop, draw (water)’ seems unnec., at least for this passage.

V.84 Earth

For a discussion of this hymn as an implicit riddle, see my ‘A Sanskrit Riddle in Three Movements: Rig Veda V.84,’ in *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. Billie Jean Collins and Piotr Michalowski, 2013, pp. 155–58. Its placement immediately after the Parjanya hymn, to which it is attached as a kind of pendant, is important. Note also that all three standard words for ‘earth’ are found in the hymn: *pr̥thivī* (1b), *bhūmī-* (1c), and *kṣām-* (3b), though in different cases and usages. The riddling middle vs. lacks such a word.

V.84.1: The exclamation with which the hymn opens, *bád*, has a very un-Indo-Aryan shape, with a plain *b* and an unmotivated retroflex *ḍ*. This *ḍ* becomes *ḷ* before words beginning with a vowel, showing the standard R̥gvedic intervocalic change -- which, interestingly, operates across word boundary here and in the 7 other passages in which *bád* is followed by a vowel; in VIII.101.11 it becomes *ṇ* before a nasal, in VIII.101.12 a *ṭ* before *s*. In 4 of its occurrences, incl. this one, it is immediately followed by *itthā*; the combined sense of the two particles escapes me. The non-Sanskritic phonology of *bád* suggests that there is a colloquial flavor to the word, but it is hard to capture exactly what that is -- esp. as the rest of the vs. doesn’t show markedly low register features.

Note the phonetic figures *párvatānām*# ... *pr̥thivī*# (ab), *#prá ... pravatvat*# (c), and *#mahná ... mahin*# (d), all positioned at pāda boundaries and all involving a fem. voc. as the 2nd word. The first two pairs of course also play off each other.

This first verse presents an unsurprising picture of the earth, weighed down by mountains whose slopes define her and providing support for the life that flourishes upon her. This vs. serves as scene-setter and contrast to vs. 2.

V.84.2: *vicāriṇī* is generally taken as ‘far-wandering’ vel sim. (e.g., Ge ‘du Wandelbare’), but cf. X.173.2, where the mountain to which the newly installed king is compared is

āvicācaliḥ ‘unwavering’; remember also that earth is said to ‘bob up and down’ (*nānnamīti*) during the thunderstorm in the preceding hymn (V.83.5).

This is the riddle vs.: the puzzle involves positing a number of qualities of the earth that don’t appear to be characteristic of her -- quite unlike the first vs. -- and implicitly asking under what circumstances these unlikely attributes would be true of the earth, who is not explicitly named. In this vs. she is addressed as a ‘wobbler’ (*vicāriṇī*), she is associated with nights (*aktúbhiḥ*), she is said to “fling moisture forward” (*perúm āsyasi*), and she is silvery (*arjuni*). Neither the unsteady actions nor the silver color and association with night are earth-like.

As Thieme already suggested (Gedichte, 58), the nights can represent the darkness of monsoon clouds and her wobbling results from the thunderstorm. She is also ‘silvery’ with rain, which she ‘flings’ in the forms of streams and rivulets down her slopes, the slopes mentioned in verse 1.

V.84.3: The first half of this verse restores to us the familiar steady, sturdy Earth of vs. 1, while the second half identifies the special circumstances that held in vs. 2. Because it is made up of two subordinate clauses, it must be attached to the previous verse and the 2nd person referent must be the same. This verse, with its straightforward diction and balanced construction, provides the answer to those dullards in the audience who failed to solve the implicit challenge of vs. 2.

The standard tr. all supply a verb for *vidyútaḥ* -- e.g., WG “wenn ... die Blitze (blitzen) ...” -- but I don’t see why the lightning bolts can’t ‘rain’ -- in particularly violent thunderstorms lightning flashes can seem to come as thick and fast as raindrops.

Note that ‘earth’ is reunited with her usual formulaic companion ‘heaven’ in the final pāda of the hymn. It should be kept in mind that this is the only hymn dedicated only to Earth in the RV, instead of to Heaven and Earth.

[V.85 JPB]

V.86 Indra and Agni

The hymn begins with the voc. dual dvandva *īndrāgnī*, and a form of that cmpd is found in 2d, 4b, 6a; vss. 3 and 5, which lack the cmpd., begin with dual pronouns (*táyoh* and *tā* respectively), while dual forms of both the demonst. and the rel. pronoun are also common elsewhere in the hymn.

V.86.1: The 2nd hemistich is a little tricky. As noted in the publ. intro. it seems to concern the Vala myth, though with Trita as hero -- an odd substitution in a hymn at least half dedicated to Indra. Moreover, there’s a functional slippage in the accusatives with the verb *prá√bhid* ‘split (forth)’. The first acc., neut. pl. *dṛ̥l̥hā*, is of course very common, used of fastnesses or strongholds (which usually get split or otherwise breached). The standard interpr. (Gr, Old, Ge, Re) take it with *dyumnā* (e.g., Old “feste Herrlichkeiten”), but this is an uneasy collocation. The *dyumnā* should be the brilliant things desired to be obtained; they are more likely to be held within strongholds than to be strongholds themselves, and the consistent use of *dṛ̥l̥hā*- as ‘fastness, stronghold’ makes it unlikely that it can here refer to the thing held rather than what holds it within. I assume that *prá√bhid* can take a double acc.: ‘split X (to release) forth Y’, with X the container and Y

the contained. Old is quite dismissive of a variant on this explanation, but I do not see the objection -- particularly as whatever *vāñīḥ* refers to, it is more likely to be the contained than the container. As for *vāñī-*, this stem usually refers to music or voices. Ge's tentative suggestion, that these are the voices of the cows released from the Vala cave, makes the most contextual sense -- even though, as Ge points out, the word is not otherwise used of animal noises. On the other hand, as he also points out, it *is* used of rivers, so that application to non-human sounds that are comparable to a choir of human voices is possible. That *vāñī-* is also sometimes used of the choir that encourages Indra in a Vala context (e.g., III.30.10) might add an additional resonance to the usage here, but I do not think it is the primary reading.

V.86.2: The publ. tr. starts the vs. in the 2nd ps. ("you two who") and ends in the 3rd ps. ("these two"). This does not represent the text entirely fairly, because the grammatical person is entirely unclear until the last pāda, which contains an acc. dual dvandva and a 3rd ps. dual acc. prn. (*tā*) and a 1st ps. pl. verb. Until pāda d Indra and Agni are represented only by the insistent rel. du. *yā* (a, b, c). The vs. could therefore be couched entirely in the 3rd ps. ("the two who ..."), as the standard tr. do. I stand by my modulatory tr. because, based on vs. 1 with its voc. dual dvandva and 2nd du. verb *āvathaḥ*, we start vs. 2 assuming the 2nd ps. context carries over, and nothing disturbs that assumption until the very end of the vs.

V.86.2–4: Vs. 3 is the middle vs. of the hymn, since vs. 6 is in a different meter and is an extra-hymnic summary vs. It has the marks of an omphalos, esp. semantic and syntactic obscurity. The real difficulties lie in the central 3cd along with 4a, which is verbally related to 3cd by the problematic *eṣ*-forms (see below). The omphalos is framed, in classic omphalos fashion, by *indrāgnī (tā) havāmahe* in 2d and 4b.

V.86.3: 3cd has elicited much disc.; see esp. the lengthy treatment of it by Old, with several different possible tr. supplied, Ge's n. 3cd, and a fairly detailed disc. in WG's n. (now supplemented by an even lengthier and somewhat ill-tempered treatment by Slaje [Vájra, 92–94]). Among the problems are 1) what is the referent of the 'wood(en)' in instr. *drūṇā*; 2) who is the subj. of the verb and is it his hands (*gābhastyoḥ*) that are in question; 3) what is *gāvām* construed with; 4) what case is *vṛtraghná*, that is, what is its pausal form?

I will begin with 3): flg. Ge (n. 3cd), I supply a loc. **éṣe* to govern *gāvām* "(in the quest) for cattle." This is supported by *éṣate* in this pāda, *éṣe rāthānām* "in the quest for chariots" in the next pāda (4a) likewise with gen., and X.48.9 *gāvām éṣe*. As Ge suggests, **éṣe éṣate* may have been simplified by a sort of word-haplology. However, this interpr. is slightly complicated by the fact that I, at least, take *éṣe* and *éṣate* to different roots: *éṣe* as a loc. sg. to a thematic deriv. to *√iṣ* 'seek' and *éṣate* (with most) as the stem *īṣa-* + *ā*, which I take to be the orig. desid. to *√i* 'go' (see Gotō 1st Cl. p. 77, citing Hoffmann; Heenen Desid. 96ff.). The publ. tr. "goes questing (in his quest) for cattle" seems, however, to connect the two etymologically. I meant rather that the 'seek' sense of nominal *éṣa-* "bled" into the desid. sense 'desire to go', on the basis of their shared phonology and the fact that 'seek to go' is very close to 'quest'. The verb form *éṣa-* must, of course, have a preverb, because it should not otherwise be accented.

As for 4), the underlying form of *ṛtraghñá* — contra the Pp and most interpr., who take it as dat. *ṛtraghñé* — I think it is a genitive (*ṛtraghñáh*), dependent on *gábhastyoh* -- a possibility floated but ultimately rejected by Old. A parallel passage with a weapon (in fact, a *didyút*; see our 3b) being wielded in the arms of a man is found in VII.25.1 *pátāti didyún náryasya bāhóḥ*. A dat. does not make much sense here because *ā* *√iṣ* doesn't ordinarily take a dative, nor does *prāti*, so we are left with no way to fit a dat. **ṛtraghñé* into the existing syntax of the sentence, save as a free-floating dat. of benefit. (Re, curiously, seems to take it as a loc. “chez *Ṛtrahaṇ*” [*sic* the retroflex *ṇ*]. This seems to go back to an idea of Hillebrandt's that it belongs to an otherwise unattested thematic stem; see Old. This has nothing to recommend it.) In answer to 2), if I am thus correct that the hands are those of Indra, it seems likely that he is also the subject of *éṣate*. Otherwise the subject is an unidentified other party or (so most interpr.) is the missile (*didyút*) of pāda b. What then to do with *drúnā*? This is the most problematic of the problems. Most interpr. take it as the handle of the *didyút* (which, acdg. to WG, might be a sort of Vedic boomerang). In VIII.96.11 and IX.98.2, the same instr. seems to refer to a wooden paddle or the like. A similar wooden implement, usable as a weapon, may be meant here -- though it seems a come-down for vajra-wielding Indra. More likely it is equipment esp. suitable for cattle herding -- a prod or goad, and this would account for Indra's trading in his usual weapon for something more appropriate to a quest for cows. Of course, since soma is usually poured into wooden cups, this may also depict Indra with a wooden soma cup in his hands, preparing to drink before he goes out on his quest. I might emend the publ. tr. to “With the wooden (goad / soma-cup) in the hands ...”

I am not at all certain of the correctness of any of these answers to the questions posed above. Nor do I have any explanation for *prāti*, beyond pointing out that 4c begins with rhyming *pātī*. And, most especially, I don't understand why this cramped and obscure half-verse is found in this otherwise rather anodyne hymn.

V.86.4: As noted above, the *éṣe* + GEN. here helps explain 3cd. It is also integrated into the omphalos-framing (semi)repeated pāda *indragnī havāmahe*. Most standard tr., however, render *éṣe* here not as ‘in quest of, in pursuit of’, but as ‘rush, run, course’ (e.g., Ge “im Rennen der Wagen,” Re “pour la course de chars,” WG “anlässlich eines Wagenrennens”), implicitly accepting Gr's separation of *éṣa-* into two stems ‘das Hineilen, Eilen’ and ‘Aufsuchen, Begehren’. *éṣe* + GEN. is found three times elsewhere in V -- V.41.5, 8 (both *rāyá éṣe* “in quest of wealth”) and this very pāda in V.66.3 -- and it seems uneconomical to give these similar syntagms in the same maṇḍala two entirely different meanings. Old (ZDMG 62: 477–78 [=KISch 286–87]) makes similar points, arguments accepted by Bl (RReps ad V.66.3).

With the phrase *turásya rādhasaḥ* compare the cmpd. *tuvi-rādhās-* (3x, incl. V.58.2). This pair, cmpd. and free phrase with *tuvi-* and *turá-* respectively, confirms at least a synchronic connection between the Caland cmpding form *tuvi-* and the *-rá-* adjective, even though from *√tū* we should expect long-vowel **tūrā-*. Contamination with *turá-* ‘swift, impetuous’ surely contributed to the vowel shortening, as is generally supposed: the two adjectives would be hard to sort out in many contexts where vague and general flattery was being conveyed. For *turá-* and *√tū*, see also *tavāse turāya* (3x) with a different derivative of *√tū*.

V.86.5: The verb *puró dadhe* gives a more Agni-esque cast to the vs. than the more Indiraic vss. that have preceded.

The standard tr. separate c and d into two clauses, but I think the two expressions are meant to be balanced against each other. The idea seems to be that though (*cid*) the two gods deserve portions (*árhantā*), I have set them out as if they themselves were portions (*ámśā-iva*), prizes for a prize-winning steed. What it means to “set them out” I don’t know. It’s worth noting that *√arh* regularly takes *pītīm* ‘drink(ing), share of drink’ as object (e.g., V.51.6), so the reciprocal notion would be familiar to the audience.

V.86.6: *havyá*, so accented, is generally ‘oblation’, as opposed to *hávya-* ‘invocation’. However, in this case it is difficult not to see a pun, with the hymn just completed counting both as an oblation (“*like* ghee ...,” pāda c) and an invocation, accompanying the physical oblation. The pun is further enabled by the adj. *śūṣyā-* ‘forceful’, which in its other two occurrences (I.54.3, VII.66.1) modifies types of speech (*vācas-* and *stóma-* respectively).

This pun may help explain the curious expression “like ghee purified by stones” (*ghṛtām ná pūtām ádribhiḥ*). The problem of course is that it is soma, not ghee, that is purified by stones. It is very doubtful that stones could play a role in preparing melted butter (pity the poor cow), and although the root *√pū* is occasionally used of *ghṛtā-* (VI.10.2 and esp. the fixed simile *ghṛtām ná pūtām* in III.2.1, IV.10.6, and esp. the very similar VIII.12.4 *ghṛtām ná pūtām adrivaḥ*) -- and consider the English term for ghee, “clarified butter” -- it is overwhelming characteristic of soma. The standard tr. deal with the disharmony in this simile by separating it into two -- e.g., Ge “durch die Presssteine (gepresst), wie Schmalz geklärt.” By contrast, I think the ill-assorted technology in the simile was deliberately introduced, to match the same punning lack of fit in the frame, where the forceful/noisy *havyá-* has been poured (*áhāvi*): the jarring “ghee pressed by stones” calls attention to the more subtle mismatch in the frame. We might almost call this ritual synaesthesia.

V.87 Maruts

Re nicely characterizes this hymn (in his comm. on vs. 5) “l’hymne est fait de débris empruntés au cycle ancien des M.” Certainly there is a sense that the vss. are constructed of loosely connected phrases, which may well be connected with the unusual meter.

As disc. in the publ. intro., the final word of the 2nd pāda of each vs., *evayāmarut*, appears to be an exclamatory internal refrain without syntactic connection to the rest of the vs. Ge by contrast takes it in each case as forming a nominal sentence with unexpressed Viṣṇu (usually, but see below): “(Viṣṇu is der) mit dem die Marut gern kommen.” But though Viṣṇu is surprisingly prominent in this hymn, I don’t think he outranks the Maruts, and the formation of *evayāmarut* is too peculiar to be folded into a conventional (if invisible) nominal clause. Though sg., I think it must refer to the Maruts, who, after all, appear in the collective sg. in the rest of the vs. (pādas cde) as a troop (*śárdha-*). For the phrase on which this is built, see V.41.16 *evayā marutaḥ*.

V.87.1: The grammatical identity of *giriḥ* (in sandhi) ‘mountain-born’ is problematic (see Old’s disc.). The Pp. takes it as *giriḥ*, which could be nom. pl. fem. (so Gr and Re) and

modify ‘thoughts’, but this makes little sense: the thoughts in question are surely home-grown, as it were, not outsourced from a mountain. (Though Old’s offhand suggestion that the cmpd might mean “in der Rede geboren,” with otherwise unattested loc. sg. of *gír-* ‘hymn’, is worth considering as a second punning reading, suitable for ‘thoughts’. See *gírā* in 3a.) *gírijāḥ* could likewise be nom. sg. masc. and refer to Viṣṇu. This is the basis for Ge’s first Satzparenthese “-- er ist der Berggeborene, mit dem die Marut gern kommen --” and he is followed by Scar (136). But switching the ref. to Viṣṇu from dative (... *mahé ... víṣṇave, marútvate*) to nominative in the middle of a pāda right at the end of the dative phrase is highly unlikely. Although the morphology doesn’t entirely work, I think it must be a dative. The problem of course is that the dat. to this *-ā*-root noun should be underlying **gírijé*, which should appear in sandhi as *gírijá*, not *-já*, as here. It should be noted, however, that datives in *-é* to root nouns in *-ā* are exceedingly rare (see Macd., Vedic Gr. p. 252; AiG III.125), and beside them exist infinitives in *-ái* to roots in *-ā* (Macd. loc cit.; AiG III.129) like *pratikhyaí, vayo-dhaí*. Esp. in this sandhi situation, I see no reason why this extended dat. sg. would not have been available even to a non-infinitive. In favor of a dat. referring to Viṣṇu is the very similar passage I.154.3 *prá víṣṇave sūśám etu mánma, gírikṣíta urugāyāya víṣṇe*, with the semantically corresponding dat. root-noun cmpd. *gírikṣíte* ‘mountain-dwelling’ in a lengthy dat. phrase referring to Viṣṇu and *prá ... etu mánma* matching our *matáyo yantu* almost exactly. (Curiously WG tr. *gírijā* as if a dat. parallel to *marútvate* “... zum grossen Viṣṇu, der in Begleitung der Maruts ist, der in den Bergen geboren ist,” but Scar, who was responsible for this vol. of WG, seems to hold onto the nom. sg. interpr. in his n. -- though the n. is a bit incoherent.)

The hapax cmpd *bhandád-iṣṭi-* is variously rendered. Both Ge and WG (latter flg. Gotō, 1st pres. cl., 224) interpr. *-iṣṭi-* as “sacrifice” (hence Ge’s ‘opferliebend’, WG ‘deren Opferungen erfreuen’). But *-iṣṭi-* is far more often ‘desire, quest, seeking’ than ‘sacrifice’ in the RV, and notice the concentration of such forms of *√iṣ* in the previous hymn (V.86.3, 4, at least by my interpr.). As Lowe points out (*Participles*, 270–71), *bhandát-* and its ilk result from reanalysis of governing cmpds, producing pseudo-act. participles to roots without an active paradigm (like *√bhand*, which is otherwise only middle). The cmpd is exactly parallel to rhyming *krandád-iṣṭi-* (X.100.2), whose interpr. also varies. Although both cmpds have the look of governing cmpds, neither *√bhand* nor *√krand* is transitive; I therefore think we have more or less standard bahuvrīhi semantics ‘having a fortunate quest’ and ‘having a roaring quest’ respectively, whose English I have adjusted to something more palatable.

The adjectivally accented *távase* beginning d points up the nominally accented rhyming *śávase* at the end of e. With Re I think the Maruts are being equated with *śávas-* itself, but it would be possible to take *śávase* as a separate purpose dative ‘for strength’ (with or without *távase*).

On *dhúni-vrata-* see comm. ad V.58.2.

V.87.2: This vs. is quite loosely constructed. To begin with, the rel. cl. of ab has no obvious main clause, though the two *yé*s do, of course, refer to the Maruts, who show up in the voc. in c. The rel. cl. could also hang off vs. 1, with pl. *yé* picking up the collective sg. *śárdha-* in 1cde.

The next question is what belongs with each *yé*. The easiest solution and the one taken by the standard tr. (as well as Klein DGRV I.118) is to take the first as a nominal cl. *yé jāṭā mahinā* and the 2nd as containing the accented verb *prá ... bruváte*. But there are several factors against this. For one thing the *prá* that begins the 2nd pāda is actually a repeat of the one that begins the vs. (#*prá yé jāṭāḥ ... yé ca ..., prá ... bruváte ...*); that is, the first *prá* seems to have been extracted from the second *yé* clause and fronted around the first, which may well be a violation of RVic clause structure and at best is highly unusual. If we take *prá ..., prá ... bruváte ...* as the verb for both *yé* clauses, as I do, it is considerably less problematic. Moreover, the *yé ... yé ca* construction is far more at home in expressing complementary pairs (see Klein I.115–16) than in conjoining coreferential entities with semantically unconnected predicates, as the standard tr. requires (e.g., Klein 118: “Who were born with greatness and who now themselves proclaim (their might) with knowledge.”). In my interpr. the *yé ... yé ca* construction expresses two types of Marut birth, “born/produced by might” and “self(-produced/born),” with the *svayám* signalling the 2nd type. The Maruts are called *svajāḥ* in I.168.2; cf. also I.64.4 *sākām jajñire svadhāyā ...* “They [=Maruts] were born all at once by their own power.” I see only two arguments against my interpr.: 1) the *nú* in the second *yé* clause, which might mark a chronological progression (as in Klein’s tr. [also WG]; Ge and Re both ignore the *nú*, and it’s certainly true that *nú* need not be temporal); 2) the apparently required underlying assumption that there are two groups of Maruts. As to that, I don’t think the complementary pairing needs to indicate that there are two distinct groups of Maruts sorted by their means of birth, but rather that we can view their births in different ways.

The next question is how to construe *prá ... bruváte*. Ge and WG both take it as reflexive “announce themselves,” but *prá √ brū* is not elsewhere reflex./pass., even in the middle. Re supplies as object “leur naissance,” which can be justified, but I prefer Klein’s “their might.” The resonant word *śávas-* is found on either side of this phrase, at the ends of 1e and 2c and is the focus of 2cde, and *prá √ brū* elsewhere takes such objects (*indriyām* I.55.4, *bālāni* X.54.2).

The rest of the vs. consists, in my opinion (flg. Re), of two parallel clauses, each beginning with instr. of respect, followed by *tád* and a gen. referring to the Maruts (2nd ps. in c, 3rd in d), and, as predicate, a negated form of *√ dhṛṣ* ‘dare (against), assail’. The *tád* is specified as *śávas-* in the first clause, which identification carries over into the second:

krátvā tád vo (maruto) nādhṛṣe śávaḥ
dānā mahná tád eṣām ádhṛṣtāso (nádrayaḥ)

This striking parallelism makes the interpr. of Ge and WG unlikely: they take *krátvā* as the weapon that someone might try to use, unsuccessfully, against the Maruts’ *śávas-*, whereas *dānā mahná* they take as instr. of respect. Actually, Ge’s treatment is more complicated: his tr. reflects the interpr. I just paraphrased (“Diese eure Macht ist nicht durch Einsicht zu erzwingen”), but in his n. 2c–e he describes the three instr. as parallel: “Der Sinn ist jedenfalls, dass keiner wagt, es ihnen an Umsicht, Freigebigkeit und Grösse gleichzutun.”

As Ge points out (n. 2e), masc. pl. *ádhṛṣtāsaḥ* has been attracted to the number and gender of the simile (*ádrayaḥ*); it is still specifying *śávaḥ* in the frame.

It’s also worth noting that pādas c and d both contain *ná* in sandhi with a following vowel in quite similar phonological sequences: *nādhṛṣe ... nádrayaḥ*. The first

ná is the negative (matched by *a-* in *ádhr̥ṣṭāsaḥ* in the next pāda); the 2nd is the simile marker.

V.87.3: Like vs. 2 this vs. begins with several relative clauses (*yé* pāda a, *yéṣām* c), with no clear main clause.

The first pāda of this vs. is syntactically straightforward, but we might wonder why the Maruts are heard “through a/their hymn.” In answer, there is the fact, often referred to above, that the Maruts are singers as well as sung-to. Further, in this context their “hymn” may be a metaphorical reference to thunder. It is also possible that it is a pun, as indicated in the publ. tr. and also implicitly by Scar (537), with the *-ā* variant form of the *i*-stem loc. sg. of *giri-*. (Interestingly Scar’s alternative “mit einem Lied (/im Gebirge)” in the root noun book is not reflected in his tr. in WG, which limits itself to “mit ihrem Lied.”) Of course, such a loc. sg. would be wrongly positioned: it is the *-au* loc. sg. form that is overwhelmingly found at pāda end (see, e.g., Lanman, Noun Infl., p. 385), but as a secondary punning reading the “wrong” form could be acceptable, esp. as it precedes a consonant, as most forms of loc. sg. *-ā* do. Thus the Maruts would be heard “on a mountain” -- as their storm often is.

The hapax nom. sg. *írī* is problematic formally and semantically. In this sandhi sit. the long *ī* final can only belong to a devī-type *-ī*-stem or an *-in*-stem. It is usually cited as the latter (e.g., Gr, EWA), but this analysis seems excluded formally because *-in*-stems are always suffix-accented. An underlying *-in*-stem is emphatically denied by AiG II.2.328 (“Die Barytona v. *írī* ... gehören nicht hierher”; see also Old’s serious doubts). Debrunner (AiG II.2.407–8) seems to favor (if “favoring” means sticking it in that section but then calling it “ganz unklar”) a masc. devī-type *-ī*-stem, but of course such stems are rare and problematic in all their occurrences. Nothing in the passage actually excludes an analysis as a *feminine* *-ī*-stem, but who would such a feminine be? The other question of course is what is it derived from and what does it mean. I follow the line of least resistance that has been fld. by a number of others and connect it with *írya-*, which is better attested though not much clearer, and is found in another Marut hymn in V, V.58.4; see comm. ad loc. If the basic sense is something like ‘energetic’, the form of *írya-* in V.58.4 is positive in sense, while *írī* is negative.

I do not understand the pāda-final *ā*. Assuming that *īṣte* belongs to $\sqrt{īṣ}$, that root does not otherwise appear with *ā* (or any other preverb). It’s worth noting that *īṣte* here is the only *t*-full 3rd sg.; the usual and very well-attested 3rd sg. is, of course, *īṣe*. We might try to connect the form with $\sqrt{īṣ}$ or $\sqrt{iṣ}$, but neither is promising formally or semantically.

The last pāda, *prá syandrāso dhúnīnām*, confronts us with a lexical conundrum: it contains two plurals, one nom., one gen., both of which are good Marut words. For the Maruts as *syandrā-* see V.52.3, 8; for *dhúni-* see *dhúni-vrata-* in this hymn (1e) and V.58.2, as well as the simplex adj. in numerous passages (e.g., V.60.7). So which one modifies the (unexpressed) Maruts, and what should we do with the other? The poet seems to be messing with our minds: we encounter the first, *syandrāsaḥ*, and understandably assume it refers to the Maruts, then come to the second, *dhúni-*, which is an even more characteristic Marut word, and have to readjust. Ge supplies ‘chariots’ (Wagen, sim. WG Fahrzeuge) with the nominative, and the publ. tr. tentatively follows that. Re manages to make both words refer to the Maruts, “(dieux) bruyants qui rapides (vont) de l’avant,” breezily remarking “il n’est pas indispensable de sous-entendre « les

chars ».” But, though I’m sympathetic to his intuition that both words should refer to the Maruts, the grammatical difference is unambiguous. In Max Müller’s tr. of this hymn (SBE 32), he tr. “the rushing chariots of these roaring Maruts come forth” and notes that “chariot” was Oldenberg’s suggestion (presumably in their consultation on the SBE translations; the suggestion is not registered in the *Noten*). One of the problems with supplying “chariots” is the preceding pāda (d), also in the nom. pl., which seems clearly to describe the Maruts. If *syandrāsaḥ* does not refer to the Maruts but to their chariots, we must either assume that the flashing entities in d are also chariots or put an unsignalled break between the two pādas. The publ. tr. essentially does the latter, but it is unsatisfactory. Ge does the former, which isn’t satisfactory either, and WG stir the pot even further by supplying ‘weapons’ as the comparandum in d.

V.87.4: The “common seat” (*samānāsmāt sādasaḥ*) is presumably one shared by Viṣṇu and the Maruts and is also presumably the same as the *sadhāstha-* in the previous vs. (3c) -- perhaps the midspace? The standard interpr. (incl. mine) also assume the same seat (or a similar place) is the referent of *svāt* ‘from his own’ in pāda c. For other exx. of the idiom \sqrt{yuj} +ABL. ‘yoke from’ with ‘seat’ in the abl., see Old.

Similar to *āyukta tmānā* is V.52.8 *prā ... yujata tmānā*, in the latter passage the verb is used absolutely, without expressed obj. That is possible here too, though it is also possible, and indeed more likely, to take *viṣpardhaso vímahasaḥ* in d as the obj. (so also Re and WG), referring to horses, an interpr. that saves supplying a verb to govern that phrase, as Ge does (“lenkt”). (See Max Müller’s solution below.) It should be noted, however, that neither of these adjectives is otherwise used of horses: *viṣpardhas-* is found twice elsewhere, once of human contenders (I.173.10), once of, apparently, flames (VIII.23.2); *vímahas-* is only attested once elsewhere, in I.86.1 of the Maruts. Max Müller in the SBE 32 tr. takes the two adj. as a voc. phrase addressed to the Maruts. This seems unlikely in the middle of a sentence devoted to Viṣṇu and only turning to the Maruts in its last word, *nībhīḥ*, and so a ‘horse’ interpr. seems the best course.

The publ. tr. renders *ādhi ṣṇúbhiḥ* as “upon the (mountains’) backs,” but in accord with the standard sense of this phrase (e.g., V.60.7) and in harmony with the standard tr. I would now alter this to “along the (mountains’) backs.” This complicates the rendering of the rest of the clause, because there is no verb of motion, just ‘yoke’. Both Re and WG supply an expression to provide this motion: Re “(pour courir) à travers les hauteurs” and WG “(zur Ausfahrt) über die (Berg-)Rücken.” Reluctantly I would join them and supply something like “(to travel) along ...”

The standard explanation of *śévṛdha-* as a haplology of **śéva-vṛdha-* (already Gr, endorsed by AiG I.279, tentatively also by EWA s.v. *śéva-*) seems correct, but this does not settle its sense. Cmpds in *-vṛdha-* have a range of senses, both transitive and intransitive, and of relationships to their 1st member, and none of the quite varied contexts in which *śévṛdha-* appears is sufficiently diagnostic. Several of them apply to Agni as the ritual fire just kindled (X.46.3, X.61.20 [the latter accented *śevavṛdhá-*]); once (I.54.11) it is used of ‘brilliance’ (*dyumná-*) and once (III.16.2) of ‘riches’ (*rāyaḥ*). The preponderance of the evidence, esp. the two “fire just born” passages, seems to point to an intransitive/passive reading of *-vṛdha-* and an instr. reading of *śé(va)-*, hence ‘growing strong through kindness/benevolence’ or, perhaps better in English, ‘through kind attention’ (to which I would now change this tr.). Although an intrans. reading of the

publ. tr.'s "strengthening with kindness" is possible, this English expression is more likely to be read as transitive, and I would therefore alter the tr. to the clearer 'growing strong ...' What this descriptor means in our passage is entirely unclear to me -- that the Maruts are treating Viṣṇu well and he thrives?

V.87.5: Note the chiasmic phonetic figure that begins the vs.: *svanó ná vo*.

The caus. injunc. *rejayat* needs an obj. I supply 'earth' on the basis of intrans. *rejate* passages with *bhūmi-*, *pṛthivī*, et sim. as subj., but any standard cosmic feature will do (Re 'I'univers', WG 'alles').

Pace Gr, *ṛñjāta* is better analyzed as a 3rd pl. mid. athem. form than a 2nd pl. act. them. All the standard tr. follow the 3rd pl. mid. interpr.

The source of *sthāraśman-* is disputed. First note that this peculiar form can be partially motivated contextually: 6c begins *sthātāro*, so there was some incentive to begin our pāda with a word of similar shape. We can begin by dismissing the odd Pp analysis of this cmpd, *sthāḥ'raśman-*. It is difficult to know what this is meant to represent. AiG II.1.316 and II.2.9 take *sthā-* simply as the cmpded root or root noun, and Wackernagel (II.1.316) classifies it with verb-first verbal governing cmpds, an analysis that has been taken up by others (see e.g. Tribulato, *Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds*, 164 and passim), though there are no transitive forms to *√sthā* except the *p*-causative. Bloomfield (RVReps ad loc.) suggests that it's "a kind of haplology" from *sth(ir)āraśmānaḥ*, with *sthirā-* 'firm' as 1st member (note Sāy.'s gloss *sthiraraśmayo*), and this is accepted by Ge (n. 5d). It is not clear where the long *ā-* of his posited *sth(ir)ā-* would come from, however; is he thinking of a nom. pl. syntagm **sthirā raśmānaḥ*, with univerbation and loss of the noun's accent? Moreover, in the Nachtr. to AiG II.1.316 [=Nachtr. 87] Debrunner points out that haplology of Bl's posited form should produce **sthirāśman-* (undoubtedly why Bl calls it "a kind of haplology"). Re proposes a 1st member adj. **sthāmān-* 'bien en place' or 'solide', internally derived from the noun *sthāman-* 'station, standing place', but this requires several more steps derivationally and semantically, and the haplology (if that's what he sees it as) would involve loss over an intermediate syllable and loss of a heavy consonant-final syllable, both of which are problematic: *sthāmān-raśman-*. Certainly *sthirā-* makes the most sense semantically, but, as noted above, Bl's haplology runs into formal difficulties. However, if we begin with my observation that 6c *#sthātāro* makes a *sthā* opening desirable, an irregular reduction of **sthirā-raśman-* may be the best option. In fact if we operate with a slightly different form of the 1st member, the development may be easier to explain. I suggest positing a reduced form of *sthirā-*, namely **sthṛā-*, showing the same *-irV-* ~ *-rV-* alternation as *indra-* ~ **indira-* (metrically guaranteed, but not transmitted in the Saṃhitā; cf. AiG I.55) and the 3rd pl. med. pf. endings *-ire* and *-re* (AiG I.23). **sthṛā-* would thus show the loss of an apparent svarabhakti vowel, rather than the insertion of one. The posited cmpd **sthṛā-raśman-* would then undergo liquid dissimilation, not haplology. This still doesn't explain the long *ā-*, but the parallel *sthātārah* might help there.

V.87.6: Note *#sthātārah ... sthana#*.

This vs. reprises some of what came before. The focus on *śāvas-* earlier in the hymn (1e, 2cde) is emphatically revived with ab ... *vṛddhaśavasah ... śāvah*; the hapax epithet *suśukvan-* in the nom. pl.. *suśukvānaḥ* in 3b is cleverly echoed by the pf. part.

śuśukvāṃsaḥ, where the redupl. *śu-* matches the prefix *su-*; and the simile in 3d *agnāyo nā svāvidyutaḥ* appears in reverse order (and a different shared quality) in *śuśukvāṃso nā-agnāyaḥ*. There is also a local repetition of *tveṣā-* in 6b, echoing the same stem in the same position in 5b.

V.87.7: This vs., too, reprises earlier material: there is a 3rd “fires” simile, this time marked with *yathā*, not *nā*, and extended over the pāda boundary (*agnāyo yathā, tuvidyumnāḥ*); *avantu* in b echoes *avatu* in 6b in the same metrical position; the ‘seat’ returns for the third time (pāda c), with yet a different word: *sādman-* versus 3c *sadhāstha-* and 4b *sādas-*.

The last two pādas present several problems. One is how to reconcile *yēṣām* and *śārdhāṃsi*, which are presumably coreferential and refer to the Maruts. Simplest is to accept Ge’s “der reflexive Gebrauch des Relativs” (n. 7d); cf., e.g., V.61.12 and comm. thereon. The publ. tr. does not render *yēṣām* literally, but as “when ... of them,” for the sake of English, since “at whose drives” is awkward in context.

The causal connection between the journey of the Maruts (d) and the spreading out of the earth (c) is clear in V.58.7, also adduced by Ge: *prātiṣṭha yāman pṛthivī cid eṣām* “Even the Earth has spread herself at their journey,” but pāda c cannot be brought into the domain of the relative in d (though Old tries) because of the lack of accent on the verb *paprathe* in c. Instead d and e must together make a circumstantial clause dependent on c. With Ge and Re I supply a verb of motion ‘ap(proach)’; this can be partly generated from the *ā* in c, though that *ā* is primarily a postposition with the loc. and is not in the right place for a preverb in tmesis. The *étana* in the next vs. (8a) may support the supplying of a verb of motion here.

The next question in de is the grammatical analysis and reference of *mahāḥ*, which presents us with entirely too many possibilities: abl./gen. sg or nom./acc. pl. of *māh-*, nom. sg. of *mahá-*, adv. *mahás*. On the basis of the gen. phrase in the next vs., 8c *vīṣṇor mahāḥ* (cf. also 1a *mahé ... vīṣṇave*), I take it as gen. sg. and supply Viṣṇu: the Marut troops are here said to be Viṣṇu’s. This more or less follows Ge; Re takes *mahāḥ* as adv., WG as nom. sg. See also Old’s disc.

The final problem is the bahuvrīhi *ādbhuta-enas-*, which is found once elsewhere (VIII.67.7). The problem is to find some plausible overlap between the senses of the two members and a plausible reason why whatever is so constructed should apply to the Maruts. The standard sense of *éna-* is ‘offense, transgression, outrage’; *ādbhuta-* is famously problematic, but probably the most widely accepted analysis currently is as a negated form of *√dabh* ‘deceive, trick, harm’ (see EWA s.v.), hence ‘infallible, unerring’, shading (probably because of loss of transparency) into ‘wonderful, astonishing, ineffable’. Put these together and you get the highly unconvincing ‘having infallible offenses’ or the like -- not a good epithet for a favored group of gods. Clearly something has to give, and in most interpr. it’s the semantic integrity of the parts; e.g., Re decides that *éna-* here preserves an earlier sense, derived from its relationship to *ínóti* and means ‘élan’, yielding a cmpd “à l’élan extraordinaire,” which fits smoothly into the context by virtue of suppressing the semantics of both cmpd members. In the other occurrence of the cmpd in VIII.67.7 I take it as applying to the Ādityas (most others see it as a gen. sg.) and meaning ‘whom (others’) offenses cannot mislead’. That is, the stripped-down sense is ‘possessing unmisleading/misleadable offenses’, but the offenses are committed by others

and the Ādityas are not tricked by them. This may provide more tricky structure than a bahuvrīhi can quite manage, but it does preserve the lexical senses of both members. It may mean this here as well -- the Maruts are no more trickable than the Ādityas -- and I propose that as an alternate tr. But the publ. tr. takes a different route, with the sense ‘harm’ for \sqrt{dabh} , hence ‘whose offenses are beyond harm’ -- meaning, perhaps, that the violence and turmoil attendant on the Maruts’ stormy passage on the one hand leave no lasting damage and on the other cannot be held against the Maruts. They are not moral lapses.

Note the figure in c: *pr̥thú paprathe ... p̥r̥thivam*, which is both phonological and etymological.

V.87.8: The first word in the vs. *adveṣāḥ* must be adverbial; it of course resonates with the 2nd to last word in the vs., *dvēṣāṃsi*.

The construction of the gen. (or possibly, in principle, abl.) phrase *viṣṇor mahāḥ* isn’t entirely clear. Old is insistent that it belongs with the voc. *samanyavaḥ*, hence “of equal fervor with Viṣṇu,” but this adj. is not otherwise construed with a third party but rather indicates that those so described are equally fervent with each other. Moreover, the genitive is not the most likely case for the proposed meaning, and we might also expect the gen. phrase to lose its accent or take vocative accent if it were part of the vocative phrase. The standard tr. take the gen. as simply identifying the Maruts as “Viṣṇu’s,” and this may well be the best way to do it. The publ. tr. construes it with *smāt* ‘together with’ at the beginning of d, as Gr also indicates. The genitive case is problematic, however: *smāt* takes the instr. Further, as Ge points out, rather than *smāt* we should expect **asmāt*, the 1st pl. abl. prn. to be construed with *yuyotana ... āpa dvēṣāṃsi* “keep hatreds away from us”; see parallels cited by Ge in n. 8d. Unfortunately *asmāt* does not work metrically. WG cleverly suggest that the end of c and the beg. of d, underlyingly **yuyotanā *asmāt*, were combined in sandhi as **yuyotanāsmāt* and then decoupled first into **yuyotanā, smāt* and then, with shortening of the variable final vowel of the impv., to the transmitted *yuyotana, smāt*.

The instr. *daṃsānā* must belong with the simile: cf. VIII.101.2 *tā bāhūtā nā daṃsānā ratharyataḥ* “With their wondrous skill as if with their arms they drive their chariot,” also adduced by Ge.

V.87.9: The first two pādas of this vs. are essentially variants on the first two pādas of the previous vs., with 8a *gātum étana* corresponding to 9a *gāntā* and *śrótā hāvam* identically opening both b pādas. The adverbial *adveṣāḥ* ‘without hatred’ in 8a is matched by *araksāḥ* ‘undemonically’ in 9b, though the adv. has been moved to the second cl. (With Re I take it as an adv.; Gr takes it as an adj. with *hāvam*, which requires him to identify only this occurrences of *hāva-* as a neut.; WG see it as a nominative in a stand-alone nominal sentence. The patterning of vss. 8–9 just laid out makes the adverbial interpr. the strongest one.)

The final word of pāda, *suśāmi*, makes both metrical and morphological trouble. The pāda is short a syllable (11, not 12) and the cadence is bad even for a Triṣṭubh, with a light penultimate syllable. Gr proposes to fix the first of these problems by reading *suśāmiyā*, but though this gets us 12 syllables, it makes the cadence worse -- not to mention that there’s no reason why the textual change would have occurred. Old

proposes to read *suśāmī*, matching the other two instr. occurrences of this stem; the same phenomenon is found with the simplex, where an instr. *śāmi* with short final occurs at the end of the pāda, while *śāmī* is found pāda-internal. Since in our passage the next pāda begins with a cons. cluster, the original length of the final vowel would be obscured anyway. However, this suggestion does nothing to fix the cadence or the deficient syllable. See also the disc. in WG; in the WG tr. they take it as a neut. acc., but the disc. in the n. is more equivocal. I have no solution. Of course, those who wish to see laryngeal effects preserved at this stage would argue that the problematic short penultimate could be explained by the fact that $\sqrt{\text{śam}}$ is a *seṭ* root and the root syllable would originally have been heavy (**śamH* in a bastardized notation).

The rest of the vs. is more opaque, or rather it is difficult to reconcile the simile in c with the directive to the Maruts in de. The problem is similar to the one posed by *ādbhuta-enas-* -- that the two parts of the expression are semantically disharmonious. The wish expressed to the Maruts is that they should be *durdhārtu-*, which should mean ‘difficult to maintain or uphold’ or, extending the sense of $\sqrt{\text{dhṛ}}$ a bit, ‘difficult to restrain’. This works pretty well in the directive: the Maruts should not hold back from punishing someone who insults one of us. The gen./abl. *nidāḥ* is not the ideal case, but it may well refer back to the same form in 6d *tē na uruṣyatā nidāḥ* ‘deliver us from insult,’ with a highly condensed expression. In the publ. tr. I have tr. the form in 9e as “at an insult” rather than “from an insult,” because “difficult to restrain from an insult” sounds as if the Maruts are itching to insult *us*. The question is -- why are they like ancient mountains (*jyēsthāso nā pārvatāsaḥ*) when they are acting thus? As a class of objects, mountains are among the least likely to need restraining: they are fixed and stable. Ge gets out of this problem by supplying, out of whole cloth, a different quality that the Maruts and the mountains have in common, the parenthetical “(ragend),” but there is no basis for this. WG take *jyēsthā-* itself as the point of comparison (despite the fact that it should really be part of the simile proper) and push its sense: “sehr mächtig wie die Berge.” I think the clue to the solution is the location of these mountains, *vyòman* ‘in distant heaven’. There are of course no mountains in heaven, at least in the usual Vedic cosmological picture -- but there *used* to be: the winged mountains that flew around until Indra clipped their wings. The splv. *jyēsthāsaḥ* ‘most ancient’ may refer to this primal, unclipped state. Although this interpr. may seem farfetched, I think it best accounts for the odd expression -- and this may be Re’s view too, based on his tr. “comme de très puissantes montagnes (qui circuleraient) dans l’espace” (he has no disc.). Note in any case that the mountains here recall the mountain(s) in vs. 1 (*giriḥ*?) and possibly vs. 3; the agreement in sense with vs. 1 provides another example of non-lexical ring composition.

Commentary VI.1–20

VI.1 Agni

VI.1.1: As noted ad loc., the first hymn of Maṇḍala IV begins identically (IV.1.1.a): *tvám hí agne*, with the same puzzling use of ordinarily causal *hí* in the first pāda of a hymn. It might be possible here to tr. the first hemistich as a causal clause subordinate to cd: “Because ... you became the first minder of this insightful thought and the Hotar, you made ...”

On the stem *manótar-* see comm. ad II.9.4 and IV.1.16, 5.10. Note also that the HvN pausal resolution of the word as *manóta* is faulty; it should end in a long *-ā*.

Ge construes the gen. *asyā dhiyáh* with both *manótā* and *hótā*, but the latter doesn’t usually govern a genitive.

The *sīm* in c presumably refers to the *dhī-* of b. The publ. tr. could be slightly altered to “made it into power ...”; so Ge “... machtest es zu ... Macht.” On the infinitival construction in cd, see also Keydana (253). Note the attraction of the object of *sāhadhyai* into the dative case (*vísvasmai sáhase*). Pāda d is also noteworthy in having three forms of *√sah*, though two belong to the same *s*-stem.

VI.1.2: Pāda b ends with one of the rare examples of non-concessive *sán*, nom. sg. m. pres. part. to *√as*. Its presence here may be due to an effort at metrical adjustment. The stem *īḍya-* is almost invariably read distracted as here, and it is extremely common in pāda-final position. This is fine for dimeter meter and for Jagatī, but the distracted stem obviously doesn’t fit a Triṣṭubh cadence. The addition of monosyllabic *sán* allows such a cadence here. Note also that *sán* rhymes with *gman*, which closes the next two hemistichs (2d, 3b). The only ex. of a non-distracted form of *īḍya-* (save for a lone Xth Maṇḍala gen. sg.) is found likewise in a Triṣṭubh cadence in IV.24.2 *sá vṛtrahátye hávyah sá īḍyah*, where a non-distracted *īḍyah* sits uncomfortably after a distracted *háv’yah*. So, two different solutions to the problem of fitting *īḍya-* into a Triṣṭubh cadence.

Ge suggests that the second hemistich “spielt auf Agni’s Flucht ins Wasser an.” I don’t myself see this, and I do not know what his evidence is, beyond *ānu gman* ‘have followed’. In this ritual context, the “god-seeking men” “have followed Agni first,” because he is the conduit of their offerings to the gods and the divinity who is installed in their own houses. They must go through him, as it were, to reach the gods. The first hemistich emphasizes this ritual connection: Agni “sits down” (that is, is installed) as Hotar and superior sacrificer, and the place where he is installed is specified as “the footprint of refreshment” (*ilās padé*), a kenning for the ritual ground (see, for a similar installation scenario, I.128.1 and II.10.1).

On *mahó rāyé* see comm. ad IV.31.11. The interp. of the rest of pāda d is uncertain, primarily because of the multiply ambiguous *citáya-* stem. The pāda most resembles V.15.5 *mahó rāyé citáyann átrim aspah*, rendered by Ge as “du hast jetzt zu grossem Reichtum dich offenbarend dem Atri (aus der Not) herausgeholfen” (though in our passage here he takes *citáyantah* as “aufmerksam,” a completely different sense of *citáya-*) and in the publ. tr. (JPB) as “...then appearing greatly for wealth, you have rescued Atri.” My publ. tr. here (“distinguishing themselves”) is closest to Ge’s tr. of V.15.5, though I think it adds a crucial element. The point must (or at least may) be that

the men seek to make especially conspicuous offerings to the gods, via Agni, for the sake of acquiring the wealth that accrues to the successful sacrificer. The apparent reflexive tr. ‘distinguish oneself’ is really just an extension of the common value of *citáya*- ‘appear’/ ‘appear (good), be conspicuous’. Re’s “fixant leur pensée sur la richesse (pour l’atteindre) grandement” is an extension of Ge’s “attentive” sense, but I think he has extended too far.

VI.1.3: The first hemistich of this vs. presents some difficulties. One of the problems is that the acc. *yántam* in the first pāda most naturally invites Agni as referent, since the main verb of the clause, *ánu gman*, is the same as in 2cd, where Agni was definitely the acc. complement. But in pāda b Agni is represented by a loc. *tvé* and there is a different acc. *rayím*. One solution has been to construe *rayím* loosely (or not so loosely) with the pf. part. *jāgrvāṃsaḥ*, leaving *yántam* in pāda a as the only acc. with *ánu gman*. This is the solution Old favors (ZDMG 55.271–72 = KISch 730–31: “bei dir Reichtum erwachend”), but *√gr* ‘be awake’ does not otherwise take an acc. Both Ge and Re supply a parenthetical non-finite verb more or less dependent on *jāgrvāṃsaḥ* to govern ‘wealth’: “das sie bei dir Reichtum (erwartend) gewacht haben” and “... vigilants, (pour atteindre) en toi la richesse.” Since I prefer not to supply anything I don’t have to, I’ve tried another tack -- making *yántam* (with Agni as referent) and *rayím* conjoined goals of *ánu gman*. In other words, the wakeful men (presumably the priests alert at the sacrifice) pursue both Agni as he comes with goods and the goods themselves that are nearby him after he has deposited them on the ritual ground. I don’t, however, find this very satisfactory -- though I don’t find the other possibilities satisfying either (and I simply don’t understand Ludwig’s interpr., as reported by Old, 271–72 = 730–31). Somewhat in favor of my interpr. is Re’s comment that *tvé rayím ... ánu gman* is a “variation inorganique” (whatever he means by that adj.) of *tvā ... rāyē ... ánu gman*. I would rephrase it slightly to say that my “they follow you *and* wealth” (3ab) is a variant (inorganic or not) of “they follow you *for* wealth” (2cd)

In any case, the string of accusatives in cd all clearly refer to Agni, and we are back on firm ground.

VI.1.4: Again Ge claims that this verse is about the myth of the flight of Agni, presumably on the basis of *padām devāsya ... vyántaḥ*, but the track of the god doesn’t have to be his flight, but simply the ritual cursus.

How one interprets the larger sense of the vs. depends on how one interprets the verb forms: *āpan*, *dadhire*, and *raṇayanta*, esp. the first. Both Ge and Re take *āpan* as preterital (“... haben sie ... erlangt,” “ont obtenu”), presumably taking it as a pluperfect or a thematic aorist (both either augmented or not) to *√āp*, and Ge clearly thinks the subj. is the Aṅgirasas. (Gr takes it as an aor.) But nothing prevents it from being a pf. subjunctive. In that case, the priests pursuing the ritual cursus in pāda a, who are seeking fame (*śravasyāvaḥ*), *will* obtain fame through their priestly activities. The pf. *dadhire* in c can then have, as often, immediate past reference (“they have assumed names” – presumably their priestly titles), and the injunctive *raṇayanta* in d is easily compatible with that scenario as a general timeless presential. Because of the otherwise exclusive focus on the ritual function of Agni in this hymn, my interpr. seems preferable to one that goes haring off into the mythological past.

Note *śrávaḥ ... ámr̥ktam* “indestructible fame” as a variation on the formula *śrávaḥ ... ákṣitam*.

VI.1.5: The referent of the phrase “both riches of the people” (*rāya ubháyāso jánānām*) is not entirely clear. The standard assumption is that it refers to material goods of some sort, but which are the two kinds? Ge (n. 5b) cites Sāy on the TB for heavenly and earthly riches -- though Sāy on our passage suggests rather (domestic) animals and non-animals (*paśvapaśurūpāṇi*). Ge’s own suggestion is our own goods and those of our enemies, based on VII.83.5 *yuvám hí vásva ubháyasya rájathah*, where the publ. tr. (JPB) tentatively suggests rather those of war and peace. Acdg. to Re, they are material and spiritual goods, which he thinks are *rayí-* and *vásu-* respectively -- a completely arbitrary and ad hoc differentiation of these two extremely common stems, not supported in other passages as far as I can see. Ge’s interpr. is more plausible, but it seems strange to announce that goods of whatever sort “strengthen” Agni -- esp. as in vss. 2–3 Agni is depicted as the bringer and provider of goods for us. I have a completely different view of the phrase -- that it refers metaphorically to manpower. In VI.14.3 the “riches of the stranger” (*rāyo aryáḥ*) contend with each other (*spárdhante*), where the verb invites an animate referent for the subject. Moreover, *ubháya-* regularly refers to two different groups of beings: e.g., I.60.2 *ubháyāsaḥ ... usíjo yé ca mártāḥ* “both ... his (ancient) priests and mortals (now)”; II.2.12 *ubháyāsaḥ ... stotāraḥ ... sūráyaś ca* “both praisers and patrons.” In II.6.7 *jánmobháya* “both breeds” refers to the human and divine races, similarly *jātām ubháyān* in IV.2.2. Here either human/divine or patrons/singers (or some other division of mortals) would be possible, but I favor the latter, given the concentration on humans and their ritual activities here.

VI.1.6: Pāda b *hótā ... ní śasāda yájīyān* closely echoes 2a *ádhā hótā ny àsīdo yájīyān*. The opening of pāda c (as well as 7a), *tām tvā*, also matches 2c, and *dīdivāṃsam* of c matches the same adj. in 3d.

Whatever the exact posture described by *jñubādhah* (for detailed disc. see Scar 343–45), the Engl. idiom “on bended knee” conveys the same sense of physical reverence.

VI.1.6–7: I do not understand why 6c has the act. pf. part. *dīdivāṃsam* while, in the same metrical position, qualifying the same entity, and apparently meaning the same thing, 7c has the middle part. *dīdiyānaḥ* (whose tense-aspect stem affiliation is not entirely clear: its accent weakly suggests that it already belongs to the new redupl. pres. [reinterpreted from the pf.], but the redupl. forms to this root are in flux; see my “perfect impv” paper in the Lubotsky Fs.). Of course a nom. form of the act. part would not fit this slot in 7c, but an acc. form of the middle part. would be fine in 6c. I doubt that the poet is contrasting old perfect and new pres., or trying to draw a semantic difference between the voices. The participle *dīdiyāna-* is the only medial form to this root; all the finite forms are active, with intrans. value, as are the two act. participles, old-style pf. *dīdivāṃs-* and new-style redupl. pres. *dīdyant-*.

VI.1.7-8: Both Ge and Re take *návyam* in 7a as an adv. (e.g., “aufs neue”), but since the adj. *návya-* in the nom. (hence not a possible adverb) regularly qualifies Agni (V.12.3,

VII.4.8, VIII.11.10, X.4.5), I see no reason not to take it as an adj. here. The reference of course is to the newly kindled ritual fire.

Ge, flg. Ludwig, thinks that 7c concerns battle, which again I find difficult to see. I am more persuaded by Proferes's reading (pp. 29–30), that the hymn in general presents Agni as the fire held in common by the larger community and that in vss. 7–8 “this common fire is a symbol of centralized sovereignty,” therefore a leader of the clans and, in 8a the clan-lord of each and every clan.

Vs. 8 is couched entirely in the acc., referring to Agni. It can't be directly attached to either what immediately precedes or what immediately follows, since both 7cd and 9ab have Agni in the nom. However, it follows nicely after the accusatives in 7ab, with 7cd an intrusion. To indicate that the description of Agni is in the acc., I have resupplied “we implore” from 7b.

On the semantics of the root $\sqrt{tuś}$ in *nitósana-*, see comm. ad VIII.38.2.

The hapax cmpd. *prétiṣaṇi-* is curiously formed and its sense not entirely clear, esp. because the root affiliation of *-iṣaṇi-* is uncertain and because the cmpd type is muddled, at least by its interpreters. Ge takes the 2nd member with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’: “der das Auftreten (des Opferpriesters) wünscht”; while Re opts for $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’: “qui pousse en avant l’incitation,” with alternatives in the notes “qui aspire à aller de l’avant” ($\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’) or “qui fait avancer l’incitation (des humains)” ($\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’). The ‘seek, desire’ root is also represented by Debrunner’s “zum Vormarsch strebend” (AiG II.2.208). In my interpr. I take Old’s point (Noten ad loc.; he doesn’t discuss in ZDMG 55) that the accent suggests a bahuvrīhi, and I favor a connection of the 2nd member with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘impel’ and esp. the 2ndary verbal stems *iṣanaya-* and *iṣaṇya-*, both ‘impel’. A literal rendering would then be something like “having the impulsion of the forward progress (of the sacrifice),” but in English the bahuvrīhi gloss is too awkward, hence my “impelling ...” The point here is that Agni controls the pace and movement of the sacrifice, which progress is often expressed by the idiom *prá √i* (cf. the common loc. absol. *prayaty ādhvaré* “while the ceremony is advancing”) found in the 1st member *préti-*. The 2nd member *iṣaṇi-* is immediately followed by the part. *iṣáyantam*, but I think this is a playful juxtaposition: the two words have nothing to do with each other, and the sense ‘prospering’ for the latter was established in the fuller expression in 2b.

VI.1.9: There are a few small questions in this vs. In b both Ge and Re take instr. *samídhā* as referring to the concrete material kindling stick, as often -- while I think it refers to abstractly to the moment of kindling (as also, in my view, in VI.2.5 and quite possibly VI.5.5). The abstract sense is allowed by Scar (52–53), and the fact that the dat. to the same stem, *samídhe*, can be used as an infinitive (see, inter alia, Keydana 186 n. 160) supports this interpr. It has to be admitted, though, that the same instr. in the following vs. (10b) does refer to the physical object.

In c my “knows his way around” is a literal calque of *pári védā* into an English idiom (cf. almost identical passage I.31.5). (A more chaste rendering would have been “thoroughly knows.”) In both passages we might have expected univerbation of the preverb and verb with loss of accent on *pári* in the rel. cl.; I have no explanation for why this did not happen, save for the possibility that *pári* does not function as a conventional preverb but as an adverb or postposition and also given the fact that such univerbation is not generally obligatory.

Ge and Re take c with d rather than ab; this is certainly possible and there are no implications either way.

VI.1.10: The doubling of the 2nd sg. enclitic *te* by init. *asmaí*, the here-and-now demonstrative, is somewhat unusual, though in the same general vein as *tám tvā* (2c, 6c, 7a).

Ge and Re (see also Klein I.329, Oberlies II.133) take *védī* as a loc., but in this passage, embedded in a long series of instrumentals, there seems no reason not to interpr. it as the instr. it appears to be. See AiG III.155, where Wack identifies it as an instr. here. The very similar passage VI.13.4 *yás te sūno sahaso gīrbhír ukthaiḥ ... vedyānaḥ* (that is, probably to be emended to **védyānaḥ* and analyzed **védyā ...*), supports the instr. interpr. -- which is argued for for both passages by Bloomfield (RR ad VI.1.10) and Old (Noten ad VI.13.4).

Re (see also Klein I.52, 71) take *bhāsā, śrávobhiś ca* as a conjoined NP, with Re putting immediately following *śravasyāḥ* into a separate syntagm (Klein doesn't treat anything but the two nouns). Although *ca* does generally conjoin nominals, both the pāda break between the instrumentals and the etymological figure *śrávobhiḥ ... śravasyāḥ* suggest that the two instr. belong with different parts of the clause.

VI.1.12–13: These two vss. play on the two words *purú-* 'many' and *vásu-* 'good' in this final explosion of begging for a suitable return from the god.

VI.1.12: I take *nṛvát* as an adverb, since this neut. is almost always so used. Ge and Re instead take it as a full adj. 'consisting of men, accompanied by men' modifying a gapped noun (Besitz, la richesse) and implicitly parallel to *bhūri ... paśvāḥ* "abundance of livestock." I am not convinced, and curiously the passage Ge cites in his n. 10a as support for the interpr. contains a *nṛvát* that must be adverbial. Still, I do have to admit that a few such expressions do exist outside of the neut. sg.: I.92.7 *nṛvātaḥ ... vājān*, IX.93.5 *rayīm ... nṛvāntam*.

VI.2 Agni

VI.2.1–2: The opening of the first hymn in this maṇḍala, *tvám hí* (see above), is replicated in the first two vss. of this hymn. The *hí* is similarly hard to account for in both these vss.

VI.2.1: The etymology and therefore the sense of the vṛddhi form *kṣāita-* (IX.97.3), *kṣāitavant-* (here) are disputed; see EWA s.v. The question is whether it belongs with *kṣití-* 'settlement' (Aves. *šiti-*), etc., to *√kṣi* 'dwell', or is the counterpart of YAves *xšaēta-* 'lordly' vel sim., to *√kṣā* 'rule over'. As the Avestan forms show, the two interpr. are not etymologically compatible. With Ge (hesitantly) and Re (sim. AiG II.2.127 [though see 933]), I have opted for the former. For one thing the various 'people, settlement' words are prominent in this run of hymns: *kṣití-* VI.1.5, *carṣaní-* in this vs. and twice in the next (VI.2.2), as well as VI.1.8, *vís-* VI.1.8, and it also makes sense for Agni, as the ritual fire in the household and the focus of the extended family and clan unit, to be associated here with the glory of those people. Another reason emerges from

consideration of the whole vs.: the verb stem *púṣya-* (see *puṣyasi* pāda d) is formulaically associated with *kṣéti* ‘dwells in peace’, belonging to the same root $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ (cf. *kṣéti púṣyati* I.64.13, 83.3, VII.32.9 and similar expressions); see esp. in this very same hymn VI.2.5cd ... *sá puṣyati, kṣáyam* ... “he prospers his dwelling place.” However, the other interpr., ‘lordly’, is certainly not excluded, esp. since both occurrences of *kṣáita-* are associated with *yásas-* ‘glory’ (*kṣáitavad yásah* here; *yaśástaro yaśásām kṣáitah* IX.97.3 of Soma).

The simile *puṣtīm ná puṣyasi* “you prosper X like prosperity” seems a bit lame. I suppose the idea was to capture the cognate accusative. Or it can be a placeholder for *puṣyati kṣáyam* in vs. 5 and the very awkwardness of the first expression focuses attention on the “repaired” (or perhaps “enhanced”) phrase in vs. 5.

VI.2.2: I doubt that the *vājín-* of the 2nd hemistich is just any horse. It could be a mythical horse: Dadhikrā is called *vājín- viśvákrṣṭi-* “a prize-winner belonging to all communities” in IV.38.2. Or a god, perhaps Soma, Indra, or the Sun.

VI.2.3: The standard tr. take *juhvé* to \sqrt{hu} ‘pour, offer’, but this causes a problem with the main cl. verb, the pres. *indhate* ‘kindle’, if we assume that the pf. of \sqrt{hu} has some kind of preterital sense. It does not make ritual sense to offer the melted butter in the fire before kindling it. Ge avoids the problem by translating with a present, but this is ad hoc. With Sāy. I take the verb to $\sqrt{hvā}$ ‘call’ instead, since invocations can be and regularly are made after the fire is kindled. Although Kü follows the \sqrt{hu} interpr. (605), he admits that the alternative should be seriously considered (n. 1316). It might be objected that a pf. to the set root $\sqrt{hvā}$ should be read trisyllabically (*juh^uve*), as it indeed is in X.149.5, but as Kü points out (n. 1317), an undoubted 3rd sg. pf. to $\sqrt{hvā}$, *juhve* in I.32.6, is disyllabic. (The sequencing of actions problem with \sqrt{idh} -- \sqrt{hu} could be avoided if the former means something like ‘fan the flames’, an action that could indeed follow the pouring of the butter into a banked fire. But I don’t know that we have any evidence for this sense -- beyond the fact that *indhate* belongs to a pres. stem and could have durative value.) For further support for my interpr. of this vs. see immed. below.

VI.2.4–5: These two vss. are in some ways an expansion of VI.1.9: 4ab are the equivalent of VI.1.9a (for disc. see below); 5ab corresponds to VI.1.9bc. Note esp. VI.1.9b *yás ta ānaṭ samídhā havyádātīm* “who after kindling you [lit. with the kindling of you] has achieved your oblation-giving” and VI.2.5ab *samídhā yás ta āhutiṁ, níśitīm mártyo náśat* “The mortal who after kindling (you) [lit. with the kindling (of you)] will achieve the offering to you and the whetting of you.” (A side note: *havyádātīm* in VI.1.9b is the counterpart of *āhutiṁ* in VI.2.5a, but note that VI.1.9 also has *āhutiṁ* in the immediately following pāda (c).) In both VI.1.9b and VI.2.5a the root noun instr. *samídhā* seems to express priority of action: “with X (then) Y” → “after X (then) Y.” If this interpr. is correct, it provides support for my assertion ad VI.2.3 that kindling must precede oblation and therefore the pf. *juhvé* cannot belong to \sqrt{hu} ‘pour’. For further evidence for the priority of kindling to oblation, see II.37.6 *jōṣi agne samídhāṁ jōṣi āhutiṁ*, VIII.19.5 *yáḥ samídhā yá āhutiḥ yó védena dadāśa márto agnáye*, X.52.2 *brahmā samíd bhavati sāhutiḥ vām*.

It might be observed in passing that the temporal priority I'm assigning to the instr. *saṁídhā* also accounts for a much more widespread syntacto-semantic development -- that of the standard preterital use of the gerund. Since by most lights the gerund in *-tvā* (and most likely the one in *-ya*) is a frozen instr., we can envision a development of the type “with going” → “having gone,” etc. See my review of Tikkanen, *The Sanskrit Gerund* (1987), in *JAOS* 109 (1989): 459-61.

VI.2.4: The problematic form in this vs. is the first word *ṛdhat*. It clearly belongs with the root aor. attested primarily in the opt. (*ṛdhyāma*, etc.) but also found once in the participle *ṛdhánt-*, with expected suffixal accent. It is the root accent that distinguishes the form here. Old (ZDMG 55.279 = KISch 738; also Noten) suggests that it is a neut. part. used adverbially, with accent shift (**ṛdhát* → *ṛdhat*) -- claiming that adverbial accent shift can go either way, simply marking an oppositional formation. But the standard exx. (*dravát* to *drávati*) involve a rightward shift, and in any case the whole notion of adverbial accent shift has recently been called into question (see Emily Barth's Cornell diss.). Re considers both possibilities and opts finally for the adverb, while Ge takes it as a finite form. I prefer to take it as an aor. subjunctive (see also Lub, Concordance, where it is so identified) parallel to *śaśámate*. Although I cannot entirely explain the zero-grade root syllable for expected full-grade **árdhat* (though see below), I can suggest a local explanation for the (supposedly) unexpected root accent. The next hymn contains the hapax verbal-governing cmpd. *ṛdhád-vāra-* ‘bringing wishes to success’. Whatever the original grammatical identity of the 1st members of this fairly common cmpd. type, synchronically they appear to be neut. sg. participles in *-át* with accent consistently on the suffix (type *bharád-vāja-* [in fact, the name of the poet of this hymn and of the VIth Maṇḍala in general], *dhārayát-kavi-*, etc.; see AiG II.1.317–20), and the verbal stems from which they are derived regularly are accented one syllable to the left. So, for the examples just given, 1st class pres. *bhárati*, *-áya*-formation *dhāráyati*, etc. I would therefore suggest that our poet, who had *ṛdhát-vāra-* in his repertoire, back-formed the root-accented finite form *ṛdhat* on this model. A possibly simpler alternative is to begin with a hypothetical root aorist paradigm, whose injunctive act. sg. **árdham*, **árd/t*, **árd/t* should have full grade and root accent and whose subjunctive should likewise have both: **árdhā(ni)*, **árdhas(i)*, **árdhat(i)* (cf. injunc. *kár* and subj. *kárati*, e.g.). As it happens, the root aor. of *√rdh* is attested only in forms where we expect zero-grade root and suffixal accent, but the starred forms just given are the paradigmatically expected act. sg. forms. Under this explanation, the root accent of subjunctive **ṛdhat* is not the problem; its zero grade is. And we can explain that either by the influence (at time of composition or of redaction) of *ṛdhád-vāra-* in VI.3.2 or by the absence of other attested full-grade verbal forms to this root (though cf. gerundive *árdhya-*) and consequent generalization of the zero-grade. Of the two explanations just given, I mildly favor the first – in part because the poet Bharadvāja would have been acutely aware of the accentual properties of his name.

A minor support for the interpr. of *ṛdhat* as finite subjunctive, not adverbially used participle is provided by formulaics. As Re sketches, *√rdh* can take *yajñám* as object; cf. X.110.2 *mánmāni dhībhúr utá yajñám ṛndhán* “bringing the thoughts and the sacrifice to fulfillment through his visionary thoughts.” The VP *yajñám √rdh* “bring sacrifice to fulfillment” can be seen as a variant of simplex *√yaj* ‘sacrifice’, and *√yaj* and *√śam* form

a conjoined pair for our poet in nearby hymns: VI.1.9 *só agne īje śāsāme ca mārto* “O Agni, that mortal has sacrificed and ritually labored” and VI.3.2 (the same vs. that contains *rdhādvāra-*) *īje yajñēbhiḥ śāsāme śāmībhiḥ* “he has sacrificed with sacrifices, he has labored with ritual labors.”

X.110.2 quoted above also suggests that, despite the pāda break, *dhiyā* in our passage is better construed with *īdhat* as in the publ. tr. than with *śāsāmate* with, e.g., Ge “... (und) mit Andacht den Dienst versieht.”

Note the sandhi *ūtī śā*, with retroflexion despite the lack of a close syntactic connection, as well as the unusual position of ordinarily pāda-init. *śā*. An incomplete collection of relevant passages shows that this retroflexion of non-initial *śā* in ruki contexts is standard but not invariable: IV.26.4 *prā sū śā* ..., VI.2.4 *ūtī śā* ..., VI.14.1 *bhāsan nū śā* ..., VI.20.5 *urū śā* ..., VII.104.10 *nī śā* ..., VIII.20.16 *abhī śā* ..., IX.73.8 *trī śā* ..., IX.79.3 ... *arīr hī śā*. But I.64.13 *prā nū śā* ..., without ruki.

VI.2.5: The two adjectives *vayāvantam* and *śatāyusaṃ* are best taken as proleptic, with Ge and Re.

For extensive disc. of this vss., see comm. ad VI.2.4–5 above.

VI.2.6: Just as in VI.1.2 there is a nom. sg. masc. pres. part. *sān* without any obvious concessive value; unlike VI.1.2 there is no metrical explanation available. The close sandhi in the phrase *divī sān* might seem to give us a clue -- that the two words should be read as a constituent and are the equivalent of a circumstantial clause: constituency could account for the ruki. This is responsible for my tr. “when it is in heaven” (sim. Ge), instead of construing *divī* with *ātataḥ* like Re (“s’étendant au ciel”). However, assembling the retroflexion data both for *sān/sāt* in a ruki environment and for *divī* with following *s-* weakens this hypothesis. In the former case *sān/sād* generally doesn’t exhibit retroflexion; see III.9.2 *dūrē sān*, IV.15.1 *vājī sān*, IV.27.1 *nū sān*, VIII.43.9 *gārbhe sān* (though the first and third phrases are constituents); V.44.3 *sacate sād*, VI.27.2 *māde sād* + *niśādi sāt* + *vividre sād*, X.129.1 *nó sād*. However, there is retroflexion in II.41.10 *abhī śād*, *ānti śād* IV.5.10, VIII.73.1 (though the two forms don’t form a syntactic constituent in any of these passages) and in IX.61.10 *divī śād* (almost exactly our phrase). In other words, the data are equivocal. On the other hand, the loc. *divī* regularly retroflexes the initial *s-* of forms of *√as*, as here: I.108.11 *divī śthó* [dual verb], V.2.10 *divī śantu*, V.60.6 *divī śthā*, VI.33.5 *divī śyāma*, and the just cited IX.61.10 (cf. also VI.52.13 *dyāvi śtha*), though it does not retroflex other initial *s-*s; cf. I.125.6 *divī sūryasya*, V.27.6 = V.85.2 *divī sūryam*, V.35.8 *divī stómam*, VIII.56.5 *divī sūryo*, X.75.3 *divī svanó*, X.85.1 *divī sómo*. It thus appears that the retroflexion of *śān* here is an automatic product of a rule that induces ruki in *s-*initial forms of the verb ‘to be’ after *divī* and does not give information -- or at least high-quality information -- about constituency. I have no idea why *√as* should exhibit this behavior; it cannot be due to (lack of) accent, since several of the ruki-ed forms are accented (including the one here). MLW comments: “But maybe it was despite its accent somehow a clitic just as there are accented 2nd pos. clit. This reminds me of the loss of *s* in Old Latin comedy which is especially well attested before the verb ‘to be’.”

VI.2.7: The 2nd hemistich presents some interpretational problems, generated by the standard assumption that *jūrya-* belongs to $\sqrt{j\acute{r}}$ ‘be/get old’. Not only is the expression “delightful like an aged one in his stronghold” odd, but such interpr. require bleaching out the gerundive value of *jūrya-* (esp. unlikely given that it’s parallel to *trayayāyyah* in d and *īḍyah* in a). Cf., e.g., Ge’s “behaglich [cozy, snug] wie ein Greis in seiner Burg,” which also pushes *raṇvā-* into a meaning otherwise unknown to it. Re’s “joyeux, tel un vieil (homme) dans la forteresse” maintains the meaning of *raṇvā-*, but the connection between it and the simile seems strained. Old (ZDMG 55: 279 = KISch 738) cleverly suggests that there’s a crisscross word order, with the son of the simile in d appropriate to the adj. in c and vice versa: so something like (he doesn’t actually translate) “delightful like a son, to be protected like an old man in his stronghold.” But this is an ad hoc response to dissatisfaction with the apparent pragmatics of the passage.

These problems can be solved in twofold fashion. 1) I take *raṇvāḥ* as a pun, a word common to both similes. In both cases it applies to Agni, but in two different senses. 2) This reinterpretation is enabled by a different analysis of *jūrya-*. I take it to the root \sqrt{jvar} ‘burn, flame’, showing the same zero-grade as in *jūrṇí-* ‘firebrand’ (<**jvṛH-C*, with loss of -v- before *ū/u*, as in *urú-* < **vṛH-u*). I can see no possible formal objection to this analysis, despite the apparently universal insistence that *jūrya-* must belong to $\sqrt{j\acute{r}}$.

Starting with these assumptions, we can take the two gerundives, *jūryah* in c and *trayayāyyah* in d, as the predicates of their respective pādas (as *īḍyah* is of pāda a). One of the drawbacks to the standard interpr. is that this syntactic parallelism is broken. In c the picture is of a battle-eager (warrior) (for a similar usage of *raṇvā-* see X.115.4 and remember that *rāṇa-* means both ‘joy’ and ‘battle’) who is to be enflamed / set blazing; in the simile *jūrya-* is metaphorical, but of course the word is literally applicable to Agni the fire, who is the upameya, the target of the simile. One minor problem with this interpr. is that the simile marker *iva* is in the wrong position: we would expect to find it after *raṇvā-*. But there are enough displaced simile markers in the RV that this positioning is not a major obstacle.

When applied to the simile in d, *raṇvā-* has its more usual meaning ‘delightful, bringing delight’, which is appropriate to the son and helps explain the desire to protect him. Here the publ. tr. adds “to the home” to “a son who brings delight.” I made this addition because I think there’s a buried pun. On the one hand, in c *raṇvāḥ purí* (“battle-lusty warrior in a fortress”) construes a locative with the subject (acdg. to my view of the constituency) and we might expect a similar loc. in the corresponding expression; on the other, *raṇvā-* in its meaning ‘delightful’ is often a descriptor of a home or construed with a loc. of ‘home’. Cf. I.69.4–5 *raṇvó duroṇé* “bringing joy to the house,” precisely of Agni. It may be that *pūrí* can be directly applied to the simile in d and in that context means ‘home’ -- though I doubt it: RVic *pūr-* does not have domestic associations. Instead I think that *raṇvā-* in the “protected son” context evokes *duroṇé*, and this subsurface evocation is realized in the next verse by the phonologically similar loc. *dróṇe* ‘wood(en) cup’. The unexpected and unusual use of *dróṇa-* in that vs. (for which see comm. ad loc.) suggests that it may have been deployed there in order to play on the unexpressed (*)*duroṇé* here. This may seem overclever; in that case the tr. could stop short at “to be protected like a son who brings delight.” In any case, it would probably better to put “to the home” in parens.

A last comment on the hemistich: I have tr. cd in the opposite order, so that the domestic half (d) immediately adjoins the “dear guest” of b. This is not necessary, but given that my interpr. of c involves a radical rethinking of the standard view, it seemed best to make the new reading easier to assimilate.

The gerundive of d, *trayayā́ya-*, is a hapax and a striking formation -- in the first instance, just because of the rhythmic rollout of -VyV- sequences. With regard to its derivation, as Debrunner points out (AiG II.2.285–86), it seems to pattern with -ā́yya-gerundives built to -ā́ya-stems: *panayā́yya-*, *mahayā́yya-*, *spr̥hayā́yya-*. However, there is no such verb stem **trayā́ya-*. Debrunner adds the parenthetical remark “von v. Präs. *trā́ya-*,” but of course in that case we should expect **trā́yā́yya-*. Both the short root vowel and the extra -ya- remain unexplained by that derivation. I have only the wispiest gestures towards an explanation. For $\sqrt{trā}$ we would probably expect an -ā́ya-formation **trā́paya-*; however, it might have followed the model of $\sqrt{pā}$ and $\sqrt{pyā}$ with a -y-hiatus filler instead (*pā́yā́yati* and *pyā́yā́yati* [AV+] respectively), hence **trā́yā́yati*. We might then invoke the tendency of roots with the shape *CRā* to shorten their root vowel in the *p*-causative, type *jñā́payati* and, specifically with *Crā* root, *śrā́pā́yati* (both AV+). For disc. see my 1983 monograph on the -ā́ya-formations, pp. 208–11. So one might posit such a shortening to the differently formed causative to a *CRā* root **trayā́yati*, which could serve as base for our *trayayā́yya-* here (encouraged by the short root vowels of the -ā́ya-stem -ā́yya-gerundives quoted above). But the chain of assumptions and unattested forms seems too long, and we might instead just attribute *trayayā́yya-* to a poet’s whimsical multiplication of -ya-s -- his version of tra-la-la. MLW suggests: “From *i*-extended form of **terh-* ‘rub’ (Lat. *trivī*, etc.), with double sense ‘to be rubbed’, i.e., caressed, and also referring to the fire drill?” This is an appealing suggestion, but the lack of other representatives of this root in IIr. might disfavor it.

VI.2.8: The voc. *ā́gne* was omitted in the publ. tr. I would insert “o Agni” after “purpose.”

Note that the first hemistich begins with *krátvā* and ends with *kṛtvā́yah*.

This vs. displays the same verbal intricacy as the immediately preceding vs. 7. As also in vs. 7 the first hemistich is less complex than the second, but that doesn’t mean it lacks puzzles. The principal question is the root affiliation of *ajyā́se*. With Ge, I take it as a pun, as passive to both $\sqrt{añj}$ ‘anoint’ and \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’ (Old opts for \sqrt{aj} , Re for $\sqrt{añj}$)—a pun that we also find frequently in Maṇḍala IX. The primary connection is presumably to $\sqrt{añj}$: the ritual fire is “anointed” with the offering butter; cf. the nearby occurrences of the ppl. *aktá-* ‘anointed’ (VI.4.6, 5.6). But the loc. *dróṇe* casts a shadow on the clarity of this association. Though the stem *dróṇa-* is doubtless a deriv. of *dā́ru-/drú-* ‘wood’ (see EWA s.v.), it doesn’t refer to wood as a general material, much less to firewood. It is specialized as the (wooden) cup for soma; the stem is mostly limited to the Soma Maṇḍala, but even in its two other occurrences in VI (37.2, 44.20) it refers to the soma cup. Therefore, if we want to take *dróṇe ajyā́se* here to mean something like “(the fire located) on the (fire-)wood is anointed,” we must take *dróṇe* as a specialized stand-in for *vā́ne* or the like (see the passages assembled by Ge in n. 8a; cf. also *drusádvā* ‘sitting on the wood’ in the next hymn, VI.3.5), whose meaning has been twisted. This unusual substitution pushes us in two directions. On the one hand, if *dróṇe* here is meant to evoke *duroṇé* ‘at home’ in the previous vs. (7cd), we can explain its unusual employment here

and the twisting of its referent from wooden cup to wood -- and even take it as gesturing to ‘home’ here as well, ‘home’ being Agni’s fireplace as well as the home of the sacrificer. On the other hand, since the soma after its purification is regularly driven into its containers, we can take *ajyāse* also to *√aj* ‘drive’ and see the common identification of the two ritual substances, fire and soma, that pervades much of the RV. One of the characteristic ritual actions performed on Soma would here be attributed to Agni. The simile in b, *vājī nā* ‘like a prize-seeker’ works with either verb, since horses are both anointed and driven. Moreover, both *vājín-* and *kṛtvya-* are regularly used of soma -- further strengthening the Agni/Soma connection sketched in pāda a.

The similes in the next two pādas cause further problems. In c the first question is the case of *svadhā*. Ge and Old favor nom., Re and I instr. If *svadhā* is nom., the series of similes with Agni as implicit subject and upameya is disrupted. The next issue is what is meant by a *párijmā ... gáyaḥ*. Both Ge and Re take it as some sort of mobile home (e.g., Ge “ein fahrender Hausstand”). Although in a pastoral society like that of the RV such a notion is not as comic as it might at first seem — and although fire is frequently depicted as burning across the land — I do not think that that is the image meant there. Note first that *gáya-* is several times associated with the preverb *pári* (esp. *pári √pā* VI.71.3, X.66.3, though as an object not a subject, I have to admit). And from its literal sense ‘earth-encircling’, *párijman-* can develop the sense ‘encircling, encompassing’. That is the sense I see here, with the domestic deity Agni compared to the extended family that embraces everything belonging to it -- a likely reference to the ritual fire as the joint possession and symbol of the Ārya clans.

The second simile depends on the meaning of *hvāryā-*. This stem must belong to the root *√hvr̥* ‘go crookedly’. Ge thinks it refers to a bird, which has little to recommend it since there’s already a horse in the passage; others (Re, Th [KlSch 78]) to the meandering or zig-zag movement of the fire (e.g., Re “(il va) zigzaguant ...”). I prefer to take it as a gerundive (despite the accent, which is unusual for such a formation) and indeed one to an underlying causative. My further assumption is that the “young steed” of the simile is being trained, by being run in circles (around someone in the middle holding a rope attached to the horse -- a standard part of horse training today it seems from images and videos conjured up by Google -- and recall the Mitanni horse-training tablets with their numbers of ‘turns’ [*vartana*]). Although *√hvr̥* often refers to more random motion, it implicitly contrasts with motion in a straight line, which a circle is not. The advantages to this interpr. are 1) it would refer to something that the ritual fire actually does or is made to do: the Paryagnikaraṇa or the circling of the sacrificial animal (and associated paraphernalia) with a firebrand; 2) it would implicitly pick up *párijmā* from the beginning of the hemistich, with a more literal sense of ‘encircle, encompass’ than in pāda c. If this latter suggestion is correct, as in 7cd the first word of pāda c, *párijmā*, would be applicable to the similes in both c and d with slightly different senses, just like *raṇvāḥ* in 7c.

VI.2.9: With Ge, I supply the verb ‘eat’ in pāda a. Although Ge does not give his reasons, the existence of a parallel passage in this Agni cycle gives a clear warrant: VI.15.1 *jyók cid atti gárbho yád ácyutam* “For a long time the embryo eats just what is immovable.” Re supplies a different verb in a from the one he supplies in b: “(tu ébranles) ... comme le bétail (dévore) ...” But this violates the structure of the RVic simile.

The problem in the 2nd hemistich is the form *dhāmā*. Gr, fld. by Lub, interprets it as a 1st pl. root aor. injunctive, but though a 1st person would work in some hymns, there seems to be no personal intrusion in this one -- nor can I figure out how a 1st pl. “we establish(ed)” would fit here. Both Ge and Re take it as a neut. pl. to *dhāman-* and therefore the subject of *ṛścānti*. However, this requires an interpr. of *dhāman-* -- Ge “Kräfte,” Re “pouvoirs-d’état” (whatever that means) -- that I do not think is possible for this word, and, in any case, can “powers” hew? On the basis of VI.6.1 (also in this cycle) *ṛścādvana-* ‘wood-hewing’ (the compounded version of our *vānā ṛścānti*), which modifies Agni, I think that the subject of *ṛścānti* must be Agni, or rather some parts of Agni, since a plural is required. I therefore take *śikvasaḥ* as a nom. pl., not gen. sg. (with Ge, Re), referring to Agni’s flames or his various embodiments. This leaves *dhāmā* stranded; I take it as an annunciatory main clause with *yād* as the definitional relative clause: “(this is your) principle, that ...” My tr. assumes a neut. *singular dhāmā*, allowed by Wackernagel (AiG III.272), Old (ZDMG 55: 280 = KISch 739), etc. It would also be possible to tr. as a plural: “(these are your) principles, that ...” A different possibility is enabled by Ge’s suggested alternative tr. of *dhāmā* (n. 9c) as “Erscheinungsformen,” which is more palatable than his “Kräfte.” If we allow the meaning of *dhāman-* to stretch to this extent, we could tr. cd “when the forms of you, the dexterous one, hew the woods,” with *śikvasaḥ* a genitive with *te*. Nonetheless, I still prefer the publ. tr.

VI.2.10: I interpr. pāda a (which is identical to IV.9.5a) as a variation on passages like X.2.2 *vēṣi hotrām utā potrām jānānām* “pursue the office of Hotar and of Potar of the peoples,” but with gapping of the terms for the priestly offices.

The standard tr. take *samṛdhāḥ* as an abstract ‘success’ (e.g., Ge “Schaff ... Gelingen”; cf. also Re, Scar [67]), but the only other occurrences of this root noun, in the frog hymn VII.103.5, clearly means something like ‘unison’, referring to the frog chorus. One of the two finite forms of this lexeme, *sām āṇḍhe* in X.79.7, also seems to have this sense: Agni “comes together” with his parts or limbs (*pārvabhiḥ*). The other, in X.85.27, has a sense closer to simplex *ṛdh* ‘be (completely) realized, come to success’. In our passage here, the ‘unison’ interpr. makes sense, esp. in the larger context of this hymns (and also VI.1), with the focus on Agni as clanlord of the separate Ārya clans, which are nonetheless working towards a common goal. On the other hand, the appearance of simplex *ṛdhat* in this hymn (4a, on which see comm. ad loc.) and in the cmpd. *ṛdhādvāra-* in the next (VI.3.2) might suggest a rendering closer to the simplex here as well.

VI.2.11: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. forms a slight ring with vs. 1, with voc. *mitramahaḥ* echoing *mitrō nā* of 1b.

Both Ge and Re take *vīhī* as having a double acc., with *svastīm suksītīm* the secondary object expressing benefits we seek from the gods whom we pursue (e.g., Ge “Ersuche die Männer des Himmels um Glück, um gutes Wohnen.” But this seems unnecessary (and is not the usual syntax of *√vī*); the root *√vī* takes a variety of objects, including concrete inanimates, as in VI.12.6 (in this cycle) *vēṣi rāyāḥ* “you pursue riches,” and here I see it as having both inanimate and animate objects.

Pāda d *dviṣō āmhāmsi duritā tarema* is a reprise of 4d *dviṣō āmho nā tarati*.

VI.3 Agni

VI.3.1: The standard tr. take *te* with *jyótiḥ*, i.e., “your light.” Because of its somewhat unusual pāda-final position, however, I construe it rather with immediately preceding *devayúṣ* “seeking you as god.” The retroflexion in *devayúṣ te* might have been interpr. as an indication of constituency and therefore as support for my interpr., but this argument does not hold. For retroflexion of *te* after a rukified or -fiable -s, cf. I.11.6, 7 (I.131.4, IV.42.7) *vidúṣ te*, I.48.6 (I.69.7, VIII.24.17) *nákiṣ te*, I.104.1 (VII.24.1) *yóniṣ te*, IV.4.3 (VIII.71.8) *mákiṣ te*, IV.10.4 *ābhíṣ te*, V.38.1 *uróṣ te*, VI.44.11 (VIII.40.9) *pūrvíṣ te*, VII.3.4 *prásitiṣ te*, VII. 18.18 *rāradhúṣ te*, VIII.14.3 *dhenúṣ te*, VIII.17.6 *svādúṣ te*, VIII.44.23 *syúṣ te*, IX.104.4 *góbhiṣ te*, X.33.7 *pitúṣ te*, X.38.3 *asmābhiṣ te*, X.56.2 *tanúṣ te*, X.85.40 *agníṣ te*, X.112.1 *ukthébhiṣ te*. Counterexamples: I.80.8 *bāhvós te*, I.147.2 *vandārus te*, I.163.3 *āhús te*, III.55.22 *niṣṣídhvarīs te*, IV.12.1 *trís te*, IX.79.5 *āvis te*, IX.86.5 *prabhós te* [VII.99.7 *váṣaṭ te*]. In other words, retroflexion is the most common outcome of *te* after a word ending with a ruki-fiable *s*, though it is not without exception. Constituency does not seem to play a role, nor (though this is not clear from the examples just assembled) does metrical position: all of the non-rukified examples occur first in their pādas, but rukified examples occur in every sort of metrical position, including, regularly, initial in pāda. See also the data on retroflexion discussed just above ad VI.2.6.

In the 2nd hemistich *ámhaḥ* is the most problematic form. In the syntagm *pāsi ... mártam ámhaḥ* we should like an ablatival reading: “you protect the mortal *from* narrow straits.” There are several ways to achieve this reading or to configure the form in a syntactically different way. For general disc. of this problem see Old, ZDMG 55: 280–81, and Schindler, Root noun, pp. 10–11. Gr (fld. by Kuiper III 1: 49 [1957]) invents a root noun *ámh-* for just this passage, beside the very well-attested *s*-stem *ámhas-*, to which our form could be the abl. Although this solves the immediate problem, inventing a stem for a single occasion otherwise has little to recommend it, and we should in any case expect accent on the ending, **ámháḥ*. Others take it as an abl. to the *s*-stem, truncated in some way and at some period. M. Hale (Fs. Melchert) sees it as an archaic zero-grade abl. to the *s*-stem, preserved from a pre-*proto* stage of IE -- though he otherwise sets forth quite cogently the arguments against positing the preservation of such archaisms. Wackernagel (AiG III.80) interprets it as a haplology from **ámhasaḥ*, an ad hoc solution that again solves the problem, but rather crudely. Schindler, flg. an oral suggestion of Hoffmann’s (in turn fld by Scar 135, 300), takes it as the acc. it appears to be, governed by a participle to be supplied (he suggests *ā√r*, on the basis of V.31.13): “den Sterblichen, den du, O Gott, beschützt, wenn er durch Verlassenheit in Bedrängnis (gerät).” This again takes care of the form, but requires supplying material from nowhere.

I also am inclined to take it as an acc., but not via the same mechanism as Schindler (/Hoffmann), but by way of syntactic ambiguity plus metrical convenience. I start with the fact that 1) abl. *ámhasaḥ* is common with *√pā*, often final in a Jagatī cadence; in this cycle cf. VI.16.30, 31 (though these two are actually in dimeter cadences) ... *pāhy ámhasaḥ*#. 2) Another, semantically similar, expression involves *ámhas-* and (*ví*) *√muc* ‘release’, but this expression can have two different syntactic realizations: personal ACC. + ABL. of the danger, or ACC of danger + personal ABL. Cf., e.g., I.118.6 *ámuñcatam vārtikām ámhaso níḥ* “you two released the quail from *ámhas-*” versus II.28.6 (etc.) *vatsāḍ ví mumugdhy ámhaḥ* “release *ámhas-* from the calf.” The same duality of construction is found with *√pr* ‘carry across, rescue’. Cf. in the next hymn VI.4.8 *pārṣy*

āmhaḥ “carry (us) across narrow straits” versus VII.16.10 *tān āmhasaḥ pipṛhi* “rescue them from narrow straits.” I suggest that here we have a blend of these constructions extended to semantically similar $\sqrt{pā}$. The person remains in the ACC., but the danger is put into the ACC. as well. The similarity of the expression here ... *pāsi* ... *āmhaḥ*## and, in the next hymn, VI.4.8 *pārṣi āmhaḥ*## may have contributed. And I don’t think we should discount metrical convenience: the expected abl. *āmhasaḥ* is fine for a Jagatī cadence but doesn’t fit a Triṣṭubh cadence like this one, whereas *āmhaḥ* is quite common in Triṣṭubh cadences. So if the poet can find a syntactically principled way to use acc. *āmhaḥ* here, he will — and, in my opinion, he did. Note also *āmho mārtaṁ* in the next vs. (2d), the same words in opposite order to our *mārtaṁ āmhaḥ*, as well as *āmhaḥ* in the previous hymn, VI.2.4.

A less pressing problem is how to construe the instr. *tyājasā*. In the Hoffmann/Schindler interpr., it is simply construed with the invented participle: “wenn er durch Verlassenheit in Bedrängnis (gerät).” Both Ge and Re take it as the cause leading to *āmhaḥ*, e.g., Ge “... vor Not infolge einer Unterlassungssünde,” but Ge suggests in a n. (1) that it could be an instr. of accompaniment with *āmhaḥ* (“vor Not und Sünde”). That is the tack I adopt here, but I consider *tyājas-* as something that might befall the hapless mortal rather than something he might commit (like Sünde) and bring about his bad fortune. On the semantics of *tyājas-* here and elsewhere in the RV, see Old, ZDMG 55.280–82.

VI.3.2: As Ge points out, pāda a recalls VI.1.9a with *īje śasamé* as here; the addition of *ṛdhāt-* in pāda b also recalls VI.2.4a *ṛdhat ... śasāmate*. In fact, the diction of the first hymns in this Agni cycle is very similar; cf. e.g., the repetition of *āmhas-* (VI.2.3, 11; 3.1.2, 4.8), the use of the verb $\sqrt{naś}$ (*ānaṭ* VI.1.9, *aśyām* VI.1.13, *naśat* 2.5, *naśate* 3.1, 2, *aśyāma* 4x 5.7), etc. Other echoes have been treated elsewhere in the comm. The two forms of *naśate* in these first two vss. express mirror images: the first (1b) has the virtuous mortal as subject, suitably rewarded by attaining the light; the 2nd (2d) has the same mortal as object, with the verb negated, to express the evils that will not reach the mortal.

On *ṛdhād-vāra-* see comm. ad VIII.46.23

VI.3.3: This vs., esp. its 2nd half, bristles with difficulties and has been interpr. in an exhausting variety of ways (not only the usual tr., but also, e.g., Old at length in ZDMG 55.283–84=KISch 742–43; Thieme Unters.; Lüders, AcOr 13 [=Phil.Ind.]; Scar 146–47; Gonda, Ved.Lit. 219). I will not treat these other interpr. in detail, but merely lay out my own, which is in closest agreement with Lüders (“Ved. heṣant-...,” Philol. Ind.: 781ff.) through the first half of c. The general point of the vs. seems to be, as often, to contrast the fearsome and militant aspects of Agni with his benign ones.

It might also be pointed out that pāda a, which is the most straightforward part of the vs., has a bad cadence that is not easily fixable; in fact it presents an unusual sequence of 5 light syllables: (*sūro ná yá*)*sya dṛśatīr a(repā)*. I do not see any way to make *-tīr* heavy.

The first question, in the relatively transparent 1st hemistich, is what *bhīmā* modifies. Though Ge and Re take it with *dṛśatīr* -- that is, Agni’s appearance is both spotless (*arepā*) and fearsome -- the pāda boundary weakly suggests that *bhīmā* should be

construed with the other fem., namely *dhīh*. On the assumption that this *dhī-* is Agni's, *bhīmā* identifies the *dhī-* with the violent side of Agni.

In c, with Ge and Lü inter alia, I assume that a new clause begins with *nāyām* and, also with Lü, that *heṣasvant-* means 'possessing arms, armed'. The opening of this pāda *heṣasvataḥ śurúdhah* then is a nominal clause, with the gen. *heṣasvataḥ* expressing possession. Cf. III.38.5 *imā asya śurúdhah santi pūrvīḥ* "here are his many proliferating riches"; sim. IV.23.8 *ṛtasya hí śurúdhah santi pūrvīḥ* "Of truth there exist many riches." The rich spoils that fall to Agni are presumably the various materials he burns.

The published tr. importantly omits *aktóh*. It should be corrected to "(But) on his own, by night, this one here ..." This temporal adverb implicit contrasts with *sūro ná* of pāda a. That is, the appearance of the militant Agni is compared to the sun, the light of day, whereas the benign Agni described in the second half of c + d is a phenomenon of night.

On the famous crux *nāyām* see comm. ad VIII.2.28 and my 2013 Fs. Hock article. Pace Thieme (1949: 51–52) and Lub, who classifies this passage separately, I believe that *nāyām* here belongs with the other occurrences of this syntagm.

The adj. *raṇvā-* recurs here from VI.2.7. On its indirect association with 'home, dwelling' in that passage and its direct associations elsewhere, see comm. ad loc., also I.66.3 and X.33.6. Here it might be better to render the phrase *raṇvó vasatīḥ* as "delightful dwelling" rather than "cozy nest" to bring out the echoes with the passage in the previous hymn.

I take *kútrā cid* as temporal rather than spatial.

VI.3.4: This vs. continues with the description of violent Agni.

Pāda d has caesura after 3; there are two other exx. of this metrical irregularity in the hymn, 6b and 8b, both of which have bad cadences as well. Here the early caesura might be calling attention to the extreme alliteration of the pāda: *dravír ná drāvayati dāru dhákṣat*. The same is not true of the others.

The 3rd sg. *bhásat* is most likely a subj. to a root aor.; see Gotō 82.

The hapax *yamasānā-*, an apparent participle to a supposed "Doppelstamm" to \sqrt{yam} , does not fit the pattern of most of the other *-asānā-* stems, on which see comm. ad IV.3.6 -- in that it neither falls into the semantic sphere of violent activity nor has an associated *s*-stem. Note here, however, that *rabhasānā-*, which meets both criteria, is found in the last vs. of this hymn (8d) and could have provided a model for this formation. I also wonder if *yamasānā-* is not a pseudo-cmpd. of *yāma-* 'bridle' (e.g., V.61.2) and $\sqrt{sā}$ 'bind', as if with a middle part. of the root aor. *asāt*, etc. (*viśāṇa-* in V.44.1, identified as a part. by Gr., is better taken as an *-ana-* nom. to the same root [*<sā-ana-*]; cf. AiG II.2.193). Hence, 'being bound to the bridle'. Needless to say, this would not be well formed by standard Vedic compounding rules, but is not completely out of the question as a nonce inspired by *rabhasānā-*, itself a nonce. Note also the phonological figure (*yam*)*asānā āsā*.

The simile in c, *vijéhamānaḥ paraśúr ná jihvām*, has been variously interpr. I take the frame to be (*agnīḥ*) ... *jihvām* -- that is, the tongue is Agni's, as usual, and refers to his flame(s). As for the comparandum, the ax -- I assume that *its* tongue is its blade, extending from the handle as a tongue does from a mouth. The blade might be found in

the next vs. in *dhārā* (5b). See VI.2.7–8, where I argue that a word missing from vs. 7 is found or gestured toward in the following vs.

The hapax *dravīh* in the next pāda is universally taken as a nom. sg. masc. to an *i*-stem *dravī-* meaning ‘smelter’ (so Gr, etc., and cf. AiG II.2.297) or ‘cutter’ (so Hoffmann, Aufs. 420, to $\sqrt{drū}$ ‘cut’, rather than \sqrt{dru} ‘run’). But agent nouns in simple *-ī-*, though they do exist (see AiG II.2.296–97), are not exactly thick upon the ground. I suggest instead that it is a neut. *-īs*-stem like *havīs-* ‘oblation’, *sarpīs-* ‘melted butter’ (on this type, including those built to anṭ roots, see AiG II.2.364–67). It would then be a cognate object to *drāvayati* in the simile and, on the one hand, be a more likely substance to be caused to run than wood (*dāru*) and, on the other, refer to the parts of wood that really do ‘run’, like sap. It might be worth noting that the much later cvi formation *dravī-bhū* (etc.) means ‘become liquid, liquefy’. (This of course has nothing to do with the *-ī-* in *dravīh*, but does show that ‘run’ is used of liquids, a reasonably widespread semantic extension -- e.g., in English.)

The standard tr. take *dāru* as the obj. of *dhākṣat* ‘burning’, rather than of *drāvayati*. This is, of course, the safer course. But cf. V.41.10 *nī riṇāti vānā* ‘he liquefies the trees’ (also of Agni), V.58.6 *riṇatē vānāni* ‘the trees dissolve,’ both with the root \sqrt{ri} ‘flow’.

VI.3.5: This vs. is comparatively straightforward, esp. the first hemistich.

I take *tējah* in its literal etymological value: ‘sharpness’ → ‘point’, given *tigmā-* ‘sharp’ in 4a.

In c note the phonetic play of (*citrādh*)*rajatir aratīr*.

Despite the pāda boundary, I take *vér ná* as the simile with both c and d, unlike most, who limit it to d. The root \sqrt{dhraj} ‘swoop, soar’ (found in the b.v. *citrā-dhrajati*) is generally limited to birds (cf. I.165.2, IV.40.3) and the wind, and so comparison to a bird here would be apt. Note also that a form of \sqrt{dhraj} and an uncompounded form of *pátman-* are found together in 7c.

Though most interpr. take *aktóh* as a gen. either with *aratīh*, imposing a forced reading on the latter (Ge “der Lenker der Nacht,” Lü [Philol.Ind. 783] “als Herr der Nacht”), or with a gapped “Agni” (Th [Unters.] “der (Agni) des Nachts”), I think it likely that it is adverbial, as it is two vss. earlier (3c) in the same metrical position. So also Re.

Our *druśādvān-*, a hapax, exists beside 2 occurrences of the simple root noun cmpd. *druśād-* -- one of which is in an exactly parallel context: IX.72.5 #*vér ná druśād* (like our #*vér ná druśādvā*). I assume that the extension by the derivational suffix *-van-* simply serves metrical convenience, since the forms seem identical semantically. Several other *-śād-* cmpds have the same extension: *nṛśādvān-* (1x), *parīśādvān-* (1x), and *admasādvān-*, found once in the very next hymn (VI.4.4), and *-van-* extensions are not rare in root noun cmpds, esp. to roots ending in *-ā*, such as *vājadāvan-* ‘giving prizes’, *sahasradāvan-* ‘giving thousands’, etc.

The final word of the vs., the b.v. *raghu-pátma-jamhāh*, is unusual for the RV in having three full members, as Re notes. He discusses the cmpd at some length and considers it a “conglomérat” of a tatpuruṣa **raghu-pátman-* (entirely parallel to *raghu-pátvan-*) and the attested bahuvrīhi *kṛṣṇā-jamhas-*, tr. “(dieu) au vol rapide, au plumage (noir)” (I.141.7). I see no reason to involve the latter cmpd., detach the (compounded) first member *raghu-pátman-* from the second, *jāṃhas-*, and insert a ‘black’ not found in

the text to qualify the second member. The English designation “flight feathers” would have the same structure (save for the bahuvrīhi) as *raghupátma-jamhas-*, that is, “feathers suitable/specialized for flight.” Note that in this bahuvrīhi with a cmpd first member, “first member accent” actually falls on the second member of the first cmpd., matching that of the original tatpuruṣa (cf. just cited *raghu-pátvan-*) -- in other words, when the bahuvrīhi is formed, the internal structure of its first member is no longer visible to the process.

VI.3.6: The noun *rebhá-* is generally tr. ‘singer’ and the root \sqrt{ribh} from which it is derived, ‘sing’. However, as I discussed in “On Translating the Rig Veda” (2000, Proceedings of UCLA IE conf.) and again in the Intro. to the publ. tr. (p. 78), the limited number of attestations of the verbal root and the variety of contexts in which it is found suggest that its meaning is more specific than ‘sing’. That the sound of \sqrt{ribh} can be compared to that made by birds of prey (IX.97.57) or by ungreated wood on a wagon (TS VII.1.1.3) suggests something on the lines of ‘squawk, squeak, rasp’ -- a hoarse or husky voice quality that would perhaps not be surprising in a middle-aged man in antiquity, esp. one who spent a lot of time huddled over fires. (See also X.87.13 where these performers produce “harshness of speech.”) The verb with which *rebháḥ* is construed in this passage, *rārapīti*, is likewise usually rendered in very general fashion, as ‘speak, praise’ or the like. But again it seems to have a more specific sense: ‘mutter, murmur’ vel sim. (see EWA and, e.g., Schaefer, Intens., both s.v. *rap*). So the anodyne tr. of Ge “Wie ein Bard ruft er ... laut” and Re “comme un barde ... il parle-puissamment” (both ascribing real intensive sense to *rārapīti* rather than the more likely frequentative) can be replaced with something both more pointed and more appropriate to Agni, who is the referent here: “like a hoarse-voiced (singer) he keeps muttering (=crackling) with his flame.”

The phrase *prāti vasta usrāḥ* should be read with accented *vásta*, an old correction, endorsed by Oldenberg inter alia. Cf. pāda-final *vásta usrāḥ* at IV.25.2, VII.69.5, VIII.46.26. The erasure of accent here may be redactional, based on the verb *vaste* in the next hymn, VI.4.3b. It should be noted, however, that Re interpr. *vasta* as a finite verb form to \sqrt{vas} ‘wear’ (“Comme un barde, il se revêt des aurores”), and he is followed by Lub. That the exact phrase, but with accent, occurs 3x elsewhere makes this interpr. unlikely. There remains, however, the question of what the underlying form is. The Pp analyzes it as *vaste*, but Old prefers -o (both here and for the other occurrences of the phrase), a loc. to *vástu-*. On -o (from -au) as u-stem loc., see AiG III.153–54, and now TY, who argues for its continuing a PIE endlingsless loc., which would be preserved unaltered in a cadential formula. Cf. also *sāno ávye* “on the ovine back,” also with putative endless loc. *-au to *sānu-*. See disc. ad IX.86.3.

As for *usrāḥ*, in this phrase it appears to be an anomalous gen. sg. to the notional stem *usr-*, whose gen. sg. also appears as *usrāḥ* (III.58.4, possibly also VI.12.4, but see comm. there). See AiG III.213. The long-vowel -āḥ ending seems to be the result of “feminizing” the form; cf. loc. sg. *usrām* in X.6.5 (on the pattern of *devy-ās*, *devy-ām*). Since in all four instances of *vásta usrāḥ*, *usrāḥ* is at the end of the pāda, the length could be redactional for **usrāḥ*, as the forms would be metrically equivalent. However, gen. sg. *usrāḥ* is found in other contexts, e.g., in II.23.2. We should also bring into the mix II.39.3 ... *prāti vásta usrā*, with an unaccented dual voc. *usrā* referring to the Ásvins, and perhaps IV.45.5 *usrā jarante prāti vástor ásvínā*, where the *usrā* may be again be a dual modifying

the Ásvins (so Ge, implicitly Pp.) or a masc. nom. pl. (*usrāḥ* out of sandhi) modifying the fires that ended the preceding pāda – or another gen. sg. *usrāḥ* to be construed with *prāti vástoh*.

Although *prāti* is not found in the other 3 exx. of the phrase, *prāti vástor* is attested in II.39.3, IV.45.5, X.189.3, so it is likely to form part of the phrase here. Given its position, it would be difficult to take it as a preverb with *rārapīti*, esp. since \sqrt{rap} isn't otherwise construed with *prāti*; see comm. ad V.61.9.

As noted previously, pāda b is metrically bad, with caesura after 3 and a bad cadence *mitrāmahaḥ*, where we should have a heavy penult.

The *īm* in Wackernagel's position in pāda a is, in my opinion, a long-distance anticipation of the *īm* in c, and both are placeholders for *nṛn* at the end of c and d. This might be clearer if the publ. tr. read "he keeps muttering to them."

The second hemistich consists of a pair of parallel relative clauses with no overt verb. It also, quite unusually, shows verbatim repetition after the caesura: x x x x / *aruṣó yó divā nṛn*. Such tag repetitions are far more characteristic of short echo pādas in meters like Atyaṣṭi, and even in those meters there tends to be some patterned variation. I don't know what function this repetition serves here. I would attribute it to the poet's flagging imagination, except the rest of the hymn bursts with imagination.

There have been various solutions to the lack of verb in these relative clauses. Old, fld. by Re, supplies 'protects' ($\sqrt{pā}$). There's nothing wrong with this -- it provides a verb to govern acc. pl. *nṛn*, and "protect men" is a relatively common predicate, as Old points out. But there's nothing in the context that imposes this addition; the closest we can come is *pāsi* in 1d. Ge takes these as nominal clauses -- "der bei Nacht, der am Tage das rötliche (Ross) der Männer ist" -- which saves him from supplying an unmotivated verb, but requires *nṛn* to be a gen. pl., which I think we should avoid if at all possible. The simplest solution, at least as far as I can see, is simply to continue the verb of the first hemistich, *rārapīti*. The *īm* of 6a, echoed by *īm* in c, may suggest that the clauses follow the same template, and as noted above, *īm* in 6a is easiest to explain if it anticipates *nṛn* in the relative clauses. Needless to say, when a verb needs to be supplied in the RV, a silent iteration of a verb in a previous nearby pāda or verse is often the best choice. And in this case the intensive (=frequentative) form of *rārapīti* in b may be reflected iconically in the implied repetition of Agni's muttering in the rest of the verb. The next two vss. provide some further support for this suggestion. In 7ab an intensive in the relative clause of pāda is matched by an intensive to the same root in pāda b, and in 8a supplying an intensive in the rel. cl. to match the one in the main clause of b also makes sense. Although I still think the 2nd half of this vs. is clumsy, it may be clumsy apurpose.

VI.3.7: More or less with Ge (fld. also by Re), I supply a word for sound or noise as the subj. of pāda a; see Ge's parallels cited in his n. 7a. They opt for 'voice', while I favor something generated from the two verbs in this hemistich, both derived from \sqrt{nu} 'roar', e.g., *nāvā-* 'roar(ing)'.

The two verbs themselves require comment, *nāvīnot* and *nūnot*, both pāda-final. First, note that the accent on the first but not the second requires that pāda b must be the main clause to pāda a. The stems of the two verbs are similar but not identical; both have heavy or intensive redupl. and appear to mean pretty much the same thing. *nāvīnot* is clearly an intensive to \sqrt{nu} (or $\sqrt{nū}$? see EWA s.v.); the stem is attested once elsewhere in

the RV (VII.87.2), though the better-attested intens. stem is *ánono/*-. The other verb *nūnot*, which is also attested once elsewhere (V.45.7), is less clear morphologically. Wh classifies it as a redupl. aor., and Schaeffer (Intens. p. 147) also attempts to argue for this identification. There are two problems with taking it as a redupl. aor. First, there is no causative attested to this root — *nāvayati* is only found in the Skt. lexica, not independently in text, at least acdg. to Whitney (Rts) — but a redupl. aor. of this shape should be secondarily generated to a causative. Second, a redupl. aor. should have transitive/causative value, but neither occurrence of *nūnot* has this sense, and in our passage it is difficult to see how to construct such a contrastive value for *nūnot* in opposition to *nāvīnot*. They seem to be used in identical fashion. Schaeffer in fact does try to claim that *nūnot* has factitive-transitive value, translating *nāvīnot* as “brüllt” and *nūnot* as “Gebrüll erregt.” But “Gebrüll erregt” is a translational sleight of hand -- simply a phrasal paraphrase of “brüllt,” enabled by German (similarly in English “shouted” / “raised a shout”). There is no acc. obj. in the Skt.; the noun “Gebrüll” is a dummy noun. I therefore think we should take them both as intensives with the same meaning. I do not understand the reduplication vowel of *nūnot*; metrically **nonot* would have been equivalent and could belong to the better attested intensive stem cited above -- though it should be noted that the attested 3rd sg. to that stem is a (pseudo?) set *nónavīti*, so the secondary form might be expected to be **nonavīt*. All of this is made more complicated by the metrical irregularity of pāda b, which has only 10 syllables. However, (*oṣa*)*dhīṣu nūnot* provides a fine cadence to this line, while repeating *navīnot* from pāda a would yield enough syllables but a bad cadence, (*oṣadhī*)*ṣu navīnot*, and the hypothetical **nonavīt* would also produce a bad cadence.

rukṣā- is a hapax. It is generally taken as a nom. sg. -*as* out of sandhi with a meaning ‘shining’, derived from *√ruc*. So Gr, Ge, EWA s.v., etc. This is perfectly possible, harmless, and not very interesting. I favor the more daring hypothesis: that it is a loc. in -*e* out of sandhi and belongs to a **rukṣā-* ‘tree’, found also in the widespread MIA *rukkha-* ‘tree’ (Pāli, Pkts.), which is probably a metathesis of *vrkṣā-* ‘id.’ (see EWA s.v. *vrkṣā-*). So also Re. In this context it could be indirectly alluding to its source by its position after *vr̥ṣā*, which is phonologically close to *vrkṣā-*.

The second hemistich presents its own difficulties. A crucial problem is the apparent lack of a verb. Ge and Re supply ‘fill’ (e.g., “Himmel und Erde mit Gut (erfüllt)”). I follow Old’s suggestion (ZDMG 55.290=KlSch 749; not very enthusiastically alluded to in the Noten) that we should emend *dām* in d to *tán* (root aor. injunctive to *ā√tan* ‘stretch’). As he points out, this lexeme with *ródasī* (vel sim.) as object/goal, often Agni as subject, and an instr. is quite common, esp. in this set of hymns (VI.1.11, 4.6, 6.6 [recall how tight the phraseology is in this Agni cycle]); cf., e.g., *ā yás tatántha ródasī ví bhāsā*. Although I strenuously resist emendation ordinarily, the echo of IV.19.7 *dāmsupatnīḥ* might have led to the change here. (On that form see comm. ad loc.) In any case, *pace* the Pp. (see also Lubotsky s.v. *dām-*), I think it unlikely that the sequence contains the accented monosyllable *dām* followed by an accented *supátnīḥ*. Inter alia, the root noun *dām-* outside of the cmpd *dāmpati-* and esp. the archaic gen. *dán* in the phrase *pátir dan* are confined to Maṇḍalas I and X. If the emendation of *dām* to **tán* seems too radical (and I’m inclined now to think it is), I would read **dāmsupatnīḥ* with one accent, supply a verb, and tr. “... (fills) with goods the two worlds, who (thus) have (in him) a wondrous husband.”

In c I take the participle *yán* with both the simile and the frame.
Note the return of \sqrt{dhraj} (*dhrajāsā*) and *pátman* (*pátmanā*) from 5cd.

VI.3.8: The vs. is structured as two *vā* alternatives; the reason for this is unclear. See Klein II.203–4.

The rel. cl. of pāda a has no verb, and the verb of b, *dauidyot*, must belong to a main clause because of its lack of accent. Ge, Re, and Klein (II.203–4) supply “become strengthened”; this certainly makes sense, but there is nothing in context or parallel passages that encourages this invention. Kü (206) goes for a more restrained “versehen ist,” a nominal clause with predicative instrumentals, I suppose. But given the twin rel. cl./main cl. intensives in 7ab (*nāvīnot ... nūnot*) and the intens. *dauidyot* in 8b, I wonder if the same pattern holds here, and we should supply an intens. form of \sqrt{dyut} in a.

The *arkā-* of pāda a are most likely both chants and rays.

Pāda b is once again metrically irregular: it has a caesura after 3 and its cadence consists of 4 heavy syllables (*s''vebhiḥ śúsmaiḥ*).

VI.4 Agni

VI.4.1: As Re also points out, the *yáthā ... evá* framework of this vs. and the *adyá* and the *-sí*-impv. *yakṣi* in the *evá* clause lead us to expect a preterite in the *yáthā* clause: “as you *have sacrificed (in the past) ..., so sacrifice today.” Encountering the pres. subj. *yājāsi* instead is surprising. Re operates with his usual parentheses to introduce the preterite: “S’il est vrai que (tu as sacrifié et) sacrifieras ...” I have inserted the totalizing qualifier “always” (“regularly” vel sim. would also work) to enable the future sense that I generally see in the subjunctive. Taking the subjunctive in a more modal fashion (“should sacrifice”) or, à la Tichy, as expectative (“Just as [I expect] you to sacrifice ...”) would be less troublesome in this passage, but I am reluctant to allow context to dictate function to that extent. I should note that Tichy does not treat this passage in her subjunctive monograph. IH suggests that the subjunctive here may show generalizing value, as in Greek, spread from indefinite contexts (“whoever [will] do X ...,” as in VI.5.4-5 ... *yáḥ ... dádāsat / śá ...* “whoever will ritually serve, he ...”).

VI.4.2: Ge takes both *vibhāvā* and *caḥṣāṇiḥ* as transitive: “Er ist unser Erleuchter wie der Erhellter am Morgen.” But well-attested *vibhāvan-* does not elsewhere take an object or an objective gen. (on X.8.4 see comm. ad loc.). By contrast, *caḥṣāṇi-* is a hapax and so its value is more up-in-the-air. AiG II.2.207 takes it as an agent noun ‘Erhellter’ and explains it (p. 208) as a nominalization of an infinitive in *-āni*; in our passage *caḥṣāṇir ná* “als Anzeiger” is said to rest on **caḥṣāṇi ná* “wie um anzuzeigen.” But this is not how RVic similes work, and further a class of *-āni* infinitives is marginal at best (see most recently Keydana, *Infinitive im Rgveda* pp. 190–96). I take it as an intrans. ‘sighting, vision’ -- AiG II.2.207 lists action nouns as one of the two standard values for *-āni*-nominals -- to harmonize in sense with *vibhāvā*, though other interpr. are not excluded. Old suggests ‘Beschauer’, sim. Re.

The tr. of *védyā-* is in accord with my usual interpr. of this stem as ‘to be acquired’ (see comm. ad II.2.3) and my understanding of the original meaning of the

epithet *jātávedas-* (in d here) as ‘having (all) beings as possessions’. However, ‘to be known’, found in the standard tr., would certainly be possible here.

Note that the phrasal verb *cáno √ dhā* ‘take delight’ takes an acc. obj. *vandāru*, as is standard.

In the 2nd hemistich it is uncertain (but not terribly important) which of the nominatives is the predicate with *bhūt*. It is more difficult to attribute the usual change of state sense ‘become/became’ to *bhūt*; Hoffmann’s interpretation (p. 136) as a general statement about Agni seems reasonable. Indeed, I might be tempted to emend my ‘has been’ to ‘is’, to match the presential injunctive *cáno dhāt* in the preceding hemistich. The presence of this unnecessary *bhūt* may well be accounted for by the figure in which it participates: *uṣarbhúd bhūd*, which pleasingly has near rhyme forms from two different roots.

The collocation *uṣarbhúd- átithi-* recurs in VI.15.1.

VI.4.3: The first hemistich treats the billowing smoke and bright flames of physical fire. The kernel of the first pāda, ... *yásya panáyanti ábhvam*, is almost identical to II.4.5 *ā yán me ábhvaṃ vanádaḥ pánanta* “The formless mass [=smoke] of the woodeater which they (first) marvelled at.” Cf. comm. ad loc. In that verse also the next step for Agni is to become bright. In our vs. I supply ‘mortals’ from 2c as subj. of *panáyanta*, but undefined ‘they’ is also possible.

The problem in pāda a is *dyāvo ná*. We might like this to be genitive sg., allowing it to be parallel to *yásya* and depend on *ábhvam*: “whose formless mass they marvel at like that *of heaven.” But there is no way that *dyāvaḥ* can be a genitive, and in any case it is also not at all clear that heaven is shaped like a formless mass. Old (ZDMG 55.291 = KISch 750) attempts to rescue this interpr. by assuming anacoluthon and mixture between the two constructions “Agni has *ábhvam* like the heavens” and “they admire A’s *ábhvam*,” but besides being overtricky, in both instances ‘heaven’ should be genitive, since Skt. lacks a ‘have’ verb and uses GEN X for such values. (He does not push this interpr. in the Noten.) Taking *dyāvaḥ* as the nom. pl. it must be, Ge and Re assume that *dyāvaḥ ná* belongs with the second pāda, as a simile with the verb *vaste* -- so Ge “Er ... kleidet sich wie die Himmel in Glanz.” Although this makes sense, it is syntactically impossible, at least as far as I can see: it requires fronting the simile around the entire relative clause, a major violation of standard RVic syntax. My own interpr. takes both the morphology and the syntax seriously: given the structure of the pāda, nom. pl. *dyāvaḥ* should be being compared to the subject of *panáyanti*. In fact, this is possible semantically as well: the heavens can marvel at Agni’s smoke that is billowing all the way up there. As often, assuming what the meaning of a RVic passage should be has led interpreters to distort the grammar to get to that meaning and has prevented them from reflecting on what the poet meant in producing a non-hackneyed image.

The 2nd hemistich presents its own problems, primarily because of missing or unspecified arguments to the verb. In c *ví ... inóti* lacks an overt object. Ge supplies “Schätze” and interprets the phrase in positive fashion. He reasonably cites as parallels, both from the immediately following hymn, VI.5.3 ... *inoṣi ... vāsūni* and VI.5.1 ... *ínvati dráviṇāni* with ‘goods’ and ‘chattels, treasures’ as obj. respectively. But these passages lack the preverb: although Gr lists VI.5.3 with *ví* as preverb, and Ge apparently follows him, *ví* in that passage should be construed otherwise, not as a preverb with *inoṣi*; see

comm. ad loc. In my opinion a more telling parallel is found in VI.10.7, also in this Agni cycle, with the *vī. vī dvēṣāmsīnuhī* “dispel hatreds.” Re also considers the expression to be negative, on the basis of the same parallel, and tr. “lui qui chasse au loin (les ennemis).” The preverb *vī* is not found elsewhere with this verb. IH now makes the attractive sugg. that the obj. is actually the ‘smoke’ implied in the first hemistich. I consider this an alternative possibility.

In d the verb *śíśnathat* is construed with an acc. *pūrvyāñi*, but the referent of this generic adj. ‘primordial’ is not clear. Other occurrences of both of these words (*√śnath* and *pūrvyā-*) don’t give clear formulaic guidance for what to supply as the real obj. This pāda is identical to II.20.5, an Indra hymn, and it does seem imported from an Indric context here. (Bloomfield does not comment in RVReps.) Ge supplies Burgen (with ?) here, but Werke in II.20.5. Although the former works fine semantically, *pūr-* ‘fortress’ is fem. and so is excluded. Re supplies “performances”; he does not indicate what Sanskrit word he had in mind or why he thought it was apposite. Though it is the case that both *kṛtāni* and *kārmāni* appear with *pūrvyā(ñi)*, I do not see how one can ‘pierce’ them. I supply ‘domains’ (*dhāmāni*), on the basis of IV.55.2 *dhāmāni pūrvyāñi*, VIII.41.10 *dhāma pūrvyām*, although not with a great deal of confidence.

Ge and Re take *ásna-* as a PN, but I see no reason not to take it, with Gr, as a straightforward derivative of *√as* ‘eat’. Mayr splits the difference in his PN book, listing it as a PN but noting its likely original identity with the adj. *ásna-* ‘hungry’.

VI.4.4: The rare word *vadmán-* is found only here and in VI.13.6, also belonging to this cycle. It presumably presupposes a neut. **vādmān-* ‘speech’, from which *vadmán-* was derived by accent shift, like neut. *brāhman-* → adj. *brahmán-*. *vadmā* here participates in a phonetic figure with pāda-final *admasādvā*, where both the 1st cmpd member *adma* and the 2nd *sādvā* match the basic phonological structure of *vadmā*.

The immediate context in VI.13.6 is similar, *vadmā sūno sahaso no vīhāyā*, but it contains the full voc. phrase *sūno sahasaḥ* “o son of strength,” rather than the truncated *sūno* here (the only place in which the bare voc. *sūno* is found in the RV). The phrase “son of strength” is hypercharacteristic of this Agni cycle: besides VI.13.6 the full voc. is found in the 1st vs. of this hymn (1b), as well as nearby VI.1.10, 5.5, 11.6, 13.4–6, and 15.3, and the acc. *sūnūm sāhasaḥ* in VI.5.1, 6.1, the nom. in VI.12.1. This density of occurrence alone would strongly suggest that gen. *sahasah* has been gapped here, but I wonder if a factor contributing to the omission of *sahasah* is the two occurrences of *ūrj-* ‘strengthening nourishment’ in pāda c, given the similar, common voc. phrase *ūrjo napāt* “o descendent of nourishment” (e.g., in this cycle VI.16.25). The *ūrj-* forms would, as it were, substitute for *sāhas-* in this stereotyped “son/descendent of X” expression.

It is difficult to contrive a causal sense for *hi* here, and the particle is therefore not rendered in the publ. tr.

The meter of pāda c is problematic. HvN make the obvious distraction *tuvām*, which produces an orthodox opening of 4, but a bad cadence. Old (both ZDMG 55.291 and Noten) suggests not distracting *tvām*, which produces an opening *sá tvām na ūrja-*, with caesura in the middle of the cmpd *ūrja-sane*, and reading *ūrjam* trisyllabic (with a medial rest: *ūrj am*). Although I usually pay heed to Old’s metrical observations, this requires two highly unusual features: the caesura splitting the type of cmpd that is seldom split and a reading of *ūrjam* that is unprecedented in the occurrences of this stem, while

failing to distract *tvám*, which is more often disyllabic than not. In this instance Old's usual good sense seems to have deserted him, and the HvN reading seems preferable. Part of the bad cadence may be attributable to following a phrasal template: pāda-final *ūrjaṃ dhā(h)* has the same structure as pāda-final *cāno dhāt* in 2b. However, the light final preceding it (*ūrjasana ūrjaṃ dhā(h)*) is harder to explain; of course the *-a* represents voc. *-e* in sandhi and perhaps we can unusually restore it.

VI.4.5: The first half of this vs. is fairly straightforward; the second bristles with nearly insoluble difficulties.

The adverbial *nītkti* 'sharply' presumably refers to haste -- as in Engl. "look sharp!" meaning "hurry!" Alternatively it could refer to the shape of flames, with their apparent sharp edges.

In b *rāṣṭrī* is quite surprising, whether it is applied to *vāyúḥ* 'wind' (so Ge) or to Agni (publ. tr.), since it is fem. and both of those are masc. (*pace* Debrunner, who suggests, implausibly, in AiG II.2.407 that *vāyú-* might in this passage be "ausnahmsweise Fem."). Gr simply lists this occurrence as a separate stem *rāṣṭrī* masc., next to the same stem identified as fem. (Curiously, Tichy [-*tar*-stems] takes no notice of the form; she recognizes only the two fem. occurrences of *rāṣṭrī*.) It unfortunately cannot be the masc. nom. sg. of an *-ín*-stem 'possessing a kingdom (*rāṣṭrá-*)' because it should then be accented **rāṣṭrī*. This *-ī*-stem occurs twice elsewhere referring to Vāc and therefore is clearly fem., as we would expect. In our passage I think it has been employed as an imperfect pun with (unexpressed) *rātrī* 'night' to evoke that stem in this passage concerning Agni's dominance of the nights (*aktūn*), here expressed by a distinct stem *aktú-*.

The image is that of a triumphant king marching across territory. Cf. the similar sentiment in VI.9.1, again part of this Agni cycle, ... *ná rājā / ávātiraj jyótiṣāgnís támāṃsi* "(Agni) like a king suppressed the dark shades with his light" and IV.4.1 (also of Agni) *yāhí rājeva ámavāṃ íbhena* "Drive like an aggressive king with his entourage." The relevance of the wind is unclear to me, except perhaps to indicate the speed of Agni's progress.

As noted above, the 2nd hemistich is a mess. So Old (ZDMG 55.291–92) "Der dritte Pāda ist schwierig und ein s i c h e r e s Resultat wohl unerreichbar." Interpr. therefore differ significantly, and I cannot treat the details of all. As already noted by Old, some help is given by semi-parallel passages containing $\sqrt{t\bar{r}}$ + *árātīḥ*: IX.96.15 *átyo ná vājī táratīd árātīḥ* "(he,) like a prize-winning steed, outstrips hostilities" (also with a horse in the simile, as here); III.24.1 *duṣṭáras táraṇn árātīḥ* "hard to overcome, but overcoming hostilities"; and, in this Agni cycle, VI.16.27 *tárantō aryó árātīḥ* "overcoming the hostilities of the stranger." Similar to this last passage is VIII.60.12 *tárantō aryá ādísāḥ* "overcoming the aims of the stranger." These parallels suggest that the frame of the passage is *árātīḥ* $\sqrt{t\bar{r}}$. The superimposability of the last two passages further suggests that *árātīḥ* and *ādísāḥ* in our passage should be equated, since acc. plurals of both serve as obj. of *tárantāḥ* in the same formula, and that *ādís-* here has negative connotations, unlike some other occurrences of this stem. Of course, the difference in case between them here (acc. pl. *árātīḥ* versus gen. pl. *ādísāḥ*) makes the equation tricky, but I think that, in juxtaposing these two negatively viewed objects, the poet has demoted one (*ādís-*) to a

dependent genitive. (That is, rather than having “may we outstrip hostilities (and) (ill-)intentions,” we have “may we outstrip the hostilities *of* (ill-)intentions.”)

The remaining problem in pāda c — and it is a major one — is what to do with the truncated relative clause introduced by *yās te*. Old (ZDMG 55.292, reprised in Noten) considers numerous possibilities, none of which he seems particularly enamoured of, and Ge, Re, Gonda (VedLit. 236), Hoffmann (Fs. Thieme [1980] =Aufs. III.753–54), Scar (708), etc., add more. A number of interpr. take the rel. construction as embedded between the verb *tūryāma* and its object *ārātīḥ*, sometimes by introducing an otherwise unidentified new actor, sometimes by emending *yās* to **yās* to allow it to refer to one of the fem. pl. *ādīśām* or *ārātīḥ*. I would of course prefer to avoid such embedding on principle, and in fact each attempt to produce such an interpr. runs into further difficulties, which require emendation (of the rel. pronoun or of gen. *ādīśām*), highly unusual case usage, or supplying significant amounts of material — or a combination of the three. So embedding does not produce an otherwise clean syntactic or semantic result. I will not rehearse the details of all these ultimately unsatisfactory proposals, but simply present my own (also ultimately unsatisfactory, I’m afraid). I take *tūryāma yāḥ* to be an improper relative construction “... we who ...”, with disharmony in number between the 1st pl. verb and the sg. rel. prn.; the sg. *yāḥ* would have been imported from/enforced by the numerous rel. cl. in this Agni cycle beginning *yās te* and referring to the pious mortal and his ritual service to Agni. Similar 2nd position rel. are VI.2.4 *īdhād yās te* ..., 2.5 *samīdhā yās te* ..., and there are also a number of pāda-initial exx. of *yās te*: VI.1.9, 5.5, 13.4, 15.11. Thus, although the overall structure of the sentence in cd is couched as (1st) plural, the template of the “pious mortal” defining relative clause would impose a singular in that construction. (Note that the *person* is unspecified, since the rel. cl. lacks a verb.) In the publ. tr. I supply a verb “serve,” but I would now omit the verb, with the rel. cl. only nominal *yās te* “who is/are yours” or “who is/are for you.” The main-clause verb *tūryāma* would have been fronted around this minimal clause.

We come finally to the simile of pāda d, which again has inspired numerous interpr., which again I will leave undiscussed. The particular issues are 1) the precise sense and reference of (*pari*)*hrūt-*, 2) the grammatical identity of *hrūtaḥ* and *pātataḥ*, which could both be either gen.-abl. sg. or acc. pl., 3) whether those last two should be construed separately or together, 4) whether √*pat* can mean ‘fall’ at this period. I answer 4) with a negative, though Ge’s and Scar’s interpr. depend on that sense. I also follow Hoffmann in seeing the simile as depicting a race and racecourse, though I think *-hrūt-* refers to the curves of the racetrack and the curving course of the racehorse. I take both *hrūtaḥ* and *pātataḥ* as acc. pl., but in separate syntagms: *pātataḥ* is the obj. of *tūryāma* in the simile and refers to the competing horses “flying” around the course -- thus corresponding to *ārātīḥ* in the frame -- while *hrūtaḥ* is construed with *parihrūt* as an etymological figure and has no direct correspondent in the frame. For the other occurrence of the root noun *hrūt-*, where it likewise refers to real life curves, see comm. ad IX.61.27.

VI.4.6: *ā ... bhānumádbhīr arkaīḥ ... tatántha* is an elaboration of VI.6.6 (next hymn) *ā bhānúnā ... tatantha*. In our passage *tatántha* is accented because it follow pāda-initial, extra-sentential voc. *ágne*.

In c *nayat* ‘leads’ would seem to need an obj.; with Re I supply “us.” Ge leaves it object-less.

There is no agreement about where to construe the instr. *śocīśā*. Re takes it with *aktāḥ* (“oint de flamme(s)”), while Ge’s interpr. isn’t clear (at least to me). I assume it goes with the VP: Agni’s bright flame illuminates the passage around the darkness(es).

I am rather baffled by the simile in d. The vṛddhi form *auśijā-* is usually used as the patronymic of Kakṣivānt, one of the great poets of maṇḍala I (e.g., I.119.9, 122.4, 5), but morphologically it could also simply be a derivative of *uśij-* ‘(type of) priest’. It also occurs once (I.112.11) with the rare word *vanīj-* ‘merchant’; that passage also contains Kakṣivānt (though not in the same syntagm). Ge claims that our passage is part of “die Sage vom fliegenden Kaufmann,” but the two other passages he cites (one of them I.112.11) certainly do not add up to a saga, and *ḍīyan* ‘flying, soaring’ does not have to belong to the simile as he (and Re) take it. I am inclined to think that the referent of *auśijāḥ* is, as usual, Kakṣivānt. His (other) patronymic, according to the Anukramaṇī, is *dairghatamasa* ‘descendent of Dīrghatamas’, another celebrated poet of Maṇḍala I, whose name means ‘having long darkness’ (=blindness, quite possibly). I suggest that we have here a reference to Kakṣivānt via the vṛddhi deriv. *auśijā-*, and this reference to Kakṣivānt then obliquely evokes his relationship to Dīrghatamas. So, somewhat ironically, a poet connected to “long darkness” leads us around (/helps us avoid) darkness. I would further suggest that *pátman ... ḍīyan* “soaring in flight” might refer to soma exhilaration (as in X.119 the Labasūkta). Cf. I.119.9 *māde sōmasyauśijó huvanyati* “in the exhilaration of soma, (Kakṣivānt), the son of Uśij, cries out (to you),” where Kakṣivānt, identified as *auśijāḥ*, cries out “in the exhilaration of soma.”

If this nomenclatural intertextuality seems too far-fetched, we can take *auśijā-* simply as descended from / connected to (fire-)priests and assume that Agni is being compared to his priest (for, to me, unspecified reasons).

VI.4.7: This vs. has a number of metrical problems or peculiarities. In pāda a the caesura unusually splits the splv. suffix from its base: *mandrá-tamam*; pāda b has an unusual opening (on which see below). Pāda c is, at least by the Pp. analysis, not only a syllable short (hence HvN’s rest at 5), but has a bad cadence for a Triṣṭubh; for possible solutions, see disc. below. Pāda d also has a bad cadence, but a different one and not easy to fix.

Instr. *arkaśokaīḥ* unites the instrumentals *arkaīḥ* of 6a and the *śocīśā* of 6d. I take it as a pun, with *arka-* representing both ‘ray’ and ‘chant’, both of which meanings are found for this stem in nearby passages: in the immediately preceding vs. 6a it means ‘ray’ and refers to the similarity of Agni’s rays to those of the sun; in the next hymn VI.5.5 it appears in a sequence of ritual items, adjacent to *uktaīḥ*, and must refer to priestly chants. In our passage “ray-flames” are attributed to Agni, “chant-flames” to “us.”

In b, as noted above, the first word *vavṛmāhe* is metrically bad: a heavy 2nd syllable would be preferable, as it would in the other 4 occurrences of this 1st pl. pf., as well as in 2nd sg. *vavṛṣé*. Kü (459) plausibly suggests that the original reading of this form was **vuvūrmāhe*, as we would expect for this *seṭ* root, which was redactionally changed, as *aniṭ* forms crept into this root. Note the echo *-māhe māhi*.

The accent on *śróṣi* is somewhat troubling, as it is very unlikely to begin a clause. One could construct such a meaning: “Since we have chosen you ... as a great thing for us, listen, o Agni!” But the most natural way to construe the sequence is ... *naḥ śróṣi*

“listen to us” (cf., e.g., I.133.6, VI.26.1 (...) *śrudhī nah*, etc.), as Old (ZDMG 55.292) also points out -- which in turn requires that immediately preceding *māhi* be part of that clause to host the enclitic *nah*. Old (ZDMG 55.292–93 and Noten) suggests rather that *śróṣi* is still under the domain of *hi*, but this seems unlikely, since it would involve an asyndetic conjoining of a preterital perfect and a *śi*-impv. (/subjunctive). I suggest that the accent was supplied redactionally on the basis of *pārṣi* in the next vs. (8b) and, especially, *ghóṣi* in the next hymn (VI.5.6d), both in the same metrical position and receiving their accents honestly.

śróṣi is also the only attestation of this *śi*-imperative, an isolated formation beside the very well-attested root aorist. In particular, there are no *s*-aor. subjunctive forms of the type that regularly support the *śi*-impv. I do not entirely understand how or why it was formed, but, given the tight formulaic relationships between the hymns in this Agni cycle, I suggest it may have been based on semantically identical and rhyming *ghóṣi* in VI.5.6; as was discussed above, it is possible that the accent of *śróṣi* is owing to the same source. However, MLW reminds me that “*s*-forms of *k’leu* are very wide spread in Indo-European (Lith. *klausyti*, TB. *klyaus* and there might even be an exact match for *śróṣi* in Messapic *klaohi*. Cf. also *srausat*. Nonetheless, I still favor an internal Skt. explanation.

As already noted, pāda c is both metrically deficient and afflicted with a bad cadence. Old (both ZDMG 55.293 and Noten) suggests restoring *devātātā*, as in 1a, also pāda final. Though this would fix both metrical problems and would also make contextual sense, I do not understand how such a corruption could have arisen. I prefer, and have adopted, Ge’s suggestion (n. 7cd) to read *vāyúm* beginning pāda d as *vā āyúm*, with *vā* going with the previous pāda. *devātā* appears several times in a Triṣṭubh cadence followed by a monosyllable (IV.44.2, 58.10, VII.85.3) -- so ... *devātā vā#* would be a fine pāda-end -- and the *vā* can easily conjoin the two instr. *śávasā devātā*. The reanalysis of *vā āyúm* to *vāyúm* can have been based on pāda-initial *vāyúr* in 5b. Agni is called *Āyu* on a number of occasions (see, e.g., I.31.11, X.20.7, and Gr s.v. *āyú*- def. 2). Although Ge’s idea seems eminently sensible to me, it is passed over in silence by Re. An asterisk should be inserted before “*Āyu*” in the publ. tr.

I do not see any way to improve the cadence in d. The splv. *nṛtama-* is not suitable for the cadence of any Rigvedic meter, though it also appears there in VI.33.3.

VI.5 Agni

VI.5.1: I supply ‘our’ with ‘thoughts’ (*matībhiḥ*) in pāda b, though the subject of the overt verb *huvé* is only 1st singular. I assume that the *vah* ‘for you’ is addressed to the poet’s fellow celebrants and therefore there is an implicit 1st pl. It would, however, also be possible to tr. “with my thoughts.”

ínvati is obviously a thematized Vth Class pres. (see Gotō, 1st class, p. 76). What is rather surprising is that the athematic stem is found two vss. later, as *inoṣi* in 3c, as well as in the previous hymn (*inóti* VI.4.3; cf. also the impv. *inuhí* in nearby VI.10.7). It is true that *ínvati* provides a more favorable heavy syllable in 2nd position, but I do not otherwise see the motive for using both stems in this hymn.

Note the etymological connections *yúvānam* ... *yáviṣṭham*, *ádrogha(-vācam)* ... *adhruk*, and (*viśvá-*)*vārāṇi* (*puru*)*vārah*.

VI.5.2: In almost all occurrences in which it is possible to determine, animate forms of *yajñīya*-refer to gods. They may be the referents here as well: the gods may send goods to Agni to be redistributed to his mortal worshippers.

The syntax of *cd* is somewhat problematic, since there is incongruity between the simile and the frame. Ge evades this by taking the simile that begins *c* (*kṣāmeva vísvā bhúvanāni*) with *ab*: “In dir ... bringen die opferwürdigen (Götter) ... Schätze zum Vorschein wie die Erde alle Geschöpfe,” and beginning a new clause with *yásmín*. This is not impossible, but it is unnecessary and, given the hemistich break, undesirable if another interpr. can work. Various ones have been tried (see Old, ZDMG 455.293 and Noten), but, flg. Old, I think it is yet another example of case disharmony in similes, utilizing two possible alternative interpr. of the verb (*sám ...*) *dadhiré*. In the frame this medial verb has a passive sense ‘be held, encompassed’, with *saúbhagāni* as subj. For this construction cf. VI.38.3 *bráhmā ca gíro dadhiré sám asmín* “the sacred formulations and the songs together have been placed (/are encompassed) in him.” But the same verb form can also be transitive, with the object expressing what is encompassed or placed. This is the construction of the simile, with nom. *kṣāma* (or *kṣāmā*? see Old) and acc. *vísvā bhúvanāni*. For such a transitive construction, cf. III.19.4 *bhūrīni hí tvé dadhiré ánīkā ... yájyavo jánāsaḥ* “the peoples eager to sacrifice have established in you [=the fire] your many faces.” In our passage the *object* of the simile thus corresponds to the *subject* of the frame; that both are neut. pl. makes their correspondence easier to process, despite their different grammatical functions.

VI.5.3: As noted above *ad vs. 1*, we have both thematized *ínva*- and *athem. ínó*- in this hymn, with very similar objects: *drávināni* ‘movable goods’ (1c), *vásūni* ‘goods’ (3d). As was also noted above, *ad VI.4.3*, Ge (and others: cf. Gr and Re) construes the *ví* opening pāda *d* with *inoṣi* in *c* and uses this supposed lexeme to argue that *ví ... inóti* in VI.4.3 has positive value. As I argued there, *ví ... inóti* is more likely to mean ‘dispel’ and to take a negatively viewed object. In our passage here I do not think that *ví* belongs with *inoṣi*. Instead I think *ví* forms a phrase with immediately following *ānuṣák*; cf. the same pāda-initial expression I.58.3, 72.7, IV.12.3, as well as #*ví ... ānuṣák*# V.16.2. I assume that the expression arose from passages like I.72.7 *vy ānuṣak ... dhāḥ* “distribute in due order” with *ví √ dhā* (reinforced here by *vidhaté*), and then *ví* and *ānuṣák* became phrasally fused.

VI.5.4–5: These two vss. are contrastively paired: each has a generalizing rel. clause describing the activities of a mortal -- harmful in 4ab, beneficial in 5ab -- while the 2nd hemistichs of each set out the results of such actions. The pairing is further emphasized by the phonological similarities of the oppositional verbs *abhidāsat* ‘will assail’ (4a) and *dádāsat* (5b) ‘will ritually serve’.

VI.5.4: Note the extreme etymological figure that occupies the whole of pāda *d*: *tápā tapiṣṭha tāpasā tāpasvān*. For the last two words, see the parallel structure in 6b.

VI.5.5: I now would be inclined to take *samídhā* as an abstract “with kindling,” rather than as the concrete material “with kindling wood” as in the publ. tr. See disc. *ad VI.1.9, 2.5*.

VI.5.6: The pāda-final *sáhasā sáhasvān* is morphologically entirely parallel to 4d *tāpasā tāpasvān*.

In d *tād* may not be a temporal adverb as in the publ. tr., but a neut. acc. obj. of *juṣasva*, with which ‘speech’ vel sim. should be supplied. So Ge and Re -- e.g., Ge “so freue dich an diesem (Gedicht) des Sängers.” However, since *√juṣ* can take a gen. complement (though more rarely than the acc.), *jaritūḥ* may be construed directly with the verb, as in the publ. tr.

On *ghōṣī*, which I take as an anomalous *-sī* imperative, see comm. ad IV.4.8, which contains the other occurrence of this form. On the possible relationship between *ghōṣī* and *śróṣī* in VI.4.7, see comm. ad loc.

VI.5.7: This vs. is characterized by etymological figures: b *rayīm rayivah*, c *vājam ... vājáyantaḥ*, d *ajarājāram* -- a stylistic tick found also in vss. 1, 4, and 6 -- see comm. ad locc.

VI.6 Agni

VI.6.1: The subject of this vs. is not overtly expressed, but it cannot be Agni, who is the acc. goal. Re cleverly suggests that the subject is indicated by the participle *grṇánt-* ‘singing, singer’ in the last pāda of this hymn. If so, this is an oblique form of ring composition.

Contrary to my usual principles, rather than construing *návyasā* with *yajñéna* in the next pāda (so Ge, Re), I supply a form of ‘speech’. I do so on the grounds that *návyas-*, particularly in the instr., is specialized to the realm of speech. Cf. *návyasā vācasā* (VI.62.5) as well as the famous pāda-final disharmonious formula *návyasā vācaḥ* (II.31.5, VI.48.11, VIII.39.2), along with fem. forms of the comparative with different ‘speech, thought’ words (e.g., nearby VI.8.1 *matír návyasī*).

The hapax *vṛścād-vana-* ‘hewing wood’ shows the poet’s penchant for the type of cmpd. that provides his name, *Bharád-vāja*. Cf. also *ṛdhád-vāra-* in VI.3.2.

VI.6.2: The first hemistich mixes the visual and the audible in a species of synaesthesia, esp. clear in the description of Agni as “brightening thunder,” but note also his “ever-roaring” flames.

The standard tr. construe *purūṇi pṛthūni* with *bhárvan*; e.g., Ge “die vielen, breiten (Flächen) fressend.” But nearby VI.12.5 *anuyāti pṛthvīm* favors taking the acc. as an acc. of extent with the verb *anuyāti*, as in the publ. tr.

Note the phonetic figure in *pāvakāḥ purutāmaḥ purūṇi, pṛthūni*, esp. the last three words, of which the first two also etymologically related.

VI.6.3: Alliteration continues, with *ví ... vísvak* (a), *śuce śúcayaḥ* (b), *návagvā vānā vananti* (cd). The first two are etymological figures; in the third, intricately structured one, *vānā vananti* is not, but mimics one.

Flg. Ge (fld. by Re), I assume that the Navagvas are in an unmarked simile: the flames break and overcome the woods as the Navagvas broke Vala. The gapping of the simile marker *ná* would not be surprising in the *-na*-rich environment of the figure noted

above: *nāvagvā vānā vananti*: we might have expected *divyā *nā nāvagvā*, and haplology would not be surprising.

The identity of the root found in *tuvi-mrakṣā-* is disputed; see EWA s.v. *MARC*, with $\sqrt{mṛc}$ ‘harm’, $\sqrt{mṛj}$ ‘wipe’, and $\sqrt{mṛś}$ ‘touch’ all possibly in play. $\sqrt{mṛc}$ ‘harm’ seems the most likely to me. The Schwebeablaut outcome *-mrakṣ-* is standard when *-kṣ-* ending the root syllable would yield a super-heavy cluster **-rkṣ*. Cf. *drakṣyati* (not **darkṣyati*) to $\sqrt{dṛś}$ (see AiG I.212–13). Any of the roots just listed would follow this pattern.

VI.6.4: In my view (flg. Re), the rel. cl. of the first hemistich hangs off the previous vs. 3 and supplies the subject (*śúcayaḥ* ‘flames’) of *vananti* in 3d. However, Ge takes the rel. prn. *yé* as a stand-in for ‘wenn’, providing a subordinate clause to cd, with its resumptive *ádha*. The conspicuous alliteration of vs. 3, continued here (4a) — *śukrāsaḥ śúcayaḥ śuciṣmaḥ*, also a triple etymological figure — might be a weak arg. in favor of a connection with vs. 3, esp. 3b *śuce śúcayaḥ*.

In b *kṣāṁ* must be read disyllabically.

In the publ. tr. “like” should be enclosed in parens, as there is no overt simile marker in b. The question is why the flames are likened to “unharnessed horses” (*viśitāso áśvāḥ*). Ge and Re think they are grazing, and this interpr. might fit well with *vápanti* ‘shear, shave’ -- a slightly different image of what happens to vegetation when fire moves across the earth: grazing “shears” the grasses like shaving does. However, I tend to think that *viśita-* adds a different semantic dimension: horses out of harness racing about wildly without control.

In d the standard view (e.g., Ge, Re, Macd [*Hymns*, p. 74], Klein [DGRV II.106], Mau [p. 24]), fld. also in the publ. tr., is that the gen. *pṛśneḥ*, lit. ‘speckled, dappled’, refers to the earth. And this seems perfectly reasonable. However, it should be noted that *pṛśni-* is nowhere else unambiguously used of the earth in the RV, except in the metaphorical *dhenúm ... pṛśnim* “dappled cow” in I.160.3. Though Re (comm. ad loc.) suggests that there is such a ref. in IV.5.7, 10, those are desperately obscure passages and nothing can be built upon them. Generally *pṛśni-* names the mother of the Maruts, who seems to have been a dappled cow, and “dappled (cow)” → “earth” is not a difficult step in RVic discourse. Still it should be kept in mind that it’s a step that hasn’t been taken elsewhere.

VI.6.5: The rendering of *goṣu-yúdh-* as ‘cattle-raider’ loses the specificity of the loc. pl. 1st member, but ‘of the one battling for cattle’ seemed excessively heavy.

The hapax *kṣāti-* is built to $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘burn’. I have borrowed the felicitous bilingual pun ‘ardor’ from Maurer.

On Gotō’s posited \sqrt{di} ‘destroy’ supposedly found in *dayate* here, see comm. ad III.34.1. There is no need for a separate root, as ‘divides’ → ‘fragments’ is a plausible semantic pathway.

VI.6.6: This vs. has a number of connections with phraseology elsewhere in this Agni cycle: *ā ... bhānumádbhiḥ ... tatántha* (VI.4.6): *ā bhānúnā ... tatantha* (6a); *dhṛṣatā* (3d, 6b); *spṛdho bādhasva* (VI.5.6): *bādhasva ... spṛdhah* (6cd, though with the two forms

belonging to separate clauses, not a VP as in 5.6); *vanuṣyāt* (VI.5.4): *vanuṣyān vanúṣaḥ* (6d).

The referent of the gen. phrase *mahás todásya* ‘great goad’ is not entirely clear -- some take it as some feature of Agni (e.g., Ge), others as the sun (e.g., Mau). Most construe it with *bhānúnā* (as I do), though Re takes it with *pārthivāni jráyāṃsi*. If, as is likely, it goes with *bhānúnā*, this provides a good clue to its identity. The bahuvrīhi *svār-bhānu-* ‘having the radiance of the sun’ is obviously based on a genitival tatpuruṣa **svār-bhānú-* ‘radiance of the sun’, and GEN. *bhānú-* would simply be the analytic version of this cmpd., with the phrase *mahás todásya* substituted for putative gen. **sūrah* or **sūryasya*. VI.4.6 *ā sūryo ná bhānumádbhir arkaīḥ* “like the sun with its radiant rays” provides further support for this interpr. Although it is true that in nearby VI.12.1, 3 the ‘goad’ (*todá-*) appears to be Agni, the qualifier ‘great’ in “*great* goad” here might point to the cosmic body, the sun, of which the earthly fire is a less powerful earthly counterpart.

VI.6.7: The insistent etymological alliteration in this vs. seems to me inartful overkill, though it certainly provides an explosive climax. The forms of \sqrt{cit} in the first hemistich — *citra citrām citáyantam ... citrakṣatra citrátamam* — give way to \sqrt{cand} in a slightly more restrained array, *candrām ... cándra candrábhiḥ*. Since both roots belong to the same semantic sphere and begin with *c*, the difference in effect between the hemistichs is minimal.

It is not clear what should be supplied with the fem. instr. pl. *candrābhiḥ*. The standard tr. use ‘flames’, and I’ve followed suit, but *súci-*, which figured in vss. 3–4, is unfortunately masc. when used as a noun. Re suggests alternatively *stutíbhiḥ* ‘praises’ (fld. by Mau), pointing to the adjacent *gr̥naté* ‘singer’, but it is more natural to take the instr. *candrābhiḥ* with Agni syntactically, rather than construing it with the dat. participle, and further, *candrā-* seems never to be used with verbal products.

VI.7 Agni Vaiśvānara

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is heavily seeded with forms of \sqrt{jan} ‘beget, be born’. The epithet *vaiśvānará-* is also found in every vs. (1b, 2c, 3c, 4d, 5a, 6a, 7a), in all cases initial in its pāda.

VI.7.1–2: These two vss. are paired, both ending with *janayanta devāḥ* and sharing an opening pāda with the structure ACC SG + GEN ACC SG + GEN; this NP structure is also found at the end of 1c and 2c (one iteration each), but is upended by GEN + ACC SG *yajñásya ketúm* in 2d. It is perhaps a measure of the sensitivity of the RV to subtle patterns that this syntactic metathesis feels strikingly disruptive. It may well be that the poet generated this disruptive order in order to call attention to this very phrase; see the importance of the word *ketú-* in vss. 5 and 6, with the comm. there. There is an important difference, however: here the “beacon of the sacrifice” must be Agni, whereas in vss. 5–6 it is the sun.

There are only three finite verbs in this two-vs. sequence, all injunctives: 1d *janayanta*, 2b *abhí sám navanta*, 2d *janayanta*. The temporal reference is therefore unspecified. I tr. them as preterites (as do Ge and Re) on the assumption that Agni’s begetting by the gods happened only once in the mythological past. It would be different if priests were the subject.

VI.7.1: Since Agni is often called the mouth of the gods, Ge (and others) assume that the loc. *āsán* in d refers to Agni, and the gods have produced a drinking cup (*pātram*) to put in his mouth. But this requires Ge to treat the three-pāda accusative phrase that opens the hymn and refers to Agni as grammatically untethered, as an anacoluthon with the referent picked up in the loc. in pāda d (see his n. 1d). But, with Re, I see no reason why Agni cannot be conceptualized here as the cup that the gods drink from. Re considers *āsán* simply an attribute limiting the *pātra*-, a “réipient pour la bouche, réipient à boire,” while I take it as referring to the gods’ (collective) mouth.

Note the phonologically matching words *aratīm* and *ātithim* stationed in the same metrical position in pādas a and c.

VI.7.2: On *mahām* as acc. sg. masc. see AiG III.251, EWA s.v. *mahānt*, p. 338.

The paradox of calling fire “a great watering trough” (*āhāvā-*) simply sharpens the slightly discordant image in 1c of Agni as ‘cup’. Although *āhāvā-* is clearly derived from *ā√hu*, a standard lexeme for the oblations that Agni would be receiving, this particular noun is associated with a well in X.101.5 and is therefore associated with more mundane acts of pouring water (which of course should extinguish fire). Agni is a trough because the gods get their “water” there.

VI.7.3–5: The middle of the hymn is characterized by initial (or modified initial) forms of the 2nd sg. prn.: 3a *tvát*, 3b *tvát*, 3c VOC *tvám*, 4a *tvám*, 4c *táva*, 5a VOC *táva*.

VI.7.4: *abhí sám navante* reprises *abhí sám navanta* of 2b and perhaps confirms the preterital interpr. of that injunctive, since the verb in this vs. is marked as pres., though the gods are also subject here. However, how to interpret the tense values in the 2nd hemistich is unclear. Pāda c has an unambiguous impf. *āyan*, which, with its goal of immortality (*amṛtatvám*), would seem to refer to the remote mythological past (though see below). The verb is the last pāda, *ādīdeḥ*, can be either a plupf. (to the older stative pf. *dīdāya*) or an impf. to the new redupl. pres. remodeled from the pf. stem (Kū opts for the impf.; see 228). But whatever its morphological identity, it seems to refer to an event in the immediate past or the immediate neighborhood -- assuming that *pitróḥ* refers to the two kindling sticks -- namely, the regularly repeated kindling of the fire. This interpr. would be supported by 5c with pres. part.: *jāyamānaḥ pitróḥ upásthe* “being born in the lap of your two parents.” In the publ. tr. I assumed that the first hemistich refers to the regular kindling of the fire and the gods’ response, while the 2nd one refers to the Ur-kindling in mythological time. However, I now wonder if we should interpret the abstract *amṛtatvám* in c in light of the voc. *amṛta* in pāda a. In the first hemistich Agni is addressed as “immortal one” when he is being born and the gods cry out to him; indeed the voc. “o immortal one” might be the content of their cry, expressed in the verb *abhí sám navante*. In the second hemistich the gods went to immortality (*amṛtatvám*), that is, to the abstract quality possessed by the one addressed as *amṛta*, and they did so “according to your [=Agni’s] intentions” (*táva krátubhiḥ*), again when he was born. The gods’ journey to *amṛtatvám* may therefore not be one of the distant mythic past (or not only of the distant past), but one they undertake whenever he is kindled. The abstract

principle of immortality may also be found in the gen. *amṛtasya* in the last pāda of the hymn (7d), where Agni is identified as its protector.

Note that the phrase *vísve ... devāḥ*, parcelled out over two pādas, may teasingly invite us to connect the first term, *vísve*, with the dominant epithet in this hymn, *vaiśvānarā-*.

VI.7.5: The disjunction between pf. *dadharṣa* in the main clause of b and impf. *āvindaḥ* in the subord. cl. of d is likewise a bit disturbing. Flg. Kü (266), the publ. tr. renders the perfect presentially as “ventures against,” but I might be tempted to change that now to “has ventured against” (cf. Ge’s “... hat noch keiner angetastet”). The question is what is the relationship between the two clauses. I think that Agni’s *vratās* are those that he established after he discovered (*āvindaḥ*) the phenomenon in d.

This in turn raises the question of what that phenomenon is and, more precisely, to which noun (*ketúm* or *vayúneṣu*) the gen. *áhnām* belongs. Most (Ge, Re, Old) take it with *vayúneṣu*; cf., e.g., Re “quand ... tu eus découvert le signal-lumineux pour les jalonnements des jours.” Old, who should know better, even cites word order as support of this interpr. And certainly *áhnām* does (once) occur with *vayúna-*: II.19.3 *aktúnāhnāṇ vayúnāni sādhat* “He perfected the patterns of the days through the night.” But far more often *áhnām* limits *ketú-*, several times in a Vaiśvānara context: VII.5.5 *vaiśvānarām uṣāsām ketúm áhnām* “V., the beacon of the dawns and of the days”; X.88.12 *vaiśvānarām ketúm áhnām akṛnvān* “they made V. the beacon of the days.” Cf. also III.34.4 *ketúm áhnām*, X.85.19 *áhnām ketúr uṣāsām*, and VI.39.3 *imām ketúm adadhur nū cid áhnām*, this last with separation between the noun and its gen. as in our passage. In my interpr. of this pāda the *vayúna-* are the ritual patterns, the regularly repeated sequence of events in the ritual, including the kindling of the fire. The “beacon of the days” is the sun, which rises at that kindling. (clarified in the next vs.), in contrast to the “beacon of the sacrifice” in 2d, which is Agni. Note that Agni, addressed as Vaiśvānara, is here distinct from the sun, which he finds. (See further ad vs. 6.). Finding the beacon of the days in the (ritual) patterns means recognizing and replicating the regular rising of the sun that coincides with the kindling of the ritual fire. As usual in Rigvedic discourse the correct performance of ritual governs the rhythms of the natural world.

To return to the question of the relationship between the two hemistichs, I suggest that the “great *vratās*” of Agni that no one has/does venture against are the ritual patterns, esp. the dawn kindling, which in turn control the repeated return of the “beacon of the days.”

VI.7.6: This vs. continues, and clarifies, the theme of the 2nd hemistich of vs. 5. Although Agni as Vaiśvānara is often identified with the sun and although several of the passages cited immediately above, ad 5d, identify Vaiśvānara with the “beacon of the days,” here Agni Vaiśvānara is separate from the sun (as indeed he was in 5cd), which is his eye (*vaiśvānarāsya ... cákṣasā*) and which is further characterized as “the beacon of the immortal one” (*amṛtasya ketúnā*), taking up the *ketú-* of 5d, which Agni found. The sun “measures out the backs of heaven” by crossing the sky on his daily passage.

In c the referent of *tāsya* in the phrase *tāsya ... mūrdhāni* “on his head / on the head of this one” is not specified and could either be the sun, as expressed by the instr. of ab, or Agni Vaiśvānara. It is surely the latter, however: *mūrdhāni* echoes the first word of

the hymn, *mūrdhānam*, which refers to Agni himself as the “head of heaven.” And the *viśvā bhūvanāni* “all creatures” who take their place on this head are a twist on Agni’s epithet *vaiśvānarā-* ‘belonging to all men’, which dominates this hymn.

On the formation of *visrúh-*, which occurs only here and in V.44.3, see comm. ad V.44.3, where I connect it (as a number of others do) to *√ru(d)h* ‘grow’. In our passage this etymological connection is actualized in the figure *ruruhuḥ ... visrúhaḥ*, and the vegetative image is further anchored by the simile *vayā iva* “like twigs.” With Re (and Kellens, *Noms. rac.*, 82–83), I think the ‘outgrowths’ are Agni’s flames, but unlike those two I would not *translate visrúhaḥ* as ‘flames’: it’s a metaphor.

VI.7.7: In this vs. the subject of the cosmogonic *ví√mā* ‘measure out’ is Agni Vaiśvānara, not the sun, as in the immediately preceding vs., and the more usual identification of Agni Vaiśvānara with the sun seems to have reasserted itself. See VI.8.2.

In a *sukrátuḥ* reprises *krátubhiḥ* in 4c, and it might have been better to render the *krātu-* in the same way -- either as “by your resolutions” ... “the very resolute one” or “by your intentions” ... “he of good intention.”

VI.8 Agni Vaiśvānara

This hymn, like the last, is dedicated to Agni Vaiśvānara and has a form of this epithet in every vs. but 5, always pāda-initial as in VI.7. However, the hymn is somewhat different from VI.7. In that hymn Agni Vaiśvānara was distinct from and dominated the sun (see esp. VI.7.5–6) until the last vs., while in this hymn the usual identification of Agni Vaiśvānara and the sun is in evidence. See esp. vs. 2.

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is also heavy with initial *v*’s, esp. in the earlier parts of the hymn, which index the epithet. Note esp. the three hemistichs that begin with the preverb *ví* (2c, 3a, 3c), as well as 1ab ... *vīṣṇaḥ ... vocaṃ vidáthā ...*, 2ab ... *vyòmani, vratāni ... vratapā ...*, 3cd ... *avartayad, vaiśvānaró viśvam ... vīṣṇyam*.

VI.8.1: On *prkṣā-* see comm. ad II.34.3.

VI.8.2: Here Agni Vaiśvānara is “being born in highest distant heaven” (*jāyamaṇaḥ paramé vyòmani*), presumably in the form of the sun, in contrast to VI.7.5 with the same participle but a different location: *jāyamānaḥ pitrór upásthe* “being born in the lap of your parents,” usually a kenning for the ritual kindling sticks, so that VI.7.5 refers to the kindling of the ritual fire. In that vs. Agni found the sun (“beacon of the days”), which was therefore distinct from him, and in the next vs. (VI.7.6) the backs of heaven were measured out by the sun as an organ -- the eye -- of Agni Vaiśvānara (*vaiśvānarasya vímitāni cákṣasā, sánūni diváh*). Only in the last vs. of that hymn, VI.7.7, did Agni Vaiśvānara himself measure out the cosmos and take on his usual solar aspect. The two pādas VI.7.7a (*ví yó rájāṃsy ámimīta sukrátuḥ*) and our VI.8.2c (*vy àntarīkṣam amimīta sukrátuḥ*) are almost identical, but the former represents the resolution of the disjunction between Agni Vaiśvānara and the sun, while no such disjunction is found in our hymn.

VI.8.3: The cosmogonic activities of Agni Vaiśvānara continue here, but I would argue that they are instances of the *daily* creation of the cosmos by the light of the sun. The propping apart of the two world halves refers to the visual separation of earth and sky at

the horizon at first light, and the rolling out of the two skins is a similar image, of the full extent of earth and sky revealed to sight at that time.

It is not entirely clear why Agni Vaiśvānara is called an “unerring ally” (*mitró ábhutaḥ*; see the identical phrase in I.94.13 and similar I.77.3 *mitró ná bhūd ádbhutasya rathīḥ*). Agni is of course regularly identified as an ally (*mitrá-*) and is compared to Mitra because of his role as go-between between gods and men; in this particular case the sun’s role as the most visible of the gods and the heavenly being most clearly engaged with human life may have elicited this description. The covert presence of Mitra here may also play off the covert presence of Varuṇa in 2b, in the phrase *vratāni ... vratapā arakṣata* “as protector of *vratas*, he guarded the *vratas*: *vratās* are Varuṇa’s special province, although curiously Varuṇa is never called *vratapā-* in the RV.

The interpr. of pāda b is disputed because of disagreement about the sense and formation of *antarvāvat* (also found in I.40.7). Ge tr. the pāda as “er zerteilte die dazwischenliegende Finsternis durch das Licht” (almost identically also Oberlies Relig. I.191), presumably with the ‘between’ sense of *antár* nominalized with the complex suffix *-vā-vant-*. Re denies that the formation has a complex (or duplicate) suffix but rather considers it an imitation of *arvāvāt* ‘nearby’, despite the difference in accent, and renders the word (in his note) as “un domaine intérieur (= invisible).” His tr. of the pāda is “il a fait que les ténèbres (devinssent) par la lumière un domaine-cachée.” So, he takes *antár* in the meaning ‘within’, but the further morphological analysis is unclear. Old (ad I.40.7) also sees the ‘within’ sense of *antár* here, but with a more plausible interpr. of the suffixal material — with the whole meaning ‘inhaltsvoll’ (that is, ‘having [something] within’). He also considers it is entirely or roughly synonymous with *antárvant-*. (Both of these views are also found in AIG II.2.893, and the whole is laid out with admirable clarity by Schmidt [B+I 102]. Both AIG and Schmidt explain *-vā-vant-* as pleonastic.) The second observation seems to me the most important clue: *antárvant-* is in fact only attested in the fem. *antárvatī-* (III.55.5, X.91.6) in the meaning ‘pregnant’. In both I.40.7 and our passage here the ‘pregnant’ sense is used metaphorically of non-females (*kṣáya-* ‘dwelling place’ in the former, *támas-* ‘darkness’ in the latter). (So also Schmidt; AIG doesn’t go quite this far.) One could speculate that the pleonastic suffix is used because a non-fem. *antárvant-* would seem distinctly odd, and the addition of a second suffix attenuated this oddness. In our case, the *antarvāvat* can directly modify neut. *támaḥ*; in I.40.7, since *kṣáya-* is masc., the connection is less direct. See comm. ad loc. In our passage this interpr. produces a striking image, of the darkness of night swelling with light as day breaks.

VI.8.4: I have no idea what the buffaloes (*mahiṣāḥ*) are doing here or why they do what they do in the lap of the waters. Ge (n. 4a) suggests that the buffaloes are the gods or the old singers, but this does not actually explain anything (including why they would be called buffaloes). Ge notes the very similar passage X.45.3 *ṛtīye tvā rájasī tasthivāmsam, apām upásthe mahiṣā avardhan* “The buffalos strengthened you, who were standing in the third realm, in the lap of the waters.” That passage occurs in a hymn concerned with Agni’s triple birth, one of which is in the waters, but the identity of the buffaloes remains unclear. In X.8.1 it is Agni himself who as buffalo grows strong in the same place: *apām upásthe mahiṣó vavardha* “the buffalo has grown strong in the lap of the waters.”

The second pāda shows the connection between Agni Vaiśvānara and royal power and the second hemistich the connection between that thematic complex and Vivasvant, as Proferes convincingly argues (*Sovereignty*, pp. 28–29 and passim). The passage cited just above, X.45.3, may also concern Agni Vaiśvānara.

Note the phonological intertwining of #*vísō ... / ... vivásvato* # *vaiśvānaró* ...

VI.8.5: In the first hemistich the distribution of the accusatives is at issue: *vidathyām ... rayīm yaśásam ... návyasīm*. The first, *vidathyām*, must be either masc. or neut.; *yaśásam* is ambiguous between masc. and fem. (though far more often masc. than fem.); *návyasīm* is clearly fem. The sole noun, *rayīm*, is generally held to be normally masc., but occasionally fem. Although I think this statement is true, I also think that the number of supposedly fem. occurrences can be considerably reduced, to the point that apparently fem. examples should be viewed as aberrancies, not as normal if rare usages. In this particular case Old (ZDMG 55.296 [=KISch 755], not restated in Noten) and Ge decide that *rayīm* must be fem. here, as evidenced by *návyasīm*, so that another noun must be supplied for *vidathyām* to modify. Old supplies *agnīm* and takes that phrase as an obj. to the part. *gr̥ṇádbhyaḥ* (without tr.), while Ge supplies *vīrām* (which does indeed occur with *vidathyām* in I.91.20 and VII.36.8) as an obj. parallel to *rayīm*: “... einen in Weisheit tüchtigen (Mann) ... und Ansehen bringenden neuen Reichtum.” Re allows everything to modify *rayīm*: “une richesse (émanant) des participations-rituelles, (richesse) honorable, plus nouvelle,” with his n. on the gender mixture seemingly meant to cast obscurity rather than illumination. In my opinion, *rayīm* is masc. here, modified by *vidathyām* and *yaśásam* (so also Thieme, Unters. 48, who simply elides *návyasīm*), and *návyasīm* belong to a separate NP, for which I supply *matí-* ‘thought’, which appears in the phrase *matír návyasī* in the first vs. of the hymn, 1c. Note that vs. 1 also contains a form of *vidátha-* ‘ceremony, rite of distribution’, to which our *vidathyā-* must belong (pace Ge, who seems to derive it from √*vid* ‘know’). In vs. 1 the poet proclaims the *vidáthā* of Agni and announces that a “newer thought” is being prepared for him. In this vs. he asks Agni to keep providing both wealth for the *vidátha-* and a “newer (thought).” Although Agni does not himself compose the poem, it is a commonplace of RVic discourse that the gods provide the inspiration for the poets’ compositions.

In the 2nd hemistich Ge and Re take *téjasā* with the simile (“mit dem Schärfe (der Axt)” and “avec l’aigu (de la hache)” respectively), while I attribute the sharpness only to Agni in the frame. Certainly their interpr. fits the word order well (*vaníṇaṃ ná téjasā*), though it doesn’t necessarily require *téjasā* to be part of the simile. On the other hand, it does require *pavyéva* at the beginning of the hemistich to be dissociated from the later simile or at least considerably sidelined. In the end, I would go for a compromise position, that *téjasā* should be read with both simile and frame: “as if with a metal wheel rim, hew down the curser with your sharpness like a tree with the sharpness (of an axe vel sim.).”

I have not separately rendered *nīcā* in the phrase *nīcā ní vṛśca*, which seems simply to reinforce the *ní*.

VI.8.6: Both Ge and Re take *ajāram* with *suvíryam* (e.g., “die unbeugsame Herrschaft, das nicht verwelkende Heldentum”), while I take it with *kṣátram*. The Ge/Re interpr. is perfectly possible, and there are no grammatical or syntactic features to allow a clear

decision. My interpr. is based on the rhetorical arg. that the two privative adjectives (*ánāmi* and *ajāram*) belong together, but I can also see that rhetoric might also favor parallel phrases: PRIV-ADJ. X, PRIV-ADJ. Y. My other, quite faint, consideration was that the adj. *ajāra-* was used of the king (=Agni) in the previous vs. (*rājan ... ajara*) and would transfer easily from the king to his dominion (*kṣatrā-*).

VI.8.7: On Ge's proposed emendation of *iṣte* to *iṣṭébhiḥ* see comm. ad I.143.8, which has the same form in a lexically and rhetorically similar passage (containing, inter alia, *pāhi* and *ádabhebhiḥ*). Old (ZDMG 55.296 = KISch. 755) is adamantly opposed to Ge's suggestion, and there seems no good reason to emend the passage and no obvious trigger for such a corruption.

It is difficult not to interpr. the *-iṣ*-aor. injunc. *prá ... tārīḥ* as an impv., given its overt coordination with *rākṣā* in pāda c.

VI.9 Agni Vaiśvānara

On the structure of this complex hymn and for a verse-by-verse synopsis, see publ. intro. It has been much translated and discussed -- in addition to the usual treatments, see, e.g., Thieme, *Gedichte*; Renou, *Hymnes spéculatifs*; Wendy Doniger, *Rig Veda*. Oldenberg (ZDMG 55.296–97) gives a detailed (for him) account of the contents and pronounces it an *ākhyāna*, an opinion repeated in the *Noten*, though he doesn't spell out who the speakers might be verse by verse. Gonda (*Vedic Literature*, 99) calls it "a profound glorification of Agni as the great immortal conceived as the inner light and placed among the mortals to guide them in the mysteries and intricacies of the ritual." As discussed in the publ. intro., the hymn concerns the development of the poet's craft and resembles IV.5, in which the poet also receives his poetic inspiration from Agni Vaiśvānara. I do not see the poetic contest (brahmodya) that others (starting with Geldner [*Ved. Stud.* II.181–82], fld by Re, Doniger, George Thompson ["Brahmodya"]) take as the mise en scène of the hymn. See Old's explicit rejection of the brahmodya interpr. (ZDMG 55.297), with which I concur. The brahmodya interpr. primarily rests on a brief phrase in vs. 2, on which see below.

VI.9.1: The first hemistich has two nom./acc. dual expressions (*áhaś ca kṛṣṇám áhar árunam ca* and *rájasī*) and a dual verb *ví vartete*. The question is which of the two dual expressions is the subject of this verb, or is the subject both or neither? The standard interpr. (Old, Ge, Re, Doniger) is that both expressions serve as subject and that *rájasī*, usually an expression referring to space, here qualifies the two day(-halves), light and dark. However, flg. Thieme, I instead take *rájasī* as an accusative expressing extent of space, preferring to keep the temporal and spatial concepts separate. I do have to admit that an image of rolling out the dual spaces finds support in the preceding hymn, VI.8.3c *ví cārmaṇīva dhiśāṇe avartayat* "He rolled out the two Holy Places [=world-halves] like skins," and even more so in VII.80.1 *vivartáyantīm rájasī sámante* "(Dawn,) unrolling the two adjoining realms." The object of the transitive *ví vartáya-* in those passages should be the subject of the intrans. simplex verb. Nonetheless, see nearby VI.7.7 *ví yó rájāmsi ámimīta* "who measured out the dusky realms," with *rájas-* as object, and the frequent use of *ví* to refer to movement through space. As I see it, the image here is of the day and night proceeding through the cosmos, spreading first light and then darkness. Since *ví* can

also be used for alternating movement, that notion is also probably present: “The black day and the silvery day roll out *alternately* through the two dusky realms,” referring to the regular alternation of night and day.

Re points out two minor anomalies in word placement: *ca* in pāda a, *ná* in pāda c. The first is not immediately second in its constituent (expect **áhaś cārjunam*, like the first constituent *áhāś ca kṛṣṇám*, not *áhar árjunam ca*). Klein (DGRV I.133) suggests that the construction is a conflation of the expected sequence (given as starred just above) and one with only an adjective in the second constituent (*kṛṣṇám cáhar árjunam ca*, as he constructs it). This is possible but seems somewhat over-complex. It’s worth noting that a properly placed *ca* would be damaging to the meter, whether it was read undistracted (*cārjunam*), the more common option for *ca* + V, or distracted (*ca árjunam*). I had thought that another argument for the unusual placement might be that *ca* + V is generally avoided, but a quick glance at Lubotsky turns up about 70 instances of *ca* + V (out of 1094 total instances of *ca*). I doubt that this represents a statistically significant underrepresentation, although I ran no tests.

As for *ná*, it ordinarily is also positioned after the first element in the simile, but it is highly unlikely (that is, quite impossible) that Agni is being compared to a king *being born*, with the simile comprising *jāyamāno ná rājā*, but rather Agni, even as he is being kindled, is compared to the victorious (adult) king, with the simile just *ná rājā*. Such “wrong” positioning is not unprecedented — other examples have been noted in the comm. — and, as Re points out, it is “masked to the eyes” by *jāyamānaḥ*, which matches *rājā* in number, gender, and case.

VI.9.1–2: Note the echo of the last word of vs. 1, *tāmāṃsi*, in the last word of the 1st hemistich of b, ’*tamānāḥ*. The latter form is the pres. part. to the 1st class pres. of √*at* ‘wander’, with aphoresis of the initial vowel after *samaré*. This abhinihita sandhi, relatively rare in the RV, is metrically guaranteed, and it may have been applied in order to bring the participle more into phonological line with *tāmāṃsi*.

VI.9.2: The 1st person speaker, the poet in training, takes over here, with a statement of his ignorance about his own metier. He expresses this ignorance in the metaphor of weaving, a well-known trope for poetic composition that reaches back into Indo-European antiquity.

The main support for the brahmodya interpr. is the loc. *samaré*, which is almost universally construed with (*á*)*tamānāḥ* in the sense “entering the contest” (vel sim.: Ge: “wenn sie in den Wettstreit eintreten,” Re: “quand ils marchent dans l’arène”). But this bends the sense of both words. The other occurrence of the medial participle *átamāna-* (II.38.3) does not signal the type of purposeful motion implied by those translations; there are no other middle forms in the RV, only a single active (I.30.4), whose goal-oriented motion can be accounted for by both the voice and the presence of a preverb. Assuming that √*at* is continued by younger √*aṭ* (see EWA, s.v. *AT*), the usual gloss of the root, ‘wander’, is probably accurate. As for *samará-*, it is obviously formed of the same elements (*sám* √*ṛ* lit. ‘come/move together’) as *samāraṇa-*, which does usually mean ‘collision, conflict’ (cf. also the hapax denom. *samaryátī*), and it has a derivative *samaryá-* that generally refers to the same. But *samará-* itself is found only twice elsewhere, both times in the meaning ‘gathering, confluence’ with a genitive expressing

goods or spoils (VI.47.6 *samaré vásūnām*, X.139.3 *samaré dhānānām*), a benign assemblage rather than a hostile clashing together. Thus, “entering the contest” is at best a weakly supported interpr. of *samaré* ‘*tamānāḥ*’; we are free to interpret that phrase differently and, with the supposed rival poet-competitors removed from the passage, to concentrate on the real competition -- that between the poet and his father, as set out in the second hemistich of this vs.

However, let us first consider the rest of the first half-verse. The poet expresses his ignorance of three things: *tántum ... ótum ... yám váyanti*. Most tr. try to make *tántum* and *ótum* grammatically parallel, either by making them both nouns (e.g., Re “Je ne connais point la lisse ni la trame ...”) or both infinitives (e.g., Thieme “Nicht verstehe ich [die Fäden des Aufzugs] zu spannen, nicht [die Fäden des Einschlags] zu weben.”). This is understandable, since the two terms are identically formed, with full-grade accented root and *-tu-* suffix. However, this morphological identity conceals a difference in usage. *tántu-* behaves like a straight noun: it has nominative forms; it occurs in the plural; it has adjectives modifying it (e.g., IX.83.2 *śócantaḥ ... tántavaḥ*, as well as *tatá* ‘stretched’ several times) and genitives dependent on it (e.g., IX.73.9 *rtásya tántuḥ*). By contrast, outside of this hymn *ótu-* is found only in the clear dative infinitives *ótave* (X.130.2) and *ótavaí* (I.164.5, where in fact acc. pl. *tántūn* is construed with it). I therefore think that *tántum* and *ótum* in this passage are non-parallel, just as the third source of ignorance, expressed in a rel. cl., is not parallel to either of the others. In my view, having three non-parallel objects to the verb *víjānāmi* makes the bewilderment stronger: it’s not just three different things the poet doesn’t understand, but three categories of things -- which categories of things are expressed by different grammatical categories: a noun, an infinitive, a relative clause (without antecedent). “I do not understand the thread (noun), nor (how) “to weave” (infinitive), nor “what they weave” (rel. cl.). Although *-tum* infinitives are quite rare in the RV (5 stems, acdg. to Macdonell VG §586b, Re GLV §371), I suggest that *ótum* was formed and used here, rather than the already existing dat. inf., to provide this grammatical contrast with apparently identical *tántum*.

Since, contra the standard tr., I do not believe that the subject of the verb *váyanti* refers to rival poets, I must propose a different subject. Here the alternative possibilities for *átamāna-* and *samará-*, as discussed above, provide the clues, along with a rudimentary understanding (which is all I have) of the weaving process. With the warp threads (*tántu-*) stretched lengthwise on the loom, “wandering” is a pleasingly apt description of the way the weft threads go alternately under and over the warp threads proceeding horizontally, and this mingling of warp and weft could easily be characterized as “a meeting/gathering.” My only uncertainty is the precise identity of the subjects who do the weaving (*váyanti*). Are they the weft threads themselves as they wander over and under? Are they the human weavers, or their fingers, manipulating the weft threads? Or some technological substitute like shuttles. As MLW reminds me, that Vedic India knew such technology is clear from X.130, a cosmogonic hymn whose operative metaphor is weaving and that contains a word plausibly taken to be ‘shuttle’ (*tásara-* in vs. 2).

Of course, since the weaving in this verse is metaphorical for poetic composition, ultimately the subjects of *váyanti* must underlyingly be poets — those who do know how and what to “weave.” But my point here is that the imagery of weaving is carried further than the standard brahmodya interpretation allows: the wandering and the coming together refer to the weaving process, not to a putative poetic competition. Moreover,

with the contest interpr. banished, the underlying poets need not be guys physically present in the next room, as it were, polishing their verses; they can be any poets in the tradition. Which brings us to the father.

The second hemistich contains two sets of polarized terms: *putrá-* / *pitár-* ‘son’ / ‘father’ and *pará-* / *ávāra-* ‘above’ / ‘below’. (That *pará-* and *ávāra-* make up a polarized pair is clear from numerous passages in which they are contrasted [e.g., I.164.17, X.88.17].) The case assignment in the text, nominative for the first of each pair, instrumental for the second, makes it clear that it is the son who is above, the father below, although this is the counterintuitive pairing. As noted in the publ. intro., despite his professed ignorance of poetic craft, the young poet feels that he must not only equal but surpass his father, to further the poetic lineage. That *pará-* can mean not only ‘higher’ but also ‘further’, while *ávāra-* means both ‘below’ and ‘nearer’, allows the sense of “furthering” the line also to be read in the passage. The father is close by, both to the poet and the present moment, but the poet himself must go farther, in the future, beyond the model of his father, to speak “what is to be said” (*vāktvāni*); it is perhaps ironic that the only other occurrence of *vāktva-* in the RV outside this hymn is as a genitive pl. dependent on ‘father’: III.26.9 *pitāraṃ vāktvānām* “the father of what is to be said,” referring to Agni. It is a nice touch in our vs. that because ‘father’ is in the instr., it better fits the phonological template of ‘son’ than the direct cases would: *putrá ... pitrá*.

VI.9.3: This vs. is responsive to vs. 2, repeating pāda a almost verbatim, while transposing it into the 3rd ps. from the 1st and into the positive from the negative. The 2nd pāda abbreviates the 2nd hemistich of vs. 2, pulling out the all-important object and verb (*vāktvāni ... vadāti*) that had been scattered across two pādas in vs. 2. The 2nd hemistich introduces new material — identifying the person who does know what the poet says he doesn’t yet — while replacing the *pará-* / *ávāra-* pair with the almost identical *pāra-* / *avāḥ* ‘below’ [adv.].

The first half-verse with its near identical repetition is straightforward, but, with its repetition of “just he ... he ... he” (*sá íd ... sá ... sá*) as the subj. of ‘knows’ and ‘will speak’, it promises both a resolution to the poet’s anxiety of ignorance in 2ab and an answer to the question “whose son?” (*kásya putráḥ*) in 2cd.

But though the identity of the “he” of 3ab is surely revealed by the relative cl. in the 2nd hemistich, beginning “who ...” (*yáḥ*, 3c), the referent is far from clear. There are both an apparent and apparently obvious answer and, in my opinion anyway, a covert but enlightening answer that depends on tricky manipulation of the words as given -- which is, after all, the point of the hymn, to learn the ins and outs of verbal weaving. The standard tr. take Agni as the subject of the whole vs.; he is the one who know the thread and the weaving and can say the things to be said. There is a good, obvious piece of evidence that this interpr. is correct: the subject of the relative clause in c appears to be identified as *amítasya gopāḥ* “the herdsman of the immortal.” This epithet was used of Agni only two hymns previously (VI.7.7); it *seems* to clinch the identification. But note what precedes it: *yá īm cíketat* “who will perceive him/it.” Ge (fld. by Doniger) takes *īm* as referring to the thread, while Re simply ignores it. But Thieme takes *amítasya gopāḥ* as the content of the act of perception, as a quotation: “der ihn (Gott Feuer) erkennt: ‘[Er ist] der Hüter des Lebens,’” with *īm* the obj. of *cíketat* anticipating the revelation of Agni’s role and power in the quote. I find Thieme’s interpr. very persuasive. The one

who knows all this is not Agni, but the poet who rightly perceives Agni, who possesses the esoteric knowledge acquired by contemplating the ritual fire and receiving its vision.

Thieme then takes pāda d as referring to the poet-subject of c, but I think we can go one better: d is both a description of the poet, as Thieme takes it, *and* a continuation of the right perception of Agni that the poet received, the second part of the quoted revelation “he is the herdman of the immortal.” In this latter interpr., Agni “moves about below” (*avás cáran*) as the ritual fire of mortals, but “sees above the other one” (*paró anyéna páśyan*), because he (in the form of smoke) goes to heaven bringing the oblations to the gods. By my rules of placement for *anyá-* (1997, Fs. Beekes), it should be definite here (“the other,” not “another,” as in most interpr.). Here “the other” is quite possibly the sun, which is Agni’s allo-form but also presumably somewhat lower in heaven than the smoke carrying the oblations. In the alternative application of this pāda, to the poet, I differ in some crucial ways from Thieme (whose interpr. I will not present further here). The poet also “moves about below” not only as a mortal on the earth, but also as a son, who in one sense is “below” his father in the lineage. But he “sees above the other,” who is the father whose skills he is trying to best. Though in this pāda both *aváh* and *pára-* refer to the son, whereas in 2cd *pára-* referred to the son and *ávare-* to the father, here the ultimate superiority of the son is triumphantly announced, whereas in 2cd this outcome was in question. The cleverness and intricacy of this 2nd hemistich, esp. immediately following the near verbatim repetition found in the first, is a clear demonstration that the young poet has come into his skills and his poetic heritage.

VI.9.4: As argued in the publ. intro., this vs. is the omphalos of a well-structured omphalos hymn, and it contains the “message” of the hymn: the revelatory vision of Agni immediately before the eyes of the poet. This immediacy is conveyed by the near-deictic pronoun that begins the first three pādas — *ayám* (a), *idám* (b), *ayám* (c) — and also ends the first pāda (*imám*). The immediacy is also conveyed by the abrupt command “look at him” (*páśyatemám*) at the end of the 1st pāda; since the impv. is in the 2nd plural, it cannot be addressed to the poet alone. Instead I suggest that it is the poet speaking, urging his priestly colleagues to behold the revelation that has just come to him. As noted also in the publ. intro., the name Agni does not occur in this verse. In fact, in the whole hymn *agní-* is found only in the first and last vss. (1d and 7b), another reinforcement of the omphalos structure. But every phrase in this vs. is an unmistakable description of Agni, and each could be matched by many similar phrases in Agni hymns. Unlike many omphalos vss., this one is not enigmatic and riddling (save for the omission of the name), but straightforward and obvious, one might say *blazingly* transparent. In this way it captures the poet’s sudden burst of enlightenment, in which he truly *sees* for the first time what is (and has always been) in front of him. As such it can be characterized as an epiphany in the technical sense: although the ritual fire has been there all along, it is only now that the poet sees that the fire is really the god. This divine revelation is underscored by the two occurrences of “immortal” (*jyótir amṛtam* b, *ámartyah* d), taking up the poet’s initial true perception in 3c, where he saw that Agni was “the herdsman of the immortal” (*amṛtasya gopāḥ*).

dhruvá in *dhruvá ā* is ambiguous. The Pp. takes it as nom. *dhruváh*, but modern interpr. differ: Old (ZDMG 55.297 and Noten, with Gr [transl.], Hillebrandt, Pischel) and Thieme opt rather for the loc. *dhruvé*, while Gr (Wö), Ge, and Re follow the Pp. — as do

I: *dhruvām* modifying Agni as light (*vyōtīḥ*) in the next vs. (5a) seems decisive. The constructions are quite parallel: the “steadfast light” of 5a was also “set down” (*nīhitam*), just as “steadfast (Agni)” was “set down” (*nīṣattāḥ*) in 4c. A loc. interpr. is not out of the question, however.

VI.9.5–7: The last three vss. of this hymn are dominated by play on the syllable *vī*, which is also evident, though recessive, in the first part of the hymn. Starting with 5c every hemistich begins with *vī*: 5c *vīśve*, 6a *vī*, 6c *vī*, 7a *vīśve*; note also *vī* in the middle of 5d and 6a and beginning 6b. This sequence culminates in 7c *vaiśvānaraḥ*, whose first syllable is phonologically a vṛddhi form of *vī* and whose first member *vaiśva-* is morphologically a vṛddhi derivative of *vīśva-*. That the two forms of *vīśve* in 5c and 7a are in the syntagm *vīśve devāḥ* “all the gods” and the 2nd member of *vaiśvānara-* is contrastively *-nara-* ‘man’ makes the pattern all the more pleasing. And of course it is Agni *Vaiśvānara* who is the source of the poet’s revelation and therefore the focus of the hymn. The stationing of *vaiśvānaraḥ* at the beginning of the last hemistich of the hymn also forms a ring with the same form at the beginning of the second hemistich of the 1st vs. and reinforces the omphalos structure.

VI.9.5–6: The transference of the properties and powers of Agni to our poet is explicit in these two vss. In 5a Agni is light set down or deposited (*vyōtir nīhitam*); in 5b he is “swiftest mind” (*māno jāviṣṭham*). In 6b the poet comments on “this light that has been deposited in (my) heart” (*idām vyōtir hṛdaya āhitam yāt*; note the near-deictic *idām* again), and in 6c “my mind goes widely” (*vī me mānaś carati*).

The two vss. are also contrastive. In 5 *all* the gods sharing the *same* mind and the *same* perception (*sāmanasaḥ sāketāḥ*) converge on Agni as the *single* focus of their intention or resolve (*ēkaṁ krātum abhī vī yanti sādhu*), whereas in 6 the poet vividly describes the dis-integration of his senses, emphasized by the repetition of *vī* ‘widely, apart). But rather than expressing a worrisome loss of physical and mental control, the vs. seems rather to dramatize the exciting expansion of his sensory horizons, the limitless potentials for thought and speech that he now experiences. His ears flying apart (*vī me kārṇā patayataḥ*), his mind moving widely (*vī me mānaś carati*) are anticipated by Agni’s mind “swiftest among those flying” (*jāviṣṭham patāyatsu*), and the insistent *vī* in this vs. is given a positive spin by the pattern of *vī*-s leading to *vaiśvānara-*, as discussed above.

In the omphalos structure this vs. is twinned with vs. 2, where the poet worried about his lack of knowledge and skill; here his mind and body can literally not contain the possibilities. One index to the change in his mental attitude may be shown by the difference in mood between the tentative subjunctive *vadāti* in 2d and the purposeful future *vakṣyāmi* in 6d. Both are in questions, but the first wonders “whose son *will (be able) to speak ...?*” while the latter seems only to question which of the many possibilities he should begin with: “what *shall I say?*” There are only two finite forms of the future to √ *vac* in the RV (plus one participial form), so the choice of this form must be marked here. The other is *pravakṣyāmaḥ* in I.162.1, announcing the recital of the heroic deeds (*vīryāṇi*) of the horse to be sacrificed and therefore functioning exactly like the more common, likewise annunciatory *prā vocam* (e.g., in the famous opening of the Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32.1 *īndrasya nū vīryāṇi prā vocam*). The correspondent of this future is found rather often in Old Avestan, where 1st sg. (*fra*) *vaxšiiā* regularly performs the same

function of proclamation, as in Y 30.1, 45.1 — perhaps indicating a common IIR. employment of this future as an introducer of formal praise. The use of this form here suggests that our speaker is foreseeing his role as official encomiast and poet of record, not simply casting about for something to say. It is possible that *svid* (*kīm svid vakṣyāmi*) contributes to this sense, but I don't have a good sense of the function of this particle in the RV.

VI.9.7: The final vs. of the hymn forms the outer frame of the omphalos structure with vs. 1. We have already noted the resposion of hemistich-initial *vaiśvānarāḥ* in 1c and 7c and the only two occurrences of the stem *agní-* in 1d and 7b. Another important verbal repetition is *tāmas-*, the last word of vs. 1, found in 7b in the phrase *tāmasi tasthivāṃsam* “(Agni,) standing in darkness.” The sentence in which this is found seems an odd way to end a hymn: “all the gods, in fear (*bhiyānāḥ*), offered homage (*anamasyan*) to you, while you were standing in darkness.” Why are the gods afraid and what time period does the augmented imperfect refer to? And why is this somewhat downbeat statement the real end of the hymn (the last hemistich being a generic request for aid)? I don't have certain answers to these questions, but I think the omphalos structure gives us some guidance. This final vs. seems not simply to circle round to the 1st vs., but in fact to take us to a time (right) before the events depicted in the first vs. In vs. 1 Agni overcame the darkness with his light (1d); here he is still in darkness, before he has become equipped with light, before he has been kindled, in fact. The gods are afraid because they fear he won't light up -- and, reading between the lines, he will only light up if the human ritualists kindle him. Even the gods are dependent on our dawn sacrifice, and, reading further between those lines, our newly minted poet will have a crucial role in making that sacrifice succeed.

The last hemistich has a curious etymological figure, repeated for emphasis: *avatūtāye* (i.e., *avatu ūtāye*) “let him help for help.”

VI.10 Agni

VI.10.1: In the lexeme *puró√dhā*, *purāḥ* serves as a pseudo-preverb; the phrase shows extreme distraction (pseudo-tmesis) here, with *purāḥ* initial in the 1st hemistich and *dadhidhvam* final in that hemistich. The phrase is then revitalized with *purāḥ* opening pāda c, thus directly adjacent to its verb though across a hemistich boundary. That the opening words of pāda c, *purá ukthébhiḥ* belong to the clause in the first hemistich is further shown by the abrupt clause boundary and change of subject in the middle of c, clearly signalled by a typical clause-initial sequence of PRN + Wackernagel-position particles, *sá hí naḥ*.

Pāda b has two extra syllables. The meter could be easily fixed by deleting *agním* with no ill effects to sense or metrical structure. This is an old idea (see Old's reff., ZDMG 55.298), but though harmless, it may be better to accept the text as given (see Old, Noten ad loc.).

On *suṛktí-* as a secondary bahuvrīhi, meaning ‘possessing/receiving (hymns) that possess a good twist’, see comm. ad II.4.1. This interpr. as a masc. adj. is imposed by the otherwise unbroken string of acc. sg. masculines: *mandráṃ divyám suṛktím ... agnīm*. In the comm. ad II.4.1 I suggest that it can also have the primary bahuvrīhi meaning

‘having a good twist’, referring to Agni’s curls of smoke and flame. This would also be possible as an alternative or secondary reading here.

I take *adhvaré* as part of the loc. absol. *prayatí yajñé*, contra Ge. (Re seems to ignore the second loc.) Nothing much rides on either choice.

VI.10.2: As was discussed in the publ. intro., this hymn traffics in disappointed expectations and truncated syntax, and this vs. displays both in extreme form. The vs. begins *tám u* “him/it [acc. sg.] PARTICLE.” Given that the dedicand of the hymn is Agni and vs. 1 contained a long acc. phrase referring to Agni (though that vs. ended with Agni as nom. subj.), we might expect that *tám* = Agni, and our expectations would be supported by a little formula found in various places in the RV (see Klein, *Particle u*, 67–68):

VIII.95.6	<i>tám u ṣṭavāma yáh</i>	“let us praise him who ...”
VIII.96.6	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi yáh</i>	“praise him who ...”
V.42.1	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi yáh</i>	(ditto)
I.173.5	<i>tám u ṣṭuhi ... yáh</i>	(ditto)

as well as variations on it. In our vs., immediately following *u* there is a long interruption, consisting mostly of vocatives addressed to Agni (*dyumaḥ purvaṇīka hotar, ágne*), leaving the *tám* in syntactic suspension. But when we finally reach the end of the hemistich, we encounter a nominative participle *idhānāḥ* ‘being kindled’, which can only refer to Agni. This leaves the initial *tám* doubly unmoored: it can’t refer to Agni, as we’d thought, and it can’t be construed with *idhānāḥ*, which is intransitive and doesn’t take accusatives.

The resolution of one of these problems comes at the beginning of the second hemistich, which opens with the acc. *stómam*, which must be the referent of *tám*. This is a pleasing twist on the formula just noted: the root \sqrt{stu} is preserved, but as a coreferential nominal, not as the verb governing the *tám*. There is also an element of “vertical mantra,” since the elements of the NP *tám stómam* are positioned “vertically” in identical metrical slots.

There is no resolution of the other problem, however: what governs this acc. phrase. *stómam* is immediately followed by the rel. prn. *yám* introducing a dependent clause (and reminding us of the *yáh* in the quoted formula). There is no overt governing verb in the main clause; all we know is that it should have Agni as subject, given the nom. part. *idhānāḥ*. Ge, flg. Sāy. and fld. by Re (in his tr., which reflects neither of his suggestions in the n.), supplies the impv. “hear.” This is of course nothing wrong with the sense of this (“[hear] this praise which ...”), but there is also nothing in context to support it. I have supplied “take to yourself,” assuming a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$. There are two pieces of supporting evidence for this. It could be generated (somewhat trickily) from *dadhidhvam*, the impv. in the previous verse. And — rather stronger evidence — a similar expression is found overtly in vs. 6: “you [=Agni] have taken to yourself the well-twisted (hymn)” (*dadhiṣe suvrktīm*), with a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ with Agni as subject and a praise as object. Old’s “nimm ... an” (both ZDMG 55.299 and Noten) coincides with my interpr., but he does not, as far as I can see, provide a motivation for it.

What to do with the rest of the first hemistich, namely *agnībhīr mānuṣaḥ*, is another problem. With Ge I take *mānuṣaḥ* as dependent on *hotar*, despite the distance between them and the fact that *mānuṣaḥ* is accented in a voc. phrase (easily accounted for

by the distance). The phrase *mānuṣo hōtar-* is common in the RV (e.g., I.180.9, II.18.2, IV.6.11, V.5.7). The instr. *agnībhiḥ* must be construed with the part. *idhānāḥ*, as witnessed by the identical expression in the next two hymns (VI.11.6b, 12.6b), but whether it is an instr. of accompaniment as I take it (“along with the [other] fires”), as apparently also Ge, or a true instrument (e.g., Re “allumé par les feux...”) isn’t certain — though I’m not sure what Re’s “being kindled by the fires” would mean.

The relative cl. of pāda c is in no better shape than the main clause of ab. It too lacks a verb. Though there *is* a finite verb in pāda d, *pavante*, it not only lacks an accent and therefore can’t be part of the rel. cl., but it is also intrans. and cannot take *yām* as object. Moreover, both *asmai* and *mamāteva* present difficulties of their own. Let us begin with *asmai*. It surely refers to the recipient of the praise, which just as surely must be Agni. But Agni is addressed in the extensive vocative phrase in ab, and so he must be present both as 2nd ps. addressee and 3rd ps. recipient in the same sentence. Switch of person even within a syntactic construction is of course not unusual. I have no particular answer to this example of it beyond suggesting that 1) the poet may have lost a bit of track of his referents in this syntactically truncated construction, and 2) *asmai* may also be serving as a near deictic, pointing to “this (Agni) here.” It is barely possible, but I think highly unlikely, that *asmai* refers to another ritual participant, despite Ludwig’s interpr. (see Ge n. 2c) “für diesen Opferer.”

mamāteva is presumably to be analyzed, with the Pp., as *mamātā iva*; the resulting *mamātā* is a hapax. It is generally taken as a PN (“like Mamatā”), an interpr. whose strongest support is the vṛddhi deriv. *māmateyā-*, usually a metronymic of Dīrghatamas (I.147.3, 152.6, 158.6, particularly clear in the last passage), which presupposes an underlying PN of this shape. Both the *-eyā-* suffix of *māmateyā-* and the name Mamatā itself suggest that the person may be female. However, there is some direct evidence that a masc. **mamāta-* is found in the Bharadvāja lineage. Cf. VI.50.15 *evā nāpāto māmā tāsya dhībhīr / bharādvājā abhī arcanti arkañ* “In just this way the Bharadvājas, the descendants of me, this Mamata, chant with their insightful thoughts, with their chants,” where *māmā tāsya* is probably a play on the PN. For disc. see Old, ZDMG 42.211–12 = KISch 580–81, though I do not think the text needs emending. However, our *mamātā* is also most probably a pun, on a *-tā-* abstract built to the gen. sg. of the 1st ps. pronoun; such a stem is attested Epic+ in the sense ‘Selbstsucht, Eigennutz’. In this reading it could be an instr. sg. of the *-tā-* stem, ‘with/in my me-ness,’ in addition to being a nom. ‘like Mamatā’. On these questions see now Mayr, PN 2.1.393. Old (ZDMG 55.298–99) explored the possibility of taking *mamātā* (or *-ta*) as the missing verb of the rel. cl., as did I, but both of us came up short.

It is therefore likely that another verb has to be supplied. Contextually, ‘sing, speak, chant’ vel sim., is likely, and both Ge and Re go in that direction, as do I. Specifically I supply a form of *√rc* ‘chant’, which takes *sūṣām* as obj. on a number of occasions (I.9.10, X.96.2, 133.1); see also VI.50.15 cited just above with the locution *abhī arcanti arkañ*. All three of us assume that the verb is 1st sg, although there is less support for that assumption, since there are no other 1st persons, sg. or pl., in the hymn. The pun “in my me-ness” that I see in *mamāteva* would provide some support for my “I,” but neither Ge nor Re so interprets *mamāteva*.

VI.10.3: This vs. also appears to be deliberately misleading, though less so than vs. 2. It begins *pīpāya sá* “he becomes swollen.” Although $\sqrt{pī}$ ‘swell’ is not a particularly Agnaic verb, it still could be applicable to the ritual fire, and the audience might expect an unidentified subject to be the deity of the hymn. But the second pāda, with dat. *agnāye* and nom. *vīprah*, contravenes our expectations: it is the poet who becomes swollen, as a result of his successful service to Agni.

I would emend the tr. of pāda a: *śrāvasā* should be rendered ‘with fame’, not ‘with praise’.

VI.10.5: The usual truncation of instr. pl. *ūtūbhiḥ* (appropriate to final position in Jagatī and in dimeter meters) to sg. *ūtī* in final position of a Triṣṭubh pāda. Cf., e.g., *nītamābhir ūtī* in VI.19.10 versus, e.g., V.40.3 (etc.) *citrābhir ūtūbhiḥ*. Our own hymn contains an ex. of the full instr. pl. phrase in 3c *#citrābhiḥ ... ūtūbhiḥ ... #*. I consider such truncations to be synchronically generated, providing no evidence for any deep historical practice.

The bahuvrīhi *puruvāja-* is a hapax and may be a play on the poetic lineage *bharadvāja-*, which name appears in 6c.

VI.10.6: Another slightly off expression: with monotonous regularity throughout the RV Agni is described as ‘sitting’ or ‘sitting down’ or ‘made to sit (down)’. Although ‘sit’ in these locutions is always expressed by the root \sqrt{sad} , it still seems odd to characterize the human ritualist as ‘sitting’ (*āsānāḥ*, using the regularized participle to $\sqrt{ās}$, not *āsīnā-*), in a context where we might expect the referent to be Agni.

The expression *dadhiṣe suvṛktīm* “repairs” both vs. 1 and vs. 2. In 1a we had the adj. *suvṛktīm*, which had to be a masc. referring to Agni and therefore a secondary bahuvrīhi. Here *suvṛktī-* has its usual meaning of ‘well-twisted (hymn)’ and is presumably fem. As for *dadhiṣe*, recall that I suggest supplying a medial form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ to govern *stómam* in 2. Here we have the full VP.

VI.10.7: The accent on *inuhí* can easily be explained as contrastive to the immediately following verb *vardháya*.

VI.11 Agni

VI.11.1: Although the vs. seems superficially straightforward, it presents a number of small difficulties. We might start with the meter of pāda c: in order to reach 11 syllables, something has to be distracted. HvN suggest *nāsatyā*, but this produces a bad cadence: – ~ ~ ×. Oldenberg (ZDMG 55.300 and Noten) instead suggests distracting the initial preverb *ā*, which produces an even worse cadence (*-ñā nāsatyā* – – – ×). And the third possibility, *nāsatyā*, produces a third type of bad cadence (~ ~ – ×). Only if we could read the first vowel of *nāsatyā* as distracted – ~ can we fix the cadence, but there is no real license for this.

The first morphological problem is *bādhaḥ* in pāda b. Gr takes it as the acc. pl. of a root noun ‘Treiber, Förderer’, but it is hard to fit this into the passage semantically. Schindler (Rt. nouns) finds the passage unclear and does not commit to a root noun interpr., much less a case form. Scar (346–47) takes it as a root noun, but in the abl. sg. (“aus dem Drängen heraus”), in which he calls a “hoffnungslos obskur” passage -- a

characterization that, given the super-abundance of hopelessly obscure parts of the RV, seems rather overdramatic for this minor conundrum. With Old (ZDMG 55.300), Ge, and Re -- and *pace* Scar (346–47) -- I take *bādhah* as an adverbially used neut. *s*-stem, like (and perhaps truncated from) *sabādhah*, also an adverbially nom.-acc. *s*-stem, which, however, Scar also thinks is an old abl. sg. of the root noun. However, even if Scar should be right, the interpr. of *bādhah* as abl. sg. of a root noun could be adapted to the adverbial interpr. with one further step (as he recognizes): ‘out of urgency’ → ‘urgently’.

The next question is the application of the simile *marútām ná práyukti* and the morphological identity of the last word. To start with the latter, with most interpr. I take it as an instr. **-tī* shortened in pause (or, with a more modern descrip., with loss of its final laryngeal in pause [and here before a vowel beginning the next hemistich]). But what does the hitching up of the Maruts have to do with Agni’s sacrificial performance? My assumption is that the simile is limited to qualifying the adverbial *bādhah* ‘pressingly, urgently’. Since everything the Maruts do is precipitous, no doubt the yoking up of their horses is performed with the same urgency, to get on the road as soon as possible. Both Ge and Re push *prá√yuj* further than I think it should go -- to ‘impulsion, instigation’ (“wie auf Betreiben der Marut” and “à l’instigation des Marut” respectively), a sense that seems distant from the ‘yoke, hitch up’ sense of *√yuj*. I also don’t see that the Maruts would be the ones to set Agni’s sacrificing in motion; they are not even associated with the dawn sacrifice and don’t have much to do with Agni. My “at the hitching up” reads as if it were a locative. Though that tr. was made for English parsing reasons, I might slightly alter it to “with the hitching up.”

In pāda d both Ge and Re (flg. Gr’s interpr.) take *hotrāya* as simply referring to the sacrifice (e.g., “zu unserm Opfer”), but *hotrá-* is elsewhere not the sacrifice, but the office of Hotar or the performance of the Hotar’s duties. My tr. (“turn [various gods] to the Hotar-work”) makes it seem that those gods will perform that office, but, since Agni is the Hotar par excellence (see, e.g., pāda a, also 2a, 6a), it must rather be that Agni is urged to cause the gods to turn towards his own performance of his duties. It might be clearer if the tr. read “toward my Hotar-work.”

VI.11.2: The disposition of the elements in pāda b is not entirely clear. In the publ. tr. I construe *antár* with *mártyeṣu* “(god) among men/mortals” and consider *vidáthā* an acc. of extent of time/occasion “through the rites.” Ge agrees with the first, but supplies a verb to govern *vidáthā*: *sādhān* “der ... die Opfer (zustande bringt),” on the basis of two passages containing this phrase (III.1.18, IV.16.3 *vidáthāni sādhān*). I did not believe then that these two passages constituted sufficient formulaic support for supplying a form of *√sādh*, but now I’m more sympathetic to Ge’s view. But there are also other possibilities. In Agni passages *antár* is often in a lexeme with *√i* or *√car*: ‘go between’ -- usually between heaven and earth or men and gods. Flg. Old and Re, such a lexeme, with the verb of motion supplied, could be construed with *vidáthā*: e.g., Re “(te mouvant) entre les participations-cultuelles.” And, if we take *vidátha-* in its occasional meaning of ‘(cosmic) divisions’, we can follow Thieme (Unters. 43) in his interpr. “zwischen den Verteilungen (Himmel, Luftraum, Erde) ist er, der Himmlische unter den Sterblichen.” Any of these is, in my opinion, possible, but I will stick with the publ. tr., as involving the least amount of extra manipulation.

Since *vāhnir āsā* is a fairly common locution (see passages assembled by Ge ad I.76.4), instr. *āsā* ‘with the mouth’ is not parallel to instr. *juhvā* ‘with the tongue’, despite grammatical and semantic similarity.

VI.11.3: There are several metrical problems in this vs. Pāda c has the caesura after 3; there seems no way to remedy this, and the rest of the meter is fine. Pāda a is rather more interesting: the Samhitā text as given yields 10 syllables; there are two possible distractions: *dhán(i)yā* (HvN’s choice) and *t(u)vé*, but both produce the same bad cadence ($\sim - - \times$). As Old points out (ZDMG 55.300 and Noten), if we distract neither of these choices, the vs. reads fine until the last word, with an opening of five and *dhiṣāṇā* taking post-caesura position. (It is worth noting that *dhiṣāṇā*- is almost always immediately post-caesura, whether after an opening of 4 or of 5.) All that’s wanting to make a fine Triṣṭubh line is a single light syllable preceding *váṣṭi*. Although I would not presume to supply such a syllable (nor does Old), it does seem preferable to allow for a rest here with syncopation, rather than to choose one of the two possible distractions that yield a bad cadence.

The syntax and exact sense of the first hemistich are somewhat unclear. Ge and Re take the pādas together, with *dhiṣāṇā* as subj. both of *váṣṭi* and of the infin. *yájadhyai* (approx. “the Holy Place wishes to sacrifice in you ...”). I have two objections to this interpr.: 1) as Old (ZDMG 55.300) points out (sim. Re; see below), it is Agni who should be doing the sacrificing (though I.109.4, where *dhiṣāṇā* presses soma willingly [*usātī*], renders this objection less forceful); 2) the *prá* beginning pāda b suggests that there’s an intermediate verb form between *váṣṭi* and the infinitive or at least that there’s a subclausal break at the pāda boundary. Re also notices the 2nd problem indirectly, suggesting in his n. an alternative tr. “elle veut (ceci): qu’(Agni) sacrifie en avant” (with the *prá* presumably represented by “en avant”). My publ. tr. reflects such an intermediate verb form, from a supplied form of $\sqrt{dhā}$, with a form of ‘you’ also to be supplied — with the sense “to (put) (you) forward to sacrifice ...” For $\sqrt{dhā}$ + *yájadhyai* see nearby VI.15.15 *ní tvā dadhīta ródasī yájadhyai* “One should set you [=Agni] down, to sacrifice to the two world-halves.” The locution *dhiṣāṇā* $\sqrt{dhā}$ is also quite common, aided by real or pseudo-etymological association; cf. III.31.13 ... *dhiṣāṇā* ... *dhāt*; III.56.6 *dhiṣaṇe* ... *dhāḥ*, IV.34.1 ... *dhiṣāṇā* ... *ádhāt*; VI.19.2 ... *dhiṣāṇā* ... *dhāt*; VII.90.3 ... *dhiṣāṇā dhāti*. However, I am now no longer sure that my objections to the standard tr. are strong enough to merit the additional complexity of my publ. interpr., and I am also disturbed by having to interpr. loc. *tvé* as “in regard to you.” The next hymn contains a passage that strongly encourages construing *tvé* here with *yájadhyai* “to sacrifice in you”: VI.12.2 *ā yásmin tvé ... yákṣat*. I would now alter the tr. here to “For even the wealthy Holy Place longs to sacrifice in you to the gods, to their races, for the singer” -- though I am still bothered by the *prá*.

Another problem in this syntagm is *devāñ jánma*. Old (explicitly, ZDMG 55.300) and Ge (in tr.) take *devāñ* as a gen. pl., a form that could either represent the survival of a very archaic PIE gen. in **-ōm* or the truncation of the standard form *devānām*. I do not think this nec., subscribing to Re’s assertion (in n.) “*devāñ jánma* ne comporte pas de désinence abrégée ou archaïque, mais signifie «la génération (, à savoir) les dieux»,” with *devāñ* and *jánma* as parallel acc. However, I now realize I cannot entirely gainsay the

other instances of *devāñ jánman-*, which also favor a gen. pl. and now suggest an alt. tr. “... sacrifice to the races of the gods.”

In the second hemistich the referent of the subj., *vépiṣṭho áṅgirasām ... vípraḥ* is in question. Ge, flg. Sāy., suggests the current poet, and the presence of the singer in b (*gr̥naté*) might support this view. However, his superlative status among the Áṅgirasas makes it more likely that it is Agni. Cf. the similar expression in I.127.1 *jyēṣṭham áṅgirasām vipra* “(We call upon you), o inspired poet, as the oldest/most important of the Áṅgirasas,” as well as the fairly frequent use of *áṅgirastama-* ‘first/best of the Áṅgirasas’ for Agni (I.31.2, 75.2; VIII.23.10, 43.18, 44.8). If Agni is the referent, there has been a switch from 2nd ps. reference (*tvé* in pāda a) to 3rd ps. reference here, but this is hardly novel. See the next vs. (5).

As disc. ad VI.3.6, I interpr. *rebhá-* not as ‘singer’, but as ‘hoarse/husky-voiced (singer)’, sometimes used of Agni, whose crackling is likened to singing. He is so identified nearby in VI.3.6, and the use of this adj. here is another piece of evidence that Agni is the referent of the subject in this hemistich.

In d *chandáh* is taken by Gr as the sole example of suffix-accented thematic *chandá-* (not only in the RV but, acdg. to Whit, Rts., anywhere), beside *chándā-*. Gr glosses our form ‘singend, preisend’ and *chándā-* as ‘glänzend, strahlend’; Ge, by contrast, takes it as an *s*-stem and dismisses the accent: “*chandáh* doch wohl für *chándāḥ*.” Pointing to the suggestive juxtaposition *mádhu chandáh* here, a near exact match for the PN *madhuchandah*, to whom the first ten hymns in the RV are ascribed (though the name doesn’t appear in the RV text), he tr. “seine süsse Weise.” Re follows suit (“le doux chant”), with the somewhat cryptic note “*chandáh* «qui charme», comme *chándāḥ*.” (Curiously, Old doesn’t comment.) Although I would like to be able to follow their interpr., with *chandáh* an anomalously accented neut. *s*-stem, rather than an *-á*-stem with Gr, I do not see any way to get the suffix accent redactionally or grammatically. My interpr. in the publ. tr. introduces complications, in order to avoid positing arbitrary accent shifts. I suggested that the form *is* an *s*-stem, derivationally related to neut. *chándas-* ‘rhythm, meter,’ showing the usual rightward accent shift of adjectival possessive derivatives to neut. *s*-stems -- hence ‘having rhythm’. I would have preferred that the form in the text were *chandās* (*chandā* in sandhi), describing Agni the poet, but it is not. I therefore suggested that it is either a neut. used adverbially (“rhythmically” as in the publ. tr.) or that it qualifies *mádhu* “rhythmic honey,” of the song. But as discussed ad V.52.12, VIII.7.36, and I.92.6 I am now disturbed by the late distribution of the neut. *s*-stem *chándas-*, which might call into question the existence of forms based on it deeply embedded in the core RV. I don’t quite know what to do and leave my unsatisfactory solution in place, at least for now.

VI.11.4: On *svápāka-* see comm. ad IV.3.2.

Note the switch from 3rd ps. reference (pāda a) to 2nd ps. (b). The 2nd ps. reference continues by default through the rest of the vs., though the publ. tr. appears to switch back to 3rd ps.: (“(anoint) him ...”) for Engl. convenience.

VI.11.5: Old (ZDMG 55.301), fld. by Ge and Re, interprets *vṛñjé* as a *t*-less 3rd sg. passive, rather than as the 1st sg. it appears to be. I do not see the necessity for this. The same VP is found in I.116.1 (... *bárhīr iva prá vṛñje*), where the 1st ps. interpr. is

reinforced by the flg. pāda containing the 1st sg. act. *iyarmi*. Further, in the almost identical pāda VII.2.4 *prā vṛñjate nāmasā barhír agnaú*, the med. 3rd pl. *vṛñjate* must be transitive with sg. *barhíḥ* as obj. The best support (see Old) for a pass. interpr. is that then all 4 pādas in this vs. would begin with a passive (b: *áyāmi*, c *ámyakṣi*, d *ásrāyi*), but in that case we might expect a form *more* parallel to the other three. Although *√vṛj* has no passive aorist attested, there are no morphological or phonological barriers to building **ávarji* (cf. the very common *ásarji* to *√srj* ‘discharge’). I confess I do not understand the sequence of tense, with pres. *vṛñjé* in the *yád* clause, followed by 3 main clause augmented aorists, but taking *vṛñjé* as a passive does not solve this problem.

I do not understand the semantic difference between *sádman-* and *sádana-*, if there is one.

VI.11.6: As noted above, ad VI.10.2, the phrase *agníbhīr idhānāḥ* is found both there and in the next hymn, VI.12.6. It therefore seems unlikely that *devébhiḥ* should be construed in this collocation, despite its apparent parallelism, and, with Ge and Re, I take it as an instr. of accomp. with *daśasyā*.

My interpr. of the simile in the 2nd hemistich differs from the standard. Ge and Re assume that the comparandum for *vṛjānaṃ ná* is *ámhaḥ*. Given the adjacency of the two expressions, this is reasonable. Ge’s version, however, relies on a somewhat unlikely interpr. (insofar as we understand this root) of *áti √sras* as ‘abstreifen’ (strip off): “... möchten wir die Not wie einen Gürtel abstreifen,” and the notion of “stripping off” *ámhas-* seems odd. Re’s “puissions nous ... glisser hors du défile-étroit comme (hors de) l’encerclement (ennemi)” does better with the verb, but requires *vṛjāna-* to have a particular negative sense not elsewhere met with (*pace* his citation of X.27.5). In the publ. tr. I take the simile with *rāyáḥ* .. *vāvasānāḥ* “clothing ourselves in riches,” comparing the wealth we wear with a girthband. For a very similar expression, cf. I.173.6 *sám vivya índro vṛjānaṃ ná bhūmā* “Indra has enwrapped himself in earth, like a circlet,” with the same simile. Although the distance between *rāyáḥ* and the simile might speak against this interpr., it does work better semantically, and the parallel passage provides strong support. It does give me pause, however, that MLW is not convinced and thinks *vṛjānaṃ ná* must be construed with *ámhaḥ*.

VI.12 Agni

VI.12.1: The ‘goad’ (*todá-*) found in VI.6.6 reappears here, as well as in vs. 3. Thus, 3 of the 5 occurrences of this word in the RV are found in this Agni cycle. In VI.6.6 I argue that the referent of the “great goad” is the sun (see comm. ad loc., sim. I.150.1). Old (ZDMG 55.301, also Noten) thinks the sun is the referent in our passage as well, and, further, he construes the gen. *todásya* in pāda b with *śocíṣā tatāna* in pāda d, on the basis of VI.6.6 *bhānúnā ... todásya ... tatantha*. Although the parallel is suggestive, the distance between the genitive and its supposed governing instr. in our passage seems too far, esp. since the 2nd hemistich begins *ayám sá* “here is he” or “this one here,” a sequence that seems to open a new (though co-referential) clause. Moreover, in vs. 3 *todá-* seems to refer to or be compared to Agni himself, and so the internal evidence of the hymn favors a connection of the goad with Agni, not directly with the sun. I therefore follow Ge in taking *todásya* as dependent on *rāt*, which also governs *barhíṣaḥ*. It may be that *rāt* ...

todāsya “ruler of the goad” is a phrase like *sūnūḥ sāhasaḥ* “son of strength” (see 1c), where “son of X” is tantamount to X. In the same way “ruler of the goad” may be the equivalent of “the goad” itself. Both the sun (“the great goad”) and Agni are goads because with their appearance at dawn they set the world in motion. Since Agni is often taken as an earthly form of the sun, sharing the same third party identity would not be surprising, with Agni being the lesser of the two by nature.

For Agni as “ruler of the ritual grass,” see VIII.13.4=15.5 ... *asyā barhīṣo ví rājasi*, though the subject there is Indra.

I take *yājadhyaī* as a predicated infinitive (sim. Ge, Re, Keydana [Inf., 171]). The VP *ródasī* √*yaj* is found elsewhere in this cycle: 11.4 *yājasva ródasī*, VI.15.15 *ní tvā dadhīta ródasī yājadhyaī*, with the same infinitive.

VI.12.2: On *svápāka*- ‘very clever’, also VI.11.4, see comm. ad IV.3.2. As noted there the Pp. analyses this sequence as *sū āpāka*-, though Ge and Re take it as a cmpd ‘having a lovely backside’. Kü (214), however, follows the Pp. analysis (also fld. by Gr), and tr. “von Ferne kommend” (as Gr does). I do not see how a derivation from *āpā(ñ)c*- ‘facing/turned backward’ could yield such a sense, esp. in a non-ablatival formation, and, furthermore, Agni, the most *present* of gods, should not be “coming from afar.” Keydana’s “der du entfernt bist” lacks the ablatival element but still runs afoul of the other problems just noted.

‘Heaven’ (*dyaúḥ*) is the performer of the sacrifice in Agni; the qualification *sarvātātā-iva* “as if in its entirety, in its entirety as it were” is explained, reasonably, by Ge as meaning the gods collectively, with *dyaúḥ* ‘heaven’ equivalent to “die Götterwelt.” Re follows this interpr., suggesting that *sarvātātā* is a variant of *devātātā*. For all the gods performing such sacrifice, see, e.g., X.88.7 adduced by Ge.

In tr. *yajatra* as ‘the means of sacrifice’ I am taking the *-tra*-instrument suffix seriously: Agni as the receptacle and recipient of the oblations is indeed the *means* to sacrifice.

In the publ. tr. the phrase introduced by the em-dash “— you the very clever ...” contains only vocatives, though for ease of English they do not read as vocc.

jāmhas- is found independently only here, but also appears in the bahuvrīhis *kṛṣṇā-jāmhas*- (I.141.7) and *raghupātma-jāmhas*- (in nearby VI.3.5). Though *jāmhas*- has no direct cognates and at best a root connection to IE **ǵhengh* ‘go’ (EWA s.v.), the cmpds occur in contexts that limit the semantic realm to birds (to which Agni is compared in both cases, as also here) and that point to a bird body part, *pace* Gr’s ‘Weg, Gang, Bahn’ -- wings, wing-feathers, or plumage. The question is what the point of comparison between the bird’s *jāmhas*- and three-seated (*triśadhástha*-) Agni is, if in fact the simile is meant to further characterize that descriptor. Ge suggests that a bird alighting from flight appears to settle on his two wings and his tail-feathers (though MLW points out to me that, observationally, a bird appears to settle not on its two wings, but its two *legs*). MLW then suggests that “maybe *jāmhas*- means originally ‘stride’ and then the ‘striding parts/ locomoting parts’ and finally ‘the bottom parts’” which in a bird may be three. Re, by contrast, takes the simile separate from *triśadhástha*- and also interprets *jāmhas*- as ‘enjambée’ (stride), though, as he explicitly admits, this involves “renouncing” the meaning ‘plumage’ that he ascribes to the same word in nearby VI.3.5,

because “on obtient un sens plus facile” (a very dangerous principle to apply to RVic lexicography!).

With most, I take *yájadhyai* again as a predicated inf. “(you are) to sacrifice,” as in vs. 1. Kü (214) curiously interprets it as passive (“... sind die Opfergaben ... zu opfern”), though, as Keydana (174 n. 171) points out, the nom. *triṣadhástḥaḥ* is then left hanging.

VI.12.3: The rel. cl. that begins this vs. cannot span the hemistich, since the verb that ends b, *adyaut*, is unaccented. There is the further problem, long noted (see Old ZDMG 55.302), that the apparently easy application of the initial adj. *téjīṣṭhā* to the next noun *aratīḥ* is problematic, because *aratī-* is masc. (though both Thieme [Unters. 29] and Re are willing to allow a fem. here, and Old toys with this notion). In my view the rel. cl. consists only of the first two words, *téjīṣṭhā yásya*, with *yásya* of course referring to Agni. The rest of the hemistich is couched in the nominative, with descriptors most naturally applicable to Agni (like *aratī-*, which generally has Agni as its referent), and so a syntactic shift must happen between the *yásya* and the following nominatives.

Therefore, a noun must be supplied with *téjīṣṭhā* in the rel. cl., as Old already suggested (ZDMG 55.302 n. 1). His candidates are ‘Glut’ or (in pl.) ‘Flammen’; Ge follows the former suggestion, supplying *tapanī* as in II.23.14. In contrast I suggest ‘course’. As we’ve seen, the Agni cycle of VI is tightly knit, and in VI.3.4 (a hymn with another connection to this one, disc. ad vs. 2) we find *tigmám cid éma ... yásya* “whose course is sharp ...” Of course, *éman-* is a neut. and cannot be supplied with fem. *téjīṣṭhā*, but cf. I.53.8 *téjīṣṭhayā ... vartanī*; *vartanī-* generally means ‘course, track’, though in that particular passage I take it as ‘(wheel)edge’. In any case that fem. would fit here nicely and match the “sharp course” of VI.3.4.

Note that both *(-)rāt* and *todā-* return from vs. 1. As discussed ad vs. 1, *todā-* now seems to apply directly to Agni. I take this word as part of the simile (so also Ge, Re), despite the right displacement of the simile particle, *todó ádhvan ná*, for which I have no explanation.

Hemistich-final *adyaut* echoes *dyaúḥ* at the end of 2b.

In c the first question is the meaning and root affiliation of the hapax *dravitā*. Older interpr. ascribe it to \sqrt{dru} ‘run’: Gr ‘Renner’, apparently (with some attenuation) Ge ‘Ausreisser’, while Re renders it as ‘fondeur’ (smelter), with, presumably, a developed sense of \sqrt{dru} . However, the set character of the agent noun makes this problematic, and Hoffmann (MSS 10 [1957] 70 = Aufs. 420) convincingly connects it with his set root $\sqrt{drū}$ ‘cut, reap’ -- an ascription that has been followed essentially by everyone since (e.g., EWA s.v. *DRAV*, Gotō 1st Kl., 138–39, Tichy Nom.Ag., 35, 285, Keydana Inf., 194 n. 18). The adj. characterizing this agent noun, *adroghá-*, is unexpected. It ordinarily means ‘undeceptive’ and qualifies speech (as in the bahuvrīhi *ádrogha-vāc-*), but “undeceptive reaper” is puzzling. I pushed the adjective further than it should probably go, to ‘undisguised’, which, in conjunction with *tmán* ‘in person’, may express that Agni’s role in cutting down plants is plainly evident to all. But the locution still seems awkward. Tichy’s ‘zuverlässig’ (trustworthy, reliable) mitigates some of this awkwardness and does not stray too far from the sense of the adj.; I would be inclined to emend my tr. to ‘trustworthy’.

In d *avartrá-* is likewise a hapax. It appears to be a bahuvrīhi built to *vártra-* (AV+) ‘dam, dike’; see Debr’s Nachtr. to AiG II.1 (p. 58).

VI.12.4: The first hemistich is partly assembled from material also found elsewhere: the quite straightforward 2nd pāda is identical to VII.12.2b. The post-caesura portion of the first pāda, *etārī ná sūṣaīḥ*, is also found at V.41.10, where the pre-caesura portion, *grñīté agnīḥ* ‘Agni is sung’, is functionally identical to our 2nd pāda (esp. *agnī ṣṭave* ‘Agni is praised’). On *etārī* as a loc., see comm. ad V.41.10; note that this word is a partial anagram of 3a *vanerāt*.

In c note the insistent phonetic figure: dr(ú)vanno **vanván** krát(u)vā ná árvā.

The interpr. of pāda d is difficult because of the highly unusual form *jārayāyi*, which has been much discussed (see esp. Old ZDMG 55.302–3). Since the hemistich otherwise lacks a verb form, it is tempting to see a verb here. But the accent makes trouble because this is a main clause with no syntactic break evident before the word. Nonetheless, it is generally taken as a nonce aor. passive and quite possibly a punning one: as a denom. to *jārā-* ‘wooner, lover’ (hence ‘become a wooer’) and as a pass. built to the caus. *jārayati* (/ *jaráyati*) ‘awaken’. The pun is most clearly expressed in Ge’s tr. “wie der Vater des Uṣas zum Buhlen ward, so wurde er durch die Opfer erweckt”; he takes it as referring to the myth of incest of Heaven, also signalled by the phrase *usrāḥ pitéva* ‘like the father of Dawn.’ Although I am always game (perhaps too game) to see puns everywhere in the RV, I am dubious about the one suggested here. For one thing the somewhat anomalous stem *uṣār-/usr-* is never used for personified Dawn, but only for the temporal dawn. (For supposed voc. *uṣar* in I.49.4 see comm. ad loc. and Lundquist 2014.) It seems unlikely that the stem typed for the goddess, *uṣās-*, would not be used in this myth where her identity is so very crucial. Moreover, I rather doubt that *usrāḥ* here is a gen. sg. with *pitéva*. Not only is the simile particle wrongly placed (though this is not rare), but *usrās* is almost always an acc. pl., which can express extent of time (e.g., VII.15.8). The solution I favor for *jārayāyi* is one also mentioned by Old, stemming from Ludwig, and endorsed by Debrunner in the Nachtr. to AiG I [p. 163] -- that it belong to a gerundive stem *jārayāy(i)ya-* ‘to be awakened’ and the expected nom. sg. **jārayāy(i)yaḥ* lost its final syllable by haplology before *yajñāḥ*, not surprisingly in this *y(a)*-rich environment. This gerundive is predicated and serves in lieu of a finite verb. For a similarly formed predicated gerundive, see nearby *trayayāy(i)yaḥ* at VI.2.7.

VI.12.5: With *tákṣat* we can supply *vānā* on the basis of I.127.4, as noticed by the standard comm.

ṛṇā- is otherwise neut., meaning ‘debt’ (Gr’s supposed fem. *ṛṇā* in X.127.7 is actually a neut. pl.). I am inclined to assume that this masc. nom. sg. is a nonce application. But see the cmpd. *ṛṇa-cyút-* ‘shaking the debtor’ in VI.61.1, in which I also interpr. *ṛṇa-* as masc. and animate. I would now suggest that the masc. may have been extracted from the privative bahuvrīhi *anṛṇā-* ‘without debt’, which, though not found in the RV (perhaps because it belongs to the technical legal register), is reasonably well established in the AV.

The last word of the vs., *rāt*, seems to reprise the similarly pāda-final *rāt* in 1a and *vanerāt* in 3a, but because it is unaccented, it must be a verb form belonging to *√rāj* ‘go straight’.

VI.12.6: In the first pāda as transmitted (metrically faulty), there is a hapax *nídāyā(h)* supposed built to a fem. *nídā-* ‘scorn’. There is no verb to govern this word, so “protect” vel sim. must be supplied. Ge adduces nearby VI.14.5 *nídāḥ ... uruṣyāti*, while Gr suggests II.34.15 *nídó muñcātha*. I am now somewhat more sympathetic to these makeshifts than I was when I produced the publ. tr., but the fact remains that protection from scorn would be rather intrusive in the passage, in a hymn that focuses almost exclusively on Agni’s travel and speed. In the publ. tr. I suggest a different analysis of the sequence, which I still favor: *arvann íd *āyāḥ*, resegmenting the Pp. analysis and taking *āyā(h)* to *ā√yā* ‘drive here’. This requires an alteration of the Saṃhitā text by accenting *āyāḥ*. The posited verb form could be an impf., injunc., or subj. to the root pres. to this root, or an indic. or injunc. to the *s*-aorist. Since no other such forms occur unambiguously in the RV, it could have been reanalyzed and lost accent. For a possibly similar form see *yā(h)* in V.33.2 and comm. ad loc. Although the particle *íd* would be slightly oddly positioned after a voc., it is fairly regular in pre-verbal position when the verb is final in its pāda (e.g., in this maṇḍala VI.19.13 *śátroḥ-śatror úttara ít syāma*, 42.3 *dhṛṣát tám-tam íd eṣate*, 45.7 *yó gṛnatām íd āsitha*). Note also the phonetic figure closing a and b: *nídāyā(h)ḥ ... idhānāḥḥ*, which would be stronger if the first was *ídāyā(h)*.

VI.13 Agni

VI.13.1: The voc. *ágne* was omitted from the publ. tr.

Although *śruṣṭī* can represent nom. sg. *śruṣṭiḥ* and is so taken by Ge, Re (and seriously entertained by Old), I accept the traditional analysis as instr. sg. (allowed by Ge in n. 1c); elsewhere the instr. sg. form is almost always pāda-initial as here, whereas the rare nom. sg. never is. The point seems to be that Agni listens to us attentively and subsequently metes out rewards.

VI.13.2: As usual, the form *iśé* is subject to multiple possible analyses, but most interpr. opt for a dat. of *iś-* ‘refreshment’, as do I. With most (but not Old), I split pāda a into two nominal clauses, based on the apparently clause-initial sequence *ā hí* after the caesura. The enclitic *naḥ* must of course belong properly to the 1st clause, though it can be understood with the 2nd as well.

In pāda b, the referent in the simile qualified as *párijmā* ‘encompassing’ has been variously identified: Ge (sim. Lü) Vāyu, Re the sun or Agni solaire, Gr Agni himself. By contrast, I supply ‘household’ (*gáya-*), on the basis of nearby VI.2.8, where Agni is said to be *párijmeva ... gáyah* “encompassing like a household” (on which see comm. ad loc.). This simile would play on Agni’s well-known connection to the domestic sphere. The point of comparison is that the household is the unit that controls the wealth of its members. I supply “over treasure” on the basis of *rátanam* in pāda a; *kṣayasi* in b needs a gen. complement to parallel the simile in c: *mitró ná brhatá rtásya*. 3

VI.13.3: The anomalous root pres. *bharti* (otherwise found only at I.173.6) here immediately precedes *vājam* and therefore evokes the poet of this maṇḍala, Bharadvāja. As is remarked elsewhere in the comm. to VI (passim), there is much play with this name. Here it is possible that the nonce athematic form *bharti* was substituted for a

thematic injunctive *bharad* because the latter produces a bad cadence. This does not account for *bhārti* in I.173.6, but I am way off ascribing deep archaism to *bhārti* (as is often done; see, e.g., A. Willi, *Origins of the Greek Verb*, 177, 197).

VI.13.4: The sequence *vedyānaṭ* is emended by Old (ZDMG 55.304 and Noten) to *védyānaṭ* with two accents (that is, underlying *védyā* or *védī* ‘with the altar’ + *ānaṭ*). He convincingly adduces nearby VI.1.10 *védī sūno sahaso gīrbhir ukthaiḥ*, identical to our pāda a save for the first word. See comm. ad loc. The standard interpr. read *vedyā* (Ge, Re, Lub, etc.) with the Pp and render as ‘with wisdom’ vel sim. It’s worth noting that *vedyā-* is otherwise only plural, an argument about ascribing our sg. form to that stem.

With Ge I think *prāti vāram* should be construed together, even though the standard expression is *prāti vāram* (II.11.21, etc.). Re suggests a haplology from **prāti vāram vāram*, but this seems unnecessarily complex. I consider *vāram* from **vāram* a minor metrical adjustment to fit a Triṣṭubh cadence. And see immed. below for another possible lengthening.

Ge takes *dhānyā-* as ‘grain’, a deriv. of *dhānā-* ‘id.’. Certainly the other occurrence of *dhānyā-* does have this meaning (V.53.13; cf. also *dhānyākṛt-* X.94.13), but here a deriv. of *dhāna-* ‘wealth’ makes more sense (see Re’s ‘richesse’). Old suggests emending to *dhānyam*, which exists in this meaning, but I don’t see the need for this. Why not simply take it as a (nonce) *-ya*-suffixed vṛddhi deriv. of *dhāna-* (on such formations see AiG II.2.834ff.), since vṛddhi derivatives are fairly prominent in this hymn (*saúbhagāni* 1a, *sauśravasā* 5a)?

VI.13.5: Despite their distance from each other, the two datives *nībhyaḥ ... puṣyāse* seem to form a de facto infinitive phrase: “for men to thrive” -- although it is certainly possible to construe them as separate datives with *dhāḥ* “establish (goods) for men, (goods) for thriving.”

I supply ‘goods’ with the neut. pl. adjectives *sauśravasā suvīrā*, on the basis of *vasavyaiḥ*, the last word of the preceding vs. (sim., Re “[choses]”). It would also be possible, with Ge, to take *sauśravasā* as a substantive: “Diese Ruhmesherrlichkeiten.” Cf. also Thieme (Fremdl., 47).

On first encounter the sentiment of cd is unsettling. What the text seems to say -- and what I think it does say -- is that Agni provides good things for the archetypal pair of inimical creatures, the wolf (*vīka-*) and the stranger (*arī-*). (For the pairing, see, e.g., nearby VI.15.3, where Agni is asked to keep us free of them.) It seems even worse that what Agni provides in our vs. is “an abundance of livestock” (*bhūri paśvāḥ*; cf. nearby VI.1.12) that becomes *vāyas-* (‘vigor, vital energy’) for those creatures: in other words he deprives human communities of their domestic livestock in order to feed hungry wild beasts and outlaws. There have been two basic responses to this apparent breach of the divine/human compact. Acdg. to Old (ZDMG 55.305), since Agni provides even for the wolf and so on, he should most definitely provide at least as much for us. Ge more or less follows this interpr. (see n. 5d), as do I. It is supported by a similar passage in an Ásvin hymn, VII.68.8 (also adduced by Ge) *vīkāya cid jāsamānāya śaktam* “Do as you are able, even on behalf of a wolf that is worn out.” Note the *cid*, which is unfortunately missing in our passage. (Cf. also VI.45.2 *avipré cid vāyo dādhat* “placing vitality even in the uninspired,” with the VP *vāyah √ dhā* as here and a *cid*.) By contrast, Thieme (Fremdl.,

47), fld. by Re, interprets the dat. phrase *vīkāyāraye jāsuraye* not as a dative of benefit, but of malefit, as it were: “...wenn du gross machst die Lebenskraft des Viehs durch deine Stärk für den (i.e. zur Verteidigung gegen den) Wolf, den Fremdling, der verschmachtet.” The slipperiness of glossing “for” as “for defense against” seems unacceptable to me, a clear instance of allowing our contextual expectations to trample the grammar. Th also severs the little formula *bhūri paśvāḥ* (found in nearby VI.1.12, as already noted, as well as III.54.15), taking the gen. *paśvāḥ* with *vāyaḥ* (“die Lebenskraft des Viehs”) and *bhūri* as part of a phrasal verb with *kṛṇōṣi* (“wenn du gross machst”). Re’s interpr. basically follows Th’s, with some curlicues of its own.

Although Th/Re produce a more acceptable sense, they do so at the expense of the clarity of the grammar, which is supported by a number of parallel passages. I think we must accept that Agni is providing for these undesirables. It might be worthwhile to speculate about what the real world analogue might be. Here I suggest (with no certainty at all) that this might be a forest fire. MBh I.217–19 depicts the horrific burning of the Khāṇḍava Forest, in which most of the animal denizens of the forest were killed in the conflagration and those that tried to escape were cut down by men stationed at the perimeter. Although in the MBh account there is no difference between prey animals and their prey -- they all perish -- it does suggest an analogue, that wolves and outlaw men might capitalize on the panic roused by a forest fire to capture easy pickings. An internet search turns up a passage in J. F. Bendell, “Effect of Fire on Birds and Mammals” (in *Fire and Ecosystems*, ed. T. T. Kozlowski, 1974), 75: “many birds and mammals are attracted by fires, probably to feed upon prey driven from their homes. Komarek (1969) mentioned species of birds in Australia, Africa, and North America that come to and hunt in front of fires.”

On the meter of d see Old ZDMG 55.305 and Noten.

VI.13.6: Both Ge and Re separate pādas a and b, and Ge’s tr. seems at least potentially to take the subj. of a, *vadmā*, as non-coreferential with Agni (“Ein Redner ... (werde) uns ... zuteil”), but since *vadmān-* occurs only here and in nearby VI.4.4, where it definitely refers to Agni, I do not see the point.

A factor influencing the Ge/Re separation of the pādas may be the apparent presence of enclitic *naḥ* in both pādas: ... *no vīhāyā(h)ḥ* / ... *no dāḥḥ*. However, the second *naḥ* should almost certainly be read as the final syllable of the preceding *vājī*, thus **vājīnaḥ*, acc. pl. of *vājīn-*, a possibility floated by Ge in n. 6b. Note only does this reading eliminate the pleonastic enclitic, but it also eliminates the only supposed neut. nom./acc. sg. to *vājīn-*, which would be required to modify neut. *tókam* (e.g., Ge “siegestekrönten leiblichen Samen”). A change is only required in the Pp.; the Saṃhitā text is undisturbed. An asterisk should be inserted in the publ. tr. before “prize-winning.”

The seemingly late position of *naḥ* in pāda a, before the final word *vīhāyāḥ*, is actually not so late after all: it can count as (modified) Wackernagel’s position, after an accented initial word (*vadmā*) followed by the phrasal vocative *sūno sahasaḥ*.

VI.14 Agni

VI.14.1: This vs. is beset with small difficulties, which add up. To begin with, what should be done with *dúvaḥ* in the first pāda? Since the first hemistich has only a single

expressed verb, *jujōṣa*, the question is whether both *dúvaḥ* ‘friendship’ and *dhíyam* ‘insight’ are objects of this verb. Re (flg. Gonda) takes the two nouns as appositional and both objects of *jujōṣa*: “Le mortel qui a-toujours goûté en Agni le privilège (de) la vision-poétique,” but this depends on his particular interpr. of *dúvas-* and, even with that, doesn’t make a lot of sense to me. Ge in his n. 1ab calls *jujōṣa* a Zeugma, which I think *ought* to mean that both nouns are its object, with slightly different senses of the verb -- but in fact he supplies a separate verb with *dúvaḥ*: “Welcher Sterblicher Agni die schuldige Achtung (erweist) und mit seinen Gedanken gern (seiner) gedenkt.” Since he seems to take *dhíyam jujōṣa* as a phrasal verb “gern (seiner) gedenkt” [think well of him, vel sim.], he may be using Zeugma in a different sense (unless he’s taking “erweist” as a different sense of *jujōṣa*). But I do not see submerging the distinct sense of $\sqrt{juṣ}$ ‘taste, enjoy’ into an anodyne idiom with *dhī-*, ‘think well of’, and I don’t see how he could get that out of the two words that go into it. In the publ. tr. my solution to the *dúvaḥ* problem was to supply a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ as in IV.8.6 (also adduced by Ge), I.4.5, VII.20.6, all with acc. *dúvas-* + LOC, as here. It would also be possible to supply a form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$, as in III.16.4, IV.2.9, VIII.31.9 with the same complements. However, the two hymns following this one each contain a form of \sqrt{van} ‘win’ with *dúvas-* as obj.: VI.15.6, 16.18, and I would therefore change my tr. to “(has won/wins) friendship in/by Agni.”

In the second pāda we encounter two closely related stems: the root noun *dhī-* as object of *jujōṣa* and the instr. *dhītūbhiḥ* to the *-tī-* stem to the same root, and some distinction must be meant. In my opinion, *dhīt-*, esp. in the plural, are generally the insightful thoughts of the human poet, whereas *dhī-* can be the insight that gods bestow on that very poet and that gives rise to his *dhīt-*, and those two values are found in our passage: the poet savors the *dhī-* that Agni provides him, which is manifested in the poet’s *dhīt-*.

The second hemistich presents more problems, beginning with the first word: *bhāsan* is analyzed by the Pp. as *bhāsat*, hence as a finite verb form -- either an injunc. to a thematic stem *bhāsa-* (so Gr, Macd VGS, tentatively Whitney Rts) or the subjunctive to a root aor. (so Gotō, 1st Kl, 82; also EWA s.v. *BHAS*¹). This is not impossible, but I take the underlying form to be the same as the sandhi form, *bhāsan*, and, with Old (ZDMG 55.305–6, Noten), identify it as a act. part. nom. sg. masc. The question is to what stem. Although as just noted, the older authorities posit a them. pres. *bhāsa-*, in fact the other two forms to this putative stem, *bhāsat* VI.3.4 and *bhasáthas* VI.59.4, are more likely root aor. subjunctives (see Gotō ref. above and my comm. ad locc.) Of course, a root aor. participle should technically be **psán*, but one wonders how long that would last. In any case, taking it as a finite form would not appreciably change the meaning of the hemistich; in that case I would alter the tr. to “he will chew it now; he should ...”

The pāda-medial sequence *X nú śá prá* is somewhat puzzling, since both *śá* and *prá* seem out of place. Gr takes *prá* with *bhāsan*, but I think it goes more naturally with *vurīta*, though in either case the position of the preverb is odd. I’m also not sure what, if anything, the retroflexion of *śá* after *nú* is telling us. I have found no other examples of this sequence, though cf. VIII.27.18 with ... *páro nú śāḥ*, without retroflexion.

The next question is what \sqrt{bhas} ‘bite, chew’ is doing in this context. Ge tr. “der soll zuerst den Mund auf tun,” remarking in his n. 1c that it means something like ‘yawn, gape’ -- but he doesn’t explain what this means in context. Both Old and Re supply “enemies” as obj. (e.g., Old “... möge (seine Feinde) zermalmend”); this makes

somewhat more sense, esp. given the hostile sentiments later in the hymn. But I think it can be better integrated into the context of the vs. in which it's found. The vs. has a sequence of verbs $\sqrt{juṣ}$ 'taste, savor, enjoy' -- \sqrt{bhas} 'bite, chew' -- $\sqrt{iṣam}$ $\sqrt{vṛ}$ 'choose (as) refreshment / nourishment', all centering on eating. In my view they all take the same object, *dhīyam*, and all metaphorically refer to the mortal poet's eating the insight that Agni has conferred on him -- that is, consuming it and turning it into his own substance. It is a striking image.

VI.14.3: As discussed ad IV.48.1 and VI.1.5, I take the phrase *rāyo aryāḥ* "the riches of the stranger" here and in IV.48.1 (cf. also VI.47.9; also *aryāḥ ... rayīḥ* in VI.20.1) and the phrase *rāya ubhāyāso jānānām* "both the riches of the peoples" in VI.1.5 as referring metaphorically to people, as the most valuable resource of a society. In our passage there are three different parallel designations for these same people: "the clans of Manu" (*mānuṣo viśaḥ*) understood from the last pāda of the previous vs. (2d), "the riches of the Ārya" (pāda b), and "the Āyus" (*āyāvaḥ* in c). To make matters more complex, these people are not only contending among themselves -- that is, divided and engaging in internal conflict -- but are also fighting united against common enemies, namely the Dasyu (*dāsyum*) and one without commandment (*avratām*), as was already seen by Ge (n. 3). This is the usual "fission and fusion" model of Rigvedic society, as discussed at length by Proferes (2007, esp. Chap. 2). The internal conflict is expressed in the first hemistich by the reciprocal verb *spārdhante* 'they contend with each other', while the second hemistich concerns their joint enterprises, expressed by the participles *tūrvantaḥ* 'overcoming' and *śīkṣantaḥ* 'seeking to vanquish'.

VI.14.4: The hero whom Agni bestows here is the concrete realization of the help (*avas*-) sought in vss. 1 and 3.

The standard interpr. (though not Gr) construe *sāvasaḥ* with *bhiyā* "with fear of his vast power." This is certainly possible, but a construction with *saṃcākṣi* seems equally possible and the adjacency of the two words (though across a pāda boundary) very weakly supports my interpr.

VI.14.5: By my interpr. *rayīḥ* here has the same metaphorical sense as *rāyaḥ* in 3, namely manpower, or perhaps more narrowly the hero given by Agni in 4. Both Ge and Re take *sahāvā* 'victorious' as an epithet of Agni, despite the hemistich boundary. This is presumably because the adj. is felt to be more appropriate for an animate being than for wealth -- but this problem disappears if we take wealth figuratively for manpower. (They may also unconsciously take the 2nd position of *yāsya* in c as an indication that the rel. cl. begins there, though of course they regularly interpret 2nd position relatives correctly.) The repeated adj. *āvṛtaḥ* is also better applied to an animate being (4x of Indra, once [oddly] of barhis), and it must belong to the rel. cl.

VI.15 Agni

VI.15.1: On *rñjase* see comm. ad IV.8.1. A tr. "aim at/towards" would be more transparent here.

The problematic pāda here is c: *divāḥ*, *kác cid*, and *ā* are difficult to construe and interpret. Ge takes the first as referring to ‘day’ rather than ‘heaven’ and makes it dependent on *kác cid*: “zu jeglicher Zeit des Tages,” but *divāḥ* is far more often ‘heaven’ than ‘day’ (the latter sense usually confined to use with *trír ā* and a few temporal adverbs). Re takes *divāḥ* as an abl. of ‘heaven’ (“Il s’avance du ciel”), and he takes the *kác cid* adverbially with *janúṣā ... śúciḥ* (“pur de toute manière quant à la naissance,” where the indefinite sense of *kác cid* has been replaced by a totalizing one). In the publ. tr. I agree with Re in taking *divāḥ* as ablative of ‘heaven’, construing it with distant *ā*, and supply ‘food’ with *kác cid*. But I now don’t think this makes much sense. I will suggest an alternative that makes more sense, but that doesn’t solve all the difficulties and requires some special pleading.

First I’d observe that the word order in this pāda seems particularly contorted. I ascribe this to the position of *janúṣā*: this instr. occurs 20 times in the RV and it always occurs immediately after the caesura, whatever its function in the clause. In this particular case, it is generally agreed that *janúṣā* should be construed with *śúciḥ* (see Ge’s n. 1c), despite the intervening material. I’d argue that the need to plunk down *janúṣā* smack in the middle of the pāda has disrupted the constituencies of the rest of the pāda as well. Therefore, we cannot use word order and adjacency as reliable guides here (even less so than in the rest of the RV).

Now, let’s start with the verb *véti*, which opens the pāda, and with the observation that the poet of this hymn is supposed to be Vītahavya, who is in fact mentioned in both the other vss. of the trca (2c, 3d). If we decompose this cmpd. name we can make a putative *havyām* ‘oblation’ the object of *véti* (cf. I.74.4 *véṣi havyāni*; sim. III.53.1, VI.60.15, etc.; for similar gapping in this hymn, see 14b), which can be qualified by *kác cid*: “he pursues any (oblation) whatever.” I further suggest that *divāḥ* should be construed with *ā*, as in my publ. interpr., but that here *ā* means ‘all the way to X’, rather than ‘from X here’. Although in the ‘all the way to’ sense, *ā* normally precedes the ablative (see Gr, s.v. *ā*), as already noted, the word order in this pāda seems particularly scrambled, and, in any case, *ā* often follows an acc. in the ‘to’ sense. I would therefore now substitute the tr. “Just he, blazing from birth, pursues any oblation whatever all the way to heaven.” This would be a description of the flames rising up towards heaven as they carry the oblation up to the gods.

The next pāda is implicitly contrastive: although the flames of the ritual fire actively reach for heaven in pāda c, the fire itself, just kindled, starts by burning the kindling sticks, which are immovable as opposed to the oblation later poured into the fire.

The cadence of d is bad.

VI.15.2–3: In accord with the standard interpr., in the publ. tr. I take *vītā-havya-* in 2c and 3d as a PN, which the Anukr. also provides as the name of the poet of this hymn. But since in VII.19.3 the cmpd is an adj. modifying Sudās (‘whose oblation is pursued’), I now think it likely that the same adjectival value should be slotted in here as well: “well pleased in the one whose oblations is pursued” and “for the one whose oblation is pursued.” See also disc. of *vītī-hotra-* ad II.38.1. The Anukr. ascription was transparently plucked from these two vss.

VI.15.2: The first hemistich treats Agni in the accusative, so that no grammatical person needs to be expressed. It therefore appears to continue the 3rd ps. of vs. 1, but modulates to the 2nd ps. reference of cd.

VI.15.4: As noted in the publ. intro., this initial vs. of the 2nd ṛca is a variant on the 1st hemistich of the 1st ṛca: in their first pādas an opening of 5 ending in *vo* is followed by *ātithim*; the end of the 2nd pāda of vs. 1, *ṛñjase girā*, is reprised by 4cd ... *suvṛktībhiḥ*, ... *ṛñjase*.

VI.15.5: In b both Ge and Re take *uśāsaḥ* as a nom. pl. rather than a gen. sg. as I do (e.g., “comme les aurores avec leur rayon”). Either would work contextually. However, in IV.1.17 in the phrase *uśāso bhānūḥ* (like our *uśāso ná bhānúnā*), *uśāsaḥ* has to be gen. sg. and Ge so interprets it there.

In c and d I take the crucial terms with double reference, in both simile and frame. In c this term is the pres. part. *tūrvan*: in the frame it refers to Agni and is construed with loc. *yāman* “going in triumph on his course”; in the simile it is construed with loc. *rāṇe* “like the victor in the battle.” The battle with (lit. of) Etaśa is a reference to the conflict between Indra and the Sun involving the Sun’s horse Etaśa in some unfortunately puzzling way. To make this clear, “battle over Etaśa would be a better rendering, as MLW points out to me. A further resonance of this phrase *tūrvan ná yāman* is the PN Tūrvayāṇa found several times in the RV, incl. nearby VI.18.13.

nū in c seems to have no function and is curiously positioned, though it might be noted that there’s a minority position of *nū/nū*, penultimate in the pāda, and this is fairly common in VI.

As for d, the standard interpr. (Old ZDMG 313 + Noten, Ge, Re) take the part. *tatṛṣṇānāḥ* only with the simile; this requires supplying an elaborate verbal predicate (“goes to water”) that is not found in the Sanskrit; cf., e.g., Old “er der herbei (eilt) wie im Sonnenbrand der Durstende (zum Wasser eilt).” I again think that the participle applies in both simile and frame: in the simile it refers to someone becoming thirsty in the (sun’s) heat, whereas in the frame it refers to Agni “thirsting” for oblations. This participle is used unambiguously of Agni elsewhere (I.31.7, II.4.6) in describing his voracious appetite for fuel.

In a clever poetic trick the sun is referred to indirectly in both c (his horse Etaśa) and d (his heat: *ghṛnā*).

VI.15.6: The locatival inf. *gṛñṣāṇi* occurs only here and in VIII.12.19. Curiously, in both passages it is construed with āmreḍitas: here *priyām-priyam ... ātithim* (matching *agnīm-agnim* in pāda a), in VIII.12.19 *devām-devam ... índram-índram*. I don’t quite know what to do with this fact. Keydana (p. 178) takes it as a “Matrixinfinitiv” functionally equivalent to an imperative, pointing to impv. *duvasyata* in pāda a. However, it would also be possible to interpret it as I do, with *duvasyata* the main verb of both pādas and the infinitive an adverbial adjunct to both pādas. I would change the tr. of the āmreḍitas, however, to one more in harmony with that in VIII.12.19: “Time after time do friendly service to the fire with a kindling stick, time after time to your dear guest, in hymning (him).”

The morphology of *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi* is of course unusual, though it belongs with the small group of RV *-san-i* locative infinitives, some of which (cf. esp. *upastr̥ṇīṣāṇi*, which, however, I now consider to be based on *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi*; see comm. ad VI.44.6) are built to already derived verbal stems (see AiG II.2.924–25). In this passage it phonologically echoes *ghṛṇé* and *tatr̥ṣāṇāḥ* in the preceding vs. (5d), and in the next vs. (which also belongs to the next *ṛca*) *pāda*-final *gr̥ṇe*, which is also of course etymologically related.

VI.15.7: This vs. begins a new *ṛca*, but seems like a mish-mash of the vss. that precede it. The 1st *pāda*, *sámidham agnīm samídhā girā gr̥ṇe*, telescopes vs. 6: *agnīm-agnīm ... samídhā* (a), *gr̥ṇīṣāṇi* (b), *gīrbhiḥ* (c). It also contains two etymological figures (*sámidham ... samídhā* and *girā gr̥ṇe*). The next *pāda*, *śúcim pāvakām puró adhvaré dhruvám*, is more eclectic in its sources: *śúciḥ* (1c), *pāvakáyā* (5a), *svadhvarám* (4b); *pāda*-final *dhruvám* has no direct correspondent, but resonates with both *dúvaḥ* (*pāda*-final in 6e) and *adrúham*, which ends the next *pāda* (7c). The first two words of *pāda* c, *vīpram hótāram* have correspondents in 4c and b respectively. Only *pāda* d breaks significantly new ground.

VI.15.9: The publ. tr. fails to tr. *dūtó devānām*. The tr. should be emended to “... as messenger of the gods, you speed ...”

The lexeme *vī√bhūṣ* occurs only here and I.112.4 until Epic, and it is not entirely clear what it means here. “Seeking manifestation” of the publ. tr. depends on the usage of rare *vī√bhū*, which can mean ‘become manifest’; an example is found (at least by my lights) in vs. 14. But it might have the less marked meaning ‘becoming conspicuous, distinguished’ or ‘becoming extended/extensive’. In any case it picks up *vībhúm*, which opens the last *pāda* of the preceding vs. Note also the polarized preverbs *vī* and *sám* at opposite ends of the hemistich.

The Pp. takes *ubháyāṁ* as acc. pl. masc. *ubháyān* (so also Gr), but as Old suggests (ZDMG 55.313, Noten), it could be neut. pl. *ubháyā* with nasalization in hiatus, and a neut. pl. construed with *vratā* is an attractive choice here. The phrase *ubháyā(ṁ) ánu vratā* “following both (kinds of) commandments” would of course refer to those of gods and men, who were mentioned in 8c.

VI.15.10: This vs. is rhetorically pleasing, though unremarkable in content. It opens with three cmpds with *su-* as first member, all in the realm of appearance (at least as I interpret the sequence) *suprátikam sudṛśam s(u)vāñcam*. The next *pāda* juxtaposes a negated form of the pf. part. of *√vid* with a comparative built to the same stem (though different allomorph), *ávidvāṁso vidúṣṭaram*, picked up by a third form to this participle, *vidvān*, at the end of the next *pāda* -- which itself participates in an alliterative sequence *vísuvā vayúnāni vidvān*.

svāñc- of course patterns and inflects with the *-añc-* stems, generally built to preverbs/adverbs in the meaning of ‘directed’ (e.g., *údañc-* ‘directed upward’), and in 2 of its 6 occurrences (IV.6.9, VII.56.16) the context favors the sense ‘well-directed’ (VI.58.4 is unclear). But here, as well as in similar adjectival sequences in VII.10.3 and in IX.73.7, it appears with words referring to seeing or appearance, and I suggest that this usage preserves a semantic relic of the ‘eye’ word (**h₃ekʷ*) that, according to most, is one contributor to the blend that produces the hybrid suffix *-añc-* (see, e.g., AiG III.230). I

therefore render it in these contexts as ‘of lovely outlook’ (contra Ge’s ‘schön von ... Bewegung’). Re’s ‘de belle allure’ avoids the directional sense and may reflect an analysis similar to mine, but he does not comment. A zero-grade of the ‘eye’ word is also buried in *prātīka-*, also found in our sequence (*suprātīka-*), and in *ānīka*, which contributes *svanīka-* in 16a (for both see EWA s.vv.).

Although pāda-final *vidvān* is generally used absolutely, here it must take an object, *vayúnāni*.

The clear *s*-aor. subj. *yakṣat* in c invites a subjunctive reading of *vocat* in the next pāda, though it is of course injunctive. Nonetheless, modal readings are quite common for this stem.

VI.15.11: This vs. is unusually conjunction-heavy, with *utā* in pāda a (conjoining clauses) and in d (conjoining nouns), and *vā* 3x in c. In fact there at first appear to be more *vā*’s than there are constituents to conjoin: *yajñāsya vā nísitim vā-úditim vā*. However, Klein (DGRV II.195) plausibly explains the first *vā* as sentential (I would prefer the term ‘clausal’ in this case), connecting pāda b with its relative clause *yáh ... ānaṭ ...* with its continuation in pāda c. The other two *vā*’s are subclausal, conjoining the two *-ti*-stem action noun phrases, *nísitim vā-úditim vā*, both of which govern the gen. *yajñāsya*, the constituency being interrupted by the clausal *vā* in Wackernagel’s position.

In c I assume that the verb is a gapped repetition of *ānaṭ*. Klein tr. the skeleton of bc as “who has attained ... or (has brought about) ...,” so I assume he thinks c has a different underlying verb from b. But the full VP *nísitim ... ānaṭ* in nearby VI.13.4, as well as VI.2.5 *nísitim ... naśat* also in this Agni cycle, establish this as a ritual idiom.

Note the complementary preverbs *ní* ‘down’ and *úd* ‘up’ in the conjoined *nísitim ... úditim*. The latter word is not otherwise used as a ritual term; in all its other occurrences it is a loc. and refers to the rising of the sun. Here it seems to refer to the outcome or the progress of the sacrifice, though it could be more narrowly used for the “rising up” of the fire when it is kindled. This is probably the better interpr. because in 2 of the 4 occurrences of *nísiti-*, VI.2.5 and VIII.19.14, it is implicitly use of the fire.

VI.15.12: The problematic pāda here is c. The initial *sám* in both c and d and the fact that d otherwise contains only a phrase in the nominative invite us to assume that c and d have the same structure and that we should supply the verb *abhy ètu* from c for d, as well as, quite possibly, *tvā*. But though the NP in d, “thousandfold desirable wealth,” is something we would quite naturally invite to “come to you entirely,” the general assumption is that *dhvasmanvát*, whether it modifies *páthah* ‘fold’ (Gr, Re) or not (Old, Ge), refers to something undesirable -- e.g., Old’s (ZDMG 55.313) tentative “was voll von Zerfall [decay] ist.” It is therefore uncomfortable to invite it to come anywhere near Agni or us. Certainly both occurrences of its base *dhvasmán-* (IV.6.6, VIII.66.15) are in fact in negative contexts. But the substance itself, smoke, is semantically neutral, and in this ritual context something ‘possessing smoke’ can be positive: the oblation as it is poured into the fire will be surrounded by smoke, and, by one model of the sacrifice, it will go to the gods in Agni’s smoke as that smoke rises to heaven. I therefore supply *havyám* here (found in this *ṛca* in 10d), and take *tvā* and *páthah* as two sequential accusatives of goal. Agni is the first destination of the smoke-wrapped oblation, which must be poured into the fire, but it then goes to “the fold (of the gods)” for their

consumption -- *devānām* is a standard dependent gen. with *pāṭhaḥ* (esp. in Āprī hymns, II.3.9, III.8.9, etc.).

VI.15.13: Pāda b is nicely configured: *viśvā veda jānimā jātāvedāḥ*. The first two and the last two words alliterate. The final word, the epithet *jātāvedas-*, is immediately preceded by two independent words etymologically related to its two members (in reverse order): *veda* to *-vedāḥ*, *jānimā* to *jātā-*. (Of course, *-vedas-* may ultimately derive from *√vid* ‘find, possess’, but at least folk-etymologically it belongs with *√vid* ‘know’.) And *viśvā veda* evokes the cmpd *viśvā-vedas-*, a parallel formation to *jātā-vedas-*. Nothing profound here, but a pleasing way to deploy four words.

VI.15.14: The first pāda is a 13-syllable Triṣṭubh; as Old notes (ZDMG 55.313 and Noten), it would be possible to delete init. *agne* without affecting sense, but on the other hand it is difficult to see why it would have been secondarily appended.

In pāda a it is unclear how to construe *viśāḥ*. Note first that by accent it must be abl./gen. sg., not acc. pl. (*viśāḥ*). Ge (see n. 14ab) takes it as a second gen. with following voc. *hotāḥ*, but in that case we would expect *viśāḥ* to lose its accent in the voc. phrase (as *adhvaryasya* has), and, further, *viśó hotar-* is not a standard title, as far as I can find. It might be possible to supply **pāti-* “(lord) of the clan,” matching *grhāpatiḥ* in the previous vs. (13a), next to *hotā*, cf. *viśpātiḥ* in 8d. However, I think the most likely solution is similar to the one also proposed for 1c -- to supply *havyām* as the object of *vēḥ* in b (see *havyā* in d), with *viśāḥ* dependent on *havyām*. Recall that the poet’s name is Vītahavya, and he seems to like concealed puns on his name. As a support for their connection, note that the two phonologically similar words *viśāḥ* and *vēḥ* take the same position in their respective pādas. Re’s solution is somewhat similar to mine, with *viśāḥ* dependent on an object supplied for *vēḥ*, but his proposed object is “la fonction du messenger” and he makes *adhvarasya* a parallel gen. to *viśāḥ* ignoring its lack of accent. His supplied obj. *dūtyāni* is certainly conceivable: he adduces IV.7.8 *vēr adhvarāsyā dūtyāni ...* But to my mind the pun on the name of the poet weighs more heavily.

In pāda b there is close sandhi in the sequence *vēṣ t(u)vām*; the reason for this is unclear, esp. since by all standard interpr. (incl. mine) *t(u)vām* belongs to a new clause -- the parenthetical one marked by *hī* -- and so there is a particularly sharp syntactic boundary between them.

In c *mahinā* fits semantically much better in the subordinate *yād* clause than in the main clause (and is so taken by the standard interpr.), but it seems to be positioned too far to the left, with another element interposed before the subordinator: ... *mahinā ví yād bhūḥ*. I attribute this word order disturbance to the same factor that caused trouble in 1c: like *janúṣā*, *mahinā* only occurs immediately after the caesura in trimeter vs. Given this constraint, the only possible adjustment to produce the expected sequence would be an ordering *mahinā *yād ví*, which would put the subordinator in the correct 2nd position of its clause but produce a bad Triṣṭubh cadence (– – ~ ×). A somewhat similar situation is found in II.1.15c *prkṣó yād átra mahinā ví te bhúvat*, where *mahinā* causes some distortion in word order, though the placement of the subordinator is not affected.

With Lüders (438) I take *ṛtā* as neut. acc. pl. and supply ‘hymns’ (Lieder), rather than taking it as an instr. sg.; this interpr. is supported by VII.39.1 *ṛtām ... yajāti*, with the neut. sg. acc.

Note the phonetic interplay of *v*, *h*, and *y* in d *havyā vaha yaviṣṭha yā ...*

VI.15.15: As Old points out (see publ. intro.), this is no doubt the last vs. of this collection of ṛcas, with vss. 16–19 later additions. There is some faint sign of ring composition with the first ṛca: *súdhītāni* in pāda a reprises *súdhitam* in 2a, as *dadhīta* with Agni as object does *dadhūh* also in 2a. The last three pādas of this vs., esp. de, appear to be a refrain: pāda e is identical to VI.2.11e = 14.6e in this Agni cycle, and pāda d *āgne víśvāni duritā tarema* is a variant of VI.2.11d = 14.6d *dviṣó āṃhāṃsi duritā tarema*, hence my supplied “narrow straits” here. These refrain pādas also signal that the hymn (or the ṛcas loosely collected into a hymn) once ended here.

On the anomalous position of *hí* here, see comm. ad III.31.12, where the idiosyncratic behavior of *√khyā* is discussed. Here the immediate preverbal position of *hí* is esp. anomalous because the preverb *abhí* has been fronted (as opposed to III.31.12 ... *ví hí kyán* #, where the preverb stays in the verb complex).

VI.15.16: The phrase “wooly womb” (*ūṃāvantam yónim*) is striking as a designation of Agni’s seat. Ge (n. 16b) thinks it refers to the barhis, but in fact the fire is not placed on that dry grass, which might produce a conflagration disruptive to the ritual. I think it must rather refer to twigs and foliage still present on the firewood.

In agreement with Ge (who is hesitant -- see n. 16c) and Re, I see a verse-internal enjambment: the two accusatives directly after the hemistich boundary, *kulāyīnam ghr̥tāvāntam*, qualify *yónim*, which ends pāda b; then there is a syntactic break in the middle of the pāda, with dat. *savitré* construed with d, not c. This is unusual, but it is difficult to find a function for *savitré* in the preceding clause.

VI.15.17: Ge and Re take *ānkūyānt-* as a positive quality parallel to *āmūra-*; e.g., Re: “(dieu) faiseur de méandres, (dieu) exempt d’égarement.” I think rather that they are opposites and that the vs. concerns the flight of Agni and his recovery by the gods: note the imperfect *ānayan* (Pp. *ā ānayan*, though technically it could be *ā nayan* with an injunctive). Though Agni sought to elude the gods by taking a circuitous course, they found him and brought him straight back from the dark depths of the water. The “dark places” can of course also refer to the night, after which the ritual fire is kindled, but I think the primary reference is mythological.

VI.15.18: On *jāniṣvā* as belonging to the *-iṣ-* aorist, see Narten (Sig.-Aor, 68).

VI.15.19: The slangy *asthūri* ‘not one-horse’ is appropriate to this later addition to the hymn. Its positive *sthūri* ‘one-horse’ is found in the RV only once in the late X.131.3, also in a slangy context.

VI.16 Agni

VI.16.1: The tr. “for the human race” reads like a dative, but *mānuṣe jāne* is of course a locative. Unfortunately English lacks the “bei” / “chez” locution that would idiomatically tr. this loc.

VI.16.2–3: The first pādas of these vss. end respectively in *adhvaré#* and *ádhvanah#*, which seems to signal an awareness of the deeper etym. relationship between the two stems.

VI.16.3: Klein (DGRV II.122) tr. b *pathás ca devāñjasā* as “and the paths going straight unto the heavenly ones,” apparently reading *devāñjasā* as a compd., contrary to the Pp. and all standard tr. (incl. mine), which separate *deva* as a voc. Although I think the voc. interpretation is correct, cf. X.73.7 *pathó devatrāñjaseva yānān* “... the paths as if going straight to the gods,” with the adv. *devatrā* immed. preceding and construed with *āñjasā*. On the basis of X.73.7 and similar phraseology, Insler (KZ 82 [1968] “Vedic *āñjasā*, *ñjasānā-*, and the Type *sahasānā-*,” p. 6) takes *devāñjasā* as a shortening of *devatrāñjasā* or “a type of haplological abbreviation of *devayānān āñjasā*” or possibly even directly as an “adverbial-type compound” *devāñjāsā*, and Klein must be flg. the Insler interpr. one way or the other. Although X.73.7 is suggestive, I do not think it is sufficient to allow the rather extreme type of haplology posited by Insler.

VI.16.4–6: As noted in the publ. intro., each vs. in this *ṛca* begins with a form of the 2nd sg. prn., although all three are slightly different: the acc. sg. *t(u)vām* in 4a shows distraction; both 5a and 6a contain the nom. sg., but the 1st is undistracted, the 2nd distracted.

VI.16.4: Klein (DGRV II.122) ascribes “logical conjunctive value ‘therefore’” to *ádha* here, connecting vss. 3 and 4. But since vs. 4 begins a new *ṛca*, it seems unlikely that vs. 4 is being conjoined to the *ṛca*-final vs. 3. Moreover, *ádha* here is displaced from its usual pāda-initial position to immediately precede *dvitā*, as it does several times elsewhere (I.132.3, VIII.1.28, 84.2, all pāda-final as here; also pāda-initial VIII.13.24 = IX.102.1, VIII.83.8). On the preceding page (DGRV II.121) Klein calls *ádha dvitā* a collocation and gives it “quasi-formulaic status.” The occurrence here must belong to this group.

In b *bharatō vājībhiḥ* “Bharata with his prize-winner” is an untranslatable pun on the poet’s name Bharad-vāja, whose name appears in the next vs. (5c).

The ritualistic verbs *īle* ‘reverently invoke’ (a) and *ījé* ‘sacrifice’ (c) are exact rhymes (save for accent). I take them here as 3rd sg., as do Ge and Re. Although the 3rd sg. to the former stem is usually *ītte* with *īle* the 1st sg., in this context a 3rd sg. reading is favored, and the lack of accent on *īle* allows it to be drawn into the morphological orbit of the pf. *ījé* (cf. 3rd sg. perfect-accented *īḍé* in IV.3.3). Kü (389), flg. Tichy, takes both verbs as 1st sg., which is equally possible, as long as Bharata is referring to himself by name: “You do I, Bharata, reverently invoke ...”

VI.16.5: A verb must be supplied in this vs., with ‘give’ being the obvious choice.

VI.16.6: The “divine race” (*daívyam jánam*) here may resonate with the “human race, race stemming from Manu” (*mānuṣe jáne*) in 1c, though they belong to different *ṛcas*.

VI.16.7–9: This *ṛca* likewise has a form of the 2nd sg. prn. beginning each vs. (7 *t(u)vām*, 8 *táva*, 9 *t(u)vám*), again all different.

VI.16.8: (*prā*) *yakṣi* is morphologically ambiguous -- 2nd sg. act. -*si* impv. or 1st sg. middle *s*-aor. -- and opinion is divided: Old (ZDMG 55.314, Noten) dithers and doesn't ultimately decide; Ge, Narten (Sig.Aor. 200–201), and Klein (DGRV I.385) opt for the 1st sg., Re for the 2nd but to the root $\sqrt{yakṣ}$. A strong factor in favor of a 2nd sg. to \sqrt{yaj} is the presence of an undoubted form of this same -*si* impv. in the following vs. (9c; cf. also 2c); in favor of a non-2nd-sg. interpr. is the difficulty of construing pāda-initial *táva* with such an impv. I consider the form the 2nd sg. act. to \sqrt{yaj} , on the basis not only of 9c but also vs. 13 in the previous hymn (VI.15), where Agni is the subj. of a (pres.) impv. to *prā* \sqrt{yaj} : VI.15.13d *yájiṣṭhaḥ sá prā yajatām ṛtāvā* “let him, the best sacrificer, the truthful one, set the sacrifice in motion.” What then to do with the rest of the first two pādas? I accept Ludwig's suggestion (registered by Old) that *prā yakṣi* is a parenthesis -- or rather, I think that, because of the rigid parallel patterning in this ṛca, *táva*, which belongs with the clause beginning *saṁdṛśam*, has been fronted around the peremptory impv. *prā yakṣi*, and that it is dependent on the NP *saṁdṛśam utá krátum*: “your manifestation and resolve do they take pleasure in.” This is, strictly speaking, ungrammatical, but rhetoric occasionally trumps syntax.

VI.16.10: Both Ge and Re supply ‘gods’ as the underlying object of *vītáye*, and this is supported by *devāvītaye* in vs. 7 (and 41). But as in the previous hymn (VI.15.1, 14), I think the default object of $\sqrt{vī}$ here is *havyá-*, suggested by the name Vīta-havya, the poet to whom VI.15 is ascribed. Here the *havyá-* can easily be extracted from the parallel purpose dative *havyá-dātaye* in b and its absence explained as gapping. However, the Ge/Re solution is certainly possible, and there are no major implications either way.

VI.16.13–15: Another ṛca with fronted ‘you’ beginning all three vss., though here the 2nd two occurrences actually involve the enclitic with preposed pronominal prop: 14–15 *tám u tvā*, as opposed to 13 *tvām*. This ṛca is also characterized by snippets of mythology, contrasting with the otherwise monotonous focus on the standard ritual tropes. Unfortunately the snippets are just that -- they remain undeveloped.

This ṛca is recited in śrauta ritual during the churning of the fire; see Krick (Feuergründung, 297)

VI.16.13: On the ritual use of the lotus and the relevance of this vs., see Krick (Feuergründung, 155–59), where (155) she calls this vs. “die Primärquelle für die Verwendung eines Lotusblattes im Feuerritual.”

In c *vāghātaḥ* can be gen. sg. or nom. pl. (as I take it, with Ge and Re). Since I don't know what's going on here, I would certainly not exclude the gen. sg.: “... (churned) from the head of every *vāghát*” (so Krick 297) It is perhaps relevant that *vísvasya vāghātaḥ* phonologically echoes *vísvasya jāgataḥ* “of the whole world” (I.101.5, IV.13.3, VI.50.7, VII.60.2, 101.2, X.73.8).

VI.16.16: The stem *ítara-* is very rare in the RV and has a late distribution: besides this passage it is found only in the funeral hymns X.16.9–10 and X.18.1. This comparative isolation makes it difficult to determine its nuance here. Both Ge and Re (cf. also Klein DGRV I.266, Oberlies RdR I.242) think the phrase “other hymns” (*itarā gírah*) refers to

the hymns of a rival sacrificer (or sacrificers), and certainly the *-tara-* suffix implies a choice of two, which has the further potential implication that one of them is bad. But, though the publ. tr. rather vaguely reflects this interpr., I now think it is likely wrong. Instead, I think that the implicit contrast is between *itthā* ‘in just this way’ and *ítara-*, and I further think that *ítarā gírah* is the acc. obj. of *brāvāṇi*, not the nom. subj. of a nominal clause in embedded direct speech. By this interpr. the speaker is telling Agni that in addition to the hymn or hymns he [=Agni] has already heard, the speaker will tell him other hymns *in the same manner* as the previous ones. In other words, he is promising a continuation of the recitation that has already pleased Agni, as well as promising to strengthen him with a physical offering — the usual pairing of verbal and physical in the sacrifice. This interpr. follows that of Hertha Krick (Feuergründung, p. 571): “Komm herbei, Agni, schön will ich dir auf solche Weise noch andere Lobpreisungen sagen! Durch diese Tropfen sollst du wachsen.” I would now emend the tr. to “Come here. I will speak other hymns to you, Agni, in this same way, and with these drops here you will become strong.”

Oberlies claims that this is one of the only places in the RV that soma is pressed for Agni, but I do not see why the drops (*indu-*) can’t be drops of ghee. To be sure, *indu-* overwhelmingly refers to soma drops, but I don’t think that soma *has* to be the referent.

VI.16.17: Note the phonological resonance between 16b *ítarāḥ* and 17b *úttaram*.

The temptation is very strong to take *dadhase*, despite its lack of accent, as the verb of the subord. cl. introduced by *yátra kvà ca* in pāda a, whose correlate *tátra* begins the last pāda (c). And indeed almost all interpr. (Old, Ge, Re, Klein DGRV I.266) have succumbed to this temptation. Old (ZDMG 55. 314–15) constructs an elaborate justification for the interpr., which he maintains in the *Noten* (though without the extensive special pleading). But despite Old’s claim (*Noten*) that “*dadhase* kann nicht ohne Gezwungenheit als Hautptsatzverb aufgefasste werden,” I see no problem. I agree that a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ should be supplied in the *yátra* clause -- perhaps *hitám*, as in I.187.6 *tvé ... máno hitám*. The main clause of b, with its short-vowel subjunctive *dadhase*, expresses the next step in the process: after he has set his mind on something, he then will apply his skill to it -- the progression from mental conception to physical realization that we frequently encounter in the RV. I take *úttara-* here not as a qualification of value, ‘higher’ (e.g., Klein’s “higher skill”), but as a temporal or logical ‘next, later’ expressing the progress from a to b. The *tátra* clause of c gives us a third step, but the fact that this adverb correlates with *yátra* does not mean that the intermediate clause has to be under the domain of *yátra*.

VII.16.18: It is not clear whether *te pūrtám* refers to a gift given *to* Agni or *by* him. The publ. tr. takes it in the former sense, assuming that our gift to Agni will trigger his own actions for us in pāda c, in the standard reciprocal model of Vedic sacrifice. Scar (293), in keeping with his interpr. of *nemānām* (see below), also thinks it’s a gift to Agni, but from others (“was [dir von anderen] geschenkt wird”). Re (see esp. his n. expanding his tr.) takes it as Agni’s gift to us, and I interpr. Ge’s “deine Schenkung” in the same fashion. In fact, either interpr. is possible, and the choice will be influenced by one’s interpr. of pāda c.

The stem *néma-*, cognate to Aves. *naēma-* ‘half’, is implicitly oppositional, picking out one moiety or side, or simply “some” out of a larger group. Here the unaccented gen. pl. *nemānām*, part of the voc. phrase headed by *vaso*, refers, in my view, to *our* side. This is clearly Ge’s view because he footnotes his slightly awk. “du Gott der einen Partei” with “Der Fromme oder Arier.” Other renderings are so awkward as to be almost unintelligible: Re “o Vasu, (dieu) de quelques-uns,” Klein (DGRV II.71) “o Vasu of some (races).” And Scar (293) takes it as referring to the opposition (“o du Vasu der andere”), which then requires Agni to do some amends-making in pāda c. I consider it extremely unlikely that the poet would address Agni, the focus of his praise, as a god of just *some* people, diluting his power and denying his omnipresence -- much less as a god of others. I might, however, slightly modify the publ. tr. from “on (our) side” to “of (our) side.”

At first glance pāda c, *átho dúvo vanavase*, with its middle voice seems to involve Agni’s winning *dúvas-* for himself. This would be compatible with the Ge/Re interpr. of pāda a: if Agni gives us a not insignificant gift in pāda a, he has a good chance of winning our *dúvas-* in c. However, the almost identical expression in the immediately preceding hymn, VI.15.6d *devó devēṣu vānate hí no dúvaḥ* “for the god will win friendship for us among the gods,” with the crucial loc. *devēṣu* and dat. of benefit *naḥ*, suggests that Agni is winning something on our behalf. Cf. also, in this hymn, VI.16.28 *agnír no vanate rayím* “Agni will win us wealth.”

The root \sqrt{van} ‘win’ is strongly represented in this hymn, esp. in the middle section. Here we have *vanavase*; elsewhere *vanvánn ávātaḥ* 20, *vanván* 26, *vanvántaḥ* 27, *vanate* 28, as well as *vivāsasi* 12. This repetition cuts across *ṛca* boundaries.

VI.16.19: The “passive” aorist *agāmi* is a hapax and, in this context, a scrambling of adjacent *āgní(r)*.

VI.16.20: The root $\sqrt{dās}$ ‘piously serve’ almost never takes an acc. object of the service or offering (but see vs. 31 below); moreover, it almost exclusively has a mortal subject and a god as recipient of the piety. Here, however, we have the opposite situation: it is impossible to avoid taking Agni as subject and a very concrete *rayím* as acc. object, with the implied recipients being us mortals. The clue here may be the preverb, as *āti* $\sqrt{dās}$ in its other occurrence seems to mean something like ‘out-pious the pious’: *maghaír maghóno áti śūra dāsasi* “With your bounties you outdo the bounteous ones in piety, o champion [=Indra].” Although the case frame is not exactly the same, the nuance is similar: human patrons are bounteous, but Indra is super-bounteous. In our passage Agni provides wealth “beyond all earthly (goods).” I previously thought that “earthly goods” were simply those material things that have their origins on/in the earth rather than heaven, but it may well be more pointed than that here: “goods that are given by those who stem from/dwell on earth, that is, humans.” So Agni outdoes human givers by providing wealth in excess of all the goods they can supply. On ‘goods’ as the appropriate noun to supply with *vísṃvā ... pāṛthivā*, cf. VI.45.20ab *sá hí víśvāni pāṛthivāṃ, éko vásūni pātyate* as well as VI.59.9, IX.100.3, X.111.10.

VI.16.22: Pāda a contains a 2nd plural enclitic prn. and a plural voc. (*vaḥ sakhāyaḥ* “to/of you, o comrades”), while c has two 2nd singular imperatives (*árca gāya*). The discrepancy

in number must reflect the common situation of a poet's mixing address limited to himself with address to his colleagues and fellow ritual participants. So Ge (n. 22), and see my 2009 "Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra," BAI 19 (Fs. Skjaervø). Ge suggests without much enthusiasm that *ārca gāya* could be shortened 1st sg. subjunctives (**ārcā *gāyā*), evidently responding to Caland/Henry's reading the verbs thus in their 1906 *L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. 428 (see Old, who likewise rejects it). It's worth noting that VI.45.4 has the same configuration but with 2nd plural imperatives: *sākhāyaḥ ... , ārcata prā ca gāyata* "o comrades, chant and sing forth ..." This parallel is adduced by Bl (RR) ad V.52.4, where he calls our verse "a scrappy stanza ... modelled after existing patterns" (that is, VI.45.4). The parallel is certain apposite, but I doubt that our number discrepancy is simply the result of our poet jumbling together scraps drawn from different sources.

VI.16.23: The injunc. *sṭdat*, in conjunction with the acc. of extent of time *mānuṣā yugā* "through the human lifetimes," seems almost to have shed the literal sense of the root \sqrt{sad} 'sit' in favor of expressing pure durativity ("who, through the human lifetimes, *has (always) been ...*") -- though the immediately following *hótā* evokes the standard phrase for the installation of Agni as Hotar, with the full 'sit' clearly present if metaphorically meant. as in VI.1.2 *ādhā hótā ny āsīdah* ... ("then you sat down as Hotar") in this Agni cycle. I rather imagine both senses are meant.

VI.16.25: Given the proximity of *ūrj-* '(solid) nourishment' beginning c, *iṣayaté* in b might better be rendered in a manner closer to *iṣ-* 'refreshment' in the same semantic domain. So Ge "für die speisewünschenden Sterblichen," Re "pour le mortel cherchant la jouissance." I might suggest an alternative "... for the mortal seeking refreshment, / o child of nourishment." What gives me pause, however, is *iṣáyantaḥ* in vs. 27 in the same *ṛca*, where the 'prosper' sense is favored. Although our dat. part. has accent on the ending, whereas *iṣáyantaḥ* has (secondary) "causative" accent, in fact oblique forms of -*āya*-participles seem regularly to have desinential accent: cf. *mahayaté* (VII.32.9) to *maháyati*, *kṛpayatāḥ* (VIII.46.16) to *kṛpáyati*. See disc. in my 1983 -*āya*-book, p. 49 with n. 3. Therefore these two nearby forms are likely to belong to the same stem and invite the same tr.

VI.16.26: The *krātu-* is presumably Agni's; cf. vs. 23 *kavíkratuḥ* used of him. Ge tr. *krátvā* as "Mit dem Gedanken," and takes the interior pādas bc as the directly quoted content of that thought. In addition to the aberrant tr. of *krātu-* (though one could tr. "with the intention"), this seems unnecessary. Although, as Ge notes, *krátvā* in IV.1.1 does introduce such direct speech, it is marked there by *ítí*, and the circumstances there are different as well.

VI.16.29: This vs. ushers in a set of forms of \sqrt{bhr} (also vss. 36, 40, 41, 47, 48).

VI.16.30: Note the close sandhi effect in the voc. phrase *brahmaṇas kave*. As Ge points out, this pāda is a variant of I.18.3 *rākṣā no brahmaṇas pate*, with the more usual head noun *pāti-*. Because it is part of a voc. phrase and such phrases show close sandhi effects

elsewhere, this does not necessarily belong with the other instances of irregular sandhi of -s before *kaví-*, on which see comm. ad VII.18.2, though that may be a factor.

VI.16.31: I do not know what the *ā* ending the first pāda is doing. Sāy. takes it as preverb with *dāśati*, but this root doesn't otherwise appear with *ā*, and pāda-final position is a strange place to put a preverb. There's a pāda-final *ā* also in 35a, but it is easier to justify, as governing a locational acc.

I am disturbed by the usage of *dāśati* here; for another problematic form to this root, see disc. ad vs. 20 above. The example here describes not pious service but a hostile act exactly contrary to the standard usages of the root. It also deviates from the usual case frame (offer service to a god [DAT] with an offering vel sim. [INSTR]), though a few passages match ours by expressing the offering in the ACC, e.g. I.93.3 ... *yá āhutīm, yó vām dāśād dhaviṣkṛtim* "whoever will piously perform a poured offering or the preparation of an oblation for you." Assuming the reading is correct, I think we must see this as a monstrous reversal: instead of piously offering an oblation (ACC) to a god (DAT), the evil mortal is impiously offering *us* (ACC), as a sort of oblation, to a weapon of death (DAT). The standard tr. (including mine) elide the shock of the use of this verb of ritual service in such a context, by tr. *√dāś* differently from usual. But I'm not sure how to remedy this in tr. without a lot of explanatory baggage. Perhaps "who will 'piously' offer us ..."?

Ge and Re take *tásmāt ... āmhasaḥ* as a single NP "from that *āmhas-*," but this requires taking *yáh* in pāda a as an improper rel. for "when" (so Ge) or seeing the relation between ab and c as an anacoluthon (so Re), because their interpr. of c provides no referent for *yáh ... mártah* in the dependent cl. This can all be fixed by separating the two abl. in the main clause, with *tásmāt* the correlative to *yáh*. Since the immediately preceding vs. (30) has exactly the structure envisioned for our c pāda -- two parallel ablatives, one *āmhasaḥ* and the other referring to a person -- there is very local precedent.

VI.16.35: This vs. is syntactically incomplete (unless we take *sīdan* in c as a predicated pres. part., which seems unlikely, since this is a repeated pāda [=IX.32.4, IX.64.11]), but it works well as adjunct to the previous vs., 34.

Pāda a shows the preoccupation with kinship that is characteristic of Agni material. The paradox "father of his father" (*pitúṣ pitā* [note close sandhi effect]) probably reflects two themes -- 1) that the priest who kindles the fire is in some sense his/its father, but Agni the god has a fatherly relationship to his mortal worshipers, 2) that the offering fire (later called the *Āhavanīya*) is "taken out" of what is later called the *Gārhapatya* and is therefore in some sense its son, but the offering fire is more important than the other fires on the ritual ground and can therefore be considered their father.

The meaning 'syllable' for *akṣāra-* is quite stable in later Skt., but in the RV it sometimes has its literal sense 'imperishable'. Nonetheless in our passage I think 'syllable' is meant: the ritual fire is kindled when the hymn (here represented by the syllable) is recited. So, more or less, Ge "bei der (heiligen) Rede (?) aufleuchtend" (sim. Kü 250), though cf. Re "dans (l'espace) inépuissable."

The pāda-final *ā* in c was mentioned above ad vs. 31, where it was pointed out that the occurrence here in 35c can easily be accounted for. *ā* frequently governs a

preceding acc. (see collection in Gr., col. 169), and in fact *yónim ā* is found not only in this pāda and its repetitions (see above), but also in similar pādas in IX.61.21, 65.19).

VI.16.39: Unlike most *-hán-* cmpds, whose 1st member is the target of the smiting, in *śarya-hán-* the 1st member *śarya-* ‘arrow’ must be in an instr. relationship with the 2nd (see Scar 693), like *muṣṭi-hán* ‘smiting with the fist(s)’. Because “like a powerful shooter with arrows / one who shoots arrows” is exceptionally awkward in English, I’ve substituted ‘sharpshooter’, though it interferes with the *tigmá-* in *tigmá-śṛṅga-* ‘sharp-horned’ in the next pāda.

VI.39.40: The simile marker *ná* is wrongly placed in pāda b, for no obvious reason.

The two comparanda to Agni -- a bangle in the hand, a newborn babe, both carried -- suggest that this is the newly kindled fire, probably the offering fire, being taken out of the householder’s fire and carried to the east.

VI.16.41: This impression about vs. 40 is supported by vs. 41.

VI.16.42: However, the waters are somewhat muddled by vs. 42. The loc. *jātāvedasi* (the only such form in the RV) is puzzling, since *jātāvedas-* is one of the standard epithets of Agni and the accusatives in the vs. clearly refer to Agni as well. Thus we must be dealing with two fires. This idea would be perfectly compatible with the scenario I suggested for vs. 40 -- *except* that acc. *gr̥hapátim* in pāda c suggests that the newly born fire being “whetted” is not the offering fire (later to be called the Āhavanīya) taken out of the old fire and moved to its new location, but rather what will come to be called the Gārhapatya. The (later) ritual complex that our passage most resembles is the creation of the Mahāvedi (see my Hyenas, p. 89, inter alia), in which the old Āhavanīya of the standard ritual ground is moved further to the east during the creation of the Mahāvedi, and the old Āhavanīya becomes the Gārhapatya. Thus it seems that vss. 40–41 concern the further displacement of the Āhavanīya fire and 42 depicts the resettlement of the original householder’s fire onto the place the Āhavanīya occupied in the more restricted ritual ground. This may be Ge’s view; see his n. 41ab, where he refers to the *agnipraṇayana*, which is the technical term for carrying the Āhavanīya to the Uttaravedi in the animal sacrifice (see Sen, Dict. of Vedic Rituals, s.v.; Caland-Henry, Agniṣṭoma pp. 78–79). However, his n. 42 goes in a different direction. If this really does concern the creation of the Mahāvedi from the ordinary ritual ground, we would have evidence for this degree of elaboration already in (late) Rigvedic ritual.

VI.16.43: The *hí* in the impv. clause is somewhat disturbing, since there is no following impv. in this vs. to which the *hí* impv. clause could serve as basis. However, 44a contains two impvs. that logically follow the *yukṣvā* ‘yoke!’ -- namely *yāhi ā vaha* “drive and convey here!” and so the usual use of *hí* in impv. clauses can be seen here, across two vss.

VI.16.44: The very compressed pāda b could be elucidated with “... for (them=gods) to pursue (them=offerings).” There are numerous parallels that establish this as the intention.

VI.16.47: Bloomfield (ad V.6.5) proposes tr. our passage “We bring ... oblation with song fashioned in the mind,” suggesting that “the cases of *ṛcā* and *havīḥ* are inverted.” This is certainly true at the level of deep-structure formula: *hṛdā taṣṭā-* “fashioned by the heart” normally modifies a verbal product, e.g. I.171.2 *stómo hṛdā taṣṭāḥ*. But, as so often, the poet is playing with our expectations by producing a twist on the standard phraseology.

VI.16.47–48: This long hymn (or the short final *ṛca*) seems to end with a buried poetic signature: 47b ends with *bharāmasī*, 48c with *vājīnā*, the last word of the hymn. Together they are the elements that make up the poet’s name Bharadvāja.

VI.17 Indra

This hymn is marked by clusters of localized repetitions and echoes; see disc. below.

VI.17.1–3: These first three vss. form something of a unity. Each begins with a “drink!” imperative (1a *pībā sómam*, 2a *sá īm pāhi*, 3a *evā pāhi*), and each contains the lexeme *abhí√ṛd* ‘drill through to’. As outlined below, it is a pleasingly designed rhetorical structure, whose balance and contrast only become evident after conscious analysis.

VI.17.1: Ge (flg Gr, fld. by Schmidt, B+I, 144) takes *yám* as obj. of *abhí* and referring to *sómam* in the opening impv. phrase (“Drink the soma, towards which ...”). As Old points out (both ZDMG 55.319–20 and Noten), this entails either that the soma is within the cow enclosure or at least that breaking into the cow enclosure is a necessary auxiliary action for getting or preparing the soma -- which is, of course, not a standard part of the Vala myth. Old therefore emends the text, from *yám* to **yáh*, producing parallel rel. clauses concerning the Vala myth and the Vṛtra myth respectively, with Indra the subject of both, represented by **yáh*. But how would this corruption arise? Old suggests that **yáh* (**yá* in this sandhi context) was changed to *yám* because it immediately follows *abhí*, but it is hard to conceive of a Rigvedic poet who could be misled by a separable preverb, esp. since the 2nd hemistich has a supposedly parallel rel. cl. containing *yáh*, likewise following a preverb (*vī*). I agree with Old that Ge’s interpr. is unlikely, but I do not think this requires changing the text. Instead I think *pībā sómam* is an abrupt hortatory opening, essentially detached from the rest of the vs., and I take the *yám* as referring to the *ūrvām gávyam*. This whole clause anticipates the imperatival main clauses that end the next vss., 2d *sá indra citrām abhí ṛndhi vājān* and 3d ... *abhí gā indra ṛndhi*, both with *abhí√ṛd* and an obj. that refers to the contents of the cattle enclosure. My interpr. requires the rel. cl. of 1ab to float in syntactic suspension till it is resolved in 2d, with a number of other things going on in between -- mostly rel. clauses with Indra as subject, but I do not think this is much to ask of a Rigvedic audience. In fact, I think that the rel. cl. in 1ab is the initial marker of the ring structure that prevails in these three vss.

In d Ge suggests that *vṛtrām* is a “collective singular” and should be construed with neut. pl. *vīśvā amitṛyā*, tr. “alle feindseligen Vṛtra’s.” I see no advantage to ignoring the number, and the passages he adduces as parallel do not impose the notion of “collective singular.”

VI.17.2: Again I think the “drink!” imperative is semi-detached from the rest of the vs., a mere interruption of the sequence of rel. clauses with Indra as subj., which begins with a fully realized clause in 1cd and continues in 2abc with a set of five compressed definitional nominal clauses with an izafe-like feel.

VI.17.3: The “drink!” sequence is brought to an end with a summary *evā* in 3a. The verse continues with a series of 7 choppy imperatival clauses, all but the first (*māndatu tvā*) with Indra as subj., which balance the choppy nominal relative clauses of vs. 2. The last of these clauses is the third iteration of *abhí√trd*, with which we began.

VI.17.3–5ab: *māndatu tvā* in 3a inaugurates a 3-vs. sequence chained together by the root *√ma(n)d* ‘exhilarate’, a sequence whose 1st vs. (3) overlaps with the last vs. of the initial triad. The other representatives also occur in the 1st pāda: *mādāḥ* in 4a and *mandasānāḥ* in 5a. Cf. also *matsarāsaḥ* in 4d. The conceptual unity of the sequence is underlined by the fact that 5ab is a rel. clause that must hang off the previous vs. The 2nd hemistich of 5 marks a sharp break.

VI.17.6: This last vs. of the Vala section reprises *ūrvām gavyam* from 1b with *ūrvāḍ gāḥ* in 6b, both immediately pre-caesura, producing a ring. Thus, the supposedly problematic rel. cl. of 1ab participates in two rings in this brief 6-vs. section, with different parts of the clause in play in the two rings. See disc. ad vs. 1.

VI.17.7-10: An initial phonological sequence unifies this set of vss.: from the 2nd half of 7 through the 1st half of 10, every hemistich begins with *ádḥ* (or the variants *ád* and *áh*): 7c *ádḥā(rayo)*, 8a *ádha*, 8c *ád(eva)*, 9a *ádha*, 9c *áh(im)*, 10a *ádha*.

VI.17.7: Both Old (ZDMG 55.320 and Noten) and Ge (fld. by Klein DGRV II.92–93) strongly argue that *paprātha* belongs to *√prath* ‘spread’, not *√prā* ‘fill’, to which Gr assigns it. I find their insistence puzzling. On their side, *ví√prath* is a fairly common lexeme, used often of the earth, whereas *ví* is rare to non-existent with *√prā*. But the actual verb form is wrong for all sorts of reasons. First, the indic. pf. of *√prath* is otherwise only middle, but this would be act. Second, the root *√prath* never otherwise has *vṛddhi* forms, but the root syllable here is *prāth*. Then, if it is a 3rd sg. (so Ge “Er breitete ...”), it opens a cosmogonic sequence of 2nd sg. expressions, and such formulaic cosmogonies tend to be consistent in ps. and no. (though see 9cd below). Recognizing this last problem, Old suggests it’s a 2nd sg., standing for **paprath-tha > *papraththa*, with the heavy syllable **atth* redistributing metrical weight [not his terminology] to *āth*. This type of change would not be unusual in Middle Indic, but it would have been useful to provide parallel examples in the Rig Veda. Moreover, since *√prath* is a set root, we should in any case expect a 2nd sg. **paprathitha*. The only factor on their side of the ledger is the preverb, and since our poet no doubt playfully recognized that the form would evoke *√prath*, it is not surprising that he would import the preverb. Unambiguous perfect forms to *√prā* ‘fill’ frequently take the earth as obj. as here (e.g., III.30.11 *índra ā paprau pṛthivīm utá dyā́m*), which makes the Old/Ge intransigence all the more surprising.

In pāda a *māhi dāmsaḥ* interrupts the obj. phrase *kṣām ... urvīm*. Ge's nominal phrase “— ein grosses Meisterstück—” is less disruptive than my nominal clause “great is your wondrous skill,” and might be preferable on those grounds.

VI.17.8: As Ge points out, the non-god (*ādeva-*) is presumably Vṛtra. This identification is clinched by the fact that the verb here, *aūhiṣṭa* ‘vaunted himself’ (*√uh/oh*), reappears in the (pseudo-)participle *óhasāna-* modifying *āhi-* ‘serpent’ in the next vs. (9c).

In d the pres. *vṛṇate* is a bit surprising in this mythological narrative.

VI.17.9: The word and particle order of the 1st hemistich seems designed to produce despair in those of us who seek (and believe in) principles and rules for such ordering: *ádha dyaús cit te ápa sã nú vájṛād, dvitānamat ...* seems randomly to scatter nouns, pronouns, and particles through the first pāda. However, I think that my interpr. of the first pāda imposes more rationality on the sequence than Ge's does and also eliminates at least one further problem. Note first the preverb *ápa* in the middle of the 1st pāda, though preverbs in tmesis (as this is, from *anamāt* in b) usually move to metrical boundaries. [It is true that it appears directly after the caesura, but generally a preverb in tmesis takes this position only when the verb is in the same pāda, or such is my impression.] Note, moreover, the apparent doubling of the subject *dyaúḥ* with the pronoun *sã* likewise in the middle of the same pāda, directly after the preverb. Note finally that after a beginning that seems to conform fairly well to Rigvedic word-order norms (extraclausal introductory *ádha*, noun+emphatic ptcl *dyaús cid*, enclitic prn. in modified 2nd position *te*), the clause seems to begin over again: preverb *ápa*, prn. *sã* (curiously, fem. *sã* seems more inclined to 2nd position than masc. *sã*), modified 2nd pos. ptcl. *nú*. Ge's tr. simply ignores this stuttering start (“Da wick selbst der Himmel von deiner Keule ..”), and he also doesn't comment on the fact that his interpr. implicitly requires *dyaúḥ* to be picked up by a fem. prn.: Gr lists this passage as one where that noun has fem. gender. Although ‘heaven’ sometimes does seem to be fem., such passages are rarer than Gr makes out, and this example would be esp. striking because there's no reason for *dyaúḥ* to be doubled by a pronoun in the first place, whatever its gender.

I think both problems can be solved by assuming that *sã* actually adds a second referent to the clause; in context with ‘heaven’ this would obviously be the fem. ‘earth’ (generally *prthivī-*, but perhaps here, because of their joint presence in 7ab, *kṣã-*). No Rigvedic audience would need further specification, once the feminine gender of the referent was established. By this interpr. the post-caesura sequence *ápa sã nú ...* is not an awkward redo of the 1st half of the pāda, but introduces a parallel subject to *dyaúḥ*, more clearly distinguished from ‘heaven’ than in the usual dual dvandva formulation. The separation of the two subjects is, in my opinion, signalled by *dvitā* ‘yet again’ beginning the next pāda; I render it here as “likewise also.” The parallels adduced by Ge (IV.17.2, I.80.11, II.12.13, V.32.9) actually support my interpr. because all four of them depict *both* heaven and earth (or in the case of the last, the two world-halves) trembling in fear of Indra.

Alternatively, MLW suggests (p.c.) that *dyaúḥ* could have fem. gender here because of its unmanly behavior in flinching away from Indra's weapon. Restarting with *sã* would emphatically draw attention to this gender switch: “Then even Heaven, really a *she* ...” This is clever, but I still prefer my own solution.

Flg. Ge (“... dass er für alle Zeit erlag”), I take *śayáthe* here as a quasi-infinitive expressing purpose with *jaghāna*; in this function it seems directly parallel to *śayáthāya* in the next hymn (VI.18.8), to the same stem. Unfortunately they must then be in different cases, the dative, understandably, in VI.18.8, the loc., less understandably, here. However much I would like to, I cannot find a way to make our *śayáthe* a dative, there being no athematic stem **śayáth-*. We could, of course, interpr. the locative as a real expression of location: “struck down the serpent in his lair,” but not only am I reluctant to lose the semantic connection with VI.18.8, but the acc. extent of time *viśvāyuh* ‘for a full lifespan’ only makes sense with the verbal interpr. of *śayáthe* ‘to lie’.

Despite Gr and Lub, a number of *viśvāyuh* forms, which they assign to the stem *viśvāyu-* and therefore interpr. as nom. sg. masc., must have the 2nd member *āyus-* and therefore be nom./acc. sg. neut., often used as an adverbial indication of extent of time as here (so Ge’s tr. as well; see above). See AiG II.2.479. I concede that it would be possible to take the form as a nom. here — “when Indra, having a full lifespan, struck down the serpent ...” — with Indra’s full lifespan implicitly contrasting with Vṛtra’s death, but I find the extent-of-time adverbial more compelling. And in a passage like I.68.5 *viśvāyur viśve āpāmsi cakruḥ* “all have performed their tasks lifelong,” the plural subject rules out a nom. sg. interpr. for *viśvāyuh*. Although the stem *viśvāyu-* certainly exists, it has a doublet with final *-s-*, exactly like the simplex pair *āyu-/āyus-*.

Assuming the correctness of the above disc. of *viśvāyuh*, Vṛtra’s fate, “to lie there for a full lifespan,” is somewhat ironic, since he’s dead: he will spend his full lifespan dead.

VI.17.10: With Old I assume an underlying *mahé*, contra Pp. *maháh*, despite Ge’s doubts (n. 10b).

The morphological identity of *vavṛtat* isn’t at all clear. Gr calls it a “Conj.” aor.; Whitney seems to suggest a subj. to a redupl. pres. Lub identifies it as a “[RED.AOR.inj.(them.)].” A pf. subj. makes the most formal sense, save for the zero-grade root syllable, but a subjunctive would be out of place in this mythological passage. Kü (460) treats our form as a “Sonderfall” and calls it a thematic injunctive, expressing an action prior to that of the verb *sám piṇak* in d. Since, in his view, this same anterior value is expressed by the impf. of the caus. (*āvartayat* in I.85.9), he calls our form an “Oppositionsbildung zum Kausativ,” whatever that means, but ultimately gives up on determining its morphological identity. I agree that the form cannot functionally be a subjunctive and am willing to accept that it is a nonce injunctive -- but this is a description, not an explanation. Note the pf. opt. *vavṛtyāt* in 13d, whose redupl. profile *vavṛt-* matches that of this form.

As for what the clause expresses, I assume that Tvaṣṭar is manufacturing the *vájra-* by turning it on a lathe or lathe-like device. (The internet tells me that the lathe dates back to antiquity, with good evidence from ancient Egypt, but it is difficult to know how much to trust this.) Alternatively, but less likely in my view, Tvaṣṭar is displaying it to Indra by turning it here and there to allow its spikes and edges to glint in the light.

The other verb form in this vs., *sám piṇak* in d, also presents difficulties, because, despite being in a relative cl., it is unaccented. I have no explanation for the failure to accent (nor does Old, I’d point out). Of course, one can note the unusual position of the rel. prn. *yéna*, at the end of pāda c as the first word of the subord. clause that otherwise

occupies d, with the rel. prn. intervening between the acc. sg. masc. phrase *nīkāmam arāmanasam* that modifies the *vájram* of the main cl. and the acc. sg. masc. phrase *návantam áhim* that provides the object of the rel. cl. But Rigvedic poets are unlikely to be thrown by this positioning. It is also noteworthy that pāda c as it stands has only 10 syllables; Old suggests that we might read *iénā* to round out the Triṣṭubh, which would be unprecedented in the rel. prn., as far as I know. Pāda c is also unusual in having 5 light syllables in a row: (*nīkā*)*mam arāmana(saṃ yéna)*, and indeed, were we to read *íénā*, this would rise to 7. Since *arāmanasa-* is a hapax and it participates in a metrically disturbed sequence, it may be that the pāda is somehow corrupt. But no way of fixing any of this comes to mind.

On the retroflex *ṇ* in *piṇak*, see Old, ZDMG 55.321.

VI.17.11: For Agni as the subj. of *pácat* and cooker of the buffaloes, see V.29.7–8 adduced by Ge and Old, ZDMG 55.321.

In the 2nd hemistich we have only two expressed subjects, Pūṣan and Viṣṇu, but a plural verb *dhāvan*. The obvious solution, as seen by all, is to assume that other gods participated in this action.

The question is -- what action? The verb is generally assigned to $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘run’. Gr gives a transitive-causative value to this stem in this passage and this passage alone (Gr “jemandem [D.] etwas [A.] zuströmen”); Ge follows this trans. interpr.: “... liessen für ihn den ... (Soma)stengel ... strömen,” and indeed interprets another passage as having this value (IX.54.2). However, since all other acc. with $\sqrt{dhāv}$ are goals to an intrans. verb of motion, this contextual adjustment is unacceptable. Gotō (1st Klasse, 183 and n. 325) disputes both of Ge’s trans. interpretations and fixes this passage by dividing the two pādas into two clauses. The first has an acc. goal *sārāṃsi* (“...eilen zu den drei [Soma]seen”), which seems reasonable (indeed cf. IX.54.2 *ayám sārāṃsi dhāvati*), but he must supply a verb (‘gave’) out of thin air to make pāda d to work: “[sie geben] ihm den Vṛtratötenden, berauschenden Somastengel.” The problem can be solved by assigning the verb to the other root $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘rinse’, part of the standard vocabulary of soma preparation. VIII.2.25 (*ā dhāvata ... sómaṃ vīrāya*) presents an exactly parallel construction with soma as acc. obj. and the recipient, Indra, in the dat. Moreover, ‘rinse’ would add a complementary food-preparation term to \sqrt{pac} ‘cook’ in pāda b, with both solid and liquid nourishment thus covered, whereas ‘run’ is a bit of a non sequitur. The only thing that gives me pause is X.113.2 *tám asya víṣṇur mahimānam ójasā, aṃśúm dadhanvān ...*, where we have Viṣṇu, the *aṃśú*, and an undoubted ‘run’ (to the separate root $\sqrt{dhan[v]}$). But this late passage does not seem to me sufficient to outweigh the fact that a ‘rinse’ interpr. here allows the hemistich to be a single syntactic unit and forestalls the need to supply a verb for d out of nowhere.

VI.17.12: In d *apásah* ‘busy, industrious’ (Ge’s fleissig) is, of course, a pun on the ‘water’ word, whose acc. pl. is *apás*.

VI.17.14: I take the construction $\sqrt{dhā}$ ACC [anim.] ACC.ADJ -*mant-/vant-* to mean “provide someone (X) with something (Y),” lit. “establish X as possessing (-*mant-/vant-*) Y.” The datives of ab are then further objects to aspire to: once the poets have brilliance,

they can use that brilliance, which transforms into poems, in pursuit of more worldly goals, the prize, etc. This interpr. essentially follows Ge's.

VI.18 Indra

VI.18.1: This vs. contains two pairs of positive/negative etymological figures, both consisting of a pres. participle with “active” value (though one of them is morphologically middle) and a negated past part.: *vanvánn ávātaḥ* “vanquishing but unvanquished” and *āṣāḥam ... sāhamānam* “conquering but unconquered.” It may not be an accident that the root syllables in each pair, though related by standard derivational processes, are quite distinct because of morphophonemic changes: *van* / *vā* and *sah* / *ṣāḥ*.

VI.18.2: On unclear *khaja*- see comm. ad VII.20.3.

VI.18.3: The sequence 2ND SG. PRN *ha tyád* (here *ha nú tyád*) is fairly common and appears to be strongly emphatic, hence my tr. “it was just you” (etc.). In several hymns (I.63.4–7, VIII.96.16–18) this construction is found in series.

I take the fronted *ásti* followed by *svid* to be a strong existential “does it exist?” rather than simply the possessive constr. that Ge sees: “Hast du ... diese Manneskrafte ...?”

For *tád ṛtuthā ví vocaḥ* see the nearly identical phrase in X.28.5 and the disc. of the lexeme *ví* / *vac* as X.11.2. I argue there that it means ‘provide a decisive answer to a question’, and a question has certainly been posed here.

VI.18.4: The fronted *ásti* in the previous vs. is matched by equally emphatic, fronted *sád íd*. Although Ge takes *sát* as the modifier of the *sāhaḥ* that begins the next pāda, I think instead that it answers the question posed in 3cd and therefore implicitly modifies *vīryām* in 3c. This is then further specified as *sāhaḥ* beginning in b, which then is qualified by the adjectives *ugrām* and *tāvīyaḥ* in c.

The last three pādas of the vs. are a veritable riot of etymological figures, with two each in b and c and one in d: b *sāhaḥ sahiṣṭha turatás turásya*, c *ugrām ugrásya tavásas tāvīyaḥ*, d *áradhrasya radhratúraḥ* ... The 2nd member of this last cmpd, *-tur-*, belongs etymologically with the 2nd figure of b, *turatás turásya*, though unfortunately since it's used in a somewhat different sense, this connection cannot easily be conveyed in translation. Similarly, the 2nd figure of c, *tavásas tāvīyaḥ*, picks up the *tuvi-* of the cmpd in a, *tuvi-jātá-*. So, in addition to the juxtaposed linear figures, there is some interweaving across pāda boundaries.

VI.18.5: As the opening words of pāda b, *itthā vādadbhiḥ*, indicate, the previous pāda is the direct speech of the Ṃgirases. In keeping with the two immediately preceding vss., I take *astu* as an existential: “let that partnership (still) exist.” The wording is otherwise very like IV.10.8 *śivā naḥ sakhyā sántu ... devēṣu yuṣmé*. The clear loc. *devēṣu* in that passage anchors the loc. identity of *yuṣmé* both in that passage and this one. The loc. is somewhat odd: generally *sakhyá-* is construed with gen. or instr., as already set forth by Gr s.v. However, cf. VII.22.9 (=X.23.7), which also contains a pl. ps. prn. in *-e*: *asmé te santu sakhyā śivāni*. In the publ. tr. I take the *asmé* there as a dat.: “Let there be friendly

fellowship of you for us.” But in light of the two parallel structures with *yuṣmé*, I think it must be a loc., and these three passages, each of which is rendered differently in the publ. tr., should be harmonized. I now think that all three are existential (although the two with *śívā-* could be equational, with a pred. adj.) and that the loc. specifies the locus of the partnership, either in or “bei” the pronominal referent. Though this is functionally equivalent to “with,” as in the publ. tr., I would slightly modify the tr. to better reflect the loc.: “Let there (still) be age-old partnership for us among you,” though “... with you” would in fact be clearer.

The placement of *valám* in the middle of the instr. phrase in b, with its governing verb (*hán*) not found till c, is somewhat odd, but see comm. ad vs. 8 below.

Presumably the Vala cave is “prospering” because it is full of cows. On the accent of *iṣáyantam* here, see my *-áya-Formations*, p. 49 and n. 3.

The positive active / negative passive figure found twice in vs. 1 is here embodied in the single word, the root-noun cmpd voc. *acyuta-cyut-* ‘shaker of the unshakable’.

VI.18.6: The vs. contains 3 coreferential *sá*, at the beg. of a and of c and in the middle of c. I have interpr. the first half of c as belonging with ab, with the loc. *tokásātā tánaye* parallel to loc. *mahatí vṛtratūrye* in b and the mid-pāda *sá* in c introducing a new cl. Others (Ge, Schaef., Intens. 126) take all of c with d. There is no way to determine and very little riding on it. However, see the comm. on the next vs.

The *hí* in pāda a seems to have little or no causal value; similarly the one in 4a.

Although the overt *ásti* reminds us of the other overt forms of \sqrt{as} in previous vss. (3, 4, 5), which were (at least by my lights) existential, *ásti* here seems to be a straight copula and therefore pleonastic.

In *tokásātā tánaye* we can assume that *tánaye* shows a kind of gapping of the 2nd cmpd member found in *toká-sāti-*, hence a putative **tánaya-sāti-*. Ge’s cited parallels, e.g., II.30.5 *tokásya sātāu tánayasya ...*, confirm this.

VI.18.7: This vs. continues the overabundance of *sá* from the last vs., esp. in the 2nd hemistich, with initial *sá* and post-caesura *sá* in c and initial *sá* in d, in addition to the one opening the vs. Each of these *sá* is associated with a different instr. phrase or phrases. The one in the first hemistich has the capacious bipartite *majmánā ... ámartylene nāmnā* embedded in a full clause with the verb *prá sarsre*; the two in pāda c occur only with instrumentals (*dyumnéna* in the opening and the conjoined *śávasotá rāyā* after the caesura); the one in d has only a single instr. (*vīryèṇa*) but is part of a clause again, though with a pred. adj. *sámokaḥ*, not a finite verb. Since the structure of this vs. is like that of vs. 6, the question again arises as to where to attach c (or the two parts of c). Flg. Ge I take all of c with d, construing all the instrumentals with *sámokaḥ* ‘at home (with)’. But I now see that, because the structures in c are minimal, it could as well go with ab (or the first half with ab, the second with d). This would produce alternative translations “Through his greatness and his immortal name he extended himself, (and also) through his brilliance and his power and wealth. He is at home with heroism.” or even “Through his greatness and his immortal name he extended himself, (and also) through his brilliance; he is at home with power and wealth and with heroism.” (This last, with the first part of c leaning backward and the 2nd leaning forward, would mimic my interpr. of

vs. 6.) Again I do not see a way to decide the question, but I think it's worth noting how the poet has cleverly constructed pāda c so that it is ambig.

VI.18.8: As Ge points out (n. 8b), the role of Cumuri and Dhuni in the RV is to be put to sleep by Indra, so that Dabhīti can deliver the coup de grâce to them. See the various passages adduced by Ge and esp. nearby VI.26.6. In our vs. they are marooned at the end of the first hemistich, and after an initial verb in c another set of Indra's victims is introduced: Pipru, Śambara, and Śuṣṇa. Ge asks whether we should assume an ellipsis with the Cumuri/Dhuni phrase (in other words, supply a form of "put to sleep") or a zeugma (in other words, to take them as objects of *vr̥ṇák* with the Pipru group, though their fates were met in different ways). I have chosen the 2nd option. The audience would certainly know the particular destiny of Cumuri and Dhuni but would also be able to lump them in with other targets of Indra, all as objects of a generically violent verb. (It may be worth noting that *vr̥ṇák* here is one of the very few forms of *√vr̥j* that lacks a preverb, though cf. nearby VI.26.3.) The segregation of Cumuri and Dhuni in pāda b, away from the verb and the other victims, might give us pause, but cf. vs. 5, where the obj. *valám* is found in the interior of pāda b, with the verb beginning c.

In d the datives *cyautnāya* and *śayāthāya* have parallel infinitival function. For the latter cf. also *śayāthe* in the preceding hymn (VI.17.9, with disc. ad loc.) with the same apparent meaning but in a different case.

VI.18.9: *udāvatā* is read *udāvatā* by the Pp. and is generally considered the instr. of the pres. act. part. of *úd√av* 'help', with metrical lengthening (so explicitly Lub), a lengthening that is unmotivated. It is also the case that *úd* is not especially common with *√av*, though I concede that the six passages I'm aware of make this an established usage. I also find it surprising that there is no preverb with *tiṣṭha* in the expression in b, *rātham ... tiṣṭha* "mount the chariot," since this expression is almost always found with preverb, generally *ā*, also *ādhi*. I therefore wonder if the initial string in pāda a is actually concealing the preverb(s), in tmesis: *ud-ā*, followed by the uncompounded pres. part. *āvatā*. This analysis is responsible for my tr. "up and mount ..." I realize, however, that a number of objections can be raised. The combination *ud-ā* doesn't otherwise occur with *√sthā*, but I would point out that both occur with that root individually. Two further potential problems: 1) two preverbs next to each other in tmesis, rather than the usual single one. I confess I do not know of other examples. 2) the accentuation: the accented vowels of *ā* and *āvatā* would coalesce, resulting in a single udātta -- this is unproblematic -- but the lack of accent on *ud* looms larger. Here I rely on Macdonell's observation (VGS, p. 469) that when *ā* is immediately preceded by another preverb, *ā* alone has the accent. In Macdonell's formulation this applies (only) to these sequences when compounded with verbs; I would here extend that to the same sequence in tmesis. This may be too much machinery to deploy simply in order to account for the surprising, supposed metrical lengthening of *udāvatā* and the surprising lack of preverb with *tiṣṭha*, but it seems worth considering. Alternatively, it could be that *udāvatā* is a compd pres. part., but compd not only with *úd*, but also *ā*. This is the solution of Rivelex (I.541), and it may be the best compromise, though *ā* is not otherwise found with *√av*, as far as I know. (I have not been able to find the *ā+√av* claimed by Rivelex in the head note on p.

538, and in the claimed *prá ā* passage (VIII.23.2), *ā* is a postposition, as is more or less admitted p. 543 n. 1.)

The *ca* in the instr. phrase in pāda a seems pleonastic, and if it is implicitly connecting the two adj. modifying *tvákṣasā*, viz. *āvatā* (or *udāvatā*) and *pānyasā* (Klein DGRV I.71 “aiding and wondrous”), they seem ill-assorted semantically. I wonder if it is meant to connect the first ADJ.-NOUN pair with a 2nd, with gapping of the noun modified by *pānyasā* (“with your helpful energy and ever more admirable X”). But there is no standard *pānyas*-NOUN formula, so I will not pursue this.

In d Old (Noten) and Ge assume that the *māyāḥ* are negative magical wiles that belong to Indra’s opponents. A negative valuation of *māyā-* is of course common, and is clear in the nearby passage VI.22.9, where a pāda almost identical to our c, urging Indra to take his mace in hand, precedes one in which he is urged to destroy *māyāḥ* (VI.22.9cd *dhiṣvā vājraṃ dākṣiṇa indra hāste, vīśvā ajurya dayase vī māyāḥ*) -- though see comm. ad loc: a secondary positive reading is also possible. This parallel is an important piece of evidence for both Old’s and Ge’s assessment of *māyāḥ* here. However, this reasonable interpr. ignores one major factor in our passage: the verb *abhī prá manda*. This lexeme occurs a number of times elsewhere (V.4.1, VII.33.1, VIII.12.13, 93.19), and it is always otherwise positive: act. ‘exhilarate’, mid. ‘become exhilarated’. A negative interpr. of *māyāḥ* requires a serious distortion of the meaning of the verb (e.g., Old’s ‘verwirren’, adopted from BR), whereas assuming the *māyāḥ* belong to Indra allows it to have a small extension of its usual sense: ‘exhilarate’ → ‘stimulate’. Just as soma exhilarates and stimulates Indra for the Vṛtra-smashing, so does Indra exhilarate and stimulate his own powers. Old in fact previously (ZDMG 55.323) made a good case that the *māyāḥ* are Indra’s, third in a list of his Kampfmittel that includes the chariot of b and the mace of c, and he suggested a tr. “Setze deine Wunderkräfte in freudige Erregung” very much like mine. He attributes his change of heart in the Noten to VI.22.9 just cited and to his consideration of “Der Gesamteindruck des Auftretens von *māyāḥ* in den Indraliedern.” But, in fact, he overlooked one very crucial occurrence, in this very hymn: in vs. 12 Indra himself is called *purumāyā-* ‘having many magical powers’ (cf. also nearby VI.21.2 and 22.1 in this same Indra cycle, also III.51.4). This seems to me clinching evidence against the Ge/Old interpr. of our d: Indra has many *māyā-* and he deploys them to achieve his ends. (Gotō [1st Kl., 236 n. 521] finds the passage puzzling, but does try to reconcile it with the usage of the verb, not entirely successfully.)

VI.18.10: The imagery is somewhat mixed here: it is hard to see how either a missile (nom. *aśāniḥ*) or a lance (instr. *hetī* [contra Pp. *hetīḥ*, as seen already by Gr etc.]) can *burn down* anything. I assume it’s a transferred visual image from the fire simile, since flames can have a lance-like shape and shoot out dramatically.

The fem. instr. adj. phrase *gambhīrāya ṛṣvāyā* lacks an overt referent. Ge supplies *Stimme* without disc. In the absence of any obvious choices, I follow Gr in assuming *hetī* from pāda b. Neither *ṛṣvā-* nor *gambhīrā-* has a standard fem. referent.

The obj. of *ruṛōja* is likewise unexpressed. Ge supplies *Burgen* (*púrah*, a common obj. of this verb), but (n. 10cd) suggests that *rākṣaḥ* from b is also possible. Since the *yó ruṛōja* rel. clause of c is picked up by the main cl. of d, I instead supply *duritā*, which is the obj. of the conjoined verbs of d. Elsewhere *duritā* is the obj. of *√han* (IX.62.2, 90.6, 97.16), a verb semantically similar to *√ruj*.

VI.18.11: Gr takes the referent of *yásya* as ‘wealth’ (see col. 1114, s.v. *yótu-*). But it is far more likely that it is Indra, whom we are urging to come here -- and whose arrival might be threatened by the actions of the ungodly man. (It is not possible to determine from Ge’s tr. (“den”) what he thinks the referent is.) The relationship between *yāhí* and *yótoḥ* might be clearer if the rel. clause were tr. “... never has the power to keep away.”

On *yótoḥ* see now also Keydana (Inf., 77–78), who does not consider it a true infinitive. He takes *yásya* simply as the determiner of a gen. action noun *yótu-*. I am more inclined to see *yótuḥ* as an infinitive, and therefore consider *yásya* as an example of “attraction” to the case of the infinitive from an underlying obj. **yám*. The dative to the same stem does function as an infinitive and takes acc. rection: VIII.71.15 *agním dvéṣo yótavai no grñīmasi* (cf. VIII.18.5 *dvēṣāmsi yótave*).

VI.18.13: This vs. is structurally reminiscent of vs. 8. Like there, we have a clause occupying the first pāda (both ending in *bhūt/bhūt*, as it happens), with (most of) b belonging to a different but radically incomplete clause, containing a marooned set of accusative PNs whose fate at the hands of Indra is well known. Pāda c continues with other accusative victims of Indra, but also provides a verb to govern them. In both vss. the names in the b clause have a well-known and quite specific outcome at Indra’s hands: Cumuri and Dhuni in 8b were put to sleep by Indra, to weaken them for a death blow administered by someone else; as for our vs., acdg. to I.53.10 Indra made Kutsa, Āyu, and Atithigva subject (*arandhanāyaḥ*) to Tūrvayāṇa, who also appears by name in our pāda d. In both 8b and 13b the publ. tr. follows the same strategy: co-opting the verb in c (*vrñák* in 8, *ní śísāḥ* in 13) to govern not only the accusatives in its own pāda but also those in pāda b. This is syntactically a bit more complex in our vs. because b is a relative clause (with *yád*) so the unaccented verb of c cannot be applied to it directly. I still think this is the correct strategy in 8 and probably also here as well, but the presence of dat. *asmai* in b along with its likely referent *tūrvayāṇam* in d makes me wonder if Ge (n. 13b) may be right in simply supplying the verb found in the very phrase in I.53.10 *tvám asmai kútsam atithigvám āyúm, ... arandhanāyaḥ*, despite the isolation of that passage and its distance from ours. (Alternatively we could use *árdayaḥ*, which governs the same three names in VIII.53.2, but there is no dat. there; and it is likewise isolated and distant.) Old (both ZDMG 55.323 and Noten) is also in favor of supplying such a verb. Note in passing that unaccented *asyai* in our b presupposes a referent already in the discourse, so it must be anticipating *tūrvayāṇam* in d. For Tūrvayāṇa cf. the simile *tūrvan ná yāman* in nearby VI.15.5 with disc. ad loc.

VI.18.14: The aor. subjunctive *káraḥ* is generally taken as preterital, an interpr. licensed by Gr, who identifies it as “Impf.” But this is morphologically irresponsible, and further, given the injunc. *mádan* in the main cl. (b), a proper subj. value is quite possible. I think this is an example of the standard rhetorical move to take Indra’s signal mythological deeds and make them a model for his behavior in the future, to our benefit. The next and final vs. continues this point of view. See Hoff (Injunc. 55 and n. 37) for a similar assessment, though he also envisions the possibility of “Konjunktiv im präteritalen Sachverhalt.”

VI.19 Indra

This hymn is something of a bricolage, with numerous phrases, pādas, and whole verses borrowed from elsewhere. (I say “borrowed” rather than the more neutral “parallel to,” because the sheer number of the matches strongly suggests that there is a magpie quality to the construction of this hymn.) For details of the matches, see Ge’s nn. (though he doesn’t note all of them) and Bloomfield RR.

VI.19.1: The publ. tr. should read “manfully” with adverbial *nṛvāt*.

On possible configurations of the terms connected by *utā*, see Klein DGRV I.341.

Gr derives *aminā-* from \sqrt{am} (‘mächtig andringend, gewaltig’), but it must belong to $\sqrt{mā}$ as thematic parallel to *āminant-*. See Old (ZDMG 55.323).

The phrase in d, *sūkṛtaḥ kartṛbhir bhūt* “he was well made by his makers,” is somewhat startling as a description of the great god Indra. Who are his makers? Is this a depiction of his original creation, or does it have a more narrow and current application? Because of the previous pāda, ... *vāvṛdhe vīryāya* “he has been strengthened for his heroic deed,” I am inclined towards the latter: the soma drinks and ritual activities and praise have made him the consummate heroic actor. The pl. agent noun *kartār-* may refer to the soma drinks or to the priests who prepared and offered them to Indra. Because I think the reference is to the immediate past, I would slightly alter the tr. from “was well made” to “has been well made.”

VI.19.1–2: These two vss. show a penchant for synonymous pairs: 1d *urūḥ pṛthūḥ* “wide (and) broad,” 2b *bṛhāntam ṛṣvām* “lofty (and) towering,” *ajāraṃ yūvānam* “unaging (and) youthful.”

VI.19.2: *śāvasā sūśuvāṃsam* “swollen with strength” is an etymological figure, though *śāvas-* has lost its tight connection to $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘swell’. Both words are reused in this hymn: 6a *śaviṣṭham ... śavaḥ* “strongest strength”; 7b, 8b *sūśuvāṃsam*.

VI.19.4: Since *śākā-*, so accented, is the adj. ‘able’, not a noun *śāka-* ‘ability’, I supply ‘men’ on the basis of IV.17.11 *ebhūr nṛbhiḥ ... asya śākaiḥ*.

With pāda d I supply opt. *syāma*. Cf. II.27.7 *ūpa syāma puruvīrā āriṣṭāḥ*, sim. vs. 16; X.128.3 *āriṣṭāḥ syāma tanvā suvīrāḥ*.

VI.19.5: The gen. phrase *vāmāsya vāsunaḥ* in b is difficult to construe. Ge supplies “(Spender)” as its head noun; my tr. assumes that it is a loose genitive specification of the *paśú-* that is lurking in the *-kṣú-* in the bahuvrīhi *puru-kṣú-* ‘possessing much livestock’. This interpr. is suggested by the other occurrence of this gen. phrase in VIII.1.31 *utā vāmāsya vāsunaś ciketati, yó ásti yādvah paśúḥ* “of the valuable goods what will stand out is the livestock coming from Yadu,” where the *vāmā-* *vāsu-* is identified as a particular *paśú-*. But the syntax proposed for our passage is sketchy.

By accent *rāyaḥ* should be nom. pl., not, as I have tr. it, gen. sg. As Ge suggests in his n. 5c, it reads literally “the paths, the riches ...” Nonetheless, Old (ZDMG 55.324 and Noten) considers the nom. pl. reading “forced” (gezwungen) and interprets it as a gen. sg. (on the basis in part of VII.18.3 *pathyā rāyaḥ* with a clear gen. sg.). In the ZDMG

treatment he explicitly says that emending the accent isn't necessary, though he doesn't indicate why.

In d Ge suggests a haplology of **samudréṇa ná*, with an instr. rather than a loc., as in III.36.7 *samudréṇa síndhavo yādamānāḥ*, where he proposes a similar haplology. This is possible, but not nec.: I see no reason why rivers can't unite *in* the sea as well as with it. As for III.36.7 see comm. ad loc.; I do not think that a simile particle is necessary there.

VI.19.6–8: As noted in the publ. intro., all three of these vss. contain the phrase “bring here to us”: in 6a and 7b *na ā bhara* straddles the early caesura; in 8a *ā no bhara* opens the vs. Since vss. 6–8 are the middle vss. of this hymn, this repeated phrase might identify an omphalos, but if so it is quite a weak one. The vss. are not particularly noteworthy for their content, and the enclosing vss. do not provide the usual frame structure.

VI.19.6: The first hemistich is notable for the superlative etymological figures: double *śáviṣṭham ... śávaḥ* “strongest strength” (or, in fact, triple, since *śūra* ‘hero’ is ultimately related to these words) and triple *ójiṣṭham ójaḥ ... ugrám* “mightiest mighty might.” The triple etym. connection of the first phrase is better conveyed by Ge's “Bring uns, du Starker, die stärkste Stärke” than by the publ. tr. Note also that the adjacent words in b *ójo abhibhūta* “... might, o overpowering one,” though not syntactically connected here, form a bahuvrīhi modifying Indra in the preceding hymn, VI.18.1 *abhíbhūti-ojas-* ‘of overpowering strength’.

On the phrase *dyumnā ... mānuṣāṇām* see comm. ad X.42.6.

VI.19.7–8: I tr. *sūśuvāmsam* in both vss. as ‘swollen with strength’, although the *śávasā* found in 2c is absent, as a portmanteau tr. to capture the full sense of the root. This participle picks up *śáviṣṭham ... śávaḥ* in vs. 6.

VI.19.7: On the long root vowel in *jigīvāmsaḥ*, see Old ZDMG 55.324, where on the basis of the metrical evidence he surmises that, at least in this post-caesura position, the form should be read with short root vowel (**jigī-vams-*), the form found in the younger Vedic texts. See also Arnold (Ved. Met. 143), who considers the short-*i* form required in 3 of the 5 occurrences of the strong stem, and Kü (189 n. 225), who considers it proper except in III.15.4. Kü cites Anttila (1969, Schwebeabl. 61) as explaining the lengthening in the Saṃhitā text as analogy to *ninīvāms-*. However, it is much more likely that it is a morphologically conditioned lengthening, meant to distinguish the *-i*-vowel proper to the root from the *-i*-liaison vowel that has become associated with suffixes/endings. Thus *jigī-vāms-* with long vowel is kept separate from the type *tasth-ivāms-*, as I already argued in my 1988 article on the vocalized laryngeal (224–25), though without factoring in the metrical evidence pointing to this lengthening as late and redactional. (Of course, in *tasthivāms-* the *-i-* would originally have represented the zero-grade of this *-ā* root, but by synchronic RV it has been reanalyzed as part of the suffix. See disc. in my 1988 art.)

VI.19.8: In d the *utá* is oddly positioned, since it appears to be meant to conjoin *jāmīṃr ājāmīn* “kin and non-kin,” there being no other likely candidates. Klein (DGRV I.356–57) calls it a “peculiar passage” and classes it with two other examples of what he

schematizes as *utá* X Y (/ Z ...). The pair *jāmi- ājāmi-* is several times asyndetic (I.111.3, IV.4.5, VI.44.17) as here, so no conjunction is actually necessary, but we can cite nearby VI.25.3 ... *jāmāya utá yé 'jāmayah*, where the *utá* is correctly placed. Perhaps our passage is a blend of the asyndetic figure and the “X and which Y” construction in VI.25.3.

VI.19.10: The medial 1st pl. s-aor. opt. *vaṃsīmāhi* contrasts with the active 1st pl. s-aor. subjunctive *vaṃsāma* in 8c, but the medial optative must have been modeled on the rhyme form *maṃsīmāhi* in the same metrical position in 7d. The “rest” following *vaṃsīmāhi* may call attention to the verb by isolating it metrically.

Besides this echo, note also *nṛvāt*, which replicates *nṛvāt* in 1a, and *vāmām* recalling *vāmāsyā* in 5b, while the gen. *vāsvaḥ* is in slight discord with the differently formed gen. *vāsunaḥ* in 5b.

I tr. *śrómatebhiḥ* as ‘attentions’, that is, the attentive hearing(s) that Indra gives to men’s words. For similar use of *śrómata-* in a somewhat clearer context see VII.40.5.

The referent of the “both kinds of good[s]” in c is not clear, at least from immediate context. In the very similar passage VII.82.4 *īśānā vāsva ubhāyasya*, it seems to refer to goods belonging to war and peace; similarly in the next hymn, VII.83.5 *yuvām hí vāsva ubhāyasya rājataḥ*, where a reference to war and peace -- or perhaps to the goods of enemies and of allies -- is likely. In II.9.5 the referent of *ubhāyam ... vasavyām* is also open-ended, but Re’s suggestion there that it’s livestock and offspring is perhaps the most satisfactory. In our passage the nearest contrastive pair is *jāmīnīr ājāmīn* “kin and non-kin” in 8c, so perhaps “both kinds of good[s]” refers to the goods belonging to these two groups whom we hope vanquish in battle. Note *vṛtrāny ubhāyāni* “both kinds of obstacles” in 13c, which Ge, persuasively, takes as referring to the “kin and non-kin” of 8d. MLW suggests another possibility: “movable and immovable,” which has a fine Indo-European pedigree.

The acc. obj. phrase in d, *rātnam māhi sthūrām bṛhāntam*, contains an apparent gender clash: *rātna-* is neut., as is *māhi*; *sthūrām* can be either neut. or masc., while *bṛhāntam* must be masc. It is tempting to correlate the two genders with the two kinds of goods in pāda c: a “great treasure” (neut.) and “substantial lofty X” (masc.). This might be possible: *sthūrā-* *bṛhānt-* qualifies masc. *rayí-* in IV.21.4 *sthūrásyā rāyō bṛható yá īśe* (and cf. X.156.3 *āgne sthūrām rayīm bhara*), and *bṛhānt-* not infrequently modifies *rayí-* (cf., e.g., VI.6.7). Thus, we could assume an underlying **rayīm* for the last two adjectives, yielding a tr. “grant a great treasure (and) substantial lofty (wealth).” This might be supported by *rāyā ... bṛhatā* in the last pāda of the hymn (13d). Nonetheless, this seems unduly artificial, and I would prefer to assume that at the end of this acc. phrase, encouraged by ambig. *sthūrām, bṛhāntam* has simply taken its accustomed pāda-final place in Triṣṭubh. As reported by Old (ZDMG 55.325 and Noten), Ludwig suggested *substituting* (that is, emending) *rayīm* for *māhi*, a suggestion roundly rejected by Old, who simply says (Noten) that masc. *bṛhāntam* is construed with neut. *rātnam*.

VI.19.12: Note a different kind of gender mismatch in pāda a. Though in the idiom with *√man* “consider oneself X” / “be considered as X,” X is in the same case as the underlying subject (see, e.g., 7c *maṃsīmahi jigīvāmsaḥ* “we could be considered victors”), here it is construed with an adverbial neut. *māhi*. That this is not necessarily a

property of “think oneself great” is shown by I.178.5, VII.98.4 *maható manyamānān* “... those thinking themselves great,” with acc. pl. matching the subject of the participle.

VI.19.13: On *ṛtrāṇy ubhāyāni* “both kinds of obstacles” see comm. ad vs. 10.

VI.20 Indra

On the metrical irregularities in the hymn, see Old ZDMG 55.324 and Noten.

VI.20.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the “ask” in this hymn comes at the beginning, not the end as is more usual. It is also excessively convoluted in syntax and phraseology. (My interpr. of the vs. is in great part guided by Th [Fremdl. 58] and to a certain extent Ge., though as far as I can see Ge simply fails to tr. parts of it.) The actual referent of the definitional rel. cl. that occupies the first hemistich is not encountered until the second word of pāda b (*rayīḥ*), preceded by a discontinuous simile *dyaúr ná ... bhūma* “like heaven the earth,” whose first part has been fronted around the rel. prn. *yāḥ*, and by a verb in tmesis, *abhí ... tasthaú* “surmounts,” whose preverb is stationed after the caesura in pāda a and whose verb form proper opens pāda b. And this is only the beginning!

A first paraphrase of the first hemistich would be “as heaven (surmounts) the earth, the wealth that surmounts ...,” with “wealth” corresponding grammatically and functionally to “heaven.” This first stab makes it immediately clear that we need an acc. obj. in the frame to correspond to *bhūma* in the simile, something that wealth can “surmount.” One acc. is obvious: *jānān* at the end of the hemistich. But what do we do with *aryāḥ* at the end of the first pāda? Old (ZDMG 54.169–70) takes it as an acc. pl., tr. “wie die Himmel über der Erde (sollen) die Schätze über den Geizigen (erhaben sein).” However, there is a reasonably well-attested phrase *rāyo aryāḥ* “the riches of the stranger” (IV.48.1, VI.14.3, VI.47.9, and esp. VI.36.5; cf. also VI.1.5 and comm. on all those passages). In VI.36.5 it is found in exactly this context: *dyaúr ná bhūmābhí rāyo aryāḥ* “Like heaven over the earth, sur(mount) the riches of the stranger,” with *rāyo aryāḥ* an object phrase exactly parallel to *bhūma* in the simile. It therefore seems best here to assume a gapping of acc. pl. *rāyah*, whose presence is suggested by the nom. *rayīḥ*, with *aryāḥ* a gen. as elsewhere. Hence “wealth that surmounts (the wealth/riches) of the stranger ...”

And what does this “wealth of the stranger” consist of? In all cases it seems to refer to manpower, not to material wealth, and our passage makes this clear by further specifying it as *jānān* ‘people(s)’.

As if the poet hadn’t misled us enough already with the intertwining of constituents and gapping of a crucial word, he also plants a false cue. The word *bhūma* is of course the acc. sg. to the neut. *n*-stem *bhūman-*, as shown esp. by the parallel VI.36.5. But in its position directly after the preverb *abhí*, it looks mighty like a verb -- and could almost (but only almost) be the 1st pl. root aor. *bhūma*, though with wrong accent (expect **bhūmá*, a form not found in the RV). The lexeme *abhí√bhū* is close in meaning to the *abhí√sthā* we have here (whose verbal part has been postponed till the 2nd pāda), and given its sandhi form the rel. prn. *yā* (underlying *yāḥ*) could equally be underlying *yé*, which could match the number of the putative 1st pl. verb form (“we who surmount ...”). Of course, as just noted, the accent on *bhūma* is wrong, and we would further expect *abhí* to lose its own accent and univerbate with an immediately following verb in a rel. clause.

But I nonetheless think that the poet meant for his audience to follow this false trail, however briefly.

After this tangled beginning, the second hemistich is completely straightforward: the acc. *tām* picks up the rel. cl. couched in the nom., with the implicit referent “wealth,” modified by three acc. OBJ+VERBAL NOMINAL cmpds, all objects of “give” (*daddhī*). This is the last time in the hymn that Indra is asked to give us anything; the only other appeal to Indra is in 10a, where we pray to “win anew.” Almost all of the rest of the hymn treats previous heroic deeds of Indra, though it should be noted that many of these are presented in the injunctive, and the notoriously slippery usage of the injunctive may leave the possibility of current application open.

VI.20.2: This vs. begins like vs. 1, with a form of ‘heaven’ followed by the simile marker *ná* (1a *dyaúr ná*, 2a *divó ná*). In this case there is nothing in the frame that explicitly corresponds to the gen. *diváh* in the simile, though the dat. *túbhyam* is roughly parallel: like the “lordship of heaven,” lordship was conceded to you (Indra) and is therefore yours.

The standard idiom for ‘concede’ is *ánu √ dā*, not, as here, *ánu √ dhā*. Cf., with phraseology similar to here, VI.25.8 *ánu te dāyī ... satrá te víśvam ...* (sim. II.20.8). But *√ dhā* is also found in this idiom elsewhere, e.g., VI.36.2 *satrá dadhire ánu vīryāya*. Old (ZDMG 55.326, Noten) seems prepared to follow Gr (Tr.) and v. Bradke in emending *dhāyī* to **dāyī*, but this seems unnec. The two roots are formally very parallel and in many contexts their meanings are barely distinguishable; I see no reason why *√ dhā* cannot have acquired this idiomatic meaning with *ánu* in imitation of *ánu √ dā*. In this particular case *ánu √ dhā* may have been used in preference to *ánu √ dā* because of the technical use of *anudéya-* in vs. 11 below. See disc. there.

Note that the ‘lordship, lordly power’ (*asuryà-*) is in the control of the gods and conceded to Indra, another indication that the later Asura/Deva divide is not present in the core RV. See also VI.36.1 below.

VI.20.3: The publ. tr. takes Indra as the subj. of *āvat* in d, with *dartnúm* an action noun “when he aided the splitting ...” But, on the basis of other *-(t)nú-* stems (cf. AiG II.2.696–97 and 741–42), *dartnú-* is more likely verbal/agentive (‘splitting, splitter’) and the subject of *āvat* should then be soma (“the somian honey” *mádhu- sómyá-*). So explicitly Old (ZDMG 55.326, with convincing parallels; Ge appears to follow, though his tr. is more equivocal. I would therefore change the tr. to “when it [=soma] aided the splitter of all the strongholds.”

VI.20.4–5: As Ge (n. 4–5) notes, these two vss. probably belong together as an account of the ever-fragmented Śuṣṇa / Kutsa myth, though the connection of the Pañis (pāda a) to this myth is somewhat uncertain. Old (ZDMG 55.325–27 [=KlSch 785–86]) treats these vss. in detail.

VI.20.4: I read the instr. plurals opening the two hemistichs (*śatañh* 4a, *vadhañh* 4c) “vertically” -- that is, as a single NP distributed over two clauses. This seems to be Ge’s solution too: “Durch hundert (Streiche) ...; durch (deine) Streiche ...”; so also Old ZDMG 55.326. The fact that a form of *√ pad* needs to be read in pāda c, matching

apadran in pāda a supports this interpr. It would, however, be possible to interpr. *śataīḥ* as “by the hundreds,” referring to the felled Paṇis. So Kü (424).

In the publ. tr. I took the beneficiary of Indra’s actions in pāda b to be a single person, “the ten-armed poet” (*dāśoṇaye kavāye*)(so Ge), and since *dāśoṇi-* recurs in 8a apparently qualifying *vetasú-*, I considered this to be a reference to this shadowy Vetasu. But I now think this identification is incorrect or at least misleading. When the word *kaví-* is found in an Indra / Kutsa / Śuṣṇa context it always (in my current view) refers to Uśanā Kāvya, and I believe that to be the case here — strengthened by the fact that the other two occurrences of *arká-sāti-* (I.174.7, VI.26.3) are found with *kaví-* in the Kutsa / Śuṣṇa myth, where the word must surely refer to Uśanā Kāvya. (Old makes the same point, ZDMG 55.326–27.) I therefore now think that “for the poet” means “for Uśanā Kāvya,” and “for the ten-armed” is likely a reference to a different person, identified as Vetasu in vs. 8. (Old considers the additional possibility that *dāśoṇi-* is an epithet of UK, but seems to favor the separation into two individuals.) On the basis of 8a and Ge’s disc. there (n. 8), it further seems likely, or at least possible, that *vetasú-* in 8 refers to Kutsa, and therefore in our 4b the two datives refer to Kutsa and UK. I would therefore now alter the tr. to “for the sake of the ten-armed one [=Kutsa?] and of the poet [=Uśanā Kāvya].”

My tr. of *dāśoṇi-* in this vs. and in 8a reflects the current consensus, endorsed by Mayr (EWA s.v. *oṇí-* “offenbar ‘Arm’”), that *oṇí-* means ‘arm’ (as opposed to Gr’s ‘Schutz’ and ‘Mutterbrust’), but I think that this interpr. might be ripe for revisiting. The passages are not particularly diagnostic -- the most important evidence is the fact that the stem is generally dual -- and it lacks a clear etymology (though it’s sometimes connected with *√av* ‘help’). There is also the question of the cmpd. sandhi: if *dāśoṇi-* consists of *dāśa* + *oṇí-*, it should of course come out as **dāśauní-*. The -o- has been accounted for (see EWA s.v. *oṇí-* [p.c from J. Schindler], Mayr PN s.v. *dāśoṇiya-*) by invoking TS I.2.6.1, where the widely attested mantra *abhí tyám devám savitâram oṇyòḥ kavíkratum* (AV VII.14.1, etc.) instead contains *ūnyòḥ*. The *ū-* initial would indeed yield the proper sandhi result, but given the otherwise overwhelming attestation of *oṇyòḥ* in the mantra, the TS variant does not have much support. Since at present I don’t have a better solution, I stick with ‘ten-armed’, but consider it quite dubious.

That *arká-sāti* means ‘winning of the (sun’s) rays’ is strongly suggested by *sūryasya sātaú* in the next vs. (5d), though, as Old points out (ZDMG 55.327), it could in addition mean ‘winning of the chants’.

I don’t understand pāda d, but I would point out that another “insatiable Śuṣṇa” passage also has a mention of mealtime: IV.16.12 *kútsāya śúṣṇam asúṣaṁ ní barhīḥ, prapítvé áhnaḥ kúyavaṁ sahásrā* “For Kutsa you laid low insatiable Śuṣṇa, who brings bad harvest, with his thousands, before the day’s first meal.” Perhaps the point is that despite his voraciousness, Śuṣṇa is deprived of his meal by Indra’s timely blow. In that case the subj. of *arīrecīt ... prá* here is Indra, who leaves nothing for Śuṣṇa.

VI.20.5: For the unusual position of *sá* and its rukied initial (*urú śá*) see disc. ad VI.2.4.

VI.20.6: Namī is found also in I.53.7, also along with Indra against Namuci, and in X.48.9, where he also has the patronymic *sāpīya-* as here.

VI.20.8: This vs. is made difficult both by our very sketchy knowledge of the personnel and the myth and by the syntax. Both Old (ZDMG 55.328–29 [=KISch 787–88]) and Ge (n. 8) devote considerable space to disc. of it. The vs. seems to pun on PNs in a way discouragingly similar to VII.18, the very obscure account of the Ten Kings battle. The nearby vs. VI.26.4 is of some help in the interpr. of this one, as is X.49.4.

My approach to the vs. partly follows Ge's, but differs in several important ways. Like Ge (who adopted it from Baunack; see his n. 8), I supply a verb of speaking to introduce the second hemistich, which we both take as the direct speech of Indra. (By contrast Old construes *úpa sṛjā* in d as the verb governing the acc. in ab, but given the distribution of the rest of the elements in the vs., esp. the preverb *ā* opening pāda c, this seems unlikely.) But rather than taking the acc. PNs in ab as the addressees of this speech as Ge does, I construe them (loosely) with the hapax bahuvrīhi *svabhīṣṭi-sumnaḥ* 'having/showing the favor of his dominance', with Vetasu [=Kutsa?] and Tuji as the recipient of this favor. The intens. adj. *tūtuji-* 'thrusting', found elsewhere modifying a whirlwind (*bhṛmi-* IV.32.2) and a chariot (X.35.6), punningly points to Tuji, who is found in nearby VI.26.4 in the company of Vetasu and Tugra, as here. (In that vs. there is also redupl., but it is located on the verb: *tvām tūjim ... tūtoḥ* "you strengthened Tuji.")

In that vs. Indra strikes down Tugra for Vetasu (VI.26.4c *tvām tūgraṃ vetasāve sácāhan*). I think the same situation is depicted here in cd, though less violently, with Vetasu(-Kutsa) referred to by the adj. *dyótana-* 'brilliant, flashing' expressing a dat. of benefit. In this connection Baunack's adducing (see Ge's n. 8c) of I.63.3 *kutsāya dyumaté* "for heaven-bright Kutsa," another dat. of benefit in the Śuṣṇa myth, is apposite. Ge (also Gr, Mayr PN) takes *dyótanāya* as a PN, but no such person Dyotana is found elsewhere, and in its other two occurrences (I.123.4, VIII.29.2) the stem is an adj. with the expected etymological meaning.

The next question is *ibham*. This is pretty much universally interpr. as a PN, referring to another enemy of Indra. This is in part based on X.49.4, where Tugra and one Smadibha are made subject to Kutsa (and the Vetasu [pl.] and Tuji are also found). Old, for ex., considers Ibha here simply a shortening of Smadibha, and the context of the word in our pāda certainly supports a pun on the latter name: (*ā tūgraṃ śá*)*śvad ibham* ...; cf. X.49.4 (*tūgraṃ kútsāya smádibham*, with the last syllable of the adverb *śásvad* a close match for the 1st syllable of the PN in X.49.4 (if it is indeed a PN). But *ibha-* is elsewhere in the RV a common noun meaning 'retinue' or 'vassal' (the common denominator being the inferior position vis-à-vis someone in power); cf. also the MIA evidence, such as Pāli *ibbha*. And 'vassal' would be an appropriate word for someone made subject to another -- hence my tr. of the phrase *śásvad ibham* as "perpetual vassal," referring to Tugra. (For a somewhat despairing attempt to fit X.49.4 into this scenario, see comm. ad loc.)

Finally, we must deal with the verbal expressions at the end of the vs., *úpa sṛjā iyádhyai*. The first question is what form *sṛjā* represents out of sandhi. The Pp. reads *sṛja*, that is, a 2nd sg. act. impv., with lengthening of the final vowel in the Saṃhitā text. But of course in that case the normal outcome in sandhi should be coalescence into **sṛjeyádhyai*. After some agonizing, Old accepts the Pp interpr. (though he also flirts with a 2nd sg. subj. *sṛjāḥ*), but Ge (n. 8) opts instead for Baunack's suggestion, that the underlying form is *sṛjai*, i.e., a 1st sg. middle subjunctive (so also Lub, though with !). This is the interpr. I have also adopted. Although the 6th cl. pres. *sṛja-* is predominately active, there are a few middle forms; the pf. is about evenly divided between active and

middle forms in transitive usage (including several 1st pl. *sasṛjmāhe* with *úpa*), and there are two 1st sg. *s*-aor. forms *ásṛkṣi* with *úpa* in trans. usage. Taking the form as a 1st sg. also entails the direct-speech interpr. of Baunack/Ge. (It's worth noting as an aside that Sāy. simply glosses *upa srja* with *upāsrjat*, apparently untroubled by matters of sandhi and grammatical identity; this was followed by Gr [Tr.], though unmentioned in the Wö.)

As Old points out (ZDMG 55.328), the lexeme *úpa √srj* is often used of releasing / dispatching calves to their mother, and this must account for the simile *mātúr ná*. Although this idiom is generally benevolent, it also emphasizes the hierarchical dependency of the young on their mother, and this would be appropriate for the vassal Tugra's subordinate position with regard to Kutsa.

I take the inf. *iyádhyai* to *√i* 'go', or more particularly to the stem *īyate* 'speeds' (*√i* or *√yā*), rather than to *√yā* 'implore, beg' with Lub. It simply completes the action of the main verb "release/depatch them to go ..." The preverb *ā* beginning the 2nd hemistich is more likely to go with this inf. than with *úpa srjai* (pace Gr, also Ge, who thinks [n. 8c] it could go with either one), simply because we'd otherwise expect the order *úpa+ā* (cf. VIII.27.11 *úpa ... ām̐, ásṛkṣi ...*).

After all this, the alterations of the publ. tr. would be minimal:

"Indra showed the favor of his dominance to Vetasu [=Kutsa?] of the ten tricks and ten arms and to the thrusting (Tuji), (saying)

"Tugra as perpetual vassal for brilliant (Vetasu=Kutsa?) shall I dispatch, like (calves) to their mother, to speed (to him)."

VI.20.9: The participial phrase *bíbhṛad vájram* here and in VI.23.1 below may be intended to invoke the name *bharád-vāja-*, the poet of this hymn and indeed of this maṇḍala, by an expression that seems the syntactic equivalent of that type of governing compound — with the prior member belonging to the same root and the 2nd member a phonological variant of the obj. Matching the first member exactly would be problematic, since the nom. sg. of the participle would be *bhāran*. The punning on PNs noted with regard to the immediately preceding vs. may be in evidence here as well.ⁿ

VI.20.10: In b *enā* can simply be adverbial, as Ge and KH (Injunk. 168) take it, but it is also regularly used as demonstrative with forms like *nāmasā* 'homage' (I.171.1, II.23.14, etc.), *sūktēna* 'hymn' (II.6.2), *bráhmanā* (IV.36.7), and in this context, where the sacrifice is mentioned (*yajñāih*), I think it likely that the verbal part of the ritual evidenced by the verb *prá ... stavante* "they start up the praise" is further specified with the near deictic, referring to this current praise hymn.

The syntactic relationship between pādas c and d is ambiguous. With Ge, I take d as the main cl., with c dependent on it. But KH (Injunk. 168) takes them as parallel subordinate clauses dependent on b. Either is possible, because the verb of d, (*d*)*hán*, is initial in the pāda and can owe its accent to that alone.

Note the allit. in (*śāra*)*dīr dārd, dhán dās(īh)*, esp. noticeable because it consists of four syllables in a row, belonging to four separate words.

Old (ZDMG 55.329–30 and Noten) calls *dart* in c into question, arguing that it should be a 2nd ps. and the *-t* is faulty. But there seems no reason not to assume that both *dart* and (*d*)*han* are 3rd ps. verbs; although Indra is referred to in the 2nd ps. in pāda a, shift between the persons is a commonplace in RVic discourse. The sandhi situation here

favors the retention of the *-t*, though the matter is somewhat complex. As is generally known, final clusters are simplified, retaining only the first. The exception is that *-t*, *-ṭ*, and *-k* after *-r-* are retained if they belong to the root (Wh, Gr. §150b Macd. VGS §28a, etc.) -- which the *-t* in *dar-t* does not ($\sqrt{dṛ}$). However, *dar-t* is pāda-final and the next pāda begins in the transmitted text with *dhán* (for *hán*), whose *dh* is the automatic result of the (re-)introduction of occlusion of initial *h-* after a final stop (see, e.g., Wh, Gr. §163). The standard practice is that the *h-* is replaced by the voiced aspirate corresponding to the place of articulation of the final stop -- in this case, a dental. If we assume that this rule was operative before final clusters were simplified, a sequence of 3rd sg. *dard dhán* with apparently pleonastic gemination would favor the non-simplification of the cluster *-rd dh-*. (On cases of gemination and degemination in the text, see my “False Segmentations and Resegmentations in the Rigveda: Gemination and Degemination” [to appear in a forthcoming Fs.].) Pāda c is identical to I.174.2b, and in that passage the case is more difficult because there the context is entirely 2nd ps. As I argued in the comm. to that vs. (q.v.), the final *-t* there may have been introduced from our passage.

VI.20.11: Pāda c contains one of the three instances of the gerundive *anudéya-* in the RV and the only masc. form -- a form called by Ge “ganz unsicher.” This gerundive belongs to the lexeme *ánu* $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘hand over, concede’ discussed above, ad vs. 2. I have discussed one of the fem. forms *anudéyī* in the difficult hymn X.135 at length (“The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of a Brahmin: A New Interpretation of Ṛgveda X.135.” *Journal asiatique* 302.2 [2014]: 245–57). In that article I established that the idiom *ánu* $\sqrt{dā}$ can be further narrowed in certain contexts to mean ‘forgive/acquit a debt’; and the debt in question can be referred to with the gerund *anudéya-*, *-ī*, as (the debt) ‘to be acquitted’. In X.135.5-6 this debt is actually a reference to the inborn debts of a Brahman, which he must pay off during his lifetime, one of which is the need to provide his ancestors with (grand)sons. As argued in that article (255–56), I think the same sense can be seen in our passage. To cite from the article: “The second half of this verse seems to allude to a complex intergenerational relationship in which Indra intervenes. The god hands over a grandson (*nápāt-*) to his grandfather (*mahé pitré*), a transaction that sounds like a man’s fulfillment of his debt to his ancestors by fathering a son, thereby providing them with a grandson. This grandson is said to be *anudéya-*. I would suggest that the grandson here serves as the concrete manifestation of the debt that is to be acquitted, and the technical term *anudéya-* is therefore applied to him. If I am correct, this is another, though more muted, piece of evidence for the existence of the notion of a man’s inborn debt in the Rig Veda.”

On Navavāstu or Navavāstva, see comm. ad X.49.6

VI.20.12: This is identical to I.174.9; see comm. on that vs., esp. with regard to *pārṣi*.

VI.20.13: Dabhīti is the beneficiary of Indra’s putting Cumuri to sleep in VI.26.6. Cumuri’s companion Dhuni is found with him in VI.18.8, and in our passage he immediately follows vs. 12, which contains two adj. usages of *dhúni-* ‘tumultuous, boisterous’.

The second hemistich portrays Dabhīti assembling or preparing four different requisites of the sacrifice in four different morphosyntactic expressions: 1) a full

participial phrase *sómebhiḥ sunvān* “pressing with the soma juices,” 2) a bahuvrīhi *idhmābhṛtiḥ* lit. ‘having the bringing of the firewood’, 3) an *-ín*-stem possessive *pakthī* ‘having cooked food’ (based on an unattested **pakthá-* ‘cooked food’), and 4) an instr. of accompaniment *arkaīḥ* “along with the chants.” The identity of the third has been called into question by Old (ZDMG 55.330, Noten). Though the sandhi form *pakthy* is analyzed by the Pp. as *pakthī* with the long vowel appropriate to the nom. sg. of an *-ín*-stem, in fact in the cadence it would better be read short (though keep in mind the metrical disturbances throughout the hymn). Old toys with the idea that it has been influenced by the PN *pakthá-* and that it is underlyingly an instr. to the *-tí*-stem *paktí-* ‘cooked food’, hence **paktī* with shortening before the following vowel. This seems unnecessarily complex, and the PN *pakthá-* is neither well attested nor found nearby this passage. Since shortening of *-ī* in hiatus was available for the instr., I see no reason why it shouldn’t have been analogically extended to the nom. of an *-ín*-stem in this case. Moreover, I think the morphosyntactic variety just described was deliberate, and replacing 3) with an instr. like that of 4) would disturb the sequence.

VI.21 Indra

VI.21.1: As with hemistich initial *#śataīḥ ... #vadhaīḥ* in VI.20.4 in the immediately preceding hymn, I take *#imāḥ ... #dhíyaḥ* as a “vertical” NP, “these insights.” Their positioning allows them to get out of the way of the intense etym. figure in b: *hávyaṃ ... havyā havante*. This figure is complicated by the fact that *hávya-* is used in two slightly different senses, controlled by slightly different constructions of the verb *√hū / hvā*. Although the normal object of this verb is a god or other being called upon, very occasionally it can take the call itself as object (see comm. ad IV.23.3), and of course derivatives like *háva(na)-* express the call itself. In our passage *havante* ‘they invoke’ takes the usual type of object, namely Indra here, who is qualified by the gerundive *hávya-* ‘to be invoked’. But the insights (*dhíyaḥ*) themselves are also so qualified; here *havyāḥ* must mean not ‘to be invoked’, but ‘to be called [=spoken]’. In order to keep the vocabulary constant, I have tr. ‘deserving to invoke’, in contrast to ‘deserving to be invoked’ applied to Indra.

The vertical NP just discussed unbalances syntactic constituency, and, unusually, the hemistich boundary cannot be respected.

In d most take *īyate* to *√yā / ī* ‘implore, beg’; so, e.g., Ge “... wird ... erbeten” (likewise Lub, Kulikov, *-ya*-presents 495). I assign it rather to ‘speeds’, though either is possible.

VI.21.2: The nominal rel. cl. *yó vídānaḥ*, interrupting a string of accusatives, is syntactically curious. It seems to represent a sort of izafe, rather than a real embedded relative cl. I have tr. it as if acc. *índram* were the predicate of the participle (“who is known as “Indra”), despite the difference in cases. Ge, in contrast: “der bekannt ist.” My interpr. might be better represented as “I will praise him — Indra, as he is known — whose ...” This interpr. fits well with the doubts expressed about Indra later in the hymn, esp. vs. 4. See also *vídānaḥ* in 12b.

The instr. *gīrbhīḥ* in b might be better construed with the verb *stuṣe* in a: “I will praise him with songs”; it has been displaced to the right to be nearer to *gírvāhasam*.

The second hemistich contains a strikingly mixed construction, with the usual matched pair heaven and earth in two different cases, acc. *dívam*, abl.-gen. *pr̥thivyāḥ*, though construed with the same verb. The two different cases are controlled by two different PREVERB + \sqrt{ric} combinations, one overt, one implied. Overt is *āti* \sqrt{ric} ‘extend beyond, surpass’, which is rather rare but takes the acc., as in VIII.92.14, 22 *ná tvāṃ indrāti ricyate* “nothing surpasses you, Indra” (cf. also X.90.5); hence our ... *dívam āti ... riricé*. The implied construction is the more common *prá* \sqrt{ric} ‘extend beyond’ which takes the abl., as in I.61.9 *asyéd evá prá ririce mahitvām, divás pr̥thivyāḥ pári antárikṣāt* “his greatness projected beyond heaven and earth, beyond the midspace” (note clear abl. *antárikṣāt*) (cf. also I.59.5, 109.6, etc.), hence our ... *pr̥thivyāḥ ... ririce mahitvām*. Examples of this latter constr. are found in this group of Indra hymns (VI.24.3, 30.1), and despite the absence of *prá* here it is not surprising that the abl. construction would creep in.

VI.21.3: On the meaning of *vayúna-*, see comm. ad II.34.4.

As has long been known, the RVic desid. stem *íyakṣa-* belongs to \sqrt{nas} ‘attain’, not (*pace* Gr) \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice’. See, inter alia, EWA s.v. *NÁŚ*¹; Heenen (Desid. 79–82).

The question in the 2nd hemistich seems like a non sequitur, which makes me somewhat sympathetic to Sāy’s reading as a (negative) indefinite: *kadā cid* “they do not ever violate ...” But this reinterpr. is arbitrary, of course, and further, the *kadā* question inaugurates a series of questions in vs. 4, each with a *ka-* form: a *kúha*, b *kám* ... *kāsu*, c *káh*, d *káh* ... *katamáḥ*. It may be that we have to ask about the whereabouts of Indra in vs. 4 because he has ceased to appear to us because we have (or may have) violated his ordinances.

VI.21.4: *-tama-*forms implicitly index a referent among three or more possibilities. The interrog. *katamá-* here echoes *purutáma-* of 1a. I have chosen to render *katamá-* with the heavy tr. ‘which of many’ because in this series of questions the poet is anxiously surveying all the possible sacrifices and sacrificers who may have attracted Indra away from us.

VI.21.5: The *utá* in the middle of pāda c uncomplicatedly conjoins the temporally contrastive *madhyamāsaḥ* “the middle ones, those in between” and *nūtanāsaḥ* “the current ones” (see Klein DGRV I.301, 311), but the one beginning pāda d, in Klein’s words (DGRV I.382) “introduc[es] a new nonparallel clause.” It is not represented in the publ. tr., which should perhaps read “And ... take cognizance of the one who is closest.” The reason for this apparently pleonastic conjunction may be that “the closest one” (singular *avamá-*) is not only a subset of “the current ones” (plural *nūtanāsaḥ*), but the climax of the series of temporally sorted comrades.

VI.21.6: This ultimate insider, “the closest one” of 5d, is immediately picked up by the slightly more distanced “closer ones” (*ávarāsaḥ*) in 6a. Here their comparative closeness is not contrasted with previous generations of Indra’s comrades, as in vs. 5, but with the older, distant deeds of Indra. These closer ones are “asking” (*prchántaḥ*) about Indra. Their asking may refer directly to the questions in vs. 4, but it also implies that, however “close” they are, they do not have direct access to knowledge about Indra.

The limits on our knowledge are explicitly acknowledged in the 2nd hemistich, where we praise Indra only insofar as know him (*yā́d evá vidmá*). This subordinated expression is embedded in the larger clause: *ārcāmasi ... , yā́d evá vidmá tāt tvā mahāntam*, where the obj. of *ārcāmasi* is *tvā*, but the *yā́d ... tāt* diptych is clearly formulaic and frozen. This expression reminds us slightly of the *yó vídānaḥ* of 2b, likewise with *√vid* ‘know’ and likewise technically embedded.

VI.21.7: JPB suggests that the “face of the demon” spreading out against Indra is the hood of the cobra, namely Vṛtra.

The referent of the expression beginning b, *máhi jajñānám* “having been born great,” is entirely ambiguous. It may be, as the publ. tr. takes it, an acc. with *tvā*, referring to Indra. Or it may be, as Gr and Ge take it, a neut. nom. modifying the neut. *s*-stem *pājah*. Technically speaking, of course, *máhi* is neut. and might therefore give weight to the latter possibility. But *máhi* can be adverbial here, evoking the apparently fixed expression *máhi jātám* (I.163.1, III.31.3, cf. I.156.2); cf. also V.60.3 *máhi vṛddháh* ‘grown great’. I now think the ambiguity is meant, and the phrase can apply to either of the antagonists (or rather, in the case of the *rakṣás*-) its visage. The ambiguity is hard to convey in tr.; perhaps “... (each) born great.”

The two verbs in the first hemistich, *abhí ... ví tasthe* and *... abhí ... tiṣṭha*, belong to the same root (*√sthā*), are positioned identically, and differ fairly minimally from each other: tense-aspect stem, voice, person, as well as an extra preverb with the first. Unfortunately the etymological connection can’t be easily captured in tr.: “has stood wide against you” is unidiomatic and opaque.

The 2nd hemistich seems implicitly to convey that our anxieties about our intimacy with Indra were well-founded. In 5ab our forebears were identified as Indra’s “ancient comrades” (*pratnāsaḥ ... sákhāyaḥ*), with later generations apparently grandfathered into this select group (5cd). But here we learn who Indra’s “ancient comrade” really is — his mace: *táva pratnéna yújyena sákhyā vájreṇa*.

VI.21.9: The use of parallel and etymologically related purpose datives *ūtáye* and *ávase*, stationed in the a and b pādas respectively, seems pleonastic. I have tr. one as nominal and one as infinitival, but this distinction rests on nothing in the passage.

VI.21.10: Like 1b, pāda c here contains an extravagant etymological figure based again on *√hvā* ‘call’: *hávam (ā) huvató huvānāḥ*.

The phrasing of d also seems awkwardly pleonastic -- *ná tvā́vāṁ anyáḥ ... tvád asti* “no one like you exists, other than you” -- in comparison with the usual expression, found in nearby VI.30.4 *ná tvā́vāṁ anyó asti* “there exists no one else like you” (cf. VII.32.23).

VI.21.11: In c Ge tr. *āsúḥ* as if it were a present: “die Agni zur Zunge haben und die Wahrheit pflegen.” Although this is contextually tempting, the pf. of *√as* is never presential. Cf. Kü (111): “Es ist stets (zumindest auch) vergangenheits bezogen gebraucht.” At best we could render it “who have (always) had Agni as their tongue ...”; this might in fact be better.

In any case the pf. *āsúh* in c matches *cakrúh* in d, and this latter action appears to be one in the distant past -- even though it's not entirely clear what action it refers to. Interpr. is not helped by the fact that *dāsa-* is a hapax, though it is reasonable, with Ge (n. 11d), to take it as “der mythische Stammvater der Dāsa's oder Dasyu's,” or indeed referentially identical with the well-attested stem *dāsa-* referring to some variety of enemy to the Ārya (see Old, etc.). But what the relationship between Manu and Dasa is in this passage and what the gods were attempting to bring about are both unclear -- an unclarity also facilitated by the ambiguity of *úpara-*, which can mean, inter alia, ‘lower’, ‘closer’, or ‘later’. The publ. tr. “... put Manu very close to Dasa” is opaque; in fact I do not now know what I meant by it. Ge takes *úpara-* as ‘later’ and assumes that the gods made Manu Dasa's successor (Nachfolger). I am now inclined towards Old's solution, however: that the gods put Manu below (the ‘lower’ sense of *úpara-*) in the earthly region “for Dasa,” with the dative of malefit, not benefit: they set Manu to do to Dasa whatever he deserved. MLW comments “Wouldn't this most sense if it meant 'they made Manus superior to Dasa'? Could the original meaning of **upara-* as preserved in Avestan, be kept here? For the sentiment cf. VI.19.13 *śátroḥ-śatror úttara ít syāma*.” this would be a neat solution, though I wonder whether a reading that requires the opposite sense (‘above’) of one of the senses of this stem (‘lower’) would be available.

VI.21.12: *vidānaḥ* in b reprises *yó vidānaḥ* in 2a and thus forms a weak ring.

VI.22 Indra

VI.22.1: To add to the similarities between VI.21 and VI.22 noted in the publ. intro., *havya-* is applied to Indra in the first pāda here, recalling 22.1b *havyam ... havyā havante*; note also *purumāyā-* in b, a descriptor of Indra also in VI.21.2d (as well as nearby VI.18.12).

On *sátvan-* see comm. ad I.173.5.

VI.22.2: The vs. lacks an overt finite verb. With Ge I supply a form of *√arc*, picking up the main clause verb of vs. 1, *abhy ārca* of 1b. The instr. *matíbhiḥ* in our d is parallel to *gṛbhīḥ ... ābhīḥ* of 1b.

The “seven inspired poets” (*saptá víprāsaḥ*) evokes the Saptarṣi, the “seven seers.” I am not certain whether the phrase here refers to the Saptarṣi and, further, whether they are identical to the Navagvas; the numbers suggest not. It is worth noting IV.42.8 *asmākam ātra pitāras tá āsan, saptá řṣayaḥ* “Our forefathers, the Seven Seers, were here,” with *pitāraḥ*, as here, as well as IX.92.2 *řṣayaḥ saptá víprāḥ*, where the Seven Seers are identified as *vípra-s*.

The interpr. of the cmpd *nakṣad-dābhá-* given in the publ tr., ‘who catches up to the cheat’, cannot be correct. That tr. assumed a structure of the verbal governing cmpd type, like *bharád-vāja-*, but the accent is wrong. I therefore now see that a conventional tatpuruṣa interpr., with the 2nd member an agent nominal governing the first, should be the correct interpr.; so Gr ‘den Nahenden vernichtend’, Ge ‘der den Einholenden (?) täuscht’. (Curiously AiG does not seem to comment on this cmpd, despite its somewhat aberrant form) The cmpd thus conforms to the type *hasta-grābhá-* ‘grasping the hand’, at least as to its 2nd member, but the first member appears to be the weak form of the pres.

part. to the pres. *nákṣati* ($\sqrt{nakṣ}$ ‘approach, reach’). I do not know, offhand, of any cmpds formally so constructed, and I am further puzzled by the apparent sense ‘tricking / cheating / outwitting the one who approaches’. Forms of the root $\sqrt{nakṣ}$ generally have benevolent sense, as in the medial *nákṣate* in this very hymn (5d), where the song ‘catches up’ to Indra, or act. *nákṣanti* in this same Indra cycle, VI.34.3, where thoughts and voices approach Indra, strengthening him, so there is no apparent reason for Indra to \sqrt{dabh} someone innocently coming up to him. I would emend the tr. to “him who outwits the one(s) approaching,” but still feel that the first member is concealing something I can’t crack. Some light on the cmpd may be shed by the verb forms *ānaśúh* and *nákṣate* in the following vss. (4b and 5d respectively; see below), and this set of vss. seem to share preoccupations and themes. MLW suggests that *nakṣat* could represent the root $\sqrt{naś}$ ‘disappear, destroy’, with -s- suffix and desid. meaning (“who deceives the one who seeks to destroy him”). This is semantically much more attractive than the suggestions given above, but I am dubious about the morphology. The root $\sqrt{naś}$ does not have a desid. at any period of the language, and in any case we should properly expect reduplicated **ninakṣa-*. Moreover, non-caus. stems to this root have the intrans. sense ‘disappear, perish’. The forms in the immediate vicinity cited above that belong to *naś* / *nakṣ* ‘reach, attain’ would also cause interference.

Note the presence of both \sqrt{dabh} ‘trick, cheat’ and \sqrt{druh} ‘deceive, lie’, with Indra depicted as engaging in the former activity, but possessing speech that is *ádrogha-* ‘undeceptive’. In 8a he attacks the “deceitful people” (*jána- drúhvan-*).

VI.22.3: The lack of accent on the demon. in the phrase *asya rāyāh* is notable. Ge tr. “um solche Reichtum,” clearly taking *asya* as modifying *rāyāh*, and Old (ZDMG 61.828 [=KlSch 259]) defends a similar interpr., saying “der weitere Verlauf schildert dann den Reichtum ausführlicher.” However, unaccented oblique stems of *ayám* are ordinarily pronominal, and that interpr. is readily available here: the *asya* can refer to Indra, who immediately precedes in a different case (*índram*).

On the *yāh* of pāda c as breaking the pattern established earlier in the hymn of reference to Indra, see the publ. intro.

VI.22.4: Although there is no overt mark, I take initial *tán no ví vocaḥ* as a question (contra Ge), matching the overt questions in cd and introducing the indirect question in the *yádi* clause; see also *prchántī* in the next vs. and the questions in the previous hymn, VI.21 3–4, 6).

The poet seems to be harking back to vs. 2 in 4ab and vs. 3 in 4cd. In vs. 2 the ancestral poets praised Indra, but the god is described as *nakṣad-dābhá-* ‘outwitting the one(s) approaching’. Here the poet asks if previous singers obtained (*ānaśúh*) Indra’s favor. Although this pf. belongs to the root $\sqrt{(n)as}$ ‘attain, reach’, which is synchronically separate from $\sqrt{nakṣ}$ ‘approach’, the latter root is a fairly transparent enlargement or development of the former (see EWA s.v. *NAŚ*¹, p. 28; Narten, SigAor. 160, Gotō, 1st Kl., 192), and, of course, some forms of $\sqrt{(n)as}$ have the root syllable *nakṣ* (e.g., desid. *ínakṣati*, though see *íyakṣati* in the previous hymn, VI.21.3). I therefore suggest that *ānaśúh* implicitly responds to *nakṣat-* in 2c. With my new (and, I hope, more accurate) interpr. of *nakṣad-dābhá-* in 2c, I now think that vs. 2 implies that Indra may deviously rebuff the attentions of his praisers and have done so even to the legendary poets of the

past. Here the poet directly asks the question if these previous poets (/singers) actually obtained (*ānaśūḥ*) the favor they sought in approaching (*nakṣat-*) Indra, whose benevolence cannot be taken for granted.

In the 2nd hemistich the questions turn to Indra's portion (*bhāgá-*) and his vital energy (*váyah*) in battle, but also refers to the wealth he may bring. The two cmpds *púruhūta purūvaso* respond to *puruvîrasya ... purukṣóḥ* in 3d.

The voc. *khidvah*, presumably to a *-vant*-stem **khídvant-* (AiG II.2.896, or, less likely, **khídvān-* or **khídvāms-*), belongs to the synchronic root $\sqrt{\text{khid}}$, which, despite its relative rarity, displays a variety of senses centered around aggressive action. Since this stem is a hapax, it's difficult to know which of the senses is reflected here; Gr renders as 'drängend (so also EWA s.v. *KHED*), bedrängend, Ge 'Abzwacker'. The only RVic nominal form to this root is *khédā* (3x), which in its clearest occurrence (VIII.77.3) means 'hammer' or the like. I have evoked this sense here, in the English idiom 'hammer-head', thus forming an unjustified etym. figure in tr. "headstrong hammer-head" -- 'headstrong' representing *dudhra*. Although the standard tr. are safer, the fact that the form is a hapax to a poorly attested root invites a more noticeable tr. than 'pressing'.

I follow W. E. Hale (*Ásura-*, 65) in taking *asura-* in *asurahán-* as referring to human 'lords' who lead forces inimical to us.

VI.22.5: This vs. is beset with difficulties, starting with the syntax, on which see Old. The major problems are that there is no finite verb until *iṣe* in d and that it is unclear what the limits are of the rel. cl. marked by *yásya* in b. If we follow Old's first option, that the rel. cl. occupies pādas a-c, the rel. prn. (towards the end of b) is positioned far too deeply in the clause. His 3rd option envisions a discontinuous rel. cl. partly embedded in and partly following the main cl., with the rel cl. verb being *nákṣate* in d -- a syntactic configuration that is simply impossible. His 2nd option, basically adopted by Ge as well, takes the rel. cl. as limited to *vépī vākvarī yásya nū gīḥ*. This is more acceptable, though the rel. cl. would be definitely embedded, not only in the main clause but within a long acc. NP (*tám ... índram* [REL CL] *tuviṅrābhám ...*). My own solution is similar to this, but limits the rel. cl. to *yásya nū gīḥ*; this not only better accounts for the position of the particle *nū* but also diminishes the effect of the embedding, because brief nominal rel. clauses, roughly equivalent to izafe constructions, seem to be at least marginally acceptable in RVic syntax. See esp. *yó vídānaḥ* in the previous hymn, VI.21.2. Scar's (208) tr. appears to follow the same analysis, with the rel. cl. limited to "[das Lied,] das nun ihm gehört ..."

The root noun cmpd *rabhodā-* is glossed by Scar (208) in the first instance as 'Ungestüm, Gewalt, Kraft gebend, aufnehmend', leaving it undetermined whether Indra bestows or assumes *rābhas-*, a question that Scar discusses in some detail without coming to a definite conclusion. Since, as Scar notes, there are several good exx. of *rābhas-* and related words as objects of medial $\tilde{a}\sqrt{\text{dā}}$ 'take, assume' (e.g., I.145.3) and since the pāda in which the adj. is found seems to depict Indra on a rampage (*tuviṅrābhám tuvikūrmīm* "powerfully grasping, powerfully ranging"), the medial 'assume' value makes the most sense. Although ideally we might want the preverb \tilde{a} represented, root noun cmpds with the structure NOUN-PREV- $\sqrt{\text{ }}$ seem to be rare to non-existent. (Cmpds of the type *tveṣá-sam-dṛś-* in 9b below aren't counterexamples, because, as the accent shows, the root noun

cmpd *saṃdṛś-* has been in turn incorporated into a bahuvrīhi), and in any case the outcome of *rabhas-ā-dā-* would be hard to parse once sandhi rules had applied.

The verb of the main clause must be *iṣe* in d, but what it represents is uncertain. Gr (Nachtr., 1755) assigns it to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’, identifying it as a 1st sg.; Old tr. as 3rd sg. ‘er regt sich ... an’, which I assume means that he assigns it to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’, though he doesn’t comment on either root affiliation or morphology. Ge suggests a 3rd sg. either to \sqrt{i} (built like *stuṣe*, acdg. to him, though *stuṣe* is overwhelmingly *first* sg.) or to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ (which $\sqrt{iṣ}$ he doesn’t say, though his tr. ‘sucht’ suggests $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek’). Lub gives *iṣe* as an independent lemma (p. 321), with a question mark, no gloss, and 4 occurrences. As my tr. ‘seeks’ indicates, I think it belongs to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek’ and is a 3rd sg. A number of other forms to this root take *gātúm* ‘way’ as obj. (pres. *ichá-* I.80.6, IV.18.10, VI.6.1; pf. *īṣ-* I.112.16, III.1.2). But what is the form? Almost the only way to get a 3rd sg. in -e (outside of archaic forms like *duhé*) is in the perfect, and as we just saw, other forms of the pf. of this root take the same object. I suggest that we do, or did, have a pf. here, whose expected form would be **īṣe*. This putative form with heavy root syllable would in fact work metrically here. See also IV.23.6 and X.20.7, where I suggest the same underlying form for the transmitted form with light root vowel; the suggested long vowel is a significant metrical improvement in both passages. (Lub’s 4th ex. in VIII.46.17 is better taken as part of a cmpd. *āramiṣe*.) There are several ways to explain the short vowel. On the one hand, it can be wrongly extracted from combinations with preverbs like *upeṣé* in I.129.8, whose correct analysis is *upa īṣé*, but could also in principle contain **īṣé*. On the other hand, the dat. *iṣé* to the root noun *iṣ-* ‘refreshment’, found in nearby VI.13.2, 17.14, might have influenced it. MLW suggests that it’s simply an archaic 3rd sg. middle pres., like *duhé* just cited – which would cut the Gordian knot.

Stepping back from the formal difficulties of the vs., we can try to fit its contents into the context of the hymn. The vs. seems to express the same questioning anxiety as vs. 4: do the singers -- and their song -- succeed in reaching Indra and attaining his good opinion, or does he respond to their approach with disdainful tricks? While asking this question, the song seeks her way and approaches what sounds like an intimidatingly formidable Indra, hoping for acceptance and favor. That we have moved from the plural male poets/singers of vss. 2 and 4 to the lone female song (fem. *gīḥ*) makes the mismatch of power all the clearer. The verb *nákṣate* in the final clause brings us back to *nakṣad-dābhá-* in vs. 2.

VI.22.6: Indra’s overwhelming power, viewed with some apprehension in the previous vss., is a positive force when it is exercised for our benefit against external foes, and the hymn now turns to this happier theme.

The publ. tr. assigns the instr. phrase *ayā ... māyāyā* “with this magic power” to Indra, whereas Ge and Old assume that the phrase goes with *vāvṛdhānám* and refers to Vṛtra’s *māyā*; Old is in fact quite scornful of the former interpr. However, see comm. ad nearby VI.18.9, where I argue that Indra is regularly credited with *māyā* in this Indra cycle. See, e.g., 1d in this hymn and 2d in the previous one (VI.21.2), both with *purumāyā-* qualifying Indra. It is also the case that this hymn contains hostile *māyā*; see 9d. I therefore now think that *māyayā* in this vs. has double application. Its tight embedding in the acc. phrase *tyám māyāyā vāvṛdhānám* does suggest that it belongs to Vṛtra, but the initial near-deictic *ayā*, outside that NP, refers, in my opinion, to “this

(*māyā*) right here” -- namely Indra’s. I would therefore amend the tr. to “With this (magic power of yours) right here ... (you shattered) him who had grown strong with his magic power.”

The identification of the vajra with “the mountain that has the speed of thought” goes back to Sāy.

Though the first hemistich lacks a verb, it is easy enough to supply ‘shattered’ from *rujō ví* in the 2nd half-vs.

VI.22.7: The predicated inf. *paritamsayādhyai* has no clear subject, but *vaḥ* must serve in this capacity, referring to the poets, who will perform this action with “their newer insight” (*dhiyā nāvasyā*). The model for this action is the previous poets referred to in 2ab who praised and stimulated Indra, here represented by the adverbial *pratnavāt* ‘in the ancient way, as the ancients did’. The force of *pari-* in the infinitive must be to indicate that poets from all competing groups will try to pull Indra to their side.

Ge renders *animānā-* as ‘ohne Vorbild’ (pattern, model), but there seems to be no support for this tr. The only occurrence of *ní√mā* that I know of in the RV is in the enigmatic creation hymn III.38.7d *ní ... mamire*, where it is paired with *ā ... mamire* (7a), with both verbs referring to the ‘measuring out’ of creation and created things. There is another occurrence of the negated adj. *animānā-* in I.27.11, but nothing in that passage pushes the word to mean anything beyond ‘without measure’.

VI.22.9: The lexeme *ví dayate* is often used positively, of distributing good things to deserving people; cf., e.g., III.2.11 *vásu rātnā dāyamāno ví dāśúṣe* “distributing goods and treasures to the pious man.” However, a few passages are, or can be, negative, esp. III.34.1 *dāyamāno ví sátrūn* “fragmenting his rivals” (probably also IV.7.10). Here the dominant sense must be negative and the wiles must be Vṛtra’s (and perhaps those of other enemies) — though a positive spin is just possible as a second reading: “distributing your magic wiles,” that is, deploying his own *māyā*-s widely. See comm. ad VI.18.9 on Indra’s use of his *māyā*-s in combat.

VI.22.10: The main cl., occupying the first hemistich, has no verb; I supply *dhiṣvá* from 9a, though any verb of providing, giving, bringing would work as well (see Ge’s “bring”).

The phrase *dāsāny āryāṇi vṛtrā* “Dāsa and Ārya obstacles,” with the contrastive pair *dāśa- ārya-* juxtaposed in c, is, surprisingly, a fairly well-attested formula, variously realized. In addition to the phrase here, also

VI.33.3 *dāsā vṛtrāṇi āryā ca*

VI.60.6 *vṛtrāṇi āryā ... dāsāni*

VII.83.1 *dāsā ca vṛtrā ... āryāṇi ca*

X.69.6 *dāsā vṛtrāṇi āryā*

Although the existence of *Ārya* obstacles might seem odd, *dāśa- ārya-* is a species of merism that would seem to encompass all the types of human obstacles we might encounter, both belonging to our larger community and alien.

The further specification *nāhuṣāṇi* in d appears to be an afterthought that focuses our enmity on a defined group within the larger whole; elsewhere the clan ancestor Nahus and derivatives of that word are generally positively viewed members of the community,

including in the two other occurrences in VI (VI.26.7, 46.7). See comm. ad IX.88.2, X.80.6, etc.

VI.23 Indra

For the repetitive lexicon and the unusual amount of linkage between vss., see publ. intro.

VI.23.1: The rendering of *nímiśla-* as ‘intertwined’ may be a bit over the top, but ‘attached to’ or ‘linked to’ is too anodyne; assuming an underlying sense ‘mixed’, the point is that Indra can’t be separated from the substances and words offered to him in the ritual.

The standard NP *suté sóme* is polarized at the boundaries of pāda a, allowing *sóme* to directly adjoin its rhyme form (and ritual partner) *stóme* over the pāda boundary -- a simple but effective use of word order.

On *bíbhrad vájram* see comm. ad VI.20.9.

VI.23.2: The gen. phrase *dákṣasya bibhyúṣaḥ* is troublesome, as it is not clear who or what it refers to or what its syntactic function is. Old interpr. it as a “dativischer Gen.,” though he gives no tr. But Ge seems to take it as a gen. absolute: “während der Entschlossene Furcht hatte.” In either case *dákṣa-* seems to be taken as an adj. qualifying a human and this fearful human is taken to be one on our side, aided either directly (dative gen.) or indirectly (gen. abs.) by fearless Indra. In this passage the single ‘skillful’ (or ‘determined’: Ge’s ‘entschlossen’) person would presumably be the soma-presser (*súṣvi-*) of ab, and this is not impossible. However, although there are a few undoubted exx. of adjectival *dákṣa-* ‘skillful’ (e.g., I.51.2 *dákṣāsa ṛbhávaḥ*), in most clear exx. the stem is a masc. abstract ‘skill, ability’, and in doubtful cases I prefer to seek such a meaning. Here I suggest that the “fearful skill” belongs to Indra’s enemies, the *dásyūn* of d, and depicts their fading confidence in their skill or ability to counter Indra. Under this interpr. it can either be a gen. abs. with Ge (though this construction is rare at any stage and is supposed not to exist before Vedic prose; see Delbrück, AIS 389–90) or is a gen. of quality (although this construction is also marginal) with *dásyūn* “the Dasyus of frightened skill.” The publ. tr. represents an absolute interpr.; the gen. of quality might be a better analysis, but is difficult to render in Engl., as the tr. just given shows (better “of daunted/craven skill,” but this would lose the etymological figure). (Kü’s [336] tr. avoids the problem, but unfortunately only by an unusual grammatical lapse on his part: he explicitly identifies *bibhyúṣaḥ* as acc. pl., which it could be, but tr. the phrase *dákṣasya bibhyúṣaḥ* as a single NP [“für den Geschickten die sich fürchtenden”] apparently failing to remember that *dákṣasya* requires the whole phrase to be gen. sg. He takes this supposed acc. pl. as parallel to *sárdhataḥ*, which he separates from *dásyūn* and takes as another qualifier of those aided by Indra. His full tr. is “Oder wenn du für den Geschickten die sich fürchtenden furchtlos unterwarfst für den Kühnen, Indra, die Dasyus.” The misparsing of *dákṣasya* excludes this tr.)

VI.23.3–4: The alternation of root-accented *-tar-* agent nouns and redupl. agentive *-i-* stems, both with verbal rection, is a distinctive characteristic of these two vss.

VI.23.5: The first pāda contains an example of an embedded relative that is difficult to sidestep: in *āsmāi vayāṃ yād vāvāna tād vivīṣma* the first two words dat. *āsmāi* and nom. *vayāṃ* rightly belong to the main cl. *tād vivīṣma* “we toil at that,” which follows the dependent cl. *yād vāvāna* “what he holds dear.” The two preposed pronouns set the participants and case roles for the vs. (see esp. *īndrāya* opening b and d, as well as the two 1st pl. verbs *vivīṣma* and *stumasi*) -- hence my tr. as a cleft construction -- but the construction still seems unusual.

The opening of c, *suté sóme stumasi*, takes the same elements found in the figure in vs. 1ab and plays on different phonological similarities. Here *sut(é)* and *stu(masi)* are scrambled versions of each other, while *sóme* stands somewhat apart.

VI.23.6: The first hemistich can be interpr. as a rough repair of the problematic 5a: what Indra holds dear (5a) are the formulations that he makes strengthening for himself (6a), and this is what we have toiled for (6b), with *vivīṣmaḥ* in a syntactically more orthodox position than in 5a. (6a also of course is responsive to 5d.)

The phrase opening the 2nd hemistich, *suté sóme sutapāḥ*, echoes 5c, with *sut(apāḥ)* an anagram of *stu(masi)*.

The referent of the acc. pl. neut. adjs. in cd is unspecified; either the pressings or the formulations -- or, better, both -- would work. Both are elsewhere qualified as *śāmtama*:- cf. VIII.33.15 *sávanā santu śāmtamā* and V.73.10 *imā bráhmāṇi vārdhanā ... santu śāmtamā*.

A rare ex. of variant readings, the hapax *rāṇḍya-/rāṇḍrya-* is unclear. Ge refuses to tr. it. The publ. tr. ‘enjoyable’ (which should be marked with ?) rests on Hoffmann’s suggestion (reported in EWA s.v. *rāṇḍya-*), deriving it from $\sqrt{raṇ}$ (or \sqrt{ram}). Certainty of course is impossible, but some such meaning fits the context.

vākṣana- in d serves as a synonymous substitute for *vārdhana-* (5d, 6a).

VI.23.7: Note pleonastic *#urúm ... ulokám#*.

VI.23.8: As in III.41.6 (=VI.45.27) *mandasvā* is not accented despite following *hí*; see comm. ad III.41.6. I have no explanation (nor does Old, despite his ref. to himself). It can be noted that in all three passages the *hí* occurs in 3rd position, after the verb (all three identically *sá mandasvā hí*), but this position is not sufficient to explain the lack of accent, since *hí* elsewhere occurs after its accented verb (e.g., I.2.4 *índavo vām uśánti hí* ; cf., e.g., I.105.18, 131.6, III.14.5, 26.8, VII.3.3, 23.5, 59.5, VIII.21.18, IX.85.2, X.30.12, 34.11). Note esp. I.189.6, IX.49.4, X.68.7, where *hí* is in 3rd position after the verb as here. Since *hí* often appears after initial accented verbs -- for 2nd sg. med. impvs. like *mandasvā* see the numerous exx. of *#yukṣvā hí* (I.10.3, etc.) -- it might be possible to construct a scenario wherein when such an impv. is displaced from initial position by the pronoun *sá*, it loses its accent by some sort of syntactic analogy. But I find this unlikely: RVic poets are quite sensitive to their accent rules.

Pāda c lacks a verb, but the close parallelism of b and c (*prá [...]* *imé*) and the semantic connection of the two nom. pls *yajñāsaḥ* and *hāvāsaḥ* impose *aśnuvantu* from b.

In c the 1st pl. prn. *asmé*, which could be either dat. or loc., doesn’t work very well as either. Ge tr. “von uns,” which makes contextual sense but ill fits either possible case form. The publ. tr. takes it as loc., though the tr. is awkward.

I don't know why the modal temperature has been raised, as it were, by precative *yamyāḥ* in d -- though it is the case that there are no 3rd sg. root aor. impvs. attested to \sqrt{yam} , perhaps because a putative **yamtu* or **yantu* would coincide with the much more common 3rd pl. root pres. impv. to \sqrt{i} 'go'.

VI.23.9: Once again a dependent clause seems to follow fronted portions of the main clause, in this case *tām vaḥ sakhāyaḥ*. (Although *vaḥ sakhāyaḥ* could belong semantically in the dependent clause, their lack of accent requires them to follow along with *tām*, or so it seems to me.) As in 5a the fronted material seems to establish the participants in the rest of hemistich: the god and the worshipers. The acc. *tām* is then doubled by both *īm* and the real referent *īndram* in the main clause of b.

The foregoing assumes that the ellipsis of the verb in pāda a is not to be filled with a verb that could take *tām* as object or goal. I have in fact tried to find such a verb that an audience would supply when confronted with *sām ... sūtēsu*, but I have not been able to come up with a plausible one. The most likely verb to supply is \sqrt{as} , esp. given 5d *yāthāsat*, 9c *āsati*, and 10c *āsad yāthā*. Ge supplies "sich ergötze," presumably a form of \sqrt{mad} or \sqrt{mand} , which would work contextually. But there is no positive evidence for this conjecture (unlike the three subjunctive forms of \sqrt{as} with *yāthā* just cited), and both roots are only marginally construed with *sām*.

VI.23.10: I would slightly change the tr. of the loc. absol. to 'has been pressed' or 'was pressed' to accord better with the immediate past of the hymn-summary verb *astāvi*.

Klein (DGRV I.442–43) interpr. *maghónaḥ* as acc. pl. ("the liberal ones"), which it could be morphologically, but $\sqrt{kṣi}$ 'rule over' always takes the gen. (Gr gives one passage with supposed acc., V.37.4, but it belongs to the etymologically separate root $\sqrt{kṣi}$ 'dwell', and in any case in that passage I do not construe the acc. with that verb.)

The *utá* in c is troubling: it does not seem to conjoin anything and it seems randomly positioned in the pāda. Klein groups it with a small set of passages where he thinks *utá* means '(and) also, as well', and he suggests that it focuses on the immediately preceding word *jaritré* 'singer', who will also receive patronage from Indra, in addition to the soma-presser in 9d. I find this unpersuasive, though I don't have an altogether better solution. One possibility is that we should supply the nom. sg. corresponding to gen. sg. *maghónaḥ* of b, namely **maghāvā*, and *utá* would conjoin this supplied noun with *sūrīḥ*. This would change the tr. to "so that he will be (liberal [/a benefactor]) and a patron to the singer." A slightly different solution, but still with the supplied **maghāvā*, would be to take *utá* as starting a new clause, with *sūrīḥ* qualifying Indra, yielding a tr. "so that he [=the liberal mortal of b] will be (liberal) to the singer, and Indra (will be) a patron and giver of wealth ..." Indra is called a *sūrī-* in this Indra cycle (VI.29.5=37.5) and elsewhere. This second suggestion is probably less disruptive to the syntax than the first one, but I weakly favor the first because *sūrī-* is more often used of human patrons than of gods.

VI.24 Indra

VI.24.1: In the publ. tr. *ślóka-* is rendered as 'noise', but I would now alter that to the sense I usually give that word, 'signal call' (see comm. ad I.51.12) -- namely the noise

that emanates from the sacrifice, often made by the pressing stones, to alert the gods that the sacrifice is underway. Of course, it is possible here that it refers to more general noise (as in the Engl. expression “joyful noise”) associated with the sacrifice.

In the publ. tr. I give full lexical value to the expression *sācā sōmeṣu* as “when the soma juices are in his company.” This is certainly possible, but, as noted in the comm. ad IV.31.5, *sācā* with loc. often lacks lexical value and simply signals an absolute (or absolute-like) construction. Here I might substitute the tr. “when the soma juices (are pressed).”

Ge seems to take *nībhyaḥ* as a beneficial dat. (“für die Männer”), but it is more likely that it is an agent with the gerundive, since such formations do take dat. agents. (See my “Case of Agent ...”) It is possible, however, that I’ve misinterpreted his tr. “... ist er ... für die Männer zu preisen,” and it’s actually the equivalent of an English “for ... to” construction (“for the men to praise”), which would give it agentive value.

VI.24.2: The bahuvrīhi *urvyūtiḥ*, matching 1d *ākṣitotiḥ* at pāda end, is morphologically problematic. It must be read as a quadrisyllable, and, further, the 2nd vowel must be short (*urvī(y)-ūtiḥ*) in the Triṣṭubh cadence. (The Pp. reads *urvī ’ūtiḥ*.) Old simply remarks of it that the expected form **urú-ūtiḥ* “wäre phonetisch unbequem,” which is perfectly true but doesn’t account for the form. There are several different analyses of it in the lit. Wack (AiG II.1.52 [also 274], flg. Johansson 1897) assumes that it represents **urvī+ūti-* with the fem. form of the adj. *urú-* as 1st member compounded with a fem. 2nd member. He does not mention that the form has to be metrically distracted, much less that the distracted vowel must be read short. Of course, the prevocalic outcome of *-ī(<*iH)* would likely be *-ī(y)* as here. But the real problem is that there seem to be no other good Vedic examples of the type of cmpd envisioned, with a derived fem. adj. stem as first member showing gender agreement with the 2nd; the cmpds *uru-kṣitī-* and *urú-gavyūti-* with the stem form of the adj. as 1st member even when cmpded with a fem. *-ti-* stem, provide counterexamples. (Wack could argue that the fem. was used in our case for metrical convenience; but without a grammatical model for this kind of compounding, it seems difficult to imagine a Vedic poet inventing this type even to rescue his cadence.) By contrast Lanman (Noun Inflection, pp. 380–81, esp. 381 B.4c) suggests that the first member represents the older fem. instr. in *-ī*, shortened to *-i*. (Actually he thinks *-ī* is a “contracted” form of *-iā*, but that aspect of his view is not relevant here.) Although there is more precedent for the instr. sg. than for a fem. stem-form as first cmpd. member, at least with archaic personal pronominal stems (type *yuṣmā-datta-* ‘given by you’), the problem here is that there is no functional reason to have an instr.: the cmpd. must mean ‘having broad/wide-ranging help’, not ‘having help with a broad [fem.] X’. Lanman’s solution is found, in a slightly different package, in BR and is reproduced by Gr (though dismissed by Wack). The BR lemma contains the lapidary “*urvyā + ūti*,” expanded a bit by Gr to “*urvī = urvyā, I. f. von urú*.” Although I think the purport of these formulations is the same as Lanman’s, the invocation of *urvyā* allows us to pursue a different path: to take *urvī-* as truncated from the adverbial *urvyā*, orig. of course the long instr. of fem. *urvī-* but only used as an adverb. Although the fem. instr. is still the ultimate source, it would be possible for the poet to perceive *urvī-* in *urvyā* as a base form to which the instr./adverbial ending had been affixed and therefore available for compounding. I would also tentatively put forth yet a different, though related, analysis: that *urvī-*

preserves in altered form the old Caland compound-forming *-i-*. The derived *u*-adj. *urú-* should substitute this *-i-* when compounded, yielding **ur-i-* (of the type *ṛji-* ‘silvery’, Aves. *bəṛəzi-* ‘lofty’). This **ur-i-* of course never appears, but I would suggest that *urví-* may indirectly contain it, grafted onto the adj. stem *urú-*, encouraged by the independent adv. *urviyā*.

The phrase *śáṃso narām* is a reordered variant of *narām (ná) śáṃsa-*, on which see comm. ad II.34.6. Here I interpr. it as I do the similar phrase *śáṃsam āyóḥ* (IV.6.11, V.3.4) “Laud of Āyu,” as referring to the god as a sort of embodiment of the praise he receives. As I point out in the comm. ad IV.6.11, it is rather like referring to someone as “the toast of the town” or perhaps “the talk of the town” -- both of which English expressions are quite peculiar when considered literally.

On *dāti* as a root aor. subj., see comm. ad IV.8.3. Here it would be better rendered ‘he will give’.

VI.24.3: The ‘help’ (*ūtí-*) found in the first two vss. (*ákṣitotih* 1d, *urvyūtih* 2b) recurs here uncompounded. The forms of help “have grown outward” (*vy ūtáyo ruruhuḥ*) in d, an image that expands on *urvyūtih* ‘having broad help’ in 2b.

Despite Old’s detailed disc. of the first hemistich, in which he takes *bṛhán* with *ákṣaḥ* as “the lofty axle,” I am persuaded instead by Ge’s interpr. Citing the nearby passage VI.21.2 ... *āti mahnā ... riricé mahitvám*, where Indra’s greatness (nom. *mahitvám*) projects beyond the two worlds in/with their greatness (instr. *mahnā*), he supplies synonymous nom. *mahimā* here as well, referring to Indra’s greatness, with instr. *mahnā* belonging to the two worlds as in VI.21.2. Although *te* is adjacent to *mahnā*, it has been independently positioned by Wackernagel’s Law and need not limit the following instr. Ge presumably chose to supply *mahimā* rather than the *mahitvám* in VI.21.2 because we need a masc. here, given masc. *bṛhán*, but it also works better because *mahnā* also belongs to this *-mán*-stem.

VI.24.4: The vs. begins and ends with pādas containing triple etymological figures: a: *śácīvatas te puruśāka śákāḥ* and d: *dāmanvanto adāmānaḥ sudāman*. The effect seems clumsily heavy, but it is quite possible that I’m missing something. At least in the 2nd case, *sudāman* is a pun uniting two roots *√dā* ‘bind’ and ‘give’. It is possible that there is a buried pun also in pāda a. The previous vs. compared Indra’s aid to the branches of a tree (*vṛkṣasya ... vayāḥ*); another word for ‘branch’ is *śākhā-*, which is phonologically close to the *śāk-* forms. Perhaps the poet is punning off this unexpressed synonym.

Old is insistent that *srutí-* should be read **sṛtí-* here and in most other instances in the RV (see his comm. ad I.42.3). I don’t understand his reasons and stick with the transmitted reading.

The imagery in pāda b is complex. In its other occurrence (I.56.2=IV.55.6) *saṃcāraṇa-* is used of the converging of rivers into the sea. Here the word *srutáyaḥ* ‘streams’ maintains the flowing imagery (another reason to keep the reading, *pace* Old [see immed. above]; see also 6a), but they are streams of cows, not of water, and this phrase (“converging like streams of cattle”) is a simile, where the comparandum is Indra’s abilities. But in what way do Indra’s abilities flow? On what are they converging? Indra himself? or, more likely, the lucky mortal recipients of his aid?

The simile in the 2nd hemistich, “like cords for calves,” likewise applying to Indra’s abilities, is also opaque. Ge cites the dharmasūtra compd *vatsa-tantī*- (ĀpDS I.31.13, GDS IX.52), but though apposite, it is not helpful. The passages in question simply state that a snātaka should not step over a *vatsa-tantī*. Without knowing more about the details of Vedic animal husbandry, we cannot get too far, but I assume -- based on “binding without bonds” -- that calves were kept under control with very gentle ropes or perhaps by means other than tying. But why should these gentle measures be compared to Indra’s abilities?

VI.24.5: The publ. tr. of this vs. differs in a number of respects from the standard interpr. In particular, in the first hemistich, flg. an interpr. of JPB’s, the two pairs *anyád adyá kárvaram anyád u sváh* “one deed today and another tomorrow” and *ásac ca sāt* “non-existent and existent” are taken as a chiasmic square, with *anyád adyá* matching *sāt* and *anyád u sváh* matching *ásat*. In other words the deed Indra does today is existent, while the one he will do tomorrow is (as yet) non-existent. The standard interpr. takes *ásat ca sāt* as an expression of process: Indra makes each deed (the one today, the one tomorrow) that was as yet non-existent into an existent one (so Ge “... macht Indra das Unwirkliche alsbald wirklich”). This does seem a possible interpr., and I would suggest an alternative tr. “One deed today and another tomorrow -- Indra makes the not (yet) existent (deed) existent.” Klein (DGRV I.170, II.24) takes *ásac ca sāt* as “the bad and the good,” which deviates from the usual sense esp. of the former and breaks the thematic connection with the first pāda: “(Performing) one deed today and another tomorrow, Indra turns hither immediately the bad and the good.”

In the 2nd hemistich the standard interpr. takes Mitra, Varuṇa, and Pūṣan as the individualized seriatim singular subjects of *paryetāsti* (= *paryetā asti*), as in Ge’s “Mitra und Varuṇa und Pūṣan kommen uns dabei dem Wunsche des Nebenbuhlers zuvor.” (Tichy [-tar-stems, 188] follows Ge’s syntactic template, but with an aberrant interpr. of *pári √ i*.) As Ge’s blithe disregard of the sg. verb shows, the triple subject is somewhat awkward given sg. *asti* (though singular verbs with a series of singular subjects are indeed found). But there are several other problematic aspects to this strain of interpr. On the syntactic level, it is surprising to find *asti* in a main clause if its function is simply copular (“M, V, and P is/are *paryetā*”); *asti* in main clauses is almost always existential. On the thematic level, these other gods are intrusive in the hymn -- the focus so far has been entirely on Indra -- and it seems odd suddenly to credit these gods with the power to effect a desirable thing for us, when Indra has been performing the heavy lifting all along. I therefore think that Thieme (Fremdling, 53) is correct in taking Indra as the unexpressed subject of *paryetā asti*, though he doesn’t discuss the passage or, rather disingenuously, even quote the preceding pāda with the other possible subjects. Given these factors, I think that *asti* is implicitly contrastive and emphatic: the other gods are there for us in some sense, but *it’s Indra* who ... As for the sense of *paryetā* and *pári √ i* in general, the literal meaning is ‘go around’, hence ‘encompass’ and hence to contain and control, a sense that works very well here.

VI.24.6: The simile in pāda a makes explicit the flowing water implicit in 4b (see disc. above). But it is not clear what the waters are being compared to. Old suggests Schätze and Segnungen, with various rather vague parallels suggested. I find Ge’s citation of

nearby VI.34.1 more to the point. Pāda b of that vs. reads *vī ca tvád yanti vibhvoḥ manīṣāḥ* “Out from you go inspired thoughts far and wide.” Although Indra is generally viewed as the goal and recipient of poetic thoughts and praises, he is also, as Ge says in his n. 6ab to our passage, “der Aufgangspunkt der Dichtkunst und des Kultus.” Here we can supply as subject and comparandum the ‘inspired thoughts’ (*manīṣāḥ*) of 34.1 or some similar reference to poetic production. The more conventional view of Indra as poetic goal is expressed in the 2nd hemistich, which roughly corresponds to VI.34.1a *sām ca tvé jagmúr gíra indra pūrvīḥ* “Many songs have converged on you, Indra.”

The verb (*vī*) ... *anayanta* is a bit troubling because even the rare medial forms of the overwhelmingly active pres. *náya(ti)* are otherwise transitive. Cf., e.g., V.45.10 *udnā ná nāvam anayanta dhīrāḥ* “Like a boat through the water the wise ones guided (him).” I see no choice but to assume that this form has acquired a nonce intrans. sense because of its middle voice.

VI.24.7: The distribution of the three measures of time vis-à-vis the two verbs *jāranti* and *avakarśáyanti* cannot be determined for certain, nor does it really matter. The pāda boundary favors keeping *māsāḥ* with *śarādah* (“whom neither the autumns nor the months age, nor the days make lean”), but the position of the various *nā*-s might favor bracketing *māsāḥ* with *dyāvah*. This is how Ge tr., and I have followed suit, though I don’t feel strongly one way or the other.

VI.24.8: *stavān* is an intractable form, found also in II.19.5, 20.5. In all three cases it is found in this same, apparently nom. sg., form, referring to Indra, and with the likely value ‘being praised, having/receiving praise’. In all three cases it also occurs at the end of a Triṣṭubh pāda, which suggests that the root syllable should be heavy (**stāvān*) -- though Old (ad II.19.5) does not regard this as a problem. Old discusses the form in great detail ad II.19.5 without reaching a firm conclusion; see also KEWA III.521, with listing of the lit. but again no conclusions. Assuming that the form belongs to *√stu* ‘praise’ (other proposed root affiliations are properly dismissed by Old), there are two main strains of explanation: as a truncation or as a haplology. Several different underlying forms have been suggested for the truncation; the least problematic is Pischel’s suggested pres. mid. part. *stavānāḥ* (1x; versus fairly common *stāvāna-*). But least problematic doesn’t mean *unproblematic*: lopping off inflectional endings isn’t a practice we find elsewhere in the RV, esp. when it leaves an unanalysable form, and we might expect the accent to follow that of the common root-accented participle. The haplology explanation (owing ultimately to Johansson, who was responsible for one of the explanations of *urvyūtiḥ* above, vs. 2) has found more general acceptance (see AiG I. Nachtr. 161, though cf. Mayrhofer’s lack of enthusiasm in KEWA, cited above) -- that it is derived from a *-vant-* stem, nom. sg. **stava-vān*, with haplologic loss of the medial syllable. Old raises several objections to this: first, that the accent is wrong. The accent of *-vant-* stems is overwhelmingly that of the base noun; if the putative stem was formed to *stáva-* ‘praise’, it should have yielded **stá(va)vān*. Old’s 2nd objection has to do with this base form: that *stáva-* is found only once in the RV.

I tentatively advance a different explanation from either of the prevailing ones, that it is formed with a Hoffmann suffix (**-Hon-* / *-Hn-*), to the just mentioned *stáva-* ‘praise’, hence ‘having praise’. This would produce the attested long vowel; moreover,

insofar as we can tell, the Hoffmann suffix attracts the accent. See *somān*- ‘having soma’ (based on root-accented *sóma*-) and discussion ad I.18.1. Of course, the rarity of the base form *stáva*- is a problem here, as it was for the -*vant*-stem explanation just presented, but perhaps because the Hoffmann suffix was not synchronically productive and therefore our *stavān* should be an old form, this rarity is less problematic than for the productive -*vant*-stems. It might also be possible to posit a long-vowel base **stāva*- (cf. fem. *stāvā*- VS XVIII.42), with expected Brugmann’s Law outcome for a standard **o*-grade thematic noun, producing **stāvān*. Though, once the formation of **stāvān* was no longer understood, this vṛddhi would have been eliminated in the transmitted text in favor of the guṇa prevailing in the verbal forms, it would still be reflected in the heavy syllable called for by the cadential pattern. As for the nom. sg. in -*ān* instead of the **-ā* expected for an *n*-stem, I would suggest that the stem was assimilated to a -*vant*-stem.

VI.24.9: In a the instr. *ámatreṇa* can be supplied with the instr. adj.s, extracted from the possessive *amatrín* ‘having an *ámatra*-’.

In b *sutapāvan* reprises *sutapā(h)* in 1b.

vyūṣtau (*/-iṣu*) almost always occurs with dependent *uṣásah* -- “at the early brightening of the dawn” -- and of course is derived from the same root \sqrt{vas} ‘dawn’ as *uṣás*-. Here we find the apparent opposite: *aktór vyūṣtau* “at the early brightening of the night”; despite the anonymity of the genitives, I think the two expressions refer to the same time period, the moment when the deep darkness of night begins to lift. This can be considered as brightening either of the night or of the dawn. On the almost identical expression in V.30.13 and its morphological twist, see comm. ad loc.

VI.25 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn has an omphalos shape, with vs. 5 the omphalos, surrounded by matched vss. 4 and 6. Although vss. 3 and 7 do not show similar matchings, there is some repeated phraseology between vss. 1/2 and 8/9: *vṛtrahátye* 1c, 8b; *spṛdhaḥ* (...) *mithatīḥ* 2a, 9ab.

VI.25.1–2: On *avīḥ* (1c) and *áva tāṛīḥ* (2d) as “hortativ,” see Hoffmann Injunk. 264.

VI.25.1: That *avīḥ* of c is also the verb of d is suggested by passages like I.110.9 *vājebhir no vājasātau avidḍhi*, VIII.46.11 *dhíyo vājebhir āvītha* with \sqrt{av} and an instr. of *vāja*- ‘prize’.

VI.25.2: Ge supplies the verb ‘drive’ in c (“Mit diesen (treib) alle Angriffe auseinander”), but I see no reason why it can’t be in the orbit of d. In vs. 1 the two pādas cd share a single verb (*avīḥ* c), as do the first two pādas of this vs. (*vyathayā*). With this pattern established, it seems reasonable to take *áva tāṛīḥ* in d as also governing the accusatives of c. Under this interpr., I take *vīśūcīḥ* as proleptic, rather like 3d *kṛṇuhī párácaḥ* “put them far away.”

VI.25.3: Pāda c lacks a verb to govern the acc. *vithurā śávāṃsī*. On the model of 1cd, 2ab, and 2cd, we might simply deploy the (first) verb of d, *jahí*, across the pāda boundary: “smash their faltering powers” or, with proleptic adj., “smash their powers (to

be) faltering.” However, *vithurā* is derived from the root \sqrt{vyath} ‘falter’, whose causative supplied the verb in 2ab, *vyathayā*. I therefore think there’s a different kind of trick here: the poet expects us to supply the CAUSATIVE feature of the verb in 2b with the lexical feature of that verb contained in the adj. *vithurā* -- hence my tr. “(render) their powers faltering.”

VI.25.4: *tanūrúc-* is, of course, a root noun cmpd., ‘shining with/in their bodies’, but the bahuvrīhi-like tr. works better in context.

kṛṇvaite is clearly meant as a 3rd du. mid. subjunctive to the 5th cl. pres. of $\sqrt{kṛ}$, but it has the wrong grade of the suffix: we expect **kṛnávaite* (cf. 2nd du. mid. *ásnávaithē* [VII.70.4]). It clearly simply anticipates the root pres. 3rd du. mid. *brávaite*, which ends the next hemistich (4d). This imitation comes at a metrical cost: the heavy root syllable *kṛṇv* produces a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. (The grammatically correct form would also, of course, be metrically problematic.) A root aor. subj. **karaite* would fit the meter better, but there’s no warrant for emendation. For a passage in which the poet simply avoids the middle dual subjunctive of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ altogether by substituting a plural, see comm. ad I.178.2.

The locative string in cd is the usual expression of the stakes -- a type of loc. absol. lacking an overt participle. The full expression is *dhāne hité* “when the stake is set” (VI.45.11, 13, etc.). The string here contains a formulaic pair, *toké ... tánaye* “progeny and prosperity” with three other locc., one inserted inside the formula. On the basis of VI.31.1 (q.v.), where a *ca* after *tánaye* better delineates the pairing, I would slightly change the tr. to “when progeny and prosperity [or, offspring and lineage], cattle, water, and fields are at stake.”

The two *vā*-s (4a, 4c), in conjunction with the subjunctives, seem to set out a deliberative choice: “it may be that X ... or it may be that Y.” The two possibilities floated as to how one champion might defeat another set the stage for the next vs. (5), which forecloses any possibility that one of the champions, even a successful one, could take on Indra. The two *vā*-s are slightly off-balance, however, since the first one is located in the main clause (a) to which the first *yád* clause is immediately appended (b), while the second is found in the second *yád* clause, whose main clause seems to be, by default, the original pāda a. This seems to me a minor problem: the point is that the two champions (*śūra-*) in pāda a may defeat each other in single combat (b) *or* in a full-on battle (cd). The first *vā* would be better positioned in pāda b, but it has been shifted to the front of the whole main-cl./dep.-cl. construction -- a sort of super-Wackernagel’s Law position. Klein (DGRV II.194, 201–2) treats the two *vā* occurrences separately, taking the 2nd as conjoining (or disjoining) the parallel *yád* clauses b and c, but the 1st as the equivalent of “the asseverative particle *vaí*.” This seems somewhat perverse to me: two occurrences of the same particle in a single verse, esp. a particle that regularly appears in pairs, invite a unified explanation; moreover, I am very dubious that *vā* is ever used for *vaí*, a particle that is rare in the RV anyway. Even Klein can only identify 6 passages where he thinks *vā* = *vaí* (DGRV II.201), of which he finds syntactic support for only 3. That 6c contains a pair of *vā*-s whose syntactic connection is clearer provides evidence that these two *vā*-s also form a pair.

VI.25.6–8: Each of these vss. contains at least one derivative of *nṛ́-* ‘(superior) man’: 6a *nṛṇṇám*, 6c *nṛvátí*, 7c *nṛtamāsaḥ*, 8d *nṛśáhye*.

VI.25.6: By my analysis this vs. matches 4 in structure and in referents, forming with 4 a ring around the omphalos vs. 5. In the first pāda the unspecified pair (*ubháyoḥ ... ayóḥ* “of both of these”) refers, in my view (as also, apparently, Ge), to the two *krándasī* (lit. ‘war-cries’, viz., opposing forces) of 4d; Indra has mastery over the manly power of both of them, as vs. 5 has already implied. The verb of 6b, *hávante*, doubles *brávaite* in 4d semantically; both refer to verbal appeals to Indra for help in battle. The two forces referred to in an oblique case in pāda a return as subject in pāda d, with yet another 3rd du. med. subjunctive, *vitantasaíte*.

Pace Ge, who gives them different roles, the locc. in c are parallel and match those of 4c, expressing what is at stake in the battle. Although it might seem odd to name a *vṛtrá-* as a stake, I think the point is that the battle may be about confronting an obstacle or about acquiring a rich dwelling place. Klein’s tr. (DGRV II.159) “when they battle each other in the (struggle with the) obstacle or in (the struggle for) great dwelling space rich in heroes” reflects the same view. See Schaeffer (Intens. 126–27) for detailed disc. A similar use of *vṛtréṣu* is found in the next hymn (VI.26.2), where it is implicitly parallel to *góṣu*, an expression for the stakes.

I take the subordinator *yádī* in b as representing *yád* + *ī* (‘when’ + acc. particle) (as described pp. 305–9 in my 2002 article “Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*”), rather than conditional *yádi* ‘if’. All that needs to be done is to insert a notional word space between *yád* and *ī*. The pāda could use an overt acc. (*ī* ‘him’, as obj. of *hávante*), and ‘if’ does not make sense.

The publ. tr. implicitly reflects a similar analysis of *yádi* in d, but I now think that interpr. is probably incorrect. In favor of it is the parallelism with the matched vs. 4, which contains two parallel *yád* clauses. But several factors, both formal and functional, weigh against it: the final *i* of *yádi* is short and does not occur before a cons. cluster, which elsewhere facilitates the shortening of the particle *ī*. Moreover, an acc. referent is not necessary to the clause, since the verb is a reciprocal middle (though see I.131.3, also with med. *ví√tams*, *ví tvā tatasre* “They have tussled over you,” a passage that also contains a loc. of the stakes). The publ. tr. also renders the subjunctive *vitantasaíte* as an indicative. I now think that the conditional *yádi* and the subjunctive contribute to the same semantic effect. For a full revised tr. see below.

On the assumption that cd forms a single dependent clause (as it does in the publ. tr. and in Ge), the *yádi* is too deep in the clause, following not only the nom. du. adj. *vyācasvantā* that opens pāda d but also the complex loc. phrase that occupies pāda c. This problem could be easily remedied by connecting c with b, rather than with d, leaving *yádi* in standard 2nd position in a clause now consisting only of d. The only obstacle to that reassignment is my interpr. of *maháh*, which in the publ. tr. I take as a sentential adverb and construe with *vitantasaíte* (“... keep tussling mightily”). However, that interpr. is quite fragile, esp. because of the position of *maháh*, and I am happy to abandon it, though I do not have a particularly good alternative suggestion. Schaeffer (Intens. 128) first suggests that it is an adverb, with adjectival aspirations (not her phrase), construed with the following phrase *nṛvāti kṣáye*, in the manner of Old’s (ZDMG 55 [1901]: 270–71) interpr. of *mahó rāyē* “mächtiglich zu Reichtum” → “zu mächtigem Reichtum” -- in this instance “mächtiglich männerreiches Land” → “grosses männerreiches Land.” Alternatively she suggests it could be an acc. pl. with gapped *devān* as a goal or obj. of

vitantasaíte (“sooft die zwei ... (Völkerschaften) die Grossen (Götter) angehen ...”). This second suggestion seems quite implausible, but the first one is possible, in the absence of anything better. In any event, it is essentially the interpr. given by Ge (“um einen grossen männerreichen Wohnsitz”), however he arrived at it. (Judging from his n. 6cd it rests on Sāy.’s high-handed glossing of *maho* with loc. *mahati*.) Klein’s tr. “great dwelling space rich in heroes” (see above) simply follows Ge and also shows a quasi-adj. interpr. of *mahāḥ*.

Putting all this together, I offer the revised translation:

“He is master of the manly power of both of these (armies) when the ritual adepts call on him in the clash,

whether an obstacle or a dwelling place rich in men is at issue — if the two (armies) in their expansion will keep tussling mightily back and forth with one another.”

VI.25.7: As usual, *aryāḥ* has a number of possible interpr. Ge takes it as nom. pl. identical to the *sūrāyaḥ* in d. Old suggests either acc. pl. or abl. sg. without choosing one. Thieme (Fremdling, 73–74) opts for the abl. sg., which he construes (as does Old) with the splv. *nṛtamāsaḥ*: “... als unsere, im Vergleich zum Fremdling sehr heldenhaften Schutzherren ...” But of course an ablative with a superlative would be highly unusual (though Old offers a single parallel and a ref. to Delbrück’s Vgl. Syn.). I also take it as an abl., but suggest construing it with *purāḥ*. I now see that this is also problematic, since it is not clear that *purāḥ* ever takes the abl. Gr gives two exx.: but in IV.7.9 the supposed abl. is a gen. and construed elsewhere; in III.53.23 the form in question (*āśvān*) could be either an abl. sg. or an acc. pl. in sandhi. Nonetheless I hold to this interpr. Although *purāḥ* + ABL is not a robust construction, the related *purā* is regularly found with the abl. Here I would suggest that we have a sort of pun. The lexeme *purāḥ* + √*dhā* ‘set in front, install’ is of course very common, and that phrase is found here, *dadhiré puró naḥ*. Although, as I just said, to express “ahead of / in front of the stranger” we might expect *aryāḥ* [abl.] ... *purā*, there was interference with the VP *dadhiré puró naḥ* “they have set us in front,” and *purāḥ* prevailed.

VI.25.8: The HvN ed. resolves the contraction across pāda boundary of *yajatréndra* as *yajatrā́ndra*. This must be a careless error, since the Pp. has *yajatra índra*, and the stem *yájatra-* has root accent.

VI.25.9: Pāda c = I.177.5c and X.89.17c. Ge (fld. by Klein, DGRV I.458) construes *vástoḥ* with *vidyā́ma* (“Möchten wir Sängers ... den neuen Tag erleben”), but well-attested *vástoḥ* is otherwise a temporal expression ‘at dawn, in the morning’. In both the other passages, the pāda in question is adjoined by a pāda that likewise begins *vidyā́ma* (following in I.177.5, preceding in X.89.17), and the obj. of that *vidyā́ma* can be assumed with the one in the repeated pāda. The d pāda of X.89.17 is almost identical to d here, with the substitution of a different poetic family: *viśvāmītrāḥ* for our *bharádvājāḥ*.

The function and position of *utá* in d are unclear. The publ. tr. implicitly assumes that it loosely connects the 2nd hemistich with the 1st (“And with your help ...”), but locating this clausal conjunction in 2nd position of the 2nd pāda of what it’s conjoining would be an irrational poetic strategy. I now think it likely that it conjoins the temporal expressions *vástoḥ* and *nūnám*, and I would alter the tr. to “With your help ... might we

Bharadvājas know (this), as we sing at dawn and also now” (or “might we know (this) at dawn and also now, as we sing”). The curiosity then is the position of *te*, which can only belong to something in the preceding pāda: either “with your help” (as I take it in the publ. tr.) or “as we sing to you.” I suppose that *utā*’s strong tendency to take 1st position makes it a natural host for enclitics even when it is not so located, but it really seems odd that it would sweep *te* up and away from the elements it should be limiting.

VI.26 Indra

On the various stylistic tics of this hymn, see publ. intro.

VI.26.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., the 1st two vss. play on the word *vāja*-, presumably as a reference to the Bharadvāja bardic line: 1b, 2b *mahó vājasya*, 2a *vājī* ... *vājineyāḥ*.

VI.26.1: On *vāvr̥ṣāṇāḥ*, see comm. ad VIII.61.7 on *úd vāvr̥ṣasva*.

VI.26.2: The hapax *vājineyāḥ* is somewhat surprising, because the *-eyā*-suffix generally builds metronymics (AiG II.2.505–11), and so it should mean ‘son of a female prize-winner / of a prize-winning mare’ -- a feminine connection that would be particularly surprising if it’s meant as a reference to the Bharadvāja family. Although I don’t have a good explanation, I do think the intrusion of this marked suffix, fairly rare in the RV, should be taken serious, and if *vājineyā*- is derived from the *vājínī*- (found in *vājínī-vant*- and *vājínī-vasu*-) (cf. AiG II.2.507 for this possibility), this provides another support for my contention that *vājínī*- has real fem. reference, and its *-ī*- is not simply an Erweiterung (*pace* Debrunner, AiG II.2.409). See disc. ad I.48.6.

Since pāda c lacks a main verb, it could belong either with ab or with d. Ge takes it with ab, seeming to refer to VI.46.1 as a parallel, and the publ. tr. follows suit. On the basis of VI.25.6c with contrastive locatives of the stake, one of which is *vr̥tré* (see comm. immed. above), I am now inclined to reassign it to d, with *vr̥tréṣu* (c) and *góṣu* (d) the stakes. The revised tr. would be “... secured; to you ... when obstacles (are at stake), to you when cows (are at stake) does the fistfighter look as he fights.”

VI.26.3–6: These vss. are tr. and discussed by Hoffman (*Injunk.*, 183–84).

VI.26.3: As discussed ad VI.20.4, the three occurrences of *arká-sāti*- ‘the winning of the sun’s rays’ (I.174.7, VI.20.4, and here) are all found in conjunction with a poet (*kaví*-) and in connection with the Kutsa / Śuṣṇa myth. These associations point fairly decisively to Uśanā Kāvya as the poet in question.

Pāda b contains one of the few occurrences of *√ vr̥j* ‘twist, wring’ without preverb; another is found nearby at VI.18.8.

Hoffmann (183) reads injunc. *pārā han* for Pp. *pārā ahan*. Given the preponderance of injunctives in these vss. and esp. *han* at the end of 5c, this seems likely. (See also *sácāhan* in the next vs. and 6d.)

VI.26.4: As in 3c, Hoffmann (184) reads *sácā han* in c rather than Pp. *sácā ahan*, which seems perfectly plausible. As for the unequivocal imperfect *āvaḥ* in b, he suggests that

this may not have been the original form, citing the almost identical I.33.14b *prāvo yúdhyaṃtaṃ vṛṣabhāṃ dáśadyum*. If the original reading was **prāvaḥ*, it could contain the injunctive: *prā avaḥ*. However, it is unclear to me how the corruption would have arisen, particularly because in the next vs. (5) the d pāda begins *prāvaḥ*. Moreover the pāda preceding I.33.14b begins with *āvaḥ*, a clear imperfect matching the one here. Hoffmann's other observation -- that this pres. stem has no clear injunctive forms (and only one possible one, *āvaḥ* in I.121.12, which more likely belongs to the *s*-stem noun; see comm. ad loc.) -- seems more apposite. For whatever reason the injunctive to this stem was avoided -- or, perhaps better phrased, *āva-* was treated as the injunctive stem.

On the poorly understood myth in cd, see VI.20.8 and X.49.4 and comm. on both.

I do not entirely understand what *sācā* is doing here; it seems to add little and have no obvious syntactic connection to the rest. As discussed ad IV.31.5, *sācā* with loc. is regularly a pleonastic marker of the loc. abs., but there is no loc. here. Gr cites our passage here as an ex. of *sācā* after a dat. meaning “zu seinen Gunsten,” but I don't understand how this meaning would have developed from ‘together with’. The same sequence (*sācā han*) is found two vss. later (6d) in the same general context: Indra's smiting of an enemy on behalf of a mortal friend, and I.63.3 *tvāṃ śúṣṇam ... kútsāya dyumāte sācā han* shows the same configuration. In all three passages I tr. it ‘in partnership’ as an adverbial. Perhaps *sācā* signals an esp. close relationship between Indra and his mortal beneficiary. The voc. epithet of Indra in 7c, hapax *sadhavīra* ‘you who have our heroes as companions’ in my tr., might support this view, and see also 8ab. I am not entirely persuaded by my own interpr., however.

On *tūtos*, *tūtot* as belonging to a redup. aor., not the perfect (contra Wh Rts, Macd. VGS), see detailed disc. by Kü (220–21); Hoffmann also identifies it as an aor. (183); Gr already took it as a caus. aor., and see also Schaeffer (Intens. 129–30). On *tūtuma* (X.50.5–6) as a possible 1st pl. to this stem, see comm. ad loc.

VI.26.5: For the association of *barhāṇā* and *ukthā-* see VI.44.6 *ukthāsya barhāṇā*.

Pāda b contains one of the few exx. of the “-*si* imperative” that betrays its non-imperative source, since *dārṣi* occurs in a subord. cl., from which imperatives are barred. Here it shows its original subjunctive value in a purpose cl. (so also Hoffmann, 183).

Initial *āva* in c breaks the long pattern of 2nd sg. pronouns beginning the hemistich (vss. 2–5a, resumed vss. 6, 7c, with such forms also beginning even pādas 2d, 4d, 7b). Perhaps it is meant to resonate with 4b #*āvo*, 5d #*prāvo*.

VI.26.6: As I have discussed elsewhere (Sacrificed Wife, 176–84), *śraddhā-* in Vedic is not simply an abstract ‘trust, faith’, but refers specifically to trust in the efficacy of ritual and hospitality, and indeed to the concrete manifestations of this trust through ritual gift-giving. The plural *śraddhābhiḥ* here, paired with *sómaiḥ*, seems to refer to the offerings themselves. For Dabhīti's hospitality as specifically ritual, see nearby VI.20.13 and for the use of *śraddhā-* in a Dabhīti context X.113.9.

On *sācā* see comm. ad vs. 4.

Pāda d contains a fine sequence of alliterative sibilants of all three types: *ṣaśtīm sahasrā śācyā sācā han*.

VI.26.7: Acdg. to JSK (DGRV I.286), this is one of the two passages in which *canā* lacks negative value. (I think there are more, though negative context is the default; see comm. ad X.49.5, etc.)

Ge takes *tvāyā* as the agent with *stāvante*: “dass die Helden ... von dir gelobt werden.” But Indra as the *praiser* of mortals seems off; *tvāyā* is better taken as an instr. of accompaniment, esp. given the larger context of the hymn, in which Indra works for and in conjunction with mortals (see esp. disc. ad vs. 4 with regard to *sācā*). The hapax cmpd *sadhavīra* applied to Indra seems to reflect this situation, though exactly what the word means is unclear (Gr ‘mit den Männern seiend’, Ge ‘Heldengenosse’), and its lack of accent makes it difficult to determine even what type of cmpd it is. (AiG has no disc. of it.) I take it as an underlying bahuvrīhi ‘having heroes together (with oneself)’ vel sim., expressing the mutual relationship between our men and Indra.

Ge takes the instr. phrase *trivārūthena náhuṣā* as referring to Indra: “da du ein dreifacher Nahus bist.” He bases this interpr. on X.49.8 *ahám ... náhuṣo náhuṣtaraḥ* “I [=Indra] am a greater Nahus than Nahus.” But this passage is in an ātmastuti, a genre in which Indra claims to be the best example of everything, and the construction with comparative in fact *precludes* an identification of Indra with Nahus: he is asserting that he has more of what makes Nahus Nahus than Nahus himself does. It is an expression like “more Catholic than the Pope.” (As for X.99.7, which Ge also cites, I have now changed my interpr. from the publ. tr. and will register the change in the comm. in due course.) I consider Nahus here another recipient of the praise being doled out.

I would also take issue with Ge’s bleaching of *trivārūtha-* from ‘having/providing threefold defense’ to simply ‘threefold’. This cmpd. otherwise has its full lexical value, mostly modifying *sārman-* ‘shelter’, and the simplex *vārūtha-* ‘defense’ is robustly attested, so the 2nd cmpd member had not become opaque.

VI.26.8: This final wish to become Indra’s dearest companions neatly sums up the dominant theme of the hymn, esp. the last vss.

VI.27 Indra

VI.27.1–2: These two vss. form a tight pair, whose responsions are detailed below.

VI.27.1: This vs. is structured by the extreme repetition of *kím*, found 5 times in interlocking sets. In the 1st hemistich 3 occur in the phrase *kím (u) asya* LOC. The 1st 2 are initial in the 1st pāda and immediately after the caesura, while the third one, rather than opening the 2nd pāda, gives the impression of syncopation by being placed after pāda-initial *indraḥ*. The third pāda has the sequence in scrambled order: ... LOC *kím (té) asya*, with the tonic prn. *té* incongruously inserted. The last *kím u*, in pāda d, lacks both *asya* and the LOC, but clearly is conjoined with *kím* in pāda c with the rest of the phrase construction truncated.

There are many possible ways to interpr. this construction. The first question is whether *kím* is a question particle or a neut. interrogative prn. (see, e.g., Etter, *Fragesätze*, 75, 124–25), or indeed if some of the occurrences are one, some the other. I am firmly of the opinion that, simply on rhetorical grounds, the number of repetitions favors a referential prn. for all, rather than a particle. Moreover, vs. 2 offers a concrete answer to

the question “what?” — namely *sát* ‘being, what exists’ — in the same number and in the same positions as *kím* in vs. 1. The responsion could hardly be more complete. Another question is whether pāda a should be read independently, as containing two parallel nominal clauses, with the hemistich-final verb only having domain over pāda b, or whether the verb should be read with the whole hemistich. Because of the parallelism of the *kím (u) asya* phrases I opt for the latter solution, as does Ge.

Another curiosity is the fact that *asya* is unaccented in all its occurrences. Unaccented forms of this pronoun should be anaphoric, with a referent preceding in the discourse, but of course in the 1st vs. of the hymn there is no preceding discourse. However, the first two locatives, in pāda a, establish without doubt the identity of the referent -- soma: “in the exhilaration (*máde*) of it” and “in the drinking (*pītaú*) of it” could refer to nothing else in the universe of RVic discourse. See the numerous examples of *máde sómasya* (generally in that order) in Lub, beginning with I.46.12; the loc. of *pītí-* is almost confined to our passage, but the dat. phrase *sómasya pītáye* is almost inescapable (see again Lub). The 2nd set of locatives, *sakhyé* ‘in the fellowship’ and *niśádi* ‘in the installation’ are less clearly typed for soma -- and in fact the latter might sidetrack us to Agni and his ritual installation -- but by that time the soma context has been unequivocally established. The unusual application of *ní√sad* to soma simply shows the frequent secondary fusion of the two principal ritual divinities/substances.

The first hemistich is otherwise unproblematic, but the second one raises some further questions. The first word, *rāṇā*, is taken by the Pp as nom. pl. *rāṇāḥ* in pausa, an interpr. followed by the standard treatments. By this interpr. these “joys” are the subj. of *vividre* in the main cl. Both act. and mid. forms of this pf. are normally transitive, and so the question should be “what did the previous joys find, what the new ones?” See Ge’s “Oder was seine guten Launen bei der (Opfer)sitzung sind, was haben die ... erreicht?” But this does not make a lot of sense to me: in what way are “joys” agents here? Old seems to get out of this semantic problem by taking the verb as a sort of pass./intrans. with gen. *asya* as the experiencer (presumably referring to Indra) and *kím* as a predicate nominative: “oder die Freuden, die bei (seinem, des Soma) Sichniederlassen ..., als was sind diese ihm eignen ... erfahren?” But besides forcing an unnatural sense on the verb, it assumes a different referent for *asya* in c from the referents of the 3 occurrences in ab (as does Ge’s). My own interpr. is based on a different analysis of *rāṇā* — as the instr. sg. of the root noun *rán-*, attested as dat. sg. *rāṇe*, loc. sg. *rán*, and indeed (*pace* Gr) as this same instr. sg. in IX.7.7 (see Old ZDMG 63 [1909]: 289 = KISch 305). (Note that with the elim. of the supposed nom. pl. in our passage, the stem *rāṇa-* is entirely singular, save for a single late loc. pl. *rāṇeṣu* [X.120.5], quite possibly confected to produce a Triṣṭubh cadence from sg. *rāṇe*.)

With *rāṇā* otherwise interpr., the subj. of *vividre* is open. I supply “priests” (or a similar group of mortal devotees of Indra); cf. *nūtanāsaḥ* in similar usage in nearby VI.21.5 and the similarly contrastive expression *pūrvebhir ṛṣibhiḥ ... nūtanair utá* in I.1.2. One problem remains, however. By my interpr. *asya* in c has the same referent as the other 3 exx. in ab, and like them it is construed with a loc., here *niśádi*: the insistent repetitive pattern of the vs. imposes this reading. But *asya* is stationed in the main clause, as marked by the immediately preceding *té*, correlative with *yé* in the nominal relative cl. (cf. the whole pāda *rāṇā vā yé niśádi kím té asya*), though it should precede *kím té*. (Ge’s rendering cited above also has this problem, though he construes *asya* with *rāṇā(h)*, not

niṣādi.) I can only explain this by assuming that acdg. to the pattern established in ab, *kīm* (x) *asya* LOC, *kīm* here has carried the pronoun *asya* along with it into the main cl., even though the constituency is in all cases *asya* LOC.

VI.27.3: In the publ. tr. I followed Ge in rendering *samasya* as ‘whole’ (ganz), not very happily. This unaccented stem is an indefinite (‘some, any’), and, as disc. ad X.29.4, it generally has clear pejorative meaning. Perhaps here *ná ... sama-* means ‘not any’ = ‘none’ and the poet is complaining that Indra has been holding back on them. I would now emend the tr. to “But yet we do not know any of your greatness, nor generosity, o generous one, nor every current benefit (of yours). O Indra, your Indrian strength has not shown itself.” For the somewhat similar passage in X.54.3 see comm. ad loc.; in VIII.21.8 *sama-* is used in a context similar to this one, in which it’s implied that Indra had previously been withholding his bounty.

VI.27.4–5: Hoffmann (Injunk. 163–64) tr. and discusses this pair of vss., with special reference to the change from augmented to injunctive verbs.

VI.27.5: Abhyāvartin Cāyamāna is the subj. of the dānastuti in vs. 8. Although I resist interpr. words with clear morphology as PNs, in this case *cāyamānā-* (so accented and appearing only in this hymn) should be separated from the pres. part. *cāyamāna-* (2x), on which see comm. ad VII.18.8.

As in VI.20.10, this vs. contains a 3rd sg. root aor. *dart* with retained (or restored) final cluster *-rt*, even though such retentions are supposedly only licit if the *-t* belongs to the root. I argued ad VI.20.10 that the sandhi situation there favored the retention of the cluster (before following *dh-* [*< *h-*]). I suggest that our form here has been adopted from that passage, since verse-final position would not favor the retention. Another passage containing *dart* that seems dependent on VI.20.10 is I.174.2b, identical to VI.20.10c, though in I.174.2 *dart* must be a 2nd sg., and so is doubly illicit.

VI.27.6: On the warriors’ slang in this vs. and the curiously literal attempts at interpreting *pātrā bhindānāḥ*, see publ. intro. and Old ad loc., Ge n. 6d. For *śārave pāyamānāḥ* see disc. ad X.27.6.

VI.27.7: The purport of this vs. and the referent of *yāsya* in pāda are disputed. As Ge points out (n. 7), Sāy. thinks ab refers to Indra and his two fallow bays, while Ge thinks *yāsya* refers to Śṛṇjaya found in c and marks the beginning of the dānastuti. I agree with Sāy. that Indra is the referent of *yāsya*, but not that the two cows are really his two horses. As noted in the publ. intro., I instead assume *gāvau* refers to the two rivers found in vss. 5 (Hariyūpīyā) and 6 (Yavyāvatī). A strikingly similar expression refers unequivocally to two rivers in the famous hymn III.33 (Viśvāmitra and the Rivers): III.33.1 *gāveva śubhré mātārā rihāṇé* “licking each other like two mother cows (their calves)” (cf. also III.33.3). The only problem is that though, in this gender-variable stem, du. *gāvau* can be either masc. or fem. (for the latter, see *gāvā* in III.33.1 just cited), one of the du. adjectives in our passage, *aruṣā*, should be masc., since the fem. of this stem is *āruṣī*, which in fact appears with pl. *gó-* in I.92.1-2: *gāvó ’ruṣīḥ, āruṣīr gāḥ*. I can only assume that since the rest of this dual NP (*gāvau ... sūyavasyū ... rērihāṇā*) could be

either masc. or fem., *aruṣā* was just slotted in, esp. because it looks like a possible fem. du. Alternatively, MLW suggests that *aruṣā* could in fact be feminine and an archaism, since the *devī*- inflection of thematic color adjectives is an innovation.

The verb *antār ... cārataḥ* is somewhat difficult to interpr. This lexeme generally refers to a journey between two locations -- often of Agni's journey as messenger between heaven and earth. Here no locations are specified, and, assuming the correctness of my identification of the dual subject as the rivers of vss. 5–6 (not a certain assumption), it is two rivers that must be performing the action. Perhaps the verb is reciprocal, expressing action between the two subjects: “(the two rivers) go back and forth one to the other,” but this would leave *yāsya* without an obvious role in the clause. Instead I take *yāsya* as the beneficiary of the action (that is, as if an honorary dative) and assume the rivers are acting as go-between for Indra, either between his forces and the enemy's or between the two divisions of the Vṛcīvant forces referred to in 5d. The genitive is assuming some of the functions of the dative already in the RV, and of course in later Sanskrit dative genitives are extremely common -- probably indirectly reflecting the loss of the dative in MIA.

VI.28 Cows and Indra

VI.28.1: In pāda a ‘house’ is supplied as obj. of *bhadrām akran* on the basis of 6c *bhadrām grhām kṛṇutha*. Ge simply “haben Glück gebracht,” Whitney (AV IV.21.1) “have done what is excellent,” and this is certainly possible.

VI.28.2: Pāda b contains what may be the only ex. in the RV of nominalized *svá-* to mean ‘own property’. Note that the owner of the *svām* here is not the subject of the verb *muṣāyati*, which is Indra, but rather Indra's client and worshiper. There is therefore no reflexive relationship between *svá-* and anyone in the clause. For similar usage see disc. of *svāpati-* ad X.44.1.

What precise kind of land *ābhinne khilyé* refers to is unclear; see disc. by Old and Ge n. 2d. The general opinion is that *ābhinne* (‘uncut, unsplit’) describes land that hasn't been broken into parcels, but I wonder if it instead means ‘unploughed’ -- that is, unsplit by a plough.

VI.28.3: I do not understand what nuance the vṛddhi of *āmītrá-* adds to *amitra-*. Both seem simply to mean ‘enemy, foe’. MLW suggests that it might be a collective, a possible function for a vṛddhi deriv.

Ge takes *vyáthiḥ* as a “falsch Weg” upon which the enemy will lead the cows, requiring him to supply a complex verb phrase to *√dhṛs*, “wagen ... den falschen Weg (zu führen)” (see also his n. 3b for an even more complex alternative). But *vyáthis-* ‘wandering or meandering course’ fits the normal aimless wandering of cows in pasture, and surely we wish to prevent cattle rustlers (or the like) from taking advantage of the cows' wandering. Cf. Whitney, AV IV.21.3 “shall dare attack their track (?)”; Klein (DGRV I.219) “a hostile one shall not venture upon their way.” For the wandering habits of cows, see 4cd *urugāyám ... ví caranti* “They wander far across wide-ranging (space).”

Given the acc., it seems best, with Ge et al., to take *devān* only with *yájate*, not, as in the publ. tr., also with *dádāti*. I therefore would emend the tr. to “With those (cows)

that he sacrifices to the gods and (that) he gives ...” The expression is compressed: the instr. *yābhiḥ* should of course only be construed with *yájate*, and we should have an acc. **yāḥ* as obj. of *dádāti*. As a parallel to *devān*, Ge supplies a datival “(den Sānger)” with *dádāti* (sim. Klein loc. cit.), but I see no reason to limit the recipient in this way. Cf. the open-ended 2b *úpéd dadāti*, which specifies neither gift nor recipient. The unstinting giver is rewarded.

The tr. of the main cl. is also somewhat misleading. “Is accompanied by” for *sacate* sounds more passive in English than is meant, esp. given the *sahá*. I would now slightly emend to “he keeps company with them ...”

VI.28.4: On *reṇú-kakāṭa-* see EWA s.v. *kakāṭikā-*, *kṛkāṭa-*. Some part of the back of the head/neck is meant. What exact threat the dusty-necked steed poses to the cows isn’t exactly clear. Sāy. explains *árvā* as *yuddhārtham āgato ‘śvaḥ*. I would limit the “intent to fight” more narrowly to a cattle raid, but there is no further evidence to bring to bear. See immed. below.

saṃskṛtatráṃ is also somewhat problematic. It is generally referred to the root $\sqrt{kṛt}$ ‘cut’ (see AiG II.2.170 and, most recently, EWA p. 316 s.v. *KART*¹), but this affiliation is disputed by Whitney (Roots, p. 23) and, most vigorously, by Old, who assigns it to $\sqrt{kṛ}$ for both formal and semantic reasons. The standard rendering is ‘Schlachtbank’ (slaughter or, Whitney [AV, despite Rts], slaughterhouse). Against this interpr., Old makes the reasonable point that in this pre-ahimsā era there’s no reason why a cow-owner wouldn’t have his cows slaughtered when he wanted to. But Old’s own solution is excessively convoluted and requires that the final *-tra-* belong to $\sqrt{trā}$ ‘protect’, which seems dubious. (On *gotrá-* and other possible forms of the thematized root noun *-trā-* in compounds, see Scarlatta [194–95].) To meet Old’s objections, we can interpr. the clause in the context of the preceding clause and of the whole vs. The 2nd half of the vs. expresses a wish for the safety of cows that roam widely, presumably not always under the control and in the sight of a herdsman. The first hemistich mentions several misadventures that could befall these roving cattle. Pāda a refers, if I’m right, to a cattle raid conducted by horsemen -- what in the Old West (or at least the Old West of the imagination) would be called rustlers. It may be that the “dusty neck” of the horse in question indirectly indicates that the horse is not a well-cared-for beast of the Ārya elite, or else that the raid requires hard riding in rough country. The second pāda may indicate that the cattle rustled were taken for meat or, under a different scenario, that the cows wandered into territory controlled by tribals, non-Ārya, or even non-elite Ārya (all without access to horses) who would ambush, kill, and eat them. Both pādas would imply that the cattle are far from the safety of their home and enclosure.

My “place for dressing” reflects the possibility (see above) that *saṃskṛta-* belongs to $\sqrt{kṛ}$ not $\sqrt{kṛt}$, and is a euphemistic expression for slaughter. However, if it does belong to $\sqrt{kṛt}$ “... for slaughter” would be just fine.

The word order in pāda b is somewhat aberrant. The fem. pl. subj. *tā(h)* occurs right after the verb, followed by the preverb *abhí*, which ends the pāda: x x x x x, *úpa yanti tā abhí*. We would ordinarily expect the pronoun *tā(h)* to occur early in the clause (cf. pāda a *#ná tā(h)* [=3a]) and the preverb to precede the rest of the verbal complex. The word order disturbance may have been caused by the need to fit the bulky 4-syllable *saṃskṛtatram* into the pāda, since it won’t fit the Jagatī cadence.

VI.28.5: The publ. tr. follows the usual configuration of equational nominal sentences, with the subject in 2nd position, the predicate nominal 1st. This interpr. is supported by the fact that the verb *achān* is singular, agreeing with *bhāgaḥ* and *índrah*, not with pl. *gāvaḥ* ‘cows’. However, the standard tr. (Ge, Wh) follow the opposite order, e.g., Ge “Diese Kühe sind mir wie Bhaga ...” In which case, we would have to assume that *achān* simply agrees with the nearer referent, even though it is the predicate.

In c the phrase *sá janāsa índrah* must be a deliberate echo of the famous refrain of II.12. It also demonstrates the standard Vedic prose syntactic rule that in an expression of the type “what is X, that is Y,” the demonstrative in the 2nd cl. will agree with Y, not X, in number and gender, even though its real referent is X, or in this case cows. For further disc. see Brereton’s “*Tat tvam asi* in Context.”

VI.28.6: This vs., like 5c, has an echo from the 2nd Maṇḍala: the final pāda *bṛhád vo váya ucyate sabhāsu* “Your vigor is declared loftily in the assemblies” strikingly resembles the Gṛtsamāda Triṣṭubh refrain *bṛhád vadema vidáthe suvîrāḥ* “May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes.” Both begin with adverbial *bṛhát* and contain a verb of speaking -- a passive in our case -- and a loc. of the place where the speech is spoken: *vidáthe* ‘at the ceremony of distribution’, *sabhāsu* ‘in assemblies’, with *sabhā-* probably inhabiting a lower register, as might be appropriate for cows.

Kulikov (-*ya*-pres., 214) denies a passive value for *ucyate* here and tr. “Your energy sounds loudly in the assemblies” for reasons that don’t seem sufficient to me.

VI.28.7: Note that *sūyávasam* echoes (*gāvau* ...) *sūyavasyū* in the preceding hymn (VI.27.7).

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

VI.28.8: The usual tr. of this vs. tend towards the euphemistic -- e.g., Ge “Dieses Befruchtungsmittel soll ... sich fruchtbar zeigen”; Kulikov (-*ya*-pres., 153 with nn. 373, 374) “Let this increase increase in these cows.” But \sqrt{prc} means ‘fill, engorge, mingle’, and with *úpa*, the preverb of intimacy, it takes on a distinctly sexual sense. I take it as ‘inseminate’ in this passage, especially because of the bull’s semen in c. See disc. also ad I.40.9. Moreover, the -*ana*-suffix on *upapārcana-* is one that ordinarily signals a transitive sense and often has a close connection to a transitive -*āya*-formation (though not in this case). Unlike the standard tr. I take pāda a as a nominal sentence and *prcyatām* in b as an impersonal. In my interpr. *upapārcana-* is the ‘inseminator’ -- either the bull or the bull’s penis or semen, whose match is found in the hyper-virile Indra in d. My interpr. requires that that the two locc. in the 2nd hemistich (*rétasí*, *vīryè*) have a different usage and appear in different clauses from *góṣu* in b.

VI.29 Indra

VI.29.1: Three of the four pādas begin with a form of *māh-*, incl. the curious acc. sg. masc. *mahām* in d.

sepuḥ is the only perfect form attested to the root \sqrt{sap} in all of Sanskrit. Ge tr. it with present value (“Den Indra ehren die Herren”) without comment, and the publ. tr.

follows suit. Kü (547) argues strenuously -- and plausibly -- against this interpr. on historical grounds and takes it as “kontinuativ”: “Indra haben (seit jeher) die Männer ... geehrt (and ehren ihn jetzt noch).” This interpr. might fit well with the curious double participle in pāda b: *yāntaḥ ... cakānāḥ*. Although both Ge (“voll Verlangen nach der Gunst des Grossen kommen”) and Kü (“indem die [au ihm] gehen, um die Gunst des Grossen [zu erlangen], begierig”) take the two participles as independent and with their full lexical value, Ge suggests (n. 1b) that they could form a periphrastic construction, which is in fact reflected in the publ. tr.’s “as they go on finding pleasure in the great one,” with *yānt-* supplying a continuative sense. The participial periphrasis might be an attempt to signal the continuative value of the perfect in pāda a, which that form cannot do on its own. The nearest thing to such a continuative in English would be “The men have (always) kept honoring Indra ...” or (less clumsily) just “have (always) honored,” and I would now substitute one of these tr.

Ge construes *sumatāye* with *cakānāḥ* (see tr. cited above), but forms of the root $\sqrt{kā}/kan$ regularly take the acc. or loc., never the dative. Note that Kü supplies a verb to govern *sumatāye* and takes *cakānāḥ* absolutely. I suggest rather that *sumatāye* is parallel to *sakhyāya* in pāda a. Since $\sqrt{kā}/kan$ can also occasionally take the gen. (cf. VII.27.1 *śávasaś cakānāḥ* “taking pleasure in your strength”), I take *mahāḥ* with *cakānāḥ*, though a tr. like Kü’s would also be possible: “for the sake of the partnership and benevolence of the great one, taking pleasure/desiring (it/him).”

I do not understand why *ásti* is found in pāda c, since there is no need for an overt copula, and it is difficult to interpret the verb as an existential. It is true, however, that overt copulas are more common in subordinate than in main clauses. Or perhaps *ásti* is part of the effort to express present continuative.

VI.29.3: As in I.37.14 (see comm. ad loc.), *dúvaḥ* here must be a nom. pl., not the usual sg. neut., nor the acc. pl. identified by Gr. On the somewhat aberrant syntax of this construction, see disc. by Kü (386–87). The juxtaposition of du. *pādā* and *dúva(h)* suggests that the latter is also meant to evoke *d'vé*, the neut. du. ‘two’ with ‘feet’.

Ge couches b in the 3rd ps. (see tr. cited below), but since this nominal clause is positioned between two clauses with undoubted 2nd ps. ref. to Indra (pāda a: *te*, d *babhūtha*) and itself contains no overt indications of 3rd ps., there is no reason to switch person and then switch back.

The instr. *śávasā* was omitted in the publ. tr. Although Ge tr. it with *dákṣiṇāvān* (“ist durch seine Macht ein Lohnausteiler”), the close association between *dhṛṣṇú-* and *śávas-* elsewhere in the RV (e.g., I.54.2, 56.4, I.167.9, IV.16.7, VI.66.6; cf. I.54.2 (etc.) *dhṛṣṇúnā śávasā*) suggests a tr. “As the mace-bearer, bold with (your) vast power ...” As was just noted, in the publ. tr. *śávasā* was omitted entirely; the just suggested tr. should be substituted.

Note that pāda b is a lexically variant version of 1c, which contains *vájrahastaḥ* for our *vajrī* and *dātā* for our *dákṣiṇāvān*.

VI.29.4: Whatever the etymological facts -- the root affiliation of the pf. *mimikṣ-* (etc.) is disputed (see, e.g., Kü 385–89, who assigns it to $\sqrt{myakṣ}$, and EWA s.v. *MEKṢ*, esp. 374) -- the two forms of *mimikṣúḥ* in this passage (vss. 2, 3) are synchronically associated with *miśla-* / *miśrá-* here. As noted in the publ. intro., the three vss. form an omphalos

with the theme of attachment, and the superlative *āmiślatama-* ‘most firmly attached / entwined / intermixed’ in pāda a provides the climax -- at least in my view. Not all interpr. see the contextual continuity and therefore do not tr. accordingly. E.g., Ge renders *āmiślatama-* as ‘der anziehendste’ (the most attractive), which captures neither its use in this context nor its probable connection with **meik* ‘mix’ (EWA s.v. *miśrá-*)(though the base verb ‘anziehen’ has a physical dimension closer to the sense I see). I am happy to say that Old’s interpr. is very close to mine, including supplying Indra with the adj.: “Der gepresste Soma soll der am besten (dem Indra) anhaftende [clinging] sein.”

The referent of the loc. *yásmín* in b is unclear. The structure of the half-vs. suggests *sá* of a, namely soma, and this seems to be the standard interpr.: cf. Ge’s “Der gepresste Soma ist der anziehendste, zu dem Kochspeise gekocht wird ...”; also Kulikov (p. 403, p.c. from W. Knobl) “That Soma is pressed as most easily mixing, with which [, when being pressed,] cooked food is being cooked.” I don’t understand either of these tr., esp. the latter, and they do not make ritual sense: food is not cooked in/for/with soma (though grain can be mixed in it). Since, in my interpr., Indra is another, if unexpressed, participant in pāda a, I take *yásmín* as referring to him. This identification is supported in the larger context by *yásmín* in 2a, the beginning of the omphalos, where it refers to Indra’s hand (*yásmín háste* “in which hand”), or as Ge suggests there (n. 2a), “*yásmín* ist Attraktion für *yásya*” (referring to Indra directly). These two occurrences of *yásmín* (2a, 4b) would frame the omphalos ring-compositionally. The suggested reference to Indra gets further support from passages like IV.24.7 *yá índrāya sunávat sómam adyá, pácāt paktīr utá bhṛjījāti dhānāḥ* “Whoever will press soma for Indra today, will cook the cooked foods, and will roast the grains ...”

The two pres. participles in cd, *stuvántaḥ ... śámsantaḥ*, must be predicated, substituting for a main verb.

VI.29.5: Kü (221) suggests that the pf. part. *tútuajāna-* may already be a lexicalized adj. meaning ‘sich bemühend, eilend, eifrig’ and tr. its occurrence in our passage quasi-adverbially, “mit Eifer,” an interpr. fld by Lowe (Participles, 216). But it seems to me to have its full lexical value, deriving from *√tuj* ‘thrust’, in this context, where the preceding pāda describes Indra forcing apart (*bābadhe*) the two world-halves and the following pāda compares him to a herdsman driving together (*samījamānaḥ*) his herds -- both actions requiring some amount of thrusting. In its other occurrences this part. either clearly or arguably has lexical value; cf. e.g. I.61.12 ... *prá bharā tútuajānaḥ ... vájram* ... “bear down the mace, thrusting ...” In general, I see no reason to rob forms of lexical value unless they regularly appear in contexts in which such value would be semantically inappropriate. That a participle does not appear with a full panoply of complements does not mean that it has been semantically bleached beyond recognition -- a view that is at odds with, e.g., Lowe’s approach to the issue.

Ge sharply denies (n. 5d) that *īja-* can belong to *√aj* ‘drive’, but he was of course writing before the full flowering of laryngeal theory. For the derivation see EWA s.v. *Aj*, p. 51.

I tr. hemistich-final *ūtī* with pāda c, but the fact that that pāda has an exact repetition in VI.37.5d throws that interpr. into doubt. Nonetheless, I still think *ūtī* is to be construed with the preceding pāda, skipping over the simile that begins pāda d. It should

really be Indra's help that is in question, not that of the herdsman, an interpr. reinforced by the initial sequence in the 2nd pāda of the next vs., 6b *ūtī́ ánūtī́*, also referring to Indra.

VI.29.6: The double *evā́* (a, c) strongly marks this as an extra-hymnic summary vs.

Mamḍala VI (cont'd)

VI.30 Indra

VI.30.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the first pāda is an oblique ref. to the soma sacrifice that strengthens Indra for the Vṛtra-smashing; cf. III.40.7 *pītvī sómasya vāvṛdhe* also with Indra as subj.

VI.30.2: The use of *bhūt* with the āmreḍita *divé-dive* seems to reinforce the regularly recurring individual nature of the event: it is not that the sun is always lovely, but that it becomes visible anew, every day. This is more or less Hoffmann's view -- he cites and tr. the pāda 4x (pp. 135, 140, 267, 274) -- though he slightly changes his terms of analysis from citation to citation (e.g., 135 expressing the truth of natural laws; 140 iterative).

It is striking that both c and d end with 3rd sg. root aor. injunctives, *bhūt* and *dhāt* respectively. It is all the more striking because they don't seem to have parallel functions. As just noted, *bhūt* expresses a recurrent, hence not time-limited event, but *dhāt* seems to express a particular (cosmogonic) action in the past. Hoffmann characterizes this as "resultative Konstatierung" (214) and tr. (216) "Der Machtvolle (Indra) hat weithin die Wohnsitze verteilt." By not considering the two adjacent pādas together, Hoffmann avoids confronting this functional discrepancy; I have no explanation of it, though see comm. on the next vs.

VI.30.3: The relationship between natural activity in the present and the deeds Indra performed in the past to set that activity in motion is made clear in the 1st hemistich. The rivers continue to do the work (pāda a) -- presumably flowing through their assigned channels -- that Indra started them on by digging those channels in the mythic past (pāda b). The temporal immediacy of the rivers' work is emphasized by the opening phrase in pāda a *adyā cin nū cid* "even today, even now" with doubled emphasizing *cid*, while pāda b portrays Indra's original action with the augmented impf. *āradaḥ*. This offers us a clue as to how to interpret 2cd, with its functional and temporal discrepancy. As is well known and often expressed, Indra put the sun in heaven in the first place; cf., e.g., I.52.8 *ādharmaḥ divy ā sūryam dṛśé* "You fixed the sun fast in heaven to be seen." Since the audience would be well aware of this, they could connect the continued re-appearance of the sun every day in pāda c (*divé-dive* somewhat matching 3a *adyā cin nū cid* functionally) with Indra's original deed, referred to in general terms in the preceding pāda (2b) *yāni dādhāra*. Indra's creation of the sun is also referred to in the final pāda of this hymn, 5d ... *sūryam janāyan*.

In pāda a we can possibly see a secondary pun in *āpaḥ* 'work' -- namely *apāḥ* 'waters' (see 4c, 5a), despite the accent difference.

VI.30.5: Pāda a contains two fem. pl. nouns (one clearly, one likely accusative), *apāḥ* 'waters' and *dūrah* 'doors', and a fem. pl. adj. *vīṣūcīḥ* 'wide, wide asunder, in all/opposite directions' that could modify either or both. It also contains the preverb *vī*, stationed between the two nouns and with a metrical rest right before it that draws attention to this position. It does not, however, contain a verb. There are three syntactic possibilities (at least as I see it): 1) we should supply two different verbs, each forming a possible lexeme

with *ví* and each governing one of the two nouns; we should supply a single verb, 2) which takes a double acc. or 3) which governs both nouns in parallel. (Old and Ge n. 5a lay out slightly different possibilities.) Ge opts for the second: “Du (liessest) die Gewässer durch die Tore nach allen Seiten (laufen),” supplying *asṛjah* from 4d. It is not clear what the doors through which the waters surge would be. I think it is rather the first. With Ge I would supply *asṛjah*, but with only *apáh* as obj. Although $\sqrt{sṛj}$ is relatively rare with *ví*, ‘waters’ is of course regularly the object of other forms of this root, particularly *áva* as in the immediately preceding pāda. Moreover $\sqrt{sṛj}$ is used of the release of liquid in VII.103.7 (“frog” hymn), where heated milk-drinks “attain their own release” (*aśnuvate visargám*). As for the 2nd object, $\sqrt{vṛ}$ ‘unclose, open’ is standard with ‘doors’, and I supply a form of $\sqrt{vṛ}$ here. The point of this hemistich is that Indra opens up and disperses everything closed and enclosed. What the “doors” are in this scenario is still somewhat unclear: it could be, as in Dawn hymns, the doors of darkness and refer to Indra’s flooding the world with light (note the sun and dawn in the last pāda of the vs.), or it could simply refer to Indra’s general opening up of spaces, esp. the Vala cave.

In b the ppl. *ḍṛlhá* is reprised from 3d, but with a nice twist. In vs. 3 Indra makes the spaces firmly fixed, but here he breaks open what *had* been firmly fixed.

VI.31 Indra

VI.31.1: On the semantic connection between the first and second hemistichs, see publ. intro. Particularly note the simple etymological figure in cd #*ví* ... #*ávocanta* ... *vívāca*## in the half-vs. concerning the disunity of the various peoples; here the etymological sense of *carṣaṇí-* as ‘bordered, separate (people)’ also gets fully used. In contrast to the *ví*-s of cd, we might have expected the presence of *sám* in ab to express the unity found there, since this is the standard contrastive pairing. But the theme of unity is expressed in ab by *ékaḥ* and *hástayoḥ*. Indra alone takes them all into his two hands.

The phrase *rayipate rayīnām* is clearly of the familiar “X-lord of X-es” type, though it has some twists. On the one hand, though *rayipate* is a voc. and lacks accent, *rayīnām* has its usual accent even though oblique case forms in voc. phrases regularly lose their accents. On the other, the nom. *ékaḥ* should be construed with the voc. *rayipate*, not independently (that is, the pāda doesn’t mean “You have become the one, o wealth-lord of wealth”). Ge takes the phrase as a predicative voc. The publ. tr. represents the construction as a haplology, because the predicative voc. is next to impossible to render into English -- or German: Hoffmann’s (Injunk. 218) “du (Indra) bist es allein geworden, o Reichtumsherr der Reichtümer” is cautionary in that regard. Ge’s cited parallel IV.17.6cd *satābhavo vásupatir vásūnām, dátre víśvā adhithā indra kṛṣṭīḥ*, which closely resembles the hemistich here, reinforces the constituency of our *rayipate rayīnām*.

In c the standard formula *toká- tánaya-* ‘progeny (and) posterity’ is interspersed with other locatives of the stakes, in the sequence *toké apsú tánaye ca sūrē*, I take the *ca* here as connecting the formulaic pair and have tr. them together, with the others postponed. Cf. VI.25.4, 66.8.

VI.31.2: *cyāvayante* is the only med. form to this stem, against 16 act. transitive ones. Although in my 1983 monograph (p. 126 n. 43) I identify it as intransitive, I now think it is a passive to the transitive act.: “are bought to shaking, caused to shake” rather than a

simple intr. semantically identical to *cyávate* (i.e., just ‘shake’). Fear of Indra is the cause and Indra the unexpressed agent.

VI.31.3: The content of this vs. is somewhat illuminated by the similar account of the Śuṣṇa battle and the theft of the sun’s wheel in IV.16.9–14, esp. vs. 12, as Old and Ge point out.

The tenses and moods of this vs. are ill-assorted; for various views, see Old, Hoffmann (Injunk. 190–91), Klein DGRV II.101–2. The first issue is the impv. *yudhya* ordering Indra to fight a mythological enemy long since defeated. Old reports with apparent, though not full-voiced, approval, Gr’s (Üb) suggestion to read injunc. *yudhyaḥ*, but later points out that the gods are often urged to do a deed that actually happened in the past -- hence the transmitted impv. *yudhya* would be perfectly fine. (And Gr Wö lists the form thus.)

At the beginning of c, *dāśa* is taken by Ge (fld. by Klein; see also Gr Wö) as an impv. to $\sqrt{damś}$ ‘bite’ (in the sense ‘stachle’ [spur on, goad]), with ‘horses’ supplied as obj. Given the discrepancy between the root meaning and the sense suggested here, as well as the absence of an expressed object, it seems best to follow Old (who cites Gr’s Üb. [though curiously Gr in the Wö interprets it as Ge does]) and Hoffmann and take *dāśa* as the numeral, referring to the companions of Śuṣṇa (like the thousands [*sahāsrā*] mentioned in IV.16.12 containing *śúṣṇam aśúṣam ... kūyavam* as here).

A new clause begins in the middle of pāda c, introduced by *ádha* and containing the injunc. *muṣāyaḥ*, which is hard to harmonize with the impv. (*yudhya*) that precedes it. Ge (fld. by Klein) interpr. the injunc. as a functional impv., coordinated with the impv. he sees in *dāśa*; cf. Klein “Goad (thy horses) ... and steal the wheel of the sun.” Whereas Hoffmann takes the injunc. as “generell”: “Da stiehst du die Scheibe der Sonne,” further specified in his discussion with “da ... stiehst du (immer wieder), hast du die Fähigkeit (Eigenschaft) zu stehlen.” Neither the impv. nor the general reading seems satisfactory: although some injunctives function as imperatives, that usage is limited to a few stems, generally the root aorists *dāḥ*, *dhāḥ*, and *bhūḥ*. As for the “general” interpr., although it might make sense to say of someone (even Indra) “you have the capability/propensity to steal,” it is stretching what “general” means to apply it to a single and quite specific event: “you have the capability/propensity to steal the sun’s wheel.” The publ. tr. follows the presential rendering of Hoffman: “you steal” (though without the “general” nuance). I now think this is incorrect and that the injunctive simply expresses the past here. The first part of the vs. vividly evokes the attack on Śuṣṇa by imagining it before our eyes, with the speaker urging Indra to enter the fight. But the narrative then reverts to a recital of the mythical past. I would therefore alter the tr. to “So then you stole the wheel of the sun.”

The last VP in the vs. brings up a different issue. The transmitted Samh. text is *āviverápāṃsi*, analyzed by the Pp. as *āviveḥ rāpāṃsi*, from an assumed underlying **āviver rāpāṃsi* with simplification of the double *r* across word boundary by the well-known sandhi rule. This interpr. is followed by Ge and Klein; cf. Klein “Thou has set aright the damages.” But as in I.69.8 (q.v.) I follow Old (accepted also by Hoffmann) in reading *āviver āpāṃsi*, with *āpas-* ‘labor’. This does not require alteration of the Samh. text.

VI.31.4: The preverb *áva* is positioned somewhat oddly for a preverb in tmesis, though it does follow the caesura and is thus adjacent to a metrical boundary. We might have expected it to migrate to the pāda-initial position. Its displacement may be to allow the pattern of verse-initial forms of the 2nd sg. pronoun to continue: 2a *t^uvád*, 3a *t^uvám*, 4a *t^uvám*.

My all-purpose tr. of the (more or less lexicalized) desid. to *√śak* ‘be able’, namely ‘do one’s best’ (see ad I.112.19), loses the etymological connection here with *śācyā śacīvaḥ* “o able one, with your ability” -- but something like ‘strive to be able’ implies the possibility of Indra’s failure, which does not fit his divine profile.

The voc. *sutakre* is a hapax, analyzed by Gr as belonging to a *su-takri* ‘very fast’, but by the Pp (fld. by the standard modern interp.) as *suta-kre*. As Old points out, *sunvaté suta-* would be the same type of etym. figure as *śācyā śacīvaḥ*. Sāy. glosses *abhiṣutena somena kṛita*, and this in fact remains the standard interpr. For disc. of both sense and morphology (transfer of the root noun to long-vowel *√krī* to a short *i*-final) see esp. Old and Scar (87–88). Both cite as support for the purchase of Indra the very interesting passage IV.24.10 (q.v).

This is the only 5-pāda vs. (Śakvarī) in the whole run of Indra Triṣṭubh hymns (VI.17–41) and seems designed to insert the poet of this maṇḍala into the hymn and associate him with his sometime formulaic partner Divodāsa. See esp. VI.16.5bc *dīvodāsāya sunvaté / bharadvājāya dāsūṣe* also in this maṇḍala. Those two Gāyatrī pādas are almost identical to ours, except for one ritual participle, *gr̥ṇaté*, substituting for another, *dāsūṣe*, in the Bharadvāja pāda -- and for the three additional syllables in each pāda (d *sutakre*, 3 *vāsūni*) to fill out the Triṣṭubh. The addition of this extraneous material to adapt the shorter line to a different metrical form may account for the fact that *vāsūni* seems to have no syntactic or semantic connection to the rest of the vs. Although Ge construes it with *āsīkṣaḥ* (“wobei du ... DAT ... die Schätze zu verschaffen suchtest”) (sim. Gr), *śīkṣa-* does not elsewhere take an acc. (the few supposed passages in Gr are to be interpr. differently) but generally only a dative. See disc. ad I.112.19 etc. The publ. tr. takes *vāsūni* as a loosely attached acc. goal of Indra’s helpful actions: “for goods” or, to make the purpose somewhat clearer, “for (them to obtain) goods.” The poet would have been better off just throwing in another voc., as he did at the end of d. The addition of *vāsūni* here may have been facilitated by the appearance of ... *gr̥ṇaté vāsūni*# twice elsewhere (IV.24.1, IX.69.10), in both of which *vāsūni* is the object of a verb earlier in the pāda.

VI.31.5: Another tricky etymological figure is found in the hapax cmpd *satya-satvan*, both members of which have developed their own lexical senses but both derived from *√as* ‘be’.

For *prapathin* see comm. ad I.166.9.

The stem *carṣanī-* returns as the last word of the hymn, echoing 1d, for which see publ. intro. The ring composition is rather perfunctory.

VI.32 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., the first vs. is a meta-verse in which the poet refers to his own just-composed praise; the remaining vss. constitute that praise, and all begin with the prn. *sá*, a stylistic repetition that unifies and defines the praise-hymn proper. It is

noteworthy that, although the vocabulary and rhetoric leave no doubt of the identity of the recipient of the praise, the name “Indra” is not mentioned until the last vs. (5b) and the word “god” not at all. In this connection note the unaccented dat. *asmai* ‘for him’ in the first pāda of the hymn. Such unaccented oblique pronominal forms assume a referent already in the discourse, so Indra is present from the beginning despite not being named or even referred to at this point in the hymn, and the dative descriptors that follow in this vs., particularly *vajrīṇe* ‘possessing the mace’ in c, simply reinforce the audience’s recognition.

VI.32.2: The identity of the “two mothers/parents of the poets” (*mātārā ... kavīnām*) has been much discussed; see esp. Old, as well as Ge (n. 2ab) and Schmidt (B+I 151). The two leading candidate pairs are Heaven + Earth (/the two World Halves) and Heaven + Dawn, but only the former seems at all likely to me. Dawn and Heaven are not a stable pairing and therefore would be unlikely to be referred to by the pregnant dual *mātārā*, whereas this dual is regularly used of Heaven and Earth. Cf. esp. IX.75.4 *prarocāyan rōdasī mātārā śuciḥ* [/ IX.85.12 *prārūrucad ...*], where *rōdasī* ‘the two World Halves’ is explicitly present and where the verb is a lexical variant of our *āvāsayat* ‘caused to shine’.

Why they are considered “the parents of poets” is not clear. If it isn’t simply that Heaven and Earth provide *everyone* the conditions for existence and therefore count as universal parents (which seems rather weak), perhaps they become parents of poets when Indra makes them shine with the sun, calling forth the poetic effusions at the dawn sacrifice. The tenuousness of the parental connection has led to suggestions for other ways to construe *kavīnām*. Ge suggests that the clause is a blend of two senses: Heaven and Earth are the referents of the dual, and they are simply named as parents without indication of their offspring, but the poet also wanted to refer to Dawn as the (single) mother of the Aṅgirasas, and so the gen. pl. *kavīnām* belongs only to this putative expression (*mātāram kavīnām*). This seems overly complex, and in addition I know of no evidence that Uṣas was the mother of the Aṅgirasas. Old suggests that *kavīnām* could be construed as genitival agent with *gṛṇānāḥ*, but since that participle is in a different clause, that solution is out. Perhaps the best, if we don’t want to construe it with *mātārā*, is Sāy.’s, to take *kavīnām* as the equivalent of a dative of benefit (*aṅgirasām arthāya*).

The part. *vāvasānāḥ* in c has generally been ascribed to √*vas* ‘want, be eager (for)’: so Gr and Lub, as well as the tr. ‘begierig’ of Ge and Schmidt. However, Kü has argued (478–80) that all forms of the perfect stem *vāvas-* actually belong to √*vās* ‘bellow’, not √*vas* -- though he sneaks some of the semantics of the latter into his glosses ‘brüllen sehnsüchtig’ (etc.). Although I do not want to eliminate the pf. to √*vas* in so absolute a way as Kü, in this passage at least I think the participle embodies a pun and, moreover, the primary sense is ‘bellowing’, not ‘being eager’. The central narrative of the Vala myth has Indra vocalizing in concert with the Aṅgirasas (“the very attentive versifiers”) in order to break open the cave and release the cows. No doubt he was “eager” to accomplish this, but it is the noise-making that is the focus of the myth. In this vs. we get a double view of Indra: he is both hymned (*gṛṇānāḥ* b) presumably by the Aṅgirasas and also sings (/bellows) along with them, with two complementary participles, both modifying Indra and stationed at the end of adjacent pādas. The cooperation of Indra and the Aṅgirasas is emphasized in the next vs.

VI.32.3: On *mitájñu-* see Scar 344; it is used here in a context very similar to *abhijñú* in III.39.5, which also concerns Indra and the Aṅgirasas at the winning of cattle and contains parallel phraseology: *sákhā ha yátra sákhībhiḥ ... abhijñú ... gā anugmán* “When the comrade with his comrades the Navagvas, the warriors, from their crouch followed after the cows.” The ‘knee’ cmpds presumably describe the stance of the warrior-poets in this conflict, at least in these two passages. However, in VII.95.4, a hymn to Sarasvatī, it describes the position of “reverential ones” (*namasyà-*) imploring the goddess in prayer, and though there is a martial portion of VII.82.4, where another example of the stem occurs, the form in question is found in the part of the vs. that describes invocations made in peace time. The final instance of the word, in III.59.3, is too generic to pin down. Thus, it seems that a posture with “fixed knees” may be adopted in various circumstances, including that of prayer.

The second hemistich contains a series of balanced etymological figures: *púrah purohā sákhībhiḥ sakhīyán, ... kavībhiḥ kavīḥ sán*. I am somewhat puzzled by the nom. sg. pres. part. *sán*, which is usually concessive, but which should not have that function here. The use of *sán* is esp. surprising because it breaks the parallelism of the two rhyming post-caesura phrases in cd: ... *sákhībhiḥ sakhīyán, ... kavībhiḥ kavīḥ sán*. We should expect rather **kavīyán*, matching *sakhīyán*, and in fact the stem *kavīyánt-* does exist (IX.94.1 *kavīyán*, also in pāda-final position). Perhaps an exact match would have been considered too sing-songy, and the near-match phonologically of *-īḥ sán* with *-īyán* suggested the figure without insisting on it. Or else the poet wanted to emphasize that Indra is indeed a poet, in addition to his usual roles as victorious warrior and first comrade among comrades. In the latter case, the phrase might be tr. “being himself a poet along with poets.”

VI.32.4: Pāda b is also found at IV.22.3b, where it is a part of an independent nominal clause. However, here it fits well within the larger clause structure, whose main verb is *prá yāhi* at the end of the vs. Cf., e.g., VIII.2.19 *ó sú prá yāhi vājebhiḥ*, with the *vājebhiḥ* of our b. The fact that this pāda is a self-contained repetition aids in the interpr. of the surrounding pādas a and c, both of which contain fem. instr. pls., *nīvyābhiḥ* and *puruvīrābhiḥ* respectively. Although two masc. instr. pls. intervene, *vājebhiḥ* and *súṣmaiḥ*, they can be sequestered in the ready-made pāda b, and the two feminines of a, c can be construed together.

Although Gr interpr. the hapax *nīvyābhiḥ* as belonging to a fem. noun *nīvyā-*, most subsequent interpr. take it as an adj. If both *nīvyābhiḥ* and *puruvīrābhiḥ* are adjectives, we need to determine the underlying referent that they modify. As just noted, the first of these instr. is a hapax, but *puruvīra-* occurs 9x in the RV; in 6 of these occurrences it modifies *rayí-* ‘wealth’ (IV.44.6, VI.6.7, 22.3, 49.15, VIII.71.6, X.167.1), including 3x in VI. Given the marked predominance of this collocation, the most likely referent for *puruvīra-* in our passage is also *rayí-*. Now *rayí-* is ordinarily masc., but there are occasional fem. usages, and although I have tried to whittle down their number (see comm. ad VI.8.5), it cannot be reduced to zero. One occurrence of *puruvīra-* is a clear fem. modifying *rayí-*: X.167.1 *rayīm puruvīrām*. I therefore supply a form of ‘wealth, riches’ here, with fem. gender, as referent for both fem. adjectives. It may be that the feminine was chosen here to signal that these instr. pls. do *not* modify the masc. instr. pls. in b.

This now brings us to the meaning and affiliation of the hapax *nīvyā-*. This is generally and fairly plausibly connected with *nīvī-* ‘loincloth’ or undergarment of some sort, first attested in the AV and found also in the VS and early Vedic prose. The developed meaning of our adj. is supposed to be ‘(something) to be wrapped and carried in a *nīvī-*’. Cf. Ge’s “mit in den Schurz gebundenen (Geschenken?)”; Old more expansively suggests that Indra could knot into his loin cloth a host of strong sons. He compares *nīvibhāryā-* ‘to be carried/worn in the *nīvī-* in AV(Ś) VIII.6.20 (=AVP XVI.81.1), which is certainly suggestive. However, this interpr. encounters a practical difficulty: just how much can be carried in a loincloth? Even Indra, whose garments are presumably more capacious than ours, would probably not be able to fit into his underwear the extravagant amount of gifts we generally ask him for. The images that come to mind — at least to my mind — are of a hobo’s bundle at the end of his stick and of a stork delivering a baby in a cloth sling (presumably a diaper?) hanging from its beak, both of which have limited carrying space. The AV passage containing *nīvibhāryā-* simply confirms this. Found in a hymn “To guard a pregnant woman from demons” (in Whitney’s title), the verse in question concerns possible miscarriage (*áva √pad* lit. ‘fall down’, but a standard idiom for miscarriage) and recommends that the pregnant woman carry/wear two remedies in her *nīvī-*: VIII.6.20bcd *yád dhítām māvā pādī tát / gárbham ta ugráu rakṣatām bheṣajau nīvibhāryā* “What has been deposited [=embryo], let that not ‘fall down’; let the two powerful remedies to be worn/carried in your *nīvī* protect your embryo.” This obviously involves inserting into the garment some sort of prophylactic of modest enough size that it could be reasonably worn on an everyday basis -- not taking off the garment and stuffing it full of goodies.

The publ. tr. maintains the connection with *nīvī-*, or rather with *√vyā* ‘envelop’, which at least some take as the root at issue (see Gr, also [critical] disc. in KEWA s.v. *nīvīh*; the morphology is admitted difficult, and EWA casually suggests a connection to *nī √yu* ‘join’ [perhaps anticipated by Ge’s invocation, n. 4a, of *nīyūt-*], which does not seem a better alternative, as it would require an unprecedented alternate syllabification of the zero-grade of *√yu* to **iv*). The publ. tr. ‘to clothe (him)’ rests on the metaphor of clothing as wealth. Cf. nearby VI.35.1 *kadā stómaṃ vāsayo ‘sya rāyā* “When will you clothe his praise-song with wealth?” However, I now see that I brushed aside problems of both form and function: the root *√vyā* does not distract its initial cluster, but both meter and accent require a reading *nīvíyā-*; if the form is meant to be a gerundive, it should be passive in function, a usage not reflected in the translation; vowel-final preverbs do not lengthen before *√vyā*; *nī* is not found with *√vyā* in the RV. I now suggest that the form belongs to a different root entirely: *√vī* ‘pursue’. This root *is* found with *nī* in the RV, though only in the intensive (see Schaeffer, 190–91), in a usage I tr. ‘bear down on’, though here it could mean something more like ‘track down’ or simply ‘pursue’. Among the many objects that forms of *√vī* take, riches and the like are found (e.g., in this maṇḍala VI.12.6 *vēṣi rāyāḥ*). Moreover, in root-noun cmpds with this root, vowel-final preverbs are lengthened: *pratī-vī-* (3x), *prā-vī-* (1x), and cf. *devā-vī-* (12x) beside *deva-vī-* (1x, though cf. common *devā-vīti-*). (On these lengthenings see Scar 499, 500, 501.) The derivation is not without problems. If the form is a gerundive (as I’d like), the root accent is fine, but we would expect *guṇa* or *vṛddhi*, not zero-grade. Despite this formal problem, I think this root affiliation and formal interpr. solve many of the problems that

other interpr. face, and so I would emend the tr. to “... with (riches) to be tracked down/pursued ...” in place of “... to clothe (him).”

VI.32.5: *sárgēṇa ... takṭáh* is a decomposed variant of *sárga-takta-* (III.33.4, 11)(or, vice versa, the cmpd is compounded from this phrase).

Ge terms this a “dunkler Sagenzug,” but I’m not sure why it can’t just be a snippet of the Vṛtra myth, after the serpent has been killed and Indra has released the pent-up waters, as I say in the publ. intro. Although vss. 2–3 concern the Vala myth, Vala and Vṛtra themes often appear in the same hymns. Ge also considers it difficult to supply the missing verb in b, but given *sárgēṇa* in a and the passively used aor. part. *srjānāḥ* in c, implicitly modifying the waters, the missing verb is most likely a transitive form of $\sqrt{\text{srj}}$, with acc. *apáh* as obj., rather than Ge’s “hat ... (geleitet).” Among the many such passages, see very nearby VI.30.4 *ávāsṛjo apó áchā samudráṁ*, also with Indra as subj. Sim. Sāy.’s *visrjati*.

The root-noun cmpd. *turā-ṣāt* picks up *turāya* in 1b in a nod towards ring composition. I tr. ‘overcoming the precipitous’ rather than my ‘overcoming the powerful’ in the other three passages (III.48.4, V.40.4, X.55.8) in order to capture this echo.

In c the negated root noun cmpd *ánāpāvṛt* can either be adverbial (so Gr and Ge) or modify *ártham* (so Scar 508). I favor the adv. reading (also in its other occurrence in X.89.3): it is surely the waters, not the goal or purpose, that do not turn aside.

VI.33 Indra

VI.33.1: The pāda-final *dāsvān*, to be read with distraction as *dāasvān*, presumably reflecting a laryngeal hiatus, resonates with *sauvaśv(i)yam* and *s(u)vaśvo* in b, despite the different sibilants. The stem *dāsvant-* (8x) must always be read distracted and presumably reflects, as already indicated by Gr, an underlying *s*-stem built to $\sqrt{\text{dā}}$, hence in Ilr. terms **dāh-as-*.

VI.33.2: In c I tr. *ví pañīm̐r asāyaḥ* as “you dispersed the niggards.” I now think this probably is wrong, in that I cannot find a semantic pathway there from *ví√(n)as̥* ‘reach through’, etc. The closest passage to ours that contains this multivalent lexeme is X.29.8 *vy ānaḥ indraḥ pṛtanāḥ svójāḥ* “The very powerful Indra has penetrated the battling hosts,” and I would alter the publ. tr. to “you penetrated through the niggards ...” The only thing that gives me pause is the very similar passage adduced by Ge, VII.19.9 ... *ví pañīm̐r ádāsan̐*, which I tr. “They ... have distanced the niggards through ritual service” (for which see comm. ad loc.).

As the above disc. suggests, I take *asāya-* as belonging to the root $\sqrt{(n)as̥}$, but the morphology is not straightforward. With Whitney’s tentative suggestion (Skt. Gr. §1066b), I assume it belongs with the class of *-āyá*-presents to zero-grade roots that are generally related to 9th class presents (e.g., *gṛbhñāti*, *gṛbhāyá-*) and ultimately reflect (in my opinion, flg. Saussure) *-yá*-deverbatives built to the weak stem of the 9th class pres. (*-nH-yá-*). Unfortunately, of course, $\sqrt{(n)as̥}$ had no final laryngeal and no 9th class pres., though it does have a well-attested 5th class *asnóti*. I must assume secondary spread of the *-āyá*-suffix to this root (see also *nasāya-* X.40.6, also apparently to $\sqrt{\text{nas̥}}$), perhaps facilitated by the nasal-suffixed present. MLW suggests here a clever alternative, that

aśāyah actually represents a haplologized form of the causative of $\sqrt{śi}$ ‘lie’, *śāyāyati*, and with *vī* means ‘you caused the niggards to lie in pieces / scattered about’. Although Wh (Rts) lists this causative as beginning only in the sūtras, it may well appear once in the AV (Ś IV.18.4); see my *-āya*-formations, pp. 134–35. Although MLW’s suggestion is appealing on its own -- and the haplology would not be problematic (see the *-yaya*-haplology posited above in VI.12.4) -- the other forms of the stem *aśāya*- (I.34.7, X.43.6, 92.1) are not easily amenable to a ‘lie’ interpr. but fit ‘reach’ quite well; *aśāyata* in VIII.73.9, usually grouped with these forms, I take to $\sqrt{śā}$ ‘hone, sharpen’ (see comm. ad loc.).

VI.33.3: The Ārya obstacles are presumably peoples akin to us, but fighting against us. On the contrastive pairing *dāsa- ārya*- in this phrase, see comm. ad VI.22.10.

As noted in the publ. intro., Indra’s apparent weapons of “well-placed cloaks” (*súdhitebhir átkaiḥ*) are puzzling. I think this is a reference to Indra’s shape-shifting ability, to wear “different hats” in different situations -- and Ge’s parallels in n. 3c suggest that he is of the same opinion. Old discusses at length and uncharacteristically endorses the suggested emendation of Ludwig/Bergaigne of *átkaiḥ* to *arkaiḥ*, though he does admit it’s hard to explain how the corruption would have arisen. I think this is a fairly insuperable problem, esp. since *súdhita*- is not a particularly likely descriptor of ‘chants’, and is in fact not found with words of that sort.

As also noted in the publ. intro., I suspect that *súdhita*- is a buried play on words. It is stationed between *vāneva* “like the woods, trees” and *átkaiḥ*. In conjunction with the former, it evokes *svádhitī*- ‘hatchet, axe’; cf., for similar context, X.89.7 *jaghāna vṛtrām svádhitir vāneva* “He smote Vṛtra, like an axe the trees.” For another pun involving *svádhitī*-, see V.32.10 where the “Heavenly Hatchet” (*devī svádhitīḥ*) probably plays on *svadhā*- ‘independent power’. See comm. ad loc.

As already pointed out ad VI.4.7, *nṛtama* is not suitable for the cadence of any Vedic meter, and save for this passage and VI.4.7 it avoids this position. It is found several times with *nṛṇām* in the cadence but in the reverse order: IV.25.4 *nṛtamāya nṛṇām*, V.30.12, X.29.2 *nṛtamasya nṛṇām*, where the oblique forms of *nṛtama*- support a good Triṣṭubh cadence. The order may have been flipped here, but why?

VI.33.4: The injunc. *bhūḥ* here has imperatival force, a function of the injunctive generally limited to the root aorists *dāḥ*, *dhāḥ*, and *bhūḥ*.

VI.33.5: I do not see any difference in sense between the imperatival injunc. *bhūḥ* of 4b and the pres. impv. *bhāvā* in 5b.

With Old, who argues this at length, I take the Saṃhitā *mṛṇīkā* as loc. *mṛṇīké*, rather than Pp. *mṛṇīkāḥ*. See also Klein, DGRV I.314. The conjunction *utá*, which connects it with clear loc. *abhīṣṭau*, strongly supports this interpr. (Ge’s interpr. is not clear.)

The opening of the 2nd hemistich, *itthā* PARTICIPLE, matches that of the opening of the last hemistich in the preceding hymn (VI.32.5), and the *divī* opening pāda d resembles *divé-dive* in the same position in VI.32.5.

The final pāda has a bad cadence: *goṣātamaḥ*. As MLW points out, this form should really be **goṣātamaḥ* (splv. to *goṣā*-). Such a reading doesn’t improve the

expected Triṣṭubh cadence, but it would provide a proper Jagatī cadence (and metrical variety at the end of a hymn is not unexpected). The pāda can be read with 12 syllables without difficulty: *diví ś'yāma pārye *goṣātamaḥ*. As for the transmitted short vowel form, it might have been changed to match *nṛtama* in 3d, although, as noted there, the light initial syllable of that form is itself metrically problematic.

VI.34 Indra

VI.34.1: The first hemistich of this vs. (and thus of the hymn) contains a compact summary of the Rigvedic poetic economy, with the god Indra both the focus of the poets' praise songs and the source of inspiration for them. This is expressed in two antithetical pādas, conjoined by double *ca*, with the oppositional preverbs *sám* and *ví* opening the pādas and two 3rd pl. verbs of motion providing the verbal expression: *jagmúḥ* and *yanti*. The first of these is accented, the 2nd not, even though the two pādas are coordinate, as the double *ca*-s show. The accent of *jagmúḥ* can be accounted for by the principle that accents the first of two explicitly contrastive verb forms, though usually such verbs are adjacent or nearly adjacent. Klein's (DGRV I.167) of contrastive double *ca* constructions has several such passages, with the 1st verb accented; e.g., I.123.12 *pārā ca yánti púnar ā ca yanti*. Our passage is unusual only in having more matter between the verbs. Note how very parallel the pādas are: PREV *ca* 2ND-SG-PRN VERB, with the pre-verbal loc. *tvé* and abl. *tvát* carrying their own contrastive weight.

Another ex. of phrasal echoes among the Indra hymns in this cycle: *purā nūnām ca* "previously and now" plays off against *nūnām ... aparāya ca* "now and for the future" in the immediately preceding hymn (VI.33.5). See also possibly VI.35.5.

The Saṃhitā prevocalic form *stutāya* is universally read/interpr. as underlying nom. pl. -aḥ, beginning with the Pp. (also Gr, Ge, Lub, Kü 584), but HvN unaccountably restore -e, which must simply be a lapse.

The dvandva *ukthārkā* (to be distracted to *uktha-arkā*) is most likely a neut. pl., serving as another subject of the verb *pasṛdhre*, not a dual masc., which is harder to fit into the syntax of the clause -- though plural dvandvas are far rarer than dual dvandvas in early Vedic. This is one of the earliest exx. See Whitney Gr. §1255e; Macd VG §265; VGS p. 269; AiG II.1.38, 156. The 2nd member *arkā-* is itself masc. when independent. The cmpd. deviates from dvandva orthodoxy in other ways: it has only one accent, and at least in this metrical context the first member ends in short -a and is probably in stem form (or else show shortening in hiatus).

VI.34.2: The heavy presence of *puru*-PAST PART. cmpds in the first hemistich (*puruhūtāḥ ... purugūrtāḥ ... purupraśastāḥ*) was prepared for by the fem. pl. *pūrvīḥ* in 1a and the (unrelated) *purā* in 1c.

It is difficult to render the gerundive + injunctive phrase *anumādyo bhūt*, "has become one to be cheered on" is excessively fussy.

The instr. *asmābhiḥ* was unaccountably omitted in the publ. tr.: I correct to "... to be cheered on by us."

VI.34.3: To say that praises don't *harm* Indra seems a little odd: who would think that they would?

nákṣanti is one of the few examples where *íd* by itself seems to induce accent on the verb; most of the putative examples (see Gr s.v. *íd*, §5, p. 206) involve pāda-initial verbs that could owe their accent to their position. I am not entirely certain, however, that this passage exemplifies this property of *íd*, since initial *índram* in b could be enjambed over the pāda break, and *nákṣanti* start a new clause. V.32.5 presents an undoubted ex. of *íd* inducing verb accent.

I interpr. *yádi* in c as **yad ī*, i.e., an example of the enclitic acc. *ī* unverbated with a preceding *yád* (see my 2002 “RVic *sīm* and *īm*,” Fs. Cardona). This is a particularly clear ex., because of the parallel *yád* later in the pāda (**yád ī stotāra śatām yát sahasram* “when a hundred praisers, when a thousand”), where an imbalance of subordinators (“if a hundred praisers, when a thousand ...”) would not make sense. Moreover the form is followed by a cons. cluster (*yádi stotārah*), so that the meter would be unaffected by **ī* shortened to *-i*.

VI.34.4–5: The identical openings of these two vss., *ásmā etád*, pick up the last clause of vs. 3, *śám tád asmai*, and invite the two phrases to be interpr. as separate clauses, with *śám* to be supplied from 3d, as both Old and Ge point out.

My interpr. of the rest of ab is generally inspired by Ge.

The form *mimikṣá* is interpr. by the Pp. as *mimikṣáh*, though *mimikṣé* is also possible and is a strong alternative. In the former case, it would be an adj. built to the verbal stem *mimikṣ-*, parallel to adj. *mimikṣú-*; in the latter a 3rd sg. mid. pf. The pf. interpr. is followed by Gr and Kü (386), though Kü (n. 690) does allow the possibility of the thematic adj. as an alternative. AiG (II.2.86) and Lub take it as an adj., and Old and Ge consider both possibilities, but favor the Pp. reading. I too take it as an adj., in part on grounds of syntactic parallelism: 4ab and 5ab are quite parallel. They both begin with the *ásmā etád* clause discussed above; then a ritual feature (soma *sómah* / praise hymn *stotrām*) is announced as in/for Indra (*índre* / *índrāya*), with the verbal notion connecting the offering and the god expressed by an augmented passive aor. (*ny àyāmi* / *avāci*) in the latter part of b. If we have a finite verb *mimikṣé* in the early part of b, it chops the pāda into two clauses and destroys the parallel structure (a point made somewhat differently by Old). Moreover, the simile in 4a *divy ārcéva māsā* (with *diví* parallel to *índre*; see also Old) works better if construed with *ny àyāmi* than with *mimikṣé*, but given the word order it would have to belong to the *mimikṣé* clause if *mimikṣá* stands for that verb.

As for the just-mentioned simile, I am entirely persuaded by the gist of Ge’s suggestion (n. 4ab) that *māsā* should signal an elliptical dual *sūryā-māsā* ‘sun and moon’, the two heavenly bodies set in heaven, as soma is set in Indra. However, he deals rather wispily with the stumbling block to this interpr., namely the accentuation of *māsā*, proper to the instr. sg., instead of the expected dual *māsā*. Judging from his lapidary treatment, he would by preference read (that is, emend to) du. **māsā* directly, with *arcā* also du. Hence his tr. “wie (Sonne und) Mond, die beiden Strahlenden.” But if *māsā* must be maintained, he would interpr. (see n. 4ab) *arcéva* as containing **arcáh*, the nom. sg. to an otherwise unattested them. stem *arcá-* and exhibiting irregular sandhi, and *māsā* as an instr. of accompaniment, rather like the expression in X.138.4 *māséva sūryah*, in which *māséva* presumably conceals the instr. *māsā* construed with nom. sg. *sūryah*: “like the sun with the moon,” that is, “the sun and the moon.” I would very much like to rescue Ge’s interpr. based on an elliptical dual, an interpr. reflected in the publ tr., because I think it

has to be fundamentally correct in context. But it is going to be challenging. I would prefer not to emend *māsā*, and I also do not think that excavating *arcāḥ* irregularly from *arcéva* is the way to go. My flimsy alternative proposal (though followed by Old; see below) is that *arcéva* contains the nom. sg. of a fem. -ā stem *arcā-* (found in the Br., in a different sense) ‘shining/beaming one’ → ‘sun’. Old, flg. Ludwig, in fact also opts for a nom. *arcā* ‘der Glanz’, though he connects this Glanz with the moon: “wie zum Himmel der Glanz vom Monde (gelenkt wird).” For the connection of the sun with forms belonging to √*arc*, see V.79.9, VIII.7.36 *sūro arcīṣā*, and of course it is regularly said that the sun is set/placed *diví* ‘in heaven’ (e.g., XV.85.2 *diví sūryam adadhāt* “when he placed the sun in heaven”; see disc. in my 2010 Fs. Melchert article on the “Placer of the Sun”). I suggest that this stem *arcā-* is found only here because it was mobilized to contrast with -*arkā* ‘hymns’ at the end of 1d. I would now alter the tr. to “the soma has been set firmly in Indra, like the shining one [=the sun] along with the moon in heaven.” Note that an instr. of accompaniment is used with a nom. in lieu of a coordinate expression in the 2nd hemistich: *hāvanāni yajñāḥ* “our invocations along with our sacrifices” = “our invocations and sacrifices.”

Note that under this interpr., the supposed root noun *ārc-* would no longer exist, since this stem rests only on this form in all of Skt., supposedly the instr. *arc-ā*. In fact, the existence of this root noun was already denied by Schindler in his 1972 diss. (s.v.), because of its full grade, and he rehearses the various alternative proposals, including Hoffmann’s (oral) suggestion that *arcā* is the loc. to *arcí-*, a stem that has the merit of existing, though it is hard to fit it semantically into this passage. The actual root noun to √*arc/ṛc* ‘shine/sing’ is of course *ṛc-* ‘verse’, which gives our text its name.

In c the phrase (*abhí*) *sām yád āpah* “when the waters con(verge) (on him)” reminds us of the opening of the hymn, where songs converge on Indra. I do not pretend to understand the construction of cd. Indra is obviously the unexpressed object of *vāṛdhuḥ* (cf. 3b *īndram ... vardháyantīḥ*) and the comparandum for the simile that opens the hemistich, *jānam ná dhánvan* “like a man in the desert,” but the verbless *yád* clause seems rather casually embedded and with the *yád* unusually positioned after two preverbs (unless *abhí* should be taken only with somewhat distant preceding *jānam*).

VI.34.5: The balance and reciprocity between god and worshipers evident earlier in the hymn also characterizes its ending. The last thing said about Indra is that he is our ‘strengthenener’ (*vṛdhāḥ* 5d), just as our offerings, both material and verbal, have strengthened him (*vardháyantīḥ* 3b, *vāṛdhuḥ* 4d).

VI.35 Indra

This hymn is tr. by Schmidt in B+I 152–53.

VI.35.1: Ge takes *bráhma* as an abstract “Hohepriesterschaften,” standing for the personal pl. *brahmāṇaḥ* (n. 1a). I see no reason to take *bráhma* in any sense other than its usual ‘sacred formulation(s)’ (pl. in this instance)(nor does Schmidt, who tr. “Wann werden die Gedichte ihren Sitz auf dem Wagen haben?” [152]). The vs. concerns the exchange of priestly praise for material goods bestowed by the god: the clothing of our praise with Indra’s wealth (c) and the bejeweling of our insights with his prizes (d) are vivid metaphors. The first pāda contains a likewise striking image: the chariots in which our

formulations take up their position are presumably the chariot(s) Indra gives us, which will also be heaped with goods. It is our production of the formulations that brings the chariots. The intent of this image is made clearer by vs. 3b *viśvápsu bráhma kṛṇávaḥ*.

Both *bhuvan* and *dāḥ* are subjunctives, or at least have subjunctive function. Contra Hoffmann (246), I am inclined to take *dāḥ* as a real subjunctive (< **dā-a-s*), though without metrical distraction, not an injunctive, while both of us take *bhuvan* as subj. here.

On *dhíyaḥ karasi vājaratnāḥ* see X.42.7 *kṛdhí dhíyam ... vājaratnām*.

VI.35.2: Both Ge and Schmidt take the first hemistich as depicting a hostile encounter between two sets of men and heroes expressed by the verb *nīlayāse* (Ge: “... dass du Herren mit Herren, Mannen mit Mannen in Kampf verwickeln wirst?”; HPS [153] “... dass du ... handgemein (?) werden lässt?”); Old is less certain but suggests that “kämpfen machen, überwinden” is expected. But the basis of this hapax demon. *nīlayāse*, namely *nīlā-* ‘nest’, invites an interpr. depicting a more intimate and amicable relationship (like the adj. *sānīla-* ‘of the same nest’, referring to brothers and comrades), and the middle voice reinforces that sense. In my 1983 monograph on *-āya*-formations, I follow an interpr. suggested by Insler, that the verb means ‘accept as equals’ (pp. 84–85). Although I think that may be an implication, I now think it can be taken more literally: ‘put in your own nest’. Indra is bringing our fighting men into intimate contact with his own (the Maruts and/or Aṅgirasas [the latter being mentioned in vs. 5]) under his auspices; with these now conjoined forces he can win the contests and the cattle at stake.

The accent of the denom. *nīlayāse* (expect **nīlayāse*) has been retracted because the form is transitive (acc. *nīn ... vīrān*) and has been attracted into the *-āya*-transitive / causative class (see my 1983 monograph).

VI.35.3: This vs. is a reprise of and variation on vs. 1. Like vs. 1, it treats the rewards that accrue to verbal praise, and in fact repeats two of the three types of verbal products found in vs. 1 (*bráhma* 1a/3b, *dhíyaḥ* 1d/3c), with *stómam* (1c) and *hāvanāni* (3d) being the novel terms. *bráhma* and *hāvanāni* are modified by bahuvrīhis that express the material reward they will obtain (‘all goods’ [*viśvápsu*] and ‘cattle as bounty’ [*gómaghā*] respectively). In the c pāda the chariot motif of 1a returns in slightly different form: we “team up” our insights, as Indra does his teams (*niyútaḥ*) -- the teams that, pulling his chariot (cf., e.g., I.135.4 *rátho niyútvān*), will bring Indra and his bounty to the sacrifice, where the “teams” of insights will be exchanged for the goods he brings.

On *viśvápsu*- see comm. ad I.148.1.

VI.35.4: Both *jaritré* and *gómaghā* are repeated from the previous vs. (where they were not in the same clause), though the latter has changed gender: in 3c it is neut. pl., while in 4a the same sandhi form is fem. pl. and represents underlying *gómaghā(h)*. This bahuvrīhi has spawned two parallel descriptors: *ásva-ścandrā(h)* and *vāja-śravasah*, all three modifying fem. pl. *pṛkṣah*.

The tr. ‘lay on’ (that is, provide, often lavishly, often of meals or feasts) is an English idiom that precisely calques *ádhi dhehi*.

I take *iśah ... dhenúm* as a double acc. with $\sqrt{pṛ}$ ‘swell’ -- lit., ‘swell the cow the refreshments’, that is, ‘swell the cow with refreshments’. Ge hesitates (n. 4c), but in the

tr. opts for two acc. in parallel (‘swell the refreshments, (swell) the cow’), as does Schmidt (p. 153).

The root-noun cmpd *surúc-* (9x) is generally a bahuvrīhi meaning ‘having good light, very bright’, as in II.2.4 *tám ... candráṁ iva surúcam* ‘him [=Agni] very bright like gold.’ For just this passage Gr posits a substantivization: f. ‘heller Glanz’. This is unnecessary, as *surúcaḥ* here can be a fem. pl. acc. picking up and modifying f. pl. *śśah* in c (and indeed the glittering *prkśaḥ* in b). It obviously forms an etymological figure with the opt. *rurucyāḥ*.

As for this verb, it should have transitive/causative value (‘make shine / illuminate’), and it therefore functionally overlaps with the redupl. aor. *árūruca-*. This overlap is complicated by the fact that several apparent pf. forms *rurucuḥ* also have this value, in some of which lengthening the redupl. to **rūrucuḥ* would provide a better cadence, though in our passage such a lengthening would produce a worse cadence. For disc. of these ambiguous forms see comm. ad IV.7.1, 16.4. As I say there, because the 3rd sg. pf. *ruoca* and the pf. part. are intransitive, I am inclined to think that the transitive 3rd pl. forms originated in the redupl. aor. but were absorbed by the pf., with shortening of the redupl. vowel.

VI.35.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the first hemistich of this vs. is quite unclear; I am not at all certain my interpr. is correct, but I don’t think it’s appreciably worse than any others, which I will not treat at length. One observation about it, which doesn’t really aid in its interpr., is that it seems to play off the Agastya Triṣṭubh refrain (I.165.15d, etc.) *vidyāmeśāṁ vrjānaṁ jīrādānum* ‘May we find refreshment and a community having lively waters.’ A large proportion of the occurrences of *vrjānaṁ* are found in that refrain. The *jīnva* at the end of our vs. picks up the *jīrā-* of the refrain, and its *śśam* is matched by our *śśah* in 4c.

I’d also point out that the antithetical temporal expressions we noted in the two previous hymns, *nūnām ... aparāya ca* ‘now and for the future’ (VI.33.5) and *purā nūnām ca* ‘previously and now’ (VI.34.1), may be echoed by *nūnām ... anyāthā cid* ‘now and also otherwise.’

But let us now turn to the serious problems of the vs.: 1) there is apparently no verb (or anything else) to govern *tám ... vrjānaṁ*; 2) there is no verb to govern the presumed acc. *dúraḥ* ‘doors’ in the rel. clause; 3) esp. if *grñśé* is taken to be the verb of the rel. cl. and a 2nd sg. passive ‘you are praised’ (as it is by most tr.), since the passive can’t govern an object, and ‘doors’ would be quite an outlandish object anyway.

My interpr. starts with the two things I think we can hold onto:

1) the collocation *ví dúraḥ* inevitably brings to mind the idiom *ví dúraḥ √ vr* ‘open the doors’, used inter alia for the breaking of dawn, which is also often homologized to the opening of the Vala cave (e.g., VII.79.4), an act ascribed to Indra. This is mentioned several times in this Indra cycle (VI.17.6, 18.5, 30.5). Thus the most likely way to interpr. the first part of 5b *sūro yāc chakra ví dúraḥ* is as a rel. cl. referring to this action, supplying the verb *√ vr* (or sim.): “When, o able one, as champion you (open[ed]) wide the doors.” If we thus interpr. the rel. cl., the supposed passive *grñśé* is displaced from its supposed role as verb in that clause (though we could, of course, assume the ‘open’ idiom was participial and *grñśé* could then be the main verb).

2) *gṛṇīṣe* (generally unaccented) is otherwise almost entirely a 1st sg. -*se* form, “I (shall) sing/praise,” so the passive interpr. just mentioned is not attractive in any case. In the last vs. of a hymn such an assertion of a 1st ps. praiser is certainly apposite and expected.

The gist of my interpr. rests on these two observations. I take *gṛṇīṣé* as a 1st sg. and not part of the dependent clause, which expresses the formulaic ‘open the doors’. *gṛṇīṣé*’s object is *vrjānam* at the beginning of the hemistich. The verb *gṛṇīṣé* is accented because it immediately follows a subord. clause. The major problem that I see is that this requires that the *yád* clause be embedded, and I don’t see any way out of that. I would also prefer if Indra were the object of the praise, not (merely) the *vrjānam*. He might indeed be represented by the init. *tām*, which would then not modify *vrjānam*. This would produce an alternative tr. “Him here and now do I sing, as (I do/did) otherwise the community, when ...”

I am not entirely satisfied with this interpr., but I do not have anything better to offer (nor do other interpr.).

The rest of the vs. is much less problematic. The most important thing to note is that the *dhenú-* ‘milk-cow’ must be masc. because of the adj. *śukradúghasya* ‘having bright/clear milk’. This gender not only goes against nature, but also against the phrase in 4c *sudúghām ... dhenúm*, with the fem. adj. *sudúghām*. The gender switch is obviously deliberate, and the likely reason for it was already formulated by Sāy.: that this is a reference to the soma-plant and the soma juice that is milked out of it. (Both Ge and Schmidt take the two genitives separately, which rescues the gender of *dhenóḥ* but ignores the shock value of the gender switch.)

That pāda b has to do with opening the Vala cave is supported by the mention of the Aṅgirasas in d.

Also in d, *bráhmanā* is ring-compositionally related to *bráhma* in 1a.

VI.36 Indra

VI.36.1: Although the stem *viśvá-janya-* is of course a bahuvrīhi and has the basic meaning ‘possessing all peoples’ vel sim., the point here must be that all peoples prepare soma for Indra, hence my ‘stemming from all peoples’ referring to the soma drinks. The reciprocity between the people’s offering of exhilarating drinks and Indra’s apportioning of prizes (c) is clear.

The publ. tr. renders the injunc. *dhāráyathāḥ* as a present; it could also have past value: “when/as you upheld ...”

As it is elsewhere (cf. W. E. Hale, *Ásura- in Early Vedic Religion*, 59–62), *asuryà-* ‘lordship’ is ascribed to Indra, and the fact that he maintains this lordship ‘among the gods’ (*devéṣu*) demonstrates once again that *devá-/ásura-* is not yet an antithetical or hostile pairing in the RV. This same Indra cycle contains a similar expression: VI.20.2 *ánu ... asuryāṃ devébhir dhāyi víśvam*.

VI.36.2: Since verbal forms of *√yaj* are not otherwise found with *ánu* nor does the lexeme *ánu-prá√yaj* occur anywhere else, I take *ánu prá yeje* as a technical reference to the fore- and after-offerings (*prayājá-*, *anuyājá-*, already attested in late RV). The *ánu*

may have been included because of the idiom *ánu* √ *dā* ‘concede’ in the next pāda. On the weak pf. form *yeje* (versus *īje*) see comm. ad I.114.2 and Kü 391–92.

Contra Ge, Klein (DGRV I:224–25), and Scar (115–16), who take *c* with *d*, I construe *b* and *c* together, with the two datives *vīryāya* (*b*) and *syūmagābhē* *dúdhaye* ‘*rvate*’ (*c*) parallel to each other and serving as the indirect object to *dadhire ánu* ‘have conceded’ in *b*. This allows *ca* at the end of *c* to take its usual role conjoining NPs, rather than serving as a clausal conjunction (joining *b* and *cd*) as Klein is forced to take it. In either case the *ca* is unusually positioned, but as a clausal conjunction its position might be more jarring.

This interpr. also allows a better case frame in *d*: *ápi* √ *vrj* *krátum* + LOC is an idiom of subordination; cf. X.48.3 *máyi devāso* ‘*vrjann ápi krátum*’ “To me have the gods bent their will” (sim. X.120.3). But for both Ge and Klein the dative of *c* must take the place of the usual loc.; e.g., Klein “And to (him), the bucking courser grabbing the reins, do they direct their determination in the battle against the obstacle.” In my interpr. I supply a loc. ‘to him’ in *d*, likely gapped because of the presence of the circumstantial loc. ‘at the smashing of *Vṛtra*/obstacles’ (*vrtrahátye*), with the dat. of *c* more naturally construed with the verb in *b*, *ánu* √ *dhā*, which ordinarily takes a dative.

With Gr, Ge, and Klein, I take the root noun cmpd. *syūma-gābh-* in *c* as having the transitive value “pulling at [/grabbing] the reins,” expressing the impatience of the “headstrong charger” that is Indra. Curiously, Scar (115–16) gives it the passive sense “der ... beim Zügel gepackt wird,” indicating that the same headstrong charger has to be reined in. Although this interpr. is in principle possible, in practice it seems unlikely that the poets would dare to consider (much less desire) curbing Indra’s impetuous rush.

VI.36.3: I take fem. pl. *sadhrīcīḥ* as implicitly modifying all the NPs, though attracted to the gender of the adjacent noun, fem. *ūtāyah*. So, it seems, also Ge.

VI.36.5: In *b* Ge takes *rāyah* as subject and supplies the same stem as obj., on which gen. sg. *aryāḥ* is dependent, while apparently supplying a form of the same root √ *sthā* (or √ *as*) with *abhī* as I do: “Wie der Himmel über der Erde, so (sollen) die Reichtümer sich über die (der) hohen Herren (erheben)” (sim. Thieme, Fremd. 59). The publ. tr. is different, in taking *rāyah* as an acc. despite the accent (expect **rāyāḥ*, but the nom. form is sometimes found for the acc.) and supplying Indra as subject of a supplied impv. to *abhī* √ *sthā* (*/as*): “Like heaven over the earth, sur(mount) the riches of the stranger.” However, I now see that Ge must be correct, because the expression here has to be interpr. alongside similar phrasing elsewhere in this Indra cycle: VI.20.1 *dyaúr ná ... abhī bhūma aryás, tastháu rāyīḥ* ..., which I tr. “wealth ... surmounts (the wealth) of the stranger, ... as heaven does the earth.” This passage contains the same two-term simile *dyaúr ná (...)* *bhūma*, the same NP *rāyi- aryāḥ*, and the same preverb *abhī*. However, it is more explicit, in having an overt finite verb *tastháu*, and, most important, in having an undeniable nominative *rāyīḥ*, which must correspond to *dyaúḥ* in the simile. The publ. tr. of our passage should therefore be altered to “Like heaven over the earth, let (our) riches sur(mount) (those) of the stranger.”

Ge takes *cakānāḥ* in *c* as passive: “auf dass du ... bei uns beliebt seiest.” But the pf. *cake*, including its fairly frequent participle *cakānā-*, is always “active” in sense: ‘take pleasure, desire’; cf. Kü 142–43. In the publ. tr. I moved the instr. *śávasā* immediately

preceding the part. to be construed with the 2nd part. *cékitānaḥ*, as a parallel to *vāyasā* (“showing yourself with your strength and your vigor ...”). I am now uncertain about this because of two similar passages: V.3.10 ... *sāhasā cakānāḥ* with an *s*-stem instr. as here and VII.27.1 ... *śāvasā cakānāḥ* with a gen. of the same *s*-stem as here, both immediately preceding *cakānāḥ* as here. Although I still don’t think *śāvasā* should be construed directly with *cakānāḥ* as the source of enjoyment, I now think it probably should remain in the larger participial phrase: “so that you with your strength will keep finding enjoyment in us ...”

VI.37 Indra

VI.37.1: I take *svārvān* as implicitly conjoined with *kīrīḥ*, with the pair displaying the range of mortals who call upon Indra. This is one of Old’s suggestions; alternatively he suggests that it is proleptic, but this seems overly complex — though it seems to underlie Ge’s interpr.: “denn auch die Arme ruft dich erleuchtet.”

VI.37.1–2: On the shift in referent between the *hārayaḥ* in 1b (Indra’s horses) and the one in 2a (soma drops) see publ. intro.

VI.37.2: Accented *asyā* in c presupposes the gen. phrase in d *mādasya somyāsya*, even though the two genitives are construed differently: the one in c as (partitive) gen. with *√pā* ‘drink’, the one in d dependent on *rājā*.

VI.37.2–3: The implicit identification of Indra’s horses with the soma drops is reinforced by the use of the part. *ījyantaḥ* for both (2b, 3c).

VI.37.3: It is not possible to respect the hemistich boundary in tr. without awkwardness.

VI.37.4: Ge (fld. by Klein, DGRV I: 250) takes *vāriṣṭhaḥ* as an ex. of hypallage. standing for **vāriṣṭhām* and characterizing the *dākṣiṇā*. This must be because they take the adj. as meaning ‘broadest’, splv. to *urú-* (though I don’t quite see why the priestly gift could be broad if Indra cannot be). By contrast I follow Gr in consider some forms of the stem *vāriṣṭha-* as ‘choicest, most excellent’, a splv. to *vāra-* ‘choice’, though of course that adj. should not, originally, produce a primary splv. (Note, however, that **vāratama-* would be metrically unfavorable.) AiG II.2.452–53 allows such a splv. in late Vedic, though not for our period, but I see no reason why it can’t be early, encouraged by semantically and phonologically parallel *vāsiṣṭha-* ‘best’ (→ Vasiṣṭha).

Ge and Klein also take the *ca* in 4d as subordinating d to c (cf. Klein “through which ... thou dost avoid straitened circumstances, when ... though dost deal out the gifts of the lord”). I do not understand the need for this. Since pāda c is a rel. cl. beg. with *yáyā*, there is no reason that d cannot still be in the domain of that relative, accounting for the accented verb *dāyase*, and the action of d does not seem logically subordinate to that in c. I therefore take *ca* here as conjoining parallel subordinate clauses.

In fact, d is a better candidate for rel. cl. with *yáyā* than c is: assuming that *yáyā* refers to the *dākṣiṇā* of pāda a, it easily makes sense with d: “with which (priestly gift) you distributed ...,” but rather less sense with c. Why should the *dākṣiṇā* enable Indra to

avoid *ámhas-*? In fact, I wonder if, at least in c, the passage has been adapted from an expression with a different feminine referent. Perhaps a passage like II.34.15a *yáyā radhrám pārāyathāti ámhah* “with which you carry the feeble one across difficult straits” (with both *yáyā* and *ámhah*, polarized as here), where the referent of *yáyā* is *ūtīh* ‘help’ (15c).

The last item on which I disagree with Ge (/Klein) is the function/identity of *sūrīn*. Flg. Ludwig, they take this as standing for the gen. pl. (hence, “the bounties of our patrons”). But there is no need for this, as Old also points out, since the apparent acc. pl. can be syntactically accommodated -- either as a parallel to *maghā* (“apportion bounties [and] patrons”) or, as both Old and I prefer, in a double acc. construction with *dāyase ví*: “apportion bounties (to) patrons.” The point of the latter is that the patrons are the middlemen between the gods and the priest/poets: Indra gives the *sūrī-* riches and they redistribute them to the ritual workers. It would seem odd indeed to have Indra distributing riches that *already* belonged to the patrons, as the genitive would imply.

VI.37.5: As the last pāda of this vs. shows, Indra is the ultimate super-patron.

VI.38 Indra

The publ. intro. states that reference is unclear in the hymn “until the last pāda of vs. 2”; this is somewhat misleading, in that a form of *indra-* is found in the *second* pāda of vs. 2 -- though the identity of the other referent there remains cloudy.

VI.38.1: The unclear reference just noted is found in the first word of the hymn, 3rd sg. aor. *ápāt* ‘he has drunk’, whose subject is not expressed. On the one hand, this is an Indra hymn and Indra is the prototypical drinker of soma (cf., e.g., the opening of nearby VI.40.1 *indra piba*, as well as *ápāh* in the 1st vs. of the next hymn, nearly identical to our verb and with Indra clearly meant as subj.), so we might expect Indra as subject. On the other, the most likely referent of the almost immediately following nominative *citrátamah*, who bears the invocation upward, is Agni, and as the mouth of the gods, he can also be considered to drink (though not usually soma). Parsimony might suggest that the two unidentified subjects in the first hemistich are identical, hence Agni. In the publ. tr. I supply Agni, with ?, but I am not at all certain that the first subject isn’t Indra. Or, more likely, that the poet meant to leave it open.

The subject of cd is also left unspecified; again I assume Agni: if he is embarking upward in ab, then the journey (*yāman*) in c is most likely his, though Ge supplies Indra. The only nominative attribute, *sudānuh*, is no help, as it is used of Agni and Indra about equally. What I take from the uncertainties of reference in this vs. is that the poet wants to keep us guessing.

The pāda-final splv. *citrátamah* produces a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. There is no obvious way to fix it, and the other 5 instances of this stem are found elsewhere in the line, where they work metrically.

VI.38.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., I think vs. 2 functions as complementary to 1: in the first vs. the *indra-hūti-* is conveyed *up* to Indra (presumably in heaven); in 2 he -- and his ears -- are brought *down here* to the *devá-hūti-* performed at the sacrifice.

VI.38.2: In b *ghóṣāt* is morphologically ambiguous: it can be a subjunctive to the them. pres. *ghóṣa-* (accented because first in its pāda) or the abl. to the them. noun *ghóṣa-* (so Gr). For possible interpr. involving this abl., see Old. By contrast I follow Ge (and Lub) in taking it as a verb form, parallel to *tanyati* later in the pāda. The major problem this interpr. poses is how to construe gen. *índrasya*. Under the abl. interpr. of *ghóṣāt*, the gen. is dependent on that noun, but without that support it must find another role in the following clause (to which it must belong, because *tanyati* is unaccented and cannot start a new clause). With Ge (n. 2b) I take it as loosely construed with *bruvāṇāḥ*, though in a different sense from Ge's "der sich zu Indra Bekennende" -- rather as the topic of the speech.

As for the subject of *ghóṣāt* and *tanyati*, I think it anticipates the *deváhūti-* of c. This of course creates a problem of its own, in that *bruvāṇāḥ* should be fem. if *deváhūti-* is the referent. But given the poet's general evasiveness about referents, I think in b we're dealing with an as-yet-unidentified verbal product, which is then specified as *deváhūti-* (the same *índra-hūti-* of 1b) in c.

VI.38.2–4: After the absence of overt referents in vs. 1, starting with 2b we have a form of *índra-* in every hemistich through vs. 4 (2b *índrasya*, 2d *índram*, 3b *índram*, 3d *índre*, 4a *índram*, 4d *índram*). His name is again absent in the final vs. of the hymn, vs. 5, suggesting that this pattern is deliberate and a species of ring composition, marked by absence not presence. The next hymn (VI.39) also shows this structure, with the three middle verses (2–4) united by the shared initial deictic *ayám* and the first and last (1, 5) standing out against this pattern.

VI.38.3: As usual, the enclitic *vah* 'for you' refers to the priestly colleagues of the poet on whose behalf he acts; as is also usual, the Engl. tr. has to be heavier and more prominent than the recessive 2nd position accentless *vah*.

The second hemistich contains, in my view, a double *ca* construction conjoining two clauses, in which the first verb, *dadhiré*, is accented (and the 2nd, *vardhat*, is not). Klein (DGRV I.176–77) notes that the whole could be interpr. "as a sentential X *ca* Y *ca* construction" (as I do), but favors separating the functions of the two *ca*-s, taking the first *ca* as conjoining the two nouns in the sequence *bráhmā ca gírah*, while he allows (DGRV I.226–27) that the 2nd *ca* is a clausal conjunction. This seems like a desperate makeshift to avoid the (to me, at least) obvious connection between the two *ca*-s— esp. as it requires that in *bráhmā ca gírah* the usual X Y *ca* construction be replaced by the much less usual inversion, Y *ca* X (or in Klein's parlance, X *ca* Y: DGRV I.169ff.). (According to Klein [DGRV I.51 and 169], there are 464 occurrences of X Y *ca* and 45 of X *ca* Y -- a factor of 10.) In my opinion, the accented *dadhiré* is an example of the usual type of contrastive verb accent, and the *ca* ... *ca* construction is a hyped version of "both ... and," viz., "not only ... but also."

In d *ádhi vardhat* is syntactically somewhat problematic. It lacks an overt acc. obj., even though active forms of *várdha-* (and other stems to this root) are overwhelmingly transitive -- a value reinforced by no less than 4 pāda-initial occurrences of transitive active *várdha-* in the very next vs. (4a + b *várdhāt*, 4c *várdha*, 4d *várdhān*), all with Indra as explicit or implied object! It is inconceivable to me that Indra is not meant as the object in 3d as well, despite locative *índre* in this pāda, but I seem to be

alone it that view. Note Ge's intransitive "... möge an Indra stark werden," fld. by Klein (177) "will find strength in Indra." Gotō (1st Klasse, 291) sees the problem, but suggests that "we" are the gapped object: "...macht [uns?] bei Indra stark." In my opinion, the aberrant loc. is conditioned by *ádhi*, which when independent often takes a loc. (see Gr, s.v. *ádhi*, p. 45, nos. 13–17). *ádhi* √ *vṛdh* is found only here, and once in the middle (IX.75.1), in all of Skt. acdg. to MonWms. My "puts strength in Indra" reflects the transitive periphrasis I see in this lexeme. The syntactically clearer forms of act. *várdha-* in the next vs. can be viewed as a type of poetic repair.

VI.38.4: The singular number of both forms of *várdhāt* (a, b) is worthy of a small note. The subject of the first is the conjoined NP *yajñá utá sómaḥ*, with 2 singular nouns. As often, the verb agrees with one of them (presumably the nearer one), rather than being in the dual, as would also be possible. In b the subject is the even more complex NP *bráhma gíra ukthá ca mánma*, of which the two middle terms are clearly plural (fem. and neut. respectively), while the two neut. *-n*-stems that bookend the phrase, *bráhma* and *mánma*, could be either sg. or pl. Flg. Ge (sim. Klein DGRV I.198–99), I take the first as sg. and the last as pl., again assuming that the verb agrees with the nearer term, namely *bráhma*. But it is possible that *bráhma* is actually pl. and that this is an ex. of the famous but fairly rare construction of a sg. verb with a neut. pl. subj. Although there is no way to tell, I'm tempted to alter the tr. to pl.: "... the sacred formulations will strengthen," given the undoubted pl. of the two middle terms and the possible pl. of the last one.

yáman reprises the same word in 1c, though they have somewhat different meanings.

Although nom. pl. *dyávaḥ* ordinarily refers to 'heavens', in this case the context clearly establishes the meaning 'days'.

VI.38.5: The half-verse boundary has to be breeched in tr. to avoid awkwardness.

After the spate of act. transitive forms of √ *vṛdh* in vs. 4 (and 3d), the middle pf. part. *vāvṛdhānám* provides a contrastive intransitive/passive, agreeing with Indra, the object of the transitive forms.

Contra Ge, I take *ásāmi* with *vāvṛdhānám* despite the pāda boundary, on the basis of VI.19.2 *yó vāvṛdhé ásāmi* in this same Indra cycle.

On the *ca* in b, see Klein, DGRV I.54–55.

VI.39 Indra

The whole hymn is tr. and disc. by Schmidt (B+I 149–51).

VI.39.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the NP in the gen. that occupies the first hemistich (and part of pāda c) remains unresolved until the governing verb, *ápāḥ* 'you have drunk', which opens the second hemistich. The referent of this phrase -- namely soma -- also remains unresolved until the very end of pāda b, with the tip-off *mádhvaḥ* 'of the honey'. (Though initial *mandráśya* 'gladdening' might appear to point to soma, in fact it's far more often used of Agni.)

VI.39.2–4: As noted in the publ. intro. (and see comm. ad VI.38.2–4 above), the three middle verses are marked by repeated use of the near deictic in pāda-initial position,

beginning every hemistich but 2cd and coming to a crescendo in vs. 4 with three iterations: *ayám* 2a, *ayám* 3a, *ímám* 3c, *ayám* 4a, b, c. The unidentified referent of all these deictic forms is soma — see Old’s disc. — but soma at least partially identified with Indra, as the opener of the Vala cave. The repeated use of the deitic, pointing to something in the immediate vicinity of the speaker, focuses on soma as the ritual substance on the sacrificial ground.

The three vss. also share an etymological figure type, with transitive (/causative) verb taking a negated object to the same root: 2c *rujád árugṇam*, 3a *dyotayad adyútaḥ*, 4a *rocayad arúcaḥ*. And the presence of the preverb *vī* in pāda-interior in each vs. (2c, 3a, 4b) is another shared feature.

On vss. 3–4 see Hoffmann, Injunk. 142–43.

VI.39.2: The first pāda is truncated, though the frequency of the Vala theme and the stereotyped phraseology associated with it easily allow the missing parts to be supplied. With *páry ádrim usráḥ* we can add the part. *sántam*, as in IV.1.15 *gāḥ ... pári śántam ádrim* “... the rock surrounding the cows” (cf. VI.17.5). As for the verb, \sqrt{ruj} is the (or a) standard root for this mythological action (cf. nearby VI.32.2 *rujád ádrim*), and *ruját* opening pāda c can serve in the first hemistich as well. (Scar [425] unaccountably supplies “ging” instead.)

The second pāda contains an elementary etymological figure, with the root noun cmpd *ṛtayúḥ*- flanked by its component parts: *ṛtá(-dhītibhir) ṛtayúḥ yujānāḥ*. The publ. tr. renders the first cmpd. as “by those of true insight,” implying that *ṛtá-* is adjectival, and the second as “the one whose yoke is truth,” implying that it is a bahuvrīhi. I would alter this tr. to “the one yoked with truth, having been yoked by those whose insights are truth (that is, the priest/poets).”

The third pāda also contains a simple etymological figure: *rujád árugṇam* “he breaks the unbreakable.”

In d Ge, Schmidt (149), and Scar (425) all take *yodhat* as a preterite (e.g., Ge ‘bekämpfte’), but I don’t see how it can be anything but a root aor. subjunctive (so explicitly Macd. VGS, 410). If this analysis is correct, it makes it likely that the injunc. *ruját* in c also falls in the present/future (or perhaps, in Hoffmann’s terms, *zeitlos*) realm. Note that Hoffmann (Injunk. 142–43) so interprets the following two vss. (3–4), which, as we’ve seen, pattern closely with vs. 2. Nonetheless the three scholars just mentioned take all of vs. 2 as preterital, whereas I consider this to be an instance of the reconfiguring of mythological deeds as actions we hope to be repeated in the current time.

Old wants to emend *índraḥ* in d to voc. *índra*, to allow soma to be the subject of *yodhat* as it is of the rest of the vs., and he points to this same voc. *índra* at the end of the next hemistich (3b). However, it is hard to see why the first of two identical forms would be redactionally altered to be *different* from the second, and the shifting conceptual boundary between soma and Indra as agents in this sequence makes the transmitted text unproblematic, as Old also admits.

VI.39.3: The identity of *ayám* as soma is fixed by *índuh* ‘drop’ towards the end of b, but not until fairly late in this sequence. The play of *índu-* and *índra-* so prominent in Maṇḍala IX is found here in their adjacency at the end of the hemistich.

VI.39.4: Whether the referent of the ‘unshining’ (*arúcaḥ*) is the same as that of the ‘unlit’ (*adyútaḥ*) of 3a, namely the nights (*aktūn* 3a), is unclear. Hoffmann suggests so, with ?, and I see nothing against it. Both *adyút-* and *arúc-* are hapaxes in the RV, so we can’t bring to bear other usages of these words.

Ge (explicitly n. 2b) considers *ṛtayúj-* here as having a different sense from the same cmpd. in vs. 2: “mit dem Recht im Bunde” (2b) versus “mit den rechtzeitig geschirrten Rossen” (4c). Even if *ṛtá-* ever had the sense ‘timely, punctual’ (which it does not), it is inconceivable to me that in a hymn of this length, the poet would use the same cmpd. in two very different senses, within two vss. of each other and marking the boundaries of an omphalos. Schmidt (149) also considers this unlikely, though he attributes the contrary view to Lüders, who, as far as I can see, doesn’t hold it or at least explicitly state it; Scar (425) temporizes in his disc., though he tr. the other three instances of *ṛtayúj-* (incl. our vs. 4), all modifying ‘horses’, with the anodyne ‘wohlgeschirrten’, as opposed to our vs. 2, which he renders ‘der Verbündete des R̥ta’ -- in other words, implicitly following Ge’s differentiation. I would alter the publ. tr. from “whose yoke is truth” to “yoked with truth,” as in vs. 2.

VI.39.5: Note that there are some echoes of vs. 1 in this final vs. The singer in the dative *gṛmaté* is found in both vss., immediately after the caesura (1d, 5a); *īṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’ opens the pāda in 1d and 5b; and there is a teasing reflection of pāda-initial *ápā(h)* (1c ‘you have drunk’) in pāda-initial *apá(h)* (5c ‘waters’).

VI.40 Indra

VI.40.1: I take *gaṇé* as referring to the troop of Maruts, as often, not an unidentified set of mortals making up a “(Sänger)schar,” as Ge seems to take it. Assuming that it refers to the Maruts, this provides conceptual ring composition with the final word of the hymn, *marúdbhiḥ*, as noted in the publ. intro.

VI.40.2: In the 2nd hemistich the series of subjects -- the cows, the men, the waters, and the stone -- detail the various elements, both animate and not, that collaborate to produce the soma: the cows as the milk to be mixed in, the men who perform the pressing and the other ritual actions, the waters that both swell the soma stalk and are mixed with the pressed juices, and the stone used to press the stalks.

As Ge notes (n. 2cd) the final *asmai* has two possible readings: it can double *te* in c, “for you ... for that one [=you] to drink,” or it can refer to soma, appearing earlier in the clause in the acc. phrase *tām ... índum* “this drop.” I favor the latter, with dat. *asmai* attracted into the dat. as complement of the dat. infin. *pītáye* (as subj., as in the publ. tr. “for it to be fully drunk,” or as obj. with *te* as subj. “for you to drink it fully”). Because the infinitive phrase *pītáye sām asmai* is separated from the rest of the clause and repeats the preverb/adverb *sām*, I favor the former. The use of the near-deictic *asmai* for soma, even unaccented, recalls the insistent *ayám* for soma in the preceding hymn (vss. 2–4; see comm. ad loc.), and it also forms a little ring in this vs., with init. *ásya* (2a) having the same referent as *asmai* at the end of 2d.

VI.40.3: In sandhi the phrase *sutá indra sóma ā* is completely ambiguous between nom. *sutáh ... sómah* and loc. *suté ... sóme*. The publ. tr. interprets it as the former, while the Pp. reads the latter. Although nothing rides on it, I would now be inclined to follow the Pp., with two parallel loc. absolutes: “with the fire kindled (and) the soma pressed, let your fallow bays ...”

VI.40.4: As noted in the publ. intro., *váyo dhāt* here echoes almost the same phrase in 1d *váyo dhāh* (both also introduced by pāda-init. *āthā*), but with reciprocal switch of subject and beneficiary: Indra creates vitality for the sacrifice in 1d; the sacrifice does the same for Indra in 4d.

VI.40.5: The disjunctive construction marked by two occurrences of *vā* ‘or’ describing the possible places where Indra might be contains three non-parallel terms: an adv. *īdhak*, a loc. NP *své sādane*, and a dep. clause with locative subordinator *yātra ... āsi*. It is also a nice instance of Behaghel’s Law.

A verb of motion has to be supplied in c, but this is amply anticipated by *ā yāhi* in 3d and 4a. Assuming this impv. should be supplied in c, it rhymes with *pāhi* in d.

VI.41 Indra

VI.41.2: I take *vāriṣṭhā* as a likely pun, not only ‘widest’ (hence a throat that can accommodate a lot of soma at one gulp), but also ‘best’; cf. disc. ad VI.37.4.

For *prā √sthā* with soma as expressed or implied obj., cf. I.15.9, VII.92.2, and, with *prāsthitam*, II.36.4, 37.2.

I do not know the exact semantic nuance of *sām √vṛt*, but I think it must mean something more than Ge’s “mitkommen.” I take it here as purposive ‘turn oneself to’, with *gavyūḥ* expressing the purpose, but this may be pushing the idiom.

VI.41.3: Note that the equational sentence ending d, *yās te ānnam*, does not show gender attraction between subj. and pred., as in later Vedic prose, although this phenomenon is found elsewhere in the RV. See, e.g., X.10.4, 11.8 and comm. thereon.

VI.42 Indra

An unsistent play on preverbs structures this hymn. *prāti* appears with 3 different verbs in the 1st 3 vss.: *prāti ... bhara* 1ab, *pratyétana* 2a, *prati bhūṣatha* 3b, while in the last vs. the *prāti ... bhara* of vs. 1 is replaced by the more usual presentation verb *prā bhara* (4b).

VI.42.2: As sometimes elsewhere (I.9.2, VIII.1.17, X.32.8), *enam* doubles *īm* in the phrase *ém* (that is, *ā + īm*) *enam*, a pile-up of two acc. enclitics, whose referent is postponed till the end of the hemistich, *somapātāmam*. On this sequence see my RVic *sīm* and *īm* (2002), 302–3 and n. 18.

There is no obvious reason for the accent on *pratyétana* (Pp. *praty étana*). (Old’s [ZDMG 60: 732] ref. is barely a mention and provides no real explanation.) The assumption about *étana* is that it is a 2nd pl. impv. of the root pres. of *√i*, with unexpected full grade of the root, unexpected verb accent in a main clause, and unexpected root

rather than ending accent (versus *itá*, though of course the full grade would account for the root accent). I think rather that it should be analyzed *ā-itana*, with accented preverb contracted with the unaccented expected zero-grade root syllable of the verb. We would thus have an unaccented verb as expected in this apparent main clause. But this suggestion raises two problems: 1) when two preverbs precede an unaccented verb, they should both be accented (though most the exx. I have identified have verbal material between the 1st and 2nd preverbs), e.g., IV.4.4 *prāty ā tanuṣva*, and we should therefore expect accented **prāty* here as well; 2) *ā* is already present pāda-initially in *ém*. Balanced against these problems is the fact that *ā* is usually the 2nd preverb in a complex (see *prāty-ā √ tan* just cited), and the assumed *ā*(...) *prāti* would be quite unusual (almost no such sequences registered in MonWms). I think we must assume that, more or less simultaneously, *ā* was doubled to serve as clitic host to *īm* in the frozen sequence *ém enam*, besides immediately preceding the verb, and that *étana* was reinterpr. as simply a full-grade accented impv. (cf. unaccented *etana* in V.61.4, on which see comm. ad loc.), not as containing a preverb — which reinterpretation then induced loss of accent on **prāti*. The doubling of *ā* is somewhat like the doubling of preverbs sometimes found in the Gāthās, though there that seems to be a redactional change.

VI.42.3: I take *yádī* as representing *yád ī* with the enclitic acc. *ī*, parallel to *īm* in the last vs. Note that *ī* here is pre-C, while *īm* in 2a is pre-V.

As Ge notes (n. 3cd) there is some uncertainty about the subj. and goal of the verbs here -- Indra or Soma. I take the subject in both cases to be Indra. In c *védā víśvasya* “he knows of it all” echoes 1b *víśvāni vidúṣe* “to the one who knows all things,” an unequivocal ref. to Indra. I think there is a contrast between c and d of a familiar type: Indra *could* go to any soma ritual (“knows of it all”) but comes just to our soma (*tām-tam íd*).

VI.42.4: The āmreḍita pronoun *tām-tam íd* referring to soma in 3d is then contrasted with another pronominal āmreḍita, *asmā-asmā íd*, referring to Indra; the near deictic announces him as having arrived at the ritual ground, to which he was hastening in 3d.

On the surprising last hemistich, see publ. intro.

VI.43 Indra

VI.43.2: As Ge points out, this must be a ref. to the three soma-pressings: the “middle and end” are respectively the Midday Pressing and the Third Pressing; the “sharp-pressed” refers to the freshly pressed soma of the Morning Pressing, which must be especially pungent.

VI.43.4: The HvN ed. unaccountably omits this vs.

VI.44 Indra

VI.44.1–3: In the refrain of pādas cd, the position of *sá* and of the unaccented elements *indra te* strongly suggests that the clause begins in the middle of c -- or rather that *sómaḥ sutáḥ* has been extracausally topicalized. Although in vss. 1–2 this nom. phrase could

belong to the rel. clause of ab, that prospect is foreclosed in vs. 3, because soma is represented in the rel. cl. of 3ab by the instr. *yéna*.

I do not understand why this refrain contains an overt form of the copula *ásti*. Outside of dependent clauses, overt *asti* is generally an existential, but that function is highly unlikely here.

In addition to the refrain that unifies all three vss. of this *ṛca*, the three vss. are structured by rel. clauses in ab with soma as the referent of the rel. prn.

VI.44.3: This vs. subtly undermines the autonomous power of Indra. In the refrain of all three vss. Indra is addressed as *svadhāpate* ‘lord of independent power’, but here in the first hemistich Indra is said to be *like* (*ná*) “one grown strong by (his own) power,” *like* “one overpowering by *his own* forms of help” (*svābhīr ūtibhīh*). In other words the power that appears to be Indra’s own (*svá-*) is really produced for him by soma.

VI.44.4–6: Although this *ṛca* does not have glaring signs of unity, it particularly concerns the songs that strengthen Indra and rouse his aid to us. It also has a subtle morphological ring; see the disc. of the loc. inf. in 3d.

VI.44.4: On *āprahan-* (or, less likely, *āprahana-*), see Old, Scar (689). Scar construes *vaḥ* with this form (“der nicht auf euch einschlägt”) as well as with *gr̥ṇīṣé* (“... will ich für euch preisen”). I take *vaḥ* only with *gr̥ṇīṣé* and supply ‘us’ with the root noun cmpd.; Ge likewise takes *vaḥ* with the verb and supplies “keiner” as obj. of the cmpd. There is no way to choose and no reason to do so, since all three are more or less equivalent: Indra is all powerful but does not threaten the community to which the poet belongs.

VI.44.5: The *íd* in pāda a seems displaced: we would expect *yám íd ...*, though that order would produce a choppy meter. The *íd* in c is better positioned, though we actually might expect it to be limiting *asya*, not the *tám* anticipating *śúsman*. The publ. tr. does not render either *íd*; if I were to do so, the result would be “(It’s) just (him) whom the songs make strong ... just his tempestuous force that the world-halves respect.”

VI.44.6: This vs. is syntactically more complex and ritually more technical than the other two vss. in this *ṛca*.

The most noteworthy form is the loc. inf. *upastr̥ṇīṣáni*, a hapax, not surprisingly. In my opinion it is possible to account for the creation of this form from context, albeit indirectly. The first vs. of this *ṛca* contains the well-attested 1st sg. *gr̥ṇīṣé* (4b), belonging to the tight class of *-sé* 1st sgs. in the ‘praise/sing’ semantic sphere. Beside *gr̥ṇīṣé* there exists a *-śáni* infinitive *gr̥ṇīṣáni* (2x, incl. once in this maṇḍala, VI.15.6). I think our poet built *upastr̥ṇīṣáni* on the model of this *gr̥ṇīṣáni*, as a partial echo of *gr̥ṇīṣé* in 4b, based on the existence of 9th class presents to both of these roots. Because it echoes that 1st sg. I interpr. the predicated inf. with 1st ps. ref. (“it [is mine] to lay ...”). Once again, as in 4, the *vaḥ* refers to the poet’s fellow officiants.

In the ritual the ‘underlayer’ is the layer of butter spread on the ladle underneath the principal offering. Here it is used in a doubly metaphorical sense: the underlayer for Indra could presumably be configured physically as the barhis on which he would sit, but

at another metaphorical remove it could refer to the recitations that provide him with a figurative foundation.

The poet then, by a clever trick, mobilizes this underlayer of words to serve as a metaphor for the multiplication of Indra's forms of help for us. This is accomplished by means of a simile: *vípo ná ... ūtáyah* "forms of help like inspired words," thus implicitly equating the two. These *vípah* 'inspired words' (not, with Ge, 'fingers') are ours, in fact the very *ukthá-* found in pāda a, dependent on *barhāṇā*. The connection between the two is suggested by the phrase *barhāṇā vipāḥ* "by the power of inspired speech" in VIII.63.7 (*vipāḥ* there is gen. sg., as opposed to our nom. pl. *vípah*, as the accent shows). In cd the poet asserts that like our hymns, which rise to Indra, spreading from their position as interconnected (*sakṣītaḥ* 'dwelling together') underlayer, his forms of help will similarly grow up and out. On this vs. see also Scar (97).

VI.44.7–9: On the meter of this ṛca see Old, Proleg. 91 and HvN metrical comm. The fading in and out between Virāj and Triṣṭubh is further complicated by the openings of 3 in 11-syllable lines in 7b, c.

The ṛca concerns soma and contains lexical and thematic respensions.

VI.44.7: The medial pf. part. *papānā-* is one of only 3 forms of the middle pf. in the RV, 2 of which, incl. this one, are used passively. See Kü (309). Note that a deriv. of the other root $\sqrt{pā}$ 'protect', *pāyúḥ*, is found in the 2nd hemistich.

The vs. is notable for a number of hapaxes: *acait*, *staulā-*, and *dhautārī-*, the latter two also marked by vṛddhi.

On *acait* as a nonce *s*-aor. to \sqrt{cit} 'perceive', see Narten (114).

staulā- here is reminiscent of the likewise impenetrable *staunā-* in this same maṇḍala VI.66.5. No remotely credible guesses have been proposed for these forms, or for *dhautārī-*; Ge (n. 7c): "ganz dunkel" and he fails to tr. the NP; Old: "Über *staulābhir dhautārībhiḥ* scheint kein Ergebnis erreichbar"; EWA (II.762 and I.783) also throws up its hands. I am inclined to connect *staulā-* and *staunā-* with similar words but with aspirated initial *sth-*, namely *sthūrā-* 'brawny, sturdy' and *sthūṇā-* 'post' (see comm. ad VI.66.5) respectively, but I cannot explain the phonological discrepancy.

As for *dhautārī-*, Old tentatively suggests that it might belong with one of the roots $\sqrt{dhāv}$ 'run' or 'rinse'. For translational convenience I have assumed the former, but without any conviction. In any case the striking double vṛddhi *-au-* of these paired nominals must be meant to draw attention to the phrase.

VI.44.8: The passive interpr. of the pf. part. *papānā-* in 7b is affirmed by the pass. aor. *apāyī* in 8a.

Similarly, the second pāda clarifies the sense of 7b, where it was said that soma "has perceived what is better for the gods." What is better seems to be the gods' intent, announced here in 8b, to achieve glory. The VP *mānas* $\sqrt{kṛ}$ generally means 'set one's mind on/to'; cf. V.61.7, I.54.9, II.26.2=VIII.19.20 (though V.30.4 and X.117.2 are outliers).

The forms grouped by Gr under a stem *mahás-*, an adj. meaning 'gross', generally have other interpr., either adverbial or belonging to a diff. stem (e.g., gen. sg. to *māh-*). Although a suffix-accented adj. *mahás-* built by accent shift to neut. *máhas-* 'greatness'

would fit the standard pattern (type *yásas*- ‘glory’ → *yaśás*- ‘glorious’), the realization of the pattern in this lexical item seems to have been rare to non-existent. In this passage most (Gr, Ge) do take *maháh* as a neut. adj. to this stem, modifying *nāma* (“acquiring a great name”), but because of the general avoidance of such an adj. I prefer to take *maháh* as the masc. nom. sg. to *mahá-*, a quotation of the name he received.

In keeping with the interpr. of the root \sqrt{ven} as ‘track, trace, seek’, I interpr. its grdv. *venyá-*, when not a PN, as ‘(worthy) to be tracked/sought’.

VI.44.9: This *ṛca*-final vs. reprises and repurposes some of the statements in the opening vs. 7. The skill (*dākṣa-*) that Soma found in 7a we ask him to bestow on us in 9a. Soma, “having won” (*sasavān*) in 7c, is asked to help us in winning (*sātaú ... avidḍhi*) in 9d. Unfortunately nothing in 9 sheds light on the problematic instr. phrase in 7c.

VI.44.10-12: This *ṛca* foresees various disasters and tribulations and asks Indra for his help in combatting them.

VI.44.10: I am not sure of the exact nuance of $\sqrt{bhū}$ + DAT. Gr takes it as meaning ‘angehören, eigen sein’, with a rare dat. here, instead of the gen. usual in this idiom (his no. 13). Ge renders it thus (“dir ... haben wir uns zu eigen gegeben”). Even with the gen., Gr identifies very few passage with this value, and most of these should be otherwise interpr., and I also wonder about an augmented aor. in such a sense. The publ. tr. is by contrast “we have become ready for you,” and I think something like this is the intention (perhaps “we are here for you”). We are awaiting his advent at the ritual and the generosity he will display there, but there is some worry that he will fail to show up, as the 2nd clause of the 1st hemistich shows.

Note that the fairly rare root \sqrt{ven} appears here soon after the appearance of its deriv. *venyá-* in 8d. It is possible that this lexical association led to the grafting of this *ṛca* onto the previous one in this loose collection of short hymns.

VI.44.11: On *niṣṣīdh-* see comm. ad III.51.5.

VI.44.12: The morphological identity and syntactic function of *maghónaḥ* in d are unclear. See esp. Old’s disc. It can be either acc. pl. or gen.-abl. sg. (or an irregular nom. pl., a possibility that Old considers and dismisses). The problem is that in neither case would it form part of a standard construction with the verb $\tilde{a}\sqrt{dabh}$. Ge (n. 12d) thinks of a double acc.: “trick (our) benefactors out of you” -- that is, the non-giving ones might scare Indra off from our sacrifice or get their invitation to him first, thereby depriving our maghavans of Indra’s presence. This certainly conforms to a regular worry that sacrificers express, but the construction is unprecedented. Old opts for the abl. sg. The purport of his interpr. is essentially the same as Ge’s: that the non-givers not trick Indra away from (abl.) the maghavan, which he sees as our human patron. The publ. tr. follows Old, though it might be clearer if it were “... not trick you away from (our) benefactor.” Although this construction is also unprecedented, adding an oblique complement to a transitive construction seems less radical to me than investing it with a second acc. However, I now see another problem with the Old solution: the *ṛca* opens with a voc. *maghavan* addressed to Indra (10a), so it might be odd to have another sg. form of this

stem referring to a human. And I don't see how to construe an abl. *maghónaḥ* referring to Indra in the same construction that contains an acc. *tvā* with the same reference. Nevertheless, I still favor Old's interpr. and simply allow for this shift of reference; such a shift from divine to human is also necessary if the form is taken as plural, with Ge. There is another possibility, raised and dismissed by Old, that *maghónaḥ* is in fact acc. pl., but the two acc. are conjoined: "mögen nicht die Nichtgeber dich betrügen (und) die Spender." This is not outside the realm of possibility.

VI.44.13–15: Another soma *ṛca*.

VI.44.13: The first hemistich contains disharmony of number in a constructio ad sensum: The priest is urged to offer of the pressed (soma-drink)s in the plural (*sutānām*); the reason for this is immediately given in the 2nd part of pāda b, *sá hy āsya rājā* "for he is its king." Unaccented singular *asya* presupposes a referent already in the discourse, with "it" referring to soma, represented in the previous clause as a plural. The singular is then continued in the rest of the *ṛca* (*asyā* 14a, *tām ... sómam* 14cd, *sutām ... sómam* 15a, with sg. *sutām* picking up pl. *sutānām* of 13a).

VI.44.14: As Ge point out (n. 14a), the "many shapes" (*purú várpāṃsi*) that Indra knows could either be his own (given his penchant for shape-shifting) or those of the various demonic enemies he destroys. I assume that the poet meant to leave it ambiguous, though it's worth noting that the one instance of the bahuvrīhi *puru-várpas-* refers to Indra (though in the late hymn X.120.6).

The hapax *-sí* impv. *hoṣi* has no structural support in the RV, the only aor. attested being the pass. aor. *áhāvi*. However, an act. *s*-aor. is reasonably well attested in Vedic prose, beginning with the BYV Samhitās (*ahauṣīt*, etc.); see Narten (Sig.Aor. 288). It is difficult to know whether *yoṣi* is indirect evidence for a *s*-aor. subjunctive to this aor., **hoṣat*, etc., to which *hoṣi* would ultimately belong, or whether it was created as a nonce beside the other *-sí* impvs. in this ritual sphere such as *yákṣi*, *mátsi* and has nothing to do with the aor. forms in prose. I weakly favor the latter explanation.

VI.44.15: The vs. is characterized by three root-accented agent nouns (*pātā* a, *hántā* b, *gántā* c), all pāda-initial, all with acc. obj./goal. Then in d the pattern is switched: a suffix-accented agent noun (*avítā*), interior in its pāda (immed. after caesura) with (objective) gen. complement. All of them are presumably predicates of *astu* in pāda a. I consider this simply an instance of the RVic tendency to shake up established patterns; I doubt that the poet is attempting to draw a distinction between Indra's habitual roles as drinker, smiter, and goer, in contrast to a situational role as helper, as Tichy claims (*Die Nomen agentis auf-tar- im Vedischen*, 298–99; cf. 257 and passim). Among other things, "help" is one of the most frequent things we ask Indra to do for us; it is surely one of his standard, habitual roles. It happens that there is no root-accented **ávitar-*, though *avítár-* is extremely common, and so no such form was available to match the first three *-tar-* stems in this vs. I do not know if the gap is accidental or systemic.

Note that *kārúdhāyas-*, a rare bv., reappears here from 12 -- again, a possible reason for attaching this *ṛca* to the preceding one.

VI.44.16–18: Here the power of soma to rouse Indra to beneficial action is the general subject of the *ṛca*. The three forms belonging to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’ in the 1st hemistich, *pātram* ‘drinking cup’, *indrapānam* ‘giving drink to Indra’, and *apāyi* ‘has been drunk’, in echoing the first word of the preceding vs. (15a *pātā* ‘drinker’), may have caused this *ṛca* to be grafted onto the last.

VI.44.16: Ge takes *indrasya* as agent of *apāyi* (“Indra hat seinen lieben Göttertrank getrunken”), but finite passives, even verbs of consumption, don’t take genitive agents.

VI.44.17–18: These two vss. contain two exx. of unexpectedly accented 2nd sg. impvs.: 17a *jahí* and 18d *kṛṇuhí*, both internal to the *pāda* and preceded by material belonging to the same clause. Old cites both (in a list of other puzzling passages; ZDMG 60: 736), but provides no real explanation. In both cases it is possible to construct ad hoc justifications. For the *jahí* of 17a, note that 17d also contains an accented form of this same impv. (though with metrically lengthened final) in the sequence *prā mṛṇā jahī ca*, where *jahī* contrasts with the immediately preceding impv. *prā mṛṇā* and has its accent honestly, as it were. It could be that *jahí* in *pāda* a received the accent redactionally or as a poetic imitation of the *jahī* later in the vs. As for *kṛṇuhí* in 18d, it might be taken as contrastive with the (rather distant) imperatively used injunctive *kaḥ* at the end of b to the same root; however, they are not used in the same idiom. It’s also worth noting that *kṛṇuhí* is followed by particles that ordinarily take 2nd position in a clause (*smā no*), and so *kṛṇuhí* by default appears to be in 1st position. And both 17a *jahí* and 18d *kṛṇuhí* are right after the caesura. But none of these explanations seems sufficient -- e.g., post-caesura position does not induce accent on verbs -- and I think we must consider these two exx. as peculiarities of the composer of this *ṛca*.

VI.44.17: The object phrase in the 1st hemistich provides an ex. of number disharmony (of a different type from that in vs. 13). The main objects of Indra’s smiting are “rivals (and) foes,” the pl. phrase *śátrūn ... amitrān*, but they are further specified as “kin and non-kin,” *jāmím ajāmím*, in the singular. The same disharmony is found in IV.4.5 *jāmím ajāmím ... śátrūn*, where the *śátrūn* that closes our *pāda* a substitutes for *amitrān*.

VI.44.18: For the idiom in *sūrīn kṛṇuhí ... ardhám*, cf. II.30.5 *asmān ardhám kṛṇutāt*.

VI.44.19–21: This *ṛca* has a more obvious unifying feature than the last several: the repeated ‘bull’ words, *vṛṣan-* and *vṛṣabhá-*. I count 16 exx. of the two stems in the three vss. The bull(ish) grammatical subjects of the three vss. are different: 19 Indra’s horses, 20 the soma drinks, 21 Indra himself. The *vṛṣan-* stem predominates; *vṛṣabhá-* only appears beginning in the last *pāda* of 20 (though prepared for by instr. pl. *vṛṣabhiḥ* in 20c). I do not see any appreciable difference in their usage; note the coreferential dative *vṛṣṇe ... vṛṣabhāya* in 20d and, even more striking, the use of the two stems in strictly parallel expressions in 21a and b: *vṛṣā ... divó vṛṣabhāḥ pṛthivyāḥ* “the bull of heaven, the bull of earth” and *vṛṣā síndhūnām vṛṣabhá stíyānām* “the bull of the rivers and the bull of the standing waters.” Nonetheless, Ge carefully distinguishes them, with Bull reserved for *vṛṣabhá-* and *vṛṣan-* rendered as Riese / riesig ‘giant’. But I very much doubt if the intent was “you are the giant of heaven, the bull of the earth,” etc.

The concentration on the bull words leaves little room or energy for other poetic flourishes.

VI.44.20: Although they belong to different, and distant, *ṛcas*, the partitive gen. construction here, ... *prá ... sūtānām*, DAT *bharanti* ..., matches that in vs. 13: ... *prá ... sūtānām*, DAT *bhara* ... and occupies the same position in the vs., though in our vs. \sqrt{bhr} also has a direct acc. object *sómam*.

VI.44.21: Given the parallelism of the phrase *vṛṣā síndhūnām vṛṣabhá stíyānām*, it is clear that the gen. pl. *stíyānām* must be in semantic complementarity with *síndhūnām* ‘of the rivers’. Almost the same pair is found in VII.5.2, with a substitution for the first nom.: *netā síndhūnām vṛṣabhá stíyānām*. Gr glosses *stíyā-* ‘Schneefeld, Gletscher’, but, given the relative lack of attention to snow and the like in the RV once the Indo-Aryans had left the high mountains mostly behind, some other type of water contrasting with rivers seems more likely -- with Ge’s “der stehenden Gewässer” a likely alternative (cf. also Lüders, Varuṇa I.144). Re’s “eaux-stagnantes” (EVP XIII.56 and 141), though expressing a similar contrast, is less appealing because of the negative implication of “stagnant waters”: would Indra really want to be their bull? The question then is what the form is derived from; EWA classifies it with the root $\sqrt{styā}$ ‘be stiff’, of limited attestation in Skt. but found also in MIA, which seems reasonable. However, I am tempted to see a primary or secondary association with $\sqrt{sthā}$ ‘stand’, since forms of this root (with the sense ‘stand still’) can be used of waters. Cf., e.g., the famous phrase describing the rushing of the waters freed by Indra in the Vṛtra battle in I.32.10 *átiṣṭhantīnām* “of those (waters) not standing still.” Re (EVP XIII.141) in a lapidary comment -- “fait comme *díya-*” -- seems to hint at a direct derivation (*díya-* to $\sqrt{dā}$, then *stíya-* to $\sqrt{sthā}$) without pursuing it, and Lub (*System*, 104) tentatively suggests that it belongs to an **-i*-enlarged form of $\sqrt{*steh_2}$, viz. **steh_2-i-*, but doesn’t further spell out the details. The trick of course is to keep the laryngeal from aspirating the *t*; if we start with Lub’s root, the zero-grade **steh_2-i-* would presumably metathesize to **stih_2* (as with $\sqrt{pā(y)}$ ‘drink’: *pītā-*), which would yield *stíy-* before a vowel. But I have no commitment to such an analysis. In any case it is impossible to tell whether the form belongs to a short or a long *a/ā* stem, since it only shows up in the gen. pl.

VI.44.22–24: As noted in the publ. intro., repetition also characterizes this *ṛca*: the *ayám* that opens every hemistich, along with two other *pādas* (23b, 24b). In all instances the referent is Soma, whose name, however, does not appear until the opening of the last *pāda*, 24d (though the reliable synonym *indu-* ‘drop’ is found in 22d). The beginning of the first vs., 22a, identifies the subject as a god (*ayám deváh*), and the *ṛca* attributes powerful agency to him, including deeds generally associated with Indra, such as the defeat of the Paṇi (22b), the placing of light in the sun (23b), and the propping apart of the two worlds (24a). It is only the specification of Indra (in an oblique case) as the “yokemate” of “this god” early in the *ṛca* (22b *índreṇa yujā*) that prevents the audience from assuming that *ayám deváh* refers to Indra (who is, after all, the dedicand of the hymn). Nonetheless, the virtual identification of Soma with Indra is clear.

VI.44.22: As just noted, *īnduh* ‘drop’ opening pāda b firmly identifies the subject as Soma, but the common word play between phonologically similar *īndu-* and *īndra-*, found esp. in Maṇḍala IX, underlines the permeable boundary just noted between Indra and Soma in this ṛca.

The brief narrative allusion in pāda c (“stole the weapons of his own father”) sounds like a fractured version of the just-born Indra stealing the soma from Tvaṣṭar, but it is hard to know how to square that tale with this formulation.

VI.44.23: As Ge points out (n. 23cd), in the 2nd hemistich Soma the god is differentiated from soma the drink, with the god finding the distant, hidden drink.

tritēṣu is the only pl. form to this stem in the RV, and it is not at all clear what it is doing here. Ge takes it as the PN Trita, with the pl. referring to Trita and his brothers, among whom Soma (the god) finds soma (the drink). But I know of no such narrative, and Ge does not cite one. I take the form instead as representing the older adj. ‘third’ (see EWA s.v.), the older correspondent of *trītya-* ‘third’ (which, of course, is also old, having Iranian cognates). As is well known, there are three heavens, and I take the “third realms of light” to be the third or highest heaven, here in the pl. because it is conceived of as further subdivided. For soma as resident in the third heaven, see K. Klaus, *Die altindische Kosmologie*, 175 with n. 66. It is possible (but only *possible*) that the vs. implicitly depicts the three heavens, with the dawns in the nearer one, the sun in the middle, and the soma in the third.

The drink is threefold presumably because of the three pressings of the soma sacrifice.

VI.44.24: (*vī*) *śkabhāyat* echoes *astabhāyat* in the first vs. of the ṛca (22b).

I will not speculate on the numerology in *saptāraśmi-* ‘having seven reins’ and *daśayantra-* ‘having ten fastenings’, whose referents may be ritual or cosmological, or (most likely) both.

VI.45 Indra

This hymn contains 5 instances of the phrase “the stake (that is) set,” *hitá- dhána-*: 3 acc. sg. *hitám dhánam* (2c, 12c, 15c), 2 loc. sg. (11b, 13b). All but one of these has the order just given, but one of the loc. exx. (13b) is found in the opposite order, as *dháne hité* as opposed to 11b *hité dháne*, which matches the order of the accusatives. A survey of the other examples of the phrase in the RV turns up one more ex. of the acc. *hitám dhánam* (VIII.80.8), but a number of further loc. exx., almost all of which have the flipped order found in 13b *dháne hité* (I.40.2=VI.61.5, I.116.15, I.132.5, VIII.3.9, IX.53.2) versus *hité dháne* (X.63.14). There is only one ex. of the phrase outside of the acc. sg. and loc. sg., namely *dháneṣu hitéṣu* (VIII.16.5). It thus appears that the acc. and loc. exx. have different underlying orders. Since the word order in this phrase, in both acc. and loc., is, at least to the naked eye, metrically indifferent (always ~ – ~ –), it is hard to see what is driving the variable order, esp. since almost all instantiations of this phrase are pāda-final (except for I.116.15 and 132.5). Within this very limited data set, it would be possible to assume that the variant order signals different syntactic intentions: “the set stake” (acc.) as opposed to the loc. absol. “when the stake (is/was) set,” with secondary predication. Dieter Gunkel (pers. comm.) tells me that he produced a similar

(independent) hypothesis when investigating “swappable bigrams” with Kevin Ryan (some of which results were presented in Vienna, June 24, 2015). However, given the vagaries of RVic word order, it is difficult to know if such a hypothesis would hold up across a large set of data. It would be useful to investigate word order in clear loc. absolutes.

VI.45.3: I have silently suppressed the plurals in *prāṇīṭayaḥ* and *ūtāyaḥ* (guidance and help, rather than guidances and helps). Given that *prāṇīṭayaḥ* reprises *ānayat ... sūnīti* in the 1st vs. of the ṛca, it might be better to translate it as “Great is his leading.”

The three *-ti*-stem abstracts *prāṇīti-*, *prāsasti-*, and *ūtī-* recall *sūnīti-* in 1b.

VI.45.4: As was implied in the publ. tr., there is more cohesion across ṛcas than within them. In this 1st vs. of the 2nd ṛca there are a number of connections to the previous one: the 1st word *sākhāyaḥ* recalls *sākhā* in 1c; in b the impv. *prā ... gāyata* “sing forth” is a variant of the nominal form *prāsasti-* (3b) to the lexeme *prā √ śams* ‘proclaim forth’; in c the nominal clause *sā hī naḥ X* resembles 1c ... *sā naḥ X*; c contains another *-ti*-stem abstract, *prāmati-*, like those in 3 (two of which are cmpd with *prā-*); and the final word of the vs., *mahī*, echoes the 1st word of 3 *mahīḥ*.

VI.45.5: The sequence *ékasya ... dvāyoḥ ... / utēdṛṣe yāthā vayām* “of one, of two and for such as we are” is a nice example of Behagel’s Law. It also shows variant syntax in a conjoined construction, since the third conjoined member is dative (*īdṛṣe*), while the first two are gen. (unless *dvāyoḥ* is loc., which seems unlikely). The result, at least in translation, is almost awkward, but the formal switch in case (and number) has semantic consequences, in my opinion. The sequence first presents itself as a purely numerical one (cf. Klein DGRV I.332–33), and we might expect “of one, of two, and *of however many we are.” But the sg. *īdṛṣe* changes the focus from the quantity of the beneficiaries to their quality (“such as we,” in implicit contrast to people outside our circle of lesser value), and the dative emphasizes the benefactive nature of Indra’s actions. Ge’s “auch für einen solchen, wie wir sind” misses the point, in my view.

VI.45.6: I supply ‘us’ as obj. in both a and b, adapted from 4c and esp. 5c; Ge supplies “Männer” (in b), presumably on the basis of *nṛbhiḥ* in c. Either will work, but ‘us’ seems to provide more continuity.

nāyasi in a connects across ṛcas with *ānayat* in 1a, and *ukthaśamsīnaḥ* in b with *prāsastayaḥ* in 3b. In 3b Indra is said to have many *prāsasti-*, and here the producers of these (*prā*)*śasti-* are identified (as us or, with Ge, men).

VI.45.7: More cross-ṛca connections: *bráhma-vāhas-* 7a/4a, *sákhi-* 7b/1c/4a.

VI.45.8: Ge takes *ūcuḥ* to *√ vac* and supplies *hitāni* with *nī*. “In dessen Händen ... alle Güter, wie man sagt, nieder(gelegt sind),” but Old’s view, that *ūcuḥ* belongs to *√ uc*, which regularly takes the preverb *nī* in the meaning ‘be accustomed to, be at home in’, is preferable. (And in fact Ge admits as much in n. 8a.)

VI.45.9: This vs. contains two parallel direct objects (“strongholds” and “tricks”) in two parallel clauses, which presuppose the same verb. The preverb (*vī*) is given at the beginning of pāda a, the verb (*vṛhā*) itself at the beginning of the 2nd hemistich; they must be assembled to produce the full lexeme.

VI.45.10–11: These vss. form a syntactic pair characterized by simple enjambment. Both vss. begin *tām u tvā*, with the iteration of this phrase in 11a still part of the main clause of vs. 10 (and the object of 10c *āhūmahī*). The rest of the first hemistich of 11 consists of two rel. clauses, whose predicate (the predicate for both clauses), *hāvyaḥ*, is found at the beginning of c. The rest of c is a separate impv. clause. Although the content of these two vss. is banal in the extreme, the syncopated effect produced by having the syntactic units not conform to metrical units gives it a bit of oomph. The vs. pair is unified by the ‘call’ motif: 10c *āhūmahī* ‘we have called upon’, 11c *hāvyaḥ* ‘to be called upon’ / *hāvam* ‘call’. The root *√śru* also provides unity: 10c *śravasyāvaḥ* ‘seeking fame’, 11c *śrudhī* ‘hear’, also, in 12b *śravāyyān* ‘worthy of fame’.

VI.45.10: After the opening *tām u tvā*, the rest of the hemistich consists only of vocc. *satya somapā, īndra vājānām pate*, with only a single accent among them: *īndra* is accented because it’s initial in its pāda, while the gen. pl. *vājānām* is unaccented because it’s part of a voc. phrase. Note that in the HvN ed. *vājānām* bears an impossible, final-syllable accent, a typo that should be deleted.

VI.45.11: It is worth noting that in the temporally contrastive rel. clauses (a: *purā* ‘previously’, b: *nūnām* ‘now’) whose joint predicate is the grdv. *hāvyaḥ* (see above), the one with past reference has an overt copula, pf. *āsitha*, while the one with current reference has the copula gapped.

VI.45.12: The phrase *hitā- dhāna-* is repeated from 11b and also picks up the same phrase in 2c. (See disc. above.) In fact 12c *tvāyā jeṣma hitām dhānam* is a telling variant on 2c *īndro jētā hitām dhānam*. In vs. 2 Indra is described as a/the (habitual) winner of the stake, while by vs. 12 it is we who hope to be the winners with his help. The vocalism of the precative *jeṣma* matches that of the agent noun *jētā* in 2. See further 15c. Note also that 2b contains an instr. *ārvatā* “with a steed” (in that case an unsatisfactory one) like *ārvadbhiḥ* in 12a.

The opening of the vs. is called “stark elliptisch” by Ge, who sees two different possible constructions (n. 12a): “with insights (might we overcome) (the insights of other poets) and with steeds (might we overcome) steeds” or “with insights (as) steeds ...” His tr. seems to reflect the first (though without supplying any further material), while I prefer the second.

VI.45.13: The new tr̥ca opens with yet another example of the ‘stake’ phrase, this time in opposite order (*dhāne hité*). For further on the order in this phrase, see the above intro. comm. to the hymn.

VI.45.14: The subjunctive *āsati* was omitted in tr.: the first line should read “Your help that will have ...”

VI.45.15: The VP \sqrt{ji} *hitám dhánam* returns from 2c and 12c, with two instances of \sqrt{ji} : *jési jiṣṇo hitám dhánam*. Here the subject is Indra as in 2c, not ‘we’ (12c), but he is making use of *our* (*asmākena*) chariot.

VI.45.16: As Old notes (though not in those terms), we seem to have an embedded *main* clause here -- in that *tám u stuhi* forming the second part of pāda a interrupts the rel. cl. that begins the vs. (*yá éka íd*) and continues through the rest of b and c, with the accented verb *jajñé* in c. Since *yá éka íd* is in fact only a single constituent, it might be best to consider it fronted around the brief main cl.

VI.45.18: The precativ perfect *sāsaḥīṣṭhāḥ* is striking.

VI.45.19–20: These two vss. contain superlatives to bahuvrīhi *s*-stems that appear earlier in the simplex: 19c *bráhma-vāhastamanḥ*; 4a *bráhma-vāhase*; 20c *gír-vanastamaḥ*; 13a *gírvanaḥ* (also 28b).

VI.45.21: Ge takes *niyúdbhiḥ* and *vājebhiḥ* as parallel, and therefore the ‘teams’ are among the things with which Indra fulfills our desire. Given the position of *niyúdbhiḥ* in the 1st pāda and its usual usage, I think it rather refers to Indra’s teams, with which he travels ‘here’, and I take *ā* both with *pṛṇa* and with a verb of motion to be supplied. For a similar use, see VI.22.11 *sá no niyúdbhiḥ ... ā gahi ...*, also addressed to Indra in this cycle.

VI.45.22–24: This *ṛca* concerns itself with cows, picking up *gómadbhir gopate* from the end of the preceding *ṛca* (21c). In particular 23b *vājasya gómataḥ* “prize of cows” reprises 21bc *vājebhiḥ ... gómadbhiḥ* and is then echoed by *vrajám gómantam* “enclosure of cows” in 24ab.

VI.45.22: The first pāda contains the common locution in which a poet addresses himself in the sg., but makes a nod to his ritual colleagues in the 2nd pl.: *tád vo gāya*. Lit. this should be “Sing (o poet=me) this, (on behalf of) you all (=priests).” See my “Poetic Self-Reference in the *Rig Veda* and the Persona of Zarathustra” (Fs. Skjaervø, BAI 19 [2005]), where this passage is disc. p. 69. The effort to introduce the 2nd pl. into the English would overbalance the tr., in a way that the slender enclitic *vaḥ* does not.

The simile in c is somewhat unsettling: “Sing what is weal for the able one as if for a cow.” Presumably it’s not the song that would be weal for a/the cow. Sāy.’s explan., reported by Ge (n. 22c), may well be correct: “as (fodder is) for a cow.” Recall also 7c *gām ná dóhase huve* “I call upon (Indra) like a cow for milking,” where the cow simile is filled out. In light of this passage it may be that here what is weal for the cow is not fodder but rather the call to be milked, which would better resemble the song that is weal for Indra: “Sing what is weal for the able one, as (a milking call) is for a cow.”

VI.45.24: There is some difference of opinion on the source of the apparent indefinite *kuvítsa-*, a hapax. Ge (n. 24a) asserts that *sasya* is the gen. corresponding to *sásmin*, enclitic after *kuvíd* (presumably presupposing a notional word space *kuvít sasya*). But the

standard opinion, already registered by Gr (< BR; see also explicitly AiG II.1.327, repeated AiG II.2.924), is that it is derived from the univertation of a syntactic sequence *kuvít sá* (roughly “is it indeed this one?”), which is then secondarily inflected. This seems the more likely explanation, and in fact there is such a sequence attested in IV.51.4 *kuvít sá*. This passage contains a deliberative either/or question “should it be the old course or a new one ...?” *kuvít sá ... sanáyo návo vā yāmaḥ*, a context that favors development into an indefinite of the type “someone or other.” In fact, our passage might be more clearly rendered as “to the cattle enclosure of someone or other.”

VI.45.25–27: There is no obvious unifying feature in this *ṛca*, though Indra is compared to a cow in the first two vss.

VI.45.25: On the intensive pf. *nonuvuḥ* see Schaeffer (45) and Kü (283).

VI.45.27: This vs. is identical to III.41.6, q.v. The lack of accent on *mandasvā* despite the following *hi* is puzzling.

VI.45.28–30: Again no unity in the *ṛca*.

VI.45.28: Although, as just noted, there’s no unity in the *ṛca*, there is some continuity between *ṛcas*. Like the first vs. of the previous *ṛca* (25), this one has polarized nom. *#imāḥ ... gíraḥ#* “these songs” framing the first hemistich, which responds to the acc. *gíraḥ* in the middle of the *ṛca* before that (23c). Moreover, the simile “like cows their calf” (28c) reprises “like mothers their calf” in 25c.

VI.45.29: This vs. is syntactically dependent on 28, with the acc. *purūtāmam* picking up *tvā* in 28a.

The cognate expression *vājebhir vājayatām* “competing for the prize with their prizes” is a bit puzzling. I interpr. it as being a slight play on words, with the instr. *vājebhiḥ* referring to the singers’ songs, expressing the means by which they compete, while the prizes they compete for are material goods and fame. This interpr. is somewhat supported by the next vs., where we hope that our praise-song is the most successful one.

VI.45.30: Notice the very un-Ārya phonology of the name of the patron, Bṛbu with two plain *b*’s. (On Bṛbu as patron see Kuiper, *Aryans*, p. 6.) It is probably not an accident that this vs. contains only one of two reff. to the Gaṅgā in the RV (the other a voc. *gaṅge* in X.75.5), since the Gaṅgā is at the limits of the RVic geographical horizon.

The simile is more lit. “(he is) broad like the Gangetic girth.”

VI.45.31: Pādas ab are identical to VIII.94.3. For my interpr. of the hemistich and esp. of the phrase *aryá ā* see comm. there. Given the un-Ārya phonology of Bṛbu’s name, there may be a particular pleasure in hymning the un-Ārya patron Bṛbu *away from* the *arí-*

VI.46 Indra

This hymn nicely demonstrates the distribution of impv. forms to *√bhū* that I discussed in my 1997 “Syntactic constraints on morphological change: The Vedic

imperatives *bodhi*, *dehi*, and *dhehi*”: *bháva/bhava* is found initial (3d) or final (10d, 11a) in its pāda or clause, while *bodhi* is internal (4c).

VI.46.1–2: Although the presence of *hí*, with its generally causal value, is often a puzzle when it appears in the first pāda of a hymn, this one helps signal the conceptual unity of this opening ṛca, with vs. 1 providing the various circumstances under which we call upon Indra and vs. 2 containing the contents of our latest address to the god -- a call for additional generosity from him.

The poet plays with the 2nd sg. pronoun. Historically -- and usually synchronically in the RV -- the nom. sg. *tvám* is disyllabic (*tʷvám*) and the acc. sg. *tvām* is monosyllabic, with occasional distraction to two syllables in analogy to the nom. But here the 1st vs. has three distracted acc. sg. *tʷvām*, prominently pāda-initial (a, c, d), while the nom. sg. at the beginning of the 2nd vs. is monosyllabic. To match disyllabic *tʷvām*, in 2a the two syllables are filled out by the addition of the pleonastic *sá* (#*sá tvám*), which is syntactically at home as subject marker of the 2nd sg. impv. *kíra* (see my 1992 “Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?”). Since *sá* in such contexts is unnecessary, its presence draws attention to the metrical interchange between the nom. and acc. of the pronoun here.

VI.46.2: Ge takes *rathyàm* as an adj. modifying *ásvam* (Wagenross); Gr does as well, assigning the form to the *vṛkī*-inflected stem *rathī-* (so also Lub). Neither of these interpr. is impossible; however, I prefer to take *rathyàm* as belonging to the marginal them. stem *rathyà-* (beside better attested *ráthya-*) and also to take it as a third term in the gifts we want from Indra. There is nothing riding on the choice of interpr., however.

VI.46.3: This vs. shows some continuities with the previous pragātha: the root noun cmpd *satrāhā* (3a) echoes *satrā* in 2d, as *satpate* (3c) does *sátpatim* in 1c. There is also the variant 1st pl. mid. root form to $\sqrt{hū}/hvā$, *hūmahe* (3b), which contrasts with *hāvāmahe* in 1a. I can see no difference in sense here, and I think there are several other factors at work. On the one hand, extremely common *hāvāmahe* (+/- accent) is almost never pāda-internal, whereas the rare-ish *hūmahe* (+/- accent) appears about half the time in that position (but see pāda-final *hūmahe* in 6b) -- so it partly replicates the *bháva/bodhi* distribution discussed above. But perhaps more important is that the poet seems to be playing with metrical variants in a way similar to *sá tvám* discussed above. Pāda b reads *índram tám hūmahe vayám*. There is no good reason for *tám* because *índram* more than sufficiently provides the acc. obj.; moreover, all things being equal, *tám* (and its paradigmatic fellows) generally opens its pāda/clause and in particular does not follow a coreferential noun. The common 1st pl. *hāvāmahe*, already found in 1a, would easily fit in a version of this pāda that lacked the *tám*: **índram hāvāmahe vayám*. I suggest that the poet called attention to his manipulation of the variant verb forms by inserting a pleonastic *tám*, like the pleonastic *sá* in 2a, and inserting it in the “wrong” place, which would draw the attention of his audience even more.

VI.46.4: *vṛṣabhéva* is somewhat problematic: the Pp. analyzes it as *vṛṣabhā íva*, which is phonologically impeccable, but what form would *vṛṣabhā* represent? Old’s solution (flg. Lanman, Noun Inflection 329) that it is an underlying nom. sg. is surely the most likely,

whether we subscribe to Lanman's "crasis after elision [of the *s*]," i.e., *vr̥ṣabhās iva* → *vr̥ṣabha iva* → -e-. The publ. tr., as well as Ge., implicitly follows this route. A long-shot possibility is that the Pp. *vr̥ṣabhā* is the underlying form, and it's an old instr. sg. modifying or doubling *manyúnā*: "with bullish battle-fury" or "with battle-fury as a bull." But *vr̥ṣan-* is the 'bull' stem generally used (quasi-)adjectivally, not *vr̥ṣabhā-*. It might also be possible to see it as a voc. *vr̥ṣabha*: this would easily account for the sandhi, but we would have to assume it got secondarily accented after it was no longer understood as a voc., and this would also introduce the interpretational problem of a voc. in a simile (though unfortunately there are a few such).

On the problematic *ṛcīṣama* see the despairing comm. ad I.61.1.

The three loc. in d specify the 'stakes' (*dhanā-*) referred to by *mahādhané*.

VI.46.5: The voc. phrase in c, *citra vajrahasta*, is repeated from 2a.

The verb *prāṇ* must be read disyllabically. It could therefore technically be a subjunctive (so apparently Gr), and in fact the light first syllable required could reflect the loss of root-final laryngeal before the subjunctive suffixal vowel. Hoffmann insistently calls it an injunc. (215 n. 201, 221), fld. by Lub, and the publ. tr. ("you ... fill") reflects an injunctive interpr. But since this is not a cosmogonic act -- Indra is filling the world halves with "fame" -- a subjunctive interpr. is possible, esp. following the impv.: "bring us fame with which you *will fill* both these world-halves." I consider this a possible, perhaps even desirable alternative.

VI.46.6: The distracted acc. *ṛvām* from 1a, c, d returns here, again as object of "we call," but with *hūmahe* rather than the *hāvāmahe* of vs. 1.

On *pibdanā-* see also comm. ad IX.15.6. The stem is obviously derived from a redupl. form of *√pad*; cf. the hapax med. part. *pībdamāna-* (X.101.11). The orig. sense is likely 'keep stepping, go step-by-step,' vel sim., as an iter. See EWA s.v. *PAD*, with ref. to Strunk and Gotō. A literal gloss could then be 'plod, trudge'. This literal sense is seen, in my view, in the participle in X.101.11 *vāhnir āpībdamānaḥ* 'plodding draught horse', and in IX.15.6 I also take *vāsūni pibdanā* as a somewhat comic reference to cows as "plodding goods." Our passage here is more difficult, as the word is contrasted with *vithurā-* 'wavering'; this opposition accounts for the standard glosses as (Gr) 'feststehend, fest', (AiG II.2.595 'fest' (but .203 'erstarkend'), (Ge) 'dauerhaft', (Re) 'solides' (both latter in IX.15.6), but my 'gain(ing) a foothold' seems to preserve the root etymology and sense, while fitting the context.

VI.46.7–8: This pragātha is stitched together by the *yād (vā)* construction (7a, c, 8a, b).

VI.46.7: The main cl. begins in the middle (or rather towards the end) of pāda c, with *ā bhara*. Since this phrase is only 3 syllables, the audience would not mistake the syntactic break for a pāda break despite the extra length of the c-pāda in Br̥hatī.

satrā reappears once again (cf. 2d, 3a).

VI.46.8: On the verbal rection of *turvāṇe* see Keydana (Inf., 245–47). Note also that the circumstantial loc. *nr̥ṣāhye* "at the conquering of men" and the purpose infinitival phrase

amitrāṇ ... turvāṇe ‘to vanquish our foes’ have the same semantic structure, though different syntax.

VI.46.9–10: The unity of this pragātha is required by the fact that the rel. cl. of 10ab must depend on the imperatival cl. of 9d, with initial *yé* (10a) picking up the last word of 9, *ebhyaḥ* ‘from those’.

VI.46.10: *dhṛṣṇuyā* reprises 2a.

VI.46.11–12: This pragātha shows both internal and external connections. As in the previous pragātha the 2nd vs. is syntactically dependent on the first, with the *yātra* clause of 12ab parallel to the *yád* clause of 11cd and both subordinate to the imperatival clause of 11b. In addition the first and last hemistichs (11ab, 12cd) open identically, with *ádha smā*, which echoes *ádha smā* of the last hemistich of the previous pragātha (10cd).

On the particular connection of vs. 12 with vs. 9 see immed. below.

VI.46.11: The first pāda is a bare variant of 3d: both contain the complex verbal construction *vṛdhé √ bhū* ‘be for strengthening / be there to strengthen’, each with the complement enclitic *naḥ*. The only difference is the placement of the impv.: initial *bhāvā* in 3d, final *bhava* in 11a, differing only in accent and, possibly, in the length of the final vowel: the Pp. resolves the cross-pāda sandhi *bhavéndra* with short *bhava*, like 10d, but a long vowel would be equally possible.

VI.46.12: The publ. tr. contains a grammatical error. It takes *priyā* as modifying fem. pl. *tanvāḥ*, but the sandhi context of *priyā* makes this impossible: it would have to be **priyāḥ*. It must modify *śárma* (as Ge takes it, also Gr), which must then be a neut. plural to the -an-stem. This tr. should be corrected to “... stretch wide their own bodies as dear shelters ...”

Ge takes *tanvāḥ* and *śárma* as implicitly conjoined (“Wo die Tapferen ihre Leiber breit machen (and) die lieben Schilde des Vaters”), but I think it more likely that the champions are stretching their bodies to *serve as* shelters/shields. Under this interpr. the plural of *śárma* makes sense: multiple bodies multiple shields.

Pādas abc strongly echo 9abc, with the c pādas esp. close, both containing the VP *chardír yacha* (in opposite order and non-contiguous in 12c) + conjoined DAT. beneficiary (9c *maghāvadbhyaś ca máhyaṃ ca*; 12c *tanvè táne ca*). However, the first hemistich of 12 varies tellingly from 9ab: in 9 it is Indra who holds out the shelter (*śaraṇám*), which is equated with the *chardíḥ* of c, but in 12 it is the mortal champions (*śūrāsaḥ*) who offer their own bodies as shelter (*śárma*). (Although the two words for ‘shelter’ are different, they are transparently related and share the same descriptors elsewhere.) The bodies of the mortal warriors are theirs to deploy, but also under the protection of Indra, as shown not only by *tanvè* in the next pāda as recipient of Indra’s protection, but also by *tanūpāḥ* ‘protector of bodies’ in 10d, applied to Indra.

The last pādas of vss. 9 and 12 provide the final thread of connection between the two vss., since both contain the impv. *yāváyā* ‘keep away’. In 12d the accent on the verb is anomalous, but I have no trouble assuming that it was adapted from 9d, where the initial position of the verb requires it.

VI.46.13–14: As was noted in the publ. intro., this last pragātha stands somewhat apart from the rest of the hymn, though it does show connections with the beginning of the hymn. The near repetition found between the last two pragāthas (9–10 / 11–12; see disc. above) gave the sense that the hymn was coming to an end. As often, RVic poets seem to enjoy shaking up our structural expectations. The lack of a main clause in the whole of this two-vs. complex is especially striking and ends the hymn on an unsettled and somewhat frenzied note.

VI.46.13: The form *ārvataḥ* ends the first pāda of this vs. and the last of vs. 1, but with different grammatical identities: gen. sg. in 1d, acc. pl. here. This difference may be one indication that this pragātha both responds to the rest of the hymn and distances itself from it.

mahāadhané is repeated from 4c.

VI.46.14: While vs. 13 has a relatively perspicuous structure -- a single transitive *yád* clause whose final pāda is a simile matching the acc. direct object -- vs. 14 is a structural mess. Its first pāda is another simile in the acc. matching the direct object of vs. 13; it is followed by a *yádi* (or **yád ī*, see below) clause (b), which may or may not contain a verb, followed by a rel. cl. (cd) introduced by *yé*, containing another simile referring to the same direct object but now in the nom. By now the original referent is quite distant, and it is not entirely clear which parts belong to the simile, which to the frame.

Pāda b is esp. problematic, mostly because of the ambiguity of the phrase *ānu śvāni*, in which *śvāni* has been identified variously as a noun or as a verb. The preponderance of opinion favors the former: Whitney (§390b, though see Roots, where he lists it, with ?, as an aor.), Gr (though he allows for the other poss.), Ge, Lub. On the other hand, Old, flg. BR, considers it a verb form, a passive aorist. Wackernagel (AiG III.23) is uncertain. The noun-faction is further divided by what stem they assign it to: neut. *-i*-stem (Gr, Lub), root noun in *-an-* (Wh, and presumably Ge, since he tr. it as a loc. “im Getöse”). If it is a noun (‘sound’, vel sim.), a verb needs to be supplied with *ānu*, but this of course would pose no problem. I am always reluctant to oppose Old, and in this particular case there is strong objective evidence that he is correct, namely the close sandhi effect that retroflexes *ṣ* after *ānu*. A collection of all *s*-forms after *ānu* produces remarkably clear-cut results: *ānu* only retroflexes following verb forms, never nominal forms. Although it may seem overkill to list all the examples, the collection may be useful for other purposes:

ānu + VERB: I.167.10 [=182.8, III.39.8] *ānu śyāt*, I.185.4 *ānu śyāma*, V.73.4 *ānu śtāve*, VIII.3.8 *ānu śtuvanti*. There is only one verbal form without retroflexion: IV.4.2 *ānu sprśa*.

ānu + NOMINAL (etc.): I.33.11 [=I.88.6, 176.2, III.51.11, IV.33.6, 52.6, VII.56.13, VIII.88.5] *ānu svadhām*, I.80.1 (etc.) *ānu svarājyam*, I.121.3 *ānu svajām*, I.134.1 *ānu sūnītā*, I.191.15 *ānu samvataḥ*, III.7.6 [=V.59.1, IX.63.6] *ānu svām*, III.33.3 *ānu samcārantī*, III.35.8 *ānu svāḥ*, IV.40.4 *ānu samtāvīvat*, IV.45.6 *ānu svadhāyā*, V.32.10 *ānu svadhāvne*, V.34.1 *ānu svadhāmitā*, VI.25.8 *ānu sāho*, VII.7.2 [X.14.2] *ānu svāḥ*,

VII.31.7 *ánu svadhāvarī*, VIII.4.8 *ánu spighyām*, VIII.6.38 *ánu suvānāsa*, IX.103.5 *ánu svadhāḥ*, X.17.11 *ánu saṃcārantam*, X.17.11 *ánu saptá*, X.56.3 *ánu satyā*, X.103.6 *ánu sám*.

Among the nominals it is striking how many begin with *sv-* as in our case.

I can see only one possible conclusion, that Old must be right, this is a 3rd sg. passive (or rather, intransitive) aor., and we need to supply a subject. Old suggests chariot, which seems reasonable. As he points out, the RV has a bahuvrīhi *svanád-ratha-* lit. ‘having a sounding chariot’ (though prob. used as a PN), and a chariot sounding “following the roar (of the horses)” makes sense. II.4.6 *vāṛ nā pathā ráthyeva svānīt* “like water along a path, like chariot (wheels) he has sounded” provides a parallel not only for the sounding chariot, but also for the rushing, sounding rivers in the simile of pāda a.

A few other loose ends in pāda b: I interpr. *yádi* as **yád ī* “when it,” with shortening of *ī* before the cluster *kl*. A condition ‘if’ doesn’t make sense. As for that cluster, *klóśa-* is the only *-l*-form to *√kruś* ‘cry out’. Is this racetrack slang?

Pāda c compares the steeds circling the race course to birds (of prey) circling over the raw flesh of a dead animal (a striking image). Ge considers the loc. *gávi* to be the correspondent of *āmiśi* in the simile: the cow is the prize over which the horses circle (“die wie die Vögel um das Aas, so um die Kuh(herde) kreisen”). The publ. tr. by contrast takes *gávi* as a piece of horse tack, the reins or something else made of leather, and construes it with *grbhītāḥ*. I now favor Ge’s interpr., which is more striking and which also conforms to the loc. of the stake found several times in this hymn. I would amend the tr. to “who, like birds over raw flesh, keep circling (the race course) over the bovine (prize), being held firm in your two arms ...”

VI.47 Indra

VI.47.1–5: As indicated in the publ. intro., the first 5 vss. of the hymn constitute a praise of soma, shading, towards the end, into simultaneous praise of Indra. It is formally unified: beginning with vs. 2, all but one (2cd) of the hemistichs begins with *ayám*, and vs. 1 contains four exx. of *ayám* as well (2 each in the 1st 2 pādas), though oddly positioned.

VI.47.1: Although this vs. is quite straightforward in general, it has some peculiarities. To begin with, the four nominal clauses with *ayám* in the first hemistich are all in the unusual order X *ayám*, which is reversed (/repaired) in the four subsequent vss. See esp. the opening of 1a *svādúṣ kīlāyám* corrected to the more standard 2a *ayám svādúḥ*. I have no idea what motivated the X *ayám* order.

It is not clear to me whether the four clauses name four different types/preparations of soma or all four refer to a single soma (or, in some way, both: all soma drinks, no matter how prepared, are in essence one).

Note also the particle *kīla*, which is rare in the RV, esp. outside of X: only 5 of the 12 occurrences are not in X, and 2 of them are in this vs.

I am also puzzled by the accent on *asyá* in c. Since the soma is amply referred to earlier in the vs., we would expect unaccented *asya* (cf., e.g., *papivāṃś índro asya* V.29.3, 30.11). I have no explanation, and it seems not to have bothered any other commentator.

VI.47.2: This vs. chains rel. clauses, with the gen. rel. *yásya* in b referring to the soma in a, while nom. *yáh* in cd refers to Indra, who first appears in the rel. cl. of b.

It is difficult (though perhaps not impossible) to construe *ví ... hán* ‘smash apart’ with the acc. *cyautnā* ‘exploits’ in c as well as the more likely object *dehyāḥ* ‘walls’ in d. It is therefore best to follow Ge (also Hoffmann, Injunkt. 168) and supply a form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ or the like in c.

VI.47.3–5: As noted in the publ. intro. as well as above, the praise of soma modulates towards praise of Indra in this sequence, starting in the 2nd half of vs. 3. The first half of 3 clearly identifies soma as referent with the ppl. *pītāḥ* ‘when drunk’, but the cosmogonic deeds of 3d and of at least the first half of 4 begin to sound Indraic. We are brought abruptly back to soma in 4d (*sómo dādhāra*), but this almost seems like a trick or a feint to keep us from drifting further. And vs. 5 again sounds Indraic, esp. the final *vṛṣabhó marútvān* “the bull accompanied by the Maruts”: *marútvant-* is overwhelmingly an epithet of Indra. For a similar nearby sequence of vss. that oscillates between soma and Indra (and also uses *ayám* as an organizing word) see VI.44.22–24 and comm. ad loc.

VI.47.3: It is not clear what noun to supply with fem. pl. *urvīḥ*, though something like ‘worlds (so Ge), realms’ makes sense. The same *śad urvīḥ* is found in X.14.16 in unclear context, and as a voc. in X.128.5 *dévīḥ śad urvīḥ* ‘you six broad goddesses’, again with uncertain referent – though I now accept the standard view that these are the six cosmic spaces; see comm. ad locc. Elsewhere *urvīḥ* applies to waters or rivers, but liquid doesn’t seem appropriate here. Perhaps in our vs. it’s evoking a pl. of *prthivī* ‘earth’, with a pun on a different word for ‘broad’, *urú-*, *urvī-*. Note that *prthivī-* occurs in the next vs., dependent on *varimán-* ‘expanse’, which is derivationally related to *urú-*.

VI.47.4: The first hemistich has a repetitive structure inside a chiasmic frame. The opening *ayám sá yāḥ* is balanced by *ayám sáḥ* at the end of b; we might perhaps expect **yó ayám sáḥ* in fact. The single verb *ākṛṇot*, inside this frame, does for both objects, which are responsive: morphologically identical and near-rhyming acc. *varimāṇam ... varṣmāṇam*, each with a dependent gen. belonging to a matched semantic pair, *prthivyāḥ ... divāḥ*.

Pāda c is problematic. It lacks a verb, so it is impossible to know for sure what relations are envisioned among the ill-assorted lexical items; the real-world referents of *pīyūṣam* ‘beestings’ and *tisṣṣu pravátsu* “on/in the three slopes” are uncertain; it is not even clear whether it should be grouped with ab or with d. Ge groups it loosely with d, renders *pīyūṣam* as “Seim” and *tisṣṣu pravátsu* as “in die drei Strömen,” and supplies “hat ... geschaffen” as the verb. I am not sure what he’s trying to convey, and *pravát-* does not straightforwardly mean ‘stream’, but ‘slope’ or ‘plunge’. The publ. tr. takes c with ab, supplying *ākṛṇot* from there, but I am now doubtful about this, in part on the basis of IX.109.6 *divó dhartāsi śukráḥ pīyūṣah* “You, the gleaming beestings, are the supporter of heaven,” where soma is identified as *pīyūṣa-* and identified as an upholder (*dhartár-*), reminiscent of our d *sómo dādhāra*. As for *tisṣṣu pravátsu*, I wonder if this is shorthand for “*pravát-* plus two” as expressed in VII.50.4 *praváto niváta udvátaḥ* “(from) the slope, the depth, and the height”—possibly referring to the three worlds, which all appear in this verse: heaven and earth in ab, the midspace in d. Perhaps the idea is that Soma placed or

supports the distillation of himself, his liquid essence, in all three worlds. If this is so, a form of $\sqrt{dhṛ}$ borrowed from d would work better than $\sqrt{kṛ}$ from ab.

I also now realize that the preterital tr. of *dādhāra* in d, matching that of Ge (“hat ... befestigt”), is wrong, since, as Kü points out, the pf. of $\sqrt{dhṛ}$ is always presential.

Putting this all together, I would alter the tr. of cd to “this one (upholds) his ‘beestings’ in the three “slopes” (=worlds); Soma upholds the broad midspace,” with absolutely no certainty about the rendering of c.

VI.47.5: HvN divide the 2nd hemistich as ... *skāmbhanenód# dīyām*, with *úd* the final of pāda a and *dīyām* distracted and pāda-initial. But this is clearly wrong: *úd* is a preverb in tmesis with *astabhñāt* and should open the pāda, and *dīyām* is rarely if ever distracted. Lub’s division is correct.

As noted above, the 2nd hemistich of this vs. sounds esp. Indraic.

VI.47.6: *rayi-sthāna-* is a bahuvrīhi, lit. ‘having your place/standing in wealth’ vel sim., though the publ. tr. is less awk.

VI.47.7: The vs. is built on variant repetition: ab *prá nah ... , prá nah ... prataram* / c *supāró ati-pārayó* / d *sú-nītiḥ ... vāmá-nītiḥ*.

I have no idea why in the identical sequence *prá + nah*, the first has retroflexed *ṇ* and the latter does not. Both *prá*-s are preverbs in tmesis with 2nd sg. impvs. (*paśya* and *naya*). The only differences are 1) the first *prá* sequence is not initial (being preceded by voc. *índra*), 2) in the second sequence the impv. immediately follows *nah*, while in the first some verbal material intervenes, and 3) in the first *nah* functions as a dat. but in the second as an acc. None of these differences should (as far as I can see) trigger different sandhi effects.

VI.47.9: The vs. contains three phonologically similar splvs., stationed at pāda edge: *#váriṣṭhe ... #váhiṣṭhayoḥ ... / ... váṛṣiṣṭhām#*. This is somewhat reminiscent of the phonological/morphological figure in 4ab *varimāṇam ... varṣmāṇam*, esp. since *váriṣṭhe* and *váṛṣiṣṭhām* belong to the same roots as the two forms in 4.

In b the HvN text should read *śatāvann*. This voc. is variously interpr. (see Old for some reff.), but I follow Ge, and implicitly the Pp., in taking it as (metrically) lengthened **śata-van*, to a -*van*-stem, contra Gr’s *śata-ava(n)t-*, with the pres. part. of \sqrt{av} ‘help’. This *śatā-van-* would be a byform of better attested *śatá-vant-*. It needs to belong to a -*van-* rather than a -*vant-* stem because otherwise the expected voc. would be -*vas*. But we find -*vant-* and -*van-* stems side-by-side, notably in *maghāvan(t)-*. Debrunner (AiG II.2, most clearly p. 904, citing this passage) argues that -*vant-* stems are “sachlich” while -*van-* stems are “persönlich,” which would work for *śatávant-* versus our *śatāvan-*, but not, obviously, for *maghāvan(t)-*.

The tr. of d is disputed. Ge takes *rāyaḥ* as nom. pl. (as it generally is) and the subj. of the sg. verb *tārīt*: “nicht sollen die Reichtümer eines hohen Herren die unseren überbieten.” This requires that the sg. verb take a *masc.* pl. subj. While the neut. pl. + sg. verb construction is fairly rare, but attested and inherited, I do not know of masculine pl. equivalents. Old (ZDMG 54: 170) thinks the incongruity of number is the result of the adjustment to the formulaic nature of *rāyo aryāḥ*, tr. “mögen uns nicht die Kargen den

Reichtum überwinden,” with *aryāḥ* nom. pl. of *arí-* -- in other words a *different* masc. pl. subj. with sg. verb. Thieme (Fremdling, 56–57) makes appropriately short work of both of these proposals, but I find his own solution puzzling: “Möge nicht überholen unsere Reichtümer [der] des Fremdlings.” Since he adamantly rejects the masc. pl. + sg. verb interpr., all I can figure is that he’s generating a *singular* **rayīḥ* to serve as subject (represented by his bracketed [der]), but there is no support for this and it seems an artifice of convenience. No doubt mine does, too: like Thieme I take *rāyaḥ* as acc. pl., as it sometimes is (though *rāyāḥ* would be expected), and for sg. subj. I supply *īṣ-* ‘refreshment’ from the previous pāda. I also interpr. the verb *tārīt* not as hostile ‘overcome’ but as a plain verb of motion ‘cross over to’; cf. usages like *ātāriṣma támasaḥ pāram asyá* “we have crossed over to the far shore of this darkness” (I.92.6 = I.183-84.6, VII.73.1). The point is that the refreshment we’ve begged Indra for should not fall into enemy hands.

As discussed esp. ad IV.48.1 and VI.14.3, 20.1, I take the phrase *rāyo aryāḥ* “riches of the stranger” as referring to manpower.

VI.47.10: For the simile in b, see VI.3.5.

VI.47.11: $\sqrt{hvā}$ is the signature word here.

VI.47.11–13: The first pāda of 12 recasts that of 11: with *sutrāmā* matching *trātāram* and *s^uvāvāṁ āvobhiḥ* matching *avitāram*; 13a then repeats *sutrāmā s^uvāvān*. The connections between 12–13 and neighboring vss. in this hymn make it less likely (at least to me) that they are direct evidence of the Sautrāmaṇī ritual here, instead of being pressed into service of that ritual later. See publ. intro.

VI.47.12: In addition to the repetition just described, 12b *sumṛīkó bhavatu* is a variant of 10a *mṛlā*, and *ābhayaṁ kṛṇotu* reminds us of 8ab *ānu neṣi ... ābhayaṁ*.

VI.47.14: The long vowel of *urū* is puzzling. Since it appears in the simile *urū ná rādhaḥ*, it should be neut. sg. *urū*, and acdg. to Gr and AiG III.145 (with reff.) it is, with metrical lengthening. By contrast, Lub identifies it as a nom. pl. Since the frame corresponding to this simile is neut. pl. *sāvanāni purūni*, I also prefer neut. pl.; it may show attraction to the number of the frame: “the many pressings are broad like your bounty.”

As Ge (n. 14d) cleverly points out, the waters, cows, and drops are the three ingredients of soma.

VI.47.15–18: As noted in the publ. intro., this section, which concerns Indra’s fickle attentions to various clients in turn, is marked grammatically by *āmreḍitas* and intensives (i.e., iterative/frequentatives), expressing the constantly shifting nature of the actions and their objects. See the publ. intro. for the continuity of content I see in this section.

VI.47.15: Ge renders d exactly opposite to the publ. tr.: “so macht er den Vorderen zum Hintermann” (fld. by Klein, “āmreḍitas”: “he makes the one at the fore into one who lags behind”). But the simile in c is about walking one step at a time (“putting his two feet down one after the other”), and unless Indra is walking backwards my interpr. must be

correct. It's true that *pūrvam* 'in front' precedes *āparam* 'behind' in the text, but word order is scarcely a reliable guide in the RV, esp. since in nominal sentences we often get PREDICATE SUBJECT order. (Furthermore, there's a sort of iconic ordering of the two adjectives, with *pūrva-* first, which can be independent of the larger sense.)

VI.47.16: In d *viśaḥ ... manuṣyān* do not match in gender. Old suggests that the latter might be gen. pl., and Ge's tr. as such: "die Stämme der Menschen." I see no reason not to take it as the acc. pl. it appears to be, as a parallel obj. to *viśaḥ*, not a modifier.

VI.47.17: The *pūrva-āpara-* binary returns from 15, but here I think it not only refers to those ahead and behind positionally (as there), but also has a temporal sense (not represented in the publ. tr.): his previous allies in pāda a he dumps in favor of newer ones in b.

The hapax *ānānubhūtīḥ* is not entirely clear, but two things must be kept in mind: 1) it's a fem. pl., presumably acc.; 2) its sense must be derived from *ānu √ bhū*, which generally means 'come close to, give way to'. Because of 1), it should modify *śarādaḥ* 'autumns', a fem. cons. stem (so Ge). But Ge's rendering "dass sie an ihm nicht wahrgenommen werden" seems distant in sense from the verbal lexeme; Old's "(alles) Sichnichtanschliessen ..." seems closer. I take the cmpd as a bahuvrīhi meaning 'having no intimacy' and interpr. it as proleptic in an expression of purpose: Indra shakes off the years *so that* they do not come close/attach themselves to him. (Ge's "dass sie ... nicht ..." has the same proleptic purpose interpr.) The point is that one can't get old if one keeps the years at a distance; my "close in" is meant to capture the slangy tone of the passage (see also "double-cross" in b).

VI.47.18: This vs. concerns Indra's shape-shifting propensity, enabled by his *māyā-*. It is a slightly more complex formulation of III.53.8 *rūpām-rūpam maghāvā bobhavīti, māyāḥ kṛṇvānās tanvām pāri svām* "Form after form the bounteous one assumes, wrapping his own body in tricks." Although *prātirūpo babhūva* should lit. mean "he has become one having a form corresponding ...," this seemed awkward.

Ge thinks the form in b is Indra's *true* form, to be recognized behind the various disguises in pāda a; by contrast, I think each form Indra assumes is meant for display and none of them is the "real" one. *prāti √ cakṣ* is the lexeme used for the display of the girl at the svayamvara; see its use with Dawn in I.113.11 and 124.8. Each constituency is shown a different form—hence the āmreḍita *rūpām-rūpam* in a and the thousand horses in d, which presumably take each different form of Indra in a different direction.

VI.47.19: This vs. makes a small ring with vs. 15, both containing *kāḥ* + SUBJUNCTIVE. The fact that this vs. is in a different meter (Bṛhatī, not Triṣṭubh) from the whole hymn that precedes it may also signal the end of a section. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this vs. is meant as reassurance: in contrast to the endlessly multiplying Indra of vs. 18 (and the fickle Indra of the previous vss.), Tvaṣṭar has now taken control, yoking only a single team (for Indra's journey, in my opinion) and exerting his dominion over forms, thus reining in Indra's excess shape-shifting. Although the word *rūpā-* does not appear in the vs., it can be easily supplied with *bhūri* on the basis of Tvaṣṭar's well-known role as

shaper of forms (cf. Macd., Ved. Myth. 116, and passages like I.188.9, VIII.10.28, X.100.9, 184.1).

The 2nd hemistich poses a rhetorical question about Indra (unnamed): why would Indra stick by the enemy when our sacrifice is so appealing? We are essentially urging him to switch sides again, and since he does so frequently, we have hope of succeeding.

Assuming that *pákṣa* in sandhi represents *pákṣaḥ* (so Pp), it belongs to a neut. *s*-stem found only here in the RV, but attested in AV and elsewhere. This requires us to allow an acc. with $\sqrt{ās}$ ‘sit’, rather than the usual loc. There is no warrant to emend the accent to **pakṣá* and take it as a loc. to the *-á*-stem.

Pāda d constitutes a loc. abs., with the part. *āsīna-* used pregnantly for ‘sitting (a sattra)’. The introductory *utá* is curious, since there is nothing it can conventionally conjoin. Klein (DGRV 45–56) classifies it with the unclassifiable residue of *utá* forms, tr. it ‘especially’. The publ. tr. follows this tack. However, I think we can derive it from the standard uses of *utá* ‘and’. English has an idiom in which ‘and’ is used to add as an afterthought what the speaker considers the clinching, but somewhat off-topic, circumstantial argument -- as in a sequence like “why would he break up with her now-- and with her just graduated?”

VI.47.20: The pres. part. *satī* in b is concessive, while *saté* in the same position in d is not.

VI.47.21: My tr. differs conceptually and syntactically from Ge’s, also, to a lesser degree, from Schmidt’s (B+I 83). Ge thinks the obj. *sadṛśīḥ ... kṛṣṇāḥ ... jāḥ* refers to the nights (“die ... gleichen (Nächte), die schwarzen Kinder”) and that *anyām árdham* “the other side” is the goal to which Indra drove the nights. Acdg. to him, this is a different image of the singer’s “Not” -- the first narrowness, the second unbroken night. I find the supposed change of topic, from the tight place in which we found ourselves in vs. 20, unlikely; instead I consider this vs. a continuation of vs. 20, in which Indra drives away the enemy, as often described as black or dark, that implicitly hemmed us in, a view shared by Schmidt. However, the latter agrees with Ge in taking *anyām árdham* as a goal, “Täglich vertrieb er die gleichen schwarzen Kinder von ihrem Sitz an die andere (Welt-)Hälfte,” whereas I consider it a characterization of the enemy and so in apposition to *sadṛśīḥ ... kṛṣṇāḥ ... jāḥ*, the phrase into which it’s interleaved. The “other half” would be the alternately favored and disfavored sides in vss. 15–18, as well as the “side of the hostile” (*dviṣatāḥ pákṣaḥ*) of 19c.

HvN disassemble the sandhi across cd as *vasnayánta*, but this dual must have a long final; so Pp.

The part. *vasnayántā* is a hapax, but related to *vasná-* ‘price’, *vásnya-* ‘to be sold, up for sale’. It modifies the two enemies of Indra, Varcin and Śambara, of whom we know little beyond Indra’s enmity towards them. The denom. *vasna-yá-* is therefore interpretable in a number of ways. Gr takes it as ‘feilschen’ (haggle), while Ge tr. ‘Lösegeld fordern’ (demand ransom), calling the two enemies Raubritter (robber barons) in his intro. (p. 144). EWA posts both tr., though they do not seem at all equivalent to me. Schmidt returns to Gr’s feilschen. I add yet another possibility -- ‘mercenaries’ -- on the basis of a literal rendering of normal denom. semantics ‘seek X’, hence ‘seek a price’. But given the state of our ignorance about these two foes, no interpr. is secure (though I

very much doubt that the two were ‘haggling’ with Indra when he picked up his vajra). We should note that in the next vs. (22c), we accept “the goods belonging to Śambara” (*śāmbarām vāsu*), which may refer to Śambara’s *vasnā-* in 21, though not in a way that disambiguates it.

Gr takes *udāvraje* as a PN, Ge as a place name. My tr. follows Schmidt’s interpr. (83–84) as a bahuvrīhi ‘dessen Hürde das Wasser ist’, as a description of a mountain surrounded (or semi-surrounded) by a body of water.

VI.47.22: *kóśayī-* is a hapax; its difference, if any, from well-attested *kóśa-*, which also appears in the following vs., in the same number of ‘ten’, can’t be determined.

VI.47.25: The verb *abhy āyaṣṭa* is problematic, at least in my view. It is supposed to be the 3rd sg. mid. root aor. to \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice’. The form is morphologically impeccable, but 1) *abhí-* is not found with \sqrt{yaj} anywhere else in the RV, or indeed in Vedic; 2) for \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice to’ to take an acc. of humans, rather than the standard gods, is skirting blasphemy. In this passage it is said to mean ‘honor’, but it is hard to see how the ubiquitous root \sqrt{yaj} could be so bleached, nor why the addition of the preverb *abhí-* would effect this change. The publ. tr. “has reached towards” reflects a different analysis. I suggest that it actually belongs to the root aor. of $\sqrt{(n)aś}$ ‘reach, attain’, which does appear fairly regularly with *abhí-*. A putative injunc. in this lexeme, **abh(ī)y aṣṭa*, could have produced a segmentation **abhí-yaṣṭa*, and in turn an augmented form *abhí āyaṣṭa* could have been generated to it. The sense of the passage might be similar to the current (annoying) English idiom “reach out to,” meaning “proactively contact in a positive way,” and refer to the Sārñjaya’s transfer of goods to the Bharadvāja poets. However, I recognize that it is generally preferable not to posit such a morphological misunderstanding and reformation, and also that my semantic substitution isn’t altogether compelling. MLW suggests an alternative etymology, connecting it to *yáśas-* ‘glory’, etc. and taking it as a med. root formation meaning ‘made famous, ennobled, glorified’. Both the morphology and the root semantics would work, though I am somewhat skeptical that a middle formation of that sort would have transitive-factitive sense.

VI.47.26–31: These vss. are repeated in the Aśvamedha section of several early Vedic ritual texts, directly after the 1st 14 vss. of the weapon hymn VI.75 (e.g., VS XXIX.52–57, TS IV.6.6).

VI.47.26: Because of the *hí*, I have made *ab* the causal foundation for the beginning of *c*. If we are willing to allow *hí* to be some kind of unspecified emphatic, the clauses can be disjoined, with the first hemistich simply “you should become ...”

As in the matching sequence ... *pratāraṇaḥ suvīraḥ* in I.91.19, ‘lifetime’ could be supplied as the implicit obj. of *pratāraṇaḥ*.

VI.47.27: The awkward ‘strongness’ in English tr. is meant to represent the difference between *ójas-* ‘strength’ in pāda *a*, the standard nominal abstract to this root, and *ojmán-*, found only here in the RV, though attested in subsequent Vedic texts.

Although the ref. to the chariot in vs. 26 is hardly transparent, in *this* vs. it has become a barely solvable riddle. In particular, “the strongness of the waters enclosed by

cows” (*apām ojmānam pári góbbhir āvṛtam*) could not be interpr. without 26a, c: the “strongness of the waters” is presumably the tree (*vānas-pāti-* in 26a, 27b), or rather the wood of the tree -- so called because plants grow only when watered. “Enclosed by cows” recalls 26c “knotted together with cows’ (hide)” (*góbhiḥ sāmṇaddhaḥ*), referring to the leather that binds the wooden parts.

VI.47.28: Why the chariot is all the things it’s implicitly identified with in ab is not entirely clear: it is the mace of Indra presumably because it performs similar assaults, and the face of the Maruts presumably because its front is as glittery and fast-moving as they are. But the Mitra and Varuṇa identifications elude me.

VI.47.31: Ge explains pāda a persuasively as “Raub und Wiederraub der Kühe,” with the ‘yonder ones’ (*amūḥ*) those belonging to the enemy and the ones here (*imāḥ*) our own.

I do not understand why *cāranti* is accented. Ge takes it as implicitly subordinated (“Wenn ... sich sammeln”), which would account for the accent, but there’s no other evidence for subordination. It could be ascribed to the vague principle that the verb is accented in a clause that provides the basis for the next clause, as Old suggests only to question (ZDMG 60: 725 n. 1 = KISch. p. 200).

VI.48 Agni and Maruts

Renou treats this hymn in EVP XV (142–46).

VI.48.1: I take the two pādas of the first hemistich as entirely parallel, with an instr. āmreḍita followed by a dat. of benefit/purpose. Others (Ge, Re, Klein [āmreḍitas]) instead interpr. *dākṣase* as a infinitive or quasi-infinitive.

The 2nd hemistich has disharmony of number between the expressed subject, pl. *vayām*, and the 1st sg. verb *śamsiṣam*, a rare but not unheard-of phenomenon. Here we can link it to the āmreḍitas that dominate the vs., esp. the doubled preverb *prá-pra*, in tmesis from the finite *śamsiṣam*. Perhaps this serves as a sort of individuating feature: “I after I ...,” that is, “we.” This cannot be conveyed in Engl., though I admit that the publ. tr. “we — that is, I —” is itself barely English.

VI.48.2: The first hemistich of this vs. is problematic. First, the acc. phrase *ūrjó nāpātam* referring to Agni should be (and indeed must be) the obj. of *dāśema* ‘we would ritually serve’, but this DIR.OBJ + VERB sequence is interrupted by a parenthetical nominal clause apparently referring to Agni in the nominative (*sá ... ayām*). Further, the make-up of the complex *hināyām* is much discussed. As it happens, I devoted a brief article to just this expression (“RV *sá hināyām* (VI.48.2) with a Return Visit to *nāyām* and *nānā*,” Fs. H. H. Hock, 2013). There I suggest that the proper segmentation is **hí nā ayām*, with the particle *hí*, which has lost its accent in the confusion, the nom. sg. *nā* to *nár-* ‘man’, a form otherwise not found independently until the Amarakośa, extracted from the old āmreḍita *nā-nā* ‘man after man’, used adverbially to mean ‘every man for himself, on his own’, plus the near deictic *ayām*. Alternative views are discussed in the art. cit.

VI.48.3: The second hemistich has two alliterative etymological figures: c *śocīṣā śósucac chuce* and d *sudūtībhīḥ sū dīdihi*. The second is esp. nice, with *su-* ‘good’ as the first cmpd. member echoed by *sū* the independent particle.

VI.48.4: Pāda a juxtaposes two 2nd sg. forms of √*yaj*, the indic. pres. *yājasi* and the -si-impv. *yākṣi*, in separate clauses. This juxtaposition presumably accounts for the accent on *yājasi*.

In d the obj. must be *vājā*, extracted from *vājotā*. Grammatically this should be a dual, but a dual is semantically unlikely (Old “Dual *vājā* ist gewiss nicht anzunehmen”). Best to take it as a pseudo-/nonce neut. pl. For the phrase cf. (as Ge does) I.48.11 *vājām hī vāmṣva*; on this basis it is likely that *vājā* is obj. of both *rāṣva* and *vāmṣva*, although the position of *utā* associates it esp. with *rāṣva*.

VI.48.5: Because of the context, which contains other landscape features, I now think *ādrayaḥ* here might be better tr. ‘mountains’, at least as an alternative.

On *pīprati* as ‘carry to term’, a specialization of ‘carry to the far shore’, see comm. ad I.156.3, also in a birth context. Most take it as belonging to ‘fill’ (Gr, Re), while Ge tr. ‘nähren’ and considers it a blend of the two roots √*pṛ* (n. 5ab). Rather than assigning it to ‘fill’, I prefer to think that it participates in a word play with *papraú* ‘has filled’ in the next vs. (6a).

VI.48.9: Although *ūtyā* could be taken with the impv., the instr. of *ūtī-* has a robust relationship with *citrā-* elsewhere (e.g. I.172.1, II.17.8, IV.23.2, VI.10.5, VI.26.5).

vidā in the Saṃhitā text can represent either a lengthened form of the impv. *vida* or a subj. *vidāḥ* (so Pp., also Gr, Lub). Both Ge and Re tr. as an impv. (as do I), which fits the imperatival tone of the hymn better than a subjunctive.; see esp. parallel *codaya* in b. Although neither Gr nor Lub gives other imperatives to this stem, most of the forms analyzed as *vidāḥ* are better taken as imperatives like this one (e.g., I.36.14, 71.7, VIII.61.7).

The particle *tú*, which ordinarily takes standard 2nd position, is out of place here. The same sequence, *tucé tú naḥ*, is also found in VIII.27.14, where it is also out of place. I have no explanation.

VI.48.10: *pārṣi ... partībhīḥ* “deliver to the further shore with deliverers” both continues the ‘ford’ motif of the last vs. and picks up the same verb in 5b, where it has more restricted semantics.

Pādas b and c contain two different forms of √*yu* ‘keep away’: the negated adj. *āprayutvan-* lit. ‘not distant / absent, not inattentive’ and the impv. *yuyodhi*.

Note the chiasmic figure *hélāṃsi daívyā ... [á]devāni hvārāṃsi ca*. The inner terms, *daívyā ... ádevāni*, are of course etymologically related, but, though both neut. pl. *a*-stems, have different endings; the outer terms, *hélāṃsi ... hvārāṃsi* are paired only by their initial *h-* and their neut. pl. *s*-stem ending *-āṃsi*. The *ca* is of course misplaced: we would expect **ádevāni ca hvārāṃsi*. Klein (DGRV I.53) says that *ádevāni hvārāṃsi* “is treated as an indivisible unit, and *ca* is therefore displaced to third position,” but this is a description, not an explanation. I would suggest that the poet didn’t want to interrupt his

pretty chiasmus. (The placement of *ca* also enables an iambic finish to the pāda, whereas the expected order would not, but I doubt if this is the major reason.)

VI.48.11–13: On these three vss., see publ. intro.

VI.48.11: On *návyasā vácaḥ* # see comm. ad VIII.39.2, I.26.2.

VI.48.12: The publ. tr. renders *dhúkṣata* as if it were a subjunctive (“will milk out”; sim. Ge) to an *s*-aor., but the form must be an injunctive to a *sa*-aor., given the augmented forms *ádhuḥṣata*, etc., and the sec. ending *-ta*. Of course, the injunc. could be used modally, but a presential “who milks out” might be better.

VI.48.13: With Ge I take *dhukṣata*, identical save for the accent to *dhúkṣata* in 12b, as a 2nd pl. act. impv., not a 3rd sg. mid. injunc. In a n. (13a) Ge allows the possibility of the latter analysis, which would produce the paradox that a cow is milking a cow. Re opts for this latter analysis -- the cow milking herself. Although I am always quick to see paradox in the RV, in this case I think the poet is playing with morphology instead, while bringing the final vs. of this 3-vs. sequence back to the 2nd pl. impvs. of vs. 11.

Note the direct object in balanced coordination, NOUN *ca* ADJ / NOUN *ca* ADJ, with both *ca*-s properly positioned (unlike 10cd above) and with each bahuvrīhi epithet having the shape *viśvá-CoCasam*.

VI.48.14–19: On these Pūṣan vss., see publ. intro.

VI.48.14: Despite the change in topic, *srprá-bhojasam* (a) responds to *viśvá-bhojasam*, which ends the previous vs. (13c).

The enclitic *vaḥ* in Wackernagel’s position in pāda a must wait for the verb *stuṣe* towards the end of d to find its syntactic niche. It refers, as usual, to the fellow priests on whose behalf the poet will praise the god. Ge’s “Diesen euren (Gott)” (sim. Re), attempting to find a function for it within the first pāda, is unnecessary.

This vs. contains four gods to whom Pūṣan is compared and four adjectives. It is therefore not surprising that both Ge and Re distribute one adjective per god. My tr. differs: it honors the pāda boundary between c and d, which sequesters the two-adjective sequence *mandráṃ srprábhojasam* in the pāda with Aryaman, leaving Viṣṇu shorn of any epithet. This decision wasn’t made only on the basis of the pāda boundary (which would be weak evidence), but also because *srprá-bhojas-* ‘providing lush nourishment’ is an adjective more appropriate to the hospitable Aryaman than to Viṣṇu. See Thieme, *Fremdling* 105, 143; M+A 83. By contrast, Viṣṇu and Pūṣan are often mentioned next to each other, almost as if interchangeable (e.g. VI.17.11, VIII.54.5, with the pāda-opening *pūṣā viṣṇuḥ*) and without descriptors.

The final infinitival *ādiśe* can be taken in a number of ways: Ge (fld. by Scar 221–22) rather whimsically as “um (ihm) einen Wink zu geben,” while Re instead gives “pour attirer-son-attention.” I do not think it can be separated from the two forms of *ā√diś* (including vs.-final *ādiśe* as here) in the nearby Pūṣan hymn VI.56.1. In that vs. I take the lexeme as meaning ‘designate (X as Y=epithet)’, and I think something similar is meant

here: by giving Pūṣan attributes and identifying him with various gods I've uniquely identified him.

VI.48.15: This vs. not only continues the identification of Pūṣan with other gods -- here the Maruts, characterized by three different descriptors -- but is syntactically dependent on the previous vs. and its verb *stuṣe*. It also contains the first mention of Pūṣan himself (pāda b), at the end of the series of identifications.

The three adjectives, *tveṣām*, *tuviṣvāṇi*, and *anarvāṇam*, must qualify both the *śārdhah* 'troop' of the Maruts, a neut. acc. *s*-stem, in the simile, and *pūṣāṇam*, a masc. acc. *-n*-stem, in the frame. They seem to split the difference with regard to gender: *tveṣām* is of course ambiguous as to gender, but *tuviṣvāṇi* is neut. and *anarvāṇam* masc. The latter is adjacent to masc. *pūṣāṇam* and separated by the pāda boundary from the neut. phrase, so it is not surprising that it would adopt a masc. form. Moreover, a proper neut. acc. to this stem would be **anarvā*, which almost fatally obscures the 2nd member of the bahuvrīhi. The same substitution of masc. acc. *anarvāṇam* for expected neut. **anarvā* is found with the very same neut. acc. referent *śārdho mārutam* in I.37.1; cf. comm. there. The expected neut. NA presumably underlies the them. adj. *anarvā*-; see comm. ad I.185.3. Ge's and Re's strategy of taking *anarvāṇam* as only modifying Pūṣan (e.g., Ge "den unerreichten Pūṣan, der ...") is thus both unnecessary and probably wrong, given its application (not in a simile) to the Marut troop in I.37.1.

VI.48.16: The little nominal clause *aghā aryó ārātayaḥ* with its unremarkable sentiment ("evil are the hostilities of the stranger") may have been a popular saying, as it's found in the same form nearby in VI.59.8, an Indra-Agni hymn. It is not clear to me why Pūṣan would care or why the speaker seems to impart it as a secret.

VI.48.17: This vs. seems to continue the poet's direct speech to Pūṣan, and if it is meant to be a secret, it will remain so: as noted in the publ. intro. the vs. is close to unintelligible. My interpr. differs markedly from those of others (or rather, from that of others: Re and Klein [DGRV I.289] basically follow Ge; Old, however, differs from them in cd, suggesting several other alternatives, none of which he stands behind).

The first pāda is deceptively straightforward, at least syntactically. It is a prohibition against uprooting a particular kind of tree. The tree name, however, is a hapax, with un-Ārya phonology (*kākambīra*- with plain *b*), and why this tree should be left in the ground is unsaid. As for the word, it's possible that it's a partial scrambling of Pūṣan's epithet *karambhāḍ*- 'gruel-eater' (VI.56.1), but even if so, it doesn't get us anywhere.

The next pāda shows some word-order disturbances that cause me to interpret it differently from the standard and in fact to make a small emendation to the text. The text as transmitted reads *āsastīr ví hí nīnaśaḥ*, with, apparently, a preverb in tmesis in 2nd position (*vi*) and the particle *hí* in 3rd position. Both of these would be quite unusual, though it must be admitted that in this kind of informal speech we might expect deviations from normal order. The *hí* also suggests that the pāda offers the causal grounds for either the preceding clause or the following one. Ge and Re choose the former option, but I don't see how pāda a follows from pāda b as rendered by them, at least given our ignorance of the significance of the Kākambīra tree. To address the word-order problems

I suggest that instead of *ví hí* we read **vihí*, the 2nd sg. impv. to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’. (An asterisk should be inserted in the publ. tr. before ‘pursue’.) Although this impv. is more often *vīhí* with long root vowel (as in nearby VI.50.2), there are several exx. with short root vowel (e.g., III.21.5, where the short vowel is metrically favored and perhaps guaranteed).

Given the obscurity of this vs., it would not be surprising if the puzzled redactors split the syllables and endowed *ví* with an accent as if it were a preverb. If my reading is accepted, we have either a sort of serial verb construction: “come on (and) destroy,” or simply a chronological series: “pursue and destroy.” The latter is reflected in the publ. tr. By my interpr. the redupl. aor. *nīnaśaḥ* is accented because it starts a new clause. Unfortunately I cannot explain why we have a redupl. aor. injunc. rather than a caus. impv. (**nāśāya*) following the first impv.

My interpr. of the 2nd hemistich diverges from the standard even more, taking Klein’s tr. (DGRV I.289) to stand also for Ge’s and Re’s: “And may the sun not (shine) for even a day for the one who grasps the neck of the bird.” We all agree that *mótá* stands for *mā + utá*, with *utá* conjoining the two prohibitive particles in a and c. Beyond this, anyone confronting this hemistich must deal with several textual problems: 1) the meter of c is disturbed; in fact Old calls it “hoffnungslos”; 2) it is difficult to decide what underlies the transmitted sequence *áha evā*, the Pp. takes *áha* as *áhar*, but, needless to say, this sandhi would be unusual; 3) *evā* with long final is almost always pāda- or clause-initial, as opposed to generally 2nd-position *evá* (see Lub s.vv.). In fact, in Minkowski’s detailed treatment of the two forms (JAOS 115.3 [1995]: 388–400) this particular passage is “the only one possible counterexample” (p. 391) to this rule of placement. (With Old, Minkowski floats the possibility that two syllables are missing after *áha*, producing an 8-syll. pāda, with *evā caná* then pāda-initial in a 12-syll. one. Since it is impossible to know what those missing 2 syllables might have been and since, all things being equal, we’d prefer a Satobṛhatī vs. [see publ. intro.], which would have 12 8, not 8 12, as its 2nd half, I will deal with the text we have.) In addition to these formal problems, there are a few crucial lexical ambiguities: 1) *sūrah* can be nom. sg. of the thematic stem *sūra-* or gen./abl. sg. of the athem. stem *svār-*; 2) as noted above, the underlying form of *áha* is unclear: does it belong somehow to the ‘day’ word (*áhar*, *áhan-*) or is it the asserverative particle *áha*? 3) *vēh*, which should be read as a disyllable, can be a case forms of the ‘bird’ word (*ví-*), either nom. or gen./abl. sg., or a verb form to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’. The standard interpr. presented above chooses the first of each of those lexical alternatives; in all instances I choose the 2nd.

The standard tr., with ‘sun’ as subject, supplies ‘shine’ as the verb; no justification is given by anyone who so interprets it (as far as I’ve been able to find). My interpr. attempts to find some clues in context. There are a few; whether they are false trails or not I cannot be certain. The first is the verb of pāda a, which is presented as parallel to pāda c by the *mā ... móta* construction. The verb is *úd √ vṛh* ‘tear up’. Various forms of $\sqrt{vṛh}$ are found in the often puzzling “wheel of the sun” myth, describing the ripping off of this wheel. Cf. I.130.9 *sūraś cakráṃ prá vṛhat ...*; I.174.5 *prá sūraś cakráṃ vṛhatād abhīke* [=IV.16.2]; V.29.10 *prānyác cakráṃ avṛhaḥ sūryasya*. In two of these three passages the gen. sg. of ‘sun’ is *sūrah*. Although this is slender evidence, it is, at least, evidence (as opposed to the random fantasy of the standard tr.), and I therefore borrow the verb $\sqrt{vṛh}$ from pāda a and supply ‘wheel’ as its obj., with a dependent gen. *sūrah*. This is supported by a nearby passage in a Pūṣan hymn, VI.56.3 *utádāḥ paruṣé gávi, sūraś*

cakráṃ hiranyāyam / ny aīrayad rathītamaḥ “And yonder golden wheel of the Sun he set down in the ‘gray cow’ -- he the best charioteer.” (This is the same hymn that contains the form *ādiśe* disc. above ad vs. 14.) It is not at all clear what story that passage is telling, but we *can* see that Pūṣan, who is our addressee here, changes the placement of a detached “wheel of the sun,” with the sun-genitive *sūrah* as here. The detachment might result from tearing the wheel off the chariot of the sun. This chain of reasoning accounts for my tr. of the first part of pāda c: “And certainly don’t (tear off the wheel) of the sun.” I am taking *āha* as the particle, not a form of ‘day’ (though ‘day’ could be worked into that tr.). Of course this interpr. does not solve the sandhi problem: we should expect *āhaivā*. But if a new clause begins with *evā*, as I think it does, the unusual sandhi break would be more understandable.

Starting a new clause solves the problem of non-initial *evā* noted above. But what is the content of the clause? Like the standard tr., I take *ādādhate* as a dat. sg. pres. act. participle, with *grīvāḥ* ‘necks’ as object. However, I do not think this refers to the neck(s) of a/the bird. Instead, as noted above, I take *véḥ* as a verb form to $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$, given my emendation in pāda b to **vihí*, *véḥ* to the same root would follow naturally (or as naturally as we’re going to get in this vs.). Given its disyllabic reading, I take it as standing for **váyas*, the 2nd sg. subjunctive to the root present. I’m assuming that Pūṣan wants to give chase to (or at least follow) whoever does whatever he’s doing to the necks, and if he (Pūṣan) tears off the wheel of the sun, he won’t be able to. As for *grīvāḥ* $\sqrt{dhā}$, I conjecture that this describes one action in the harnessing of horses to the chariot. Note $\sqrt{dhā}$ in VII.34.4 *ā dhūrṣú asmai dādhātāśvān* “Put the horses to the chariot poles for him,” and recall that the horse Dadhikrā is “bound at the neck” (*grīvāyām baddhāḥ*) in IV.40.4. But the “place necks” phrase is open to multiple possibilities, none of which imposes itself.

There are a couple of grammatical loose ends in this extremely loosely constructed interpr.: 1) dative complements are rare to $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$, 2) *véḥ* is accented, though there’s no obvious trigger for the accent. It may be that it borrowed the accent from my putative **vihí*, or that the implied causal dependency of the *evā* clause (thus my “for thus never ...”) induced it. Or that the redactors had no idea what this meant (a mental confusion we share) and took it as a form of ‘bird’.

To lay out my reasoning in detail is, I realize, not necessarily to convince -- but at least there *is* reasoning every step of the way. I challenge other interpr. to provide the same!

VI.48.18: Ge and Re take the comparison to be between the partnership and the leather bag (e.g., Ge “Deine ... Freundschaft soll sein wie der ... Schlauch”), but the partnership is in the nom. (*sakhyām*) and the bag is in the gen. (*dṛteḥ*), as is Pūṣan (*te*). Given the deep uncertainty of this part of the hymn, grammar is all we have to hold onto, and grammar tells us that it is Pūṣan who is compared to the bag. For the partnership with Pūṣan, see I.138.4fg.

VI.48.21: Ge and Re take the rel. cl. of ab as unconnected with the rest of the vs. But surely the *yāsya* refers to Indra, as is made clear by the ‘Vṛtra-smashing’ references in de.

The adj. *vṛtrahām*, twice modifying neut. *śāvah* (d, e), is attributed to a hapax thematic stem *vṛtra-há-* by Gr (see also Re’s comm.), beside the very well-attested root

noun cmpd. *vr̥tra-hán-*. Although this analysis must be synchronically correct, I wonder if the form here has not been re-marked from the expected neut. to the root noun, which should probably be **vr̥tra-há-* – though see AiG III.239, acdg. to which *-há* can also serve for the neut. (see comm. ac X.170.3). However, MLW suggests that the neut. could have been simply the sten form **vr̥trahán*, which could be misheard as *vr̥trahám*. See also disc. of *satrā-hám* ad V.35.4 and also of *anarvám* ad I.185.3. The re-marking must already have happened and the thematic stem extracted before the composition of this passage, since the *-am* ending makes position in the cadence.

VI.48.22: The first half of this vs. is straightforward: both Heaven and Earth were born only once. The same “only once” (*sakṛt*) appears in pāda c as well, but with the mention of Pr̥ṣṇi things get complicated, esp. when pāda d is taken into account. The hemistich reads *pṛṣṇyā dugdhām sakṛt páyas, tād anyó nānu jāyate*. Pāda c is unproblematically “only once was the milk of Pr̥ṣṇi milked.” Ge takes the milk here to be, symbolically, the Maruts; the point of the pāda is that Pr̥ṣṇi “ward nur einmal Mutter.” (In this I think he is correct.) His d is “Nach dem wird kein anderer geboren” (sim. Re “(nul) autre ne naît à la suite de (tout) cela”), both with an indefinite reading of *anyáḥ* as ‘(no) other’; the publ. tr. also has an indefinite reading, but limited to the Maruts -- that is, the Maruts were born all at once and no other Maruts followed: “Another (of the Maruts) is not born after this.” But all of these interpr., however easily they go down, should be wrong. As I have demonstrated at length (“Vedic *anyá-* ‘another, the other’: syntactic disambiguation,” Fs. Beekes, 1997, pp. 11–18), indefinite and definite readings of *anyá-* are distinguished positionally: 2nd position *anyá-*, as here, is definite. (For a clear ex. see in the next hymn VI.49.3b with an *anyá-* ... *anyá-* “the one ... the other” construction.) Our pāda d should mean “the other is not born after this.” This passage needs to be considered in conjunction with VI.66.1 *márteṣv anyád doháse pīpāya, sakṛc chukráṁ dudhe pṛṣṇir ūdhaḥ*, whose 2nd pāda is very close to our pāda c. VI.66.1 has an implicit *anyá-* ... *anyá-* construction: the *anyád* in the 1st pāda refers to Pr̥ṣṇi’s udder and is contrasted with the *ūdhaḥ* in the 2nd pāda, which invites a reading with a second **anyád*. The publ. tr. renders this “while the one stays swollen to give milk to mortals, only once did Pr̥ṣṇi milk the gleaming (milk/semen) from (the other) udder.”

VI.66.1 is only limited help, however. Although its 2nd pāda is, as just noted, semantically and formulaically very comparable to our first, and its first pāda contains a form of *anyá-* as our 2nd one does, there are several important discrepancies: the *anyá-* in VI.66.1 is neut. and therefore pairs easily with the *ūdhaḥ* of the following pāda, but our passage contains a masc. *anyáḥ* which cannot be directly referred to the (neut.) milked *páyasḥ* of the preceding passage nor to Pr̥ṣṇi’s (neut.) udder, which must be lurking in the passage too. Moreover, though the *sakṛt* pādas of our vs. (abc) refer to a discrete event *in the past*, the verb of d, the *anyá-* pāda, is present (*ānu jāyate*).

I can see two ways of handling this problematic pāda, an easy one and a hard one. In the easy one I ignore my own rule about *anyá-* placement and take *anyáḥ* as indefinite, with a tr. similar to Ge/Re: “no other is born following this” / “another is not born following this.” The publ. tr. “Another (of the Maruts) is not born after this” was adapted from von Bradke (Fs. Roth 118) and was an attempt to limit the scope of indefinite ‘other’ to “other Maruts” and therefore wring a semi-definite sense out of it. But that’s a cop-out: it’s still indefinite, and the more general rendering of Ge/Re may be more

satisfactory if we are going the indefinite route.

Although this is the easier alternative, I am not at all sure it's the wrong one -- though I'm reluctant to toss out the *anyá-* rule without a struggle. The harder way makes reference to yet another desperate *Pr̥ṣni* udder passage, this one II.34.2: *rudró yád vo marutaḥ ..., vṛṣājani pr̥ṣnyāḥ śukrá ūdhani* "when Rudra was begotten for you as the blazing bullish (semen = rain?) in the udder of *Pr̥ṣni*, o Maruts." For the difficulties of this passage and my interpr. of it, see comm. ad loc. The passage refers, in my view, to the birth (or a birth) of the Maruts' father Rudra, which "birth" then led to the birth of the Maruts. Acdg. to this passage, Rudra took shape ("was born") as "bullish semen" in *Pr̥ṣni*'s udder. As I say in my comm. ad loc., "It is this semen that combines with *Pr̥ṣni* to produce the Maruts; it can also, in naturalistic terms, be the rain in the thunderclouds that are *Pr̥ṣni*'s udder. This gender mingling and loss of distinction between the Maruts' bull-father (=Rudra) and their mother *Pr̥ṣni* in the udder are also found, in somewhat different fashion, in IV.3.10d *vṛṣā śukráṃ duduhe pr̥ṣnir ūdhaḥ* 'the bull as *Pr̥ṣni* milked gleaming (milk/semen) from his (/her) udder' and in VI.66.1d *sakṛc chukráṃ duduhe pr̥ṣnir ūdhaḥ* 'only once did *Pr̥ṣni* milk the gleaming (milk/semen) from the udder.'"

I now think it possible (though only that) that the masc. *anyá-* of our passage refers to Rudra (and/or his semen); in that case the referent is definite (as my rule requires), and the *pāda* means "The other [=Rudra] is not born after this," in other words, the normal order of nature prevails: the father/semen was born in *Pr̥ṣni*'s udder before the sons, the Maruts, who resulted from the mingling of those essences and who were "milked out" of that udder -- a bit of an anticlimax, to be sure: we wouldn't in fact expect Rudra's birth to follow his sons'. I am not sure that this is the correct way to interpret the passage, but it does conform to the known syntactic rules and also has suggestive connections with other troubling passages involving the same features: Rudra, his semen, *Pr̥ṣni*, her udder, her milk, and the Maruts.

VI.49 All Gods

The verb 'quicken, enliven' (*√jin*ν) appears at widely scattered intervals in this hymn (6b *jinvatam*, 11c *jinvathā*, 14d *jinvatu*), but enough to count as a leitmotif.

VI.49.1: Although non-formulaic groupings of gods are frequently encountered in All God hymns, the trio *vāruṇo mitró agnīḥ* is perhaps a little strange, since we expect this trio's third member to be instead Aryaman. And indeed that sequence is quite common: there is a much-repeated dimeter *pāda* *vāruṇo mitró aryamā* (I.26.4, etc.; see repetitions listed in Lub), and the same sequence is regularly found at the end of a Jagatī *pāda* (I.40.5, V.46.5, VII.66.11, 12, etc.). I wonder if *agnīḥ* is some sort of makeshift substitute for *aryamā* in a Triṣtubh cadence where *aryamā* wouldn't fit (cf. the same sequence in the acc. in the next hymn, VI.50.1, and it is found elsewhere in both nom. and acc., incl. the repeated *pāda* VI.51.10). After all, Agni is compatible with pretty much any Vedic god and could be slotted in when the more specialized divinity was metrically inconvenient.

VI.49.2: The fuller expression in X.3.7 *diváspr̥thivyór aratír yuvatyóḥ* "the spoked wheel of Heaven and Earth, the youthful ones" makes the identity of "the two youthful ones" clear.

Ge and Re take *yájadhyai* as a predicated infinitive with unexpressed subject “I” (without comment), with Agni the obj.: “... Agni ... will ich verehren”; “je veux lui sacrifier.” I instead supply “(I invoke)” (parallel to *stuṣé* ‘I will praise’ in 1a) to govern *agním*, who is then the subject of the inf. Although this involves supplying material, elsewhere in Agni contexts this infinitive is generally used of him, as subject, in his priestly role. Cf., e.g., III.1.1 ... *mā ... váhniṃ cakartha vidáthe yájadhyai* “you have made me your draught-horse, to offer the sacrifice at the ritual distribution.” And in this hymn see VI.49.9 *hótā yakṣat ... agnīḥ* “the Hotar Agni will sacrifice,” with Agni as agent-subject of the active verb.

VI.49.3: My tr. of *sūro anyā* “the other is the sun’s” follows Old, who adopted it from Ludwig. Ge (/Re) supply an instr. *raśmībhiḥ* ‘with the rays’, parallel to *stṛbhiḥ*, on which *sūrah* depends. This seems unnec. Re’s claim that the accent on *pīpīśé* “déconseille l’interprétation de *sūrah* donnée par Old.” does not convince: although by the Old reading *pīpīśé* is not part of both *anyā* clauses as it would be with the additional instr., it occurs at the boundary of two explicitly contrastive clauses, which would, I think, be sufficient to induce accent.

VI.49.5: Note the tricky word positioning, with pāda-final *yāḥ* picking up pāda-init. *sá*, in a nominal rel. cl. continued in the next pāda. It may be that in a structurally simple hymn like this the poet seeks to vary the ways he introduces the listed divinities and their attributes and to jazz up the syntax.

VI.49.6: If my comment immed. above is correct, this vs. is a fine example of it. To begin with the surface, the first hemistich has a dual voc. (*párjanya-vātā*) and a dual impv. (*jinvatam*). So far all is well. But the 2nd hemistich has a plural voc. (*sátyaśrutāḥ kavayaḥ*), whose referents are not identified, and a singular voc. (*jágata sthātā*), whose referent is not identified, flanking a rel. prn. in the gen. and an instr. pl. (*yásya gīrbhīḥ*), with the rest of the vs., following the singular voc., containing an apparent main cl. verb in the 2nd pl. (*ā kṛṇudhvam* [so Pp.]). The simplest thing to do is to disjoin the two half-verses, keeping the dual and plural parts separate. But that leaves us with an incomplete rel. cl. that has nothing to do. The problems are discussed at length by Old, though he does not come to a firm determination.

Both Ge and Re take the first hemistich as independent, as do Old and Scar (556). By contrast, I consider it the main cl. on which cd is dependent. Since my interpr. of ab resembles theirs almost to the end, however, we are in happy agreement so far. For the connection of Parjanya and Vāta with the *pūrīṣāni ... āpyāni* “watery outpourings,” cf. X.65.9 *parjánýāvātā vṛṣabhā purīṣínā*. The only question is whether *prthivyaḥ* in our passage depends on *vṛṣabhā* or the watery outpourings: its accent (as opposed to unaccented voc. *vṛṣabhā*) speaks (weakly: see Old comm.) for the latter, the pāda break for the former, and the consensus is for the former. I’m not at all sure it matters.

In my interpr. of ab as the main cl. to cd, I supply a beneficial dat. “for him,” referring to the human poet, to serve as main cl. referent for the rel. *yásya* in c. As just noted, the standard interpr. take ab as an independent cl., and therefore must account for the rel. prn. *yásya* in a different way. Before tackling that, let us first determine who the vocc. in cd refer to.

The pl. voc. phrase *sátyaśrutaḥ kavayaḥ* beginning pāda c: by almost universal agreement, beg. with Sāy., this refers to the Maruts, on the basis of the pāda-spanning voc. phrase *sátyaśrutaḥ kávyayā yúvānaḥ* used of the Maruts in V.57.8, the only other occurrences of *satya-śrut-*. (It is worth remarking here that, though in both V.57.8 and here the pāda opens with the first two vocc., in V.57.8 *kávyayā* is accented, whereas here it is not. I have no explan.) The identification with the Maruts seems reasonable, though of course nothing about the phrase uniquely identifies the Maruts. However, note that in vs. 11 below they are addressed as *yuvānaḥ kavayaḥ*, with two of the terms found in V.57.8.

As for *jágata sthātar* in d, most tr. leave the referent unidentified (e.g., Ge n. 6cd “Wer der *jágataḥ sthātar* sein soll, ist nicht deutlich.”). Since the agent noun *sthātar-* in the sg. is otherwise used only of Indra, he seems a likely referent, esp. because he is also regularly associated with the Maruts. The added wrinkle is that there must be a pun here as well: the stem *sthātár-* (so accented) ‘the still’, always in the form *sthātúḥ*, is the regular formulaic partner of *jágat-* ‘the moving’; cf., e.g., in the next hymn, VI.50.7 *vísvasya sthātúr jágataḥ*. The poet’s urge to make this play on words may have contributed both to the contorted syntax and the unclarity of reference we’re trying to untangle.

The two referents of the vocative phrases, the Maruts and (if I’m right) Indra, are the joint 2nd pl. subjects of the verb in d. On this, I think, we are all agreed. But all standard interpr. follow the Pp. in taking *ā kṛnudhvam* as an unaccented, and therefore main clause, verb. (See, explicitly, Old “... ist offenbar Imperativ und hat Hauptsatzakzent.”) Under this interpr., something else has to be done with the *yásya gīrbhīḥ* of c. Most people supply material like mad: Ge adds a “towards him” in his main cl. and “you take pleasure” as verb in the rel. cl.: “machet alles was lebt, (dem) geneigt, an dessen Loblied (ihr Freude habt)” -- in other words, he manufactures most of the relative cl.; Scar similar, though he gives a wide choice of ways to fill out the rel. cl., thus demonstrating exactly how untethered this interpr. is: “durch dessen Lieder{ihr das könnt/ihr so heiss/ihr gepriesen werdet} (?)” Re, by contrast, eliminates the rel. cl. by folding it into a voc.: “(toi) par les paroles de qui (les chose se réalisent)” -- though it still requires extensive material to fill it out, again based on nothing.

My solution is to take *ā kṛnudhvam* as the verb of the rel. cl.: the Saṃhitā text of course reads *ākṛnudhvam*; it is only the Pp. that inserts a notional word space after *ā*. If we instead interpr. the sequence as an augmented imperfect, with accent on the augment, that is, *ā + ākṛnudhvam* (which does not require emendation), we do not have to fill out the rel. cl., because it already has an accented verb and that verb has an object: “you made the moving world your own.” This expression, *ā √kṛ* (middle) + INSTR. has close parallels, one containing *gīrbhīḥ* as here: cf. I.77.2 *tám ū námobhír ā kṛnudhvam* / X.6.5 *agním gīrbhír námobhír ā kṛnudhvam*. In both those passages I tr. “attract here with reverence (and hymns).” The difference in interpr. may be ascribed to the fact that in our passage here, the gods are subj. and the hymns come from the human poet, whereas in the two passages just cited mortals are also the subj. However, I may want to rethink both of those passages, to “make him [/Agni] your own.” Since in both passages Agni is the object, he does not have to be attracted here, since as the ritual fire he already *is* here.

Thus, by my interpr. all of cd is a rel. cl., dependent on a “for him” or the like to be supplied in the main cl. of ab. Note that both Ge. (“dem”) and Scar. (“für ihn”) must

supply the same beneficial dative, but they do so with the supposed main cl. verb *ā kṛṇudhvam* in d. Although my interpr. produces an awk English tr., it accounts for the Sanskrit considerably better than the alternatives. What it means for the gods to “make the moving world their own” I’m not sure -- but perhaps the usual RVic notion that human praises strengthen the gods for their heroic deeds and, perhaps in this case, that these praises bring the gods and their human worshipers (part of the “moving world”) into a closer relationship.

VI.49.7: After the syntactic pyrotechnics of the previous vs., this one comes as a relief. Because of the subjunctive *yamsat* ending the vs., I assume a modal value also for *dhāt* ending the first hemistich, as do Ge and Re.

VI.49.8: With most (Gr, Ge, Re), the publ. tr. takes the hapax *pāripātī-* as ultimately derived from $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’, not *pāti-* ‘lord’. However, this analysis has grave formal problems not solved by Re’s cavalier “hapax tiré de *pā-* ... mais influencé, pour la forme, par *pāti-*”: it would be quite difficult to get a short-vowel root syllable *pa-* from $\sqrt{pā}$ by any normal derivational process. I now think that it *is* a cmpd. of *-pāti-*, even though Wackernagel’s ‘ringsum Herr’ (AiG II.1.260) reflecting this analysis is not terribly satisfactory. My change of heart was occasioned by considering the first verse in the first hymn of the Pūṣan cycle that begins soon after this hymn, VI.53.1, whose first pāda ends *pathas pate* “o lord of the path.” I would now tr. our passage, “the complete lord of every path.” It might be worth noting that VI.53.1 also enlists Pūṣan’s help with our *dhī-* ‘visionary thought’, as here.

Most take *vacasyā* as instr. sg. to the *-ā* stem *vacasyā-* ‘eloquence’, requiring a verb to be supplied (e.g., Ge “(preise ich)”). I instead interpr. it as 1st sg. act. to the denom. *vacasya-* (not otherwise found accented). There are two problems with my analysis: 1) the other two forms of the verb *vacasya-* are medial; 2) *vacasyā* is accented, though supposedly a main-cl. verb. The first is not too difficult: verbs of proclaiming/praising can be labile with regard to voice. The second is more problematic and might require me to follow the standard view, tr. “(I praise, vel sim.) with my eloquence.” But see disc. of *vardháyā* in 10b, where I suggest that our *vacasyā* here is indeed a verb and has borrowed its verbal accent from *vardháyā*.

The phrase *kāmena kṛtāh* is used of Pūṣan also in nearby VI.58.3–4.

VI.49.10: The form *vardháyā* can be either 2nd sg. impv. (Gr, Ge) or 1st sg. subjunctive (Re). I opt for the latter, partly because there seem to be no other unambiguous impvs. addressed to priests/mortals in this hymn; the priestly/poetic function is represented by 1st sg. (e.g., *stuṣé* 1a) and 1st pl. (e.g., *huvema* pāda d this vs.) verbs. It is also accented despite pāda-medial position, presumably because it lies in the center of a balanced construction: *rudrām dívā ... rudrām aktau* “Rudra by day ... Rudra by night.” Given this accented, non-initial, 1st sg. subj., I wonder if *vacasyā* in 8a is in fact also a verb (as in my first analysis, represented in the publ. tr.) and has borrowed its accent from *vardháyā*.

Despite Ge’ and Re’s comments, considering ‘separately’ (‘allein’, ‘à part’) for *īdhak* only to reject it, this must be the correct tr. In his n. 10d Ge cites II.33.4, where we hope not to anger Rudra by invoking him with an invocation shared with another god or gods. See comm. ad loc. The fact that Rudra’s sons are addressed in the next vs. (11), as

well as namelessly in 6cd (see above), might make the need for a separate invocation of Rudra all the more acute.

VI.49.11: The interpr. of *varasyā-* as somehow a deriv. of *vāra-* ‘wish’, found, e.g., in Gr, Ge, and AiG II.2.244, is contextually understandable: Ge’s “Kommet ... zum Bittgesuch des Sängers” makes more immediate sense than my “come hither in response to the singer’s longing for space,” with “in response to” smuggled in to make the sentence somewhat more parsable. But there is no *vāras-* to $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$ ‘wish, choose’, whereas *vāras-* means ‘wide space’, something that RVic poets often express a desire for. Re hesitates (his word), but opts for ‘desire for space’ and adduces the quite apposite I.181.9 *varivasyā gṛṇānāḥ* “singing (to you) with a desire for space,” comparable to our *gṛṇatō varasyā*.

The causal relationship between c and ab, suggested by *hí(c)*, is not straightforward. But in its only other occurrence (IV.51.3), *acitrā-* refers to a *place*, one without brightness, therefore by implication sterile and lifeless. Thus the desire for (positive) space expressed in b is contrasted with (negative) space that the Maruts can, nonetheless, bring to life.

I don’t understand the point of d.

VI.49.12: This vs. contains two exx. of case disharmony between simile and frame, one each in ab and cd.

Though Gr takes *ájā* as a 2nd sg. impv., both Ge and Re interpr. it as a 1st sg. subjunctive, as do I. This would bring the count to three in this hymn, by my interpr. (8a, 10b, 12b).

This verb takes a straightforward acc. obj. *yūthā* ‘herds’ in the simile, as well as an adverbial acc. goal *ástam* ‘home’. But in the frame it lacks an overt obj.: I supply ‘praise’, Ge ‘Lied’, Re ‘mon hymne’. And the goal is the personal dative of the divinity (*vīrāya*, etc.).

The mismatch between simile and frame is greater in cd, and once again the simile is the more straightforwardly expressed. The poet exploits the syntactic ambiguity of intrans./trans. *-āya-* formations, in the form here of the redupl. aor. *pīspṛsati* $\sqrt{spṛs}$ ‘touch’, meaning both ‘make X [acc.] touch Y [acc./loc.]’ and, notionally passive, ‘make Y [acc.] touched by X [instr.]’. The simile uses the latter construction: “cause the firmament (acc. *nākam* = Y) to be touched by stars (instr. *stíbhīḥ* = X). In the frame the X is the “inspired words” (*vīpaḥ*, acc. pl.) and the Y is the body (*tanvì*, in the loc., an alternative case to the acc. in this construction). Both words and body are limited by genitives, referring to the poet (*vacanāsyā* ‘of the speaker’) and the god (*śrutāsyā* ‘of the famed one’). For further disc. of the passage and of the phenomenon in general see my “Case Disharmony.”

Our poet further muddies the waters by reversing the more common relationship between forms of \sqrt{vip} and \sqrt{vac} . The stem *vacanā-* ‘speaking, speaker’, referring to a person, is attested only 3x in the RV, whereas *vācas-* ‘speech’ is ubiquitous; the root noun *vīp-* ‘inspired (word[s])’ is not uncommon, but is far outnumbered by the stem *vīpra-* ‘inspired poet’. So we might have expected the phrase **vīprasya vācaḥ* “the speech of the inspired poet” (cf., though not with a gen., VIII.61.9 *vīpraḥ ... vācaḥ*), not *vacanāsyā vīpaḥ* “the inspired words of the speaker.”

VI.49.13: Another syntactic trick, though far less complex than in the last vs. The first half-vs., describing Viṣṇu's cosmogonic deed, is couched in the 3rd ps., with the pf. *vimamé* 'he measured out', but in the 2nd half, expressing our present-day desire to live under Viṣṇu's protection, the god is in the more intimate 2nd ps., in the phrase *tásya te*, lit. 'of this you,' where *tásya* provides the syntactic pivot to 2nd sg. enclitic *te*. On such doublings see my "sa figé."

For "hard-pressed Manu" (*mánave bādhitāya*), see the same phrase in VII.91.1, where, as here, a god (or gods) perform(s) a cosmogonic deed that allows the sacrifice to be instituted.

VI.49.15: The publ. tr. should read "the herdsman of great truth," since *gopām* modifies *rayīm*.

With Old I read *cakrāmāma*, a pf. subj., not *ca krāmāma*, pace Klein (DGRV I.188, 190). This reading is accepted by Kü (147 and n. 146).

I take *kṣáyam ... yéna ... abhí cakrāmāma* as an explicit "X and (which) Y" construction on grounds of content: I do not think our "peaceful dwelling" (*kṣáyam*) is the means by which we will trample and destroy our enemies. Instead I think we have the usual RVic implicit contrast between war and peace (*yoga-kṣemá-* in one rendition), with 'peace' expressed by a noun and war by an elaborate rel. cl.

VI.50 All Gods

VI.50.1: The hymn begins with the 1st ps. mid. *huvé* 'I invoke/call upon', like the last hymn, which began (VI.49.1) *stuśé* 'I will praise'.

On the ill-assorted trio Varuṇa, Mitra, Agni, see comm. ad VI.49.1. Here the phrase is in the acc., but likewise in a Triṣṭubh cadence. The expected Aryaman is added in the next pāda.

VI.50.2: It's not clear to me which gods Sūrya is supposed to pursue. The last descriptor, *agnijihvāḥ* 'having Agni as tongue' suggests it is, in fact, all the gods, since they all receive the oblation through him.

Note the juxtaposition of *ṛtá-* and *satyá-*; a similar of more elaborate ex. is found in the next hymn, VI.51.10 *ṛtādhītayo vakmarājasatyāḥ*.

VI.50.3: There is a surprising lack of agreement about the construction of this vs. Both Ge and Re take ab as a separate clause, which requires them to supply a verb for it ("ihr ... besitzt"; "qui avez"). In cd they also both construe *mahāḥ* in the *yathā* cl., but this is impossible, since it precedes the main verb *karathaḥ*. (I take *mahāḥ* adverbially, as often and in 6d below [by my account].) See Old for a rather fussy disc. of various possibilities in cd. I do not see the problem with my interpr., which has *karathaḥ* in c govern the accusatives in ab, with a *yāthā* purpose cl. taking up most of cd (starting with *vārivaḥ* right before the subord. conj.) This cl. lacks an overt verb, but an existential subjunctive *ásat* 'there will be' is easy to supply. (All interpr. must do something like this, unless they emend to accented **káarathaḥ*.) Ge (n. 3cd) worries about the tautology of ... *no, asmé* ..., which he avoids by construing *naḥ* with *mahāḥ* ... *vārivaḥ* and *asmé* with the NP of d

(“Machet, dass uns grosse Freibahn werde (und) unserem Wohnsitz Befreiung von allem Übel”)(sim. Re), but I find the pronominal doubling far less troublesome than extracting a piece of the subord. clause and fronting it around the main verb, as the Ge/Re interpr. requires. However, it would be possible to construe the two pronouns separately but within the confines of the *yáthā* clause: “so that there will be for us a flawless wide realm for our peaceful dwelling” or, perhaps better, “... for us to dwell peacefully.” For a similar doubling, see X.99.8 and comm. ad loc.

Since the shelter and wide realm we wish for are physical in nature, on the basis of my reinterp. of *anehās-* (comm. ad X.61.12) I would now substitute “flawless” for the more morally focused “faultless.” See also the “flawless path” in the next hymn, VI.51.16.

VI.50.5: Both Ge and Re take b as an indep. cl., while I interpr. it as a dependent clause parallel to pāda a, likewise hanging off *yéṣu*. Either is grammatically possible, since the verb of b *síṣakti* is pāda-initial and could owe its accent to that position. And in fact there’s little actual difference in content between the two interpr., because both Ge and Re sneak the Maruts into the pāda anyway.

The more crucial question in b is the meaning of the hapax *abhyardhayájvan-*. Most take it as expressing a hostile, oppositional, or at least separated relationship, e.g., Ge “Gegenverehrer,” AiG II.1.67 “gesondert opfern,” Re “(dieu) recevant un sacrifice distinct.” Certainly by the time of the BYV Saṃhitās, *abhyardhá-* (or *-ás*; see below) is used to mean ‘apart from, separated from’; cf., e.g., MS II.5.4 (52: 14) ... *yó rājanyò ‘bhyardhó viśás carati* “a Rājanya who goes about apart from his clan” (/ Amano “... der Rājanya, der von seinem Volk abseits wandeln”). (For Amano’s interpr. of the form as an adv. in *-ah* and her detailed discussion of its use in this textual stratum, see her n. 2500 [that number is not a typo!].) However, in the RV *árdha-* (and *ardhá-*) refers rather to a ‘half’ or a ‘side’. In X.26.5, a passage adduced by Ge, Pūṣan is described as *prátyardhir yajñānām*, which even Ge tr. as “der bei den Opfern (mit den Göttern) halbpact macht” and Sāy. glosses *ardhabhak* ‘half-sharer’. The point, I think, is that Pūṣan is almost always in partnership with other gods, indeed often in dvandvas like *indrā-pūṣán-* (cf. nearby VI.57.1), *somā-pūṣán-*, and the only sacrifices he is likely to receive will be shared with (an)other more prominent god or gods. In a way, this characterization of Pūṣan is the exact opposite of Rudra in the previous hymn (VI.49.10), where it is emphasized that Rudra receives a separate invocation, apart from the other gods. For Pūṣan’s relationship to the Maruts, see nearby VI.48, where the Pūṣan vss. (14–19) are sandwiched between Marut vss. (11–13, 20–21) and Pūṣan is compared to the Marut troop (VI.48.15).

Compared to later texts, the gerund is comparatively rare in the RV; the *-tvā* gerund is found only 21x. The configuration of pāda c shows that the gerund phrase (*śrutvā hávam marutaḥ*) must constitute a separate syntactic unit here, since the subord. conj. *yád* occurs only after the whole phrase, and it is followed by 2nd-position part. (*d*)ha.

VI.50.6: The publ. tr. omits the *íd*. I might emend it to “Just he will hear the call.”

In cd I take *ca* as “inverse” *ca* (X *ca* ... Y, rather than normal X ... Y *ca*) connecting the two very similar participial phrases ... *úpa ca stāvānaḥ*, ... *úpa mahó*

gr̥nānāḥ# “being praised and being hymned.” Klein (DGRV I.122–23, 125, 173) by contrast takes it as conjoining the verbs of the two clauses, *śrávat* and *rāsat* in the configuration #*śrávat* ... *úpa ca stāvāno, rāsat* ...), but placed after the preverb of the verbal lexeme in the 2nd clause (that is, by his interpr. *úpa* ... *rāsat*). Since *úpa* never appears otherwise with $\sqrt{rā}$ but is quite common with \sqrt{stu} , this interpr. seems unlikely.

As noted above (ad 3c), I take *mahāḥ* as the adverbially used -s-stem, against the standard view that it is a masc. acc. pl. (to the stem *māh-*) modifying *vājān*. The standard view is not impossible, but given the paired *úpa* ... PART construction, word order favors taking *mahāḥ* as part of the 2nd participle phrase.

VI.50.8–10: These three vss. contain a series of perfect optatives, *jagamyāt* (8b), *vavṛtyāt* (9b), *jagmyātam* (10a), but they do not show any peculiarities of register or usage. The connection among the vss. is also signaled by *utá*, which opens the second two. Klein (DGRV I.424) notes the co-occurrence of the “optative series” (he does not mention that they are belong to the pf.) and the *utá*s.

VI.50.8: With Ge and Re, I take the simile *uśáso ná prátīkam* as a nominative phrase, matching the subject Savitar. Since the dakṣiṇās are distributed at dawn and Dawn is therefore associated with munificence, her face (= her light) can be characterized as a discloser of valuables. However, it would also be grammatically possible to take it as acc., with Savitar disclosing valuables as if disclosing the face of Dawn, though I think this less likely.

VI.50.9: “within (the sphere of)” is an attempt to render the loc. *rātaú*, since “Might I always be in your giving” is hard to parse. Klein’s (DGRV I.422) “Might I be ever (present) at thy giving” is more elegant. I might emend the publ. tr. to “Might I always be (there) at your giving.”

VI.50.10: This vs. poses several syntactic problems. In ab the position of *aṅgá* speaks against taking the full hemistich as a single cl. (so, more or less, Klein DGRV I.422). Since *aṅgá* otherwise invariably takes 2nd position, it should not be found this deep in the clause; moreover the immediately preceding personal prn. *yuvám*, also encourages an interpr. as a new cl. Both Ge and Re do divide the sequence into two clauses, but both include *dhībhīḥ* in the 2nd clause -- which essentially defeats the purpose of the clause division, since *aṅgá* is still in the wrong position, just not as wrong as if the whole thing were one clause. Their solution is understandable because it could allow them to avoid taking *vīprā* as a predicated vocative. So Re “car vous êtes (donneurs) de pensées-poétiques, ô inspirés!” with *vīprā* as real voc. Ge’s interpr. seems to combine the worst of both worlds — including *dhībhīḥ* in the 2nd cl. despite the position of *aṅgá* and taking *vīprā* as a predicated voc. (see his n. 10b): “gerade ihr seid redebegabt mit (guten) Gedanken.” My interpr. limits the 2nd cl. to *yuvám aṅgá vīprā*, which imposes a predicated voc. but honors the position of the particle.

The second hemistich is even more problematic. The standard tr. interpret the sequence as a *clausal* simile / frame construction, with different verbs in the simile and the frame, (*a*)*mumuktam* (simile) ... *tūrvatam* (frame), and *ná* marking the first *clause* as a simile. Cf., e.g., Klein (DGRV I.422–23) “As ye freed Atri from great darkness, (so)

cause (us) to pass out of difficulty ...” (my emphasis). But such constructions *do not exist* in the RV among the hundreds and hundreds of examples of similes in that text: similes are only nominal, and if a verb is implicitly part of it, it is held constant between simile and frame. See my detailed disc. in “Case Disharmony.” The only possible examples that approach such a clausal construction are those providing a model and the action to be based upon it, but the very few such exx. we have involve *yáthā ... evā* “just as ..., even so ...” — as in a childbirth spell: V.78.7 (cf. also 8) *yáthā vātaḥ puṣkarīṇīm, samīṅáyati sarvātaḥ / evā te gārbha ejatu* “As the wind sways a lotus-pond in every direction, so let your unborn child stir.” These conditions are not met here, and I think it a methodologically dangerous practice to posit an entirely unprecedented construction on the basis of a single ambiguous passage.

The way to a solution begins with the first verb, which is realized as *amumuktam* in the Pp. The only evidence for the augment is the avagraha in the printed Saṃhitā text(s): *’mumuktam*; the sandhi conditions do not require the augment. In fact Gr lists the form as unaugmented, and Old gets it right (in my view) the first time: “wie den Atri von der grossen Finsternis, (so) löset (mich ...).” But he then, unfortunately, has second thoughts, and although he recognizes that “*ná* nicht Satzvergleichungspartikel ist,” he decides that *ná* can sometimes overstep its boundaries and function like a clausal simile marker (not his term). The single ex. he cites (VII.58.3), however, does not show what he claims it shows, at least in my opinion, and it is also not like our passage, in that even by his interpr. the two clauses would have the same verb (in diff. mood and voice: *ví tirāti, ... prá ... tireta*). Whether Ge, Re, and/or Klein were influenced by Old’s arguments or not, they all follow the clausal interpr., which I hope I have shown is unacceptable.

My own interpr. is identical to Old’s first pass, with impv. *mumuktam* and a supplied ‘me’ as obj., parallel to *átrim* in the simile. As for the second verb, I follow Gotō (1st Kl., 163 n. 258) in taking *tūrvataṃ narā* as a parenthetical clause. This allows the abl. phrase at the end of d, *duritād abhīke* “from difficulty at close quarters,” to be construed with *mumuktam*, parallel to the abl. *mahás támasaḥ* “from great darkness” in the simile. However, if the parenthetical interpr. seems too awkward, it might be possible to take d as a single, separate cl.: “be victorious from difficulty at close quarters,” though *tūrv* seems not to take an abl. elsewhere.

VI.50.11: The only problems in this vs. are found in pāda d: the accented verb *mṛlātā* and the immediately following *ca*: the verb because there is no obvious reason for its accent, the *ca* because it’s not clear what it conjoins. To begin with the second, Klein (DGRV I.82), flg. Ge, takes *ca* as conjoining the impv. *mṛlātā* with the pres. part. *daśasyántaḥ* beginning c, assuming an implicit imperatival expression *daśasyántaḥ *sta* “seid gefällig und erbarmet euch” / “(be) favoring and have mercy.” Re, by contrast, seems to assume that the *ca* conjoins the last in the series of nom. pl., *divyāḥ pāṛthivaso, gójātā ápyāḥ*, judging by his “... et (vous enfin) nés des eaux,” though this would require an unprecedented displacement of *ca* to the right, with the verb inserted between the last nominal term and the *ca*. Between these two ad hoc solutions, the first seems distinctly better than the 2nd. To register it, I should perhaps emend the tr. to “(Be ones) showing favor ... and be merciful,” despite the clunkiness.

The verbal accent is -- or may be -- less of a problem. If we do assume that the *daśasyántaḥ* stands for an imperatival clause, then *mṛlātā* would begin a new clause.

Although neither Ge nor Klein mentions the accent on the verb, it would be an argument in favor of their analysis. However, if we take the participle simply as the participle it appears to be, then it modifies the implicit subject of *mṛṛátā* and the verb should not be accented. There could be another way to get the accent in that case, though it seems artificial (or rather, even more artificial than the other suggestion). The sequence of four nom. pl. noted above is divided across two pādas, as shown by the comma in the quoted sequence. Only the first two have to be nominatives rather than vocatives: *divyāḥ* because of its non-initial accent, *pārthivāsaḥ* because it is accented in the middle of a pāda. The following two, the first two words of d, *could* be vocatives, accented because they are initial in the pāda. They would then match the undoubted voc. *devāḥ* at the end of the same pāda. If *gójātā āpyāḥ* are vocatives, then the immediately following word *mṛṛátā* would need to be accented after these extra-sentential elements. However, this analysis requires the unappealing step of assuming an unsignaled change of case from nominative to vocative in the middle of an apparently unitary sequence.

After all this syntactic fuss, we may overlook the interesting question, who are the “cow-born” gods (who appear elsewhere, in similar sequence [VII.35.14, cf. also X.53.5]). Quite possibly the Maruts, an offhand suggestion of Re’s. Remember their cow-mother Pr̥ṣni.

VI.50.13: On the phrase *tvāṣṭā devébhir jānibhiḥ*, which, with Re, I consider to be the equivalent of “with the wives of the gods, with the divine wives,” see comm. ad II.36.5.

VI.50.15: On the phrase *māma tāsya* as a probable play on the PN Mamatā, see comm. ad VI.10.2.

The phrase *vāsavo ādhṛṣṭāḥ* returns from 4b, where it refers to the Maruts (unless, with Ge and Re we take *vāsavaḥ* there, and here, as referring to a separate group, the Vasus). There it was immediately preceded by *hūtāsaḥ* ‘invoked’, here by *hutāsaḥ* ‘offered to’, an understated but clever variation. In this context, the final totalizing vs. of the hymn, the “unassailable good ones” should probably refer to all the gods, in a gender-inclusive pairing with the *gnāḥ* ‘(divine) ladies’ -- an unusual bow to the female side.

VI.51 All Gods

For the structure of this hymn (or, rather, composite of two hymns), see publ. intro.

VI.51.1: The full realization of the dual dvandva *mitrā-vāruṇā-* as two independent dual genitives separated by a pāda-break and several words -- *mitráyoḥ ... vāruṇayoḥ* -- is a fine demonstration of the reality of this type of compd. in the Sprachgefühl.

I do not understand the pāda-final *ā(m̐)*. Generally in this position *ā* follows an abl., reinforcing the meaning “von ... her” (see Gr. col. 169), or a loc. But *mitráyoḥ* is of course not an abl., and, though it could grammatically be a loc., by sense it can only be a gen. It seems pleonastic -- perhaps added to allow a Triṣṭubh cadence.

VI.51.2: *vidátha-* is here not ‘ceremony of division, rite’, but rather ‘division’ itself, referring to the divisions of the gods. Ge aptly adduces VI.52.15 in the next hymn, where the gods are born in 3 different localities.

Pāda b is a 12-syllable Triṣṭubh, which can be fixed by reading **devāñ* for *devānām* -- an archaic (or truncated) gen. pl. likely found in other passages containing *jánman-* (I.71.3, VI.11.3, X.64.14). The restoration of **devāñ* is supported by Lanman (Noun Infl. 354, Arnold 101, 307, Old, etc.). On this form see disc. esp. ad X.64.14. The full phrase, *devāñāṇ jánma* is found in this same hymn, VI.51.12, where it is metrically impeccable; the change of **devāñ* to *devānām* in our vs. can be ascribed to the influence of the phrase in 12.

Old strenuously objects to taking *sanutár ā ca* as a conjoined phrase of directional elements (flg. BR), and Re agrees with him. I do not see the problem; *ā* is of course generally a preverb and less commonly an adposition, but in these usages it is clearly directional/locational, and conjoining it with another such element seems well within RVic syntactic bounds, even if the other word is more clearly adverbial. Moreover, neither Old nor Re gives any indication of what to do with *ca* if it's not conjoining the two. I therefore follow Ge (flg. BR) and Klein (DGRV I.63). (The case of Re is a bit complex: he expresses his objections to the BR view in the notes to the Viśvedevāḥ hymns in EVP IV, but in the tr. of those same hymns in EVP V he tr. as a conjoined phrase “au loin et au près.” Either he forgot or he changed his mind.)

VI.51.3: The opening of this vs., *stuṣé*, is identical to the beginning of VI.49 and very similar to the beginning of VI.50 (*huvé*), both of which vss. (VI.49.1, VI.50.1) contain the divine list discussed in the next paragraph.

We have already had occasion to note (comm. ad VI.49.1, 50.1) the unexpected trio Varuṇa, Mitra, Agni, in which Agni substitutes for expected Aryaman. Here we have a different third member: Aditi, Mitra, Varuṇa (*áditim mītrām váruṇam*), opening rather than closing the pāda. Of course, as their mother, Aditi has a closer connection to Mitra and Varuṇa than Agni does, but in fact she is rarely found in their immediate company: only in the voc. phrase II.27.14 *ádite mītra váruṇotá* also pāda-init. and in a larger list of gods in V.46.3. In our passage the missing Aryaman is added at the beginning of the next pāda (3c), just as he was added in the pāda (c) immediately following the list in VI.50.1b. Note that in VI.50.1 *áditim* precedes the trio in the first pāda of the vs. (VI.50.1a).

In pāda a I take *maháḥ* as an acc. pl., contra the standard tr. (Ge, Re, Scar 291) “herdmen of great truth.” Either is of course grammatically and semantically possible, but I was influenced by the undoubted acc. pl. *maháḥ* also referring to the gods in the next vs. (4b) as well as 9d.

The *vah* in pāda a is ambig. With the standard tr. (Ge, Re, Scar 291), I take it as referring to the gods in the 2nd ps. On the other hand, references to the gods have so far been in the 3rd ps. and will remain so in the next vs.; 2nd ps. address only appears in vs. 5. So it would be equally possible to take *vah* as an instance of the common practice of a poet addressing his priestly comrades, “I will praise, for you/on your behalf, the great herdsmen of truth ...” Nothing much hangs on the difference, nor is there any way to determine which is correct.

Note that *ádabdha-dhītīn* ‘having undeceivable inspired thoughts’ at the end of c echoes *áditim* beginning b, despite the differences in lexicon and even segmentation. It also is responsive with *rtá-dhītayah* ‘having truth as inspired thoughts’ in 10d, and the two form part of the ring around the omphalos vss. 6–7. While *ádabdha-* is taken up by *ádabdhān* in 4a.

For *sadhanyāḥ* I now favor the scenario sketched by Scar (291) as an alternative to the analysis as belonging to a root noun cmpd. *sadha-nī-*. See comm. ad IV.1.9. As noted there, Scar begins with a *sa-dhāna-* ‘common wealth’ to which a **sadhanī-* ‘sharer in common wealth’ → ‘companion’ could be formed. He then suggests that because of a perceived connection with $\sqrt{nī}$, the stem was reinterpreted and reformed as *sadhanī-*. Although this requires more machinery than simply taking it as a root noun cmpd. to $\sqrt{nī}$ in the first place, the semantics of that supposed cmpd. are somewhat troublesome; moreover the stem *sadhanitvá-* can be more easily derived by this route. MLW alternatively suggests that the stem is a *vrkī* deriv. to *sadhāna-*. This would account for the morphology more easily than what was just sketched; however, it would have to be masc. *vrkī* form. Not impossible of course (cf. *rathī-*), but one more required assumption.

VI.51.4: I follow Ge (as well as Th Fremdling, Oberlies I.344, etc.) in rendering *suvasanā-* as ‘good dwelling’, against some potentially good arguments to the contrary. The stem is attested only once elsewhere, IX.97.50 in the phrase *vāstrā suvasanāni*, where it clearly refers to good garments (\sqrt{vas} ‘wear, clothe’), and the base of our cmpd, *vāsana-* (a hapax), likewise only means clothing. Citing these words, as well as *vastra-dā-* ‘giving garments’ (V.42.8; like our phrase *suvasanāsyā dātīn*), Re holds firm to “donateurs de bonne vêtue” (so also Gr). But *sātpatīn* ‘lords of settlements’ in the preceding pāda supports a ‘dwelling’ interpr., and it would be easy to form such a deriv. to the well-attested root \sqrt{vas} ‘dwell’. (Note that the derivatives that would support the ‘clothing’ sense are found in that sense only once apiece, so do not seem well established enough to block such a formation.)

Ge construes *divāḥ* with *nīn* and take *kṣāyataḥ* absolutely: “die mächtigen Herrn des Himmels.” As in vs. 2, Re seems to have changed his mind (a phenomenon I know well; witness this comm.) between the comm. fascicle (EVP IV) and the tr. fascicle (EVP V): in the former he comments of *kṣāyataḥ* “emploi absolu,” but in the latter tr. “seigneurs résidants du ciel,” with *divāḥ* dependent on the participle. He evidently assigns the participle to ‘dwell’, though the participle of the root pres. to that root is only *kṣiyānt-*, while *kṣāyant-* belongs to *kṣāya-* ‘rule over’. (Curiously he correctly interpr. the finite *kṣāyatha* in 7c as “vous réglez.”) Ge (etc.) must base their interpr. on the existence of the phrase *divó nārah / nīn*, but though this collocation is attested elsewhere (e.g., V.54.10, VI.2.3, VI.2.11=14.6), it is not a particularly common expression, and $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘rule over’ regularly takes a genitive, incl. in 7c *viśvasya hí kṣāyatha* “for you rule over all,” a phrase Re in fact cites in his comm.

VI.51.5: This vs. consists primarily of a string of vocatives, plus a couple of 2nd pl. impvs., so in one way it is quite straightforward. However, the accentual behavior of the vs., and particularly the vocc., is peculiar. The first pāda consists only of vocatives: two double names (Father Heaven, Mother Earth) and a single adjective (by word order belonging to the latter, but it is a root noun cmpd and its voc. is indifferent to gender). Each word in the pāda is accented (with voc. accent): *dyaùṣ pítāḥ pṛthivi mātār ādhruk*. The first three words of the next pāda are likewise vocatives: a name plus epithet and a different (pl.) name. Only the first of these is accented: *āgne bhrātār vasavaḥ*. The next word is an impv. *mṛlātā*, and it is accented after the extrasentential voc. phrase (cf. comm. ad VI.50.11, where this was floated as a possibility to explain an unusually accented verb

[the same verb in fact], though rejected). The third pāda also begins with three vocatives, one a two-word phrase, one an individual name, with only the first accented: *viśva ādityā adite*. I am completely puzzled as to why the first pāda differs from the next two. Old is also puzzled: “Behandlung der Vokativakzente befremdet, aber wir haben kein Recht zu rühren.”

The content of the vs. is otherwise banal. As Re points out, *viśva ādityāh* is a stand-in for *viśve devāh*.

VI.51.6: Pāda d must remain in the domain of *hī* in c, as shown by the accent on *babhūvá*, as is recognized by the standard tr.

The repetition of *yūyám* at the beginning of d is, I think, due not only to rhetoric but to the desire to make the ps./no. of *babhūvá* perfectly clear. The 2nd pl. act. pf. is surely the least well attested form of the act. perfect system (save for 1st du.), and it also has a highly under-characterized ending (-a), which has the misfortune to be identical to the ending of the best attested form in the pf. system, the 3rd sg., as well as the less well attested 1st sg. (For the relative strengths of attestation, a glance at Macdonell’s Vedic Grammar §485 will suffice.) In most pf. paradigms it would be distinguished from those forms by ablaut grade (e.g., 1st sg. *cakāra*, 3rd sg. *cakāra*, 2nd pl. *cakrá*), but here, because the pf. of *√bhū* doesn’t ablaut, only the accent separates it from 3rd (and 1st) sg. *babhūva*. This may be another reason that it was kept syntactically in the realm of *hī*, to require it to have an accent. It’s worth noting that this is the only 2nd pl. pf. to *√bhū* in the RV.

dákṣa- is ordinarily a noun, ‘skill’, but in the publ. tr. I was persuaded by the standard tr. to render it as an adj. ‘skillful’ with *vācas-*. This phrase also occurs in VIII.86.1 and, with a different derivative of *√vac*, in X.113.9 *dákṣebhir vacanébhiḥ*. In the latter I tr. as an adj. “with skillful words,” but in the former as two independent nouns “of skill and of speech.” I am uncertain which is correct. Re is quite stern: “*dákṣa-* est nécessairement adjectif ici et en plusieurs passages ...: inutile de chercher à éviter ici l’emploi, avec Gr., emploi qui est le seul substantif en skt cl.” The Classical Skt. usage is suggestive, but I am wary of the absolutist language of “nécessairement” and “inutile”: very few things in RVic interpr. are absolutely necessary. I would therefore allow an alt. tr. here: “you have become (the charioteers) of (our) skill and speech.” That vs. 9 contains a cmpd. containing the noun, *pūtá-dakṣa-* ‘of refined skill’, though modifying the gods, might support a ‘skill’ interpr. here, esp. as the ‘charioteer’ motif is found there as well.

VI.51.7: On apparently anomalous *mā ... bhujema* see comm. ad IV.3.13.

Re points out the rarity of the cmpd. *viśvádeva-* in the pl. referring to the All Gods (though to his X.125.1 should be added VII.35.11). At least in our passage the full voc. *viśve devāh* would produce a bad cadence.

VI.51.8: In this deliberately repetitive vs. (6 occurrences of *nāmas-*), it is difficult to render the repeated verbs *ā vivase* (a, d) in the same way. As the desid. to *√van*, *vivāsa-*, esp. with *ā*, means lit. ‘seek to win here’, hence ‘attract’, which is fine in pāda a. But with the object “committed offense” (*kṛtām énaḥ*) the sense is harder to manipulate. I take it as ‘win back’, hence ‘redeem’; Ge ‘abbitten’ (beg pardon, apologize), with no attempt to connect this tr. to the literal meaning or to the other occurrence of the verb in the passage;

Re makes good use of his usual parentheses: “je l’attire (pour le détruire),” which evades the problem.

VI.51.9: This vs. recalls the *nāmas-* vs. (8), with its two occurrences of *ā vivase*, one of which is construed with instr. *nāmasā*. Here we have the verb form *ā name*, which imitates *ā vivase* in preverb and med. 1st sg. form, but with the verbal root from which *nāmas-* is derived, *√nam* ‘bow, bend’. It also is construed with an instr. of the *s*-stem, *nāmobhiḥ*.

VI.51.10: Judging from the repeated *té* and the *u* that follows the 2nd one (strikingly in the middle of a pāda), we should be dealing with two parallel clauses, one nominal, one verbal. The accent on *nāyanti* shows that the 2nd clause is in the domain of the *hí* in pāda a. Ge renders as two clauses, but does not seem to keep the 2nd in the *hí* domain; Re ignores the *té u* and tr. as a single clause. There does not appear to be a main clause in the vs., unless we want to construe cd as a nominal main cl. (“they are of good rule ...”).

sukṣatrā- reprises the same word in 4c, and as noted ad vs. 3, *ṛtā-dhīti-* matches *ādabdhā-dhīti* in 3c. The two are part of the supportive ring around the omphalos vss. 6–7.

Once again we meet the trio Varuṇa, Mitra, Agni (see comm. on vs. 3, and previous vss. noted there), but Aryaman is nowhere in the vicinity and Aditi only in a rather random list in the next vs. (11).

Consonant with the focus on truth in this hymn, pāda d is framed by the words *ṛtā-* and *satyā-*, the former as first member of a cmpd, the latter as last member. As was just noted, *ṛtā-dhīti-* is a well-formed bahuvrīhi with a parallel already in the hymn. But *vakma-rāja-satya-* is distinctly peculiar. For one thing, it has three members, which is unusual for the RV. But more striking is the final member *satya-*, whose relation to the prior (complex) member *vakma-rāja(n)-* is unclear. (Curiously, AiG doesn’t touch this cmpd.) Its only possible parallel is the even stranger *ṛtā-jāta-satya-*, with both *ṛtā-* and *satyā-*, in IV.51.7 (see comm. ad loc.). Gr glosses “dem Lenker der Gebete treu oder willfährig.” Ge treats as two separate words “die beredten Könige, die wahrhaften,” without commenting on this disjunction (or does he think it’s a dvandva?), though he cites Sāy. as interpr. “wahrhaftig gegen die Herren der Rede d.h. die Sänger,” which is also reflected in Gr.’s gloss. Old’s “in Wahrheit Könige der Rede” and Re’s “qui sont vraiment les rois de la parole (sacrale)” are in essential agreement, and the publ. tr. follows them -- though I feel as though we’re all missing something.

VI.51.11: The publ. tr. seems to suggest an etymological relationship between “earthly realm” and “Earth,” but in fact they are lexically distinct: *kṣāma* and *pṛthivī*, though adjacent.

The list of strengtheners in ab is oddly assorted, but up till the last term they are all divinities or (*pṛthivī*) capable of being so configured; I therefore don’t understand the presence of the “five peoples” (*pāñca jánāḥ*), who are humans. Ge’s ref. to X.53.4 is no help (at least to me); see now comm. ad loc.

Both Ge and Re take the injunc. *vardhan* as modal “may they / let them strengthen.” Certainly the impv. *bhāvantu* in the 2nd hemistich would support this interpr., but in general modal readings of injunctives are rather rare.

The 2nd hemistich contains 5 cmpds with *su-* as first member, all but the last bahuvrīhis, as Re points out. The odd-man-out is *sugopāḥ* ‘good herdmen’. All 5 have accent on the 2nd member.

VI.51.12: As disc. in the publ. intro., this is the final vs. of the first hymn in this composite group and as such summarizes the just-concluded hymn and asks for divine favor, naming the poet, or rather his family.

The grammatical identity and the use of *nāmśi* is uncertain. Gr labels it as an aor. (also Wh Rts), 1st sg. middle, and this interpr. is reflected in Ge’s and Re’s tr. -- though both add a modal feature (“möchte ich ...,” “je voudrais ...”) that would again be somewhat unusual for an injunctive. Lub also groups it with the root aor. and calls it an injunc. but with ? (By contrast Hoffmann won’t commit to an analysis [219].) In one sense a finite aor. is the most likely interpr., but if so, we must explain the accent on what appears to be a non-initial main-clause verb. The hemistich would also switch from 1st ps. in this pāda to 3rd ps. in the rest of the vs. (*bhāradvājaḥ ... yāti ...*), and though RVic discourse is certainly capable of that, it’s one more anomaly. The publ. tr. follows Old’s preference for Ludwig’s interpr. of the form as an infinitive. In either case (finite form or infin.) it is, as Old says, “auffallend gebildet.” I take it as a loc. inf. with a purpose function, though I realize that this is ad hoc.

In the context of later śrauta ritual, the application of *hotā* and *yājamānaḥ* to the same individual would be strange. But the ritual roles so distinct in middle Vedic śrauta texts are by no means clearly parceled out in the RV, and in particular *yājamāna-* does not usually identify a particular ritual role but acts as an attributive participle, as I think it does here.

VI.15.13–15: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider the remaining vss. to belong to a different hymn (or hymns?), appended to the unified, well-structured hymn found in vss. 1–12. Vss. 13–15 are unified by their meter, including an unusual variant of Uṣṇih with the configuration 8 8 / 8 4; see disc. ad vs. 13. Whether vs. 16, in Anuṣṭubh, belongs to this set or was independently appended I don’t know, but it certainly has a “final” feel to it.

VI.51.13: This first vs. of the extra material has various lexical ties to the first hymn: *vr̥jinām*: 2c *vr̥jinā*; *satpate*: 4a *sātpatīr*; *ripūr*: 7d *ripūḥ*, which might help explain why it (and the following two vss.) were attached here.

Ge attaches *daviṣṭhām asya satpate* to ab and begins a new cl. with *kṛdhī*: “Schaffe gute Fahrt.” I assume that one of his motivations is the accent on *kṛdhī*, which appears to be in the middle of a pāda. And he may feel that making “easy passage” (*sugām*) for a criminal would be contrary to expectation. However, he seems to ignore the *asya* -- at least I find nothing in his tr. that corresponds to it. The accentual problem can be easily resolved: the three vss. 13–15 seem to have an 8 8 / 8 4 structure, rather than 8 8 / 12. On this analysis of the meter, *kṛdhī* starts a new pāda and should be accented. In vs. 14 *vīko hī śāḥ* is a new clause and nicely fits a separate pāda, and in vs. 15 *gopā amā* is also syntactically separate.

Vs. 15 also supports my interpr. in another way: *kārtā naḥ ... sugām* “make good passage for us” is syntactically parallel to my interpr. of 13 ... *asya ... kṛdhī sugām*

“make good passage for him,” with *naḥ* corresponding to *asya*. As for making good passage for a criminal, the point is to get him as far away as fast as possible, and good passage will accomplish this faster than bad.

(Re’s interpr. is overly complex; though he does find space for the *asya*, he does not deal with the accented verb. I won’t treat it further here.)

VI.51.14: The unusual position of *hí*, normally a 2nd position element, is due to immediately following *kam*. For whatever reason (and I don’t know it), *hí kam* is a phrasal unit, whether it occurs in expected 2nd position (I.98.1, II.28.8, VIII.11.10) or not (VIII.44.24, IX.49.4, X.100.5). II.37.5 may provide a transition between the two, since the *hí kam* sequence is not pāda-initial there, but it is in 2nd position in its clause.

The standard treatments (Gr, Ge, Re) take *vāvaśúḥ* to $\sqrt{vaś}$ ‘wish for’, but Kü (477–80) has argued persuasively that morphological factors favor instead a connection with $\sqrt{vāś}$ ‘bellow’ -- though he allows for a secondary contamination from the former root for a sense “sehnsüchtig brüllen.” I am in complete agreement. The most salient feature of the pressing stones is their noise, and so bellowing for Soma’s companionship like the bovines that are the usual subjects of $\sqrt{vāś}$ makes perfect sense.

See comm. ad vs. 13 for the four-syllable pāda consisting of the nominal sentence *vīko hí śāḥ*. As I argued in my 2009 “Function of Animals in the RV” (Paris animal vol., 206–9, esp. 208), the wolf is a cross-category in RVic classification, and this statement is a quasi-legal declaration that a particular human evil-doer is an outlaw -- with parallels in other early Indo-European traditions.

VI.51.15: In the second hemistich *ādhvan* ‘on the road’ and *amā* ‘at home’ are contrastive, as Re points out. The brief tag *gopā amā* must be a separate clause: both Ge and Re supply an imperatival “be,” as do I. Again clausal division supports the metrical division suggested ad vs. 13.

VI.51.16: One possible arg. for taking vs. 16 with the three that precede, despite their metrical difference, is that *s^uvastigām* in b is reminiscent of *sugām* in 13d and could form a little ring. But I’m not at all certain this is sufficient.

On the basis of my reeval. of *anehās*- (see comm. ad X.61.12) I would now substitute the tr. “on the flawless path,” since our desire is for a physically perfect path, not a morally blameless one. See also comm. ad VI.50.12.

VI.52 All Gods

For the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

VI.52.1: The instr. of ab, in two semantic sets -- Heaven and Earth, sacrifice and ritual labors -- apparently are the entities that the speaker swears by.

The vs., at least its 2nd hemistich, has a slangy feel -- with the unusual phonology of the root \sqrt{ubj} ‘crush’ and the lexeme *ní√hā* ‘be bent double’ (in my rendering; see comm. ad VII.104.10), found elsewhere only in a curse in the Anhangslied VII.104.10.

The agent noun *yastár*- seems like a potential candidate for the role of technical term for ‘Sacrificer’, which was rejected in favor of *yájamāna*-.

VI.52.1–2: It is unfortunately impossible to capture in Engl. the play between *ānu* √ *man* ‘concede’ (1a) and *āti* √ *man* ‘d disdain’ (2a), with the further echo of *āti* in *atīyājā-* (1d).

VI.52.2: *nīnitsāt* is an unusual formation: a subjunctive to a desiderative. It may lend immediacy to the action, which is to be taken against a formulation that is *being performed* (note the pres. part. *kriyāmānam*).

Old, Ge, and Re all take *vr̥jināni* as a nominalized adjective (“seine Falschheiten,” etc.), modified by or identified with *tāpūṃsi* (e.g., Ge “dem mögen seine Falschheiten zu Feuerflammen werden”), rather than simply as an adjective. It would be possible to tr. it adjectivally (“for him let there be twisting, scorching [flames]”). In the publ. tr. I chose to render *vr̥jināni* both ways, as a nominalized adj. (‘twisted [ways]’) and as an adj. ‘twisting’ characterizing the flames. In this way the punishment fits the crime. Note that *vr̥jinā-* was used twice in the preceding hymn, VI.51.2, 13.

VI.52.3: Ge (and to a lesser extent Re) takes the repeated *kīm aṅgá* as “why?” But this seems more insulting to Soma than seems wise if we are urging him to strike our enemies. I take it rather as marking a series of solemn rhetorical question setting out the reasons why Soma should come to our aid.

VI.52.4: Although this vs. begins a new ṛca, it continues the series of pres. participles that bring a vivid immediacy to the poet’s bids for help: *kriyāmānam* (2b) ‘being performed’, *nidyāmānam* (3c) ‘being scorned’, and here *jāyamānāḥ* (4a) ‘being born’, *pīnvamānāḥ* (4b) ‘swelling’. The *dhruvāsaḥ* ‘steadfast’ in c brings all this ongoing action to a halt, and *devāhūtau* breaks the series entirely -- until the next vss.

VI.52.5: Another pres. part. *uccārantam* ‘rising’.

Ge and Re interpr. *devān* as a truncated gen. pl., which would be esp. unusual in pāda-initial position (pāda-final being at least arguably more plausible, since truncation and the adjustment of cadences in different meters are possible factors). Old seems to take this interpr. as tantamount to a moral lapse (“... scheint mir Verlassen des geraden Weges”). He takes it as the acc. pl. it appears to be, but construes it with *āgamiṣṭhaḥ* (“der den Göttern am besten mit Hilfe beispringt”). Although this is syntactically possible, it is semantically unlikely: Indra, who by the evidence of the repeated and expanded phrase in 6a is clearly the subject, is most welcome to come to *us*; I doubt if we care whether the gods hope for his arrival or not. My own solution is somewhat dodgy: I take *óhānaḥ* as a pass. part. ‘being lauded as’ with the venerable formulaic phrase *vásupatir vásūnām* “goods-lord of goods” as the title given by the laud (so far so good), with *devān* a loosely relational acc., almost an acc. of extent: “(lauded) over/across the (other) gods.” (Ge’s and Re’s interpr. of *vásupatir vásūnām* and *óhānaḥ* vary, and I will not detail them here.)

VI.52.6: The part. *pīnvamānā* is repeated from 4b, with a small twist of phraseology: Sarasvatī swelling *with* the rivers, rather than the rivers swelling as in 4b.

The syntactic status of the various gods in bcd is unclear. Are they all separate subjects of *āgamiṣṭhaḥ* (so Re)? Or should we supply other verbs? Ge supplies “sei” with cd, but keeps b with a, implicitly making Sarasvatī another subj. of *āgamiṣṭhaḥ*. Or is this

just the beginning of an All God list, with no predicates required -- or feeding into the next *ṛca* inviting the All Gods to come here?

VI.52.7–12: These two *ṛcas* (7–9, 10–12) are in Gāyatrī, and the first *ṛca* esp. is an elementary production, with almost no tricks (though see vs. 9). One wonders whether great swaths of RV-period poetry were similarly lackluster and therefore not generally preserved.

VI.52.9: This vs. consists of two 3rd pl. impv. clauses, ab and c. The 2nd is entirely straightforward, and the first is until the end, where we find a hemistich-final rel. prn. *yé*, clearly coreferential with the subj. of the impv. but difficult to construe: *úpa naḥ sūnávo gírah, śṛṇvāntu amṛtasya yé*. The only grammatical way to interpr. this is as a tag nominal rel. cl. *amṛtasya yé* “who (are) of the immortal one.” But this leaves the main-cl. subj. *sūnávaḥ* underdefined: it is not any set of sons that we invite to hear our hymns, but only the sons of the immortal one. But tag rel. clauses generally give additional, not necessary, information about their referents in the main clause, and so such an interpr. would leave the sentence oddly unbalanced. We cannot take the whole hemistich as a rel. cl. (“which sons of the immortal ...”), not only because the rel. prn. would be too deep in its clause, following both subject and VP, but also because impvs. do not occur in subordinate clauses in the RV. I think we’re dealing with a poet who knew about tag rel. clauses and wanted to try his hand at one, but didn’t know how they work. As Ge points out (n. 9ab), the substance of the cl. is identical to X.13.1 *śṛṇvāntu víśve amṛtasya putráḥ*. Given these considerations, I have not attempted to render the *yé* -- passing in silence over a journeyman’s lapse.

VI.52.10: The first hemistich here does assay a little figure: *ṛtā- ṛtú-* across the *pāda* boundary.

The use of *yújya-* in c is not entirely clear to me. I take it to mean that the offering, the milk (*páyaḥ*), is ritually associated with the calls (*hávana-*) the gods are hearing. Cf. VI.3.8. Ge and Re think that the association is between the substance and the gods.

VI.52.11: This vs. is essentially parallel to vs. 10: various gods are to enjoy both verbal and material offerings, with the verb stem *juṣá-* ‘enjoy’ held constant. Vs. 10 has an impv. *juṣántām*, but our vs. an injunc. *juṣanta*. The latter may be a substitute for the impv. in a metrical situation that favors a light final syl.

VI.52.13–15: I consider these three vss. as a *ṛca*. They are thematically unified, by their focus on the gods in general and (esp. vss. 13 and 15) by their classification of the gods into groups based on their location and type. On the supposed Jagatī meter of vs. 14, which would not match its *ṛca* partners, see ad loc.

VI.52.13: The disjunctive pairing *yé agnijihvá utá vā yájatrāḥ* is puzzling if we take the *utá vā* seriously. Klein’s tr. (DGRV II.168–69) can stand for the standard tr.: “which ones have Agni as their tongue or are worthy of worship.” Klein considers this an example of “opposed but nonantonymous terms” giving a “subcategorization of heavenly ones.” But

when so rendered there seems to be no distinction between the two groups: the general run of gods who are worthy of the sacrifice also receive those oblations through Agni -- there's no reason for a *vā*. I am therefore inclined to pay attention to the *-tra* instrument suffix on *yājatrāḥ*: 'the instruments or means of sacrifice'. Such an interpr. divides the set into those who require Agni as intermediary and those who directly effect the sacrifice. Exactly who the latter might be, I'm not certain -- perhaps only Soma. If I am correct, *yājatra-* is used differently from *yajñīya-* in the next vs. But see vs. 17 where *yājatra-* does not seem to have the instrument sense.

VI.52.14: This vs. is metrically problematic. The Anukr. (also HvN) identifies it as a Jagatī, but the vs. instead seems mostly to be aiming to be a Triṣṭubh, like the surrounding (and thematically related) vss. 13 and 15. To begin at the end, d is simply a standard Triṣṭubh pāda (though with uncommon break): 11 syllables with a fine cadence. The intermediate pādas b and c have 12 syllables (possibly 13 in c), but a Triṣṭubh cadence, which seems more diagnostic than the syllable count. Old (ad loc. and ad I.53.10) favors an "überzählig" interpr. for both, in other words as Triṣṭubhs with an extra syl.; see his disc. in Prol. 67. Only pāda a is an unproblematic Jagatī, and even here, as Old points out (though he does not favor this analysis), it might be possible to read the final word *yajñīyāḥ* as a disyllable, which would again produce a perfect Triṣṭubh.

VI.52.16: Agni and Parjanya seem an odd couple, and this dual dvandva is found only here. But recall that the two appear together earlier in the hymn, in vs. 6 (with Indra and Sarasvatī), and in fact Parjanya is oddly well represented in this set of All God hymns; cf. the dual dvandva *parjanya-vātā* in VI.49.6, 50.12. In our vs. the two are given a division of labor, conveyed by the "the one ... the other" construction of c (*īlām anyó janáyad gárbham anyāḥ*), but curiously which god is responsible for which begetting is unclear enough to have produced entirely opposite interpretations. In his n. 16c Ge, who does not commit himself in his tr., cites Sāy. at length, who thinks that Parjanya produces the *īlā-*, while Agni produces the *gárbha-*. Re the exact opposite: "Que l'un [Agni] engendre l'oblation-liquide, l'autre [Parjanya] le germe." Although I think Re is more likely correct, the analysis is by no means certain. Note, on the one hand, nearby VI.50.12 *parjanya-vātā pipyatām íṣam naḥ* "Let Parjanya and Vāta swell refreshments for us," which supports Sāy.'s interpr. On the other, Parjanya is more regularly associated with *rétas-* 'semen', and one passage in one of the three hymns dedicated to him, V.83.1, is esp. telling: *réto dadhāti óṣadhīṣu gárbham* "He deposits his semen as embryo in the plants," with the *gárbha-* found here. The ambiguity is probably meant.

As Ge points out, the two products are reconciled in the last pāda, where both gods are urged jointly to give us "refreshments accompanied by offspring" (*prajāvatīr íṣaḥ*), with *prajā-* standing in for *gárbha-* and *íṣ-* for *īlā-* from pāda c.

VI.52.17: A typical final vs. summarizing the ritual. For *yajatrāḥ* see comm. ad vs. 13.

VI.53 Pūṣan

Although, as noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is remarkably bloodthirsty, there is also a minor theme focusing on poetry and poetic formulation. The word *dhī-* 'poetic vision' is found in the first and last vss., shaping a faint ring, as well as in vs. 4. And

Pūṣan is called *kaví-* in vs. 5, and his awl is the ‘impeller of the *bráhman-*’ (*brahma-códanī-*) in vs. 8.

VI.53.2: This is the only possible passage in the RV in which *grhápati-* ‘houselord’ may refer to a human (as also noted by Oberlies, I.355 n. 99); in all other cases its referent is Agni. (See my forthcoming “The Term *grhastha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder.”) The presence of *nárya-* ‘stemming from men’ and *vīrá-* ‘hero’ may support a human reading for *grhápati-*; in both cases we seem to be aiming for valuable goods given to us by human patrons, and “a houselord of value” (*vāmám grhápatim*) would be a third such instance. However, since both *ní-* and *vīrá-* can also refer to gods in the RV, the human element is by no means assured, and the otherwise exclusive use of *grhápati-* for a god in the RV is telling. If the word does refer to a human, this may be another indication of the popular character and lower linguistic register of the Pūṣan hymns, as *grhápati-* does refer to humans in the AV.

DL suggests to me that, though the dominant sense of *vāmá-* here must be ‘valuable’, there might be a pun on *vāmá-* (or *vāma-*; see EWA s.v.) ‘left’, immediately following *práyata-dakṣiṇam*. The 2nd member of that bahuvrīhi is of course *dákṣiṇā-* ‘priestly gift’, but the adj. stem *dákṣiṇa-* means ‘right (/south)’. Although *vāmá-/vāma-* ‘left’ is not attested until the ŚB, it could well have been current in ordinary speech before that, as its presence in MIA (e.g., Pāli *vāma-*) suggests. Perhaps another sign of the more demotic lexicon of this hymn.

VI.53.3: For some reason Ge always refuses to tr. the standing epithet of Pūṣan, *āghṛṇi-*, though he fearlessly takes on far more challenging lexical items. The word must belong to the inherited root \sqrt{ghr} ‘be hot, burn’, etc., found only in nominal forms in Skt.; see EWA s.vv. *ghṛṇá-*, *gharmá-*. Why Pūṣan is glowing, fiery, I don’t know; perhaps it would be best to adopt Re’s ‘ardent’.

ví mrada is the only verbal form to this root in the RV, and such forms are quite rare in Vedic (*ví mradate* MS, *mradaya-* TS). (For detailed disc. see Gotō 247–48.) The root is otherwise found in the RV only in the cmpd. *ūrṇa-mradas-* ‘soft as wool, lit. having the softness of wool’ in the funeral hymn X.18.10. I wonder if *mrada* belongs to the technical terminology of fabric construction and therefore would fit in with Pūṣan’s connection to homely, practical activities, as in the words for ‘awl’ (or whatever *āṛā-* is) and the like in this hymn. However, the TS, MS passages don’t support this speculation.

VI.53.3–4: Note *ví mrada* (3c), *ví mṛdhaḥ* (4b).

VI.53.5–6: On *āṛā-* see EWA s.v. It is difficult to determine exactly what tool it was, but it seems to have had a sharp point, at least later means ‘awl’, and means ‘awl’ in cognate languages. In any case it is the sort of utilitarian implement that we would not expect to find in the hands of, say, Indra, but that is appropriate to the more down-to-earth handyman Pūṣan. The word is found in Vedic only in this hymn (vss. 5, 6, 8). Re’s ‘lance’ seems entirely too elevated; Ge’s ‘Stachel’ is a better fit.

VI.53.7–8: These vss. contains the delightful phrase *ā rikha kikirā kṛṇu*, whose playful sonic effects I endeavored to capture in my anachronistic tr. The word *kikirā* is of course a hapax (though cf. YV *kikkīṭā*), and I doubt if a lexical meaning is to be sought for it.

I do wonder whether the original phrase read **kuru* for **kṛṇu*. The former is, of course, a late form, belonging to the irregular paradigm *karōti*, *kurutē* that will replace the well-behaved 5th cl. *kṛṇōti* after the RV. The impv. *kuru* is found in only two passages in the late RV, but in a colloquial hymn like this it would be at home, and the phonological patterning would be improved: *ā rikha kikirā *kuru*, with CV syllables containing repeated high vowels and a consonantal *r* in each word, in addition to the *k*'s. This **kuru* would have been replaced redactionally by the *kṛṇu* standard in RVic discourse on the basis of *kṛṇuhi* in 10c. Vs. 10 displays a more formal level of discourse and imitates the final hymn-summary vss. found through the RV, and the standard RVic form of the pres. of \sqrt{kr} is in order there.

VI.53.10: As just noted, this vs. leaves the rough-and-tumble and provides a solemn and conventional end to the hymn. For a similar sequence of X-*sā*-cmpds in a hymn-final vs., see, e.g., IX.2.10, whose pāda b is identical to pāda b here, save for the case (nom. vs. acc.). It also, as noted before, ring-compositionally echoes vs. 1 *dhīyé* with *dhīyam*. The *dhī-* that we launched in vs. 1 will now (we pray) be crowned with goods.

The first hemistich nicely begins and ends with *utā*, though the two have different functions—the first as interstanzaic conjunction (Klein DGRV I.401) and the other conjoining the acc. obj. nouns in series (ibid. 351–52).

VI.54 Pūṣan

A remarkably unproblematic hymn on the whole.

VI.54.7: The sequence *mākiḥ ... mākīm ... mākim*, each followed by an injunctive in prohibitive sense, is remarkable, in that all three can be read (and are read by me, seemingly also Ge: “keines ... keines ... keines ...”) as expressing the same (negated) subject of the verbs -- but only *-kiḥ* has a nominative “look.” It would be possible, with Gr, to take *mākīm* as ‘nimmer, nicht’, as against *mākis* ‘niemand, keiner’, but the sing-song parallelism of the passage invites the two forms to be interpr. identically. (A Gr-inspired interpr. should yield “let none disappear; let it never be harmed ..., etc.”) Re claims that *mākis* is personal (“puisse aucun(e)”) while *mākim* is impersonal (“puisse rien” or “... jamais”) -- the latter (“jamais”) is of course Gr’s position, the former (“rien”) seems hard to maintain in this passage, where surely the subjects of the verbs are all the same, namely the cow that is our concern in this part of the hymn. I think we must reckon with a morphological extension even greater than that found in the free-standing particles *sīm* and *īm*. Those two stand for all numbers and genders, but always have accusative function. (See my 2002 Fs. Cardona “RVic *sīm* and *īm*.”) Here, perhaps by way of the adverbial-type readings favored by Gr and Re (see VIII.45.23), *-kīm* has lost all distinctive case function and can be used as a nominative. See a similar use of *nākīm* in VIII.78.4.

On Hoffmann’s analysis of *neśat* as a redupl. aor. to $\sqrt{naś}$, see comm. ad IV.1.17.

VI.54.8: On *īrya-* see comm. ad V.58.4.

In c I take *rāyāḥ* as a morphological pun, both gen. sg. with *īśānam* and acc. pl. with *īmahe*. See a more complex example in the next hymn VI.55.2, as well as VIII.26.22, 46.6, 53.1 for the identical pāda with identical interpr.

VI.54.10: The first two pādas are marked by alliteration: *pāri pūṣā parāstād, dhāstam dadhātu dākṣiṇam*. The sandhi-induced *dh* of *dhāstam* (for underlying *hāstam*) is esp. nice.

VI.55 Pūṣan

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is structured by an ever-shifting lexical chain. The links are as follows: vs. 1 *rathīḥ* -- 2 *rathītāmam* / 2 *rāyāḥ sākḥāyam* -- 3 *rāyāḥ ... sākḥā* / 3 *ajāsva* -- 4 *ajāśvam* / 4 *svāsura* ... *jārāḥ* -- 5 *svāsura jārāḥ*. For the last vs. which lacks a precise repetition, note *bhrātā* in 5 phonologically echoed by *bībhṛataḥ* ending 6, although they are of course lexically unrelated. We might also note that the verb in 1b, *sacāvahai* ‘let us two accompany each other’, is echoed by the ‘companion’ word *sākhi-* in vss. 2, 3, and 5, and *ajā-* ‘goat’, found in the cmpd. *ajāśva-* ‘having goats as horses’ of vss. 3–4, reappears in 6 without the horses.

VI.55.1: The tonic 1st dual nominative prn. *vām* ‘we two’ is a hapax -- the only occurrence of this distinct nominative in all of Sanskrit, replaced post-RV by *āvām*. See AiG III.465–66. It opens its clause, but because it follows the vs.-initial impv. *ēhi*, it appears to be in 2nd position. Is it an accident that this is where the extremely well-attested enclitic dual 2nd ps. *vām* is ordinarily found?

VI.55.2: As noted ad VI.54.8 above, this vs. contains a more complex variant of *īśānam rāyā īmahe* in VI.54.8c. There I interpr. *rāyāḥ* as both a gen. sg. with *īśānam* and an acc. pl. with *īmahe*. In our vs. here, *īśānam* is found in pāda b with an undoubted gen. phrase *rādhaso mahāḥ*, while in pāda c *rāyó sākḥāyam īmahe* we again find a *rāyāḥ* that is both gen. sg. (with *sākḥāyam*) and acc. pl. (again with *īmahe*). This complex seems like a partial “repair” of 54.8, since it makes clear that *īśānam* takes the gen., which in turn suggests that *rāyāḥ* in 54.8 may have that reading too.

VI.55.3: The āmreḍita *dhīvato-dhīvataḥ* ‘of every visionary’ recalls the focus on *dhī-* in the nearby hymn (VI.53.1, 4, 10).

VI.55.4–5: As noted in the publ. intro., these allusions to incest seem remarkably matter-of-fact. The vss. seem to focus more on the kinship relations — sister, mother, brother, comrade — than any potential violation of them.

VI.55.5: Ge interpr. *abravam* to mean “I have spoken *of*” (“(Von Pūṣan) ... habe ich gesprochen”), but the fact that we immediately urge him to hear us suggests that we have spoken *to* him. In the next hymn VI.56.4 ... *tvā ... brāvāma* also clearly means “we speak/say to you.”

VI.55.6: This vs. presents several problems, both located in pāda b: the hapax *niṣṛmbhāḥ* and the highly unusual position of the accented 3rd ps. pl. prn. *té*.

To tackle the first issue first, I am generally persuaded by Berger's 1966 explan. of the Skt. *śrambh* forms as hypersanskritizations of MIA *vissaddha*, etc., in his view itself a cross of Skt. *viśvasta-* and *śraddhā*. See EWA s.v. *ŚRAMBH* and esp. KEWA s.v. *śrámbhate*. My 'trusty' reflects this possible connection with *śraddhā-* 'trust'.

The position of *té* is highly unusual; this pronominal stem overwhelmingly takes init. (or modified init.) position in its clause. When it does not, it is usually adjacent to the verb or has some other obvious reason for its placement. Here it seems dropped in randomly. I therefore propose to read **tejana-śríyam*, with *téjana-* 'sharp point' found once elsewhere in the RV and also thereafter. The only alteration of the Saṃhitā text this requires is dropping the accent on *té*. Here *téjana-* would refer to the goad or awl that Pūṣan wields (see, e.g. VI.53.5–6, 9). In the publ. tr. I made use of Narten's understanding of *-śrī-* in such cmpds as meaning "vollkommendmachen": see her KISch. 352 n. 19 for the transmitted reading of this cmpd *jana-śrī-* rendered as 'die Menschen ... vollkommenmachend' -- though I took **tejana-* as instr.: 'who brings (all) to readiness *with his sharp (goad)'. But I now prefer a different value for *-śrī-* 'splendid with his sharp (goad)' vel sim., more in keeping with my interpr. of other *-śrī-* cmpds like *ghṛta-śrī-* 'splendid with ghee'. On the multiple semantic possibilities of *-śrī-* cmpds see Scar (544–54); on this cmpd in particular, Scar (551): my interpr. is basically his choice B (though of course with *jana-* rather than *tejana-* as 1st member).

VI.56 Pūṣan

VI.56.1: As noted in the publ. tr., there is difference of opinion about the purport of pāda *c nā téna devā ādīśe*. Ge thinks it's a positive expression (n. 1c): Pūṣan likes porridge so much that he'll come without being asked twice. Re thinks it's more ambiguous: for him the idiom *ā√dis* means 'target' (viser), incl. by evil speech or the like, hence 'menace' -- here, targeting Pūṣan with the epithet means that he doesn't have to be targeted "réellement." (Klein's [DGRV I.420] I just don't understand: "by that one is the heavenly one not to be so designated." Does he think that in using that nickname the human is being too familiar with the god?) I find Re's interpr. simply puzzling, but, though Ge's is more persuasive, I think the point is rather that the epithet is a unique designation that picks out Pūṣan once and for all. The usage of *ā√dis* in nearby VI.48.14 is similar; see disc. there. See also VI.57.2 below. MLW adds arguments supporting my interpr.: "In Vedic prose *ā√dis* is used to refer to the specification of which god gets which offering and I think this may be an old old meaning of this verb with parallels in Umbrian."

VI.56.2–3: There is general consensus (Ge, Re, Klein loc. cit.) that Indra is the subject of both of these vss., with Pūṣan appearing only as the instr. companion in 2b. By contrast, I consider Pūṣan the "best charioteer" (*rathītamaḥ* in 2a and 3c), because in the immediately preceding hymn *rathī-* (VI.55.1c), *rathītama-* (VI.55.2a) are unequivocally used of Pūṣan. My interpr. requires that the subject change from 2a to 2bc, where Indra is indeed the subject, but see the *anyāḥ ... anyāḥ* construction in the next hymn (VI.57.2, cf. 3) where the two gods each appear contrastively in the nominative. This interpr. also has the advantage that Pūṣan doesn't disappear in the middle of his own hymn.

VI.56.2: Pāda c is essentially identical to VI.57.3 in the next hymn, but there Indra's two fallow bay horses are Indra's companions when he smashes obstacles.

VI.56.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the content of this vs. is quite baffling, though the syntax and, for the most part, the lexicon are not. Ge (n. 3) pronounces it a “dunkler Sagenzug,” and I can only agree. I have argued that it is connected with the even more baffling VI.48.17 (see comm. there) and that these two passages associate Pūṣan with the “tearing off the Sun's wheel” myth that remains tantalizingly out of our reach. But this must remain speculation.

The *paruṣé gāvī* tr., “in ‘the gray cow’,” is of course masc., so should perhaps be “gray bull,” though I meant cow=bovine. The phrase is reminiscent of V.27.5 *paruṣāḥ ... ukṣānaḥ* “gray bulls/oxen,” but that phrase is in a dānastuti and does not help us with the metaphor here. For another possible – if extremely tenuous – connection see comm. ad X.5.5. If, as I suggest in the publ. intro., the image is of sunrise through a gray cloudbank, it may be related to another obscure passage, X.55.5, where something gray (*palitā-*, not *paruṣā-* as here) swallows the moon.

VI.56.4: Since Pūṣan is the god who sends the cows home and watches over paths and journeys in general, it is entirely appropriate that he should “make [various objects] reach their goal” (*sādhaya*), including our thought. Cf. in the first Pūṣan hymn of this cycle, VI.53.4 *sādhantām ... no dhíyaḥ* “Let our poetic visions reach their goal.”

VI.56.6: The publ. tr. implies that both ‘well-being’ (acc. *svastīm*) and ‘wholeness’ (dat. *sarvātātaye*) are the complements of *īmahe* ‘we beg’, and in fact I think that is the intent of the passage, however loose the syntax. But it might be possible to construe the dat. with ‘well-being’: “we beg you for well-being to completeness,” i.e., for well-being in its entirety.

VI.57 Pūṣan and Indra

VI.57.2: Note the use of ‘porridge’ as an identifying attribute of Pūṣan; this supports my contention above (ad VI.56.1) that ‘porridge-eater’ is a descriptor that uniquely identifies Pūṣan.

VI.57.3: See VI.56.2 above.

VI.57.4: The root noun *rít-* to *√ri* ‘flow’ is a hapax.

VI.57.5: Though apparently straightforward, this vs. is rather oddly constructed, esp. pāda b. The conjoined NP *pūṣnāḥ ... índrasya ca* “of Pūṣan and Indra” is separated by some distance, though perfectly comprehensible. It is the material that separates it, pāda b *vr̥kṣásya prá vayāṁ iva*, that seems awkward. Particularly odd is the mid-pāda position of *prá*, which is far from its verb (if it has a verb; see below) and breaks up a simile with which it seems unconnected: *vr̥kṣásya ... vayāṁ iva* “like the branch of a tree.” In the simile itself *iva* is wrongly placed (expect **vr̥kṣasya-iva vayāṁ*). It is also doubtful that *prá* is in tmesis from the verb (*ā*) *rabhāmahe*, since *prá* never otherwise occurs with

√*rabh*, which is very common with *ā*. I have no explanation for either the position or the function of *prā*. As for the wrong placement of *iva*, putting it after the 2nd term of the simile is not altogether rare and is therefore less puzzling. Note the similar placement of the simile marker in the much more elaborate simile involving a tree branch in X.134.6 *pūrvēna ...padā, ajó vayām yáthā* “as a goat [grasps] a branch with its forefoot.”

All of this may have something to do with the poet’s attempt to set up the play *vayām* (a), *vayām* (b), though that play would have been more effective if *vayām* were pāda-final, not followed by *iva*.

VI.57.6: The lexeme *úd√yu* is found only here in the RV. Ge tr. “lassen ... die Zügel schiessen,” approx. “give free rein to” (sim. Re). Since *ní√yu*, with *ní* the oppositional preverb to *úd*, can mean ‘rein in’ (see disc. ad X.93.9), this makes sense – hence my ‘ease up on’.

VI.58 Pūṣan

As noted in the publ. intro., the style and in part the register of this, the only trimeter hymn in the Pūṣan cycle, is more elevated than the rest. Still, characteristic lexical items -- *ajāśva*- ‘having goats for horses’, *āṣṭra*- ‘goad -- are found.

VI.58.1: It is quite unclear what this vs. is conveying, and my interpr. differs radically from the standard. Flg. Sāy., both Ge and Re supply *rūpām* as the referent for the *anyád ... anyád* construction and further assume that these are two forms of Pūṣan, namely, in Ge’s words (n. 1ab), “die solare und die gewöhnliche Form des Pūṣan.” I find this unlikely for two reasons: 1) I know of no evidence for two forms of Pūṣan, and none is supplied by those who interpr. it thus; 2) there is a perfectly good neut. referent available for the *anyád ... anyád* construction, namely the two day-halves (*āhanī*) in b, whose descriptor *viśurūpe* ‘of dissimilar form’ seems meant to specify the disjunctive choices given in pāda a. (For a similar disjunctive description of the day-halves, with *anyá- ... anyá-*, see nearby VI.49.3.) Moreover, those who take pāda a as referring to Pūṣan’s two forms are forced to take *viśurūpe āhanī* in the simile, as a not very convincing acc. of extent of time (Ge: “du bist wie der Himmel während der verschiedenen Tageshälften”) or the like (Re’s rendering [“tu es comme le ciel aux deux portions-du-jour”]) leaves the syntactic status of the dual expression quite vague). Further, this interpr. pushes the simile-marking *iva* almost to the end of a pāda supposedly consisting entirely of a simile. Although, as just noted (ad VI.57.5), simile markers are sometimes positioned later than expected, this would be quite late indeed.

So by my interpr. the two oppositional day-halves belong, in some sense, to Pūṣan. Why I’m not sure, nor do I know why he is “like heaven.” In conjunction with his mission to the sun in vs. 3 and the ships he uses to travel there, I might speculate that this has to do with Pūṣan’s role as psychopomp for the dead, described in the funeral hymn X.17.3–6, esp. vs. 6 *prāpathe pathām ajaniṣṭa pūṣā, prāpathe divāḥ prāpathe pṛthivyāḥ / ubhé abhī priyātame sadhāsthe, ā ca parā ca carati prajānān* “On the forward path of paths was Pūṣan born, on the forward path of heaven, on the forward path of earth. / He wanders back and forth to both the dearest seats, foreknowing.” Perhaps his wanderings back and forth to heaven approximate the regular alternation of day and night, and that pair is therefore “his” in some sense. (Such an interpr. gets us close to his two “forms,”

an interpr. I have just rejected -- I still think that is wrong, however.) As for why he is like heaven, this must rest on the *hí* clause of pāda c, his giving aid to all *māyā*. What does this mean? Is his mission to take the dead from earth to heaven conceptualized as a *transformation* of the dead, which might be achieved by *māyā*? A last, smaller but nonetheless nagging, question is why, with day characterized as ‘gleaming’ (*śukrām*), is night said to be ‘belonging to the sacrifice, worthy of the sacrifice’ (*yajatām*)? Most Vedic sacrifices take place during the day, save for the Atirātra. Perhaps rites for the dead were associated more with night. MLW adds that this is true “certainly in Roman rituals like the Lemuria and Feralia.”

All of this speculation is tissue-thin, and I do not set much store by it. However, at least it confronts questions that the other interpr. have not raised.

VI.58.2: Most of the contents of this vs. conform to the characteristics of Pūṣan elsewhere in this cycle, even *dhiyaṃjinvā-* ‘quickenning poetic vision’ (see esp. VI.53), but “fitted into all creation” (*bhūvane víśve arpitaḥ*) and “surveying the creatures” (*saṃcākṣāṇo bhūvanā*) attribute to him a more cosmic role than usual. His speeding (*īyate*) may be a reference to his travels between earth and heaven referred to above, ad vs. 1.

víśve is one of two loc. sg. to this stem with the noun ending *-e* (the other being IV.16.9), but the pronomina *víśvasmin* is also only found twice, both times in X.

VI.58.3: Pūṣan’s ships (*nāvah*) are, to my knowledge, not encountered elsewhere. But, as noted above vs. 1, I would tentatively connect them and the mission of the Sun (*dūtyām sūryasya*) with his role as psychopomp of the dead. One question is whether there are two sets of ships -- those in the sea and those in the midspace -- or one, with the midspace being configured here as the sea (Ge’s Luftmeer). I subscribe to the latter view.

VI.58.4: Pūṣan’s “good lineage (*subándhuḥ*) from Heaven and from Earth” directly recalls X.71.6 cited above ad vs. 1 *prápathe pathám ajaniṣṭa pūṣā, prápathe diváh prápathe pṛthivyāḥ* “On the forward path of paths was Pūṣan born, on the forward path of heaven, on the forward path of earth.”

On the Sūryā story, see, inter alia, my 2001 “The Rigvedic svayaṃvara? Formulaic evidence” (Fs. Asko Parpola) and 2003 “Vedic vrā: Evidence for the svayaṃvara in the Rig Veda?” (Fs. H.-P. Schmidt). It is very telling that Pūṣan is given to Sūryā here (*yām devāso ádadhuḥ sūryāyai*) rather than the reverse: the ordinary description of marriage, at least later, is *kanyā-dāna-* ‘the gift of a maiden’, but here she receives rather than being given, presumably a nod to her active role in the Svayaṃvara. Note the much more conventional depiction of Sūryā’s wedding (to a different bridegroom) in the wedding hymn, X.85.9 *sūryāṃ yát pátye ... savitādadāt* “when Savitar gave Sūryā to her husband.”

VI.59 Indra and Agni

On the structure of this hymn and the relationship between the two gods, see publ. intro.

VI.59.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the clichéd intro. “I shall proclaim (*prá √ vac*) the manly deeds ...” associated esp. with Indra hymns (esp. I.32) is here directed to both

gods. The “real” subjunctive *vocā* is found only here in the RV, in contrast to the more common injunctive / functional subjunctive *vocam*.

The enclitic *vām* is unusually stationed pāda-final, but in fact it occupies 2nd position in its small clause, the loc. absol. *sutēṣu vām* “on (the soma-drinks) having been pressed for you two.” Ge takes *vām* with following *vīryā* (“euren Heldentaten”), but the pāda break that separates them makes that less likely. Re ignores the *vām* in his tr. and attaches the loc. absol. to the rel. cl., which is syntactically unlikely. Pāda-final *vām* is in fact a tic of this hymn; see 2a, 4a, and 5a besides our 1a. Perhaps it echoes the 2nd syllable of *yuvām* ‘you two’, found at pāda end in 1d, 2c.

The contents of the 2nd hemistich is quite dramatic. The standard view going back to Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 1c) is that the slain Fathers are the Asuras and that this event is also reflected in the enigmatic X.124. However, see my 2016 treatment of X.124, “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. Staal), which rejects the view that that hymn concerns the Deva/Asura conflict. Here in our passage, certainly the easiest interpretation is that the rivals of the gods are the Asuras, but keep in mind that the Deva/Asura conflict so prominent in the Brāhmaṇas and later does not really surface until very late RV. Moreover, even in the old interpr. of X.124 neither Indra nor Agni appears to have been an Asura. I do not know what to make of our passage, but I doubt that the old interpr. holds.

VI.59.2: The pāda-final *vām* here is also in syntactic 2nd position (as it is in 1a), since *bāl itthā* is an extra-clausal exclamation, and the clause proper begins with *mahimā*.

For *mahimān-* with \sqrt{pan} , see nearby VI.75.6, as well as VIII.101.11, X.75.9, etc.

I am puzzled by the pāda-final *ā*. Gr (col. 171) classifies it as emphatic after numbers or grades, to show that the number or grade has been reached, but the phrases he lists there are quite heterogenous.

VI.59.3: On pleonastic *sācā* see comm. ad IV.31.5. Ordinarily such a *sācā* marks a locative abs., but in this instance *sutē* is to be construed with *okivāmsā*. The pāda-final phrase *sutē sācām* may be there to provide a rhyme-form variant to *sutēṣu vām*# (1a, 4a), which really are loc. abs.

VI.59.4: In the 2nd hemistich the form *bhasáthaḥ* is problematic and its identity disputed. With *-thaḥ* it looks like a 2nd du. act. verb, as is to be expected in a hymn dedicated to dual divinities, esp. directly after a voc. du. *devā*. However, this should be a main-cl. verb, and it therefore should not be accented. And even if it should be accented, it has the wrong accent: we have two other forms to an apparent them. stem, both with root accent: 3rd sg. *bhásat* (subjunctive to root aor., acdg. to Gotō 82) VI.3.4 and identical (by most lights) VI.14.1 (I consider that form a nom. sg. part. *bhásan*). In response to these problems, Ge (inter alia, going back to Aufrecht [see Old] and cautiously endorsed in EWA s.v. *BHAS*) interpr. it as a noun *bhasátha-* ‘the noise of the mouth when eating’ (Ge, das Geräusch des Mundes bes. beim Essen). But although this solves the accent problems, it creates greater difficulty elsewhere: not only would that stem be a hapax, but Ge’s attempt to fit it into the rest of the clause produces something close to nonsense, whereas a du. verb works well in the clausal syntax. Old and Re wisely opt for the verb (maybe also Gotō 82), the latter without remarking on the accentual problem and the

former without suggesting a solution. I also accept it as a verb ‘snap at’ and also lack a solution to the accent. It cannot be attributed to *caná*, which doesn’t induce verbal accent. Its complement is *vádataḥ*, which I take as gen. sg., the correlative of *yáḥ* in the rel. cl. of ab -- with gen. as an alternative to acc. in verbs of consumption (biting counts). As Old points out, it could also be acc. pl., but that would lose the connection with the rel. cl. (Re supplies an acc. obj. on which the gen. depends: “vous ne mordez nullement (les richesses de cet homme) qui dit ...,” which seems unnec. and unmotivated.)

VI.59.5: As noted in the publ. intro., here the poet dissociates the two gods and in the 2nd hemistich focuses only on Agni. I think the dissociation begins in the 1st hemistich, with ... *asyá vām ... cīketati* (in my tr.) “...shall perceive *this one* of you two,” with *asyá* referring to one of the gods only. Ge and Re by contrast interpr. *asyá* as referring to an unidentified thing (a wonder or the like) belonging to both.

On cd as referring to Agni and his flames, see the very similar phrase in an Agni hymn X.79.7 *viśūco áśvān yuyuje*. Gonda (Ved. Lit. 133) may be right that this refers to Agni using the same vehicle to carry the oblations to heaven and to bring the gods to the sacrifice. Re interpr. the hemistich as referring to both Agni and Indra, at the cost of a lot of machinery liberally sprinkled with parens.

viśūcaḥ would be better rendered as ‘facing in opposite/different directions’.

VI.59.6: The fem. footless (*apadvátī*) and footless (*padvátībhyah*) are most likely Dawn and her cows, either the rays of light that are the Dawn cows or the real cows that go to pasture at dawn. Cf., with Ge, I.152.3. She appears here presumably to mark the dawn worship where the ritual fire is kindled and Indra appears.

Both Ge and Re divide the 2nd hemistich between Agni (c) and Sūrya (d). I am in full agreement that c belongs to Agni, describing the spread of his flames and crackling of the new fire. But I do not follow their assignment of d to Sūrya. Since the hymn is dedicated to Indra and Agni, we would expect the paired god to be Indra, not Sūrya, who has no place in the hymn. And it easily applies to Indra, as long as we interpr. *padā* as an instr. sg. of ‘foot’. Cf. with the same phrase, incl. the same verb, I.51.6 ... *arbudām ní kramīḥ padā* “With your foot you [=Indra] trampled down Arbuda” and, with a diff. root but the same preverb, also of Indra, VIII.64.2 *padā pañīm̐r arādhāso, ní bādhasva* “With your foot stamp down the ungenerous niggards.” Ge and Re take *padā* as neut. pl. to *padá*- ‘foot-step’, construed with *trīṃśát* as a measure of the distance that Sūrya has crossed. I don’t know why they feel the need to introduce Sūrya here -- I suppose because of Uṣas in ab.

With Ge I take *cārat* as a finite verb, an injunctive, accented because it’s implicitly contrastive with the next clause.

VI.59.8: With Ge (cf. also Oberlies, RdV I.457) I supply ‘him’ as obj. of *yuyutám* in d, referring to the *ari*- of b. Re supplies a pl. obj., referring to the *dvēṣāṃsi* of b. This is not impossible, but it makes more sense to deprive the stranger of sunlight than his hatreds.

VI.60 Indra and Agni

VI.60.1: The vocab. of this vs. shows a slight tendency towards morphological

elaboration: in addition to the straightforward *sāhastamā sāhasā*, there is *sāhurī* to the same root but with the rare suffix *-urī*; the deriv. *vasavyā-* for ‘goods’, rather than standard *vāsu* (as in the preceding hymn VI.59.9). This latter word returns at the end of the hymn.

The 3rd sg. *śnáthat* that opens the hymn is somewhat puzzling morphologically. The root √ *śnath* has a poorly attested verbal system, save for the *-āya*-transitive and associated redupl. aor.; besides *śnáthat* it consists only of two exx. of the athem. impv. *śnathihi*, and a couple of *-iṣ*-aor. forms. Narten (258–59) argues convincingly that *śnathihi* should belong to a root aor. (rather than a root pres., as it is generally classed), which could serve as the base for the formation of the *-iṣ*-aor. Our form *śnáthat* could formally easily be a subjunctive to this root aor., but the problem is that a subjunctive works quite badly in context, esp., since it is explicitly conjoined (by *utā*) with the following pres. indic. *sanoti*. It could alternatively be the injunctive to a them. stem, though in that case it would be the only representative of that stem. Narten discusses *śnáthat* in n. 810, where she rather says that though it’s used in a general sense, nothing stands in the way of its being a subj. to the root aor. I find this somewhat disingenuous, as subjunctives aren’t generally (/ever?) used in such a sense. She also allows the possibility that it could be injunctive to a thematic stem. (see also Klein DGRV I.366, who allows either). Much as I dislike multiplying entities, I’m inclined to go for the thematic injunctive for functional reasons. Unfortunately a root aor. injunc. **śnathīt* would have been easy to build, so the thematization cannot be the result of avoiding a problematic form.

VI.60.2: Assuming that *uśāsah ... ūlḥāḥ* is a single NP, the question is what happened to the dawns. Ge, fld. by Re, thinks that the dawns were taken away, that is, abducted (entführten, enlevées). If, as Ge suggests (n. 2), this concerns the Vala myth, the dawns qua cows can be conceptualized as taken / stolen by the Paṇis. (Oberlies [RdV I.180] goes further, seeing this as part of a myth about bridestealing, ultimately involving the Ásvins, though he admits [n. 150] that our vs. does not tell us who abducted the Dawn(s) or where she was taken.) HPS (B+I 180 n. 33,) indignantly rejects the abduction interpr. and suggests rather that, on the basis of VI.64.3, 5, the dawns are drawn (*ūlḥāḥ*) by bulls. Although this is possible, and the cited passage is quite nearby, it doesn’t make a lot of sense for Indra and Agni to “do battle” for the dawns if the dawns are moving on their own steam, whereas if they were abducted, they need help.

In d Agni must be the immediate subj. of the clause, given the adjacency of the voc. and the 2nd sg. verb (*agne yuvase*) -- but, as Re points out, *niyútvān* is more an epithet of Indra than of Agni -- and, as he doesn’t point out, even more an epithet of Vāyu in conjunction with Indra. I therefore wonder if this has not been adapted from an Indra-Vāyu context, with a different set of dual divinities. The d pāda is also very close to an Indra passage fairly nearby: VI.47.14 *apó gā vajrin yuvase sám índūn*, with Indra as the subj. of *yuvase*: “You join together the waters, the cows, and the drops, you possessor of the mace.” The substitution of Agni and the attribution to him of Indra’s qualities and actions is in conformity with the tendency noted in the publ. intro. of favoring the Indraic in this supposedly shared hymn.

VI.60.4: I do not have a view on how (or whether) to fix the meter of pāda a; see Old.

It is thinkable, but by no means necessary, that instead of reading quadrisyllabic *indrā-agnī* (as in vss. 5, 7, 14), we could read trisyllabic *indrāgnī* (as in 8, 9, 15) with a haplogologized enclitic *naḥ*: *indrāgnī ná *no mardhataḥ*.

VI.60.4–5: Note the phonological (and partly etymological) figure *mardh(ataḥ)* (4c), *mīdh(aḥ)* (5a), *mṛl(ātaḥ)* (5c).

VI.60.6: On the formula *vṛtrāni āryā ... dāsāni* see comm. ad VI.22.10.

Note the curious position of *āpa* in tmesis, embedded in the obj. NP: *ható vísṣvā āpa dvīṣaḥ*.

VI.60.8: I follow Ge in construing *dāsūṣe* with *sānti* (“which are for the pious”) rather than with *puruspīhaḥ* (Re “pour l’adulateur les très enviés”) because *puruspīh-* doesn’t seem to appear with a dat. elsewhere. See the almost identical IV.47.4.

VI.60.8–9: 8c and 9a differ minimally from each other, and it is difficult to see an aspectual (or other) distinction between root aor. impv. *ā gatam* and pres. impv. *ā gachatam* -- though of course there may be a nuance we cannot catch. Note also 14b *ūpa gachatam* and 15c *ā gatam*.

VI.60.10: The root *√svañj* is ordinarily middle; it has only two active forms, this one (*pariṣvājat*) and the plupf. *paryāśasvajat* in I.182.7. The latter can be explained as an *āduhat*-type remarking of the middle pf. *śasvaje* (see comm. ad loc.), but this active remarking of the them. pres. *-ṣvājate* is harder to explain. Gotō (1st Kl., 338–39) notes the prevailing middle voice and this anomalous act., but makes no attempt to account for it.

VI.60.11: The syntactic affiliation of the final pāda of this vs., consisting of a dat. *dyumnāya* and an acc. phrase *sutārā apāḥ*, is unclear. Old suggests taking the acc. as a second obj. of *āvīvāsatī*, or rather suggests supplying the same verb as main clause verb “(he also wins) waters ...” But since the structure of ab, in which the mortal seeks Indra’s favor, invites a demonstration of that favor in the main cl., I therefore borrow *kṛṇoti* (deaccented) from 10c, with Indra as subj. This is also Re’s solution and apparently Ge’s. For *√kṛ* in similar expressions, see VII.97.8 *kārad brāhmaṇe sutārā sugādhā* “He [=Bṛhaspati/Indra] will make good fords, easy to cross, for the sacred formulation” and IV.19.6 *sutaraṇām akṛṇor indra sīndhūn* “You made the rivers easy to cross, Indra.”

VI.60.12: On the double sense of *pipṛtam* see Ge and Re.

VI.60.13–15: On the connection of these vss. to the hymn, see publ. intro. For the ring composition between the 1st ṛca and this one, note the verbal respension *vasavyā-* (1, 14), *rādhas-* (3, 13), *vājayāntā* (1) and *vājasya sātāye* (14).

VI.60.13: On the insistent *ubhā* see publ. intro.

I have taken *āhuvādhyai* (and *mādayādhyai*) as predicated infinitives with the subj. *ubhā*, as does Re. However, *vām* in pāda a makes some difficulties for this interpr., and

Ge takes that pāda (but not b) as having an implicit 1st ps. subj.: “euch beide ... will ich herrufen” (a) versus “beiden sollen sich ... erfreuen” for *mādayādhyai* (b). I think the two clauses should be parallel and therefore take *vām* as a dependent gen. on *ubhā* (“both of you two”), although it must be admitted that *ubhā-* generally agrees with its referent in case.

VI.61 Sarasvatī

On the structure of this hymn and its similarity to the immediately preceding one, see publ. intro.

VI.61.1–3: The hymn begins with the near-deictic nom. sg. *iyām*, establishing the feminine subject immediately and emphatically (“this she here”). Since the just-given tr. is at best graceless and, more to the point, not English, I have opted to focus on the gender rather than the deixis. The next vs. also begins with *iyām* and the final vs. of the tṛca with the voc. *sārasvatī*.

VI.61.1: Although, as just noted, the hymn establishes the feminine referent from the very beginning, she is also credited, from the beginning, with powers and deeds that seem distinctly unfeminine, esp. pāda c.

Sarasvatī’s gift to the pious Vadhryaśva is universally, and I think correctly, interpr. as a son named Divodāsa, and this gift is further interpr. as reflecting the requital of the “debt to the ancestors” found in the doctrine, attested somewhat later (1st clearly articulated in TS), of the three debts that a Brahmin owes on his birth (to gods, ancestors, and ṛṣis). The requital of this debt is, in the standard view, expressed by the root-noun cmpd *ṛṇacyút-* in our passage. I think this is more or less correct, but not in a straightforward way. Both Ge and Re twist the sense of \sqrt{cyu} to get it to express the requital of the debt directly: “der der Schuld (an die Manen) tilgte [paid off]” (sim. Kü 153); “qui ébranle la dette (aux mânes).” But \sqrt{cyu} means ‘set in motion, agitate, shake’, and the best we could do to get the idiom we want is to push its meaning to ‘shake off’, hence ‘get rid of’, the debt. But ‘shake off’ is not a sense of \sqrt{cyu} at least in my experience. An unmanipulated sense of the cmpd should be ‘shake/agitate the *ṛṇa*’, and that is how I interpr. it -- ‘shake the debtor’ -- with a masc. *ṛṇá-* ‘debtor’; the only other non-neut. form of this stem is also in VI (VI.12.5), where it likewise means ‘debtor’, not ‘debt’. In other words I assume that Divodāsa inflicts rough punishment on a debtor; this helps explain why he is characterized as *rabhasá-* ‘violent, wild’, which does not make much sense if he’s just a baby who serves as his father’s payment to the ancestors.

However, I also think the sense seen by Ge and Re -- Divodāsa as requital for the debt his father owes to the ancestors -- is also indirectly signaled here. The standard lexeme for this technical term is *ṛṇám $\sqrt{cí}$* ; a root-noun cmpd formed to this lexeme would be *ṛṇa-cí-t-*, which in fact is attested once, at II.23.17. Our cmpd *ṛṇa-cyú-t-* is phonologically similar to it, and an acc. sg. **ṛṇacítam* would produce a terrible cadence (4 lights), whereas *ṛṇacyútam* is well adapted to a Jagatī cadence (though the immediately preceding syllable should be heavy, not light: (*rabha*)*sám ṛṇacyútam*. What I am suggesting is that *ṛṇacyútam* is the correct reading and it means what it looks like it should mean, without the manipulation of Ge and Re. But that it also phonologically evokes **ṛṇa-cítam*, which gives a second, resonant meaning to the passage. This

suggestion is similar to, but ultimately quite distinct from, Gotō's (133 n. 166) that *ṛṇa-cyūt-* is a transitive active version of *ṛṇa-cīt-*, generated from a Zwangslage (predicament, dilemma) in order to express the sense 'entgegennehmen lassen' barred from the other compd, which in his view means 'die Busse entgegennehmen'. Scar also discusses *ṛṇa-cyūt-* at some length (126–27), offering several possibilities, but not very usefully.

As for the notion of a man's inborn debts in the RV, I think it is alluded to in our text, but quite rarely. The clearest ex. is in the late hymn X.135 (see my "The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of a Brahmin: A New Interpretation of Ṛgveda X.135." *Journal asiatique* 302.2 [2014]: 245–57), but there is another more glancing reference to it in Maṇḍala VI in VI.20.11, also discussed in the art. cit. In that article I argue that the original system, as seen in the RV, involves only *two* debts: a son for the ancestors and sacrifice for the gods; Brahmacarya for the ṛṣis is a later addition after the institution of studentship had developed.

On the root affiliation of *cakhāda* see EWA s.v. *KHED* and Kü (152–53), with lit. The pf., which appears only here in the RV, takes a double acc. On this pāda see Old. and the parallel I.93.4, with √ *muṣ* 'steal': *yád ámuṣṇītam avasám paṇím gāḥ*.

VI.61.2: Once again, the attributes and actions ascribed to Sarasvatī are decidedly unfeminine, starting with the almost comically off-kilter comparison of her to a root-grubbing boar. The identification of the *bisakhā-* as a boar is owing to Hoffmann (MSS 8: 5 = Aufs. 387). The point of comparison between the river and the boar must be their noise: *śúṣmebhiḥ* 'with her snortings', though the root-grubbing is presumably part of it, as the river in spate noisily pulls off pieces of the banks. For *śúṣma-* as the characteristic noise of Sindhu, another river, see X.75.3.

Note *ávase* in c, which echoes *avasám* in 1c and is in turn echoed by *á (vi)vās(ema)* in d.

VI.61.3: The phonologically marked (plain *b*) name *bṛṣaya-* is found elsewhere only in I.93.4, where his offspring (there called *śéṣaḥ* 'remainder') are destroyed as they are here. That is also the vs. that contains the parallel passage cited above ad vs. 1. Although I.93 is a hymn to Agni and Soma and there are no clear connections between the hymns otherwise, at the very least we can probably assume that Bṛṣa was a *paṇí-*. I do not understand why *vísva-* modifies this PN: "every Bṛṣaya" meaning Bṛṣaya and his ilk? his kin? (MLW adds "In Latin a name can be used in the plural to mean 'people like X' Multi Mani Ariciae 'There are many manius types at Aricia' This is no doubt a universal.") Or does this imply that the word is not a PN, but a meaningful descriptor of a foe?

Acdg. to Klein (DGRV I.434–35), the 2nd hemistich begins with an ex. of inverse *utá*, conjoining the clauses of c and d though positioned at the beginning of c. Although this is probably the default explan., I am drawn to Re's more content-rich suggestion that *utá* sets up the contrast between the very different actions of c and d—though under that analysis we might expect a contrastively accented verb in c (**ávindah*), and, moreover, he gives no parallel passages in which *utá* has such a function.

The hapless 'them' (*ebhyaḥ*) in d must be the 'god-scorers' (*deva-níd-*) of a, as is the general consensus.

VI.61.4–6: This *ṛca* is almost empty of content, in part because so much of each Gāyatrī — not a capacious meter in the first place — is occupied by repeated material: the last 6 of the 8 syllables of the 1st pāda of each vs. contain the nom. (4) or voc. (5, 6) of the NP *devī śārasvatī*, and the b pādas of 4 and 6 contain responsive material: *vāṇebhiḥ vājīnīvati* (4) and x x *vāṇeṣu vājini*. Otherwise, as a helper (*avitrī*) she is twice asked to help (4c *avatu*, 6b *āvā*). In the publ. tr. these two impvs. are rendered in two different ways: “Let ... help” and “aid” respectively. I would now change the 2nd to “help” as well to mark their essential identity (save for ps.). [Note that the HvN restoration of *avitrī āvatu* in 4c is wrong: correct their *avitrī* to *avitrī*.]

VI.61.5–6: This, the middle vs. of the *ṛca*, consists only of a rel. cl., which I consider preposed to vs. 6, though without a resumptive pronoun correlative with *yāh*. I supply one (‘him’) as obj. of *āvā* in 6b. Both Ge and Re instead supply ‘us’ as the obj. of that verb, leaving the rel. cl. in 5 without any syntactic tether. The middle vs. of the next *ṛca* (8) also consists just of a rel. cl.

VI.61.7–9: Unlike the preceding *ṛca*, this one dispenses with repetition and therefore has more room for meat, comparatively speaking.

VI.61.7: The vs.-initial *utā* seems to introduce the *ṛca*, as does the identically placed *utā* in vs. 10.

VI.61.8: Like vs. 5, this middle vs. of the *ṛca* contains only a rel. cl., which I consider to hang off vs. 7, though it could also attach to the flg. vs. 9. Both 7 and 9 have an overt possible correlative for *yāsyāh* in 8a: 7a *syā ... śārasvatī*, 9a *sā*.

VI.61.9: The various tr. (Ge, Re, Klein [DGRV I.402]) supply a verb in pāda a, reserving *ātan* (c) for bc. I do not see why. Both Ge (n. 9a) and Re do allow for the possibility that *ātan* has domain over the whole vs., but both identify that possible constr. as a zeugma. Again, I don’t see why -- while it is true that hatreds and rivers are different kinds of entities, mingling of the mental and the physical is standard practice in the RV.

Because of its position within the NP *vīśvā āti dvīṣaḥ*, *āti* is probably not a preverb in tmesis, but rather an adposition. This view is supported by the fact that there are no other exx. of *āti* √*tan* in the RV (as Re points out) or elsewhere, at least acdg. to Mon-Wms.

The position of *anyāḥ* identifies the sisters as a defined and limited group, and of course, as the next vs. states (10b *saptāsvasā*), Śārasvatī has precisely seven sister rivers.

VI.61.10: On *ṛca*-introducing *utā* see ad 7 above.

We might expect the splv. *priyātamā* in this construction.

I don’t exactly know how to interpr. the VP *stomyā bhūt*, with injunc. aor. of √*bhū* (or indic. aor? the Saṃhitā sequence *stomyābhūt* could contain augmented *abhūt*) and the pseudo-gerundive *stomya-*. The same construction is found in vs. 12 *havyā bhūt* (or *havyā *abhūt*). In vs. 12 Hoffmann (140) takes it as iterative, presumably because of the āmṛḍita *vāṇe-vāṇe*: “ist bei jedem Preiskampf anzurufen.” But √*bhū* is a change-of-state verb and the aorist should (in a well-behaved language) be punctual. In both vss. the

standing characteristics of Saravatī are being described, so she should not have “*become* one worthy to be praised/invoked,” because the just-mentioned characteristics are not new. We might speculate that, because there’s no injunctive of \sqrt{as} , in order to express a non-temporally marked copula (as opposed to a nominal sentence with suppressed copula) you have to turn to $\sqrt{bhū}$ and the aorist injunctive. But this seems like a long shot. Ge and Re take it as modal: “... sei ... preisenswert”; “soit apte à (recevoir) ... la louange” (though Re remarks “*bhūt* au sens d’*abhūt*,” without recognizing that the *Samhitā* text could in fact contain *abhūt*). Note that vs. 13 (which is not part of this *ṛca*) contains a predicated pseudo-gerundive in the same semantic sphere, *upastútyā* ‘to be praised’, *without* aux.

VI.61.11: In b *urú rájaḥ* ‘broad realm’ is identical with *antárikṣam* ‘midspace’. Perhaps supplying two terms for one place is designed to give the impression of the usual three-termed whole, earth, midspace, heaven — here: earth, midspace x2. The river’s physical position presumably precludes claiming that she has filled heaven as well (though Lū would presumably favor that).

VI.61.12: But heaven as part of her domain is apparently smuggled in, without naming it, in *triṣadhástḥā* ‘having three seats’ opening this vs.

The vs. in general is characterized by fairly straightforward numerology: in addition to the three seats, the seven parts are presumably her sister rivers and “five peoples” is the familiar expression for the totality of the Ārya. The 1st vs. of the *ṛca* inaugurated the numerology with *saptásvasā* ‘having seven sisters’.

On *havyā bhūt* see comm. ad vs. 10.

VI.61.13: The sequence *mahínāsu* is perfectly ambiguous. It can be a fem. loc. pl. of the poorly attested them. stem *mahína-*, as I take it in the publ. tr. and as Old is inclined to do. Or, with Pp., Ge, and Re, it can be disjoined into *mahínā āsu*, nom. sg. fem. to the same rare them. stem and loc. pl. fem. to the near-deictic pronoun, unaccented because the referent is in the discourse. (Gr actually lists both *mahínā* and *mahínāsu* for this passage.) The difference in meaning is minimal: my “... who by her greatness shines ... among the great (rivers)” versus “the great one who by her greatness shines ... among the (rivers).” I now find that I am more disposed to go with the Pp. analysis, for reasons of wordplay, not meaning. The instr. *mahimnā* in this passage is one of only three exx. of this form in the RV, with the restored *-mn-* cluster to the stem *mahimán-* -- against well-attested instr. *mahinā* with the (old) cluster reduction of *-mn-* to *-n-*. If we accept the Pp. interpr., the adjacent words *mahimnā mahínā* would implicitly play on both forms of the instr., with the nom. sg. *mahínā* differing from the standard instr. *mahinā* only by accent. If we instead take *mahínāsu* as a loc., that play is lost or at least considerably diluted.

The construction of b, esp. of *anyāḥ*, rests on that of 9ab.

On *upastútyā* see comm. ad vs. 10.

VI.61.14: In b the standard tr. (Ge, Re; cf. also Hoffmann 48) take *páyasā* with the 2nd cl.: “do not come up short with your milk.” However, *mā* is almost always clause-initial, whereas this interpr. requires it to come in 2nd position, with the enclitic *naḥ* even further into the clause. Moreover, no other forms of \sqrt{dagh} are construed with an instr. Instead I

take *āpa spharīḥ* as intransitive ‘spring away’, with *pāyasā* a species of instr. of accompaniment or, perhaps, an instr. of separation.

VI.62 Aśvins

The first part of the hymn is marked by repeated dual prns. opening the vs. or hemistich: 1c *yā*, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a *tā*, 5c *yā*, 6a *tā*. This pattern more or less coincides with the division of the hymn discussed in the publ. intro. After the beg. of vs. 6 the pattern is broken and does not reappear.

VI.62.1: The usual ambiguity of *jāra-* ‘awake’ or ‘sing’, with the usual possible double application in a context like this, though *jāramāṇasya* in 4a speaks for ‘sing’.

In c *usrā* is taken as du. by Gr., flg. the Pp. However, it more likely represents *usrāḥ* in sandhi, a gen. sg. fem. See extensive disc. by Old ad II.39.2, as well as his brief acknowledgement of this underlying form in his comm. on this vs.; Ge’s tr. reflects this interpr. Inter alia, 3 (V.3.8, 45.8, VIII.46.21) of the 5 occurrences of *vyūṣi* are preceded by a fem. gen. sg. *asyā(h)*, referring to Dawn, and the 4th (besides this one) has a voc. of Dawn *uṣo vyūṣi* (VII.81.2). On fem. gen. sg. *usrāḥ* see comm. ad VI.3.6

In his n. 1d Ge hesitates about the root affiliation of the desid. *yūyūṣataḥ* (*√yu* ‘join’ or *√yu* ‘separate’) and the function of *pāri* (preverb or adposition). Although his tr. reflects a root affiliation to ‘join’ (“... zu umspannen suchen”), he offers an alternative tr. in the n. reflecting ‘separate’ (“... fortzurücken suchen”), an interpr. followed by Heenen (Desid. 209). Such an interpr. would be conceptually possible: in the dim light of dawn and the morning mists, the Aśvins allow the boundaries of earth to be seen by “separating” them. However, I consider *√yu* ‘join’ more likely, in the sense, with *pāri*, of ‘encompass’, referring to the usual round-the-world journey of the Aśvins. The constr. seems a conflation or crossing of the usual *sadyāḥ* [H+E] *pāri √ilyā* [/VERB OF MOTION] expression “encircle heaven and earth in a single day,” as in I.115.3, 128.3, III.58.8, IV.45.7, etc., with the prior act of harnessing (*√yu*) the horses. For passages that incl. *ántān* (as here), see V.47.4, X.108.5: e.g., V.47.4 *divás caranti pāri sadyó ántān* “They circle around the ends of heaven in a single day.”

VI.62.2: This vs. presents both number and person disagreement, the first more acute than the second. As noted above, the vs. begins with the dual NA prn. *tā*, surely referring to the Aśvins, and this 1st pāda ends with an apparent dual part. *cakramāṇā* presumably modifying the prn. But the next pāda contains a plural verb *rurucuḥ* (*rurucū* in sandhi), which cannot take the dual as subject -- nor as object. (Because of its sandhi position *cakramāṇā* could instead reflect underlying pl. -*āḥ*, but the initial *tā* seems almost designed to anchor the participle as dual as well.) Curiously both Ge and Kü (431) tr. the dual NP as subj. of the pl. verb without comment -- either because of a rare grammatical lapse on their parts or because they view it (without comment) as an example of improper agreement. (It is certainly true that a dual **rurucatuḥ* would be metrically disastrous, so lax haplology would be thinkable.)

I believe that we must take the number and the number disharmony seriously, and I therefore take pādas a and b as separate clauses. The first lacks a finite verb. We can either consider the participle as predicated (“they two [are] striding ...”) or, my preference, as pendant to 1cd, with dual its subj. As noted in the publ. intro., there is

another likely enjambment between vss. 2 and 3. The next question is the identity of the pl. subj. of d. There is one pl. form in pāda a: instr. pl. *śúcibhiḥ*. Ge and Kü take this as referring to the *rājōbhiḥ* ‘spaces’ in b, but Re suggests that it anticipates the horses (*āśvaiḥ*) in 3bc. If we accept Re’s identification of the ‘gleaming ones’ as horses, this provides a possible pl. subj. for *rurucuḥ*. As gleaming ones themselves, they could “shine the radiant beam of the chariot” through the spaces. This may make them sound a little like Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer, but at least it avoids a grammatical solecism.

The ps. disagreement is, by contrast, very mild and standard RVic practice: the dual subj. returns in 2cd but as 2nd ps. rather than 3rd, as we learn by the verb *yāthaḥ* late in pāda d.

Note c *purū vārāṃsi*, a rhyme form to *urū vārāṃsi* ending 1d.

VI.62.3: This vs. presents a different type of grammatical disharmony, though it again concerns how to construe the first pāda. Once again it begins with du. *tā*, but in this case that prn. *can* be the subj. of the 2nd dual pf. *ūhathuḥ*. (Though by my rules,= I would prefer not to have a 3rd ps. prn serving as subj. to a non-imperative verb [see my “sa figé”], I do have to reckon with a fairly clear ex. in 6ab.) The problems lie in 1) *vartīḥ* ‘circuit’ and 2) *yād*. To begin with the 2nd, if *yād* is functioning as a subordinating conjunction and ab is a single clause, *ūhathuḥ* in b should be accented. (It is not clear to me what Ge does with the *yād*; he seems just to ignore it.) Now *yād* is badly positioned for a clausal subordinator, and it is possible that rather than being a subordinating conjunction it’s functioning as a sort of izafe in the phrase *tyād vartīr yād āradhram* “the circuit that is unslackening,” connecting the adj. *āradhram* to *vartīḥ*. I would be inclined to that interpr. if it weren’t for the problem of *vartīḥ* itself. This noun is always the complement of the verb $\sqrt{yā}$ in the phrase “drive the/a/your circuit,” incl. in this same hymn, 10ab ... *vartīḥ* ... *yātam*, and in the next one, with phraseology similar to ours, VI.63.2 *pāri ha tyād vartīr yāthaḥ* ... It would be very difficult to make it the obj. of *ūhathuḥ*, which already has an obj. of its own in any case. But the preceding pāda, 2d, has a form of $\sqrt{yā}$, and I suggest that we simply supply it in 3a as well, which is again pendant on the preceding vs. By this interpr., subordinating *yād* is still badly positioned, but it could have been displaced by the insistently fronted *tā* in this section of the hymn. I take *āradhram* as a neut. adv., but it could also modify *vartīḥ* (“unslackening circuit”) without benefit of an izafe. In fact I now would accept the izafe interpr., which eliminates the badly positioned subordinating *yād*. I would still supply a form of $\sqrt{yā}$ as the verb of pāda a, but not in a subordinate clause. This in fact allows me to supply a form of the impv., which the *tā* invites (see above). I would now close vs. 2 with a full stop, and tr. 3a “Drive this circuit which is unslackening.”

The lexeme *pāri* $\sqrt{śi}$ means lit. ‘lie around’ and is used, e.g., of Vṛtra surrounding the flood in IV.19.2, etc. Assuming that *śayādhyai*, *pāri* here belongs to the same lexeme, it must have a developed sense: to surround and thus circumscribe, keep within bounds. Why a “pious mortal” would be pursuing a course that needs such control is not clear to me. I suppose it could just mean that, since the Aśvins circle around the earth (1cd), that circle marks the boundaries of where humans can wander.

Note the echo effect of *vartīḥ* (a) / *vyāthiḥ* (d).

VI.62.4: As noted ad vs 1., *jāramāṇa*- here seems to belong to ‘sing’, not ‘awaken’, and

therefore may limit the form in 1b as well. Based on 1b *huve járamāṇaḥ* “singing, I call upon” and 5b *ā vivāse* “I seek to attract,” I have supplied a 1st ps. referent for the genitives here.

The bahuvrīhi *yuyujānā-saptī* ‘having a harnessed team, having a team that has been harnessed’ is unusual in having a middle pf. part. as its first member. (See AiG II.1.43.) The publ. tr. “having harnessed their team,” though it follows both Gr and Ge, is misleading: I do not think it is a *bharād-vāja-*, *codayān-matī* type governing compd. I would therefore emend to “having a harnessed team,” with the occasional pass. value of the med. pf. to \sqrt{yuj} ; see Kü (407). However, things may be somewhat more complex. There are four occurrences of this med. part., one nearby in VI.59.5, three in the same metrical position as here (immed. after an opening of 5). All of them are transitive. It is possible that a free phrase like **yuyujānā saptī* “the two having yoked their teams” became unverbated and reinterpreted, with adjustment of accent and the like. But I do not insist on this.

In d *pratnāḥ* ‘age-old’ qualifying the priest contrasts with *návyas-* ‘newer’ in a, qualifying the singer, as well as *yúvānā* ‘two youths’ in d referring to the Ásvins. The first pair recurs in the next vs., 5b. See comm. there. The “age-old Hotar” is of course Agni.

VI.62.5: The stems *návyas-* ‘newer’ and *pratnā-* ‘age-old’, found at opposite ends of the preceding vs. (a and d), are juxtaposed here in the phrase *pratnā návyasā*, in case the duller members of the audience had missed the contrastive terminology in 4. But this phrase is doing two other things as well: du. *pratnā* refers to the Ásvins, who were, in 4d, identified as *yúvānā* ‘youths’; and *návyasā* modifies *vácasā*, “with a newer speech,” repairing the slightly off phrase in 4a, where it was the singer, not his song, who was newer.

The pf. *babhūvātuḥ* should not have been rendered as a straight pres. in the publ. tr. I would change to “who have become.” It also forms a slight figure with *śámbhaviṣṭhā*, which precedes it immediately before the pāda break.

VI.62.6: As noted ad vs. 3, I would prefer not to have the 3rd ps. prn. *tā* serving as a subject of an indicative 2nd ps. verb (pf. *ūhathuḥ*), but the repetitive *tā* pattern may have imposed it here.

The adj. *areṇú-* ‘dustless’ (8x) twice qualifies ‘paths’ (I.35.11, 163.6); the latter of these passages is in the instr. pl. as here. This suggests that *yójanebhiḥ* ‘treks’ is used here as a near synonym for ‘paths’.

Ge takes *bhujántā* to \sqrt{bhuj} ‘benefit, enjoy → utilize’ (benutzen), but better, with Gr, Re, Lub, to \sqrt{bhuj} ‘bend’. In any case this participle is clearly meant to echo the name Bhujyu.

VI.62.7: The narrative précis in pāda c belongs with the equally bare-bones accounts in I.117.16, 116.20, X.39.13, and esp. I.119.6. Because this seems to refer to one of the Ásvins’ previous deeds, I have tr. the supposed injunctive *yātām* (so Pp) as a preterite. Note in fact that nothing forbids extracting an augmented form *ayātām* from the sequence *rathyāyātām*; see the clear *ayātām* in I.116.20 depicting the same myth.

Although *śayú-* has been reinterpr. as meaning ‘orphan’ in some of its occurrences (see comm. ad IV.18.12), given the favoring of PNs in Ásvin hymns and the lack of an

‘orphan’ context here, I retain the PN.

In d I take *īti* as a summarizing device, indicating that the three exploits sketched in abc are examples of the Aśvins’ *sumatī-*. With Ge I see no choice but to supply a verb like ‘you showed’ to govern the acc. *sumatīm*.

As is clear to all, *cyāvānā* is at the least a play on the name Cyavāna (same accent), another client of the Aśvins.

VI.62.8: The grammatical identity of *bhūmā* (Pp. *bhūma*) is disputed. Ge considers it to belong to a (hapax) adj. stem **bhūman-* derived from *bhūmán-* ‘abundance’, used adverbially (“reichlich”). This does not seem to have much to recommend it. More appealing is to make it somehow related to a word for ‘earth’. Re tries an instr. of *bhūman-* ‘earth’, but not with much conviction. Old rehearses -- mostly to firmly reject -- other possibilities, incl. the one that I favor: that it is the loc. of *bhūmī-*. He objects that we should expect (and do indeed get) *bhūmyām* to this fem. stem, but at this period I don’t think this would be necessary for a fem. short-*i*-stem. His other object is more cogent, that to a short-*i*-stem we would expect *bhūmau* pāda-final. I don’t have a clinching arg. against this, but would point out that there is some variation in these patterns. And this pāda seems to be playing with the heaven / earth distinction by other means: we first have the two world halves (*rodasī*), followed by (*pra-*)*dīvaḥ* ... *bhūmā*, which distantly evokes *dyāvā-bhūmī*. The off-balance pairing is matched by the off-balance pairing of gods and mortals discussed immediately below.

The conjoined NP *devānām utá martyatrā* “of gods and among mortals” shows the familiar god / mortal opposition, but what Klein (DGRV I.311–12) calls “a peculiar absence of morphological parallelism.” It is tempting to make it mean “the anger of the gods towards mortals,” but I think *utá* is there precisely to block that reading, *pace* Scar (429) “Den Groll der Götter ... der auch auf die Sterblichen gerichtet ...ist.”

VI.62.9: As noted in the publ. intro., the syntax of this vs. is unregulated. However, the sense is quite clear. The first hemistich consists of a rel. clause, whose rel. prn. and finite verb are both in the 3rd sg.: *yáḥ ... cīketat* “who will keep watch”; it also contains another verbal form, *vidádhat*, which I take, with Ge and Old, as a pres. part. nom. sg. m. to the redupl. pres. of *√dhā*, but which could be, as Old points out, a short-vowel subjunctive (so, “... will regulate ... and will keep watch”). (Nothing rides on the choice.) But this happy singular environment is interrupted by a dual nom./acc. (which must be nom. in this case) *rājānau* “two kings,” which is further specified by the two nom. singulars *mitró vāruṇaḥ*. The sense is clearly “which one (of) the two kings, M (or) V ...,” but this is not what it says: “which one, the two kings, Mitra, Varuṇa, will keep watch,” leaving the audience to choose what subject, in what number, it prefers.

I take *rājasah* as the gen. obj. of *cīketat* (so also Old), in the usual syntactic pattern of verbs of perception, which can take acc. or gen. complements. By contrast, Ge has it dependent on *rājānau*, but, as Re points out, the two are rather distant, and further I know of no other passages in which *rājas-* is construed with *rājan-*, although that expression would be appealingly alliterative -- though it is true that M+V are called *dhartārā rājasah* “upholders of the space” in V.69.4.

The second hemistich has no direct syntactic connection to the first, though again it is quite clear what is meant. It contains a 2nd sg. impv. *asya* ‘hurl’, which must be

addressed to the referent of the rel. prn. in ab -- that is, either Mitra or Varuṇa. Although it is common to change person reference even within RVic vss., it is somewhat unusual to do so in this kind of syntagm.

In d Re calls the phrase *dróghāya cid vácase* a bahuvrīhi “défait,” for **drogha-vacas-* [he gives no accent], like *drogha-vāc-*. Judging from his tr. “auf den gar verlogenen Anuiden,” Ge seems to agree. But this seems unnec.; the dative targets of the missile in c and d are both *s*-stem abstracts, *rākṣas-* ‘demonic power’ and *vácas-* ‘speech’ respectively. I see no reason to try to manipulate the target in d to be personal. Scar (469) interpr. as I do.

VI.62.10: I supply ‘to prosper’ with *tánayāya* on the basis of nearby VI.49.5 (=I.183.3) ... *iṣayádhyai, vartír yāthás tánayāya tmāne ca*, with very similar phraseology.

I take pāda c with ab, rather than with d, as is the norm (Ge, Kü [509]), in order to capture the opposition between *ántara-* ‘nearer’ and *sánutya-* ‘distant’. Cf., e.g., VI.5.4, which has both *ántara-* and *sánutya-* as well as *vanuṣyá-*. By my interpr. the Áśvins are urged to come near to us, “because of the distant dereliction of a(nother) mortal” -- that is, because some other mortal, far away, hasn’t done his ritual duty, they should come to us, who will. I suppose I could construct a way to take c with d: some mortal’s dereliction of duty would cause the Áśvins to chop off some heads. But I find it easier to account for c as presented. The last, independent pāda just takes part in the general bloodthirstiness of the last few vss.

Against Ge, who takes it to \sqrt{vrj} , I assign *vavṛktam* to $\sqrt{vraśc}$ ‘hew’, along with Whit (Rts), Gr, Re, and Kü, inter alia. Cf. the clinching parallel in X.87.16 *téṣām sīṛṣāṇi ... āpi vṛśca*.

VI.62.11: As noted in the publ. intro., the last phrase of the hymn, *gr̥naté citrarātī* “you two providing bright gifts for the singer” exactly repeats the end of vs. 5, which marked a transition in the earlier part of the hymn.

VI.63 Áśvins

The hymn contains many metrical irregularities and a marked tendency towards 10-syl. lines. See Old for details and disc.

VI.63.2: The abl. (or, in principle, gen.) *riṣáḥ* is a bit hard to construe. Whenever this form occurs elsewhere (and it’s not rare), it is with a form of either $\sqrt{pā}$ or $\sqrt{rakṣ}$: “protect from harm.” Ge supplies ‘protect’ here as well: “(zum Schutz) gegen Schaden.” However, in the absence of a lexical ‘protect’ and in the presence of a verb of motion (*yāthah*), I take it as an ablative of place-from-which.

VI.63.3: There is no expressed subj. to *ákāri* and the abl./gen. *ándhasaḥ* has nothing to depend on. Ge takes it as a partitive gen. (n. 3a) but simply tr. as an indef. subject (“Trank ist euch bereitet”), while Re takes it as belonging to an elliptical construction and suggests supplying either *sutám* or *pāntam*. I prefer to assume that the subject of *ákāri* has been gapped, and *ándhasaḥ* is an abl. of source.

In this context I take *vārīman* ‘in/on the expanse’ as referring to the ritual ground on which the barhis has been strewn, rather than simply Ge’s “in voller Breite.” See *vāriman*

in 11.

vavande is of course ambig. as to person, but given the 1st ps. in 2a and no intermediate 3rd ps. officiant, it is most likely 1st (so also Ge).

In real-world terms the phrase “the stones have anointed you” is, of course, distinctly peculiar. But in the foreshortened universe of RVic discourse, this simply abbreviates the sequence “the stones pressed out the soma liquid, which was prepared for you to drink, and your drinking of it was as if it were anointing you (and perhaps did, by running down your chin).”

VI.63.4: The ‘gift’ (*rātī-*) in b is the ladle containing the ghee. Re points to passages (III.19.2, IV.6.3) where the ladle is described as *rātīn-* ‘possessing/providing gifts’.

In d Ge takes *āyukta* as passive, with the Hotar as subj. and *nāsatyā* as the obj. of a loc. inf. *hāvīman*: “der eingespant is, die Ns zu laden.” The pass. interpr. is explicitly rejected by both Old and Re, in favor of a rendering like mine. Although Ge’s interpr. is appealing in certain ways, there are several things against it: 1) the well-attested mid. root aor. of *√yuj* is almost always transitive (pass. *āyukta* in V.17.3, I.48.7) -- there is after all a distinct passive aor. *āyojī*, *āyujran* to express this function; 2) I know of no instances (nor does Old) in which loc. *hāvīman(i)* functions as an infin. and takes an object.

VI.63.6: I assume that “the flourishing of Sūryā” is simply an elaborate way of saying Sūryā. (MLW comments simply “Cf. Gk. βίη Ἡρακλείη.”) Ge (n. 6b; fld. by Re) suggests that it is meant to convey that the beauty of Sūryā increases the beauty of the Aśvins but I don’t see this. I take the dat. *śubhé* in the same way as *śriyé* (5a and commonly elsewhere, e.g., in the next hymn VI.64.1), *vāpuṣe* (6c), as vaguely attached datives of purpose/result.

The latter (*vāpuṣe*) Ge takes adverbially (“erstaunlich”), and he construes *vām* simply as a poss. gen. (“Eure Vogel(rosse)”). I think there is more content here and take *ānu* with *vām* (“after/following you”), separated because *vām* is taking Wackernagel’s position. The beautiful chariot of the beautiful Aśvins carrying the beautiful Sūryā must have been an amazing sight, and the birds in their wonder follow it. As their relative geographical positions indicate (birds after chariot), I think these birds are not, or not only, the Vogelrosse pulling the Aśvins chariot, but also the birds in the world who see the marvel and rise up to accompany it. The songs of the birds in a choir (*vāñī*) reach the Aśvins to make them well-praised (*súṣṭutā*). As this indicates, I take *súṣṭutā* as dual (so also Gr, Ge), a proleptic adj. describing the state of the Aśvins after the birdsongs reach them. However, as Ge points out (n. 6d), *súṣṭutā* could also be a nom. sg. fem. modifying *vāñī* ‘choir, music’, and the adj. is in fact strategically placed between the nom. sg. fem. and the duals. Although a “well-praised choir” doesn’t make a lot of sense in this context, Ge cites VIII.100.11 ... *vāḱ ... súṣṭutā* -- though it’s worth pointing out that in that passage the reference is to the goddess Speech, while in our passage, as noted, I take the *vāñī* as referring to the “choir” of birdsong.

VI.63.7: As noted in the publ. intro., the chariot journey in this vs. echoes the mythological one in vs. 6 but updated to a wish for the present day.

Ge divides the 2nd hemistich into two separate clauses, by pāda. In this interpr. the nouns in d are in the nom. pl. and follow the Aśvins’ chariot that was launched in c

(“viele Labsale ... folgen ihm”). The publ. tr. takes the two pādas as a single cl., with the nouns in d in the acc. pl. and the chariot following them. Neither of these conjures up an entirely comfortable picture if *ānu* is strictly ‘following’ – either all the good stuff got left behind and has been sent after the chariot, or it’s all zipping along ahead. But my accusative alternative could be taken to mean that the refreshments et al. are already at the ritual ground. This would be supported by ab, esp. b. But it is contra-indicated by VI.62.4 in the immediately preceding Aśvin hymn, where *prkṣam* and *iṣam* are two of the things the Aśvins are bringing. However, if *iṣidh-* is a variant of *niṣṣidh-* ‘tribute’ (see below), the first of these alternatives is the more likely.

The hapax *iṣidh-* is of uncertain formation and meaning, though it obviously falls into the category of desirable things at the ritual. There are (at least) two competing etymologies. One has it as the doublet of *niṣṣidh-* ‘tribute’ (for lit. see EWA I.198; favored by Re); the other (see EWA I.200) as a deformation of a putative **iṣudh-*, like the likewise hapax *prkṣúdh-* (I.141.4), serving as the base of the denom. *iṣudhyá-* and cognate to Aves. *iṣud-*. The *ud(h)-* in these forms is explained by Humbach as the zero-grade of the PIE root $\sqrt{*}uedh$ ‘lead’, no longer found in Indo-Aryan as a verbal root. (I suggest an alternative etym. of *iṣudhyá-* ad I.128.6 and more fully in my forthcoming article “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *iṣud-*, *iṣūdiia-*: The Aim of Praise.”) Narten (YH 159-63) accepts Humbach’s etym. and further explains our *iṣidh-* as altered from **iṣúdh-* by folk etymology with \sqrt{idh} ‘kindle, burn’ (162 n. 104) in passages in which the word is connected with Agni, since kindling wood is Agni’s source of strength. This last seems quite weak to me: ‘burn’ contributes no obvious semantics to the noun at least in its only occurrence here -- which has nothing to do with Agni -- and the *iṣudhyá-* forms, though not numerous, ought to provide some anchor against such a deformation. For this reason I tentatively follow the first interpr., though only because nothing better seems to be currently on offer. If *iṣidh-* is somehow a doublet of *niṣṣidh-*, which occurs several times with *pūrvīh* (III.51.5, VI.44.11) as here, then the reference would be to the tributes that the Aśvins received from the mortal worshippers. I would now alter the tr. to “... after the refreshments, fortifying powers, and the many tributes.”

VI.63.8: The hapax *ásakrām* is another proleptic adj. (see 6d). This fem. sg. can apply equally to the two fem. sgs. *dhenúm* and *iṣám*.

The *ānu* that has not yielded completely satisfactory sense in 6c and 7d here is entirely at home: the various ritual offerings to the Aśvins, both verbal (*stútaḥ* ... *suṣtutíḥ*) and physical (*rásāḥ*, the soma juices), accrue to them *following* the gift they bestow on the sacrificers.

VI.63.9: Although in the publ. tr. I accept Ge’s interpr. of *pakvā* as ‘cooked (food)’ (so also Gr, Hoffmann [231], Klein [DGRV I.97], Scar [587]), in this mass of valuable livestock I now find it unlikely that the poet would memorialize for posterity the gift of a few ready-prepared meals. It is more likely to be a technical term in animal husbandry -- perhaps ‘mature(d)’ (< ‘ripened’), qualifying horses or cattle of a particular age. Although it is neut. pl. and therefore can’t qualify the animals directly, I suggest that parallel to sg. *śatám* in the conjoined phrase *sumīlḥé śatám peruké ca pakvā*, we may supply **śatā(ni) *gāvām pakvā* “mature hundreds of cows” for “*hundreds of mature cows.” A similar constr. seems to be suggested by Gr (Nachtr. to *śatā-*), where he

proposes that *pakvā* be construed with *śatām* as an ex. of his 10) “der Singular neben einem in gleichem Casus stehenden Substantiv des Plurals.” Although this particular interpr. seems precluded by the *ca* in the passage, I do think the neut. *pakvā* qualifies a (gapped) neut. numeral. I would now alter the tr. to “and (hundreds) of mature (cows) at (the hands of) Peruka.”

Hoffmann (230–31) interprets the two clauses in the 2nd hemistich as modal, with injunc. *dāt* rendered as ‘soll ... schenken’ and the sandhi form *abhiṣāca* interpr. as an inf. **abhiṣāce* with the sense “soll ... folge.” This is all in service of his somewhat bizarre insistence that the injunctive aorist doesn’t express immediate past tense (aktuelle Vergangenheit), which is, in his view, the province of the *augmented* aorist. At least in my view, Hoffmann’s restricted and often non-linguistically grounded model of the injunctive has led him to deny the obvious intent of the *dānastuti* here: the gift generally needs to have been given to be praised! As for the supposed infinitive **abhiṣāce* (which, it must be admitted, he does not insist on), there are no other such forms, whereas the nom. pl. is attested elsewhere. We must simply accept that it takes verbal rection, here the acc. pl. *ṛṣvān*; see Scar (587–88).

On *smāddiṣṭi*- see comm. ad III.45.5.

VI.63.10: As in the immediately preceding vs. Hoffmann (230–31) interprets the two forms of *dāt* as modal, “soll ... spenden.” The same objections apply.

The voc. *nāsatyā* was omitted in the publ. tr.

The voc. *vīra* is stubbornly sg., though the reference must be to the du. *Ásvins*. Perhaps, as MLW suggests, simply a shortened du. voc.

VI.63.11: I take loc. *váriman* in the same way as its variant in 3a, as referring to the ritual ground. Ge here: “in weitem Masse,” seemingly referring to the patrons.

VI.64 Dawn

VI.64.1: *supátha*- and *sugá*- recur in 4a, conjoined by *utá*.

Note the phonological reciprocity between *vísṣvā* and *vásṣvī* in the same metrical position in c and d respectively. The latter is, of course, simply the fem. to *vásu*- ‘good, goods’, and here it must make at least partial reference to the goods Dawn disburses, she being here the *Dakṣiṇā*, priestly gift, personified. This could have been better conveyed in the publ. tr. by ‘goodly’ rather than just ‘good’. I think there may also be a buried grammatical pun, for, if there existed such a stem, the *-in*-stem possessive to *vásu*- should be **vasvín*- ‘possessing goods’, with nom. sg. **vasvī*, differing from our form only by accent.

It would be possible to construe *pāda* with *abhūt* and a pred. nom.: “she has become the goodly priestly gift ...” But it is common in Dawn hymns to announce the arrival of Dawn in the first verse, and an annunciatory “she has appeared” (< “come into being”) is more in harmony with the usual practice of Dawn hymns. This is the tack of the standard tr. (Ge, Re; see also Gonda [Ved. Lit. 218]).

VI.64.3: As Ge points out (n. 3cd), the acc. *śátrūn* must be read as the obj. of both similes and acc. *tāmaḥ* ‘darkness’ as the obj. of both frames, though the former only appears in c

and the latter in d. The two similes compare Dawn not only to a male figure, but to a skillful, highly trained male warrior: archer and chariot-driver.

In c the simile marker *iva* occurs after the 2nd term, not the 1st (might expect **sūra ivāstā śātrūn*). Perhaps *sūra- āstar-* is perceived as a unity, “champion archer”; cf. I.70.11 *āsteva sūrah*, IV.36.6 *sūro āstā*, I.8.4 *sūrebhir āstrbhiḥ*, and, with lexical substitution, II.42.2 *vīro āstā*. There is also the fact that in similes with three terms matching two different cases, there’s some fluctuation in the position of the simile marker.

VI.64.4: For *sugā- supātha-* see vs. 1.

Ge suggests that *avāté* “(even) when it is windless” describes a wonder, that Dawn crosses the water even without wind in her sails. I am not sure what evidence we have for sails, in addition to oars, in ancient Indian boats, but I have not systematically inquired into this. However, the “windless” circumstances might simply make reference to the previous pāda: the waters are also *sugā-* ‘easy to travel’ when there is no wind and therefore no turbulence. The word *avāté* also plays off the descriptor of Dawn in the next vs. (5a), *āvātā* ‘unsurpassable, unvanquished’; Old in fact suggests that we might read **āvāte*, voc. of the latter stem, though a word play is much more satisfying poetically, and he does not dismiss the ‘windless’ interpr. out of hand.

VI.64.5: The beginning of the first pāda, *sā ā* [so Pp., Samhitā *sā*] *vaha yā*, replicates almost exactly the beginning of 4c, *sā na ā vaha*. The close similarity of the two openings supports the disjoining of *sā* in 5a into *sā ā*, which is also required by the meter.

As noted above, nom. sg. fem. *āvātā* ‘unvanquished, unsurpassable’ plays on the loc. *avāté* ‘windless’ in 4b. The neg. stem *āvāta-* is generally paired with the positive pres. part. *vanván*, in the phrase *vanvānn āvātaḥ* “winning but unwon” (5x, incl. VI.16.20, 18.1 in this maṇḍala). But here and in nearby VI.67.8 it is found in the fem. and outside of the contrastive pair. In neither of these passages is the application of the adjective clear. I have therefore, somewhat reluctantly, adopted a version of Re’s attenuated ‘insurpassable’ (which, however, he seems to reject in his n.).

Both Ge and Re take cd as a unified rel. cl. (e.g., “die du als Göttin ... erschienen bist”), but this is impossible, because *bhūh* is unaccented. I instead attach c to ab, and take d as an independent imperatival clause. I now see that it would be possible to take cd together, with the nominal rel. cl. *yā ha devī* acting as an izafe; as noted elsewhere (passim) such izafe-like rel. phrases can be embedded. This would produce a tr. “You, who are a goddess, o daughter of heaven, become worthy to be seen ...,” with no appreciable difference in meaning.

VI.64.6: This vs. is identical to I.124.12.

Pāda b may contain another izafe-like embedded rel. construction, like the possible one in 5c: *nāraś ca yé pitubhājah* “and the men who are partakers of food.” The question turns on where to construe hemistich-final *vyūṣtau*. It could belong to the rel. cl. “... partake of food at the first flush,” in which case there would be no embedding. But it seems as if this temporal designation should apply to both actions: the flying up of the birds and the eating of the men, not just the latter. Moreover *te* in 2nd pos. of the hemistich is most easily construed with *vyūṣtau* at the end, in which case the nominal rel. must be embedded.

This hemistich also seems syntactically unbalanced. If we assume that we have an “X and which Y” construction, conjoining birds and men (so Klein, DGRV I.56), they should be the joint subject of *úd ... apaptan* ‘have flown up’, an action appropriate to the first group but not the second. Surely the real intent is that at the moment of dawn the birds fly up and the men eat, so what is intended to be conjoined are the two verbal notions, with one a finite verb and the other the 2nd member of a root noun cmpd. (on which see Scar 352).

VI.65 Dawn

VI.65.1: As Re points out, the expected expression is *duhitā divāḥ* “daughter of heaven,” but it has been elaborated here by the cmpd *divojāḥ* ‘born of heaven’, with the gen. as 1st member. The standard phrase returns in the last vs.

This vs. piles on the words for night and darkness: *rāmyāsu ... tāmasāś cid aktūn* “amid the nights ... even across the nocturnal shades of darkness.”

VI.65.2: The same emphasis on the dark night is found here in *tāma ūrmyāyāḥ* (with acc. *tāmaḥ* as head noun, against the dep. gen. *tāmasaḥ* in the previous vs. (1d). With *ūrmyā-* here the poet introduces yet another ‘night’ word.

VI.65.3–4: There is lexical chaining between 3d and 4a with the identical phrase *vidhaté rātnam* in the same metrical position.

VI.65.4–5: For the repeated opening *idā* (4a, 4b, 4c, 5a) see publ. intro. The two outer exx. are both *idā hī*; the two inner ones are followed by phonologically similar them. datives: 4b *idā vīrāya* / 4c *idā vīprāya*.

VI.65.6: The voc. *divo duhitar* repairs, or “de-elaborates,” the phrase in 1a; see ad loc.

VI.66 Maruts

On the difficulties and with an overview of the Maruts’ birth story in vss. 1–5, see publ. intro. The hymn was treated at length by P. von Bradke, “Von der Marut wunderbarer Geburt, RV 6, 66” in Fs. von Roth (1893), 117–25, whose disc. is in great part incorporated into Old’s notes.

VI.66.1: This vs. is conceptually, lexically, and syntactically similar to VI.48.22; see extensive disc. ad loc., with ref. to other passages alluding to this mythological event.

For *nāma pātya* “own a name,” cf. II.37.2 *dadīr yó nāma pātyate* “who owns the name ‘giver’,” adduced by Re.

The 2nd hemistich consists of a truncated *anyā-* ... *anyā-* construction, with the 2nd *anyā-* gapped. This implicitly contrastive structure must account for the accent on *pīpāya* in the first clause.

Contra the standard interpr. (Old, Ge, Re), I take *śukrām* and *ūdhaḥ* separately, as the double acc. obj. of √ *duh*, rather than having the former an adj. modifying ‘udder’, also in other relevant passages that contain the same two words (II.34.2, IV.3.10).

VI.66.2: For a more complex comparison of the Maruts to fire(s), see vs. 10.

In c, where the gen. pl. *eṣām* seems to preclude the Maruts as referent of the nom. pl. *areṇávo hiranyāyāsaḥ*, Sāy. supplies *rāthāḥ*, and this might be possible or at least harmless, although the positive evidence for it is slim. The 2nd adj. *hiranyāya-* is used not infrequently of chariots or their parts (wheels, wheel-rims), but also of a wide range of other things, including gods and those include the Maruts (V.87.5); ‘dustless’ has a more limited range of application. In nearby VI.62.6 it qualifies *yójanebhiḥ*, rendered there as ‘treks’ and, as I argue ad loc., a near synonym for ‘paths’, which are twice described as ‘dustless’ (I.35.11, 163.6). This is as close as we’ll get to chariots: in its 8 occurrences it is never used of chariots or parts thereof. It is, however, used of the Maruts in I.168.4. Because chariots are intrusive in our passage and interrupt the otherwise constant reference to the Maruts in the nom. pl. (ab and, in my opinion, d) and because the combination of adjectives doesn’t point to chariots -- or any referent *but* the Maruts, who are described by both adjectives elsewhere -- I now think the nom. plurals in c refer to the Maruts. What then to do with *eṣām*? I propose construing it with the instrumentals in d. The pāda boundary intervenes, but this is hardly fatal. I would now emend the tr. to “dustless and golden, they came into being all at once with their (*eṣām*) manly and male powers.”

However, *pace* Ge and Re, even if we were to keep ‘chariots’ as the referent in c, I do not think these same chariots could be the subj. of d. Rather, by that interpr., c is parenthetic and the Maruts return as subj. in d, which again treats the topic of their simultaneous birth. Ge’s parallels (see n. 2cd) contravene his tr. (“ihre staublosen goldigen (Wagen) sind zugleich mit ihren Manneskräften und Stärken entstanden”) because the parallel passages with *sākām* √*jan* (etc.) all concern the birth of the Maruts—certainly not their chariots!

Pāda-init. *sākām* plays off identically position *sakṛt* in 1d.

VI.66.3: There is much disagreement about this vs.; my interpr. is closest to Old. In my opinion (and in Old’s too, though he doesn’t use the term ‘gender-bending’), this once again, as in vs. 1, refers to the gender-bending androgyny of Pr̥ṣni who fulfills both maternal and paternal roles in the birth of the Maruts, though Rudra is identified as their father in pāda a.

The masc. pl. rel. pronouns *yé* (a) and *yān* (b) have no direct correlative in either c or d. But both the gen. sg. *mahāḥ* in c (see below) and *subhvé* in d (see below) pick up the masc. pl. conceptually. For a similar -- and clearer -- example see vs. 9, with ab referring to the Marut troop in the sg., and cd picking up that reference with pl. rel. prn. *yé* (c) and a pl. abl. noun (d).

In b, despite the lack of an identifying gendered pronoun or adj., the subject and the referent of *dādṛviḥ* must be Pr̥ṣni, as is generally agreed.

In c Old discusses the possible interpr. of *mahāḥ* at some length. Much depends on the analysis of *vidé*. Ge takes it as transitive (“denn die Mutter kennt ihre Grossen”), with *mahāḥ* acc. pl.; Re as well, though with a diff. interpr. of *mahāḥ*. But *vidé* is overwhelmingly pass.-intrans.; only VII.40.5, cited by Ge (n. 3c) seems to require a transitive interpr. I take *vidé* in its usual passive sense and interpr. *mahāḥ* as a gen. sg. dependent on *mātā*; the sg. referent is the collectivity of the Maruts in their flock.

Note the allit. in c: *mātā mahó mahī* and the etymological relationship between the

last two terms. Note also the unusual pāda-final position of *sā́*, which may result both from being displaced by the alliterative sequence (though why not 1st position?) and from the desire for the striking repetitive *sā́, sā́* over the pāda and clause boundary. This repetition is enhanced by the matching vowels before and after: (*mah*)ī *sā́, sā́* ī(*t*). This is only one of two rukied *sā́*s in the RV (the other = X.64.15 #*ví sā́*), even though *sā́* occurs elsewhere in ruki environment (even pāda-finally, as in VIII.27.18 ... *nú sā́*). I do not understand the reason for the ruki: there does not seem to be particularly close syntactic nexus between *mahī* and *sā́* here.

Pāda d fully expresses the gender paradox, at least by my interpr. (and Old's). As noted in the publ. intro., *gārbham* √*dhā* 'place the embryo' is the defining idiom of the male role in pregnancy, and here it is difficult (but not impossible!) to avoid taking its subject to be the female Pṛṣṇi. In fact, both Ge and Re (tr.) do wriggle out of it, by making *sét* [= *sā́ id*] *pṛṣṇih* a nominal sentence (Re's "elle (s'appelle) Pṛṣṇi" has a particularly peculiar charm) and supplying Rudra as the subj. of the idiom. But there is no support for this in the passage, and only insistence on expected gender roles can impose the interpr. Indeed the init. *sā́ id* draws attention to the paradox: "it was *just her* -- Pṛṣṇi -- who implanted the embryo. (Interestingly, while Re follows the Ge tack in his tr., in his comm. he embraces the paradox: "c'est Pṛṣṇi qui (en fait : *id*) a mis le germe ..." Since the tr. and the comm. are found in the same fascicle of EVP -- X, pp. 40 and 98–99 respectively -- his about-face is head-spinningly rapid. It should also be admitted that Ge [in n. 3d] also allows the possibility of a single clause and a feminine subject.)

This leaves *subhvè*. In the Rudra-as-emplanter scenario, this dat. refers to Pṛṣṇi (see Ge n. 3d and Re [tr.] "en (l'épouse) feconde," also Scar 369), but part of the reason for Re's change of heart was that he did not believe that *subhvè* could be fem. (see his comm.). In the Pṛṣṇi-as-emplanter scenario *subhvè* would refer to Rudra (so Gr, Old, Re [comm.]). I think neither solution is correct. The compd. *subhū-* in the pl. is used a number of times of the Maruts (5.41.13, 55.3, 59.3, 87.3), including once in a birth context: V.55.3 *sākāṃ jātāḥ subhvàḥ* "born all at once, good in essence." As with *mahāḥ* in pāda c I interpr. the singular here as referring to the collectivity of the Maruts.

VI.66.4: Another difficult vs., esp. the end of pāda a: *āyā nú*, which has provoked much disc. (see esp. Old). I consider it a śleṣa. Central to my approach is the assumption that there's a clause break before these two words in either reading. On the one hand, I have adopted von Bradke's clever idea (op. cit., 121), that *āyā nú* is direct speech, with *āyā* the 1st sg. pres. subjunctive to √*i* 'go' followed by the temporal particle *nú* in expected clause-2nd position. This is the collective announcement of the Maruts, "who do not retreat from their birth": "I will go now." They are eager to exit the womb (or udder). We might of course expect a plural verb, but Marut reference always vacillates between pl. and collective sg. (see in fact the immediately preceding vs. 3), and this exact expression echoes that of Indra in the narrative of his unnatural birth in IV.18.2 *nāhām āto nír āyā* "I will not go from here," a narrative that might well have been familiar to all.

The other reading of *āyā* is the more generally accepted one, though I think other interpr. have missed a crucial detail. It is generally taken as the instr. sg. fem. of the *ayām* prn. (back to Max Müller; see Ge n. 4a). But this form is ordinarily accented on the final, *ayā́*. Initial accent on the oblique forms of this pronominal stem is restricted to emphatic usage in pāda-initial position (cf. the variant usage of, e.g., *āsya*, *asyá*, and *asya*). Those

like Ge and Re who take it as this instr. but construe it with the rest of pāda a must wave away the accent (or ignore it, as Re does). For such interpr. cf. “Die nicht vor der Geburt *auf diese Art* zurückscheuen ...”; “... devant un naissance *de la sorte*” (my italics). However, init. accent is perfectly at home if we assume a clause break before *áyā*, an assumption supported by the position of *nū*, which overwhelmingly takes 2nd or modified 2nd position. I think it emphatically announces the way the birth *really* happened -- and given the unnaturalness of the birth (being “milked out” of their mother), emphasis is certainly called for.

Either of these interpr. seems to require that the *yād* in c actually have domain over b as well (though there might be a way out of that if one were sufficiently ingenious), but given the syntactic tangle the vs. is already in and the looseness of the relativization elsewhere in this hymn) (see a similar problem in the next vs., 5b, this does not seem to me too much of a problem.

In b it is not clear to me what flaws the Maruts needed to purify; Ge (n. 4b) suggests it’s the unnatural pregnancy and birth, and he may well be right.

Gr (and Lub) assign *ukṣāmānāḥ* to *√ukṣ* ‘sprinkle’, but ‘grow’ seems more likely (so also Ge, Re).

Our problematic expression may have spawned the two *ānu* forms (in c and d) from *áyā nū*. The first is in the familiar expression *ānu jóṣam* (II.21.3, etc.) “according to / at pleasure”; the latter I construe with *tanvām* (cf. I.147.4 *ānu mṛkṣīṣṭa tanvām*, with similar discontinuity). Neither *√vakṣ* / *ukṣ* nor *√mṛc* otherwise *ānu*.

VI.66.5: This last vs. of the birth saga does not let up on obscurity, and my interpr. differs in part from those of others, though there is general agreement on the point of the vs.; see, e.g., Ge (n. 5): that the Maruts got no milk from their mother, but undeterred, they quickly became the Maruts we know, with their shared name and their tumultuous behavior. It is striking that the vs. also identifies the Maruts with Pṛṣni verbally. Not only is the same construction used for their names (1b, 5b; see next para.), but within the vs. both Pṛṣni (a) and the Maruts (c) are called *ayās*- ‘irrepressible’ (with this adj. regularly used of the Maruts elsewhere), and *sudānu*- ‘of good drops/gifts’, a standing epithet of the Maruts, is applied to Pṛṣni in d (see Ge’s n. 5d)

The vs. is also linked ring compositionally with vs. 1. In 1b it is asserted that the two udders referred to in 1c and d — the latter being Pṛṣni’s udder, which will produce the Maruts as milk — “own the same name ‘milker’” (*samānām nāma dhenú pátyamānam*), while in 5b the Maruts after birth assume their (shared) name “Marut”: *ā nāma dhṛṣṇú mārutaṃ dádhanāḥ* -- note, inter alia, the echo of *dhenú* in *dhṛṣṇú*. Note also 1c / 5a LOC *dohāse*: in 1c the other (=non-Pṛṣni) udder constantly gives milk (*dohāse*) to mortals (*márteṣu*), while here in 5a Pṛṣni does not give milk (*ná ... dohāse*) to the Maruts (*yéṣu*) even right after birth -- even though she milked them out of that very udder.

The vs. also has repeated phonological play with *ayā* (a), *ayāso* (c), (*āv*)a *yāsad* (d), picking up the problematic *áyā* of 4a.

In addition to its other problems, the vs. is metrically troubled, with a bad cadence in a and 9 syllables in c.

Both Ge and Old (and also von Bradke) take *makṣū* with the b pāda, which requires the rel. cl. of pāda a to be embedded, but I think it goes rather with its own pāda, indicating that even right after their birth Pṛṣni deprived them of milk (sim. Re). I then

take the *yé* of *c* to have domain over *b* as well -- the same aberrant relative placement as suggested for 4bc.

The hapax *stauná-* is, as Re says, “ininterprétable” (which does not stop him from trying). Ge suggests reading **astaunāḥ* (with abhinihita sandhi after *yé* in the *Saṃhitā* text), deriving it from \sqrt{stu} and tr. ‘ohne Lob(?)’. Although this has the merit of connecting it to a known root and without phonological disturbance, I find Re’s tr. “sans être inertes” (without comm. on the etym., but perhaps based on von Bradke’s “Sie stehen nicht still”) more appealing in context, since it would provide a satisfying contrast with *ayāsaḥ*: in Re’s tr., “eux qui, sans être inertes, (sont bien au contraire) inlassables.” I am also struck by the echo pointed out by von Bradke, with our *staunā* matched by *(ta)sthau ná* in the next vs., 6d. As often, contextual poetics may have led to the choice of an enigmatic word. My own extremely speculative interpr. (“like posts”) is that it is related to *sthūṇā-* ‘pillar’, which is well anchored in Iranian (YAves. *stūna-*, *stunā-*, OP *stūnā-*, as well as Middle and Mod. Iranian) and found also widely in MIA and NIA (Pā, Pkt *thūṇā*, etc.). This suggestion requires the perhaps counter-intuitive assumption that the aspiration in *sthūṇā* is secondary, perhaps based on the MIA form (where initial **st* would of course develop into *th*); the unmotivated retroflex *ṇ* in the Vedic form might give some support to that hypothesis. And secondary (if it *is* secondary) association with $\sqrt{sthā}$ ‘stand’ would also encourage an aspirated initial. Another wrinkle is that it may have trisyllabic scansion (so Gr), but that is further than I can go. For a similarly impenetrable form in this maṇḍala with the same phonological profile, see *staulā* in VI.44.7 and comm. ad loc.

The last problem in the vs. (or at least the last one I will tackle) is in d: does *nū cid* here mean ‘even now’ or ‘never’. Ge, Re, and von Bradke opt for the latter; Scar (405) gives a choice of both. Although these two choices seem starkly oppositional, they may amount to the same thing with the subjunctive *áva yāsat*: even now she is trying to appease them, and she never will be able to.

VI.66.6: With some relief we can pass on from the clotted vss. containing the Maruts’ birth story to the considerably more straightforward terrain of their adult exploits. This vs. is, however, linked to the preceding one: *ugrāḥ* in 6a picks up the last word of 5, *ugrān*. It is also barely possible that *suméke* ‘well-fixed’ to \sqrt{mi} ‘fix, implant’ resonates with *staunāḥ* in 5c, *if* that means ‘post’.

As indicated in the publ. tr., the vs. is also structured by the pun on du. *ródasī* ‘(two) world halves’ and nom. sg. *rodasī*, the PN of the Maruts’ consort, differing only by accent.

As noted by Old and Re, the simile marker *ná* is wrongly positioned, before the simile itself: *ná rókaḥ* rather than expected **róko ná*. Re suggests it is to avoid vs.-final *ná*. But see the disc. above of 5c, with the ref. to von Bradke’s happy observation that *(ta)sthau ná* here matches the hapax *staunā(h)* in that pāda, which can easily account for the wrong placement here: the order was adjusted to facilitate the inter-vs. echo. My tr. also reflects my interpr. of *svásociḥ* at the end of previous pāda as part of the postponed simile (*svásociḥ*, ... *ná rókaḥ*## “like a self-blazing light”). Although *svásociḥ* can of course modify *rodasī*, to which it is adjacent, taking it with the simile would not only put *ná* in expected, if distant, second position, but also produces a more effective simile in

my opinion: “like a light” seems pretty lame, as if Rodasī was a glorified headlight, but “like a self-blazing light” has more oomph.

VI.66.7: Both Ge and Re take *pathyā* as the obj. of *sāadhan* (e.g., “... die rechten Wege nehmend”), but since the former is regularly used, with or without *ānu*, to express extent of space and since the latter can be used absolutely, I prefer my rendering.

VI.66.8: In c, on the basis of VI.31.1 I would adjust the tr. to reflect the formulaic pair *tokā- tānaya-* to “progeny and posterity, the waters, and the sun”; see also VI.25.4.

Flg. Ge, Re, and Klein (DGRV II.123, 194), the publ. tr. takes *pārye ... dyōḥ* as referring to a particular, decisive time or hour of the day (Klein “in the last (hour) of the day”), but I now think it more likely that the phrase is simply a metrically driven variant of *divī(...)* *pārīye / pārīye diviḥ* “on the decisive day,” a locution found quite commonly in the VIth Maṇḍala (VI.17.14, 23.2, 33.5, 40.5; also *pārīye āhan* VI.26.1). In pāda-final position that expression is only appropriate to Jagatī/dimeter cadences. Re makes a similar suggestion in his comm, despite his tr. “à l’heure-décisive du jour.” I would therefore slightly emend the publ. tr. to “on the decisive day”; sense supports this change: the act described in this pāda is more likely to be localized to a particularly important day, not a particularly important part of the day.

On the tendency of *ādha* to occur adjacent to locatives, see Klein DGRV II.95.

VI.66.9: For the switch between singular reference to the Marut collectivity in ab and plural reference to the same group in cd, see disc. ad 3cd.

A particularly insistent etym. figure in c: *sāhāmsi sāhasā sāhante*. The metrical irreg. of the pāda, with a likely rest at 5 (so HvN), after *sāhāmsi*, may draw attention to it.

On the address to Agni in d, see comm. ad 10.

VI.66.10: The comparison of the Maruts to fires in 2a (*yé agnāyo ná sóśucann idhānāḥ* “those who kept blazing up like fires being kindled”) returns here in the first hemistich with more contorted imagery. In the similes of both a and b the Maruts are compared not directly to fire, but to something that is a metaphor for fire: “the dart of the ceremony” (a) and the more familiar “tongues of fire” (b). The somewhat unexpected invocation of Agni in the last pāda of the preceding vs. (9d) prepares the way for these similes.

In d I have followed Ge and Re in selecting the final word, *ādhr̥ṣtāḥ* ‘unassailable’, as the predicate. But given that the first 5 vss. of the hymn concern the Maruts’ birth and that the 1st half of this vs. compares them to fire, I wonder if the predicate is rather *bhr̥ṣṭajjanmānaḥ* ‘of flashing birth’, as von Bradke takes it: “..... leuchtend ist die Geburt der unwiderstehlichen Marut.” The striking phonology (...j ...jj) of the cmpd certainly draws attention to it.

VI.66.11: Note the fairly common *bhr̥ṣṭad-ṛṣti-* in a immediately following the identically formed hapax *bhr̥ṣṭaj-janman-* in 10d.

The final pāda has attracted more concerned comment than I think it deserves; see esp. the great fuss Old makes about it. The issue is what to do with the simile containing two nominatives *girāyo nāpāḥ* (= *nā āpāḥ*), lit. “like mountains, waters.” The consensus seems to be that the two noms. convey a single image, with a more complex structure

underlying it: namely the waters (of) the mountains, mountain water, Bergwasser. I don't see why this is necessary; instead I think the thoughts are being compared both with mountains and with waters, which are both *ugrá-* in different ways. (Old allows this possibility.)

Note that the adjectives qualifying the inspired thoughts, *śúci-* and *ugrá-*, were used of the Maruts earlier in the hymn, in 4c and 5c, 6a respectively.

VI.67 Mitra and Varuṇa

VI.67.1: The hymn does not start promisingly, with a bad, and unfixable, cadence in pāda a (*jyēṣṭhatamā*). Pāda c also ends with a superlative (*yāmiṣṭhā*), which makes a fine cadence. Perhaps this morphological parallelism invited the deployment of the double splv. *jyēṣṭhatamā* in this unfavorable position.

Both Ge and Re predicate the infin. *vāṛdhādhyai* to a supplied 1st pl. (e.g., “M+V ... wollen wir erbauen ...”), but there is no reason why the dual dvandva *mitrāvāruṇā* can't be a nom., with a passive reading of the infin., as I take it. In Re's case the supposed 1st ps. subj. leads him to take *vaḥ* as obj. (“vous les plus puissants ...”), though of course it is plural and does not match the referents in number and, compounding the grammatical lapses, to tr. *mitrāvāruṇā* as voc. (“ô Varuṇa-Mitra”). This was not Re's finest hour. Ge manages to shift *vaḥ* off into an oblique role (“für euch,” presumably referring to the human beneficiaries of the 1st ps. poet-ritualists' activities), but absent a 1st ps. subj., *vaḥ* can be attached directly to the poets' songs used for strengthening, as in the publ. tr.

In c the grammatical identity of *raśmā* (in sandhi with the simile particle *raśméva*) is unclear. It is generally taken, I think correctly, to the *-n*-stem *raśmán-*, otherwise found only in cmpds. Gr calls it an instr., and Wackernagel concurs (AiG III.268), as does Re (clearer in the comm. [EVP VII] than in the weaselly tr. “comme (avec) une rêne” [EVP V]). But *-mā* instr. to *-man*-stems are rare; AiG cites only the likewise hapax *drāghmā* in X.70.4. We might rather expect **raś(a)nā* or the like (cf. *mahinā* to *mahimán-*), and in fact such a posited form might yield the well-attested *-ā*-stem *raśanā-* ‘halter’ as a decasuative from the instr. (though the Iranian forms showing this same internal vowel [see EWA s.v.] might give us pause). Ge by contrast takes it as a nom. sg., which is grammatically impeccable as long as the stem is masc. (Since its other two occurrences are in bahuvrīhis, it is impossible to be sure, but suffix-accented *-mán*-stems are in fact generally masc.; cf. AiG II.2.754.) Either nom. or instr. would work fine in the passage; in the former case the comparison would be to Mitra and Varuṇa as controllers; in the latter to the arms with which they perform the controlling (*bāhúbhiḥ svaīḥ*). In neither case would *raśmā* match the frame in number. I have followed Ge in taking it as a nom., though I would like it to be dual, like *apāsā* in 3c, but this is morphologically impossible.

The verb form *yamātuḥ* is generally assigned to the pf. stem (Gr, Wh Rts, Kü), though Lub lists it with the root aor., labelling it a nonce. Kü (399) derives this non-redupl. pf. by analogy to “nur scheinbar reduplikationslosem *takṣathur* : *takṣur*” to the 3rd pl. injunc. root aor. *yamur*. Since there is no real semantic connection between the two roots \sqrt{yam} and $\sqrt{takṣ}$, and the supposed model *takṣathur* is found only once in the RV, in Maṇḍala X (as opposed to the well-established redupl. pf. *tatākṣa*, etc.), this seems an unlikely channel. A more likely one is found in the immediate context: the pāda ends ...

yamátur yámiṣṭhā, with the dual splv. “best controllers” serving as subj. to the etymologically identical verb. In these circumstances substituting the root syllable *yam* found in the splv. for the weak form *yem* found in the proper dual pf. *yemáthur* (2x; cf. also 3rd du. *yematur*) would not be surprising.

VI.67.2: The first hemistich displays a sort of contrastive ritual synesthesia. In the first pāda an inspired thought (*manīṣā*) is ‘spread forth’ (*prá stṛṇīte*), an action not literally applicable to a verbal product but suitable to the barhis or ritual grass found in b, which is *not* the obj. of this verb. What is going on in b is not clear until we reach the next vs. The b pāda of 2 contains a set of apparently unconnected notions without a unifying verb: *úpa priyā námasā barhír ácha* “up to, the two dear ones (or, with a dear one), with homage, to the ritual grass,” but the corresponding pāda in 3 pulls together this disarray: *úpa priyā námasā hūyámānā*. The missing verbal action is ‘call’, and now the two dear ones, the instrumental homage, and the barhis all make sense. I therefore (with Ge, but not Re) supply a form of ‘call’ in 2b. And ‘call’ is more appropriate to the inspired thought of pāda a than the spreading that occurred there. In the publ. tr. I supply a participial form modifying the inspired thought and having active semantics, with *priyā* as acc. obj. (“calling [you] two dear ones”). I now see that it might be desirable to supply the exact form found in the next vs., the dual pass. *hūyámānā*, tr. “... you two, the dear ones being called ...” However, there is a grammatical obstacle, in that *vām* in 2a must be a gen./dat. enclitic, not an acc., and therefore there is no available acc. in the structural frame of the hemistich that a passive participle could modify. This might be finessed by taking b as a sort of loosely connected new start. However, I prefer to stay with the publ. tr., both for the syntactic reasons just mentioned, and because it makes the connection between the inspired thought and the call to the gods more direct.

The nominal rel. cl. *yád vām varūthyām* is another ex. of an izafe-like construction. Here, since nothing follows it but a voc., it does not appear embedded, as many such phrases do, but it adds to the dossier of these constructions, on which see my forthcoming “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian.”

VI.67.3: For the connection of the first hemistich, and esp. b, with 2ab, esp. 2b, see comm. on the preceding vs. Here, since Mitra and Varuṇa are subjects, the pass. participle *hūyámānā* is in the nom.

The 2nd hemistich is extremely problematic. Among other things, the rel. prn. *yaú* in c calls for an accented verb, but the only finite verb in the hemistich is unaccented *yatathaḥ* in d; the hapax *apnastháḥ* in c is of unclear meaning and has an uncertain grammatical identity; the following simile *apáseva* has been variously interpr.; *śrudhīyatáḥ* is a hapax denominative part.; and even if all these questions are solved, what does it all add up to?

Before addressing any of these questions directly, note several plays on the syllable *yā* in the early part of the hymn: 1) PREV + dual rel. pronoun in the initial sequences *sám yā* (1c), *sám yāv* (our 3c) (as well as *prá yā* [4c] and, with slight transformation, *pári yád* [5c]); 2) dual verbs *yamátuḥ* (1c), *yantám* (2c), *ā yātam* (3a), *yatathaḥ* (3d). These observations set the stage for a way to reason through the problems of this hemistich.

Let us begin with the problem of the lack of accented verb in what must be a rel. cl. introduced by *sám yaú*. Assuming that d, with its unaccented verb, is the main cl. corresponding to the rel. cl. of c, which has no overt verb, there is a non-arbitrary way to generate one: in 1c the same opening sequence *sám yā* (differing only in the form of the dual rel. prn., attributable to the variation in the following initial) does have an accented verb, pf. *yamátuḥ*, reinforced by the immediately flg. splv. *yámiṣṭhā*, with the verb of 2c, *yantám*, also belonging to the root \sqrt{yam} . Our opening *sám yaú* cries out for (or at least whispers for) a similar form of \sqrt{yam} , and so I have supplied it. Note that the obj. of *sám ... yamátuḥ* in 1cd is *jánān* as here. (Ge [n. 3cd] supplies *náyathah*, on the basis of V.65.6 *yuvám mitremám jánam, yátathah sám ca nayathah*, also a M+V passage; this is a reasonable idea based on a good parallel, and in some ways amounts to the same thing: he tr. “die die Menschen zusammen(halten)” -- but I prefer mine because it is generated within the hymn’s context. Old appears to supply a form of \sqrt{yat} matching the one in the main cl. of d, as does Re.)

On the question of *apáseva* there is now a reasonable consensus (Old, Ge, Re, and me, but see Gr and Old for alternative views) that this represents a dual NA *apásā* referring to M+V as subjects. They are therefore controlling the peoples (*jánān*) as workers (or, perhaps better, work-overseers) do. But we must now confront the hapax *apnastháḥ*. This is likely a cmpd of *ápnas-* ‘property, riches’ and a form of $\sqrt{sthā}$. But what form? Gr, Debrunner (AiG II.2.37), and EWA (s.v. *ápnas-*) assign it to a them. stem *apnasthá-*, which would require it to be a nom. sg., which ill accords with the assumed dual subj. If it is nom. sg., then *apásā* would be pushed into the acc. slot, where there is no syntactic place for it, or else, with an unenthusiastic suggestion of Old’s, it would be an instr. sg. to the neut. *s*-stem, for **ápasā*. Better to take it, by Old’s preferred interpr., as belonging to a root-noun cmpd *apnas-sthá-*. Under this interpr. it would be an acc. pl. This seems the least objectionable from a contextual point of view; even though acc. pl. to root nouns in *-ā* aren’t certainly attested (see the not very helpful treatments of Lanman [Noun Inflec. 451 and passim], Macdonell VG 253), both *-as* and *-ās* seem to be possibilities. The 1st members of cmpds in *-sthā-* generally have a locative relationship to their 2nd member, so ‘standing/staying in *ápnas-*’ is the likely meaning. As for its function in the clause, I take it as qualifying *jánān* (so also Old, though with alternatives), while Ge and Re take it as part of the simile (e.g., “... die die Menschen zusammen(halten) wie Werkmeister die Lohnarbeiter”), and Scar, flg. Neisser, takes it as the designation of a group of people distinct from the general *jánān* but still in the frame. In the absence of other attestations of the cmpd or underlying phrase, this cannot be decisively determined. For a detailed disc. of the word and the passage, see Scar 645–46.

The denom. *śrudhīyā-* is, by most accounts (see Old, Re), but not by Ge’s (see n. 3d), built to the 2nd sg. impv. *śrudhí* ‘listen!’. It is an acc. pl. part. The question is what sense it is conveying. Gr glosses ‘gehorsam sein’, but since *even (cid)* this group of people is put in its place by M+V with their greatness (*mahitvā*), it is unlikely that they were already obedient. Old (see also Re) suggests that it is people who address M+V with this impv., perhaps indicating that they stand in a close or privileged relationship with those gods. I think rather that it may refer to people powerful enough to command obedience from other men through such peremptory commands. They would then be similar in stature to the *apnastháḥ*: two sets of people used to getting their own way (rich and demanding), who have to submit to M+V.

VI.67.4: The birth of M+V from Aditi. This vs. is also beset with difficulties. The major structural one is determining the interrelationships of the three subordinate clauses, in abc, marked by *yā*, *yád*, and *yā* respectively, and their joint relationship (or not) to the main clause in d. Once again, there are numerous competing views; I will not rehearse them all. In my view, the three subordinate clauses are not all parallel and semi-independent, but rather the two introduced by the dual rel. prn. *yā* (a, c) are parallel and jointly dependent on the middle cl. introduced by *yád* (b). In tr. I have flipped the order of a and b in hopes of making the sense a bit more parsable. I further think that the two forms of *yā* ‘which two’ have as antecedent in b the sg. *gárbham*: “the embryo which was those two” or “the two as embryo.” M+V formed one of the pairs that Aditi gave birth to serially and in that sense were a single *gárbham*.

Let us then concentrate first on pāda a. Here, as in 1ab, there is an infin. in *-dhyai* predicated of a god’s name, *áditiḥ*: “When Aditi (was) to bear.” The puzzle in the vs. is *ṛtā*, and numerous analyses have been proposed: nom. sg. fem. to normally neut. *ṛtā*- ‘truth (etc.)’; short instr. sg. to the same stem; dual to the same stem; a 3rd sg. denom. verb to the same stem (emending to **ṛtāyád* from *ṛtā yád*), or, the solution I favor, as a short loc. sg. to *ṛtū*- ‘season’ (so Ge, though see his n. 4b), even though *-u*-stems supposedly have only *-aul/-avi* locc. (but see Lanman p. 411: “if there is any certain instance of a L in *-ā*, it must be regarded as due to false analogy.” I see no problem with analogy, false or otherwise).

The two *yā* clauses are nominal. The first (a) presents no problems. In the 2nd (c) most tr. supply a verb with *prā*, e.g., Ge “die sich gross hervortun” (sim. Re). However, I take *jāyamānā* as a predicated pres. part. and *māhi* as an intensifier of *mahāntā*.

In d the sense of the verb *ní dīdhaḥ* is unclear, and the lexeme *ní√dhr̥* is not common. Gr glosses this passage as ‘machen’ with double acc.; Ge tr. ‘hatte ... getragen’, Re ‘avait placé en secret’. In the three other passages containing *ní(ā)√dhr̥* that I know of (IV.2.12, VI.17.6, *ní-ā* VIII.17.13), the idiom means something like ‘fix’ or ‘secure’, but here I think it applies to the process of birth: ‘bear down’. Although I know of no other such exx., this kind of technical birth context doesn’t come up very often in the RV. The birth process interpr. fits well with the predicated pres. part. of c: “who *were being* born” as well as with the indication in b that Aditi had reached her precise time for giving birth.

VI.67.5: This vs. is refreshingly straightforward, even though the main cl. of d seems something of an irrelevancy after the grand statements in abc.

VI.67.6: The vs. is knit together with phonological and etymological figures. Each pāda contains a form of *div/dyū*: a *dyūn*, b *dyoḥ*, c *-devo*, d *dyām*. Note also the phonological similarity of the two du. verbs *dhārāyethe* (a), *dṛm̐hēthe* (b), with the latter reprised etymologically by *dṛl̐hó* in c. Pādas b and d also rhyme.

Unlike the standard tr. I take b as part of the *hí* cl. beginning in a, with cd as the main cl. Since the verb of b, *dṛm̐hēthe*, is initial, it can owe its accent either to its position (as most interpr. it) or to belonging to a subord. cl., as I do. Nonetheless, there is little riding on this choice, though I would support mine by pointing out that the fact that M+V made the back of heaven firm (b) could serve as a reason why the sun is also firmly fixed

(c).

Contra Klein (explicitly, DGRV I.379–80) and Ge/Re (implicitly), I do not think that *utá*, positioned in the middle of c, conjoins b and c, but instead begins a new cl., which continues through d.

With Ge (and, judging from his tr., Re), I divide *dhāsínāyóḥ* into *dhāsínā ayóḥ*, with the gen.-loc. du. of *ayám*, not *āyóḥ*, gen.-abl. sg. of *āyú-* with the Pp.

VI.67.7: Ge follows Sāy. in interpr. this vs. as referring to rain and river waters. Although this would accord better with the enigmatic gush (*dhāsí-*) of 6d, it doesn't fit the vocabulary or apparent sense of this enigmatic vs. The best clue we have is pāda a, where "to fill the belly" (*jaṭhāram pṛṇādhyai*) belongs to a phrase for drinking soma to satiation (cf. nearby VI.69.7 and V.34.2, X.104.2, as well as other locutions involving soma and the belly). (Both Old and Re also take the pāda as referring to soma.) Once the poet has established the soma context with this reasonably clear phraseology, he can (and does) treat the subject in a more obscure fashion.

In b and c I take the feminine plurals *sābhṛtayaḥ* 'of the same rearing / pedigree' and *yuvatāyò 'vātāḥ* 'unsurpassable maidens' as referring to the fingers (of the priests) that press the soma. Such locutions, referring to the shared kinship of the fingers (because they belong to the same hand), are frequent in the IXth Maṇḍala and the forms are always feminine. I am tolerably certain of the second identification, since the action ascribed to them in pāda d, distributing their "milk," would be a reasonable way (given the tropes of soma preparation) to characterize the work of the pressing fingers. I am less certain about the identification in b, because "fill the seat" (*sádma ... pṛṇánti*) is not as easy to connect with soma preparation. "Seat" could refer, inter alia, to the ritual ground or the cosmos -- both are attested -- but neither is generally flooded with soma. *sābhṛti-* is a hapax, so it does not help identify the referent. So the sense of pāda b remains in doubt for me.

Note another ex. of a *-dhyai* infinitive, though this time not as the predicated substitute for a main verb.

VI.67.8: Pāda a lacks a verb; on its structure and on the grammatical interpr. of *sumedhā(h)*, see esp. Old. Since it is likely that *sumedhā(h)* is a nom. sg., referring to Agni, this slots the du. *tā* into the acc., and we need a verb to link the two. Though Old's 'lead' is possible, I follow Ge/(Re) in supplying 'call', since this connects this ritual vs. with those in the earlier parts of the hymn (2ab, 3ab; see publ. intro. and comm. ad locc.). As is generally recognized, the referent of the nom. is Agni; III.57.5, adduced by Old, makes this quite clear: *yā te jihvā madhumatī sumedhā, āgne ...*

The word *aratí-* 'spoked wheel' in b is another word regularly applied to Agni. This pāda also contains, by most interpr., two words associated with truth, *satyá-*, modifying *aratí-*, and *ṛtá-*, but these interpr. are hard-pressed to come up with a convincing interpr. of the loc. *ṛté*. By contrast, I interpr. it as I do the similarly structured II.29.4 *mā vo ráthah ... ṛté bhūt*, where, with Re, I take *ṛté* as the postposition 'without', construed with a pronominal enclitic in 2nd position: "Let (our) chariot not come to be without you." See comm. ad loc. In the passage here I assume that the absence of M+V at the ritual ground induces Agni to call them with his tongue (=crackling). This interpr. also fits with the rivalry vss. to follow (9–11): if M+V are not here, where are they? Probably at the sacrifice of a competitor. In the comm. to II.29.4 I consider an alternative interpr. with *ṛté*

the loc. of *ṛtá-* ‘truth’. If I were to do so here, the passage could mean “when the spoked wheel (of the sacrifice) [=Agni] has come into existence / has been realized for you at/in the truth [=the sacrifice or place of sacrifice?].” I still prefer the publ. solution.

On (vi) *cayīṣṭam* see Hoffmann, Aufs. II.367.

VI.67.9–11: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. seem to concern themselves with rival sacrificers.

VI.67.9: The first half of this vs. is fairly straightforward; the problems arise in the 2nd hemistich, primarily because of *ápīyah* in d. The first hemistich describes the behavior of the contentious and impious rivals, while the 2nd defines such people as outside the normal categories of beings. Pāda c asserts clearly that those who don’t attend upon the sacrifice are neither gods nor men, and in d they are compared instead to *ápīyah* ... *putrāḥ*, which is universally tr. as “like the sons of the watery female” (e.g., Ge “wie die Söhne der Wasserfrau”). Not only does this make no obvious (or unobvious) sense, but the morphology is essentially impossible: it is very difficult to get *ápīyah* to be either the gen. sg. of a fem. *-ī*-stem or the nom. pl. m. of an adj. See the rather despairing assessments of Ge (n. 9d), Debrunner (AiG II.2.401), and esp. Scar (592 n. 841). Desperate situations require desperate measures, and I therefore part company with the consensus interpr. of *ápīyah* and suggest an entirely different derivation -- as a negated root noun cmpd to the set form of the ‘swell’ root $\sqrt{pī}$. We should expect a root-accented **a-pī-*, with nom. pl. **apīyah*, but I would suggest that this unclear hapax would have been attracted to the reasonably well-attested ‘watery’ stem *ápīya-* and the accent retracted. As for meaning, I suggest that ‘not swelling/swollen’ means ‘not growing / thriving’, and in reference to children to stunted or underdeveloped ones, afflicted by what is now called “failure to thrive” in pediatric medicine. Note that the anīṭ form of the ‘swell’ root makes a negated root-noun cmpd *apīt-* in VII.82.3 *āpinvatam apītaḥ* “you two made the unswollen (waters) swell.”

The publ. tr. does not represent the rel. prn. *yé* in c but treats all of cd as the main cl. corresponding to the subord. clauses of ab. I do not know an easy way to do this, but might suggest an alternative tr. of cd as “those not attending on the sacrifice who are neither gods ... nor mortals are like children ...”

VI.67.10: Ge and Re take the first hemistich here as a continuation of the description of bad ritual behavior, with cd introducing our contrastively correct practice. I think rather that the whole of 10 describes this good behavior. One advantage of this interpr. is that it allows *ād* opening c to have its normal sense ‘after that’, which Klein (DGRV II.135–36) must explicitly deny it. By my interpr. the first pāda sets the ritual scene, with the various priestly speakers “distributing” the types of ritual speech, as is standard in Vedic ritual. Some of these speakers recite the Nivids, the formal invocations. After this “we” take over by speaking *ukthá-*.

On *kīstá-* ‘praiser’ see comm. ad I.127.7. I see no evidence for Re’s ‘mauvais-prêtres’ beyond his contextual assumptions.

The interpr. of ab as referring to bad practice turns on the part. *manānāḥ*, which most take as meaning ‘(falsely) considering X as Y’ (e.g., Ge “was sie für Einladungssprüche halten”), but no evidence is presented that this should be the meaning

of this root aor. part., the only occurrence of the participial stem. Most other forms of this medial root aor. (mostly attested in the subjunctive) have a positive sense: ‘bring to mind’, ‘conceive’, ‘ponder’, etc. The publ. tr. has ‘pay heed to’, but any of the other suggested tr. just given would work as well, while ‘(falsely) consider’ has no support in this stem.

Pāda d is syntactically problematic. The last two words (*yatatho mahitvā*) are identical to the ending of 3d and appear to sketch a ring and a return to the focus on M+V’s ability to put human beings in order. Because of this salient repetition, I am reluctant to ascribe an entire different sense to this phrase in this vs. than in 3, as both Ge and Re do, with both also unacceptably stretching the meaning of the verb form. In order to take d as a single cl., they must also treat *nākiḥ* as a simple neg. rather than in its usual meaning ‘no one’, since the verb *yatathaḥ* is 2nd du. and cannot take ‘no one’ as subject. In order to avoid this problem, I create problems of my own. I take *nākiḥ* as a radically truncated sentence “No one ...” This is based on the observation that one of the most common contexts in which *nākis* appears is as subj. of *minat* (etc.) ‘violate(s)’ (cf., e.g., I.69.7, IV.30.23, VI.30.2, etc.). I therefore suggest that *nākiḥ* here is an implicit response to the description of the behavior of bad rivals in 9b *priyā dhāma yuvādhītā minānti* “they violate the dear ordinances ordained by you”. Here in *our* ritual “no one” performs such violation. With *nākis* out of the way, the rest of the pāda can be harmonized with the use of *yatatho mahitvā* in 3d. There M+V ‘set in place’ various peoples (*jānān*). Here I would re-supply *jānān* and take *devébhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment: M+V set in place the peoples along with the gods. I would prefer not to have to impose such a radical analysis on this pāda, but I find other analyses even more unsatisfactory.

VI.67.11: On *avóḥ* see AiG III.535, Lub 121.

The first hemistich lacks a verb, but something like ‘we seek’ is a reasonable bet, to govern *áskṛdhoyu* ‘not stunted’, which elsewhere modifies ‘wealth’ (VI.22.3) and ‘treasure-conferral’ (VII.53.3), hence my ‘giving’.

Ge produces an elaborate interpr. of cd as a portrayal of battle: ‘cows’ = bow string, ‘straight-flying one’ = arrow (followed by Watkins, Dragon 171). Although such tropes would be at home in other parts of the RV, I see no martial context in this hymn that would encourage such a reading. Better to interpr. the hemistich within a ritual context, since this has been prominent in the hymn. The cows can, as so often, be the milk meant to be mixed with the soma; the ‘straight-flying one’ (*rjipyá-*, on which see comm. ad IV.27.4) can be the soma, or, as in IV.27.4, the falcon that carried the soma, and the bull in d is also the soma. Re follows Ge’s battle interpr., though (in his comm.) he also sees it overlaid with soma imagery.

VI.68 Indra and Varuṇa

Pace Old, I do not think this consists of two (much less three) hymns, with 1–8 forming one, 9–11, or 9, 10–11, one or two more. As indicated in the publ. intro., the last three vss. focus on the ritual here-and-now, but this topic-switch from praise and request to ritual exhortation is easily accommodated within the same hymn. That 9–10 are in Jagatī in contrast to the Triṣṭubh in the rest of the hymn is not sufficient to signal a hymn break, esp. since 9–10 doesn’t match either of Old’s suggested groupings.

VI.68.1: The opening of this hymn has some features in common with the opening of the last one (VI.67.1), and of course both hymns are dedicated to dual divinities, with Varuṇa shared. The 1st hemistich of each ends with a *-dhyai* infinitive; the 1st pāda has a 2nd ps. enclitic in 2nd position (*vaḥ*, *vām* respectively), and the 2nd hemistich begins PREV *yá-* (*yā*, *yāḥ* respectively). However the hymns unfold very differently.

Ge takes *sajóṣā(h)* at the end of pāda a as an “erstarrter Kasus oder Hypallage” (n. 1a) referring to I+V. But grammatically it should modify *yajñāḥ*, and there is no semantic obstacle to taking it thus. Re agrees, and further remarks that, since *sajóṣas-* regularly takes an instr., it is tempting to construe it with *śruṣṭī* — a temptation he resists and I have succumbed to.

I take the gen./abl. *vr̥ktābarhiṣaḥ* as the oblique subject of the inf. *yājadhyaī*, rather than predicating that inf. to cognate *yajñāḥ* — though the latter construction (reflected in Ge and Re, insofar as I can untangle their clotted syntax) is not impossible: “This sacrifice of the one who has twisted the ritual grass, raised up, is to be sacrificed to you ...”

Judging from the fuller expression of X.50.3, which contains both *iśé* and a form of *sumná-*, the point here is that Indra and Varuṇa will *receive* refreshment at the sacrifice and will *dispense* their favor to the performer thereof.

VI.68.2: Although the vs. is addressed to both gods, Indraic qualities predominate: *śáviṣṭha-* almost always qualifies Indra, who is regularly called a *śūra-*; *maghávan-* is of course a standing epithet of his, and the splv. *mámhiṣṭha-* frequently modifies him; both *tuviśúṣma-* (3x) and *sárvasena-* (3x) are otherwise only used of Indra; and *vr̥tratúr-* encapsulates Indra’s signature deed. Only *ṛténā* falls in Varuṇa’s domain.

I do not understand the position of *tā hí*, though 1) *hí* sometimes takes immediate pre-verbal position even deep in the clause, and 2) the heavy NP *śūrāṇām śáviṣṭhā* (with the first word having quadrisyllabic scansion) would not fit metrically in a putative pāda #*tā hí śūrāṇām śáviṣṭhā bhūtā*.

VI.68.3: This is the only vs. in the hymn that clearly disjoins the two gods and describes each by his own qualities (though see comm. ad 8–9) -- though as Re points out, the description of Varuṇa in d is somewhat obscure. I take it to refer to Varuṇa’s ritual activity, as against Indra’s warrior exploits.

Although *śúṣma-* (2c) and *śūśá-* (3a) are not etymologically related, their phonological similarity associates them, and they are positioned identically in these two vss. See also the *śūrāṇām śáviṣṭhā* figure in 2b and *śávasā* in 3c: there is an abundance of *śulū / śav* forms.

On the constr. of *cakānā* see Kü (142–43 and n. 132), who rejects Ge’s passive interpr.

VI.68.4: As noted in the publ. intro., it is quite rare to present the collectivity of gods as subdivided into female and male divinities. I’m not sure why this context has evoked it.

As Re notes in passing, the 1st hemistich contains two forms of *nṛ-* ‘man’ in different usage. The first (*náraḥ*) is contrasted with *gnāḥ*, as male to female, and identifies these *náraḥ* as gods; the 2nd (*narām*) appears to refer to the mortal poets as superior men and agents of the praise of the gods. For this putative gen. agent, compare the similar

constr. with the same ppl. at I.122.10 *narām gūrtáśravaḥ* “whose fame is sung by men” (and cf. also I.180.8 *narām ... práśastah*).

In 2 of its 4 occurrences *svágūrta-* modifies rivers and can reasonably be rendered ‘self-praised’ because rivers generate their own noise (gurgling), which can be conceptually configured as praise. But in our passage it seems unlikely that the gods are praising themselves (*pace* Ge). In IV.19.10 the adj. modifies *ápāmsi*, Indra’s ‘labors’, and there I tr. “welcomed for themselves’, since labors don’t have the capacity to praise themselves. I suggest the word in this passage has a similar sense, even though, as animate beings, gods *could* praise themselves. But I think the point is that, though the All Gods are going to take second place after I+V in pāda c, the poet acknowledges that they deserve some praise of their own. *-gūrta-* picks up etymologically related *gr̥ṇīhi* ‘sing!’ in 3a, with *gr̥ṇānā* (8a), *gr̥ṇántah* (8c) continuing the lexical chain.

Pāda d contains a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction, *dyaús ca pṛthivi*. The introduction and invocation of Heaven and Earth seems a little odd in a hymn celebrating Indra and Varuṇa, and the sense of the pāda is somewhat unclear. See Old’s disc. The pāda seems to indicate that Heaven and Earth stand out from the other All Gods just as much as Indra and Varuṇa do, an elevation of gods other than the addressees of the hymn that deviates from standard RVic practice. The structure of the hemistich, with instr. *mahitvā* ending c and expressing the quality by which I+V are preeminent, invites us to take pāda-final *urvī* as a similar instr. of an abstract ‘width, breadth’, rather than the usual fem. du. NA. This would yield “you stand out from them by your greatness, o Indra and Varuṇa, (as) do you two, o Heaven and Earth, by your breadth.” Although such an abstract *urvī-* does not otherwise exist, I am still tempted to assume that this was the intent of the passage: giving a well-known measure of superiority (the width of H+E) as a standard by which to judge that of I+V.

VI.68.5: Several minor sound plays in the vs.: *dāśati* (b) / *dāśvān* (c); *iṣā śa dviṣās*.

VI.68.6: The publ. tr. failed to render *devā*; insert “O gods” at the beg. of the vs.

VI.68.7: It is difficult to render the comparative of *sutrātarā-* without awkwardness, and so I have not attempted to do so.

Note the etymological and phonological figure *tiráte táturiḥ*. The cadence is bad, and it would be better to read **tatūriḥ*. Of the 5 occurrences of this stem, this reading would be preferable also in IV.39.2 and probably VI.24.2, but dispreferred in I.145.3 and VI.22.2. The 4 occurrences of the similarly formed *pápurī-* are always metrically better with a light root syllable.

VI.68.8: Ge (n. 8c) claims that this pāda applies only to Indra, but this is not entirely evident to me. It is true that VI.33.5c, adduced by Ge, is almost identical (*itthā gr̥ṇānto mahínasya śárman*) and refers to Indra, and it is also true that *śárdhas-* ‘force’ regularly refers to the Marut troop, Indra’s regular associates, and could (but need not) here. However, the context still does not seem to me sufficiently diagnostic.

VI.68.9–11: On the annunciatory forms of *ayám* in these three vss., see publ. intro.

VI.68.9: Ge also (n. 8c) claims (fld. by Re) that this vs. is entirely Varuṇa's. This is more plausible: he is mentioned by name in b, and *māhivrataḥ* 'having great commandments' in c makes it likely that the clause in cd has Varuṇa as subject —though note that *māhivrata-* is used of Varuṇa only here, with two occurrences each of Agni and Soma, and moreover *dhṛtavratā* is addressed to both gods in the next vs. (10b). Nonetheless, *samrāj-* in pāda a is used frequently of Indra as well as of Varuṇa, so the 1st hemistich may (and probably does) contain an exhortation to the poet to chant both to Indra (as sovereign king) and Varuṇa. The publ. tr. could make this clearer if 'and' replaced the comma: "to the lofty sovereign king (and) to the god Varuṇa"

VI.68.11: The 2nd pāda has a rather insistent but elementary phonetic/etymological figure: *vṛṣṇaḥ ... vṛṣanā vṛṣethām*, and the last word of the vs. *mādayethām* resonates with the long adj. qualifying soma in the 1st pāda, *mādhumattamasya*.

VI.69 Indra and Viṣṇu

Re's treatment is in EVP XV.43–46. He claims that the "thème indraiique" dominates, though I find the hymn's phraseology so bland that it's difficult to assign qualities and deeds to one or the other, and in fact the most salient action in the hymn, the wide-striding of vs. 5, is Viṣṇu's characteristic deed. See further in the publ. intro.

The hymn is (in my view) repetitive and pedestrian, with only a few striking images and phraseological tricks. This strikes me as an indication that the poet was "phoning it in" -- the composition of the hymn does not seem to have commanded his full attention. The question might then arise why the hymn was preserved in the Saṃhitā. This might be partially due to the rarity of Indra-Viṣṇu hymns (only the first three vss. of I.155 and the middle three vss. of VII.99 -- so this is the only hymn entirely dedicated to both) and in fact of Viṣṇu hymns in general. As Viṣṇu, a fairly recessive god in the RV, began to come to prominence in the post-RVic period, the assemblers of the RV collection may have gathered what scraps they could and exercised less critical judgment than usual in order to create a place in the text for this newly important deity. The O'Henry-type ending, sprung by the final vs. (8), might also account for its preservation.

VI.69.1: Acdg. to Re, *kárman-* is esp. associated with Indra, *ís-* with Viṣṇu, but I see no clear evidence of this.

pārā- 'far shore' and *pārāya-* 'cause to cross [to the far shore]' are of course etymologically related, and here they express allied notions: just as we cause Indra and Viṣṇu to reach the 'far shore' of their labor, so do they cause us to cross something unspecified, but quite possibly the reference is to completing the ritual.

VI.69.2: It is striking -- and perhaps a little insulting -- to refer to the gods Indra and Viṣṇu as soma-holding tubs, though of course once they have drunk the soma, that is what, in effect, they are. This image recurs in 6d.

The two heavy pres. passive participles *śasyāmānāḥ* and *gīyāmānāsaḥ* seem meant to convey that the sacrifice is currently ongoing, hence my "as they are being ..."

In d *arkaiḥ* is taken by Ge and Re as referring to the chants of the sacrifice, and in the context of recitation and singing this sense is clearly the principal one. Both Ge and Re interpr. the instr. as meaning "in the form of," and I have followed them in the publ.

tr. -- though an instr. of accompaniment “along with chants” would also be possible. I further think the word is a pun, with the secondary sense “along with the rays (of the sun)” as often (e.g., VI.4.6). This would be a temporal designation of dawn, when the sacrifice is taking place. That the next vs. contains a similar pun (in my view) supports such an interpr. here.

VI.69.3: *dráviṇo dádhanā* in b is essentially the same VP as *dráviṇam ... dhattam* in 1c. I do not know why the *s*-stem *drávinas-* was substituted for the thematic *dráviṇa-*, esp. as the acc. of the latter, *dráviṇam*, would fit the meter just as well. The first VP, *dráviṇam dhattam*, reappears in 6c.

There are other echoes of previous vss.: 3cd *sám vām ... sám* repeats 1a, and *matínām* in c both repeats the same word in the same metrical position in 2a and anticipates it in 4c.

The 2nd half of this vs. is structured like that of vs. 2, esp. pāda d, where both 2d and 3d have the form PREV *stómāsaḥ* PRES.PASS.PART. INSTR.(‘song’)-*aiḥ*. The instr. could, as in the previous vs., express accompaniment.

As in 2, I see a pun here: because of the etym. figure *añjantv aktúbhiḥ* “let them anoint with ointments,” the principal sense of *aktú-* must be ‘ointment’, here metaphorical for the “ointments of thoughts.” But instr. *aktúbhiḥ* often means ‘through the nights’, as in the phrase *dyúbhir aktúbhiḥ* “through the days and the nights” (e.g., I.112.25), and I see this temporal sense here as well.

VI.69.4: As just noted, *matínām* occurs here for the 3rd time, while *juṣéthām* is repeated from 1c.

VI.69.5: As noted in the publ. intro., both gods are credited with wide striding (b), although this is normally only Viṣṇu’s act. The cosmogonic opening out of the spaces in the more vaguely phrased 2nd hemistich can be applied to Indra, however.

VI.69.6: The image of the gods as soma-holding tubs returns here in d, but this time it is mediated through the image of them as the sea (*samudráḥ*) and therefore couched in the singular.

The d pāda is a repetition of 4d, save for the substitution of *hávam* for *gírah*. Such verbatim repetition of a full pāda within a hymn is very rare (save for refrains) and relatively rare even between two hymn -- again, in my view, an indication that the poet was not feeling particularly inspired.

VI.69.7: In ab Ge honors the pāda break and construes *sómasya* with *jaṭhāram pṛṇethām*. But we might expect an instr. *sómena* in that case (as in V.34.2), and the enjambment envisioned here is very mild. See a parallel in X.104.2, where the gen. also is better construed with a preceding form of $\sqrt{pā}$.

VI.69.8: On the surprise ending here and the splitting up of what was throughout the rest of the hymn an indissoluble pair, see publ. intro. The first pāda keeps the two as a pair, with dual verbs *jigyathuḥ* and *jayethe* asserting that both won and both did not lose the contest. The audience would first take this as meaning they did not lose to their (joint)

opponent. But in b we have the first splitting of the pair into two (implied) singulars (*ná ... katarás canáinoḥ* “neither one of these two”), which could raise the possibility that they were contending with each other -- but paradoxically neither one lost. Their mutual contention is then made explicit in pāda c, with, inter alia, a reverse Vāyav Indraś ca construction (*indraś ca viṣṇo*) serving as the subj. of a dual verb (*āpasṛdhethām*), which in the middle voice refers to *mutual* conflict, and the final pāda explains (or implies) how in such a situation neither one lost: the 1000 (cows) were split into three parts, and as later Vedic texts indicate, Indra got two-thirds and Viṣṇu one-third. It may be that the reversal of the Vāyav Indraś ca construction, which puts *indraḥ* in first position, also signals his relative, but not complete, dominance in this story.

VI.70 Heaven and Earth

Re ÉVP.121ff.

VI.70.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., the focus here is on the various liquids associated with Heaven and Earth and their sheer moisture. Vs. 1 has ghee, honey, milk (by implication, in the compd. *madhu-dúghe*), and semen; in vs. 2 they are said never to dry up (*ásaścantī*) and possess streams, milk, ghee, and semen. The compd. *madhu-dúgha-* ‘milking out honey’ in 1b is reprised by the VP *ghṛtām duhāte* in 2b (with a diff. obj.). Another responsion is *bhúvanānām* ‘creatures’ (1a) and (*asyá*) *bhúvanasya* ‘(this) creation’ in 2c.

VI.70.1: On the construction *bhúvanānām abhiśríyā*, see comm. ad X.66.8.

pr̥thivī here (and in the same phrase in 4c) is of course a blindingly obvious pun: though used as an adj. here (‘broad’) it is of course (almost) identical to the standard word for ‘earth’, found in the dual dvandva *dyāvā-pr̥thivī* in the next pāda (also 4a, 5a). By an accident of grammar, the nom./acc. dual fem. (in *pr̥thivī*, here modifying the dual dvandva) and the nom. singular. fem. *pr̥thivī* ‘earth’ have the same ending *-ī*. This grammatical pun is only actualized fully in the final vs. of the hymn, where we get the conjoined singular NP *dyaús ca pr̥thivī ca*.

VI.70.3: On the double etym. figure *prá prajābhir jāyate*, see comm. ad VIII.27.16.

With Re I take *dhármaṇas pári* with a full lexical sense of each element, rather than, with Ge, as a weakened adverbial “pflichtgemäß” (dutifully). Heaven and Earth provide the physical foundation (*dhárman-*) starting from which the pious man can found his family line, just as Heaven and Earth themselves took their places (apart) according to the *dhárman-* of Varuṇa in 1c. This pāda is found twice elsewhere: VIII.27.16 and X.63.13. In both those cases, I tr. the abl. phrase “from his foundation” (that is, the foundation of the subj. of *jāyate*) rather than “from your [=H+E]’s foundation.” The possessor is of course not explicit in any of the passages. I am inclined to leave the publ. translations standing, despite their disagreement over the suppressed genitive, but it should be noted that in any of the three a different choice could have been made.

The abundant references to real liquids in vss. 1–2 find their metaphorical expression in the creatures ‘poured out’ (*siktā*) from Heaven and Earth (d). This ppl. picks up the imperative *rétaḥ siñcatam* “pour the semen” addressed to H+E in 2d. However, I take the implicit subj. of *siktā* to be *bhúvanā* ‘creatures’ vel sim. (see 1a), not,

with Gr, *rētāṃsi* ‘semens’. *prajāḥ* ‘progeny, offspring’ from the previous pāda would also be possible; it would only require altering the Pp reading *siktā* to fem. pl. *siktāḥ*, but no alteration to the Saṃhitā text.

My “poured out from you” of course tacitly misrepresents the case of dual *yuvóḥ*, which must be gen.-loc., not abl. But it’s worth noting that the 2nd du abl. *yuvát* is attested only once in the RV, and I take *yuvóḥ* as an ex. of the all-purpose genitive: poured out from you and hence yours.

The explicitly contrastive *vīsurūpāṇi sāvratā* reminds us of the phrase in the Yama/Yamī hymn X.10.2, *sālakṣmā ... vīsurūpā*, describing Yamī compared to Yama: “having the same marks, but dissimilar form.”

VI.70.4–5: These two vss., concerning ghee and honey respectively, have similarly structured 1st halves: a case form of the substance opens the vs. (4a *ghṛtēna*, 5a *mádhu*), while the 2nd pāda consists of three 3 cmpds in the dual with the substance as 1st member. The 2nd members do not repeat (*ghṛta-śrīyā ghṛta-pīcā ghṛtā-vīdhā*, *madhu-ścūtā madhu-dúghe mádhu-vrate*), but only the last two are not root noun cmpds.

VI.70.4: The ghee vs., with four instances in the 1st hemistich, echoing in the first word of the hymn *ghṛtávatī*. There is also some recycling and remixing of vocab.: 1a *abhiśrīyā*: 4ab *abhī-vṛte ghṛta-śrīyā*, as well as outright repetition: 1b / 4c *urvī prthivī*.

Although I have rethought a number of *śrī-* cmpds with ritual items as first members (see comm. ad III.26.5), including *ghṛta-śrī-* in other passages (see I.128.4), in this context the intransitive sense seems better.

The third pāda contains a ritual pun, “set in front at the choosing of the Hotar priest” (*hotṛvūrye puróhite*): *purohité* here modifies H+E, but ordinarily it is the Hotar priest himself who is “set in front.”

VI.70.5: In b *madhudúghe* reprises the same word in the same metrical position in 1b.

What ‘having honeyed commandments’ refers to is not clear to me; it is a hapax and picks up similarly pāda-final *śúci-vrate* ‘of pure commandments’ (2b) and *sāvratā* ‘having the same commandments’ (3d).

I configure cd slightly differently from the standard, which takes *yajñám dráviṇam ca* as what H+E establish for the gods and the misc. acc. in d as what they do for us. My interpr. is informed by two passages in the immediately preceding hymn: VI.69.1 *juṣéthām yajñám dráviṇam ca dhattam* “enjoy the sacrifice and confer wealth” and VI.69.6 *dráviṇam dhattam asmé* “confer wealth on us.” In both passages *dráviṇam* is implicitly or explicitly meant for us, while in the 1st *yajñám* is meant for the gods to enjoy. This matches the use of *dráviṇa-* elsewhere: it’s what mortals want and gods confer on them. I therefore construe *dráviṇam* as the first member of the complex NP to be taken with *asmé* in d (*dráviṇam ca ... máhi śrávo vājam ... suvīryam*. Ge (n. 5c) recognizes the problem but chooses to go with the pāda division. My interpr. has the further advantage of not having to take *devátā* as an honorary dative, but rather with the instr. value that it should have.

VI.70.6: On the grammatical pun that accounts for the disjoining of the dual dvandva *dyāvā-prthivī*, see comm. ad vs. 1. This disjoining is somewhat reminiscent of the same

move in the previous hymn, where the dvandva *īndrā-viṣṇū* appears in every vs. except the last, where not only are the two gods separated (*īndraś ca viṣṇo*), but contend with each other. There is no contention here, but the grammatical shift is the same.

VI.71 Savitar

Re EVP XV.26ff. On the division into two hymns, see publ. intro., as well as Old and Ge (both minimally).

VI.71.1: I take the locative expression *rājaso vídharmaṇi* as expressing a verbal notion “in/at his spreading apart ...,” rather than as marking a location like Ge (“im Zwischenreich des Raumes”). In this I am in general agreement with Re, who calls it a “semi-infinitif,” a typical Re evasion, though I am sympathetic to it here.

VI.71.2: The *-mani* form *vídharmaṇi* ending 1d prepares the way for a 2nd such expression, *savitúḥ sávimaṇi*, though with a subjective, not objective gen. The parallelism might be better expressed in tr. by “at the best impelling of ...” This locative (semi-)infinitive is then explicitly conjoined with a datival one: *vásunaś ca dāvāne* “for the giving of goods.” On the lack of parallelism see Klein DGRV I.94.

Somewhere between the 1st vs. and the last pāda of vs. 2 Savitar’s reference changes from 3rd (clear in the 3rd ps. verbs of which he is subj. in 1b, c *ayamsta* and *pruṣṇute*) to 2nd (clear in 2nd sg. *ási* in 2d). This verb makes it clear that the reference in the whole rel. cl. of cd must be 2nd ps., but in the main cl. of ab *devásya ... savitúḥ* could be either 3rd or 2nd -- a typical modulation tactic in the RV.

In both hemistichs the construction of the (semi-)predicated (semi-)infinitives is abrupt. In each case there’s a form of the verb ‘to be’ (*syāma* b, *ási* d) with loc. (and in b dat.) infinitivals. For ease of parsing I have supplied “(there)” and “(busy)” respectively.

VI.71.3: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

VI.71.4: On the almost identical first pādas of the 1st and 2nd hymns of this composite, see publ. intro. In addition to the exact repetitions of the a-pādas, note that both 1 and 4 have a verbal expression from the *sū* root that gives Savitar his name: 1b *sāvanāya* and 4d *suvati*. This vs. also recycles and remixes some of the vocab. from the final vs. of the preceding hymn, 3: 3c *híraṇya-jihvaḥ* gets redistributed into 4b *híraṇya-pāṇiḥ* and 4c *mandrá-jihvaḥ*, and a further X-body part bahuvrīhi, *áyo-hanuḥ*, is added.

VI.71.5: This vs. continues variations on vs. 1. Like 4a it begins *úd u* (or in this case *ū*). The VP in 1ab *híraṇyáyā, bāhū ayamsta* is almost entirely matched by 5ab *áyān ... bāhū, híraṇyáyā* with exactly reverse order and act. verb rather than middle.

The publ. tr. follows the attractive suggestion of Re concerning *ābhvam* ‘formless’, that it refers to the wind. That the wind tends to drop at evening provides some support for this interpr. I would further suggest that the *cīd* in the phrase *kác cīd ābhvam* is doing double duty: expressing both ‘(what)ever’ and ‘even’.

VI.71.6: On the injunc. *sāvīṭh* in imperatival function see KH, Injunc. 264. He ascribes this usage to the fact that 2nd sg. act. imperatives to *is*-aorists are quite rare.

In c I accept the emendation of *kṣáyasya* to **kṣáyasi*, which goes back to Aufrecht (see Old, Ge, Re, all of whom accept it; against this tide is Scar 353–54, though he doesn’t even note the general view). Inter alia, it provides an accented verb for the *hr̥* in pāda c; *syāma* in d is unaccented and should therefore not be construed with the previous pāda.

VI.72 Indra and Soma

Re’s brief comments are found in EVP XVI.108–9. His assessment -- “banal” -- is spot on. For the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

VI.72.1: The pleonastic *máhi ... mahitvám* “great greatness” may be in service of phonological play: *máhi tád vām* is echoed in abbreviated form by immediately following *mahitvám*.

The (near?) synonyms *sūryam* and *svàr* are found as the obj. of the same verb *vividáthuḥ* in c. I have followed Lü (191) in tr. the first as ‘sun’ and the 2nd as ‘sunlight’ (“Sonne ... Sonnenlicht”), which is almost the same as Ge’s “Sonne ... Himmelslicht,” but preserves the lexical similarity better. Re prefers ‘ciel’. The verb is accented because it stands between its two predicates and thus implicitly serves two clauses.

VI.72.2: Here the verb in a, *vāsáyathaḥ*, is accented because it follows the extrasentential voc. *índrāsomā* and therefore effectively begins the vs.

The first hemistich describes dawn and the sunrise in the pres. tense as repeated daily events. The 2nd hemistich by contrast recounts the original separation of Heaven and Earth. The 2nd verb in this hemistich, the augmented impf. *ápratham* (d), clearly locates the action in the past. The previous verb, *skambháthuḥ* (c), is formally anomalous. It is generally identified as a non-reduplicated pf. (so explicitly Gr; listed with the pf. by Whitney [Roots], Macdonell [VGS]; by implication Re) because of its clear 3rd du. pf. ending. But in addition to its lack of redupl., its full-gr. root syllable is unexpected. Kü treats the form in some detail (574), both functionally and formally. Since in the end he decides it is not built to the pf. stem, he begins by trying to deny that it has past value, despite the following augmented impf., suggesting rather that it can have “generell-zeitlos” sense. This (in his view) opens the door to taking it as an injunctive, probably to a root aorist. It then owes its pf.-type ending to analogic spread from the equally non-reduplicated 3rd pl. *skambhur* (X.65.4), whose ending could belong to the pf. or, possibly, to an aorist. Since the conceptual structure of the vs., with the actions of ab contrasting with those of cd, imposes (in my view) a preterital sense on *skambháthuḥ*, I am not persuaded by Kü’s general/timeless interpr. But, on the other hand, I don’t need to be: Kü is still under the sway of the Hoffmannian interpr. of the injunctive, but this straitjacket of a linguistically implausible verbal “category” should not limit our readings of this maximally unmarked form-type, and there is, in my view, abundant evidence for injunctives used as straight preterites. I am therefore willing to accept that *skambháthuḥ* (and *skambhuḥ*) somehow reflect an aorist, which the root otherwise lacks, and a root aorist might be expected beside the nasal pres. *skabhnāti*, as Kü points out. He provides what seems to me an overly complex analogic explanation for the full-grade root syllable, which can simply result from a formal match with the immediately following cognate instr. *skámbhanena*. (It might be noted that a putative **skabháthuḥ* with zero-grade root

syllable would produce a slightly better break.) What I don't understand -- and Kü doesn't mention -- is why the verb is accented. It is right in the middle of its clause, preceded by a tonic preverb and a tonic object, so the explanations for the accents of *vividáthuḥ* (1c) and *vāsáyathaḥ* (2a) are not applicable. Perhaps it acquired its accent redactionally because the reasons for the accents of those two verbs were no longer clear.

VI.72.3: I do not understand why the Vṛtra-smashing is couched in the pres. tense, *hatháh*. The injunc. 2nd du. *hatám* would fit the same metrical slot, and its corresponding impf. *ahatam* was in fact used in 1d. The rest of the vs. is preterital, with augmented imperfects *amanyata* (b), *airayatam* (c) and pf. *paprathuḥ* (d). One might argue that the accented injunc. could easily be mistaken for the masc. acc. sg. ppl. as a modifier of *áhim* ... *vṛtrám*, but *hatám* as 2nd du. impv. is fairly common elsewhere (though, it seems, not with an acc. sg. obj. that could facilitate the misidentification). Another possibility is that this is an attempt to convey relative tense in the absence of a functional pluperfect: if Heaven's giving consent (2nd half of b; *ánu* ... *amanyata*) logically precedes the smashing itself — not a foregone conclusion: Heaven may have cheered them on while they performed the smashing — then the present *hatháh* would express the action that followed the one conveyed by the impf. *amanyata*. But I consider this unlikely.

Well-attested *samudrá-* is otherwise masc.; with Lü (192 and n. 1) I take neut. pl. *samudrāṇi* in d as an adj. and supply *árṇāṃsi* from c.

VI.72.4: Ge (see also Gr) takes *āmāsu* as modifying *vakṣāṇāsu* ("in die rohen Bäuche"), which is certainly possible grammatically. However, in other instantiation of this paradox it is the cows that are raw. (See an ex. below.) Hence the publ. tr., with first the cows (a), then the udders of the cows (b) as the depository of the cooked milk.

Ge follows Gr in taking the fem. of *jāgat-* (here loc. pl. *jāgatīṣu*) as simply designating a female creature ("in ... weiblichen Tieren"), but esp. in this context, in which the milk is held firm despite not being tied, the fact that the cows are in motion seems relevant. Cf. another phrasing of the same image in III.30.14 *āmā pakvām caratī bībhratī gauḥ* "Herself raw, the cow roams about carrying the cooked (milk)," where *caratī* seems to correspond semantically to *jāgatīṣu* here.

The publ. tr. might be slightly altered to reflect the unaccented *āsu* in c: "within them, the dappled moving (cows)."

VI.72.5: Ge, flg. Sāy, supplies *rayīm* in ab, quite persuasively because the same phrase *apatyasācam śrútyam* explicitly modifying *rayīm* is found in I.117.23, II.30.11. Re suggests rather *śúṣmam* on the basis of c, but this does not enter into the same formulaic nexus and seems a less likely gift in any case.

VI.73 Bṛhaspati

Re EVP XV.66–67.

VI.73.1: Pāda c is somewhat troubled, since neither of the first two words, *dvibārhajmā prāgharmasād*, is clear. Let us work from the end. The rt. noun cmpd. *prāgharma-sād-* is not otherwise attested, but *gharma-sād-* 'sitting by the gharma drink/pot' is found in adjacent vss. in X.15.9–10, also characterizing *pítár-*. It is not clear what the prefixed *prā-*

would add semantically (see Old, Ge n. 1c, Scar 564) nor why it should have a long vowel (if it belongs to *prā*). I therefore favor a different segmentation of the sequence, one roundly rejected by Old even as he mentioned it -- namely, to take the *prā* as the final of the preceding word, hence (in the first instance, but see below) **dvibárhajmā-prā(h)*, as the root noun to $\sqrt{prā}$ ‘fill’. This requires a change in the Saṃhitā text: accenting the *prā(h)* and (possibly, but see below) de-accenting *dvibárha-*, hence **dvibarhajmā-prā(h)*. This root noun is common in such cmpds; see, e.g., *antarikṣa-prā-* ‘filling the midspace’, *rodasī-prā-* ‘filling the two world-halves’, with similar cosmic locales. Rather than seeing in *dvibárhajmā-* a form of *ājman-* ‘course, drive’ with Ge, Re, Scar 255 (e.g., Ge ‘der eine doppelte Bahn(?) hat’) (Schmidt B+I 214 refuses to tr.), I segment it rather as *-jmā-*, with the *-jm-* ‘earth’ element belonging to the archaic and multiformed *kṣām-* ‘earth’ word (see also Re, who, though drawn to the possibility in his comm., rejects it in tr.). The supposed prior member *dvibárha-* obviously strongly resembles the reasonably (14x) well-attested *s*-stem bahuvrīhi *dvibárhas-*. But we should expect **dvibarho-jmā-* or the like and must therefore posit either a thematic byform **-barha-* or a secondary redactional adjustment. (Wackernagel’s solution, flg. Bartholomae [AiG I.339, cf. II.1.65, 125], that *dvibárha-jmā-* was simplified from **dvibárhaj-jmā-*, with *-aj-* the sandhi form of *-ad-*, which in turn is a sandhi form of *-as-* before a voiced sound, seems to me without merit, though clever.)

In any case, the unclarity of the structure of the cmpd. and the uncertainty of the lexical affiliation of *-jmā-* or *-ajmā-* in the posited **dvibarhajmā-prā-* could have led to redactional reanalysis, with segmentation of **prā-*, which was then attached to what follows. However, one problem with my analysis is that it assumes a three-, or indeed four-, member cmpd. **dvibarha-jmā-prā-*; these are rare in the RV and might be expected to be rarer when archaic elements are involved. I therefore have a further suggestion, which also addresses another problem with the analysis. Consider VI.19.1, where Indra is described as *carṣaṇīprā utā dvibárhā(h)* ‘filling the domains and doubly lofty.’ If we re-segment and readjust the beginning of our sequence here, to a two-word phrase **dvibárhā *jmā-prā(h)*, **dvibárhā* can keep its accent, we are saved from positing the thematic byform (since **dvibárhā* would be nom. sg. m. to the *s*-stem), and we avoid a multi-member cmpd. True, we have to lengthen the final of *dvibárha*, but it is already metrically heavy (before the cluster *-jm-*). This would yield a description of Bṛhaspati ‘doubly lofty, filling the earth’ that is similar to that of Indra in VI.19.1. It also fits the thematics of the hymn; note Bṛhaspati’s bellowing to the two world-halves in d and, especially, his making wide space (*ulokām ... cakāra*) in the next vs.

VI.73.3: I do not understand why *hánti* in d is accented. Nor does Old (“Akzent ... befremdet”). Both Ge and Re evade the problem by reading *pāda-init. bṛhaspátīḥ* with the previous *pāda* as subj. of a nominal sentence, leaving *hánti* to begin a new cl. The publ. tr. does the same. Despite adopting the Ge/Re strategem in my tr., I consider this solution artificial but have nothing better to offer.

VI.74 Soma and Rudra

Re EVP IX.74 and 128.

VI.74.1: In my view, *iṣtī-* in b is meant to express both ‘desire’ and ‘sacrifice’ (from $\sqrt{iṣ}$

and *√yaj* respectively), encapsulating the reciprocity inherent in the compact between gods and men. Ge is sympathetic to ‘sacrifice’ (n. 1b) but points to the accent: ‘sacrifice’ is ordinarily accented *íṣṭi-*. But secondary senses (that is, puns) often ignore accentual differences, and furthermore, as JL has persuasively argued, the older accent of *-tí-* abstracts was suffixal, and selective accent retraction can be observed in the course of the Vedic period, so we might assume an older **íṣṭi-* ‘sacrifice’.

VI.74.3: The nominal rel. cl. *yád ... ásti* is in some sense pleonastic: the two ppl. *baddhám* and *kṛtám* could simply modify the neut. *énaḥ* directly. But the structure seems designed to sketch a two-level structure: the outrage committed (by us) *that is* bound to us. Note that abl. *asmát* should be construed with the main cl. (“unhitch, release ... from us”: *áva syatam muñcátam ... asmát*), and so the rel. cl. is technically speaking embedded. But this seems to be one of the fairly common examples of semi-embedded izafe-type relative clauses.

VI.74.4: As often, a pattern imposed earlier in the hymn is partly altered at the end. In this case the vs.-initial voc. *sómārudrau* of 1–3 is postponed till the beginning of the 2nd pāda.

The simplicity and banality of this hymn (and perhaps an eye to the finish line) seem to have led both Ge and Re into uncharacteristic (and independent) lapses: Ge tr. ab in the 3rd ps., despite the clear voc. *sómārudrau* and clear 2nd du. impv. *mṛṣatam*; Re twists (at considerable verbal expense and with a characteristic parenthesis) the du. *sumanasyāmānā* ending the vs. as an acc. pl. modifying *naḥ*: “protégez nous (en sorte que nous ayons) l’esprit bien disposé.”

VI.75 Weapons

Re EVP XVI (1976): 109–11 provides notes; it is tr. in the earlier Hymnes spéculatifs (1956) but without philological notes.

It is possible that this hymn was tacked onto the maṇḍala because of *tigmāyudhau tigmāhetī* “possessing sharp weapons and sharp missiles” at the end of the preceding hymn (VI.74.3), though this is not a necessary hypothesis. The first 14 vss. are repeated in a number of places in the early Vedic ritual texts as part of the Aśvamedha (e.g., VS XXIX.38–51, TS IV.6.6).

VI.75.1: The first word of the hymn, *jīmūtasya*, signals that we are out of the core RVic lexical domain: this word for ‘thunder-cloud’ is found only here in the RV, though it is fairly amply attested elsewhere in early Vedic, and it has no obvious synchronic or diachronic etymology.

The construction of the riddle seems a bit weak to me, since the solution, given in d, *várman-*, is anticipated by its derivative *varmín-* in b.

VI.75.2: This vs. displays the proper RVic distribution of the suppletive stem of ‘bow’, whose nom./acc. sg. is supplied by *dhānuṣ-* and the rest of its paradigm (and cmpding forms) by *dhānvan-*. On this suppletion see AiG III.318 and esp. the detailed disc. of Hoffmann (Aufs. I.330 = Spr. 20 [1974] 18), as well as EWA s.v. *dhānuṣ-*. Here the instr. sg. *dhānvanā* opens pādas a, b, and d (and see loc. *dhānvan* in the next vs. 3c), while

nom./acc. sg. *dhānuḥ* holds the same position in c. Gr identifies a single occurrence of *dhānva* as nom./acc. sg. (V.7.7), which would thus violate the suppletive pattern, but this is otherwise universally and rightly assigned to the homonymous stem *dhānvan-* ‘wasteland’. The form *dhānva* (or quite possibly *dhānvā*) in II.33.10 is identified by Gr as a pl., which would fit the suppletive paradigm. It is generally, however, taken as a sg., which would not. However, see comm. ad II.33.10, where I now suggest restoring Gr’s pl. interpr., contra the standard sg. renderings incl. that of the publ. tr. The RV suppletive pattern is soon broken: already in the AV *dhānus-* begins to acquire oblique forms.

Technically speaking, *dhānuḥ* could be an acc., modified by *apakāmām* (if this stem can be adjectival; see below), which could be tr. “he makes the bow of his rival lose its desire,” but this requires supplying a generic animate subject for *kṛṇoti*. The stem *apakāmā-*, again a hapax in the RV but found elsewhere in early Vedic, is generally taken as a noun (Ge’s ‘Unlust’ being the best rendering), but I think it possible that it’s a nominalized bahuvrīhi ‘having desire gone/away’; there are not enough stems of this structure to anchor the grammatical value to accentual behavior, in my opinion. In any case, lacking the useful German ‘Unlust’, I have tr. as if we had a lexeme **āpa √ kṛ* ‘make (go) away’, with *kāma-* as obj. Cf. *āpa-ā √ kṛ* in passages like nearby VI.59.8 *āpa dvēṣāṃsy ā kṛtam* “make hatreds stay far away” (≅ III.16.5). (Gr identifies one instance of an *āpa √ kṛ*, in VIII.18.7, but the verb and preverb there belong to separate constituents; see comm. ad loc.)

VI.75.3: In d *sāmane*, lit. ‘togethering’ vel sim., has a double sense, referring to the ‘gathering’ of battle as well as to a festive gathering, with the latter appropriate to the female similes in the vs.

Exactly what sound is expressed by the verb *śīṅkte* is unclear (beyond possibly “shink”). Not only is this verb barely attested, but it is hard to conceive of a sound that both a maiden and a stretched bowstring would make. One of the practical questions is whether this 2nd hemistich still depicts the bowstring pulled back to the archer’s ear and held there or if it has moved on to the release of the bowstring as it propels the arrow; pāda d might suggest the latter. Numerous possibilities have been tried. The publ. tr.’s ‘jangles’ was meant to evoke the later kāvya trope of a woman dancer with jingling anklets, but I recognize that it is a less good fit with the bowstring -- though it might work if the string has just been loosed. The only other occurrence of the verb in early Vedic (not in a repetition of this vs.) is in the riddle hymn, I.164.29, where it *may* refer to the sound that the gharma pot makes as the milk is being heated in it. The publ. tr. (JPB) renders it ‘hums’ there (so also Doniger), Whitney in the equivalent AVŚ passage (IX.10.7) ‘twang’; the latter is an unlikely noise for a pot, but so, I think, is humming. (And certainly jangling or twanging seems out.) In our passage Ge tr. “quieckt” (squeak, squeal) and Re (Hymnes spéc.) “vibre”; in the TS equivalent (IV.6.6c) Keith “twangeth”; in the VS equivalent (XXIX.40) Griffith “whispers” (so also Maurer for the RV). Acdg. to the internet, all bows make some sort of a twanging sound when the string is released, but the better tuned a bow is, the quieter: well-tuned bows can be almost silent. Since twanging seems excluded for a maiden and since none of the other suggestions is particularly compelling, I will stick with ‘jangle’, though not with much confidence.

The standard tr. take *pārāyantī* in a fairly generic sense (e.g., Ge’s “die ... durchhilft”), but its literal meaning ‘cause to cross / reach the far shore’ works just as

well, if not better, if we supply ‘arrow’ as obj.: the bowstring celebrated here causes the arrows to cross the space from the bow to the battle.

VI.75.4: The pun on *sāmana*- implicit in 3d is made explicit in 4a; the single word is held constant, but in two different senses, between the simile and the frame.

Maurer (308) considers the simile in b “a bit irregular, since, strictly speaking, it is not the bow-ends that hold the arrow, but the bowstring.” But if the bow is held on a horizontal axis, with the bow ends horizontally aligned, the part of the bow between the ends dips down like a lap, and it is the lowest part where the tip of the arrow is placed. Again according to the internet, the bow should be parallel to the ground when positioning the arrow on it (an action called “nocking”); this would be the position envisioned above.

The 2nd hemistich depicts the positions of the ends of the bow while the arrow is shot: first (c) the two ends of the bow approach each other as the bowstring is pulled back, decreasing the vertical space between the ends -- although as far as I can tell from YouTube, the ends never actually meet. This movement is described as *saṃvidāné* ‘finding each other’. The lexeme *sām* √ *vid* often has the more abstract sense ‘make an agreement’, and I think this may also be operative in the passage, though I’m not quite sure how: perhaps their agreement or compact is to “pierce the rivals” (*āpa śātrūn vidhyatām*), as the rest of the pāda urges. Most tr. only recognize this latter sense in our passage (e.g., Re, Hymnes spéc., “d’un commun accord”), missing the physical sense applicable to the manipulation of the bow. In d the bowstring is released, propelling the arrow, and the two ends “spring apart” (*visphurāntī*) and resume their position at rest. The contrastive preverb pair *sām* / *ví* calls attention to these contrastive actions. None of the tr. I consulted (Ge, Re, Doniger, Maurer, as well as Keith for TS and Griffith for VS) seems to have recognized that a two-step process is being described. There is one possible problem with my interpr., namely that forms of the root √ *sphṛ* often take an object, and there is an acc. *amītrān* here that it could govern. However, there are a number of forms to the root that lack objects, incl. the other occurrences of the participle (VII.89.2) and nearby aor. *āpa spharīḥ* (VI.61.14). And I prefer to take *amītrān* either as a further specification of the obj. of *āpa ... vidhyatām* in c or as a poorly marked acc. of goal.

VI.75.5: The expression *bahúr asya putráḥ* in the singular is somewhat surprising next to the fem. pl. *bahvīnām*, but Re’s suggestion that it is a “bahuvrīhi défait” can be adopted, whatever we may think the grammatical process is. I have adopted Griffith’s “with many a son” (both RV and VS tr.; see also Maurer), which is surprisingly apt. As is generally recognized, the masc. and fem. referents are both arrows: in addition to the standard fem. *īṣu-*, forming part of the ‘quiver’ cmpd itself (*īśudhī-* in c), there are masc. ‘arrow’ words, incl. *bāṇá-*, found in vs. 17 below, and *śalyá-*.

Another onomatopoetic word: *cīscā*, which is a hapax (though cf. *cīscīśākāram*, with √ *kṛ* as here, not attested till the sūtras; see Hoffmann Aufs. 39). Since it expresses the sound of the quiver, “clatter” (pub. tr.), “rattle” (Doniger, Maurer), “clang and clash” (Griffith, RV and VS) all seem within reasonable range; Keith’s “whiz” much less so. Again the sound may in fact just be “chishcha.”

VI.75.6: Both hemistichs of this vs. express the same paradox, that an entity *behind* can lead something in front of it. In ab the good charioteer (*suṣārathīḥ*) “leads forward” (*nayati ... purāḥ*) the horses that are physically in front of him; in cd the reins, which stretch in front of the charioteer from his hands, follow his mind, which is physically behind them (*mānaḥ paścād ānu*).

VI.75.7: The middle of *kṛṇvate* is nicely appropriate.

The publ. tr. follows Re in taking *vājāyantaḥ* as belonging to the denom. stem ‘seek the prize’, despite the accent (expect **vājāyāntaḥ*), since we would otherwise expect the part. to have an object. See also Old, ZDMG 55.294 (=KlSch 753).

In its other RVic occurrence (X.163.4) *prāpada-* means ‘front of the foot’, but here I find it hard to assume that the horses are daintily trampling the soldiers with their tippy-toes and so tr. “with their forefeet.” However, since technically it seems that horses do walk/run on their toes, perhaps that’s what the poet intended. Moreover, IH points out that it would be the front of the horses’ hooves that would first make impact on the soldiers’ fallen bodies.

The sense of *ānapavyayantaḥ* is disputed, or rather most tr. water down what I think its sense must be. It’s a negated part. to *āpa* √ *vyā* ‘strip off, divest’ of garments, to √ *vyā* ‘envelop, wrap’. See VII.81.1 *āpo māhi vyayati ... tāmaḥ* “She [Dawn] unwraps the great darkness.” But most tr. attenuate this in some way that loses the sense of the root entirely, e.g., Ge “ohne sich zu entziehen” (withdraw oneself), Griffith “never flinching,” Keith “unflinchingly,” Doniger “without veering away,” Maurer “unrelenting”; Re (EVP) assigns it to a different root: *āpa-veti* ‘cesser’ (whose participle should be *-*vyant-*; he doesn’t deal with the morphology), though in Hymnes spéc. he tr. “sans même s’écarter (de leur voie).” I think we should take the form seriously and I suggest that it means that the horses’ trampling is so powerful that it can kill a man even while he is still in armor (hence my “without divesting”). That the form is underlyingly transitive (as I have just claimed) is disputed on principle by Lowe (*Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, 277), where he argues that negated participles are (“almost always”) intransitive and tr. this ex. as “without withdrawing.” I would dispute the principle and therefore his interpr. of this passage.

VI.75.8: I follow Ge in accepting the view of the comm. to VS XXIX.45 that *hāvīḥ* is a shortening of *havīrdhāna-* ‘oblation-deposit’, with the √ *dhā* supplied by the definition found in the next pāda, containing *nīhitam* ‘deposited’. However, see Old in particular for other ways to interpr. *hāvīḥ*.

The standard tr. take *ūpa ... sadema* as transitive with the chariot as object: e.g., Ge “setzen,” Re (Hymnes spéc.) “installer,” Doniger “place,” Oberlies (II.223) “setzen.” But *ūpa* √ *sad* is a standard locution for ‘reverently approach, do honor to’, and that surely is the sense here (so Griffith, Maurer “hono(u)r”).

VI.75.9: On *kṛchre-śrīt-* see most recently Scar (543–44). Re’s (EVP) objection to Ge’s tr. (“die Zuflucht in der Note”) and his over-complex substitute can, I think, reasonably be dismissed.

Most tr. take *citrā-senāḥ* as containing the ‘army’ word (e.g., Ge “eine wunderbare Heerschar bildend”), and this is certainly possible. I interpr. it rather as ‘weapon’ because

of the proximity of *īṣu-* ‘arrow’ in the adjoining cmpd *īṣubalāḥ* ‘arrow-strong’.

VI.75.10: This is the last vs. of the first part of the hymn (see publ. intro.), at least by content, though the next vs. is also in trimeter meter, and it has a typically eclectic group of addressees and divine name-checks.

Pāda b could be simply a nominal sentence: “H+E (are) kindly to us,” but the hortatory cast of the 2nd hemistich makes this unlikely.

I would now substitute “flawless” for “blameless” in b; see comm. ad X.61.12.

Pūṣan probably makes his appearance here because he watches over roads and journeys.

The 2nd singular impv. *rākṣā* beginning d has no obvious subject. The voc. immediately preceding it, at the end of c, is pl. *ṛtāvṛdhaḥ*, as are the other vocc. in pāda a. The only available sg. is *pūṣā* in c, but he is subj. of a 3rd ps. impv. The pāda is identical to nearby VI.71.3d, where the sg. Savitar is the addressee, and it was presumably adapted from there, as Re (EVP) notes. As the last pāda of the apparent hymn-ending vs., it is not surprising that it has an external source and is only loosely attached.

VI.75.11: The “eagle” is of course the feathers that provide the fletching at the back end of the arrow. The “tooth” of the arrow is presumably its tip -- the arrowhead -- so called because it “bites” its target. The arrowhead is quite unlikely to have been made from a deer’s tooth, however -- their teeth being short and flat and unsuitable for piercing. But acdg to the internet, deer antlers were/are used for primitive arrowheads. The cows in pāda b are of course leather sinews, and again the internet tells us that sinew was/is frequently used to attach the arrowhead to the shaft (with some how-to advice, which generally involves chewing on the leather first).

Pāda b recalls 5d, though the material objects in questions are different, the quiver in 5, the arrow in 11: pāda-final *prāsūtā* matches *prāsūtaḥ* in 5d in the same metrical position, and both contain the past part. of *√nah* ‘tie’ earlier in the pāda, also in the same metrical position, 5d x x *nīnaddhaḥ*, 11b x x *sāmṇaddhā*

The verb of pāda d is literally “run together and apart” (*sām ca ví ca drāvanti*), but “clash and separate” seemed to me to have a better ring.

VI.75.12: *śárma yachatu* at the end of d responds to *śárma yaṃsan* ending the previous vs., though the vss. are in different meters.

VI.75.13: The first hemistich is strongly alliterative: *jañghanti ... jaghánān ... jighnate* and plays on two different redupl. verb forms to *√han*: the intensive and the regular redupl. pres. Although I generally agree with Schaefer that “intensives” are really frequentatives most of the time, in this particular passage the presence of the med. redupl. pres. *jighnate*, which almost always has pl. objects (as here) and therefore fills the frequentative slot, pushes the intens. stem *jañghan-* towards a true intensive value.

práçetas- ‘discerning’ may seem an odd descriptor for horses, but the point is well captured by Doniger’s “who sense what is ahead” (perhaps an expansion on Re’s [Hymnes spéc.] ‘prévoyant’). The horses are presumably too smart to go into battle unless they’re forced by the whip.

VI.75.14: This is the last of the vss. repeated in the Aśvamedha sections of the YV.

pári is the signature word of this vs.: *páry eti* (a), *paribāḍhamānaḥ* (b), *pári pātu* (d).

On the cmpd *hasta-ghná-* see Old and Lü (ZDMG 96: 39), the latter summarized by Re (EVP).

There are numerous diff. interpr. of *vayúnāni* here. I assume that it refers to the different possible trajectories of the bowstring when it is released.

The last pāda may emphasize the masculinity of the handguard and the archer because the bowstring, from which the handguard protects the archer, is feminine.

VI.75.15: The antelope head and metal mouth of the arrow are not entirely clear. I assume that this refers to a deer-antler arrowhead (as in 11a) with a further metal tip attached to it. The internet assures me that such things have been discovered, if rarely, in archaeological contexts. Ge (n. 15b) suggests either this or that the *múkham* is the ring that connects the shaft and the arrowhead. But as far as I can tell, in my exploration of the odd internet world of makers of primitive arrowheads, there would not be a separate metal ring or socket used to attach a bone/antler arrowhead to the shaft; when there's a metal attachment, the whole arrowhead is metal.

In a hymn so attuned to the grammatical gender, and therefore of the metaphorical gender, of the key words, there is a special frisson in describing the feminine arrow (*īsu-*) -- here in the dat. *īsvai*, whose *-v-ai* stem+ending shows the specifically feminine inflection of short *-u*-stems -- with a cmpd that ends with *-retas-* 'semen'. The accent of the cmpd *parjanya-retas-* shows that it must be a bahuvrīhi 'having (or in this case, in my opinion, receiving) the semen of Thunder/Parjanya'; hence tr. like Re (Hymnes spéc) "semence de Parjanya," Doniger "to this seed of Parjanya" are misleading and grammatically wrong. As to what this refers to in practical terms, Re may well be correct that the shaft of the arrow is made of reed, which grows in the rains and is associated with the thunderstorm.

VI.75.16: *amīṣām* is of course the gen. pl. of the far deictic prn. *asaú* and could be more literally tr. as "do not leave a single one of those yonder standing," but this seemed a bit heavy.

VI.75.17: The beloved RVic contrast of *sám* and *ví* is on display here with *sampátanti* (a) and *visíkhāḥ* (b).

Strictly speaking, *iva* comes too late in the simile *kumārā visíkhā iva*, since the 'lads' must definitely belong to the simile, not the frame. This late placement is not unusual, however.

Because of the multivalence of *ví* the bahuvrīhi *visíkhā-* can have two different senses and has been interpr. with both. If in this cmpd *ví* means 'without', as often, the whole cmpd means 'without/lacking hair' -- so Gr "ohne Kopfhaare"; he is followed by Re (Hymnes spéc.) "aux crêtes dénouées" and Maurer "tuftless." By contrast, if *ví* means 'out, apart', as often, the cmpd means 'with hair apart', that is, perhaps, sticking out every which way. Ge renders it "mit aufgelöstem Haarbusch," and he is followed by Doniger "with untrimmed locks of hair" and me; Old implicitly assumes the same meaning. If the first meaning is correct, these could in fact be some kind of projectile that lacks fletching. (Acadg. to the internet, it is possible to shoot unfletched arrows, though

not generally recommended.) Or perhaps the arrows lost their fletching in the intensity of the shooting. Nonetheless, this seems the less likely sense. If it means “with hair out/apart” (my “unruly hair”), it can refer either to the arrows themselves, coming in from every angle: if each arrow is compared to a strand of hair, the visual effect would be of “bedhead” hair, matted and sticking out in all directions. Or it can refer to the fletching; when innumerable arrows rain down, their feathers would again produce a chaotic visual effect.

The predicate *śárma* √*yam* returns from vss. 11–12, and 17d is identical to 12d.

VI.75.18: Note the near-rhyming forms *mármāṇi* .. *vármaṇā*, echoed in c by *vārīyo várūṇaḥ*.

VI.75.19: I take the phrase *svó áraṇo yás ca níṣtyaḥ* as a three-member sequence indicating progressive distance from the speaker. I’m assuming that in this context an *áraṇa-* is someone who inhabits the same general territory, but belongs to a different group, while the *níṣtya-* are from beyond the territory. Re’s tr. (Hymnes spéc.) is in agreement: “Celui, proche ou lointain ou même étranger.” Others seem to take the 2nd two terms as (near-)synonyms; so explicitly Klein (DGRV I.108–9).

Commentary VII

[VII.1–17 JPB]

VII.18 Indra (Battle of the Ten Kings)

I have little or nothing to contribute to the interpr. of this famous hymn, esp. of its historical or quasi-historical aspects. The hymn has been extensively treated by a number of scholars both fairly recently, esp. H.-P. Schmidt (*Indica* 17 [1980], 41–47) and M. Witzel (in *The Indo-Aryans in Ancient South Asia* [1995], esp. 333–37), and in the past, and I will therefore limit my comments. See the publ. intro. for structural and contextual disc. I am certain that many puns, wordplays, and snide asides are completely unrecoverable today and respectfully suggest that we put our energies into interpreting parts of the RV where we have a chance of success.

VII.18.1: Pāda c contains two parallel nominal clauses. Both should be in the causal domain of the *hí*, but it is located only in the 2nd of the two. We might have expected **t'vé hí gāvah sudúghās tvé áśvāh*, which would have been just as good metrically.

On the pun in d see publ. intro. and comm. ad vs. 4.

VII.18.2: As I interpr. it, the first hemistich presents us with a causal *hí* clause followed by an imperatival non-sequitur. What is immediately striking is that it is emphasized that Indra is dwelling in peace and domestic harmony -- not always the first picture of Indra we conjure up -- in a hymn that is about to become very very martial. In the imperatival clause of b, he is also identified as a wise *kaví*, again not a militant role for Indra. Perhaps the connection between the causal *hí* clause and the imperatival ones that follow is that Indra has the leisure to pay due attention to our hymns and reward our poetic offerings (which, as a *kaví*, he has the connoisseurship to appreciate) with aid and material goods.

The interpr. just given assumes that *áva* opening b and *piśā* opening c are both imperatives. Both of these identifications have been questioned. Some (e.g., Lub) take *áva* as the preverb (Gr by implication, since he does not list it under *√av*), but both Ge and Old (the latter after some hesitation) interpr. it as an impv. to *√av* 'help'. As for *piśā*, Gr takes it as the instr. of a root noun, but most subsequent interpr. as the impv. to an otherwise unattested them. aor. to *√piś* 'adorn, ornament' (see, e.g., Old, Ge, Schindler [Rt. Noun], Lub). Our form could well be a thematic substitute for a form of the root aor., found once in the part. *piśānā-*, since the expected root aor. impv. should be the quite opaque **pīdhí*.

As indicated ad I.71.10, I do not have an independent view about the morphology of *vidúṣ*, which occurs in the same phrase in both passages (*abhí vidúṣ kavíḥ sán*). I do think that it is a nom. sg. (with Old), not a haplogized acc. pl. as Ge takes it (see his n. 10b ad I.71.10). (Debrunner [AiG II.2.471] seems weakly to assign it to a *-u*-stem [but possibly to *-uṣ-* instead] and interpr. as a nom. sg., while Wackernagel [AiG III.300, which publication of course long predates II.2] accepts Ge's acc. pl.) To me the form looks as if it is a truncated form of the weak form of the pf. part. *vidvāms-*, though it could of course belong to a *u*-stem *vidú-* instead -- but whether it is archaic or innovative I wouldn't venture to say.

However, it is tempting to compare it with OAvs. *vīduš* (Y. 28.4, 45.8), which Insler (124–25 ad Y. 28.4) interprets as the nom./acc. sg. of the pf. part. used adverbially, while Humbach (1991: II.22) takes it as a nom. sg. meaning ‘witness’ without pronouncing further on the morphological analysis beyond that it’s “etymologically related” to the pf. part., and Kellens-Pirart (1990: 306) instead suggest it is cognate with Vedic *vidhū-*. Insler says explicitly that “Rigvedic *vidús* (2x) requires a different explanation,” without specifying what it is. Kü for his part (39) suggests that both Vedic *vidúš* and the Avestan forms (including others like OA *vāunus*) aren’t directly connected to the pf. part. but are redupl. *u*-stem adj. like *jigyú-*. However, at least a secondary association with the perfect is needed for *vīduš*/ *vidúš* to account for the *de*-reduplication they would exhibit, which matches the pf. stem.

It is also curious that in neither passage is the pres. part. *sán* concessive, though that is the usual function of the nom. forms of this participle. However, here the *sán* is by my interpr. in tmesis with *abhí*, which opens the repeated phrase, in the sense ‘be preeminent’ (so also Ge), even though participles in tmesis are rare – or perhaps less rare than is generally thought.

The apparent close sandhi with following *kavīḥ* that *vidúš* exhibits seems to me not to support the haplology explanation, though the sandhi issue is complex. Mark Hale (in “Preliminaries to the Study of the Relationship between Syntax and Sandhi in Rigvedic Sanskrit” [MSS 51, 1990], as well as the unpubl. *Wackernagel’s Law: Phonology and Syntax in the Rigveda* [1995], 33–36) insightfully discusses the general problem of irregular sandhi of *-s* before *k-*. The great majority of the examples occur before forms of $\sqrt{kṛ}$, and Hale plausibly accounts for this phenomenon by pointing out that *kṛ* has an *s*-mobile doublet $\sqrt{skṛ}$ and that the unusual *-s* sandhi outcomes can result from the doubled *-s s-* that would be underlying. The single example of such a result before the PN *kāṇva-* can also be so explained, since we have a synchronic doublet *-skaṇva*. However, Hale’s invocation of the *s*-mobile explanation for the exx. before *kaví-* is not supported by internal evidence for a **skaví-* or by solid evidence of *s*-mobile cognates outside of Indic, and I therefore think the *kaví-* examples require a different explanation -- though I don’t know what that is. We should first note that they form a more limited set than Hale’s presentation (1995: 36 n. 28) makes clear. The two *vidúš kavīḥ* passages are identical, and *paśuṣ kavīḥ* occurs in our same hymn (8d) and is most likely responsive to the earlier example; *vásuṣ kavīḥ* (I.79.5) is nearby *vidúš kavīḥ* in I.71.10 (though admittedly not attributed to the same poet) and could be based upon it. *brahmaṇas kave* (VI.16.30) is in a voc. phrase where close sandhi effects are at home; cf. the very similar *brahmaṇas pate* (I.18.3). Of Hale’s collection, this leaves V.59.4 *kás kāvya* [*sic*, not Hale’s *kāvyaḥ*] and *ṛtás kavīḥ* (VIII.60.5). The latter is problematic for a different reason: it contains one of only two exx. of a masc. *ṛtá-*; the other is in the same phrase (IX.62.30) but with standard sandhi *ṛtáḥ kavīḥ*. In fact most occurrences of *kaví-* (*kāvya-*, etc.) preceded by *-s* do show the standard visarga (e.g., among the many, I.76.5 *kavībhiḥ kavīḥ*). I don’t know what to make of all this. I am inclined to think that the irregular sandhi originated in the morphologically problematic phrases *vidúš kavīḥ* and *ṛtás kavīḥ* and is a dark reflection of their troubled morphology. It then had a very limited spread. But since I don’t understand what the morphology is or how this could affect the sandhi, this is not much of a theory! In any case, the poet of this hymn seems to showcase this sandhi anomaly, by not only including the two *-uṣ ka-* examples (2b, 8d), but also

adding the correct *āsús canéd* (9b) and close sandhi *rāradhuṣ te* (18a); cf. also *susupuh śāt* (14b).

The cows and horses attributed to Indra in 1c reappear here in c as his ornamental gifts to us.

VII.18.4: The desid. part. *dúdukṣan* is mildly notable because 1) it does not exhibit reverse-Grassmann (**dúdhukṣan*) unlike the *s*-aor. *ádhuṣat* (also, however, *adukṣat*); 2) it is a real part., not the *u*-adj. often substituting for the part. in the desid. (**dudukṣú-*).

Because of the overt switch to the 1st ps. in c, I take the pf. *sasṛje* in b as 1st ps. (flg. JPB p.c.), with *vásiṣṭhaḥ* doubling the underlying subject. The pf. form is of course ambig. between 1st and 3rd.

As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. exhibits a kind of ring comp. via an anagrammatic pun: 1c *vásu ... vániṣṭhaḥ* “best gainer of goods” is compressed into the name of the poet *vásiṣṭhaḥ* (*vás[u]... [ván]iṣṭhaḥ*). This brings the first section of the hymn to a close; the battle scene erupts abruptly in the next vs.

VII.18.5: My tr. of the 2nd hemistich follows Old’s, contra Ge.

VII.18.6: The first hemistich contains two ironic reversals, based on what are presumably personal names or plays on them. In the first pāda *yákṣu-*, perhaps a pun on Yadu, can be rendered as ‘sacrificer’ (so Schmidt, from whom I adapted the tr.), and he himself becomes the sacrifice, or a part of it: *puroḷāḥ* ‘offering cake’.

The presumed underlying form of this nom. sg., *puroḷās* (also found in III.28.2), is unexpected: to the stem *puroḷās-* we might rather find **puroḷāt*. See Scar (221) with lit. It is worth pointing out in this case, as well as with equally unexpected *sadhamās* in the next vs., that the final of both forms matches that of *sudās*, our hero the king Sudās, and so there may have been some adjustment in that direction, esp. in a hymn given to phonological manipulation. Unfortunately this doesn’t explain the occurrence in III.28.2.

In b the name of the ill-fated enemy *mātsyāsaḥ* is also the common noun ‘fish’, and this word should be read in both the simile and the frame. Following Old (and Ge, who adopted Old’s suggestion), I take *āpīva* as containing not only the particle *āpī* ‘also’ but also a putative loc. sg. to *āp-* ‘water’. Although there are vanishingly few singular forms to this stem in the RV, they do exist (also in Avestan). The loc. should also be accented **apí*, but in puns accentual fluidity is common. The “fish” pun cries out for the “water” interpr., though Schmidt seems to reject it. He then introduces a pun that isn’t supported by the text, rendering *rāyé ... níśitāḥ* as “hooked on wealth (like fishes on bait).” Though this is appealingly cute, it is hard to push *ní√śā* ‘whet (down)’ to ‘hook’, and dat. *rāyé* is also hard to fit into that idiom. Moreover, (*nī*) *√śā* is a sort of signature verb in this hymn; cf. 2d, 11c, 24d, and in particular the positive 2d *śíśṭhi rāyé asmān* “whet us for wealth” appears to be the polarized counterpart of our negative *rāyé ... níśitāḥ*. I wish I could find a clever expression to capture the image, but so far I have been unable to.

There is a diversity of opinion on what is happening in d as expressed by the verb *atarat*. Ge thinks that friend is helping friend, though this requires *√tṛ* to mean ‘help’, not a usage I’m aware of; Old that the enemy ranks were divided into two parts, both fleeing but one faster than, and therefore overtaking (*√tṛ*), the other. This seems also to be

Schmidt's view, though his "crossed (overcame)" shows a non-idiomatic usage of English 'overcame' (meaning 'overtook'?). The Old/Schmidt view seems possible, but I interpr. it in the light of VIII.1.4, where I take *tartūryante* to refer to the crisscrossing movements of people in opposite sides of a conflict. I suggest that here *sákhā sákhāyam* refers to former comrades who are now fighting on opposite sides and crossing each other's path in the battle line: the shifting alliances of the participants in the Ten Kings battle are notorious and much discussed (see esp. Witzel's treatment cited above).

VII.18.7: Ge (fld. by Gotō, 1st Kl., 222) takes *bhananta* as reflexive ("... nannten sich") with *śívāsaḥ* as pred. nom., but the responsive pairing of act. 3rd pl. pres. *bhananti* and mid. 3rd pl. injunc. *bhananta* in adjacent vss. in the same metrical position in IV.18.6–7 (see comm. ad loc.) marks *bhananta* as a text-book case of *-anta* replacement, as disc. in my 1979 article. Flg. Schmidt, I take cd as the direct speech implied by *bhananta*. Old also rejects the Ge interpr.

The /s/ of the names *bhalānās-* and *ālīna-* and the unmotivated retroflex *-ṣ-* in *viṣāṇīn-* suggest peoples outside of the Ārya mainstream, although of course they could also show the kinds of deliberate phonological deformation found elsewhere in the hymn. It's possible that *bhalānās-* reflects a form of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$, hence my 'raiders'. It is not clear whether *śívāsaḥ* should be interpr. as the usual adj. ('kindly') or as the name of another group of fighters. The publ. tr. reflects the former (flg. Schmidt), but I am now inclined to consider the latter more likely, primarily because it's not phonologically outlandish. In this case I'd tr. "The Pakthas and the Bhalānases spoke out, and the Alinas and the Viṣāṇins -- (all) 'kindly' --" This would be a sarcastic aside about the martial forces ranged against us.

If we accept the Schmidt/Witzel distribution of the allegiances of the various named forces, those named in ab are complaining about the defection of the *sadhamād-* who led them to the battle but has now gone over to the Tr̥tsu (/Sudās) side and has turned to attack the *nṛ̥n* ('superior men'), by which they mean themselves. The *sadhamād-* is most likely Indra, and so losing him as an ally would be a serious blow.

On the unexpected form *sadhamās*, if the nom. sg. to *sadhamād-*, see Scar (381) with lit. I think it unlikely that it's an acc. pl., a possibility Old considers by assigning it to a diff. root. As noted above (vs. 6) with regard to *puroḷās*, the rhyme with king Sudās may have played a part.

Ge's interpr. of the syntax of cd is impossible: it contains an embedded *main* clause! His rel. cl. consists of *ā yó 'nayat ... yudhā nṛ̥n* "... der seine Mannen unter Kampf heranzuführte" -- the beginning of c and the end of d. While his main clause is the end of c and the beginning of d, ... *sadhamā āryasya, gavyā tr̥tsubhyo ajagan ...* "Der Mahlgenossen des Ariers ... ist aus Verlangen nach Kühen den Tr̥tsu's (zu Hilfe) gekommen." My tr. follows Old's, which is slightly adjusted by Schmidt.

VII.18.8: Both this vs. and the following one concern the Paruṣṇī river, known from elsewhere in the RV and later. In the 2nd pāda the VP *vī jagrbhre páruṣṇīm*, lit. "they grasped apart the P.," is generally taken to mean 'divert' the course of the river (so already Gr, also Ge; Schmidt slightly differently 'divided'). The lexeme \sqrt{grabh} occurs only once in the RV, but this seems a reasonable interpr. -- though I'm not exactly sure how this feat of engineering would have been accomplished. Perhaps so many bodies

accumulated in the river that it either had to flow around them (hence Schmidt's 'divided') or switch its course altogether. The use of the middle *jagrbhre* might support the former interpr.: they themselves [i.e., their own bodies] parted the river. One is reminded of Iliad 21.205ff., where Achilles drives his enemies towards the Scamander river, which berates and then fights with Achilles for filling the river with corpses.

In the preceding pāda *āditi-* is also sometimes taken to be a river (Ge n. 8a, Schmidt), but this seems much less likely to me. Aditi is, of course, a well-known goddess, and her miscarriage is also a well-known mythological incident, in the narrative of the sequence of her twin births ending with one miscarriage and one live baby -- found already in the RV (see the clear passage X.72.8). It therefore seems wiser not to make her capriciously into a landscape feature, but to start with the mythological facts that might match the VP *āditiṃ srevaśāntaḥ* "making Aditi abort." Now, as is often related in middle Vedic texts, when the eighth embryo of Aditi aborts, it becomes first the discarded Mārtāṇḍa ('stemming from a dead egg'), but is then fixed up and becomes Vivasvant, a name for the sun (see my Hyenas, pp. 204-8; this identification is already implicit in the RV, *pace* Hoffmann). I wonder if "causing Aditi to abort" refers to her aborted son, the sun, and in this case, by metaphor, to an eclipse of the sun -- or at least something that could pass for one. If the dust of a pitched battle got thick enough it could rise to blot out the sun's rays temporarily. Rising dust is often elsewhere a sign of intense fighting in the RV, and flights of arrows so thick that they obscure the sun are a feature of battles in the epics (e.g., MBh IV.53.26, 31). This loss of light could render the combatants *acetās-* (b), lit. 'without perception' in b.

The *durādhyāḥ* 'ill-intentioned ones' are probably the same faction as those referred to, probably sarcastically, as 'kindly' (*śivāśaḥ* in the previous vs., 7b).

Apparently alone of all tr. and comm., I do not have an opinion about who the personnel are in cd. See the various suggestions, esp. those of Schmidt and Witzel.

As for *cāyamāna-*, I assign it the intrans./pass. sense 'being perceived as, appearing as', rather than, e.g., Schmidt's "receiving due respect." Gotō's interpr. (1st Kl. 137) is closer to mine, but he considers it reflexive: "sich als ... betrachtend, sich für ... haltend." He does not tr. this passage (or the other participial form in X.94.14). Whoever the subject is -- Schmidt and Witzel think it's Vasiṣṭha, the purohita of Turvaśa, but I remain agnostic -- in my view this kavi has been felled, at least temporarily, and therefore gives the impression of being a *paśú-*, in this case a sacrificial, or already sacrificed, animal. Note the main verb *aśayat* (√śi 'lie'), which is the signature verb describing the slain Vṛtra in I.32. Note *paśúṣ kavīḥ*, which shows the same sandhi before *kavīḥ* as *vidúṣ kavīḥ* in 2b; see disc. there.

VII.18.9: With Ge (etc.), I take *ná* in pāda a as a simile marker, not a negative; the simile and frame participate in a pun on (-) *ārtha-*. What they reached was a *nī-ārtha-* 'failed goal' (see, e.g., VI.27.6, X.107.8), which is *like*, but tragically *not*, their real goal.

In b note *āśúś* (*canéd*), which echoes *paśúṣ* (*kavīḥ*) in the previous vs. (8d) also pāda-initial. Here the sandhi is of course standard.

The adj. *sutúka-* occurs 7x in the RV; acdg. to EWA (s.v.) its meaning and etymology are unknown, though it is generally translated in the 'quick, swift' realm (like so many other unclear RVic adj.), e.g., Gr "rasch dahin eilend," Ge (this passage) "spornstreichs fliehend." On the basis of X.42.5, where it appears parallel to *sváṣṭra-*

‘easily goaded’, I suggest that it means ‘easily thrust/thrusting’ and is ultimately derived from \sqrt{tuj} ‘thrust’. Under this analysis, of course, the voiceless *-k-* is a problem. Easiest would be to extract it from the unattested nom. sg. of the reasonably well-attested root noun *túj-*, which should be **túk*, supported by pre-C forms like **tugbhís*, **tukṣú*. This is essentially a variant of Re’s (EVP XII.108) suggestion that it belongs to a root \sqrt{tuc} , a doublet of \sqrt{tuj} , but it avoids the awkwardness of positing this extra root to explain one stem. In fact, Re suggests in passing that it could start from an athematic nom. sg. **sutuk* (he gives no accent), but he prefers the \sqrt{tuc} hypothesis.

In view of the disorderly rout of these forces described in the next vs., presumably due to the collapse of their alliance, I now wonder if *amítrān* refers not to their non-alliance with us (as in the publ. tr.), but to the lack or loss of unity among themselves.

In d Ge takes *mānuṣe* as a place name (“in Mānuṣa”), on the basis of JB III.244, which identifies it as the place of the Ten Kings battle. But, as Ge admits (n. 9d), the JB rendering could easily result from a misunderstanding of our passage. Old suggests (not very enthusiastically) that it refers to (all) the enemies “in der Menschenwelt.” Schmidt’s interpr. is somewhat puzzling, putting it in an (unexpressed) simile contrasting the “castrates” of *vádhi-vāc-* to a (presumably virile) man expressed by *mānuṣa-*: “who were talking like castrates in the world of a man.” I think rather that it refers to Manu’s race or people: all other loc. singulars of this stem modify *jāne* (save for I.12.8.7, where it qualifies the semantically close *vṛjāne*). I take the expression as concessive “(though) in Manu’s (race)”: the point is that the opponents belong to the larger Ārya community though they are fighting against us. They therefore in principle share the same sacrificial practices, including ritual speech, but their ritual speech is ineffective (or so we hope), like that of a castrate. The extensive ritual references in the account of the battle only work under these conditions.

The cmpd. *vádhi-vāc-* ‘possessing gelded/castrated speech’ provides another parallel to the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, whose vs. 7 likens Vṛtra to a *vádhi-* wishing to become a bull.

VII.18.10: The vs. begins *īyúr gāvo ná*, very similar to the opening of the preceding vs. 9 *īyúr árthaṃ ná*. The simile of the cows without a cowherd (*gāvo ná ... āgopāḥ*) presumably depicts the disordered flight of the troops that have lost their leader.

I have now considerably changed my interpr. of the 2nd pāda. In the publ. tr. I take *citāsaḥ* as belonging to \sqrt{ci} ‘perceive’, meaning ‘perceived as, seeming’, rather than to \sqrt{ci} ‘gather’, the usual interpr. I now think the standard root assignment is correct, but that it means not ‘assembled, gathered’ (so Ge, Schmidt) but ‘piled up’. In other words, the panic-stricken troops, running pell-mell without an overall leader, hit an obstacle and pile up on top of each other in a heap of bodies.

The object they run into (*abhi*) is the opposing side, which is acting as allied forces under a properly concluded agreement: *yathākṛtām ... mitrām*. The standard view of this phrase is that it describes the situation of the subjects, the fleeing fighters, construed with *citāsaḥ* and therefore referring to an accidental or on-the-spot alliance; so Ge “zu zufällig geschlossener Freundschaft geschart,” Schmidt “... assembled for an alliance made on the spur of the moment.” But as Old points out, *mitrām* \sqrt{kr} is the standard phrase for concluding an alliance in the normal fashion, not for one made under pressure or by chance. It therefore better describes the well-organized forces the subjects

are confronting, and as I said in the comm. to the preceding vs., the adj. *amītrān* there may well describe the lack of alliance among these fighters going to defeat, here contrasted with our side, which is acting in concert under a functioning alliance. I would therefore alter the publ. tr. to “They went ... piled up against an alliance properly concluded [=their enemies].”

In c the pl. *pṛśnigāvaḥ* may well be the name of a clan, as Old suggests; the PN interpr. is followed also by Ge and Schmidt as well as the publ. tr. But it of course has a straightforward bahuvrīhi interpr. (‘having dappled cows’) and, more to the point, echoes the cow simile of the first hemistich, with *-gāvaḥ* in the same metrical position as *gāvaḥ* in a. That the first member *pṛśni-* is immediately repeated in the cmpd *pṛśni-nipreṣitāsaḥ* calls further attention to the cmpd analysis. As for the 2nd cmpd., I am drawn to Ge’s suggestion (n. 10) that *pṛśni-* is a pun on the river name Paruṣṇī.

In d *rānti-* is problematic. In its other occurrence, IX.102.5, it clearly means ‘joys’. But that makes no sense here. Ge refuses to tr.; Old tentatively suggests that the word has developed into a “sakral-poetisch” term for cow, presumably starting from ‘joy’. Schmidt tr. “supply lines” (< ‘refreshment’ < ‘enjoyment’), but this seems a semantic chain too tenuous, esp. since the logistics and support for the battle do not otherwise figure in this hymn (unless in 15cd). I take it as ‘battler’, assuming that it shows the same semantic bifurcation as *rāṇa-*, both ‘joy’ and ‘battle’.

The phrase *śruṣṭīm cakruḥ* opening d, “they followed orders,” forms a ring with the same phrase in 6c. This is, at first, puzzling, since vss. 6-10 do not appear to form a discrete section. However, on 2nd glance we can note that these five vss. mark out the most intense and name-heavy portion of the battle. Starting with the next vs. Indra takes over the fighting, and the hymn turns to the celebration of Indra and his victorious feats; vs. 5, preceding this section, also attributes the whole victory to Indra. The god is absent from 6–10, with the combatants on their own and engaged in pitched battle.

VII.18.11: The king who is the subj. of ab may be Sudās (so Ge, flg. Sāy.) or Indra, who appears by name in d, or Sudās identified with Indra. Given the ring-compositional structure discussed ad vs. 10, I favor either Indra or Sudās=Indra.

The relationship between the simile of c and the first hemistich is intricate and partly unclear. The first hemistich portrays the destruction by a king of a large force belonging to an otherwise unknown pair (the Vaikarṇas), using the anīṭ root *nī√stṛ* (root aor. *ny āstah*) ‘strew down’ found also in other hostile encounters (e.g., II.11.20). Pāda c by contrast sketches a *ritual* incident in a simile, but the simile is slightly “off” for several reasons. For one thing, the predicate phrase *sādman ... barhīḥ* “the ritual grass on the seat” suggests that the verb to govern it should also be ‘strew down’, though in its set form (cf., e.g., VII.43.2 *stṛṇītā barhīḥ*). The actual verb of the simile, *nī śīśāti* ‘whets down’, is far less appropriate to its object, and we must assume a metaphorical use of this verb in the simile -- a piling of figurative language on figurative language, made all the more peculiar by the fact that the verb of b would be better suited to the simile of c and vice versa. (Recall also that [*nī*] *√śā* is the signature verb of this hymn; see comm. ad vs. 6.) It is almost as if the simile had been turned inside out or the two clauses had swapped out verbs. Also disturbing the simile is the fact that the subject of the clause, which, as agent of a verb governing ritual grass, should be a priest or ritual functionary, is identified as *dasmā-* ‘wondrous, wonder-worker’, an adj. otherwise only applied to gods,

esp. Indra (e.g., in nearby VII.22.8). So it too seems more at home in the main clause of ab than in the simile of c, an association made stronger by the fact that *dasmá-* several times occurs with *rājan-* in a simile (IX.82.1 *rājeva dasmáh*, X.43.2 *rājeva dasma*) and *rājā* is the subject of ab. The interconnections become even more tangled when we consider the 2nd of those just-cited similes: X.43.2 *rājeva dasma ní śadó 'dhi barhīṣi* “Like a king, wondrous one [=Indra], sit down upon the ritual grass,” which contains the grass and the root \sqrt{sad} ‘sit’, but there realized as a verb rather than as the loc. nominal *sádman*.

VII.18.12: The “famous old” Kavaṣa, with his non-Indo-Aryan name, reminds us of Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, named by the Anukramaṇī as the poet of X.30–34. See comm. ad loc.

Old suggests that we read *ānuṃ*, not *ānu*, in b -- thus a PN, not a preverb -- given the co-occurrence of the PNs *ānu-* and *druhyú-* elsewhere, incl. 14a, I.108.8, etc., as well as the vṛddhi deriv. *ānava-* in the next vs. (13c). I have adopted this suggestion; note that it does not affect the meter, as the next word (*druhyúm*) begins with a cluster.

The relationship between the two hemistichs is loose and unclear. On the basis of vs. 11, esp. 11d, and the epithet *vájrabāhuḥ* in 12b, we are entitled to assume that the 1st hemistich has Indra as subject and is couched in the 3rd ps. But the 2nd hemistich refers twice to ‘you’ (d *tvāyántaḥ ... tvā*), manifestly referring also to Indra, and the verb in the first hemistich, *ní vṛṇak* is ambig. between 2nd and 3rd -- a typical modulation point. I would keep the publ. tr. (“he wrenched down”), but with the awareness that the transition to 2nd ps. reference may already be underway.

The 2nd hemistich has Indra’s followers as subj., with d containing a rel. cl. with nom. pl. *yé*. How to construe it is the question. Although there is no overt (or indeed covert) representation of this plural group in the first hemistich, Ge takes the whole of cd as an improper relative, tr. “während deine Anhänger, Freundschaft für Freundschaft erwählend, dir zujubelten.” This not only reinterprets *yé* as a general subordinator rather than a rel. prn., but it also has this subordinator placed very deeply in its supposed clause. I prefer to take pāda c as containing a predicated root aor. part. *vṛṇānāḥ* [“(They were) choosing your partnership ... (those) who ...”], which allows the rel. cl. of d to have a more standard configuration, referring to the pl. subj. of the nominal clause of c.

VII.18.13: With nom. *índraḥ* this vs. seems to return to 3rd ps. reference—though it’s worth noting that both verbs of which *índraḥ* is subject are ambig. between 2nd and 3rd ps. (*dardaḥ* b, *bhāḥ* c), and so an appositive 2nd ps. reading “(you,) Indra, ...” is barely possible.

The adv. *sadyáḥ* ‘in an instant, all at once’ seems to clash semantically with its verb *dardaḥ*, given the usual function of the “intensive” as a frequentative. It would probably be better here to render *sadyáḥ* with Ge as ‘in a single day’, indicating that Indra could destroy multiple fortifications in a limited time span.

The 1st pl. *jēṣma* is generally interpr. these days as a precativ: see esp. Hoffmann (Injunk. 254), Narten (Sig.Aor. 119–20), and Ge’s tr. “Möchten wir ... besiegen.” Certainly the other two occurrences of this form in the RV (VI.45.12, X.156.1) have clear modal value. But in this context, in a long narrative set in the past, though carried in part by injunctive forms like *dardaḥ* and *bhāḥ* in this vs., a modal would be jarring and would interrupt the narrative by suddenly expressing a hope for the future. I therefore follow, for

this form here, the older interpr. of *jeṣma* (see reff, in Hoffmann and Narten) as an irregular injunc. (for expected **jaiṣma*; cf. *ajaiṣma* VIII.47.18=X.164.5).

VII.18.14: Pāda b is notable for its alliteration, making full use of all three sibilants: *ṣaṣṭīḥ śatā suṣupuh ṣaṭ saḥāsrā*. The sums are tautological, as Old points out: sixty hundred and six thousand amounting to the same number. Both ‘sixty’ (*ṣaṣṭīḥ*) and ‘six’ (*ṣaṭ*) reappear in the next pāda. The standard interpr. is that these sixty-six in c are just an addition to the six thousand enumerated in the previous pāda. However, Old suggests that they constitute the opposite side, the ‘heroes’ (*vīrāsaḥ*) ‘seeking favor’ (*duvoyū*), who are fighting against those enumerated in pāda b. This interpr. has the merit of not requiring those two words to be used ironically (on the latter, see Ge’s n. 14c), and it also makes the victory that much more impressive, that this small number, with Indra on their side, could defeat many multiples of themselves. The same point is made more forcefully in vs. 17. The same balance between the good guys and the bad guys, as it were, is found in the next vs., 15, where the Tṛtsus of ab are Indra’s allies, but their opposite numbers are found in cd.

VII.18.15: As just noted, the vs. is divided into two, with the Tṛtsus of Indra’s party in full flood in ab (on the attack, one presumes) and their enemies abandoning their possessions under the pressure of this attack. These enemies are identified as *durmitrāsaḥ*; as with *amitra-* of 9c, this descriptor seems meant to signal the fraying or loss of the alliances that bound them and perhaps also to identify these alliances as badly formed in the first place. The other example of this form as a full adj. is nearby in VII.28.4; *durmitrā-* in X.105.11 is used as a PN in a quite possibly independent play on the PN *sumitrā-*.

The first hemistich is straightforward; the second has its puzzles, starting with the form *prakalavid* (or, theoretically possible, -*vín*) in c. See, first, Old, who rejects several previous suggestions and hesitantly follows what is found in Gr, as does Ge (as do I): a root-noun cmpd. with *√vid* ‘know’, a 1st member related to *kalā-* ‘small part’ (VIII.37.17), used adverbially (Gr ‘die kleinsten Theile berechnend’ → ‘kleinlich’). Scar (486) discusses in somewhat more detail but reaches the same hesitant conclusions. The universal uncertainty has much to do with the difficulty of fitting this sense into context. I take the cmpd as implicitly contrasted with *vīśvāni* in d. By my interpr., the enemy forces measure their supplies precisely and parsimoniously, “knowing every little piece” (Old “mit Kunde jedes kleinsten Teils”) -- hence my idiomatic “with a miser’s eye.” But when confronted by the Tṛtsus’ attack, they profligately abandon everything and flee.

Kü (608) interpr. *mímānāḥ* as reflexive/intrans. ‘die kleinlich sich messen’, though with ?, but, despite the middle voice, the other forms to this stem are consistently transitive.

VII.18.16: Pāda c is notable for the alliterative and etymological figure *manyúm manyumyò mimāya*, with the middle term *manyu-mī-* containing the noun to its left (*manyú-*) and the root noun of the verb to its right (*√mī*). Though *mimāya* phonologically echoes *mímānā(h)* at the end of 15c, they of course belong to different roots.

Pāda d contains a rare and curious idiom PATH *√bhaj*; cf. VII.39.1 *bhejāte ... pánthām*, possibly IX.102.2 *ābhakta ... padām*, which I take (with Ge) to mean “set out

on the road,” similar to, though with a different idiomatic verb, Engl. “hit the road.” The expression is complicated here by the question of how to construe *pathó vartaním*. Is *patháh* acc. pl. and direct object of *bhejé*, with *vartaním* the obj. of *pátyamāṇaḥ*? Such is the interpr. of Ge and Kü (334, 368) -- Ge with an idiomatic interpr. of *bhejé patháh*, Kü with a more literal one. However, I think it more likely that *patháh* is a gen. sg. dependent on *vartaním* on the basis of IV.45.3 *ā vartaním mádhunā jinvathas patháh* “You quicken the course of the path with honey.”

VII.18.17: If my interpr. of 14c is correct in taking the small number (66) as the allies of Indra facing off a much larger force, this vs. continues the same theme, first as a straightforward statement (a), then with two different metaphors (b, c): Indra easily prevailed despite the relative insufficiency of his tools.

In b, if the standard interpr. of *pétva-* as ‘castrated ram, wether’ is correct (see, e.g., EWA s.v.), the pairing of target and instrument is esp. striking: a fierce but female wild animal, the lioness, and a castrated but (originally) male domestic one, a wether, with opposition of both animal-type (wild/domestic) and gender, with the latter complicated by the emasculation of the male representative.

The same thematic and syntactic template prevails in c, but neither the target nor the tool is clearly identified. *veṣṭ-* (in the instr. *veṣyā*) is a hapax; the standard tr. ‘needle’ derives from Sāy., but in fact this doesn’t make much sense. *srakti-* has better representation: it’s found in the compd. *náva-srakti-* ‘9-srakti-ed’ (also VS *cátuaḥ-srakti*) and has an Aves. cognate *sraxti-*, *ṣraxti-* ‘edge, side’. EWA connects it with *srká-* ‘fang’. To figure out what must be going on, we need to turn to the verb, *áva ... (a)vṛścat*. The lexeme *áva √ vṛśc* ‘hew down’ is found only once elsewhere, in I.51.7, where it is used figuratively. But *ní √ vṛśc*, with the semantically similar preverb *ní*, twice appears with a concrete image: hewing down trees with an axe. See esp. I.130.4fg *táṣṭeva vṛkṣám vaníno ní vṛścasi, paraśvéva ní vṛścasi* “like a carpenter a tree from the wooden one [=forest], you cut down (the serpent) -- as if with an ax you cut (him) down” (sim. VI.8.5). The acc. pl. *sraktīḥ* in our passage matches the role of the trees in the passages just cited. I suggest that as ‘edge’ it refers to the edges of a tree trunk or to something that is, as it were, pure ‘edge’ -- a pole. As the instr., *veṣyā* should correspond to the axe. A needle doesn’t work, but perhaps a pin -- a small, sharp-pointed object that would ordinarily not have much success in felling tall poles. I agree with Old that the expression is probably proverbial.

The ending of d, *bhójanā sudāse*, is identical to the end of the last vs., 15d, preceded by *vísṣvāni* (15d) and *vísṣvā* (16d) respectively. The *bhójanā* that the enemies abandoned in 15 are here given to Sudās by Indra.

VII.18.18: I follow Ge in taking this vs. as direct speech.

Although Ge’s tr. of *rándhi-* in b as “schwache Stelle” is appealing, I preferred to register the etymological figure between the verb of pāda a, *rāradhuḥ*, and this noun.

Note the close sandhi *rāradhuṣ ṭe*, which reminds us of *vidúṣ kavīḥ* (2a) and *paśúṣ kavīḥ* (8d), as well as correct *āsús canéd* (9b).

The rel. prn. *yáḥ* is too deep in its clause, following both direct objects of *kṛṇóti*: *mártān ... stuvatáḥ* and *énaḥ*. I have no explan. for this violation.

VII.18.19: This is the last vs. with direct reference to the battle. The following two (20–21) provide general praise of Indra’s aid and generosity, leading up to the 4-vs. *dānastuti*.

Ge (n. 19d) insightfully suggests that pāda d is an ironic reflection on the horses that died in the encounter.

VII.18.20: Ge takes *pūrvāḥ ... nūtnāḥ* as qualifying *sumatāyaḥ ... rāyaḥ*: “Deine Gnaden und deine Reichtümer, die frühere und die neuesten, sind nicht vollständig aufzuzählen, so wenig wie die Morgenröten.” I prefer to take them with *uśásaḥ*, for several reasons. First, the word order, with *uśásaḥ* nestled between the two temporal adjectives, favors this interpr. Also my interpr. allows the *ná ... ná ... ná* sequence to be entirely negative, rather than requiring the last to be a simile marker. Moreover, the contrast between former and current dawn(s) is a standard trope in the RV, with *pūrva-* qualifying dawn in a number of passages. And finally morphology is against it: Ge would need to explain why a fem. nom. pl. *pūrvāḥ*, rather than the masc. *pūrve*, was used to modify a mixed feminine (*sumatāyaḥ*) and masculine (*rāyaḥ*) NP; ordinarily the default would be masc., esp. in this case where the masc. is closer to the adjectives. (He could of course invoke the supposed occasional use of *rayí-*, *rāy-* as feminine, but these exx. are vanishingly rare, if they exist at all.) I take the whole dawn phrase as an acc. of extent of time. It would be possible to assign the temporal adjectives to *uśásaḥ* but interpr. that phrase as a simile in the nom., as Scar (167) does: “Nicht sind deine Gnaden, nicht deine Gaben zu überschauen, genausowenig wie die vergangenen und jetzigen Morgenröten.” I still prefer mine, since Scar’s interpr. again requires the third *ná* to be a simile marker, even though it does avoid the problems raised by taking the temporal adjectives with the NP in pāda a.

In c *dévaka-* is a lovely ex. of the use of the *-ka-* suffix both in a pejorative sense and as signal of a lower register. Edgerton’s (*-ka-*suffix, 43) tr. is rather nice: “the wretched little fellow who thought himself a godling.”

The form *mānyamānā-* is of course peculiar, though its source is clear: it is a *vṛddhi* deriv. of the middle part. *mānyamāna-* ‘think oneself to be ...’ Although Ge takes it separately from *dévaka-* as two distinct pejorative epithets (“...den Götzen, den Dünkling”), I find it hard not to think that the participial usage is not still present and that *dévaka-* is the de facto predicate nominative. The *vṛddhi* is perhaps used to turn the typical subject of this participle into a category characterized by blind arrogance (“the type of blowhard who would think himself ...”) -- well captured by Edgerton’s tr.

The verb in d, *bhet* (*√bhid*), recalls the enemy Bheda targeted by Indra in vss. 18–19.

VII.18.21: The sense of the first pāda is disputed, primarily because it is unclear how to construe the abl. *grhāt*. Old discusses at length without a definite decision; Ge has his own idiosyncratic view: that in this context, with the abl. *grhāt*, *prá √mad* means ‘to go on a pilgrimage’ (“die ... von Hause fortgepilgert waren”), a bizarre interpr. (rejected by Old), which he connects to *abhí ... pramandúḥ* in VII.33.1, where his pilgrimage interpr. seems equally odd. The phraseology here needs to be considered in the context of similar expressions, not only VII.33.1, but also VIII.61.9 *sá prá mamandat tvāyā* and vs. 12d in this hymn *tvāyānto yé ámadann ánu tvā* (and consider the immediately preceding pāda 12c *vṛṇānā átra sakhyāya sakhyām*, which resonates with our c *ná te ... sakhyām*

mṛṣanta). Because of their proximity in the same hymn, I think vs. 12 needs to be weighted more heavily than the other passages, despite the difference in preverb (*ānu* there versus *prá* here). That vs. states that the men devoted to Indra cheered him on -- in other words, Indra was the recipient of an overt expression of their devotion -- and in turn they acquired a partnership with him. I now think that *prá ... ámamaduḥ* in this vs. should also be transitive, with Indra as the object. Perhaps by haplology **tvā tvāyā*. I would therefore alter the publ. tr. to "... who exhilarated (you) in devotion to you," with a different type of overt expression of devotion, here the soma. Pāda c then indicates that by doing so they did not neglect the responsibilities of their side of the partnership and (d) happy days ensue as a result. Interpreting *prá ... ámamaduḥ* here as transitive also has the merit of matching the use of *abhí ... pramandúḥ* in VII.33.1, where there is an overt object *mā*. The similar expression in VIII.61.9 is more equivocal; see disc. there.

This reappraisal of the verbal complex does not, however, solve the ablative problem. My proposed solution, already found in the publ. tr., is quite simple: the individuals named in pāda b (who include Vasiṣṭha) are relatives, "from the (same) house" -- a use of 'house' similar to that in expressions like "the House of Atreus." Under this interpr., there is no physical movement out of or location away from an actual dwelling. As this is the only abl. form of *grhá-* in the RV, it is difficult to know if such an idiomatic usage is possible, but given that the verb in its clause is not a verb of motion and cannot be made one without damage to its normal semantics, this seems like a reasonable alternative.

bhojá- 'provider, benefactor' is used of Indra elsewhere on a number of occasions (e.g., VI.23.9), but it is also used explicitly of a human *sūri-* 'patron' in VIII.70.13, as well as being repeated densely in X.107.8–11, the hymn devoted to the dakṣiṇā and the *bhoja*-s who give it. So I suggest in our vs. that its application to Indra in c is an attempt to transfer the epithet to the *sūri*-s in d.

VII.18.22: The first two pādas begin the enumeration of the Paijavana's *dāna*- mentioned in c -- an enumeration continued in 23.

The simile in d, *hóteva sādma páry emi*, is one of the few clear references to the animal sacrifice in the RV, with this depicting the Paryagnikaraṇa; cf. IX.97.1, where the animals are explicit.

VII.18.23: On *smáddiṣṭi-*, see comm. ad III.45.5.

In ab I supply *vahanti* on the basis of d, with Ge.

VII.18.24: The *śrávas-* in pāda a echoes the one in 23d.

Ge, flg. Sāy., takes ab as separate clauses, supplying "(sich ausbreitet)" as the verb in pāda a. This is unnecessary: the hemistich can be a single clause, with the accent on *vibabhāṣā* in b conditioned by the rel. *yásya* in a. (Ge considers this possibility in n. 24ab.) Kü (333) also follows the single clause interpr.

Note the lengthened 3rd sg. pf. ending in *babhāṣā*, guaranteed (and required) by the cadence. On lengthening of the pf. endings see the brief remarks by Kü (42), though without any indication of the relative frequency; it is my impression that lengthening of the 1st/3rd sg. -a is quite rare in the RV, but I haven't made a count.

The fame being distributed is presumably that of Sudās, though covertly assimilated to Indra's; note the explicit comparison of the praise he receives to Indra's in the simile in c. The āmreḍita "every head" (*śīrṣṇé-śīrṣṇe*) must refer to every person, or rather every person eligible for fame (excluding women and non-elite males), in Sudās's entourage: they all get a piece of the fame-pie that he acquired by himself. The geographical extravagance of "every head between the two wide world halves" -- that is, every eligible person on earth -- is presumably part of a totalizing claim about the outcome of the Ten Kings' Battle, that the whole world was brought under Sudās's sway.

The loud sound of rivers in flood is the point of the comparison in c. One of the words for 'river', *nadī*, is folk etymologically (and probably etymologically; see EWA s.v.) connected with \sqrt{nad} 'roar', as in the explicit etymological statement in AV III.13.1 *yád adáh samprayatīr áhāv ánadatā haté | tásmād ā nadyò nāma stha* Wh "Since formerly (? *adás*) going forth together, ye resounded (*nad*) when the dragon was slain, therefore ye are streams (*nadī*) by name."

The signature verb *ní√śā* 'whet down' that we have met a number of times before (see comm. ad vs. 6) now implicitly takes Sudās as its subject, as a sort of climactic usage.

The PN *yudhyāmadhí* is obviously a speaking name, with some form of \sqrt{yudh} 'fight' embedded in it. See Old for various possibilities for its formation. It is tempting to see as its base a 1st pl. middle **yúdhya mahi* "let's fight," with the older expected 1st pl. ending **-madhi* before de-occlusion.

VII.19 Indra

VII.19.1: Rhetorically interesting to begin a hymn with a syntactically non-independent verse. This verse consists only of relative clauses (*pace* Ge; see below), which find their main clause referent in the first word of the 2nd verse (and indeed subsequent verses), namely *tvám*. Although 'you' clearly is the referent, the first relative clause of vs. 1 has a 3rd ps. verb (*cyāváyati*), though the second one switches to the 2nd person (*prayantāsi*). It might be possible to attribute the 3rd ps. in ab to attraction to the simile, but such a switch would be very rare.

The simile marker *ná* in pāda a is wrongly placed, after the 2nd member of a three-word simile, not the first (*tigmásṛṅgo vṛṣabhó ná bhīmáḥ*). Ordinarily, given such a structure, the first word would be interpreted as the common term and therefore not a part of the simile proper ("sharp-horned like a fearsome bull"), but Indra doesn't have horns, which should certainly belong to the bull. The wrong position may result from the fact that X *ná bhīmá-*, where X = an animal, appears to be a formulaic structure, esp. *mṛgá- ná bhīmá-* (I.154.2, 190.3, II.33.11, etc.; also *simhá- ná bhīmá-* IV.16.14, IX.97.28 and others). This smaller fixed phrase would then be fitted into a simile containing another term.

Ge takes pāda d as a main clause, following the Pp., which analyses *prayantāsi* as containing unaccented *asi*. But this requires him to invent a verb for the relative clause of c ("raubst") for which there is no support – and no need. Already Old suggested accenting *ási* contrary to the Pp.

Old (see also Tichy) also notes the nice example of case disharmony, where both gen. *gáyasya* and acc. *védaḥ* are objects of the agent noun *prayantā*. As has often been

noted, suffix-accented *-tar*-stems generally have genitive complements, as opposed to root-accented ones, which generally take accusatives. But enough exceptions exist to allow *prayantā* to take both. That *gáyasya* is parallel to *védaḥ* and not to *ádāśuṣaḥ* is shown by passages like IX.23.3 ... *ádāśuṣo gáyam* and VIII.81.7 *ádāśūṣtarasya védaḥ*. It is possible, but not necessary, that *prayantāsi* is a periphrastic future.

I have no explanation for the comparative *súṣvítara-* ‘better soma-presser’, beyond the occasional use of the comparative for emphasis or intensification, without comparandum.

VII.19.2: Pāda b is repeated in IV.38.7, there of Dadhikrā the racehorse. (This repetition is not noted in Bl RR.) Re at IV.38.7 and Ge here (but not there) take *súśrūṣamānaḥ* as meaning something like “putting oneself at the disposal (of someone else, here Kutsa).” I assume that they are thinking of the enlarged root $\sqrt{\text{śruṣ}}$ ‘be obedient’, but the two meanings seem quite distinct to me – I can’t see Indra being obedient to any man – and formally our participle is a well-formed desiderative to $\sqrt{\text{śru}}$. In both places I take it as meaning “desiring to be heard/famed”; here Indra also helps out Kutsa, but at least part of his aim is to ensure his own fame. In IV.38.7 there is no subsidiary beneficiary, and so the focus on the subject and his fame is ever clearer. Heenen is similarly puzzled by Ge (238 n. 263) but tr. “(toi qui) en personne as la volonté d’écouter au combat,” attributing an active sense to the middle participle.

The word *dāsam* beginning c plays off both *(á)dāśuṣo* in 1c and *sudāsam* in 3b.

VII.19.3: Trasadasyu and the Pūrus also appear in IV.38 (vss. 1, 3), which contains the pāda in common with our 2b.

In the publ. tr. the cmpd *vītá-havya-* is rendered ‘whose oblation is worthy pursuing’, but this “potential” meaning is strictly suited rather to *vītí-hotra-* (on which see II.38.1). I would now emend to “whose oblation is pursued”.

VII.19.4: This verse puts into analytic (that is, syntactically independent) form some expressions met as compounds in the previous verse. Most obvious is *(bhūrīṇi) vṛtrā ... haṃsi*, which realizes *vṛtrahátyeṣu* in 3d. (Notice that both refer to plural events, handling their grammatical plurality in different ways.) A real *dāsyu-* is destroyed in 4cd, plucked from the name Trasadasyu in 3c. In a slightly different relationship, *devāvītau* ‘in pursuit of the gods’ here contains a form of the root $\sqrt{\text{vī}}$ ‘pursue’ found as 1st compound member in *vītahavyam* ‘whose oblation is worth pursuing’ in 3a. And within this verse *nṛbhiḥ* doubles the first member of the next word, *nṛmano*.

VII.19.5: This verse presents some interlocking syntactic and lexical problems. Unlike Ge, I take pādas b and c together. Splitting them requires him to supply a verb for b (“brachst”) again lacking support or necessity. Presumably again he is following the Pp, which analyzes *śatatamāviveṣīḥ* as containing unaccented *aviveṣīḥ*. I prefer to accent it and thus allow it to be the verb of the *yád* clause beginning in b.

In either case *śatatamā* is a problem. Everyone wants it to be the 100th thing (probably *pūr-* ‘fortification’) that Indra destroys (after the 99 in b). Gr suggests reading *śatatamām*, which would provide the desired feminine accusative (agreeing with *pūr-*), but among other things would damage the meter (since, s.v. *viṣ*, he is still reading an

augmented *aviveṣṭh*). Ge suggests that it [what is unspecified, presumably the sandhi agglomeration] is to be dissolved (“aufzulösen”) into masc. *śatatamām*, and the 100th thing that Indra destroys is Śambara himself. He makes no mention of meter, though this dissolution would cause the same metrical problem. Old suggests supplying neut. pl. *cyautnāni* (without translating), but I don’t see how an ordinal “hundredth” can qualify all hundred items in the plural. There is a much simpler solution: to take *śatatamā* as a feminine instrumental with the old ending *-ā*. Although Old claims (in arguing against Gr) that the fem. stem should be *śatatamī-*, this is simply wrong. See AiG II.2 §457, which establishes *-ā* as the rule and *-ī* as the rare exception. Cf. for *-tama*-stems *purutāmā-* of Uṣas and *mātītāmā-*, and for ordinals the well-attested feminine *prathamā-*. Or, if Ge is correct that the reference is to Śambara himself, *śatatamā* can be a masculine instr. sg. In either case the text can stand as it is, with no metrical or sandhi problems, and the syntax can be rescued.

Ge takes *nivēśane* in c as ‘at evening’. The word generally means ‘causing to settle down’ (the usual association of *-ana*-nominals with the transitive-causative *āya*-formations) or, as a noun, ‘settling down’, and is sometimes associated with Savitar’s bringing the world to rest in the evening (IV.53.6, I.35.1, VI.71.2), an association that must have led to Ge’s tr. But the word never otherwise means ‘evening’. I read it with its full lexical value, but with a sinister edge. “Bringing them to rest” is a euphemism like *āsvāpayah* ‘you put to sleep’ in 4d. Old mentions the “going to rest” possibility, but opts instead for “in the dwelling place (of the enemy).” Again, there seems to me no reason for this attenuation of the meaning.

The root *√viṣ* means ‘work, work over’, or here ‘work to the end’, again used in a slightly euphemistic sense. Note the phonetic echo between *nivēśane* and *(a)viveṣṭr*.

The d pāda is a perfect chiasmus, even to the positioning of a conjunction between verb and object: *āhañ ca vṛtrām nāmucim utāhan*. The mixture of *ca* and *utā* is curious. Klein (DGRV I.186–87) is not sure how to analyze it; he suggests either that it’s a “both ... and” type of construction, with each conjunction appearing 2nd in its phrase (or so I interpr. his lapidary disc.), or that “*ca* is a sentential conjunction adjoining d to the rest of the stanza, and *utā* conjoins the clauses of d.” I prefer the former.

VII.19.6: *sānā* is generally taken (Gr, Ge) as a neut. pl. adj. ‘old’ agreeing with *bhójanāni*, and this is certainly possible. I find the sentiment somewhat odd, however: to announce to Indra that the delights he has given to his client are “old” seems slighting. I prefer to interpret the word as the 2nd sg. act. impv. to *√san* ‘win’; exactly this form occurs several times in initial position elsewhere. What gives me pause, however, is I.178.4, which contains very parallel phraseology, *sānā tã te indra nāvya āguḥ*, and where I do interpret *sānā* as ‘old’. The difference there is that the poet contrasts the old deeds of Indra with the new ones (*nāvya*) that have come and so avoids insulting the god. In any case, either the ‘old’ or the ‘win’ interpretation is possible here, though I have a preference for the latter.

The oblation of Sudās’s that was worth pursuing (*vītāhavyam*) in vs. 3 has now been given by him (*rātāhavyāya*) here, tracking the progress of the sacrifice to the point of mutual benefit of man and god.

The phrase *dāśúṣe sudāse* “for the pious Sudās” displays syllabic metathesis, *dā-śū / su-dā*, with neutralizing play on all three sibilants. The poet seems to like this

collocation: see comment above on vs. 2 for connections across three verses and below on VII.20.2.

VII.19.7: My construction of the first hemistich differs from Ge's, both with regard to the syntactic role of *te* and the sense of *pářiṣṭau* and leads to a very different interpretation of the meaning. The latter word, literally 'encirclement', is generally taken as always negative, a tight spot or constriction (Ge's "in dieser Klemme"), but I find this interpretation hard to reconcile with the hic-et-nunc deictic *asyām*, since the poet has given no indication that he is currently in distress. (Ge's note suggests that this is a memory of the situation in VII.18, the Ten Kings battle, but this seems to me an ill-supported attempt to account for the deictic.) I therefore think the *pářiṣṭi-* here is positive – Indra's encirclement (that is, protection) of us now – and *te* is to be construed with *pářiṣṭau*: "in this enclosure (that is, protection) of yours." Weak support for this may be provided by the first pāda of the next verse, 8a, where ... *te ... abhíṣṭau*# matches ... *te ... pářiṣṭau*# here, with rhyming forms and identical morphology – and a parallel positive sense: "in your charge." There is also a parallel in the next hymn, in roughly the same part of the hymn, with *te asyām* as here and a string of locatives: VII.20.8 ... *te asyām sumataú ... várūthe ... nípītau* "in this benevolence of yours, in your defense, in your protection for men." In our passage Ge (followed by Scar 207) instead takes *te* as the subject of the infinitive *parādaí*, in order to make this work he has recast the sentence from one with 1st person subject (*mā ... bhūma* "may we not be...") to one with 2nd ps. subject: "Nicht sollst du uns ... dem Bösen preisgeben." Scar's tr. maintains the syntactic structure of the original, but otherwise follows Ge's interpretation. Better is Keydana's (*Infinitive im Rgveda* 156, 203) interpretation of *parādaí* as a passive infinitive, as I take it – though he still takes *te* as the ultimate agent of the handing over. Again, I don't see that the poet has expressed any fear that Indra will betray them; rather, he hopes that the protection Indra provides them will keep any such ill-fortune from befalling them, a hope that is repeated in the next pāda.

The poet's penchant for case disharmony (see 1cd above) recurs in pāda d, where I read *priyāsaḥ* both with gen. *táva* and with loc. *sūriṣu*.

VII.19.9: I take pāda c with ab, since all three have 3rd ps. subjects referring to Indra's worshipers and clients, with pāda c a rel. cl. beginning with *yé*. Ge, by contrast, connects c with d, although d now refers to the same people in the 1st ps. (*asmān vṛṇīṣva* "choose us"). He does not, however, take *asmān* as coreferential with the *yé* of c, but rather apparently interprets the relationship between the clauses as a kind of improper relativization: "for the same alliance (*yújyāya tásmāi*) as (those) who (*yé*)..." This has the advantage of providing some reason for the final *tásmāi*, which I find hard to account for, though I find his way of linking the clauses too tricky. Scar takes the first pāda as a temporal subordinate clause ("As soon as they are in your charge, the men..."). This is worth considering, although I am dubious about the subordinating quality of *sadyás cid*. In the end, although I am not entirely certain of my own way of putting together the various elements in this verse, I have not been convinced by those of other tr. either.

Note the poet's playful variation on 8a ... *te maghavann abhíṣṭau* with ... *té maghavann abhíṣṭau*, where the simple addition of an accent turns the 2nd ps. sg. into a 3rd ps. pl.

nāraḥ śamsanti recalls the epithet *nārāśāmsa*, and then participates in an interweaving of two words for ritual speech: *śamsanti ukthaśāsa ukthā*.

The lexeme *ví√dās* occurs only here, as far as I know. Like the idiom *ā√yaj* ‘attract by sacrifice’, it combines a directional preverb with a root of ritual activity, producing a portmanteau “(send) away by performing ritual service’. So Old ‘hinweghuldigen’, which he paraphrases as “honor the god such that the Pāṇis become distant.”

On the syntagm *yújyāya √vṛ* see comm. ad IX.88.1.

VII.19.10: We might have expected an unaccented gen. pl. **narām* in the voc. phrase with *nṛtama*, but don’t get it. There are no unaccented occurrences of this genitive. It would be possible instead to read *narām* with *etē stómāḥ* (“these praises of men”), but *nṛtama*- + gen. pl. of *nṛ-* is a fixed phrase, though usually with *nṛṇām* (I.77.4, III.51.4, IV.25.4, etc.). I am now inclined to read *narām* with both *stómā(ḥ)* and *nṛtama*. It is positioned between them, adjacent to both. The publ. tr. could be modified to “These praises of men are for you, o most manly of men.” The first gen. is subjective. Note the co-occurrence of *narām*, the older gen. pl. to *nṛ-*, and the newer one *nṛṇām* in this verse.

Ge takes b as an independent nominal clause, while I consider it a sort of definitional relative clause manqué, that is, lacking the relative pronoun *yé* which would find its referent in the initial *tēsām* of c.

Although d looks to contain a simple conjoined NP, each of whose members consists of two members, *sákhā súraḥ* and *avitā nṛṇām*, each with a *ca* between the two members (so Ge, JSK I.195), I prefer to take *súraḥ* as the principal predication of Indra, with the other two terms, *sákhā* and *avitā nṛṇām*, secondarily predicated of Indra as *súra*-. Although this introduces a minor complication in word order, the fact that *súra*- is overwhelmingly a noun and is used independently of Indra in the very next pāda (11a) persuades me that this analysis is correct, especially since both “comrade” and “helper of men” are terms that explicitly encode Indra’s relationship to men, while “champion” is of a different order. The distribution of *ca*’s makes no problems for this analysis.

VII.19.11: The finals of pādas a and c echo each other: ... *ūtī* # ... *úpa stīn* #

I think it quite likely that *mimiḥy* out of sandhi should be accented (*mimihī*) contra the Pp., given the balanced clausal-type constructions before and after (*úpa no vājān ... úpa stīn*), a possibility Old raises but considers uncertain.

VII.20 Indra

This hymn shows some stylistic tics, esp. a penchant for oddly placed particles (vss. 2, 4, 5) and for final enclitics (1d, 7d, 8b, 9a, 9d, as well as the refrain 10d).

VII.20.1: A grammatical figure in the pāda-initial reduplicated *i*-stems, b *cákriḥ*, c *jágmiḥ*, both functioning as verbs (*cákriḥ* takes acc. direct object *āpaḥ*; *jágmiḥ* an acc. goal *nṛśadanam*). For this type see Grestenberger 2013 (JAOS 133).

āpo nāryaḥ is reminiscent of *āpāmsi ... nāryāni* in the next hymn (VII.21.4), though there the words form a phrase and here they are in two different cases and numbers.

VII.20.2: Continuing the focus on nominal forms with verbal rection, the poet picks up the pāda-initial agent noun *trātā* of 1d and deploys three more pāda-initial nominative *tar*-stems in 2a, c, d: *hāntā*, *kārtā*, and *dātā*, each with an acc. object (*vr̥trām*, *ulokām*, and *vāsu* respectively). Although pāda b lacks a subject *tar*-stem, it does have one as object: *jaritāram*. The stem that began it all, *trātā* in 1d, contrasts with those in vs. 2 by being suffix-accented, and it should therefore, according to general practice, have a genitive complement. I suggest that it's not an accident that its object is the enclitic *naḥ*, which could be accusative (and thus parallel with the objects in vs. 2) or genitive (and thus conform to the usual rule). Recall this poet's tricky case syntax with the *tar*-stem *prayantā* in VII.19.1.

The occurrence of parallel datives *sudāse* (c) and *dāsūṣe* (d) recall their collocation in VII.19.6; see comments there.

The phrase *āha vai* (*āha vā* in sandhi) interrupting the VP is very peculiar. It is easier to account for the *vai* than the *āha*: the particle *vai*, rather rare in the RV though very common in Vedic prose, is often found directly before the particle *u*. In this hymn it occurs twice (also 4d), in both cases before *u*, though not the particle *u*. Here before *ulokām*, which by most accounts is a haplology of **urú* [**ulú*] *lokām*, and in 4d before the perfect *uvoca*. I have no explanation for *āha*, whose function is also opaque to me in general. Although *āha* often takes Wackernagel (or modified Wackernagel) position, it is more flexibly positioned than most RVic particles, so showing up in the middle of the pāda as here is not as anomalous as it might be. My exclamatory tr. is meant to signal the interruptive quality of the phrase, but makes no claims as to its semantic accuracy. I suspect that the poet is indulging in phonological play (one faint possibility: *āha vā u* mimics the opening of the next pāda, *dātā vāsu*) or morphological or lexical manipulation, but it's too deep for me.

VII.20.3: *khaja-* lacks an etymology (see EWA s.v. *khaja-kīt-*), but embedded in an epithet of Indra in martial contexts like this, 'tumult' serves as well as anything else.

The particle *īm* here lacks its usual accusative function (see Jamison 2002) and does not take its usual Wackernagel position; it therefore reminds us a bit of the similarly irrational *āha vai* of the preceding verse. However, *īm* does serve to forestall a hiatus between *janúṣā* and *āṣalḥaḥ* and its position immediately after the former can be taken to signal that *janúṣā āṣalḥaḥ* are to be construed together. For another example of *janúṣem* see the next hymn (VII.21.1).

Pāda c is very similar to X.29.8 *vy ānaḍ indraḥ pṛtanāḥ svóḍā(h)*, though the verbs, despite their surface similarity (*āse* [*āsa* in sandhi], *ānaḥ*), belong to different roots: *√as* and (*n*)*aś* respectively. Bloomfield (RReps) is adamant that the passages must mean the same thing: *vy āse* 'threw himself through' → 'pervaded', exactly parallel to *vy ānaḥ* 'pervaded'. But although the two passages are obviously in conversation with each other – and I also agree with Bloomfield that *pṛtanā-* should have the same sense in both (though not, per Bl, 'battle'), this does not mean, in my view, that they have to be identical – the sly play on the verbal roots shows that. I take *ví√as* here as in V.55.6 *vísṽ it spṛdho maruto vy āsyatha* "O Maruts, you disperse all rival contenders."

Note the sibilant play beginning with *samādvā* and continuing through the end of the hemistich.

VII.20.4: Again the poet plays with case disharmony, construing both inst. *ándhasā* and loc. *mádeṣu* with *uvoca*.

Note again the apparently functionless *vaí* and see disc. above ad vs. 2.

VII.20.5: Once again a particle is positioned oddly: *ádha* in the middle of the relative clause (versus properly positioned *ádhā* in 3d). Klein (II.130) suggests the *ádha* here “is either a subclausal conjunction [but conjoining what? sj] or weakly conjoins the second distich with the first,” but neither explanation accounts for the mid-pāda position.

VII.20.6: On *bhreṣate* as an *s*-aor. subj. to $\sqrt{bhrī}$, see KH (Fs. Schubring = Aufs. 29–34, Narten Sig. Aor. 184). The only other verb form attested to this root is *bhrīṇānti* in II.28.7. Note the phonetic echo *bhreṣate ... reṣat*.

The final pāda has two linked uncertainties: the identity of the verb and the case form of *rāyá*. Though the Pp. reads dat. *rāyé*, gen.-abl. *rāyāḥ* is equally possible. The choice depends in great part on the analysis of the verb *kṣáyāt*: whether it belongs to $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ or $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘rule’. If the former, it would be a subjunctive; if the latter, an injunctive. The immediate context favors a subjunctive (*dádhate* in the rel. clause attached to this main clause, plus *bhreṣate* [on this form as an *s*-aor. subj. to $\sqrt{bhrī}$, see EWA s.v. *bhrī*, with ref. to Hoffmann], *reṣat* probably, and *āvívāsāt* in ab), but this does not necessarily decide for an affiliation to ‘dwell’, because there are no overt subjunctives to the Class I present of ‘rule over’ (no **kṣáyāt*) and the injunctive might function modally here. Parallel passages cut both ways. On the one hand, ‘rule’ regularly takes the gen. of ‘wealth’: cf. I.51.14 (of Indra) *rāyāḥ kṣayati*, VII.93.2 *kṣáyantau rāyāḥ* (Indra and Agni), X.106.7 *kṣayad rayīṇām* (though in an otherwise incomprehensible verse); on the other, a form of ‘dwell’ appears in a parallel passage with the material from the end of the pāda: VI.3.1 ... *sá kṣesad ṛtapā ṛtejāḥ*. Old, having considered both possibilities, opts (slightly) for the latter; Ge’s tr. also assumes an affiliation with ‘dwell’ and a dat. *rāyé*: “der wird im Frieden lassen, um zu Reichtum (zu gelangen).” The publ. tr. instead chooses ‘rule over’ and gen. *rāyāḥ*, though I recognize that both possibilities were probably in the poet’s mind. One slender support for my choice may be the parallel phrase in 9d ... *vásva ā śakaḥ*... “you hold power over goods,” with gen. *vásvaḥ* reprising the gen. *rāyāḥ* that opens 9c.

VII.20.7: By my interpr. (and Ge’s) *śíkṣan* is a predicated pres. participle, parallel to the subjunctive *áyat* in the 2nd clause; it seems to have adopted the modal sense of this parallel finite verb.

Note the play between the two initial words of pādas a and b: *yád* and *áyad* (*áyaj* in sandhi), where the second is actually a subjunctive to the root present of \sqrt{i} ‘go’.

The question in c is not overtly marked, but I follow both Old and Ge in taking it as such.

VII.20.8: *ághnataḥ* is a gen. sg. negated act. pres. part. modifying *te* ‘of you’ in the preceding pāda; the heavy modal tr. is a concession to English.

VII.20.9: *stāmú-* is a hapax and there is no agreed upon etymology or interpretation. Gr takes it as belonging to \sqrt{stan} ‘thunder’ and meaning something like ‘sighing’ (with no

explanation of the semantic distance), and he is followed implicitly by Oberlies (II.210). KEWA also registers this idea, but in EWA it seems to have been abandoned, without anything to replace it. Ge, on the other hand, connects it to the root $\sqrt{stā}$ ‘steal’, a suggestion I find very appealing. However, his further interpretation does not seem compelling: “und verstohlen hat (der Sänger) geklagt.” The structure of the hemistich, with two clauses joined by *utá*, each with a verb of noisemaking, whose subject in the first clause is an animal, suggests that an animal should be the subject of the second as well. I therefore suggest that *stāmú-* means ‘thieving’ and it is a well-known characteristic of some animal or other. I suggest ‘monkey’: monkeys are of course well known for thievery and Vṛṣākapi, Indra’s monkey pal in X.86, steals “the goodies of the Arya” (X.86.1). Monkeys are also known for their sharp cries. The presence of *vṛṣā* (recalling Vṛṣākapi) in pāda a may support this idea, but of course all of this is very tentative, and in particular I have no explanation for why configuring his praise as a screeching monkey would please Indra (unless, again, to remind him of his friend Vṛṣākapi). An alternative animal possibility is the magpie, which has a reputation at least in the West as a thief (cf. Rossini’s opera “The Thieving Magpie” [La gazza ladra]), although the internet tells me that this reputation is undeserved. There are species of magpies in northern India and they do make sharp cries.

While it is impossible to be certain about the meaning and etymology of the hapax, as often with hapaxes and other rare words it is possible to suggest reasons why it appears in just this passage. Its position in its pāda is identical to that of *stómo* in the preceding pāda, and it echoes that word phonologically. In fact, the phonological play is quite subtle: underlyingly *stoma* = *s t a u m a*, and *stāmu* = *s t a a m u*, with the vowels around the *m* simply reversed.

The old idea that *stāmú-* is cognate to Grk. *στωμυλός* ‘talkative, loquacious’ was revived with considerable discussion by Ch. de Lamberterie (*Les adjectifs grecs en -υς*, 1990: 704–14 [esp. 704–5]) and recently considered anew and more or less dismissed as impossible to demonstrate by Brent Vine (“Greek *στωμυλός* ‘chatty’,” *Indo-European Linguistics* 7 [2019]). Although the coincidence of form and possible semantics is suggestive, I think it unlikely that an entirely isolated *stāmú-* (no root, no related nominal forms) would have been preserved in this sense from hoary antiquity, and although it might have inhabited a lower register and therefore generally not surface in “high” Vedic, I know of no possible MIA correspondents. Furthermore, the anagrammatic word play noted above makes it more likely that the word is semi-artificial, though based on attested material -- hence my favoring of the $\sqrt{stā}$ ‘steal’ connection.

The return of the singer (*jaritár-*) in the last two verses of this hymn (9c, 10c) forms a faint ring with his appearance in 2b.

VII.21 Indra

VII.21.1: Some recycling and recombination from the last hymn: *janúṣem uvoca* combines *janúṣem* (20.3b) and *uvoca* (20.4d), each in its metrical position, and *ándhaso mádeṣu* echoes *ándhasā mádeṣu* of 20.4d.

devám appears to be one of the few adjectival forms of the stem, modifying neut. *ándhaḥ*. Although I would like to reduce the number of these supposed adjectival forms to zero, it is difficult to see what else to do with it here.

VII.21.2: In the *-āya*-book (Jamison 1983: 50), I take *vipāyanti* as intransitive, in keeping with its vocalism, supplying a form of \sqrt{sad} , which is extraordinarily common with *barhís*:- “(Sitting on) the barhis, they become inspired.” However, the publ. tr. takes *vipāyanti* as transitive, despite the vocalism, both to avoid supplying extraneous matter and because I did not think the pressing stones that are the verb’s unexpressed subj. should sit on the barhis. I failed to note that in V.31.12, adduced by Ge, the pressing stone “will be brought down to the vedi” (*āva védīm bhriyāte*). Since the vedi is where the barhis is strewn, the passage seems to put the stone in a position actually to “sit on the barhis.” See also VIII.27.1 *agnír ukthé puróhito grāvāṇo barhír adhvaré* “Agni has been set in front while the solemn speech (is being recited), as have the pressing stones and the ritual grass while the ceremony (is going forth),” which has the stones and the barhis set out together, and III.42.2, which describes soma as *barhiṣṭhām grāvabhiḥ sutām* “stationed on the ritual grass, pressed by stones.” The transitive interpr. found in the publ. tr. has the merit of not requiring an extra verb to be supplied, but what ritual event it might depict is unclear. I suppose that the vigorous activity that pressing required would make the material on which the pressing apparatus was placed (presumably the barhis) tremble. But I now tentatively favor my old 1983 intransitive interpr., which takes better account of the vocalism. Moreover, since what is most often emphasized about the pressing stones is the noise they make, “become inspired” (like *vípras* ‘inspired poets’) would express this well-known characteristic of theirs. Note in the next hymn, VII.22.4ab, where the call of the pressing stone (*hávam ... ádreḥ*) is parallel to the thought of the inspired poet (*víprasya ... manīṣām*). Indeed in that passage the *vípra* might refer to the pressing stone itself. On the vedi as the place where the soma pressing apparatus is placed, see Oberlies, *Der Rigveda und seine Religion*, 254.

Ge takes *grbhād ā* as “bis zur Handhabung,” but in that use of the ablative with *ā* (“all the way to”) the noun follows the *ā* (see Gr s.v. *ā*). Better to interpret it as a standard ablative expressing the place/person from which the pressing stones are being brought to the ritual ground for use (so, e.g., Scar 591). Old argues persuasively that *grbhā-* is an agent noun. For \sqrt{grabh} with the pressing stones, see *grāva-grābhā-* (I.162.5), the title of a functionary, “Handler of the Pressing Stones.”

dūrāüpabdaḥ must be nominative plural, so, although the stem is universally (Gr, EWA, AiG II.2.75) given as thematic, this form (versus *upabdaīḥ* VII.104.17) must belong to a root noun. Gr suggests instead reading *-upabdās*, an emendation Old rejects as unnecessary without commenting on the stem.

VII.21.4: Ge supplies a second, accusative, form of *āyudha-* as object of *viveṣa* and supplies “enemies” as the referent of *eṣām* ‘of them’, while making the accusative phrase in b the object of *vidvān* ‘knowing’: “Der Fürchtbare hat mit den Waffen ihre (Waffen) abgetan, der aller mannhaften Werke kundig ist.” But there are several reasons to reject this interpretation in addition to the necessity of supplying a significant word. The root $\sqrt{viṣ}$ ‘labor, bring to fulfillment’ does not mean ‘abtun’ (dismiss, brush aside). Moreover it regularly takes *āpas-* ‘work’, a form of which appears in pāda b, as object; see esp. IV.19.10 *āpāmsi ... nāryāviveṣīḥ*. By contrast, the participle *vidvān* is usually used absolutely, without object. As for the referent of *eṣām* it would of course possible to supply “enemies,” although they are not mentioned previously in the hymn: the only

preceding masc. or neut. plurals are the pressing stones (subject of the whole of vs. 2), the “finely made (fortifications)” of 3d, and, in a simile, the charioteers in 3c. Because the pressing stones are extravagantly celebrated in vs. 2 and called Indra’s “companions,” I think it likely that they are the referents here: the soma they produce is their weapon, and this soma fuels Indra’s labors. This is also Caland-Henry’s solution (*L’Agniṣṭoma*, p. 285 and n. 3).

I supply “fortifications” (*púraḥ*) from c as the obj. of *jaghāna* in d. It is possible that we are meant to think instead (or in addition) of the archetypal obj. of this verb, the serpent Vṛtra, who is concealed in the instr. (*m*)*ahi(nā)* directly before the verb. Cf. *áhinā* in 3b.

The first word of the verse, *bhīmáḥ*, picks up the last word of vs. 3, *bhīṣā*.

VII.21.5: A verse with several rare words. The neut. pl. *vāndanā* in b is unclear; the neut. sg. *vāndanam* in VII.50.2 appears to be some medical condition, and in AV VII.115.2 it refers to some sort of negatively viewed plant (a parasitic plant, acdg. to Gr; see also EWA s.v.), neither of which is helpful here. I think it better to start with the root \sqrt{vand} ‘praise, extol’ and give it a negative twist appropriate to the context, hence my ‘sycophant’: praise gone wrong. A similar negative interpretation is needed for the usually positive term *vedyā-* in the same phrase. Why *vāndanā* is neuter and not masculine isn’t clear to me; perhaps a better tr. would be “sycophancy, sycophantic (words).” With sorcerers and flatterers in this first hemistich we then have two different ways in which *ṛtá* can be undermined within our own community, while the *arí-* ‘stranger’ whose ways are contrary to ours and the phallus-worshippers in the second hemistich represent external threats to *ṛtá*.

In c *vīṣuṇa-* ordinarily means ‘variable, various’, which here shades into ‘variant’ and, with the negative reading prevailing in this verse, ‘contrary’.

The lexeme *ápi* \sqrt{gam} occurs in the RV only here, but *ápi* \sqrt{gam} can have a sexual sense (“inire feminam” as Gr chastely phrases it), and that image would be appropriate here, given the grammatical subject.

VII.21.6: I take the injunc. *bhūḥ* in the first pāda as imperatival, although Ge’s preterital value is also possible.

The particle *ádha* is once again oddly positioned; cf. VII.20.5. In this case, however, it seems a mistake for (or a play on?) *ádhi*, which regularly appears with locatives (esp. cosmological locatives) in just this metrical position – including a number of times with the phonological variant of the endingless loc. *jmán* here, namely the *i*-loc. *kṣámi*: ... *ádhi kṣám*# (5x, e.g., I.25.18). See also nearby pāda-initial *ádhi kṣámi* in VII.27.3b.

Pāda b contains one of the standardly cited examples of neut. pl. subject with singular verb: ... *vīvyak* ... *rājāmsi*.

The verb in d, *vīvidat*, is morphologically slightly problematic. Following Gr I interpret it as a subjunctive to the act. pf. of \sqrt{vid} ‘find’, but we ought then to have full-gr. root syllable **vīvedat*. Kü (493) takes it as an injunctive “in komprehensivem Gebrauch,” but the perfect injunctive ought not to be thematic, but rather **vīvet* (like *vīvyak* in b). In the end I take it as a wrongly formed subjunctive.

Ge. construes the enclitic *te* with *ántam*: “... dein Ende finden,” but the enclitic seems wrongly positioned for this interpretation (insofar as we understand the positioning of adnominal enclitics – but see *te asuryāya* in 7a), and at least one parallel passage suggests that it is the end of his *śávas-* that is at issue: I.100.15 *ná ... śávaso ántam āpuḥ*.

VII.21.7: Note the juxtaposition of the gods (*devāḥ*) and Indra’s “lordship” (*asuryāya*).

For the meaning of the idiom *ánu √ mā*, see Kü (279). It parallels the concessive sense of *ánu √ dā* ‘concede’ and *ánu √ dhā* ‘id.’

VII.21.8–9: Final *varūtā* of 8d is matched by final *tarutra* in 9b.

VII.21.8: The “man like you” (*tvāvataḥ*) is the human patron because he, too, distributes largesse. So also Ge (n. 8d).

VII.21.9: *vanvántu* ‘let them combat’ and *vanúṣām* ‘rapacious ones’ are presumably derived from the originally separate roots *van* ‘win, vanquish’ and *vaní* ‘love, desire’, but since these roots have become synchronically entangled, the pair presents itself like an etymological figure, like I.132.1=VIII.40.7 *vanuyāma vanuṣyātaḥ* “may we win against those who seek to win.”

VII.21.10: This verse is identical to the final verse of the last hymn (VII.20.10), but in this case *maghāvāno junānti* “the bounteous ones incite (us)” is the positive equivalent of the negative *ná ... jūjuvur naḥ* “They do not incite us” in vs. 5, where the internal enemies served as subject.

VII.22 Indra

VII.22.2: I tr. *ásti* as an existential (“exists to be yoked”) rather than simply a copula with the predicated gerundive *yújyaḥ* (“is to be yoked”) because the 3rd sg. pres. of *√ as* is almost always an existential, given that the copula is almost always gapped. However, this may be too emphatic a tr., and it is the case that a surface copula is more likely to be found in subordinate clauses than main clauses. See Jamison 1990 (“Tense of the Predicated Past Participle ...,” IJ 33: 1–19) pp. 4–5. The gerundive + *asi* in 7c (*hávyaḥ ... asi* “you are to be invoked”) supports a simple copula interpr. here.

VII.22.3: The position of *ā* in the middle of the NP *vācam ... imām* is worth noting. Gr takes it as a preverb with *bódhā*, but *√ budh* does not otherwise occur with *ā*, and its position would not be normal for a preverb in tmesis. Note also that *bódhā* + SPEECH is found in the next vs. (*bódhā ... manīṣām*) and in the preceding hymn (VII.21.1d *bódhā ... stómam*), both times without preverb. I am tempted to assume that the poet inserted an unnecessary adverbial *ā* ‘here’ to produce a proper cadence. Pāda-final *vācam émām* is also found in IX.97.13, a verse attributed to Upamanyu Vāsiṣṭha, again without obvious function.

VII.22.4: The lexeme *ví√pā* in later Vedic is regularly found in specialized sense in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, and there it refers to the feat of separating the *surā* from the other

liquid (milk or soma). This sense and context are already found in the late RVic hymn X.131.4 in the med. part. *vipipānā*. See Old ad loc. (and NGGW 1893, 348–49). Though it has been suggested that this usage belongs to a separate root $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘go’ (see, e.g., EWA s.v. *PĀ*³), this seems unnecessary and somewhat perverse. Although the other $\sqrt{pā}$ passages (all medial) don’t have a Sautrāmaṇī association, I think they (or most of them) belong to this same lexeme, though Old is less certain. Here the stones are separating the soma juice from the stalk. In IV.16.3 the pressing stone is also the subj., and there is a pressing stone association in III.53.10. However, I.112.15 is more enigmatic. The subj. there is an ant (or someone called “ant”), *vamrā-*, and the vignette occupies half a pāda in a list of the Aśvins’ helpful deeds. For further on that passage, see disc. ad loc.

VII.22.5: A nice example of the potential iterative-repetitive value of a reduplicated present (*vivakmi*) reinforced by an adverb (*sādā* ‘always’).

VII.22.7: The first pāda could also be another obj. of *kṛṇomi* in b.

VII.22.8: Ge seems to take the participle *mānyamānasya* as a functional reflexive ‘think oneself to be’, with the added sense of self-conceit (“der du dir darauf etwas einbildest”). Although I would certainly not ascribe to Indra excessive modesty, in this context, where the poet is emphasizing the poets’ inability to capture all of Indra’s greatness, I think it unlikely that he is focusing on Indra’s egotism. I instead take the participle in a passive sense ‘be thought to be’, as sometimes elsewhere – *pace* Kulikov (339–40), who follows Gotō.

VII.22.8–9: The subject of the verb in 8b, *úd aśnuvanti*, is not specified. In my view the subject is postponed to 9ab: neither the older nor the younger poets are capable of expressing all of Indra’s powers in their formulations. Although this interpretation requires enjambment over a verse boundary, the main clause in 9c to which 9ab is supposedly subordinate has no appropriate referent for the relative pronoun (*asmé* works awkwardly at best), whereas 9ab neatly completes the thought of vs. 8.

VII.22.9: The publ. tr. interpr. *asmé* as a dat. But the parallel in IV.10.8 *śivā naḥ sakhyā sántu ... devēṣu yuṣmé*, where the *-mé* pronominal form is anchored as a loc. by *devēṣu*, makes a loc. reading more likely. Cf. also VI.18.5 *tán naḥ pratnáṁ sakhyám astu yuṣmé*. I would therefore change the tr. to “Let there be friendly fellowship of you among [or, with] us.”

VII.23 Indra

VII.23.1: I follow Ge in taking *upaśrotā* as a periphrastic future (contra Tichy, 189, 364).

VII.23.2: Note the echoes at the beginning and end of the first pāda: *áyāmi ... (dev)ájāmi(r)*. As often, the local patterns created by the use of hapaxes (as *devájāmi-* is in the RV) may help account for their deployment.

I don’t understand Ge’s rendering of pāda b, where he seems to take singular *ghóṣa(h)* of pāda a as the implied subject of plural *irajyánta*. I take the verb as a

contrastive passive/reflexive to the otherwise active stem, more or less following Old's interpretation, with *śurúdhah* as subject.

The root noun cmpd *vívāc*- echoes the redupl. pres. *vívakmi* in the preceding hymn, VII.22.5, though of course the *ví*'s have nothing to do with each, being the preverb and the reduplicating syllable respectively.

VII.23.4: 'Teams' (*niyút*-) often appear in context with Vāyu and his driving. Often, of course, they are his teams, but here and frequently elsewhere the 'teams' clearly stand for our poetic thoughts. Cf., e.g., I.135.2, VI.47.14, X.26.1. Therefore, it is unnecessary to supply, with Ge, a verb of guiding or yoking to make the teams into Vāyu's.

The instr. *dhībhiḥ* is taken in the publ. tr. as an instr. of accompaniment, but it could also be an instr. of price/exchange: "in exchange for (our) visionary thoughts."

VII.23.5: The syntactic frame of *dáyase* here is wrong: it ordinarily takes an accusative of the material distributed and a dative of recipient on the rare occasions on which the recipient is made explicit. A clear example is found in the preceding verse, 4d ... *dáyase ví vājān*, also nearby VII.21.7 *maghāni dayate*. The position of *hí* is also anomalous, though note that it exactly replicates the position of *ví* in the phrase in the preceding verse just cited and may well owe its position to this rhyme. Despite the syntactic aberrancy I think that *mártān* must represent the recipient, and the parallelism of the *dáyase* phrases in the adjacent verses has imposed the accusative recipient. (There is also an apparent double accusative, of goods and recipient, in one other passage: VI.37.4 *maghā ... dáyase ví sūrīn* "you apportion bounties to our patrons.")

VII.24 Indra

VII.24.1: The conjoined phrase *avitā vṛdhé ca* is not syntactically parallel in the strict sense, but both the agent noun *avitār*- and the purpose dative *vṛdhé* are properly construed with the 2nd sg. copula, subjunctive *ásah*. For the latter, cf., e.g., I.89.5 ... *yáthā ... ásad vṛdhé*, and for the cooccurrence of the two terms VI.33.4 ... *avitā vṛdhé bhūḥ*.

VII.24.2: The striking expression "your mind ... has been captured" presumably indicates that our successful preparations for the ritual have forcibly brought Indra to the soma sacrifice, with the implication that he is prevented from going to the sacrifices of others.

In pāda a *dvibárhāḥ* appears to be a masc. nom. sg., though I take it (as Ge does) as modifying neut. *mánaḥ*. Gr, by contrast, suggests that it belongs with masc. *sutáh sómaḥ* in the following pāda. Although Gr's solution might seem to be grammatically more satisfactory, on several occasions *dvibárhā(h)* does seem to modify a neut.: I.114.10, VII.8.6, possibly IV.5.3, and AIG III.288 allows neut. sg. to -*as*-stem adj. in -*āḥ*. In most instances, as here, the -*āḥ* is pāda-final, and so the long vowel isn't metrically guaranteed. See on this phenomenon also comm. ad II.31.5.

Gotō (1st Cl., 226 n. 483) interprets *bharate* in c not as a passive (with Gr, Ge, and me; also H-P Schmidt, Fs. Nyberg), but as a self-involved middle: "Lobpreisung, deren Milchstrom losgelassen ist, bringt [ihre Milch] dar," on the basis of his principle that medial Class I presents cannot be used passively. But in my opinion at least, this principle cannot be maintained in general, and certainly in this context, with passive

expressions dominating the first hemistich, a passive reading is most natural and the image of the praise hymn bringing its own milk borders on the comic.

With others I take pāda d as an extension of c, with *īyám ... manīṣā* an appositive to *suṁvṛktīḥ*. However, it would be possible to take it independently: “this inspired thought is constantly invoking Indra,” since, though fairly rare, predicated present participles do exist, and the short staccato clauses of the earlier part of the hymn may invite an independent reading here.

VII.24.3: Despite its position, *tavāsam* should not modify *āṅgūśām*, though that is grammatically possible, but *tvā*, since the adjective is a regular epithet of Indra.

VII.24.4: The intens. part. *vārīvr̥jat* can only be intransitive here, as there is nothing overt or latent that could serve as object (so also Ge “zu uns einbiegend,” Schaeffer [191] “immer wieder (zu uns) einbiegend” -- though with a different nuance from my tr.). However, forms to the root $\sqrt{vr̥j}$ ‘twist’ are otherwise always transitive, including the other ex. of the intens. part. (VI.58.2). I do not have an explanation.

VII.24.5: Uncompounded $\sqrt{vāh}$ to \sqrt{vah} ‘convey’ is attested only here, but it is common in compounds, e.g., *indra-vāh-* (4x). See Scar (473-80; for the grade of the root, esp. 479).

The two different simile markers in b (*iva ... nā*) may be highlighting two different aspects of the complex simile.

The genitive of goods with $\sqrt{īd}$ ‘invoke’ is somewhat aberrant. Although for this root Gr allows acc., dat., or gen. of the material desired, the only other genitive passage he cites is VIII.31.14, where the genitive is otherwise to be construed. However, there seems nothing else to do with *vāsūnām*, and the construction is reminiscent of nearby VII.32.5 ... *śrútkarṇa īyate vāsūnām* “he of listening ears is implored for goods.” Moreover, in X.20.2 *agnīm īle bhujām*, the gen. pl. *bhujām* is best interpr. this way (“I invoke Agni for delights”), contra the standard interpr. Alternatively we could assume the gapping of a noun like *sambhāraṇam* ‘assemblage’ as in the next hymn, VII.25.2d *sambhāraṇam vāsūnām*, but this seems less likely.

In d the *śrómatam* is presumably the ‘hearing’ that gods extend to men’s hymns. See VII.32.5 just cited for a similar sentiment.

The simile *divīva dyām* is opaque to me. Ge tr. “Wie Tag auf Tag,” but neither of these case forms of *div-/dyu-* is used temporally, but only spatially of ‘heaven’. Placing “heaven upon heaven” must refer to Indra’s cosmogonic deeds, but the connection with Indra’s activity in the frame is vague. Old believes that setting heaven on heaven means that Indra is fixing heaven in its proper place.

VII.24.6: For *pūrdhi* see EWA s.v. *PAR*¹⁷² ‘give’.

VII.25 Indra

VII.25.1: Although *mahá(h)* in the first pāda is a genitive, I have tr. it in the vocative phrase to avoid the awkward “(Be) here with the help of you, the great one, o strong Indra.”

Ge supplies ‘mind’ from *d* as the subject of the first pāda, but this seems unnecessary.

I take pāda *c* as a clause parallel to *b*, with the *yád* in *b* having domain over both, hence accented *pātāti* in *c*. By contrast, Ge (see also Old) takes it as a circumstantial clause dependent on *d* and supplies “(Wenn).” This is certainly possible, but my solution seems simpler.

The threatened possibility of Indra’s wandering mind may account for the capturing of his mind in the previous hymn, VII.24.2.

VII.25.4: The prohibitive clause *ná mardhīh* is of course grammatically incorrect. We expect *mā* with the injunctive in prohibitives, and in fact find it with this same stem several times: *mā no mardhīh* IV.20.10, *mā no mardhiṣtam* VII.73.4, 74.3, always with the 1st pl. enclitic following the *mā*. Non-prohibitive forms of \sqrt{mrdh} almost always occur with the negative *ná*, e.g., *ná mardhanti* (I.166.2, III.54.14); there are no positive attestations of this verb. Our passage must be an odd conflation of the prohibitive passages with enclitic *no* and the non-prohibitive passages with negative *ná*. Or alternatively, and in my opinion less likely, this is a non-prohibitive use of the injunctive: “you do/did not neglect.” That, however, is Hoffmann’s solution (Injunk., 101), taking it “als allgemeine Eigenschaft” of Indra’s: “du lässt nicht im Stich.” See his discussion, where he also points out that that **mā mardhīh* would be metrically bad.

VII.25.5: The opening of my tr. of this verse is meant to capture the odd order of noun and demonstrative, *kútsā eté* ...

With Ge I supply a form of \sqrt{rc} ‘chant’ as the main verb of the first hemistich, since this verb takes *sūśám* as object in a number of passages (e.g., I.9.10, X.96.2). Cf. nearby VII.23.6 *vásiṣṭhāso abhí arcanty arkaīh*, with the nom. pl. subj. of a group of contemporary singers and the verb \sqrt{rc} in the last vs. of the hymn (VII.25.6 is repeated from VII.24.6).

VII.26 Indra

VII.26.1: *nṛvāt* in *d* may, as frequently, be adverbial (“I manfully beget...”) or, as in the publ. tr., a neuter acc. sg. modifying *ukthám*.

VII.26.3: On *ní√mrj* see comm. ad II.38.3. The idiomatic sense ‘drag down forcefully’ (as in I.140.2, where Agni drags down trees like an elephant) allows the idiom to develop a sense not only of coercion (on the part of the agent) but of submission (on the part of the object), which is probably responsible for its use of a husband’s action towards his wives.

The use of *sárva-* rather than *vísva-* for ‘all’ may be a sign of lateness.

VII.26.4: The *utá* of pāda *a* is echoed by *ūtáyo* in *c*, which in turn is picked up by *ūtáye* in 5a.

Pāda *b* opens with *ékaḥ* ‘one, single’ and *c* ends with *pūrvīh* ‘many’, a contrast that appears to be highlighted.

The verb *saścata* in d is morphologically ambiguous. My publ. tr. follows Ge in rendering it as a modal (Ge “... sollen ... zufallen,” SWJ “will be companions”). Ge does not, however, comment on the form. Gr identifies it as a 3rd pl. to an athematic redupl. stem *saśc-*; since this stem precedes and is distinct from his “schwaches Perf. *saśc-*,” he must consider it a redupl. pres., as Whitney and Macdonell (VGS) do; Hoffmann (Injunc. 260) likewise calls our form an injunctive. A 3rd pl. mid. injunc. is certainly possible here, but if we wish to maintain the modal value (which, in fact, is not actually necessary), the injunctive is a small embarrassment, since modal value for the injunctive is fairly rare and generally limited to particular forms like *dhāś*. An alternative would be to take it as a 3rd singular subjunctive, possibly built to the perfect stem. The neut. pl. *bhadrāṇi* ... *priyāṇi* could serve as subject to the singular verb in the well-known inherited construction, though it is not overwhelmingly common in the RV. Of course, we would far prefer a primary *-te* ending for the middle subj., but I do not think secondary *-ta* is impossible. Alternatively, with an analysis as 3rd plural injunctive, the tr. could be changed to “... are companions to us.”

VII.27 Indra

VII.27.2: The relative clause in the first pāda has no overt referent in the main clause of b, but I supply an instr. *tēna* (see also Ge’s n.; his first alternative, to supply *tām*, is less attractive because *śikṣa-* doesn’t ordinarily take an acc.).

I interpret c as containing an implicit pun. The form *vīcetā(h)*, masc. nom. sg. of *vīcetas-*, derived from the root *√cit* ‘perceive’, means ‘discriminating’, hence my ‘tell things apart’, and is regularly applied to Indra (and other gods). But this leaves *dr̥ḷhā* with no verb to govern it. (It cannot be object of *āpa vṛdhi* in d, because the *hī* in c should trigger verbal accent.) I suggest that *vīcetā* (in sandhi) might also be secondarily construed as the agent noun of *vī√ci* ‘pile apart, pull apart’, governing *dr̥ḷhā*. Of course we would expect the Saṃhitā text to show coalescence of the final vowel of the agent noun and the initial vowel of the next pāda, but the recitational text would not reflect that. Although most agent nouns compounded with preverbs take suffix accent, compare *nīcetar-* (I.184.2) to a different root *√ci* ‘perceive’. If this suggestion seems too radical, it would also be possible to detach the preverb *vī* from *vīcetā(h)* and supply a form of *√vṛ* ‘cover’ (found in *āpa vṛdhi* in d), producing the familiar lexeme *vī√vṛ* ‘uncover’.

VII.27.3: The *yād* in b is rather deeper in the clause than I would like, following the prep. phrase as well as its nominative referent.

The *cid* in d is somewhat surprising: *cid* generally means ‘even’, but “even when praised” (*ūpastutaś cid*) is the opposite of what we should expect. Both Ge and I have avoided this problem by tr. *cid* almost as a subordinator or at least a circumstantial (Ge “zumal da ...,” SWJ “just when”). I now wonder if it expresses anticipatory polarity with *nū cid* in the following pāda (4a). Since *nū cid* means ‘never’, *cid* in 3d could mean ‘always’.

VII.27.4: Note the rhyming pāda-final ... (*sáh*)*ūtī*(a), ... *ūtī*(b).

In b Ge takes *dānāḥ* as gen. sg. of *dāmān-*, dependent on *vājān*: “... den Lohn der Gabe.” This is possible, though it would be more natural to have *vājān* as object of some

form of $\sqrt{dā}$ (esp. given the parallel he cites, VI.45.23 *dānām vājasya*, with *vājasya* dependent on *dānām*). I therefore prefer to take *dānāḥ* as the ablative singular of the *mān*-stem, with verbal rection, or, possibly (but somewhat farfetched) the nom. sg. of an otherwise unattested medial root aorist participle of $\sqrt{dā}$.

The combination of *abhí* with $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’ would occur only here in the RV (and the other saṃhitās); Ge renders it as ‘willkommen’. I suggest that it belongs rather to $\sqrt{vyā}$ ‘envelop’ and continues the theme of confinement found in 1d and 2d. The idea here is that the cow was once enwrapped or enclosed but freed by Indra to swell for us. It is possible that *abhí**vītā* is actually a pun on both those roots, and the tr. should reflect this ambiguity: “... gift-cow swells ..., (previously) enclosed, (now to be) pursued by his comrades,” vel sim. The presence of *vyāntaḥ* ‘pursuing’ in 5c supports this possibility.

VII.28 Indra

VII.28.1: The 2nd hemistich begins and ends with a form of *vísva*- ‘all’: #*vísve ... vísam(-inva)*##.

VII.28.2: Pāda a continues the theme of competitive invocations embodied in the lexeme *ví* $\sqrt{hvā}$ in 1c *vihāvanta* with *hávam ... ví*, even though the two words are not to be construed together.

“Your greatness” as an agent may seem odd, but consider “your majesty, your highness,” which pose no such problems in English.

I interpret *bráhma* in b as plural rather than singular because of pl. *bráhmā* in 1a and because there are multiple seers in 2b.

I take c with ab, contrary to Ge, who takes it with d. His is technically possible, but it seems to imply a backwards sequence of events: Indra is born only when he has taken the mace in his hand. Ge avoids the problem by radically bleaching the meaning of *janīsthāḥ* to make it an auxiliary or copula substitute (“wardst”) with *āsālhaḥ*: “so wardst du unbezwinglich.” This seems too high a price, esp. as *ajāñé* appears in the next verse, where Ge gives it its full lexical value (“er ist ... geboren”).

With *janīsthā āsālhaḥ* compare VII.20.3 *janúṣem āsālhaḥ*.

Although nominative forms of the pres. part. to \sqrt{as} ‘be’, particularly *sán*, are ordinarily concessive, I cannot see a concessive force here. Perhaps it is here almost as a place-holder, to match the *yád* forms in the same position in surrounding pādas (2b, c, 3b [whose *yán* in sandhi rhymes with *sán*]).

VII.28.3: I take ab as dependent on the previous verse, 2d, describing Indra’s cosmogonic deeds right after birth. For a novel, but not ultimately persuasive interpretation of this hemistich, see Old. Note that forms of $\sqrt{nī}$ open and close this half-verse: #*táva prañīti ... nínétha*##.

The position of *yád* in this dependent clause is somewhat disturbing. It occurs in Wackernagel’s position in the second pāda (b), but the a-pāda is part of this same clause and is intimately interwoven with the elements in pāda b: note esp. the acc. pl. *jóhuvānān*, which modifies *nīñ*, the third word in b. Although superficially late position of subordinating elements is not uncommon in the RV (see, e.g., *hí* in pāda c), what

precedes is generally syntactically unified, belonging to a single constituent (as in pāda c), but this is not true of the assorted material found in pāda a. I have no explanation.

For the oppositional pun in *sám ... ninétha*, standing for *ví (... ninétha)*, see the publ. intro. As I explained there, since *sám* and *ví* are preverbs of opposite meaning that frequently pattern together, the *sám* here evokes the *ví* of the lexeme *ví√hvā* earlier in the hymn (with *√hvā* present here in the intensive part. *jóhuvānān*) and the various expressions of Indra's pushing *apart* the two world-halves. E.g., nearby VII.23.3c *ví bādhiṣṭa syá ródasī mahitvā* (I.51.10, VI.29.5, etc.). These associations would prompt the audience to take "bring together" as standing for "push apart," in the standard mythology of Indra.

After the 2nd ps. description of Indra's mythological activity in 2d–3ab, the second half of vs. 3 summarizes the birth in the 3rd person. Ge's interpretation, which makes c parenthetical and connects ab with d despite an awkward change of person, seems clumsy.

VII.28.4: A curious verse. It begins conventionally enough, with a plea to Indra to favor us "though these days" (*ebhīḥ ... áhabhiḥ*). Which days is not clear, but I assume it means "now." The verse then turns towards the moral sphere: the peoples (*kṣitáyah*) who are *durmitrá*- 'having bad allies/alliances' (or possibly 'bad allies') are purifying themselves (*pávante*). This pāda presents a number of problems: not only whether *durmitrá*- is a bahuvrīhi or tatpuruṣa (opinion is divided; I take it as the former; see also comm. ad VII.18.15), but also whether the *kṣitáyah* are intrinsically our enemies or are members of our larger community who have fallen into an evil state. *kṣitáyah* are ordinarily presented either positively or neutrally, but see III.18.1, where they are *purudrúhaḥ* 'possessing many deceptions', so an intrinsically hostile reading is possible (if, in my opinion, less likely). If here they are intrinsically hostile, the point may be that if they're sprucing themselves up, we had better get to work on it as well, to meet the challenge of our enemies. If they are not our sworn enemies but peoples with whom we have dealings (or who we ourselves actually are), is it that they are purifying themselves *of* their bad allies/alliances, and therefore are worthy of Indra's aid? Varuṇa, as if evoked by his partner Mitra in *durmitrá*-, then makes his appearance, noting untruth and releasing us from it. As was stated in the intro., Varuṇa's presence is unexpected here. I now wonder if the hymn is specialized for a particular ritual context (signaled by "these days"), perhaps the Varuṇapraghāsa. A purificatory period (like that described in pāda b) might be appropriate then. For this reason I favor an interpretation of pāda b in which the *kṣitáyah* are identified with, or associated with, us.

VII.28.5: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse serves as refrain for VII.28–30, so that it does not respond to (or at least need not respond to) the immediately preceding Varuṇa verse.

In b the genitives *mahó rāyáḥ* and *rādhasaḥ* may either be parallel or one dependent on the other. I follow the latter interpr., with the *rāyáḥ* phrase dependent on *rādhas*-. Although I have not found absolutely diagnostic passages, *rādhas*- is regularly modified by adjectives (like 'bovine') that specify the type of *rādhas*-, and *mahó rāyáḥ* may be a defining genitive of the same type.

VII.29 Indra

VII.29.1: Pāda d (*dādo maghāni maghavann iyānāḥ*) is almost a rewrite of V.28.5ab *vocéma ... maghāvānam ...*, ... *rādhaso yād dādan naḥ*, with *iyānāḥ* ‘being implored’ substituting for *vocéma* and *rādhaḥ* for *maghāni*.

VII.29.2: The pāda-initial voc. *bráhmaṇ* shows the accent of the neut. *bráhmaṇ-* ‘formulation’, though it clearly belongs to the m. *brahmán-* ‘formulator’. The confusion is probably deliberate; the first word after the voc. phrase is *bráhmaḥṛīm* with the neut. 1st cmpd member, neut. pl. *bráhmāṇi* is found in pāda d, and note that the preceding hymn begins *bráhmā* (V.29.1a), with the neut. (see also V.29.2b).

Just as 1d is a variant of V.28.5ab, so also does 2b (*arvācīnó háribhiḥ yāhi tūyam*) appear to play on V.28.1ab ... *úpa yāhi ...*, *arvāñcas te hárayaḥ ...*, as well as echoing the immediately preceding vs. (29.1b *ā tu prá yāhi harivaḥ ...*) with *háribhir yāhi tūyam*.

VII.29.3: Ge takes *tatane* as a preterite (“... habe ich ... gespannt”), but the full-grade root syllable should signal a subjunctive, which also fits the context better (opt. *dāsema* [b], subj. *śṛṇavaḥ* [d]). In contrast Kü (210) considers the form a properly formed indicative and a relic, the regularly developed product of **ta-tṇ-h₂aṇ*; although this could be possible, it seems unnecessary, given that the context favors a modal form.

Note that the hemistich finals *dāsema* (b) and *hávemā* (d) rhyme, though they are morphologically entirely distinct.

VII.30 Indra

VII.30.1: Although tr. as if parallel, *māhi* in d is an adverbial neuter, whereas *mahé* in c is a dative modifying *nṛmnāya*. However, “greatly for dominion” seemed overly fussy in English.

VII.30.2: The first hemistich is characterized by alliteration, *v*-s in a, *u*-s and sibilants in b: *hávanta u tvā hávyaṃ vīvāci / tanūṣu sūrāḥ sūryasya sātaú*.

suhántu in d is a nice example of a proleptic adjective: “weaken the obstacles (so that they are) easily smashed.”

VII.31 Indra

VII.31.2: Unlike other interpreters, I take *utá* as marking a new clause, summing up the actions of the poet (who addresses himself in 2a) and his ritual companions (whom he addresses in vs. 1) and comparing them to the actions of the Maruts (*yáthā nárah*). Klein (I.409) takes *utá* as connecting vss. 1 and 2, but the position of *utá* in 2b makes that interpretation awkward. Ge takes it as connecting *ukthám* and *dyukṣám* (“... ein Loblied ... und zwar ein himmlisches”). His interpretation assumes a new clause beginning with *yáthā* in the middle of b and also takes *cakṛmā* in c as a sort of dummy verb substituting for a verb of poetic speech (“wie wir Männer es ... gedichtet haben”). But, although “just as we have done” works fine in English as a dummy verb, I am not sure that *√kṛ* can be bleached in the same manner in Sanskrit – though I notice, with some chagrin, that I

suggest just such an explanation for *kṛṇóti* in I.77.1. Since the Maruts as Indra's singers are mentioned elsewhere in the hymn (explicitly vs. 8, implicitly vs. 12) and are often called *náraḥ*, my interpretation of b has some support. The position of *yáthā* as a simile marker might be problematic, however; it can be ameliorated by assuming that *dyukṣám* forms part of the simile "as the superior men (made/make) a heavenly (speech), we have made ..." For *dyukṣá-* qualifying 'speech', cf. the compound *dyukṣá-vacas-* (VI.15.4).

VII.31.3–4: Although these verses straddle a *ṛca* boundary, they are neatly responsive. The repeated *tvám* of vs. 3 is matched by the initial *vayám* of vs. 4, and the repeated *-yú-* ('seeking X') adjectives of 3 are again matched by the *tvāyú-* 'seeking you' of 4a. The final word of both verses is the voc. *vaso*. Even the *gavyú-* 'seeking cows' of 3b has its complement in 4b *vṛṣan* 'o bull'.

There is no obvious noun to supply with *asyá* 'of this' in c. Ge supplies "Schrei," and my "cry" follow him; Klein (I.175) instead "act." The phraseology reminds us of the refrain of I.105 *vittám me asyá rodasī*, which I tr. "Take heed of this (speech) of mine, you two world-halves."

VII.31.5: Contra Ge (and Klein DGRV I.175), I take *váktave* with *nidé*, not with *árāṇve*, which respects the *pāda* boundary and also conforms better to the semantic domain of the two nouns: *níd-* 'scorn' is verbal, whereas *árāvan-* is more general. In either interpretation the position of *ca* is a problem, since it appears with the first member of a conjoined NP, not the second. In my interpretation the configuration is X *ca* X' ... Y, in the Ge/Klein interpretation X *ca* Y...Y'.

VIII.31.6: On the basis of VIII.92.32 *tváyéd indra yujā vayám, prāti bruvīmahi spṛdhaḥ* "With you as yokemate, we would respond to the challengers," I supply 'challenger' here.

VII.31.6–7: Again there is responsion across the *ṛca* boundary: 7a *mahāṁ utāsi* echoes 6a *tvám vármāsi*.

VII.31.7–8: Echo between 7b *svadhāvarī* and 8b *sayāvarī*, though they occupy different metrical positions.

VII.31.10: Much phonetic and morphological play, with the repeated *prá*s, the repetition of *mahé mahi-* (note that this replicates the *mahé ... máhi* of VII.30.1cd), and, especially, the chiastic finale: *prá carā carṣaṇiprāḥ*, where the last element, the root noun *-prāḥ*, is of course unrelated to the first one, the preverb *prá*.

VII.31.12: Because the *vāṇī* 'choir' in vs. 8 was qualified as *marútvatī* 'composed of Maruts', I supply Maruts here with pl. *vāṇīḥ*. It is also possible, and perhaps preferable, to assume that the plural indicates that several choirs are involved: both the Maruts and (we) the human singers.

In c *barhayā* could also be 1st sg. subjunctive, as Ge takes it. Either interpretation fits the context fine; I slightly prefer the 2nd sg. imperative, because it returns us to the imperatives of vss. 1–2.

VII.32 Indra

VII.32.2: It is tempting to take *suté* as parallel to *mádhau* in the simile and *sácā* with *ásate*, rather than taking *suté sácā* as a formulaic phrase with semi-pleonastic *sácā* as the publ. tr. does. The former interpr. would yield “because these who craft sacred formulations for you sit together at [=by/around] the soma like flies on honey when (the soma) is pressed,” an interpr. also suggested to me by Dieter Gunkel (p.c., 11/5/15). I chose the latter path because of the parallel cited by Ge, X.50.7 ... *brahmakṛtaḥ suté sácā* # However, it could be argued that X.50 is presumably a later composition than VII.32 and need not provide unassailable evidence for how VII.32.2 should be interpreted.

VII.32.3: *sudákṣiṇa-* is a triple pun. In its only other RVic occurrence (VIII.33.5) it means ‘having a good right (horse)’, but it could equally mean ‘having a good right (hand)’, alluding to the immediately preceding *vájrahasta-* ‘having the mace in his hand’. And, in keeping with the theme of giving, it can refer to the *dákṣiṇā-*, the priestly gift distributed at the dawn sacrifice. This would respond to the *rāyáskāma-* ‘desirous of wealth’, which opens the verse.

VII.32.5: Ge joins c with b, rather than d as I do. This is possible, but the topic of giving in both c and d connects them thematically.

VII.32.8: *ávase kṛṇudhvam* is close to a periphrastic causative, since “make [=create] (him) for help” is unlikely to take the long-created Indra as object. Zehnder (p. 7 and passim) takes it as such.

VII.32.9: *kṛṇudhvám ... ātúje* similarly functions as a periphrastic causative. So also Zehnder (p. 20 and passim).

VII.32.11: Although ‘seeking the prize’ is ordinarily accented as a denominative (*vājayánt-*), as opposed to ‘incite’ (*vājáyā-*) with causative accent, in this context, the denominative sense seems clear. See comm. on 14d below.

VII.32.14: *śraddhā* is most likely instrumental, but its lack of contraction with the following vowel in the Saṃhitā text gives pause. See Old on this problem.

vājī vājam siṣāsati seems like a variant of *gámad vājam vājáyan* in 11a with different emphasis. See also 20a below.

VII.32.17: The relative clause of b, *yá īm bhávanti ājáyah*, is very peculiar. There is no possible referent for the *yé* in either the preceding or the following main clause, and in addition the *īm* lacks function. It seems like a mangled paraphrase of I.81.3 *yád udīrata ājáyah* “when (battle-)drives arise/happen,” but what caused the mangling is unclear to me. The *yé* can be by “attraction” to the m. nom. pl. *ājáyah* from putative **yád*, and this set of Indra hymns has several examples of functionless *īm* (VII.20.3, 21.1). But it still lacks motivation.

The VP *nāma bhikṣate* “desires a share in your name” is striking and a little puzzling. The same phrase *nāma √bhaj* is found in V.57.5, but there it means that the Maruts, the subjects of the verb, all share the same name. Here, by contrast, it must be a clever way of saying that everyone calls Indra’s name, a novel paraphrase of the common epithet of Indra *puruhūtā* ‘called upon by many’, found in this verse and vss. 20 and 26. (The English slang equivalent would be “wants a piece of you.”) Ge renders *nāma bhikṣate* as “Deinen Namen fleht ... an” (implores), robbing the expression of its vividness.

VII.32.18: The root $\sqrt{īś}$ overwhelmingly takes the gen.; the construction here is identified by Gr (s.v. *īś*, col. 236: #8 mit dem Acc.) as mixed: the gen. *yāvataḥ* is construed with the implied 2nd ps. “as much as you are lord over” (*yāvatas tvám [īśiṣe]*) in pāda a, which is picked up by the acc. *etāvad* in the contrary-to-fact “if I were lord over so much” (*yád ... etāvad ahám īśiya*). I think it more likely that *etāvad* here is a quasi-adverbial summing up of the dependent clause; a more literal tr. would be “if I were lord to such an extent as” or the like. The other passages assembled under Gr’s #8 can be variously explained and do not provide strong evidence for an alternative case frame with $\sqrt{īś}$. In III.18.3 *yāvad* is again adverbial; see the publ. tr. “inasmuch as I am master ...” In VIII.68.7 *īśe* is properly construed with a gen. (*kṛṣṭīnām*) in its own pāda; the acc. cited by Gr, *pūrvyām ānuṣṭutim* in the previous pāda, is probably an acc. of respect (see comm. ad loc.) For nearby VII.37.7 as well as III.51.4, the latter cited only as a possibility by Gr., see comm. ad locc.

The cmpd. *radā-vasu-* ‘excavating goods’ is analyzed by the Pp. with short 2nd vowel: *rada-vasu-*. Though Gr. suggests the correct reading is **radad-vasu-* (like *kṛtqḍ-vasu-* VIII.31.9), Wackernagel (AiG II.1.316) compares it to the *trasá-dasyu-*, with -a-final first member.

VII.32.22: Despite Ge’s easy “dessen Auge die Sonne ist,” I cannot accept this for *svarḍṣam*. First, *ḍṣ-* is never an ‘eye’, but rather ‘seeing’ or ‘having the appearance of’, and furthermore, it’s Varuṇa who has the sun as his eye (that is, as his spy). Here I think the point is rather that Indra, like the sun, sees everything in the world, here expressed by the merism “the moving and the still.”

VII.32.24: There are two word plays in this verse. The simpler one is between the impv. *bhara* ‘bring’ in pāda a and the āmreḍita *bhāre-bhare* ‘at every raid’, where the noun *bhāra-* has been specialized from ‘(an occasion for) bearing away’ to ‘raid’.

The more complex one involves the creation and disappointment of expectations. The verse begins with *abhī śatāḥ*. The juxtaposition of these two forms (the latter being the pres. part. to \sqrt{as} ‘be’ in either gen.-abl. sg. or acc. pl.) and their close sandhi, with retroflex initial *ṣ*, invites the audience to fill in the semantics of the lexeme *abhī √as* ‘be superior’. But to our surprise, at the end of this hemistich we find the semantic opposite, *kānīyasaḥ* ‘the lesser ones’, requiring us to revise our analysis of the opening, dissolving the presumed lexeme into the directional preverb/preposition *abhī* and the independent pres. participle modifying *kānīyasaḥ* much later in the line. For extensive discussion see Old.

I cannot follow Gr, Old in interpreting *jyāyah* as voc., but take it, with Ge, as neut. sg. with *tād*. Among other things, AiG III.296 notes only two masc. vocatives in -*īyas* in the RV, this one and *ōjīyah* in X.120.4, which is also better taken as a neut.

VII.33 Vasiṣṭha and the Vasiṣṭhids

On the structure and thematics of this famous hymn see the publ. intro., as well as the introductory remarks of both Old and Ge. With VII.18, the account of the Battle of the Ten Kings, it bookends the Indra hymns of VII and contributes its own background to the (fragmentary) narrative of King Sudās and the Ten Kings Battle.

The name *vāsiṣṭha*- appears in every vs. of this hymn, primarily at the end of the d pāda: vss. 1, 2, 3, 4, (not 5, 6, though *vāsiṣṭha*- appears in both c pādas,) 7, (not 8, though it's in middle of d,) 9, (not 10 though in c, nor 11 though in a,) 12, 13, 14.

VII.33.1: By most accounts this vs. is spoken by Indra, who is the referent of the 1st ps. enclitics *mā* and *me* in pādas a and d and the subj. of 1st ps. *voce* in c.

As noted already ad VII.18.21, Ge has a peculiar interpr. of the verbal lexeme (*abhī*) *prā* √ *mad* as 'go on a pilgrimage', for which there is no support that I can see. Old also rejects this interpr. I follow Old's view that Indra is present at a competing sacrifice - a constant preoccupation of the Indra hymns of VII -- and recalling the Vasiṣṭhas' ritual service to him, he gets up to leave the sacrifice where he is present to go to theirs. Pāda d is the embedded self-quotation of Indra, providing the reason for his departure for the Vasiṣṭhas.

The descriptors of the Vasiṣṭhas *śvityāñcaḥ ... dakṣiṇatāskapsardāḥ* are found almost identically in VII.83.8 *śvityāñcaḥ ... kapardīnaḥ*, where they modify the Tṛtsus, Sudās's fighting force in the Ten Kings Battle, in a hymn much concerned with that battle. Vasiṣṭha was at least an adoptive member of the Tṛtsu clan. See Ge's n. 1a and esp. vss. 5, 6, and 15 in this hymn.

Despite the position of the generally sentential, Wackernagel's Law particle *hī* far to the right in b, the verb complex *abhī hī pramandūḥ* must have domain over the entire hemistich, with *mā* in 2nd pos. in pāda a serving as its object. As often, when a preverb stays with its verb at the end of a clause rather than moving to the front of its clause, *hī* is inserted, between preverb and verb (or here preverb₁ and preverb₂ verb).

VII.33.2: In this vs. the perspective and location shifts from Indra, at the competing sacrifice announcing his intention to go to the Vasiṣṭhas, to the Vasiṣṭhas at their place of sacrifice "leading" Indra to them. The vss. are linked by *dūrāt* 'from a distance' (1d, 2a), in 1d referring to the distant location of the Vasiṣṭha from Indra's point of view, in 2a the distant location of Indra from that of the Vasiṣṭhas.

With Old, I consider Pāśadyumna Vāyata the hapless sacrificer whom Indra deserted in favor of the Vasiṣṭhas. But I do not follow Old in thinking that b describes an intermediate place on Indra's journey from PV to the Vasiṣṭhas.

VII.33.3: With this vs. we pass to the Ten Kings Battle and the Vasiṣṭhas' crucial efforts in securing Indra's aid for Sudās. The emphatic repeated opening of the first three pādas *evén nū kam* highlights the critical incidents. The two sequences *evéd* and *nū kam* are

both found fairly frequently elsewhere, but never elsewhere together, so it's difficult to judge the force of their combination.

VII.33.4: Ge appears to be right that this vs. is also Indra's speech. He picks up the *bráhmanā vah* from 3d in pāda a and also addresses them as 'superior men' (voc. *narah*), just as he spoke about the superior men (acc. *nṛṇ*) in 1c.

Ge takes *pitṛṇām* with both *júṣṭī* and *bráhmanā*; I doubt the first, as does Old. Since I think Indra is addressing the Vasiṣṭhas at the time of the battle, not a younger generation of Vasiṣṭhas long after the battle, his "by reason of your fathers' sacred formulation" (*bráhmanā vo pitṛṇām*) must refer to the formulation they inherited from their own poetic forebears and are putting to use in enlisting Indra's help.

The action Indra performs in response to the Vasiṣṭhas' employment of the *bráhman*- is not altogether clear. (Old, after some speculation, concludes "'ich komme hier nicht zur Klarheit.") The bare phrasing *ákṣam avyayam* must mean literally "I enveloped the/an axle," but whose axle it is and whether the enveloping is a help or a hindrance aren't recoverable from context. However, as Old points out, III.53.19 may provide some guidance. That vs. is addressed to an axle (voc. *ákṣa*) in a series of vss. (17–20) mean to avert possible disasters that might afflict a team of oxen and the vehicle they are pulling. In vs. 19 the axle is urged *abhí vyayasva khadirásya sām* "Engird yourself in the hardwood of the Acacia tree," before being told to be and stay firm (*vīlāyasva*). The first instruction to the axle contains the verb (*abhí*) √ *vyā* 'envelop, engird', which I take as referring to fixing the ends of the axle firmly in the wheel hubs till the ends are literally surrounded with / enveloped in the wood of the wheel hub. If the same type of action is referred to here, Indra is performing a positive action, presumably securing the axle of the Vasiṣṭhas or their allies in position, to protect them and their chariot from harm, as Indra promises with *ná kílā riṣātha*.

As Ge points out (n. 4c), *śákvarī*- is the name of a meter with martial associations. As he also points out, this fairly rare meter is found in the first three vss. of X.133, a hymn to Indra attributed to Sudās Paijavana, that is, the royal hero of the Ten Kings Battle, though there is no particular ref. to that battle in X.133. Since *śákvarīṣu* is plural here, it would be better tr. "in Sakvarī (verses)" than "in Śakvarī (meter)," as in the publ. tr.

VII.33.5: For the very compressed simile of the thirsty and heaven, cf. V.57.1 *trṣṇáje ná divá útsā udanyáve* "like the well-spring of heaven for a thirsty man seeking water," where the "water" part is made clear.

VII.33.6: It is a curious, but perhaps coincidental, fact that the sole occurrence of *daṇḍá-* in the RV is found in the same hymn with the only occurrence of the vṛddhi deriv. *maitrāvaruṇá-* (vs. 11), given that the *daṇḍa*- 'staff' is the emblem of office associated with the Maitrāvaruṇa priest in śrauta ritual. See Minkowski, *Priesthood in Ancient India*, pp. 141–54 and passim. The conjunction in our hymn was pointed out to me by Elizabeth Tucker.

The addition of the pejorative and sometimes diminutive suffix *-ka-* on a word already meaning 'small' -- *arbha-ká-* -- is a nice slangy touch.

In c the *ca* appears to be subordinating (so also Klein, DGRV I.242–43), though because *ābhavat* is pāda-initial, its accent need not be due to subordination.

VII.33.7: For the riddles here, see publ. intro. I make no effort at a definitive solution (or even any solution at all). In this abstention I follow the good example of Old.

VII.33.9: On the weaving, see publ. intro. and vs. 12c, as well as comm. ad vs. 14.

VII.33.10–13: Old discusses Vasiṣṭha’s two births and suggests that they are presented in reverse chronological order. The birth depicted in vs. 10 is the second birth, while 11–13 treat the first. In the first birth Mitra and Varuṇa emit semen at a Sattrā, which falls into a pot and ultimately gives rise to the seer Agastya. But a drop of this semen is taken into a lotus, somehow comes to the Apsaras Urvaśī, who somehow conceives and gives birth to Vasiṣṭha “from mind.” In the second birth the wondrously conceived divine being of the 1st birth is received into a human Gotra. Old is uncertain about the details; I am even more uncertain.

VII.33.10: In III.51.4 I take *sām* √ *hā* as ‘compact oneself together’, that is, ‘concentrate one’s essence’, and that seems the image here, of the embryonic Vasiṣṭha taking shape from concentrated lightning. Ge (n. 10a) suggests rather that it refers to semen suddenly poured out. I do not see this, and his suggested parallel in X.95.10 seems irrelevant, esp. since the lightning there is Urvaśī.

Old’s argument that vs. 10 depicts one birth and the following vss. another depends in part on taking the two *utā*s of 10c and 11a as marking the two births. This would be more convincing if the first *utā* were not in the middle of the pāda. This position seems better accounted for by assuming that 10c refers to both births, with *utā* conjoining *tāt te jānma* and *ēkam*, as Ge takes it (“das war deine (eine) Geburt und eine ...”). So also Klein (DGRV I.368). The double *yād* in b and d support this interpr., with each *yād* introducing one of the births. I follow this general interpr.

The *yād* in b is very deep in its clause, with both subj. and obj. preceding it, if pādas ab form a single clause as in the standard tr. (incl. Ge and the publ. tr.). It would, however, be possible to take pāda a as the main clause on which b is dependent: “light was compacting out of lightning when M+V looked upon you.” This would solve the problem, but the unusual position of *yād* could also be attributed to an attempt to make b and d parallel, each recounting one of the births and opening with the putative father (or fathers) followed by *yād*, with a preterital verb and the obj. *tvā* (the latter in different orders): b *mītrāvāruṇā yād āpaśyatām tvā* and d *agāstyo yāt tvā viśā ājabhāra*. In this scenario, pāda a, which is a single NP, would have been fronted around the core clause.

With Old (fld. by Ge), I read dat. *viśé* contra Pp. *viśāḥ*. The clan in question is supposed to be the Tṛtsus.

VII.33.11: The pub. tr. reads “born from her mind,” but given the uncertainties of this birth story, the mind need not be Urvaśī’s, but someone else’s, or even pure mind. So it might be better rendered as “born from mind.”

On the semen (if that’s what the drop is) and the lotus, see disc. ad vss. 10–13. If the underlying narrative really does involve transporting spilled semen in a leaf and long-

distance conception therefrom, it anticipates the MBh narrative in which the king Vasu ejaculates while hunting, catches the semen in a leaf, and tries to send it home to his wife Girikā by enlisting a bird, though the bird and the semen meet with a disaster over water that leads to the semen impregnating a fish (MBh I.57.35ff.).

I take *drapsām skannām* as a nominal clause, rather than taking *cd* as a single clause with *drapsām skannām* coreferential with *tvā*.

VII.33.12: As Ge points out (n. 12a), *praketā-* is otherwise only a noun, and so it is best to go against the Pp's reading *praketāḥ* in favor of the loc. *praketé*. (Ge also entertains the possibility of reading **sapraketāḥ*.)

The "both" are presumably both births; so Ge.

The weaving in pāda c is repeated almost verbatim from 9c, but with the single Vasiṣṭha, not the pl. Vasiṣṭhas as subject. As noted in the publ. intro., I assume that this refers to the production of the sacrifice. See comm. ad vs. 14 below.

The hapax *sādāna-* is not entirely clear. Ge suggests that it stands for **sādādāna-* by haplology and tr. "der ... immerdar Geschenke hat." He does not render the *utā vā*, implicitly taking *sahásradānaḥ ... sādānaḥ* as appositive adjectives. Klein (DGRV II.169) follows Ge's interpr. of *sādānaḥ* without mentioning the possible haplology and states that the conjoined terms in the phrase *sahásradana utā vā sādānaḥ* "come close to being synonymous." His tr. "having a thousand gifts or having constant gifts" both illustrates this suggestion and shows how flat-footed such a phrase would be. Old discusses without coming to a conclusion, though he does reject the haplology explan., which goes back to Ludwig. My own interpr. takes the text as given and interprets the second adj. as additive "and one gift (more)," with *sādāna-* 'with (a) gift' standing for 'with one gift'. If the *utā vā* should be read as disjunctive 'or' (as I admit it should), perhaps this is instead a version of the Archilochus fox-and-hedgehog dichotomy ("the fox knows many things, but the hedgehog one big one") -- hence "having a thousand gifts -- or one (big) gift." This in fact is now my preferred tr. What the gifts refer to I have no idea.

VII.33.13: This vs. is the basis of Old's (and others') reconstruction of the 1st birth of Vasiṣṭha (see comm. add vss. 10–13), with Mitra and Varuṇa at a Sattrā emitting semen into a pot, which then gave rise to both Agastya and Vasiṣṭha. Unfortunately the details of this vs. are far from clear, though pāda b does (fairly) straightforwardly depict a dual entity pouring semen into a pot.

The gravest problems are in pāda a. The opening *satré ha* is interpr. by Sāy, fld. by Ge., as standing for *sattré* 'at a Sattrā'. The single *-t-* versus double *-tt-* before *-r-* is of course not a problem [Max Müller's ed. in fact prints *sattré*], but it *is* the case that, though the word *sat(t)rá-* and its ritual complex are well attested already in Saṃhitā prose, the word is not found elsewhere in the RV. (However, the ritual almost surely already existed; there seems a clear reference to it in vs. 9 of the Indra hymn III.31, where the Aṅgirasas "sit a sitting" [*sādanam* √ *sad*, though with the words not in the same VP] to open the Vala cave. See comm. ad loc.) However, Gr suggests reading **satréhá* instead, to be analyzed as the adv. *satrā* 'entirely' and *ihá* 'here'; the only change required would be accenting the second word. Old sits on the fence, but seems weakly to favor the Sattrā interpr., as do I, since it at least provides richer semantics and a ritual context for the

actions. Moreover the particle *ha* would exactly match the same particle in the same location in pāda c.

The next problem is *jātaú*. If it is a dual ppl. (rather than a loc. sg. to the putative stem *jāti-*, which, however, is not found in the RV), it can of course modify the dual subjects of the verb *siṣicathuḥ*, and it is also quite possible that that dual subject is Mitra and Varuṇa, as Old and Ge interpr. it. The problem is thus not syntactic but semantic. In what way would M+V be “born” at a Sattrā? Ge elides the problem by (as far as I can see) folding it into an anodyne phrase with *iṣitā*, rendered as “erregt geworden,” where I assume the ‘geworden’ is a bleached, auxiliary-like version of *jātaú*. Sāy glosses it as *dīkṣitau*, and this might nicely reflect the middle Vedic configuration of the *dīkṣā* of a soma sacrificer as tantamount to a second birth. No forms of the (secondary) root $\sqrt{dīkṣ}$ are found in the RV; however, both *dīkṣā-* and *dīkṣitā-* are attested in the AV, with the former fairly common. I therefore am inclined to follow Sāy’s interpr. -- or what I assume Sāy’s interpr. rests on -- that *jātaú* refers to the conceptual rebirth of a consecrated sacrificer. This rebirth would be somewhat comparable to the two births of Vasiṣṭha himself. This interpr. of *jātaú* would be more clearly expressed than in the publ. tr. by rendering it “(re)born [=consecrated] at a (ritual) Session.”

Pāda c appears to describe the creation of Agastya (see comm. above ad vss. 10–13). Māna is the name of Agastya’s father and family or indeed of Agastya himself. See Mayrhofer PN s.v. for reff.

Kü (99, 570) has a very diff. interpr. of the vs. In the first hemistich he takes *kumbhé* as a dual, modified by the dual ppl. in pāda a and subject of the dual verb in b: “Beim Somaopfer geboren, angetrieben durch Verehrungen haben die beiden Krüge den gemeinsamen Samen ergossen” (99). This is grammatically impossible, because *kumbhá-* is masc., as the two occurrences of the acc. pl. *kumbhān* show, and so its dual should be **kumbhā(u)*. In c he takes *mānaḥ* as ‘house’: “Mitten daraus ist ein Haus hervorgegangen” (99=570). He does not comment on the mythological content of the vs., but though *māna-* ‘building, house’ is at least marginally attested in the RV (clearest in VII.88.5), the creation of a house from semen would be such an outlandish feat that the creation of a seer seems positively plausible.

In b the pf. *siṣicatuḥ* has a retroflexed root init., as we would expect. But the other two forms of the pf. in the RV (*sisicuḥ* II.24.4 and *sisice* III.32.15) do not. I have no explanation for the discrepancy.

VII.33.14: As Ge (n. 14) points out, this vs. seems to pick up 10d, describing the second “birth” of Vasiṣṭha, when Agastya presents him to the clan, and it seems to consist of Agastya’s direct speech. As Old points out, the first hemistich seems to identify the three priests of śrauta ritual, though not by title: the Hotar, supporter of the *ukthā-*; the Udgātar, supporter of the *sāman-*; and the Adhvaryu, supporter of the pressing stone, i.e., the one who performs the physical actions. Assuming this is the case makes it reasonably likely that the weaving of “the covering stretched by Yama” (9c, 12c) does indeed refer to the production of the sacrifice. Vasiṣṭha is thus presented as responsible for the whole of the sacrifice, not just a portion of it.

VII.34 All Gods

Re characterizes this hymn as “invitation without praise.”

The first 21 (or actually 20 and a half) vss. of this 25-vs. hymn are in Dvipadā meter. Despite its name, this meter should be considered to consist of *four* pādas of 5 syllables each, since verbs located in the 6th syllable of a putative 10-syl. pāda are generally accented (see 3b, d, 4b, 6b, 20d); however, consider 14d, 17d, where verbs in that position are unaccented. Those two violations fall in the latter part of the Dvipadā portion and may be beginning the transition to Triṣṭubh, which takes over in the 2nd half of vs. 21. On the meter see Old, Prol. 95–98.

VII.34.1: HvN’s resolution of the sandhi and accentuation of Saṃhitā *śukraítu* in pāda a as *śukra étu* is incorrect: the Pp rightly reads *śukrá etu*.

The reference to the departure of our well-crafted *manīṣā* is a fitting beginning to a hymn, as describing the dispatch of the praise hymn to the targeted divinities.

VII.34.2: Ge (n. 2a), flg. Sāy., takes the waters as subj. of *vidúh* and suggests that the point is that the waters are older even than Heaven and Earth: they are the Urelement. They therefore were around for the creation of H+E and know all about it. In the absence of any other obvious subject, this seems reasonable.

In the 2nd hemistich the function and position of *ádha* are somewhat puzzling. Klein (DGRV II.96 n. 23) lists it with passages with the “logical conjunctive value” ‘therefore’. But he does not tr. it or comment on its non-clause-init. position, and I find it difficult to wring a ‘therefore’ sense out of it. In the Prol. (369 n. 1) Old suggests that the PB parallel (I.2.9, VI.6.17) with the reading *adhah* ‘below’ is correct and the RV should be emended, but he essentially drops that idea in the Noten, remarking that RV *ádha* is “tadellos” and that the emendation would also require altering the accent (to *adháh*). Our passage is reminiscent of IV.17.10 *ayám śṛṇve ádha jáyann utá ghnán*, which I tr. “this one is famed for conquering and smiting.” Both passages have a mid-clause *ádha* that introduces a pres. participle or participles and both contain a form of *śru*. See comm. ad IV.17.10. In both cases I think *ádha* opens a mini-clause that modifies or expands on the main verb. In our passage I think the point is that, though rivers are very noisy when they flow (as is often emphasized in Vedic texts), these waters also know how to listen. Note also that in our case *ádha* is pāda-initial, though not clause-initial.

VII.34.3: As noted in the introductory remarks above, both *pínvanta* and *mám̐sante* are accented because they open 5-syl. pādas.

Both Ge and Re take the (soma) sacrifice as the referent of *asmaí*, contra both Sāy. and Old, who supply Indra instead. I definitely side with the latter. Like many All God hymns, the separate vss. can serve as little riddles, each pointing to a different god,, and the mention of *vṛtréṣu* ‘(battles against) obstacles’, even in the plural, seems a tip-off that Indra is lurking.

I’m not quite sure what the subjunctive *mám̐sante* is meant to convey -- perhaps that in times to come poets will talk about them that way in the accounts of the Vṛtra-slaying?

VII.34.4–6: Note the chiasmic verb sequence 4b *dádhāta* [... 5a *sthāta*] ... 5d *tmánā hinota* ... 6ab *tmánā* ... *hinóta* ... 6c *dádhāta*, with one interruption.

VII.34.4: The 2nd pl. subj. of *dád dhāta* is unspecified, but is probably the priests / poets associated with the current sacrifice, who were referred to in the 1st pl. *asmāt* in vs. 1. See vss. 5–6, where this identification is more explicit.

Once again both Ge and Re take *asmai* as referring to the sacrifice. They also take the nominative(s) of the 2nd hemistich as coreferential with the subj. of the impv. *dád dhāta* in a: in other words, “put the horses to the chariot pole, as Indra (does/did).” This seems unnec. Old’s view that the *asmai* refers to Savitar, who is then the subj. of the 2nd hemistich, is far more plausible. Although *hīraṇya-bāhu-* is found only here in the RV, the very similar *hīraṇya-pāṇi-* ‘having gold hands’ is used a number of times of Savitar, and the uncompounded phrase *bāhū ... hīraṇyāyā* is used of Savitar’s arms in nearby VII.45.2 (also VI.71.1, 5), as Old points out. Since Tvaṣṭar fashions the mace for Indra in I.32.2, calling him *vajrín-* here is perfectly sensible.

VII.34.5–6: The 2nd pl. impvs. in these two vss., 5a *abhí prá sthāta*, 5d *hinota*, 6b *hinóta*, 6c *dád dhāta*, all take the sacrifice (*yajñám*, explicitly 5b, 6b) as object and make the identification of the subject as the priests/poets, suggested ad vs. 4, more likely.

VII.34.5: The simile *āheva*, despite Pp *āha iva*, is surely to be analyzed as *āhā iva*, as Old indicates, pointing out that in other places where it occurs (e.g., IV.33.6) the Pp. gives the long vowel form. Both Old and Ge take *āhā* as nom.: “set out on the sacrifice, as the days (do [=follow one after the other]).” Re takes it as acc., supplying “as (the sun) does the days,” which requires that he make the verb *abhí prá sthāta* transitive (“mettez en marche”), which is unlikely. I prefer to take it as acc. extent of time, meaning something like “keep going in the performance of sacrifice, as one keeps going day after day.”

VII.34.7: Like vss. 3 and 4, this contains an unaccented oblique form of *ayām*, in this case *asya*, and as with those vss., I think it likely that *asya* is the sign of a riddling mention of a god -- in this case likely Agni, as Old tentatively suggests. Ge and Re also see a reference to the offering fire.

I do not understand the simile in the 2nd hemistich. If the *bhūma* that the earth bears is its surface, what would an equivalent burden be for the offering fire?

In order to get 2 Dvipadā pādas in the 2nd hemistich, we must read **pr̥thivī* for *pr̥thivī*, as Old points out. Otherwise we have a Triṣṭubh anticipating the switch to Triṣṭubh that happens much later in the hymn.

VII.34.8: Old asserts that *āyātu-* is a determin. compd., not a bahuvrīhi, thus ‘non-sorcerer’ rather than ‘not having sorcery/sorcerer’. The publ. tr. reflects -- and indeed reflects somewhat loosely -- a bahuvrīhi interpr., though I think the difference is minor. Re also takes it as a b.v.: “sans (user de) sorcellerie” (tr. EVP V), “sans user de procédés magiques” (comm., EVP IV); see also Wh n. ad AV tr. VIII.4.16. Nonetheless, a determin. interpr. is a reasonable alternative: “I -- no sorcerer -- invoke the gods.” A 2nd RVic occurrence of this stem, acc. *āyātum* in VII.104.16, with AVŚ+P repetitions, is not registered in Gr., which omission is probably responsible for Re’s erroneously calling our occurrence a hapax in his comm. Unfortunately this other occurrence does not resolve the question of compd type. The compd. is not disc. in AiG.

Presumably the implied opposition in this vs. is between sorcery in the 1st half-vs. and truth (*ṛtā-*) of the 2nd half. So also Re (comm.).

VII.34.9: Once again the unspecified 2nd pl. subj. should be the priests/poets.

Note the extreme alliteration of ... *devīm dhīyaṃ dadhidhvam*.

The morphological identity of this last form, *dadhidhvam*, can be queried. The three occurrences of this form are normally assigned to the perfect rather than the redupl. pres. (see esp. Kü 275), on the grounds that the *-i-*liaison is proper to the perfect. Yet no corresponding med. 2nd pl. impv. is built to the pres. stem; indeed, the posited correspondent (cf. Whitney, Gr. §668), the monstrous **dhaddhvam*, is not attested in Vedic (as imperative, injunctive, or augmented imperfect). It is likely, therefore, that *dadhidhvam* serves as impv. to both pf. and redupl. pres., neutralizing the distinction between those T/A stems. In fact, given that in this passage it is parallel to the present impv. *kṛṇudhvam* in the same vs. and immediately follows on an unambiguous redupl. pres. form to the same root and with the same obj. (8d *dhīyaṃ dadhāmi*, 9b *dhīyaṃ dadhidhvam*), a present-stem interpr. is favored. On ambig. pf. impvs. see my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative” (Fs. Lubotsky).

VII.34.10–11: After several vss. with a ritual, priestly focus, we return to the semi-riddling listing of gods, with these two vss. devoted to Varuṇa. In 10 the subj. Varuṇa is withheld till the 2nd half, thereby producing a quickly solved riddle. Vs. 11 does not name him at all, but the referent is clear from the phraseology, as well as the previous vs.

VII.34.10: The easiest thing to do with fem. gen. pl. *āsām* is to have it modify fem. gen. pl. *nadīnām*, as Ge and Re do (e.g., “de ces rivières”). But it is unaccented and therefore should be a pronominal demonstrative, rather than an adjectival one. I therefore assume that it picks up the waters (*āpaḥ*) earlier in the hymn (2c, 3a); the connection of Varuṇa with the waters, though not as firm in the RV as it is later, would evoke them. The rivers are then in apposition to these unnamed waters. Re in his comm. notes the “lien” of *āsām* with *āpaḥ* earlier in the hymn but seems to stop short of syntactically separating *āsām* from the rivers in this vs. For further disc. see comm. ad I.68.7.

VII.34.12–13: The 2nd pl. subjects of all the verbs but *vy ètu* in 13a must be the gods in general. The priests/poets who were previously unspecified 2nd pl. subjects do not command the powers to carry out the desires specified.

VII.34.12: The hapax *ādyu-* has been variously analyzed and rendered: e.g., Sāy. *adīpti-* ‘non-shining’, reflected in Gr’s ‘glanzlos’ and probably Re’s ‘sans éclat’; Old ‘excluded from heaven’. But Ge’s (n. 12b) comparison of Old Avestan *aidiiu-* (YH 2x, plus a YA rep.) ‘harmless’ is surely correct and is accepted by EWA, etc. For disc., with earlier lit., see Narten, YH 280–81.

Our half-verse *ādyuṃ kṛṇota śāmsaṃ ninitsóḥ* is nearly identical to VII.25.2c *āré tām śāmsaṃ kṛṇuhi ninitsóḥ*, though in a different meter (our two 5-syl. pādas of Dvipadā versus Triṣṭubh). To accommodate the meter the verb and object had to be flipped and a different predicate supplied. This metrically driven modification procedure is instructive.

VII.34.14: Initial injunc. 3rd sg. -iṣ-aor. *āvīn* (for *āvīt*) matches the init. *āviṣṭa* (+u) of 12a, which I (and the standard tr.) take as a 2nd pl. -iṣ-aor. impv. Re. takes *āvīt* here as hortatory/imperative (“Qu’Agni favorise ...”), but I see no problem in having a preterital (or perhaps general present “Agni aids ...”) injunc. form in this vs. characterizing an individual god. The 2nd pl. is found in the hortatory address to the gods in general, parallel to impv. *kṛṇota* in 12c, whereas *āvīt* is followed by an augmented pass. aor. *adhāyi*, expressing the reciprocal human action in response to the god’s help.

The first half-vs. contains two exx. of -*l d* → -*n* sandhi before nasal: (*āvīt* →) *āvīn no* and (*havyād* →) *havyān nāmobhiḥ*. Re renders the latter as if it were an acc. pl. to *havyā-* (“... favorise nos oblations”), but this must be an example of a hasty Homeric nod, since *havyā-* ‘oblation’ is always neut.

Whose *nāmobhiḥ*? Ge takes them as Agni’s, which he offers to the gods. I think it more likely that it refers to *our* acts of reverence to Agni, to which he reciprocates by aiding us. So also Scar (40: “durch {unsere} Ehrerbietungen”). Re takes *nāmobhiḥ* with the following clause: “Avec hommages a été déposée ... la louange ...”). This avoids the problem and works well semantically, but in this hymn verses regularly fall into two clauses separated by the half-vs. boundary, and there are no examples of a portion of b adjoined to the clause of cd.

VII.34.15: Here the 2nd pl. address appears to be to the priests/poets.

This is the one of the few vss. in which the half-vs. break does not coincide with a major syntactic break, and this is made more noticeable by the fact that there is a clause break between pādas c and d.

VII.34.16: Assuming that it is the serpent that is sitting in the depths, that is, that the referent is Ahi Budhnya, who is found explicitly in vs. 17, I see no alternative to taking the nom. sg. pres. part. *śīdan* as the predicate of a nominal sentence in cd, picking up the acc. obj. *abjām ... āhim* in ab. Sāy. simply indicates that *śīdan* is for acc. *śīdantam*, and Ge and Re tr. cd as if it were a rel. cl. (e.g., “qui siège ...”), a translational choice that blurs the Sanskrit. The alternative, which unifies the syntax at the expense of the sense, is to take *śīdan* as implicitly modifying the 1st sg. subj. of *gṛṇīṣe* ‘I will sing’ in the first hemistich. So Scar (134): “... Den wassergeborenen Drachen preise ich ..., {ihn}, der auf dem Grund der Flüsse weilt, wenn ich im Finstern sitze,” construing c (*budhné naḍṇām*) with the acc. serpent of ab and d (*rājassu śīdan*) with the 1st sg. subj. This interpr. seems highly unlikely: why would the poet “I” be sitting in the darkness? and where does Scar get the “weilt” for the serpent?

I do not understand the reason for the close sandhi of *rājassu śīdan*.

VII.34.17: The first half vs. is also found in V.41.16, and in both places it is metrically anomalous. Here it has the requisite 10 syllables for Dvipadā, but the caesura/pāda break comes after the 4th syllable, so that it does not fall into two 5-syl pādas. In V.41.16 (which, with the following vs. 17, is metrically different from the Triṣṭubhs that make up the bulk of that hymn) it has 10 syllables, rather than the expected 11. It is also somewhat striking that two vss. in our hymn are devoted to the very minor divinity Ahi Budhnya, when far more important gods receive only one, and I wonder if 17 hasn’t been inserted to make the identification of this divinity clearer, since vs. 16 does not give him his full

title. It is worth noting that our 17cd was already flagged above as one of the few places in the hymn in which a verb beginning the d pāda is not accented. This may provide further support for the idea that the vs. is a later insertion.

VII.34.18: The nom. pl. subjects of the two half vss. are different, in my opinion. The loc. ‘men’, recipients of the fame bestowed on them by (presumably) gods in ab, are the ones who go forth for wealth in cd.

The phrase *śārdhanto aryāḥ* has an almost identical correspondent in nearby VII.21.5 *śā śardhad aryó viṣuṇasya jantóḥ*, where the second phrase shows (or at least strongly suggests) that *aryāḥ* is gen. sg. On the phrase see Thieme (Fremdling 54–55).

VII.34.19: My tr. “the worlds” assumes that *bhūmā* is pl., contrary to the standard, who tr. “the earth.” I would be happy with the latter.

I have taken *-senā-* as ‘weapon’ here, but it could as well be ‘army’, with Ge, Re, etc. It does not affect the sense appreciably.

VII.34.20: The pl. “wives” (*pātnīḥ*), as often in the RV, must refer to the Wives of the Gods. As I have argued elsewhere (“‘Sacrificer’s Wife’ in the Rig Veda: Ritual Innovation?” 2018 in Proceedings of the 13th World Skt. Conf., 2006), one of the models for the introduction of the Sacrificer’s Wife (*pātnī*) in Vedic ritual, beginning in the late RV, is the presence of the Wives of the Gods on the ritual ground, as here. Tvaṣṭar is their usual companion and chaperone. He is also associated with the shaping of the embryo in the womb, as in the pregnancy charm X.184.1. The request that he confer heroes on us here must be a prayer for sons (who will become) heroes.

The 3rd pl. verb *gāmanti* is classified by Wh (Roots) as a them. present, to a stem not otherwise found (at least in the RV). Macd’s identification (VGS, verb list) as a root aor. subjunctive is surely correct. Although grammars give the 3rd pl. act. subj. ending only as sec. *-an*, it does not seem to me that the Sprachgefühl for this part of the paradigm is terribly strong, and it is easy to imagine extending the 3rd *singular* choice between sec. *-at* and prim. *-atī* to the 3rd pl. For a similar case see *karanti* in X.48.7, which Wh identifies as a root pres. form.

VII.34.21: As noted above, the first hemistich contains 10 syllables falling into two 5-syllable pādas, but the second half is a straight Triṣṭubh, anticipating the Triṣṭubhs of the rest of the hymn.

The stem *vasūyú-* can modify both masc. and, as here, fem. nouns. This exact phrase, *arāmatir vasūyúḥ* is also found at VII.1.6.

VII.34.23: Both Ge and Re take *rāyaḥ* here as nom. sg., parallel to the other entities like mountains and waters, but I do not see why the construction that ends vs. 22, *ví dadhātu rāyaḥ* “let him apportion wealth,” is not simply continued here. There *rāyaḥ* must be the obj. of the verb, whether acc. pl. or partitive gen. sg.; in either case the preferred accent would be *rāyāḥ*, but there are enough forms with the opposite accent that we need not be too troubled. If we can accept the wrong accent in 22d, I see no reason not to do so in 23a. Re gestures towards my interpr. in his n.

VII.34.24: Note the izafe-like *yé sahāsaḥ* nominal relative clause.

Correctly accented gen. sg. *rāyāḥ* appears here; see comm. on vss. 22–23.

On the infinitive construction here, see Keydana, Infinitive im Ṛgveda, 70, 159.

VII.34.25: I do not understand why Ge and Re render the *juṣanta*, to the common and well-understood medial stem *juṣáte* ‘enjoys’, as ‘grant’ (zibilligen) and ‘agree’ respectively. Although it is true that the final vss. of hymns frequently ask gods for things, it is also true that we commend our praises to them -- and surely that’s what’s going on here: we want the gods to take pleasure in the hymn, or the ritual in general, that we have just offered them.

VII.35 All Gods

As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn is remarkably monotonous and has no real content -- simply the unbroken repetition of the wish that various gods or natural elements “be luck” (*śám*) for us. It therefore needs and deserves very little comment. Besides the deities mentioned in each vs., what variety there is in the hymn is found in the adjuncts associated with each one, often a characterizing adjective (e.g., 1b) or an oblique case form expressing accompaniment (e.g., 1a) or circumstance (e.g., 1d). The 1st 13 vss. follow a fairly rigid template: # *śám* (*naḥ*) GOD NAME (ADJUNCT) (“BE”) (with the latter expressed by a 3rd ps. impv. of $\sqrt{bhū}$ or \sqrt{as} , or gapped; there seems no functional difference between \sqrt{as} and $\sqrt{bhū}$ in this hymn). The order of adjunct and “be” can be flipped. Sometimes a single god (or god pair) occupies a pāda; sometimes two separate *śám* clauses are found in a pāda. In the former case, the adjuncts fill the extra space, while in the latter case the god/power name is all there is room for. In a few cases, noted below, the pattern is broken by the substitution of a verb other than ‘be’.

VII.35.1: This gods listed in this vs. are dual divinities, each with Indra as the first part of the pair and all expressed in dual dvandvas. All have the expected double accent except *indrāgnī* in pāda a, which always lacks an accent on the first member in its numerous occurrences. Re suggests this is because the putative dual ending on **indrā-* is not perceived because of its coalescence with the initial vowel of *agnī*. This is fairly plausible, though there are a number of instances where the word must be read with four syllables and there the dual ending of the 1st member should have been recoverable. For further on the distracted reading, see comm. ad X.65.2.

VII.35.2: In a and c the provider of luck is *śāmsaḥ* ‘Laud’, a clear play on the ubiquitous *śám*. In c *śāmsaḥ* is the head of a NP with dependent gen.: *satyāsya suyāmasya*.

In d Ge renders *purujātāḥ* as “der viele Nachkommen hat,” but given the form of this cmpd., this can hardly be correct. Cmpds. of the shape *puru*-PAST PPL (+ACCENT), like frequent *puru-ṣutá-*, *puru-hutá-*, mean ‘much Xed’ or ‘Xed by many’, and in cmpds. with *jāta-* as 2nd member, *-jāta-* means ‘born, generated’ not ‘offspring’. Re, who tr. “aux nombreuses naissances,” suggests that Aryaman is so qualified because of his association with marriage.

VII.35.3: Although sg. fem. *urūcī* is not otherwise used of the earth in its 5 other occurrences, the du. modifies *ródasī* in VI.11.4 (and at some distance in IV.56.4), which supports Ge's supplying of Earth here.

The well-attested adj. *suháva-* almost always modifies a god or gods and means 'easy to invoke'. Ge supplies 'names' here, and I follow him: "god X, easy to invoke" and "the name of god X, easy to invoke" are functionally nearly identical. And in X.39.1 *pitúr ná nāma suhávam* "(the chariot), easy to invoke like the name of one's father," we have the posited phrase, though "name" is in a simile. Re rejects this interpr. in favor of a nominalized *suháva-* "les appels propices (faits) aux dieux," with, in my opinion, insufficient reason.

VII.35.4: The relentless pattern "luck be" is briefly broken here in pāda d, with *śám* the object of the verb 'blow' (*śám ... abhí vātu*).

VII.35.5: Ge takes b as another break in the pattern: "Das Luftreich soll uns Glück sehen lassen," with *śám* the object of the inf. *drśáye*. But this seems unlikely: the clause is easy to interpret within the template, and furthermore the periphrastic causative assumed by his tr. would be awkwardly or impossibly expressed (lit. "let the Midspace be for us to see luck"); to express such a meaning we would expect rather a form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ("let the Midspace make us to see luck").

VII.35.6: The last pāda here again has a real verb 'let hear' (*śṛṇotu*), not simply 'be', and *śám* is thus displaced from predicated nominative ("X be luck") to adverbial usage ("for luck"), with *naḥ* correspondingly promoted from dative ("for us") to acc. obj. of the verb ("hear us"). Note that this same construction might be found in pāda b and c, which lack verbs, while pāda a must follow the usual pattern because of its *astu*. Thus bc possibly, "let Varuṇa ... (hear us); let Rudra ... (hear) us." However, I think it likely that b+c simply follow a. In any case it's striking (or at least striking in a hymn that otherwise has so little variation) that the verbal construction changes within the vs., while the pattern of personnel is rigidly fixed: each pāda contains a single god as subject with an instr. pl. of his entourage.

VII.35.8: The first pāda again has a verb with content, *úd etu* 'let go up', and as in 6d this slots *śám* into an adverbial role.

VII.35.8: *bhavitra-* is found only here in the RV. My "(the means of) Creation" gives full functional value to the instrument suffix *-tra-*. Gr "die Welt," Ge "Creatur (?)," Re "le séjour-des-existences"; see Re's n. for further, though inconclusive, disc. The immed. preceding hymn contains *janitra-* (VII.34.2), which seems to mean something similar, insofar as it's possible to tell.

VII.35.14–15: These last two vss. stand apart from the 13 monotonous vss. that precede them, though they hardly have more content.

VII.35.14: The first hemistich refers, as often, to the hymn just concluding, with particular insistence on its absolute currency in the present moment, as shown by the

pres. participle and the comparative adj. ‘newer’: *idám bráhma kriyámānaṃ nāvīyaḥ* “this sacred formulation being made anew.”

Who the “cow-born ones” are is debated (see, e.g., Ge, Re, and the long n. by BI [RV Rep. 316–17]), a question I confess to finding not very interesting, perhaps because the longueurs of this hymn have dulled my senses.

The last phrase of 14, the afterthought nominal rel. cl. *utá yé yajñíyāsaḥ*, is probably meant to include all stray divinities and cosmic or natural elements that don’t fall under the first three categories (heavenly, earthly, cow-born) but might deserve worship. It might be better rendered “and those (others) who are worthy of the sacrifice.”

VII.35.15: The just discussed phrase in 14d *yé yajñíyāsaḥ* is picked up by 15a *yé devānāṃ yajñíyā yajñíyānām*. I assume that this phrase doesn’t introduce another group of worthies, but is simply an intensive elaboration of the original phrase. The next pāda qualifies them with another derivative of √*yaj*, the *-tra*-stem *yájatra-*, which I interpr., somewhat capaciously, as meaning that they provide the occasion or reason for Manu’s sacrifice.

VII.36 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn can be read as a progress through a sacrifice. Re (EVP IV.97) follows Hillebrandt in seeing it as a “*récitation du pressurage vespéral*.” Hillebrandt (Myth. II.128 n. 3) in fact considers it as forming, with VII.37.1–7 and VII.38, an old śāstra for the Evening (or Third) Pressing. Although the focus on Indra and the Ṛbhus in VII.37 does identify *that* hymn as associated with the Third Pressing, I do not see that association here. The kindling of the ritual fire that climaxes our vs. 1 (d) suggests rather the Morning Pressing, as does the sun’s sending out the cows in 1b (so also Ge n. 1b). Moreover, most of the gods named in our hymn are not Third Pressing gods; for example, the Maruts, mentioned twice (vss. 7 and 9) are primarily associated with the Midday Pressing, and though the Third Pressing begins with an Āditya cup (which could subsume Mitra and Varuṇa), that pair is prominent in the Morning Pressing and are found here in vs. 2; Sūrya (vs. 1) is certainly not appropriate to the Evening Pressing. As far as I can, VII.36 and VII.37 are ritually independent.

VII.36.1: As Ge (n. 1a) and Re indicate, the opening of this hymn, with *prá bráhmaitu* (that is, *bráhma etu*), is very like the opening of nearby VII.34.1 *prá śukraítu* (= *śukrá etu*) ... *manīṣā*, with both referring to the beginning of the ritual day with the dispatch of the poets’ verbal offering to the gods.

Note the figure *ví ... sasṛje* (b) / *ví ... sasre* (c), both with 3rd sg. mid. perfects built to phonologically similar roots and compounded (in tmesis) with the same preverb.

Narten (1969 “Ai. *sṛ* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht” = Kl. Sch. 135–41) recognizes two synchronically distinct roots √*sṛ*, primarily act. ‘loslaufen, eilen’ and primarily med. ‘sich ausstrecken’. The two forms of the med. pf. *ví sasre* (here and X.71.4) belong to the latter root; see also Kü (553). The instr. *sānūnā* I take as idiomatic for “on her back,” rather than expressing something like “along the back (of something else).” The other occurrence of the pf. *ví sasre* in X.71.4 contains an explicitly sexual image *utó tvasmai tanvām vísasre, jāyeva pátye úsatī suvāsāḥ* “And for another she

[=Speech] has stretched out her body, like an eager well-dressed wife to her husband,” and the same picture of feminine yielding is presumably meant here.

Re curiously takes *pr̥thú prátīkam* as a “pre-compound” modifying Agni, but I follow Ge in taking it as an acc. construed with *ádhi*, a reference to the part of the earth on which the ritual fire is kindled.

VII.36.2: My tr. of *bruvānāḥ* “when called upon” follows Thieme’s (Mitra and Aryaman, p. 69), which in turn follows Meillet’s ([1907] “quand il est invoqué”; see Thieme p. 40). Ge and Re both take *bruvānāḥ* as pass./reflex. ‘be called, call oneself’ with *mītrāḥ* as predicate (e.g., “der Mitra (Freund) heisst”). I now think something halfway between is probably correct. When $\sqrt{brū}$ is not cmprded with a preverb, it does not seem to take an acc. of addressee, so my passive version with addressee as subj., “when called upon,” is probably wrong. However, I don’t think it’s a mere naming construction. Rather, Thieme’s 1st tr. (p. 40) “Contract, when named ...” conveys the intent better: that, when the word -- and god -- alliance/Alliance is spoken at the concluding of a pact, the pact acquires its efficacy. JPB’s tr. of the almost identical III.59.1 “Mitra arranges the peoples when (Alliance) is declared” cleverly plays on the ambiguity of the word *mītrā-*, and I would substitute something like that here.

VII.36.3: The general consensus, beginning with Sāy. (see also Ge, Re [by implication], Lüders 395, Oberlies RdRV II.213), is that this vs. describes the rainy season, with Parjanya as the divinity. But in a hymn with such a strong ritual focus, such a detour into meteorology would seem out of place. I think that it instead concerns soma/Soma, but, as so often, with a cosmic nimbus surrounding this ritual substance. It is, of course, a commonplace that Soma in the IXth Maṇḍala is regularly called a bull; cf. one of the many passages, with the same verb of roaring as here: IX.82.1ab ... *sómaḥ* ... *vṛṣā* ... *acikradat*. The association of Soma with heaven in IX is also too ubiquitous to need demonstration, as consultation (passim) of the 2nd vol. of Oberlies’s *Relig. Ṛgveda*, devoted to the Soma hymns (e.g., “Der Himmel als Heimat des Soma” [14–16]), amply demonstrates. For Soma circling “a great heavenly seat” (*máhi sádma daívyam*) see IX.83.5. That Soma as cosmic bull *evokes* the concept of the thunderstorm, as I think this vs. does, is quite different from declaring that the vs. directly depicts the storm.

Under my interpr., the *sūdāḥ* (for further on this word see below) that swell like milk-cows would be the soma stalks after their soaking or even the cows that provide the milk to mix with the just-pressed soma. Pāda a is more difficult to fit into this scenario. The quieting of the wind does not have an unambiguous analogue in the soma sacrifice. It could refer to the common dying of wind at evening, but this would require following Hillebrandt’s view that this is an Evening Pressing hymn, a suggestion rejected above. In IX.22.2 the surging of the soma juices is compared to that of the wind, and so our passage might refer to arresting the flow of the soma when it is mixed with milk. But I do not consider this a strong suggestion and remain uncertain how to fit pāda a into the overall ritual focus.

I assign *rante* (so Pp.) to $\sqrt{rā}$ ‘(come to) rest’ (so also Lub), along with *ranta* in I.61.11 and nearby VII.39.3, contra the various other interpr. to be found in the lit. I see no reason not to read the prim. ending *-ante* indicated by its sandhi situation and restored by the Pp., despite Lub’s entry “*ranta!*,” suggesting a sec. ending and injunctive form. As

far as I can see this isolated stem can be as easily a root present as the root aorist identified by Lub.

The meaning of the word *sūda-* is much disputed. It occurs three times uncompounded in the RV (here and in IX.97.44 and X.61.2), as well as once in a compd. *sūda-dohas-* (VIII.69.3). Gr's 'Süssigkeit, süßer Trank', which I essentially follow, has been rejected by most comm. and tr. since, starting with Pischel, who interprets it as 'Somabeisatz', referring to the extras added to the soma. Another strain of interpr., in part dependent on post-RVic passages, takes it as referring to small bodies of standing water. For disc. and various alternate tr., see, e.g., Old, *Noten* II.263–64; Bloomfield, *RR* 101; KEWA III.493 (with fuller disc. than EWA II.740); Gotō (1st class, 342–43); Re comm. ad loc. The general opinion is that there are at two distinct words *sūda-*. In our passage Ge renders it as 'die Lachen' (pools) and Re as 'les mares' (ponds). While I have not investigated the post-RVic ritual passages, which may belong elsewhere, I see no reason that the RVic occurrences can't be united under one rubric. The passage in IX.97.44 refers to the preparation of soma and in fact seems almost to gloss the phrase *mādhvaḥ sūdām pavasva* "Purify yourself into the sweetness of honey" in its pāda a by *svādasva ... pāvamānaḥ* "sweeten yourself as you purify yourself." X.61.2 is an obscure mythological snippet in a hymn bristling with difficulties; I argue there (comm. ad loc.) that *sūda-* refers to the sweet admixtures to soma, in contrast to the soma itself. The compd *sūda-dohas-* in VIII.69.3 modifies cows in a passage that also treats the preparation of soma and seems to mean something like "milking out the sweetness / giving the sweetening milk"; we can compare the root-noun compd *havya-sūd-* 'sweetening/preparing the oblation' (I.93.12, IV.50.5), also containing a form of *sūd* and also modifying cows, in soma-preparation context. It is esp. telling that in I.93.12 the cows are urged to 'swell' (*ā pyāyantām*), just as the *sūdaḥ* in our passage are compared to cows and they 'swell' (*āpīpayanta*). The only passage in the RV that might favor a 'puddle / pool / pond' interpr. is the one under disc. here, and that is because the vs. has been interpr. (wrongly in my view; see above) as referring to the thunderstorm, whereas I think it is clear that soma preparation is at issue here as well as in the other *sūda-* passages. Though I still believe that the word is related to the 'sweet' root, my interpr. of *sūda-* is otherwise in line with Pischel's -- I think it likely refers to the sweetness(es) / sweet admixtures that are added to the pressed soma -- though I have not arrived at this interpr. by the same route as Pischel. Since *sūda-* is elsewhere a noun, I would slightly alter my tr. here to "the sweetness(es) have swelled like milk-cows," though the barbarity of the plural 'sweetnesses' would preclude allowing it in the publ. tr.

VII.36.4: The construction of this vs. is skewed: the first hemistich contains a typical generalizing rel. cl. referring to proper ritual performance ("who[ever] will yoke ..."). It is couched in the 3rd sg. and contains a pres. subjunctive (*yunājat*). In the 2nd hemistich, pāda c contains another 3rd sg. rel. cl., this time with a pres. indic. (or possibly subj.) (*mināti*), but without a ritual focus, and pāda d contains a 1st sg. optative that does relate to the ritual (*vavṛtyām*). This ill-assorted trio of clauses has been variously treated. Ge thinks that both rel. clauses have gods as subject, though not necessarily the same god (see n. 4), and that at least the rel. cl. of c has *aryamānam* in d as referent of the rel. prn. Re, mostly flg. Sāy., takes a pious human as subject of ab and supplies a main cl. with it. I think rather that d provides the main cl. for ab, with c a distinct rel. cl. dependent on d,

and that there is a switch of reference between the 3rd sg. *yāḥ ... yunājat* of the first hemistich and 1st ps. *vavṛtyām* of d: “I” am the embodiment of the proper ritual actor as defined in ab. The rel. cl. of c is quite distinct and does indeed depend on *aryáman-* in d; the god I wish to bring here to my ritual is the one who can neutralize the battle fury of my (and his) enemy. Switch of reference between 3rd ps. and 2nd ps., even within a single vs., is extremely common when referring to gods, and I see no reason why a similar switch between 3rd and 1st would not be possible when referring to the poet/ritual officiant. For a 1st ps. version of the 1st pāda, cf. I.82.6 *yunājmi te bráhmanā keśínā hárī* (also III.35.4, VII.19.6).

dhāyú- is a hapax. Gr glosses ‘durstig’, connecting it to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘suckle’. Old suggests, quite doubtfully, that it belongs rather to $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘run’, and this suggestion underlies Ge’s ‘rennlustig’; see also AiG II.2.470, where it is explained as showing an exchange between -v- and -y-. EWA s.v. (rightly) rejects this root affiliation, in favor of one suggested by Gotō (1st Kl. 179 n. 311) to \sqrt{dhan} ‘id.’. Re tr. ‘riches en dons’, but suggests an association with *dhāyas-* ‘nourishment, sustenance’, bringing us back to Gr’s and indeed Whitney’s (Roots) root etym. to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘suckle’. My ‘seeking fodder’ reflects the same association.

Note the faint phonological figure of (b) *suráthā sūra dhā(yu) / d su(k)rát(um)*.

I follow JPB (Ādityas, 171–72) in taking *aryáman-* here as a descriptor of Indra. As Brereton points out, it makes no sense for Aryaman to appear when the poet is seeking to attract Indra. Moreover, the action of pāda c, confounding battle fury, is much more appropriate for Indra (cf., e.g., nearby VII.18.16 *índro manyúm manyumyò mimāya*), who is also the most common referent for the adj. *sukrátu-* ‘very resolute’.

VII.36.5: Ge and Re in their different ways attempt to wring a more palatable tr. from *yajante* than the VP should allow. The problem is that the acc. with this verb here is not a god, the usual object, but two desirable qualities of a god, namely fellowship/companionship and vitality/vigor. In Ge’s rendering the reverent ones “request” these qualities (erbitten); in Re’s they “obtain them by sacrifice.” But though Re claims that this is the meaning of medial forms of \sqrt{yaj} , in fact uncompounded middles take the god sacrificed to, just like active forms; cf. nearby VII.42.3 *yájasva ... devān*. It is forms (both act. and mid.) compounded with *ā* that acquire the meaning ‘obtain by sacrifice’. I therefore think the abstract qualities fellowship and vitality must be the objects of our sacrifice/worship, standing in for their divine possessor.

I take *ṛtásya dhāman* “domain of truth” as referring to the ritual ground (as does Sāy.).

Ge’s tr. of *bābadhe* tentatively connects it with \sqrt{bandh} ‘bind’ (flg. Sāy.), not $\sqrt{bādh}$ ‘(op)press’ (see his n. 5c). But \sqrt{bandh} otherwise lacks a pf. in the RV and beginning in the AV its weak forms have a base *bedh-*. The standard weak 3rd sg. pf. to $\sqrt{bādh}$ is *babādhé*; see Kü 330–31. Schaeffer (156) takes *bābadhe* as an intens. pres., parallel to *badbadhé* with both following the standard perfect in function, and Kü (331; cf. also 488) seems to follow, though he takes *badbadhé* as an intensive perfect, distinguished from the present *bābadhe*. Since all these stems have a 3rd sg. ending characteristic of the perfect, I consider at least *bābadhe* to be a straight perfect, with adjustment of the vowel length of redupl. and root syllable to conform better to such distribution elsewhere in the perfect system; cf. esp. *vāvṛdhé* versus *vavārdha*. The intens.

badbadhé then adopted the inflectional patterns of the other two redupl. stems. As for what the verb means here, although *ví√bādh* generally has a negative sense ‘thrust away (undesirable things)’, here I think the same literal sense refers to the god’s pushing out towards us the *pr̥kṣaḥ* ‘fortifying nourishments’ we want in exchange for praise. Re (comm.) suggests a slightly different semantic pathway.

VII.36.6: According to Old and Ge, this vs. consists only of dependent clauses, and this is certainly true descriptively: there are two subordinate clauses marked by the subordinating conj. *yád* ‘when’ (a) and the rel. prn. *yāḥ* (c), one accented verb (*susváyanta*) in the rel. cl. of c, and no main verbs. In the publ. tr. I take d as a covert main clause, signalled only by the preverb *abhí*, with which I supply a verb of motion. However, it is perfectly possible that d is simply a continuation of the rel. cl. of c, though I do not then know what to do with the *abhí* init. in d. Under the interpr. with cd as rel. clause the 2nd hemistich would simply be “who are richly fertile, rich in milk, rich in streams, swelling with their own milk.” In any case, if it lacks a main clause, the vs. cannot be attached either to preceding vs. 5 or following vs. 7; it would have to be an independent if incomplete structure.

The first hemistich lacks a finite verb, and in my view the participle *vāvasānāḥ* (whether pf. or intens.; Kü 488 [and Schaeffer by omission] favor the former) serves as predicate. However, both Ge and Re supply a verb of motion, presumably on the basis of initial *ā*: “her(kommen)” and “ar(rivent).” This is of course possible. Both Ge and Re also take the part. *vāvasānāḥ* as belonging to the pf. of *√vas* ‘desire’, whose participle is homonymous with that of *√vās*: “zusammenverlangend” and “riches en désirs” respectively. Although this cannot be faulted formally, the well-known noise-making quality of rivers (embodied in the very word *nadī-*) provides a more vivid image and, on the other hand, it is not clear what the rivers would be eager for.

On the near-hapax *susváyanta* see my *-áya-Formations* (52–53), where I argue that the other occurrence of the stem, act. part. *susváyantī* (X.110.6=AV V.27.8) is founded upon this passage and that the form here has been generated in the playful and alliterative context of this vs. (see esp. the following *su-* adjectives *sudúghāḥ sudhārāḥ*) loosely to *susū-* ‘well-bearing’, a connection already suggested by Weber (see Old). Such a derivation matches the theme of the rivers’ burgeoning fertility that dominates the vs.

VII.36.7: HvN’s restoration of the pausal form at the end of c as *caránti* is incorrect; it must be *carántī*, as the Pp. has it.

Ge suggests that the ‘imperishable’ (*ākṣarā*), an esoteric designation for ‘cow’, is the Dakṣiṇā, while Sāy. thinks rather of Vāc. In this Marut vs. I wonder if it doesn’t refer to their mother Pr̥śni.

For the phrase *yújyam ... rayím* see VIII.46.19.

The nom. pl. *té* is very oddly positioned, in the middle of both clause and pāda, breaking up the NP *yújyam ... rayím*, and not even adjoining the caesura. I have no explanation.

VII.36.8: The NP *dhiyó avitāram*, characterizing Bhaga, reprises the VP *dhíyam ... avantu* in 7b, where the Maruts were the subject.

The phrase *sātaú vājam* in d is somewhat problematic. Ge takes it, without comment, as equivalent to the common *vājasya sātaú* (e.g., VII.21.7) with a genitive: “bei dem Gewinnen des Preises.” Re follows, commenting “seul exemple de *sāti-* avec régime Acc.” But this is the problem: although the dative inf. *sātāye* regularly takes the acc. (e.g., IX.8.2 *sātāye vāsūni*), the loc. to the same stem never does. And in fact even the dative, when construed with *vāja-*, takes the gen.: *vājasya sātāye* (V.9.7, VI.60.13, IX.7.9, X.93.10). In the one apparent exception, IX.68.7 *vājam ā darṣi sātāye*, the acc. is actually object of the main verb. I therefore think that *vājam* here has to be an obj. of *prá ... kṛṇudhvam*, parallel to the divinities and semi-divinities in the vs.

VII.36.9: On *niṣikta-pā-* see Old and now Scar (306).

I take *prajāyāi* as a quasi-infinitive. See also X.73.5.

VII.37 All Gods

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is primarily devoted to the Ṛbhus (vss. 1–2) and Indra (vss. 3–7), which associates the hymn with the Third Pressing.

VII.37.1: The function of *abhí*, initial in c, is unclear; the verb of this hemistich, *prṇadhvam*, final in d, does not appear with *abhí* elsewhere.

On the triple-backed (*tripṛsthā-*) soma, see Ge’s n. 1c, where he suggests among other possibilities that it refers to the three ingredients making up the soma drink (soma juice, water, and milk).

VII.37.1–2: The stationing of the adj. *ámṛkta-* ‘indestructible’ at the end of the b pādas of both vss., in each case some distance from its noun, is clearly deliberate, but I’m not sure what it’s signaling.

VII.37.3: There is some lexical chaining here: in pāda a the standing epithet of Indra, *maghavan*, picks up the pl. *maghāvatsu* in 2a (in the same metrical position), thus implicitly asserting an identification of the human patrons of 2 with Indra. The quasi-inf. *deṣṇām* (trisyllabic, to be read *dayiṣṇām*), also in pāda a, echoes *dayadhvam* at the end of vs. 2. Although *deṣṇā-* is standardly taken as a deriv. of √*dā* ‘give’ (so already Gr., also AiG II.2.927–28, EWA s.v. *DĀ*, II.714), it is at least secondarily associated with √*day* ‘distribute’ here. A more distant, and less telling, lexical echo is *pūrṇā* ‘full’ with 1d *prṇadhvam* ‘fill!’.

Note the abundance of *vāsu-* forms (*vāsunaḥ* b, *vāsunā* c, *vasavyā* d).

For d Ge (n. 3d) appositely cites VIII.32.15 *nákir asya ... niyantā sūñtānām*, which he tr. ad loc. as “Keiner tut ... seinen Gnadegaben Einhalt,” with *sūñtānām* an objective gen. with *niyantā*. I am therefore puzzled as to why he does not take *sūñtā* here as standing for acc. pl. *sūñtāḥ* in sandhi, as the obj. of *ní yamate*, the same lexeme as in VIII.32.15. Instead he follows the Pp. in taking it as nom. sg. *sūñtā*, subj. of the verb: “Deine Grossmut hält die Schätze nicht zurück” (sim. Re). My tr. takes account of VIII.32.15 and goes against the Pp.

VII.37.4: The connection of the first two vss., dedicated to the Ṛbhus, and the subsequent Indra vss. is made clear here: Indra is called *ṛbhukṣán-* (cf. the pl. applied to the Ṛbhus in

1b, 2b) in pāda a and compared with *vāja-* in b. Vāja is of course the name of one of the Ṛbhus, and they are all addressed as *vājāḥ* in 1b. Both Ge and Re take the simile *vājo ná* as containing the PN (e.g., “comme un Vāja”), though Ge allows the common noun sense as an alternate (“wie der gute Vāja [die gute Beute]”), but I think the comparison is stronger if the ‘prize’ sense is more prominent and the relationship to the Ṛbhu name is backgrounded. However, I would now emend the tr. to recognize the PN explicitly: “Like a prize [/like (the Ṛbhu) Vāja] ...”

Pāda b, with its description of Indra going home, is reminiscent of the envoi in the fallow-bay-yoking oblation at the end of the soma sacrifice (cf., e.g., I.82a, III.53.4-6) and is therefore appropriate to the Third Pressing context.

VII.37.5: This vs. presents minor problems of syntax and the uncertain fit of certain lexical items. In the first pāda it is not clear what the *pravātaḥ* are that Indra regularly gains for his devotee. The stem *pravát-* generally refers to a slope or sloping course. Ge takes it as an abstract Vorsprung (lead or advantage), Re as a course, Tichy (Nom.ag. 307) as “die schnellen Wege” (with !). I think the clue is found in nearby VII.32.27 *tvāyā vayām pravātaḥ śásvatīr apò ’ti śúra tarāmasi* “with you let us cross over the (river-)courses one after another, cross over the waters, o champion.” Here as well the reference seems to be to Indra’s aiding us in gaining new lands by crossing river after river.

As for pāda b, all three just-named scholars take *dhībhiḥ* as part of the main clause found in pāda a and embed the first part of b within this frame. Cf., e.g., Ge’s “Du gewinnst selbst ... den Vorsprung ab nach den Absichten, mit denen du (etwas) unternimmst.” But, though convenient, this kind of embedding is foreign to RVic sentence structure. Instead I think we must take the rel. prn. *yābhiḥ* as coreferential with *pravātaḥ* in the main cl. (*pravát-* being, of course, fem.). The instr. of *pravát-* generally expresses extent: ‘along the slope (etc.)’ (e.g., VIII.5.37=13.8=IX.24.2 *āpo ná pravātā yatīḥ* “like waters going along a slope”), and so here I assume that Indra accomplishes his work (*víveśaḥ*), that is, assures victory for us, along the river-courses that are being fought for. The other instr. fem. in this hemistich, *dhībhiḥ*, is then independent of *yābhiḥ* and part of the rel. cl. that *yābhiḥ* introduces, and I take it in the same sense as the instr. *matībhiḥ* in 2d and *dhiyā* in 6c: “in accord with [thought/vision].”

The success of Indra’s activities on our behalf is announced in c and his help duly noted. The number mismatch in the instr. phrase *yújyābhir ūtī* is common in Triṣṭubh cadences containing instr. *ūtī-*, truncated from iambic cadences (dimeter / Jagatī) of the type ... *viśvābhir ūtībhiḥ* (I.23.6 etc., etc.). See further disc. ad VI.10.5.

VII.37.6: The trans./caus. *vāsáyasi* is here used in a curious idiomatic sense. The other two occurrences of this stem, nearby each other in III.1.17, 7.3, are straightforward in function: ‘cause to dwell / settle down’. But here the verb is used in a complaint: ‘cause to wait, cool one’s heels, hang around, bide one’s time’. The idiom is reinforced by the very rare use of the simile particle *iva* with a verb. My “seem to be ...” is meant to capture this *iva*; it could also be rendered ‘as it were’. Ge (n. 6) suggests that this is a hint to the poet’s patron that he (the poet) has been waiting too long for his dakṣiṇā.

The adj. *tātyā-* is a transparent deriv. of the familiar word for father, *tatā-* ‘daddy, papa’. I therefore think the rather formal register of Ge’s *väterlich* and Re’s *paternel* strike the wrong note; surely the idea is that Indra’s *dhī-* is affectionate and indulgent.

VII.37.7: The sense and syntax of this vs. are extremely challenging. My interpr. differs from those of the other standard tr. I will not treat these in detail, but will note two important points of difference. I do not think that Indra is the referent of *yām* in pāda a (as, e.g., Old does), and I do not think that *tribandhū-* in c is a PN, much less a reference to Vasiṣṭha (see, e.g., Ge, Mayr PN s.v.).

My sense of the structure of the vs. is that the two outer pādas (a, d), which match by virtue of being relative clauses introduced by *yām*, go together, with the referent of the *yām* the same in each: a mortal man beset by difficulties. These relative clauses depict the same unfortunate situation, the dissolution and isolation of this man. The two inner pādas (b, c) are the main clause (or a subordinate and a main clause in b and c respectively) and present Indra as the antidote and refuge for the unfortunate mortal. This complicates the clause relations but has the virtue of making sense (some sense, anyway). Many details remain to be discussed, however.

In pāda a the VP (*abhī yām ... īse*) is puzzling: $\sqrt{īś}$ does not otherwise occur with *abhī*, and it is found overwhelmingly with a genitive, not an accusative complement. (For disc. of other possible acc. exx. cited by Gr., see comm. ad VII.32.18. Commenting on this passage, Re suggests that $\sqrt{īś}$ appears with the acc. only when it is a pronoun, but this is not borne out by the distribution; among other things, there are plenty of pronominal genitives with $\sqrt{īś}$.) Here the clue to the usage is provided by a passage in the next hymn (cited by Old), VII.38.4 *abhī yām devy āditīr gṛṇāti*, which has the identical structure, save for a different named goddess (also a *-ti*-abstract) and a different verb, *gṛṇāti* (against our *abhī yām devy nīrtīś cid īse*). The root $\sqrt{gṛ}$ regularly takes both *abhī* and the acc. In VII.38.4 the one referred to by *yām* is benevolently greeted by the benevolent goddess Aditi; our passage seems to have been constructed as a deliberate contrast to this happy scene, with the malevolent goddess Nirṛti extending her sway to an unfortunate mortal. (The passages differ in one notable way, however: in VII.38.4 the referent of *yām* is the god Savitar.) The pairing of the two passages accounts for the unexpected preverb and unexpected accusative with *īse* in our passage.

The middle pādas referring to Indra (in my view) present the god as a sort of venerable figure with whom the beleaguered man of pāda a (and d) can take refuge. Indra’s venerable status results from the years that have accumulated for him, as pāda b indicates, and in c the subject (who, in my opinion, is the mortal man referred to by the rel. pronouns in a and d) approaches Indra because of the god’s attainment of age. That old age is presented as a positive feature of Indra also gives the mortal reassurance that his own aging can likewise be positive.

As already noted, I do not follow the almost universal interpr. of the hapax *tribandhū-* as a PN nor the further identification of that PN with Vasiṣṭha. Instead I take it as the bahuvrīhi it is in full lexical value: ‘having three bonds’, with the bonds referring to kinship as *bāndhu-* does so often. I further think that this is a reference to the three-generations model so prevalent later: a man with both father and son (or perhaps, as later, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather), ensuring the continuity of the male line and, esp. later, the śrāddha offerings to the ancestors. Although this theme is not prominent in

the RV, it can be discerned indirectly in several passages; see X.135 (and my article “The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of a Brahmin: A New Interpretation of R̥gveda X.135,” *Journal asiatique* 302.2 [2014]: 245–57) and VI.20.11 (also discussed in that article, as well as comm. ad loc.). A man who had achieved the *tribandhú* state would be well along in years, and his approach to a similarly aging Indra would be appropriate. In fact, the depiction of Indra at this stage of life in this vs. contrasts strongly with the usual representation of Indra as young and virile. Note that *tribandhú*- may form a faint ring with *tripṛsthá*- ‘three-backed’ in 1c.

In d we return to the afflictions visited on our unhappy man -- this time by (other) mortals. Thus a and d show him as the target of a divinity (the *devī* Nirṛti, a) and men (*mārtāḥ*, d), with Indra as the literal intercessor. Both Ge and Re tr. the clear subjunctive *kṛṇávanta* in d as a preterite (“beraubt haben,” “ont rendu”), but there is no justification for this and neither provides one. Exactly what the other mortals will or would do isn’t entirely clear to me, and it depends in great part on how we interpret -*veśa*- in the compd *āsvaveśa*-. In V.85.7, containing an array of apparently non-kin relationships, JPB tr. ‘neighbor’; in IV.3.13, again in a set of calibrated relationships, I do so as well, though in X.49.5 the publ. tr. renders it as ‘vassal’ (but see now comm. ad loc.). Here, if I am correct about the sense of *tribandhú*-, -*veśa*- should refer to a relationship outside the close family line. The sense would be: when mortals deprive him of his non-blood (or less closely related) associates (pāda d), he still has his tight paternal lineage (*tribandhú*-pāda c). My ‘clansmen’ could be correct (based on the usual sense of *vís*-), but ‘neighbor’ or even ‘vassal’ (or Re’s ‘clientèle’) could, too. I do not think Ge’s Anhang fits, however. I now wonder, however, if Gr’s “kein eigenes Haus habend, heimatlos” might be correct. In my general disc. of *veśá*- ad X.49.5 (q.v.), I take *veśá*- ‘neighbor’ as backformed to *prátiveśa*- ‘neighbor’, lit. ‘having one’s house facing/opposite’, with an underlying *veśa*- ‘house’ (perhaps accented *véśa*- and the equivalent of Grk. φοῖκος, etc.). Our compd could contain this same ‘house’; the pont then would be that even if mortals deprive him of his dwelling, he will still have his kin. So I offer an alt. tr. here: “... bereft of his own house.”

VII.37.8: The first pāda of this vs., *ā no ... stavádhyai*, is reminiscent of 1a *ā vo ... stavádhyai*, and thus forms a ring, already anticipated by the echo of 1c *tripṛsthāḥ* in 7c *tribandhúḥ*. However, it also makes an appeal to Savitar, who does not figure otherwise in the hymn, and thus seems to anticipate the first two vss. of the next hymn, VII.38, which are dedicated to that god. Indeed the Anukr. identifies that whole hymn as dedicated to Savitar, but see publ. intro. to VII.38 for the view that it really is an All God hymn.

VII.38 Savitar [/All Gods]

On the likelihood that this is actually an All God hymn, despite the Anukr.’s ascription to Savitar and the domination of Savitar in the first vss., see publ. intro.

VII.38.1: On the presential value of the pf. of \sqrt{yam} and of this passage in particular, see Kü 395.

VII.38.3: Ge takes *āpi ... astu* as “...soll Anteil (an Opfer) haben,” but this isn’t necessary in the passage, and I know of no parallels with that sense.

VII.38.4: On the close parallel to our pāda a in the previous hymn, see comm. ad VII.37.7.

The sequence *vāruṇaḥ ... mitrāso aryamā* presents a twist on the usual trio of the principal Ādityas, Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, since *mitrāsaḥ* is plural and, as Ge suggests (n. 4d), must be a word play, referring to the common noun *mitrá-* ‘ally’. Obviously the god Mitra must also be referenced, with *mitrāsaḥ* found in Mitra’s usual place in the sequence of names.

VII.38.5: On this assortment of minor divinities, see publ. intro. In particular, *ékadhenu-* ‘having one milk-cow’ is a hapax, and who these beings are is otherwise unknown.

The structure of the vs. is quite loose. The initial *abhí* invites us to group the vs. with the preceding one, where *abhí* opens three of the four pādas (a, c, d) as the preverb with two forms of the root $\sqrt{gṛ}$ (*gṛṇāti* a, *gṛṇanti* c). This is indeed how I construe it, with the main cl. represented only by *abhí* and a gapped **gṛṇanti* (hence my “(as do) those”), and the rest of the first hemistich occupied by the rel. cl. introduced by *yé*. In other words, the Gift Escorts, described in the relative clause, also greet Savitar. The root \sqrt{sap} does not otherwise appear with *abhí* (anywhere in Skt. as far as I know; *pace* Gr). Therefore taking the whole of the 1st hemistich, beginning with *abhí*, as a single rel. cl. (as Ge seems to) is not a favored option, esp. since there is no corresponding main clause in the vs.: the 2nd hemistich has a set of new sg. subjects and singular verbs. Ge is forced to take it as a syntactic truncation; see his —. Re gets out of this difficulty by supplying a pl. impv. to $\sqrt{śru}$ for ab “(qu’ils nous écoutent),” parallel to *śṛnotu* in c, but the *abhí* of pāda a seems to me to point to a connection with the previous vs. as just argued.

I do not understand what *mithó vanúsaḥ* is meant to convey -- perhaps that the Gift Escorts avidly compete with each other to provide the best service? IX.97.37 *sápani yám mithunāso níkāmaḥ, adhvaryávaḥ ...* is similar, with both \sqrt{sap} and a form of \sqrt{mith} and with *níkāma-* ‘eager’ semantically matching our *vanús-*; there the sense seems to be that the Adhvaryus of various sacrifices compete with each other to be best at serving Soma (“whom they serve, eager in rivalry -- the Adhvaryus ...”).

The VP *rātím* \sqrt{sap} seems almost to be a gloss of the root-noun compd. *rāti-śāc-* and might help us determine the function of this enigmatic group of divinities or semi-divinities. The use of a transitive VP as apparent gloss makes it unlikely (at least to me) that *-śāc-* has a passive / intransitive sense in the compd (Scar’s ‘von Gaben begleitet’ [593, Ge sim.], Re’s ‘qui ont le don pour attribut’). Gr’s transitive ‘Gabe gewährend, Spende betreibend’ is closer to the mark, though muddling the sense of the root \sqrt{sac} .

The conj. *utá* is oddly positioned in the middle of its pāda, and it is not clear what it’s conjoining. Klein (DGRV I.380) follows Re in positing an ellipsed **śṛmvantu* in the 1st hemistich, with the *utá* conjoining that clause with the *śṛnotu* clause here. But even were we to supply that verb (see above for reasons not to), *utá* would still be out of position: we would expect it pāda-initial. I think that the *utá* is loosely conjoining this clause with what precedes, but that this does not require matching verbs. I further think that it has been postponed in order to allow *áhiḥ* to take initial position, in order to echo the *abhí*’s that open this vs. (5a) and three of the pādas in the preceding vs. (4a, c, d). Notably, two of the twelve pādas containing *áhir budhnyàḥ* elsewhere in the RV are opened by *utá* (I.186.5, VI.50.14), with the latter almost identical to ours except for the

order of *utá* and the divine name: VI.50.14 *utá nó 'hir budhnyàḥ śṛnotu*. This would give support to my view that the ordinary order was disrupted to allow the semi-rhyme of #*abhí*/ #*áhi*(*ḥ*). (Note that when *utá* was moved to mid-pāda, it took the Wackernagel-positioned *naḥ* along with it.)

VII.38.6: The presence of *yāti* ‘begs’ in d solidifies the affiliation to the same root of the mid. part. *iyānāḥ* in b. I follow Re in taking the part. as a passive, though this interpr. is somewhat problematic. The pāda also appears identically in VII.52.3b, where the participle has transitive, though self-beneficial, usage. Ge takes it that way here as well (“darum bittend”), and Bl (RR, ad our passage) claims that there is “no good reason” to take *iyānāḥ* passively here. However, the context favors a passive interpr.: Bhaga gives the treasure away when we (or the powerless one of d) beg for it; I do not think Bhaga is himself begging it from Savitar, as an intermediate step before giving it away himself. Moreover, the same mid. part. is regularly used in the passive; cf., e.g., VII.17.7, 29.1 also in VII. Although I am reluctant to give identical pādas, esp. in the same maṇḍala, different interpretations, in this case the multivalence of the medial voice of this root (finite *īmahe* is regularly transitive, e.g.) allows the same sequence to be used in two different ways.

VII.38.7–8: These last two vss. concern the *vājínāḥ* ‘prize-winners’. As indicated in the publ. intro., although most (in addition to the usual tr., see Oberlies RdV II.240) take these to be horses, as so often, I instead take the referent of *vājín-* to be the Maruts. In an All God hymn the default expectation is that gods are the dedicands. And there are numerous phraseological parallels that support the identification. See esp. nearby VII.36.7, where the Maruts are called *vājínāḥ*, as well as in the immediately preceding hymn, where VII.35.9 *śám no bhavantu marútaḥ svarkāḥ* is almost identical, save for the expressed subj., to our 7ab *śám no bhavantu vājínāḥ ... svarkāḥ*. The stem *svarká-* occurs only 3 times; besides these two occurrences, the third, in I.88.1, refers to the Maruts’ chariots. The voc. phrase *amṛtā ṛtājāḥ* in our 8b is found also, addressed to the Maruts, in V.57.8 *ámṛtā ṛtājāḥ* (accented).

VII.38.7: On *jambháya-* ‘crush’, see comm. ad II.23.9 and my *-áya-*Formations, p. 93.

The cmpd. *sanemí-* lit. means ‘along with its/the felly’ (see, e.g., AiG III.75, EWA s.v. *némi-*), but is a way to express ‘entirely’ (“felly and all”): “with all its gear,” “bag and baggage,” “lock, stock, and barrel” are idiomatic English equivalents.

VII.38.8: It is appropriate that the *vājíns* should be the topic in a clause with the āmṛḍita loc. absol. *vāje-vāje*. The etym. figure would be clearer if the loc. had been tr. “whenever prizes (are at stake)” vel sim.

VII.39 All Gods

VII.39.1: The first pāda somewhat echoes the first hemistich of the preceding hymn (VII.38.1ab), with the final verb *asret* mimicking likewise final *ásísret* in 38.1b and the verb’s object *sumatím* resembling *amatím* in 38.1b and in the same metrical position. This is perhaps an additional reason to consider VII.38 to be fundamentally an All God

hymn properly situated in the All God cycle, rather than an intrusive hymn to Savitar. See disc. in the publ. intro. to VII.38.

I do not know the referent of *vāsavaḥ*. Perhaps, given the connections with VII.38.1, it is Savitar. The same phrase *sumatīm (...) vāsavaḥ* is found in III.4.1 (an Āprī hymn), but the referent is no clearer there. Ge suggests that the referent is Agni himself. This would work in both passages and may be correct; inter alia Agni is frequently the referent of *vāsu-*, but the non-signalling of coreference with the subject still seems a little odd. The pl. *vāsavaḥ* appears in vs. 3 modifying the gods.

On the idiom PATH √ *bhāj* see comm. ad VII.18.16.

The publ. tr. fails to render *naḥ* in d. I would emend to “will offer our true (hymn)” or “will offer for us ...”

Both Ge and Re avoid making *ṛtām* obj. of *yajāti*, both by making it an adverbially used acc. of respect (vel sim.): “... möge er ... das Opfer *richtig* [my italics] vollziehen” and “(selon) l’Ordre.” I follow Lü (436–39, esp. 439) in considering *ṛtām* ‘truth’ here a representation of ‘hymn’: “... möge ... ein Lied darbringen.”

VII.39.2: This vs. presents a number of minor problems. The first is the usage of the verb in pāda a, med. pf. *prā vāvṛje*. Ge and Re interpr. it as passive, e.g. “Das Barhis ist ... gelegt,” as does Kü (461). Since this is the only med. form of the pf., against several act. transitive ones, this is possible, but it should be noted that med. forms of the present are generally transitive. Cf. very similar VII.18.4 *prā vṛñjate ... barhīḥ*, where the 3rd pl. form of the verb precludes a passive reading. Moreover, the passive reading would require the adj. *suprayā(h)* to modify neut. *barhīḥ*; in my opinion (contra Gr and possibly Ge, Re; see also Old’s somewhat cryptic n. to II.3.5), this form belongs to the *s*-stem *suprayās-* and is a nom. sg. masc., but even if this grammatical analysis is incorrect, I do not see any way to get a properly inflected neut. sg. in *-ā(h)* out of any possible stem. The difficulty disappears if we take *vāvṛje* as transitive, supplying Agni from vs. 1 as subject. Undoubted acc. forms of the *s*-stem adj. (*suprayāsam*) modify Agni 3 times out of the 4 clear occurrences of the stem (II.2.1, 4.1, VI.11.4). Although Agni in his physical form as fire is not a likely twister of barhis, of course, he has just been identified as a Hotar in 1d and in his priestly role could perform other priestly actions.

I take *eṣām* as gen. for dat., as often, and referring to the gods (so also Ge, Re).

As noted in the publ. intro., the hapax *bīṛīṭa* (in sandhi; Pp. *bīṛīṭe*) in b is completely opaque. See EWA s.v. The only thing that is clear is that it has aberrant, non-Indo-Aryan phonology, with plain *b* and unmotivated retroflex *ṭ*. It is not even evident what grammatical form it might be: standing next to dual *viśpatī*, it might be expected to be a dual as well. Indeed a pragrahya *bīṛīṭe* would be better metrically, as Old points out. If the sandhi represented in the Saṃhitā text is correct, however, it could be a loc. in *-e*. Both Ge and Re take it as such, following in their tr. Yāska’s gloss *gaṇa-* (see also Kuiper, Aryans 31 and Kü 461), and both construe *viśām* in the next pāda with it (“in der Gefolgschaft ihre Clanleute” and “dans l’arroi des clans” respectively). A hemistich boundary between a locative and its dependent genitive seems highly unlikely to me, esp. when it is not a well-known standard expression. In the publ. tr. I take it as a loc., but decline to translate; I would now be inclined to take it as a nom. dual, but also decline to tr., hence “like two ? clan-lords.” Unlike many problematic hapaxes, this one does not seem to be phonologically generated.

With Ge and Re, I interpr. the verb in b, *ā ... iyāte*, as ‘hasten here’. Lub classifies it with *√yā* ‘beseech, beg’, and the morphology supports him: the form cannot belong with well-attested *īyate* ‘hastens’ both because of its short root syllable and because of its athematic ending, whereas it could easily belong to the medial root pres. of ‘beg’ (cf. part. *iyānā-*). But ‘beg’ does not fit the context, and esp. with Vāyu forming one of the paired subjects and with the time specified as dawn and the occasion the Early Invocation, the common formulaic *vāyav ā yāhi* (I.2.1, etc.) and its variants, calling Vāyu to the first pressing, imposes itself here. I don’t understand the morphology, but a poet who could inflict *bīriṭe* on us is capable of confecting a nonce verb form in the same pāda.

If *viśām* is not dependent on *bīriṭe*, what is it doing? A survey of the occurrences of this gen. pl. reveals that it is often pāda-initial (as here) and dependent on *viśpāti-* (e.g., III.2.10, 13.5, V.4.3), *pāti-* (e.g., I.127.8, VI.15.1), or a similar authority figure. I therefore loosely construe it with *viśpatī* in b, though I resupply that word in c. Alternatively, II.4.1 *viśām agnīm ātithimṣu suprayāsam* ‘Agni, the guest of the clans, who receives very pleasurable offerings’ is suggestive, since it contains a form of *suprayās-* modifying Agni. But ‘guest’ is missing in our passage, and in any case the *suprayās-* form is in a different clause.

As for the *aktór uśasaḥ* phrase, Ge. (n. 2c) has convinced me that it’s an abbreviated version of *uśaso yāman aktóḥ* ‘at the coming of dawn from night’ (III.30.13, VI.38.4). Perhaps the loc. *yāman* was gapped because of the presence of the loc. *pūrvāhūtau*, although the latter is not part of the same phrase.

The epithet *niyútvān-* ‘possessing a team’ is primarily used of Vāyu, and therefore, although Pūṣan intervenes between *vāyúḥ* and *niyútvān*, it must modify Vāyu, with the name and the epithet polarized at the edges of the pāda.

Vāyu and Pūṣan do not generally appear together and do not form a natural pair; I don’t know the reason for their joint appearance here. As far as I know, Pūṣan has no part in the Morning Pressing.

VII.39.3: There is almost universal agreement that *jmayā* represents an adverbial instr. of exactly that shape, despite the hiatus, rather than Pp. *jmayāḥ*. See, e.g., Old, Re, Scar 421, with lit.

With Sāy., cited by Ge, the Maruts must be the referents of *śubhrāḥ* in b: pl. forms of this adj. generally modify the Maruts, and the midspace is especially associated with them.

Note that *marjayanta* must be reflexive, with real medial value, rather than being a straight transitive -*anta* replacement of the type commonly found with -*āya*-formations.

On *urujrayaḥ* see comm. ad V.54.2.

Assuming the Agni is the messenger in d (so, e.g., Ge), this vs. contains both standard models of the sacrifice: “the gods come to the sacrifice” and “the sacrifice goes to the gods.”

VII.39.4: Pāda b contains *viśve ... devāḥ*, though distracted. Since this is the middle vs. of the hymn, this specification of the dedicands of the hymn may constitute a not very noteworthy omphalos. It also introduces a brief flood of named gods (4d, 5).

VII.39.5: In the first hemistich Agni appears to be playing on both sides, as it were: he is commanded (voc. *agne*) to bring (*ā ... vaha*) a series of gods here, including Agni (acc. *agním*) at the end of pāda b. This seems conceptually odd: Agni the god does not need to be brought to the sacrifice -- he's already there -- and it is also hard to see how he would bring himself. Ge's (n. 5b) explanation that including Agni in the list serves for "Vervollständigung der Götterversammlung" seems weak. In that case we might expect Agni to come at the end of the list, and in any case too many gods are missing from the list to consider it a complete collection. It might be possible to consider the Agni to be brought as the celestial Agni, i.e., the sun. But I think it more likely that *agním* is parallel to *gírah* in pāda a, and both are acc. of goal, expressing the ritual elements the gods will encounter at the ritual: hymns and the ritual fire. The standard tr. take *gírah* in this way, and I see no reason why *agním* can't have the same function.

In c *eṣām* is hard to construe. I follow Old in accepting the BR emendation to **eṣām* 'quick'. Old cites the parallel in the very next hymn VII.40.5 *viṣṇor eṣāsya*. As Old points out, the corruption can have arisen on the basis of likewise pāda-final *eṣām* in 2a. There are of course no metrical consequences. The emendation was not explicitly signaled in the publ. tr., which should read "... Viṣṇu, *the quick." Neither Ge nor Re accepts (or even takes note of) this emendation.

VII.39.6: I take *yajñīyānām* as gen. for dat., as in 2a.

In b I assume that Agni obtains from the gods, and then gives to mortals, what the latter wish. Cf. a fuller expression in VI.5.7 *aśyāma tām kāmam agne tāvotī* "May we attain this desire, Agni, through your help." On the basis of that passage, as well as X.96.7 *só asya kāmam ... ānaśe*, both with *kāmam* √(n)as, I also take *nākṣat* as an *s*-aor. subjunctive to √(n)as, rather than as an injunc. to √nakṣ, *pace* Narten (*s*-aor. 160) and Gotō (1st Kl. 192), who assert that no such subj. exists to √(n)as.

In d I take the position of *nú* within the instr. phrase *yújyebhir nú devaīḥ* seriously, indicating that the gods are *now* to be our yokemates, now that we have made successful sacrifice to them.

VII.39.7: A fine meta-summary vs., which is also the final vs. of the next hymn (VII.40.7).

VII.40 All Gods

VII.40.1: The standard interpr. take *vidathyā* as nom. sg. fem. modifying *śruṣṭīḥ* (e.g., Thieme [Unters. 48] "die zur Verteilung führende Erhörung"), and this is certainly the default reading. However, it leaves the *sám* in the VP *sám etu* with little to do, and I wonder if *vidathyā* is not instead an instr. sg. fem., which would justify the lexeme *sám* √i 'come together'. This adj. modifies *vāc*- in I.167.3, and "hearing" and "ceremonial (speech)" would make a nice pair. The speech would also stimulate the praise (*stómam*) we aim at the gods in the next pāda.

In b I take *práti ... dadhīmahi* in its idiomatic sense, 'to fix an arrow (on a bowstring), to aim', though a more generic one (Ge 'anheben', Re 'commencer') is hardly out of the question.

In d *ratnínah* ‘possessing treasure’ is perfectly ambiguous: it can be a gen. sg. and modify *asya* (standing for Bhaga) or a nom. pl. modifying the 1st pl. subj. of *syāma*. In the publ. tr. I take it as the former (as does Thieme loc. cit.), while Ge and Re take it as the latter (though Re recants in his notes, deciding that the gen. sg. is better, on the basis of *ratna-bhāj*- VII.81.4). In fact, I think it’s probably meant to be both, with the nom. pl. a proleptic use, and would now emend the tr. to “may we, possessing [=acquiring] treasure, be at the apportioning of him who possesses treasures.”

Gr (s.v. *ratnín-*), Ge, Re, and Thieme (loc. cit.) all take the referent of *asya* to be Savitar, and the presence of unaccented *asya*, which should refer to someone/-thing already in the discourse, supports this interpr. However, since the next hymn (VII.41) is entirely devoted to Bhaga as distributor of goods and since *vibhāgé* appears to be a pun on his name, I think Bhaga is equally plausible. The lack of accent on *asya* could be accounted for by this pun.

VII.40.2: A series of four singular nouns are the subject of *dadātu*, a singular verb.

The verb *niyuvaíte* is esp. appropriate for Vāyu, who is regularly called *niyútvant-* ‘having a team’. Note the use of this adj. in the immed. preceding hymn, VII.39.2, where it must qualify Vāyu rather than Pūṣan, despite the word order (see comm. ad loc.).

VII.40.3: The pl. verb *junánti* in c has two singular subjects, Agni and Sarasvatī, which should trigger a dual verb, or else a singular one as in 2ab. Since Agni and Sarasvatī do not form a stable set of gods (as, e.g., Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman do), it is not clear what god or gods should be supplied to justify the plural verb. Re adds a parenthetical “(et autres)”; possibly the Maruts addressed in the first hemistich?

With Ge and Re, I take *tāsya* as a dependent genitive limiting *rāyāḥ* and referring to the man whom the Maruts, Agni, and Sarasvatī help -- not as a demonstrative adjective with *rāyāḥ*, which would be grammatically possible.

VII.40.4: Contrary to Ge and Re, I take pādas a-c as a clause subordinate to the main cl. of d.

On *anarvā* as the nom. sg. of a fem. *n*-stem, see JPB (Ādityas 218)

VII.40.5: Flg. Old, I emend *vayā* to ‘*vayā* (= *avayā*)’ ‘propitiation’, which only requires the insertion of an avagraha but no emendation. Ge and Re also accept this suggestion. The word should have been marked with an asterisk in the publ. tr.

VII.41 Bhaga (or All Gods)

Like VII.38, which is essentially an All Gods hymn though ascribed by the Anukramaṇī to Savitar, this hymn is properly located within the All Gods sequence, the last of three 7-verse hymns in Triṣṭubh (save for our vs. 1 in Jagatī), followed by an All Gods hymn of 6 vss. Nonetheless, the Anukramaṇī assigns most of it (vss. 2–6) to Bhaga, with vs. 1 to the Liṅgoktadevatāḥ and vs. 7, an extrahymnic vs. (see publ. intro.) to Uṣas. The 1st vs. calls on a range of gods, including Bhaga (pāda c), in monotonous fashion, before settling down to exclusive focus on Bhaga beginning with vs. 2, and it was surely meant as an All God hymn and positioned in the All God collection for that reason. The hymn is also found in AV (Ś III.16, P IV.31)

VII.41.1: As was just noted, this vs. is in Jagatī in an otherwise Triṣṭubh hymn (and hymn sequence) -- or rather its first three quarters are. The final pāda is in Triṣṭubh and ends with the verb 1st pl. opt. *huvema*, which gives a Triṣṭubh cadence and also ends the first pāda of the next vs. (2a), contrasting with its semantic match 1st pl. pres. indic. *havāmahe* in the first pāda (1a), which provides a Jagatī cadence. The switch in meter at the end of the vs., cleverly accomplished while holding the verb essentially constant, and the variant repetition of the opening of the 2nd hemistich, *prātār bhāgam*, at the opening of vs. 2, *prātar(-jītam) bhāgam*, knit the 1st vss. together despite the metrical difference and the range of gods in vs. 1.

VII.41.2: On the first pāda of this vs. see comm. immediately above.

The referent of the repeated rel. prn. *yā-* (b, c, d) is Bhaga, and we therefore might expect that in the sequence in d *yām bhāgam* the latter word refers to the god (as the same acc. does in pāda a and in 1c). But instead it is almost surely merely a pun on the divine name and its first reading is as the homonymous (and of course etymologically identical) common noun ‘portion’ -- though the more usual word for ‘portion’ is *bhāgā-*. At best it could be read twice, once as the name, once the common noun (“which Bhaga ... portion ...”). If we follow the Pp., *bhāgam* must be part of the quotation ended by *īti*, because the other word in the quotation, *bhakṣi*, is read by the Pp. as unaccented and cannot therefore be initial in the quotation/clause. In principle, however, the sandhi form *bhakṣīti* could contain both an accented particle *īti* and an accented *bhakṣi*, contra the Pp. which could -- and should -- then be the only word in the quotation.

Part -- but only part -- of the solution depends on how we analyze the verb form. Old and Ge inter alia (e.g., Scar 157) take it as a 1st sg. middle, which could therefore be accented, since medial *s*-aor. forms take accent on the ending (cf. *bhakṣīyā*, *bhakṣīmahi*) -- though it need not be. (Indeed no one, as far as I know, rejects the unaccented Pp reading in favor of **bhakṣi*.) I follow the view of Sāy. (also Gr, Wh. [AV tr. III.16.2], Narten [p. 179 n. 512] inter alia [see Old’s reff.]), that it is a 2nd sg. act., that is, a *-si* impv. (ultimately derived from the act. *s*-aor. subjunctive; cf. *bhakṣat*), where we should expect root accent (**bhákṣi*) if the form were to be accented. Because there seems to be universal agreement that *bhakṣi* is unaccented, the divergent interpretations of the morphology do not affect the interpr. of where the quotation begins, but it seems worthwhile to point out the possible interpr. not taken.

One reason I prefer the *-si* impv. interpr. is that the 1st sg. interpr. might impose more modality on an injunctive than we might expect: cf. Ge’s “ich möchte ... teilhaft werden” (though Scar’s “ich bekomme ...” avoids modality). The context favors a request, rather than a statement of accomplishment.

VII.41.3: Although the *prātār* of vs. 1 and 2a has disappeared, this vs. seems to contain a reminiscence of it: 1c *#prātār bhāgam* is echoed by 3a *#bhāga prā(ne)tar* (in opposite order), and pādas c and d then pick up *prā ṇ(etar)* of 3a in *#bhāga prā ṇo* and *#bhāga prā ṇībhiḥ* (latter without retroflexion). This is hardly the most sophisticated effect in Rigvedic poetry, but it is an illustration of the subtle concatenative effects that can provide unity and a throughline in even the most banal (as this hymn mostly is) composition.

VII.41.3–5: The concatenation continues in the next vss. The ending of vs. 3, ... *nṛvántaḥ syāma*, echoes in the following two vss. The 1st pl. opt. *syāma* is repeated at the end of 4a and d and 5b, while the *-vant*-stem adj. shifts from *nṛvántaḥ* (3d) to another punning *bhágavantāḥ* (both ‘possessing a portion’ and ‘accompanied by Bhaga’) in *bhágavantāḥ syāma* (4a, 5b; cf. *bhágavān* 5a). And *bhágavān* in 5a matches *maghavan* in the same metrical position in 4c.

VII.41.4: On the structural relationship of the various *utá*-s here, see Klein DGRV I.355–56.

VI.41.5: The punning continues here with a clever twist: even Bhaga himself should become possessed of a portion (*bhágavant-*) (a); (only) in this way (*téna*) will we become *bhágavant-* (b). In other words, Bhaga needs to get his own portion before he can pass it on to us.

This vs. forms a slight ring with vs. 1: the intensive verb *johavīti* provides one additional stem to the two forms of $\sqrt{hū}$ in vs. 1, *havāmahe* and *huvema*.

VI.41.6: This vs., bringing the Dawns into the picture, forms the transition to the extra-hymnic vs. 7 (see publ. intro.). Note that we have the newer nom. pl. form *uśāsaḥ* in 6, whereas 7, a repeated vs. (=VII.80.3), has the inherited *uśāsaḥ*.

The racehorse Dadhikrā(van) seems intrusive in this vs., but he is the subject of the nearby hymn VII.44. Here as there he is associated with dawn and the Dawns. As suggested in the publ. intro. to that hymn, the association may be with the dakṣiṇā, which is distributed at the morning pressing and which often consists at least partly of horses.

VII.41.7: Though this vs. is also found, better situated, in a Dawn hymn (VII.80.3) and is quite possibly extrahymnic here, the emphasis on the valuable goods, esp. livestock, that the Dawns bring, to distribute as dakṣiṇā, well fits the hope for a good portion that characterizes the rest of the hymn. Note esp. that in 3cd we hope to be propagated with cows and horses (*góbhir áśvaiḥ*) and to become possessed of men (*nṛvántaḥ*), matched here by the entities by which the Dawns are accompanied: *áśvāvatīr gómatīḥ ... vīrávatīḥ*.

VII.42–43: All Gods

These two hymns are in some ways companion pieces, progressing similarly through the ritual and sharing means of expression and images. For details see individual discussions below.

VII.42 All Gods

VII.42.1: The first three pādas of this vs. begin with *prá* ‘forth’ and seem to express the dynamic beginning of the sacrifice. None of the three verbs ($\sqrt{nakṣ}$, $\sqrt{vī}$, $\sqrt{nū}$) is commonly found with *prá*, so the use of the preverb here seems situational -- that is, the three *prá* \sqrt{X} are not standard lexemes; rather, the poet has attached *prá* to all three to emphasize that all parts of the sacrifice are setting out at once.

krandanú- is a hapax, built with the rare suffix *-anú-* (AiG II.2.210). Of the very few other such stems, one -- *nadanú-* ‘roar’ (1x, also *nadanú-mant-* 1x) -- belongs to the same semantic field, and another -- *nabhanú-* ‘spurting’ (1x, also *nabhanũ-* 1x) -- belongs to the same root as the genitive qualifier of our form *nabhanyà-* ‘inclined to / about to burst out’. I think it likely that this roar refers to all the sonic parts of the sacrifice: the just kindled fire (for *agní-* as subject of \sqrt{krand} , cf. e.g., X.45.4), the soma (often the subject of \sqrt{krand} in IX), the hymns (cf. VII.20.9, with *stóma-* as subj.), and most likely also the pressing stones that appear in d.

The cows “swimming in water” in c presumably stand in for the milk to mix with the soma, though the exact ritual reference is unclear. In the soma sacrifice it is the soma that undergoes a water bath (see IX.106.8 where *udaprút-* modifies the soma drops), not the milk.

The verb *yujyātām* in d requires some discussion. On the surface, the form is a 3rd du. act. opt. root aor., and this is how Ge and Re render it and how Gr and Lub classify it. Old, however, points out that the pressing stones are usually yoked (in the passive) rather than yoking something else (in the active). He wishes to take it instead as built to the passive stem *yujyá-*, but the question then is what the form is meant to be. Old himself favors a passive injunctive: though this should have the form **yujyetām*, he suggests that the rarity of such forms might have generated the “wrong” form on the analogy of athematic 3rd du. med. injunctives/imperfects in *-ātām*. He also floats the possibility of a subjunctive, though that should have the primary ending (expect **yujyāte*, I suppose, not at this period the **yujyaite* of the grammars). Although the publ. tr. reflects Old’s view that the context favors a passive, I now believe that the act. opt. analysis of Ge/Re, etc., with *pésah* ‘ornament’, referring to the soma, as object, is correct. The passage, and the verb, would play with the standard passive expression (pressing stones are yoked), but take them as agents of the yoking. I would therefore now emend the tr. to “The two pressing stones should yoke the ornament of the ceremony.”

VII.42.2: The ‘road’ of Agni, *ádhvān-*, in pāda a picks up its etymological relative *adhvarā-* ‘ceremony, lit. ritual cursus’ in 1d, a relationship unfortunately difficult to convey without awkwardness in tr.

Sāy. reads **sú te* for *suté*, and Old favors this reading on the grounds that *suté* is rare in Agni context. But since the last hemistich of the preceding vs. (and possibly pāda b as well) concerns the soma, this does not seem a cogent enough objection to change the text. Sāy. likewise reads **jánimā nīṣattaḥ* rather than *jānimāni sattāḥ*. This would make fine sense -- and *ní√sad* is a very common idiom for Agni’s seating at the ritual when acting as Hotar -- but it again requires emending a text that makes sense on its own.

As indicated in the publ. intro., the varicolored horses in bc are Agni’s flames. The “I” of d is presumably the poet impersonating Agni as Hotar.

VII.42.3: The pl. subj. of *mahayan* in pāda is unclear; the most likely referent would be the priestly colleagues of the 1st ps. sg. poet subj. of *huvé* in 2d; in this spirit Ge supplies “die Sänger,” Re “les chanteurs.” However, Old adduces the almost identical passage VII.61.6 *sám u vāṃ yajñám mahayam námobhiḥ* with 1st sg. *mahayam*. Noting that small differences between otherwise identical passages are common, he does not insist on the 1st sg. interpr. However, given the 1st sg. of 2d, I am now inclined to consider this a

strong possibility, and would emend the translation (or at least provide as an alternative): “I magnify the sacrifice for you all ...” This makes the interpr. of *vaḥ* easier: as is common with such enclitics in ritual context, *vaḥ* should refer to the rest of the officiants, but if they are also the 3rd ps. subjects of *mahayan*, this produces a clash. The emendation of *-n* to *-ṁ* is of course trivial.

The *prá* of vs. 1 returns in d, though in the common idiom *prá √ ric* ‘project, extend beyond, surpass’. The medial pf. of this root, acdg. to Kü (426–27), is always presential and has the stative sense “hervorhinausragen über *Abl.*” The ablative is of course missing here. In our passage I think the sense is primarily physical: the ritual fire is gaining strength and its flames project outward on the ritual ground (“in the nearness” *upāké*), though the fire’s surpassing superiority may also be referenced. The physical image is found, differently expressed, in the companion hymn VII.42 in vs. 2d *ūrdhvā śocīṁṣi ... astuḥ* “The flames have stood up erect.” Given the *prá* here, this *might* be taken as a reference to the movement of the ritual fire to the east, but the fire seems to me to be already established in its location.

Both Ge and Re supply a ‘speech’ element to their interpr. of *mandrá-*, “wohlfredende” and “à la voix-harmonieuse” respectively, but its derivation from *√ ma(n)d* ‘exhilarate/be exhilarated / gladden/be glad’ does not suggest or require such a semantic extension. It is true that the adj. regularly modifies *jihvā-* / *juhū-* ‘tongue’ and is also found in the bahuvrīhi *mandrá-jihva-* ‘having *mandrá* tongue(s)’. But generally when Agni’s tongue is mentioned, it is as the instrument for eating the oblation and conveying it to the gods, not as a speech organ. His tongue is gladdening because it gives the gods pleasing nourishment. Agni himself is very often *mandrá-* as well, as in our passage -- probably for at least two reasons: 1) like his tongue, he is the conveyor of the oblation to the gods, 2) he produces general gladness by his presence and role in the sacrifice. Both factors are probably at issue here: in c he is commanded to sacrifice to the gods (thus conveying the oblation to them); in vs. 4, esp. d, he gives “a desirable reward” to the mortals whose dwelling he is established in.

VII.42.4: For *dāti* see comm. ad IV.8.3.

VII.42.5: The *adhvarám* of pāda a echoes *adhvarasya* in 1d and provides a faint ring, since the last vs. (6) is extra-hymnic.

In the publ. tr. in c the verb *sadatām* is taken as a sg. impv. with Agni as subject. At best, this would be a middle 3rd sg. (though tr. as a 2nd ps.), to a stem, and indeed a root, that is otherwise relentlessly active. This is just an error on my part. The form must be a 3rd du. act. impv., with Night and Dawn (the decoupled dual dvandva *nāktā ... uṣāśā*) as subj. -- as is the standard interpr. (Gr, Ge, Re). The tr. should be emended to “Let Night and Dawn sit here on the ritual grass.” Although this may be conceptually difficult to interpret -- times of day do not usually have a physical presence at the ritual and it is hard to conceive Night and Dawn sitting on the barhis – it is in fact a standard trope in the Āprī hymns; see, e.g., I.142.7, 188.6; VII.2.6; X.70.6, 110.6). For the “repair” of this image in the next hymn, see comm. ad VII.43.3. The ultimate reference is probably to the daily offering to Agni at the two twilights (later called the Agnihotra), though the immediate source must be the Āprī litanies.

VII.42.6: As just indicated, this vs. belongs to the class of “meta” final vss., commenting on the hymn just completed. I would now be inclined to tr. the root pres. injunc. *staut* as “has just praised.”

The second pāda is interesting for the interaction between analytic phrases and compounds. That is, the first member of the bahuvrīhi *rāyās-kāma*- ‘having desire for wealth’, *rāyāḥ*, itself a gen. case form rather than stem form in composition, is modified by / compared to an independent gen. *viśvápsnyasya*, as already disc. by Wack, AiG II.1.33. The connection of this adj. with ‘wealth’ is clear from VIII.97.15, where the independent gen. *rāyāḥ* is modified by *viśvápsnyasya*: *kadā ... rāyā ā daśasyer, viśvápsnyasya ...* On the sense of the adj., see comm. ad VIII.97.15.

VII.43 All Gods

VII.43.1–2: The 1st two vss. of this hymn begin with *prā*, recalling the insistent *prā* in the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn (VII.42.1) and presumably fulfilling the same function: to express the energetic initiation of the ritual. However, both *prā* √*rc* (1a) and *prā* √*i* (2a) are standard lexemes, unlike those in 42.1.

VII.43.1: The inf. *iṣádhyai* is a hapax and variously interpr.: e.g., Ge “dass sie gern kommen,” Re “en sorte que (nous) en tirions profit.” The root affiliation is also not entirely clear; e.g., Lub classifies it with √*iṣ* ‘send’, though we do not of course know how he would tr. it. Both Re’s disc. and his tr. seem to me plausible: he takes it as “un doublet isolé d’*iṣayádhyai*” and cites Burrow’s (1955) interpr. “pour que nous soyons prospères.” It is worth noting that the few instances of *iṣayádhyai* (I.183.3=VI.49.5, VI.64.4) also occur in a Triṣṭubh cadence *and* that that form in isolation is ill-formed for such a cadence, since the root syllable should be heavy in such a cadence. In I.183.3=VI.49.5 this problem is avoided because the root syllable amalgamates with a preceding final vowel: *yéna narā nāsaťyeṣayádhyai*. But in VI.64.4 *rayīm divo duhitar iṣayádhyai* the cadence is simply bad (and in fact produces an uninterrupted run of 5 light syllables). Haplology of the suffix *-ayá-* to our form *iṣádhyai* here fixes this metrical problem.

vīprā in c, modifying *brāhmāṇi*, is the only neut. N/A form of this stem, but the stem does modify a different word for thought/poetic formulation, *matí-*, as fem. *vīprā* (VII.66.8, VIII.25.24). The Pp. analyzes it instead as nom. pl. m. *vīprāḥ*, which is of course a possible form underlying the sandhi, but which cannot be easily fitted into the sentence. Sāy. does it by sleight of hand: he glosses the first part of pāda c as *yeṣāṃ vīprāṇāṃ medhāvināṃ brahmāṇi*, converting the supposed nom. pl. *vīprāḥ* into a gen. pl., and then supplies *vīprāḥ* as subj. of *pra ... arcan* in the main clause in a: *te vīprāḥ prārcann pūrveṇa sambandhaḥ*, an attempt to justify the nom. in the rel. cl. Needless to say, this doesn’t work.

The verb *viyānti* in d is ambiguous. With the Pp., Gr., etc., it may be taken as belonging to *vi* √*i* ‘go apart, spread out’, but it could also belong to the root pres. of √*vī* ‘pursue, go in quest’. In a rel. cl. the accent would be the same for either analysis. Because of the connections between the preceding hymn VII.42 and this one, I favor the latter affiliation on the basis of (*prā*) *vetu* in VII.42.1b, but *vi* √*i* is certainly not excluded -- and might make slightly better sense with the simile. The tr. might then alternatively

read “go apart” for “go questing.” On the other hand, I like the idea of formulations going in quest of divine response and rewards, an interpr. encouraged by the *prá* lexemes (like *prá ... etu* in the next pāda, 2a).

VII.43.2: In c I construe dat. *adhvarāya* with *sādhú*, giving the latter richer semantics than the mere adverbial “richtig” of Ge or even Re’s “correctement.” Found twice in 42 (1d, 5a), *adhvará*-reappears here, though the word is too common to make much of this.

As noted above ad 42.3, our pāda d seems to be a clearer expression of the image of the increasing flames of the ritual fire found also in 42.3b.

VII.43.3: In two of its four occurrences *vībhṛtra*- means something like ‘dispersed’, but that makes no sense here. The third occurrence is similar to ours, however: I.95.2 ... *janayanta gárbbham ... vībhṛtram*. In both these instances it seems to be an idiomatic expression for children of an age to be carried around, in I.95.2 of the new-born fire. In our passage both Ge’s “die Tragekinder” and Re’s “des fils (en âge) d’être portés” seem on the money. Since Eng. lacks a useful expression (or means to make one) like Tragekind, my tr. is an attempt to convey the sense in brief and also to capture the implied locus of the children in our passage. In the simile they are said to be sitting on their mother (acc. *mātáram*), but in the frame the corresponding term is loc. *sānu* ‘on the back’, and I suggest that the mother’s back is implied in the simile as well. The difference between acc. *mātáram* and loc. *sānu* is a fairly trivial example of the “case disharmony in similes” discussed in detail in my 1982 IJ article of the same name.

In b the gods are urged to take their seats (*devāsah ... sadantu*) on the barhis. The action ordered is of course unremarkable and repeated numerous times in the RV, but in the context of this sequence of hymns it can be considered a “repair.” In the preceding hymn, in VII.42.5, Night and Dawn are given the same command, also in the 3rd ps., also in the thematic aor. (*náktā ... sadatām uṣāśā*). As was noted there, this produces an unusual image, though interpretable in an Āprī context; 43.3 replaces and thus repairs it with the familiar one.

In c the problem is that neither of the fem. adjectives -- nom. *viśvācī* or acc. *vidathyā* -- modifies an expressed noun, and the referential possibilities are wide open. Ge follows Sāy. by taking the nom. as the sacrificial ladle and the acc. as the flame, though in his n. (3c) he suggests that ‘speech’ would be possible for both. Re follows Th. (Unters. 49) in taking over *devātāt*- from d as the acc., tr. “(la troupe des dieux) arrivant au sacrifice,” while maintaining the ladle as the nom. (One might think that the gods might find this an odd and messy welcome!) Old thinks the nom. is definitely the ladle, but suggests various possibilities for the acc. On the basis of I.167.3 *vidathyā ... vāk*, I take the acc. as speech, with the anointing metaphorical: the ladle pours the butter offering into the ritual fire as ritual speech is recited. There is precedent for this metaphor: cf. I.61.5 *arkām ... sám añje* and I.64.1 *gírah sám añje* with ‘chant’ and ‘hymns’, respectively, as object of ‘anoint’.

VII.43.4: The isolated form *sīṣapanta* is hard to assess. By form it appears to belong to a redupl. aor., but no other forms to such a stem are attested and, more to the point, there is no securely attested -āya-transitive. I cannot evaluate *sāpáyant*- in TB II.4.6.5, which is evidently the Brāhmaṇa form Whitney lists, with ?, in Roots s.v. $\sqrt{\text{sap}}$, but even if it

belongs to the same root, it is attested too late to provide a basis on which to generate an associated redupl. aor. in the RV. Nonetheless, I see no choice but to take *sīṣapanta* as a redupl. aor. and to assume an unattested **sāpáyati* for early Vedic. What then does *sīṣapanta* mean? In my 1983 -*āya*- monograph (p. 219) I assert that it has intrans./reflex. sense, is not connected with a causative, and that it is based on nearby *sāpante* (VII.38.5) (without specifying how), but I no longer believe that. Nor, despite the temptation of the -*anta* ending, do I believe it's an -*anta* replacement. Rather I would now take it as a reflexive transitive 'serve themselves' (or, since that English idiom is too colloquial, 'do service to themselves'). The basis for this is expressed in the next pāda: the gods do their own milking (*dúhānāḥ*), producing the "streams of truth," presumably the praise hymns, by their own actions -- thus serving themselves. See Lüders (473, 475), who argues for "stream of truth" as Kultlied and (475) interprets this hemistich essentially as I do. This may be a variant on the notion that the gods are the ultimate source of the hymns that praise them because they provide the inspired thoughts to the poets, or it may be that the sheer arrival of the gods at the ritual ground provides the impetus for the "milking" of the hymns.

On the phrase *ṛtasya ... sudúghā(h)* see comm. ad X.43.9.

Both Ge and Re take the 2nd hemistich as a single cl., with *māhaḥ* as goal of *āgantana*. Ge further takes *māhas-* as "Feier" (celebration), while Re's "manifestation-de-grandeur" is closer to the root sense of the word. But I see no reason not to take this neut. *s*-stem in the standard sense 'greatness' and construe pāda c as an independent nominal cl., as in the publ. tr.

In d *sámanasaḥ* 'of the same mind' replicates the same word in 2b and provides a bit of a ring. Note that in 2 the referents are the human officiants, whereas here it is the gods, with the two groups thus implicitly equated -- an equation facilitated by the similar structures: the two words are in identical metrical positions and both follow a 2nd pl. impv., with *sámanasaḥ* modifying the 2nd ps. subj. Although 'of the same mind' in the first instance means that all members of each group have the same mind, the repetition may imply that the human officiants of vs. 2 and the attending gods of vs. 4 also share the same thoughts.

VII.44 Dadhikrā

Both by number of vss. and by its listing style, this hymn fits the sequence of All Gods hymns in which it is found, though the presence of Dadhikrā among these deities is somewhat puzzling. As noted in the publ. intro., most of the divinities named have associations with the Dawn ritual.

VII.44.3: As discussed in the publ. intro., in the middle of a hymn of utmost simplicity and banality, this vs. -- or a single pāda, c -- is utterly baffling and has given rise to competing interpr. This pāda contains two color terms, *bradhná-* 'coppery' and *babhrú-* 'brown', and a hapax *māmścatóḥ* (or better *maṁścatóḥ*; see Old): *bradhnám māmścatóḥ várūṇasya babhrúm*. Most comm. assume that the two color terms refer to horses (see, e.g., Ge n. 3c, also Old), because of the presence of Dadhikrā and because color terms often designate horses. (Cf., e.g., Re "au (coursier) couleur-fauve de Mitra, au (coursier) brun de Varuṇa.") But the introduction of two extraneous horses seems unlikely to me, in a hymn that barely strays from the dawn ritual context.

The old and once widespread interpr. of *māṁścatú-/ māṁścatóḥ* is as a cmpd. ‘chasing/hiding the moon’, with a form of ‘moon’ still containing an internal nasal and the 2nd member built to \sqrt{cat} ‘hide’ (for lit. see, e.g., AiG III.250, EWA s.v. *māṁścatú-*) - though this interpr. has generally been replaced by agnosticism about both meaning and deriv. because of the problematic details of the derivation and the uncertainty of the passages containing this form and the related ones (see below). The form in our passage is generally assumed to be a gen. sg. to a *-u*-stem. The identification of the supposed referent given in Re’s tr., “Mitra,” also has a long history (see, e.g., Old, Ge’s n. 3c with lit.) and is due in part to the presence of apparently parallel gen. *váruṇasya* and in part to a chain of semantic assumptions: if *māṁścatú-* means ‘chasing the moon’, then it can refer to the sun, and the sun in turn can stand for Mitra (see EWA s.v.). But this chain, esp. the last link, is not strong, though the apparent parallelism with *váruṇasya* is admittedly stronger.

Assessing the cmpd is somewhat aided (but not all that much) by the existence of two related words *māṁścatvá-* and *māṁścatva-*, in two nearby vss. in the Soma Maṇḍala, IX.97.52, 54 in the same *ṛca*. Vs. 52 also contains *bradhná-*. Though the exact sense of the two vss. is obscure, the context is the usual self-purification of soma, with the soma drop in 52 addressed directly and the *bradhná-* “also there, sped like the wind” (*bradhnás cid átra vāto ná jūtáh*). I tentatively identify *bradhnáh* there as the sun or the ritual fire at the dawn sacrifice, and take *māṁścatvé* in the same vs. as a temporal loc. If *bradhná-* is the sun, that body is copper-colored only at dawn and at sunset; a temporal loc. of *māṁścatvá-*, if it means ‘hiding/chasing the moon’, would mean ‘at the time of the hiding of the moon, viz. dawn’, a time appropriate to the ritual content of the vs. Returning to VII.44.3 with this ritual context in mind, I suggest that the same elements of the ritual are represented here: the coppery *bradhná-* is the sun, or perhaps the fire (I favor the sun, because the sun is well known as Varuṇa’s spy); the brown *babhrú-* is the soma, as often (IX.11.4, 31.5, etc.). And in my analysis *māṁścatóḥ* is not a gen. to a *-u*-stem, but rather a loc. du. to a root noun **māṁś-cát-* and, as in my interpr. of IX.97.52, is a temporal loc. “at the two twilights.” Of course, we should expect this loc. du. to be accented **māṁś-cátóḥ*, but the non-transparency of the stem could have led it to be reanalysed as a *-u*-stem gen. parallel to *váruṇasya*. Although the cmpd in its literal meaning would only be appropriate to morning twilight, it came to be applied to both. As for *māṁścatvá-/ māṁścatva-*, I suggest that they are *-tva*-stem derivatives of this root noun, with simplification of the geminate **māṁścat-tva-*.

Riccardo Ginevra has recently called my belated attention to Pinault’s 2008 treatment of this same word (“About the Slaying of Soma: Uncovering the Rigvedic Witness,” *Ged. Elizarenkova*, 353–88). In this extensive and exceedingly careful treatment with comprehensive treatment of the earlier lit., Pinault seriously disputes all previous analyses of the cmpd (esp. 360–64), including the one I maintain above. His most telling objection to that analysis is that the Indo-Iranian paradigm of the ‘moon’ word has no trace of the nasal found in other IE languages, since it has been vocalized in the weak forms of the paradigm and generalized from there (362–63). In order to connect *māṁś-* with the ‘moon’ word, we must assume that the nasal was preserved in just this form under exceptional phonological circumstances because of the obscurity of the formation. Although I recognize the hazards in this assumption, I am still willing to take the risk. I cannot endorse Pinault’s own suggestion, that the first member is the ‘flesh’

word, the second member was borrowed from a non-Indo-Aryan language “of the Nūristāni type” (383), and the cmpd means ‘flesh-cutting’ and refers to a disguised myth of the killing of soma. The first hypothesis (‘flesh’) is certainly possible, but the other two, esp. the second (inter alia, he gives no etymon or even source language for this borrowing), seem significantly less plausible than the isolated preservation of the nasal in ‘moon’.

Although I would hardly claim that my analysis of the cmpd or of the passage in general is airtight, it does provide an interpr. of the pāda that better fits the hymn: two more divinities (Sūrya and Soma) that the poet is calling upon (*úpa bruve* pāda b), rather than a couple of irrelevant race horses.

VII.45 Savitar

VII.45.1–2: Although Savitar’s role as god of evening, causing the world and its activities to settle down, is alluded to in 1d, his role as rouser of the world at dawn is given equal billing in that pāda (... *ca* ... *ca*). The more oblique expression in 2d must also refer to this latter role. The sun “cedes his task” of waking and rousing the world to Savitar.

VII.45.2: Both Ge and Re take the aor. injunc. *paniṣta* in c as modal, but the aor. injunc. *ānu dāt* in d as general pres. (e.g., “Jetzt sei ... gepriesen; ... ordnet ...”). But there is no reason that the first needs to be assigned modal value: the temporal adv. *nūnām* can instead draw attention to an immediate past action (“has [just] been wondered at”). And it seems preferable, if contextually possible, to take the two adjacent aor. injunctives in the same value.

VII.45.3: Klein (DGRV II.102) asserts that *ádha* in d “conjoins the second distich with the first, following an intervening participial phrase” (that is, conjoins ab with cd, the participial phrase occupying c); Klein tr. “And propping apart his broadly encompassing sunbeam he shall give mortal’s nourishment to us.” Although this seems roughly correct, the dislocated position of *ádha*, not only after the participial phrase of c but after the first, heavy word of d, *martabhójanam*, might have called for more comment. It would be possible to take c with ab -- there are no syntactic obstacles to this: the participial phrase can attach to the nom. subject of ab -- which would situation *ádha* closer to the beginning of the clause it’s conjoining (after only one word). But I favor a slightly richer semantics for *ádha* than Klein does: often ‘then’ rather than just ‘and’. And I think it likely here that positioning *ádha* in the last clause of the vs. and in fact in the last clause of the hymn proper) since vs. 4 is a meta-verse), is meant to emphasize Savitar’s last and most significant action, the actual delivery of his bounty to us mortals. The particle is found directly before the verb to stress the *action* of granting. With this analysis there is no need to attach c to ab.

VII.45.4: As just noted, this is a meta-summary final vs., referring to the very hymns (*imā gírah*) invoking Savitar at the present moment. The 2nd pāda focuses on his hands: *pūrṇágabhastim ... supānīm* “having full fists [that is, fists full of goods] and good palms.” This provides a semantic, but not lexical ring with the beginning of the hymn, where many good things are in Savitar’s hand (*háste* 1c). (I would in fact have tr. 4b -

pāñi- as ‘hand’ but used ‘palm’ instead to make the lexical difference clear in English.) The ‘hand’ focus is also continued in the two arms (*bāhū*) in 2ab, though that is so standard an image of Savitar that it may be independent here.

VII.46 Rudra

VII.46.1: This hymn begins with the NP *imā(h) ... gīrah* “these hymns,” the same phrase that opened the last vs. of the preceding hymn (VII.45.4). In that hymn it was a nom. pl.; here it is an acc. pl., but its grammatical identity does not become clear until almost the end of the vs., when the transitive verb *bharatā* ‘bring’ is found in the middle of d, right before the final brief cl. *śṛṇotu naḥ*. The ambiguity of case between the identical phrases in 45.4a and our 1a makes the connection seem closer.

VII.46.2–3: The final pādas of both vss. are semantic variants of each other: “don’t hurt our children.” In 2d the negative is expressed by the privative on the adj. *anamīvāḥ* (... *bhava*) “be without affliction,” while 3d contains the stronger and more conventional prohibitive *mā ... rīṣaḥ* “do not harm.” The word for ‘children’ is the fairly rare uncompounded root noun *jā-* in 2d, replaced by the fuller and more familiar bipartite phrase *tokā- tātaya-* “offspring (and) descendents.”

VII.46.2: The complementary etymological and morphological figure *āvann āvantīḥ* is noteworthy, but I have no idea what “helping/helpful doors” (*āvantīr dūrah*) are or do. Perhaps it is an indirect way to refer to the sacrificial offerings humans make to help the gods, in return for the help (etc.) they receive from the gods, in this case Rudra. As Re suggests ad loc. (EVP XV.161), “*dūrah* ... s’oriente vers «maison»” and the emphasis in this vs. and the next on the protection of our children and offspring may have invited this allusion to the house.

VII.46.3: The first hemistich contains two occurrences of *pāri*, but in fact it should technically have three: the first *pāri* at the end of pāda a governs the preceding abl. *divās* in the sense of ‘from’ (note the close sandhi *divās pāri*); the second, in the middle of b, should be construed with both preceding *cāraṭi* and following *vṛṇaktu* and is positioned exactly between the two clauses that contain those two verbs.

I take the hapax voc. *svapivāta* to the lexeme *āpi √ vat*, which I interpr. after the manner of Tichy. See comm. ad I.128.2. The intimacy implied by this lexeme (‘be/make familiar/intimate’) is appropriate to the focus on the household disc. above. My tr. “o you who are our familiar” does not represent the *su-*, but it is difficult to incorporate it without making an already heavy tr. even more so.

VII.46.4: The prohibitive *mā*, introduced in 3d as a variant of 2d, dominates the first hemistich of this final vs.

VII.47 Waters

VII.47.1: I have deliberately omitted to tr. the 2nd enclitic *vah*, found in c.

VII.47.1–2: *devayántaḥ* in 1ab with 3rd ps. referent (see the 3rd pl. verb *ákr̥nvata*) modulates to 1st ps. reference in 2b, also signalled by the verb (*aśyāma*).

VII.47.3: On *svadháyā mādantīḥ* see also I.124.8.

[VII.48 JPB]

VII.49 Waters

VII.49.2–3: Pādas 2c and 3c contain the same three words after the caesura, but with the first two flipped: 2c *yāḥ śúcayaḥ pāvakāḥ* and 3c *śúcayo yāḥ pāvakāḥ* (with the last word to be read **pavākāḥ* in both instances, of course). I do not understand the motivation for the permutation, although each order has a positive and negative feature: 2c puts the rel. prn. in the more usual 2nd position in the pāda, as opposed to 3c, where it is 3rd (though both positions are syntactically acceptable), but the break in 2c (–~) is decidedly less common than the one in 3c (~–)(see Arnold, *Vedic Metre*, 188).

[VII.50–52 JPB]

VII.53 Heaven and Earth

VII.53.1: The *té* that opens the 2nd hemistich is ambiguous: it can be nom. pl. m., modifying *kaváyaḥ*, or acc. du. f., providing the object of *puráḥ ... dadhiré*.

VII.53.2: Unusually, this vs. requests and depicts physical movement of Heaven and Earth, which is conceptually awkward, given that Heaven at least has a fixed position at a great distance from our ritual ground. I have argued elsewhere (“The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas,” Staal Ged., 2016) that one of the likely reasons for the eclipse of the inherited divinity and original head of the pantheon Dyaus Pitar “Father Heaven” is his inability to move about the cosmos and esp., in conformity with the newer ritual model, to come *to* our sacrifice rather than having the oblations of that sacrifice filter up to heaven. This is one of the few passages in the RV where his presence at the sacrifice is urged, and only a little thought is required to reveal it as odd.

Ge takes *sádane* as du (“den beiden Sitzen der Wahrheit”), and in favor of this interpr. is the fact that its final vowel is pragrhya in the Saṃhitā text (*sádane ṛtásya*, not **sádana ṛtásya*, as in IV.42.4), as Old points out. However, I take it, with Re and Lü (607–8)(and Gr implicitly) as a loc. sg. in the usual phrase. As Lü points out (608), gods are never themselves “seats of truth” but are located in such seats.

VII.54 Lord of the Dwelling Place

VII.54.1: On *práti √jñā* see comm. ad III.45.4.

VII.54.1–2: On *práti √juṣ* see comm. ad IX.92.1.

VII.54.2: The voc. *indo* ‘o drop’ in b is incongruous in this context, and as Ge points out, the 1st hemistich seems to have been adapted from a Soma hymn, where ‘drop’ would be appropriate. He adduces I.91.19 (c: *gayasphāṇaḥ pratāraṇaḥ* ...) and 12, whose 1st pāda also contains *gayasphāṇaḥ*, though the matches are not exact and neither of the cited pādas contains *indo*. However, *gayasphāṇa-* is found only in those two passages and in our vs.

VII.55 Sleep

As noted in the publ. intro., the first vs. does not belong with the rest of the hymn but rather with the preceding one, VII.54, to Vāstoṣpati, the Lord of the Dwelling Place. However, as also noted there, this is not just a product of wrong division of hymns: VII.55.1 is in a different meter from VII.54, and VII.54 ends with the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, which is always the final pāda of a hymn. Moreover, as Old points out, VII.54 has three vss. and follows correctly on the three-vs. hymns VII.51–53, while an additional vs. would break that sequence. Old suggests that the single vs. VII.55.1 originally formed its own hymn and that the rest of VII.55, with 7 vss., is an addition to the original collection (Anhangslied).

VII.55.1: In addition to the voc. *vāstoṣ pate* that repeats the three vs.-initial vocc. *vāstoṣ pate* in VII.54, this vs. has other similarities to VII.54, esp. VII.54.1: *amīvahā* ‘destroying affliction’ echoes 54.1 *anamīvāḥ* ‘without affliction’, as *āviśān* ‘entering’ does 54.1 *svāveśāḥ* ‘easy to enter’; sim. *sākhā* ‘companion’ and 54.2 *sakhyé* ‘companionship’. Note also that pāda c *sākhā suśéva edhi naḥ* is identical to I.91.15; I.91 is the Soma hymn that VII.54.2ab seems to have been partially based on. In addition, pāda b is identical to VIII.15.13b and IX.25.4a, both of which are addressed to Soma (on Soma as the addressee in the former, see comm. ad loc.). I do not quite understand the Soma/Vāstoṣpati connection.

VII.55.2: The target of the simile in pāda b, ‘spears’, does not precede the simile marker *iva* and in fact is as far as it can be from it in a pāda of only 8 syllables: *vīva bhrājanta ṛṣṭāyaḥ*. This arrangement may have resulted from an attempt to keep metrically unfavorable *bhrājante* out of the cadence.

On the refrain *nī śú svapa* and the present stem *svāpa-* see my “Sleep in Vedic and Indo-European” (KZ 96 [1982/83], esp. 8 n. 3).

VII.55.3: The hapax voc. *punaḥsara* may be a word play with *sārameya*. Bollée (*Gone to the Dogs in Ancient India*, 43) tr. “recessive one,” indicating that the dog is in retreat. But the rest of the context suggests an aggressive dog on the attack.

On the intens. *dardar-* here, see Schaeffer (136), who cites a very similar Avestan passage.

VII.55.4: On *√sas*, again see my ‘sleep’ art. cited ad vs. 2.

VII.55.8: Note the two hapax cmpds with loc. 1st member, *proṣṭhe-śayá-* and *vahye-śayá-* versus *talpa-śīvan-* (*-śīvarī-*), with stem form in 1st member and a different 2nd member belonging to the same root *√sí* ‘lie’. On *proṣṭha-* see KH (StII 13/14 [1987]: 129–34 =

Aufs. III.855–63), who analyzes it as *pra-ús-tha-* from the lexeme *prá √ vas* ‘spend the night away from home’, with the developed meaning ‘camp bed’ – perhaps ‘cot’ would work better here. As for *vahyá-* he sees it as something “to be conveyed”, a place of rest that can be carried or pulled; hence the standard tr. ‘litter’ works well.

VII.56 Maruts

VII.56.1: Ge takes *cd* to be the answer to the question in *ab*, but since *vs. 2* seems more directly responsive to the question, I take *cd* here as simply further specification of the subject of the question.

Unusually, *īm* has no acc. function; there is no possible accusative role it could fill.

I consider *vyàktā(s)* to be at least an implied pun. The first reading is as the nom. pl. m. of the ppl. of *ví √ añj* ‘anoint, ornament’, referring presumably to the Maruts’ characteristic adornments and their glistening appearance as (wet) bearers of rain. This interpr. is reflected in all the standard tr. However, I think it also is meant to contrast with *sánīlāḥ* ‘of the same nest’, as an indication that the Maruts are also separate individuals, and employing the common *ví/ sá(m)* polarization. The problem is to identify a morphological form that could be represented by *vyàktā(s)* and express the sense ‘separate, individual’ vel sim. I hesitantly suggest that we start with the *-āñc*-stem, *vy-āñc-*, found only in the cmpd. *uru-vyāñc-* ‘wide-spreading’. (The rarity of this stem may be accounted for by competition with the well-attested stem *viśvañc-* of almost the same meaning [‘facing in opposite directions, divergent’], which looks like a more substantial version of *vyāñc-* and is built to the extended form *viśu* of the same preverb *ví*.) If *vyāñc-* made a collective abstract in *-tā-*, **vyáktā-* ‘individuality, separateness’, the form in our passage could be its instr. sg. in adverbial usage. There are obviously weaknesses in every link in this chain of reasoning. First, the stem *vyāñc-* is very rare and limited in distribution; second, I know of no other such abstracts to *-āñc*-stems and in fact *-tā*-stems are relatively rare in early Vedic (AiG II.2.617); third, it should be accented **vyāñc-* (AiG II.2.619). However, a poet intent on packing a pun into *vyàktā(s)* might not scruple to use unusual forms to achieve it, and elsewhere in the RV puns sometimes ignore accentuation for their 2nd reading. In slight support of the suggestion, we might note that this set of hymns has one other ex. of the instr. of such a stem in adverbial usage: VII.57.4 *puruṣátā* ‘in human fashion’, as well as an instr. to a *-tāt*-abstract in the same usage: VII.57.7 *sarvátātā* ‘in your totality’, referring to the Maruts -- the exact opposite of my suggested *vyàktā* ‘in their individuality, separately’, also of the Maruts. If my suggestion is correct (by no means certain!), it would also be a pun facilitated by sandhi, since the first reading as ppl. should have underlying *-ās* and the other one as instr. simply *-ā*, but both would show up as *-ā* in this sandhi position.

Because this *vs.* is in Dvipadā Virāj (which, despite its name, consists of *four* pādas of five syllables apiece), *ádha* opens the d pāda and is therefore less oddly placed than might appear. Klein (DGRV II.128) characterizes the *ádha* as “conjoining the second [term] with the first” and tr. “the young men of Rudra and the ones having good horses.” But since the two terms are coreferential, the *ádha* (/ Engl. ‘and’) seems unnec. or even misleading.

VII.56.2: This vs. seems a response, if an indirect one, to the question posed in vs. 1. The *hí*, as often, has a higher discourse function: it gives the reason for asking the question in the first place. We could tr. “(I ask) because ...” I also consider this vs. a further expression of the “individual/collective” theme I tentatively identified in vs. 1, here conveyed by the pl. *janūṃṣi* ‘births’ in the first clause, contrasted with the sg. *janítram* ‘means of begetting’ in the 2nd. If 1ab asks “who are they *individually*?” 2ab states that the question needs to be asked because no one knows their *individual* births, even though (cd) *they* [=Maruts] know “mutually” (*mitháh*) their own (individual) means of begetting. In other words, they share the knowledge of their separate births -- something we don’t know. Note the middle *vidre*: they know facts about *themselves*, contrasting with the 3rd-party lack of knowledge in ab *nákiḥ ... véda*.

VII.56.3: This vs. continues the theme of mutuality in vs. 2, but now concerns the Maruts’ adult behavior as gods of the storm. The mutuality is expressed both by the adv. *mitháh* repeated from vs. 2 and by the reciprocal 3rd pl. verb *aspr̥dhran* “they contended with each other.”

The hapax *svapū-* has been variously, and surprisingly, interpr. See Old ad loc. (also KEWA s.v., etc.) for the numerous suggestions, incl. BR ‘broom’, Lanman ‘wings’. However, the most obvious analysis also is most likely the correct one, as a root noun cmpd. to root $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’, hence ‘self-purifying’. This is Old’s conclusion, reflected also in Ge’s and Re’s tr. and in Scar (323). Perhaps the resistance to this obvious interpr. resulted from the fact that it is a hapax -- astonishing given the centrality of Soma Pavamāna “self-purifying Soma” in RVic ritual as the subject of the entire IXth Maṇḍala -- and in this passage it has no connection with soma. Here it quite likely refers to the rain drops accompanying the Maruts’ storm, as Ge suggests.

Old acutely notes that the verb in this pāda *vapanta* resembles *pavanta* ‘they purify(/ied) themselves’. Rather than considering *vapanta* a corruption of *pavanta* (which seems extremely unlikely to me), I would instead suggest that it’s a metathetic word play (*vap* ≈ *pav*), aided by preceding (*s*)*vap(ūbhīḥ)*.

VII.56.4: Whenever the birth of the Maruts, and esp. the udder of Pṛśni, are found in the RV, bewilderment ensues, and this passage is no exception. At least it is here identified as a secret that only the insightful can perceive -- a characterization that the modern interpreter fully concurs with. For other problematic passages on this topic see II.34.2, VI.48.22, and VI.66.1, 3 with comm. ad locc. Our passage would be fairly easy to interpr. if we could take *ūdhaḥ* (that is, *ūdhar*) as a loc. sg. Such is Ge’s solution (“im Euter,” explicitly identified as a loc. in n. 4b) and also Re’s, though the latter has the grace to bury the loc. in a parenthesis: “(en sa) mamelle.” But a loc. -*ar* to *īn* stems “ist nicht nachgewiesen” (AiG III.311), and it is safer to take it as an acc. sg. as elsewhere. In my interpr. *yád* is a neut. pronoun (rather than a subord. conj.) and refers collectively to the Maruts and ‘udder’ is a species of appositive to it though with a bit of a twist: ‘udder’ refers to the contents of the udder, and that contents is the collective Marut embryo(s). This seems to me better than taking *yád* as ‘that’ or the like, as in Kü’s (175) “Diese Geheimnisse kennt der Weise, dass die grosse Pṛśni ein Euter getragen hat.” (On p. 339 Kü simply reproduces Ge’s tr., with *ūdhaḥ* as loc. and a pronominal obj. [“sie”], referring to the Maruts, supplied; he doesn’t comment on these two incompatible interpr.)

VII.56.5: The good heroes that the clan possesses are in fact the Maruts themselves, specified in the instr. Re calls this an “instrumental of identification.” Whatever term is used, it is not, in my experience, a common usage of the instr., but it is nonetheless not hard to interpret. A similar usage is found two vss. later, in 7cd.

VII.56.6: A very cleverly constructed vs., nicely fitted to Dvipadā Virāj meter. Each 5-syl. pāda consists of two words, phonologically and etymologically (or pseudo-etymologically) related. There are both repetition of morphological figures and variation on them. All four pādas end with a nom. pl. masc. adj.; the first two pādas end with superlative *-iṣṭhāḥ*, the third with the phonologically similar, but morphologically distinct *-iślā(h)*, the last with something phonologically distinct (*ugrāḥ*).

Three (a, b, d) of the four pādas contain etymological pairs; in the first two the etymological relation is reinforced by phonological repetition (*yāmaṃ yā(y)iṣṭhāḥ*, *śubhā śóbhiṣṭhāḥ*. (As for the first, the Samh. has *yéṣṭhāḥ*, but the first vowel must be distracted. HvN restore *yáyīṣṭhāḥ* with short root vowel, but I think *yā* is more likely. In neither of the other two occurrences of this stem [V.41.3, 74.8] does the meter establish the quantity of the root syllable.) In the third ex. (pāda d) the etymological relationship is not transparent, but would be available to the audience steeped in derivational morphology: *ójobhir ugrāḥ*. Although c, *śriyā sámīślā(h)*, lacks the etymological connection, it mimics it through alliteration, though it is notable that we have *miśLa*, not the also attested *miśRa*, which would match *śriyā* better. Another set of three versus one: in three pādas (b, c, d) the first noun is in the instr., but in pāda a it is not. The 2nd pāda is the only one that doesn’t deviate from the various patterns in any regard: it’s an etymological figure, ends with a superlative, begins with an instrumental.

One can also note the reversal of vowels in the root syllables of the word pairs of b and d: *u ... o* versus *o ... u*.

VII.56.7: The first pāda of this vs., *ugrām va ójah*, restates the last pāda of the preceding vs. (6d *ójobhir ugrāḥ*) as an equational nominal clause. Because of its connection with vs. 6 it also sets up the expectation that what follows will also be an etymological figure, but b *sthirā śāvāmsi* is not, though it has the same syntactic configuration as pāda a.

The loose construction of the instr. *marúdbhiḥ* is similar to that in 5a.

VII.56.8: The nominal equations of 7ab continue in the first half of this vs., and *śubhrāḥ* picks up *śubhā śóbhiṣṭhāḥ* of 6b. Although *súṣmaḥ* is not etymologically related to *śubhrāḥ*, they are alliterative.

Pāda c contains a rhyming simile: *dhúnir múnir*. Such full rhyme is quite rare in the RV and seems to provide the crescendo of this highly wrought little passage. Note also that the final word of d, *dhṛṣṇóḥ*, is a slight flip of the initial word of c, *dhúnir*.

In order to get a proper Dvipadā Virāj line, the *iva* of c has to be read ‘*va*’, as it sometimes is elsewhere. See Old. If the particle is disyllabic, however, it makes cd a Triṣṭubh pāda. Since the Dvipadā Virāj section of the hymn is drawing to a close (fully Triṣṭubh starting with vs. 12), the possible double metrical reading here may be gesturing towards the upcoming Triṣṭubh takeover. Indeed the Dvipadā Virāj begins to break up beginning in vs. 10, despite the Anukr. identification of 1–11 as DV.

In the simile of c, *iva* (/va) is out of place; we expect **dhúnir iva múnih*. This displacement was doubtless made to draw attention to the rhyme noted above. But it also interacts somewhat with the question of whether cd contains two DV pādas or one Triṣṭubh, because a quick glance at Lub shows that *iva* is fairly rare immediately after the caesura, which would be its position here if we are dealing with a Triṣṭubh pāda. I imagine that this rarity has less to do with *iva*'s accentless status (though that might contribute) than with its usual tendency to take 2nd position, which would generally put it earlier in the line. There certainly do exist trimeter lines with *iva* post-caesura, e.g., IV.18.6 *ṛtāvarīr iva saṃkrōṣamānāḥ* (cf. also V.1.1, 11.5, etc.); they are just less common than I had expected.

VII.56.10: The metrical decay noted for 8cd continues here. Although the first half of the vs. has the expected 10 syllables with a word boundary after 5 -- thus allowing a division into two DV pādas -- the opening of b is *huve*, an unaccented verb. In the immediately preceding vs. (9), pāda b opens with accented *yuyōta*, which must owe its accent to its pāda-initial position, as there are no syntactic features favoring it. The DV here is far less sensitive to the pāda boundary. Even more clearly, the second half of the vs. is an undoubted Triṣṭubh, since it has 11 syllables and a caesura after the first 4, with the unaccented voc. *maruto* spanning syllables 5–7.

Both Ge and Re (also Lub) take *vāvasānāḥ* to *√vas* 'want, desire' with the supposed object being soma, but I think it makes more sense, and requires less machinery, to assign it to *√vās* 'bellow'. Otherwise too much has been gapped and needs to be supplied; cf. Re's expansive parenthesis: "... pour qu'à satiété ... (vous vous gorgiez de soma, le) désirant-avec-force." See the same disagreement about the affiliation of the same participle in VII.36.6, with comm. ad loc.

VII.56.11: This vs. is unambiguously Triṣṭubh, consisting of two pādas of 11 syllables. The first has an opening of 5, which could be a self-contained pāda of DV, but what follows it is 6 syllables, marking the whole as a single Triṣṭubh pāda. The second part is even less ambiguous, as it has an opening of 4, so a DV division is impossible. The only feature that matches that of DV is that there are only two Triṣṭubh pādas in the vs., not four.

On *iṣmín*- see comm. ad I.87.6.

VII.56.12: The metrical boundary, however fuzzy, between the DV and Triṣṭubh sections separates the first part of the hymn from the more ritually focused one beginning here. The expression *hinomy adhvarām* "I set the ceremony in motion" announces the inauguration of the sacrifice.

This vs. harps, rather tediously, on the adj. *súci*- 'gleaming', which occurs 6x, twice each in pādas a, b, and d.

Pāda c contrasts *ṛtá*- in *ṛténa ... ṛta-sāpaḥ* with *satyá*-, the latter as goal of *√i* 'go, come'. In my view, *satyám ... āyan* refers to the truth-serving Maruts' epiphany on the ritual ground: they "came to reality" for the sacrificers, that is, they became really present. This epiphany is effected "by truth": the operation of the properly performed ritual mechanism.

VII.56.13: This vs. has no finite verbs, but three predicated tense-stem participles: pf. *upaśiśriyāṇāḥ* (b), aor. *rucānāḥ* (c), pres. *yāchamānāḥ* (d), in a hymn already well provided with such (see 10d, 11d).

As for *upaśiśriyāṇāḥ*, although pf. participles regularly have preterital value, the middle pf. of $\sqrt{\text{śri}}$ is presential (Kü 527–28) and stative, and this form contrasts with the far more common ppl. *śrita-* ‘set’ -- hence my “being set,” though this rendering somewhat undercuts the stative value.

In cd it is possible that only one of the participles is predicated, and in fact the publ. tr. renders pāda c as wholly a simile. However, this hemistich could contain two independent predications: “(you are) shining like ...; (you are) holding yourselves ...” In any case there is an unsignaled change of subject between the hemistichs: in ab the ornaments (nom. *khādāyaḥ*, *rukmaḥ*) are the grammatical subjects, while in d the Maruts must be supplied because the participle *yāchamānāḥ* seems to assume an animate subject. Pāda c is ambiguous: either the brilliants (*rukmaḥ*) or the Maruts can be shining. The etymological relationship between *rukmaḥ* in b and the part. *rucānāḥ* in c might suggest that c goes with b. However, in my publ. tr. I have privileged the hemistich boundary and supplied the Maruts as subj. of c (as do Ge and Re), but the other interpr. is certainly possible. One argument for the standard interpr. might be that the subjects of medial participles to $\sqrt{\text{ruc}}$ (well-attested *rócamāna-*, as well as *rucāná-*, *rurucāná-*, *rórucāna-*) are generally gods.

VII.56.14: Ge suggests (n. 14a) that the *budhnyā ... mähāmsi* “deep-grounded powers” are the “verborgenen Herrlichkeiten” (*ninyā*) concealed in Ṛṣni’s udder in vs. 4. Even leaving aside the fact that, as was discussed above, *ūdhaḥ* in vs. 4 should not be a loc., this interpr. seems both unnec. and too specific, esp. since ten vss. intervene. *budhnyā* here may refer to the powers that the Maruts, gods associated with the midspace, derive from the earth below, or it may simply mean something like ‘fundamental’, by a semantic development parallel to that of the Engl. word.

The preverb *prá* is showcased in the first hemistich: *prá ... irate ... , prá ... prayajyavas tiradhvam*. I am not certain what *prá* $\sqrt{\text{tṛ}}$ *nāmāni* in b is meant to convey, but I interpr. it in the context of the importance of the Maruts’ individual identities (vss. 1–4) and of calling their names (10a) earlier in the hymn. Perhaps the Maruts need to “put their names forward” and make themselves individually known before they can enjoy the Gṛhamedha offering.

As noted in the publ. intro., the ritual references in pādas b-d are quite specific, alluding to the Maruts’ role in the Sākamedha, the last of the Cāturmāsyaṇi (“Four-monthly”) rituals. See the publ. intro. for further details.

VII.56.15: The phonological figure of the two words *adhīthā*, *itthā* straddling the pāda boundary of ab provide a nice little study in syllable weight. (The echo is of course obscured by the application of sandhi in the Saṃhitā text: *adhīthéthā*). If we add in the opening of the vs., *yádi*, the echo is even more pronounced: *yádi ... adhīthā*, *itthā*, with (y)*ádi* doubling *adhī*.

Exactly what *itthā* is doing here is unclear to me, but this adverb several times appears in context with *vīpra-* and some verb of invoking (see Ge ad VII.94.5), as here (with the invoking represented by the nominal *hāvīman*). Cf. VII.94.5 ... *īlata*, *itthā*

víprasaḥ, IV.29.4 = VIII.7.30 *itthā vípraṃ hávamānam*. I suggest that *itthā* refers to the precise manner in which a *vípra-* makes the invocation.

The Maruts are asked to “give study to / be mindful of” what is *stutásya*. *stutá-* is of course a very common past *passive* participle meaning ‘(what/who is) praised’. In this context we might rather expect the abstract noun ‘praise’, and indeed Ge simply so tr.: “... des Lobpreises eingedenk seid,” with no explicit comment, but a crossref. (n. 15a) to several passages with a similar idiom but with *stotrásya* ‘praise song’ instead of *stutásya* (e.g., V.55.9 *ādhi stótrasya ... gātana*). But the poet could easily have used *stotrásya* here in the same metrical slot if he had wanted to, and so I think we must take the ppl. seriously. Re in fact does so -- “prêtez-attention à la chose-louée” -- though in his n. he simply notes its similarity to the *stotrā-* passages. I think the point is a cleverer one: the poet suggests that if the Maruts pay attention to what we poets praise -- what *gifts* we poets praise -- they will know what to bestow on us. The “if” clause is immediately followed by its corollary: “right away give (us) wealth ...” -- the poet implying that the Maruts are a quick study! Although I must admit that *stutá-* ‘praised’ seems always to refer to gods, not to material objects, the semantic extension seems an easy one, and we can invoke the term *dāna-stuti-* ‘praise of the gift’ -- though it’s notable that, although this term is ubiquitous in secondary lit. on the RV, it is not actually attested in Vedic.

By my rules, we might expect that *anyāḥ* in d should be definite (‘the other’) rather than the indefinite ‘another’ that better fits the passage (unless we assume that the *anyāḥ* is a rival poet). However, I suggest that *nū cid ... anyāḥ* is a composite negative indefinite expression like *nā kás cid anyāḥ*. Cf. VIII.24.11 *nū anyātrā cid ...*

The cadence of d is bad. It is tempting to emend injunc. *ādābhat* to subj. *ādābhāt*, which would fix the meter and fit the sense (in fact, the publ. tr. renders the verb as if a subj.: ‘will ... swindle’), though no doubt the temptation should be resisted.

VII.56.16: Each pāda in this vs. contains a simile marked by *nā* comparing the Maruts to domestic animals (a, d), spirits (b), and children (c). Except in c, the simile begins the pāda. The vs. contains only one finite verb, *śubháyanta*, in b; the functional role of the finite verb is filled instead by the adjectives that are the point of contact between the simile and the frame. In the publ. tr. I deliberately failed to render ab as the rel. cl. it technically is because the “which Maruts ... they ...” structure would have intruded upon the succession of similes.

In b opinion is divided on the sense of *yakṣa-dṛś-*. Ge takes *-dṛś-* as active, with the first member in an acc. relationship with it (“Geisterseher”), flg. Sāy. in his analysis of the syntax of the cmpd., though not of the meaning of the first member. So also Re. However, Ge considers the possibility of a pass. sense in his n. (16b), and Old opts for the pass. interpr. For disc. of this cmpd. see Scar (232); of his choices I opt for the *bahuvrīhi*.

Another oblation to the Maruts at the Sākamedha, besides the Gṛhamedha mentioned above (vs. 14), is made to the *krīḍin-* (‘playful’) Maruts on the 2nd day of the sacrifice (see, e.g., ŚB II: 20 and Eggeling, SBE XII.408). The characterization of them in d as *prakṛīṇaḥ* obviously makes ref. to this oblation.

VII.56.17: This vs. has the feel of a final vs. Though there is no overt sign of a break with what follows, the next vs. turns its attention to the Hotar, Agni, and this might be taken as a change of subject.

In the cadence of pāda a *mṛlantu* should be read with a light root syllable, contrary to normal practice. Old doubts that the form should be read with this exceptional light syllable and ascribes the irregularity to “die metrische Unebenheit” of this hymn, while HvN do accept the light reading and adduce one other occurrence that requires this scansion (IV.3.3, though that passage looks more equivocal to me).

Ge and Re take *varivasyá-*, lit. ‘make wide space’, in a general ‘help, protect’ sense (e.g., “qui protègent les Deux Mondes bien fixés”). But surely the beneficiaries are us (not the two worlds), and the idea is to make the worlds spacious for us.

VII.56.18–19: As was just noted, vs. 17 “feels” like a final (or pseudo-final) vs. If vs. 18 marks a new beginning, we can note both that in vs. 18 the Hotar invokes the gods as he would at the beginning of a sacrifice and that in vs. 19 (and 20a) the Maruts are referred to four times (19a, b, c, 20a) with the near-deictic pronoun *imé* “these right here,” which might indicate their epiphany on the ritual ground.

VII.56.18: The first hemistich of this vs. presents us with a common problem: the most obvious way to interpr. it meets a syntactic stumbling block that should not allow that interpr., and the standard interpr. ignore that obstruction. In this case the issue is the middle participle *grṇānāḥ*. This part. is attested over 50x; the vast majority of these attestations are clearly passive in value. In fact, Gr interpr. only 2 forms as “medial” (that is, transitive, not passive): this passage and I.181.9. Nonetheless, both Ge and Re take it as transitive here (though with different objects) without comment. But I think we ignore the use of the overwhelming majority of forms at our peril. In fact, since Agni as Hotar is the implicit subject of the sentence, a passive value of *grṇānāḥ* is easily possible: as both Hotar and god, Agni performs a ritual invocation (as priest) while himself being hymned (as god). (The other occurrence flagged by Gr as non-passive, I.181.9, is indeed transitive, but owes its anomalous usage to special circumstances. See comm. ad loc.)

If we eliminate *grṇānāḥ* as a potential governor of an object, the acc. *satṛācīm rātīm* must be construed with *ā ... jōhavīti*. Although the acc. with (*ā*) *√hvā* is more usually a god or other animate being, abstract entities (like ‘giving’ here) are also possible. The *vaḥ* in 2nd position in pāda a, which might have served as acc. to *ā ... jōhavīti* must then be a gen. dependent on the acc. NP. The more usual configuration is restored in pāda d *havate vaḥ* “he calls upon you,” a minor ex. of poetic repair.

In c both Ge and Re supply ‘sacrificer’ with gen. *īvataḥ* ‘such’, while I supply ‘wealth’. There is in fact no good support for either position that I can find. I prefer mine because ‘wealth’ would pick up ‘giving’ from the previous pāda, whereas there is no mention of a sacrificer anywhere. But I do not strongly favor my solution. *gopā-* ‘herdsman’ is regularly construed with *ṛtāsya* ‘truth’ (e.g., I.163.5, III.10.2), so perhaps that phrase is meant, anticipating *ādvayāvi* ‘without duplicity’ in d. Note that the *gopā-* is also *ādabdhā-/ādabhya-* ‘undeceivable’ (e.g., II.9.6, X.25.7).

VII.56.19: As was noted above, this vs. contains three examples of the near-deictic *imé*, opening the first three pādas. The publ. tr. only fully renders the first one, as three

examples of “these here” seemed too heavy. It is also worth noting that, though the *imé* forms might suggest the presence of the Maruts right here at the sacrifice (as was suggested above), the clauses in which they are found describe general activities of those gods, which would almost necessarily be performed away from the ritual ground.

Both Ge and Re follow the Pp. reading *sáhasaḥ*. Re interpr. it rather loosely as an abl., whereas Ge takes it as a gen. and as if it were the differently accented poss. adj. **sahásah* (“die Gewalt des Gewaltigen”), without comment. Old suggests that the better reading is dat. *sáhase* and cites passages containing *ā√nam* with the dat. I follow this interpr.

VII.56.20: Ge and Re both take b as a self-contained clause. I think it better (with MMüller in SBE) to take *bhīmim cid* beginning b as obj. to *junanti* in pāda a, parallel to *radhrām cid* -- beginning a new clause with *yáthā* in the middle of b. The point would be that the Maruts are so vigorous that they can energize both an entity that has no energy at all (“the feeble”) and one that has energy in excess (a whirlwind).

VII.56.21: The adj. *sujātā-* ‘well-born’ generally refers to gods, or at least to mortals; it is only here used of material goods (implicitly *vasavyā-* in the preceding pāda, hence my ‘of good quality’. Of course, it is possible that *vasavyā-* here refers, at least partly, to human capital (sons), as apparently in II.9.5 *ubháyam te ná kṣīyate vasavyām ... kṛdhi pátiṁ svapatyásya rāyāḥ*, where the second category of “goods of both types” (*ubháyam ... vasavyām*) is “wealth in good descendents” (*svapatyásya rāyāḥ*). But I don’t think this is a necessary interpr.: “well-born/produced” is likely available to semantic extension.

VII.56.22: As most interpr. point out, the three locc. in b are especially contested objects for the Ārya. See esp. Proferes (98): “Because of their economic value, rivers, plants and clans were subject to competing claims, and constituted flashpoints for conflict between various groups for whom control over resources meant increased power” -- as well as his elucidation of the three terms. See also Thieme (Fremdling 55), Oberlies (I.350).

Fem. *yahvī-* ‘exuberant’ is in the pl. typed for rivers/waters.

VII.56.23: Despite the use of *√kr* ‘make’ (2nd pl. pf. *cakra*), it is not likely that the Maruts created the *ukthāni* themselves, though they are singers on other occasions; rather they provided the occasion and the subject for the poets of earlier eras to celebrate them. Though Re’s ‘provoke’ is a bit strong, it’s the right idea. My ‘have given rise to’ is a bit weak.

VII.56.24: The sense of pāda d is somewhat unclear and the various tr. incompatible. Ge’s “wir möchten euch mehr gelten als das eigene Heim” seems esp. difficult to wring out of the Skt., though the other possibilities he suggests in the n. (24d) are somewhat more likely. I start with the *abhi√as* lexeme, which generally means ‘surmount, dominate, be superior’, which doesn’t seem to be reflected in the Ge suggestions. However, in my interpr. the enclitic *vaḥ* has only the vaguest syntactic connection to the clause. I do not have a better solution.

VII.57 Maruts

VII.57.1: My interpr. differs considerably from the standard—Old, Ge, Re—all of whom take ab as a single clause, with the sg. *nāma mārutam* the subject of 3rd pl. *madanti* and *mādhvah* the oblique obj. of that verb. So, e.g., Old “Am Honigtrank erfreut sich ... euer Marutname (=Marutgeschlecht).” The number disagreement between subj. and verb is taken as a constructio ad sensum (so explicitly Ge n. 1ab, sim. Old), and the clash between 2nd person encl. *vah* / voc. *yajatrāḥ* and the 3rd ps. verb is glossed over. I find these disharmonies disturbing and prefer to separate the two pādas. By my interpr., as noted in the publ. intro., pāda a has an idiomatic construction very similar to Engl. “has X’s name on it,” meaning “is destined for / belongs to X.” (“That cookie has your name on it” means “you should take it; I’ll cede it.”) Then in b the person switches from 2nd (*vah* ... *yajatrāḥ*) to 3rd (*madanti* with gapped subj. = Maruts), but the number is unchanged. This situation lasts through the first hemistich of vs. 2. As for the sense, I take the ‘honey’ to refer to the soma to be offered to the Maruts at the sacrifices mentioned in b: the soma oblation at the sacrifice in question is intended just for them. Alternatively, but less likely in my view, it could refer to the rain that the Maruts produce. In that case it would have the Maruts’ name because it is their product. The rain is metaphorically referred to in d *pīnvanti ūtsam* “they swell the wellspring.”

The relationship among the clauses in the 2nd hemistich isn’t certain, although there are no real implications whichever interpr. is chosen. With the standard tr. I take *pīnvanti ūtsam*, which opens d, as the main clause on which both the preceding rel. (c: *yé rejáyanti*) and the following temporal clause (*yád áyāsuḥ*) depend. In this case *pīnvanti* would be accented because it opens its pāda. However, that verb could be part of the rel. cl. starting in c (*yé* ...), with all of cd dependent on b: “... they become exhilarated -- they who set ... to trembling (and) swell the wellspring, when ...”

VII.57.2: The two suffix-accented *-tár-* agent nouns in the first hemistich take accusative objects, rather than the expected gen. (*nicetāraḥ* ... *gr̥nāntam*, *praṇetāraḥ* ... *mánma*). See Tichy (363–64). Although Tichy suggests some possible reasons for this unexpected (but not vanishingly rare) construction (pp. 367ff.), they don’t seem to be particularly applicable here.

I see no easy way to get a causal sense from *hí*, hence my “surely.”

Object-less *vītáye* is clarified by 6b *vyantu* ... *hávīm̐si*.

The pf. part. *pīpriyāṇāḥ* is interpr. by Ge/Re as implicitly prospective: the Maruts will become pleased/gratified as a result of their *vītí-*. I take it rather as having preterital value: they have first been gratified by the initial guest-reception ritual and are now awaiting their meal. A passage like I.73.1 *átithir ná prīṇānāḥ* “being gratified like a guest” supports this interpr.

VII.57.3: Ge takes *anyé* with *marútaḥ*: “Nicht glänzen andere Marut so sehr wie diese ...” But both the position of *yáthā*, which in its simile-marking role should follow the first term of the simile, and common sense (who would the other Maruts be?) strongly suggest that *anyé* refers to a group separate from the Maruts. By my rules *anyé* should be definite, and I think Re is correct in supplying ‘gods’. This would make sense in a ritual context: the other divine visitors at the ritual (save for Indra) are pretty drab compared with the Maruts.

Since the other occurrence of *viśva-pīś-* modifies Dawn's cart (VII.75.6), as Old points out a passive sense 'all-adorned' is more likely than 'all-adorning'. So Scar (319) 'allgeschmückt'.

The middle part. *piśānā-* is an isolated form: the only apparent attestation of a root aor. to this root, beside the thematized nasal pres. *piṃśā-* and the pf. *pipeśa*, etc. (However, *piśā* in VII.18.2 is taken by most as an impv. to a thematic aorist [see comm. ad loc.], which could easily have replaced the opaque root aor. impv. **pīdhī*, so the root does have a fragmentary aor. system.) That it is a participle at all has been called into question by John Lowe, who suggests it may be a Caland adj. instead ("Caland adjectives ..." 2012: 92–93; see also *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit* 2015: 133). Although I don't see any advantage in assigning it to a category of dubious existence (Caland adj. in -*ānā-*), its isolation does make it difficult to interpr. As a medial form, it might be expected to match the medial perfect usage and be pass. (e.g., VI.49.3) or reflexive (V.60.4) vel sim. However, it is generally taken as transitive, as in the publ. tr., with the transitive value ascribed to the preverb *ā* (see Gr) opening c. Lowe (*Part.* 133) disputes this interpr., declaring the supposed tmesis between preverb and participle here "a unique type of discontinuity." He prefers to construe *ā* with the finite verb *añjate* in d and take *piśānāḥ* as an intransitive adj.; *ródasī* is then an obj. of *añjate* along with *samānām añjī* and not construed with *piśānāḥ*. "All adorned and *decorated*, they anoint / the two worlds (with) the same anointing for beauty." As far as I can find, however, there are no occurrences of $\sqrt{añj}$ with double acc. When the object anointed is in the acc., the ointment is in the instr., so his suggested interpr. would be syntactically unique in a different way. I therefore prefer to construe both *ā* and *ródasī* with *piśānāḥ*. However, the construction need not be transitive "adorning the two-world halves," as is the standard interpr. and publ. tr. Old suggests several other possible relations (see also Re's n.), including that *ródasī* might be an internal / Inhalts-type of acc., expressing the ornament, hence "wearing the two world-halves as adornment." Old ultimately rejects this interpr., as does the publ. tr., but it remains a possibility, one that would better reflect the medial form.

VII.57.4: Unlike Ge/Re I attach b to c, not to a. Nothing rests on this, but the cause and the (hoped-for non-)effect are more closely allied that way.

I did not tr. *vaḥ* in c, which would have necessitated the awk. rendering "... into the way of it of yours." This vs. is over-supplied with *vaḥ*-s, with one in each pāda.

VII.57.5: Ge and Re tr. *raṇanta* as a modal ("sollen sich ... erfreuen"; "Que les Maruts se réjouissent ..."), as does Hoffmann (259), who explicitly identifies it as a subjunctive, not an injunctive, flg. Re (BSL 33.1: 6–7), who claims that *-anta* is a regular RVic subjunctive ending. I think a modal value, whether the form is identified as injunctive or subjunctive, is unnecessary and in fact fits the context less well than a preterital reading. Previous vss. refer to the performance of the sacrifice at which the Maruts are present (esp. 1ab and 2). They are now asked to provide benefits in return, and so we might assume that the sacrifice is now over (though 6ab gives me pause), an assumption supported by *kṛté* with its past reference: 'what has been/was done'.

In the publ. tr. *cīd* is not tr. I think it is a simple emphatic here "in just what has been done here," which is somewhat stilted in Eng., or else (perhaps more likely) it

actually emphasizes the following word *átra*: “in what has been done *here*” -- at our sacrifice, not at someone else’s. So Sāy. It could, of course, mean “also” or “even,” but neither of those makes sense in context -- nor does Ge’s (/Hoffmann’s) “wenigstens” or Re’s “(un peu) même.”

VII.57.6: With Ge, I take *vísvebhir nāmabhiḥ* with *stutāsaḥ*, despite the displacement of word order. In fact, there’s nowhere else to put that unwieldy instr. phrase but at the beginning of a new pāda. Re tr. it as an independent phrase, whose referent and relation to the rest of the sentence aren’t clear to me: “Alors, (une fois) loués, que les seigneurs Marut agréent, de tous (leurs) noms, les offrandes!”

VII.57.7: The contrast of *vísve ... sarvātātā* “all (of you) ... in (your) totality” highlights a constant theme of Marut hymns, that they are both individuals (emphasized by “all your names” in 6b) and a collectivity. See the treatment of this at the beginning of the previous hymn (VII.56) and comm. thereon.

The position of the patrons (*sūri-*) as middle men in the circulation of goods and services is nicely expressed here: you help the patrons; they help us.

VII.58 Maruts

VII.58.1: The gen. phrase *daívyasya dhāmnah* does not have a clear syntactic relationship to the rest of its clause. The standard interpr. (Ge, Re, Scar [62]) resupplies the word *gaṇá-* in the rel. clause and seems to take the phrase as gen. of material, as it were: e.g., Ge “die starke (Truppe) der göttlichen Rasse.” By contrast I treat the possessive adj. *túviśmant-* as a real possessive with the gen. phrase implicitly dependent on the underlying nominal *tuví(s)-/*távis-*, hence “having the power of its divine nature.”

The *utá* beginning the 2nd hemistich is relatively functionless. Klein (DGRV I.375–78) says it signals weak nexus between distichs with non-parallel structure. It might also be possible to claim that it is a sort of inverse *utá*, which should connect c with d, which *are* syntactically and thematically parallel. I also think it possible that it expresses a covert conceptual connection between the heaven indirectly referred to in b (*daívyā-*) and the midspace defined by the two world-halves in c, a space also indirectly measured by the distance from ‘chaos, disorder’ (*nírṭi-*) and the heavenly vault (*nāka-*) in d.

VII.58.2: Like the gen. phrase in 1b, the instr. *tveṣyèṇa* has insufficient syntactic grounding in its clause. Like Ge “(geschieht)” and Re “(s’est produite),” I see no choice but to supply a verb to link the subject *janūḥ* and the instr.

I have no opinion on the morphology of *janūḥ*. Gr calls it a masculine nom. sg. to the *-us*-stem *janús-*, an interpr. bolstered by the acc. form *janúṣam* (3x). AiG II.2.490 posits a paradigm of alternating gender, with m. or f. in the (nom./acc.) singular, but neuter in the dual and plural, which accords with the distribution of forms in the RV (du. *janúṣī*, pl. *janūṃṣī*) but fails to account for the gender switch. In the same vol. (II.2.496–97) Debrunner suggests that our *janūḥ* belongs to a *-ū*-stem (though acc. *janúṣam* would still need to be a masc. [or fem.] form to an *-us*-stem). The problem is that non-neut. forms of *-is-* and *-us*-stems don’t lengthen the suffixal vowel in the nom. sg., unlike *-as-*

stems. However, it seems possible that our *janūḥ* contains a nonce lengthening on the model of the vastly more common masc. -as-stems, as AiG III.292 indirectly allows. It should also be noted that because of following *cid*, the suffixal syllable of the preceding noun would be heavy, whether it originally read *janūs cid*, as in the transmitted text, or **janūs cid*, as grammar would have us expect.

The relationship between the first hemistich and the rel. cl. in c displays the RV's customary willingness to switch person reference in midstream and without warning. The first hemistich refers to the Maruts in the 2nd ps., with the enclitic *vaḥ* in a and the b pāda consisting only of vocatives. Because there is nothing to lean on, all three vocatives are accented, but in all three cases the initial accent contrasts with the inherent accent of the stem: *bhīmāsaḥ* (*bhīmā-*); *túvimanyavaḥ* (*tuvī-* cmpds. are accented either on the 2nd member [e.g., *tuvī-rādhas-*] or on the 2nd syllable of the first member [e.g., *tuvī-brahman-*]); *áyāsaḥ* (*ayās-*). There could therefore be no doubt that the reference is 2nd person; yet the rel. cl. that picks up the referents with the nom. pl. prn. *yé* is unequivocally in the 3rd ps.: (*prá ...*) *sánti*. The following pāda returns to 2nd ps. ref. with *vaḥ*.

On the “X Y *utā*” construction (rather than expected X *utá* Y) see Klein DGRV I. 344ff.

VII.58.3: In pāda a I take *maghávadbhyaḥ* as referring to our human patrons, because I take the Maruts as subj. of the 2nd pl. impv.: *dadhāta*. However, given the connections between 3ab and 6ab (for which see below), where *maghónām* refers to the Maruts, it is quite possible that the subj. of the impv. is the poet's fellow priests and the Maruts are the referent of *maghávadbhyaḥ*.

The simile in c causes some interpretational problems. Both Old (ad VI.50.10) and Re suggest interpr. that violate the structure of the RVic simile, and I think both treatments are wrong; Ge's treatment is more possible, though it differs from my own. All three take *jantúm* as part of the simile with *gató nádhvā* (= *ná ádhvā*), roughly for both “as a travelled road leads (the) people on,” while I take *jantúm* in the frame.

The RVic simile is only nominal; when a verb is involved it is shared by simile and frame. Both Old and Re take c as entirely simile, with its own independent verb (*ví tirāti*), and d as a loosely (Old) or more tightly (Re) connected frame, with its own verb (*prá ... tireta*). Old explicitly argues (ad VI.50.10) that *ná* can sometimes be a quasi-clausal simile marker, and he tr. “Der gegangene Weg vergleichsweise mag einen Menschen vorwärts bringen: so bringt auch uns verwärts.” After examining all the similes in the RV (see my “Case disharmony in RVic similes.” *IIIJ* 24 [1982] 251-71), I would vigorously contest his characterization of *ná*. Re's tr. has a more conventional simile/frame relationship, but still violates the shared verb rule: “Comme le chemin parcouru fait passer l'homme outre, qu'elle nous pousse (plus) avant ...” (The subject of d, “elle,” seems to refer to the *susṭutí-* in b.) Although the structural violation in Re's tr. would be mitigated by the fact that the two verbs belong to the same verb stem, *tirá-*, they have different preverbs (*ví* and *prá*), and therefore different senses, and are also in different moods (subj. and opt.).

Ge's rendering, “Wie ein zurückgelegter Weg der Leute, so möge es (uns) zum Ziele führen,” respects the simile structure, with the subject in the frame (“es”) presumably referring to the good praise in b (see Re also), but the sense seems off. If the

praise is to bring anyone or -thing across, it should be the Maruts (brought to our sacrifice), not us. Still I would be willing to consider a variation of Ge's interpr., with the praise as subj. in the frame, but the Maruts as obj.: "As a road when it's travelled (does) people, (the good praise) will bring the (Maruts) across."

However, I think it likely that the focus in this 2nd hemistich has shifted to the help that the Maruts will give us when they have enjoyed our praise (see the thrice repeated *yusmótaḥ* 'aided by you' in the next vs., 4abc). In particular, pāda d *prá ná spārhābhir ūtībhis tireta* is almost identical to VII.84.3 *prá ná spārhābhir ūtībhis tiretam*, addressed to Indra and Varuṇa. In the latter passage, *tiretam* must be a 2nd du. active opt. with Indra and Varuṇa as subj. In other words, in that passage gods are the subject. In our passage *tireta* is ambiguous: it can be a 2nd pl. act. opt. or a 3rd sg. mid. opt., and different factors pull in different directions. The parallel in VII.84.3 suggests we have gods, namely the Maruts, as subject here too, and the easiest way to do that is take it as a 2nd pl. A passage in the preceding hymn, VII.57.5 *prá vājebhis tirata puṣyāse naḥ* "Further us with prizes for our thriving," with 2nd pl. act. impv. to the same stem, also supports this interpr. This is the analysis of Gr, and it is also responsible for Old's "So bringt ..." On the other hand, the clear 3rd sg. *tirāti* in c invites a 3rd sg. interpr. also of *tireta*, and the following hymn contains the idioms we have here, *prá √ tī* and *vī √ tī*, there with a single instance of the verb stem in the 3rd sg. middle positioned between the preverbs: VII.59.2 *prá sá kṣāyam tirate vī mahīr īṣaḥ* "He furthers his dwelling place, ex(tends) his great refreshments." Re and Ge both opt for the 3rd sg. middle interpr., but the subject they each (seem to) provide is the good praise of b, a far cry from the gods we expect as subject of the expression found in d. My interpr. of cd solves both problems, though, admittedly, not in the most elegant fashion. I supply 'flock' (*gaṇā*; see 1a) as the subj. of both *vī tirāti* and *prá ... tireta*. We thus have a singular subject that will allow *tireta* to harmonize with *tirāti* and the divine subject that will allow d to harmonize with VII.84.3.

VII.58.4: As noted just above, this vs. is structured by three (abc) pāda-init. *yusmótaḥ* 'aided by you'. The three separate clauses containing this opening build on each other in an interesting way, and the first two are also linked by a morphophonological relationship.

To begin with the latter, both a and b end with a predicated *-ín*-stem qualifying the successful poet and the successful steed respectively with semantically parallel descriptors: ... *śatasvī*, ... *sahasrī* "possessing hundreds ... possessing thousands." The two words are also phonologically similar; to put it schematically, *SaCasRī*, where the *-s*-Resonant-*ī* final is esp. salient. The second one is correctly formed (to *sahásra*-) and well attested. The first is a hapax and aberrantly formed: the expected *-ín*-stem to *śatá*- is *śatín*-, which is in fact reasonably well attested. *śatasvín*- is obviously modeled on *sahasrín*- (already implied by AiG II.2.917 and Re ad loc.), aided by the fact that *-vín*- is regularly added to *-as*-stems (AiG II.2.917). So with *śatá*- temporarily re-configured as an *-as*-stem, the suffix *-vín*- can be affixed, allowing the stem to parallel *sahasrín*- in metrical and phonological shape. In b *sahasrī* is immediately preceded by *sāhurīḥ*, which reinforces the phonological pattern: *sah Vri(h)*.

Now as to the relations among the three *yusmótaḥ* clauses. I suggest that they can be seen as an instance of Behagel's Law (the law of "increasing members") involving syntactic blocks, not merely NPs. Pāda a contains a noun and a predicated adj. (*vīpraḥ* ...

śatasvī); pāda b a noun and two predicated adjectives (*ārvā śāhurīḥ sahasrī*). And pāda c has two clauses, a nominal one consisting of a noun (*samrāṭ*) predicated of an unexpressed subject (=Indra), and a full clause, with finite verb and object (*hanti vṛtrām*). My view of the increasing complication of syntactic structure in these three clauses produces interpr. of two of the clauses that differ from the standard. In b both Ge and Re (also Klein, DGRV I.436) take *śāhurīḥ* as an attributive adj. and only *sahasrī* as predicated (e.g., “... does the winning steed become a possessor of thousand(-fold) booty”). This is of course possible, but both the structural argument already adduced and the pragmatic fact that the horse has to become victorious before he wins prizes speak for my interpr.

In c the difference between interpr. is greater. I take *samrāṭ* as one clause, with the noun predicated of unmentioned Indra : “(Indra) is sovereign king.” This clause is linked to the next (*hanti vṛtrām*) by *utā*: “and (he) smites Vṛtra.” Ge, Re, and Klein all take *samrāṭ* simply as the subj. of *hanti* (e.g., “and with your aid does the great king smash the obstacle”). But this interpr. must ignore or explain away the position of *utā*. Klein is the only one who is explicit about the function of *utā*. He groups it with passages that contain “a repeated term within one of a set of parallel clauses,” conjoined by *utā*. But in the other exx. he gives (pp. 436–37) the *utā* is adjacent to the repeated element and in Wackernagel’s position. In our passage this should yield **yusmōta utā samrāṭ*. Klein does not comment on *utā*’s position here. Although one could argue (though Klein does not) that *utā* was displaced to the right to avoid the clash ...-ōta *utā*, in fact that is the kind of clash that RVic poets like! (Indeed the presence of *utā* in this pāda may be partly to call attention to the compositionally suppressed -*ūtā*.) My interpr. takes the *utā* as properly positioned to conjoin two clauses, and no special pleading (much less ignoring of the problem) is required.

Although Indra’s name is not mentioned, *hanti vṛtrām* is of course a definitional predicate for Indra, who is also regularly identified as a *samrāj*-. The Maruts’ role in helping Indra in the Vṛtra conflict is of course one of the contended issues in the RV (see the Agastya hymn I.165 for example).

Re takes abc as expressing the three functions, which I find hard to see. Does he assume pāda b is the third function and c the second? Surely he doesn’t see the smashing of Vṛtra in c as third function!

VII.58.5: On *jijīṛé* as a presential stative, see Kü (610–11).

VII.58.6: The first hemistich, which contains both *suṣṭutī*- ‘good praise’ and a form of *√juṣ* ‘enjoy’ with the Maruts as subject, but in separate clauses is an expansion of 3b *jújoṣann ín marútaḥ suṣṭutīm naḥ*. As was noted above, the first pāda of 3 also contains a pl. form of *maghávan(t)*-, which I take there as referring to our human patrons, because I take the Maruts as subject of the 2nd pl. impv., but the presence of *maghónām* here, clearly referring to the Maruts, may instead suggest that the *maghávant*-s in 3a are also the Maruts.

idám in b (*idám sūktám*) is yet another example of the frequent use of a form of *ayám* in the last vs. of a hymn to refer to the whole preceding hymn.

VII.59 Maruts

VII.59.1: The āmreḍita *idám-idam* in pāda a must go with the clause in b. The *ca* that connects the two clauses is slightly displaced: we might expect it to occur after the first element of its clause, namely *idám-idam*. But the pāda boundary and the intrusion of a pāda-initial voc. *dévāsaḥ* have clearly interfered with the placement, and the sequence *yám ... yám ca* makes the syntax perspicuous.

The sequence of vocc. in cd is puzzling because the first is unaccented, while the rest are accented, including those that follow the first in the same pāda: *tásmā agne váruṇa mītrāryaman, mārutaḥ* ... We would, I think, expect either all accented (**agne váruṇa mītrāryaman*) or all unaccented (*agne *varuṇa mītrāryaman*). Old suggests that a new “Ansatz” begins after *tásmā agne*, and it is of course true that the caesura follows *agne* -- but also of course true that vocatives are not ordinarily accented in that position. He also points out that the three vocc. in the 2nd part of the pāda are the names of the three principal Ādityas, which occur together and as accented vocc. elsewhere (V.67.1, VIII.19.35). In the latter passage the three vocc. are found pāda-internal post-caesura as here (see comm. ad loc.) Both of the factors adduced by Old no doubt contributed to the accentual behavior of this pāda, but it is a fine reminder that the rules of voc. accent, which we think of as fairly mechanical, are in part rhetorically driven.

VII.59.2: *yuṣmākam ... ávasā* is a variant of the cmpd. *yuṣmóta-* (i.e., *yuṣmā-ūta-*) found three times in the preceding hymn in VII.58.4.

The vs. contains two, or implicitly three, 3rd sg. act. present forms of the root $\sqrt{tṛ}$, *tarati* in b, *prá/ ví tirati* in c. For the same pairing of preverbs, see comm. ad VII.58.3 in the previous hymn.

VII.59.3: This vs. plays on the common contrast, also found earlier in this Marut cycle, between the Maruts as individuals -- here “the last” (*caramá-*) of them -- and as a collective (*vísve*).

On *sácā* as loc. absol. marker, see comm. ad IV.31.5.

I have rendered the nom. pl. *kāmínah* as an adverb (avidly) to avoid the somewhat heavy ‘having desire (for it)’.

VII.59.3–4: Both of these vss. begin *nahí vaḥ*; in neither one is it easy to produce a causal value for *-hí*, hence my ‘certainly’. The opening of 4c *abhí vaḥ* plays on the *nahí vaḥ* of 3a, 4a.

VII.59.5: Both Ge and Re take c as a single clause (e.g., “Car je vous ai donné ces offrandes”), but the position of *hí* suggests that a new clause begins with preceding *raré*, and *imā vo havyā* is a fine nominal clause announcing the oblations present right here on the ritual ground.

VII.59.6: The sequence *sádatāvitā* is analyzed by the Pp. as *sádata avitā*, with the latter form generally taken as a 2nd pl. impv. to \sqrt{av} ‘help’. But this interpr. is problematic on grounds of both form and meaning. There is no stem *avi-* to \sqrt{av} ; the best that can be done is to classify it with the *-iṣ-*aor. *ávīt*, etc., but, in addition to *-i-* rather than *-iṣ-*, the accent is wrong, since the *-iṣ-*aorist has root accent. Moreover, a form of ‘help’ fits badly

in the passage, where the main verb should provide syntactic support for the infinitive phrase *spārhāṇi dātave vāsu* “to give coveted goods.” These difficulties are treated in detail by Narten (Sig. aor. 87–88), who suggests an appealing and convincing solution, to read *sādatā vitā*, with the latter the 2nd pl. impv. to the root pres. of √ *vī* ‘pursue’, a solution that does not require emending the Saṃhitā text. As Narten points out, this pres. appears elsewhere with an infinitive. Although we ideally would expect a long root vowel (**vītā*), she adduces the 2nd sg. impv. *vihī* (3x), beside more common *vīhī*, as a model. This solution is accepted by Lub, though it is rejected by Baum (Impv. in RV 93, although he hesitates p. 167); Klein (DGRV I.166, 167; II.39) implicitly accepts the Pp. reading, but he does not cite the following pāda containing the infinitive phrase.

The accent on the 2nd pl. impv. *sādatā* presumably results from its juxtaposition and contrast with adjacent *vitā*.

āsredhantaḥ at the beg. of c can be either a voc. or a nom. pl.; nothing hangs on the exact identification.

VII.59.7: I take pāda a as a nominal clause separate from b, with predicated pres. part. *śumbhamānāḥ*. The hemistich cannot form a single clause because *apaptan* in b is unaccented despite the *hī* in pāda a. I take the sense of the first pāda to be that storms come out of nowhere, fully beautified as it were, so the beautification must have been done “in secret” (*sasvār*). The dark-backed geese of b are the storm clouds. The next hymn, dedicated to Mitra and Varuṇa, has a similarly structured vs., VII.60.10 *sasvās cid dhī sámṛtis tveṣy eṣām apīcyena sāhasā sāhante* “Because their fiery attack is even in secret and they are strong with hidden strength ...” (JPB tr.). In that vs. the finite verb in b, *sāhante*, is accented and therefore falls under the domain of *hī* in pāda a.

VII.59.8: *tirás cittāni* is a striking expression, without obvious parallels. In interpreting it, we can begin by noting that *tirás cid* is a reasonably frequent pāda opening (IV.29.1, V.75.7, VIII.33.14, 51.9, 66.12), including in the next hymn, VII.60.6. Although I toyed with the possibility of reading *tirás cit tāni* here, with the neut. pl. prn., this does not seem to be productive. However, the fact that *tirás cid* is a formulaic expression may help account for the fact that our *tirás cittāni* seems to be only loosely connected syntactically to the rest of the clause. Ge takes the expression as meaning “against/contrary to expectation” (wider Erwartung), but I’m not at all sure that *tirāḥ* can mean ‘against’ (though see X.171.4 *devānām cit tiró vāsam* “even athwart the will of the gods”). And in any case we would surely want to punish someone who tried to kill us, whether we expected him to or not. Re’s “en croisant (nos) pensées” is better; I have adapted an English idiom “cross-purposes,” which is practically a calque on the Skt. phrase. Here it reflects the hostility between the would-be attacker and “us.”

VII.59.8–9: Although, as noted in the publ. intro., the last four vss. of the hymn (9–12) must be late additions, there is a verbal link between vs. 8 and vs. 9: *tāpiṣṭhena* “with the most scorching ...” opening 8d is echoed by the Maruts’ ritual epithet *sāmtapanāḥ* opening 9a. This link may help account for why these Sākamedha vss. were attached just here.

VII.59.9–12: For the Sākamedha rites reflected in these vss., see publ. intro. and, e.g., ŚB II.5.3, esp. 3ff.; ĀpŚS VIII.9; sec. lit. including Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, 117–19; Keith, *Religion and Philosophy*, 322–23, etc.

VII.50.9: With the standard tr., I supply “come” in c, anticipating *ā gata* in 10a.

VII.59.11: The āmreḍita *ihéha* echoes that in vs. 1, *idám-idam*, forming a superficial ring. Given the apparent composite nature of the hymn, this apparent ring is presumably not a sign of a hymn conceived originally as a unity, but perhaps a hasty adjustment to try to integrate the separate pieces.

Pāda c appears to mean “I choose the/your sacrifice” (*yajñám ... ā vr̥ṇe*), as in Re’s “je choisis votre sacrifice.” But this doesn’t make a lot of sense in its baldest form. Although *ā√vr̥* normally just means ‘choose’, in this passage the *ā* appears to be used as it is with *√yaj*: *ā√yaj* means ‘attract through sacrifice’ (sim. *ā√pū* ‘attract through purification’), hence my “I will you (to come) here to (my) sacrifice,” that is, I attract you to it by the force of my will.

[VII.60–74 JPB]

VII.75 Dawn

VII.75.1: Although the Saṃhitā form *āvo* in pāda a (Pp. *āvaḥ*) is assigned to *√vr̥* ‘cover’ by Gr, it clearly belongs to *√vas* ‘shine, dawn’. See, e.g., AiG I.335. It is rightly glossed by Sāy. with *vyaucchat*. Both roots occur regularly with the preverb *ví* as here (‘dawn widely’ / ‘uncover’) and both are regularly found in dawn contexts. Here *ví ... āvas* explicitly contrasts with *āpa ... āvar* (*√vr̥*) ‘uncovered’ in c.

The latter form makes a bad Triṣṭubh cadence: ... *āvar ājuṣtam*#, where we would expect *-var* to be a heavy syllable. Old (Prol. 424 n. 1) persuasively suggests that this apparent light syllable may actually represent **āvarr* (from original 3rd sg. **āvart*), with the same doubling of final resonant before initial vowel that we find in *-nn* from older **-nt*. He suggests the same for *kar* (IX.92.5) and *abibhar* (X.69.10), both of which would be metrically better as **-arr*.

āv- is something of a signature of this vs.: *āvo ... , āviṣ(kṛṇvānā) ... / āvar*, reinforced by numerous other *a-/ā-*initial words: *āgāt / āpa ... ājuṣtam, āngirastamā ... ajīgaḥ*.

The “truth” (*ṛténa*) of Dawn must refer to her conforming to the standard patterns of the cosmos by dawning every day and indeed her embodiment of these patterns, since the regular alternation of night and day is the most salient sign of cosmic laws. The word here contrasts with *drúhaḥ* ‘deceits’ in c.

Corey Barnes (class, 12/15) pointed out the repeating pattern (*drúh*)*as táma ... (ājuṣ)tam, á(ngir)astamā*, which showcases ‘darkness’.

In d I take *pathyā* as standing for acc. pl. *pathyāḥ* in harmony with the Pp. and the standard views. Scar (137 and n. 191) tentatively suggests taking it rather as an instr. *pathyā* (“gegen den Text”), modelled on *pathyā (jánānām)* in nearby VII.79.1, where either instr. sg. *-ā* or acc. pl. *-āḥ* is possible. Although “awaken the paths” with the acc. pl. is not an entirely straightforward expression, his instr. interpr. not only goes against

the text but also requires supplying an obj. for “awaken” (“der Menschen”), and in addition “awaken (the men) along the path” doesn’t appreciably improve the sense. (Were they sleeping by the roadside?) I assume that “awaken the paths” is shorthand for “filling the paths with (newly awakened) people moving hither and thither and thereby making the paths lively.” An instr. in VII.79.1 fits the context better.

VII.75.2: Like the *āvaḥ* forms (see vs. 1), *bodhi* is ambiguous, and either interpr. could be made to fit the context. Gr takes it to \sqrt{budh} ‘be aware, be awake’, but most later interpr. assign it to $\sqrt{bhū}$ (Old, Ge, Re, Lub). However, I opt for \sqrt{budh} for several reasons. For one thing, as I have shown elsewhere (1997 “Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change,” 69–74), *bodhi* to $\sqrt{bhū}$ is in virtual complementary distribution with the parallel impv. *bháva*, with *bodhi* confined to pāda-medial position, against *bháva*, which occurs initially and finally. A pāda-final *bodhi* here would violate this distributional rule. Moreover, the last word of the preceding vs. is *ajīgaḥ*, belonging to \sqrt{gr} ‘awaken’, and I think the poet is playing off these two ‘awaken’ roots. Although Old gives numerous supposed parallels with $\sqrt{bhū}$ and the syntactic construction in our pāda, most of these involve dat. infinitives. However, two give me pause — III.54.3 *mahé śú naḥ suvitāya prā bhūtam*, VII.85.4 *āsad ít sá suvitāya ...* — both of which contain the dat. *suvitāya* and a form of ‘be(come)’. On the basis of these passages, I admit the possibility that *bodhi* here belongs to $\sqrt{bhū}$, but still think it likely that the poet is slyly playing with the ‘awaken’ roots. If it does belong to $\sqrt{bhū}$, I would explain its wrong positioning on the basis of strict parallelism between the semantically and syntactically parallel clauses of a and b, with the latter ending with the impf. (*prā*) *yandhi*.

Ge and Re construe *márteṣu* with *śravasyúṃ* (“... Reichtum, der unter den Sterblichen nach Ruhm strebt”; “... la richesse ... qui crée le renom parmi les mortels,” with Re adding a “creative” dimension to *śravasyú-* that does not seem to me to be justified, though it makes the tr. make more sense). I think rather that the sequence *dévi márteṣu mānuṣi* is meant to draw attention to two different relationships that Dawn, a goddess, has with the human world: on the one hand, she comes among mortals (*márteṣu*) every day, awakening the whole human world; on the other, she has a special relationship with the descendents of Manu, that is, the Ārya sacrificial community, a much more restricted set of humans to whom she is more tightly bound by ritual activity.

VII.75.3: The focus shifts from the sg. Dawn of vss. 1–2 to her pl. beams (*bhānāvaḥ*), but with lexical repetition linking them: *āguḥ* at the end of b echoes *āgāt* similarly positioned in 1b, *citrāḥ* repeats *citrām* (qualifying ‘wealth’) in 2c. And the nom. pl. beams and gen. sg. goddess are syntactically intertwined: *eté tyé bhānāvo* [nom. pl. m.] *darśatāyāś* [gen. sg. fem.] *citrā* [nom. pl. m.] *uśāso* [[gen. sg. fem.] *amṛtāsaḥ* [nom. pl. m.].

The phrase *janáyanto daívyāni vratāni* “generating the heavenly commandments” seems to expand on the *ṛténa* of vs. 1: by her dawning, Dawn every day recreates in visible form the rules that govern the cosmos.

VII.75.4: The initial *eṣā syā* “this very one” (fem.) matches *eté tyé* “these very ones” (masc.) opening the previous vs., referring to her beams.

As Old points out, pāda a lacks a syllable (even reading, as expected, *s’yā*). He tentatively suggests **yuyujānā*. It is certainly the case that *yujānā-*, which is fairly

common, never appears in this post-caesura position, while the four occurrences of *yuyujānā-* are all post-caesura. But it is difficult to explain why the corruption would have occurred -- perhaps haplology in the sequence (*s'*)*yā* **yuyu(jānā)*?

The “patterns of the peoples” (*vayúnāni jānānām*) seem almost to be the human equivalent of the *daívyāni vratāni* of 3c.

The pāda-final pres. *jigāti* picks up the aor. forms to the same root, also pāda-final, *āgāt* (1b), *āguḥ* (3b), but it also plays against the likewise redupl. *ajīgaḥ* at the end of 1d, belonging to the separate root *√gr* ‘awaken’.

VII.75.5: *citrā-* reappears in b (cf. 2c and 3b).

The polarized position of the phrases *īṣiṣṭutā* (beg. of c) and *vāhñibhir grṇānā* (end of d) helps anchor the application of *vāhñi-* ‘conveyor’ to ‘conveyor of ritual offerings’, since ‘praised by seers’ is unambiguous. Cf. also I.48.11 *yé tvā grṇānti vāhnayah*.

VII.75.6: And *citrā-* again, for the third time opening a b pāda.

The metaphorical use of *vāhñi-* found in the previous vs. contrasts with the literal use (well, as literal as the RV gets) of the participle *vāhantaḥ* ‘conveying’ referring to Dawn’s horses (*ásvāḥ*).

VII.75.7: The first hemistich consists of four consecutive etymological figures, all nom. sg. fem. + instr. pl. masc. — simple but effective.

On cd see Hoffmann (Injunk. 134).

VII.75.8: Since it directly follows *vāvaśanta* ‘(the cows) keep bellowing (7d)’, *nū no* opening the vs. is surely meant to evoke the root *√nu* ‘bellow, roar’, also used of bovines, with its (pseudo?) intensive (*ā*)*nūnot* (also *nónuv-*), though of course it really consists of particle followed by enclitic pronoun.

VII.76 Dawn

On the intricate structure of this hymn and its relationship to verb tense, see publ. intro. As noted there, vss. 1–2 have augmented aorists referring to the immediate past (*ásret* 1b, *ajaniṣṭa* 1c, *akar* 1d, *adīśran* 2a, *ābhūt* 2c, *āgāt* 2d); vss. 3–4 have augmented imperfects and one perfect referring to the more distant past (*āsan* 3a, 4a, *dadṛkṣé* 3d, *avindan* 4c, *ajanayan* 4d); and vss. 5–7 have present indicatives and imperatives stating general truths and urging action (*sām jānate ... yatante* 5b, *minanti* 5c, *īlate* 6a, *ucha* 6c, *jarasva* 6d, *ribhyate* 7b).

VII.76.1: Unlike the previous hymn, which contains no other divinities, this vs. introduces two (though one without name) before mentioning Uṣas, who enters only as the very last word of the vs. The two other gods are Savitar (b) and Sūrya in his role as “eye of the gods” (*devānām ... cākṣuḥ*, c).

The two virtually synonymous adj. *viśvājanya-* ‘belonging to all people’ and *viśvānara-* ‘belonging to all men’ are juxtaposed across the pāda boundary (a/b); they refer to two different entities: the immortal light (*jyótir amṛtam*), presumably the sun, and god Savitar (*savitā devāḥ*). As such they may also subtly allude to the well-known group,

the All Gods, with their first member(s) *viśvá-* and the ‘men’ words implicitly summoning up the opposite, *devá-*. The pl. gods then show up in c, with another occurrence of *viśva-* in d.

In c it is not possible to determine whose *krātu-* is being referred to. Ge takes it as the gods’, and certainly the adjacency of the two words (*krátvā devānām*) is suggestive. Re seems to favor Uṣas. However, given that it is Savitar’s action in ab that raised the light, I think it likely that the *krātu-* is his.

VII.76.2: On the relation of this vs. to its paired frame vs. 5, see publ. intro. Their relationship is signalled in the first instance by patterned repetition, with 2b and 5b almost identical: *āmardhanto vásubhiḥ* x x x x. This patterned repetition also involves poetic repair. The qualifier *āmardhantaḥ* ‘not negligent’, used unusually of paths in vs. 2b, returns in 5d with a far more appropriate referent, the Fathers or their modern-day representatives, the Vasiṣṭhas. The standard tr. either ignore the identity of the two words, found in the same metrical position, and tr. each in a way that fits the context as the tr. sees it (so Ge “unfehlbar” 2b versus “nicht zurückstehend” 2d) or choose an anodyne tr. that doesn’t reflect the act. transitive morphology of the form (Re “impeccable” in both places). But forms of the root \sqrt{mrdh} generally take an acc. obj. (or an enclitic prn. that is likely acc.) in the sense ‘neglect X’, and we would expect the participle, even negated, to reflect the same usage. As usual, I think it is incumbent on us to follow the morphology, even when it leads us to interpretations that seem, at first, awkward. Here I would first point out that Dawn “awakened” the paths in the previous hymn (VII.75.1d *pathyā ajāgaḥ*), so paths in this group of hymns appear to have more animacy than might be expected. The paths in our vs. are the ones that lead to the gods (*devayānāḥ*), and in this context “non-negligent paths” could be ones that don’t fail to lead us there, perhaps because they stay in good order, as is implied by the qualifier *īṣkṛta-*. As often with such semantic mismatches, the sense that comes from apparently incompatible words construed together is hard won, but it also leads to a deeper understanding of what the poet intended.

In the ppl. *īṣkṛta-* here and in a number of other locutions involving $\sqrt{īṣ}$ + $\sqrt{kṛ}$ (*īṣkartār-*, *īṣkṛti-*, etc.), *īṣ-* behaves like a pseudo-preverb. The most likely default source for this *īṣ-* is the root noun of the same shape meaning ‘refreshment, nourishing drink’ (so EWA s.v. *īṣ-*), although the semantics makes difficulties: the additive meaning we might expect (‘prepare nourishment’ vel sim.) is not found. Instead it seems to mean something like ‘set in order, set to rights, restore’. Although some interpr. the idiom as ‘heal’ (see EWA loc. cit.), I see no good evidence for this in the RV; certainly “healed paths” here would be even more aberrant than “non-negligent” ones. The form here is the only occurrence of the lexeme $\sqrt{īṣ} \sqrt{kṛ}$ in the Family Books; otherwise it is limited to the late RV: the finite verbs *īṣkaram* X.48.8, *īṣkṛṇudhvam* X.53.7, the past participle here and in the cmpd. *īṣkṛtāhāva-* X.101.6, as well as negated *āniṣkṛta-* VIII.99.8 and IX.39.2, agent nouns *īṣkartar-* VIII.1.12 and *īṣkartār-* VIII.99.8, X.140.5, and the fem. abstract *īṣkṛti-* X.97.9. Besides its possible etymological connection with *īṣ-* ‘refreshment’ (textually hinted at only in IX.39.2, X.48.8, 140.5), it also seems to form an antonymic pair with *nīṣ* $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘expel’; see the hymn to healing herbs, X.97, where *īṣkṛti-* is contrasted with *nīṣkṛti-*, *nīṣ kṛtha*. This rhyming contrast may account for the ‘restore’ sense, antonymic to ‘expel’. Our passage also contains interaction with a different pseudo-preverb: *īṣ-kṛta-*

can be seen as picking up (*āv*)*ír akar* in 1c. Though the augment induces -*r* sandhi, the underlying idiom is *āvīṣ* √*kṛ* (e.g., IV.4.5 *āvīṣ kṛṇuṣva*) with -*īṣ* matching *īṣkṛta*- here. *purástāt* / *pratīcī* “from the east, facing west” is another example of a paired contrast across a pāda boundary.

VII.76.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. are defined as an omphalos, and this relationship is signaled by the patterned repetition of their first pādas: 3a *tānīd* ... *āsan* / 4a *tá íd* ... *āsan* “just those were ...”

VII.76.3: Despite the straightforward, indeed ballad-like opening (“those were the days ...”), the syntax of the rest of this vs. is difficult to entangle. The problem is that there appear to be two subordinating expressions (*yā* in b, *yātaḥ pári* in c), though it is difficult to identify more than one subordinate clause; if there are two subordinate clauses, one of them would have very sketchy clausal structure. Nonetheless, Ge and Re opt for the latter solution, supplying a verb in b, both taking *yā* as neut. pl. nom. and the subject of this clause (e.g., “Nombreux furent ces jours en vérité qui (surgirent) autrefois ...”); for them cd is then a new subordinate cl. marked by *yātaḥ pári* referring to these same days (e.g., “à la suite desquels ...”). Something like this is possible, and in my many fiddlings with this vs. over the years I have more than once hovered over something like it. But the stumbling block is *prācīnam* in b, which both Ge and Re must take as an adverbial temporal expression (“vorher” and “autrefois” respectively), even though this stem is otherwise only locational ‘forwards / towards the east’, often in a ritual context. I can see no way to integrate the standard use of this stem into a nominal clause consisting only of pāda b. I therefore take bcd as a single subordinate clause with two markers of subordination, *yā* (b) a neut. pl. acc. extent of time (“through which ...”) and *yātaḥ pári* (c) referring to the place from which Dawn comes, picking up *purástāt* in 2c. The *yā* is more narrowly construed with the finite verb *dadṛkṣé* in d (“... the days through which you became visible” -- that is, dawned over and over), the *yātaḥ pári* with the participle *ācārantī* “faring forth thence [= from the east].”

I further take *prācīnam* as the goal of that participle (“faring forth ... towards the east-facing [sacrifice]”). As I just noted, *prācīna-* is often found in a ritual context, modifying *yajñā-* (VII.7.3) or *barhís-* (I.188.4, IV.5.4, X.110.4). Either would be possible here, and the point would be that Dawn is hastening from the east towards the sacrifice that, like an expectant lover, is facing towards her. Assuming with most comm., beginning with Sāy. (see esp. Old’s argumentation) that we should read loc. *jāré*, contra Pp. *jārāḥ*, the acc. *prācīnam* in the frame would be the functional equivalent of *jāré* in the simile -- GOAL -- despite the mismatch of cases, a nice example of case disharmony in a simile (as discussed in my 1982 IIJ article).

Although I realize that this is a very fussy solution, I cannot see any other way to deal with the troublesome *prācīnam*. And it is, after all, an omphalos vs., where perturbations are common. Strictly speaking, my tr. fails to render both subordinators as such: “thence” should be “whence.” But the tr. is hard enough to parse as it is.

The contrastively paired similes, “like (a maiden) faring forth to her lover, not like one going (home) again” (*jārā ivācārantī ... ná púnar yatīva*), are well understood by the standard comm. and nicely indicate that Dawn dawns with as much speed as she can muster, eager for reunion with her lover, rather than lingering like one reluctantly leaving

a tryst. For the first cf. I.123.9 ... *yóṣā ná ... niṣkṛtām ācārantī* “going to the appointed place like a maiden to a rendezvous,” also of Dawn (see also VI.75.4 in the weapon hymn). The *iva* is wrongly placed in the 2nd simile, but the poet had too many elements to fit in as it was.

VII.76.4: Although this vs. begins in the same way as vs. 3, the syntax is quite straightforward, with no dependent clauses and the Fathers as subject throughout. Once again we might consider this an example of poetic repair, given the syntactic difficulties the previous vs. posed.

VII.76.5: As noted above, this vs. marks the transition to present-tense verbs and imperatives from the distant past of vss. 3–4. Who the subject of these verbs is in vs. 5 is not entirely clear. Until the very last syllable of the first hemistich, it is impossible to know even the gender, but the oddly positioned *té* at the end of pāda b identifies the subject as masc.; up until then, since *sāṃgatāsaḥ* could be either masc. or fem., the fem. Dawns are a possibility. The second hemistich repeats the *té* immediately (c), and adds an unambig. masc. adj. *āmardhantaḥ* (as well as potentially ambig. *yādamānāḥ*). Once *té* restricts the subject to masc., our immediate thought would be the Fathers, who are the subject of vs. 4. This is the solution of both Ge and Re. However, the temporal switch between 4 and 5 might speak against that. In vs. 6 the Vasiṣṭhas are explicitly identified as the subject (6a). My own view is that the subject of vs. 5 is deliberately left unspecified, to allow a transition between, and identification of, the Fathers and their latter-day representatives the Vasiṣṭhas. That the Fathers are at least arguably present is suggested by *samānā ūrvé* “in a common pen,” since *ūrvā-* frequently refers to the Vala cave where the cows/dawns are confined and therefore could set the action of the vs. in mythological time when, as the preceding vs. notes, the Fathers “found the hidden light” and “generated the dawns,” as in the Vala myth. As for a contemporary reference, “common pen” could refer to the sacrificial ground, where the Vasiṣṭhas would be acting in concert.

In addition to specifying the gender of the subject of ab, the final *té* also repeats the final syllables of the two verbs that precede it in the pāda, *jānate ... yatante*.

VII.77 Dawn

On the structure of this hymn, as signaled by its verb forms and personal reference, see publ. intro. The first three vss. contain a series of sg. augmented aorists (started with a perfect), all but *ābhūt* with Dawn as 3rd ps. subj.: *úpa ruruce*, *ābhūt*, *ákar*, *úd asthāt*, *ásvait*, *aroci* (which last almost forms a ring with the opening pf.), *adarśi*, into which fem. sg. pres. participles have been interspersed: *prasuvántī*, *bádhamānā*, *bíbhraṭī*, *váhantī*, *náyantī*. Following that we get in vss. 4–5a an equally insistent series of imperatives: *ucha*, *kṛdhi*, *yāvaya*, *ā bhara*, *codāya*, *ví bhāhi*, with Dawn as 2nd ps. subject. In 5b the fem. pres. parts return: *pratirántī*, *dádhatī*. In the last vs. the pattern is broken again: a pl. present *vardháyanti* with the Vasiṣṭhas as subject, found in the only subordinate cl. in the hymn, and in the last pāda before the clan refrain an aor. injunctive in imperival usage, *dhāh*.

VII.77.1: \sqrt{ruc} appears with the preverb *úpa* only here. I connect it with the simile *yuvatír ná yóṣā* “like a young maiden”: *úpa* generally connotes ‘up close, intimate’, and *úpa* \sqrt{ruc} may suggest the beguiling radiance of a beloved young girl close by.

As Re points out, $\sqrt{bhū}$ + dat. inf. is rare. Here *ābhūt ... samídhe* seems to be the intrans./pass. equivalent of a periphrastic causative $\sqrt{kṛ}$ *samídhe*, as in I.113.9 *úṣo yád agnīm samídhe cakārtha* “O Dawn, since you have caused the fire to be kindled,” adduced by both Ge and Re. For a periphrastic caus. nearby, see VII.75.8 *mā ... nidé kar* “Don’t put to scorn ...”

I do not know why we have pf. *ruruce* in a vs. containing two augmented aorists, *ābhūt* and *ákar*, with two more in the next hemistich (2a *asthāt*, 2b *aśvait*); the passive aor. (a)*roci* would have been possible, and is in fact found in 2d.

VII.77.2: Whatever the reason for the pf. *ruruce* in vs. 1, its semi-repetition in the aor. *aroci* in 2d inaugurates a pattern of lexical chaining in the first part of this hymn.

vísavam opening the vs. may pick up *vísvaṃ jīvám* “every living thing” of the previous vs. or anticipate *vísvam* in 3d, where I supply ‘world’.

In c the bahuvrīhi *sudṛśīka-saṃdṛś-* ‘having an appearance lovely to see’ is an internal etymological figure, ... *ḍṛśīka- ... ḍṛś-*. Since the final segment of the cmpd, underlying -ś (or rather the product of nom sg. -ś+s), appears as -g in sandhi, it echoes the -k- of the prior member: *sudṛśīka-saṃdrg-*.

VII.77.3: More chaining: the compound etym. figure with *ḍṛś* in 2c is echoed not only by a repetition of the entire first member of the cmpd. *sudṛśīka-* (3b) but also in the pass. aor. *adarśi* (3c), while the fem. agent noun *netrī* of 2d returns as a participle *nāyantī* (3b), likewise fem., and the aor *aśvait* of 2b matches the adj. *śvetā-* in 3b.

VII.77.4: On the abrupt change of tense/mood and of person here see above and publ. intro. Notably, the lexical chaining stops here as well.

In pāda a *ānti-* ‘nearby’ contrasts with *dūré* ‘in the distance’, though the first is in a cmpd. and the latter is not. The ‘away’ / ‘here’ contrast is also found in c, though *yāvāya* means ‘keep away’ without benefit of preverb or adverb, while *ā* serves for ‘here’. The objects of the antithetical pairs are similar in the two pādas: “(bring) nearby” takes -*vāma-* ‘valuable things’ (a), *vásuni* ‘goods’ (c); “keep/send away” *amítam* ‘foe’ (a), *dvéṣaḥ* ‘hatred’ (c). Re comments similarly. *ānti-* may also implicitly refer back to the semantically similar *úpa* opening the first vs. and mark the beginning of the 2nd section of the hymn. For the complementary opposition *ānti* / *dūrā-* in a similar passage, cf. IX.78.5 *jahí śátrum antiké dūraké ca yáḥ* “Smash the rival nearby and the one who is in the distance.”

The VP *dūré amítam ucha* “dawn the foe into the distance” displays an apparent transitive sense of \sqrt{vas} ‘dawn’. This transitive sense is otherwise limited to *ápa* \sqrt{vas} ‘dawn (X) away’, as in nearby VII.81.6 *uṣā uchad ápa srídhaḥ* “Dawn dawns away failures” (= I.48.8; cf. VII.104.23, VIII.47.18). In our passage the locational adverb *dūré* ‘in the distance’ fills the role of the preverb *ápa* ‘away’, a point also made by Re. Baum’s interpr. (Impv. in RV, 164) of *amítam* as an acc. of goal, in the sense “‘illuminate the enemy (when he is) far away,’ i.e. prevent him from hiding,” is unlikely, and he does not mention the *ápa* \sqrt{vas} passages.

VII.77.5: I take the two *ca*'s in cd as marking a "both ... and" construction: *īṣaṃ ca ... gómad áśvāvad ráthavac ca rádhaḥ* "both refreshment and largesse in cattle, horses, (and) chariots." Though ordinarily we might expect the 2nd *ca* to be placed after the first term in the second constituent (hence* *gómac ca ...*), I explain its late position as resulting from treating the three parallel *-vat* adjectives as a unitary qualifier; it also allows the complementary placements of *ca* in cd: #X *ca* ..., ... *ca* Y#. Klein interprets the passage very differently, taking the two *ca*'s as independent: the first as conjoining the two participial clauses in bc (... *pratirántī* ... / ... *ca* ... *dádhatī* ...)(DGRV I.104–5) and the second as an XYZ *ca* construction, conjoining the *-vat* adjectives (86 and passim).

VII.78 Dawn

On the lexical marks of this hymn, see publ. intro. The signature word *práti* opens the hymn and is repeated at the beginning of the first two pādas of vs. 2 and in the middle of 3a; it returns at the beginning of the last vs. (5), thus sketching a ring. The other signature word, fem. pres. part. *vibhātī*- 'radiating widely' is concentrated in the latter part of the hymn, ending the pādas 3b, 4b, and 5c.

VII.78.2: The lexeme *ápa* √ *bādh* appears, as often, in tmesis. This tmesis appears to be regular even when the lexeme appears, as here, in the participle (univerbated as *apabādhāmāna*- only in the late X.103.4; in tmesis I.35.3, 90.3, V.80.5, IX.97.43 as well as here). But in our passage *ápa* is oddly positioned for a preverb in tmesis (which may account for Gr's failure to register the preverb, as also in V.80.5): immediately following the object and not adjacent to a metrical boundary, ... *bādhāmānā, víśvā támāṃsi duritāpa devī*. Although this aberrant position might suggest that *ápa* is not a preverb here but a postposition or adverb, this would require separating the expression from the well-attested verbal lexeme, which I prefer not to do. I should however note that in vs. 1b *bādhāmānā támāṃsi* is found without *ápa*.

VII.78.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. departs from the practice of the rest of the hymn by referring to plural Dawns.

práty adṛśran in the middle of pāda a repeats the opening of the hymn (1a), with polarized #*práti* ... *adṛśran*#. The plural subject in vs. 1 are Dawn's "beacons" (*ketávaḥ*).

VII.78.5: As noted in the publ. intro., the hapax denom. *tilvilāyādhvam* is the most notable feature of this hymn. This verb is clearly built to the adj. *tīlvila*-, found in V.62.7, where it appears to mean something like 'fertile': *bhadre kṣetre nimitā tīlvile vā* "(the pillar) fixed in the good or ____ field/land." Note not only the *l*-s, but the rhyming *tīl-vīl*-, a word-formation tactic not otherwise found in standard Vedic; the standard assumption is that it is a non-Indo-Aryan word (see, e.g., Kuiper, Aryans 14). The standard interpr. take it as a (presumably more specific) synonym to *bhadrá*-, though of course the *vā* 'or' construction could identify it as a contrast or even opposite to *bhadrá*-. If the word belongs to the agricultural sphere (as *kṣetra*- 'field' suggests), a non-IAr origin makes sense. It is sometimes connected (see EWA s.v.) with *tīlā*- (AV+) 'sesame', which also lacks an IAr etym. The word *tīlvila*- is found in later Vedic; most of the occurrences are in similar passages in the grhya sūtras for the erection of a housepost and are clearly

dependent on RV V.62.7 (e.g., ĀśGS 2.8.16, ŚāṅkhGS 3.3.1), but a ŚB passage seems to place it in the ‘fruitful, fertile, rich’ sphere. The passage concerns a cow let out to wander; whichever direction she goes will predict what will happen to the sacrificer. ŚB IV.5.8.11 *yádi prātīcīyād ībhyaṭilvīla iva dhāṇyatīlvilo bhaviṣyatīti vidyāt* (Eggeling) “If she goes westwards, let him know that he will be rich in dependants and crops.”

VII.79 Dawn

As noted in the publ. intro., *vī* is the signature word of this hymn. The first and last hemistichs of the hymn (1a, 5c) begin with *vī* and a form (indeed two, in the etymological figure in 1a) of \sqrt{vas} : 1a *vy uṣā āvaḥ* and 5c *vyuchāntī*, forming a ring, and *vī* opens 1d, 2a, 3c, 4d as well. This preverb also gets played with in various ways: 2b opens with *vīso* ‘clans’, whose 1st syllable falsely promises the preverb. The regular oppositional counterpart of *vī*, namely *sām*, opens 2c and provides the 2nd syllable of 1c (*susamḍṛgbhiḥ*). The alliteration of 3c is also set in motion by its opening *vī* (see below).

VII.79.1: This vs. echoes the 1st vs. of VII.75 in several ways, and VII.75.1 is helpful in resolving the verbal ambiguities in this one. Our vs. contains two occurrences (pādas a, d) of *vī ... āvaḥ* in exactly that sandhi form. The 3rd sg. augmented root aor. form *āvaḥ* is entirely ambiguous between \sqrt{vas} ‘dawn’ and \sqrt{vr} ‘obstruct, cover’, and the preverb *vī* does not help, since *vī* \sqrt{vas} regularly means ‘dawn widely’ and *vī* \sqrt{vr} ‘uncover, open’. VII.75.1 also contains two such forms, but both of them are in sandhi forms that allow their root affiliation to be unambiguously identified. VII.75.1 opens exactly like our vs., *vy uṣā āvaḥ*, but in VII.75 the sandhi form of the verb is *āvo*, which must belong to \sqrt{vas} . Pāda c of VII.75.1 contains *āvar* (though in tmesis with *āpa* rather than *vī*); again, the sandhi form *-ar* makes it clear that this verb must belong to \sqrt{vr} . Given the parallelism of the two vss., it seems almost as if VII.75.1 is providing a guide to the ambiguities of our vs. In any case the standard interpr. all distribute the *āvaḥ* forms in this vs. as just laid out.

There is another echo between the two vss.: pāda a here contains *pathyā*, which could represent either instr. sg. *pathyā* (so Pp.) or acc. pl. *pathyāḥ* out of sandhi, recalling *pathyā* in VII.75.1d, which must represent acc. pl. *-āḥ* before a vowel. In this passage I favor the instr. sg. Note also that *pāñca ksītīḥ* opening our b pāda opens VII.75.4b.

VII.79.2: Whatever the etymology of *aktú-* ‘night’ -- I favor the connection with PIE **nok^wt-* ‘night’, *pace* EWA s.v.; see most recently LIN 505 and n. 20 -- it is here at least secondarily associated with $\sqrt{añj}$ ‘anoint’ (which for some, e.g., EWA, is its etymon), since *aktūn* serves as obj. of *vy añjate*. My “glossy nights” is an attempt to capture the pun. For those who consider *aktú-* a derivative of $\sqrt{añj}$, *aktūn* here would be an internal obj. / cognate acc.; cf. Oberlies (Relig. v. II.111): “Die [rotglühenden] Morgenröten verstreichen ihre Farbe ...”

In any case, *aktūn* participates in two phonetic figures: *añjate ... ánteṣu aktūn* and the near-mirror-image *aktū(n) ... yuktā(h)*.

As in the previous hymn (VII.78), Dawn is sg. in this hymn, except in one vs., in this case this one; in VII.78, vs. 3.

VII.79.3: #*ābhūd uṣā(h)* is reminiscent of #*ābhūd agnīh* in VII.77.2, though there the construction involved a predicated infinitive. See also VII.76.2 #*ābhūd u ketúr uṣasaḥ*.

Dawn is *īndratamā* because she is *maghónī* ‘bounteous’ as he is *maghávan(t)-*. The splv. suffix *-tamā* echoes *tāmaḥ* ‘darkness’ in the previous vs., 2c.

As Re points out, *suvitāya* in b recalls *duritā* in VII.78.2.

Pāda c displays heavy alliteration: *vī divó devī duhitā dadhātī*. The pattern is set in motion by the preverb *vī*, which, as was noted above, is the hymn’s signature word. The first three words in c have *vī* itself, its inverse (*d*)*iv(ó)*, and a long-vowel variant (*de*)*vī*, but in the meantime the *d* pattern has asserted itself and carries through to the end of the pāda. The elements of this sequence are found nearby each other in other hymns in this cycle, though not with the same intense concentration. Cf. esp. VII.77.5–6: 5b *devi*, 5c *dádhatī*, 6a *divó duhitā*.

VII.79.4: As slowly becomes clear, this vs. concerns the Vala myth, as the last pāda, describing the opening of “the doors of the firm-fixed stone,” illustrates. This slipping into the Vala story accounts for the otherwise puzzling *āṅgirastamā* ‘best / most like the Aṅgirasas’ in the previous vs. (3d; found also in nearby VII.75.1, also in a potential Vala context). The Aṅgirasas, of course, were responsible, along with Indra, for opening the Vala cave and releasing the imprisoned cows; they did so by singing. As Ge points out, the praisers who benefit from Dawn’s largesse in 4b are most likely the Aṅgirasas, and they would also then be the subjects of c.

Note the phonetic echo between *rādho* (a) and (*á*)*rado* (b), which is then found scrambled in d (*dú*)*ro ádr(eḥ)*. Pāda d also contains internal phonetic play with *d*’s and *r*’s, as well as *a*, *u*, and *o*: ... *dṛḥ(asya) dúro, adr(e)r āūr(ṇ)o(h)*. This is the only trisyllabic reading of the augmented stem *aurṇo-* and the vowel hiatus *a-ū* (or *a^vū*?) emphasizes the phonetic figures.

The verb in c, the pf. *jajñúh*, is perfectly ambiguous between *√jan* ‘beget’ and *√jñā* ‘recognize’. It is now standardly taken to the former, though Ge previously (Ved. St.) assigned it to the latter, a stance criticized by Old and silently given up by Ge in his tr.

VII.79.5: As noted in the intro. above, *vyuchántī*, which opens the last pāda of the hymn (save for the clan refrain), forms a ring with the opening phrase (1a) *vy uṣā āvaḥ*. This reinforces the affiliation of *āvaḥ* in 1a with *√vas*, not *√vṛ*.

VII.80 Dawn

VII.80.1: This vs. reprises various parts of the other dawn hymns in this cycle. The first hemistich *prāti ... uṣásam ... abudhran* echoes VII.78.5a *prāti tvā ... budhanta*, with each having the mortal worshipers as subject. (Note augmented *abudhran* versus injunctive *budhanta*.) In c Dawn is “unrolling” the two world halves (*vivartáyantīm*), while in VII.79.2c her cows “roll up” the darkness (*sám ... táma ā vartayanti*) with the preverb *sám* complementary to *vī*. In our vs. *sám* is found in the same pāda in the adjective describing the two world-halves, *sámante* ‘adjoining’. Finally, Dawn’s role in “revealing all beings” (*āviṣkṛṇvatīm bhúvanāni víśvā*) reminds us of her revealing her own greatness (*āviṣkṛṇvānā mahimānam*) in the first vs. of this cycle (VII.75.1b). The act. part. in our

vs. is externally focused, while the middle part. in VII.75.1 properly captures the internal focus of that expression. The act. expression is also found in VII.76.1 *āvīr kar bhūvanaṃ vīśvam uśāḥ*.

Ge takes du. *rājasī* as referring to the Dark (and Light), i.e., Night and Day. But du. *rājasī* ordinarily refers to the two world-halves and is often used in conjunction with *ródasī* (e.g., I.160.4, IV.42.3), and I see no reason to seek a different referent here. Dawn's action of 'unrolling' the two world-halves would refer to the visual effect of the gradual revealing of their features as the dawn's light strengthens. For a similar notion, though with *vī√vr* 'uncover', see the previous hymn VII.79.1 *vī sūryo ródasī cákṣasāvaḥ* "The Sun has uncovered the two world-halves with his eye."

VII.80.2: Because of the middle voice of the part., I interpr. *návyam āyur dádhanā* as referring to Dawn's new life, which she would then assume every day. The middle voice contrasts with VII.77.5 *pratirántī na āyuh* "(she,) lengthening our lifetime." Both Ge and Re seem to imply that in our passage the new life is established for others.

The sg. *abodhi* at the end of the first hemistich matches the pl. *abudhran* in the same position in vs. 1.

Pāda d *prācīkitat sūryam yajñām agnīm* is exactly parallel to VII.78.3 *ājījanat sūryam yajñām agnīm*, which suggests that *ācīkitat* is felt as a redupl. aor. to the caus. *cetáyati*, despite the obvious drawbacks of form (we would expect **acīkitat*).

VII.80.3: This vs. is identical to VII.41.7, though it may fit better here.

The three *-v/matī-* adj., *áśvāvatīr gómatīḥ ... vīrávatīḥ*, modifying the pl. 'dawns' reprise the sequence at the end of the first hymn in this cycle, VII.75.8 *gómāḍ vīrávat ... áśvāvat*, where they qualified *rátanam*.

VII.81 Dawn

VII.81.1: Note the adjacency of *tāmaḥ* and *jyótiḥ*, though here across the pāda break.

VII.81.3: The stem *vānanvant-*, in my opinion, must be separated into two separate words on semantic grounds, neither of which is entirely clear morphologically. In VIII.102.19 and X.92.15, where it is associated with an axe (*svádhitī-*) in the identical phrase *svádhitīr vānanvatī*, it appears to belong with *vāna-* 'wood'. Cf. for the association IX.96.3 ... *svádhitīr vānānām*, X.89.7 *svádhitīr vāneva* But in VIII.6.34 it modifies *matīḥ* 'thought' in a context in which 'wood(en)' seems effectively excluded. In both VIII.1.31 and our passage I also find it difficult to make 'wooden' work, though Ge, for example, thinks our voc. addressed to Dawn (may -- he tags it with ? --) mean "Wagenbesitzende," on the assumption that the wagon is wooden and the material has come to refer to the object made of it. In VIII.1.31, where it modifies 'horses' (*áśvān*), he takes it as referring to their wooden yokes. (He refuses to tr. the form in VIII.6.34.) Mayrhofer (both KEWA s.v. *vānam* and EWA s.v. *vān-*) favors the 'wood' connection as well, and in EWA suggests that *vānan-* is the *-n*-form of a heteroclit, whose *-r-* is found in the locative 1st cmpd member *vanar-* (though one would of course not expect the *-r-* in the oblique). Re, having written in favor of the 'wood' connection (BSL 37: 19), disavows it in his n. to this passage in EVP III, in favor of "gracieuse," on what seem firm grounds. Old

discusses the problem with his customary acuity and decides for a derivation from \sqrt{van} ‘win, hold dear’, with a pun on ‘wood’ in VIII.102.19 and X.92.15. Although I generally favor seeing audacious metaphors in the RV, in this particular case I find that putting all the forms of *vānanvant-* under one rubric unduly stretches the metaphorical fabric -- though I might be open to Old’s suggestion that in VIII.102.19 and X.92.15 there is a pun on ‘wood’, but the form belongs with \sqrt{van} . This does not, however, help with the morphology. I tentatively suggest that the form derived from \sqrt{van} is the result of the further derivation or contamination of originally participial forms. The 8th class present to \sqrt{van} *vanóti* has an act. part. *vanvánt-*; if this acquired a *-vant-* suffix, the result would be in the first instance **vanv-án(t)-vant-*, which by dissimilation of the middle *-v-* could develop into our form (though with accent shift). Or the pf. part. *vavan-váms-* could have dissimilated to **vanan-váms-* (again accent is a problem). Or, starting with the pres. part. *vanv-ánt-*, we could imagine a perseverative form **vanv-an(t)-ant-*, with migration of the 2nd *-v-*. Or we can confect an intens. stem **vanvan-* with participle **vanvan-a(n)t-*, again with flip of the *v*. But all of these scenarios are pure fantasy, I’m afraid. As for the form putatively derived from ‘wood’, I have even less idea, though I suppose it’s worth pointing out that all attested forms from both stems *vānanvant-* actually have the weak form of the suffix *-vat-* and **vana-vatV*, built directly to *vāna-*, would be metrically unfavorable.

VII.81.4: This vs. presents several minor syntactic problems. Pāda b contains two apparent dative infinitives, the almost synonymous *prakhyai* and *drśé*, most likely to be construed with *kṛṇóṣi* in pāda a. The standard interpr. take the two infinitives as separate parallel constructions, though the details of these constructions differ acdg. to tr. (cf., besides Ge and Re, Scar [353] and Keydana [Inf., 167, 203]). As a typical ex., see Scar’s “... die du ... machst, dass man sieht und man das Licht schaut.” Although as far as I know there is no way to tell, I prefer to take both the datives with *svâr*; the standard expression *svâr drśé* indicates that the sun is visible, available for seeing, while *prakhyai* is used in a similar fashion to *cákṣase* in 1c.

The 2nd hemistich is more problematic. The first question is the grammatical identity of *ratnabhājah*, which could be gen. sg. and modify immediately preceding fem. gen. *táśyās te*, or nom. pl. and modify the implied pl. subj. ‘we’ of immediately following 1st pl. *īmahe*. Ge opts for the latter (“... die du Belohnungen austeilst”), but Old, Re, and Scar favor the nom. pl., as do I. For one thing other *-bhāj-* cmpds have similar syntacto-semantic value (“having a share of X”), rather than the transitive sense (“sharing out X”) required by the gen. interpr. It is of course possible that the positioning between the gen. sg. and the 1st pl. was deliberate, and the form is meant to be ambiguous.

The other problem lies in the interpr. of the two verbs *īmahe* (c) and *syāma* (d). The standard interpr. take the pāda break as a clause break (“as sharers of your treasure we beseech you; may we be like sons ...”). I find this mildly problematic, in that *ratnabhājah* would be better construed with *syāma* (“might we be sharers ...”) than with *īmahe*, and I have therefore taken it that way, with *īmahe* parenthetical and the simile in d an adjunct. This interpr. is supported by VI.71.6 *vāmabhājah syāma* “May we be partakers of the valuables” (sim. III.55.22 *sákhāyas te vāmabhājah syāma*). However, my interpr. not only complicates the syntax slightly, but the lack of accent on parenthetical *īmahe* might be troublesome -- though I don’t have strong intuitions on how verbal accent

works with parentheticals. (The one example I can come up with, however, does accent the verb that interrupts the clause: X.95.1 *mānasā tīṣṭha ghore vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāvahai nau* “Thoughtfully -- stand still, fearsome woman! -- let us two now exchange words.”) In any case it might be better to follow the standard interpr. and tr. something like “we beseech you ([for us] to be) sharers in your treasure; may we be like sons to a mother” -- though as the tr. shows, taking *īmahe* with *ratnabhājah* requires more semantic machinery.

In c *tásyās te* is a fairly unusual ex. of the double *sá tvám* construction. As is sometimes the case with oblique forms of this construction, I think it likely that the *tásyāḥ* is there to indicate the gender of the personal pronoun -- though, given the Dawn context, the fem. gender of *te* could hardly be a secret.

VII.81.6: *codayitrī maghónaḥ* is perfectly ambiguous, since *maghónaḥ* could be either gen. sg. or acc. pl. In the former case it would refer to Indra, the archetypal *maghāvan-*, in the latter to the pl. patrons (the *sūrī-* referred to in pāda a). According to the standard distribution of cases, suffix-accented *-tār-* agent nouns should take the gen.; indeed our stem does just that in I.3.11 *codayitrī sūnṛtānām*. However, this distribution is not absolute, and given the recent mention of the pl. patrons and the absence of Indra from this hymn (and mostly from this hymn cycle), a pl. reading is quite possible as well.

sūnṛtātvatī at the end of c forms a faint ring with *sūnārī* at the end of vs. 1. Note that it also recalls I.3.11 just cited.

[VII.82–89 JPB]

VII.84 Indra and Varuṇa

VII.84.3: Note that JPB tr. *tiretam*, an opt., as an impv.

VII.86–89 Varuṇa

For a detailed examination of these hymns see my disc. in *The RV between Two Worlds* (2007: 92–108).

VII.86 Varuṇa

VII.86.7b: ‘god’ omitted → “to the ardent god”

Re treats VII.90–92 in EVP XV.105–9.

VII.90 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.90.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn plays on the two senses of *niyút-* in Vāyu context: his teams of wind-horses and our teams of poetic thoughts. This ambiguity is fully on display in pāda c *vāha vāyo niyúto yāhy áchā*, where acc. pl. *niyútaḥ* is stationed between the two imperatives. *vāha* and *yāhy*. The latter is interpr. by the Pp. as accentless *yāhi*, but in this sandhi situation, followed by initially accented *áchā*, it could also represent *yāhí*. If this impv. is unaccented, *niyútaḥ* should be construed with it, with a

clause boundary after preceding voc. *vāyo*. If it is accented, it should begin a new clause and *niyútaḥ* should be construed with *vāha*. The situation is complicated by the semi-parallel passage I.135.2 *vāha vāyo niyúto yāhy asmayúḥ*, where unaccented *yāhi* is the only choice because the following word does not begin with an accented vowel. If *niyútaḥ* is to be construed with *yāhy*, it is an acc. of goal and refers to our teams (poetic thoughts); if with *vāha*, it should refer to Vāyu's teams. Curiously, both Ge and Re in both passages choose to construe *niyútaḥ* with *vāha* (e.g., "Fahre, Vāyu, die Niyut-Rosse, komm here!"), even though in I.135.2 this interpr. should be excluded. Old (ad I.135.2) opts for the other construction and tr. "fahre, Vāyu; zu (unsern) *n.[iyút-]* komm." This interpr., the only one strictly possible in I.135.2, is further supported by III.35.1=VII.23.4 *yāhī vāyúr nā niyúto no áchā* "Travel like Vāyu to our teams" where *niyútaḥ* is clearly construed with *yāhī*. However, just because *niyútaḥ* needs to be construed with *yāhy* in our passage and in I.135.2, construing it also with *vāha* isn't excluded -- so an alt. tr. of this passage and of I.135.2 could be "Drive (your teams), Vāyu; travel to our teams." See also 3c.

VII.90.2: The rel. *yāḥ* in pāda a may be somewhat deeper in the clause than we would like, following both the indirect obj. *īśānāya* and the direct obj. *prāhutim*.

VII.90.3: I take *dhāti* as a root aor. subjunctive (as apparently also Kü, judging from his tr. "... soll ... führen ...," p. 186); unfortunately it does not have a distracted root vowel, but see disc. ad IV.8.3 as well as my forthcoming article on *dāti-vāra*.

Note the extreme alliteration of b: ... *devī dhiṣāṇā dhāti devām*, with mirror-image plain and aspirated voiced stops, as well as the etym. figure *devī ... devām* enclosing the whole.

The *niyút-* in this vs. are explicitly identified as Vāyu's 'own' (*svāḥ*), which supports the view that the *niyút-* in 1c are not Vāyu's but ours.

The question in d is the referent of *vásudhiti-* 'treasure-chamber'. Both Gr and Ge identify it as Vāyu himself, though this seems pretty much excluded by the fact that acc. *vásudhitim* is conjoined with the other acc. *vāyúm* (c) by *utá* (see Klein DGRV I.323–24, though he also suggests Vāyu could be the referent). Old suggests Indra (flg. Pischel), and Re so renders it in tr. To me Agni seems more likely than either Indra or Vāyu, since Agni is actually called a *vásudhiti-* in I.128.8, and *śvetá-* 'gleaming' is more appropriate to Agni than to either of those gods. (For Agni as *śvetá-* see, e.g., V.1.4.) However, to my mind the most likely referent is Dawn, a possibility also floated by Re. Dual *vásudhiti-* occurs twice (III.31.17, IV.48.3), both times of Night and Dawn. In both cases the noun is modified by dual *kṛṣṇé* 'black', which of course characterizes only one of the pair and evokes the opposite, suppressed quality, 'bright' (see comm. ad IV.48.3). In IV.48.3 the two treasure-chambers are intimately associated with Vāyu and his journey to the sacrifice. Note also that the dawns show up in the very next pāda in our hymn (4a). The one obstacle to identifying *vásudhitim* here as Dawn is that the accompanying adj. *śvetām* is masc., but this would be problematic in any case, if it modifies *vásudhiti-*, because the noun itself is fem. (see du. fem. *kṛṣṇé* just cited)—though it can have a masc. referent (e.g., I.128.8 *agním hótāram īlate vásudhitim* "They invoke Agni, the Hotar, [as] treasure-chamber"). I assume that **śvetām* has been redactionally shortened (without metrical consequences, since it precedes a consonant-initial word) on the basis of such

equational passages, or perhaps on the basis of such passages *vásudhiti-* was simply interpr. as masc. here.

VII.90.4: In the publ. tr. the injunc. *uchán* is rendered as a preterite; I'd now be inclined towards a pres. "the dawns dawn," if the vs. depicts the ritual scene unfolding. If, however, it is an account of the Vala myth, a preterital *uchán* would be better. Since there is probably split temporal reference here, describing the actions both of the mythical Āṅgirasas originally opening the Vala cave and of the priests reenacting this mythic model, the injunctive *uchán* can fit both scenarios—likewise the perfects that follow (*vividuḥ* b, *ví vavruḥ* c, *sasruḥ* d), since that tense can be used both for both distant and immediate past. Unfortunately English does not have a temporally un- (or under-)marked tense like the injunctive, and so a choice between present and preterital translations has to be made.

On the basis of the next hymn, VII.91.4 *náraḥ ... dīdhyānāḥ* (and see also our 5a), the subject of b should be 'men' or the Uśij-priests in the next pāda, though the 'dawns' of the previous pāda would technically be available.

I did not render *cīd* in c in the publ. tr. Cf. V.29.12, where the same phrase opens the pāda and *cīd* likewise appears to be functionless. It could perhaps mean 'also' here, as a second action after finding the light.

On *ānu pradīvaḥ* see Old's extensive disc.

VII.90.5: If the previous vs. had two temporal reference points, this one seems completely focused on the ritual here and now. As noted in the publ. intro., the priests have become the draught animals that draw Indra and Vāyu's chariot -- alluding to the trope of sacrifice as chariot.

VII.90.6: As noted in the publ. intro., the use of *īśānā-* 'having dominion' here cleverly assimilates the patrons modified by this participle with Vāyu (2a) and Indra-Vāyu (5d), who receive the same modifier.

Ge (n. 6a) persuasively suggests that the striking phrase "confer the sun on us," with the patrons as subject, refers to "the great light of the Dakṣiṇā" (priestly gift). This is reminiscent of the biblical quotation "Let your light so shine before men ..." that always preceded the taking up of the collection in the Episcopal church of my youth.

VII.91 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.91.1: For my interpr. of the context of this vs. see the publ. intro., where I suggest that the vs. depicts the primal situation before the ritual was first instituted, with the gods existing without a sacrificial compact. I take *purā ... āsan* as existential, "existed previously," as I do almost the same construction (but with pf., not impf.) in IV.51.7 *purāsuḥ* -- but not *purā-āsitha* in VI.45.11, where the *purā* is contrasted with *nūnām* in disjunctive *vā* clauses. The existential reading seems to me preferable to a predicative one, whether *ṛdhāsaḥ* or *anavadyāsaḥ* were to be predicated.

The construction of *kuvīd* is unusual, in that it appears on the surface that the *kuvīd* construction consists of a rel. clause introduced by *yé* without a main clause. Old's first suggested rendering is of this type ("Bewiesen sich wohl einst die Götter als

tadellos?"); similarly Hettrich (Hypotaxe, 145). But Old alternatively suggests supplying a main verb with *kuvíd* with the relative clause subordinate to that clause ("Wie denn (verhielten sich) die Götter, welche ... waren?"), a syntactic solution silently adapted by Re. In either case *āsan* would unproblematically be accented because it belongs to the rel. cl. Although my interpr. differs somewhat from Ge's, we both take *āsan* as the verb of the main clause with *kuvíd* ("Ganz gewiss waren es schon früher die untadeligen Götter ..."), with the rel. clause either requiring a verb to be supplied (Ge) or simply being a nominal rel. cl. (me). By this interpr. the accentuation of *āsan* would contradict Gr's rule (s.v. *kuvíd*) that the verb introduced by *kuvíd* is accented only when it is in the same pāda -- but see comm. ad II.35.1 for further violations of this "rule." The construction I envisage runs into another problem, that the rel. cl. (*nāmasā yé vṛdhāsaḥ*) would seem to be embedded in the main clause *kuvíd ... āsan*). But we have seen elsewhere (e.g., VI.21.2, 22.5, 64.5, 6) that *nominal* relative clauses can function as pseudo/proto-izafe constructions and be embedded in the matrix clause. Here the rel. cl. would, further, precede the main clause proper, beginning with *purā*, and be preceded only by the rhetorical introductory *kuvíd aṅgá*, so its "embedding" is slight. This example would differ from the norm in being preposed to its referent, *devāḥ* in the next pāda.

For "hard-pressed Manu" see VI.49.13.

VII.91.2: Ge (n. 2a) suggests that *ná* in pāda a stands for haplologized **ná ná*, with both the simile particle ("Willig wie Boten") and the negative ("... nicht zu hintergehen"). Certainly it must represent the negative with infinitival dat., since *ná dábhāya* occurs twice elsewhere (V.44.3, IX.73.8) with *gopá-*, but it is less clear that we need the simile marker. Though Indra and Vāyu are probably not technically messengers in the way that Agni is, I see no real problem in identifying them thus when they come to the sacrifice from the heavenly world, rather than simply comparing them to messengers.

I do not entirely understand why *pāthāḥ* is accented, and, unusually, Old makes no comment in the Noten. I assume that it falls roughly in the category of expressions with a single verb and "zwei Subjekten, Objekten u. s. w." (specifically here the u. s. w.) treated in Old's lengthy article on Verbalenklisis in the Rig Veda (ZDMG 60 [1906]:707–41 = KISch 182–216; cited phrase p. 708=183), though in a rather cursory scan of the article I did not find this passage. The triggering phrase here would be *māsás ca ... śarádaś ca pūrvīḥ* "though the months and many autumns," with the accented verb in the middle, even though the conjoined NPs are not contrastive.

Ge tr. the just cited phrase with "viele Monaten und Herbst," though technically speaking fem. *pūrvīḥ* can only modify *śarádaḥ*, to which it is also adjacent. Klein (DGRV I.134) echoes Ge's interpr. forcefully ("... must be taken with both conjoined nouns" [my ital.]), and no doubt this is the ultimate intent, though I find preferable the rendering that matches the grammar (so also Re without comment).

VII.91.3: As discussed in the publ. intro., I differ from the standard tr. (which consider Vāyu the subject of ab and the referent of the acc. pl. in pāda a to be the sacrificers) in considering this first hemistich a disguised reference to the soma offered to Vāyu. Although the Vāyu identification might seem the default -- and it indeed may be correct -- both the vocabulary and the ritual situation seem to point in another direction. The descriptor *sumedhás-* is never otherwise used of Vāyu, but it is applied 3x to Soma or his

drop (IX.92.3, 93.3, 97.23); the only figure who receives this epithet more often is Agni. Similarly *śvetá-* is not used of Vāyu (for the supposed application in the immed. preceding hymn, VII.90.3, where I think it refers to Dawn, see comm. ad loc.), but does apply to a drop (*drapsá-*) in nearby VII.87.6, while Soma makes himself a *śvetá-rūpá-* in IX.74.7. The adj. is also used of horses (VII.77.3), and perhaps, in conjunction with *niyútām abhiśrīḥ* “the full glory of the teams,” Soma is configured here as the lead horse of the “teams” of offerings we will make to Vāyu. The beings (acc.) that the subject accompanies (*siṣakti*) are called *pīvoanna-* ‘whose food is fat’, a hapax. It seems an unlikely epithet of human sacrificers, as the standard interpr. requires. It might describe the ritual fires, but it is most clearly reminiscent of X.100.10 *úrjam gāvo yāvase pīvo attana, ṛtasya yāḥ sādane kóse aṅgdhvé* “O cows, eat nourishment in the pasture, eat fat, you who are anointed in the cup, at the seat of truth,” addressed to the milk to be ritually mixed into the soma. The masc. gender of *pīvo-annān* is something of a stumbling block to this interpr., but it might result from the variable gender of the underlying referent *gó-* ‘cow’ or reference a masc. term for milk or liquid in general. The other acc. pl. in this pāda, *rayivīdhah*, is a hapax, though reminiscent of *nāmasā ... vīdhāsaḥ* in 1a. Like the numerous other cmpds in *-vīdh-* the root noun 2nd member could have either intransitive/passive value with the 1st member in an instr. relationship (‘strong/increased by wealth’) or transitive value with an acc. 1st member (‘increasing wealth’) -- though most *-vīdh-* cmpds conform to the former type. Ge interpr. it as transitive (“die ... ihre Reichtümer mehrend”), Gr as intrans.; Old fails to comment, and Re takes refuge in vagueness (“ayant ... une richesse abondante”), which seems to lean towards the intrans. Scar (521) allows both possibilities in his gloss, though his tr. of the passage follows the transitive path, “die ihren Reichtum mehren,” echoing Ge. For my larger interpr. of the passage, either would more or less work, but neither adds much or seems particularly apt.

To sum up, though I don’t reject the Vāyu / human ritualist interpr. of the nom. / acc. in ab out of hand, I think an identification of the nom. as Soma and the acc. as the cows(’ milk) with which soma is mixed works better in the passage. (I do have to admit that Indra and Vāyu drink *clear*, unmixed soma in the very next vs.) Alternatively we might consider the ritual fire (specifically the one that receives the offerings, later called the *Āhavanīya*) the subject and the libations themselves the acc. And, on the basis of VII.92.3 in the next hymn I also now wonder if the acc. referents in ab might be the teams of wealth we meet in that vs. Basically, no single interpr. of this vs. can account for all the elements of it.

My interpr. of c follows from that of ab. I take the pl. subj. to be the drops of soma, extending themselves as offering to Vāyu -- not the priestly sacrificers. Only in d do these sacrificers make their appearance (*nāraḥ*).

VII.91.4: Both Ge and Re take ab as a series of subordinate clauses truncated without a main cl. By contrast, as I indicated in the publ. intro., I think that the *yāvat* ‘as long as’ clauses in ab project the future temporal limit to the institution of sacrifice, with cd inviting the gods to participate as long as it will last.

ḍīdhyānāḥ in b matches the same word in the same position in the immed. preceding hymn VII.90.4b, though the contexts are different.

The 2nd du. act. aor. impv. *pātam* in c echoes the 2nd du. act. pres. *pāthāḥ* in 2b, but these two root forms belong of course to two different roots $\sqrt{pā}$, ‘drink’ and ‘protect’

respectively. Both of them are anchored to their roots by root-noun cmpds closely preceding them, *go-pā* ‘cow-protectors’ (2a) and *śuci-pā* ‘drinkers of the clear (soma)’ (4a), both dual and both subject of the following verb. In fact *śuci-pā* looks both left and right, with elementary etymological figures on both sides: *śucim̐ (śomam̐) śucipā pātam̐*

VII.92 Vāyu / Indra and Vāyu

VII.92.2: For *śomam* as obj. of *prá√sthā*, see parallels cited at VI.41.2.

VII.92.3: I assume that the object of Vāyu’s quest in our house is soma. Other interpr. take *iṣṭāye* differently: Ge “um gern in sein Haus zu kommen,” which seems quite loose; Re “pour (aller le) chercher en (sa) demeure,” with the referent of “le” apparently *dāśvāmsam* of pāda a, which I suppose is possible.

As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. makes clear the equation between the teams (*niyút-*) in ab that Vāyu drives to the sacrifice, his wind-horses, and the teams of wealth he hitches up (*ní ... yuvasva*) for us in cd. In cd we would expect an accusative resumptive prn. *tān* or the like, picking up the rel. phrase *yābhiḥ ... niyúdbhiḥ* of ab and serving as obj. of *ní ... yuvasva*. The absence of this prn. is presumably what led Ge to pronounce the *yābhiḥ* of a as “die freie Verwendung des Relatives” (n. 3) and to tr. the subordinator with “Wenn.” But I think rather that the objects in cd stand for the missing **niyútaḥ*. Though the noun *niyút-* doesn’t appear explicitly in cd, elsewhere that noun can be obj. of its etymologically twin verb; cf., e.g., I.180.6 *ní yád yuvéthe niyútaḥ ...* and, in the immediately hymn, the passive phrase *niyuvānā niyútaḥ ...* (VII.91.5). Therefore the accusatives in cd expressing wealth and its material realizations are implicitly equated with *niyút-*. The important complementarity of the two forms of *ní√yu* in the two hemistichs is disguised by Ge’s bland translation of the verb in c: “gib uns”; similarly Klein (DGRV I.26) “grant to us.”

In the phrase in d *vīrām gavyam áśvyam ca rādhaḥ* “(a) hero and bovine and equine bounty,” the sg. *vīrām* is superficially unsettling and disharmonious: surely we want more than a single hero! But *vīrām* most likely is meant to characterize *rādhaḥ*, along with the common adjectival collocation *gavyam áśvyam*. However, an adjectival *vīryá-* *‘consisting of heroes’ is blocked, because that stem has been frozen as a neut. substantive meaning ‘heroism, heroic deed’. I would now be inclined to reflect what I consider the substitution of *vīrā-* for the non-functional adjectival stem and tr. the acc. phrase as “(teams that are) well-nourishing wealth for us, *bounty in heroes*, in cows and horses.”

VII.92.4: The standard interpr. (Old, Ge, Re) take the nom. pl. rel. *yé* of ab to be coreferential with the instr. *sūrībhiḥ* ‘with the patrons’ in c. This is certainly possible, but I follow Thieme (Fremd. 20) in taking it rather with the 1st pl. subj. of *syāma* in c, hence “(we) who ...” There is no morphosyntactic way to tell, as the rel. cl. of ab has no finite verb, so the person of *yé* is unspecified. I favor “we” because cd seems to set up a contrastive pair of the two instr. pl. in c / d (*sūrībhiḥ* / *nībhiḥ*), with which we accomplish complementary feats: smashing obstacles along with the patrons (c), conquering in battle

with the superior men (=warriors) (d). If the first hemistich refers exclusively to one of these instrumentals the rhetorical balance is disturbed.

I do not follow Thieme (Fremd. 20 n. 1) in accepting the old suggestion (conjectured by Gr; see Old for further lit.) that the Samhitā *vāyāva* should be taken as a nom. pl. *vāyāvaḥ*, against Pp. dat. sg. *vāyāve*, as an adj. ‘serving Vāyu’ vel sim. As Old points out, the dat. is supported by *té vāyāve* found twice in the preceding hymn (VII.91.1, 3), like our *yé vāyāve*, and in any case the posited adjectival form would be morphologically dubious (see, e.g., Re’s remarks inter alia). Most supply another nom. pl. adj. to construe with dat. *vāyāve*; cf. Ge’s “die dem Vāyu (opfern),” Re’s “(étant) au (service de) Vāyu.” But I think this is unnecessary: I take the phrase *vāyāva indramādanāsaḥ* as an example of the fungibility of compounds and free syntagms with the same structure. In other words, I would extract the \sqrt{mad} form from the cmpd and construe it also with dat. *vāyāve*. This is a particularly nice ex. of the makeshifts employed to avoid three-member cmpds – here even splitting up a dual dvandva. Although transitive forms of \sqrt{mad} generally take the acc., cf. for the dative IX.25.1 *marúdbhyo vāyāve madaḥ* “exhilarating (drink) for the Maruts and for Vāyu” and, with the same nominal form as here, VII.31.1 *prá va indrāya mādanam, háryaśvāya gāyata* “Sing forth your exhilarating (song) to Indra of the fallow bays,” though the dat. there is more likely controlled by the verb *prá* $\sqrt{gā}$. The connection between Vāyu and \sqrt{mad} is reinforced in the next vs.: 5c *vāyo ... mādayasva*.

With Old, Re, Thieme (loc. cit.), I take *aryāḥ* as gen. sg. of *arí-*, construed with *nitósānāsaḥ*, not as nom. pl. with Gr, Ge.

In cd the opt. *syāma* seems to serve as a modal-establishing auxiliary to the participles *ghnāntaḥ* (c) and *sāsavāmsaḥ* (d), perhaps a more economical and less clumsy alternative to two separate optatives (*hanyāma* and *sāsaḥyāma*) or else a makeshift attempt to express repeated modal action (expressed by my parenthetical “be (always) X-ing”).

In d *amitra-* seems deliberately positioned verse-final to contrast with *aryāḥ*, which ends the previous hemistich, and therefore most likely has its full etymological sense -- ‘(one) without alliance (to us)’ -- in opposition to *arí-*, which identifies members of our larger sociopolitical community, even if unknown to us personally.

Re treats VII.93–94 in EVP XIV, starting p. 55.

VII.93 Indra and Agni

Both Ge and Re remark on the prominence of the word *vāja-* in the hymn (“Das Schlagwort ist *vāja-*”; “Thème du *vāja-*”). Although I would certainly not deny that, the word does not seem to call attention to its dominance in the way that other signature words often do: not only is it absent from three of the eight vss. (4, 5, 7), but especially at the beginning (vss. 1–3) it is not prominently positioned (not at a pāda boundary or after the caesura) nor positioned in the same place in the vs. line -- both being ways in which a word can assert itself -- nor does it repeat the same case and number. In vss. 6 and 8 it is hemistich-final (6d, 8b) and so becomes slightly more salient. In other words, it’s certainly a theme, but a somewhat muted one.

VII.93.2: The first hemistich is hyper-alliterative, with sibilants *s* and *ś* and, esp. in the 2nd pāda, *v* and *u*, all tied together by alternations of short and long *a*: *tā sāsāś śavasānā hī bhūtām, sākamvṛdhā śāvasā śūśuvāmsā*. This phonological effect is reinforced by the etymological figure of *śavasānā ... śāvasā śūśuvāmsā*, all belonging to the root √*śū*, *śvā* ‘swell’. To capture the etymological relationship I would be inclined to adjust the publ. tr. to “o swelling ones .. swollen with swelling (strength).”

It is difficult to say which of the qualifiers is/are being predicated of Indra and Agni with the *bhūtām*, but Ge, Re, and I seem all to have settled on *sāsāś*.

vāja- is modified by *ghṛṣvi-* in IV.32.6, 9 and by *sthāvira-* in VI.1.11, 37.5. The two adjectives seem, if not contradictory, at least slightly incompatible, but note that Indra is qualified by the same two adjectives in the same order, case, and metrical location as here in III.46.1, VI.18.12. In keeping with the Indraic slant to this hymn (on which see publ. intro.), it seems as if a phrase more appropriate to Indra has been transferred to the prize.

VII.93.3–4: There is no main clause in vs. 3: the three co-referential participial phrases (... *ichāmānāḥ* b, ... *nākṣamānāḥ* c, ... *jóhuvataḥ* ...d) all simply expanding on the dependent cl. of pāda a, *úpo ha yád ... gúḥ* “When they have come”). However, the first pāda of vs. 4 echoes 3b exactly, save for number: 3b ... *víprāḥ prāmatim ichāmānāḥ* (pl.) versus 4a ... *víprāḥ prāmatim ichāmānāḥ* (sg.), vs. 4 seems to continue vs. 3. Interestingly enough, it is not possible to determine whether his new start in 4 is a main clause or continues the dependent cl. in vs. 3 -- though Ge, Re, and I all take it as an independent cl. The problem is that the finite verb *īṭe* opens the second pāda; its accent then can be owing to its metrical position and it can be a main-cl. verb (as we all interpret it). However, the accent could also signal that it’s the verb of a dependent cl., and the whole complex of vss. 34 could be interpr. “When the prize seekers have come ..., (when) the inspired poet ... invokes ..., (then,) o Indra and Agni, further us ...” -- in other words 4cd would supply the main cl. for all of 3–4ab.

VII.93.7: In d the verb is pl. (*śísṛathantu*), but only two gods, Aryaman and Aditi, are mentioned in the pāda; the subjects must therefore include the gods found in b.

VII.94 Indra and Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is made up of four ṛcas, which were probably originally independent, since four 3-vs. hymns would fit the standard pattern of hymn arrangement, but a single 12-vs. hymn following one with 8 vss. would not. There is little sign of unity within the separate ṛcas, but the content of the hymn as a whole is so generic that it would be hard to identify features that would either unify or distinguish the various parts. Also, there may be a faint, probably secondary, ring between the 1st vs. (1c) and the last (12d) (see comm. ad vs. 12), which may suggest that the four ṛcas were combined into a single hymn even before the redaction of the Saṃhitā text. The first ṛca (vss. 1–3) also has a faint sign of internal unity: the dual dvandva voc. *īndrāgnī* beginning the b-pāda in each vs. However, the 3rd ṛca (vss. 7–9) also contains the same form in every vs. (7a, 8c, 9c), and 10b also begins with this compd., though there it is not a voc. but an acc., and it requires a distracted reading (*indrā-agnī-*).

VII.94.1: Both Ge and Re take *ajani* ‘has been born’ in c as the main verb for ab, while I take ab as a separate nominal cl. Either is possible. I would be more inclined towards the Ge/Re solution if *mánmanaḥ* were an ablative, parallel to *abhrāt* in the simile (“has been born *from this conception, like rain from a cloud”). But though *mánmanaḥ* itself could be abl., it is anchored as a gen. by *asyá*, which must be adjectival (and hence go with *mánmanaḥ*) because of its accent. In fact, at least in tr. “this ... praise hymn of this conception” is a clumsy expression, though both Ge and Re make it slightly less so by adding ‘mine’ (“of this conception of mine”). Though the 1st ps. ref. is not found in the text, it does ameliorate the tr. The point is the usual one, that the verbal product, the hymn, arises from the poet’s mental functions.

VII.94.2: This vs. traces the genesis of the praise hymn further back: the poet’s insight (*dhî-*) / conception (*mánman-*) that produces is the hymn is itself the product of the gods’ stimulation, here expressed by *pipyataṃ dhíyah* “swell his insights.”

VII.94.4: The loc. phrase *índre agnā* beginning this *ṛca* echoes the repetitive voc. dvandva *índrāgnī* of the 1st *ṛca*.

VII.94.5–6: Both vss. begin with the dual pronoun *tā*, but the first is 3rd ps. (“these two”) and object of a 3rd ps. verb (*īlate ... víprāsaḥ* “the inspired poets invoke those two”), while the 2nd, followed by 2nd ps. enclitic *vām*, has switched reference to 2nd ps. and is object of a 1st ps. verb (*havāmahe* “we call upon you two”) -- thus effecting a relationship of considerably more intimacy.

VII.94.7: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

VII.94.8: On my reading **akásya* for *kásya* after *mā*, see comm. ad IV.3.13.

VII.94.10: This vs. is a fragment, a *yád* clause without a main cl. It also contains an augmented intensive *ājohavuh*; this preterital form seems out of place in a hymn that lives almost entirely in the ritual present (our actions for Indra and Agni) and immediate future (via the imperatives we address to those same gods). (Only *ajani* in vs. 1 is preterital, but this aorist refers to the immediate ritual past.) The verse is also one of the few in this hymn that lacks parallel *pādas* or near repetitions elsewhere. (See Ge’s nn and Bloomfield, RReps for some of the details, though Bloomfield does not list partial repetitions.)

VII.94.11: This vs. is likewise a fragment, a nom. dual dvandva (*vṛtrahántamā*), which supports a rel. clause characterizing Indra and Agni, but no main clause. By my interpr. (and those of Ge and Re), this rel. cl. is nominal, with a predicated part. *mandānā*. Old takes the ambig. *āvīvasataḥ* as a dual finite verb (but cannily doesn’t tr.); this interpr. requires an anomalous meaning for the form, whereas the interpr. as a gen. sg. participle, shared by Ge, Re, and me, allows the form to have its usual sense (“seek to win [the gods]”).

VII.94.12: The 3rd ps. ref. of the nom. du. in vs. 11 is transformed into 2nd ps. ref. by the 2nd du. impv. *hatam* in 12b, mediated by the dual prn. *tāū*, which in this context, with a flg. impv., can have either 3rd or 2nd ps. ref. (see my “*sá figé*”).

Ge and Re take *ābhogá-* and *udadhí-* as PNs, which seems odd since both words are easily interpretable. The latter is in fact attested in other passages as a common noun meaning ‘water-holder, reservoir’ and its components are clear. I assume that the reason for assuming a PN is that a ‘water-holder’ is considered to be a positive entity, and since it is to be smashed, it must be negatively viewed here. But “holding” water can shade into “withholding” water, a negative action, and *udadhí-* here may refer to the Vala cave (see comm. ad X.67.5, 111.4, and also HPS Vedisch *Vrata* 47 n. 84). We might here also invoke the first vs., where the hymn is produced “like rain from a cloud.” A cloud can be considered a ‘water-holder’, and the positive and negative aspects of water-holding may be contrasted in the 1st and last vss. As indicated above, although I do think the *ṛcas* in this hymn were originally independent, some sense of ring composition might have gone into their combining.

As for *ābhogá*, Old seriously doubts the gloss ‘snake’ found, e.g., in Gr. But I’m somewhat puzzled as to why. There is certainly a root *√bhuj* ‘bend, coil’ distinct from *√bhuj* ‘enjoy, benefit’, and *bhogá-* definitely means ‘(snake’s) coil’ in reference to *Vṛtra* in V.29.6 ... *bhogān sākām vājreṇa maghāvā vivṛścāt* “the bounteous one hews apart his [=Vṛtra’s] ... coils at one blow with his mace.”

VII.95 Sarasvatī

VII.95.1: The problem in this vs. is *rathyèva* in c. Contextually the most obvious interpr. is as a nom. sg. fem., subject of *yāti*, but assuming the correctness of the Pp. reading, *rathyā iva* (and there is no other viable alternative), it is difficult to find a way to get there morphologically. If it belongs to the *vrkī*-inflected *rathī-* ‘charioteer’, the nom. sg. should of course be *rathīs*. Gr assigns it to this stem, but as an instr. sg., but who would this other charioteer in the instr. be? Ge/Re also interpr. as an instr., but to a stem *rathyā-* ‘Fahrstrasse’ / ‘une route-carrosable’. See Ge’s somewhat opaque comm. in the 4th vol. of his tr. (p. 252, col. 3, ad II.4.6b) and Old’s more illuminating one, interpreting a previous, but similar formulation of Ge’s (ZDMG 61 [1907] 831–32 = Kl.Sch.262–63). Old himself prefers an interpr. as an acc. pl. *rathyāḥ* with double application of sandhi (to nom./acc. pl. **rathyās iva*). Here the acc. pl. would presumably be parallel to “all the other waters” that Sarasvatī pushes ahead of her, but the simile would ill fit the passage. (Old does not transl.) The sequence *rathyèva* occurs several times elsewhere: II.39.2, 3, III.33.2, 36.6, VII.39.1. In all but III.36.6, *rathyā* is clearly the correct dual nom./acc. to the *vrkī*-stem, and in III.36.6 I interpret it also as a dual (contra most interpr.), for reasons given in the comm. ad loc. But here that solution, wedding morphology and sense, will not work. My ad hoc and admittedly entirely unsatisfactory “solution” here is to take it as a nonce fem. nom. sg. in *-ā*, perhaps based on *asuryā* (also nom. sg. fem.) in the 1st vs. of the next hymn (VII.96.1), also of Sarasvatī. The hymns are twinned and can be read against each other.

VII.95.2: By my interpr. (as well as the standard ones), this vs. contains two forms of the act. pres. stem *céta-*, 3rd sg. *cetat* (or *acetat*: see immed. below) in pāda a and part. *cétantī*

in c. The first is found in the sequence *ékācetat*, analyzed by the Pp. as *ékā acetat*. This is perfectly possible, but an injunctive form is equally possible on textual grounds and in my opinion would fit the presential/resultative context better. See Gotō (1st cl., 138 and n. 181), who so interprets it. In any case, I take it as intransitive ‘shows / appears’, with *śūciḥ* as the predicate adjective. In c the participle *cétantī* has the sense ‘perceives, takes note’ and governs the gen. *rāyāḥ*. Given the semantic multivalence of the root *√cit* and the pleasure poets take in manipulating and juxtaposing its forms, this functional shift within a verse is not surprising. (Gotō [p. 138] also assigns different functions to the two forms.) The intrans. use of *cetat* is supported by *cetati* in the same usage in the next hymn (VII.96.3).

VII.95.3: The male subject of this vs. is not identified, but the Anukramaṇī identifies him as Sarasvant. This seems correct (despite doubts raised, e.g., by Old), given that half of the following hymn, the 2nd ṛca (VII.96.4–6), is devoted to him and he is mentioned by name in all three vss. The two hymns VII.95 and 96, despite being in different meter, should be read against each other. See comm. ad vs. 1 above.

I take med. *māmṛjīta* as reflexive, with Sarasvant both subj. and obj. (so also, apparently, Kü 373), though Ge thinks that the obj. is the racehorse and Re that both subj. and obj. are the racehorse.

VII.95.4: On *mitā-jñu-* see comm. ad VI.32.3.

The *sākhibhyaḥ* of the final pāda must be Sarasvatī’s sister rivers. As Old points out, the stem *sākhi-* can be used of females as well as males; fem. *sākhī-* is absent from the older language. See also Re ad loc. For the glorification of Sarasvatī over the other rivers, see vs. 1 and implicitly vs. 2, as well as the 1st vs. of the next hymn (VII.96.1) and VI.61.9, 10, 13. The formulation “higher than ABL” is identical to the boast of the victorious co-wife in X.145.3 *úttarāhām ... úttaréd úttarābhyah* “I am higher, higher even than the higher ones (fem.).”

VII.95.5: My interpr. of the syntax and the reference in this vs. differs considerably from the standard. Most (Ge, Re; see also Old) take b as parenthetical, with pāda a parallel to c, both containing nom. pl. m. med. participles with 1st ps. subjects, *júhvānā(h)* and *dádhanā(h)* respectively. The first part. is transitive with *imā* as object. Hence, “Offering these (oblations, vel. sim.) ... , setting ourselves in your shelter, we ...” Under this interpr. according to Re, the *yusmāt* in pāda a refers to the patrons, already found in vs. 3 -- rather loosely construed (“de votre part”). Ge fails to identify the 2nd pl. referent, while Old considers both the patrons and the rivers possible and makes no decision.

Although the Ge/Re/(Old) interpr. is certainly possible -- and has the parallelism of the two participles in its favor -- I am reluctant to bring in patrons, who figured only in the Sarasvant vs. 3, and I also prefer to avoid parenthetical clauses if at all possible. I therefore go against the Pp. in taking the first participle as *júhvānā* and neut. pl., rather than *júhvānāḥ* and masc. pl. As a nom. pl. neut., the part. is passive and forms a nominal clause with *imā*, with the participle predicated (as is not rare). The part. stem *júhvāna-* is found with both transitive and passive interpr. (Note that Gr takes this form as passive, but as a nom. pl. fem. in *-āḥ* modifying his supplied *gírah* ‘hymns’, represented by *imāḥ* [requiring him to go against the Pp reading *imā*].)

By my interpr. of pāda a, the 2nd pl. refers to the (other) rivers just featured in 4d, and in the expression *yusmād ā*, *ā* means ‘all the way to’, though it must be admitted that *ā* in that usage usually precedes (see Gr col. 169). Old himself suggests as one of his possibilities “bis zu euch hin” of the rivers or waters. The ambiguous position of *ā* in the expression in 2b *girībhya ā samudrāt* “from the mountains all the way to the sea” also has *ā* directly before an abl. expressing goal.

VII.95.6: Ge and Re seem to take *vājān* as the obj. of *vārdha* as well as *rāsi*, while I supply Vasiṣṭha, the subject of the preceding hemistich.

VII.96 Sarasvatī (1–3), Sarasvant (4–6)

VII.96.1: With Gr, Ge (etc.) I take *gāyīṣe* as a 1st sg. -*se* form of the *stuṣé* type; Old, fld by Re, takes it as a 3d sg. passive. Besides separating the form from the standard usage of *stuṣé* and the like, this leaves *brhāt ... vācaḥ* syntactically untethered. Old takes it in instr. sense, but it’s hard to get the neut. acc. to function that way.

Re also takes *mahayā* in c as a 1st sg. subjunctive, but an impv. works better with the voc. *vasiṣṭha* (d), an example of poetic self-address (treated in my 2005 Fs. Skjaevø article).

VII.96.2: On the interpretational problem posed by du. *ubhé ... āndhasī* “both stalks,” see publ. intro. As indicated there, I do not subscribe to the interpretation that takes this as a metaphorical expression of political geography. Rather I assume that the usual sense of *āndhas-* ‘soma stalk’ → ‘soma’ allows the dual to refer to two liquids. Ge (n. 2a) points out that in ŚB V.1.2.10 this dual is used for soma and surā (the profane intoxicating drink), and since in the Sautrāmaṇī ritual surā is mixed with milk, the second liquid could also be the more benign milk. Old makes a good case for the connection of soma and surā with Sarasvatī and also suggests that the formulation is meant to indicate that the Pūrus make use of profane drinks as well as soma. Re favors soma and surā without disc. Two textual passages nearer to hand suggest other possible solutions. As was noted ad VII.95.1, 3, these two adjacent hymns to Sarasvatī, VII.95 and 96, show twinning tendencies. In VII.95.2 (that is, the vs. corresponding to this one in position) Sarasvatī milks out “ghee and milk” (*ghṛtām páyah*) for Nāhuṣa, probably the designation of a human family group or lineage (see Mayrhofer, Personennamen s.v. *nāhuṣ-*); here the Pūrus (another such designation) preside over two liquids, which could be those very two. Alternatively, in this same hymn, VII.96.5, Sarasvant’s waves are characterized by honey and ghee (*mādhumanto ghṛtaścútaḥ*), and this pair is another possibility, esp. if ‘honey’ stands for soma, as often. These two vss. (2, 5) match each other in another way; see ad vs. 5 below. In the end, Ge’s interpr (at the end of his n.) that the Pūrus, living beside the Sarasvatī, inhabit a land rich in soma and milk seems to suggest the most likely image: whatever the two liquids are, they are indications of a place rich in nourishment -- in biblical terms, a land of milk and honey.

I do not know why the Maruts would be the particular companions of Sarasvatī, unless their storms swell her waters.

VII.96.3: The subjunctive *kṛṇavat* seems to have a more strictly modal sense than most subjunctives; I am tempted to tr. “should do good” or “may she do good.”

VII.96.4: Why Sarasvant should receive the pleas of bachelors seeking wives and sons is utterly unclear to me, and the standard tr./comm. don’t address this issue.

VII.96.5: The third pāda of this vs., which is the 2nd vs. in the ṛca addressed to Sarasvant, the masc. equivalent of the far more prominent Sarasvatī, parallels that of the 2nd vs. in the ṛca addressed to Sarasvatī that opens this hymn:

2c *sā no bodhi avitrī marútsakhā*

5c *tébhir no avitā bhava*

Re suggests that this parallelism attests to the secondary character of Sarasvant. The difference between the two impvs. *bodhi* and *bhava*, both to √*bhū*, conforms to the positional distribution of these two forms discussed in my 1997 “Syntactic constraints on morphological change: The Vedic imperatives *bodhi*, *dehi*, and *dhehi*” (*Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes*, ed. E. Pirart).

VII.96.6: The acc. phrase in ab *pīpivāmsam ... stānam* is the object, or one of the objects of *bhakṣīmāhi* in c, which makes the rel. clause *yó viśvadarśataḥ*, referring to the *stāna*-, technically an embedded rel. But as we have often seen, *nominal* rel. cl. -- pseudo-izafes - - are regularly found embedded.

The expression “share in the breast” seems somewhat odd, but this “swelling breast” is presumably swelling with the honey and ghee in vs. 5. As noted in the publ. intro., it is also odd to attribute this breast to the male figure Sarasvant. The more appropriate association between the breast and Sarasvatī is found in I.164.49, a passage adduced by Ge (n. 6ab).

VII.97 Indra and Bṛhaspati

Re treats this hymn in EVP XV.66–69. For the structure of the hymn and the covert identification of Bṛhaspati (/Indra) with Agni, see publ. intro. This identification is argued for extensively by Schmidt (B+I, 62–67, which also contains a complete tr. and philological comm.).

VII.97.1: This vs. plays on the ambiguity of reference of the noun *nṛ*-, which can refer both to superior (mortal) men and to gods. It also cleverly but uninsistently identifies the sacrifice as the meeting place of men and gods, the *nṛśādana*- ‘seat of men’ who come from / belong to both heaven and earth (*divāḥ ... pṛthivyāḥ*) -- though see Ge’s n. 1a for other, in my opinion less likely, possibilities. (In keeping with my current understanding of *nṛśādana*-, however, I would slightly emend the tr. to “the (ritual) session of men,” rather than “seat.”) The *nāraḥ* in pāda b, however, seem only to be men proper, that is mortals, who seek the gods at the sacrificial common ground.

In c *sunvé* is one of the rare exx. of a singular verb with neut. pl. subj. (here *sāvanāni*), a construction that is of course supported by comparative evidence. Gr interprets the verb rather as a 1st sg. transitive. This is not impossible -- and note the 1st pl. verb in 2a -- but *sunve* is otherwise passive, with 3rd pl. *sunviré* likewise passive.

In d the verb *gáman* (in sandhi) could represent either 3rd pl. *gáman* or 3rd sg. *gámat*, but both the context, with Indra mentioned in the preceding pāda, and the parallel I.178.2d *gáman na índraḥ sakhyā váyaś ca* support the 3rd sg.

The pāda is also marked by case disharmony: dat. *mádāya* and acc. *váyaś ca* appear to be joint complements of *gámat*, conjoined by *ca*. Such case disharmony is rare in *ca* collocations (see Klein DGRV I.56–57), but at least in this example poses no obstacle to understanding: the dat. expresses purpose, the acc. goal. Although neither Klein nor I find the construction problematic, Re supplies a second verb to govern *váyaḥ* (“obtenir”), and HPS interprets the acc. as an Inhaltsakk.

A more problematic issue, at least for me, is the position of *ca*, unmentioned by any one, incl. Klein. The standard tr./interpr. take the 2nd term of the conjoined NP to be *prathamám váyaḥ* “first vitality/youth,” but we should then expect the *ca* to follow *prathamám*, the first word of the second member. Although such positioning is not an unbreakable rule, it is remarkably regular. To avoid the problem I take *prathamám* as an adverb here, as I do in the parallel I.83.4 (*prathamám ... váyaḥ* without a *ca*), cited by Old and Re, for which see comm. ad loc.

VII.97.2: The problem in this vs. is *maha* (sandhi form) in b *bṛhaspatir no maha ā sakhyāḥ*. The Pp reads this as *mahe*, as do most subsequent interpr. -- though *mahaḥ* is possible and is in fact the interpr. of at least one tr.: HPS takes it as the voc. pl. of *māh-*, construed with *sakhyāḥ*, hence “ihr grossen Freunde.” But this seems unlikely: there are no voc. forms to this stem in the RV (though the derived fem. *mahī-* does have some), and the intrusion of *ā* in the middle of the voc. phrase seems unlikely. Others accept the Pp *mahe* and generally take it as a 3rd sg. verb, but opinions differ on its root affiliation and meaning. I will not detail these disagreements; see the disc. in Old, Ge’s n. 2b, Re ad loc., and Gotō 243–44. My interpr. is closest to Gotō’s: he assigns this to a root *√mah* ‘bring about’, separate from *√mah* ‘magnify’, with a *t*-less 3rd sg. of the *śáye* type (see also comm. ad I.94.1) and tr. “Bṛhaspati ist für uns imstande.” I differ from him in the interpr. of the rest of the pāda: he takes *ā* as the trigger of an unexpressed verb of motion, “[kommet] o Genossen herbei.” This seems to assume that the friends addressed are not coreferential with *naḥ* earlier in the pāda, or the referents of the 1st ps. verbs in pādas a and c. I do not entirely understand the position of *ā*, but it may show the occasional positioning of a preverb immediately after its verb or simply be an adverbial ‘here’, as in my tr.

As Re points out, the optative (*bhávema*) is quite unusual in a *yáthā* purpose cl., where the subjunctive is standard. See Gr s.v. *yáthā*, cols. 1083–84, nos. 6–8.

VII.97.3: Both Ge and Re take great pains to avoid indentifying Indra in c with *bráhmanas pátim* in b and the elaboration on this phrase in d, but as discussed in the publ. intro. and extensively by HPS, the identification is the point.

VII.97.4: The second pāda contains an equational rel. cl. with expressed copula *ásti*; main cl. equational expressions almost always lack copula (when *asti* is found, it is generally existential), but overt copulas are not uncommon in dependent clauses. It is of course optional; see the nominal rel. cl. in the preceding vs., 3d, which lacks copula.

Pāda c contains a phrase in the nominative, *kāmo rāyāḥ suvīryasya* “desire for wealth in good heroes,” which is picked up abruptly by the acc. prn. *tām*, object of the immediately following verb *dāt*. There seems no other way to interpret it -- and it goes perhaps too easily into English -- but both the syntax and sense are slightly off. The fronted expression seems like a topicalized phrase, but in Vedic topics would not default to the nominative but remain in the appropriate case for the larger syntactic frame; see in the next vs. the acc. phrase that occupies the whole of pāda a, which is the obj. of the verb in b. Moreover, one doesn’t *give* wishes/desires but rather the contents of those desires, so that the referent of *tām* may be *rayí-*, not *kāma-*. Both concerns suggest that the relationship between the *kāma-* phrase and the abbreviated *tām dāt* clause is less close than it appears. Re supplies some structure to the first phrase -- “(En nous est) le désir ...” -- and something like that might produce the necessary distance.

VII.97.5: On *pastyā-* see comm. ad I.40.7. As noted ad I.40.7 HPS in that passage renders the stem as ‘stream’ but here as ‘house’, the interpr. I prefer. Note that in our passage HvN should be corrected from *pastiyānām* to *pastīyānām* (that is, *pastyānām*).

VII.79.6: The construction of the vs. is uncertain in several regards, which center on the 2nd hemistich. The first is whether neut. *sāhaḥ* belongs in the rel. cl. or not; the position of rel. *yasya* is compatible with either answer. I take it as an independent qualifier of acc. *bṛhaspátim* in b, hence an acc.: Bṛhaspati is identified with the abstract noun ‘strength / force’ itself. I therefore assume that the rel. cl. begins with *yasya*. This also seems to be the Ge solution. The sense of Re’s tr. is similar, but he puts *sāhaḥ* in the, or a, rel. cl. as a nominative -- taking c as containing two nominal rel. clauses: “lui dont la force-dominante (est réelle, dont) le séjour-commun (est) noir.” HPS makes *sāhaḥ* the subject of an equational rel. cl.: “dessen Gewalt eine schwarze Stätte ist.” Since I think it more likely that Bṛhaspati is identified as strength itself than that his seat is, I find Schmidt’s interpr. less likely, though it does have the merit of not inserting a syntactic break in the middle of a pāda. If Bṛhaspati is identified with *sāhaḥ* here (as I think), Schmidt’s claim that Bṛhaspati is identified with Agni in this hymn -- an identification esp. clear in this vs. (see publ. intro.) -- is strengthened, since Agni is so often called “son of strength” (*sūnúsāhasaḥ*, e.g., in this maṇḍala VII.1.21, 22, 3.8, etc.).

A more interesting question is what to do with d. The pl. *vāsānāḥ* is universally, and plausibly, taken as referring to the horses of ab: in pāda they are called ‘ruddy’ (*aruṣāsaḥ*); in d they “clothe themselves in ruddy form” (*rūpām aruṣām*). The question then is whether d is simply a continuation of the main cl. in ab, the part. *vāsānāḥ* modifying *ásvāḥ* in pāda a, with the rel. cl. of c embedded in it. This is perfectly possible and seems to be the standard interpr. Although we prefer to avoid interpr. with embedded relatives, once again the rel. cl. in this instance is nominal (whichever finer grained interpr. we follow), and nominal relatives are systematic exceptions to this rule. However, I prefer to take d as a continuation of the rel. cl. introduced by *yasya*, with oppositional nominal expressions, contrasting Bṛhaspati’s dark seat with his horses which take on “ruddy form.” This interpr. allows the ‘ruddy’ in d to be more than a pleonastic repetition of the same word in pāda a and gives more punch to the *nīlavat sadhástham* of c by making it part of a contrastive pair. If this interpr. is correct, the part. *vāsānāḥ* would be predicated.

Ge (n. 6bc) notes the word play between semantically and etymologically distinct *saha-* (b) and *sáhaḥ* (c). In fact the play is more tightly constructed than he indicates, with the chiasmic figure *saha-vāho vahanti / sáhaḥ*, with the hemistich boundary isolating the semantically non-conforming word.

VII.97.7: It is difficult to wring a causal sense out of *hí* here. The vs. continues the depiction of Br̥haspati as Agni: the hundred feathers of the preening bird are the flames dipping and rising much like the action of preening; the golden axe or axes are likewise flames; while the descriptions in cd are focused on the role of Agni in the ritual.

On *śundhyú-* see comm. ad V.52.9.

I would now be inclined to tr. the bahuvr̥hi *híraṇya-vāśīḥ* (for the inflection see AiG II.2.408) as implicitly pl. ('having golden axes', rather than the publ. 'having a golden axe' flg. Ge/Re) because it seems to refer to Agni's flames. HPS tr. "mit hundert goldenen Äxten bewaffnete" without comment; he seems to have silently transferred the *śatá-* from *śatá-patraḥ* in pāda a, presumably an oversight.

svāvesā- is somewhat difficult and disputed. HPS specifically rejects Velankar's "easy of approach" and Re's "d'accueil favorable"; Schmidt's "mit seinem gute Eintritt" is closer to Ge's "bringt Glück mit seinem Eingang." HPS (p. 66) suggests that *svāvesā ṛṣvāḥ* simply evokes the image of a fire flaring up, but I don't see what 'entrance' has to do with that. I take it as 'providing good/easy entrance'; here this would refer to the entry of the libations into the offering fire, an interpretation that is in harmony with d, which concerns the subject's superior ability to provide *āsutí-*, the 'pressed drink', to his comrades, presumably the gods who consume the oblations through Agni as their mouth.

VII.97.8: I take the 'comrades' addressed by the voc. *sakhāyaḥ* to be different from those mentioned in the dative in the preceding vs. There the comrades of the god were the (other) gods who receive the oblation from Agni; here they are the comrades of the poet, who urges them to tend to the god. The identity of comrades obviously depends on who they are comrades *to*.

Pāda d implicitly echoes 4d.

VII.97.10: On *kīrī-* see comm. ad V.52.10.

VII.98 Indra

VII.98.1: Verbal forms of the root $\sqrt{pā}$ 'drink' do not appear with the preverb *áva* in the RV or, indeed, elsewhere in Skt. But this noun stem *avapāna-* is found 5x in the RV (I.136.4, VII.98.1, VIII.4.10, X.43.2, 106.2); in 3 of these passages (all but I.136.4, X.43.2) it is used of a wild beast come to drink; cf. (besides our passage) VIII.4.10 *ṛṣyo ná ṛṣyann avapānam ā gahi* "like a thirsting antelope, come to the drinking (hole)." These specialized contexts suggest that rather than meaning simply "das Trinken, der Trunk" (Gr), the stem refers to a drinking hole frequented by wild animals (so already MonWms). The preverb *áva* 'down' would refer to the physical stance of animals lowering their heads to drink. The image of Indra beating buffalos to a watering hole is rather charming.

VII.98.2: With Ge I take *yád* as a neut. rel. prn. rather than as the subordinating conj. *yád*, though this poses some minor syntactic difficulties. If the referent is ultimately soma, we would expect a masc. form (*yám*); the neut. can be explained as “attraction” to the predicated “food” (neut. *ánnam*) in the same cl. (“what you made your food ...”). As a resumptive pronoun in the main cl. we might also prefer **tásya* to *asya*, though this is a small problem.

VII.98.3: I might now slightly alter the tr. of the pf. part. *jajñānāḥ* to ‘having (just) been born’ to put emphasis on Indra’s prodigious actions immediately after his birth.

VII.98.4: On the *s*-aor. of *√sah* see Narten (Sig.Aor. 264–67) and on the lengthened grade of some forms of this aor., as well as elsewhere in the root, see Narten (op. cit.) Gotō (1st Kl. 325–26), EWA s.v. *SAH*.

On the root noun *√rt-*, see Schindler (Rt.Nouns s.v.); it belongs with *√vr* ‘obstruct’ (etc.), not, with Gr, *√vrt* ‘turn’. In this passage a derivation from ‘obstruct’ makes sense for the defensive forces that provide an obstacle to the attacking army.

VII.98.5: The first hemistich *préndrasya vocam prathamā kṛtāni, prá nūtanā maghāvā yā cakāra* is a variant on the famous opening of I.32: I.32.1ab *índrasya nú vīryāni prá vocam, yāni cakāra prathamāni vajrī*. The two contain almost all of the same elements (*prá vocam, índrasya, prathamā(ni), yā(ni) cakāra, nú / nūtanā*), with variation only with *vīryāni* \cong *kṛtāni* and different epithets of Indra, *maghāvā / vajrī*. Nonetheless the distribution of elements between clauses and the word order in each clause are significantly different. This variation is typical of RVic formulae, which generally do not follow a fixed template and are not sensitive to meter alone (both vss. in question are Triṣṭubhs).

Re comments on VII.99–102 in ÉVP XV: 99–100 pp. 39–43, 101–2 pp. 113–14.

VII.99 Viṣṇu, Viṣṇu and Indra

VII.99.1: Re supplies “other gods” as the subj. of *ánv aśnuvanti* in b. This seems perfectly acceptable, though not strictly necessary. And since in vs. 2 it is, presumably, mortals (since they are ‘born’) who fail to reach the limit of Viṣṇu’s greatness, mortals could also be the subject here. See remarks below on the formulatic connection between the two vss.

As Re points out, both the case of the complement (acc. versus gen.) and the voice (act. versus mid.) differ between 1st pl. *vidma* in c and 2nd sg. *vitse* in d. The middle voice of *vitse* makes sense, since Viṣṇu knows *his own* farthest realm; the variation in case is harder to account for. Perhaps the two earthly realms are subjects of direct knowledge, while the farthest realm is something even Viṣṇu only knows *of*.

VII.99.1–2: The b-pādas of these two vss. are variants of each other, using two different roots for ‘attain’ (*√naś*, *√āp*) and two different formulations of ‘greatness’, the 2nd an elaboration on the first:

1b *ná te mahitvám ánv aśnuvanti*

2ab ná te ... mahimnáḥ páram ántam āpa

Another example of the freedom of RVic formulaics; see comm. ad VII.98.5 in the previous hymn for further on this.

VII.99.2: Ordinarily the pres. part. should express ‘being Xed’, in contrast to the past part. ‘Xed’. But in this context *jāyamāna-* must refer not to someone in the process of being born, but more likely someone who is still alive, against *jātá-*, someone born in the past and presumably now dead.

VII.99.3: With Ge I take the first hemistich as Viṣṇu’s quoted speech. This, however, does not solve the puzzle posed by *hí bhūtám*. Is *bhūtám* an impv., as Ge takes it -- or an injunctive, with Re? If an imperative, how does it square with *hí*? This particle is not rare with imperatives, but it always seems somewhat problematic. Often it appears with the first impv. in a series, and the *hí* clause can command the action on which all subsequent actions depend, with the following impvs. often introduced by *áthā* -- see comm. ad I.10.3, 14.12, etc. -- but here there is no following imperative. In the publ. tr. I manage a syntactic sleight-of-hand, reading *bhūtám* twice, once as an injunctive in a causal *hí* clause, to be construed with the two adj. in pāda a, *írāvatī dhenumátī*, and once as an impv. in a main cl., to be construed with the adj. in b, *sūyavasínī* (schematically “because you are X Y, become Z”). Although this works, it seems somewhat artificial and requires separating the three apparently parallel adjectives into two clauses. This interpr. was based in part on I.93.7, which contains a clause ADJ ADJ *hí bhūtám* followed by an *áthā* cl. with an impv. to a different verb. In the publ. tr. of I.93.7 I take *bhūtám* as an injunc (with Ge, Re). “Since you are X Y ..., therefore ...” But in the comm. I cast doubt on that interpr. and prefer an impv. interpr. “Become X Y, then ...” Therefore, I.93.7 is not necessarily a support for my publ. interpr. here; I still weakly prefer it because of the absence of a following impv., but now consider the alternative possible: “Become full of refreshment, rich in milk-cows, affording good pasture ...” The following impv. may be missing because Viṣṇu’s direct speech is truncated. (Despite their distance in the text, comparing I.93.7 to our passage is justified by the fact that the first pāda in the very next vs. in our hymn, 4a, is identical to I.93.6d, adjacent to the vs. under comparison.)

VII.99.4: As was just noted, the first pāda of this vs. is identical to I.93.6d, where Agni and Soma are the dual subjects. Indeed, the identity of the dual subjects in this vs. is left hanging throughout the vs., and the poet may have left a false trail: the last du. 2nd ps. referents were the two world halves (*ródasī*), addressed by Viṣṇu in 3ab. Assuming that the hymn as we have it is a unity (rather than consisting of two separate *ṛcas*, plus summary vs., as is possible), *ródasī* would remain a live possibility for the subj. of this vs. until the final pāda (d), where the 2nd du. subjects are addressed as *nārā* ‘superior men’, suppling a gender that clashes with fem. *ródasī*. But since *nṛ-* has a wide range of reference, this still does not definitively identify them. Even the dual number leaves the identity open: *nārā* is used of the Aśvins (mostly), Indra-Vāyu, Indra-Agni, Indra-Varuṇa, Mitra-Varuṇa -- and only once (here) of this pair. It is only with the first word of the following vs. (5a), the voc. *índrāviṣṇū*, that the question is settled.

All of the deeds recounted in this vs. can be attributed to Indra alone (see publ. intro.), although Viṣṇu’s role in enlarging and defining cosmic space may be alluded to in

pāda a, with the creation of space for the sacrifice. Re's claim that ab belong more to Viṣṇu, cd more to Indra is overstated: the cosmogony in b has little to do with what we know of Viṣṇu but is associated elsewhere with Indra.

As Old points out, the name of the Dāsa in c, Vṛṣaśipra, seems akin to Viśiśipra in V.45.6, whom Manu defeats (note that Manu figures in our vs. 3b) -- a connection not registered in Mayr.'s *Personennamen*. However, as noted in the comm. ad V.45.6, this gets us nowhere, since we know nothing further of either of these figures. More interesting is the potential relationship between these names and Śipiviṣṭa, the epithet of Viṣṇu found in the RV only in this hymn (vs. 7) and the next (VII.100.5, 6). The first member of this epithet, *śīpi-*, looks like a Caland form of the 2nd member of the two names, *śipra-*, while the 2nd member, *viṣṭā-*, is esp. close to the 1st member of the name found in V.45.6, *viśi-*; *vṛṣa-* in our passage is a plausible re-Sanskritization cum folk etymology of a possible MIA form **visi-*, underlying *viśi*.

VII.99.5: Both Śambara and Varcin are Indra's targets elsewhere, with no involvement of Viṣṇu. They are conjoined objects (*varcīnaṃ śambaram ca*) of Indra's smiting (*āhan*) in VI.47.21.

There is numerical play between the two hemistichs: in c the numbers are raised both by a digit (9 → 10) and by a factor of 10 (9 [10] → 100; 90 [100] → 1000). The connection is emphasized by the parallel structure of the numerical expression: b: *#náva X navatīm ca* / c: *#śatām X sahásraṃ ca*. Varcin is credited elsewhere with the same number of forces: II.14.6, IV.30.15.

I do not know why the verb is in the present in the second hemistich (*hatháh*) but aorist in the first (*śnathiṣṭam*). In the passages containing the other three occurrences of Varcin (II.14.6, IV.30.15, VI.47.21) the verbs are all preterital.

VII.99.6: The adj. *urukramá-* 'wide-striding' is otherwise used only of Viṣṇu (5x), but here encompasses Indra as well, in the dual.

The dual dvandva voc. *indrāviṣṇū* that opened vs. 5 is here divided into two pāda-final vocc. in c (*viṣṇo*), d (*indra*). Presumably because they belong to separate clauses, the dvandva doesn't decompose into a *vāyav indraś ca* construction, but it does follow such constructions in placing the 2nd member of the dvandva first (see my 1988 "*Vāyav indraś ca* revisited," *MSS* 49: 13–59).

VII.99.7: On *śipiviṣṭa* see comm. ad vs. 4.

VII.100 Viṣṇu

VII.100.1: The meter of the first pāda is badly off and is not easily fixable. See Old. He suggests a distracted reading of *nū* and records the suggestion that *márto* should be emended to *márt'yo*, which HvN print as their text. If both are adopted (distracted *nū* and *márt'yo*; so Arnold p. 310), the line achieves 11 syllables, but the price may be too high, esp. as the light fourth syllable would be unusual.

Although *dáyate* generally means 'distribute (goods to someone else)', e.g., I.68.6 *tásmai ... rayīm dayasva*, in a few passages it seems to have adopted the more "middle" meaning 'receive/take a share', perhaps adjusted to the model of other words of sharing,

esp. *bhájate* ‘receive a share’ versus act. *bhájati* ‘share out, distribute shares’. See Gotō (1st Kl., 172–73), whose tr. of this passage is close to mine. As noted ad II.33.10, I do not subscribe to Gotō’s separation of forms of *dáyate* into two separate roots.

The three subsequent pādas (bcd) state the conditions under which the mortal in pāda a will receive the longed-for share. They are marked by the rel. prn. *yáḥ* in b and c; adopting Re’s strategy I have rendered them as conditionals (“if”) for clarity, rather than as straight rel. clauses (“who”). Unfortunately I don’t think my tr. makes it clear that cd are parallel to b, rather than being part of a resumed main clause, and I would now slightly emend the tr. to “..., if he will set ... and will seek ...”. The apparent non-parallelism is exacerbated by the fact that the verbs of c and d (*yájāte* and *āvívāsāt* respectively) are subjunctives, whereas *dāśat* in b should be the injunctive to the thematic pres. *dāśati*, which elsewhere attests a real subjunctive (*dāśāt*). KH discusses just this passage (Inj. 238), suggesting that in such contexts the indicative present, injunctive, and subjunctive overlap in usage.

VII.100.3: Flg. a suggestion by Ge (n. 3a, though not reflected in his tr.), I take *eṣá-* in pāda a (also 4a) as belonging to the stem *eṣá-* ‘quick’, which is used several times of Viṣṇu in the gen. expression *viṣṇor eṣásya* (II.34.11, VII.40.5, VIII.20.3), in which confusion with the nom. pronominal *eṣá(h)* (possible here) is excluded.

The hapax *śatārcas-* is problematic. The Pp analyses the 2nd member as *arcasam*, but Wackernagel (AiG I.318) points out that the sandhi between the cmpd members would require rather *-rcasam*. However, Old disputes this, claiming that it would then have to be written (“... geschrieben werden müssen”) **śatārcasam*, though it’s not clear to me why. Interpr. differ significantly: Sāy. glosses with *arcis-*. Old posits a masc. *s-* stem **arcás-* ‘singer’, comparing VI.34.3 *yádi stotāraḥ śatām yát sahasraṃ gṛṇānti* “When a hundred, when a thousand praisers sing to him ...,” an interpr. followed by Ge -- though the connection between the two passages seems tenuous to me. By contrast, Re tr. “au cent éclats,” perhaps flg. Sāy.’s *arcis-*. Since an infinitival dat. *rcāse* ‘to praise, for chanting (praise)’ is found in VI.39.5 and VII.61.6, it seems reasonable to take the underlying stem *rcas-* as the base here, as Gr does, glossing ‘hundertfach zu preisen’. My ‘worth a hundred verses’ is close to that, though perhaps ‘praises, chants’ would be better.

Because of the lack of accent on *asya*, it should be pronominal, not adjectival; I would adjust the tr. to “of him, the stalwart.”

VII.100.3–4: As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 3 and 4 are responsive. The first pāda of 4 concentrates the essence of the 1st two pādas of 3, substituting *vī cakrame* (of 3b) for *trír deváh* (in 3a) at the beginning of the pāda. This phrase, *trír deváh*, is short a syllable; Old suggests reading *tṛir*, but this seems unlikely: I don’t know of any other disyllabic readings of this extremely common numeral (either as 1st cmpd member *trí-* or adverbial *trís*). I suggest rather that the metrically disturbed opening draws attention to the beginning of this set of paired vss. by being flawed and is “repaired” by 4a. See similar remarks about 3c and 5c ad vs. 5.

VII.100.4: By concentrating Viṣṇu's strides in the first pāda of 4, the poet is free to express the aim of Viṣṇu's action -- creating space and dwelling places for the people -- in the rest of the vs.

As Ge points out (n. 4c), *asya* can refer either to Viṣṇu or to Manu, although in actuality this may not matter. It may be an instance of "trickle-down" ownership: Viṣṇu makes a dwelling place for Manu, and in turn Manu's people also get firmly planted. Or, Manu *and* the people may both be under Viṣṇu's auspices.

VII.100.5: On the name Śipiviṣṭa, see comm. ad VII.99.4. Note that Viṣṇu's name was already celebrated in 3d, though the actual name is not mentioned there.

The syntactic affiliation of *aryāḥ* is disputed: the question is whether it depends on *vayúnāni* or simply picks up *te* in the previous pāda. With Ge and Re I follow the latter course; Re argues cogently that *vayúna-* √ *vid* does not normally have a "régime extérieur" (though I.72.7, II.19.3 appear to be exceptions). I would further add that since Śipiviṣṭa seems a type of "secret name," referring to Viṣṇu as a stranger (*arí-*) might fit with that. By contrast Thieme construes *aryāḥ* with *vayúnāni*, in two somewhat different ways: Fremdling (1938, p. 41) "... kennend die Ordnungen, die für den Fremdling gelten," later corrected in Unters. (1949, 22 n. 1) to "... kennend die Geheimnisse des Fremden."

The end of pāda c *tavásam átavýān#*, with the *s*-stem adj. followed by a (negated) comparative to the same root, nicely echoes the end of 3c with the same configuration but the comparative not negated: *tavásas távīyāni*. The employment of longer and shorter forms of the comparative (i.e., with or without the linking vowel *-ī-*) allows the phrases to make an almost exact metrical match -- except that the cadence of 5c is faulty (... *-sam átavýān*), with a light syllable at the beginning (and in fact 5 light syllables in a row (... *-ī tavásam a-*), starting right before the caesura and continuing through the break and into the cadence. As in the paired vss. 3–4 the metrical disturbance may call attention to the formulaic match. *átavýān* also picks up *kīráyah* '(even) the weak' in 4c semantically.

In d the pres. part. *kṣáyantam* is rendered by both Re and Th (Fremdl.) as if it belongs to √ *kṣi* 'dwell' ("qui réside" and "... [dich,] der da wohnt"), but the part. to the root pres. of that root is *kṣīyánt-*; the part. here must belong to √ *kṣā* 'rule over' (them. pres. *kṣáyati*). Ge may be trying to have it both ways with his "der ... thront," if my German dictionaries are correct in glossing *thronen* as "sit enthroned."

VII.100.6: Exactly what this vs. is trying to tell us is unclear. Most tr. and comm. take *paricákṣya-* as referring to something blameworthy (tadelnswert); so, e.g., Ge ("Was war an dir zu tadeln ...?"), Old, KH (Injunc. 78–79). But the other example of this gerundive in VI.52.14 modifies *vācas-* specifically and seems to mean 'to be disregarded, overlooked': *mā vo vācāṃsi paricákṣyāṇi vocam* "let me not speak words to you that can be disregarded." Esp. because the verb in the dependent cl. belongs to √ *vac*, pf. *vavakṣé*, it seems reasonable to supply 'speech' here as well. The point seems to be that we should have paid attention when he called himself Śipiviṣṭa, and that even when he appears in other form(s), he should not keep the *form* of Śipiviṣṭa concealed from us, any more than we should not notice the name. But what these statements are in service of, I have no idea -- and the hymn ends here (save for the repeated vs. 7, which, however, makes a point of addressing Viṣṇu as Śipiviṣṭa).

VII.101 Parjanya

VII.101.1: As was noted in the publ. intro., this hymn has a penchant for triplets, but it is not always clear which three entities are referred to -- as in this vs., at least for me, with “the three speeches.” As Ge points out (n. 1a), the identities of the speeches depends on the identity of the addressee of the impv. “speak forth” (*prá vada*). If it is Parjanya, the dedicand of the hymn, they probably refer to thunder(claps) (so, e.g., Lü, Va 392 -- three because they sound in the three heavenly domains) or thunder, lightning, and rain (so, e.g., Doniger 174). I am inclined to follow Lü but for reasons differing from his. I suggest that this could be an early version of the triple utterance “*da da da*” of Thunder in BĀU V.2, made famous in the West by T. S. Eliot in the section of *The Wasteland* entitled “What the Thunder Said.” Note that in BĀU V.2.3 Thunder or the thundering one (*stanayitnuḥ*) is identified as *daivī vāk* (like the three *vāc*- here).

If the impv. is the self-address of the poet, it would refer probably to the three types of ritual speech (*īc*-, *sāman*-, *yájus*-), or, on the basis of VII.33.14 (which contains *prá vadāty āgre*, similar to our *prá vada [jyótir]agrā*), solemn speech (*ukthá*-), melody (*sāman*-), and the sound of the pressing stone -- or, less likely in my view, with Ge three dynamic levels of sound, soft, medium, loud. Needless to say, both sets of referents may be meant. In the natural world interpr., the “light at the front” would of course be lightning; in the ritual interpr. it would be the ritual fire.

The three speeches milk the udder of pāda b. Again the identities of the referents of the udder and the liquid it produces depend on the referents in pāda a. In the natural world interpr., the udder would be heaven or the clouds therein, the liquid the rain; in the ritual the udder would probably be the soma plant and the liquid the soma -- though the udder could possibly be the sacrifice as a whole and the good things that result from its performance.

On *vād*- *prá* √ *vad* see comm. ad VII.103.1.

In the publ. tr. of the 2nd hemistich it was not made clear which nouns go together -- since Engl. lacks the convenient tool of case. The calf (*vatsám*) is the same as the embryo of the plants (*gárbham ósadhīnām*); both are objects of the participle ‘creating’ (*kṛṇvān*), whose subject is the bull (*vṛṣabhāḥ*), which is also the referent in the phrase “as soon as he is born” (*sadyó jātāḥ*) and the subj. of “sets to bellowing” (*roravīti*). The calf, embryo of the plants, is most likely Agni, who is so called elsewhere (see Ge n. 1c). Ge suggests that it is Agni as lightning, which is possible, but I assume that lightning and the ritual fire are here assimilated, via a trope whereby the sound of thunder, likened to ritual speech, kindles the ritual fire. The bull is surely Parjanya, as is confirmed by the identical phraseology of vs. 2 of the next, related hymn (VII.102.2): *yó gárbham ósadhīnām ... kṛṇóti ... / parjanyaḥ*.

VII.101.2: Multiple candidates have been suggested for the three lights of d, but it should be pointed out that there is actually only *one* light (*jyótiḥ*), which has three *vartu*-s (*trivártu*). Unfortunately this adj. is a hapax, but it is most likely related to the better attested *trivṛt*-. For the relationship between these two and the uncertainty of the root affiliation (√ *vṛt* [which I favor] or √ *vṛ*), see Scar (511). If the form does belong with √ *vṛt* we should properly expect **trivarttu*, but of course *rTT* and *rT* clusters can generally only

be distinguished on etymological grounds (see AiG I.112–14). As for our form, AiG II.2.663 (with lit.) suggests that *trivár(t)u* in this passage is a nonce creation modeled on well-attested *tridhātu* found in the preceding pāda (c).

In any case the triply layered shelter and triply turned light conform to the triadic focus of this hymn; I’m not sure they need to be more specifically identified.

VII.101.3: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. is full of gender ambiguity and gender switching, in service of the Vedic love of paradox. Although the subject of the first hemistich is surely Parjanya, he is not identified by name, and a masc. gender pronoun only appears as the very last word of the half-vs. (... *eṣāḥ*) -- while the state and activity ascribed to the subject of pāda a are quintessentially female.

In the 2nd hemistich the referents probably align well with the implied genders, unlike pāda a: by most interpr. the mother is Earth, the father is Heaven, as usual. But the action, at least in pāda c, is paradoxical, since it is the “milk” (*pāyaḥ*) of the *father* that the mother accepts. This milk is of course a metaphor for rain. In d it is said that both the father and son grow strong on it, another apparent paradox. Assuming that the father is Heaven, this is probably an early ref. to the water cycle: rain produces plants, which ultimately produce the offerings sent to heaven via the smoke of sacrifice, swelling the clouds that then again produce rain. By most accounts the “son” who is also strengthened in d refers to mankind, the offspring of the earth.

VII.101.4: This extravagant claim of Parjanya’s cosmic centrality -- all creatures, the three heavens, and the waters all take him as their basis -- must derive from his control of the rain, as the second hemistich suggests and 5cd further develops. The vs. is also made up of pādas with either exact (a, d) or near repetitions (b, c) elsewhere in the RV (see Ge’s nn. 4a, 4c, 4d and for pāda b partial reps. in I.35.6, VII.87.5; VII.90.4, X.111.8), which may account for the generic impression it gives.

Note the fem. *tisráḥ* modifying ‘heavens’, which is ordinarily masc. The same phrase is found in I.35.6 and VII.87.5.

VII.101.5: The subjunctive *jujoṣat* in b would fit the context better with a modal reading (“let him enjoy it / may he enjoy it”), surrounded as it is by impvs. (*astu* b, *santu* c) -- though the standard rendering of the subjunctive, as given in the publ. tr., is certainly not excluded.

VII.101.6: With Lü (506), I take the first hemistich as a truth-formulation, summarily referred to by *tád ṛtaṃ* “this truth” beginning c.

VII.102 Parjanya

Although the Anukr. identifies the meter of vs. 2 as Pādanicṛṭ (7 7 / 7), it is clearly a Gāyatrī like the other two vss., with distraction of the gen. pl. ending *-nām* at the end of pādas a, c.

VII.102.2: This vs. consists only of a rel. cl; it could be attached either to vs. 1 or to vs. 3, both of which have pronouns in pādas adjacent to vs. 2 that could serve as referent (*sá* 1c,

tásmai 3a). I prefer attaching it to vs. 3, since this configuration would fit the standard model of definitional relative clause / ritually based main clause.

On *gárbham ósadhīnām* see VII.101.1c and comm. thereon.

VII.103 Frogs

My interpr. of this hymn relies on the treatment of it in my 1993 article “Natural History Notes on the Rigvedic ‘Frog’ Hymn,” *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72-73 (1991-92 [1993]) [=Amṛtamahotsava Volume, for 75th anniversary of the BORI], pp. 137–44. Since this article is not universally accessible, I will reproduce much of the commentary here (without particular ref. to pg. nos. or to the sec. lit. that is excerpted there). The hymn is one of the most popular in the RV and has been constantly tr. -- e.g., besides the usual, Macdonell (VRS and *Hymns ...*), Renou (*Hymnes spéculatifs*), Thieme (*Gedichte*), Maurer, Doniger.

VII.103.1: This first vs. is in Anuṣṭubh, as opposed to the rest of the hymn, which is Triṣṭubh, and it reads like a scene-setting introduction. Old suggests that it’s an addition.

The natural history phenomenon corresponding to the “year-long vow” (*saṃvatsarām ... vrata-[cārīṇaḥ]*) undertaken by the frogs is surely estivation, as was already suggested by H. H. Bender in 1917 (“On the Naturalistic Background of the ‘Frog-Hymn,’ RV VII. 103,” JAOS 37: 186–91). The rains (here embodied in Parjanya) trigger the emergence of the frogs, in a frenzy to mate—what is known as “explosive breeding.” A loud chorus of male vocalizations attends the mating, calling females to the breeding place.

The pf. of √*sī* ‘lie’ is represented in Vedic only by the med. part. *śasayānā-*, found twice in the RV (also V.78.9). It has full-grade for expected zero-grade in the root syllable, matching the full-grade forms of the archaic root pres. *śāye*, part. *śáyāna-*. See the matching pres. part. form at the end of 2b, *śáyānam*.

The presence of the stem *brāhmaṇá-* is of course a sign of the lateness of this hymn, since it is restricted to only the latest layer of the RV.

I now think the phrase *brāhmaṇā vratacārīṇaḥ* “(like) brahmins following their commandment” may be a sly reference to *brahmacārya-* (first found in the AV, but cf. *brahmacārīn-* in late RV X.109.5), which refers not only to the studentship phase of life stages, but also, specifically, to celibacy. The frogs, by virtue of their estivating state of suspended animation, have perforce been celibate, but they now go about energetically remedying the situation.

The phrase *vācam ... prá √ vad* is reminiscent of nearby VII.101.1 *tisró vācaḥ prá vada* in a hymn to Parjanya, who is the instigator of the frogs’ speech here.

The presence of *parjanya-* in c links this hymn to the two preceding ones (VII.101, 102) dedicated to Parjanya.

VII.103.2: The comparison of the estivating frog to a “dried-out leather bag” (*dṛtiṃ ná śúṣkam*) may reflect a natural phenomenon: a 1932 “Notes on Indian Batrachians” by one C. McCann in the *Bombay Journal of Natural History* recounts an experiment undertaken by him that involved depriving frogs of water until they became shrunken and dried out like pieces of wood and then rehydrating them, at which point they began behaving normally.

It is difficult to interpr. *sarasī* as anything but a loc., but its morphology is a bit problematic. To the well-attested *-s*-stem *sáras-* ‘pond’, the loc. sg. is the expected *sárasī* (IX.97.52), but our form not only shows an unusual ending with a long *ī*, but it also bears the accent. No other forms to a putative stem *sarasī-* (so Gr, etc.) are found.

Wackernagel-Debrunner (AiG II.1.306; II.2.384) also posit a *sarasī-* stem, a *vrkī-* type fem. with collective meaning, with loc. sg. in *-ī* (AiG III.170; see also Lanman, *Noun Inflection*, 389), by way of a contraction of **sarasī-i*. Though *vrkī-* loc. sgs. are rare, see *nadī* (I.135.9) and *gaūrī* (IX.12.3) to better established *vrkī-* stems. Rather than following the Lanman analysis of such forms as contractions of the stem vowel *-ī-* with a loc. sg. ending *-i*, I consider these forms possible exx. of endingless locatives – on the basis of TY’s discussion of this category. His exx. of loc. *camū* and *tanū* to *-ū*-stems provide a nice parallel to our *-ī* locatives (though of course in the latter case a contraction with *-i* cannot be ruled out). On balance, it seems best to posit a stem *sarasī-* with Gr, Lanman, Old, Wackernagel-Debrunner, etc. I am somewhat reluctant to do so because of its extreme isolation and the widespread attestation of the *-as*-stem *sáras-*, which in fact is found in vs. 7b, but The need for a heavy final syllable may have led to the creation of this nonce stem, but my reluctance is considerably tempered by TY’s discussion of the category. The use of the nonce *sarasī* here may have been encouraged by the need for a heavy final syllable.

VII.103.3: This vs. contains the famous hapax *akhkhalīkītya* with the otherwise non-occurring (in Skt.) cluster *-khkh-*. The word was brilliantly explained by Thieme (KZ [1951] 109 = KISch 138). He sees it as the first attested *cvī* formation in Sanskrit (but see comm. ad X.28.12). The base noun is *akṣāra-* ‘syllable’, and the sense would be ‘making syllables’ -- a reference to the Indian pedagogical technique, still in use today in traditional instruction, of students repeating the text after the teacher, syllable by syllable, word by word. Here the teacher would be the father, as was most likely the original situation -- hence *pitāraṁ nā putrāḥ* “like a son to his father.” Since even in RVic times the language used in instructing young boys would surely have been an early form of Middle Indo-Aryan, it would not be surprising that this technical pedagogical term should appear in MIA garb: *akṣāra* should yield **akkhara-* in early MIA -- and in fact does; cf. Pāli *akkhara-*. This has simply been transformed into the more “froggy” sounding **akhkhara-* → *akhkharī-* in the *cvī* formation. This onomatopoetic rendering of a frog call is worthy to take its place beside the better known imitation in Aristophanes’s brekekekex koax koax. In fact, because the word does double duty in this passage -- imitating frog vocalizations directly, while implicitly comparing the frog chorus to the call-and-response style of childhood instruction -- our word seems even more ingenious and well chosen than the Greek. And it is quite striking that both the Greek and the Sanskrit immediately convince as froggy, though they are phonologically very distant from each other.

VII.103.4: The verb in the first pāda, *ānu grbhṇāti*, is generally rendered with an anodyne ‘greet’ (Macdonell, Maurer, Doniger; sim. Re ‘salute’), ‘support’ (unterstützt, Ge), or is given a specifically ritual interpr. (Thieme, *Gedichte*). But the lexeme has a straightforward literal sense ‘grasp in following, grasp from behind’, and this literal meaning exactly describes the posture of frog mating (“amplexus”), with the male

grasping the female around her middle with his forefeet (sometimes facilitated by so-called “nuptial pads” developed during the mating season). Since once achieved, this posture is held for long periods—hours, days, even weeks or months—it would be visually salient to any Vedic bard outdoors during the rainy season, which is also the frog mating season. The only potential problem with my interpr. is that the obj. of the verb is masc. *anyám*. However, the expression here *anyó anyám* “the one ... the other” is already stereotypical in the RV for any mutual activity and will soon be frozen as the adverb *anyonyam* ‘mutually’. Moreover it is not impossible that the original text had a fem. **anyām* (*anyó *anyām ánu gr̥bhñāti enoh*): four-syllable openings almost always have a heavy fourth syllable (see Arnold, 188), whereas the transmitted text has a light one. Thus **anyām* could have been changed redactionally to *anyám* on the basis of the later adverb.

Note the phonetic echo ... *ámandiṣātām / maṇḍúkaḥ*.

The intens. *kániṣkan* in c, ‘hopped and hopped, continually hopped’, is a nice description of the apparently random and chaotic “scramble competition” of male frogs seeking partners.

VII.103.5: The pedagogical model seen in vs. 3 is made more explicit here: the repetition of one frog’s call by another is likened to that of a pupil and his teacher (*śāktāsyeva ... śikṣamāṇaḥ*). Both of these terms are used here in a specialized pedagogical sense, already seen in the Aves. desid. *śikṣa-* ‘teach’ as well as post-RV, but not found elsewhere in the RV, where extremely common *śikṣati* means ‘do one’s best’. For reff. for this Itr. usage see Heenen (233). In contrast to this widespread development of the desid. to *śak*, the use of *śāktá-* for ‘teacher’ seems to be only here – it’s derived from *śakti-* ‘ability’; see AIG II.2.111, 127.

With Maurer, I take *sárvam ... párvatā* as referring to a group of frogs, not to the section of a lesson with most others. The “speaks” in this pāda should be in parens.

VII.103.6: This vs. reflects the natural fact that different frogs have different cries, which allow the females to differentiate conspecific males from those unsuitable for their mating.

VII.103.7–9: With the behavioral model of the frogs established in the first 6 vss., the next three treat the ritual application of this model.

VII.103.7: The first ritual application is that of the Atirātra or “Overnight” soma ritual. Frogs are generally nocturnal; they are active during the day only if the weather is rainy or very humid. So, the first signal to humans of the frogs’ emergence from estivation would be the *sound* of the nocturnal frog chorus when the rain supplied them with the impetus to emerge. Hence they are compared to brahmins at an Overnight ritual speaking around a soma vessel configured as a pond. The similes are complexly intertwined: the frogs are compared to brahmins, but those hypothetical brahmins are then implicitly compared to frogs around a pond – in other words to the original target of comparison.

VII.103.8: But as the day dawns, the frogs become visible, with their drive to mate overriding any instinct to flee or conceal themselves. This visibility is insistently

conveyed by “[they] become visible; none are hidden” (*āvīr bhavanti gúhyā ná ké cī*). The frogs are compared to two different kinds of priests: brahmins (7a, 8a), who are here responsible for ritual speech, and Adhvaryus (8c), the priests who do the physical labor in Vedic ritual. They are “sweating” (*siṣvidānāḥ*): sweat is a sign of hard ritual labor in Indo-Iranian religious terminology (see my 2011 [2015] “Avestan *xšuuīd*: A Relic of Indo-Iranian Ritual Vocabulary,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 25: 19–29). Here, once again the image does double duty -- the frogs would be covered with water drops from the rains, but they are also compared to the hard-working priests officiating at the Pravargya ritual. The Pravargya is an especially sweat-inducing ritual, since it involves a hot milk drink (*gharmā-*), which must be tended as it is heated over the fire. Other features of the Pravargya conform to aspects of the hymn: there is a year-long *dīkṣā* (period of consecration for the sacrificer), reflected in both 1a (*saṁvatsarām śaśayānāḥ* “lying for a year”) and 8b (*bráhma kṛṇvántaḥ parivatsarīṇam* “creating their yearly sacred formulation”); this *dīkṣā* involves a taboo on water or moisture of any kind. But the most crucial intersection between the Pravargya and frog behavior is found in the next vs.

Note in passing the non-etym. figure *vācam akrata bráhma kṛṇvántaḥ* with two forms of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ governing two words for speech, with the subject, *brāhmaṇāśaḥ* in a derivational relationship to the 2nd form of speech.

VII.103.9: The year-long preparation for the Pravargya rite is again emphasized here in the first three pādas.

In b the *ná* is potentially ambiguous. The first reading is no doubt the negative: the ritualists/frogs do not fail to observe the proper ritual calendar. The VP *ná (...)* (*prá*) *minanti* is quite common (e.g., II.24.12, III.28.4, X.10.5). But *ná* could also be a simile marker in the phrase *náro ná*, for, after all, the subjects are frogs, *compared* to men. Since *ná* occupies the fifth syllable of the pāda, either reading is compatible with its position: an early caesura, followed by *ná*, for the negative reading; a late caesura, preceded by *ná*, for the simile.

The final pāda of the vs. is the ritual climax: the *gharmā*-drinks, heated on the fire, bubble up and overflow their vessel, as milk does when it’s been left too long on the stove. The “obtain their own release” (*aśnivate visargám*, note the middle verb), a phrase rendered rather generically by many tr. (e.g., Doniger “the hot fires come to an end”; Maurer “the heated receptacles get emptied out”), is in my view a rendering of the dramatic moment when the bubbling mass boils over. I further suggest that its analogue in the natural world is the female frog’s release of her masses of eggs (up to 2000+ in some species), which are fertilized by the male as they are released – which must be a visually striking event. It may also refer to the practice of some frogs of making a “foam nest” in which to deposit the eggs, liquid albumen whipped up by the frog’s hind legs into a “dense light foam” -- a process that also might appear like milk boiling over.

VII.103.10: This final vs. is a mock-dānastuti.

The frogs’ release and fertilization of masses of eggs in the preceding vs. serves as a model for the fertility and increase of the ritualists that are major aims in Vedic rituals. This is surely the sense conveyed by the final vs. of the hymn, describing various types of frogs as “giving” goods and hundreds of cows to us, as well as lengthening both their and our lifetimes. They do so “at a pressing of thousands,” which can literally refer

to the release of the frogs' eggs. The prodigious fertility of frogs (no matter what happens subsequent to the thousands of eggs produced) is an encouragement to our own.

The publ. tr. renders *prá tiranta áyuh* as "they lengthened (their / our) life." But the verb is of course *tirante*, a present indic., out of sandhi and the tr. should be corrected to "lengthen."

VII.104 Multiple divinities, to destroy demons and ward off evil

See the publ. intro. for an intro. to this complex composite hymn and its parts. Complete translations are given by Norman Brown ("The Rigvedic Equivalent for Hell," JAOS 61 [1941]: 76–80) and Herman Lommel ("Vasiṣṭha und Viśvāmitra," Oriens 18-19 [1965/66]: 200–27), as well as Doniger.

VII.104.1: The verse contains a remarkable eight verbs of violence, with three in the last pāda alone -- all quite different.

VII.104.2: The syntactic function of *aghám* in pāda a is ambig. It could be an acc. sg. masc. parallel to *aghásamsam*, the object of *yayastu*. So Wh (tr. of AV VIII.4.2) "against the evil plotter, the evil ..." The pāda break following it might support this reading. However, it can also be a neut. sg., modifying *tápuḥ* and therefore the subject of *yayastu*, as in the publ. tr., flg. Ge, followed also by most subsequent tr. Ge's cited parallel, VI.62.8, where *tápur aghám* belong together, seems decisive here. See also V.3.7, where *aghám* is used as a weapon against an *aghásamsa-*: *ádhīd aghám aghásamse dadhāta* "set evil upon him, the speaker of evil."

The simile particle *iva* in the simile *carúr agnivāṁ iva* is postposed, but such late placement of simile markers is not uncommon in the RV.

The hapax *anavāyá-* is unclear. Old approvingly cites Bergaigne's gloss 'qu'on ne peut détourner par des supplications', and this interpr. seems to inform most subsequent tr., including mine. But this interpr. should rest on the lexeme now understood to be *áva √yā* 'appease', and I do not see how the morphology would work. *√yā* has a zero-grade *ī*, but no *ay-* forms -- but (*an-*)*avāya-* can only be broken down into *ava+ay-a*, containing no elements of *√yā/ī*. AiG fails to treat this form. Re (EVP XVI.114) tries briefly to get it from *áva √ī*, but decides that *áva √ī* is "simpler." This is certainly the case morphologically, but the semantics are harder: *áva* is not a particularly common preverb with *√ī* and when it appears, the lexeme generally means 'go down' (with 'down' the physical direction), occasionally more generally 'go away'. Re cites V.49.5 *ávaitu ábhvam*, claiming that the verb there means 'céder', thus allowing our form to mean 'qui ne cède pas'. But I do not see a 'cede' sense in that passage, just 'go away'. This is, in fact, the interpr. found in RIVELEX (I.181), which glosses the stem *anavāyá-* as 'nicht weggehend' -- 'not going away' (metaphorically 'nicht vergehend, verbleibend', 181 n. 1) and analyses as a "Verbales Rektionskompositum/Dete<r>minativkompositum" *an-* + *avāya-* 'weggehend' (< *áva* + *√ay¹-*). This must be the correct analysis, though I am sorry to abandon the richer semantics of a derivation from *áva √yā*. My publ. tr. 'unrelenting' can still probably stand, as a strengthened expression of 'not going away'. (Note in passing that RIVELEX I.394 [s.v. *ay¹-*] glosses verbal forms of *áva* + this root as 'herabsteigen; Abbitte leisten — descend; apologize'; the second terms of the German and English glosses must result from confusion with *áva √yā/ī* and should be stricken.)

The rendering ‘worm-eater’ for *kimīdīn*- here and in the following vs., as well as in X.87.24, is based on a suggestion of Schindler and Werba recorded in EWA s.v. and also entertained by Scar (41). Note that in X.87.24 it is associated with *yātudhāna*- ‘sorcerer’, which stem figures prominently later in our hymn as well as in other parts of X.87.

VII.104.3: The first hemistich of this vs. contains 2 locative phrases, *vavrē antār* (a) and *anārambhaṇé támasi* (b). Essentially all tr. are agreed that the two phrases are parallel and refer to the same place -- and this is reasonable and probably would be the default reading. This interpr. in turn leads some (see esp. Norman Brown and Oberlies I.473) to take this as a description of Hell, or the RV equivalent thereof. My interpr. is syntactically bolder, and perhaps less well supported, but it arises from my discomfort with equating the enclosed space denoted by *vavrā*- (which is several times used of the Vala cave, e.g., IV.1.13, V.31.3) with “ungraspable darkness.” Because these locales seem incompatible, I take *vavrē antār* as referring to the place where the evil-doers are hiding / taking refuge, and the action enjoined on Indra and Soma in b is to roust them from this hole and thrust them into a dark void with no handhold, the very opposite of an enclosure. A similar use of *vavrē antār* as a place from which creatures are ejected is found in the account of the Vala myth in V.31.3 *prācodayat sudúghā vavrē antār* “(Indra) impelled forth the good milkers (who were) within the cave.” The action there is of course benign, but the loc. phrase also refers to the original location of the cows, not their destination. I must confess, however, that vs. 17 in our hymn, with the phrase *vavrām̐ anantān* “holes without end” into which the villainess is to fall, does give me pause. (On the other hand, vs. 17 is in a portion that was probably a late addition to the hymn; see publ. intro.)

VII.104.4: The lexeme *úd √ takṣ* (lit. ‘fashion up’) that opens the 2nd hemistich occurs only here in the RV, and at least acdg. to Monier Wms nowhere else in Skt.; it was clearly artificially generated to contrast with the verb *nijūrvathaḥ* (‘grind down’) at the end of the hemistich, to highlight the *úd* ‘up’ / *ní* ‘down’ contrast.

VII.104.5: Both *áśmahanman*- and *tápurvadha*- have bahuvrīhi accent, and though it’s tempting to render them as tatpuruṣas, the accent should be respected. See Old’s disc. and Ge’s wavering in the n. [he is definitely tempted], though the tr. in the text is bahuvrīhi-like.

pársāna- occurs only 3x in the RV (and nowhere else in Skt.), here and in VIII.7.34, VIII.45.41. It has no good etymology (see EWA s.v.). The sense of ‘deep place, chasm’ is thus entirely dependent on context. Such a meaning is compatible with all three passages; the strongest support for it is VIII.7.34 *girāyaś cin ní jihate pársānāso mányamānāḥ* “Even the peaks bend down, thinking themselves depths.” Parallel locatives in VIII.45.41 make it likely that it refers to a place, but not what sort of place it might be: *yád vīlāv indra yát sthire, yát pársāne párābhṛtam* “What is in a firm place, what in a solid place, Indra, what has been borne away (in)to a *pársāna*” In our passage the *ní* ‘down’ does suggest that the destination is a depth, but I also think that this interpr. has been somewhat uncritically embraced by those with preconceptions about the Vedic hell/underworld.

nisvarām ‘in silence, to silence’ contrasts with *svaryā-* ‘reverberant’, used of the weapon in 4c.

VII.104.6: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. closes the first section of the hymn, at least as I understand the structure.

The preverb *pāri* appears with \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ only here in the RV (and, acdg. to Mon Wms., all of Skt.). It seems to have been suggested by the *pāri* in pāda a, construed with $\sqrt{bhū}$, in the meaning ‘encircle’. The idiom *pari* \sqrt{hi} ‘impel around’ does not make much sense, unless the image is of *hótrā-* compared to horses made to circle a race track. Re thinks rather that it reprises *pāri bhūtu* in a: “l’offrande que (je ceins) autour (de vous en la) poussant” -- but this seems more trouble than it’s worth: he is forced to supply the crucial verb (je ceins: ‘gird, buckle on’) while relegating the actual verb stem *hinomí* to a participial adjunct (“en ... poussant”).

hótrā- is of course completely -- and not very interestingly -- ambiguous between ‘libation’ and ‘invocation’.

In the last pāda Indra and Soma are compared to *nṛpātī*. Some interpr. (Brown, Doniger) take this as a ref. to the Aśvins, and it is true that the other three occurrences of this dual refer to the Aśvins (VII.67.1, 71.4, X.106.4), as duals often do. However, I think it’s more interesting to assume that the poet is comparing these two great gods to *human* ‘lords of men = kings’, a sly switching of the hierarchy of roles. (Of course he just compared the gods to horses, so being compared to humans may be a step up.) I think Ge is correct in his interpr. of this simile: the gods should encourage our poetic formulations in the way that human kings do, by providing us with material goods. If *nṛpātī* = Aśvins, the simile doesn’t work.

VII.104.7: See publ. intro. for the init. *prāti* here echoed by that beginning 11c and forming a ring defining vss. 7–11 as a subsection. Since *prāti* ‘against’ is not otherwise found with $\sqrt{smṛ}$ (or with $\sqrt{śuṣ}$, see vs. 11), I think the preverb has been stationed at both ends of this section to focus attention on the targeted victim. See disc. in publ. intro.

The NP *rakṣāso bhaṅgurāvataḥ* is entirely ambiguous between gen./abl. sg. and acc. pl. It is almost universally taken as acc. pl. here, as parallel obj. to *druhāḥ* ‘deceits’, but I prefer gen. sg. for several reasons. For one thing “deceits (and) demons” is a somewhat off-balance coordination (though certainly not impossible in RVic discourse). More important, the second hemistich defines a single enemy who shows hostility “with his deceit” (*druhā*); it makes sense to identify this single foe as the singular demon of pāda b, who owns the deceits mentioned there. In favor of the acc. pl. interpr., in X.76.4 (cited by Ge, n. 7b; cf. also X.87.23) the same phrase must be acc. pl. obj. of a form of \sqrt{han} , as here: X.76.4a *āpa hata rakṣāso bhaṅgurāvataḥ*. On the other hand, in IX.71.1 (also cited by Ge) in the two-word sequence *druhó rakṣāsaḥ*, which we also find here, *druhāḥ* is an acc. pl. (as here), obj. of the verb *véti*, but *rakṣāsaḥ* belongs to a different syntagm and is abl. sg., construed with *pāti* “protects from the demon.” The point of citing all these parallel passages is to demonstrate that even identical word sequences can function differently syntactically in different contexts: the poets were not locked into a morphological template.

The poss. adj. *bhaṅgurā-vant-* (to *bhaṅgurá-* [AiG II.2.487], to $\sqrt{bhañj}$ ‘break’; see EWA s.v. *BHAÑJ*) modifies *rakṣās-* 3x and *hantár-* once. I choose to render its possessive

morphology by tr. ‘with his wreckage’ (lit. ‘having breakage, wreckage’), referring to the damage that a demon brings in his train -- in contrast to looser and more colorful tr. like Brown’s (reproduced almost verbatim by Doniger): “Slay those who employ demons, who hate us, who would break us to bits,” where he manages to turn both the root noun *druh-* and the poss. adj. *bhaṅgurāvant-* into verbs qualifying *rakṣāsaḥ*. Others attenuate the meaning of *bhaṅgurāvant-* to ‘crooked’, and then by easy metaphorical extension ‘tricky, malicious’ (see Gr’s ‘tückisch, trügerisch’, also EWA’s ‘trügerisch, mit krummen Wegen’; Ge, Lommel, Lü 419 ‘hinterlistig’). This interpr. is based on the second of BR’s glosses of the base adj. *bhaṅgura-* 1) zerbrechlich, vergänglich, 2) krumm, kraus, gerunzelt; see Gr’s reproduction of the 1st word of each in his gloss of (*bhaṅgurā*). This base word is not found in Vedic -- and *bhaṅgurāvant-* is found outside the RV only in passages based on RVic passages -- though *bhaṅgura* is fairly widespread in Classical Skt., where it generally means ‘breakable’, but occasionally ‘curved’ esp. in connection with eyebrows (cf. AiG III.195 in addition to BR s.v.). Since the ‘curved, crooked’ sense seems to be a late and specialized development, I see no reason to impose it on this RVic word, esp. since I see no clear line from ‘break’ to ‘be crooked’ except in such a specialized application.

VII.104.8: The lexeme *abhí√cakṣ* here seems almost a substitute for *abhí√car* ‘conjure against’, and note that the object (“me”) is qualified by the part. *cārantam*. Re notes that this is the only RVic pejorative ex. of well-attested *abhí√cakṣ*, which generally means ‘look upon, look towards, oversee’ in neutral or positive sense. It is notable that in our passage the action of this *visual* idiom is accomplished by *verbal* means (“untruthful words” *āṇṛtebhir vácobhiḥ*). Re remarks that it coincides “avec le passage de «voir» à «dire»” -- without specifying what he means.

VII.104.9: The hapax *pāka-śamsá-* is taken by some as a bahuvrīhi (implicitly, Gr ‘arglos redend’; cf. Whitney [AV VIII.4.9] “him of simple intent,” Brown “him of pure and single heart,” Doniger “the man of pure heart” [with *śamsa-* = ‘heart’?!]), but by accent it should be a determinative cmpd, contrasting explicitly with the bahuvrīhi *aghá-śamsa-* ‘having evil speech’ with 1st member accent, found in vss. 2 and 4. It is surely *my* guileless speech that is in question, since I was “acting with guileless mind” (*mā pākēna mānasā cārantam*) in the immediately preceding vs (8a). As Re points out, *ví√hr* probably refers to distortion of ritual speech.

Since *pāka-śamsá-* is a thing, not a person, the parallel *bhadrām* in b should also likewise be a thing (so Ge, Whitney, Lommel, Brown), not, as the publ. tr. (“an auspicious one”) has it, a person. I would thus take the form as a neut. acc. sg., not a masc. and slightly emend the publ. tr. to “something auspicious.” This something is probably also connected with ritual performance.

VII.104.10: I take *ní ... hīyatām* as belonging to *√hā* ‘change position’; in most passages *ní√hā* means ‘bend down’ (e.g., VIII.27.2), but here and in VI.52.1, also a curse, I take the passive as ‘be bent double’. Most tr. are unsatisfyingly generic (‘perish’ and the like).

VII.104.11: See disc. in publ. intro. and ad vs. 7 on the use of *prāti* to define this section of the hymn and call attention to the victim. As noted ad vs. 7, *prāti* √ *śuṣ* is found only here.

VII.104.12: The prim. comp. *ījīyas*- here (=AVŚ VIII.4.12; also in AVŚ V.14.12), to *ījū-* ‘straight’, should of course have a full-grade root syllable **rājīyas*-, like the superlative *rājiṣṭha* (RV 7x, = Aves. *razišta*-). Re plausibly suggests that it has adopted the root syllable of the base adjective -- though why other primary comparatives and superlatives tolerate root ablaut is not addressed. It’s worth noting that if we were to restore the expected form, it would fix a problematic cadence (*yatarād* **rājīyaḥ* ← *ījīyaḥ*), by producing a heavy syllable four syllables from the end. As it is, the cadence is ∼ ∼ – ×, rather than expected – ∼ – ×. I am reluctant to emend, however, since it is not clear how the erroneous zero-grade would have been introduced.

VII.104.13: Most interpr. (Ge, Oberlies [Rel. RV I.441], Re, Doniger, Wh [AV]), take *kṣatríyam* here as masc. personal ‘ruler’, modified by the part. *dhārāyantam*, while I take it as neut. ‘rule’ (as it sometimes is; cf. IV.20.3, V.69.1) and the obj. of the participle. The problem with the standard interpr. is that the part. has nothing to govern, and in fact a number of interpr. supply a second *kṣatríyam* (or *kṣatrám*; see Re) to occupy that role. Cf., e.g., Ge “... den Herrscher, der fälschlich (die Herrschaft) führt.” However, Lü (419), Lommel, and Brown interpr. as I do.

VII.104.14: The disjunctive “if” clauses that occupy the first hemistich are more complicated than they first appear. In the publ. tr. I took the first half, *yádi vāhám ānṛtadeva āsa*, as a contrary-to-fact expression “if I were ...” The general context speaks in favor of this interpr.: in the 2nd hemistich the speaker asks indignantly why Agni is angry at him, so the implication is that the speaker has *not* done what would occasion such anger. This assumption presumably accounts for Ge’s tr. “als ob ...” (fld. by Lommel), which is strenuously disputed by Old. But the grammar makes problems: the indicative perfect *āsa* should not express contrary-to-fact modality, but a fact in the past (that may or may not have present relevance). For contrary-to-facts of this sort, the pres. opt. usually serves; cf. VII.44.23 *yád agne syām ahám tvám, tvám vā ghā syā ahám* “If I were you, Agni, or you were me ...” Note also that the AV version has an indicative *present*, *ásmi* (Wh “If I am one of false gods ...”). So we must reckon with the real possibility that “I” did have false gods, at least in the past, and I would slightly alter the tr. to “If I was (previously) a man with false gods ...”

The parallel verb in b is the perfect *apy ūhé*. In the publ. tr. I take this as presential -- and this is quite possible, since the other forms of this pf. are so used (see Kü 489–90) -- but Kü takes it as preterital, and, given my slight reinterpret. of pāda a, this might be best: “if I called upon ...” Kü accepts Insler’s 1996 positing of a root √ *vāh* ‘respect’ separate both from √ *vah* ‘convey’ and from √ *uh* / *ūh* ‘laud’ (which latter has a full-gr. root med. pres. → them. pres. *óh(a)*-). I am not convinced of the need for this separate root and would simply group the pf. *ūhé* with the pres. of √ *ūh*, despite Kü’s argument that unless the pf. is clearly distinguished from the pres. by meaning or function, they should not belong to the same root. For further on the lexeme see comm. ad X.52.3.

What exactly this pāda is conveying is not clear. Did the speaker call upon the true gods but in a false (that is, ritually faulty or with false intent or a false heart?) way? Such is the interpr. of most comm. -- e.g., Ge “nur zum Schein” -- but Lü (420) suggests equating *mógham* and *devān* (“oder wenn ich das Falsche als Götter ... auffasste ...”), though he also gives the alternate “in falscher Weise.” And Re is more radical in his interpr. of the verb: “si j’ai une compréhension (fausse des) dieux.” Given the appearance of the same adverb *mógham* in 15d, with the sense of false speech, the standard interpr. of the occurrence in this vs. seems the correct one, esp. as it contrasts nicely with the false or untrue gods in pāda a.

The question in d is where to construe *te*. Ge (fld. by Scar 469, but with ?) takes it as a quasi-agent: “Die Falschredenden sollen dem Tode *durch dich* verfallen.” Given that *te* is an enclitic and that the verb is not passive, this seems a stronger statement than the text would seem to support. I take *te* with the *drogha-* of the cmpd *drogha-vāc-* “deceitful to you,” but I admit that it might rather go with *nirṛthām* “your dissolution” (so Brown, Doniger “your destruction”; sim. Lü) -- that is, dissolution stemming from you. Not all tr. render the *te*: it is absent from Lommel’s rendering.

VII.104.15: I use the standard English rendering of *yātudhāna-* (with cognates well attested also in Old and Middle Iranian) as ‘sorcerer’ (German Zauberer), without any implications about what practices this figure might engage in. Since in the RV the word is found only in “popular” discourse, he presumably doesn’t work his ill through orthodox ritual means.

VII.104.17: The standard rendering of *khargālā-* is ‘owl’; see, inter alia, Gr, EWA, and the various tr. of this vs. But I find this unlikely for several reasons. The ‘owl’ is found as *úlūka-* in 22a, so it is already represented in this sequence of vss. But, though one could argue that there are numerous types of owls, which could have different designations, there are other arguments against this identification. For one thing, if the word is onomatopoeic, as EWA suggests, *kharg(a)* is not a particularly owl-ish sound. I tentatively suggest the nightjar. A number of species of nightjars are found in the proper geographical area. As for behavior and appearance, judging from information aggregated from the internet, nightjars are nocturnal (“goes forth by night” *prá ... jīgāti ... náktam*), feeding esp. at the twilights; the sexes are similar, and the birds are small and therefore could be considered typically female (hence the fem. *khargālā-*). They stay hidden on the ground by day (“concealing her own body by deceit” *āpa druhā tanvām gūhamānā*): images on the internet show them visually almost indistinguishable from the ground and one YouTube video is entitled “Indian Nightjar -- Master of Camouflage”; acdg. to Wikipedia “During the day, the Indian nightjar lies still on the ground, concealed by its plumage; it is then difficult to detect, blending in with the soil.” Moreover, their cries are much easier to connect with *kharg(a)* than an owl’s, being described as “a continuous churring” (the internet provides numerous recordings of various types of nightjars). Note that etymologically the “-jar” of nightjar is derived from its churring song -- and *jar* and *kharg* are reasonably close phonetically. Moreover, their genus name is *Caprimulgus* “goat-sucker,” based on the old belief that the birds suck milk from goats; if a similar belief was also found in India, it might seem to be the habit of a sinister or at least uncanny creature -- accounting for its inclusion here among the sorcerers in animal form.

The ability of the soma-pressing stones to smash demons, referred to in d, is also found in the pressing stone hymn X.76.4 *āpa hata rakṣāso bhaṅgurāvataḥ* “Smash away the demons with their wreckage,” which incidentally contains one of the three other occurrences of *bhaṅgurāvanta-* in the RV, besides the one in vs. 7 above. The demon-destroying ability of ritual implements, especially the noise made by their clashing, also reminds me of “Manu’s Cups,” whose clattering destroys Asuras. See the various Vedic prose versions of this in my *Sacrificed Wife*, pp. 21–26.

VII.104.18: I am not entirely certain why it is the Maruts who are tasked with the destruction of these creatures, though it is probably because the demons in question have taken the form of birds and therefore are moving in the midspace, which is the Maruts’ domain. Re also cites the well-known relationship between the Maruts and the *vīś-* (see *vikṣū* here), and these animal demons may be associated with the “folk.”

The root noun *rīp-* is otherwise used of cheats and swindles (cf. also *ripú-* ‘cheating, swindler’), and I am reluctant to allow a sense ‘defilements’ only here -- though it is the almost universal solution of other tr. (Wh, Brown, Klein [DGRV II.149: “impurities”], Lommel “Unsauberes,” but cf. Ge’s “Unredlichkeit” [dishonesty], which has a moral nuance). Deception and cheating are also characteristic of the animal-demons in this section: see the *khargālā* who conceals her own body “with deceit” (*druḥā*) in 17b, the flying dog-sorcerers that want to deceive Indra in 20b, and the oblation-stealers in 21b -- so the standard sense of *rīp-* fits the larger context. However, I do have to acknowledge that the root *√rip* does mean ‘smear’, and so ‘defilement’ is not out of the question.

It is difficult to avoid taking *devé* here as an adjective ‘divine’, modifying *adhvaré* ‘ceremony’, a temptation that all tr. (including me) have succumbed to and that is endorsed by Old.

VII.104.19: The “mountain” with which Indra smites the demons must be Indra’s *vájra-* ‘mace’, identified with a mountain elsewhere, as Re points out: in VII.22.6, as well as in the curious dvandva *indrā-parvatā* (3x, only in voc.: I.122.3, 132.6, III.53.1). See comm. ad locc.

VII.104.21: I have rendered the impf. *abhavat* in pāda a as an immediate past (‘has become’), though this is not ordinarily a usage of the impf. But this sense fits the context -- with the parallel pres. *śísīte* (20c) and *eti* (d) and the imminently threatening meances -- better than a simple past.

Note the echo of *parāśaró* in *paraśúr* in c.

As Re remarks, this is the only negative use of the desid. *vívāsa-* (*√van* ‘win’), usually ‘seek to win, covet, coax’. The negative sense must be attributable to the confrontational preverb *abhi-*.

How to distribute and construe the two similes in cd is the question. I take both similes, *paraśúr yāthā vānam* “like an axe a tree” (c) and *pātreva* “like pots” (d), with the pres. part. *bhindán* (d) in two slightly different senses, ‘splitting’ and ‘breaking’ respectively (sim. Brown, Doniger). This pres. part. is anticipated by the preverb complex *abhīd* that opens the hemistich, looking like an aberrant form of *√bhid* -- a low-level ex. of poetic repair. Others (notably Ge, Wh, Lommel) take *bhindán* only with the 2nd simile,

with the first controlled by *eti* in d (e.g., Ge “Śakra fährt auf die Dunkelmänner los wie die Axt in den Baum”). But axes are more likely to “split” than to “advance,” and I take *eti* only with the acc. pl. (*satāḥ* ...) *rakṣāsaḥ* as goal. It would also be possible to take *bhindān* + *eti* as a verb phrase with auxiliary, ‘keeps splitting’ or the like.

The function, and indeed the morphological identity, of *satāḥ* is unclear. With Gr, I take it as a pres. part. to *√as* in the acc. pl., modifying *rakṣāsaḥ*. In my interpr. it means ‘real, really being X’, though that could extend to ‘really present’. Re by contrast suggests that it’s an adverb, meaning here ‘tout à fait’, also probably found as 1st cmpd. member in *sató-mahant-* (‘entirely great’ VIII.30.1) and *sató-vīra-* (‘entirely heroic’ VI.75.9). Although Re does not pronounce on the morphological analysis, AiG II.1.237 implies that it contains the adverbial ablatival suffix *-tas* / *-tās* and thus does not belong to the pres. part. of *√as*. See also EWA s.v. *satās*. Old (ad VII.32.24) allows several possibilities, incl. the adverb, which he considers assured in the cmpds. cited above. Although, with Old, etc., I think that an adverbial *satāḥ* is found in those cmpds., I do not find that interpr. *satāḥ* as adverbial here improves the sense, though I grant that the acc. pl. pres. part. doesn’t really either.

VII.104.22: The *śuśulūka-*, occurring beside *ulūka-*, must be some species of owl, and it is tempting to take it as a deformation of **śīśu-ulūka-* ‘baby owl, little owl’, hence presumably the diminutives found in many tr. (incl. mine).

Sāy. takes *kōka-* as the cakravāka bird (see Ge n. 22b), Gr, Wh, Lommel, Brown, Doniger as the cuckoo, presumably on onomatopoetic grounds. The reinterpret. ‘wolf’ is owing to Lü (see Re and EWA s.v.) and has MIA support. Despite the dominance of birds in *pādas* a and c, ‘dog’ and ‘wolf’ make a natural pair in b.

VII.104.23: Acdg. to Re, Mehendale interpr. the curious formation *yātumāvant-* in *pāda* a (also I.36.20, VII.1.5, VIII.60.20) not as a metrical variant of *yātumānt-* (so AiG II.2.775) but as a haplogy for **yātu-māyyāvant-*. I assume (I have not seen the art.) that his posited form contains *-māyā-* in one form or another and anticipates the next vs. where the female sorcerer is “exulting in her magic power” (*māyāyā śāśadānām*), though I don’t know why the form posited is not just **yātu-māyāvant-*, containing attested *māyāvant-* ‘possessing māyā’ (IV.16.9). If we accept this suggestion, or modified suggestion, the tr. could be slightly altered to “the demonic power of those possessing the magic power of sorcerers.”

The *kimīdīn-* was singular in vs. 2, but a dual matched pair (*mithunā yā kimīdīnā*) here. Why the dual is not entirely clear, but the next vs. specifies both male and female sorcerers as Indra’s target, and the *mithunā-* here suggests a sexual pairing.

VII.104.24: *vīgrīva-* ‘with no / broken neck’ is ambiguous: is it descriptive of a pre-existing condition and thus a species, ethnic, or personal slur (in English “no-neck” is an insult, referring to a burly and stupid thug or goon)? or is it used proleptically here, to indicate what will happen to those who “shake to pieces” (*rdantu*). I’ve taken it as the former, but opinion is divided and either would work in the passage.

mūra-deva- is also contested. Acdg. to EWA (s.v. *mūla-*), flg. Wack., it is an *r-* form of **mūla-deva-* ‘whose gods are roots’ (Wurzelanbeter)(see also Brown). This excursion into exotic anthropology seems unlikely to me -- not the sort of divinity that

Vedic people would posit even of their worst and most primitive enemies. Most tr. take it as ‘idol-worshiper’ (e.g., Ge Götzanbeter), without, however, indicating what the ‘idol’ rests on: ‘root’ → ‘root as representation of god’ → ‘idol’ (not a semantic chain that seems reasonable to me)? Or, more likely to me, based on *mūrā-* ‘stupid, foolish, dumb (i.e., non-speaking)’. My own ‘with feckless gods’ is rests on this association, but is closer to the sense of the original adjective. The problem of course is the accent, since *mūrā-* ‘dumb, foolish’ has suffixal accent, and *mūla-* ‘root’ has initial-syllable accent like the first member of this compound. However, accent shift in cmpds isn’t unknown; cf., in the opposite direction, the famous case of simplex *viśva-* but cmpded *viśvā-*. And the semantics works better with ‘foolish, feckless’.

Maṇḍala VIII

VIII.1 Indra

VIII.1.1: As disc. ad X.143.3, the lexeme *vī√śams* barely exists, and its sense is not entirely clear. However, here since *mā ... anyād vī śamsata* contrasts strongly with *īndram id ... śamsata*, I suggest it means something like ‘praise apart, praise on the side’ – in other words, just focus on Indra. It is likely that *vī* is a nonce addition in this contrastive usage. I would now slightly alter the tr. to reflect this interpr.

In the publ. tr. I take *ca* in d as conjoining the two clauses found in c and d (so apparently also Ge and explicitly Klein, DGRV I.103, 105). However, given that the *ca* is somewhat wrongly positioned and that it reminds us of other *ukthā ca* passages, I now consider it possible that *ukthā ca* is part of a truncated conjoined NP. See disc. ad VIII.82.4.

VIII.1.2: This verse, couched in the acc. sg. masc., is entirely dependent on the *īndram* of 1c.

In b Ge (followed by, e.g., Scar 163) takes *gām* as a “(Kampf)stier” terrorizing the communities. Although it is of course sometimes necessary to interpret forms of *gō-* as masculine, the feminine “cow” predominates (esp. in contrast to the bull of 1c and 2a), and the Kampfstier seems to me an invention of contextual desperation. I interpret it instead as the first member of a decoupled compound **go-śāh* (like *go-jīt-*), parallel to *carṣani-* in *carṣani-śāh-*. A similar decoupling is found in the next pāda, and playing with analytic versus synthetic expressions is found elsewhere in the RV (see, e.g., VII.19.3–4, V.44.6, 52.15). A plural *gās* might have been desirable, but number is of course neutralized in 1st compound members, and when decoupled, the default might be the singular.

In the compound *ubhayaṃkarām* ‘making both’, the 1st compound member *ubhaya-* ‘both’ is further specified by two syntactically independent words *vidvēṣaṇam* and *saṃvānanā* – a play reminiscent of the one proposed for the preceding pāda. For the latter word, Old considers but seems to reject the possibility that it represents *saṃvānanam* with contraction of *-a-* with following *u-* over the *-m*. It sees best to accept the text we have and interpret *saṃvānanā* as neut. pl., contrasting with the singular of *vidvēṣaṇam*. Perhaps Indra favors unions over divisions, and it would also be a clever reversal for ‘division’, which is inherently plural, to be presented in the singular, while ‘union’, which is inherently singular, is in the plural. It would also be possible to take *saṃvānanā* as an instr. singular of accompaniment: “division by hate along with union by love.”

VIII.1.3: I follow Klein (I.58–59) in taking the *ca* as connecting *āhā vīśvā* with *idām* used in a temporal sense. We might have preferred the order **āhā ca vīśvā* in the 2nd constituent. but compare I.130.2, 9 *āhā vīśveva*, where the phrase also behaves as an indissoluble unit before the particle *iva*.

VIII.1.4: Following Old I take both *vipaścītaḥ* and *vīpaḥ* as nom. pl., rather than taking the latter as a genitive sg. (with Ge et al.). The thought is that the poets and their products

that belong to and emanate from the competing sides – that of the stranger and that of our peoples – keep crossing each other in their efforts to reach and attract Indra. For a thorough discussion of the possibilities of this hemistich see Old, who calls it a “Musterbeispiel für Vieldeutigkeit.” The intensive *ví tartūryante* brilliantly captures the constant roiling motion of these competitive elements.

The abrupt imperative *úpa kramasva* seems to merit a slangy tr.

nédiṣṭham appears to be functioning proleptically: bring it here so that it will be nearby.

VIII.1.5: Klein (DGRV I.286) asserts that this is the only passage in which *caná* has “an indisputably negative value”; although *caná* is almost always found in negative context (pp. 285–86), the negation is expressed elsewhere in the context. But I think this passage can be eliminated as the one counterexample with inherent negative sense, because the second hemistich, which continues the clause in ab, “I would (not) hand over + dat.” (*pārā ... deyām*), has three further dative expressions, each governed by *ná*: *ná sahásrāya náyūtāya ... ná satāya*. The negative cast in this hemistich can be, as it were, backprojected to the 1st hemistich, with *caná* + dat.: *mahé caná ... śulkāya*. This would be a variant of Klein’s first category of negative spread (my term, not his), where the *caná* clause follows a negative clause (p. 285). Given the intricate syntax of the RV and the relative unimportance of word order, the fact that the negatives follow *caná* rather than preceding it here seems to me unimportant. (Klein does not cite the rest of VIII.1.5.)

This verse contains one of the two examples of *śulká-* in the RV. The word later becomes specialized in the meaning ‘brideprice’, but clearly does not mean that here.

On the famous root aor. opt. (trisyllabic) *deyām*, see Jamison 1999, with discussion of some of the abundant sec. lit.

VIII.1.6: Pāda c contains a cute and tricky construction: a conjoined nominative subject of a 2nd ps. dual verb, with one of the subjects gapped. That is, underlying **tvám mātā ca* “you and a mother” is reduced to *mātā ca*, with the other subject only detectable in the verb *chadayathaḥ* and implied by the *ca*. Similar gapping with the 1st dual is found, e.g., in VII.88.3 *ā yád ruhāva vāruṇas ca nāvam* “When we two, (I) and Varuṇa, mounted the boat...,” VIII.69.7 *úd yád ... grhām índras ca gānvahi* “when we two, (I) and Indra, go up to his house....” Both constructions are somewhat reminiscent of the *vāyav índras ca* construction, though that does not involve gapping.

The sentiment of the verse is likewise a bit tricky. In ab the poet dismisses father and brother as providing no benefit, in contrast to Indra, who is “good for goods” (cd), but Indra is equated (positively) with a mother, who would in this society of course have little or no control over goods and giving (as opposed to the father and brother).

VIII.1.7: On *iyatha* (rather than *iyetha*) see Kü (100), following Hoffmann 1976: 553 n. 3.

The verse contains several unexpressed presuppositions. The anxious questions in pāda a are explained by the statement in b: we ask where Indra is because we know his mind is in many places. With Ge I take *ālarṣi* in c also as a question, again explained by d: they have sung to you, so are you coming?

Pāda c contains a heavy, accentless vocative phrase: *yudhma khajakṛt puramdara*, the last two of whose members contain object-governing compounds. The long (12-syl.) third pāda of brhatī nicely accommodates such iterations.

VIII.1.8: The first hemistich reprises 7cd, with a close variant of 7d recast in the imperative (8a), and one of the vocatives of 7c made into a predicated nominative (8b). This compound (*puramdaráḥ*) is in turn transformed into an independent clause (with lexical variation) in 8d: *bhinát púraḥ*. This process is reminiscent of the play with synthetic and analytic means of expression in vs. 2.

The fem. pl. relative *yābhiḥ* has no possible antecedent anywhere in this verse or nearby verses. The only possible fem. pl. referent is the ‘fortresses’ implicit in *puramdaráḥ*, but this makes no sense. With Old and Ge I supply ‘songs’, suggested by pl. *gāyatrā* in 7d, although not directly connected thereto, because *gāyatrā*- is neuter.

Hoffmann (1967: 237–38) takes *bhinát* as a parenthetical verse filler, with the injunctive expressing a characteristic of Indra, parallel to *vajrī*. Although he is attempting to account for the fact that *bhinát* is injunctive and *yāsat* is subjunctive (and perhaps for the fact that sitting on the barhis and splitting fortresses can’t be done at the same time), this explanation seems over-complex. *bhinát* is a rhyme form to *yāsat*, and the expected subjunctive *bhinádat* would be a good candidate for haplology under these circumstances.

VIII.1.10: Most interpret *gāyatrā-vepas-* with a trans./caus. sense of *vepas-* (Gr ‘zu Gesängen anregend’, Ge ‘die die Sänger beredt macht’, Scar [69] sim.), but neither independently or in compounds does *vépas-* have this sense; it simply means ‘trembling excitation, excitement’. Moreover the usage of *gāyatrā-* nearby in this hymn (7d, 8a) indicates that Indra (who is the referent of *gāyatrā-vepasam*, though in the guise of a cow) is the recipient of the songs, not their inciter. Presumably his pleasure in them will induce him to be a “good milker” by giving largesse to the singers, but at least in this passage he does not seem to be giving inspiration to the singers in the form of songs.

Trisyllabic *ánⁱyām* in c is problematic, distinguished from *anyā-* ‘other’ both by accent and by trisyllabic reading. Nonetheless Ge (reluctantly, see his n.) tr. it as if it belonged to that stem: “eine andere [zweite]...” Old by contrast derives it from *á-ni-ya-* ‘nicht niedergehend, nicht (in Unglück) hineingeratend’. (I assume that he meant the final portion to be analyzed as the root *√i* ‘go’, with thematic vowel, but he doesn’t specify.) Both Gr and Scar (69) extend this semantically to ‘nicht versiegend’ (not drying up), which pushes the limit in my view. Its only other occurrence is in VIII.27.11, in a less diagnostic context but one that is at least compatible with a bovine referent. My own analysis of this word is admittedly quite shaky. I take it as a back formation of sorts from *ánika-* ‘forefront’ and meaning “belonging to the forefront, lead(-cow)”. Dawn is regularly called *ánika-* and the word is sometimes used of her cows (e.g., I.124.11 *yukté gāvām aruṇānām ánikam* “She yokes the forefront of the ruddy cows”). A couple of not very strong models can be adduced: *samaniká-* ‘encounter’ / *samanyà-* ‘appropriate to the encounter’, *dṛśika-* ‘appearance’ / *dṛśya-* ‘to be seen’. However, I am aware of the weakness of this analysis, and only produce it because other analyses are equally weak; Old’s is certainly thinkable, though not with the explicit extension to ‘not running dry’ made by others.

VIII.1.11: Various semi-understood myths are alluded to here, with minimal (or no) identification of the subjects of the three parallel injunctives (*tudāt*, *váhat*, and *tsárat*). I am inclined to take the subject of all three as Indra (who is clearly the subject of the middle one), but see both Ge and Old for discussion of other possibilities.

VIII.1.12: As indicated in the publ. intro., this verse poses serious problems of interpretation. It is also found in the AV in a marriage hymn (AVŚ XIV.2.47), used as an expiation when something is broken during the sacrifice, or anything on the bridal car needs mending, or when a student's staff is broken (see Whitney AV ad loc.). The verse is extensively and illuminatingly discussed by Old, who summarizes the first two pādas as indicating that (a) Indra heals without using any adhesive material to bring together the damaged parts, and b) he does so before the weapon (unmentioned but presumed by Old to be the cause of the damage) drills through to the collarbones, or rather the rib cartilage. This scenario seems plausible, although it rests on several assumptions not explicit in the text, and it is essentially followed by Ge, Tichy (1995: 327, 338), and Scar. I would only mildly dispute taking the root noun *abhiśrīṣ-* in pāda a as a concrete noun, a sort of band-aid (*ṛté cid abhiśrīṣaḥ* "auch ohne Verband" Ge, Tichy, Scar; see also EWA II.670), a piece of equipment that seems uncharacteristic of Indra. This ablative seems to me parallel to the ablative in b, *purā ... ātīdāḥ* "before drilling through," and this parallelism invites an abstract verbal interpretation of *ṛté ... abhiśrīṣaḥ* "without clasping/taking hold." The point would be that Indra can heal from afar, without even touching the afflicted, and can intervene before the damage is done. The root *√śreṣ* is primarily an Atharvan word and is found elsewhere in the RV only in the horse sacrifice hymn, I.162.11. Most similar to our passage is AVŚ III.9.2 *asreṣmāṇo adhārayan* "Without claspers they held fast."

VIII.1.13: Both this verse and the next seem to rest on the unexpressed presupposition that on our own we have a pretty poor impression of ourselves, but if Indra will pay attention to us, we'll feel good about ourselves again. (Early lessons in self-esteem!) It may be that the curious verse 12 that immediately precedes sets the stage for these verses by depicting Indra as one who can set everything to rights. See esp. the last pāda of 12.

On *duróṣa-* see EWA s.v. This rare and unclear word, appearing 3x in the RV (IV.21.6 and IX.101.3 as well as here), must be compared with similarly unclear Aves. *dūraoša-*, a standing epithet of Haoma in the Hom Yašt and also once in the Gāthās (Y 32.14). In the RV it modifies Soma only in IX.101.3; here it qualifies "us" and in IV.21.6 the Hotar, most likely Agni. The Avestan word has been variously interpr. – but no more convincingly than its RVic counterpart. The tr. adopted here, 'difficult to burn', makes a connection with the Aves. forms more difficult because *dus-* 'bad, ill' should not appear with *-r* in sandhi (see disc. in EWA), though Humbach et al. (n. ad Y 32.14) upholds this analysis. This rendering is not altogether a good fit in any of the RVic passages; nonetheless, the alternatives seem worse. In tr. it so, I'm assuming a Vedic-internal folk etymology from an opaque inherited word; the tr. therefore has no implications for the meaning of the Avestan word or for Ir. etymology. Sāy's interpr. of the word in two of the three passages falls squarely in this realm: VIII.1.13 *oṣitum anyair dagdham aśaktyā(h)*, IX.101.3 ... *durdahaṃ durvadhaṃ vā*

VIII.1.14–17: Note the concentration of nominal forms of the root \sqrt{stu} ‘praise’ in these verses: *stómam* 14d, 15a, *sadhástutim* 16a, *úpastutiḥ* 16c, *suṣtutim* 16d. The appearance of *sómam* in 17a signals a sort of ring-composition by variant, echoing the two forms of *stómam* in successive pādas of 14 and 15.

VIII.1.14: Although the primary sense of d, “take delight in your praise,” is surely that the poets will enjoy praising Indra, in the context of these two verses it presumably also implies that they will take delight because their praise will put them (back?) into Indra’s good graces and thereby improve their own view of themselves and their chances of making good.

VIII.1.15: Again the uncertainty about whether Indra will pay attention to their praise gives a slightly nervous air to the beginning of this verse. In the 2nd pāda the full form of ‘our’ (*asmākam*) is fronted; a tr. better reflecting this emphasis and in harmony with the poets’ anxieties about Indra’s attention would be “let it be *our* (soma-)drops that invigorate Indra...” Cf. 3cd.

VIII.1.16: The phraseology of this verse echoes some previous ones: its opening *ā tv ādyā* is identical to 10a, and *vāvātar-* ‘favorite’ occurs in the RV only here and in 8b (in the same position).

VIII.1.17: Because *dhāvata* in b is unaccented, it cannot be directly parallel with *sótā* in pāda a, as, e.g., Ge takes it, because the *hí* of pāda a should then have domain over b and induce accent on the verb. I take the *hí* clause as indicating the grounds or prior action needed for the next clause, as so often when *hí* appears with the imperative (see Brereton 2012). It is also possible that *sótā* is an injunctive, though clear impv. *sotā* in 19b disfavors this interpretation.

On the *īm enam* doubling see Jamison 2002.

In c I take *gavyā* as part of the frame, not the simile, because of the position of *iva*. Contra Ge, who takes *gavyā vástrā* as the simile: “[g]leichsam in Milchgewänder...” *dhukṣan* should be an injunctive to the *sa*-aorist found in *ádhuḥsat*, etc., the only reliably attested sigmatic aorist to \sqrt{duh} . It would be appealing to interpret it as a subjunctive to an athematic *s*-aorist (as the pub tr. “will milk” and Ge’s “wollen ... herausmelken” suggest), but it should then have full-grade **dhokṣan*.

On *vakṣāṇā-* ‘belly’ as a pl. tantum, see comm. ad X.27.16.

VIII.1.19: The second hemistich contains a slight reversal of expectations: *śakrá-* is a standard epithet of Indra, who must be the subject of *pīpayat* (unless we read loc. *śakre*, not nom. *śakraḥ* with Pp.). But we do not expect Indra to swell the soma drink – if anything the reverse. (In fact, Gr suggests that *śakrá-* modifies soma in just this instance.) I think we must take Indra as the indirect agent of the swelling of soma: by his presence at the sacrifice he causes the sacrificers to press and mix the soma with water and milk, thus swelling it. See Old on this verse.

VIII.1.20: *gáldā-* appears in the RV only here and its meaning and etymology are entirely unclear. See EWA s.v. as well as detailed discussion by Old. In his study of the word

(AcOr 13 [1925], see ref. in EWA), Lüders suggests that it means ‘Strom, Gerausche’; although most do not accept Lüders’ interpretation, it makes contextual sense here, and a passage adduced by Old from MŚS I.7.2.18 *ā mā viśantu indava ā galdā dhamanīnām*, where it is parallel to *indu* ‘drop’ and is the *galdā(h)* of pipes (*dhamanīnām*) also supports an interpretation in that general sphere. Note that the fact that the word begins and ends with plain voiced stops makes it phonotactically unlikely to be an inherited word, at least in the form we have it, and the *-l-* marks it as “popular.”

The notion that “begging” by inferiors of superiors is a social requirement and also a potential source of annoyance to the superior is found elsewhere in Vedic. See Jamison 1996 (Narten Fs.): 191–99.

VIII.1.21: The first three pādas of this verse are couched in the acc. sg. masc. I take them as continuing the last pāda of the previous verse, as objects of *yāciṣat* (to be supplied from 20d). So also Tichy (195). By contrast, Ge, flg. Old, supplies “(Preiset),” which is certainly possible but not generated from context. The root $\sqrt{yāc}$ takes a double acc.: “beg s.o. for s.th.” Here I assume that *mādam* of a is what is begged for and *ugrām* of b qualifies the one begged, namely Indra, as an appositive to *īśānam* ‘master’ in 20d. The referent of *tarutāram* ‘overcomer, triumphant one’ in c is most likely Indra, but it is worth noting that *māda-* is the referent of *tarutār-* in VIII.46.8–9.

Why we are begging for *māda-* ‘exhilaration’, which is a state of Indra’s, not ours, is made clear by pāda d: when Indra is exhilarated, he gives to us.

VIII.1.22: *śévāra-* ‘treasury’ is a hapax, derived from haplologized **śéva-vāra-* ‘having dear valuables’, a derivation found already in Gr (though with *vara-* as suggested 2nd member; for reff. see KEWA s.v. *śévaḥ*). Note its juxtaposition with *vāryā* ‘desirable things’ here.

I take pāda a as a nominal sentence, and supply *rāsate* ‘will grant’ in b, from c, given their parallel datives. Ge takes ab as a single sentence and supplies “verwahrt” (keeps), again possible but not generated from context.

VIII.1.25: I supply ‘yoked’ with *rāthe hiraṇyāye*, on the basis of the same phrase in 24b with *yuktā(h)*, but it would be possible to follow Ge and take it as merely a locational phrase: “[d]ich ... im goldenen Wagen.”

VIII.1.27: *abhí* in b, in conjunction with *ásti* in a, invites us to read the lexeme *abhí√as* ‘be dominant’ in b.

The second half of the verse returns to the anxieties about whether Indra will come to our sacrifice found earlier in the hymn by a series of insistent assertions that he *will* come. Alternatively these could be read as questions: “Will he come?” etc.

VIII.1.28: In c I read the injunctive *ānu carah* twice, once as preterite and once with future meaning, contrary to Ge, who only takes it as a modal: “Du mögest ... nachgehen” (followed by Klein II.121). The peculiar position of the *ádha* and the presence of *dvitā* suggest this double interpretation to me, though admittedly pāda-final *ádha dvitā* does occur elsewhere without this syntactic effect (e.g., I.132.3, VI.16.4).

VIII.1.31: Some lexical and syntactic problems here. First, though the most obvious noun to construe with *ā ... ruham* ‘I mounted’ is the acc. *āśvān* ‘horses’, in fact horses never get mounted in the RV, only chariots (including in the loc., VIII.22.9). I therefore construe *rāthe* with the verb here and take the horses loosely with *śraddhāyā*.

The next question is the meaning of the adjective modifying the horses, *vānanvataḥ*. Ge connects it with *vāna-* ‘wood’ and tr. “die ans Holz gespannten Rosse,” but, although there are undoubted occurrences of the stem *vānanvant-* that do mean ‘wooden’, I doubt that this is one of them. Among other things in the occurrence in nearby VIII.6.34 modifying *matí-* ‘thought’, ‘wooden’ is effectively excluded. I instead connect it with *√van* ‘win’, whose various participles cross each other so much that a blend of this sort would not be surprising. For further disc. see VII.81.3.

The second hemistich opens with the conjunction *utā*, which is a problem for any interpretation of this verse, since it is ordinarily a coordinating conjunction but the first hemistich is a subordinate clause (note the final accented verb *ruhām* conditioned by *yád* in a) and the second a main clause (unaccented verb *ciketati*). Klein (I.451) is puzzled by the passage but suggests that if the chariot of the subordinate clause is a gift and the valuable goods is another prospective gift, “*utā* is thereby explained.” But his tr. of the verse clearly divides it into subordinate and main clauses. I simply leave it unexplained.

Finally, what is the value of *ciketati*? Old, followed by Klein, suggests supplying the patron as subject: “(then) will (the liberal one) take note (to give me) also (some) of the desirable wealth, which is the herd of Yadu” (tr. Klein I.451), taking the verb in the I/T meaning ‘perceives’. But this requires inventing a patron (although it is true that one appears in the next verse) and, more problematic, supplying a further verbal complement, not only “take note” but “to give me,” which seems to me to be taking more liberties with the text that we should. I therefore prefer to follow Ge in taking *ciketati* in its less common intransitive value, meaning ‘appears, stands out’ (see Ge’s notes for parallel passages, which interestingly are also *dānastutis*), with the relative clause of *pāda d* as its subject.

VIII.1.34: Although Ge takes *śāśvatī* as a personal name, and indeed the name of the poet’s wife, in this *dānastuti* context it’s far more likely that the woman in question is part of the gift, and *śāśvatī* here can be seen as a semantic development of the literal meaning of the stem *śāśvant-* ‘each and every, one after the other, ever and always’ can develop to ‘constant, reliable, always available/ready.’ The woman is “ever ready” for sex, at least in the poet’s imagination. For a slightly different development of **śāś(-vant-)*, in the comparative *śāśtyas-*, also applied to a woman, see V.61.6.

VIII.2 Indra

VIII.2.2: This is an orphan verse, which cannot be construed grammatically with either 1 or 3, though a mere *yāḥ* would allow it to be the rel. clause to 3, as the initial *tām* of 3a suggests.

The them. instr. pl. *āśnaiḥ* is the only unambig. thematic form to the complex of forms related to *āśman-* ‘stone’; it is most closely related to the oblique forms with reduced cons. cluster: instr. sg. *āśnā* (RV 3x), gen. sg. *āśnaḥ* (= YAv. *ašnō*), but it is not entirely easy to get from them to the thematic form here. AiG III.269 suggests that it is a

pluralization of instr. sg. *ásnā*, which is possible in principle, but seems a bit artificial. However, it might be possible to motivate it in context: Our form is pāda-final; *ásnā* also occurs once pāda-final (IV.28.5). Our form appears before a vowel opening the next (even) pāda, and it might be that a nonce pluralization was undertaken to avoid hiatus.

VIII.2.3: I take *góbhiḥ* twice, with both the frame and the simile. In the frame it is to be construed with *tám ... śrīṇántaḥ* “preparing it with cows’ milk,” but in the simile *yávam ná* “like barley” I take it as a passive variant of the common figure “as cows enjoy a grainfield (*yávasa-*),” e.g., V.53.8 *rāṇan gāvo ná yávase*.

In c Ge supplies “lade ich,” but I read *akarṃa* from b also in this pāda, in a different idiom “make X to be at/in.” The usual idiom is *ā√kr* ‘bring here’; unfortunately there is no trace of *ā*.

VIII.2.5: *tṛprá-* only here in the RV, though it appears later and may also be related to *tṛpála-* (RV 2x), also used of soma (see EWA s.v.); ‘sharp’ is only a guess, though shared with Ge, a characterization of soma usually expressed by *tīvrá-* (as in 10b).

In c *āpa√spr* is found only here in the RV; if it belongs to *√spr* ‘win’, it might mean ‘win away’. Ge. tr. “abstossen” (repel). EWA (s.v. *SPAR*) suggests that it belongs to a synchronically separate root ‘losmachen, befreien, in Sicherheit bringen’, in which case ‘keep away’ would work.

VIII.2.6: A quite opaque verse. The underlying point, in the context of the preceding verse, is that though our own preparations of soma may not be of the best, Indra will still come to our sacrifice (vs. 5), even if other sacrificers aggressively pursue him with (better-tasting) soma mixed with cows’ milk. The repetition of two words for cow (*góbhiḥ* opening the verse and *dhenúbhiḥ* closing it) draws attention to the notion and suggests that the other sacrificers have mixed their soma with milk (the most desirable way to serve soma), while our soma was characterized in vs. 5 as unmixed, badly mixed, or “sharp” (?).

Pāda b adds its own difficulties to the verse’s interpretation, esp. the rare and disputed word *vrā-*. In Jamison 2003 [HPS Fs.] I discuss this word and its contexts at length, suggesting that it means ‘(female) chooser’ (that is, the bride at a *svayamvara* “self-choice” wedding) and is a reduced form of **varā-*. This passage gave me pause, however, and in that article I toyed with the possibility that it contains a different word *vrā-* or else that its meaning had become attenuated because it was moribund. I now think that it is the same word *vrā-* and that it does here compare the other sacrificers to women chasing husbands, perhaps hinting at the unseemly nature of this pursuit. I take *mṛgám ... mṛgáyante* as a phrasal verb with a cognate accusative, so meaning simply “go hunting.”

Note that the accent on *abhitsáranti* requires it to be part of the *yád* clause, leaving the verse without a main clause and making its dependence on vs. 5 clear.

VIII.2.7: The three soma drinks might refer to the unsatisfactory types in vs. 5 or to the soma at the three pressings, but most likely to the three types mentioned in vs. 9 (the final verse of the *tṛca* of which this is the first). We might think of this as a species of “ritual repair”: the poor versions of soma in vs. 5 are adjusted slightly to produce the properly prepared ones in this *tṛca*.

The referent of *své* in c is unclear. (Note in passing that if read as distracted *suvé* [with HvN], its first syllable matches *sutāsaḥ* of b and *sutapāvnaḥ*. However, with Old I prefer to distract the final word to *sutapāvanaḥ*; cf. *somapāvan-*, whose oblique forms require distraction although they are written with *-vn-*.) If we assume that *své* refers to the subject, then it must be soma's dwelling, whatever that is (the ritual ground?). The only other personage mentioned in the verse is Indra, but it is unlikely to be his dwelling — *pace* Ge, who construes *sutapāvnaḥ* with the loc. phrase (“im eigenen Hause des Somatrinkers”). I take it as referring to the unexpressed agent of *sutāsaḥ santu* “let them be pressed,” namely us.

VIII.2.9: There are successive gappings here: we need to supply *asi* with b, and *asi + āśīrtah* in c. I take all three clauses as 2nd person, though Ge makes b and c both 3rd person.

On *niṣṭhā-* see comm. ad III.31.10. Here it is cmpd with *puru-*, but, though root-noun cmpds with direct-object 1st members, do not also include preverbs, *puru-* here is not an object. See also *karma-niṣṭhā-* (X.80.1) ‘outstanding through his work’. A parallel rendering ‘outstanding among many’ is found in the publ. tr. and matches that of Scar (649). However, it is also possible, at least in its other occurrence in V.1.6, that it is a bahuvrīhi meaning ‘having many standouts’, referring there to flames, with a compound structure like *puru-niṣṣīdh-* (I.10.5) ‘providing many fulfillments’. Despite being a bahuvrīhi it could have root accent because bahuvrīhis compounded with *puru-* often have second-member accent. Unfortunately the bahuvrīhi interpr. does not easily fit Soma. On all these forms see my forthcoming “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian.”

VIII.2.11: It is a little odd to command Indra to undertake the sacrificial preparations that are really our job. Presumably once again (see VIII.1.19) Indra is conceived of as the indirect agent: by coming to our sacrifice he sets our preparations in motion, and our impetus for this preparation is the knowledge that he has riches to distribute.

VIII.2.12: A peculiar ending to a celebration of soma, presumably describing some of the potential side-effects of (over-)indulgence in soma.

With Ge (implicitly) I take *ūdhar* as belonging not to ‘udder’, but to a homonymous stem ‘cold’, with Avestan cognate (OA, YA *aodar-*). See EWA s.v. *ūdhan-*. The same ‘cold’ sense is found also in V.34.3 and as a pun in X.61.9. But compare Old, who finds a complex way to rescue ‘udder’, though not one sufficiently plausible to me, anyway. See also disc. ad IX.107.20.

VIII.2.13: Given the parallelism with ab, we might expect to supply *śrutāḥ* in c. However, *prā* makes some difficulties: no *prāśruta-* is attested. However, *prā śīnve, -īre* has the meaning ‘is/are far-famed’.

VIII.2.14: As Ge (n.) points out, this is a subtle jab at Indra. If the god doesn’t provide cows (and other wealth) to his praiser, then no one will pay attention to either the praiser or, by implication, the praise he produces for the god.

VIII.2.15: Note the etymological and phonological figure *śīkṣā śacīvaḥ śacībhiḥ*. The desire to have a pāda consisting of only these related words may account for the absence of *naḥ*: *śīkṣa*- regularly takes a dative. Cf. the fuller expression in I.62.12 *śīkṣā śacīvas tāva naḥ śacībhiḥ*. Of course *naḥ* can be easily supplied here from pāda a.

VIII.2.16: This verse is a minor but neat example of syntactic modulation. The first pāda is in the 1st plural, the third in the 3rd plural, while the middle one is ambiguous: the plurals here can refer to *vayám* ‘we’ in pāda a or (coreferential with *kāṇvāḥ* in c) serve as subject of the 3rd plural *jarante*. So pāda b, by being without inherent reference to grammatical person, allows “modulation” from 1st to 3rd person. I have taken pāda a as a nominal sentence, and b as having third person ref. and belonging with pāda c. But in fact the whole verse could be one sentence (as the *tvā* in pāda a suggests, since it should be the obj./goal of *jarante* in Wackernagel’s Law position) with a harsh clash between *vayám* and *jarante* (which, notice, are the absolute first and last words of the verse, so we can go along as an audience on the happy assumption that the whole verse is in the 1st plural until the rude awakening of *jarante*).

The bahuvrīhi *tadīdartha-* is a nice example of phrasal univerbation, from *tād id ārtham* “just this (is the) aim.”

VIII.2.17: In b I follow a suggestion of Re’s (EVP 13.98, ad IV.6.4) in interpreting the hapax *nāviṣṭau* as *ná *viṣṭau*, with the only emendation the accenting of the second word. Cf. I.92.3 *ārcanti nārīr apáso ná viṣṭibhiḥ* “They chant like women busy with their labors.” Old explains it rather as a haplology of **nāvaviṣṭi-* ‘new labor’ (also Re’s 1st suggestion), and he is followed by Ge “bei der Neuheit des Dichterwerkes,” taking *apásah* as a gen. sg. But by its accent *apásah* should mean ‘worker’, not ‘work’. Kü (p. 297) also follows Old, but, taking account of the accent, tr. “beim neuen Wirken des Künstlers.” In the publ. tr. “at their labor” should be preceded by an asterisk.

VIII.2.18: *pramāda-* in c is a hapax, but clearly derived from *√mad*. I do not understand where Ge gets “... gehen sie auf Reisen.” Old, commenting on Ge’s same gloss in his Gloss., says “... glaube ich nicht.”

VIII.2.19: Hoffmann (1967: 87) notes of *mā hṛīthāḥ* that the prohibitive contains a present injunctive, and he interprets it, plausibly, as “lass ab von deinen Groll...” rather than simply “don’t be angry.” However, recent work by IH (first presented at AOS March 2017; see now “A New Approach to Prohibitive Constructions in the *R̥gveda* and the *Atharvaveda*,” JAOS 140 [2020]) has argued strenuously, and in my view successfully, against Hoffmann’s claim that *mā* clauses with pres. injunc. are inhibitive, not prohibitive, showing that pres. injunc. verb are found in *mā* clauses only when the default (root) aor. injunc. is not available. Note that *√hr* ‘be angry’ only makes pres. forms. The context then must determine whether the form is inhibitive or preventive -- in particular, the simile “like a great man with a young wife,” the interpretation of which will be severely affected by interference from our contemporary assumptions about such a situation and by our lack of knowledge about the corresponding assumptions in ancient India. If we assume on the basis of popular Western depictions that young wives have many ways of annoying their old husbands (profligate spending, flirting with

younger men, etc.), but also have many wives to win back their husbands' favor, then an inhibitive would work.

VIII.2.20: The opening *mó śú* matches *ó śú* of 19a.

On first glance this verse appears to contain a *mā* prohibitive with a subjunctive *karat* (so tr. Ge), which would be grammatically quite anomalous. Hoffmann (1967: 92) claims that in the Sprachgefühl *karat* is an injunctive, but this seems extremely unlikely to me because the root aor. of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ is one of the best attested of such formations, and though the stem *kāra-* is well established, there is no evidence that it is not interpreted as a subjunctive. There's no augmented *ākara-* for example, and no thematic part. **kārant-* or **kāramāṇa-*. I therefore take pāda a as an independent clause, with gapped prohibitive copula ("don't be") with *mā*. Since the root \sqrt{as} doesn't form injunctives (or an aorist), there is in fact no way to make a prohibitive copular sentence in any other way.

As noted in the intro., I think this may be a reference to the instituting of the Third Pressing, which happens in the evening. The point may be that sacrificers who fail to have a Third Pressing risk losing the presence of a disgruntled Indra to those who do.

I do not entirely understand the social relations depicted in c. Ordinarily, in patrilocal marriage the son-in-law would be at a distance anyway; that is, the wife would be living with her husband's family. Is this a reference to an in-comer, a husband who lives with his wife's family because he's too poor and who then makes it worse by distancing himself — or to the return of a bride because the husband was too feckless? Or is this similar to the situation in the Gambler's Lament (X.34), where the husband loses his wife because of his gambling or other economically ruinous activities?

In d "down on his luck" translates *āsīrā-*, which phonologically resembles the characteristic offering of the Third Pressing, the *āśīr-* 'milk-mixture'. It thus indirectly hints at the Third Pressing theme.

VIII.2.21: The referent of "the three" in c is not clear; perhaps again the three pressings.

VIII.2.23: What to supply with *jyēsthena* 'most superior' is not clear. Ge "Schoppen"; on the basis of nearby VIII.4.4 *jyēstham ... sāhaḥ* I supply 'might'.

VIII.2.28: *nāyām* is a famous crux. See esp. Thieme (1949) and more recently Jamison 2013 (Fs. Hock), both with discussion of previous literature. After my recent reconsideration of the evidence I would now eliminate "to the landing site," since I now think the underlying expression is **nā ayām* "(just) this man here," which lost its transparency and came to mean "on one's own" and could be used for any person, not just the 3rd.

VIII.2.29–30: Verse 29 consists of a relative clause (beginning *stútaś ca yāḥ*) conjoined with the relative clause of 30 (beginning with parallel *gíraś ca yāḥ*), but the rest of verse 30 causes some syntactic problems. The main clause appears to consist of the end of 30b: *túbhyaṃ tāni*, but pāda c contains an accented verb *dadhíré*, which appears to continue the interrupted relative clause beginning in pāda a. The result is what looks like an embedded main clause, a syntactic anomaly. I am not happy with this syntactic arrangement, but if we read *dadhíré*, there seems no way to escape it. As Ge points out in

his n., the Indian Pp. and Max Müller's 1877 edition read the verb without accent, but as Ge says, "*dadhiré* ist doch wohl die richtige Lesung."

VIII.2.31: Following EWA (s.v.) I take *tuvikūrmí-* to $\sqrt{car^i}$, not \sqrt{kr} as Gr, Ge do. See disc. ad III.30.3.

VIII.2.33: Ge takes Indra as the referent of *c* with *maghónaḥ* acc. pl. referring to human benefactors ("Wenn er berauscht ist, so tut er es den freigebigen Herren gleich"). However, *mandín-* usually describes soma (although it does modify Indra in I.9.2, 101.1, and X.96.6), and the only occurrence of *māndiṣṭha-* in the RV is found in this hymn and also modifies soma: VIII.2.9 *māndiṣṭhaḥ śūrasya* "most invigorating for the champion," with a dependent genitive, which is how I take *maghónaḥ* here. I therefore, somewhat reluctantly take the subject to be soma, who is accompanying (*ánu*) Indra, who already contains the multitudes listed in pāda a. However, the appearance of pl. *maghónām* in the next verse (34c), where it refers to humans who receive Indra's largesse, gives me pause, and it is quite possible that Ge's interpretation is correct.

VIII.2.36: In the first pāda the grammatically unparallel *vipro árvadbhiḥ* express the two complementary areas in which Indra is the winner. So also Ge; see his extensive note.

VIII.2.37: On apparent impv. *yājadhva* see Old, though I don't think the last word has been said about this form.

VIII.2.38: The formation of the hapax *purutmānam* is not entirely clear. With Gr, AIG III.267 (and implicitly Ge), it presumably contains the truncated (*ā*)*tmán-* stem in one way or another, but I am dubious about the meaning generally assigned to it (Gr 'lebenreich', Ge 'langlebig'), since *tmán-* almost always means 'self' not 'life, lifebreath', and *puru-* 'much, many' doesn't seem the most likely way to characterize length of life anyway. I think it possible that it was influenced by expressions like *purú tmānā* (I.142.10) 'abundant in itself', though it is not a straight univerbation. It is also worth noting the long vowel in *-tmānam*, given that the only acc. sg. to *tmán-* is short-vowel *tmānam* (I.63.8), though I don't know what to make of this.

VIII.2.39: Ge's tr. with added "(fand)" (see also his n. and Hoffmann 1967:137) implies that this is a reference to the beginning of the Vala myth, in which the cows are stolen and leave no traces, so that Indra must find them before he gives them away. This interpretation makes sense of the otherwise opaque *ṛté cid ... padébhyaḥ*, but it seems to require a lot of added machinery. I do not have an alternative interpretation, however.

VIII.2.40: This verse as it stands poses a number of problems, but some of them disappear if, following Ge's earlier Komm., adopted also by Old, and reflected in Ge's tr., the sequence *yánn áyaḥ* (per Pp.) is read *yán náyaḥ*, which requires no change in the Saṃhitā text. This produces a subordinating conjunction (*yád* out of sandhi), which in turn accounts for the accented verb (*náyaḥ*) and allows the whole verse to be read as a single dependent clause (in my interpretation: Ge supplies the verb "... hast du ... erhört" for pādas ab, while Old suggests rather "du hast ... gesegnet"). Although my

interpretation has the *yád* uncomfortably late in its clause, after two heavy constituents (violating Hale’s old observation that only one constituent can precede the *yá*-form), it avoids supplying a verb out of nowhere for the first part of the verse, and I take the acc. phrase of *ab* as an almost extra-sentential topicalized NP, so positioned to get the name and attributes of the poet up front.

With Old and Ge I take *abhí* with *náyah*, but unlike them don’t supply ‘heaven’ as the goal (on the basis of AV XII.3.16, 17). In the RV the lexeme *abhí√nī* can take as goal *vásu* ‘goods’ (VI.53.2) or *vásyah* ‘better state’ (VI.61.14, I.31.18), and since this verse inaugurates the *dānastuti*, goods would be at issue.

As noted in the intro., there are various tales or tale fragments in Vedic prose (see esp. JB III.233-35. also ŚB III.3.4.18) linking Indra as ram and Medhātithi, but to my mind they are later and not particularly successful rationalizations of this obscure verse.

VIII.2.41: As noted in the intro., one unfortunate consequence of taking all of vs. 40 as a single subordinate clause is that the 2nd ps. referent in the subordinate clause of 40 is Indra, while in the main clause here it is Vibhindu, the poet’s patron. As I suggested in the intro., this may be a ploy to superimpose Indra’s divine generosity on the human patron by implicitly identifying them. Vs. 21 in the next hymn (VIII.3), also in the *dānastuti*, supports this hypothesis, since there Indra and the Maruts and the human patron Pakasthāma Kaurayāṇa serve as undifferentiated subjects of the verb ‘gave’ (*dúh*).

VIII.2.42: Although Ge declines to tr. *māḱī*, the interpretation of this word as a *-ka*-suffixed form of the 1st ps. possessive pronoun, accepted by Old (see also Scar 519), not only fits the context but would exemplify the tendency to use *-ka*-suffixed forms in slangy, low-register contexts such as *dānastutis*. For disc. see Jamison 2009, also 2008.

VIII.3 Indra

VIII.3.2: I am not sure why the “future imperative” *avatāt* is used in pāda c. Its use implies that Indra should, first, not lay us low and, then, actually help us. This is possible but not compellingly required by the sense.

VIII.3.4: In pāda a note *sahás(ram) ... sáhas(kṛtaḥ)*.

In c “(When) realized” may push the English beyond the Sanskrit *satyáh só*, but the word order may weakly support this rendering. As often with *satyá-*, the meaning is ‘real, really present’.

VIII.3.6: Pāda-final *śávaḥ* here is often considered to stand for instr. *śávasā* (see Old for previous lit., Ge’s tr. and n., and most recently Hale [Fs. Melchert], who takes it as an archaic zero-grade *s*-stem instr., with loss of laryngeal in pause; see comm. ad VIII.39.2). However, as Old points out, an accusative reading is perfectly possible. The presence of the same pāda-final nom.-acc. form nearby (4c, 8a, 10b) supports an accusative interpretation here.

VIII.3.7: The *pūrvá-* in *pūrvápīṭaye* ushers in a set of verses with *pūrvá-* forms (7d, 8d, 9b, 11d).

VIII.3.9–10: Although Ge takes the second hemistich as dependent on the first, because of the parallel *yénā* clause opening vs. 10, I prefer to take 9cd and 10a as dependent on 10b, with the *yénā*'s of 9c, 9d, and 10a all referring to *śāvaḥ* in 10b. But this sequence can also be seen as a type of modulation: the hearer is invited to assume that the *yénā*'s of 9c and 9d have 9b *bráhma* as their antecedent, but the opening of the next verse can cause reanalysis and a refocusing on *śāvaḥ* in 10b.

In 9c a verb needs to be supplied. Although the sentiment seems to be essentially identical to 9d (“you helped X”), the root \sqrt{av} ‘help’ does not take a dative recipient. I therefore supply a form of \sqrt{as} or $\sqrt{bhū}$ with the meaning “be there for...” Ge rather “zu Hilfe kamst.”

VIII.3.10: For *vṛṣṇi* and the phrase *vṛṣṇi te śāvaḥ* see disc. ad VIII.96.19.

Thieme (KZ 92: 46) rejects the usual interpr. of *kṣonṭh* as nom. sg., on the grounds that the nom. sg. is attested as *kṣonṭ* in I.180.5 and that *kṣonṭh* is otherwise nom. or acc. pl. However, this requires him to interpr. it as an acc. pl. of *Inhalts* or result with a passive verb: “dem (d.h.: wenn ihm) Gebrüll (aufrüttelndes Kampfgechrei) hinterhergeschrien worden ist.” The syntactic complications of this interpr. seem to me to outweigh the drawbacks of assuming that the poorly attested stem *kṣonṭ-* could generate a nom. sg. in *-ṭh*, esp. since its suffixal accent matches that of *vṛkṭ*-type nouns.

VIII.3.11: Rather than construing *vājāya* directly with *śagdhi*, as Ge does (“Tu uns, was du kannst zum Siegerpreis...”), I interpret it as the object of the participle *sīśāsate*, attracted into the dative in the fashion of datival phrases like *vṛtrāya hāntave* (e.g., III.37.5–6). For the VP see VIII.103.11 *vājam sīśāsataḥ*. However, 12d *śagdhi stómāya* may support Ge’s interpretation.

VIII.3.12: Ge’s interpretation of ab (“Tu uns, was du kannst, für diesen, der [den Preis] der Dichtung gewinnen möchte, da du ja dem Paura beigestanden hast”) is syntactically quite troublesome, in that it not only involves an embedded relative (rare to non-existent in the RV) *yád ... āvitha*, but one that splits up a close constituent *asyá ... sīśāsataḥ*. Old, by contrast, takes *dhíyaḥ* as object of *āvitha* parallel to *paurám* and cites abundant parallels for \sqrt{av} + *dhíyam*, *-aḥ*. This allows the *yád* clause to be normally positioned, although I still find the position of the *asyá* unusual. I also supply a presential form of \sqrt{av} to govern *dhíyaḥ*, since the aid to the striver’s insights seems to be a matter of current concern.

Unlike Ge I do not take *svàṇṇaram* as a fourth client of Indra’s, but as an epithet of the final name in a classic Behagel’s Law construction. In the next hymn (VIII.4.2) mentioning Ruśama, Śyāvaka, and Kṛpa there is no Svarṇara. I also take it as an epithet in VIII.12.2, but as a PN in VIII.6.39.

VIII.3.13: It is generally, and reasonably, accepted (e.g., Gr, Old, EWA s.v. *atasṭ-*) that the hapax *atasṇām* belongs with *atasāyya-*, attested twice, so its meaning depends on our interpretation of the latter – generally held to mean ‘to be called/praised’. However, I take *atasāyya* as a negated gerundive to \sqrt{tams} ‘shake’ (see I.63.6), and so *atasṭ-* should mean ‘unshakeable, unshaking, firm’. In context here, I assume that it refers to the stable, fixed

elements of the cosmic world and the standard subjects of poetry. This may implicitly contrast with *nāvyaḥ* ‘anew’, sketching the usual tension between the poet’s desire to produce a new song and the fact that his topics are preordained.

This category of possible *atasī* poetic topics is then exemplified by the sun in pāda d — a subject that, despite its greatness, does not match the greatness of Indra. This interpretation of cd follows Old; Ge switches the objects of participle and main verb, taking *svār* with *ānaśuḥ* and *mahimānam* with *gr̥ṇāntaḥ*: “Denn noch nicht haben die, welchen seine indrische Grösse besingen, die Sonne erreicht.” Although word order is hardly a reliable guide to RVic interpretation, the adjacency of pāda-initial *svār gr̥ṇāntaḥ* weakly favors the Old interpretation, which also makes more sense.

VIII.3.17: Ge takes *parāvātaḥ* in b with the second hemistich (“aus der Ferne komme...”), but the idiom \sqrt{yuj} + ablative (“yoke out of X,” that is, hitch up your horses and come from...) is found elsewhere; cf. esp. I.48.7 *eṣāyukta parāvātaḥ, sūryasyodāyanād ādhi* “This one has hitched herself up from out of the distance, from (the place of) the rising of the sun” (also I.115.4, V.87.4, VII.60.3, 75.4, X.94.12, etc.).

On *hī* with the imperative, marking that clause as the causal basis for the following imperative clause, see Brereton 2012.

VIII.3.18: Most assign *vāvaśúḥ* to $\sqrt{vaś}$ ‘desire’ (e.g., Ge “diese deine Dichter ... verlangen...”; so also Gr, Lub), but I take it to $\sqrt{vāś}$ ‘bellow’. Kü (477–80) allows both possibilities, though he argues that the original affiliation of the pf. stem *vāvaś-* was to $\sqrt{vāś}$, though it may have become partially co-opted by $\sqrt{vaś}$ by semantic overlap. I have opted for $\sqrt{vāś}$ because this hymn contains a number of instances of noise-making by poets or their substitutes: 3d *abhī ... anūṣata*, 7c *sām asvaran*, 16d *asvaran*, in addition to the usual verbs of singing and praising. Notice also the very parallel 5cd ... *havāmahe ... dhānasya sātāye*, with a verb of calling and X *sātāye*.

VIII.3.19–20: The preverb *nīḥ* is the theme of this pragātha, with seven occurrences, six pāda-initial, in eight pādas, with a variety of different verbs.

VIII.3.20: The apparent 2nd sg. verb *kṛṣé* in this pāda (pāda repeated at VIII.32.3) is morphologically problematic. One likely interpr. is as a truncated 2nd sg. pf. (implied by Lub’s placement of the form right after *cakṛṣe*), rather than as a nonce root pres. form, per Wh (Roots), Macd (VGS). Cf. VIII.63.8 *cakṛṣé tāni paúṃsyā* with pf., very like our *kṛṣé tád indra paúṃsyam*. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr. “... did you perform.” But it is difficult to see why the truncation happened; of course, opening with two light syllables is disfavored, but, as VIII.63.8 shows, it does not block the use of such a form there. A different possible explan. is as a predicated infinitive, an interpr. tentatively fld. by Kü (431 and 791, contra Old ad loc. [who is otherwise indecisive]). Unfortunately in this passage an interpr. “this manly act is to be done” does not fit well with the immed. preceding announcement of the act already done (*adhamah* c), but it does conform better in VIII.32.3, where it follows an impv. Which of the alternatives one favors depends on part on which context one considers the principal one. The other question that *kṛṣé* raises is whether it is the same as the three unaccented forms in X.49.7, 40.5–6. My feeling is that they are independent (and possibly independent of each other), but see comm. ad loc.

VIII.3.21: On the mixture of divine and human subjects, see comm. on VIII.2.40–41.

VIII.3.23: The son of Tugra is Bhujyu, a client of the Aśvins, whom they rescue with birds or winged steeds – a tale alluded to especially in the Kakṣivant hymns (e.g., I.116.3–5, 117.14).

VIII.3.24: This final vs. of the dānastuti has the form of a priamel, with a series of listed alternatives presented as foil to the last and best. This figure is quite at home in praise-poetry, and this particular ex. was identified as a priamel by Watkins in Dragon (115–16).

Although Ge (n. ad X.61.1) takes *ojodāḥ* as a neut. despite its apparent masc. form, Scar (204 n. 279) is more likely correct that it is being used as a noun here.

VIII.4 Indra

VIII.4.3: *apā* is one of the few singular forms of the *áp-* ‘water’ stem.

On *īriṇa-* as ‘salt-pocket’, see EWA s.v., citing esp. Falk, *Bruderschaft*.

VIII contains two other occurrences of *āpítvá-*, both clearly derived from *āpí-* ‘friend’ and meaning ‘friendship’ (VIII.20.22, 21.13), but the presence of the temporal designation *prapítvá-* here suggests a similar temporal analysis, *ā-pítvá-*. It is surely a pun, as indicated in the publ. tr.

As noted in my 1982 article on the structure of RVic similes (IJ 24, p. 30), the *yáthā* clause here unusually introduces a clausal simile or pseudo-simile, against the hundreds of similes in the text that only match nominals. However, the *yáthā* clause here still fulfills one of its standard functions, of providing a model for an action we wish to see the god or gods perform.

VIII.4.4: Pāda c refers to Indra’s stealing of his father Tvaṣṭar’s soma right after birth — the drinking of which made him immediately strong. See III.48.4, etc.

VIII.4.5: The image of warriors holding themselves down “like trees” belongs more to the Maruts’ rhetorical realm, where all natural phenomena bend before their storm (see nearby VIII.7.34). Vs. 10c below contains another image fully intelligible only in a Marut context.

VIII.4.6: The subject shifts without overt signaling from Indra to the man who ritually serves Indra. Indra himself features in the verse as the *yavīyudh-* ‘ever-battling’ one, who is worth a thousand others.

prāvargá- is found in the RV only here, but cannot be separated from *suprāvargám* (which I tr. ‘well in advance’) in VIII.22.18 *suprāvargám suvīryam* (cf. our *prāvargám ... suvīrye*). There is also *dāsá-pravarga-* in I.92.8, which I tr. ‘with alien-slaves as its forelock’. The *prā- ... kṛṇute* also reminds us of vs. 5a *prā cakre* ‘put forward’. It is difficult to arrive at a consensus translation for these forms; although all share the sense that the item in question is in front, it is difficult to assess the contribution of the *-vargá-* element (much less what connection it might or might not have with the Pravargya

ritual). My “with a good twist” was an attempt to render the root value of $\sqrt{v\check{r}j}$ (cf. *suvṛktī-*), but I am not now sure that it was a happy choice.

VIII.4.7: The logical connection between pādas c and d can be variously interpreted (see Ge n.). In my view pāda c expresses the desire that Indra should in short order perform a great deed that we can witness, rather than the usual bland notion that we wish to celebrate his previous great deeds. Since Indra regularly aids Turvaśa and Yadu (e.g., I.54.6), we may desire to see them (pāda d) because under those circumstances we are likely to encounter Indra doing such deeds.

VIII.4.8: Pāda a contains one of the two occurrences of *sphigī-* ‘hip’ in the RV (and in fact anywhere). The other is in III.32.11 in a thematically similar passage, *yād anyāyā sphigyā kṣām āvasthāḥ* “... when you wore the earth on the other hip.” (See comm. there.) It is difficult not to assume that the same situation is being depicted in this passage, and I therefore supply ‘earth’ here as well, esp. since a tr. without an object makes little sense (e.g., Ge’s “Der Bulle deckte seine linke Seite,” without further interpretation). In III.32.11 the image serves to give a comparison by which to measure Indra’s vast size (the preceding pāda says “Heaven did not come close to your greatness then”). Despite the truncated expression in our passage, I think the same comparative impulse applies: Indra is so big that the whole earth fits on one of his hips.

Pāda b is then thematically contrastive, though in a very indirect way. Even though he is so vast and, by implication, too important to concern himself with the likes of us, he gives freely and without feeling peevish towards the petty recipients of his largesse. This sets the stage for our invitation to him in cd, describing the soma mixed with milk (or rather, the reverse in this case: the milk mixed with the honey[ed soma]) and then urging him to come.

VIII.4.9: This verse returns to the theme of vs. 6, the prosperity of a man who has Indra on his side. The only difficult phrase is *śvātrabhājā vāyasā*, which Ge takes as referring to a particular age in the life of a man: “Er steht jederzeit in dem Alter, in dem man die Vollkraft besitzt.” Although *vāyas-* can refer to a vigorous time of life, it generally means simply ‘vigor’ itself, and I also find it hard to make *sacate* + INSTR mean “steht ... in.” I think that it simply refers to the waxing prosperity and strength of the man in question.

VIII.4.10: As noted in the intro., this verse forms a ring with vss. 3–4: 3a/10a the buffalo at the waterhole, 4d/10d Indra’s assumption of power (... *dadhiṣe sāhaḥ*).

Pāda c with *niméghamānaḥ* ‘pissing down’ fits a Marut context better than an Indraic one, and the other occurrence of this form (II.34.13) does in fact refer to the Maruts and the rain they produce. See 5d above for another motif borrowed from a Marut context. In this passage the product is presumably metaphorically the gifts that Indra showers down. On the root behind this participle, see comm. ad II.34.13.

VIII.4.12: The last pāda echoes 8d, with the same three abrupt imperatives in the same order: *éhi (prá) dravā píba*, but in 12d the initial *tásya* needs to be construed with the final imperative *píba*. On this as a quasi-serial-verb construction, see Yates 2014 [UCLA conf. vol.]. On the sandhi of *tásya* + *éhi* as *tásyéhi* (not **tásyaíhi*), see Old ad loc. and ad I.9.1.

VIII.4.13: On the basis of *bradhnásya viṣṭápam* (VIII.69.7, IX.113.10) I supply *viṣṭápam* here as well. In these contexts *bradhná-* ‘coppery’ refers to soma (see Old). For further disc. of the phrase see comm. ad VIII.69.7.

VIII.4.14: *apásu* is supposed to be the only RVic ex. of a loc. pl. to an *s*-stem in *-asu* < **as-su*, corresp. to Aves. *-ahu*.

VIII.4.16: Pāda d is, one way or another, an improper relative, in that there is no referent for the *yám* in the main clause. Ge’s ‘wenn’ suggests that he takes *yám* as standing for *yád*. I am assuming the ellipsis of a *ca*, for a “X and which Y” construction.

VIII.4.17: See the intro. for speculation about the social situation here. Pajra Sāman produces his own *dānastuti* in VIII.6.47, and our poet seems to be both denying any interest in Pajra’s windfall and declaring Pajra’s duty to compose his own thanks for it. See also Old’s extensive note on this passage.

The sequence *vémi ... ṛñjase* is reminiscent of VI.15.1 b ... *ṛñjase ... / c véti*. In that passage because of the lack of accent *ṛñjase* must be a *-se* 1st sg. (and therefore with a diff. subject from *véti*). On *ṛñjase* see comm. ad IV.8.1. In the passage here the publ. tr. follows Gr’s interpr. of the form as an *s*-stem dat. inf. (so also, e.g., Ge). However it is possible that it is also a *-se* 1st sg., but accented because it opens a new clause: “I pursue you, Pūṣan; I aim (towards you).” On the other hand, and probably decisively, the parallel pāda b *vémi stótave* also has a dat. inf. as complement of *vémi* and so the infinitive reading should stand.

VIII.4.18: Here the singer seems to be implicitly separating his own (newly acquired) cows from the alien ones of Pajra mentioned in 17 (*nítyaṃ réknaḥ* “our own legacy” 18b, *āraṇaṃ hí tát* “for that is alien” 17c) and driving them to a different pasture. For the driving see vs. 20.

VIII.4.19: Here the desire expressed in 7d, to see Turvaśa (and Yadu), is realized in imagination: the largesse of the king is so extensive that the poet feels he himself is in company with the favored Turvaśa (and family). This returns us to the beginning of the hymn (vss. 1–2), where Indra comes to various sacrificers, including Turvaśa (1d).

VIII.4.20: There is no consensus on the meaning or etymology of the hapax *nírmajām*; see EWA s.v. *nírmaj-*, with various reff. to KEWA; also Old ad loc. Scar does not comment on it, though at least by shape (though not by accent) it appears to be a root noun (presumed gen. pl. to a stem *nírmaj-*, though EWA allows possibility of *-majā*, and AiG II.1.220 lists it as *nírmajā* without further comment). The tr. ‘flawless’ is adopted from Old. Though it may not be possible to determine what the word means or where it comes from, as often it *is* possible to suggest a motive for its presence in the passage: the phonological figure (*nír-*)*majāmaje*, *nír*.

VIII.4.21: The meaning of this verse is opaque to me. Perhaps the trees (and the rest of the landscape features) are enhanced by the presence of an abundance of cattle, indicating

that the owner (or controller) of the land is prosperous. Kü (p. 413) tr. essentially as I do, but (wisely) makes no comment.

VIII.5 Aśvins

VIII.5.1: *ásíśvitat* is an isolated verbal form; the stem is otherwise not attested. Gr identifies it as the “Aor. des Caus.,” and formally this is possible (type *atitrasat* ‘made terrified’ √*tras*). However, there is no trans./caus. **śvetáyati* to which it could have been generated, and there is no possible direct object in this passage to justify a trans./caus. reading. It is more likely a nonce intrans. redupl. aor. (type *apaptat* ‘flew’ √*pat*) created to substitute for the *s*-aor. *aśvait* (or the root aor. **aśvet* on which *aśvait* is built, acdg. to Narten), which would not fit the expected iambic cadence of dimeter verse. The *i* root vocalism of √*śvit* would account for the redupl. vowel, which would by chance coincide with the redupl. vowel expected for a causative aorist: short *i* before the initial cluster.

VIII.5.2: Ge and Re take *nṛvát* as standing for *nṛvátā*, on the basis of VI.62.10 *nṛvátā ráthēna*, but there seems no reason to do so, since the adverbial neut. *nṛvát* is well-attested.

VIII.5.3: The Pp. analyses the sequence *yáthohiṣe* as *yáthā ohīṣe*, which would be, to say the least, unusual sandhi (though see *tásyéhi* in VIII.3.12). Nonetheless, the context favors a connection with the root √*ūh* ‘solemnly proclaim, etc.’ with pres. *óha-* (in my opinion); cf. I.30.4 *vācas tād ... ohase* “I solemnly proclaim this speech,” with a 1st sg. *-se* form, as apparently also here. For this passage I assume a form *ūhiṣe*, built to the presential perf. *ūhé*. This is also Kü’s solution (488–89), though he assigns the form to √*vāh* ‘anerkennen’, which, acdg. to him, is at least synchronically separate from √*oh*. Re and Lub. assign the form instead to √*vah* ‘convey’. For further disc. cf. Old and Ge (n. 3c).

VIII.5.3–4: Both these vss., though not belonging to the same *ṛca*, most likely contain 1st sg. *-se* forms.

VIII.5.4: Note the three compounds beginning with *puru-* in ab.

I emend the accented nom. *kāṇvāsaḥ* to accentless **kaṇvāsaḥ*, thus avoiding the awk. “I shall praise (and also) the Kāṇvas (shall praise)” (so Re), or the necessity of taking *stuṣé* as an infinitive. Nearby VIII.7.32 has *#kāṇvāsaḥ ... /#stuṣé ...*, with a pāda-init. accented voc. *kāṇvāsaḥ* (cf. also VIII.2.38, and with nom. VIII.4.2, VIII.6.31), and the accent here may have been acquired redactionally on these models. By my interpr. “I” (the poet, who is himself a Kāṇva) announces to his fellow Kāṇvas that he is invoking the Aśvins “for *our* help” (*na ūtáye*); the 1st pl. enclitic *naḥ* encompasses the poet himself and those addressed in the voc.

VIII.5.5: Here and in the repeated pāda VIII.22.3d I think *gántārā* may, but need not, be interpr. as a periphrastic future. There are enough possible exx. in the RV that Macdonell’s statement (VGS, p. 177) that there are no certain examples in the Saṃhitās needs reexamination.

VIII.5.6: With Ge and Re I (reluctantly) supply imperative ‘give’ in ab. It is barely possibly (but I think unlikely) that *ukṣatam* in c is a pun, belonging to √*ukṣ* ‘sprinkle’ in c, but √*vakṣ/ukṣ* ‘increase’ in ab, with the meaning “increase good wisdom for the pious man.” (Kiehnle 1979: 152 takes it to ‘increase’ in the whole vs.) Unfortunately there are no certain exx. of the act. suffix-accented stem *ukṣāti* to √*vakṣ* ‘increase’ (though see med. part. *ukṣāmāṇa-* and isolated root-accented part. *úḁsant-*), and even if so, we would probably expect them to be intrans., at least on the basis of pf. *vaváḁṣa*, etc., and the just cited pres. forms.

The hapax *ávitāriṇī-* is clearly derived from *ví√tṛ*, but its meaning is variously rendered. Gr (Sāy) ‘enduring, lasting’, Ge “die nicht auf sich warten lässt” (doesn’t keep (s.o.) waiting), on the basis of X.34.6. However, I take that passage in the Gambler hymn to mean ‘run counter’ (adopting the tr. of Macdonell), or more pointedly ‘doublecross’, the tr. I use here, though something like ‘thwart’ would convey the sense of this idiom as well.

VIII.5.8: The acc. phrases *tisráḁ parāvátah*, *divó víśvāni rocanā*, and *trīm̐r aktūn* are all accusatives of extent and presented as if they were parallel; the specification ‘three’ in the first and last underlines this supposed parallelism. But the first two express extent of space and the third extent of time. A better tr. might be “you fly around the three far distances (and? see below) all the luminous realms of heaven *for* or *during* three nights. I do not know what “three nights” refers to: there is no parallel locution elsewhere and the standard tr. do not comment. It may simply reflect the common association of the Áśvins with triplets of various sorts. See esp. I.34, which does have a roughly similar expression: I.34.7 *trīḁ ... divé-dive* “Three times, day after day ...” As for the first two accusative phrases, the *rocanā(ni)* are regularly qualified as ‘three’, so “all the luminous realms” may be synonymous with immediately preceding “the three far distances” (a phrase also found in I.34.7 and VIII.32.22).

VIII.5.9: Re (explicitly) and Ge (implicitly) supply as the verb of ab *volḁhám* ‘convey’ from 10c. This is not impossible, and the duplication of some vocabulary (9a *gómatīr íṣa(ḁ)*: 10 *gómantam ... rayím ... áśvāvatir íṣaḁ*) may favor it. But the two verses belong to different *ṛcas*, a fact that should disfavor such automatic filling in the blanks. I in fact think that ab can be construed with c. That *pāda* asks the gods to “unfasten” the paths (*ví patháḁ ... sitam*), in other words, to make the way clear, for winning (*sātáye*). The dat. infinitive *sātáye* frequently takes an accusative of what is to be won (among many exx., cf., e.g., IX.88.2 *purūṇi sātáye vásūni*). I see no reason why the accusatives of ab cannot be the object of this infinitive; with the acc. in b, *sātīḁ*, we would have not only a cognate accusative construction, but one involving two forms of the same stem. Alternatively the accusatives in ab could serve as objects of *ví ... sitam*, thus parallel to *patháḁ*. Cf. VIII.23.29, where both accusatives found here are the objects of *ápā vṛdhi* ‘uncover’, semantically similar to *ví ... sitam*: VIII.23.29bc *tvám no gómatīr íṣaḁ / mahó rāyáḁ sātīm agne ápā vṛdhi* “Uncover for us refreshments consisting of cows and the winning of great wealth, o Agni.” Hence in our passage “(Unfasten) refreshments and winnings; unfasten the paths for winning.” See further disc. ad vs. 21 below, which lends additional support to the 2nd alternative.

The epithet *aharvíd-* (4x, twice in this hymn) can contain either \sqrt{vid} ‘know’ or \sqrt{vid} ‘find’. Ge (and Gr) opt for the former, with Ge generalizing it to ‘Zeitkenner’. Scar (480–81) considers either possible, though his tr. reflect the former. In I.2.2 and I.156.4 I choose ‘know’, because both passages seem to involve knowledge of the ritual day, but esp. in the latter I recognize the possibility of ‘find’. (See comm. thereon.) By contrast the publ. tr. of this hymn has ‘find’ for both occurrences. I do not feel strongly either way, but since this hymn begins with the Ásvins accompanying Dawn (vss. 1–2) and the immediately preceding vs. (8) has a mention of their traversing the nights, I mildly favor ‘find’, expressing the Ásvins’ advent in the early morning, bringing the daylight with them. Note also *svarvidā* ‘finders of the sun’ of the Ásvins in nearby VIII.8.7. This latter well-attested cmpd. seems universally to be analysed as containing ‘find’, not ‘know’; cf. Scar 491–92.

VIII.5.12: The voc. *vājinīvasū* recurs here from 3a; in both verses it is immediately preceded by a heavy dat. pronoun, the near-rhyming *yuvābhyām* and *asmābhyam*. Its other two occurrences in this hymn (vss. 19, 30) are not so structured.

“Shelter that cannot be cheated (/deceived)” (see also VIII.85.5) is a striking and somewhat opaque expression, since *ādābhya-* usually modifies animate beings (generally gods) who aren’t gullible. I assume that the intention is shelter that can’t be breached by trickery, vel sim., but the context of neither passage gives us any help.

VIII.5.13: The Pp. analyses *yāviṣṭam* as *yā áviṣṭam*, with the latter an injunc. *-iṣ-*aor. to \sqrt{av} ‘help, favor’. Ge accepts this analysis and Re is sympathetic; however, Old dismisses it, taking *yāviṣṭam* rather to \sqrt{yu} ‘unite’, as the verbal counterpart (with initial preverb *nī*) of the common noun *nīyūt-* ‘team’. This analysis is already found in Gr and is vigorously defended by Narten (Sig. Aor. 212). One argument against the Pp. interpr. is the fact that this would produce an unambiguous embedded relative clause, and these are rare to non-existent in the RV.

VIII.5.14: The partitive gen. with *pibatam* consists of the phrase *asyá ... mādasya cāruṇaḥ* / *mādhvaḥ rātāsya*, rendered in the publ. tr. (sim. Ge) as “of “this dear exhilarating drink, of the honey bestowed,” which faithfully represents the hemistich boundary. However, it also construes the adj. *cāruṇaḥ* with masc. *mādasya*, though *u*-stem sg. oblique forms with interposed *-n-* should of course only be neut. This is in fact the only certain ex. of such a masc. form given by Lanman (Noun inflec., 410). There are several ways to avoid this undesirable morphological analysis. The least attractive is to take *māda-* here as adjectival, but this exceptionally well-attested stem is otherwise only a noun. The other two possibilities are better. On the one hand, the rest of the gen. phrase includes the neut. noun *mādhvaḥ*, and *cāruṇaḥ* can be construed with it: “of this exhilarating drink, of the dear honey ...” The drawback is that this artificially splits the gen. in b and reads part of it across the hemistich boundary. Perhaps the best solution is suggested by the other four occurrences of *cāruṇaḥ*, which always modifies *amṛtasya* ‘(drink) of immortality’, with the nominalized *amṛta-* neuter (IV.70.2, 4; 108.4; 100.4, always in the order *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ*, pāda-final as here). I suggest we read *cāruṇaḥ* here as representing that phrase and tr. “of this exhilarating drink, of the dear (drink of immortality), of the honey ...”

VIII.5.19: I don't really understand why the skin-bag of honey is set in the chariot-rut. One might think of the English expression "grease the skids," except that the Áśvins are meant to drink out of it.

VIII.5.20: The referent of *téna* 'with it' is not clear. Although the verse sequence might suggest the skin-bag of vs. 19, the chariot makes more sense, and in 30a, where *pāda* a is repeated, it does seem to refer to the chariot or parts thereof.

VIII.5.21: This vs. is structured very like vs. 9, presenting some of the same syntactic problems, but in a somewhat clearer fashion. The first two *pādas*, *utá no divyā íṣa, utá síndhūmr̥ aharvidā* are identical to 9ab *utá no gómatīr íṣa, utá sātīr aharvidā*, save for the adj. modifying *íṣaḥ* in a and the acc. pl. found in b. Recall that Ge and Re supply a verb (*volhám*) for ab, separating those *pādas* from c. Some support for their position might be found in the larger context of vs. 21: the immediately preceding *pāda*, 20c, contains *váhatam* with a variant *íṣaḥ* object ("fat," not "heavenly"). So it could be possible to read 21ab as a continuation of the VP in 20c, giving support to Ge/Re, who supply a verb from the same root (\sqrt{vah}) to govern the identically structured 9ab. But Ge happily takes ab as the obj. of the verb in 21c, *ápa ... varṣathaḥ* 'you two will open up' (*s*-aor. subjunctive to \sqrt{vr} 'cover, obstruct'). As was noted ad vs. 9, *ápa* \sqrt{vr} 'uncover, open up' is semantically very like *ví* $\sqrt{sā}$ 'unfasten', and if refreshments can be the object of the first, this should also be possible for the second.

varṣathaḥ is the only *s*-aor. form to \sqrt{vr} in all of Sanskrit. It is very possible that it was created for this passage because the resulting syllable *varṣ* evokes the root $\sqrt{vrṣ}$ 'rain', which would be appropriate for the liquids that are its objects in ab. Re also remarks on this word play.

VIII.5.22: The subjunctive *pátāt* seems to be used in an unusual past prospective sense in this mythological context. This may be an English problem, however. Since the verb of the main clause is injunc. *vidhat*, this context is not necessarily preterital, but "timeless," and the subjunctive can therefore be expressing pure future modality. The fact that the next verse is also mythological and contains an undoubted present tense form *daśasyathaḥ* shows that mythological tense is fluid here. Re remarks (ad vs. 23) that the indifference between present and preterite underlines the reflection of the current human situation in the legendary material.

VIII.5.24: *susastībhiḥ* in *pāda* b is taken by Ge (also Gr) as modifying *ūtībhiḥ* in *pāda* a ("mit diesen löblichen Hilfen"; Ge takes *nāvyasībhiḥ* as adverbial "aufs neue"), but this requires *susastī-* to be adjectival. However, almost all occurrences of this stem -- and all seven other instr. -- are nouns ('good laud')(and see nominal *susṭutīm* 'good praise', identically formed and nearly synonymous, in 30c below). Although in Gāyatrī the b-*pāda* more regularly construes with the a-*pāda*, it is not out of the question for it to go with c instead. In this case the instr. phrase of b goes well with c, and it would only represent one constituent fronted before the subordinating *yád*.

VIII.5.28: This vs., like the almost identical IV.46.4, is syntactically somewhat ragged: the beginning of pāda c, *ā hí sthāthaḥ*, should ideally be the beginning of the clause, given the fronted preverb and the *hí*. But the object occupies all of ab (and the end of c).

VIII.5.29: The syntactic disorder continues here. The main clause corresponding to vs. 28 is vs. 30; this intermediate verse, the middle one of the *tr̥ca*, is an elaborate nominal sentence couched entirely in the nominative and functions as an extensive parenthesis further specifying the features of the chariot found in 28a (in the acc.).

On *ubhā cakrā* “both wheels,” with apparent neut. pl. for expected du *cakré* see comm. ad X.10.8.

VII.5.31: The sense of this vs. is a little odd: it sounds as if the Aśvins on their journey are snacking on the comestibles they are bringing to us and we will only get the scraps. This is not the usual way to urge the gods to bring us things and makes the Aśvins sound mingy. Perhaps the point is rather that there are so many (*pūrvīḥ*) refreshments that there’s enough for everyone? Ge compares 19c, which does not seem similar to me.

VIII.5.33: The publ. tr. “feathered birds, frothing at the mouth” is, to say the least, inelegant and perhaps unintelligible. What I think is meant: the birds are compared to horses (or the horses to birds); *pruṣitāpsavaḥ* ‘frothing at the mouth’ qualifies the underlying horses and indicates their speed. Cf. the overt horses in V.75.6 *áśvāsaḥ pruṣitāpsavaḥ*, VIII.87.5 *áśvebhiḥ pruṣitāpsubhiḥ* (both Aśvin hymns)(latter =VIII.13.11 [Indra]).

VIII.5.34: The hapax *-gāyas-* (a hapax) in *ánugāyasam-* is generally taken as a primary *s-* stem to the diphthongal root $\sqrt{gā}^i$; see Whitney (Roots), AiG II.2.235, EWA s.v. $\sqrt{G\bar{A}}^2$. The contextual question is what is following what. For Ge the song is sounding after/following the chariot (“Gesang schallt eurem Wagen nach”), but most *ánu-* compounds have the structure “following X,” where X is the 2nd member (e.g., *ánu-patha-* ‘following/along the path’; with diff. accent *anu-kāmá-* ‘following/according to desire’). I therefore think the chariot is following the song; in other words, it is making its way to the ritual ground, drawn to the song being sung there. Rather like the modern expression “follow the money.”

Pāda b seems to be a clear embedded relative clause -- or else, at least as I have punctuated it, a parenthesis.

The point of c seems to be that the wheel doesn’t knock against the chariot no matter how fast it moves. Such knocking presumably would be a problem with wheels that were not securely fastened to their axle and well balanced, so the Aśvin’s chariot is, not surprisingly, well constructed.

VIII.5.36: With Sāy I take the wakeful wild beast to be soma. The obj. of \sqrt{svad} is regularly an oblation, and in IX.105.1 its object, soma, is compared to a *śísu-*, the young of an animal or human.

vā in b cannot be the disjunctive ‘or’, as there is no disjunction possible. I take it as the short form of *iva* ‘like’ (with lengthening), as Ge also seems to (on the grounds of his “sozusagen”), marking the statement as an approximative. Old’s comment is not

entirely intelligible, but he seems rather to imply that *vā* expresses a strong positive, and I therefore assume he thinks it's a form of *vaí*, as do Re and Klein (DGRV II.201–2).

VIII.5.38: There is much disagreement on what to supply with *híryanasaṃdrśaḥ* and indeed on whether it modifies *rājñāḥ*, interpreted as an acc. pl. (see Ge n. 38ab). Since it seems unlikely that Kaśu gave the poet ten golden *kings*, even as figurines (*pace* Old), it seems best to take *rājñāḥ* as gen. sg. and supply another desirable golden item. Ge suggests garments, probably in part because of the hide-tanners? Hoffmann (Inj. 229 n. 227) points out that gold(-bedecked) horses are mentioned elsewhere in *dānastutis*, and I follow him in the publ. tr. However, given how prominently gold figures in the description of chariots in this hymn (vss. 28–29, 35; cf. also 11), ‘chariots’ might be a better choice.

The apparently contemptuous ‘hide-tanning’ (*carmamnāḥ*) must be a way of indicating that, in comparison with Kaśu, all men hereabouts are no better than tanners: ignoble, low, and engaged in dirty and polluting activity. But perhaps there's just a whiff of a suggestion that Kaśu has enough cows to furnish work for many tanners -- and therefore he should be more generous with these cows to his poet.

VIII.5.39: Like many *dānastutis*, this one seems to have a bit of sting in its praise. The poet *seems* at first to be saying that the Cedis are so lavish in their giving that no one else could follow them, but the 2nd half of the verse warns that all it would take for another man to receive more praise than Kaśu is to give more. Although the *mā* prohibitive of ab is technically applied to other men (“let no one go ...”), it's really an implicit challenge to Kaśu: he can only stop others from going on his path by always giving the most.

VIII.6 Indra

VIII.6.1: The rel. clause in ab appears to be of the embedded *izafe* type, but more elaborate than most such examples.

Displaced *iva* in b; we might expect **parjánya iva vṛṣṭimān*, which would also be metrically acceptable.

VIII.6.2: The publ. tr. takes *pāda a* as a nominal sentence with a predicated present participle (*píprataḥ*), a fairly rare but not unprecedented construction. This has two advantages: 1) it provides the verse with a main clause, 2) it avoids an anomalous position for *yád*. However, since *yád* is also badly positioned in 3a and 8b, the second observation may not be an argument. See remarks on 8 below.

VIII.6.7: The co-occurrence of a 1st pl. verb (*abhí prá ṇonumaḥ*) and nom. pl. *imāḥ ... dhītāyaḥ* causes some interpretational difficulties. Ge takes initial *imāḥ* as an accusative plural object with the verb in *pāda a* (“Diese stimmen wir auf (dich) an”), separating it from *dhītāyaḥ* in b, and interprets *pādas bc* together as a nominal clause. This would rescue the word order, but an accusative with *√nu* is almost always the goal of the roaring (and this exact phrase *abhí prá ṇonumaḥ* occurs a number of other times), not the contents of the roar, as an obj. *imāḥ* would require (but see comm. on I.6.6). I prefer to take the

insights as identified with ourselves, both subjects of *abhí prá √ nu*. Old also suggests this identification, which is also found in vs. 8.

With *vipām āgreṣu* compare IX.99.1 *vipām āgre*. There are 43 occurrences of sg. *āgre* and one of pl. *āgreṣu*; it seems unlikely that the number is significant here, but simply used to supply an extra syllable.

In c Ge sees two similes, “like the flame of fire, (like) missiles,” but I think the latter is not used as a comparison but an identification, just as in 3c the Kaṇvas praises are called their “familial weapon” (*jāmí ... āyudham*).

The simile marker *ná* is again misplaced; we would expect **agnér ná śocīḥ*.

VIII.6.8: See comments on 7ab. The identification of the Kaṇvas and their *dhītí* is quite clear here.

Another example of anomalously positioned *yád*, like 2b and 3a. In fact this verse is structured entirely parallel to vs. 2: participial phrase in pāda a, *prá yád* opening b followed by an injunctive in *-anta* and a nom. pl. subj *-i*-stem, c nom. pl. referring to poets followed by *ṛtásya* INSTR. phrase.

VIII.6.10–12: This *ṛca* is characterized by emphatic pronominals: initial *ahám* 10a, 10c, 11a; *tvām* 12a; *máma* 12c.

VIII.6.10: Ge explains the form of *ājani* as “attraction to the simile” (that is, 3rd ps. instead of 1st ps.), but although obviously there is no 1st sg. passive aorist, if there were to be, this is what it would be. More problematic is the logical connection of ab with c. Ge thinks that the rebirth is “durch die Erleuchtung”; I assume he means that the acquisition of knowledge and the resulting illumination caused the poet to be reborn like the sun. But the sun is reborn every day, and the passing of knowledge from father to son presumably happens once or a few times at most -- although, if the father is the son’s teacher, it might be a daily event.

VIII.6.12: The 2 occurrences of *tuṣṭuvūḥ* are standardly interpr. as preterital (“... gepreisen haben”; see Ge and Kü [578], as well as the publ. tr.), but the context does not impose this value, and the existence of an augmented plupf. *átuṣṭavam* (III.53.12) with the same apparent meaning is disturbing. It is therefore possible that the verbs here should be rendered “... who do not praise you ... who do praise you.” The existence of a pf. subj. in a nearby hymn, *tuṣṭávat* in VIII.8.16, also supports a presential interpr. of this pf.

Pāda c contains an ellipsis: we expect an instr. here, as in VIII.1.18 *ayā vardhasva tanvā girā máma*. The appropriate word can either be extracted from the proleptic adj. *súṣtutaḥ* “by my (praise) (so that you become) well praised” (as well as the two forms of *tuṣṭuvūḥ* in ab) or, less likely, *pratnéna mánmanā* in 11a.

VIII.6.13: The accented *aírayat* in c raises questions. It is natural to interpret c as the main clause, in which case we must assume a preverb *ā* with an unaccented *airayat* (see Old ad I.157.5). This is possible semantically and syntactically, but the Pp. does not so analyze. Alternatively we could take all of vs. 13 as a subordinate clause (“when his battle-fury smoked ... (and) he sent ...”) dependent on the main clause in vs. 14, but this

is not attractive, because it not only requires a switch from 3rd ps. to 2nd, but it also yokes together two otherwise independent myths.

VIII.6.16: Ge takes the footsteps or feet in c to be those of Indra's horses, but on the basis of I.32.8 *tāsām āhiḥ patsutaḥśīr babhūva* "The serpent came to be lying at the feet of those (waters)" it should rather be the waters' feet or footsteps. What these are conceptually is not clear – perhaps deeper pools in the riverbeds? – but the parallel is clear, and furthermore Indra's horses take no part in the Vṛtra myth.

VIII.6.18: This verse is structured entirely parallel to vs. 12 and thus forms a small ring that does not conform to the tṛca structure. On *tuṣṭuvūḥ* see comm. on vs. 12.

VIII.6.19: *enām* in c would be the only accented form of the ordinarily enclitic pronominal stem *ena-*. See Old's lengthy discussion of possibilities and previous suggestions, although he does not reach a definite conclusion. My interpretation is one that Old also seems to favor, that *enām* stands for the independent adverbial instrumental *enā* 'thus, in this way' (an idea in different form that goes back to Hopkins). As he points out, in the position before *r* this would probably come out as *enām̐* with *anunāsika* (Proleg. 470), and the redactional conversion of this to a "real" *m*, esp. in a feminine context, would not be surprising. This adverb *enā* is quite often, though not invariably, pāda-initial. See esp. semantically parallel III.33.4 *enā vayām pāyasā pīnvamānāḥ* "So we (are) -- swelling with milk ..." For *pipyūṣī-* construed with the genitive, see vs. 43b below, *mādhora ghr̥tāsya pipyūṣīm*.

VIII.6.20: The first problem in this verse is what to do with *āsā*. Ge construes it with *prasvāḥ* "Die ... durch den Mund gebärend...", and it would also be possible to take it with *ācakrīran*, as Old seems to imply, yielding "with their mouth they have made you their child." In either case this would require that 'mouth' is equivalent to the products of mouth, namely noise, and that the bellowing of the cows, which stands for the poets' insights, is the instrumental cause. This is not impossible; indeed *āsā* sometimes refers to poetic speech. But I suggest instead that *āsā gārbha-* is an idiom, "infant-by-mouth," that is, nursling, and that they are nurturing him directly.

Pāda c is puzzling, in part because it lacks both a verb and both parts of the frame that should match the simile *dhārmeva sūryam*. The verb is the easiest: the preverb *pāri* invites us to supply a form of *√as* 'be', in the standard idiom 'surround, envelop'. Ge's reconstruction of the frame also seems the most likely: the subject continues to be the cows/insights of vss. 19 and 20ab, the object 'you' [=Indra]. They surround/envelop him in a nurturing, maternal manner. But the image in the simile is very different: I do not know of other places in which the sun is surrounded or enveloped in this fashion or what "supports" could be involved. If they are in fact the "supports (of heaven)," as seems at least reasonable, it is possible to envision the sun operating within a space defined by these supports – though, again, this does not seem to be a RVic notion elsewhere. See Old for other, not particularly plausible, scenarios. As indicated in the publ. intro., the translation given is very uncertain.

VIII.6.22: The position of the *utā* is abnormal, as it most naturally connects the two nominatives *prāśastiḥ* and *yajñāḥ*. See Klein DGRV I.434–45. The *utā*'s of 23b and 24a are correctly positioned.

VIII.6.25: The lexeme *abhí√tan* has the idiomatic meaning 'stretch over' and therefore 'extend control, dominate'. The image found in the simile (*vrajām nā*) is found exactly in the parallel IX.108.6, where the *vrajām* is not in a simile. Elsewhere (I.160.5, V.54.15) in the active it seems to mean 'stretch over' (and therefore dominate), and in a TS passage adduced by HO (III.4.6.2) Keith transl 'overpower', which seems right in context.

Here the question is the referent of the object in the frame, *sūra upākācakṣasam* "whose eye is near to the sun." Ge supplies "Schatz" and thinks it refers to gold, which is "near to the sun" in its color and also (hyperbolically) its value. This is quite possible, but Agni is also found in just these expressions, e.g., IV.11.1 *upākā ā rocate sūryasya*, and of course Agni is often identified as the sun. The "gold" interpretation is probably correct, however, since the idea would be that Indra controls goods and therefore can distribute them to us; what Indra's control over Agni would amount to is less clear. Note the independent gen. *sūrāḥ* dependent on the first member of the compound *upākā-*.

Because the verb of c is a subjunctive, which would clash with the preterital perfect of ab, I take c with the following verse, whose present tense verbs are more compatible with a subjunctive.

VIII.6.26–27: Vs. 26 (and if I am right, 25c) are both dependent on vs. 27 by my reading.

VIII.6.28–30: The translation of this *ṛca* is superficially easy, but its interpretation is difficult. Ge takes 28 as referring to soma, 29 to Indra (or 29ab to Indra and 29c to soma; it's not entirely clear), while Old emphatically rejects Ge and takes Indra as the referent of both verses. Neither of them is entirely clear about the identity of the plural subjects of 30, though both think that the verse is a reference to the dawn and/or the dawn sacrifice.

I do not have a solution to these riddles, though I have some further suggestions. But before presenting them, I should first point out how different the style of this *ṛca* is from the rest of the hymn. There are no proper names in the verse, either divine or human; the reference is only 3rd person; there is no specific ritual vocabulary; the presentation is all descriptive, without even an implicit hint of the hortatory; there are no similes, though the imagery is strikingly poetic. The whole effect is almost allegorical, stripped of the busy specificity and the divine-human give-and-take that characterize the rest of the hymn and reappear emphatically in the next *ṛca*.

As often in the RV, I think some of the difficulties arise because two separate referents are present. On the one hand, the location of the birthplace of the poet in 28 suggests, as Ge says, that soma is the subject. Soma, esp. the celestial soma often encountered in Maṇḍala IX, could also be the subject of 29, looking down upon the sea of the earthly soma. But in both verses poetic inspiration could also be the subject, signaled by the two forms of *√vip*, *vīpraḥ* in 28c, *vīpānāḥ* in 29c, and by the emphasis on seeing in 29 and 30. The progression from birth with insight (28c) to quivering and stirring (29c) seems to describe first the germ of the poetic idea and then its development.

VIII.6.30: In 30 in a different image “they” (poets/sacrificers?) see “the dawning light of the age-old semen” – a baffling phrase. The “milk of the age-old semen” (*páyah prasnasya rétasah*) is found in III.31.10 in a Vala context, where it may refer to the poetic products that help open the Vala cave. Here it may refer to the even further development of the poetic insight, now fitted to a ritual context and available to be “seen” by the ritualists who will make use of it. But all this is highly speculative.

VIII.6.34: “Wooden” seems excluded for *vānanvatī* here. See VIII.1.31.

VIII.6.36: Note the phonetic figure *hāribhyām haryatābhyām*. See also VIII.12.25–28.

VIII.6.38: The publ. tr. of a and c may be difficult to parse in English: “after you (roll)...” does not contain a temporal conjunction (“after”) followed by a subject + verb, but rather a prepositional phrase (“after you,” that is, “following you”) followed by a verb with postposed subject (“both worlds” / “the drops”). It might be clearer if rephrased as “following you (roll) ...”

The isolated verb form *vartī* is, curiously, identified as an injunctive by Lub, despite the apparent primary ending. Gr considers it a development of **vart-tī*, which is phonologically possible. I don’t have a firmly founded analysis of it, but I wonder, since outside of the perfect, intransitive forms of \sqrt{vrt} are medial, if this is actually a “passive aorist,” which displays the expected strong form and *-i* ending, in which case Lub’s inj. label would be correct.

In c *svānāśah* is a pun: it can either be the nom. pl. m. of the mediopassive participle of the root aorist to \sqrt{su} ‘press’ or nom. pl. m. to the thematic nominal *svānā* ‘sounding, sound’. See VIII.7.14, 17.

VIII.6.39: I give *śaryaṇāvati* its literal meaning, deriving ultimately from *śarā-*, *śārya-* ‘reed, stick’, rather than taking it as a PN as Ge does, since in other places it seems to have literal content. On the analysis see Thieme *Unters.* p. 40 n. 2. But a PN, esp. in this context, is certainly possible.

VIII.6.41: On the sense of *coṣkūyā-* see Schaeffer (201); the action envisaged is poking or prodding a fire, extended to Indra’s poking more and more good things out to us.

VIII.6.44: *vímahi-* is a hapax, but presumably built to *vímahas-* (2x) and of fairly obvious meaning.

VIII.7 Maruts

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn contains dense repetitions of vocabulary and numerous phonetic echoes within and across verses. I have noted some, but by no means all, below. Particularly common in the earlier part of the hymn is the root $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘drive’, in both verbal and nominal forms (2b, 4c [2x], 5a, 7b, 8b; also 14b, 23a, 26b, 28c, 29c).

VIII.7.1: *triṣṭúbham íṣam* “Triṣṭubh refreshment” causes some interpretational difficulties. Although in RVic discourse there is no problem with an image that involves

refreshment conceived as metrical poetry, this hymn containing the phrase in its opening phrase is in Gāyatrī meter, not Triṣṭubh. The same phrase recurs in VIII.69.1 (Indra), a hymn that is also not in Triṣṭubh. Some remove the word here entirely from the poetic sphere, as in Macdonell's "threefold Soma draught." Ge believes that it can't refer to the Triṣṭubh *meter* here, but that it must be a different technical term in recitation. I do not think that the fact that these two hymns are not in Triṣṭubh necessarily means that that meter can't be referred to in this expression; there are, after all, plenty of hymns to both the Maruts and Indra in Triṣṭubh, and the verb governing the phrase is in the imperfect and therefore should refer to another occasion. But following Ge's lead, I think it possible that '(having?) threefold rhythm' could refer to the Gāyatrī meter in which this hymn is composed, since Gāyatrī consists of three pādas. Unfortunately this will not work for VIII.69, which is composed in a variety of meters (incl. Gāyatrī, but only vss. 4–6); the verse in which the phrase is found (VIII.69.1) is in Anuṣṭubh. I might emend the publ. tr. to "refreshment in threefold rhythm." For further on the compound see Scar (641–42), who is somewhat indecisive about both the compound type and the sense.

VIII.7.2: *ācidhvam* in b (see also the identical pāda in 14b) should be read with distracted final syllable (*ācidh^uvam*) in order to make up an 8-syllable pāda, but it also should ideally have a heavy root syllable in order to avoid four consecutive light syllables in the cadence. (Even though I do not believe that the cadences of dimeter verse are as regulated as those in trimeter, iambic cadences do prevail, and four shorts would be quite unusual.) Werba (183, flg. Seebold) suggests that the form represents **ācid-dh^uvam* to *√cit*, which seems very plausible (also for the identical distracted form in I.87.2; in V.55.7 it does not require distraction and is therefore not diagnostic). Gr assigns *ācidhvam* to *√ci*, which is nearly identical in meaning to *√cit*; Lubotsky, curiously, puts it with *√ci* 'pile'. The same type of cluster reduction is found in the Marut hymn VIII.20.18 in *vavṛdh^uvam*, which likewise requires distraction and a heavy root syllable and represents **vavṛd-dh^uvam* from *√vṛt* 'turn'.

VIII.7.3: I take *úd īrayanta* here as a reflexive transitive. It thus contrast with intransitive *úd ... īrate* in 7b.

See also comm. on vs. 10.

VIII.7.1–4: Note recycling of vocab. -- *īṣam* 1, 3; *pārvata-* 1, 2, 4; *yāmam* 2, 4; *vīp/vep* 1, 4; *vāyúbhiḥ* 3, 4.

VIII.7.4 *vāpanti* is also echoed by *vepayanti* in the next pāda, and the whole verse is marked by alliteration: *v*'s, *p*'s, and *r*'s in *vāpanti ... prá vepayanti párvatān*; *m*'s in *marúto mīham* (both sets in ab), and *y*'s in c: *yád yāmam yānti vāyúbhiḥ*.

VIII.7.5: The vs. consists only of a subordinate clause. I attach it to the preceding vs., since the *yád* clause of 4c seems parallel to the *yád* clause of 5 and *yāma-* recurs here. However, there is a change from 3rd ps. ref. in 4 to 2nd ps. in 5.

VIII.7.6: Each pāda of this vs. begins *yuṣmān*, picking up *śúṣmāya* in 5c.

VIII.7.7: Both *úd ... īrate* and *vāśrā-* echo vs. 3. There is an internal echo between *aruṇāpsavaḥ* (a) and *ṣṇūnā* (c).

VIII.7.8: Exactly what atmospheric phenomenon is being described here is not clear. Ge seems to think that it's the Maruts who are traveling the path (*pānthām ... yātave* “dass sie ihre Bahn laufe”), though his n. 8b seems closer to my interpr. I suggest that it is a post-storm image: the thunderclouds/Maruts part, releasing the sun's ray and allowing the sun to travel its usual path across the sky. The parting of the clouds is expressed in c, the extending or spreading of the clouds that is accompanied by the beams of the sun.

Thieme (Fremd. 112) instead sees the Maruts releasing a ray as the path for the sun to travel: the first ray of morning, which the sun follows. But the Maruts are not dawn gods.

Pāda c is repeated as the final pāda of the hymn (36c).

VIII.7.10: The stem *ṛśni-* in the plural otherwise refers to “dappled cows” and is marked (by pronouns and modifying adjectives) as feminine; see the immediate preceding hymn VIII.6.19, as well as VIII.69.3, I.84.11. Here, however, there are no diagnostically feminine forms syntactically associated with *ṛśnayaḥ*. This allows it to refer both to (fem.) dappled cows and to the (masc.) Maruts, whose mother is *Ṛśni*. Although the Maruts are regularly called “Rudras” after their father Rudra (e.g., 12b), this is the only place in the RV where they are called “*Ṛśnis*” after their mother. This verse reprises 3bc ... *ṛśnimātaraḥ / dhukṣānta pipyúśīm īsam* “They whose mother is *Ṛśni* have milked out swelling refreshment,” with the bahuvrīhi *ṛśnimātaraḥ* matched with *ṛśnayaḥ* here and *dhukṣānta* matching *duduhré*. The *ṛśnimātaraḥ* in 3b all but ensures that we will take *ṛśnayaḥ* here as a referent to the Maruts.

The referent of the three lakes they milk out as honey is the rain they produce.

VIII.7.12: Ge and Re (see his comm.) take *sudānavo, rūdrā ṛbhukṣaṇaḥ* as predicative vocatives with the copula expression *yūyām hí śthā* “for you are ...” This seems unnecessary, since there is a fine nominative plural, *ṛácetasah*, which can serve as predicate. I take the *utá* to be connecting not the supposed predicative vocc. with *ṛácetasah*, but the two locc. *dāme* and *māde*. The predicative vocative analysis is esp. unlikely because this is a repeated pāda (I.15.2, VI.51.15, VIII.83.9; there are also further exx. of *yūyām hí śthā* ... as a pāda-opening), and only in I.15.2 is a predicative voc. likely. (See Bloomfield, RR ad I.15.2; he considers it “plain mechanical borrowing” there.)

The conjoined locc. “in our house and in exhilaration” may not seem to form a natural semantic class, but note that they are anagrams of each other: *dāme / māde*, and in a hymn so structured by phonetics, that would be enough.

VIII.7.13: I take *madacyútam* as having “active” meaning (‘arousing exhilaration’), rather than passive. Scar (126) allows either for this stem, and Re takes it as passive here. Since the passive form *mádacyutam* built with the past participle would fit the same metrical slot, I think that the active sense must be meant.

VIII.7.14: I supply loc. *upahvaré(ṣu)* in a because *ádhi* doesn't take the genitive (so can't be directly construed with *girīṇām* as Ge does), on the basis of the immediately preceding

hymn VIII.6.28 *upahvaré girīṇām* and the Marut hymn I.87.2 *upahvaréṣu yád ácidhvaṃ yayīm*, whose phraseology is very close to this.

I do not entirely understand what *iva* is doing here. Perhaps their wandering in the distant parts of the mountains is implicitly compared to their journey here.

As in VIII.6.38 (q.v) I take *svāná-* as a pun, both a passively used root aor. mediopassive participle to \sqrt{su} ‘press’ (‘being pressed’), which is eminently appropriate for drops, and a thematic adj. to \sqrt{svan} ‘sound’. Although the latter may seem less characteristic of drops, see 16a *drapsā iva ... dhámanti* “like droplets they blow their blast,” as well as 17a, where *svāná-* seems to encapsulate the same pun.

VIII.7.15: The problem in this verse is the referent and syntactic construction of gen. sg. *etāvataḥ ... ádābhyasya* (assuming that the two are to be construed together). Most take the phrase as obj., one way or another, of *bhikṣeta*. Ge takes it as a separate obj. of *bhikṣeta*, parallel to *sumnám*: “Um solche unfehlbare (Gabe), um ihre Gunst ...” Old, by contrast, suggests that the poet started out with the gen. *etāvataḥ*, meaning to continue with **sumnásyā*, but had to substitute the acc. *sumnám* for metrical reasons. He then takes *ádābhyasya* either as continuing the gen. phrase *etāvataḥ ... *sumnásyā* or as having a separate referent, the Maruts considered as a unity. Re also considers *sumná-* to be the ultimate referent, but has the genitive phrase express a partitive sense: “Puisse le mortel avoir une part, (si) petite (soit-elle), à la bonne grace ...” Sim. Bl (RR) ad loc. In favor of the Old/Re/Bl solution is the phrase *etāvataḥ ... sumnásyā* in VIII.49.9 (Vālakh.), construed with *īmahe* ‘we beg’ (cf. 50.9); see also VIII.5.27 *etāvat... / ... sumnám īmahe*. But I find Old’s metrical about-face very unlikely: RVic poets don’t have “whoops, that genitive won’t fit here” compositional moments, as far as I can tell, while Re’s semi-partitive construction seems rather weaselly. Moreover, $\sqrt{bhikṣ}$ is almost always construed with the acc. as here (genitives probably in I.152.6 and VII.90.6). And, further, in the scenario where *ádābhyasya* is part of the phrase, “unfehlbar” (Ge), “unerring” (Bl) is not what *ádābhya-* means. My solution is not necessarily better, though it does arise in part from Old’s alternative suggestion for *ádābhyasya*. I take the gen. sg. phrase as doubling the gen. pl., *eṣām*, with both referring to the Maruts -- the plural to them individually, the singular to their collectivity (so Old’s “von den als Einheit gedachten Maruts”), i.e., the Marut flock (*gaṇá-*). This seems to be Gr’s view, also Macdonell’s. It should be noted that the Maruts (in pl.) are several times referred to as *ádābhya-* (II.34.10, III.26.4).

The publ. tr. reflects that analysis, but I am not entirely certain it is right. If I were to follow some version of the other view, I would render *bhikṣeta* in two different ways depending on the case of its complement: “might beg their benevolence, might seek a share of such undeceivable ...”

VIII.7.16: However odd the expression *drapsāḥ ... dhámanti* “the droplets blow their blast” may seem, it is found twice elsewhere: the extremely enigmatic VIII.96.13 and the somewhat clearer IX.73.1. The latter is a noise-making context, as this may be.

VIII.7.16–17: 16c *útsaṃ duhántaḥ* reprises 10bc *duduhré ... útsam*, which in turn reminded us of *dhukṣánta* in 3c. Other elements in vs. 3 reappear in vs. 17: *pṛśnimātarāḥ*

in 17c was the subj. of *dhukṣānta* in 3b, and 17ab *úd u ... īrate ... úd u vāyúbhiḥ* reminds us of 3a *úd īrayanta vāyúbhiḥ* (cf. also 7ab).

On *svānébhiḥ* in 17a see comm. on 14. Because vss. 16 and 17 are so closely tied, I connect the *drapsá-* of 16a with the *svānébhiḥ* in 17a and consider this a variant of *svānaīḥ ... indubhiḥ* in 14c.

VIII.7.18: Note the extremely recessive 2nd pl. perfect *āvā:* 2nd pl. pfs. are rare and poorly marked as it is; with its initial swallowed by *yéna*, this one barely surfaces.

The referent of *yéna* and its correlative *tásya* is most likely ‘help’ (*ávas-*); so Ge. This assumption is supported by I.112.5 *yābhiḥ káṇvam ... ávatam* “with which you two helped Kaṇva,” where the referent of *yābhiḥ* is the etymologically related *ūtíbhīḥ* and the same Kaṇva story as in 18b is referred to.

As for Turvaśa and Yadu -- though, as Ge points out, their helper is usually Indra, in this run of hymns the deed is assigned to several different gods: the Maruts (here), Indra (VIII.4.7), the Aśvins (VIII.9.14, 10.5).

The construction of c is unusual. With Ge (and Re), I take *tásya* as a partitive gen. with *dhīmahi*, though somewhat reluctantly. The dat. *rāyē* ‘for wealth’ is then an indication of our purpose once we receive some help from the Maruts; Ge’s fuller “um Reichthum (zu gewinnen)” makes the purpose clearer.

VIII.7.19: *pipyúṣīr īṣaḥ* echoes *pipyúṣim īṣam* in 3c.

VIII.7.21: Ge thinks that this verse is addressed to the other singers, but this requires that the voc. *ṛkṭabarhiṣaḥ* in 20 and 21 have two different referents (so explicitly Ge’s n. 3), which seems unlikely. I take the Maruts to be the addressees, as in vs. 20, and follow Macdonell (*Hymns from the Rigveda*, p. 60) as well as Lüders (Var. 426–27) in taking the verse as contrasting the Maruts’ former friendly behavior to the poet and his fellow ritualists with their neglect now -- a neglect drawn attention to by the questions in the immediately preceding vs. 20. Acdg. to Delbrück (AiS 502), *ha sma purā* + PRESENT expresses what was accustomed to happen in the past. I also take *stómebhiḥ* not as the Maruts’ praise songs, but rather the ones produced by us, as an instrumental of price. Macdonell’s tr. “as once ye did *for praise*...” seems to reflect a similar interpr.

VIII.7.22–23: The insistently repeated *sám* in vs. 22 (4x in 3 pādas) is complemented by its opposite *ví* in 23, though *ví* needs only two occurrences to continue the pattern.

VIII.7.23: *arājín-* is a hapax. Though it is obviously derived from a root $\sqrt{rāj}$, it is not clear whether it belongs to ‘shine’ (so Gr ‘nicht glänzend’, Re ‘sans éclat’) or ‘rule’ (Ge ‘die herrenlosen Berge’; Old ‘königlos’) -- or both, as I suspect. Although neither root yields compelling sense as a negated quality of mountains, the phrase should be interpreted in light of 1c *ví párvateṣu rājatha*, where I see the same pun.

It is possible that $\sqrt{vī}/yā$ should be rendered ‘drive through’, not ‘drive apart’, although this produces a less happy contrast with *sám* in vs. 22. In that case I would tr. “they drove through Vṛtra, joint by joint, (drove) through the mountains ...”

On *vīṣṇi* see comm. ad VIII.96.19.

VIII.7.24: The pattern of repeated preverbs continues with *ānu*. The lexeme *ānu* √*av* is quite rare (but see X.113.1); presumably the poet was looking for a preverb to pattern with *sām* and *vī* in the previous vss. In X.113.1 I tr. ‘assist’, but ‘stand by’ here to provide a separable particle for the pattern.

VIII.7.25: I have punctuated pāda b, *śīprāḥ śīrśān hiraṇyáyīḥ*, as a parenthetical expression, a nominal locational clause, but in context it is the equivalent of a decomposed bahuvrīhi modifying the Maruts and parallel to *vidyúddhastā(h)* ‘having lightning in their hands’ in pāda a (so approx. Re). A bahuvrīhi *‘‘having golden (helmet-)lips on their head’’ would have been difficult to construct with these elements. Including the modifier ‘golden’ would have produced a three-member compound, which would be unusual for the RV, and determining what form ‘head’ (*śīras-* / *śīrṣ-ṇ-*) would have taken as the final member of a masc. pl. bahuvrīhi may have defeated the poet. This analytic expression is given somewhat fuller form in V.54.11.

VIII.7.26: Like almost every verse involving Uśanā, this one is quite obscure. On the morphology of the name, see my art. in Fs. Jasanoff; for the mythological background and development of Uśanā, chap. 4 in my *RV between Two Worlds*. I take this verse as a disguised treatment of the Vala myth, with which Uśanā Kāvya is associated elsewhere. Pāda a is also found at I.130.9; there I take Uśanā as an acc. of goal (or perhaps a gen. with a gapped ‘house’), while here I take it as an instr. As discussed in the Fs. Jasanoff article, the word *uśānā* behaves essentially like an indeclinable in the RV.

In my analysis the curious expression *ukṣṇó rāndhram* ‘‘the loins of the ox’’ (on *randhrá-* see Gotō 1985 [MSS 44] and EWA s.v.) is a reference to the Vala cave: the loins are a weak or vulnerable spot in animals, and MIA *randha-* ‘opening, cleft, weak spot’ shows how easily this can develop into a word that might qualify a cave. A similar circumlocution for the Vala cave is *nāme gōḥ* ‘‘in the bend of the cow’’ (III.39.6). Ge takes the phrase instead as a personal name; as he points out, Ukṣṇo Randhra is a PN in PB 13.9.19/JB III.150 and has the epithet *kāvya-*, apropos of the so-called Aukṣṇorandhra Sāman, but this is surely a secondary reinterpretation of this opaque vs.

The roaring in c is the noise of the cows penned inside the cave.

Note the phonetic echo in the initial words of the first two pādas: #*uśānā* / #*ukṣṇas*.

VIII.7.28: *prāṣṭi-* ‘side-horse’ is a rare word in the RV, occurring two other times in addition to a single instance of the deriv. *prāṣṭimant-*. As often, the occurrence of a rare word can be attributed to phonological triggers; here *pṛṣatī rāthe* / *prāṣṭir ... rōhitah* (with a nice scrambling of *th* → *h...t* in *rāthe ... rōhitah*). Our pāda b is also found at I.39.6b, with *rātheṣu pṛṣatīr* in the preceding pāda. (The other two occurrences are less phonologically driven.)

The exact arrangement of the horses isn’t clear, and the sandhi form *pṛṣatī* has accordingly received different grammatical analyses. I take it as representing underlying *pṛṣatīḥ*, an acc. pl. fem., obj. of *vāhati* (so also Gr, Bl). Ge (/Re) seems to take it rather as a nom. pl. implicitly conjoined with *rōhitah*, presumably with the verb agreeing with the latter. Hoffmann (Inj. 126) take the form as a dual nom., a parallel subj. to *rōhitah*.

Old suggests that *riṇán(n)* is a nom. sg. participle, modifying the subjects of *yānti* with incongruence of number. This seems unnecessary, since it can easily be a 3rd pl. injunctive, requiring no such grammatical adjustment.

VIII.7.29: Ge/Re take *śaryaṇāvatī* and *ārjīke* as place names, but see comm. ad VIII.6.39 above for *śaryaṇāvatī*, depending on Thieme, *Unters.* p. 40 n. 2. There he also explains *ārjīka-* as a vṛddhi adj. ‘foamy’, derived from *-rjīka-* (found in various bahuvrīhis) ‘foam’ (< ‘of white appearance’).

VIII.7.31: On *kadhapriyaḥ* see comm. ad I.30.20. Note *kád dha ... kadha-*.

The verse seems to allude to the Maruts’ supposed leaving Indra in the lurch at the Vṛtra battle, but this seems to be a slander: it is often said that they were the only gods who stayed with him (though Ge adduces ŚB IV.3.3.6, where they temporarily withdraw until Indra offers them a joint share of the sacrifice [7ff.]). Certainly 24c expresses their help to Indra at that time.

VIII.7.32–33: Note opening 32a *#saho ṣu* / 33a *#o ṣu*. HvN mark *o* in 33a as disyllabic. The agreement across vss. would be an argument against such a reading, and Old has several alternative suggestions.

VIII.7.34: On *pársāna-* see comm. ad VII.104.5. Our passage here is the best support for the usual gloss ‘depth, deep place’.

VIII.7.35: I take the final word of the vs., *váyah*, as a pun, both nom. pl. ‘birds’ and neut. acc. sg. ‘vital energy’, with the birds subject of *vahanti* in pāda a. Birds figure in several nearby hymns (VIII.3.23, 5.33), with the latter passage esp. close: ... *vām ... váyo vahantu parṇīnaḥ* “Let your feathered birds [=horses] convey you two [=Aśvins] here.” Ge instead takes the obj. of *vahanti* here to be the Maruts’ horses (supplied), with the Maruts themselves presumably the subj. Scar (415–16) has the Maruts as subj. and clouds as obj., but in the absence of any clouds in the context, it seems better not to invent them. The disadvantage to my proposal is that the ‘birds’ reading of *váyah* has to leap backwards over a nominal clause (*dhātāra stuvaté* ...) that clearly has the Maruts as its nominal referent. Nonetheless, I think this kind of syntactic manipulation is possible in punning: the audience reaches the end of the verse and realizes that ‘birds’ is the subject they were missing at the beginning, while also interpreting *váyah* as the neut. object of *dhātārah*.

I am tempted to take *dhātārah* as a periphrastic future: “they will establish ...”

VIII.7.36: Pāda b contains two ambiguous forms, whose variant interpretations have produced very different tr.: *chāndaḥ* may be nom. sg. masc. to *chānda-* ‘pleasing’ (the only other possible ex. in the RV is at I.92.6, q.v.) or nom./acc. sg. neut. to *chānda-* ‘meter’; *sūrah* can be nom. sg. masc. *sūra-* ‘sun’ or gen. sg. *svār-* ‘id.’ The standard tr. opt for the former choice in both cases, e.g., Re “tel un charmeur est le soleil, de par (son) éclat.” I have chosen the latter in both cases, at least in the publ tr., though I now have doubts about the identity and meaning of *chāndaḥ*, though I would still stand by the gen. interpr. of *sūrah*. The verse is a reference to the ritual here-and-now, the kindling of the fire at dawn: the phrase *sūro arcīṣā* “with the ray of the sun” is an indicator of that time.

In the publ. tr. I took *chāndaḥ* as “a metrical verse” because the hymn opened with a similar metrical expression: *triṣṭúbham íṣam* (see comm. ad vs. 1). The Maruts are characterized as *chandastúbh-* ‘chanting in rhythm’ in V.52.12, a cmpd that unites the *chandas-* of our vs. 36 with the 2nd part of *triṣṭúbh-* in vs. 1. To be born “like a metrical verse” makes sense in a RVic context: the fire is kindled (born) as the verbal portion of the ritual begins to be spoken (born). However, I am disturbed by the fact that the *s*-stem *chāndas-* has late distribution (X 7x, Vālakh. 1x, with deriv. *chandasyà-* found one in late IX). Although the just cited *chandastúbh-* is always analyzed (beg. with Pp.) as containing the *s*-stem, on formal grounds the 1st member could just as well be a them. form. I am therefore more sympathetic to seeing a thematic form here (Gr’s *chānda-*), perhaps with the sense ‘pleasing’. So I provide an alt. tr. “like one aiming to please.”

VIII.8 Aśvins

VIII.8.4: The hapax voc. *adhapriyā* is clearly based on the slightly better attested *kadhapriya-/prī-* (on which see comm. ad I.30.20), a form of which is found in the immediately preceding hymn VIII.7.31. The latter is a dismissive and slighting form of address (“when-friends?” -- that is, fair-weather friends) whereas *adhapriya-* seems to be the opposite: “now/here-friends,” that is, reliable friends.

VIII.8.5: I construe both *svāhā* and *stómasya* with *úpaśrutī*, although they are in different pādas. (Ge takes *svāhā* as an independent mini-clause and construes *stómasya* with voc. *várdhanā*.) Although *várdhana-* regularly does take the genitive, I am reluctant to take *stómasya* with it because we might expect the gen. to lose its accent in a vocative phrase (although this loss is of course not invariable, as Old points out). *úpaśrutī-* also takes the gen. (see I.10.3), and since *svāhā* is indeclinable, it can also be dependent on *úpaśrutī-*, at least as I see it. Old also floats the possibility that *stómasya* goes with *úpaśrutī*, though he seems to favor a connection with *várdhanā*.

It is not clear whose *dhītī-* ‘insights’ are in question in c. Ge takes them as the Aśvins’, and the fact that *kavī* ‘poets’ qualifies them directly adjacent to *dhītībhiḥ* would support this view. However, in 19cd the *dhītībhiḥ* definitely belong to the (human) poet, and this also seems to be the case with *suṛktībhiḥ* in 3b (on the basis of 22ab), as well as *dhībhiḥ* and *stómebhiḥ* in 7cd. In general the unrelenting point of this hymn is that the Aśvins are supposed to come here at our producing various verbal products for their delectation. I take the instr. in these cases to be instrumentals of cause.

With *prā* in d I supply another verb of motion. Judging from his tr. Ge must take the verb to be supplied as *prā√as* ‘be outstanding’: “Ihr ... (seid) an Gedanken ... voraus.” This is not impossible, but this is a journey hymn and not much else happens, esp. in this section: we offer praise; they come.

VIII.8.6: *yác cid dhí vām purā ...* is very like (*nahí śma*) *yád dha vaḥ purā* in the immediately preceding hymn (VIII.7.21), which, with a present tense verb, expresses habitual action in the past. Here we have instead the med. 3rd pl. perfect *juhūre* (found otherwise only in almost identical context in I.48.14; see Kü 606), also apparently expressing habitual past action. (Delbrück [AiS 501–3] does not comment on this usage.)

In both cases (also I.48.14) that action is implicitly compared to what is happening in the present. Here *my* praise is contrasted with those of the seers of the past.

VIII.8.11, 14–15: The bahuvrīhi *sahásranirñj-* ‘having thousandfold raiment’ is found only in this hymn and does not seem a particularly natural qualifier either of a chariot (vss. 11, 14) or of refreshment (15).

VIII.8.12: The stem *manotár-* is found only twice in the RV, in identical pādas (I.46.2=VIII.8.12), in the dual *manotārā*, with unexpected short vocalism in this strong form (expect **manotārā*)—as opposed to *manótar-* (so accented), which occurs only in the nom. sg. In I.46.2 the form appears in a pāda after one containing likewise dual *síndhumātarā*, which has *-tar-* legitimately, and as Old says (ad I.46.2; see also AiG III.199), *manotārā* might have been shortened in this context, with the pāda then borrowed into VIII.8.12. But Old is not enthusiastic about this explanation, and Tichy (*-tar-*stems, 58) persuasively suggests that the *-mātarā* form probably provided the context for preserving the short vowel in *manotārā*, but was unlikely to have produced it. But her explanation (if that’s what it’s meant to be), that *manotārā* is “eine dichtersprachliche Reliktform” (58; cf. 41 n. 48, where she calls both *manotā* and *manotārā* “dichtersprachliche Einzelformen”) doesn’t explain its source: the *-tar-* vocalism should not be a relic if we assume that agent nouns derive from **-tor-*stems, and blaming it on Dichtersprache is a non-account: poets don’t make up forms with no reason, at least in my view. The problem is similar to *dhánutarā* (on which see comm. ad IX.93.1), also dual, and though I have no good explanation for either of them, the fact that they are built not to roots, like standard agent nouns, but to pres. stems may have weakened the perceived links to *-tar-*stem inflection and allowed them both to assimilate themselves to *-tara-*comparatives, whose duals would have had the same *-tarā*.

VIII.8.15: The first hemistich reprises 8cd, but in this vs. the poet asks for something in response to his strengthening hymns.

VIII.8.15–16: Another example of chained vocabulary: *ghṛtaścút-* ‘dripping with ghee’, which is reasonably appropriate both for ‘refreshment’ (*īṣ-*, 14) and ‘nourishment’ (*ūrj-*, 16).

VIII.8.18: I supply “who listen” in d on the basis of V.61.15 *śrótāro yāmahūtiṣu*.

VIII.8.19: *mayobhúvā* in pāda a repeats the same word in 9d, with *śambhúvā* in b generated as a variant to it.

Pāda d, *gīrbhír vatsó ávīvr̥dhat*, is the third occurrence of this same pāda in this hymn (also 8d, 15b, except the verb in 8 lacks the accent). The instr. pl. *dhītúbhiḥ* at the end of c seems to double *gīrbhíḥ*, as *śambhúvā* does *mayobhúvā* in the first half-verse.

VIII.8.22: It may not be clear in the publ. tr. that “found in many places” is a voc. addressed to the Ásvins and does not qualify the songs and hymns. I take this form as a “vocatized adverb” in Re’s phrase, derived from *purutrā* ‘in many places’, against the standard opinion that it contains the root noun to *√trā* ‘protect’ and means ‘protecting

many' (so Sāy, Gr, Ge). Scar (194) considers both options and cannot decide. In fact I do not feel strongly about the analysis reflected in the publ. tr. and could also accept 'protecting many'. However, it might be worth noting that the adv. *purutrā* frequently occupies pāda-initial position, as here, and that there are several occurrences of it in nearby hymns (VIII.1.7, 5.16, 11.8), one of which (VIII.5.16) is in an Aśvin hymn. The Aśvins are the subj. of a form of $\sqrt{trā}$ only once (VII.71.2), but this is not a strong argument either way.

VIII.8.23: As noted in the publ. intro., the three footsteps (*trīṇi padāni*) attributed to the Aśvins must be meant to evoke the three celebrated *padāni* of Viṣṇu (cf. I.154.4). Perhaps it is simply the Aśvins' penchant for trios (not found in this hymn, however) that is the point of contact. One might note, however, that in the next hymn (VIII.9), also by Vatsa, vs. 2 asks the Aśvins to confer on us the power in the midspace, in heaven, and "through the five peoples of Manu" (i.e., on earth). Since Viṣṇu's three steps cover the same three cosmic divisions, the Aśvins' geographical reach may be alluded to here. Even more striking in the next hymn (VIII.9.12d), the Aśvins "stand in the strides of Viṣṇu" (*viṣṇor vikramaṇeṣu tiṣṭhathaḥ*).

The purport of the paradoxical pāda b is also not clear; see speculations by Old, Ge, and Re. I think it must have something to do with the anxiety expressed throughout this hymn about exactly where the Aśvins are and our oft-expressed desire for them to leave wherever it is and come to us. So we are never sure whether they are visible or hidden.

The final pāda reflects our also stated desire that the Aśvins forsake other sacrificers to come to us (see esp. vs. 8).

VIII.9 Aśvins

VIII.9.2: For the possible relevance of this verse to VIII.8.23, see comm. ad loc.

VIII.9.3: *pāri* $\sqrt{mṛś}$ is a more vivid expression than Gr's 'geistig berühren', Ge's 'befassen' indicate: in X.34.4 it is the verb the Gambler uses in his tortured imagining of others fondling his wife: *anyé jāyāṁ pāri mṛśanti asya*. Something similar seems to be the point here. The Aśvins put their powers at the disposal of other poets; Vatsa sees this promiscuity in almost sexual terms and begs them for an exclusive relationship.

VIII.9.4: I take *cīketathaḥ* 'attend to' in a somewhat sinister sense here: with the help (/invigoration) of soma the Aśvins will turn their attention to Vṛtra/the obstacle and take care of the threat he/it poses. However, I am not entirely certain why the Aśvins are being implicated in the Vṛtra battle and assimilated, as it were, to Indra. The gharma of the 1st half-verse is more naturally their drink. But see 7cd below. Note also that in 12a they drive on the same chariot with Indra. On the basis of that hemistich, which also associates them with Vāyu (12b), we can assume that it is their joint appearance at the dawn sacrifice that brings them into conjunction.

VIII.9.5: The referent of the *yád*'s in ab is not overtly expressed. Ge supplies 'Heilmittel' on the basis of vs. 15 with *bheṣajām*. That verse does not seem to me particularly

apposite. Nonetheless, I follow him, because the denom. *bhaiṣajyá-* is found in the next vs. (6b), because *bheṣajá-* is elsewhere found in the waters (cf. I.23.19), and because plants are generally associated with healing (see X.97).

ṛtām can be either a neut. sg. ppl., agreeing with *yád*, or a root aor. 2nd du. act. injunc. Gr and Ge take it as the former; Old considers the latter, but rejects it on what seem to me slight grounds. I take it as the latter, in part because the immediately preceding hymn contains 2 of the 7 (per Lub; 8 if this is counted) examples of accented finite 2nd du. *ṛtām* (VIII.8.13, 17) and also because I think it more likely that the Áśvins would be portrayed as actively producing these remedies (see 6b) than that the remedies simply got made. However, the ppl. interpr. is far from excluded.

VIII.9.6: The rendering of *ná vindhate* in the publ. tr. is opaque. By “does not get enough” I meant something like “produces in superfluity” -- from Vatsa’s point of view, there can never be enough praises for the Áśvins.

The sense relation between the *yád* clauses of ab and the main clause in c is not clear. I *think* the idea is that even when the Áśvins are preoccupied with some other activity, Vatsa keeps praising them on the assumption that they will pay attention at some point.

I am also a bit unclear on how pāda d fits with the rest. I think that it reinforces pāda c; that is, Vatsa keeps producing hymns because he knows that the Áśvins ultimately come to someone who offers them sacrifice (here represented by the *havís-* ‘oblation’). But it could instead mean that Vatsa is wasting his time, because the Áśvins go for the oblation, not the praise. This seems less likely, esp. since both praise and oblation are offered to the Áśvins in the next vs.

VIII.9.7: This new ṛca opens as the hymn does (1a): *ā nūnām*, followed by a form of *aśvín-*. The 2nd vs. of the ṛca (8) also opens with *ā nūnām*.

Ge (also Lü 362) supplies a form of ‘speech’ with *vāmáyā*, obviously as part of the seer’s ritual offering to the Áśvins. But *vāmá-* generally expresses the valuable thing that the ritualist receives from the god(s) in exchange for his ritual service, and I have taken it this way here, with (loosely) an instr. of price. I do not have an explanation for its fem. gender, however. There are no other occurrences of a fem. in *-ā* to this adjective; most forms are masc. or neut, and the other fem. forms are in *-ī*.

The honeyed soma and hot milk of vs. 4 return here.

Ge (also Lü), flg. Ludwig, takes *átharvaṇi* rather bizarrely as a nominative, but there seems no reason not to interpr. it as the loc. it appears to be (so, e.g., Old). Nor does there seem any reason not to take it as the name of a priest, as it is elsewhere (*pace* Sāy., Old). I take it as a loc. absol. without an overt participle marking it.

VIII.9.8–9: With Kü (181–82), I assign the curious paired reduplicated med. opt. forms (*ā ...*) *cucyavīrata* (8) and *ācucyuvīmāhi* (9) to the caus. reduplicated aorist, which is otherwise only active. I have no explanation for the difference in the grade of the root syllable (*-cyav-* vs. *-cyuv-*); no morphological or metrical factors can explain the variation between these two almost adjacent forms. Possibly the 3rd pl. has full grade in some kind of imitation of the full grade of act. 3rd pl. imperfects to redupl. presents (type

ájuhavur vs. *ájuhuma*), but that is found only in the active voice and not in the optative, so it would be a bizarre and tenuous imitation indeed.

VIII.9.9: The last pāda of the verse (d) is identical with the last pāda of vs. 3 (c), but the point is very different. In vs. 3 the poet asks the Aśvins to pay attention only to him despite the activities of *other* poets; here it's "we" who are moving the Aśvins, but the poet still asks for their exclusive attention. Given the constant interchange between 1st singular and plural in ritual situations, I find it difficult to think that the poet is trying to distance himself from his priestly comrades and get the Aśvins all to himself. But I don't have a good explanation.

VIII.9.10: The final pāda here is a variant of 3c and 9d, but the circumstances differ from both. Here the poet doesn't contrast himself with other rival poets (as in 3) or with the larger group of "us" (as in 9), but asks that the Aśvins pay attention as they did to previous seers -- though actually not *so* previous: Kakṣivānt and Dīrghatamas are of course famous poets represented in the collections of Maṇḍala I (I.116–26 and I.140–64 respectively); Kakṣivānt is also identified in the Anukramaṇī as Dīrghatamas's son (or descendant). A son/descendant of Vyaśva, Viśvāmitra, is the poet of VIII.23–26, and X.148 is attributed to Pṛthu (not Pṛthī) Vainya. So our poet seems to be asking for the same attention as these famous seers received, but they are not seers of the distant past but at most of a few generations ago, possibly even roughly contemporary (though the perfect *juhāva* puts the invocation in the past). They are both models and, to a certain extent, rivals.

Pṛthi in the publ. tr. should be corrected to Pṛthī.

VIII.9.16: Ge tr. *devyā ... vācā* (belonging to different pādas) as "mit der göttlichen Rede," which is certainly possible. But since Dawn is explicitly the topic of the next two vss. (17–18) and since there's a voc. *devī* (or possibly, against the Pp., a nom. *devī*) in pāda c, it seems best to separate the two instrumentals and take *devyā* as referring to Dawn. The poet has awoken with the advent of the goddess Dawn (the natural world) at the same time as the ritual speech directed to the Aśvins commences.

If nom. *devī* is read here, *vy āvar* can be 3rd ps., not 2nd. But I see no reason to go against the Pp. in this case, since Dawn is addressed in the voc. (*uṣaḥ*) in both 17a and 18a, and the unambiguous voc. *devī* is found in 17b.

VIII.9.19: *āpīta-* is better derived from $\sqrt{pī}$ 'swell' (so Ge, EWA s.v. *PAY*⁷) than to $\sqrt{pā}$ 'drink' (Lub, Re [though Re allows a double sense]).

Pāda d requires a verb to be supplied with *prā*. I follow Re in supplying 'wake', on the basis of vs. 17. Ge *kṛnvata* (on the basis of I.186.10), thus "... (lassen) ... den Vorrang." His model seems awfully distant, given that *prā bodhaya* appeared two vss. previously.

VIII.10 Aśvins

VIII.10.1: Ge and Re take *dīrghāprasadman-* as a PN, but I follow Gr and Old in taking it as a fully lexical bahuvrīhi, 'providing a long seat'. Both of the latter consider the word

an epithet of the earth, and the parallel cited by both, V.87.7 *dīrghám prthú paprathe sádma pāṛthivam*, is quite suggestive. However, the other occurrence of this form in VIII.25.20 seems to narrow its application to the ritual ground, rather than the earth in general.

I do not know quite what an *ākṛta*- house is, and the past participle *kṛtá*- is not otherwise found with *ā*. The publ. tr. ‘prepared, made ready’ follows Ge/Re. However, since the lexeme *ā√kṛ* generally means something like ‘bring here’, and since there is no second *vā* in pāda c, I am tempted to tr. “on the sea in a house directed here’, namely a boat, though this may be too whimsical.

VIII.10.2: Elsewhere *hēṣas(-vant)*- means ‘weapon’, and I see no reason to ascribe a different sense to it in this compound. So Lü (Philol. Ind. 783), contra Ge’s ‘Rosstreiber’, Re’s ‘à l’incitation rapide’. I am somewhat disturbed by the accent, however.

VIII.10.3: Re points out the similarity of *grbhé kṛtā* in 3 with *ākṛte grhé* in 1c.

VIII.10.4: Again Ge takes the presumed loc. *asūré* as a PN, explicitly rejecting Gr’s ‘sunless time’ in his n. 4b. But I do not see a good reason for this rejection, and given that the Aśvins are the “early-coming” gods and receive offerings before dawn, ‘sunless time’ makes sense ritually. As Old and Ge both point out, *asūré* is involved in word play with *sūrāyah*, which of course may account for the appearance of this hapax here, as so often.

VIII.10.5: The final clause of this vs. contains a misleading ambiguity: the second element in *átha mā gatam* ‘so come to me’ should be interpreted as *mā ā*, but *mā* could also represent the prohibitive particle, with *mā gatam* “don’t go” or even *mā ā gatam* “don’t come.”

VIII.11 Agni

VIII.11.4: The verb *veṣi* can be either a 2nd sg. indic. pres. or a *si*-impv. to *√vī* ‘pursue’. (See, e.g., the distribution as given by Lub 1330 and 1331; Lub takes this occurrences as an indic.) Ge tr. it as an indic., Re as an impv., and the publ. tr. takes it as an indicative present. Contextually I would (weakly) prefer the imperative, and the undoubted *si*-imperative *sátsi* found in 10b might support this interpr. But I am not certain that *si*-imperatives take *nā* as negative rather than *mā*. Given their derivational status as haplogologized *s*-aor. subjunctives, *nā* should be quite correct, but they have generally transferred functionally into the imperative domain and so might be expected to take *mā*, however anomalously. I know of no diagnostic passages.

The voc. ‘o Jātavedas’ was carelessly omitted from the publ. tr.

VIII.11.10: The accent of *sátsi* is probably owing to its presence in a *hí* clause. However, if one follows Ge and Re in seeing a suppressed “you have taken your seat” to be supplied with *sanāt* ‘of old’ (e.g., Re “assieds-toi comme Oblateur nouvellement, (comme tu t’es assis) anciennement!”), the accent could come from the implicit contrast between the two verb forms.

The accent on *pipráyasva* is somewhat more difficult to account for, and, curiously, the standard tr. and comm. do not mention it (incl. Kü 323). I think it also arose by contrast with another verb form, namely *ā yajasva*. The stem *pipráya-* to which this impv. belongs (see Kü and my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems,” in Fs. Lubotsky), several times co-occurs with a form of \sqrt{yaj} and on several of these occasions is accented (e.g., VIII.39.9 *yákṣac ca pipráyac ca naḥ*, also VII.17.4; cf. also II.6.8 without accent, all cited by Kü 323).

VIII.12 Indra

VIII.12.1–3: This *ṛca* is unified by a series of relative clauses (mostly introduced by *yéna*) whose antecedent in the main clause is the *tám* that opens the refrain. The presumed referent of all the relative pronouns (and the *tám*’s) is *mádaḥ* in 1b, although it could be any power or capacity of Indra’s that comes to mind.

VIII.12.1: Although it is Indra whom we expect to be the best soma-drinker, here the epithet is transposed to his *máda-* ‘exhilaration’.

VIII.12.2: Unlike Ge I take *svàṇṇara-* here as an epithet of Adhriḡu, rather than a PN (sim. VIII.3.12), though not on strong grounds, and VIII.6.39, where I do take it as a PN, undercuts this position.

Either Adhriḡu or, if he is a personage, Svarṇara receives the qualifier *vepáyant-* ‘setting atremble’, without an object. Given how little we know about Adhriḡu (or Svarṇara), it is not clear what such an object might be, though it might refer to poetic inspiration.

VIII.12.4: Ge supplies a verb (*verhílf*) to govern the accusative phrase in ab, but given the parallelism of vss. 4 and 5, it is better that this phrase is governed by the *jūṣasva* in 5a.

VIII.12.5–6: The verbal form that constitutes the refrain, *vavákṣitha* ‘you have waxed strong’, is accented. Old plausibly attributes the accent to its position as a semi-independent refrain (*Anhang*), so that it is not necessary either to supply a subordinator or to take the verb as an independent clause. Ge, by contrast, supplies a subordinator, flg. Sāy (see Ge n.).

VIII.12.6: In c *pratháyan* is used differently in simile and frame. In the former it is straightforwardly transitive, with *vṛṣṭúm* as object; in the latter it is intransitive or, at least, absolute, as in, e.g., IV.53.2.

VIII.12.7: Note the chaining between *ṛcas*, with the refrain of vss. 4–6 *vavákṣitha*, returning as the first word of the following verse, *vavakṣúh*, with person and number adjustment. Interestingly, it’s this verse where the *Anhang* refrain doesn’t precisely match the two following verses: *āvardhayat* versus *prá vāvṛdhe*, with the same root but different stem, and transitive versus intransitive. This is the only such deviation in this hymn.

VIII.12.8: I take *yádi* in pāda a as standing for **yád ī*, with shortening before the cluster *pr*. See Jamison 2002. Hence ‘when’, not ‘if’. The **ī* as usual functions as an accusative, anticipating the obj. *sahásram mahiṣān*.

The word play between the voc. *pravṛddha* in a and the refrain verb *prá vāvṛdhe* cannot be easily captured in English.

VIII.12.9: Ge takes the simile in c *agnír váneva* with ab: “Indra brennt ... den Arśasāna nieder, wie Agni die Bäume,” with *sāsaḥīḥ* only construed with the refrain: “der Siegreiche ist erstarkt” (though see his n. on 9c). But this violates the structure of the rest of the hymn, where the c pāda hangs together. I therefore take the quality held in common between simile and frame to be *sāsaḥīḥ*. For *√sah* with this simile see VIII.40.1 *yēnā dṛḷhā ... sāhiṣīmahi / agnír váneva...* “by which we might become victorious over the strongholds ... as Agni (is victorious) over the woods,” and for the reduplicated -*i*-stem governing the accusative III.16.4 *cákrir yó víśvā bhúvanābhí sāsaḥīḥ* “Who creates and overwhelms all living beings...” On this nominal type and its syntactic behavior, see Grestenberger 2013 (JAOS 133).

Arśasāna is generally taken as the name of an enemy of Indra in the RV about whom little is known. See now comm. ad X.99.7, where I accept its formation to a poorly attested root *√ṛś* ‘harm’ and suggest a tr. “Harmer” rather than taking it as a PN. This pāda is identical to I.130.8g.

VIII.12.10, 12: The verb initiating the refrain, *mímīte*, is accented, and in these two verses the accent can be explained as a result of the status of the refrain; see above ad vss. 5–6. In 11 it starts a new clause and can owe its accent to that.

VIII.12.10: Encouraged by the insistent feminines, *ṛtvīyāyatī* here is a pun, referring both to Thought’s conformity to the ritual order and to her menstrual cycle. See VIII.80.7 for the same word play involving *dhīḥ*, where the femininity of the subject is more emphasized than here. It is possible that the refrain here “she is (well-)measured indeed” can also refer to the menstrual cycle. Otherwise it probably refers to the metrical character of the thought and perhaps the fact that she measures up even to Indra’s great size. The refrain also has to be considered beside a phrase in the next hymn, VIII.13.30 *mímīte yajñām ānuśák* “measures the sacrifice in proper order.”

VIII.12.11: The subject of this verse is not made clear. Ge suggests either *stóma-* or *dhītí-*. The latter is more likely in my view, continued from vs. 10. There are no clashing non-feminines, since *devayúḥ* could serve either for masc. or fem., and in any case could be matching the gender of the *gárbhaḥ*. Another possibility is Agni, since he is regularly called an embryo in these circumstances, but the unity of the *ṛca* speaks against this. I would therefore change the “it”s in the publ. tr. (“its intention,” “it has grown,” “it is”) to feminine forms, to match vs. 10.

The VP *krátum punīte* of b is found in the next hymn, VIII.13.1b, where the subject is Indra, but that referent is not possible here.

VIII.12.12: Since *sáni-* is only a nom. actionis, not an agent, it must mean ‘winnings, gain’. What it must mean here is that Indra is what we win if we keep our part of the sacrificial bargain (*mitrá-*).

The subject of c must again be the *dhītí-*. So also Ge. But the point of the simile “like an axe” (*vāśīva*) is somewhat unclear, though Ge’s explanation seems reasonable: just as the thought is measured out metrically (*mīmīta íd*), so is an axe wielded in a regular rhythm (he compares VIII.19.23).

VIII.12.13–15: Lüders (*Varuṇa* 450) comments about the *ṛca* that it concerns only the songs sung to Indra; therefore in the refrain *ṛtá-* can only refer to “die Wahrheit des Liedes,” and the refrain *ṛtasya yád* is paraphrase for “das Lied.” I agree that the refrain refers to the verbal product offered to Indra, but prefer to supply *ukthá-* ‘(solemn) speech’, extracted from *ukthá-vāhas-* in 13a for 13c and 14c.

VIII.12.13: Ge interprets the verb *abhipramandúḥ* somewhat bizarrely as ‘go on a pilgrimage to’ (“Zu dem ... die ... Āyu’s ... pilgerten”), presumably influenced by *ukthāvāhasaḥ* ‘whose conveyance is solemn speech’. Kü (357) takes the same verb as intransitive, with the *yám* expressing the source of pleasure (“An dem die Erregten ... sich (schon immer) erfreuen”). I see no reason why it is not a straight transitive “bring to exhilaration” like other forms of the act. pf. of *√mad*.

The question is what is the relationship between ab and c. Properly speaking, the *yám* should have a referent in the main clause (which is c: note the unaccented verb *pipye*), but there is no obvious candidate. Ge simply treats ab as an unresolved relative clause, without comment. I assume that Indra, the presumed referent of *yám* in pāda a, is covertly present in c: it is his mouth in which the speech/hymn swells – the speech having been homologized to soma already by the *√mad* form in b. See also 4ab where praise is compared to purified ghee, which may mediate the simile in our c, *ghṛtām iva*. Ge, however, seems to take the mouth as belonging to the Āyus (“... ihrem Mund”); this would make sense as the source of the speech offered to Indra. Perhaps the lack of an overt genitive limiting ‘mouth’ allows both interpretations some currency. I might therefore emend the publ. tr. to “it swells in his/their mouth.”

VIII.12.19: Ge tr. the infinitival *gṛñṣáni* as a modal “soll ... loben.” Similarly Keydana, who takes it as a “matrix infinitive” with 2nd ps. subject but tr. modally (“... sollt ihr euch zu Hilfe besingen,” 174, 246). Because it is locative in form, I am somewhat dubious about assigning it this value, which is typical, and understandable, for dative infinitivals.

I have reordered the elements in c to make the sentence parsable. That the refrain *vy ānaśuḥ* should be construed with what precedes is shown by the parallel VIII.45.27 *vy ānaṭ turvāṇe śámi* “he came through to victory by his labor.”

VIII.12.24: Note the slight variation on the refrain: abl. *ójasaḥ*, parallel to abl. *ámāt* in b, versus 22–23 dat. *ójase*.

Ge supplies “the world” (extracted from the dual of a) as subject of *títviṣe* in c. I follow Old in taking Indra as subject, with the *asya* reflexive. As Old points out, in nearby VIII.6.5 it is Indra’s *ójas-* that is subject of the same verb; here the attribute has

been deflected to an oblique case and the god himself is subject. Note also X.55.1, where Indra is modified by the participle *títviṣānāḥ*.

VIII.12.25: The opening verse of this *ṛca* echoes that of the last *ṛca* (22), with 22ab *īndram ..., devāso dadhīre purāḥ* matched by 25b *devās tvā dadhīre purāḥ*.

VIII.12.25–28: The phonetic figure noted in VIII.6.36 dominates the next four verses: *haryatā hārī*.

VIII.12.27: That *te* in a is a dative of benefit, not a genitive with *ójasā* is shown by VIII.52.3 *yásmai víṣṇus trīṇi padā vicakramé*.

VIII.12.28–30: The linkage of *ṛcas* is unusually close here, with the *pāda*-length refrain of vss. 25–27 recast as the first hemistich of vs. 28 and *ā́d ít te*, which opened the refrain of 25–27, retained as the opening of the refrain of 28–30.

For the only time in the hymn the Anhang is only three syllables, *yemīre*, but this deviation is probably a word play. Old rejects Ge's older suggestion that we should read *ní yemīre* as the refrain on the basis of *niyemiré* in 28b, but although Old is probably correct that we should not change the text by accenting *ní*, I think he was too hasty in dismissing the idea out of hand. The refrain *ā́d ít te víśvā bhúvanāni yemīre* temptingly juxtaposes the final syllable of the neut. pl. *bhúvanāni* and the verb *yemīre*, and of course *bhúvanā* without its *-ni* would be a fine neut. plural as well. The audience is surely being invited to consider alternative segmentations.

VIII.12.29: The doubling of *te ... túbhyam* is presumably pleonastic in ab, with the *yadā́ te* simply repeated from 27a, 28a.

VIII.12.31–33: This *ṛca* is unified by the 4-syllable *pāda* *prādhvaré*. This *pāda* appears also in VIII.46.18 and IX.102.8, always as the final *pāda* of Uṣṇih (or the equivalent: in 46.18 Upariṣṭādbṛhatī). I interpr. it in the context of the fairly frequent fuller expression *prayaty ādhvaré*, a loc. absol. meaning “while the ceremony is proceeding,” which is esp. common in VIII: I.16.3 = VIII.3.5, V.28.6 = VIII.71.12, VIII.7.6, VIII.13.30, X.21.6; cf. also VI.10.1). I take *prādhvaré* as a truncated version of this loc. absol. and tr. it “while the ceremony is pro(ceeding).”

VIII.12.31: *Pāda* c presents some difficulties of interpretation, in particular how to distribute the three accusatives *jāmím*, *padā́*, and *pípratīm*. The last, a participle, takes *padám* as object in IX.10.7 (adduced by both Old and Ge): *padám ékasya píprataḥ* “guiding the track of the lone one safely across.” But it also takes personal objects, as in nearby VIII.6.2 *prajām ṛtásya píprataḥ* “guiding the child of truth [=poem] safely across.” I therefore take it as a semantically mixed construction, with *jāmím* ‘kin’ (which in this case, as in VIII.6.2, would be a poem or hymn) in the frame and ‘footsteps’ in the simile. By contrast, Ge takes *jāmím* as the subject of the simile, parallel to *susṭutím*: “die wie eine Schwester deine Schritte geleitet.” His interpretation reads better, but ignores the position of *iva* and also the contrasting constructions of the participle *píprat-* elsewhere.

By my interpretation the point is that the *susṭutí-* produced in ab takes the rest of the verbal portion of the sacrifice along with it to the god.

I take the refrain *prādhvaré* as a (quasi) locative absolute, as in VIII.46.18, rather than as integrated into what precedes.

VIII.12.32: Contrary to Ge, I take pāda c as part of the subordinate clause of ab, with vs. 33 the main clause. Ge. is forced to supply a verb (“geht”).

dohánā is the problem here. Gr suggests we read it as underlying *dohánās* as in I.144.2, despite the sandhi. This seems to be the basis of Ge’s interpretation (“die Melkung” as subject), but Old rejects this and takes it as an instrumental. I weakly follow Old, but neither of the interpretations is particularly compelling.

VIII.13 Indra

Although the intro. to the publ. tr. is somewhat dismissive of this hymn and dubious about any unifying factors, closer examination shows a subsurface thematic unity esp. in the mid and later parts of the hymn, roughly vss. 16-30. For discussion see below.

VIII.13.1: For b see VIII.12.11.

VIII.13.2: The word *apsujít* never occurs without an immediately preceding *sám*, whose function is not clear. See VIII.36.1–6, IX.106.3. Dissatisfaction with this expression goes back to Ludwig, and Scar (154–55) suggests that the phrase is a metrically more favorable version of **apsú sámjít* “completely victorious in the waters.” This has some merit, but it’s also worth noting in this metrical context that there seems to be a feeling that a preverb is a good way to start the final four syllables of an Uṣṇih, and when in doubt *sám* is a safe one. See in the previous hymn VIII.12.16-18 *sám índubhiḥ* (though the *sám* is functional there), 22-24 *sám ójase, -aḥ*. In its other two occurrences (VIII.36.1–6, IX.106.3), *sám apsujít* is a separable 4-syllable pāda (as long as one accepts Old’s analysis of the meter of VIII.36; see comm. there).

VIII.13.3: “I call” in the publ. tr. is a careless error for “I have called,” tr. augmented *ahve* and should be changed.

VIII.13.6: In c the subject of sg. *rohate* ‘grows’ is apparently unexpressed. Ge supplies Indra, while supplying the songs as subject of the pl. *juṣánta*, which he seems to take as transitive ‘please’: “dann wächst er [n. Indra] wie Zweige nach, wenn sie [n. Lobreden] wohlgefallen,” though I have trouble interpreting his tr. But forms of *juṣáte* almost always mean ‘take pleasure’, not ‘give pleasure’ (see 29b for *juṣánta* in just this sense). To tackle the latter problem first, I take the subject of *juṣánta* to be the closest plural noun, namely ‘branches’. Although the notion of branches enjoying themselves seems odd, I suggest it may refer to their growth under favorable conditions, with good soil and the proper amounts of water and light. (Modern gardening manuals often say that a plant “likes” this or that condition.) As for the subject of *rohate*, I take it as an imperfect pun: the form *vayā(h)* is, on the one hand, the nom. pl. of *vayā-* ‘branch’; however, a **váya(h)*, which would differ from the text only by accent and the length of the final vowel, could be the nom. sg. of the neut. -s-stem meaning ‘vitality’, and so I take it. Alternatively one

could follow Bloomfield's suggestion (made at the parallel passage II.5.4) that *vayā(h)* is the masc. nom. sg. of an internally derived **vayās-* 'possessing vitality, vital one' (=Indra). In fact I now prefer this solution and would change the publ. tr. accordingly, to "the vital one grows" (though in this case we might expect a 2nd sg. verb). (In II.5.4 this is unnecessary because Agni is easily and properly supplied as subject, and the tree branches work fine in the simile.)

VIII.13.11: On the voc. *mahe-mate* (4x), see AiG II.1.45, III.157; Wack. favors an underlying stem **mahā-mati-* with the usual combining from of *mah-*, against Gr's *mahi-mati-*. (Only the voc. is attested.) The voc. *mahe* would then be a rough-and-ready analogy to the voc. of fem. *-ā-*stems. That *mati-* is fem. would help trigger the analogy.

VIII.13.14: Although Ge interprets the stretching of the thread as a metaphorical expression for the continuation of old relationships, it seems far more likely that it reflects the normal idiom "stretch the thread" for setting up and performing the sacrifice. See vs. 18b *devāso yajñām atnata*. "The way that is known" means the standard procedure. That Indra is being urged to do this, rather than the sacrificers, might be a little odd, but see, in fact, 18b just cited, as well as 30c *mīmīte yajñām*.

VIII.13.15: The next section of the hymn is introduced by the end of this verse (*a*)*vitéd asi* "Just you are (our) helper," a phrase repeated in 26a *indra tvám avitéd asi*, signalling the subsurface thematics of the apparently disordered midsection of this hymn.

VIII.13.16–18: This *ṛca* begins and ends in the same way: 16a *indram vardhantu no gírah* and 18c *tām íd vardhantu no gírah ...* In between are several clauses with augmented verb forms (aor. *arāṇiṣuḥ* 16c, impf. *avardhayan* 17c, aor. *atnata* 18b). It is not immediately clear if these form a mythological or historical sequence or are unconnected observations about the mythological and/or historical past. The most specific statement is found in 18ab, with the gods stretching the sacrifice *trikadrakeṣu*. This same verse is found in VIII.92.12, which, however, provides no contextual help. But, as Ge points out, in I.32.3 Indra drinks soma *trikadrakeṣu* before the Vṛtra battle, and II.11.17 and II.22.1 suggest the same scenario. If 18ab is somehow concerned with a soma sacrifice connected to the Vṛtra battle, then 17 may belong to the same complex, with the "inspired poets" of 17ab perhaps being the Maruts, who in some version of the myth encouraged Indra before the Vṛtra battle, and, again perhaps, their battle cries also strengthening Indra in 17c. Note that JPB tentatively identifies the Trikadrakas in I.32.3 and II.11.7, 22.1 as the Maruts. The clause in 16c may also belong with these mythological references, if the clans (*vísah*) are the same as or equatable with the *marútvatīr vísah* in 28c.

VIII.13.17: I am puzzled as to what "downward coursing help(s)" (*pravátvatībhir ūtībhiḥ*) might be. As Ge points out, vs. 25 shows that the instr. phrase should be construed with *avardhayan* and so it must be help that the poets are giving Indra rather than getting from him (though they themselves are also *avasyávaḥ* 'seeking aid'). The stem *pravátvant-* is generally used of landscape/cosmic features that have a gentle, and by implication pleasant and easily traversed, slope; see esp. V.54.9, where heaven and earth, the paths, and the mountains all provide a *pravát-* for the Maruts' journey. The help provided to

Indra by the poets may be of the same quality, smoothing and easing his journey to the sacrifice and his participation in it. In our 8b we met waters at play going along a slope (*pravātā*). Again ‘downhill, sloping down’ implies the path of least resistance and the opposite of effortful activity. If the identification of the poets with the Maruts suggested above is correct, it might be worth noting that four of the seven forms of *pravātvant-* are found in a single verse in a Marut hymn (the aforementioned V.54.9).

We meet *vayā iva* again, repeating the simile of 6c. As in 6 I think that the tree branches are compared with Indra (and hence are acc. here), rather than being compared to the battle cries. They make Indra grow as tree-branches grow.

VIII.13.18: See the discussion of the *ṛca* as a whole above.

VIII.13.19: It is noteworthy that the properly performing praiser acquires epithets esp. characteristic of Agni and Soma (*śúci-*, *pāvakā-*), the quintessential ritual gods. Pāda c is an interesting twist on IX.24.6–7; see comm. there.

VIII.13.20: This verse is quite opaque and its grammar can be construed in a number of different ways, giving the lie to Ge’s breezy “Die Konstruktion ist klar.” See Old’s rather more despairing assessment (“Es ergeben sich mannigfache Möglichkeiten, zwischen denen sichere Entscheidung ausgeschlossen...”).

The first problem is the value of the verb *cetati* and, when that has been determined, the identity of its subject. Ge takes the verb as intransitive/reflexive “... zeichnet sich ... aus,” but an I/T value (‘perceive’) is also possible for this active stem. I interpret it so (as does Old in one of his suggested tr.), and continue as its subject the *stotā* of vs. 19.

The next issue is the reference and distribution of *tād íd rudrásya ... yahvám*, which Ge takes as subject of *cetati* and I as object. I will not rehearse the various suggested possibilities (see Ge and Old), but simply add my own: *rudrásya* is generally used with ‘son(s)’ to refer to the Maruts, who can be called ‘young’ in that context (cf. V.42.15b *rudrásya sūnūṁ yuvanyūn...*); and a neut. noun regularly used for the Maruts is *śárdhas-* ‘troop’, as in the nearby hymn VIII.15.9c *śárdhaḥ ... mārutam*. In fact see *mārutam śárdhaḥ* in the pāda immediately preceding V.42.15b, namely 15a, where the singular (15a) and plural (15b) expressions are coreferential. So here I supply that noun with *tād ... yahvám*.

Then what are the “ancient domains”? On the basis of IX.52.2 *pratnébhir ádhvabhiḥ* “along your age-old routes,” referring to the protocols of the soma sacrifice and the ritual journey of soma, I suggest that the ancient domains here are the age-old practices of the sacrifice. It is essentially equivalent to 14c *tántum tanuṣva pūrvyām yáthā vidé* “Stretch the ancient thread in the way that is known.”

In c I take *vícetasah* to refer again to the Maruts. For the switch between singular and plural see V.42.15 just cited. The Maruts are called *vícetas-* in V.54.13.

What the whole verse means and what function it fills in the hymn are not clear to me. If my interpretation of the various parts is correct (and I have no confidence that it is), the successful human praiser of vs. 19 perceives his divine model, the Maruts, whose praise inspired Indra in the Vṛtra battle, at his sacrifice, where they have placed the thought or mental power that he should himself follow.

VIII.13.21: I struggle to make the final verse of the ṛca fit with the speculative scenario sketched for the first two verses (19–20). (As far as I can tell, neither Ge nor Old makes the attempt, an omission with which I am in sympathy.) One thing to account for is the switch from 3rd ps. in 19–20 (though note *te* in 19a) to a 1st–2nd partnership in 21. I suggest that the *stotā* in 19 (and 20, by my reading) is now the 1st ps. speaker of 21. He offers Indra companionship or partnership (*sakhyām*) modeled on that shared by Indra and the Maruts, of which he had a vision in vs. 20. The sign of Indra’s choosing his companionship will be his (=Indra’s) acceptance of the speaker’s offered soma.

On *āvārah* see comm. on I.143.6. It may be better to tr. it as ‘grant’, rather than ‘choose’. If so, I would change the sentence immediately above to “The sign of Indra’s *granting* his companionship ...”

VIII.13.22: One piece of evidence for my interpretation of the preceding ṛca as having the praiser (*stotār-*) as its thematic center is his reappearance in this verse, in this anxious question. The verse expresses the reciprocity inherent in the ritual situation, with the praiser wishing to be “most wealful” for Indra, while also receiving his own benefits from the god. This reminds us of verse 17, where the poets (quite possibly the Maruts) were both seeking help and making Indra increase through the help they gave him.

VIII.13.24: Pāda b *yahvām pratnābhir ūtībhiḥ* is a deliberate echo of 20a *yahvām pratnéṣu dhāmasu*, and the only indication that *yahvām* is neut. in 20b but masc. in 24b are the pronouns *tād* and *tām* respectively that open the a-pādas. The phrase *pratnābhir ūtībhiḥ* also recalls *pravātvaṭībhir ūtībhiḥ* in 17b. These patterns suggest there is some reality to the below-the-radar thematic unity I’ve sketched out for the three ṛcas, vss. 16–24.

VIII.13.25: This verse both parrots the preceding verse (24ab ... *puruṣtutām*, ... *ūtībhiḥ* / 25ab ... *puruṣtuta*, ... *ūtībhiḥ*) and concentrates into a single expression the reciprocal aid between god and praiser that has dominated the rhetoric of the last ṛcas. In the command *vardhasva* ... *ūtībhiḥ* “become increased ... by forms of help,” the instr. should express the means by which Indra becomes strong, and that should be the help given him by others, as in vs. 17 *tām id víprāḥ* ... *ūtībhiḥ* / ... *avardhayan*... “The inspired poets increased him with helps.” But the forms of help in 25 are *ṣistutābhiḥ* ‘praised by the seers’, which suggests that these are forms of help given by Indra to us, like those in 24b. The condensed expression in this verse sets up a closed circle, a never-ending loop, in which forms of help given and received are identical and have identical results. With that established, the poet then presses his advantage and in pāda c and in 26a puts Indra squarely in the role of helping us.

VIII.13.26: See remarks on the repetition in pāda a under vs. 15 above.

VIII.13.27: Although Ge gives up on the cmpd. *pratādvāsū*, which modifies *hārī*, Old suggests that it’s a univerbation of the frequent collocation *prá tād* “forth to that” or perhaps *prá tād vásu* “forth to that good thing,” perhaps as the actual command Indra “cries out” to the horses. Rendering it in English is somewhat clumsy. And indeed it is

not an altogether satisfying explanation. I tentatively suggest emending to **prathád-vasū* ‘spreading goods’. Although $\sqrt{\text{prath}}$ usually takes geographic features as object, cf. *rayím paprathat* II.25.2, VII.42.6, with ‘wealth’, similar to ‘goods’.

VIII.13.28: Note the chaining over ṛca boundary: 27c ... *abhí svara#* / 28a *#abhí svarantu*.

Most interpreters (Ge, Old, Klein [I.383]) take *sakṣata* as the verb of the relative clause beginning *yé táva*, but it is unaccented. Old recognizes the problem but considers it unnatural to separate *táva* from *śríyam* and accounts for the lack of accent acdg to ZDMG 60, 737–38 [=Kl.Sch. 212–13], namely occasional lack of accent when the rel. pronoun and the verb are in different pādas (not, in my opinion, a compelling explanation in any of these cases). But *yé táva* functions fine as an independent rel. clause, and supplying ‘your’ again with *śríyam* is no problem in an independent clause.

Ge supplies “come” in c, but the verb in b can do duty here as well.

The Maruts, who were only latent in vs. 20 (and probably 17), appear here with Rudra, who was present in vs. 20. The Marut clans here may pick up the clans in 16c; see above.

VIII.13.29: As Ge says, the subject here probably remains the Maruts. The question is whether “which is in heaven” is a restrictive or non-restrictive relative clause – that is, are there various possible tracks and it’s the one in heaven that they like, or is there one track and it happens to be in heaven. My inclination is to take it as restrictive, and the track or footstep in which they take pleasure is the one called elsewhere the *paramá-* (I.22.20–21, 72.2, 4, 154.5, etc.), *upamá-* (V.3.3), or *uttamá-* (V.51.4) ‘highest’, as well as *divás padá-* (IX.10.9, 83.2). There seems to be an implicit contrast to this high and distant *padá-*, which they like, and “the navel of the sacrifice” (*nābhā yajñásya*), where they find themselves. But these locations may be more complementary than contrastive, since the “highest track/footstep” often seems to indicate a place where a heavenly form of the earthly sacrifice is conducted simultaneously. See, e.g., I.22.20–21 and remarks on I.21.6.

VIII.13.30: This verse uses some of the material found in the previous hymn, also in Uṣṇih: *prāci prayaty ādhvaré* is a heavy variant of *prādhvaré* (that is, *prá adhvaré*) of VIII.12.31–33; *mímīte* is identical to the refrain *mímīta íd* (12.10–12); *ānuṣák* occurs in 12.11.

Who is *ayám*? This near demonstrative should mean that the referent is actually present. It can only be Indra. In the first two verses of the ṛca the focus is on his companions, the Maruts (“who are yours [=Indra]” 28a), and now attention turns to their leader, the subject of the hymn as a whole, and in the finale to the hymn his longed-for epiphany is signalled by this dramatic *ayám*.

That Indra himself “measures the sacrifice” is consistent with his being urged to “stretch the thread” in 14c above.

Ge’s interpretation of ab is quite different from mine, and seems to envisage the sacrifice receding in the distance as the subject keeps gazing further out towards it. This doesn’t make much sense to me, and the similarity of the expression in b to the clichéd *prá adhvaré* (see just above), which refers to the temporal progress of the ritual (and in

this case, perhaps the carrying of the Āhavanīya fire eastward), makes his interpretation unlikely.

The only other occurrence of *dīrghāya cákṣase* is in I.7.3, where Indra puts the sun in the sky for this purpose. See remarks ad loc., where I point out that the expression can be either temporal or locational or both.

VIII.13.33: *prātiṣṭuti-* occurs only here. I assume that it is a praise-hymn made in response to whatever the god has done for us, though Ge suggests it is a praise that corresponds to Indra's greatness.

VIII.14 Indra

VIII.14.5: Note the phonetic figure in ab: ... *avardhayad*# / ... *āvartaya*#

VIII.14.8: The sense of c is a little unclear; I consider it a condensed expression for “he shoved (the contents of) Vala [=cows] in our direction.” The verb *nunude* was presumably chosen to contrast with *parāñúde* in 9c.

VIII.14.10: Misplaced simile marker in pāda a.

Both verbs in this verse are nonce forms: *ajirāyate* and *arājīṣuḥ*. Note their mirror image phonology, *ajirā* / *arāji*, which may help account for the creation of both the hapax denominative and the nonce *iṣ*-aorist. The former is built to *ajirā-* ‘quick’; the latter could belong to either of the $\sqrt{rāj}$ roots, ‘rule’ or ‘shine’. Ge seems to opt for the former, at least judging from his invocation of *vī rājasi* in the preceding and following hymns (VIII.13.4=15.5) in his n., but his “haben den Ausschlag gegeben” (decided the issue) is hard to derive from ‘rule over’ and also doesn’t make much sense to me. But his n. also cites *vī rājati* in IX.61.18, where it clearly means ‘shines forth’, and also cites Sāy’s gloss *dīpyante*. Narten discusses the issue and finally decides (weakly) for ‘shine’, an interpretation I share.

VIII.14.11: The two *-vārdhana-* compounds express something of the same type of role reversal found in the last hymn, where the help given by Indra and received by Indra became conflated. Here we might expect Indra to *be strengthened* by the praises and recitations, rather than strengthening them. And in fact, contrary to grammar, both Gr and Ge so interpret the compounds (Gr ‘am Loblied sich erlabend’, Ge “Denn dir sind ... die Lobgesänge, die Lobgedichte eine Stärkung”). But *-ana-* nominals have transitive-causative force and are associated with *-āya-* verb stems, and in compounds their first member serves as object. See other *-vārdhana-* compounds such as *ṛmṇa-vārdhana-* ‘strengthening manly powers’ (II.36.5), *paśu-vārdhana-* ‘strengthening livestock’ (IX.94.1), as well as numerous other stems such as *yajña-sādhana-* ‘making the sacrifice succeed’ (2x). If we stay true to the grammar, the point is that Indra, by his presence at the sacrifice and his willingness to receive praise, strengthens the products of his praisers, and this in turn creates *bhadra-* for them, as pāda c says.

VIII.14.12: The last two words of the verse are *yajñām surāḍhasam* “sacrifice, very generous,” which appear to belong together, but the latter must in fact modify *īndram*, the

first word of the verse, as it usually does. A textbook example of why word order is not a reliable guide to RVic interpretation.

VIII.15 Indra

VIII.15.2: Note the juxtaposition of *dvibárhas-* and *brhát*; for disc. of the former see comm. ad X.63.3.

VIII.15.3: By the rules established in Jamison 1992 for *sá* with 2nd ps. reference, *sá rājasi* here is in violation. But notice that this line (*sá rājasi puruṣtutam̐, éko vṛtrāṇi jighnase*) is twinned with 11ab *satrá tvám puruṣtutam̐, éko vṛtrāṇi tośase*, which begins with *satrá*, phonologically like our *sá rā* ... Also note *vī rājasi* in 5c, which could invoke a **sám rājasi* here (which would change the meter, but not improperly). For *sám* $\sqrt{rāj}$ / *vī* $\sqrt{rāj}$, see I.188.5 *virāt samrāt* ... And note that *samrājām* is the second word of the next hymn (VIII.16.1).

VIII.15.6: In c *jayā* can be a 2nd sg. imperative with lengthened final (so Pp., Gr, Ge) or a subjunctive (*jayāḥ* out of sandhi). Although an undoubted form of the imperative is found in 12c (*java*), I weakly favor the subjunctive here, the idea being that the praisers keep praising the same deed, and so he will keep doing it.

VIII.15.7–10: Every half-verse in this *ṛca* but 7c and 10c opens with a form of the 2nd sg. pronoun.

VIII.15.9: Since *kṣāya-* otherwise means only ‘dwelling place’, the text as we have it means “Viṣṇu, the lofty dwelling place,” as in the publ. tr., not “der hohe *Wohner*” (my italics), as Ge would have it. Already BR (see Gr s.v. *kṣāya-*) suggested that we read instead a bahuvrīhi **brhát-kṣayaḥ* ‘having a lofty dwelling place’. This of course makes better immediate sense, but I think we can keep the text as we have it and also avoid making *kṣāya-* into a nonce agent noun (per Ge). Given the flexibility of RVic diction, it is not difficult to identify a god with his most characteristic product—in this case, Viṣṇu’s three footsteps, particularly his highest one, which becomes an important locus in heaven (see, e.g., I.22.19–21) — and he elsewhere is said to create dwelling places: VII.100.4 *vī cakrame pṛthivīm eṣá etām, kṣétrāya víṣṇur mānuṣe ... / urukṣítum ... cakāra* “Quick Viṣṇu strode across this earth for a dwelling place for Manu ... / He has made wide dwelling.” In the RVic conceptual realm it is just one step from creating a dwelling place to being a dwelling place. The identification of Soma with a dwelling place in vs. 13 below supports the literal reading here.

VIII.15.11: The VP *vṛtrāṇi tośase* poses a challenge to the standard older gloss of \sqrt{tus} , namely ‘drip, stream’, which I defend (comm. ad VIII.38.2) against Gotō’s reinterpr. as ‘hasten’. In fact Gr has a separate lemma (2. tuç) for this passage and a few others, as a Nebenform of *tus* ‘be satisfied / satisfy’. However, I think this passage can be easily accommodated under the old rubric, with *vṛtrāṇi* as an acc. of goal, as it were: “you stream over obstacles” reminds us of the scenes in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, where the waters stream over the slain Vṛtra (see esp. I.32.8, 10).

On this verse forming a ring with 3ab, see intro. and comments on vs. 3.

VIII.15.12: Note that *nānā* opening b picks up *nānyá(h)* opening vs. 11.

VIII.15.13: The identity of the addressee in this verse is not overt. As Ge points out, Sāy suggests that the singer is addressing himself, though pādas ab make difficulties for that interpretation. Old argues for Soma, which seems likely even though, unusually for an Indra hymn, soma has not previously figured in this hymn. However, all three pādas have parallels in the soma maṇḍala: for pāda a see IX.109.3c *mahé kṣáyāya*; pāda b is repeated in IX.25.4a modifying soma; and IX.111.3e is identical to the first three words in pāda c, save for the grammatical identity of the verb form (3rd pl. injunctive in IX.111.3, 2nd sg. imperative here). That Soma is the addressee here and so the subject of the impv. *harṣayā* is also supported by vs. 4 in the next hymn (VIII.16), where the exhilarating drinks (of soma) are called *harṣumánt-*.

Again, as in vs. 9, Ge waters down the meaning of *kṣáyā-* to fit the context (“dweller,” not “dwelling”), but in his n. suggests that the dwelling, namely heaven, stands as a metonym for its inhabitants, the gods. I prefer not to recast and paraphrase the literal sense as Ge does, especially since, as it stands, this half-verse expresses a small but neat paradox involving container/contained: Soma both enters everything (b) and provides a vessel in which everything (or “we” anyway) can dwell (a).

In c *jaítrāya* picks up *jaítrā* in 3c.

VIII.16 Indra

VIII.16.2: The simile in c, *apām ávo ná samudré*, is hard to interpret. “The sea” corresponds to Indra in the frame and “the aid of the waters” should correspond to recitations and famous deeds, but what is the *aid* of the waters? Ge suggests in passing a possible connection with *avániḥ* ‘stream(bed)’, but this seems based only on superficial phonological similarity, and in the end he tr. “die Gunst der Gewässer” and hopes for the best. Old suggests an emendation to *apām *ápah* ‘work of the waters’, but it is hard to see how a nice alliterative phrase like that would become corrupted, and so, like Ge, I stick to the text transmitted and the common word *ávas-* that it seems to contain. Perhaps the point is that, like recitations that find their joy in contributing to Indra’s power, the waters take pleasure in submerging themselves in the sea, “aiding” the sea by making it bigger.

VIII.16.3: How to construe *maháh* in c is not clear. I tentatively take it as the gen. sg. of *máh-* and supply ‘prize’ or ‘wealth’. Lub groups it with the adverbial *maháh* ‘greatly’, which is also possible. I do not understand how Ge takes it grammatically, given his tr. “der grosse Beute macht,” which must somehow be rendering *mahó vājínam*.

VIII.16.4: *harṣumánt-* occurs only here, but note the impv. *harṣayā* that ends the last hymn (VIII.15.13).

VIII.16.6: The rare verbal stem *ārya-* ‘recognize’ is probably a derivative of the *arí-* word family (including *ārya-* ‘Ārya, that is, belonging to our group’) and means ‘recognize as an Ārya, treat as an Ārya’. See EWA s.v. *ĀR*, where some doubts are expressed, and

recently Kulikov (522–23), who tr. “Him alone the races treat as an ārya through his activities ...” The ppl. *āritā-* ‘recognized’ is found 4x, incl. VIII.33.5 below.

VIII.16.8: The content of ab is straightforward, but it is worth noting the phonological play. On the one hand the independent pronouns *sá ... sá* of pāda a are picked up in b by *sa(tyāḥ) sá(tvā)*. On the other, the morphologically parallel forms *stóm’yaḥ ... háv’yaḥ* in a are picked up by the morphologically different *satyāḥ* in b. (This would be a neater figure if the first two words didn’t show distraction in the suffix, as opposed to *satyā-*.) Then the *-tyāḥ* of *satyāḥ* morphs into the *-tvā* of *satvā*, which then distracts into *tuvī-* in the following word.

VIII.17 Indra

VIII.17.1: On the injunctive *sadaḥ* as functional imperative, see Hoffmann 1967: 263.

VIII.17.3: Old discusses who/what to supply with *yujā*, suggesting first the *bráhma-* of 2c, but then opting with Gr (tr.) and Ge, for soma. See Ge “(mit Soma) im Bunde.” Old rejects the possibility that it is Indra, which is the solution I have adopted here. I do so because you=Indra is almost the default with *yujā* throughout the RV. For exx. in VIII see nearby VIII.21.11 *tváyā ... yujā* (where the referent of the 2nd ps. is Indra) and VIII.68.9 *tvā yujā* (ditto), etc., etc., and for the full noun I.23.9 *índreṇa ... yujā*, etc. I would in fact suggest that the poet is here making the enclitic *tvā* do double duty; it is the correct accusative goal with *havāmahe*, but it also evokes the accented older short instr. *tvā* that as an independent word is limited to constructions with *yujā*.

VIII.17.6: The root noun cmpd dat. *samsúde* is ascribed to the root $\sqrt{svād}$ (see, e.g., Wh Rts, EWA s.v *SVAD*, Scar 618), favored by the adj. *svādúḥ* earlier in the vs., with which it forms a figure. However, since no other forms of that root show a true zero-grade, but only *svad* and *svād* root syllables even in zero-grade formations (ppl. *svāttā-*), I am skeptical. It is possible that the CRaC root syllable got frozen (as happens elsewhere; see my *-āya*-formations 208–11), with *-súde* the lone archaic survival of ablaut in this root. But I suggest rather that it’s derived from the synchronically semi-independent root $\sqrt{sūd}$, with secondary shortening of the root vowel (a possibility suggested also by Scar 626), possibly favored by semantic overlap with *-sū-t-* ‘press’ in soma-ritual context. See comm. ad X.64.15.

VIII.17.7: The consensus that soma is covered (*sámvrtaḥ*) with milk is surely correct; this is simply a different way of expressing the mixing of the two substances that is such a common trope in the soma maṇḍala, where it is often said that soma is clothed in cows (/milk). But the simile presents difficulties. For both Old and Ge a covered-up person (presumably male) is going to women/wives (Ge “soll ... wie ein Verhülter zu Frauen schleichen”). Neither of them makes any comment on this bizarre image. I prefer to follow Caland-Henry’s interpretation (cited and rejected by Old): “voilé comme des femmes [qui vont au rendez-vous].” There is evidence elsewhere in the RV of women going to trysts (e.g., X.40.2), and the abhisārikā, a woman going secretly to her lover, often depicted as veiled or disguised, is, of course, a standard figure in the later literary

and visual arts traditions. (Perhaps the untethered *abhí* in this pāda refers to this idiom, although it must be admitted that neither $\sqrt{sṛ}$ or $\sqrt{sṛp}$ appears with *abhí* in the RV.) There are a few grammatical difficulties to address. First, *sām̐vṛtaḥ* is masculine and singular, whereas the corresponding women are feminine and plural, but *sām̐vṛtaḥ* refers to soma in the frame, and the later rules about grammatical agreement between elements in the frame and the simile simply do not hold in the RV. More serious is the fact that the nom. pl. of *jāni-* is normally *jānayaḥ*. However, the asigmatic nom. sg. *jānī* in IV.52.1 shows that a long \bar{i} -stem *jānī-* had been extracted from the ambiguous forms acc. pl. *jānīs* and gen. pl. *jānīnām* (cf. AIG III.144).

VIII.17.8: *vapódara-* is a hapax, but its general analysis is fairly clear: it's a bahuvrīhi with *udāra-* 'belly' as second member and some word for 'fat' or 'bulging' presumably as first member. Filliozat (*Doctrine classique*, 126, without comment) takes it to be *vapā* 'omentum'. See EWA s.v. *vapā*.

VIII.17.12–13: Contains a number of PNs, whose exact identity eludes us. See Ge's nn., Mayrhofer PN s.vv.

VIII.17.13: *kundapāyya-* is a technical term in later śrauta ritual; see Old. I have given a literal tr. of the word and disclaim any knowledge of what this verse really refers to.

The verb *dadhre* is taken by Old as most likely a 1st sg.; Ge allows that possibility but tr. with a 3rd sg. I supply Indra as subject, both because he is the deity of the hymn and because he is the default consumer of soma. Kü (264) takes the verb as intransitive and presential with *mānaḥ* as subject: "darin bleibt das Denken fast." He also notes the possibility that this is a 3rd plural to $\sqrt{dhā}$, rather than belonging to \sqrt{dhr} .

VIII.17.15: The PN should be *Ṁṛdākusānu*, with a second long ā. The publ. tr. should be corrected.

In c the unaccented form *gr̥bhā* in the HvN edition is a mistake for *gr̥bhā̃*, with the Pp.

VIII.18 Ādityas

VIII.18.1: Ge (see also Gr s.v. *sāvīman-*) construes *ādityānām* with *sāvīmanī*, but this seems unlikely. *sāvīman-* is otherwise only found with its etymological partner Savitar, who does indeed appear in the last verse of this ṛca (3a). It is hard to believe that any other divinities could lay claim to this word.

VIII.18.2: The cmpd. *sugévr̥dh-* is a hapax; the locative 1st member *suge* 'on an easy road' was presumably suggested by the paths of the first half of the verse.

VIII.18.3: As pointed out by JPB, both Savitar and Bhaga are anticipated in this ṛca by the cognate forms *bhikṣeta* and *sāvīmanī* in vs. 1.

VIII.18.5: On *amhór uru-cakri-* see comm. ad II.26.4, on Wh's view that *amhóḥ* depends on the first member of the cmpd.

The adj. *anehásah* modifies the Ādityas, and the publ. tr. ‘faultless’ appears to be more appropriate than my reinterp. ‘flawless’ (see X.61.12 as well as vs. 21 below). However, since the pāda containing it concerns the Ādityas’ ability to make wide protective space for us, shelter that is elsewhere (indeed in vs. 21) called *anehás-*, the adj. may have been transferred from the flawless shelter to the producers of it.

VIII.18.6: There may be phonetic play between *dívā* in a and *advayāḥ* in b, facilitated by the *áditiḥ* that opens each pāda.

VIII.18.7: The *naḥ* of pāda a was carelessly omitted in the publ. tr., which should be changed to “will come to us with her help.”

The text of pāda a reads *utá syā no dívā matír*, with *matír*- ‘thought’. Ge takes this pāda a as a separate clause: “Und dies ist unser Gedanke bei Tag.” But the context seems to enforce Aditi as referent for *syā*: note the insistent repetition of nom. sg. *áditiḥ* in all 3 pādas of the previous vs., once also associated with *dívā*; the initial *áditiḥ* of our pāda b; the parallel opening of 8a *utá tyā*, also with a divine referent. Re uses his trademark parentheses to manipulate the syntax, yielding “this celebrated Aditi, (the object of our) poetic thought” -- “cette-célèbre Aditi, (objet de notre) pensée-poétique” -- which can’t be legitimately extracted from the text. The text as transmitted, with two fem. nominatives, should rather encourage an identification of Aditi with “thought,” a step I am reluctant to take. I suggest instead a slight alteration to the text, which could have read **dívāmatír*, i.e., *dívā* + **amátír* ‘banner’, contra the Pp. This requires only a change in the accent, which could have been redactional, arising because of *durmatīm* in 10b (cf. also *ámatim* in 11b). In this reading Aditi is implicitly compared to a banner or ensign. Although this comparison is not found of Aditi otherwise, *amátí-* is associated elsewhere with the Ādityas: Mitra and Varuṇa (V.62.5, 69.1) and Savitar (VII.38.1, 2, 45.2, 3).

Although as a noun, we would expect *sāmtāti* to be feminine, hence **sāmtātīm* in context, I prefer to take it here as a nonce neuter noun, rather than as a nonce neuter adjective modifying *máyah*, contra Ge’s “beglückende Freude.” Perhaps instead of a neuter, we might consider it an honorary indeclinable, matching its base *sām* ‘weal’, which opens 8b and all three pādas in vs. 9; our *sāmtāti ... karat* would be entirely parallel to 8b *sām ... karataḥ* and 9a *sām ... karat*.

Gr identifies a lexeme *āpa √ kṛ* for just this passage, on the basis of the sequence *... karad āpa srídhaḥ*, but *āpa srídhaḥ* is the refrain of this ṛca and must therefore be independent of what precedes it.

VIII.18.19: Ge and Re take *hīlāḥ* as a gen., construed with *ántaraḥ* interpreted as ‘between’; hence “the sacrifice comes between (us and) your anger.” But this poses several difficulties: *antarā* and sometimes *antár* mean ‘between’, but *ántara-* ordinarily means ‘nearer, dearer’; moreover, the other party to the ‘between’ reading, namely ‘us’, is not in the text. Old’s solution, which I follow, avoids both difficulties. He takes *hīlāḥ* as an ablative (also accepted by Schindler, Rt Nouns), construed with the comparative *ántaraḥ*. The idea must be that, given the choice between holding on to their anger and accepting a sacrifice, they will opt for the latter. This sentiment might be more straightforwardly expressed in English by “Sacrifice is closer to you than your anger,” rather than the publ. tr. “There is a sacrifice ...” However, I am disturbed by *ásti*: a

copular sentence like the one suggested does not need, and should not have, a surface copula. I therefore take it as an existential “there exists a sacrifice that is closer ...” As for the accent, *ásti* may be accented because it follows a pāda-initial voc. or because it is immediately followed by another verb and shows contrastive accent.

VIII.18.21: Since the shelter we beg for is physical in nature, on the basis of my reinterpret. of *anehás-* (comm. ad X.61.12) I would now substitute “flawless” for the more morally focused “faultless.”

VIII.19 Agni

VIII.19.1: I take *dadhanvire* as intrans. ‘run’ with acc. goal, contra Gr, Ge, Re (with the bizarre portmanteau “ont-installé en hâte”), and Kü (256–57). The secondary root \sqrt{dhanv} is otherwise intrans. (for VIII.33.12 and X.113.2 adduced by Re, Kü, etc., see comm. ad locc.). Moreover the supposed obj. *aratīm* should not be “made to run” because it is a fixed feature of the ritual ground, the fire/fireplace, which is often the object of $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘establish, place, install’ (hence Re’s tr.). After installation, it doesn’t move, but as the focal point of the ritual ground, it is approached by the gods – hence my interpr. here.

VIII.19.2: On *yantúram* see comm. ad III.27.11.

VIII.19.3: On metrically bad *vavṛmahe*, see comm. ad Kü (459) and comm. ad VI.4.7.

VIII.19.4: In the second hemistich of the publ. tr. “in heaven” (*diví*) has been carelessly repeated; the second one should be deleted.

VIII.19.7: The verse contains a double 2nd ps. address: implicitly with oblique 2nd ps. plural prn. *vah* in pāda a, explicitly with the (singular) voc. phrases in b and the 2nd singular prn. *tvám* in c. The latter invoke Agni, of course, but the former are most likely, in my opinion, the assembled peoples bringing together their clan fires. (See publ. intro.) Ge suggests rather the “Opferveranstalter” (arrangers of the ritual), which would ordinarily be the default reading of *vah* in this type of context, but given the political agenda of the hymn, I think it covers a greater number of mortals than simply the ritual officiants. In the publ. tr. I take the vocc. of pāda b with c, which allows the vocatives to be the correct grammatical number and addressed to the correct personage. Strictly speaking, however, this logical division is not syntactically possible, as the vocc. are unaccented and must therefore belong with the preceding clause, ending *syāma*. Nonetheless, the slight violation in the tr. seems justified by sense.

VIII.19.8: The standard tr./interpr. assign *védyaḥ* to \sqrt{vid} ‘know’: Ge ‘denkwürdig’, Re ‘reconnaissable’ (also Gr). But a connection to \sqrt{vid} ‘acquire’ makes more sense to me.

VIII.19.9: Assuming (see EWA s.v.) that *addhā* is cognate with Old Aves. / OP *azdā*, as ppl. to PIIR $\sqrt{*adh}$, Skt. \sqrt{ah} ‘speak’, I take this adv. to mean originally ‘in the announced / stipulated / well-known way’, which can then be bleached to ‘truly’ vel sim. But this passage allows the more literal meaning.

VIII.19.10: I supply *astu* (“let him be”) with the two forms of *sánitā* in cd on the basis of 9c *sá ... astu sánitā*. However, either a straight equational reading (“he is a winner ...”) or a periphrastic future (“he will win ...”) is also possible.

VIII.19.11–12: The VP *cáno dadhīta* “should take delight” takes complements in two different cases (both found independently elsewhere), acc. *stómam* (11b), *havyā* (11c) and loc. *rātīṣu* (12b), all connected by *vā* (11c, 12a). Another ex. of the poets’ enjoyment of syntactically licensed case disharmony.

Note the alliterative *v*’s of 11c *havyā vā véviṣad víṣah* (immediately preceded by 11b ... *viśvāvāryah* and immediately followed by 12a *víprasya vā ...*) and of 12d *váso vívidúṣo vácaḥ*.

VIII.19.12: Both Ge and Re take the hapax *avódevam*, modifying *vācaḥ*, as meaning ‘below / inferior to (that of) the gods’. This makes a nice contrast to *upárimartyam* ‘above (that of) mortals’. However, it otherwise seems an odd sentiment: it is surely a given that anything we mortals produce will be inferior to whatever comes from the gods, but this is a given that we don’t necessarily want to emphasize. In this ritual context the point of our speech is that it should be good enough (better than that of other mortals) to bring the gods to us. Hence something like Gr’s “die Götter herunterholend, sie herabblockend” seems preferable (see also Kü 492). The compound itself is a version of, or manipulation of, the reasonably common expression *avó divā / divāḥ* (I.163.6, V.40.6, VIII.40.8, IX.74.6).

VIII.19.14: My semantic reasons for rendering *áditim* as ‘boundlessness’ here, rather than as the PN of the goddess (contra Ge/Re), are given in the publ. intro. I would add here that *√dāś* almost never otherwise takes an acc. of the recipient of the pious service (except V.41.16 and possibly VI.48.2), but does occasionally take an acc. of the offering (e.g., I.71.6, 93.3). It’s also the case that *áditim* makes an irregular cadence: it should have an initial heavy syllable, though I don’t know what to make of that or how to repair it. There is also some phonetic play between pāda-final *áditim* and the final of 13a (*havyā*)*ádātibhiḥ*.

Ge, flg. Sāy, takes *viśvā* (< *viśvéd*, i.e., *viśvā+íd*) with *jānān* and explains its neut. pl. form as attraction to *udnāḥ*, “das trotz der maskulinen Form doch Neutr. ist” -- a convoluted and quite dubious explanation. It seems best to take the neut. pl. form seriously (with Re; see also Old) and supply another (underlyingly masc. pl.) ‘all’ with *jānān*, by perservation, as it were. (Old and Re do not go that far.)

As for Ge’s supposed *udnāḥ*, the Saṃhitā text of d reads *dyumnaír udná iva tāriṣat*, and the Pp. analyses the 2nd word as *udnāḥ*. But, as the HvN restoration *udná ‘va* shows, the pāda has one too many syllables. Moreover, the second syllable of *udná* would be better heavy. I follow Gr in assuming an instr. *udnā* here, despite Old’s curt dismissal. The underlying text may have been either *udnéva* or *udnā ‘va*. I find entirely baffling the Old/Ge preferred underlying form *udnāḥ* (presumably because they wish to follow the Pp.) and their analysis of it as acc. pl. masc. because the expected neut. pl. cannot be produced (“für den kaum herstellbaren neutralen,” so Old). Why would **udā(ni)* be blocked when *āhā(ni)* ‘days’, to an entirely parallel stem, is produced frequently and

easily? Re prefers taking putative *udnáḥ* as a gen. sg., which has the merit of not arbitrarily changing the stem's gender, but requires supplying an acc. (*kṣódaḥ*) for it to modify. Old's objection to the instr. sg. is that it isn't parallel to the accusatives over which the mortal is crossing. But instr. *udnā* is the idiomatic expression for traversing water (cf. V.45.10 *udnā ná nāvam anayanta*), and we have already had another instance of case disharmony in parallel expressions (see comm. on vss. 11–12).

VIII.19.15: Note the near mirror-image *dyumnám* (a) and *manyúm* (c).

VIII.19.16: Ge and Re take *cáṣṭe* here as 'appears', but this sense is otherwise not found for this stem, and I see no reason why the gods are not seeing by means of the illumination (*dyumná-*) that Agni provides. (Ge allows for the possibility of 'sieht' in n. 16a.) On the singular number of the verb, see the similar passage X.92.6 and comm. thereon.

It is the same illumination that we wish to acquire, in order to become the best path-finders (*gātuvítama-*), presumably since it's impossible to find one's way in the dark. My interpr. of *vidhemahi* reflects this desire for acquisition and differs from the standard rendering 'honor, do reverence to' (so Ge/Re). My interpr. depends first on the analysis of *√vidh* as historically derived from *ví√dhā* 'divide, ritually distribute' (see EWA II.555–56) and further on the observation that our form is the only real medial form to this secondary root (*vidhanta* in III.3.1 is an *-anta* replacement). While act. *vidhéma*, etc., means "may we distribute ritual shares (→ do honor to)," the contrastive middle can mean "may we receive ritual shares" -- much like the functional distribution of *bhájati / bhájate*. It might be argued that we should not take the middle form seriously because *vidhemahi* has been artificially created to produce an iambic cadence out of a Triṣṭubh cadence, given that act. *vidhema* is most commonly final in Triṣṭubh pādas. But in I.36.2 and I.114.2 the enclitic *te* serves this purpose: ... *vidhema te* #, a solution that would have been available here.

There is some phonetic play between the pāda-final (*gātu-*)*vítamā(h)* and *vidhemahi*.

VIII.19.17: The first hemistich resembles VIII.43.30 *té ghéd agne svādhyò, 'hā vísṣvā nṛcákṣasaḥ*, but in my opinion has a very different meaning. Given vs. 16, in which Agni's brilliance produces the light by which gods and men see, I take *nṛcákṣas-* here as 'providing sight for men', as opposed to its usual senses 'having (one's) eyes on men' or 'having a manly gaze'.

VIII.19.18: Ge takes *diví* as 'at day(break)', but this loc. is almost always used of heaven (so also Re), save for a few expressions like *pūrvyám diví* "early in the day" (II.22.4, VIII.22.6) and *diví pārye* "on the decisive day" (VI.17.14, etc.) and the cmpd. *diviyāj-* (IX.97.26) 'sacrificing in the day'. To make this locative work, I see the hemistich as containing two slightly different constructions, both involving *cakrīre*. I supply that verb from b to govern the accusatives in pāda a, where it has the straightforward sense "made X." But in pāda b, governing the acc. + loc., it means rather "make X (to be) in Y," i.e., "put X in Y." It is possible that the second acc. in a, *āhutim*, also participates in that construction ("make the poured oblation [to be] in heaven"), but it is unlikely that *védim*

does: the altar is surely earthbound. And since Agni is said to be ‘bepoured’ (*āhutaḥ*) in the next vs. (19a, also 22d, 23a, 25c), the poured oblation may well stay on earth too.

VIII.19.19: Both Ge and Re take this verse as expressing a wish (Ge “Glück bringend (sei) uns Agni ...”). This is possible, but there is no overt modal, and a straight equational reading is perfectly fine.

VIII.19.20: Ge takes *sthirā* simply as ‘Kräfte’, but (with Re) on the basis of the bahuv. *sthirā-dhanvan-* ‘having sturdy bows’ and phrasal instantiations thereof (e.g., in the next hymn, VIII.20.12 *sthirā dhānvāni*), I supply ‘bows’.

VIII.19.23: Ge takes pāda a as the dependent clause and b as the main clause, but this causes a difficulty: why is *bhārate* accented? I follow Re in taking ab as the dependent clause and c as the main clause. This accounts for the verbal accent. It also solves another problem: *yādī* is hard to render as ‘if’, but if analyzed as *yād ī* (for this phenomenon see Jamison 2002 [Fs. Cardona]), the *ī* can, as often, double the object, in this case *vāśīm*. But if *vāśīm* is not part of the dependent clause, *ī* has no obvious function.

The question then arises, what is pāda c doing? It consists of a nom. (*āsuraḥ*), a simile marker (*iva*), and an acc. (*nirñījam*). What binds them together? With Re, I supply **bharate* as the verb, from *bhārate* in b. The verb is used in two different senses: in b it describes the up-and-down motion of Agni raising and lowering (“bearing”) his axe, i.e., his flames, when ghee is poured on the fire, but in c ‘bears’ means ‘wears’, of a garment. This is a standard idiom; cf. I.25.13 *bībhrad drāpiṃ hiraṇyāyaṃ varuṇo vasta nirñījam* “Bearing [=wearing] a golden mantle, Varuṇa dons his cloak.” This is yet another example of the fondness the poet of this hymn has for parallel but disharmonious constructions.

Rather than trying to identify a particular divinity as the *āsura-* in this simile (Re: Varuṇa; Ge: “die Asura”), I concur with Hale (Asuras, 68–69) that this probably refers simply to a rich human lord who would be distinguished by his fine clothing. In the frame the *nirñīj-* would be the ghee with which Agni is bepoured. Cf. V.62.4 *ghṛtāsya nirñīg*; sim. VII.64.1, IX.82.2.

VIII.19.27: Ge and Re take this brief verse as a self-contained sentence, but this requires that masc. *sūbhṛtaḥ* modify neut. *havīḥ*. Though the masc. can be explained as attraction to *putrāḥ* in the simile, the sentence still doesn’t yield compelling sense. In this vs., a brief pendant to the preceding pragātha, I prefer to take pāda a as completing, contrastively, the thought of 26cd. In the fantasy role reversal depicted in vss. 25–26, where “I” am the god and “my praiser” is Agni, my praiser would not be ill-established (*dūrhitaḥ* 26c), but well-kept (*sūbhṛtaḥ*) in my house (27a). The two adjectives are complementary, and I therefore take the subject of 27a to be the praiser (not the oblation nor, as Ge also suggests [n. 27ab], Agni). (This is more or less Old’s view.) Pāda b is then an independent ritual instruction.

VIII.19.29: The three *tāva*’s morph from subjective to objective genitives: the will (*krātvā*) is definitely exercised by Agni, hence subjective genitive, while the lauds (*prāsastibhiḥ*) are those praising Agni, hence objective. The gifts (*rātibhiḥ*) can be either

those given by or given to Agni. This sequence is framed by two exx. of *táva (...)* *ūtíbhīḥ* “with your help(s)” (28a, 30a), with subjective genitive.

VIII.19.30: On *āvārah* see comm. on I.143.6. It may be better to tr. it as ‘grant’, rather than ‘choose’ -- hence “(the man) to whom you grant companionship.” The general sense is essentially unaffected either way: a man who is Agni’s companion thrives.

VIII.19.31: The voc. *śiṣṇo* is a hapax. Flg. Gr (hesitatingly endorsed by EWA, s.v.), I take it as a nonce *u*-adj. to a reduplicated form of $\sqrt{\text{san}}$ ‘gain, win’. Although an analysis as a desiderative *u*-adjective is morphologically impossible (there being no trace of a desid. suffix), I still wonder if that is the semantic nuance here -- as if it were an anit variant of *śiṣāsū-*. Ge tentatively follows Ludwig’s connection with $\sqrt{\text{sāl}}$ ‘bind’ (“du Fänger”); Re tr. it as a PN and considers it an imitation of *viṣṇo*. It might also be a deformation of **śiśo*, the expected but unattested voc. to *śiśu-* ‘child’, a frequent epithet of Agni. The context does not strongly favor (or disfavor) any of these hypotheses, and none of them is particularly strong.

ā dade is variously interpreted; even its root affiliation is disputed: to $\sqrt{\text{dā}}$ ‘give’ (which with *ā* in the middle means ‘take’) or $\sqrt{\text{dā}}$ ‘bind’. I take it to the former and assume an idiomatic meaning ‘take’ of a fire just “catching hold,” starting to burn -- an idiom also present in English (at least my English). If it also has its standard meaning ‘take [goods, etc.]’, the kindled and spreading fire could be “taking” everything in its path, and the ‘desire to gain’ sense I imputed to *śiṣṇo* might be weakly supported.

Gr, Ge, and Re take *kṣapāḥ* as gen. sg. dependent on *vāstuṣu* (Ge: “beim Hellwerden der Nacht”), though Re raises, and rejects, the possibility that it is acc. pl. -- the analysis I favor. The acc. pl. of *kṣap-* is found elsewhere in extent-of-time usage. Case disharmony (here between acc. and loc. pl.) is esp. common in temporal expressions, and, as we’ve seen, there are a number of other disharmonious phrases in this hymn.

VIII.19.34–35: These two vss. are so interrupted by heavy voc. phrases addressed to the Ādityas that it is difficult to follow the thread. The poet identifies a mortal who is especially favored by the Ādityas (34b) and who therefore holds power among men (35b) and then expresses the hope that “we” might be “they” (*vayám té ... syāma*, 35cd), that is, the fortunate man just identified. The switch in numbers is somewhat disconcerting, but can presumably be ascribed to attraction to the 1st pl. pronoun: “might we be he/that one” doesn’t work well in either Sanskrit or English.

VIII.19.35: The triple voc. phrase *vāruṇa mītrāryaman* is accented despite being internal in a pāda that begins with tonic elements. There is no obvious reason for this: although the vocc. follow the caesura and immediately follow an enclitic (*vayám té vo, vāruṇa mītrāryaman*), neither of these factors ordinarily triggers voc. accentuation. See, e.g., I.122.7 *stuṣe sã vām, varuṇa mitra rātīḥ*, where both conditions are found. For discussion of a similar case, see comm. ad VII.59.1.

VIII.19.37: *túgvān-* is a hapax. Ge and EWA (hesitatingly) take it as ‘ford’, following one suggestion of Gr’s; Old and Hoffmann (Injunk. 234–35) as ‘Stromschnelle,’ following

another. Of the two, ‘ford’ would make better sense in context: all this giving would be better at a place where the animals aren’t likely to be swept away by a rapidly flowing river. On the other hand, the likely root etymon, \sqrt{tuj} ‘thrust’, is not really conducive to ‘ford’. Re’s ‘source’, which I follow, solves both problems: a river at its source is generally a fairly placid affair, and \sqrt{tuj} is used esp. of the thrusting forth of progeny, a situation to which the arising of a river could be assimilated.

VIII.20 Maruts

VIII.20.2: *sudītībhiḥ* could also modify the chariots (so Ge), but Re suggests that it is a separate nominal when in the instr. pl., rendering it as “avec (vos) beaux éclats,” and I am inclined to agree on the basis of VI.48.3d *sudītībhiḥ sū dīdīhi*.

VIII.20.3–4: Pādas 3a, 3c, and 4a all begin with *vī*, with the last example doubled *vī (d)vī*. This sequence is anticipated by 2a *vī*.

VIII.20.4: The vs. describes the effects of the monsoon. The first hemistich contains three injunctives (*pāpatan*, *tīṣṭhat*, and *yujanta*) and the last pāda a present (*ējatha*), but pāda c contains the apparently augmented *airata*. Given this collection of verbs, it is difficult to produce a consistent temporal interpretation. The injunctives can harmonize either with the preterital *airata* or with the presential *ējatha*, but those two are incompatible. A way out of this dilemma was shown by Hoffmann (Injunc, 210), who suggests that the “cacophonous hiatus” *dhānvāni *īrata* was avoided by substituting the augmented form for the injunctive. (It would be good to have other exx. of such a hiatus-avoiding technique, however.) The whole verse can then be interpr. as presential or “general.” This temporal value continues in vs. 5, also describing the effects of the storm, with two present-tense verbs.

The second clause in pāda a, *tīṣṭhad duchúnā*, has been interpreted in two opposing senses. Ge supplies the *vī* of the first VP and tr. “das Unheil breitet sich aus.” But without the *vī* the verb would mean ‘stand (still)’ or ‘stop’ (so Re “stoppe le misère”). I favor this latter interpretation. Since the monsoon brings desired rain, which makes the plants grow and produces food and attendant well-being, it stops misery in its tracks, as it were. This stoppage contrasts with the movement of the features of the natural world in pādas a and c.

VIII.20.5: There are several ways to treat pāda a. The simplest (and to my mind the least satisfactory) is simply to take *ācyutā* as another subject of 3rd pl. *nānadati* (so, e.g., Schaeffer, Inten.). With Ge and Re, an intrans. ‘shake’ (vel sim.) can be supplied, on the basis of passages like VI.31.2b *ācyutā cic cyāvayanta rājāṃsi*, whose d-pāda ends *ājman ā te*, very like this pāda. I favor a different solution: simply continuing *yād ējatha* “when you stir” from the preceding pāda (4d). Although the two verses do not belong to the same pragātha, the continuity of theme is clear.

VIII.20.6: Although *jīhīta* appears, unusually, to lack a preverb, the comp. *úttarā* ‘higher’ substitutes for *úd* here. For general disc. of $\sqrt{hā}$, see comm. X.49.5.

The fem. form *úttarā* modifies (at a distance) *dyaúh*, which is otherwise overwhelmingly masc. For this occasional gender switch, see comm. ad I.57.5 and VIII.40.4.

Given that the Maruts are displaying their *tvákṣāmsi* on their own bodies (*tanūṣvā*), I wonder if there is a little pun on *tvác-* ‘skin’.

VIII.20.7: I read *ānu* both with what precedes (*svadhām*) and what follows (*śrīyam*) and do not, contra Ge, take the latter as obj. of *vāhante*. Med. forms of *vāha-* are several times used reflexively of the Maruts’ progress (V.58.1, V.60.7, V.61.11, X.77.6) without obj.

My tr. of *vṛṣa-psu-* and *āhruta-psu-* (as well as *vṛṣa-psu-* in 10a) are owing to Thieme. See reff. at comm. ad I.49.3.

VIII.20.8: The charming phrase “the music is anointed with cows” refers of course to the standard economic transaction: hymns of praise rewarded with bestowal of livestock.

Against most tr., I take pāda a as an independent nominal clause and construe b with c. The locc. in b refer to the chariot and its box, onto which the Maruts are mounting. The same phrase two hymns later, VIII.22.9 *ā hí ruhátam ..., ráthe kóse hiraṇyáye*, with a verb of mounting, seems to clinch this interpr., though Ge (n. 8b) explicitly claims that the two nearby phrases, in hymns by the same poet, are used differently.

I think *gó-bandhu-* ‘having a cow/cows as kin’ is a pun, an interpr. not registered in the publ. tr. On the one hand it refers to the Maruts’ mother Pṛśni; on the other, on the basis of *vāja-bandhu-* ‘having prizes as kin’ (VIII.68.19) and the word play in the adjacent hymn, VIII.21.4 (see comm. there), it is also a clever way to say that the Maruts have cows at their disposal to give to us. These are the same cows with which the music is anointed in pāda a.

I do not see any way around supplying a verb of motion or mounting in bcd: the Maruts mount their chariot or come in order for us to enjoy the nourishment they bring (cf. 2c *iṣā nah ... ā gatā* “come here to us with nourishment”) and to gain other desirable things, in two parallel infinitive phrases (*iṣé bhujé ... na spárase*).

The root noun *iṣ-* is tr. two different ways in 2c (‘refreshment’) and 8c (‘nourishment’). These should have been harmonized.

VIII.20.9–10: The ‘bull’ stem (*vṛṣa(n)-*) is dominant in these verses (9b, 9c, 10a [twice], 10b), with this sequence phonologically inaugurated in 9a with *vṛṣad(-añji-)* ‘raining unguents’, a synchronically distinct word – if this is the correct analysis. It is followed by Gr, Ge (tentatively), Gotō, and me, but see Old and Re for contrary views. In any case the cmpd was evoked by the repetition of ‘bull’ in these vss.

VIII.20.12: Ge takes *tanūṣu* as attenuated to something close to a reflexive (“sind nicht auf sich selbst eifersüchtig”), but in vss. 6 and 26 it is lexically robust. I think the point here is to contrast the adornment of their bodies with that of other locations associated with them (their chariots and their faces).

VIII.20.13: That their name can be “broad/widespread like a flood” may at first seem odd, but the point is simply that it is widely known.

Pāda b expresses another common point about the Maruts: they do not have individual names (though see V.52.10–11), but “Marut” serves for each one of them. I differ from Ge and Re in taking gen. pl. *śásvatām* ‘of each and every one’ as referring to the Maruts, not to the mass of people; therefore in my view the subj. of the inf. *bhujé* is the Maruts, not these same unidentified people.

I do not know if *pítrya-* here refers specifically to the Maruts’ ancestors (esp., presumably, Rudra), as I have taken it, or whether this is a more general statement: “like ancestral life force” (so, more or less, Ge and Re).

VIII.20.14: As Old points out (and as is reflected in Ge’s and Re’s tr.), *ná* must stand for **ná ná*, i.e., the simile marker followed by a negative. The same no-last-spoke image is found in V.58.5 with alternative realizations of both simile marker (*iva*) and negative (privative *a-*): *arā́ ivéd ácaramā(h)*.

The pāda break between c and d goes counter to the syntactic parallelism:
 syntax: *tád eṣām dānā́* meter: ... *tád eṣām,*
mahnā́ tád eṣām *dānā́ mahnā́ tád eṣām*

This produces a syncopated effect, emphasized by the polarized positions of the parallel instr. *dānā́* and *mahnā́* in their nominal clauses.

VIII.20.15: In c the presence of both *vā* ‘or’ and *utá* ‘and’ is curious, as is the position of the latter. Klein (DGRV I.450) suggests that the placement of *utá* after *nūnām* means that it should be construed with that adv., and so *vā* and *utá* each retains its own force.

VIII.20.16: The *yásya vā* opening this verse, parallel to *yó vā* in 15c, shows that this clause is still dependent on the main clause in 15ab *subhāgaḥ śá* “very fortunate he ...” The main clause in 16c may refer only to the *vājín-* of ab or to the various *subhāga-* folk of vss. 15–16.

The hapax *gatha* in b is an anomalous form, with a present 2nd pl. ending (*-tha*) on a root aorist stem. It is clearly a nonce form generated beside 2nd pl. impv. *gata* in 10d. The pādas are otherwise almost identical: 10d *havyā́ no vītā́ye gata*, 16b *ā́ havyā́ vītā́ye gatha*.

VIII.20.17: The identity and distribution of forms in pāda b are oddly unclear. Is *diváh* dependent on *ásurasya*, or are they coreferential, or are they independent of each other? In the first instance this produces “lord of heaven” (as I have it in the publ. tr; see also W. E. Hale [Asura, p. 75] “of the asura of the Sky”); in the 2nd “Lord Heaven” (so Ge: “Asura Himmel”); in the 3rd Re’s “(les hommes) du ciel, de l’Asura.” Do these genitives qualify Rudra (gen. *rudrásya* in a), as I take it, or *vedhásah* (so Ge: “die ... Meister des Asura Himmel,” sim. W. E. Hale), or, with Re, are they direct qualifiers of the Maruts? I opt for the first solution because *vedhás-* does not usually govern anything and because Rudra is called *ásuro mahó diváh* in II.1.6, *divó ásurāya* in V.41.3, and probably *diváh ... ásurasya* in I.122.1 contra Ge. And in fact is *vedhásah* nom. pl., as it’s universally taken, or another gen. sg., perhaps qualifying Rudra? Parallels cut both ways. Rudra is in fact called *vedhás-* in VII.46.1, but the Maruts are so called in V.52.13, 54.6.

VIII.20.18: Syntactic problems continue in this verse. Contra most interpr., I take *ab* as a continuation of vs. 17, still couched in the 3rd ps., and *cd* as a new clause directly addressing the Maruts in the 2nd ps. The first hemistich consists of two parallel relative clauses, with the two forms of *yé* positioned at the extreme ends, opening and closing the half-verse. The clauses are connected by an inverse *ca*: #*yé ca ... yé*#. This inversion is phonologically motivated, producing a mirror image figure: #*yé cārḥanti ... cāranti yé*# (Saṃhitā text, but 1st verb metrically to be read *ca árḥanti*).

There are further problems. *árḥanti* has no expressed object -- unless *marútaḥ* is taken as acc., with the subj. being unexpressed human worshipers; see Old's reff. This seems a thoroughly bad idea, given the rhetorical structure of this pragātha. Ge supplies "zu heissen" (that is, "deserve [to be called]"), which seems a fairly radical addition; Re "notre hommage" (so also Klein, DGRV I.186), which is somewhat easier to justify semantically but for which there is no parallel. My "soma drink" is based on a number of passages where some expression containing *pītīm* 'drink' (+/- 'soma') serves as obj. of \sqrt{arh} (I.134.6, II.14.2, IV.47.2, V.51.6); this is the most common expressed obj. to \sqrt{arh} .

In *b mīlhúṣaḥ* is the problem. Technically speaking, this cannot be a nom. pl. as I have rendered it. The correct form should be *mīlvāṃsaḥ*, which is found only once in the RV, though nearby (VIII.25.14, but not attributed to the same poet). Most take it here as the accusative pl. it appears to be, referring to the generous (human) patrons whom the Maruts approach (e.g., Ge "und die zu den Lohnherrn insgesamt(?) kommen"). This is certainly possible, but, with Old, I nonetheless take it as a nominative, because the stem is often used of the Maruts, including in this very hymn (3c gen. pl. *mīlhúṣām*). The misinterpretation could be aided by passages like VI.66.3 *rudrāsya yé mīdhúṣaḥ sánti putrāḥ*, where the adjective technically modifies gen. sg. Rudra, but could be interpr. as going with nom. pl. *putrāḥ*. Cf. also VII.58.5, which is entirely ambiguous. It is indeed barely possible that *mīlhúṣaḥ* here actually *is* a gen. sg., picking up the *rudrāsya* of 17a, but I think this unlikely. The morphologically weak nom. pl. here might also be favored by phonological motivations, in order to produce a form similar to *marútaḥ* in the previous pāda in the same metrical position (i.e., immediately preceding a four-syllable cadence).

yúvānaḥ here is a voc.; the identical form in 17c is most likely a nominative. The acc. to the same stem, *yūnaḥ*, opens the next vs. (19a).

In *d* the Saṃhitā *vavṛdhvam* must be read **vavṛd-dh^uvam* with both distraction and a heavy root syllable ($\sqrt{vṛt}$ 'turn'). For a similar situation, see *ácidhvam* in VIII.7.2, which must be read **ácid-dh^uvam* (\sqrt{cit}).

VIII.20.19: As was pointed out in the publ. intro., pāda *c* contains a pun: the intens. part. *cárkṛṣat* can belong straightforwardly to $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ 'plough', and in this reading the simile depicts a person engaged in ploughing singing or otherwise verbally encouraging his team, just as Sobhari sings to the Maruts. (In this case *gāḥ* would probably be better rendered "oxen.") But it can also be secondarily associated with the root $\sqrt{kṛ}$ 'celebrate, praise', which has a curiously formed 3rd sg. -*se* medial intensive *cárkṛṣe* (3x), beside act. *carkar-/carkir-*. For purposes of word play a nonce stem *cárkṛṣ-* could be extracted from the isolated *cárkṛṣe*. In this reading Sobhari is praising the Maruts like cows (see vs. 21); in other words this is a sort of reverse dānastuti. That the Maruts are called bulls in pāda *b* simply adds to the play.

Note also the phonological echo in *gāya gā(h)*.

VIII.20.20: Ge plausibly explains the sg. *hāvyaḥ* as attraction to the number in the simile (sg. *muṣṭihā*). One might also add that *hāvya-* is overwhelmingly nom. sg, and there are no masc. pl. forms attested. There seems no obvious reason for such a grammatical restriction, but it may have contributed to the somewhat anomalous form here.

All standard interpr. (including mine) take the simile in b to be *vīṣṇaś candrān ná* “like lustrous bulls,” despite the displaced simile marker -- in part presumably because “like lustrous/brilliant ones” doesn’t make much sense as a simile. I have no explanation for the placement of *ná*, nor do I understand why this needs to be a simile at all, since the Maruts are regularly called bulls without such marking (see nearby 19b, e.g., as well as 9–10, 12). Perhaps it indirectly continues the pun in the simile in 19c, which in turn is continued in vs. 21.

VIII.20.21: The cow imagery of vs. 19 (and implicitly 20) continues here. Ge and Re take this as a simile (“like cows”), but this requires interpr. *cid* as a simile marker, a function for *cid* that I do not believe in. It is even less likely because the next verse begins with a parallel structure (*mārtaś cid*), where the *cid* is definitely not a simile marker. I do, however, think that the Maruts are identified with the cows here. There are several themes intertwined. The most obvious point of comparison between cows and Maruts is their common birth (*sajātyèna ... sábandhavaḥ*) as a herd/flock and consequent lack of individual differentiation, a characteristic of the Maruts treated earlier, in vss. 13–14. But the Maruts also have a cow for a mother; this was asserted in 8c, and the phraseology there (*góbandhavaḥ sujātāsaḥ* “akin to a cow, well-born”) is echoed here (*gāvaḥ ... sajātyèna ... sábandhavaḥ*), thus alluding to the Maruts’ kinship with cows. Hence *sábandhu-* here has two senses: both cows and Maruts have common birth within their own group (that is, cows with cows, Maruts with Maruts), but cows and Maruts have a common birth with each other (cows with Maruts, due to the Maruts’ bovine mother). This type of kinship is treated also in 22ab. I also identified a secondary meaning in 8c: being akin to cows is a way of saying that the Maruts have cows to give, and I think that is slightly hinted at here.

I don’t quite understand the relevance of “they lick each other’s humps.” Lü (Varuṇa 90) suggests that the vs. praises the unity (Eintracht) of the Maruts, and, if somewhat sharpened, this may be the correct explanation. “Lick each other’s humps” may be the equivalent of English “watch each other’s backs”: individuals act reciprocally (*mithāḥ* here) and protectively for the common good of the group.

Note the echo of the final words in a and b: ... *samanyavaḥ*# ... *sábandhavaḥ*#. The opening *gāvaś cid ghā* also faintly echoes *gāya gā* opening 21a.

VIII.20.22: The theme of cross-species kinship in vs. 21 continues here, with the mortal seeking brotherhood (*bhrātrtvám*) with the Maruts.

The verse as a whole, balancing brotherhood (*bhrātrtvám*) and friendship (*āptivám*), should be evaluated in conjunction with vs. 13 of the next hymn (VIII.21, by the same poet) *abhrātrvyó anā tvám, ánāpir indra janúṣā sanād asi / yudhéd āpitvám ichase*, where Indra is said to lack either. See comm. thereon.

VIII.20.23: *bheṣajāsya* appears to be a partitive genitive.

VIII.20.24: Note the relatively elementary figure in c *máyo (no) bhūta ... mayobhuvah*.

The voc. *asacadviṣah* has given rise to multiple competing analyses, well summarized by Scar in his detailed treatment of this hapax (246–48). Most start with *dvīṣ-* ‘hatred, hater’ as 2nd member and some form of \sqrt{sac} ‘follow, accompany’ as its first, governing the second. The problem is *what* form of \sqrt{sac} ? It cannot be a straightforward thematic verbal stem or participle/injunctive (*saca-* or *sacat-* [though **asacad-dviṣah* is a phonologically possible underlying form]) because the Class I pres. of \sqrt{sac} is resolutely middle. (Debrunner [Nachtr. AiG II.1.87] also disputes this analysis on the basis that the accent is wrong for a verbal governing cmpd of that sort, but since the form is a voc. and unaccented, this argument is inapplicable. [It does apply to the other form he mentions, *jaradvīṣ-*, but these forms do not have to be parallel.]) It is also possible to take it as a standard type of root noun cmpd with the root noun governing the 1st member (‘hating the *asaca*’ or ‘not hating the *saca*’; at some point I toyed with the idea of ‘hating the non-aligned’), but this still founders on the puzzle of *asaca-*. Scar’s own solution is to divide the cmpd differently, as *asacad-vīṣ-*, with $\sqrt{vīṣ}$ ‘bring about’ as 2nd member and a form of \sqrt{sac} (2) ‘dry out’ as 1st member, hence ‘not bringing about drought’ or ‘bringing about non-drought’. Unfortunately getting *-sacat-* from this root requires a lot of not too plausible machinery -- it is no more straightforward than deriving *-saca(t)-* from \sqrt{sac} (1) -- though I am sympathetic to his argument that the meaning would fit well with the Maruts’ character. My own ‘who do not partner hatred’ rests essentially on a loose interpr. of the verbal governing analysis presented first above, though I hold no particular brief for it. I would point out that if it does contain \sqrt{sac} ‘accompany’, it could pair contrastively with *sakhāyāḥ* in the preceding vs. (23c). A very weak argument for \sqrt{sac} (1) and $\sqrt{dvīṣ}$ could be constructed on the basis of VIII.22.2, a hymn to the Aśvins but also composed by Sobhari. There the Aśvins’ chariot is described as *sacanāvantam* ‘provided with companions’ vel sim., the first word of pāda c, and as *vīdveṣasam* ‘free of hatred’, the first word of pāda d, with the same two roots. But I would not make much of this.

VIII.20.26: The voc. *marutaḥ* in c was carelessly omitted in the publ. tr.

VIII.21 Indra

VIII.21.2: *dhṛṣát* is ordinarily an adverb, originally probably the neut. of a VIth class present of which there are no finite forms – except, possibly, this one. The relative pronoun *yāḥ* invites *dhṛṣát* to be read as a 3rd sg. injunctive (and of course in a relative clause its accent would be correct). I would suggest that either the neut. part. *dhṛṣát* has been misanalyzed and pressed into service as a finite form or, more likely, that *yāḥ* is serving as a loose izafe connecting this adverbial qualifier with the subject. I’m afraid that the publ. tr. does not attempt to render *yó dhṛṣát* literally – it’s represented by “in his daring.” Note that the *yāḥ* cannot be a postposed rel. with *cakrāma* because the pf. is unaccented.

On metrically bad *vavṛmahe*, see Kü (459) and comm. ad VI.4.7.

Old suggests that the “youth” is King Citra, whose dānastuti ends the hymn. This seems perfectly plausible but nonetheless unprovable.

VIII.21.4: The publ. tr. should have a close parens after “[horses, etc.].”

I interpret this verse in the context of its pragātha. The question is who are the kin that Indra has and we do not. I suggest that Indra’s “kin” are the horses, cows, and so forth named in vs. 3. In VIII.68.19 the patrons are called *vāja-bandhu-* ‘having prizes as kin’, as a hint that they should give them to us. I think the same image is at work here: we lack kin, and you have these desirable kin (horses, etc.) that could become akin to us too.

In the second hemistich these kin become *dhāmāni*. The stem *dhāman-* is of course a highly charged and multivalent word, but in this case I think it comes close to its literal sense: ‘deposits’, that is, things put or set down ($\sqrt{dhā}$), which Indra is to bring to deposit on the ritual ground.

VIII.21.5: A verse that makes less sense the more one thinks about it, since the bird simile does not seem to fit the context: birds don’t normally sit either next to or in honey, nor do they normally roar. The simile must have as its third term “in a nest” or “in a tree” (cf. *dru-śād(van)* several times of birds) as the parallel to the loc. honey phrase.

VIII.21.6: In pāda a *ca* must have subordinating value because of the accent on *vādāmasi*. So also Klein (I.245), though he considers the *ca* originally to have signalled interstanzaic conjunction.

VIII.21.8: The loc. *samasmin* belongs to the indefinite prn. *sama-*. As discussed ad X.29.4, the stem (13x not counting repetitions) is overwhelmingly used in clear pejorative contexts, and the apparently neutral or positive uses found in VI.27.3 and X.54.3 are in fact better read as negative (see comm. ad locc.). Our passage also initially looks neutral, but in the context of its pragātha I think the intent is negative as well. In vs. 7 the poet complains that Indra has been holding out on him and his fellows, who previously “have not known your abundance.” Vs. 8 indicates that the situation has been remedied and Indra is showing favor, but I suggest that in the 2nd hemistich the poet remains dubious about Indra’s full generosity, and that *samasmin* in the loc. phrase *samasmin ... vāje ... gómātī* is meant to convey the poet’s desire that Indra exert himself for them whenever any prize of cattle, however paltry, is in play. In the publ. tr. *samasmin* is not rendered; I would emend the tr. to “whenever *any* prize ...”

VIII.21.9: The 2nd pl. reference is to the poet’s fellow ritual celebrants.

VIII.21.10: The first pāda, in the accusative, continues 9c, hanging off *īndram* there. The second pāda may be attached to the first, as Ge takes it, or to cd, as I take it. There are no strong arguments either way, but I assume the causal clause in b grounds the expectations we have in cd: because he has reached exhilaration *with us* (this last bit unexpressed), he will provide for us.

VIII.21.11: The image in this verse is of a contest for cattle, where a competitor challenges us (ancient trash talk) and we can successfully respond, thanks to having Indra

as our ally. The word qualifying the competitor, *śvasānt-* ‘snorting’, calls to mind Indra’s enemy Śuṣṇa (on the etymological connection see EWA s.v. *śuṣṇa-*) and therefore makes our human competition sound more formidable.

VIII.21.12: Continues the thought of vs. 11, that with Indra on our side we can take on all challenges and challengers. I therefore tr. the 1st pl. optatives as potential “we could” rather than the voluntative “might we” (Ge “wir wollen”). The 2nd sg. verb *aveḥ* in d does not work well in this schema, at least in its ordinary interpretation as an optative to the 1st class pres. of \sqrt{av} ‘help’. Although “you should / might you help our visions” is possible, esp. given that *dhî-* is not infrequently the object of \sqrt{av} (cf., e.g., I.117.23 *vísivā dhíyaḥ ... prāvatam me*), I have taken it instead as the imperfect of the root pres. of $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’. Although ‘thought, vision’ is not a regular object of $\sqrt{vī}$, it does occur; cf. I.77.4 *agnír gíró ’vasā vetu dhītím* “let Agni with his help pursue our hymns, our visionary thought” (note the presence of *āvasā* ‘help’ as well). This *aveḥ* would pick up the subjunctive *vayati* of 10c, also with Indra as subject, also performing this action in our service, and the visions he pursues here are those announced in 6d. I interpret the word *dhî-* in both places as referring to our fantasies about what we want out of Indra and how we could be victorious. In 12 Indra seems to have fulfilled these fantasies. Against the interpretation of *aveḥ* as belonging to \sqrt{av} we might note that the optative to the extremely well-attested thematic present *āvati* is almost non-existent. If the form here is otherwise analysed, the only secure form is *avet* in VI.47.15; *āvet* in V.34.8 I also take to $\sqrt{vī}$. However, I do not consider the standard interpretation of *aveḥ* here as belonging to \sqrt{av} entirely excluded.

VIII.21.13: The use of *bhrātrvya-*, lit. ‘nephew, cousin’, as ‘rival’ is exceedingly common in Vedic prose, but only really begins in the AV; this is the only such example in the RV. The passage here seems to be an expansion, with lexical renewal, of I.102.8 *aśatrúr indra janúṣā sanād asi* “You are without rival, Indra, by birth from of old,” but I would also suggest that the use of an explicit kinship term *a-bhrātrvyá* (as opposed to the generic *a-śatrú-*) is deliberate, given the web of relationships the poet develops in this hymn (see publ. intro.) It is possible that *-bhrātrvya-* here is meant to be taken in both the negative sense that is standard later (rival < rivalrous nephew/cousin) and in a positive one, simply naming a blood relation. Thus the hemistich could mean both “you have no nephew *and* no friend” and “you have no rival *but* no friend”). As a kinship term *abhrātrvyá-* would contrast with the *bāndhumant-* of 4a, where Indra is explicitly credited with having kin.

As disc. ad X.94.3–4, the function/meaning of the adverbial instr. *anā* is hard to pin down. I opt there for ‘evidently, clearly’ and would now substitute for “by the same token” (my ad hoc solution in the publ. tr.) “you are clearly without rival, but (also) without friend.” Indra’s superiority in might would make his lack of rival obvious, but his lack of friend is a more surprising. Note that *anā* in pāda a is phonologically echoed by *ānāpiḥ* ‘without friend’ opening the next pāda.

VIII.21.14: The motivation for some of these statements needs some explication. The first hemistich concerns two negative figures; the second one, in pāda b, the man who swells up on *surā*, the secular and disreputable drink -- in other words a drunk, a lush, or in Ge’s felicitous tr. “die Schnappshelden” -- is implicitly contrasted with a man who handles the much-honored drink *soma* in a ritual context. But why should a rich man

(pāda a) be disfavored? Perhaps because he has what he needs and need not enter into partnership with Indra, whereas we, more needy, are willing to engage in the reciprocal activities involved in honoring Indra. I reluctantly abandoned my tr. of *revántam*- as ‘fat cat’, primarily because *revánt-* is not usually used in slangy contexts.

In pāda a *nākiḥ* is problematic. This form generally serves as 3rd ps. subject ‘no one’, but in this context it cannot refer to the 2nd sg. subj. of *vindase*, namely, of course, Indra. Instead it is standardly rendered ‘never’ (e.g., Ge as well as the publ. tr.). I now wonder if it actually qualifies the acc. obj. *revántam*. Just as *nākīm* in VIII.78.4 (see comm. ad loc.) takes on nominative function (see also *mākim* in VI.54.7 and comm. thereon), so perhaps *nākis* got secondarily extended to acc. function. I would now consider an alt. tr. “You take on no rich man ...”

I’m afraid that I don’t understand the second hemistich at all, primarily because I don’t know whether the omitted object of *sám ūhasi* should be the negative figures of ab or positively or neutrally viewed humans in general. The sentiment of pāda d would support the latter idea: that when Indra enters into battle, he puts everyone together (under his protection), thereby behaving like a father. But the only other instance of *sám √ ūh* (I.131.3), also with Indra as subject, has him shoving the two opposing sides into fighting each other, with a come-what-may attitude. This seems more likely here, in which case pāda d would express the opposing sides’ competing calls to Indra to help them.

VIII.21.15: Again the cultural content here is somewhat elusive and therefore the relation of the simile to the frame not entirely clear. The woman who grows old at home (*amājūr-*) must be a spinster (see II.17.7 for the clearest context of this word), but what aspect of her activity we wish to avoid isn’t defined. It may simply be that we should not sit still and inactive at the soma sacrifice when we should be busying ourselves serving Indra. (Although one wonders whether an ancient Indian spinster was allowed just to sit around, rather than being a virtual servant to her parents and the rest of the extended family. I would think she’d be busy enough.) Or perhaps there is a pun embedded in *nī √ sad*; in later Sanskrit this lexeme can mean ‘sink down (mentally), be depressed’ and so perhaps it’s the spinster’s mental state that’s at issue. It is even possible, if we read this verse with its pragātha partner, vs. 16, to take “let us not miss out...” of 16a as a gloss on what aspect of the spinster’s life we wish to avoid in 15: she missed out on marriage, but we do not want to miss out on Indra’s gifts.

VIII.21.16: The connection between pādas a and b must be that were we to miss out on Indra’s gifts, we would be likely to complain about him.

On d see Scar 196. Ge’s “Gaben” cannot be right for *dāmānaḥ*, which should be a personal designation; see Scar’s “die Geschenke machen / Geschenke bekommen.” Perhaps like *somānam* (I.18.1) it contains a Hoffmann suffix.

VIII.21.17: There is no overt question marker, but the verse works better with vs. 18 as a series of deliberative questions, to be answered by the emphatic declaration of Citra’s preeminence in 18.

VIII.21.18: The clustering of demotic *ka*-forms in *dānastutis* (see Jamison 2008, 2009) is nicely illustrated by *rājākā́ id anyaké, yaké*, with the suffix even attached to the relative pronoun.

tatānat must be a pun on the two roots \sqrt{tan} ‘thunder’ and ‘stretch’. See Old. Parjanya of course thunders, but he also stretches through the midspace with his rain. Citra will likewise both make a big noise and extend his largesse.

VIII.22 Aśvins

Esp. towards the end of the hymn, *pāda*-initial (*C*)*ā* becomes an insistent marker: *ā́* (8c, 9a), *yā́(bhiḥ)* (10a, b), *tā́(bhiḥ)* (10c, 12a), *yā́(bhiḥ)* (12d), *tā́(u)* (13a, b, c, 14a, b), *mā́* (14c), *ā́* (15a), *prā́(tā́)* (15b), *ā́(rā́ttāc)* (16c), *ā́* (17a). The most concentrated sequence is in vss. 13–14 with the repeated dual prn. *tā́(u)* ‘these two’, referring to the Aśvins.

VIII.22.1–2: This *pragātha* contains poetic self-address at a distance. Vs. 1 begins *ā́ ... have* “I have called here ...,” while 2c ends with the voc. *sobhare*. (On poetic self-address see Jamison [Fs. Skjaervø, 2009].)

VIII.22.2: The reading of the first word of this vs. is uncertain. The *Samhitā* text apparently reads *pūrvāyúṣam* but the Pp. *pūrva-āpúṣam*, accepted by Sāy as well as Old and edited in all the standard editions (MM, Aufr., HvN). This seems to be a genuine variant reading. For disc. see Old ad loc. and Scar 320–22. I generally follow the Old analysis for the 2nd member; the objection that with a 2nd member *āyus-* the accent should be **pūrvāyusam* or **pūrvāyusām* seems cogent to me. But I have not adopted Old’s suggestion that *pūrva-* stands for **puru-* (hence ‘prospering many’, vel sim.), with the *ū* introduced under the influence of *pūrvyam* at the end of the hemistich. This is not impossible, but since *puru-spṛham* intervenes, it might have helped maintain an original **puru-* in the initial word. Scar suggests several further analyses, which seem too fussy to me.

sacanāvant- is construed with the instr. *sumatībhiḥ*: “provided with favors as accompaniment.”

I would now substitute “without flaw” for “without fault,” on the basis of my reinterpret. of *anehās-* (comm. ad X.61.12). The Aśvins’ chariot is physically, not morally, perfect. See also the use of *anehās-* in nearby VIII.18.21, 31.12.

VIII.22.4: For *īrmā́* ‘at rest, standing still’, contra Gr ‘*rasch*’, etc., Ge ‘*zurück*’, see Narten IJ 10 (1967–68) and EWA s.v.

iṣanyā- is ordinarily transitive, so I take *vām* as its obj. (so also Gr), contra Ge and Re. This must be a paradox: the motionless chariot wheel is the one that propels them, not the speedy one in *pāda* a. I do not have a vision of how this would work in practice, though.

VIII.22.6: On ploughing with a wolf, see the publ. intro.

VIII.22.11: Although *ádhrigu-* is simply a *-u*-stem, the negated form of Aves. *drigu-* ‘poor’ (see comm. ad I.61.1), in the nom. pl. it is treated as if it were a compd. with ‘cow’, with *ádhrigāvaḥ* (also I.64.3) instead of expected **ádhrigavaḥ* (see AiG III.158). But

things may be more complicated, for, as Gr notes, in I.61.1 the dat. *ádhrigave* would be better metrically as **ádhrigāve*. In this case it does not match the ‘cow’ word, whose dative is *gāve*. However, Wackernagel (AiG III.149) considers an emendation to *-gāve* unnecessary and refers to Old (Prol. 90 and Noten ad loc.) for the meter. It’s also possible that I.61.1 just borrowed the length from I.64.3, both Nodhas products, because the stem was not entirely understood.

VIII.22.12: On *viśvápsu-* see comm. ad I.148.1.

Old explains 3rd pl. *vāvr̥dhúḥ* as metri causa for du. **vāvr̥dháthuḥ*, and this is accepted by Ge. But the only other passage in which *krívi-* is found as a clear PN (though cf. V.44.4, VIII.51.8 [Vālahk.], IX.9.6 for more dubious exx.) is in a nearby Sobhari hymn, in which he is favored by the Maruts (VIII.20.24 *yābhīr daśasyathā krívīm* “with which you favor Krivi”). The *yābhīḥ* there has the same referent as here, namely *ūtíbhīḥ* ‘forms of help’ and *vāvr̥dhúḥ* is a semantic variant of *daśasyathā*. I therefore think it very likely that the plural verb is correct and that this is an allusion to the Maruts’ aid to Krivi. Recall that in vs. 1c, at least by my interpr., the Aśvins also follow the Maruts’ lead, also and identically 14b, and they are addressed as Rudras (that is, Maruts) in 14c.

VIII.22.15: The vs. begins with an echo of the first vs., or rather the first pragātha, in which the poet called on the Aśvins’ chariot (1a *ó tyám ahva ā rátham*), here reprised by *ā ... súgmyam ... / huvé* “I call the easily moving (chariot).” But in pāda b the poet thinks better of it and addresses the Aśvins directly. This change of heart is signalled by *vā* ‘or’.

Ge, flg. Sāy, takes *sakṣāṇī-* to \sqrt{sac} ‘accompany’, but as Re points out, all other forms of *sakṣāṇī-* (incl. those separated by Gr into a separate lemma derived from \sqrt{sac}) belong to \sqrt{sah} , and this etymon works fine here.

The echo of the first pragātha continues with the poet’s self-identification as *sóbharī* at the end of the verse, echoing his self-address with voc. *sobhare* at the end of 2c. *sóbharī* here is one of two occurrences of this PN that have apparently fem. endings (the other is gen. sg. *sóbharyāḥ* in VIII.103.14). Ge questioning suggests that we might be dealing with a female poet, but this seems highly unlikely, esp. given the voc. *sobhare* in vs. 2 and elsewhere in this group of hymns (VIII.19.2, 20.19). See AiG III.183 on masc. - \bar{f} -stem PN and their transfer to the *i*-inflection.

VIII.22.18: On *suprāvargám* see comm. ad VIII.4.6.

VIII.23 Agni

VIII.23.1: The hymn begins with a *hí* clause. Flg. JPB, the *hí* signals that the action in this clause precedes and forms the basis of the action in b.

On *pratīvyām* see Scar 500.

VIII.23.2: With Ge I take ab as a continuation of vs. 1, with c starting a new clause. The vocc. in ab are the self-address of the poet, as in VIII.22.1–2. Here the poet first exhorts himself with 2nd ps. imperatives (1ab) and then switches to a pseudo-modal 1st ps. -*se* in c. The first voc. *viśvacarṣaṇe* (2a) is a bit of a red herring, since this stem is otherwise used of gods. But he addresses and thus identifies himself with his speaking name

Viśvamanas in b, making it clear that he was simply appropriating the divine epithet for himself.

I supply *vāhnīn* to govern *rāthānām* in c, on the basis of *vāhniḥ* in 3c and *vāhnī rāthānām* in VIII.94.1. I surmise that this is also Re's thinking behind "(comme conducteurs) des chars," though he makes no comment.

VIII.23.3: Ge (n. 3c) takes *upavidā ... vindate* as simply equivalent to *upavindate*, which is esp. puzzling because *úpa* is not otherwise construed with \sqrt{vid} in the RV. My 'close' in the tr. 'close searching' is meant to convey the intimate nuance of this preverb.

Note the *v* alliteration in c: *upavidā vāhnir vindate vásu*.

VIII.23.5: I take *abhikhyā* in the sense of 'glance' rather than 'appearance' (as Gr, Re, and Scar 99 do). The finite forms of *abhí* $\sqrt{khyā}$ all have the meaning 'look at', as do the 2 occurrences of the gerund *abhikhyāya* (I.155.5, II.30.9). *abhikhyā* occurs 3 times (here + I.148.5, X.112.10, all compatible with a meaning 'glance' [*pace* Gr]). It may either be the instr. sg. of a root noun or (with AiG II.2.782) a haplologized form of the gerund *abhikhyāya*. Both possibilities are considered by Scar (98–99).

VIII.23.6: Contra most interpr., I take Agni as driving to the gods to present them with our praises as well as our oblations, rather than coming here (e.g., Re "arrive avec les belles louanges").

The impv. *yāhí* is accented because it follows an initial voc.

VIII.23.9: Both Ge and Re explicitly identify the subj. of *jujuṣuḥ* in c as those seeking truth (voc. *rtāyavaḥ*), the human ritualists addressed in a. Although switch between 2nd and 3rd ps. even within a verse is not rare, I think the gods are the more likely subject, as they generally are to forms of $\sqrt{juṣ}$. This verse depicts the ritual model whereby Agni brings the gods to the ritual ground to receive oblations, with this location specified by *námasas padé* -- in contrast to vs. 6, where Agni conveys the oblations and praises to the gods (presumably in heaven), the other model of sacrificial interaction.

VIII.23.16: The point of this verse seems to be that Vyaśva (the poet's father) got the goods, either directly from Agni or via the patron Ukṣan, and we hope this will provide a pattern for us.

The grammatically disharmonious phrase *mahó rāyé* would better be tr. "greatly for wealth." See disc. ad IV.31.11.

VIII.23.18–19: Just as vs. 16 provides an ancestral pattern for the poet to gain goods from Agni and/or his patron, these vss. take the gods' establishment of Agni as their messenger as the prototype for mortals' doing the same.

VIII.23.21: On the apparent bad cadence produced by *ávidhat*, see remarks ad II.1.7, where Arnold's suggestion to read a long augment is adopted.

VIII.23.24: The hapax *sthūrayūpavát* may be a pun. On the one hand, formations of this sort, with neut. -*vát* suffix, generally mean 'like X', 'as X did', with X a PN. The

presence of an undoubted ex. in the same position in the immediately preceding vs., *vyaśvavāt* ‘like Vyaśva’, strongly supports this interpr. The poet addressed by the impv. *arca* is being urged to chant ‘like Sthūrayūpa’. Gr and Re interpr. the form thus. But *sthūrayūpa-* also has lexical meaning, ‘(having?) sturdy posts’ (in the absence of accent we cannot tell whether the cmpd is a bahuvrīhi or a karmadhāraya). The yūpa is both the post to which the animal to be sacrificed is tethered and a crucial post or beam in the construction of dwellings. In this lexical meaning the comparison could either be between the praise songs and sturdy posts or someone who possesses them, *or* between Agni and the post or post-possessor. Note that it is Agni *dāmya-* (‘of the household’) who receives the chant. If the comparison is to the praise songs, they would be conceptualized as the uprights that help make the house solid. The parallel adduced by Ge, I.51.14 ... *stómo dūryo ná yūpaḥ* “a praise-song like a door-post,” is particularly apt. This is the sense reflected in my tr. and also in Ge’s and assumes a karmadhāraya. If the comparison is to Agni, a bahuvrīhi would be better: “to Agni of the household, like one [=a house] having sturdy posts.” The kinship asserted between Agni and trees in the next verse may give some support to this last interpr.

VIII.23.26: The syntax of this vs. is very difficult; Re even suggests that it consists of fragments “non syntaxisés” -- a coinage I would like to introduce to English. The standard interpr. take the NP in pāda a as acc. pl., more (Old) or less (Ge) parallel to *havyāni* in b and then either supply a verb to govern them (Ge: “bring [X to Y]”) or cobble together a very implausible syntactic bond between the verb *nī satsi* in c and the accusatives in ab (e.g., Re “En direction de tous ... assieds toi”). I take a very different route, first by interpr. *mahāḥ ... satāḥ* not as acc. pl. but gen./abl. sg. This phrase seems to have some special status: cf. I.36.3 *mahās te satāḥ* “since you are great,” same phrase in VIII.101.11 “of you who are great.” I take the referent of the abl./gen. phrase to be Agni, and I also interpr. *abhiḥ satāḥ* in the usual idiomatic meaning of *abhiḥ√as* ‘be superior to’, construed here with the acc. *viśvān*. In b I simply supply a different form of the root *√as*, namely *santu*, to be construed with the *abhiḥ* in the same meaning. The point of the sentence is that since Agni, who is superior to everything, is our Hotar and the conduit of our offerings to the gods, our oblations cannot help being superior as well.

VIII.23.27: I am not happy with the partitive gen. with *√van* in cd, but I do not see any way out of it.

VIII.23.30: The abrupt introduction of Mitra and Varuṇa may look forward to the next hymn but one, VIII.25, devoted at least in its first part, to these two gods. The last pāda of the first verse of VIII.25 (*ṛtāvānā yajase putādakṣasā*) is almost identical to the last pāda here (*ṛtāvānā samrājā putādakṣasā*).

VIII.24 Indra

VIII.24.1: Ge takes *stuṣé* here as an infinitive, but the nearby parallels he cites (VIII.21.9, 23.7) are unaccented and clearly 1st person. The switch between 1st pl. (*ā śiṣāmahi*) and 1st sg. (*stuṣé*) is not unusual in this kind of context, where the poet speaks in the 1st plural

jointly for himself and his fellow ritual performers and in the 1st singular for himself alone, with a 2nd pl. address to those same comrades (*vaḥ* in b).

VIII.24.2: Two etymological figures: *vṛtrahátyena vṛtrahā* (b) and *maghaír maghónaḥ* (c). On the unusual construction of *áti √ dās* see comm. ad VI.16.20.

VIII.24.4: Another figure: *dhṛṣatā dhṛṣṇo*.

This verse echoes vs. 3 in reverse order: 3a *stávāno ā bhara* / 3c *nirekám* // 4a *nirekám* / 4c *stávamāna ā bhara*. These echoes straddle a *ṛca* boundary.

VIII.24.5: “hindrances” (*āmúraḥ*) and “repulsions” (*paribādhāḥ*) are complementary notions, the equivalent of “thrust and parry” (or rather parry and thrust). Unfortunately they do not go well into English, esp. in the plural. On *āmúr-* see Scar 391-92.

VIII.24.6: The matching instrumentals in frame and simile are phonological variants: *góbhir* (a) / *gīrbhir* (b).

VIII.24.7: The poet of this group of hymns (VIII.23–26) is Viśvamanas, but *viśvámanasaḥ* here can be read both literally and as the PN. Note also the cross-*ṛca* echo, 6c *mánaḥ* / 7a *-manasaḥ*, and the initial figure *viśvāni viśvá-*, which together make up the poet’s name.

VIII.24.8: The opening word of c, *váso*, is read as *vásoḥ* by the Pp., followed by Old and Ge – that is, with the loss of underlying final *-s* before the cluster *sp-* -- hence a gen. sg. belonging with the long gen. sg. noun phrase ending with *rādhasaḥ*. This is of course possible, but the presence of undoubted voc. *vaso* in 7c in a hymn that is over-partial to vocatives and given to repetitions across verses, supports a voc. interpretation here.

VIII.24.10: A verse full of figures: *mahāmaha*, *mahé* (ab), *ḍṛḥś cid ḍṛhya* (c), *maghavan maghāttaye*. There is also an inter-*ṛca* echo between voc. *nṛto* (9b) and voc. *nṛtama* (10b), with *nṛto* returning in 12a.

VIII.24.14: The expression *dákṣam pṛñcāntam* is somewhat peculiar, and Ge takes the two words as separate qualifiers of Indra: “dem Verständigen, Spendenden.” However, I.141.1 *bhágam dákṣam ná papṛcāsi* suggests that *dákṣam* should be the object of the pres. participle. By the tr. “engorging skill” I mean that Indra fills his latent quality (skill) with energy (perhaps derived from soma and praise) and makes it available to use.

Acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, our poet Viśvamanas has the patronymic Vaiyaśva (vs. 23), that is, son of Vyaśva (‘without horses’), and the poet mentions his family in vss. 22, 28–29 with the distracted stem *v’yaśva-*. But in this verse he refers to himself instead as *aśv’yá-*, also distracted, which, on the one hand, is simply an anagram of the family name with the first two syllables reversed, but, on the other, credits him with possession of (or at least relationship to) horses, whereas the unmetathesized version announces him as horse-less.

VIII.24.15: On the lexeme *yújyāya √ vṛ* see comm. ad IX.88.1.

Rather than taking *nákiḥ* in c as a mere negative, paralleling rhyming *nahí* in pāda a, I'd now give it its full nom. sense: "... never before has a greater hero than you been born, no one in wealth ..."

The expression *naíváthā* (that is, *ná eváthā*), placed between the two instrumentals, is opaque: *eváthā* is a hapax. Old helpfully adduces IV.30.1 *nákir indra tvád úttaraḥ ... nákir evá yáthā tvám* "There is no one higher than you, Indra ... no one who is exactly as you are," and our *eváthā* appears almost to be a blend of *evá yáthā* or some abbreviation thereof.

VIII.24.16: I supply *siñcá* from b as the verb also of a, and supply *madántaram* of a as the object of b, with *ándhasaḥ* dependent on it as *mádhvaḥ* is in a. Ge by contrast (fld. by Klein DGRV II.183) supplies "bring" in a and takes *ándhasaḥ* as a partitive genitive in b. This is not impossible, but my interpretation requires less extraneous material.

Another cross-trca connection: *evá* in c echoes *eváthā* in 15c. More cleverly, 16ab *éd u m(ádho) ... siñcá* picks up 13a *éndum ... siñcata* (note that *édum* and *éndum* are almost identical).

VIII.24.18: On *áprāyu-* see comm. ad V.80.3.

VIII.24.19: The a pāda is repeated twice elsewhere in VIII: 81.4, 95.7. The reason for the accent on *stávāma*, which does not begin the pāda and probably not its clause, is unclear, though it may well be connected with its relationship with the exhortative 2nd pl. impv. *éta* "come on!" It would, in fact, be possible to construe *índram* with *éta nú* and begin a new clause with *stávāma* ("Come now to Indra; let us praise the superior man..."), but this seems unnatural. It is curious that Old does not comment on the accent here or in the other passages.

VIII.24.22: Here as elsewhere (II.5.1, III.27.3, both with pl. *vājínaḥ*) *yámam* governs the accusative.

VIII.24.23: A very cute pun, with *návam* meaning, as often in a hymnal context, 'anew', but in conjunction with *daśamám* 'tenth' evoking *náva* 'nine'.

caráni- is a hapax, but most likely derived from the root $\sqrt{\text{car}}$ 'wander' (see EWA s.v. *CAR^I*, though AiG II.2.207 considers it of unclear meaning). It must have been created to contrast semantically with the very frequent near-rhyme form *carṣaṇí-* 'settled/bounded peoples', whose gen. pl. *carṣaṇīnām* occurs 35x in the RV, always at the end of the pāda as here (including VIII.23.7 *hótāram carṣaṇīnām*, the adjacent hymn by the same poet). That the short initial syllable of *carāṇīnām* produces a bad cadence surely draws more attention to the word it was created in opposition to.

VIII.24.25: Elliptical and with some syntactic puzzles. See Old on the verse in general and the multiple solutions proposed in earlier lit.

In b I supply "be there" as the verb; Ge, to more or less the same effect, "beistandest."

In c I supply Śuṣṇa as the object of both verbs, since he is the demon Indra ordinarily slays for Kutsa. The problem here is that the verbs are not parallel: injunctive

śísñathah followed by imperative *ní codaya*. Somewhat reluctantly I ascribe imperatival value to *śísñathah* (so also Ge without comment), possible because of the functional shape-shifting ability of injunctives. (See the same form in VIII.70.10.) However, I am not certain how often regular injunctives can show imperatival value, as opposed to lexicalized forms like *dāḥ* and *dhāḥ*. The root \sqrt{cud} does not otherwise appear with *ní*, a fact that makes its value here even less clear. Ge supplies “horses” as object, while Old suggests importing *ávaḥ* ‘help’ from a.

VIII.24.26: Again elliptical. In ab the semantic opposition between new and old is obviously the point, but what new thing are we begging Indra for? Ge supplies “deed” (“... eine (Tat), die auch dem Älteste neu ist”). In III.31.19 the same expression *návyam* ... *sányase* refers to the making of a new hymn, but it makes no sense to beg *Indra* for a new hymn. I tentatively supply *āyuh* ‘life’, which occurs several times with *návyam* (I.10.11, III.53.16, VII.80.2). The other occurrence of *návyam sanyasé* (VIII.67.18) is found immediately after a periphrastic causative “you make live” (VIII.67.17c *dévāḥ kṛñuthá jīvāse*), and a “new life” works reasonably well in that passage. But this is all circumstantial, and I do not know why such a wish would be expressed here, beyond the usual Vedic desire to live a full and vigorous lifetime.

The *sá tvám* in c does not conform to the rules for 2nd ps. *sá* reference developed in Jamison 1992. I would therefore prefer to supply an imperative “(be) victorious ...,” which would, I think, also fit the context better. However, the offending *sá* might be explained by the 3rd ps. verb (*mucát*) in the following verse (27ab), whose relative clauses hang off 26c, in my view. In other words, the construction of the whole sentence fluctuates between 2nd and 3rd ps. subject.

VII.24.27: As noted just above, I take the relative clauses in ab as hanging off 26c. Both Ge and Old make 27bc into a single clause, but the verb in c (*nīnamah*) is unaccented although b begins with a relative pronoun *yāḥ*. I therefore take ab as being two parallel relative clauses sharing a single verb *mucát*; cleverly the poet has exploited the fact that \sqrt{muc} participates in two different syntactic constructions with accusative and ablative: “release ROPE vel sim. [acc.] from VICTIM [abl.]” and “release VICTIM [acc.] from ROPE [abl.]” (Perhaps not surprisingly, English has the same two constructions.) In 27a we find the first, though without overt expression of the VICTIM (=us or perhaps the Ārya); cf., e.g., X.97.15 *tā no muñcantu āṇhasaḥ*. In b we find the second, though without overt expression of the ROPE. Here I supply *āṇhaḥ* adapted from abl. *āṇhasaḥ* in pāda a. Cf. IV.12.6=X.126.8 *evó śv àsmán* [i.e., *asmāt*] *muñcata vy āṇhaḥ*.

VIII.24.29: The adj. *somínaḥ* can of course be either abl.-gen. sg. or nom.-acc. pl. It shares a pāda with acc. *vyāśvān*, so proximity favors taking it with that noun – as in the publ. tr. (also Ge). However, Sāy. takes it with gen. *nāryāsya* in the previous pāda, and he may be correct. Nārya appears to be the (or one) name of the patron of the sacrifice, the dispenser of the dakṣiṇā to the poets, and it would make sense to refer to him as possessing or providing soma. I would therefore entertain the alternative tr. “let the priestly gift of Nārya, provider of soma, come to the Vyaśvas.”

VIII.24.30: In contrast to the first two fairly straightforward verses of the *dānastuti* (28–29), this one bristles with slangy jokes and their attendant puzzles. It is also the only verse in the hymn not in Uṣṇih meter. The verse opens with the sacrificer (*ījānāḥ*, lit. the pf. mid. participle to √*yaj*) asking “you” an abrupt question *kuhayā kuhayākṛte*, consisting of an extended form of *kúha* ‘where’ (the extended form found only here) and an oddly formed, nonce vocative made up of the same adverbial interrogative plus (probably) *-kṛti-* (though *-kṛtā-* would also be possible). Judging from vs. 28, the beginning of the *dānastuti*, which contains a vocative addressed to Dawn, she is also the addressee here, though a reversion to the default Indra is certainly not excluded. So, literally, “where? you where-actor.” Ge takes *ījānāḥ* as the subject of the question (“where is the sacrificer?”), rather than the questioner. I follow Old: “Die Opferer fragt die Morgenröte ...,” although Ge’s interpretation is by no means excluded. The question is whether Varosuṣāman is the sacrificer himself or his patron, and without a better knowledge of the distribution of roles in RVic sacrifice, we cannot know for sure.

It is generally assumed (I think correctly) that the second hemistich is the response of the addressee to the question in ab, and it is an extended pun. He calls the subject, about whose whereabouts the question was just asked, “Vala,” that is, the name of Indra’s opponent and the cave that contained the stolen cows. But Vala is also a phonological variant of Vara, the first part of the name of the patron Varosuṣāman. He is said to be “set apart” (*āpaśritaḥ*) along the Gomatī (River), but *gómant-* literally means ‘possessing cattle’ and can also qualify the Vala cave itself (see I.11.5 *valásya gómataḥ*). Thus this line appears to be a subtle reminder to Varosuṣāman not to withhold his cattle within himself, like his phonological multiform, but to be generous to his clients. The whole line reminds us of the *dānastuti* in V.61.19: *eṣá kṣetī ráthavītīr maghávā gómatīr ānu, párveteṣv āpaśritaḥ* “This Rathavīti dwells in peace, a bounteous patron throughout the cow-rich (clans) [/along the Gomatī river], set back among the mountains,” containing one of the only two other occurrences of *āpaśrita*. I do not know the significance of this.

VIII.25 Mitra and Varuṇa

VIII.25.1: For the connection of the last pāda of this vs. with VIII.23.30, see comm. there.

VIII.25.2: The du. *mitrā* is used in two different senses: on the one hand, in its appellative sense it refers to the two gods as allies; on the other *mitrā* is a pregnant dual PN, meaning “Mitra (and Varuṇa),” with the “and Varuṇa” then pleonastically supplied in pāda b in an “X and which Y” construction (*váruṇo yás ca*).

Most take *tánā* as another dual (to thematic *tána-*), but struggle to interpr. it. I take it as the instr. sg. of the root noun *tán-* and in this context as indicating the “(home) stretch” of a race course. The image is of two charioteers running neck and neck and therefore evenly matched.

tánayā of course echoes *tánā*, though it belongs to a different stem (whichever interpr. of *tánā* is followed). In this case I accept the general interpr. as du. to *tánaya-*.

VIII.25.3: Because the phrase *asuryāya prāmahasā* is found also in VII.66.2 (also of Mitra and Varuṇa), the two words must be construed together -- though in both instances Ge construes them separately (as do Re and W. E. Hale). Moreover Ge's minimalist tr. of *prāmahas-* ("Die ... Erhabenen") does not reflect its bahuvrīhi status: it should mean something like 'having their greatness forth/in front'. In combination with the dat. *asuryāya*, some forward motion seems indicated.

VIII.25.4: This is a particularly good passage to demonstrate that the unending rivalry between the two opposed groups Devas and Asuras so characteristic of middle Vedic literature cannot be backprojected into the core RV, since Mitra and Varuṇa are called simultaneously *devāṁ āsurā*.

The phrase 'grandson of strength' (*śávaso nāpāt-*) is used a number of times of the Ṛbhus (I.161.14, IV.34.6, 35.1, 8, 37.4) and only here of other divinities. It seems based on the more common *śávasas páti-* (I.131.4, IV.47.3, V.6.9, etc.), with (*nā*)*pāt-* echoing *pát(i-)*. It also evokes semantically the phrase *śávasaḥ sūnú-* (IV.21.1, 37.4) / *putrá-* (VIII.90.2, 92.14), 'son/child of strength'.

VIII.25.5–6: The usual problem with (-)*dānu-*: 'gift' or 'drop' or both? In this case the first cmpd member *sṛpra-* 'fatty, luscious', the dwelling "in the house of refreshment" (in vs. 5), and the refreshments and rains (in vs. 6) favor 'drop', though both Ge and Re opt for 'gift' (Ge with an outdated rendering of *sṛprá-* as 'ausgedehnt'). On *sṛprá-* see comm. ad I.96.3.

VIII.25.7: "your herds" of the publ. tr. should rather be "their herds."

VIII.25.8–9: Both these verses have a subject / VP construction that's an etymological figure: 8c ... *kṣatríyā kṣatrám āsatuh*, 9c ... *nicirá ní cikyatuḥ*. The latter is reinforced phonologically by the pāda-opening *ní cin miśántā*. The unusual tmesis of preverb and participle, interrupted by the particle *cí*, may be (partly) accounted for by the desire to produce a *ní ci-* sequence matching the two that follow in that pāda.

VIII.25.9: On *anulbaṇá-* see comm. ad X.53.6. I there reject the standard rejection of a connection with *úlba-* 'caul' and reject as well the standard interpr. of the word as 'without bulges or knots'. In the publ. tr., since eyesight "without knots/bulges" didn't make sense, I substituted "without motes," with 'mote' a reasonably close equivalent to 'knot'. I now think it means something like 'without a caul', and describes eyesight unaffected by cataracts. I would now emend the tr. to "by means of eyesight without a caul [=cataract]."

VIII.25.10–12: This ṛca takes a break from Mitra and Varuṇa, introducing a somewhat random collection of other protective divinities. See also vs. 14.

VIII.25.11: The lexeme *ní√sac* is found only here in the RV and indeed, judging from MonWms, in all of Sanskrit. I consider the *ní* here intrusive, having crept in from passages like VII.38.3 *vísvebhiḥ pātu pāyúbhir ní sūrīn*. The lexeme *ní√pā* is fairly well attested, and so I think *ní* has, as it were, hitched a ride on *pāyúbhiḥ*, which is ordinarily

found with a form of the cognate verb as in the just cited passage. The insistent *nī*'s of 11c may also have played a part.

VIII.25.12: A verb needs to be supplied for ab to be a clause. On the basis of *śrudhī* in c, I supply 'sing', but any verb of service to a divinity that takes a dative would work. Ge "serve" (dienen), Re, somewhat more elaborately "apportons notre prière." Ideally we would supply *sacemahi* on the basis of *āriṣyantaḥ ... sacemahi* in 11c, but \sqrt{sac} doesn't accommodate this case frame. (The few exx. with dat. given by Gr are to be explained otherwise.)

VIII.25.13: Alliteration in the etymological figure *vāryaṃ vṛṇīmahe, vāriṣṭham*, anticipating *vāruṇaḥ* in c.

VIII.25.14: In the publ. tr. I supply "let ... grant," flg. Ge, Re, Klein (DGRV I.403). But I would now change that to "protect," assuming that the *tād* + divinities in the nom. simply continues the rel. cl. in 13c *mitró yāt pānti ...*

VIII.25.15: The standard interpr. take *bhūrṇayaḥ* with the frame (Ge "diese eifrigen Herren"), but its position at the end of the verse, far from its supposed NP, leads me to put it in the simile. (Sim. Re.) Passages like IX.17.1 ... *iva síndhavo, ghnānto vṛtrāṇi bhūrṇayaḥ* "like turbulent rivers ... smashing obstacles" give support to this assignment. The simile then consists of a nom. + acc. matching those of the frame. It might be objected that rivers don't strike against their own surge, but the image may be of fast water catching up with itself and overtopping a wave.

VIII.25.16: *itthā* is not sufficiently represented in the publ. tr. I would now insert "just so" after "the many."

ānu ... carāmasi could also be subjunctive (so Ge), "we shall proceed," though the undoubted indicative *ānu ... saścima* in the parallel phrase in 17ab supports an indicative interpr. here.

VIII.25.17: Flg. Kü I take the pf. of \sqrt{sac} as presential in value.

sāmrājyāsya is in the same position as *sāmrājyāya* 'sovereign kingship' in 8b but differently accented. The form here must be an adj. 'related to sovereign kingship'. This makes sense: its referent, the Sun, is not a sovereign king himself, but associated, as their eye and spy, with Mitra and Varuṇa, who are.

The form of *dirghaśrūt* is problematic. It appears to be a nom. sg., but the subj. of this sentence is plural ("we"). Gr takes it as a neut. pl. modifying *vratā*, as do Ge (without comment) and Re; Scar identifies it as a neut. pl. but with a query. AiG III.65–66 suggests that it follows the model of short neut. plural forms that are identical to the neut. singular belonging to other stems (type *nāma* 'name(s)'). I think we can sympathize with the plight of a poet who's trying to figure out how to make a neut. pl. out of a root noun ending in *-t*: it's simply impossible. In VII.16.8 we get *śārma dirghaśrūt*#. Since *śārma* there could technically be plural (and there were presumably other such expressions with neut. *n*-stems, etc.), it's not hard to see the poet assuming, rightly or wrongly, that *-śrūt*

can be a neut. pl. Old also adduces VIII.61.2 *vípro mánmāni dīrghaśrūt*, where the adj. modifies nom. sg. *vípraḥ* but could be interpr. as going with *mánmāni*.

VIII.25.18: I would now substitute ‘limits’ or ‘boundaries’ for ‘ends’ in tr. *ántān*.

VIII.25.20: On *dīrgháprasadman-*, see comm. ad VIII.10.1.

I don’t quite understand “non-poisonous food”: is this an understated way of referring to good food, or is it a real fear? In VI.39.5 we call upon the king (Indra or Soma) to give (*√rā*) non-poisonous plants. I also don’t understand the use of *hí* here, since *c* does not seem to be the cause or grounds for *ab*, but rather a parallel clause.

VIII.25.21: This is presumably the speech referred to in vs. 20 that controls good things.

VIII.25.23: This vs. is puzzling, in part because the identity of “these two” (*tā*) is not clear nor is the sense of *nītósana-* + GEN. The lexeme *ní√tuś* means ‘overflow with, spill down’ with an acc. of the largesse so spilled. See, e.g., IX.63.23 *ní tośase rayīm* “You [=Soma] spill down wealth” (cf. IV.38.1, VIII.54.8). I take the genitives here as objective gens., corresponding to the acc. in the VP. Since both *ásvyānām* and *hárīṇām* refer to horses, we might want the two that are overflowing with them to be the human (or possibly divine) givers. This is possible, if we take them as the two patrons who give horses in 22ab (and not the one who gives a chariot in 22c). Or it could be a reference to Mitra and Varuṇa (so Re). But du. *nṛvāhasā* ‘carrying men’ in 23c and *vājínāv árvantā* “prize-winning chargers” in 24c must surely be horses (probably the silvery and silver horses of 22ab), and this suggests that the duals earlier in vs. 23 should have the same referent. This is Ge’s solution, and he considers this expression shorthand for saying that the two horses given are worth as much as a whole herd of horses. This may be correct, but it is a bit difficult to wring it from the text.

kṛtvya- ‘effective, getting results’ is several times used of horses (VI.2.8, IX.46.1, IX.101.2), and in this context that should be the default interpr. as well.

VIII.25.24: With Old I take *víprā* as instr. sg. fem. with *matī*, contra Ge’s voc. pl. See I.82.2.

VIII.26 Aśvins and Vāyu

VIII.26.2: *mahé táne* ‘for great extension’ presumably refers to his extending his lineage.

VIII.26.3: *havāmahe havyébhiḥ* “we call with oblations” is a word play between the roots *√hu* ‘pour, libate’ and *√hū/hvā* ‘call’ and economically refers to the two complementary aspects of Vedic sacrifice, the verbal and the material. It is the mirror image of the trope “pour prayers.”

iśáyantau can belong either to trans. *iśáyati* to *√iś* ‘send’ (so Gr, Lub) or intrans. *iśáyati* ‘prosper’. I tentatively opt for the latter, with a cognate acc. of respect, *iśáh*, hence “prosper, become refreshed with respect to refreshments.” It is not entirely clear to me which root affiliation is represented by Ge’s “spenden” (probably ‘send’?) or Re’s “sécrtant à titre de jouissance” (probably ‘prosper’?).

I suggest that *āti kṣapāḥ* “beyond the nights” refers to the Atirātra soma (“overnight soma”) offered to the Aśvins the morning after, as it were.

VIII.26.8: This vs. is somewhat curiously constructed. It contains, probably, a dual dvandva whose 2nd member is itself dual: *índra-nāsatyā* ‘o Indra and the two Nāsatyas’. Since the form is in the voc. it is actually impossible to determine if it is in fact a dual dvandva or two separate vocc., *índra nāsatyā*, sg. and du. Although in most dual dvandvas the first member also has dual inflection (type *índrā-váruṇā*), see *índra-vāyū*, with stem form in the first member and a single 2nd member accent; its voc. is *índra-vāyū*, which would match the template found here. In any case, the verb is dual (*gatam*), and the rest of the verse (pāda c) is couched in the dual. VIII.26.8: This vs. is somewhat curiously constructed. It contains, probably, a dual dvandva whose 2nd member is itself dual: *índra-nāsatyā* ‘o Indra and the two Nāsatyas’. Since the form is in the voc. it is actually impossible to determine if it is in fact a dual dvandva or two separate vocc., *índra nāsatyā*, sg. and du. Although in most dual dvandvas the first member also has dual inflection (type *índrā-váruṇā*), see *índra-vāyū*, with stem form in the first member and a single 2nd member accent; its voc. is *índra-vāyū*, which would match the template found here. In any case, the verb is dual (*gatam*), and the rest of the verse (pāda c) is couched in the dual. This means that Indra is being ignored (which is possible, since the hymn is dedicated to the Aśvins), that the dual dvandva *índra-nāsatyā* is being treated as if it contained two entities, rather than one+two (which is also possible), or, more likely, that the verb agrees with the nearest entity (*nāsatyā*), as is often the case when a singular verb is used with a series of implicitly conjoined singular nouns. For another number mismatch, see vs. 11.

VIII.26.9: *vayám ... ukṣanyánto vyaśvavát* is a play on words. *ukṣanyántaḥ* is read doubly, in one sense in the frame (‘seeking bulls’) and another in the simile (‘seeking Ukṣan’). Unusually the simile is conveyed by -*vát*. On the poet Vyaśva seeking his patron Ukṣan, see VIII.23.16 *vyàśvaḥ ... ukṣanyúḥ*, where *ukṣanyúḥ* can also be read as a pun.

VIII.26.11: Pāda c *sajóśasā váruṇo mitró aryamā* “the two of one accord (and) V, M, A” is reminiscent of the number disharmony in vs. 8. It can be seen as a syntactic blend of 8c *devā devébhiḥ ... sacánastamā* “the two gods joined with the gods” and a putative plural *sajóśasaḥ* that includes the Aśvins with the other gods mentioned.

VIII.26.12: I take *sūrībhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment “for me along with my patrons,” but Ge’s view, that the patrons are the middlemen distributing the goods, is possible: “do your best for me by means of / through my patrons.”

VIII.26.13: I take the referent of ab to be Agni. Cf. III.3.5 *táviṣṭbhir ávṛtam* ‘swathed with [=in] his powers’; given Agni’s ritual role it makes sense for him to be swathed in sacrifices. Making a god the referent avoids the role reversal Re notes in *saparyántā*, with (in his view) the gods serving humans rather than the usual situation -- though he then tr. *śubhé cakrāte* as reflexive or self-involved: “ils se sont fait (pour eux-mêmes une parure - - contrapartie de b),” rather than supplying a human object. But surely it is better (with Ge) to supply as obj. of *śubhé cakrāte* the being referred to in the relative clause of ab.

VIII.26.14: With Ge I take ab as a continuation of vs. 13, still with Agni as referent. Agni is regularly called *cikitvān*, to the same stem as *ciketati* here. Clearly *vartīḥ* ‘circuit’ is to be supplied as object; it not only appears in pāda c but also in 15b, where it is modified by *nṛpāyyam* as here.

VIII.26.15: *viṣudrúheva* (that is, *-ā+iva*) is quite problematic. Ge refuses to tr., as does Scar (245–46), though by classing it with *-druh*-compounds, he indicates a root affiliation. Acdg. to Re, it’s the equivalent of **druhó viśuvīt* “opposé au Mal” or “qui met le Mal en déroute”; somewhat sim. Kü 484 “Wie die nach verschiedenen Seiten Trügenden (?)”. What all these suggestions have in common is the assumption that the 2nd member belong to *√druh* ‘deceive’. I suggest a different analysis, *viśud-rūh-*, where the 2nd member is the root noun to *√ruh* ‘mount’, and the first (*viśud-*) is a deformed version of the already deformed adverb *viśvadryāk* ‘facing in different directions’, with the complex adverbial suffix found also in *asmadryāk* ‘facing towards us’. The empty *-d-* (*-t-*) has been suffixed to the combining form *viśu-* (*/viśū*) underlying the adjective *viśvañc-* ‘facing in different directions’. For the suggested phrase, cf. IX.75.1 *rātham viśvañcam aruhat* “he mounted the chariot that faces in different directions” (with *√ruh*) and, with semantically related *√yuj* and horses not chariot, VI.59.5 *viśūco áśvān yuyujāná īyate*; X.79.7 *viśūco áśvān yuyuje vanejāḥ*.

VIII.26.16: The publ. tr. does not make sufficient clear that the messenger (*dūtāḥ*) is our praise song, not “you.”

VIII.26.17: The *íd* of c surely limits *me*, but has been displaced to the left into Wackernagel’s position; “just listen to me” is less likely.

VIII.26.18: I don’t understand what the Sindhu is doing here. Is it a third place (besides the two in 17ab) where the Áśvins might find exhilaration? Or is it a metaphor for the “good praise” and/or “bright insight” (both fem., as *síndhu-* is) in vs. 19? The agreements in vocabulary, *śveta-* and the *-yāvan/r-ī-* cmpds, speak for the latter, but the former makes more sense to me.

VIII.26.20: As often, *hí + IMPV* marks the action of the *hí* clause as the grounds for the subsequent clause (in this case c, as b is presumably parallel with a).

VIII.26.21: The voc. *ṛtaspace*, belonging to a hapax cmpd., has an unusual 1st member for a thematic stem. We should expect **ṛtapate*. But to construct that form is to confront its problem, a sequence of light syllables (4 in stem form). Rather than seeing anything archaic in the form we have, I think it likely that the cmpd was shaped in analogy to the numerous gen. *-as-pāti-* with athem. gen., esp. *bṛhas-pāti-* with similar phonological shape. See also *rāthas-pāti-*, which shows the same anomaly as *ṛtaspace*: comm. ad V.50.5. Unlike *rāthas-pāti-*, the form here makes no metrical problems.

VIII.26.22: *rāyā(h)* can be both gen. sg. and acc. pl., the former to be construed with *īśānam*, the latter with *īmahe*, between which it is positioned. So already Old. The identical pādas (VI.54.8, VIII.46.6, 53.1) are susceptible to the same interpr.

VIII.26.24: In keeping with my current understanding of *nē-śādana*- I would slightly change the tr. to “to the sessions of men,” not “the seats ...”

I do not think that Vāyu is being compared directly to the pressing stone, but rather than we call on Vāyu as we call on the pressing stone. Unfortunately this attenuates the force of the simile, but the various suggestions (Old, Ge, Re) as to why Vāyu is like a horse-backed stone are so convoluted that I find them difficult to accept. The stone may be called horse-backed for two reasons: first, since the stones are also called *sóma-pr̥ṣtha*- (VIII.63.2) and soma is commonly identified as a horse, the identification has been transferred. It may also be that it also means ‘having the back of a horse’, that is, bowed or made for carrying.

VIII.26.25: Ge takes *apáh* for *ápah* ‘work’, but this seems arbitrary. I tr. it as the acc. pl. ‘waters’ it appears to be.

As noted. ad X.50.2, this is the only ex. of a syntagm *vājam*, -*ān* √ *kṛ* that I have been able to find. Since *vājān* here is in an ill-assorted acc. phrase with *dhíyah*, I wonder if this is a maladroit version of the phrase *dhíyam* (*/-ah*) *vājaratnām* (-*āh*) √ *kṛ* “make insight(s) to have prizes as jewels” (VI.35.1 *dhíyah karasí vājaratnāh*; X.42.7 *kṛdhí dhíyam ... vājaratnām*).

VIII.27 All Gods

VIII.27.1: I take both *ukthé* and *adhvaré* as functional loc. absolutes. Cf. *śasyāmāna ukthé* (VI.23.1, also IV.20.10, X.45.10), *prayaty ádhvaré* (I.16.3 [=VIII.3.5], V.28.6 [=VIII.71.12], etc.). The latter expression appears as a full phrase in 3a *prá sú na etv adhvaráh*.

VIII.27.2: *uśāsā náktam* is a curious variant of the dual dvandva *uśāsā-náktā*, occurring only here. Old suggests that it is an ex. of a singular 2nd member following a dual in the 1st (cf. AiG II.1.154), which seems a description not an explanation. I think two factors entered into its creation: on the one hand, all forms of *uśāsā-náktā* precede a consonant; here that form would be in hiatus with vowel-initial *óṣadhīh*. (Acdg. to Old, BR think that the original form was in fact *náktā*, but it was altered to avoid hiatus.) But all forms of *uśāsā-náktā* are also initial in trimeter verse, where a heavy fifth syllable is fine. This is dimeter verse, and a heavy fifth syllable would produce a bad cadence; light -*am* √ allows an iambic cadence.

Here and elsewhere through the hymn I render *visvávedas*- as ‘affording all possessions’, not ‘possessing all knowledge’, because it is usually found in the context of the gods’ generosity.

VIII.27.6: The syntax of ab is oddly muddled for what seems on the surface a banal sentiment. The problem is the position of the relative and its relationship both to the *priyā* earlier in the verse and accented verb *prayāthána* later. The key, I think, is neut. pl. *ásvyā*

‘equine’. Contra Ge I don’t think that it should be construed with *havyā*, with “equine oblations” as a reference to the *Aśvamedha* -- an interpr. that Re rightly calls “adventurous.” The stem *ásvya-*, esp. in the neut. pl., is generally used of gifts (*rādhās-*, *maghā-*) consisting of horses that gods (or patrons) give to mortals (e.g., VII.16.10 *yé rādhāṃsi dádaty ásvyā maghā*), whereas *havyā* are of course oblations given by mortals to gods. I think we therefore must reckon with two different constructions in this hemistich, a structure that accounts for the fractured word order. On the one hand I see a nominal clause (or rather a nominal clause whose subject is itself a relative clause): “which equine gifts are yours (i.e., come from you), (they) are dear (to us).” On the other, the same predicate *priyā* has as subject a full rel. clause whose verb is *prayāthāna*: “which oblations you drive to, (they) are dear to you.” The *vah* is used both as a genitive (in the first construction) and as a dative (in the second). Unfortunately it is wrongly placed in the relative clause for this second interpr., but I can only imagine that the poet allowed this small breach to avoid doubling the *vah*, or rather that the dative could be integrated into the rel. cl.: “which oblations for you you drive to, they are dear.” Note that two different entities are dear to two different groups of beings. I have not yet solved the problem of *abhi*, however. Re’s interpr. requires *prá √ yā* to be transitive and also intermingles the main and relative clauses in an illegitimate way and should be rejected: “Di(riger) vers (nos) oblations les chères troupes de chevaux que vous mettez en marche.”

Ge takes *turā nárah* as a qualifier of the immediately following *Ādityas*. Although both *turā-* and *ní-* can sometimes apply to the *Ādityas*, they are more frequently used of the *Maruts*, who are somewhat dominant in this part of the hymn (1c, 3d, 5c, 6a, 8a).

VIII.27.11: On *án'yām* see comm. ad VIII.1.10.

VIII.27.15: I assume that *Aryaman* is tacitly included with *Mitra* and *Varuṇa* in c, given the *vah* in d (and a). In the phrase *varuṇa mitra márt'yam*, trisyllabic *márt'yam* is a sort of scrambling of *Aryaman*.

On the apparent bad cadence produced by *ávidhat*, see remarks ad II.1.7, where Arnold’s suggestion to read a long augment is adopted.

VIII.27.16: *prá prajābhīr jāyate* is a nice figure in which *prá* doubles the first part of the compd. and *jāyate* the second.

dhármaṇas pári receives quite varied interpr. I take it as a spatial metaphor: the fortunate pious man is propagated through his progeny “from his foundation,” that is, starting from himself and spreading out by children and grandchildren (etc.). On this repeated pāda and esp. on the identity of the suppressed genitive with *dhármaṇah*, see comm. ad VI.70.3 and X.63.13.

On the relationship of pāda d [=I.41.2] with the variant in X.63.13 see comm. ad loc.

VIII.27.18: The 2nd hemistich presents some niggling syntactic and lexical problems. To start with the latter, by most interpr. *ásredhantī* is transitive (Ge “ohne Schaden anzurichten,” Re “sans causer de nuisance”). But the verb to which this negated participle belongs is consistently intransitive, meaning ‘fail’, not ‘cause to fail’, and though Gr

glosses *ásredhant-* (and related stems) as transitive ‘nicht schädigend’, hence ‘heilsam’, all passages are compatible with intransitive ‘unfailing, unfaltering’. Although in this particular case ‘not harming’ might be tempting, the point here must be that the missile should go to destruction without pause or deviation in its trajectory.

I am disturbed by the pleonastic pāda-final *sā*, doubling initial *eṣā*, as well as what looks like a self-contained clausette in which it is found: *paró nú sā*. Neither Ge nor Re takes any notice of the oddly constructed c pāda; Ge takes c and d as independent clauses, while Re treats cd as a unified clause. My tr. tries to mirror the construction by taking *asmāt ... paró nú sā* as a parenthetical. I remain concerned about two things: 1) This is the only passage in which *parāḥ* seems to mean ‘far from’; other passages containing *parāḥ* + ABL. mean ‘beyond, other than’ (see also the 1st verse of the next hymn, VIII.28.1, with *parāḥ* ‘beyond’ without abl.). However, ‘far from X’ and ‘beyond X’ are close enough semantically to allay my concerns, and in fact a tr. “it is now beyond him” would work fine. 2) I do not like the position of *asmāt*, but I must assume that it was extracted from the *paró nú sā* clausette in order to conform to the pattern set in pāda a: x x *cīd asmai* matched by c: x x *cīd asmāt*.

I have reluctantly rendered *cīd* in c as ‘also’ (so also Ge), though it does not match the two *cīds* in a and b (‘even’) because I cannot make ‘even’ work. (I suppose “even this missile ...” is possible, but it is not favored.)

VIII.27.20: Most interpr. take *mādhyā ā* as indicating “in the midst (of the shelter)” (*chárdih*, of pāda b). This is certainly possible, though I weakly prefer my own rendering.

VIII.27.21: The hapax *ātúc-* is difficult. See EWA s.v. Mostly for contextual reasons it is generally taken as referring to evening or night, and it has been connected to *tvác-* ‘skin’, with the sense of ‘covering over’. I have followed this interpr., though with full awareness of how fragile it is. For one thing ‘cover as if with skin’ (which must be the presumed semantic channel, one way or another) is not an altogether compelling way to get to ‘evening’. For another, *tvác-* ‘skin’ has no zero-grade forms. Scar (182–83) discusses several possibilities. Besides the ‘covering’ hypothesis, he suggests, citing Schindler and Kü, that *tvác-* may belong with a root $\sqrt{*t\check{y}ek}$ ‘sichtbar werden’ to which *ātúc-* could also belong, and that *ātúc-* might better be taken as an adj. with *madhyāmdine* “when midday is clearly visible.” He is less disturbed than I am that this would leave the verse without a third temporal period; furthermore, given that midday is the most “clearly visible” of the three standard time periods, it seems unnecessary to mark it as such. Another problem with *ātúc-* is that one is reluctant to separate it from the dat. *tucé* ‘for progeny’ in 14c. However, it is difficult to connect them and still maintain sensible semantics in our verse. Scar makes a creative attempt: evening is the time when one goes back to one’s children, so ‘zu den Kindern hin’ becomes ‘Rückkehr nach Hause’. I admire the ingenuity but I think the unlikelihood speaks for itself.

VIII.28 All Gods

VIII.28.1: Ge unaccountably takes injunctive *vidán* as modal: “Die sollen wirklich (etwas) vorfinden,” but *asanan* (flg. Pp.) as preterital. As Old points out, however, the latter need not be augmented (with Pp.) but represent *dvitā sanan* with an injunctive, a

reading favored by the apparent parallelism with *vidán*. I follow the injunctive reading, but take both *vidán* and *sanán* as preterital in function. I also don't think that an object should be supplied with either of these verbs, contra Ge ("etwas," which he further specifies in n. 1 as "die Opferspenden") and Re ("un trésor pour l'Homme"). The absence of objects with two verbs that are standardly transitive must be deliberate. Note the absolute use of *vindate* in VIII.27.17.

VIII.28.2: The Gift Escorts (*rāti-śāc-*) are rather shadowy divine figures. In II.1.13 they escort (*saścire*) Agni at the ceremonies, a situation that may be reflected here. Otherwise they mostly show up in All God hymns (esp. a run of them in VII) as fairly uncharacterized minor divinities. For further disc. cf. comm. ad VII.38.5. See Scar 593.

In III.6.9 Agni is urged to bring the 33 gods (see our 1a) to the sacrifice along with their wives (*pātnīvant-* as here), a ritual situation that can link our vss. 1–2.

VIII.28.3: Ge hesitates between cardinal points and relative directions ("behind, above," etc.), but cardinal points are most likely better because they provide totalizing protection, which is then summed up by *sārvayā viśā*.

VIII.28.5: The phrase *saptá ṛṣṭáyah* "seven spears" may be a sly pun on *saptá ṛṣayah* "seven seers" (IV.42.8, X.130.7; also *saptaṛṣáyah* X.82.2, 109.4). Although this group is better known later and only occasionally referred to in the RV, it does have a foothold there.

VIII.29 All Gods

On the intricate structure of this hymn see publ. intro. and my *Rigveda between Two Worlds* (75–77).

VIII.29.1: The description given is apt for Soma. The soma twigs start out brown, but when they are pressed, the golden juice comes out and, as it were, anoints them.

VIII.29.2: This vs. depicts in fairly straightforward terms the installation of Agni on the ritual hearth.

The phrase *antár devēṣu* is metrically probably better taken with the second part of the vs. (as in the publ. tr. and most other tr.), but Renou prefers first, which might work slightly better. Is it meant to contrast with the same phrase in 3b or to be parallel to it?

VIII.29.3–5: The first pādas of these three vss. are nearly identical: x x *éko bibharti hásta ā(...)m*; note esp. *bibharti hásta ā(...)m*. This agreement introduces another layer of structure: if we treat vss. 1–7 as a sub-unit, all marked by X *ékaḥ*, then 3–5 are symmetrically in the center of that unit. These vss. are also reminiscent of, and perhaps anticipate, the visual iconography of later Hindu deities, each depicted with his/her characteristic object – even in this aniconic Vedic culture. The redupl. pres. *bibharti* here expresses habitual carrying, rather than a bounded action of taking an object from one place to another, the usual function of Class 1 *bhāráti*.

VIII.29.3: The riddle in this vs. is somewhat harder to solve, but the referent is probably Tvaṣṭar: for Tvaṣṭar in his capacity as “shaper” and with his secondary association with the root $\sqrt{takṣ}$ ‘hew, carve, build’, it makes sense for him to have the axe as his emblem. The poet induces this identification rather cleverly. The *vāśī-* is not Tvaṣṭar’s usual object; in fact it’s more characteristic of Agni. See nearby VIII.19.23 *vāśīm agnīr bharate*, which is mighty close to our passage. But Agni has already been slotted in (vs. 2), and the way the hymn is structured, each god gets only one vs. So we’re forced to consider alternatives. The root $\sqrt{takṣ}$, which isn’t etymologically related to Tvaṣṭar but is synchronically associated (e.g., I.32.2 *tvāṣṭā ... vājram ... tatakṣa*), can be construed with *vāśī-*. Cf. X.53.10 *vāśībhiḥ .. tākṣatha*. So, with Agni out of the picture, by a chain of associations we arrive at Tvaṣṭar:

vāśī- → $\sqrt{takṣ}$ → Tvaṣṭar

The pairing with the next verse, clearly of Indra, may also make sense, since by many accounts Tvaṣṭar is Indra’s father. Oberlies (Relig. I.336) claims that this vs. has to do with battles over settling places, which must first be made habitable by felling and burning trees, but I think this reads too much into the passage.

VIII.29.5: On *jālāṣa-* see comm. ad I.43.4.

The 2nd pāda has 10 syllables rather than the expected 8. Unfortunately deleting the somewhat pleonastic *jālāṣa* will not work because of its syllable count. It would be possible to delete either of the first two adjectives -- *śúcīr ugrāḥ* -- but I see no justification for that. It could be noted, however, that the other occurrence of *jālāṣabheṣaja-* is found at the end of an 8-syllable pāda, preceded only by *rudrām* (I.43.4). That pāda would fit nicely here, while the one we have does not, but including the name Rudra in this vs. would violate the structural principles of this hymn.

VIII.29.6: Ge tr. *pīpāya* as ‘bewacht’ and assigns it to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’ (via a byform \sqrt{pi}), because he finds “swell the paths” semantically difficult. But ‘swell’ in the RV universe of discourse is associated with prosperity and abundance, and swelling the paths can simply refer to making them productive and full of the treasure mentioned in the 2nd pāda. Since Pūṣan, the referent of this verse, ensures that livestock find their way home, is associated with paths, and is called “lord of the path” (VI.53.1 *pathas pate*), the metaphorical expression “swell the paths” makes sense as a description of his activities.

What may have tipped the balance for Ge is the simile in this pāda, “like a thief,” for it hard to explain how a thief would “swell the paths” -- whereas keeping a close watch on the path (as a semantic extension of ‘protect, guard’) is something a thief, or highwayman, would naturally do. Old is forced to suggest that the thief makes the paths prosperous for himself in his own way, presumably by robbing people who are traveling on them (sim. Re). But there is a simple solution to the simile problem: take it with the 2nd pāda as I have done (sim. Macd., Maurer). Although up to this point in the hymn, pāda boundaries coincide with syntactic boundaries, the poet is starting to shake up the structure, which has been quite static so far, and breaching the pāda break is his first step. Bolder moves follow in the next vss.

VIII.29.7–9: A new chain starts in this vs.: the verbs of the first pādas of these vss. are *cakrame* (7a), *carata(h)* (8a), *cakrāte* (better read **cakrate*, 9a).

VIII.29.8: I do not understand the apparently tautological 2nd pāda, *prá pravāśéva vasataḥ*, with the same type of double etymological figure as in VIII.27.16. Renderings like Old's "wie Reisende reisen sie" (sim. Ge, Re) are literally correct but give no hint as to what the simile is conveying. There must be some wordplay here, perhaps an astronomical reference? In later Skt. *prá√vas* can refer to exile or banishment, and already in RV III.7.3 the causative means 'cause to live apart, banish'; in II.28.6 the poet expresses the hope that we won't have to go to *pravasathāni* 'foreign dwellings' and in VIII.60.19 Agni is a house-lord *āproṣivān* 'who doesn't go abroad' (or, I suppose, even out of the house). Assuming that this meaning is also operative in *pravāśá-* accounts for my "like exiles."

VIII.29.10: On my solution to the identity of the *éke* 'some', that is, the human ritualists, see the publ. intro.

The pattern set in the rest of the hymn is also broken by placing a trisyllabic word initially before the numeral; vss. 1–9 all begin with a disyllable.

Note the phonological play between the opening verb *árcanti* and the final verb *arocayan*.

VIII.30 All Gods

For the rhetorical distance between vss. 1 and 2 see publ. intro.

VIII.30.1: The *-ka-* suffix on *arbhaká-* and *kumāraká-* mark these words as belonging to a lower register than normal Rigvedic discourse. See my 2009 "Sociolinguistic Remarks on the Indo-Iranian *-ka-Suffix."

VIII.30.2: As indicated in the publ. intro. I take the introductory *ítí* here as a mark that the preceding vs. is the quoted praise referred to by *ítí stutāso asathā* "thus shall you be praised." Re comments that this is a relatively rare passage with *ítí* not close to direct speech. But my interpr. avoids that.

The 33, the (or a) canonical number of gods, were mentioned in a nearby hymn by the same poet, VIII.28.1.

VIII.30.4: Ge takes *vísve vaiśvānarā utá* as "and all the Vaiśvānaras" (so also Klein, DGRV), but it is the gods who are *vaiśvānarā-*, as Ge clearly states in his n. 4b. (Interestingly, this is the only pl. form of this stem, which otherwise, save for one passage [IX.61.16, referring to light], is used only of Agni.) The terms that are being conjoined are *ihá* 'here' and 'belonging to all men', not gods and Vaiśvānaras; the point is that they are here and available to us because they belong to all of us. There is also complementary contrast between "all gods" and "(belonging) to all men," and the *vísve* of the former phrase has been postponed so that it can adjoin the latter: *devāsaḥ ..., vísve vaiśvānarāḥ*.

VIII.31 Yajamāna and patnī, etc.

VIII.31.2: The word order of c is slightly skewed. All things being equal, forms of the *sá/tám* pronoun, esp. in correlative usage, tend to take 1st position in the pāda/clause. This expectation is reinforced here by 2nd position *íd* 'just, only', which really should limit *tám*

(as my tr. reflects), but the verb *pāt* seems to have displaced the pronoun to the right of *íd*.

VIII.31.5: As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 1–4 and 5–9 present loosely parallel treatments of the rewards of sacrifice, with 1–4 applying to the sacrificer alone and 5–9 to the sacrificer and his wife. In this vs. *sunutáh* (5b) reprises *sunávat* of 1b, and the structure of those two b pādas is roughly the same: *sunávac ca pácāti ca* and *sunutá ā ca dhāvataḥ*, with two ritual verbs conjoined by *ca(s)*. The *nítyāśírā* ‘with its own proper milk-mixture’ referring to soma echoes *sómam ... āśíram* in 2b.

VIII.31.6: *prāśavyān* has been subject to various analyses. Sāy suggests ‘nourishment’, which is tentatively accepted by Re. Ge tr. “die für die Pünktlichen bestimmten (Belohnungen)” without comment, leaving it unclear (at least to me) even what root he assigns it to. With Old (also EWA s.v. *ŚÁ V*¹, Hoffmann apud Gotō 304 n. 723, Scar 539–40), I take it to the root *√śū* ‘swell’ and connect it to the root noun cmpd *prāśū-* in the following hymn (though attributed to a different poet), VIII.32.16. (Contra Re explicitly.) In both passages the lexeme seems to have a negative connotation, ‘swollen (with pride), puffed up’. Here the sacrificing married couple successfully ‘go up against’ (*prāti √i*), that is, compete with, these puffed-up rivals. The passage reminds us of the Agastya and Lopāmudrā hymn, I.179.3 ... *visvā spṛdho abhy āśnavāva / ... yāt samyāñcā mithunāv abhyājāva* “Let us two take on all contenders ... when as a united couple we will drive on,” depicting another sacrificing pair competing with rivals. Our vs. and I.179.3 contain the only two masc. du. *samyāñcā* in the RV. The triumph over hostile rivals is also expressed in the parallel section of this hymn (vss. 1–4) in 3c *visvā vanvānn amitriyā* “winning all (the things) of the enemy.”

VIII.31.7: *vivāsataḥ* ‘the two seek to win’ is matched in the parallel by 3c *vanvān* ‘winning’.

VIII.31.8: *putrīṇā ... kumārīṇā* “possessing sons, possessing children” expands on *prajāvatī* ‘possessing offspring’ in the parallel, 4a.

VIII.31.9: With Ge and Re, I take pāda c as referring to sex, though in a devotional context (Ge: “Kinderzeugung als verdienstliches Werk”). The point of the Agastya and Lopāmudrā hymn I.179, already cited ad vs. 6, is of course that ascetic practice must yield to sex as a duty even for the very devout.

VIII.31.10: Flg. Ge, I take *svastí sarvadhātamaḥ* as if containing a dvandva *svastí-sarva-*. Ge convincingly cites other *svastí √dhā* passages. It might be possible to take it instead as a (short) instr.: “best establishing wholeness along with well-being,” though the status of *svastí* as an instr. seems shaky to me. Scar (264) takes it as an acc., with *sarva-* in the cmpd functioning as a predicative acc. to it: “der am besten das Glück vollständig macht.”

VIII.31.12: This vs. consisting entirely of nominals is surprisingly hard to interpret, primarily because of the unclear grammatical identity of *anarváṇaḥ* and the lack of parallelism between the animates of ab and the neut. *aneháḥ* of c.

To deal with the first problem first, beside the *-n*-stem *anarván-* we must reckon with a thematized form *anarváṇa-* (so Gr, Lub), the latter of which is attested twice as apparent nom. sg. masculine *anarváṇaḥ* (V.51.11 [or pl?] and this passage) and once as apparent acc. sg. masculine *anarváṇam* (X.92.14). Unfortunately all three forms immediately follow feminine singulars (*áditīḥ*, *arámatīḥ*, *áditim* respectively). Despite this clear pattern, I was reluctant to interpr. the apparent masc. forms as fem., esp. in the case of the nominative forms, and therefore contrived ad hoc fixes for those passages. Here the fix is not too difficult: the immediately following word (beginning the next pāda) is masc. *viśvaḥ*. I take this as referring to another entity who should come here, with *anarváṇaḥ* modifying it, rather than *arámatīḥ*. The referent is in fact open-ended: “every” or “any” one with the mind of a god. Note the evocation of the All Gods through the phrase *viśvo devásya*, though the words are in different cases.

Although this will (barely) work, on reexamining the evidence I am not at all sure that it is worth denying the apparent pattern of feminine reference with this stem, and I might substitute (with Ge) “Aramati, the unassailing one,” though in this passage that leaves masc. *viśvaḥ* orphaned. Both Old (ad V.51.11; see his careful disc. there) and Re in their different ways take *anarváṇaḥ* here as a nom. pl., but the nom. pl. to the athem. stem is *anarvāṇaḥ*, and in this passage the immediately following sg. *viśvaḥ* makes further trouble. It is worth noting that the bahuvrīhi *anarván-* and its derivatives have a troubled relationship with gender in general; see comm. ad I.37.2, 185.3, VI.48.15, II.40.6. In several instances, masc. forms are used to qualify neuters (I.37.2 and VI.48.15), and the supposed masc. nom. sg. of the *-n*-stem seems to have fem. reference in II.40.6 and VII.40.4. This may have led to a certain cavalier tendency to use masc. forms to cover all genders, even when not morphologically necessary.

As for *aneháḥ*, Ge and Re supply ‘protection’ (Ge “der unfehlbare (Schirm) der Ādityas”) on the basis of VIII.18.21, while Old (ad V.51.11) takes it as an adv. (construing *ādityānām* with *viśvaḥ*), though in his comm. on this passage he rescinds this in favor of its depending on *aneháḥ* (without tr.). On the basis of I.185.3 *anehó dātrām áditer anarvām* “the faultless gift of Aditi, which is unassailable” I tentatively supplied ‘gift’ (note the presence also of another apparently variant stem, *anarvá-*; see comm. there) in the publ. tr. However, the Ge/Re solution is quite possible, and I now prefer it, since protection/shelter is often modified by *anehás-* incl. in nearby 18.21. On the basis of my reinterpret. of that adj. (see comm. ad X.61.12) I would now tr. “the flawless (shelter) of the Ādityas.”

VIII.31.14: The 1st sg. *īle* in b does not match the nom. pl. part. *saparyántaḥ* in c. I take the pl. as including the *vaḥ*, the fellow ritualists for whom the poet invoked the god. As Ge points out, V.21.3 has *saparyántaḥ ... īlate*, with number congruence.

VIII.31.18: A nice etymological pun in *āśv-áśvya-*.

VIII.32 Indra

VIII.32.2: Ge takes *ánarśanim* and *ahīśúvam* as PNs, in addition to *śṛbindum* and the familiar *píprum*. Mayrhofer (2003, *Personennamen*) is uncertain about *ánarśani-*. Scar (538–39) tr. all as PNs as well, but discusses the possible interpretations of *ahīśú-*. On the basis of the parallel he cites in IV.16.13 *píprum mṛgayam śūśuvāmsam* “Pipru Mrgaya, swollen with power,” with the pf. part. to $\sqrt{śū}$, I prefer to take *ahīśú-* as a meaningful epithet. The question is then what the first member *ahī-* represents. Although it would be easier to identify it with *ahī-* ‘fertile cow’, which matches it exactly, I prefer to take it as a metrically lengthened version of *āhi-* ‘snake’, which makes more sense in the designation of a demon. See Scar (loc. cit.), also EWA s.v. *ahī-*. All four occurrences of this stem would have four short syllables if the second weren’t long \bar{i} , but I do not otherwise have an explanation of the lengthening. But note *prāśú-* below (16b) with the same lengthening before *śú-*.

As for *ánarśani-* I would again prefer to give it full lexical value, relating it (as Gr does) to *ánarśa-rāti-* (VIII.99.4) ‘possessing non-harmful gifts’(?), *arśasānā-* designation of another demon. See EWA s.v. *arśasānā-*. However, the root etymology (supposed $\sqrt{arś/ṛś}$ ‘harm’) is not strong, and the analysis remains uncertain. If it does mean ‘harmless’, the adjective is used proleptically, as is not uncommon.

The name of the first demon, *Śṛbindu*, displays non-Indo-Aryan phonology. See Kuiper (*Aryans* 40–41).

VIII.32.3: For *kṛṣé* in this repeated pāda, see comm. ad VIII.3.20. As was noted there, the alternative interpr. as a predicated inf. “this manly act is to be done” works well with the preceding impv. *tira*.

VIII.32.4: With Ge I supply both “bring” and “soma,” though I would prefer to have more formulaic or textual support for providing this extraneous material – however, cf. II.14.8 *gābhistipūtam bharata śrutāya* “Bring what is purified by your hand [=soma] to the one who is famed,” adduced by Ge. The preverb *prāti* occurs with \sqrt{bhr} (see, e.g., VIII.20.9 *prāti ... śārdhāya mārutāya bharadhvam / havyā ...*), but is not common.

tūrṇāśa- is a hapax without etymology (though Old’s literal gloss, “was dem Ueberschreitenden Verschwinden, Untergang bringt,” implies $\sqrt{tṛ}$ and $\sqrt{naś}$, without attempting to explain the morphology). I follow the consensus, that the word refers to a watercourse of some sort, since that makes sense in context. As often, verbal play may have had a role in its appearance here: 4b #*tūrṇāśam ná ...* is partly echoed by 5c *púram ná śūra ...* (*ūr/ur na am ś*, though not in the same order in both).

VIII.32.6: An alternative syntactic analysis of ab would take everything through *vā* in b as part of the *yádi* clause with *rārāṇaḥ* as verb, and start the main clause with *dádhase*, accented because it’s clause-initial: “If you will take pleasure in my pressed (soma) or in my solemn speech, you will find delight.” There are no strong arguments either way.

VIII.32.8: I do not understand Ge’s tr. of *saṃrarāṇāḥ* as ‘mitteilsam’ (communicative, talkative) and as if it were an adjective modifying food (“bring us mitteilsam Speise...”). (I assume that the specialization of this German cmpd for [verbal] communication postdates Ge’s language acquisition stage and his usage reflects some sense of teilen ‘divide, share’.) Kü (421) suggests that this participle means “bereitwillig,

spendefreudig,” implying that it is used absolutely and doesn’t take an object. This certainly is possible here, but doesn’t bring us to Ge’s rendering. In any case, the form here (*-rarāṇāḥ* to $\sqrt{rā}$) echoes *rārāṇāḥ* (to \sqrt{ran}) in 6a.

VIII.32.10: *bṛbāduktha-* is a hapax and has aggressively non-Indo-Aryan phonology (not one, but two *b*’s). My rendering is adopted from Weber (1891, cited by EWA s.v. *bṛbū-*; see also s.v. *bṛbāduktha-*). The word must deliberately evoke the name and epithet *bṛhād-uktha-* but should not be emended thereto; see Old and Ge. If Weber’s suggestion is correct, this may be a little joke, implying that Indra is powerful but not very good with words.

The bahuvr. *sṛprā-karasna-* matches the du. NP *sṛprā karāsnā* in III.18.5, used of Agni. Given the meaning of *sṛprā-* elsewhere (‘fat, glossy, sleek’; see EWA s.v. *sarpís-*), the tr. here should be changed to “of sleek forearms.” The description is more appropriate to Agni in III.18.5, where ghee is at issue, than of Indra here, though perhaps it refers to sweat gleaming on the forearms or else simply to their evident good shape and muscle tone.

VIII.32.11: A novel construction, at least as interpreted by Ge (fld. by Klein and accepted also by me). The word *-kratu-* ‘intention, resolve’ is extracted from Indra’s epithet *śatā-kratu-* and implicitly made object of *kṛnóti*, represented by the enclitic pronoun *īm*. See Ge’s “der ... hundertfach Rat weiss und ihn ausführt.”

VIII.32.12: A similar type of construction as the immediately preceding verse, though the connection between epithet and its dynamic manifestation is clearer: the epithet *śakráḥ* ‘able’ is transformed into the verb *śakat* ‘he will be able’. For an almost identical construction see I.10.6 and discussion there.

In both 11 and 12 I take *cid* as marking the epithet to be transformed, though in 11a it is displaced to the left.

Ge interprets the hapax *antarābhará-* as “der zwischen den Kämpfen steht,” presuming an analysis *antarā-bhará-*, rejected by Old, who favors the Pp *antara-ābhará-*. This fits the context better.

VIII.32.14: Ge takes *máhi sthirám* as the neut. obj. of *āyantāram*, supplying ‘bow’: “Der den grossen starken (Bogen) spannt.” There are several objections to this. First, it’s \sqrt{tan} , not \sqrt{yam} , that is the standard idiom for stretching or spanning the bow, including in the passages he cites as parallels. Moreover, suffix-accented *-tár-* stems (like *āyantár-* here) ordinarily govern the genitive not the accusative, and although this rule is often violated, the fact that *niyantár-* in the following verse (15), an agent noun to the same root, does take the genitive makes it less likely that this one would take an accusative. I therefore take *sthirám* as a modifier of Indra (as in the next hymn, VIII.33.9, and elsewhere) and *máhi* as adverbial. *āyantár-* here is best interpreted in the context of \sqrt{yach} in 23b below.

VIII.32.16: On *prāśū-* see Scar (539–40) and vs. 2 above, as well as comm. ad VIII.31.6.

This verse is oddly couched as an impersonal. Ge’s interpretation of it is conventional: the humans have fulfilled their obligation (*ṛṇám*) to the god and he

correspondingly fulfills his to them. But the curiously detached affect of the expression gives me pause, and the temporal relations between ab and c are backwards for this interpretation: *nūnām* ‘now’ situates the first two pādas temporally after the action of the third, whose verb is the perfect *pape*, and the perfect of $\sqrt{pā}$ is generally preterital. I therefore interpret the verse quite differently from Ge. I take the debt to be Indra’s, what he owes to the human worshippers who praise and press soma for him. But he has preemptively fulfilled it: his soma-drinking is always accompanied by his gift. The reason for the indirect and impersonal expression is to avoid saying directly that Indra could owe a debt to humans. This interpretation requires taking the genitives in ab as quasi-datives, but this is quite common.

On *apratā* see Old.

VIII.32.17: The loc. *pānye* as beneficiary/target of the verbs $\sqrt{gā}$ ‘sing’ and $\sqrt{śaṃs}$ ‘recite’ is peculiar: these verbs generally take the dative or, esp. with certain preverbs, the accusative. But loc. *pānya* in sandhi matches the nominative *pānya* in sandhi (that is, underlying *pānyaḥ*) that begins the next verse (18a), and this match accounts for the unusual case usage. A small, but telling, example of how rhetorical motivations can override strictly grammatical issues.

VIII.32.18: The intensive (that is, iterative-frequentative) *dardīrat* is appropriate to the multiple objects implied.

VIII.32.20: The curious term *svādhainava-* appears to mean ‘having its own milk/milk-cows’, with vṛddhi of *dhenú-* (see AiG II.2.114). It echoes *svadhā ānu* in 19a, and, as often, this echo may help account for its deployment here. Its referent is presumably soma-pressings or soma-drinks.

The relation between pāda a and the relative clauses of bc is, at best, “improper.” That is, the two singular forms *yāḥ* in b and c must have as their (rough) antecedent the gen. plural of pāda a referring to the pressings/drinks.

VIII.32.22: I take *āti* only with b: Indra is not supposed to pass *over* the three realms, but through them on his way to us. It is only the (other) peoples he is to pass over.

I now think it possible that *āva* $\sqrt{cakṣ}$ here means, literally, ‘look down upon’, as Indra travels through the air on his way to our sacrifice. See the very similar expression in X.43.6 and comm. there.

VIII.32.23: Pāda a plays on the ambiguity of *raśmī-*, both ‘ray’ and ‘rein’.

Although the simile in c seems to match the frame in b in case (nom. *gīraḥ* / *āpaḥ*, acc. *tvā* / *nimnām*), there is a functional mismatch: the waters are not guiding the deep as the songs are guiding Indra. It therefore seems best to take *āpaḥ* as one of the occasional examples of nom. for acc. in this stem, corresponding to *tvā* in the frame, with *nimnām* a further specification of goal. Ge clearly recognizes the problem and supplies a verb for the simile in c, “wie die Gewässer ... (fliessen),” but this violates the structure of the RVic simile, which always holds the verb in common with the frame.

VIII.32.24: The *hí* in the first imperative clause provides the logical basis for the second one. See Brereton 2012.

VIII.32.26: On *īcīṣama-* see I.61.1.

As in 2b *ahīśúvam* may be a PN, but I prefer to take it with lexical value. The same problem is encountered with *aurṇavābhá-*. Arbuda, however, is a known enemy of Indra, but this episode, with snow as the weapon, is otherwise unknown. Note again the non-Indo-Āryan phonology.

The return of the theme of Indra's smashing named enemies from vs. 2 suggests a ring, and the fact that the following verses (27–28) sketch a ring with vs. 1 strengthens this impression.

VIII.32.27–28: These two verses form a sort of ring with vs. 1. There *gāthayā / máde sómasya vocata* “with a song proclaim ... in the exhilaration of soma”; here *bráhma gāyata* // ... *sómasya máde* “sing a formulation ... in the exhilaration of soma.”

VIII.32.27: The “who lays low” of the publ. tr. might be better “who lays (enemies [vel sim.]) low,” to make clear that a transitive sense is required. On the form *niṣṭúre*, whose vocalism and morphology are puzzling, assuming it's derived from *ní√stṛ*, see, e.g., Scar (642–43) and JC's (as yet unpubl.) paper on rounding of syllabic liquids in IIR. There does not seem to be a satisfactory solution.

VIII.32.28: The phrase *viśvāni abhí vratā* in pāda a is difficult to connect with any other part of the vs. The only verb in the vs. is the verse-final *cétati*, but *√cit* does not otherwise appear with *abhí* in the RV, or indeed elsewhere in Skt. as far as I know – though Ge seems to construe the *vratā* phrase with it: “der ... alle Obliegenheiten ... bedenkt” (sim. HPS [Vrata 60] “der ... alle Gelübde ... beachtet”). I wonder if this involves a crossing of *abhí√caks* ‘oversee’ with expressions like I.70.2 *ā daívyāni vratā cikitvān* “Observing / watching over all the divine commandments,” with a form of *√cit* as here. The lexeme *abhí√caks* often governs *viśva-* phrases (e.g., I.108.1 *abhí viśvāni bhúvanāni caṣṭe*) and also takes objects in the same general range as *vratā-* (e.g., *bráhmāni* VII.70.5, *dhāmāni* VIII.101.6). The drawback to this suggestion is that *abhí* is wrongly positioned for a preverb in tmesis (also a drawback to Ge's and HPS's interpr.). We should also take into account *abhí vratā* in X.66.9, which is also difficult to construe. See comm. there.

VIII.33 Indra

VIII.33.1: This verse has at least one clear subject (*vayám* ‘we’ in a) and one clear verb (3rd pl. *pári ... āsate* ‘sit around’ in d), but they do not match grammatically. There are (at least) two possible solutions: either to supply a 1st ps verb with ab (or abc) (so Ge) or to assume a modulation from 1st ps to 3rd ps. because of the nom. pl. *stotārah* ‘praisers’ in d, which, by this interpretation, would be in apposition to *vayám*. (Ge acknowledges this possibility in his n.) Despite the awkwardness I prefer the second option, in part because there is no obvious verb to supply in the earlier part of the vs. -- though I admit that Ge's “anbrausen” (*√svar*) is possible, given *svāranti* opening vs. 2 and the parallels he cites in his n. for singers and waters as subjects of *√svar*.

The other problem is the application of the simile “like waters” in b. It is not immediately clear why we are like waters. I connect the simile to the phrase *pavítrasya prasrávaneṣu* in c and suggest that the waters go in circles at this outpouring just as we take our seats in a circle. It is also possible that the waters are being compared to the pressings in the adjective *sutāvantah* “provided with pressings, (which are) like waters.”

On both difficulties in this verse, see detailed discussion by Old.

VIII.33.2: On *svabdín-* as derived from *sva-* and a reduced form of *pád-* ‘foot’, see Old, whose interpr. is fld. by Ge, though EWA (s.v.) is agnostic.

VIII.33.3: Phonetic figure in ab *dhṛṣṇav ... dhṛṣád ... darṣi*

Ge supplies “gepreisen” with the instr. *kāṇvebhiḥ*. He is probably correct that the Kaṇvas are not likely to be assisting Indra in his conquests, but I still resist supplying material without a clear basis.

VIII.22.4–6: This *ṛca* is unified by the series of rel. clauses, all introduced by *yáḥ*, most of them nominal, all characterizing Indra (4c (2x), 5a, 5b, 5c (2x), 5d, 6a (2x), 6b.

VIII.33.4: “Drink!” is an imperative that the poet Medhyātithi should not be addressing to himself, as opposed to “sing!” I therefore take it as the content of his song, addressed to Indra.

On *suté sácā* (also vs. 7) see comm. ad IV.31.5.

In d Ge takes the last two words *rátho hiraṇyáyaḥ* as a separate nominal clause “golden is his chariot.” This is possible, but I think it is far more likely a phrase qualifying Indra, despite its slight oddness. Indra can be called a chariot because he comes with lots of goods, like a chariot (see, e.g., I.125.3 *vásumatā ráthena*), and also because he’s “linked” (*sám̐mislāḥ*) to the two horses, as if he were the chariot they are yoked to and pull. Moreover, starting with 4c the rest of the *ṛca* (4c–6c) consists only of descriptions of Indra in the nominative, arranged in relative clauses. A nominal clause with a different subject would interrupt this structure.

VIII.33.5: I take the phrase *susavyáḥ sudákṣiṇaḥ* as referring to Indra’s two horses, since it follows immediately on a hemistich (4cd) concerning those horses and his chariot. But ‘sides’ or ‘hands’ are also possible. Ge simply fails to supply a referent (“Der eine gute Linke, eine gute Rechte hat”). I.82.5 *yuktás te astu dákṣiṇa utá savyáḥ ...* supports my interpretation as horses.

The stem *ākarā-* ‘distributor’ (< *ā√kṛ* ‘scatter’) occurs 3x in the RV; twice (III.51.3, V.34.4) it is construed with a gen. (*vásoḥ* and *vásvaḥ* respectively). Acdg. to Gr it takes an acc. here, and this interpr. is followed by Ge and the publ. tr. I now wonder, however, whether the apparent obj. of this nominal, *sahásrā*, is not instead truncated, by a kind of lexical haplology, from a cmpd. **sahásrā-magha-* parallel to *śatā-magha-*. I suggest an alt. tr. “the distributor who has thousands, hundreds of bounties.” The proposed cmpd., *sahásrā-magha-*, is found in VII.88.1.

On *āritā-* see comm. ad VIII.16.6.

VIII.33.6: The expression *śmāśruṣu śritāḥ* “embedded within his beard” is striking. It seems to be a slightly jocular expression, meaning perhaps that Indra has such a big bushy beard that it’s as if he’s been embedded into it -- one sees it before one sees him.

Although most instances of surface *asti* are existential, accented *ásti* often functions as a copula, esp. in subordinate clauses as here. See my 1990 “Tense of the Predicated Past Participle,” 4–5.

VIII.33.7: The presupposition behind the questions of ab seems to be that Indra becomes so formidable when he drinks soma that he becomes unrecognizable. Shape-shifting of heroes under such circumstances is a widespread mythological phenomenon.

The loc. absol. *suté sácā* is also found in vs. 4; on the phrase see comm. ad IV.31.5.

VIII.33.8: I think the idea behind the simile is that elephants establish a large territory in which they wander, and that Indra has established a similarly large territory by giving to sacrificers scattered all over the map. Ge’s “mit seinem Bruntsaft” (‘rutting liquid’) stems from an idea of Pischel’s (see Old, Kl. Sch 306) connecting this passage with the later (Epic+ *dāna-* meaning elephant’s rutting liquid [see EWA s.v. *dānā-*]). This seems unlikely and it is hard to see how simile and frame would work together.

I have toyed with another possibility that remains tantalizingly hard to realize: *dānā* may indeed be a pun, but a different one: an instrumental both to *dānā*, as it’s taken here, and also to *dāmān-* ‘rope’ (whose inst. is indeed regularly *dānā*). In this second reading *nā* would be ‘not’, not ‘like’, and *vāraṇāḥ* would be some derivative of √ *vṛ* ‘hold back, restrain’ in addition to ‘wild’. The meaning of the second reading would be “a beast not (to be) restrained by a rope,” in addition to “Like a wild elephant ... by his giving.” The second reading would harmonize with 6a, 10b *āvṛtaḥ* ‘unobstructable’ and be paraphrased by the next pāda in its own verse, 8c *nákis tvā ní yamat* “No one will restrain you.” However, I have been unable to find a way to make *vāraṇā-* a plausible form of √ *vṛ* in the correct sense and so have not pursued this possibility further.

The 2nd part of c, *ā suté gamah*, is an abbreviated version of 2c *kadā sutám ... ā gamah*. The whole pāda is paraphrased by 9d.

VIII.33.9: At first glance it is hard to find a concessive sense for the pres. part. *sán* in pāda a, despite its usual value. Indeed Ge takes ab as an independent nominal clause and begins a new sentence in c. However, the idea may be that although Indra is very tough and primed for battle, he’ll drop everything and come when we call him to the sacrifice.

The sense ‘perfected’ for *sāmskrta-* may be anachronistic; if so, ‘entirely readied’ or the like can substitute.

The *yádi* in c may be an ex. of my *yád ī* “when it ...” (see my 2002 “Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm* [Fs. Cardona] 305–9), with the **ī* shortened (redactionally?) before the cluster *st-*. The *ī* would double the obj. *hávam* later in the pāda. In this case we can substitute the alt. tr. “when the bounteous one will hear ...”

Pāda d is essentially a paraphrase of 8c, with *ā gamat* in particular doubling *ā ... gamah*.

VIII.33.10–12: A ṛca marked by repetition of *vṛṣan-* ‘bull’; every pāda but 12d contains at least one form of this stem.

VIII.33.12: On *ṛjīpin* see comm. ad IV.26.6.

“In the waters” in the publ. tr. should be corrected to “in the rivers.”

Ge and Kü (256) take *dadhanve* as transitive (Ge “... liess ... laufen,” Kü “... hat laufenlassen...”), but the other examples of this medial perfect are intransitive (VIII.19.1, also taken by Kü as transitive, can be interpreted in the same way as this one), and the accusative can easily be a goal. See comm. ad VIII.19.1 and X.113.2.

VIII.33.13: On *nāyām* see VIII.2.28. After my reexamination of the evidence (Hock Fs., 2013) I would now rephrase the translation of the first three pādas as “Drive here, most powerful Indra, to the somian honey to drink it, as bounteous one, all on your own,” eliminating “to the landing site” and construing *āchā* with *mādhu ... somyām* in the preceding pāda. The tr. “all on your own” renders *nāyām*, that is, *nā + ayām*./

A new clause begins with *śṛṇāvat* in the middle of c. Ge takes all of cd together, but the accentuation of *śṛṇāvat* is unexplained in this interpretation. Moreover *āchā* is not otherwise found with $\sqrt{śru}$ but is common with $\sqrt{yā}$. However the distribution of clauses is handled, there is a switch of person between 2nd ps. *yāhi* in pāda a and 3rd ps. *śṛṇāvat* in c, both with Indra as subj.

VIII.33.14: Note the indefinite use of pāda-initial *anyēṣām*, by rule (Jamison 1997 “Vedic *anyā* [Fs. Beekes]).

VIII.33.15: The marked emphatic initial *asmākam* in a and c is not reflected in the publ. tr., which is unfortunate because these two forms contrast sharply with initial *anyēṣām* of 14d.

VIII.33.16–19: As discussed in the publ. intro., in my view this strange pendant to the hymn is an oblique attack on what I consider a late RVic ritual innovation, the introduction of the Patnī, Sacrificer’s Wife, as a required role in standard ritual. For both general discussion of this situation and some detailed consideration of passages throughout the RV, including this one, that fight this doctrinal battle, see Jamison 2011 “The Secret Lives of Texts” (Presidential Address, American Oriental Society 2010; JAOS 131: 1–7) and “‘Sacrificer’s Wife’ in the Rig Veda: Ritual Innovation?” (Brereton and Proferes, eds., *Creating the Veda, Living the Veda: Selected Papers from the 13th World Sanskrit Conference*, 19–30). The division of speakers, again in my view, is that the poet, who opposes the new ritual model, speaks the first (16) and last (19) verses, while 17–18 are put in the mouth of Indra, who is a proponent. These verses are extensively discussed by Old and Ge, with Old somewhat more in line with my own interpretation; I will not consistently signal my agreements and disagreements with them in what follows.

VIII.33.16: I take the disgruntled speaker to be the poet and the subject of *rāṇyati* to be a rival ritualist, who has accepted the new doctrine. The “you or me” of pāda a is rather like the English expression “the likes of you and me,” meaning “ordinary people.” I take

the *nahí ... nó* (= *ná u*) as having domain only over *táva* and *máma*, not the *anyásya* of pāda b. By my rules (Jamison 1997; see ref. ad vs. 14 above) *anyá-* in this position should be definite (not Ge's indefinite "oder eines anderen..."), and I take its referent to be Indra. The referent of the *yáh* in the rel. clause in c I again take to be Indra (that is, *anyásya*), rather than the subject of *rānyati*, as Ge does. The designation *vīrá-* is of course regularly applied to Indra, and "led us here" can refer both to Indra's leadership in the acquisition of new territory and to his role in introducing the ritual innovation. And Indra starts off the next verse.

VIII.33.17–18: The repetition of *cīd ghā* (17a, 18a) may help identify these two vss. as the speech of a single individual, namely Indra.

VIII.33.17: Indra begins, cleverly, with concession: he admits that women's mental powers are not as strong as they should be. I take this as Indra's direct speech, even though pāda c is in the accusative (and pāda b could be), since I think such mixed constructions (X said "abc" / said that abc) are found elsewhere. However, little is lost if it is taken as indirect discourse. For a different sort of conflation of direct and indirect speech, see my discussion of MS II.4.3 in my 1991 "The Syntax of Direct Speech in Vedic," p. 51 and n. 10. For a novel interpr. of the history and function of the particle *āha*, including its use in this passage, see Zachary Rothstein-Dowden, "On the Etymology of Vedic *āha*," JAOS 142.1 (2022).

Note that the term *krātu-*, used extensively of Indra previously in this hymn (vss. 5, 6, 11, 13, 14), is now applied to the woman.

VIII.33.18: In my interpretation Indra's speech continues here, and having admitted the drawbacks to employing women in the ritual, he introduces the model of the yoked pair (that is, the married couple) drawing the chariot of sacrifice, a pair that must be more or less equally matched, but with the side of the pole to which the male is attached somewhat higher than that of the female. (Some animals are more equal than others.) (On the chariot pole [*dhūr-*] see comm. ad X.28.5.) The image of the sacrifice as a chariot is of course a common one, and the word *mithunā* 'complementary pair, sexual pair' seems to me the tipoff that this is about the married couple. (Old is in general agreement.)

VIII.33.19: The poet returns in his own voice to mock the new model, by imitating in the first three pādas the speech of a mother to her little daughter, inculcating proper behavior. *kaśaplakaú* in c is a hapax, but its *-ka-* suffix suggests that it belongs to a low register (note also *pādakaú* in b) and the fact that it is in the dual limits its possible applications. Old suggests "weibl. Geschlechteile" (though he moves on to breasts), and the fact that keeping one's feet together keeps them from being seen makes the labia a good possibility.

The poet then unleashes a devastating insult on his addressee, a brahman – that he has turned into a woman. I take this unfortunate figure to be the ritualist favoring the new model, and our poet is suggesting that too much association with and sympathy for women, too much emphasis on equality, will unman a man.

VIII.34 Indra

On the formal structure that dominates this hymn see the intro. The hymn is awkward to translate and, I have to say, sometimes seems awkwardly composed.

VIII.34.1: I do not understand the accent on *yayá* in the refrain, but it may be implicitly contrastive with *yāhi* in a.

VIII.34.3: Note the syntactic disharmony between simile and frame, exploiting the variant valencies of the verb, with *dhūnute* an intrans.-reflexive in the frame (“felly shakes [itself]”) but transitive in the simile (“as a wolf shakes a lamb”). See Jamison 1982.

VIII.34.5: Since the referent of *te* is Indra, explicitly comparing him to a bull in the simile *vīṣṇe nā* seems odd, since he is ordinarily simply identified as such. Ge seems to think it’s a real bull, exhibiting thirst.

VIII.34.16: See the publ. intro. for the relation between the PN Vasurocis and the vocative addressed to Indra through the first fifteen verses, *divāvaso*.

An example of the rare 1st ps. dual construction “(I) and X” as subject of a 1st dual verb, with the “I” unexpressed: *índraś ca dādvahe* “(I) and Indra took ...” For further discussion see VIII.62.11.

VIII.34.18: The apparent PN Pārāvata (‘who comes from afar’) apparently naming the patron makes sense as a speaking name in this hymn, which emphasizes the *coming here* of Indra from distant places and allows the identification of patron and Indra.

Note that the last word of the hymn is *ā*, as it was the first (and it opens twelve of the hymn’s verses).

VIII.35 Aśvins

See the publ. intro. for the pattern of repetitions in this very repetitious hymn. The c pāda of every vs. save for the last three (22–24), “in concert with Dawn and the Sun” (*saṁjōṣasā uṣāsā sūryeṇa ca*), of course refers to the Aśvins’ participation in the dawn sacrifice.

VIII.35.10–12: The first hemistichs of the three verses in this ṛca are excessively provided with *ca*’s, as well as 2nd du. act. impvs in *-tam*. Cf., e.g., 10ab *pībatam ca tṛṇutām cā ca gachatam, prajāṁ ca dhattām dráviṇam ca dhattam*.

VIII.35.11: The distribution of *ca*’s in pāda a is somewhat puzzling or, perhaps, syncopated, with the 2nd *ca* following preverb+verb (*prá stutam ca*), though the other two preverb/verb combinations in this ṛca place the *ca* in the expected position after the preverb (*ā ca gachatam* 10a and immediately following *prá cāvatam* 11a). This does not seem to be metri causa, or at least not in some obvious way.

VIII.35.13: Exactly what *dhārmavant-* is conveying here is unclear, but it is highly unlikely to be, with Ge, “von Dharma [den Gesetz] ... begleitet,” since ‘law’ is quite anachronistic for *dhárma(n)-*. I also do not think Re is correct in seeing it as a proper

noun, despite its appearance in a -*vant*-stem parallel to those containing gods' names. Rather, the repetitive template of the *ṛca* imposes the -*vant*-stem here, on the abstract principle *dhárman*- generally associated with Mitra and Varuṇa -- here perhaps referring to their authority and its manifestation (their statute) by which they impose order on the world.

VIII.35.15: *vājavant*- may mean -- instead of, or in addition to, 'accompanied by prizes' - - 'accompanied by Vāja' (name of one of the Ṛbhus) or '... the Vājas' (as a designation of all the Ṛbhus). Certainly the juxtaposition with *ṛbhumánt*- is meant.

VIII.35.16–18: A verb needs to be supplied with the d pādas of this *ṛca* (*sómaṃ sunvató áśvinā*). On both general grounds and the d pādas of vss. 1–3 (*sómaṃ pibatam áśvinā*) (see also 22b *pibatam somyám mádhu*), 'drink' makes the most sense, though 'drive to', which dominates the middle part of the hymn, is certainly possible.

VIII.35.23: On *vivákṣaṇa*- see comm. ad VIII.45.11. Contra Ge and Re, I take it with $\sqrt{vakṣ}$ 'strengthen', not \sqrt{vac} .

VIII.36 Indra

The meter of vss. 1-6 of this hymn is analyzed by Arnold (p. 248, E73) as consisting of 6 pādas: 12 12 / 8 8 8 8, and this arrangement of the stanzas is followed by HvN. Old disputes this, suggesting instead 12 8 4 / 8 12 4 8. (On the lack of accent on *śatakrato*, which he takes as a separable 4-syll. sequence, see his remarks on II.22.3.) Among other things, this division allows *sám apsujít* to be an independent sequence, as it is in its occurrences in Uṣṇih, VIII.13.2 and IX.106.3. On this expression see comm. ad VIII.13.2.

VIII.36.2–3: Somewhat unusual 2nd ps. reflexive using the standard 2nd ps. pronoun: 2a *áva tvám* "help yourself," 3a *ávasi ... tvám*. The accent on the verb in 3 is probably the textbook example of an implicitly contrastive accented verb, with predicates preceding and following.

VIII.36.6: Note *átrī... adri...*

VIII.36.7: This verse breaks out of the rigid structural mold of the first six verses, but note that it also echoes vs. 1: 1a *avitāsi sunvatáh* / 7a, c *sunvatáh ... āvitha*.

VIII.37 Indra

VIII.37.1: Although this hymn of the twinset of VIII.36–37 is the domain of the *kṣatrāṇi* 'lordly powers', it begins with the *bráhman*- that ended the last hymn and provided its key word, also echoing that verse in other ways (*āvitha, sunvatáh*).

Ge takes *sunvatáh* as acc. pl., but given the connections between the two hymns and the fact that *sunvatáh* in VIII.36 is gen. sg. in both the first and last verses of VIII.36, I find this unlikely.

There are some difficulties in distributing the words in the refrain pādas. Given its regular recurrence, *sacīpate* ‘o lord of power’ should be the first word of the refrain, but given its lack of accent it must be the last word of the non-refrain pādas. Nonetheless I have tr. it with the refrain. Also problematic is unaccented *anedya*, which comes at the end of a pāda already twelve syllables long and should therefore not belong to it. Old discusses but doesn’t really solve.

VIII.37.2: Note that *sehānāḥ ... pṛtanāḥ* in the new material of this verse picks up a phrase in the refrain of VIII.36 *vīśvāḥ sehānāḥ pṛtanāḥ*.

VIII.38 Indra and Agni

VIII.38.1–3: The referent of *tāsya* in the refrain pāda is not specified. It must fall into the cultic sphere, but could be ‘sacrifice’ or ‘hymn’ or, perhaps best, since it’s explicit in a nearby hymn by the same poet, ‘call’: VIII.35.4 *bódhatam hávasya me*.

VIII.38.2: I adopt Brugmann’s suggestion (presented and generally endorsed by Old, also Scar 417–18) to read **tośā** *sarathayāvānā* for *tośāsā ratha...* Scar assembles an impressive number of passages involving *sarátham* / *saráthā* and *√yā*, incl. I.108.1 dedicated to Indra and Agni. The suggestion has the merit of eliminating the supposed *s-*stem *tośās-* with its apparent anomalous *uśās*-like inflection with lengthened grade in the strong form *tośāsah*. The dual to the thematic *tośā-*, *tośā* exactly as here, is found in another Indra and Agni hymn III.12.4. The change does require going against the Pp. and also emending *sā* to *sa*. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before “driving on the same chariot.”

As for *tośā-*, Gotō discusses it at length (1st Class, 166–68), rejecting the old gloss as ‘drip’ in favor of ‘hasten’; his redefinition is accepted by Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *TOŚ*, replacing KEWA’s ‘drip’). Because the anodyne ‘hasten’ can fit almost any verb in the RV (and in fact the old RVicist joke is that, judging from Ge et sim., all verbs in the RV mean ‘shine’, ‘hasten’, or ‘sing’), there is nothing in the usage of the forms of this root that imposes ‘hasten’ (or excludes it). That Gotō labels his reinterpretation “plausibler” than the older one shows once again a certain deafness to metaphor and a penchant for the semantic lowest common denominator. Moreover, that most of its subjects are liquids supports the old rendering ‘drip’. The only preverb with which it is found is *nī* ‘down’. Verbs of hastening (etc.) generally take a variety of directional preverbs, of which *nī* is one of the rarest and most specialized; dripping, on the other hand, goes in only one direction, down. Gotō’s ‘hasten’ gets little or no support from the Iranian evidence he adduces (168 n. 275), which is quite weak and questioned even by him. Although as ‘drip’ *√tus* has no good etymology either (see KEWA s.v. *tósate*), I see no reason to replace it with ‘hasten’ without better evidence. In our passage ‘streaming’ probably reflects the same metaphor in English for speed. Or, like *nitósana-* in VIII.25.23, it could mean ‘overflowing’ (with goods) and refer to the anticipated generosity of the gods.

VIII.38.3: Pāda a can of course be in the acc. (not nom. as I take it) and form a single sentence with b (so Ge). There are no implications either way, but I prefer to take fronted

forms of *ayám* as annunciatory (“here is ...”) if at all possible. However, given initial *imā* (5a) and *imām* (6a), which can’t be so tr., this is not a strong arg.

VIII.38.5: Pāda b is somewhat awkward because it states that both Indra and Agni carry oblations. Ge gets out of the difficulty by making the oblations an acc. of goal with an intransitive reading of *ūhāthuh* (“... ihr zu den Opfergaben gefahren sind”), but Old convinces me (ad I.84.18, with a number of parallel passages) that we cannot sidestep the transitivity in these expressions (√ *vah* + oblation(s)). In this particular case we can attribute the transitive phrase to a feature of Indra and Agni hymns noted in the publ. intro., that both gods get credited with actions or qualities appropriate to only one of them, and Agni is of course the conveyor of oblations par excellence.

VIII.38.6: Both Ge and Re take *gāyatrā-* as a technical reference to the Gāyatrī meter and poems composed in it (also vs. 10); this is possible, but the stem is often used just of a song.

VIII.38.7: On *jenya-* see comm. ad I.128.7.

VIII.38.8: I construe the Śyāvāśva genitive phrase directly with the verb, rather than supplying ‘call’ (*hávam*) with Ge, on the basis of VIII.36.7, 37.7. But either is of course possible.

VIII.39 Agni

VIII.39.1: Ge tr. *vidáthe* as “den beiden gelehrten Stände,” commenting (n. 1de) that *vidátha-* “ist die Autorität in gelehrten Sachen.” Following Thieme (Unters. 37ff.; see also EWA s.v.), however, I take the stem as derived from *ví* √ *dhā* ‘divide, distribute’. In most instances (esp. in the loc. *vidáthe*, identical to the form here) *vidátha-* refers to the ceremonial distribution of goods and, more loosely, to the ceremony itself, but it can also refer to cosmic divisions (for other passages see Thieme’s collection; one ex. is 9b below), and that is the referent here. The presence of *ubhé* helps mark the form as a neut. dual, as opposed to the otherwise ubiquitous loc. sg.

VIII.39.2: In c I read, with Old but contra Pp, *árātūr árāv^a nām*. This does not require emending the Saṃhitā text, but simply redividing the words.

With most interpr. I take *vācaḥ* synchronically as a truncated form of the instr. *vācasā* to be construed with *nāvyasā* (also II.31.5, VI.48.11 in the same pāda-final position; versus medial ... *nāvyasā vācasā* ... VI.62.5). However, I do not regard it as an inherited instrumental showing deeply archaic morphology (with Hale, Fs. Melchert, esp. 93–95), esp. since Hale sets out very persuasively the cost of assuming such a preserved archaism (87–88), thus undercutting his own view of *vācaḥ* in these passages. I am not entirely certain what gave rise to what in my view is a synchronic, poetically generated variant. On the one hand, the expected instr. sg. *vācasā* would not fit the end of any cadence in Vedic meter; the form is almost invariably found in the break after an opening of either 4 or 5. The instr. pl. *vācobhiḥ* is, by contrast, quite common pāda final in Triṣṭubh (8 of 13 forms), and I wonder if our “instr.” *vācaḥ* did not originally start out

from a truncation of the *-bhiḥ* ending to fit into an iambic cadence (Jagatī or dimeter vs.). This of course does not get us the instr. *singular* with *nāvyasā*, however. Another factor that may have contributed is contexts in which a nom./acc. *vācaḥ* would be grammatically possible, with *nāvyasā* an adverbial instr. ‘anew’. Ours is such a passage; *vācaḥ* here can be parallel to *śāmsam* ‘laud’, hence “(set) down ... anew a speech, a laud ...” (also suggested by Scar 392 n. 544). Then analyzed as an abbreviated instr. because of its proximity to *nāvyasā*, the phrase could be used in passages in which a nom./acc. *vācaḥ* is excluded.

The tr. just suggested depends crucially on accepting my interpr. of pāda b, against that of Ge (see also Gr, Scar 392). The questions are the positive or negative value of *śāmsam* and the referent of unaccented *eṣām*. Most take the latter as referring to the *ārāvnām* of the following pāda, but, strictly speaking, unaccented forms of *ayām* should refer to something already in the discourse. Although the proximity of the two forms might allow *ārāvnām* to “count” as already in the discourse, I would prefer to find a referent preceding *eṣām*, and *devān* in 1c is available. This also allows us to interpr. *śāmsa-* in its more common positive usage ‘laud’, rather than the rare (though definitely attested) negative sense (see, e.g., III.18.2 *śāmsam āraruṣaḥ*, with a gen. akin to our *ārāvnām*).

We thus have two parallel expressions, pādas ab and cd, each beginning with *nī* and lacking a verb. I supply *√dhā* for both, with slightly different senses: ‘set down (upon)’ for ab and ‘put down’ in the idiomatic sense also found in English (though without the English specialization to speech) for cd. For *√dhā* with *tanūsu*, see, e.g., I.85.3, III.19.5, III.53.18; for *śāmsam √dhā* + loc. of god, see X.42.6a *yásmin vayām dadhimā śāmsam índre* “Indra, upon whom we have set our laud” (lit. “upon which Indra we have set our laud”).

VIII.39.3: *prá cikiddhi* presents the usual problem of forms of *√cit*: does this fall in the intransitive ‘appear, be perceived’ range or I/T ‘perceive’? I have opted for the latter, since Agni is regularly called *prácatas-*, which I interpr. as ‘discerning, provident’. But Ge and Re go for the former, which is certainly not impossible and might be supported by *ciketa* in 5a.

VIII.39.4: Ge supplies a different subject (“singer”) for *kṛpaṇyāti* in the rel. clause than for *dadhe* in the preceding main clause: “so viel Kraft verlieht Agni wie immer (der Sänger) bedarf.” This is novel, but seems unnecessary and supported neither by context nor by parallels.

The Pp. analyzes *ūrjāhutiḥ* as *ūrjā āhutiḥ*, that is, probably with an instr. 1st member, but Old prefers to see the 1st member as a stem form, either *ūrjā-* or *ūrjá-*. The latter is marginally attested in cmpds and in the verb stem *ūrjáya-*, probably originally a denom. (see Jamison, *-áya-*, 50, 81). By Ge’s interpr. (which I follow), gen. pl. *vásūnām* limits the first member of this cmpd *ūrjāhuti-*. This is common in later Sanskrit, but somewhat rarer in the RV. Re (and Klein) render it backwards (Klein, DGRV I.205–6 “whose nourishment is the oblation of the gods”), but still with the gen. pl. limiting only one of the members. It may not be sufficiently clear in the publ. tr. that I take the cmpd as a bahuvrīhi.

Note that both *-āhuti-* (*√hu* ‘pour’) and *-hūti-* (*√hū* ‘call’) appear in this vs.

VIII.39.5: The standard interpr. take *pratīvyām* as the obj. of *inóti* (e.g., Ge “er befördert die Darbringung”), and this is certainly the simplest way. But *inóti* means ‘impel’, and *práti* √ *vī* refers to the gods’ reception of mortals’ offerings, not the offerings themselves (see the root noun in quasi-infinitival usage in VIII.23.1, 26.8, and finite passages like VIII.101.10), so the simpler syntax requires attenuating the meanings of both words. I therefore complicate the surface syntax somewhat by supply an obj. to *inóti* extracted from *dákṣiṇābhiḥ* in pāda c and making *pratīvyām* the goal. If the infinitival sense of *pratīvyām* in its other two occurrences is maintained here, it could be tr. “impels (them) to be received.”

VIII.39.6: As pointed out in the publ. intro., pādas ab contain a pun -- which Ge fails to note and Re mentions in his n. but fails to render in his translation. Agni “knows the races” (*jātā ... veda*) of gods and men. Those two words in that order produce his common epithet Jātavedas. I take *apīcyām* ‘hidden, secret’ at the end of b as a separate clause, alluding to this pun: “(this is his) secret (name).” (The publ. tr. should have “name” in parentheses.) *apīcyām* (-āni) almost always qualifies ‘name’, including two hymns later by the same poet (VIII.41.5 ... *apīcyā / véda nāmāni gúhyā*). Both Ge and Re instead take *apīcyām* as a separate object of *veda*, construed with *márt(y)ānām*, while *jātā* is limited only by *devānām* (“knows the races of the gods and the secret [/Re ‘specificity’] of mortals”), though gods and mortals are frequently a merism. My view that *apīcyām* is a separate clause is supported by the meter. Mahāpañkti consists only of 8-syllable pādas, and 6b should end after *márt(y)ānām*. In fact, Old in his Prol. suggested deleting the following *apīcyām*, but in the Noten thinks better of it, allowing a 4-syllable pendant to this line. This pendant is, in my interpr., syntactically independent and a sort of meta-comment.

In e Ge supplies ghee with *nāvīyasā*: “mit erneutem (Opferschmalz).” This of course is more semantically harmonious with *svāhutaḥ* ‘bepoured’, but betrays a sad lack of poetic sensibility. The stem *nāvīyas-* is regularly used of verbal products, and it narrowly echoes *nāvīyasā vācaḥ* of 2a. Moreover, 3ab contains an example of the trope “pour prayers” (there explicitly compared to ghee: *mānmāni ... ghṛtām ná juhve*). This expression *svāhuto nāvīyasā* economically combines the “newer speech” of 2 and the “pouring prayers” of 3, using both √ *hu* (from 3) and *nāv(ī)yas-* (from 2). The poet could hardly have made his metaphorical intent clearer. (Re is only a bit less flat-footed than Ge; he gives *nāvīyasā* the correct referent [hymne], but still sneaks in a supplied beurre fondu to construe with *svāhutaḥ*.)

VIII.39.7: Gr derives *sāmvasu-* from √ *vas* ‘dwell’, and Ge’s “Hausgenosse” reflects this derivation (see also AiG II.1.75). But Old argues that it contains *vāsu-* ‘good(s)’ and compares *sahāvasu-*, *vāsubhiḥ sāha*, an analysis accepted by Debrunner (AiG II.1 Nachtr. 24, AiG II.2.471), Re, and me.

With the standard tr., I take *visvām bhūmeva* as a two-member simile, acc. + nom. A passage two hymns away in the same cycle, VIII.41.5 *sā kavīḥ kāvyā purú, rūpām dyaúr iva puṣyati* “he is a poet who fosters the many poetic arts, as heaven does its (concrete) form,” makes this analysis pretty much inescapable. But I am still somewhat concerned by the position of the *iva* (in both passages), following the 2nd element of the

simile rather than the first, and *viśvam bhūma* ‘the whole earth’ would also be a possible NP.

VIII.39.8: “Seven” here is probably a loose indication of totality (so Oberlies, II.74) rather than a precise enumeration. The number may have been displaced from *sīndhuṣu*: the rivers are generally seven.

VIII.39.8, 10: I do not understand the sudden prominence of the rivers/waters, esp. the waters that in 10e are *svāsetu*- ‘having/being their own bridges/dams’. Ge (n. 10de) thinks it alludes to the ritual sprinkling of the fireplaces with water, which may well be, but which does not explain the descriptor. In its other occurrence (X.61.16) *svāsetu*- refers to a poet who crosses the waters (*apāḥ ... tarati*) by having or making his own bridge. Are the waters providing Agni with a bridge for him to cross them? It may (or may not) be relevant that the waters/rivers are fairly prominent in the next hymn (VIII.40) to Indra and Agni.

VIII.39.9: On *vidātha*- as ‘cosmic division’ see comm. ad vs. 1 above.

VIII.40 Indra and Agni

VIII.40.2: The hapax *vavrāyāmahe* is somewhat puzzling. It appears to be a denom. to *vavrā* ‘hole’, with accent retraction because it is transitive (so Jamison, -*āya*-, 88–89). This deriv. goes back to Bartholomae and is endorsed by Old, for want of anything better. But what is its point in context? Here Re seems to show the way, taking it as oppositional to the following pāda, which begins with the contrastive particle *ātha*: “But we sacrifice just (/especially) to Indra.” The idea is that, though the hymn is dedicated to both Indra and Agni, we don’t put the two gods in the same undifferentiated category, “in the (same) hole,” as it were, but treat them individually. As noted in the publ. intro., the two gods *are* treated with more independence than in most Indra and Agni hymns (which isn’t saying much).

VIII.40.3: The clauses ab and cde begin identically, with *tā*. It is only with the last two words of the final pāda, *aśnutam narā*, that it becomes clear that a change of person has been effected between 3rd (ab) and 2nd (cde). Unfortunately this change has to be signalled much earlier in the Engl.

VIII.40.4: I take cde as consisting of two relative clauses, both introduced by *yāyoḥ* in c. The first is only pāda c and is a statement of ownership (“whose is this whole moving world,” phrased in the publ. tr. as “to whom ... belongs”); the second comprises de, with *yāyoḥ* construed with *vāsu* and Heaven and Earth the subj. of the dual verb *bibhṛtāḥ*. (Re’s tr. is sim.) Ge’s tr. differs from mine in taking cde as a single relative cl., with “this whole moving world” as a parallel subj. to Heaven and Earth. He must assume that *bibhṛtāḥ* has been attracted into the dual by the nearer paired subject. I prefer to take the dual verb seriously, and I also wonder if the moving world (which usually refers to the animate beings therein) has a collective lap. For the lap of Heaven and Earth, see nearby VIII.42.2 *pātām no dyāvāprthivī upāsthe* (in the same hymn cycle).

Judging by word order, *iyám dyaúh* should belong together and I have so tr. them. But *iyám* has the wrong deixis: *iyám* expresses near deixis and, when indicating a cosmic division, ordinarily characterizes the earth (cf., e.g., X.60.9 *iyám pṛthivī mahī*). It also has the dispreferred gender: *dyaúh* is ordinarily masc., though occasionally apparently fem. by extension from Earth (see comm. ad I.57.5). Since demonstratives are often separated from their nouns, I am tempted to take it with *pṛthivī* here (“heaven and this great earth”). But a series of passages in which the feminine near deictic does seem to belong with ‘heaven’ (*pṛthivīm dyām utémām* III.32.8, 34.8, X.88.3, 9, 121.1) gives me pause, and IX.96.3 *dyām utémām* is even worse, because it is not conjoined with an ‘earth’ word. So I have honored the word order as well as accepting the gender switch.

VIII.40.5: What this is about is not entirely clear. Ge suggests Vala, while Lüders, fld. by Re, thinks of the heavenly ocean (as usual).

That -*bāra*- ‘bank’ is a MIA development of *pārā*- ‘(far) shore’ (KEWA s.v. *jihmāḥ*, EWA s.v. *pārā*-) seems plausible.

VIII.40.6: Both *vratāti*- and *guspitā*- are found in the RV only here, but are attested later - the latter already AV.

The meter of de is faulty, with two extra syllables. Which pāda is hypermetric depends on which one *vásu* is assigned to: Old (Prol.) and Lub put it final in d, HvN initial in e. In favor of the former is *vásu*’s general preference for pāda-final position and, in particular, the final of 4e, with a form of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ + *vásu* (*bibhṛtó vásu*). Old (Noten) explicitly counsels against omitting it as others have suggested. It would be possible to eliminate another disyllable, e.g., pleonastic *vayām*, but there is no strong reason to.

VIII.40.7: Ge and Re tr. *indrāgnī* as voc., without commenting on accent. I assume this is simply a lapse on their parts.

VIII.40.8: Ge and Re take *uccārātaḥ* as the verb of all of ab, whose action unfolds “under heaven” (unterhalb des Himmels), but the contrast between *avāḥ* ‘down’ and *úd* ‘up’ invites an interpr. of cyclical complementary action -- the rising and setting of the two heavenly bodies. I therefore supply a verb of motion with pāda a.

I read pāda c with both ab and d.

Pāda d *úhānā yanti síndhavaḥ* provides support for Pischel’s resegmentation in I.32.8 of *māno rúhānā áti yanti āpaḥ* to *mānor úhānā(h)*. See Ge’s n. ad loc.

VIII.40.9: In my interpr. the verse is structured by two complementary pairings of reciprocal gifts between “us” and Indra. Both involve Indra’s gifts (*úpamātayaḥ* a, *āpīcaḥ* d) and our praiseful thoughts (*prásastayaḥ* b, *dhīyaḥ* e).

úpamāti- is variously rendered, but I take it to *úpa* $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘mete out’; cf., e.g., VII.26.5 *sahasríṇa úpa no māhi vājān* “mete out prizes to us in thousands.” Ge’s ‘Zuwendungen’ (‘contributions, donations’, but also ‘care’) could belong either to $\sqrt{mā}$ or to \sqrt{man} , but I surmise he links it to the former. Both Gr and Re connect it to the realm of speech/thought (‘Anrede’ and ‘pensées-appliquées’ respectively) with Gr explicitly positing a root affiliation with \sqrt{man} . Re gives no disc. in his comm. ad loc. (EVP 14), but in EVP 16 (ad IV.43.4) he rejects a root affiliation with $\sqrt{mā}$. Cf. also his comments

in EVP 13.155 (ad VIII.60.11). A root syllable *mā* cannot be derived from the anīṭ root $\sqrt{\text{man}}$ in any straightforward fashion, though AiG II.2.630 derives both *úpamāti-* and *abhímāti-* from *-mati-* via metrical lengthening, citing Meillet. Metrical lengthening is, of course, a non-explanation except under very controlled conditions, and the fact that other compounds with *-mati-* (e.g., metrically identical *ánumati-*) maintain the short vowel make it even less likely in this case.

In both d and e I supply ‘many’, based on the parallelism with ab *pūrvīḥ ...*, *pūrvīḥ ...* HvN’s loosing of the sandhi in d as *vīrásya apṛcaḥ* is incorrect: the initial vowel is *ā-*, which is supported by the meter and so given by the Pp (see Scar 324). Ge takes *āpṛcaḥ* as adjectival modifying *dhīyaḥ*, but I follow Old’s interpr. (so also Scar 324–25) as a nom. act.; the *vásvaḥ* with it is an objective gen., the *vīrásya* a subjective gen.

VIII.40.10: The “eggs” of Śuṣṇa are probably his progeny (so Old, Ge); see X.68.7, adduced by Ge, also X.22.11 *śúṣṇasya ... jātām víśvaṃ* and X.61.13 *śúṣṇasya ... puruprajātásya*. They can’t be testicles, given the number.

The standard interpr. takes *jéṣat* (e) as parallel to *bhédati* (d) and still part of the rel. clause beginning in c, whereas I take it as the verb of the main clause to which the rel. clause is attached. Either is grammatically possible because, if *jéṣat* is the verb of a main clause, its accent is owing to its initial position. The rel. cl. interpr. requires that cde all hang off the *tām* of a, despite the *utá*. Klein (DGRV I.302) seems to suggest that the verse is structured as an “X and which Y construction” (*tām ... utá ... yáḥ*), but as far as I know, the X and Y in such constructions always have different referents.

VIII.40.11: This verse, dedicated to Agni, is constructed entirely parallel to vs. 10 to Indra; note, e.g., the end of the b pādas: 10 ... *sátvānam ṛgmíyam*, 11 ... *sátvānam ṛtvíyam*. It therefore seems important to construe the exactly parallel cde in the same way in both verses. The only differences between the two are *ójasā* (10c) / *óhata* [-e out of sandhi] (11c), the order of Śuṣṇa and his eggs in d, and the tense/mood of the verb in e (*s*-aor. subj. *jéṣat* in 10e, *s*-aor. indic. *ájaiḥ* in 11e). My tr. reflects this strict parallelism, but others do not. Ge, e.g., takes d as the main cl. to c and e as a second independent cl., whereas in 10 he takes cde as a single rel. clause (see above). Klein, DGRV I.302, calls 11 “an awkward attempt to create a vertical parisyllabic responsio to 10a–e.” My tr. is made possible by taking *óhate* as passive (‘is proclaimed as ...’) (or possibly reflexive ‘vaunts himself as’; see V.42.11).

I now find ‘seasonal, at its season’ a somewhat misleading tr. for *ṛtvíya-* in a ritual context and would substitute ‘at the right time’ here; see comm. ad X.28.5.

VIII.41 Varuṇa

VIII.41.2: Given *prásasti-* in VIII.40.9, rendered ‘encomia’, the *prásasti-* here should probably be so tr. as well, rather than ‘panegyrics’.

VIII.41.3: I don’t understand the purport of this vs., esp. de. Ge and Re suggest various possible referents for the *véniḥ* and for the three dawns, all possible and none particularly compelling. Note the archaic weak form of the acc. pl. of ‘dawn’, *uṣáh* with true zero-grade of the suffix and simplification of the geminate *ṣṣ* (see AiG III.282).

I supply *śasvaje* with the *pāri* in c, on the basis of *pāri śasvaje* in a. Ge and Re construe the pāda without a verb (e.g., Ge: “er ist rings um die Welt sichtbar”). This is possible.

As for *venīh*, this is the only fem. form to the stem *véna-* ‘tracker, seeker’, on which see comm. ad VIII.100.5. Gr takes it as an acc. pl. coreferent with *uśás*, but most (incl. the publ. tr.) take it as a nom. pl., subj. of *avardhayan*. This is certainly possible, but the problem is to identify a referent. Ge tr. the term as “die Liebenden” (though this is not a sense of *véna-* in my view) and suggests that they could be the nights, fem. pl. *kṣāpaḥ* in pāda a, and the publ. tr. follows him in the identification, though not the gloss. Re “les femelles-vigilantes,” whom he identifies as possibly the rivers, possibly the nights. But the nights are unlikely to be “trackers” (or vigilants) – it’s dark then! And how the rivers might strengthen the dawns is a question, even if they are “les rivières célestes.” I would now return to Gr’s interpr., as acc. pl. with ‘dawns’. As disc. ad VIII.100.5 *véna-* when masc. and sg. often refers to the sun, whose ability to track the deeds of men is well known. The dawns share the quality of light with the sun and also move across the sky, and so the epithet makes a certain amount of sense. Who then is the subj. of *avardhayan*? I suggest that it is the gods, on the basis of pāda 7e *vísve devā ānu vratām* with the same *ānu vratām* as here. I would now emend the tr. to “Following his commandment, they [=the gods?] increased his trackers, the three dawns.” For another possible use of (-) *venī-* with the dawns, see X.56.3.

VIII.41.4: The hapax *sáptya-* is problematic. Most (though not Ge) take it as a derivative of *saptá* ‘7’ (e.g., Re ‘la septuplicité’, a fine coinage) and point to Varuṇa’s 7 sisters in 2e. His control over the 7 in 9e is perhaps more relevant. Ge tr. “treue Freundschaft”; though he does not comment, he must derive it from *sápti-*, though the standard view of the meaning of the latter is now ‘team’ and those meanings seem quite distinct. If the word belongs with *sápti-*, which I think more likely than a connection with *saptá* (though 9e now gives me pause), it should mean something like ‘teamwork, cooperation’. The problem is that in this hymn Varuṇa is credited with doing everything on his own; his usual companions, Mitra and Aryaman, are absent. I therefore tentatively suggest that it is based on a syncopated form (*sa-pti-*) from a putative **sa-pāti-*, hence ‘joint leadership/lordship’ → ‘leadership, master-ship’. This is a very fragile suggestion, I realize.

VIII.41.5: On the displaced simile particle here, cf. comm. ad VIII.39.7.

For a phrase similar to de see X.124.7, though it there probably refers to Indra.

VIII.41.6: The *iva* marking the simile is also displaced to the right, as in the previous vs. The simile is also more complex than it first appears. The obvious way to render it is “In whom are fixed all poetic arts like the nave in a wheel,” with Varuṇa the wheel and the poetic arts the nave, but the more likely image is that the spokes are fit into the nave -- with Varuṇa the nave and the unexpressed spokes the poetic arts.

I have no idea what or who *tritá-* stands for.

The images in de are also somewhat skewed. Ge takes the two pādas separately, with d a nominal sentence with infinitival *saṃyúje* as predicate, despite the yoking vocabulary common to both pādas. He must do that because the *gāvaḥ* in d must be nom.,

but corresponds logically to the acc. *áśvān* in e. Old suggests taking *gāvaḥ* as acc. (as also possibly in IX.24.2, on which see comm. ad loc.). I take the two pādas together, classifying it as another example of case disharmony in a simile (Jamison 1982), enabled by the syntactic multifunctionality of the infinitival *saṃyúje*, *yujé* (with both act. and pass. readings). Scar's attempt (431) to construe the two pādas together and also account for the cases shows the pitfalls, as it wanders off into fanciful territory.

VIII.41.7: The purport of this verse and the referents of the unidentified fem. pl. (*āsu*, pāda a) and masc./neut. pl. (*eṣām*, pāda b) are completely unclear to me, and multiple suggestions have been made about the identities of these entities and the ways they might fit together. I roughly follow Old's interpr., but cannot carry it further.

VIII.41.8: With Ge (n. 8d) I take *arcīṇā* as instr. to *arcí-*, not *arcín-*; among other things, “with his flaming foot” (with *arcín-*) seems comic.

VIII.42 Varuṇa and Aśvins

VIII.42.3: As disc. ad I.112.19 the old desid. stem *śíkṣa-* ‘do one's best’ in its simplex forms is ordinarily construed with a dative of benefit and no other case form. The stem is also overwhelmingly active. Of the three medial forms, *śíkṣamāṇa-* in the Frog hymn, VII.103.5, has a specialized pedagogical sense; see comm. ad loc. The other two, *śíkṣate* (I.28.3) and *śíkṣamāṇasya* here, both take acc. complements, unlike the simplex active forms. The acc. expresses the activity or product that the subject is expending his/her particular effort on. In the active this effort is generalized and diffuse: the focus is on the beneficiary of the effort.

VIII.42.4: Pl. *vīprā(h)* ‘poets’ is taken as a second conjoined subj. by Ge (“die Presssteine ... (und) die Redekundigen”), but given how often the pressing stones are said to speak, I take it (with Re) as characterizing the stones.

VIII.43 Agni

VIII.43.1: With Old I take *ástrta-yajvan-* as a karmadhāraya, not the bahuvrīhi of Ge and Re, who seem to ignore the evidence of the accent (on which see AiG II.1.80).

VIII.43.3: Ge takes *ārokāḥ* (only here in RV) as “Maschen” (mesh), and this does seem to be the meaning in late Vedic. This idiomatic sense presumably developed from ‘light flashing through openings’ to the ‘openings’ themselves. However, mesh or netting does not seem a particularly apt comparison here, and I prefer to take the word in a more literal, but still concrete, sense, esp. since *rocate* appears several times in the hymn (8c, 10b). By ‘brilliant’ I mean gems or gem-like objects (rhinestones, e.g., had they been invented then) that catch and flash light. A more abstract sense, like ‘flashes’ or ‘flares’, risks near identity with what it’s being compared with (*tvīṣaḥ*).

The force of the particle pile-up *ghéd áha* is not entirely clear to me, but this poet is partial to it. See *ghéd ... áhā* in 30, as well as *ghéd* in 29, *áha* in 8. I have not found *ghéd (...)* *áha* elsewhere in the RV.

VIII.43.4–5: *vīthak* is found only in these two vss. It is generally considered to be a formal cross of *vīthā* ‘at will’ with *pīthak* ‘separately’ (see EWA s.v., AiG III.231, Re ad loc.), a form of which appears in repeated pādas later in the hymn (18b=29b), and to maintain the semantics of the former (Ge “jäh” [‘precipitously’ -- a rather extended sense], Re “à leur gré”). Sāy, however, simply glosses it as *prthak*. I am reluctantly sympathetic to Sāy’s opinion, as ‘at will’ does not fit the contexts well, esp. 5a. (Both Ge and Re tr. it with pāda b in 4, not in its proper place.) X.91.7 *ā te yatante rathyò yáthā pīthak*, adduced by Ge, echoes our 4c. The publ. tr. reflects the Sāy gloss. However, on returning to this passage, I find the Sāy solution too convenient and entirely unmotivated, but still remain unsatisfied with the connection with *vīthā* and its suggested crossing with *pīthak*. That the formation of both *vīthā* and *pīthak* is murky does not help. I do not have anything resembling a solution, but I’m inclined to think that *vī* ‘apart’ is somehow implicated. Perhaps via an (unfortunately unattested) *-āñc*-stem, **vīyañc*- ‘facing separate directions’, whose neut. adv. **vīyak* could have been assimilated to *pīthak* given their similarity of meaning. Cf. the similarly formed *vīsvañc*- ‘facing in separate directions’, whose neut. appears two hymns later in a suggestive collocation, VIII.45.8 ... *vīsvag yáthā*.

VIII.43.8: On *jañj* see comm. ad I.168.7.

VIII.43.9: Assuming with the Pp., Macd. (VGS §48a), and Lub (s.v. *sá*) that *saúṣadhīḥ* represents *sá(h) óṣadhīḥ*, this sandhi contravenes the standard treatment; cf. I.103.5, X.88.10 *sá óṣadhīḥ*. The *sá* with 2nd ps. reference also does not conform to my rules for this usage, as it is not in an imperatival clause. I do not have an answer, though poetic factors may have had some influence: note the preceding pāda (*ap*)*sú ... sádhi(ṣ) ...*, which is a good match for the three syllables in *saúṣadhī(r)*.

VIII.43.10: I prefer to maintain the older gloss ‘kiss’ for *nīṃs* rather than flg. Gotō (200-201; cf. EWA s.v., Lub s.v. \sqrt{nas}) in the colorless substitution ‘approach’. Even if *nīṃsa-* is in origin a redupl. pres. to \sqrt{nas} , passages like this, with *múkhe* ‘on the mouth’, support the richer semantics, which could have developed from an earlier ‘approach’, used metaphorically or euphemistically.

VIII.43.12: *īmahe* is formally ambiguous and could also mean ‘approach’; Ge’s “wir nahen dir bittend” seems to represent a blend of the two.

On the cmpd. *vāreṇya-kratu-* see comm. ad IX.98.12.

VIII.43.14: *agne* has to be tr. “Fire,” rather than the usual “Agni,” because otherwise the verbal play is lost. The constant interplay in the RV between physical fire and the god Agni is hard to render in tr. because of the PN problem.

VIII.43.17: Despite the case disharmony between acc. *tvā* in a and the dat. phrase in b, I take them both as referring to Agni (so also Old). Ge takes the dat. in b as part of the simile in c, referring to a calf awaiting the cows coming to its stall. (Re’s tr. seems to combine the two.) But vs. 2a *ásmāi te pratiháryate* (and cf. VIII.44.2 *práti ... harya*) establishes Agni as the primary referent here, though a secondary connection with a calf (via the bellowing) isn’t impossible. As for the case difference, vs. 2 provides a possible solution, since the verb there is *jánāmi* ‘I generate’, construed with the dat. of benefit. Hence my “(praises generated)” here.

VIII.43.30: *vísṡvā(h)* was carelessly omitted in the publ. tr., which should read “may we all be ...”

VIII.43.31: *śīrá-* occurs 4x in the RV in the same pāda, *śīráṃ pāvakásociṡam*, and twice more in the compound *śīrásociṡ-* (also acc. *-am*). My tr. ‘sharp’ follows the current standard, but not strongly held view (see Ge, Re, KEWA, EWA) that sees a possible connection with $\sqrt{śā}$ ‘sharpen’ (see EWA s.v. *śīrá-*).

VIII.44 Agni

VIII.44.1: The phrase *adhvarāṇām abhiśríyam* could alternatively be rendered “excelling in glory over the ceremonies,” as I suggest for X.66.8.

VIII.44.10–11: The contents of the imploring mentioned in 10c seems to be given in direct speech in 11.

VIII.44.11: With Ge I supply *daha* in b, with the preverb *práti*, since *práti* is not otherwise found with $\sqrt{pā}$, the verb of pāda a, but is common with \sqrt{dah} ‘burn’. Cf. esp. I.12.15 *práti śma ríṡataḥ daha*. VII.15.13b is identical to our pāda, and the verb in pāda c of that vs. is *daha*, which governs the acc. in b.

VIII.44.14: Although in some passages I have reinterpr. *adhavara-śrī-* as transitive: “perfecting the rite” (see I.44.3 and comm. ad III.26.5), in this case context favors the interpr. in the publ. tr.

VIII.44.26: As noted in the publ. intro., Agni is repeatedly referred to as both ‘inspired poet’ (*vīpra-*) and ‘sage poet’ (*kavī-*) in this hymn, sometimes with the words in the same vs. (12, 21). Here *-vépas-*, belonging to the root of *vīpra-*, \sqrt{vip} ‘tremble, become inspired’, co-occurs with *kavī-*, filling the contrastive *vīpra-* role.

VIII.44.27: The root affiliation of *iṣema* is not entirely clear. Lub puts it with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’, but the case frame is wrong. But an affiliation with $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘desire’ is even less likely. With Ge and Re I take it as meaning ‘hasten’ or the like and note the connection of the pāda, *stómair iṣemāgnáye*, with VIII.43.11c *stómair vidhemāgnáye* in the immediately preceding hymn, with *iṣema* a near-rhyme with *vidhema* in an otherwise identical pāda. Re suggests that the form and the syntactic construction have been borrowed from VIII.43.11, but doesn’t explain what verb we’re starting with (though I surmise ‘send’). So perhaps substituting for “we would send praises to Agni.”

VIII.45 Indra

VIII.45.4: The bunda bow is the weapon Indra uses to kill the boar Emuṣa, in a rarely told myth. (See esp. VIII.77.1–2.) Its phonology sets a non-Indo-Aryan scene.

Ge renders *ké ha śṛṇvire* as “Wie heissen sie?” This is certainly possible, although I prefer my tr.

VIII.45.5: Śavasī is taken by many as the name of Indra’s mother, but there is no particular reason not to take it in its lexical sense, referring to the same woman.

The Pp. text divides the beginning of b into *girāṁ āpso*, with the second word the *s*-stem *āpsas-* ‘breast’, a word otherwise used of Uṣas (I.124.7, V.80.6). But even in a proverbial expression such as this seems to be, where semantic latitude is to be expected, “like a/the breast/chest at a mountain” (or Ge “Wie mit der Brust gegen den Berg ...,” taking *āpsaḥ* as a truncated instr. **āpsasā*) doesn’t make any sense. Old suggests a different word division: *girāṁ vāpso*, with the latter being the word for ‘wasp’ found elsewhere in Indo-European, though not directly in Indo-Aryan (except, quite possibly, in I.181.8); see EWA s.v. *vāpsas-*. This does allow sense to be made of the expression: the extraordinary size difference between a wasp and a mountain dooms the wasp, but wasps are notoriously belligerent and therefore willing to take on any opponent, however unlikely they are to defeat it. In the same way, anyone who is foolhardy enough to take on Indra will ensure certain defeat for himself.

VIII.45.6: The rest of Indra’s mother’s advice (if she is the speaker) implicitly contrasts the person who approaches Indra with requests (and, presumably, homage) and whom Indra may decide to favor with the pugnacious wasp of the previous verse that only wants to fight.

VIII.45.7: The publ. tr. may not make it clear that I think that Indra is also the “setter of contests” of the subordinate clause.

VIII.45.8: Assuming that the syntagm of the simile is *viṣvag yáthā* “as if *viṣvak*,” that is, “as if asunder,” I have slightly reconfigured the expression to conform to an English idiom. Ge seems to take the *yáthā* as expressing purpose, “dass sie zerschellen” (be smashed to pieces) but I do not understand how *viṣvak* can be configured as a verb.

Note the alliteration *víṣú víśvā ... vājrin viṣvag ... vṛha*, esp. *víṣú víśvā ... viṣvag*.

VIII.45.10: Ge takes b and c together as a single clause and has *gómataḥ* modify *te* (“zu deiner, des Kuhbesitzers, Schenkung”), but *gómant-* is not regularly used of gods (though it occasionally is) and is frequently found with *vāja-* ‘prize’, as in vs. 28 below. And *áram* is used elsewhere as predicate of a nominal clause.

VIII.45.11: There is no expressed referent in this verse, and Gr (s.v. *áśvāvant-*, etc.) indicates that it is “we” of vs. 10. However, Ge supplies “soma drops,” esp. on the strength of VIII.49.4 and the fact that *vivákṣana-* is always used of soma. This seems correct. The question is the meaning and root affiliation of *vivákṣana-*. Ge tr. ‘redselig machend’, connecting it thus with \sqrt{vac} , while I prefer to take it to $\sqrt{vakṣ}$ ‘become / make strong’, as a transitive *-ana*-nominal, beside *vákṣana-* also ‘strengthening’. The connection with $\sqrt{vakṣ}$ is asserted by Old ad X.21.1 (fld. by AiG II.2.198). See also EWA s.v. *VAKṢ*, esp. p. 487; he does not decide.

I would now substitute “flawless” for “faultless.” See comm. ad X.61.12.

VIII.45.14: Pāda c takes one aback, but the next verse explains.

VIII.45.15: On the relationship between *pramamārṣa* here and *durmārṣam* in vs. 18, see comm. ad the latter.

VIII.45.18: The first two pādas contain two perfect optatives: *śuśrūyāḥ* and *cakriyāḥ*. On the surprising dominance of perfect optatives in the RV, see Jamison 2009. I do not know why these striking forms are found together in this vs., with Indra as subject, unless the generally lower register of perfect optatives is appropriate to this sometimes slangy hymn.

The interpr. of pāda b is disputed. The publ. tr. follows Ge, also fld by Klein (DGRV II.50), in supplying ‘deed’ as object of *cakriyāḥ*, modified by *durmārṣam*: “you should do (a deed) difficult to forget.” Gr by contrast indicates that *durmārṣam* modifies *hávam* found in pāda a as object of *śuśrūyāḥ*, which noun should therefore be supplied as obj. also of *cakriyāḥ* in b. Kü (137; also 520 with slight differences) takes it in that way: “Wenn du diesen Ruf hier erhören würdest, würdest du ihn auch unvergesslich machen.” I now think this is correct. The previous vs. (17) emphasizes that Indra listens to us when we call; in this vs. we urge him not to neglect our call when he hears it, thereby showing himself to be our dear friend. Although doing unforgettable deeds is Indra’s stock in trade, this particular sequence of vss. is more concerned with his ready response to our invocation. I would now alter the tr. to “When you should hear this call here, you should make it hard to neglect.” This literal Engl. rendering is somewhat awk and a bit

misleading, since it makes it sound as if others are doing the neglecting. It would be clearer (if less literal) as “you should not neglect it.” This emended interpr. also allows *durmārṣa-* to be more closely related to the pf. *pramamarṣa* in nearby vs. 15, where the impious rich man neglects his giving. For the other occurrences of *durmārṣa-* see comm. ad X.45.8.

VIII.45.19: The logical relation between the subordinate clause (ab) and main clause (c) is somewhat indirect. The point seems to be that though we think that our behavior towards Indra has not been entirely straightforward and proper, we hope that he will continue to be generous to us despite our failings.

VIII.45.24: *mahé* was mistakenly omitted in the publ. tr. Substitute “to great generosity.”

I follow Old in taking *góparīṇasā* as standing for *-āḥ*, nom. pl. to a thematic stem, rather than, with Ge (and Pp.), as *-ā* and instr. sg. of the *s*-stem. In the simplex both *pārīṇas-* and *parīṇasā-* exist, though the latter occurs only once (IX.97.9), where it is indirectly associated with cows/milk. Old points out that soma is generally the subject of $\sqrt{\text{mand}}$ (as in 14b *mandantu ... índavaḥ*), and taking *góparīṇasā(ḥ)* here as modifying a plural form of soma drinks or drops would save having to supply another element in the instrumental. However, Ge’s interpretation does have in its favor that the more common simplex is *pārīṇas-* and that it is regularly found in the instrumental.

VIII.45.25–27: The proclamation of Indra’s deeds called for in 25c is presumably contained in the following two verses.

VIII.45.26: Gr takes *sahásrabāhve* (with distraction, *-bāhuve*) as belonging to a *u*-stem and as a poetic synonym for ‘battle’. I find this suggestion quite attractive, though this type of kenning is somewhat unusual for the RV. Ge and Old (see also EWA s.v. *bāhú-*; Mayrhofer PN) take it as a thematized *-bāhva-* in the locative as a PN (Ge: “bei Sahasrabāhva”). Though Gr’s interpretation gives the richer semantics, the problem is of course that the dative sg. should be *-bāhave*, not *-bāhve*. AiG III.139 also identifies it as a thematic locative, but allows a lexical meaning “in der tausendarmigen Schlacht,” flg. Sommer). I still think it may be a dative, with the alternative *-ve* ending (e.g., *pásve* beside *pasáve*), but a locative with lexical value is also possible.

VIII.45.27: Ge takes *vidānaḥ* as belonging to $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’ and construes it with the preceding PNs: “Das ist wahr, bei Turvaśa und Yadu bekannt.” It is true that the participle *vidāna-* ordinarily belongs to $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’, but it is usually passive and appears with a predicate, “known as X.” The idiom envisioned here, “known to,” I’m not at all sure is a Sanskrit expression, though it works well in German and English. I therefore take the participle as belonging to $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’, whose middle generally means ‘acquire’, with the soma “not to be spurned” (*ahnavāyyám*) as object. Turvaśa and Yadu offer soma to the gods elsewhere; cf. VIII.9.14 *imé sómāso ádhi turváśe yádau*. Ge takes *ahnavāyyám* with *vy ānaṭ* (“hat er nicht Abzustreitendes erreicht”), which prevents him from construing that verb with *turvāṇe* as it is in the parallel he himself cites (VIII.12.19 *ádhā yajñāya turváṇe vyānaśuḥ*). His rendering of the last two words of the pāda as

purpose infinitival clause (“dass der fromme Dienst triumphiere”) involves what seems to me a dubious construal of *śāmi*.

VIII.45.28: *jānānām* may go with *tarāṇim*, as Ge takes it (“Den Durchhelfer der Menschen”); I construe it with *b*, because *tarāṇi-* doesn’t otherwise take a genitive.

VIII.45.30: The lexeme *nír√i* ‘go out’ is specialized for birth contexts, to go out of the womb, so *yonyá-* as a descriptor of the mountain is particularly apt.

VIII.45.31: For the odd sentiments of this verse and what follows, see the publ. intro. Both Ge and Old supply an object to the first verb (*dadhiṣe*), an object drawn from ritual (Ge “das Opfer,” Old “Lob u. degl., Somatränke”), but this seems unduly restrictive. I think that the poet is apprehensive about the consequences of whatever Indra might undertake.

VIII.45.37–38: For my interpretation of this bit of dialogue, see the publ. intro.

VIII.45.37: On the basis both of the content of the verse and the use of the voc. *maryāḥ*, I consider this verse to be Indra’s address to the Maruts. The plural of *maryá* in all clear cases refers to the Maruts. And in VIII.96.7–8 the Maruts address Indra, reminding him that all the other gods but them deserted him, using the same *√īṣ* ‘shrink from’ as is found here.

Ge takes *ámithitah* as “ohne Zank” (without a quarrel), but I think it refers instead to Indra’s potentially friendless state -- ‘unpaired’ – a fear expressed by the poet in the immediately preceding verse (36). The hypothetical speaker still has a comrade (*sákhā sákhāyam*), but, like one unpaired, threatens to say to this comrade “I’m leaving.”

The form *jahā* is taken by Ge (and others) as a 3rd sg. pf. to *√hā* and therefore, implicitly, a precious example of a 3rd sg. pf. to a long-*ā* root without *-au* ending. However, Old very persuasively suggests that it is a 1st sg. subjunctive in the direct speech introduced by *abravīt*. Although to the reduplicated present of *√hā* we would expect accent on the reduplication (**jāhā*), Old argues that the fluctuation of accent in IIIrd class presents makes the accent irrelevant. I would alternatively suggest that it could be a subjunctive to the perfect stem. See Old’s extensive discussion of the various previous proposals about this form.

VIII.45.38: I consider this verse the Maruts’ insulted response to Indra’s insults, couched in a very slangy register. The first sign of this speech level is the voc. *are* (to *arí-* ‘stranger’), a vocative not otherwise found in the RV, but remember the Pāli and Pkt. “interjections” *are*, *ale*, clearly derived from this voc. (Thieme, *Fremdl.* 3–4), as well as the famous shibboleth *he ‘lavo* of ŚB III.2.1.23, consisting of an *l*-form of the plural voc. of this word in MIA guise (see EWA, KEWA s.v.). Its use as a shibboleth and with an *l*-form suggests popular speech.

Note also the lengthened voc. *vṛṣabhā* (also in 22a). Lengthened vocatives are quite rare in the RV; AiG III.96–97 cites only these two forms, but remarks that pluti vocatives were surely a feature of living speech, found in the Brāhmaṇas and in Pāli and the Prākṛits. The use of the well-known gambling term *svaghnī* also marks the speech as

low register. The substance of the Maruts' counter-accusations is that Indra greedily drank up the soma offered to him below (that is, among men). I've used the expression "lower depths" to refer to the louche aspects of a gambling place (and also possibly to the depression in the ground where the dicing happens). Indra carried on arrogantly and without sharing the soma, but then, they say, when he got into a jam in the Vṛtra battle he suddenly remembered he had pals and upbraided them for desertion.

VIII.45.39: Unfortunately this last verse of the ṛca does not seem to have any connection with the foregoing Indra-Marut dialogue. The "I" is presumably not a Marut, but the poet or other ritual officiant, and it's difficult to know how his holding on to the horses will bring about Indra's gifts. Is he holding them hostage, as it were, not allowing them to leave the ritual ground and return to heaven (recall the "Fallow-bay-yoking libation" that ends I.61–63 and sends Indra and his horses back home at the end of the sacrifice) until Indra distributes the goods? Or is he helpfully holding them to leave Indra's hands free? Given the aggressive tone of the previous two verses, I favor the former idea.

VIII.45.40: On *pári bādhaḥ* see comm. ad IX.105.6. Both there and here I suggest a haplology of the finite impv. *bādhasva*, in the putative sequence *pári *bādhasva bādhaḥ* -- rather than accepting the BR / Gr emendation to **paribādhaḥ*, accepted by Old. If we accept that emendation and make **paribādhaḥ* another acc. obj. of *jahī*, parallel to *mṛdhaḥ*, the accent on *jahī* is unexplained.

VIII.45.42: *viśvāmānuṣa-* should, by accent, be a bahuvrīhi; it is also difficult to separate from *viśvāmanus-* in the next hymn (VIII.46.17). However, most interpreters take it implicitly as a karmadhāraya: Gr 'die ganze Menschenschar', Ge 'jedermann', and Wackernagel (AiG II.1.266) explicitly identifies it as a tatpuruṣa with irregular accent ('Gesamtheit der Menschen'). But this seems unnecessary: *mānuṣa-* regularly modifies *jāna-* (so 'human race' / or 'folk consisting of the descendants of Manu'), and here we can supply an underlying *jāna-*, modified by the compound, hence '(races) consisting of all the people of Manu'. The publ. tr. seems to reflect the tatpuruṣa interpretation because the more literal tr. is simply too awkward.

VIII.46 Indra

VIII.46.6: As in VI.54.8, 55.2 I take *rāyāḥ* as a morphological pun – both genitive sg. depending on *īśānaḥ* and accusative pl. as object of *īmahe*.

VIII.46.8–9: A thematic and syntactic modulation. The *yāḥ* clauses of vs. 8 (which lacks a main clause) clearly refer to Indra's *māda-* 'exhilaration', and the *yāḥ* which opens vs. 9 seems simply to continue this construction. But the 2nd hemistich is couched in the 2nd ps. and refers to Indra, and it is possible to assume that Indra is also the subject of ab (despite the 3rd ps. construction and the 2nd ps. vocative), because the qualifiers in 9ab are better suited to Indra than to his *māda-*. (As Old says, "Übergleiten von Indras māda zu I. selbst.") In the end, though, it is better to assume a covert identification of Indra and his *māda-*, which allows a smooth transition from describing the latter to describing the former.

VIII.46.10: Despite appearances, *gavyó* is entirely parallel to *ásvayā* and *rathayā* later in the verse, since it consists of *gavyā* + *u*.

VIII.46.14: Ge takes *vāco yāthā* as a truncated clause: “soweit (es) die Rede (vermag),” but, although accented *yāthā* is seldom pāda-final, unaccented *yathā*, the simile marker, is almost always so placed. Therefore pāda-final *yāthā* here must also be a simile marker at least in my view, but see Old for contrary opinion.

VIII.46.15: Very condensed expression. The first two long pādas characterize Indra as a giver (*dadī-* 3x) of various desirable things. The third pāda, a mere four syllables, implicitly calls on Indra to actualize this identity by making the gifts.

The expression “legacy to/for the body/self” (*rékṇas tanvè*) probably stands for a son, as Ge points out in his n.

The short final pāda *nūnām ātha* is curiously formed. There are no other examples of this word sequence, but *nūnām* has a tendency to be followed by a di- or trisyllable beginning with *a-* (though usually heavy syl), e.g., *nūnām asyāḥ*, *nūnām anyā*. Moreover, *ātha* is almost always initial in pāda or clause, so its presence in this position must be signalling something special, which I take to be a peremptory command (English “now then!” corresponds nicely). Note that it echoes verse-final *yāthā* of 14 and that it again takes final position at the end of 16.

VIII.46.16: Following Old, I supply the verb “sing to” (*abhí ... gāya*) from 14 to govern the accusatives here.

In the publ. tr. I also followed a suggestion of Old in taking *kṛpayatāḥ* as acc. pl. governed by *āti*, rather than gen. sg. dependent on *várpasah* (Ge: “über diese Gestalt des Erbarmenden”). But the syntactic distribution of elements in this verse is very uncertain, due in part to the unclarity of the meter, where even pāda boundaries cannot be certainly determined. In coming to the version found in the publ tr. I reasoned that what confronts us here is a sort of syntactic śleṣa of *irajyánt-*, with the uncompounded participle as usual governing the genitive in pādas a and b (*vísveṣām ... vāsūnām* and *asyā várpasah*), while with *āti* in pāda c it takes the accusative. Cf., with *√rāj*, a root with which *irajyá-* becomes entangled, III.10.7 *ví rājasi āti srídhaḥ*. I am now not so certain: I think *kṛpayatāḥ* may in fact be a gen. as Ge takes it, but that it’s construed directly with *irajyánt-*, not dependent on *várpasah* -- with the tr. “(and has control) over the one who yearns (for him) in addition.” Under this interpr. *āti* would be an adverbial additive ‘in addition’, adding another term to the items over which Indra has control.

What “this form” refers to is not clear to me. I assume that it is Indra’s form, quite possibly one of the multiforms that he takes on at will

Since *nūnām ... ātha* reprises 15c, I find the interpolation of the *āti* puzzling, especially if it governs a previous nominal form. However, the poet (who seems to have little conscience about syntax) may have inserted *āti* here because *āti[y]ātha* would echo the *yāthā* that ends vs. 14.

VIII.46.17: Another very disturbed verse. My interpretation follows Old in great degree, but with crucial deviations.

In the first pāda I read, with Gr, Old, and Scar (61), a compound *āram-iṣe*, rather than two separate words with Ge (also Pp.; cf. Lub. p. 321 s.v. *iṣe*), who is forced to take this as a parenthetical 1st ps. declaration (“ich beeile mich recht”). This compound qualifies Indra in the dative and matches *aramgamāya* in b quite nicely.

The accent on the verb *stāvāmahe* can be accounted for (in a somewhat ad hoc fashion) as Old does, as a separate four-syllable pāda, following an eight-syllable opening.

In de (if this is the correct division), I take gen. pl. *viśvāmanuṣām* with *yajñēbhir gīrbhīḥ* “through the sacrifices and the hymns of all the peoples of Manu.” This has the somewhat awkward consequence of separating it from the immediately following gen. pl. *marūtām*, though if the pāda break follows *viśvāmanuṣām* rather than *gīrbhīḥ* as Old takes it, the syntactic separation would be less problematic. (This would produce a pāda of 10 or 11 syllables [with distraction of *-manuṣām*], followed by one of 8 syllables [also with distraction of gen. pl. *-ām*].)

Ge takes the subject of *iyakṣasi* to be the poet addressing himself, while I think that it is Indra, who is the subject of the same verb in the immediately preceding hymn (VIII.45.31). The question then is what the object is. Ge supplies the pronoun “dies,” but the referent of this pronoun isn’t clear to me. I suggest rather *sumnām* ‘favor’: the stem *īyakṣa-* several times takes *sumnām* as object (I.153.2, II.20.1. X.50.3), and it appears here in the next verse (18d), where I supply this verb. If this assumption is correct, we must then ask why Indra would seek to attain the favor of the Maruts. The key to that is probably the odd snatch of dialogue in the last hymn (VIII.45.37–38), in which Indra complains that the Maruts deserted him in his time of need; here he seeks their good will as support in the Vṛtra battle.

VIII.46.18: The referents of the plurals in this verse continue to be the Maruts of the previous verse, and I think that the same situation obtains: Indra is seeking the sacrifice and favor of the Maruts. I therefore supply *iyakṣasi* in this verse, again with *sumnām* as object. Thus one half of the VP is found in each verse: *iyakṣasi* in 17, *sumnām* in 18. (Ge also supplies the same verb stem, but in the 1st sg., referring to the poet.)

The medial transitive-causative *pātáyante* I take as a reflexive: ‘cause themselves to fly, launch themselves in flight’.

On the pseudo-loc. absol. *prādhvaré* see comm. ad VIII.12.31–33.

VIII.46.19: For wealth as a ‘shatterer’ (*prabhaṇḡá-*), see VI.68.3 where it is the implied subject of *prá ... bhanákti*.

VIII.46.20: Note the full hemistich of vocatives, all accented because there is no inherently tonic word to follow.

As Old points out, all the accusatives of the second hemistich should be grouped with *rayím* in 19, and the verb of that verse *ā bhara* continues to have domain over this one.

VIII.46.21: On the patronymic *kānītá-*, see Thieme 1963 (“Jungfrauengatte”): 244–45 (=KlSch 509–10). Acgd. to Th., the word marks Pṛthuśravas as the son of a proper, legitimate marriage, with a virgin bride.

VIII.46.23: On *ṛdhád-rī/i-* see Thieme 1958 (Fs. Turner): 157, EWA 118 (s.v. *ARDH*). Thieme tr. ‘luckily reaching wealth’. The nearby passage VIII.48.2 *śraúṣṭīva dhúram ánu rāyá ṛdhyāḥ* seems to confirm a connection between *-rī/i* and *rayí*. I tr. 48.2 “like an obedient mare the chariot pole you should follow riches to fulfillment” and adopt that interpretation here.

vītá-vāra-: Their tails are presumably straight because they are going so fast their tails are horizontal. In this interpr. the cmpd contains *vītá-* ‘straight’ (on which see comm. ad IX.97.17), as in *vītá-prṣṭha-* ‘straight-backed’, and *vāra-* ‘tail(hair)’. However, both members have different possible interpr.: *vītá-* as ppl. to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’ and *vāra-* ‘wish, choice thing(s)’ and could have the sense ‘having choice things worthy pursuing’. Cf. on the one hand *vītá-havya-* ‘having oblations worth pursuing’ and on the other *ṛdhát-vāra-* ‘bringing wishes to fulfillment’ (vel sim.) in VI.3.2. That the only other *ṛdhát-X* cmpd in the RV, namely *ṛdhád-rī-*, is adjacent to *vītá-vāra-*, which contains *-vāra-* like *ṛdhádvāra-*, strongly suggests that *vītá-vāra-* is a pun, and I would now alter the tr. to “straight-tailed (/ providing choice things worth pursuing)”

Ge takes *mathrá-* as a geographical designation: Mathra horses. But I see no reason not to connect it with \sqrt{math} ‘churn, agitate’, hence ‘skittish’. See also I.181.5.

VIII.46.24: The final pāda contains a pun on the patron’s name *Prthuśravas*. See Watkins 1995: 73–74.

VIII.46.25: I take *tāne* and *pājase* as complementary concepts, vertical and horizontal – our descendants and our synchronic extension.

VIII.46.26: This verse gives the impression of being constructed from random constituents, although some cohesion can be wrested from it.

Following Old I take b as further specifying the horses in a (*ásvebhiḥ*), with the bare numeral *saptá* substituting for the non-existent instrumental **saptábhiḥ* as elsewhere. It could also specify the number of soma drinks in c (*sómebhiḥ*), and the position of the phrase between those two instrumental expressions allows it to be construed with both. The gen. pl. *saptatīnām* of course simply depends on the numeral.

In c I supply a form of \sqrt{mad} *mand* to be construed with the instr.; so also Ge (ermuntert).

In d I supply a form such as *maṁhase* ‘you are ready’, which is common with *dānāya*, although Ge’s solution, to have the infinitive depend only on the “ermuntert” is certainly possible and probably neater. See also Scar 313.

On the possible analyses of the three-member cmpd *śukrapūtapā-* see Scar 313.

VIII.46.27: Another verse with unclear referents and no main clause. I take the subject to be the god *Vāyu*, who has inspired the human patron (*imám* in a) to give the poet a splendid *dakṣiṇā*. If *Vāyu* (deified wind) is the subject, *tmānā* lit. ‘by his breath’ is a nice touch.

In c Ge takes *araṭvé ákṣe* as a PN, and it is certainly tempting. But, although the second part of that pāda *is* a PN, interpreting all difficult phrases as names is a practice to be avoided, and Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *araṭvā-*; also *PN*s.v.) rejects the name

interpretation in favor of “aus dem Holz der *araṭu*-Baumes” (Wagenachse). There is no way to be certain.

VIII.46.28: Another virtually impenetrable verse. Rather than discuss my deviations from others’ interpretations, I will just set out the considerations that produced my own translation.

I take the referent of the *yāḥ* in the relative clauses that dominate vss. 26–28 to be Vāyu in all cases. In this verse there’s the embarrassment of the voc. *vāyo*, but since there is no verb in 28 nothing prevents it from being couched in the 2nd sg.

The *utá* in b I take as connecting *ucathyè vápuṣi* and *ghṛtasnāḥ*, both used of the *svarāṭ*, despite their different cases.

I think cd represents a new clause, with implied “your”; the *prājma* is rather like *prādhvaré* in 18, with verb extruded from the *prá*. The last little bit, *idám nú tát*, is a separate clause (like *nūnám [áty] átha* in 15–16).

In pāda a HvN read *suvarāṭ*, a reading tentatively suggested by Old (ad loc.; see also ad VII.82.2), and in fact *suva(r)-rāṭ* (with distraction of *sv-*, geminate *r*, and disyllabic *raaṭ*) would improve the meter – though given the metrical variety in this hymn, that is not a strong arg. Such a reading would support / allow an interpr. ‘shining/ruling (like) the sun, Sun-king’; see Scar 450, who favors it.

VIII.46.29: After the puzzling detour into Vāyu, this verse reunites us with the *dānastuti* of vss. 21–24 by means of *asanam* ‘I won’ in b, found also in 22a.

“Gelding” is supplied on the basis of vs. 20.

VIII.46.31: I supply *ā dade* from 32b, though *asanam* from 29a would also be possible.

VIII.47 Ādityas

VIII.47.1–18: I would now substitute “flawless” for “faultless”; see comm. ad X.61.12.

VIII.47.1: Although only Mitra and Varuṇa are mentioned in the first hemistich, *vo mahatām* is gen. pl. and must refer to all the Ādityas, who are addressed in the next clause (pāda c).

VIII.47.5: The simile is slightly skewed, though, as in English, the case frame with ‘avoid’ works either way. It might be expected that “we” would be compared to the (presumably) nominative *rathyàḥ* ‘charioteers’, but grammatically “we” are parallel to the hard places (*durgāṇi*). Of course technically both *durgāṇi* and *rathyàḥ* can be either nom. or acc. pl., so that the skewing could be avoided: “Evils will avoid us, as hard places avoid charioteers.” But this produces an unintentionally comic picture, and I follow Ge and Re in the case distribution.

VIII.47.6: This verse is contrastively complementary to the preceding one. Both *pári √ vr̥j* and *pári √ hv̥r* mean ‘swerve, turn aside, avoid’, but in vs. 5 *pári ... vr̥ṇajan* is a beneficial action, whereas here *parihv̥r̥tā* (on accent see Old, Scar 708) refers to turning aside from

the proper course, an action that causes a man to lose out on the Ādityas' gift. How substantial this gift can be for someone whom the Ādityas favor is expressed in cd.

As disc. ad X.94.3–4, the sense/function of adverbial *anā* is elusive, but I decide there for 'evidently, clearly'. That sense works well here: the point is that since any sensible person would embrace whatever Indra has to give, only someone on a crooked (=bad, evil) trajectory would miss out. I would now omit "in such a way" (the anodyne rendering of *anā*) and tr. "It is clearly only by a crooked course that a man ..."

VIII.47.9: Ge and Re take *revātaḥ* with Aryaman, not Mitra. It is true that the adj. is positioned between the two names and could in principle modify either one or both, but it belongs to the same pāda as *mitrāsya*, and the following pāda containing *aryamaṇāḥ* is a repeated pāda (=I.136.2e), in a verse where *revānt-* is not found. Since, further, *revānt-* is not a standard epithet of Aryaman, it seems wise to take it with Mitra.

VIII.47.10: I have not rendered the four nominal *yād* clauses, the last three of which merely introduce further adjectival qualifiers of *śárma*.

VIII.47.15: The accent on *kṛṇávate* is somewhat puzzling. Re explains it as a reflection of the implicit subordination following on vss. 13 and 14, but perhaps better is the implicit contrast of the *vā ... vā* construction.

VIII.48 Soma

VIII.48.1: I take *svādóḥ* as dependent on *váyasaḥ*, not qualifying it (contra, e.g., Ge's "von dem süßen Krafttrunk"). Note that Soma is called *vayodhāḥ* in the final vs. (15a) and is therefore not *váyah* himself.

s"vādh'yo opening pāda b echoes *svādór* opening a.

VIII.48.2: The first pāda is a paradox, in that confinement within leads to boundlessness. Following Ge et al., I take *ca* as a subordinator; the accentuation of *prāgā(h)* is ambiguous: the Pp. reads *prā agāḥ*, but *pra-ágāḥ* is equally possible (so Old).

How to resolve the sandhi in *śraúṣṭīva* is discussed by Old at some length; with him I take it as a fem. nom. sg. *śraúṣṭī*. The Pp. analyzes *rāyá* as *rāyé*, but *rāyáḥ* is also possible, either as gen. sg. or acc. pl. I take it as the latter. My tr. of this pāda is closest to Re's.

VIII.48.4: Note the faint echo *pītá ... pité(va)*.

VIII.48.5: On *anāha* see Kü's length and useful disc. (289). Flg. Old (accepted by Kü), I take it as a 3rd sg., not 2nd pl. with Ge, Re. The nom. pl. *imé ... pītā yaśása uruṣyávaḥ* of pāda a is (silently) resumed by sg. "soma." In order to demonstrate the change in number of the subject, my tr. appears to treat pāda a as a separate clause, which of course it is not. Among other things, the *mā* in Wackernagel's Position in a is the obj. of *sám anāha* in b.

Like 2a this hemistich is a paradox: the soma drops "seeking wide space" nonetheless tie the drinker together.

VIII.48.6: *didīpaḥ* must be a redupl. aor. corresponding to trans.-caus. *dīpáyati*, despite the light redupl. We expect **dīdīpaḥ* or even **dīdīpaḥ* (which is found in B.E. acdg. to Whitney's Rts).

Pāda-final *naḥ* serves as object to both verbs in b.

All standard treatments take *prá carā* as 2nd sg. impv., but I think it works better as 1st sg. subjunctive. See also IX.82.4.

VIII.48.9: Because of its accent *niśasátthā(h)* must still be under the domain of *hí* in pāda a, contra Ge, who takes a as a nominal clause and b as independent.

VIII.48.10: The voc. *haryaśva* (always elsewhere of Indra) is presumably addressed to a previously absent Indra, who surfaces by name in d -- though it could also be referring to soma's color.

VIII.48.11: *ánirā-* is lit. 'want of nourishment'. Since *írā-* sometimes seems specialized for liquid nourishment, I considered 'thirsts' here, and indeed in VIII.60.20, conjoined with *kṣúdham* 'hunger', 'thirst' works well. But in this passage such a translation sounds as if it refers to desires or cravings, and I think the passage refers to external threats rather than those generated within the person.

VIII.48.14: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

Vāḷakhilya

VIII.49 Indra

This hymn is twinned with VIII.50. Parallel aspects of the two hymns will be treated in the comments on the latter.

VIII.49.3: *mádā yé* in b appears to be a pseudo-izafe construction, specifying *índavaḥ*, as Ge takes it.

VIII.49.4: On *vivákṣaṇa-* see VIII.45.11.

Ge takes pāda d as a separate clause and supplies a verb, while taking *kṣudrá* as "small animals": "auf dass du ... leibhaftig wie kleine Tiere (?) brav ver(mehrest)" – an interpretation that seems to me both unnecessary and bizarre. The other RVic example of *kṣudrá-* (I.129.6), which he claims also to refer to a small animal, I take to mean 'speck'. It seems more sensible to take d as belonging with c, with the simile *kṣudréva* serving as object to *kirā́si*. The only evidence I can see against this is that *√kr* 'scatter' doesn't otherwise appear with *prá* in the RV, but that lexeme is common later. I take *kṣudrá-* here to refer to small particles of dust; see IV.38.7 *kirate reṇúm*.

VIII.49.5: Phonological figure *svadhāvan svadáyanti*.

VIII.49.6: The simile marking in pāda a seems unnecessary: why is Indra *like* a powerful hero, rather than, as usual, simply being one. Perhaps the tendency for many verses and half-verses in this hymn to begin with similes enforced that pattern here.

In c the double marking of the simile (*udrīva ... avató ná siñcaté*) also seems to serve no purpose.

kṣāranti ... dhītáyah is very close to *kṣāranti dhītáyah* in the matching hymn VIII.50.4.

VIII.49.7: The reason for the three *yád*'s in ab isn't clear. It may be that the duplications and unnecessary markings noted in this verse and the preceding one are signs of apprentice compositions.

VIII.49.8: Ge interprets the first relative clause as only consisting of *yé te* "die du hast," but all things being equal, I try to avoid interpretations that require embedded relative clauses (though see the pseudo-izafe in 3b above), and in this case a relative clause that extends to the end of b is perfectly possible. That 50.8 has the same structure is an additional support for this interpretation.

The corresponding verse in the twinned hymn, VIII.50.8d, contains *yébhiḥ svàḥ parīyase*. I therefore think that *parīyase* in our c also has domain over d, also containing *svàḥ*. Ge, by contrast, supplies *kṛnóṣi*, to produce a periphrastic causative "mit denen du die ganze Welt die Sonne schauen (lässest)."

VIII.49.9: Ge takes *gómataḥ* with *te*, not *sumnásya* as I do. This is possible but not necessary, especially since the adjective isn't exclusively, or even generally, used of beings, and since neuter *gómat* is found in the following verse (probably modifying an unexpressed word for spoils or the like, though I suppose neut. *sumnám* might be possible).

VIII.50 Indra

VIII.50.1: This verse is very close to 49.1 in structure and lexicon. Some items are identical and positioned identically: a: *surāḍhasam*, c: *yáh*, (-) *vasu*, d: *sahásreṇeva*. Others are identical words but placed differently: ab: (*abhī*) *prá ... arca*. Then there are synonyms with the same function: c: *jaritūbhyah* / *suvaté stuvaté*. Root connections deployed differently: 49.1d *síkṣati* / 50.1b *śakráṁ*; 49.1c *maghāvā* 50.1d *mām̐hate*. The only items that don't have any correspondents in the other hymn are 49.1a *abhī*, *vaḥ*; b: *índram ... yáthā vidé*; c: *purū* / 50.1a *sú śrutám*; b: *abhīstaye*; c: *kāmyam*.

VIII.50.2: The two versions of this verse deviate slightly more than those of vs. 1: identical and identically positioned: a: *śatānīkā* (though difference in number concealed by sandhi), a/c: *asya*; more or less identical, but with inflectional difference: c: *giréḥ* / *girír*, *pinvire* / *pinvate*; root connections: 49.2d -*bhójasah* / 50.2c *bhujmā*. Otherwise the verses are distinct, but notice that 50.2a *śatānīkā hetáyah* allows the noun with *śatānīkā* in 49a to be supplied.

VIII.50.3: This verse deviates from its correspondent even more than the last. Identical are *sutāsa índavo* (a) and *āpo ná* (c); root identity: 49.3b *mádā yé* / 50.3ab *yád ... ámandiṣuḥ*. In addition the simile in 49.3, where waters fill a pond, allows the underdetermined simile in 50.3 to be interpreted: it seems more likely that the pressing

has been deposited in Indra than that it has been set out for him. Ge follows the latter interpretation and is forced to supply a recipient in the simile that has no textual support: “... dargebracht wie Wasser (dem Durstigen).” See Ge’s n., which argues for his interpretation and explicitly for a different sense in the simile from that in 49.3.

VIII.50.4: The two verses differ from each other almost entirely, except that the openings of the first two pādas are identical: *anehāsam* (a), *mādhvaḥ* (b). Still, reference to 49.4 aids in the interpretation of this verse: in 49.4 the referent of *anehāsam* is clearly soma; here that is less immediately clear, but surely correct.

See Old for considerable discussion of this verse, though without reaching firm conclusions.

VIII.50.5: Yet another type of variation, whereby the poet plays on distinct but phonologically or semantically similar words. In 49.5a *ā na stómam* / 50.5a *ā naḥ sóme* the common play on *sóma-* and *stóma-* is found. In 49.5b *(d)hyānó áśvo ná* / 50.5b *iyānó ’tyo ná* the phrases are identical in sense and in morphology (medial athematic participle, *a*-stem nom. sg.) but use two different lexical realizations for both. In 49.5c *yām te svadhāvan svadāyanti* / 50.5c *yām te svadhāvan svādanti* the clauses are identically constructed, the verbs are identical and have identical meanings, though one is a Class I stem, the other an *-āya*-transitive, and the vocatives are lexically distinct, though rhyming and identically formed. Finally, both d pādas contain a locative indicating the person(s) at whose sacrifice Indra is.

The phonological figure in c, corresponding to the one in 49.5c, is more exact: *svadhāvan svādanti*, with matching plain *ḍ* s.

VIII.50.6: The two versions are closer together than the last few verses: 49.6a *ugrām ná vīrām* / 50.6a *prā vīrām ugrām* / b: *vībhūtīm* / c: *udrīva vajrinn avatō*. In addition 49.6b has *-vasum* and 50.6c *vasutvanā*, and 49.6d is almost identical to 50.4b.

I supply *ārcā* on the basis of *prā* and vs. 1, but any verb of praising or the like will do.

VIII.50.7: The somewhat awkward tripling of *yád* in 49.7 is avoided here with a simple *yád ... yád vā*, but the two versions still echo each other exactly: *yád dha nūnām ...* (a) / *yád vā pṛthivyām ...* (b), as also in c *mahemata*. The d pādas are identically structured, but lexically distinct: nom. sg. + instr. pl. (to same stem) *ā gahi*.

VIII.50.8: The versions pattern closely together despite variant semantics: *(a)irāso / (rath)irāso hárayo yé te ...* (a); *vātā... /... vātasya ...* (b); *yébhīr ... mānuṣaḥ* (c); *yébhīḥ (...)* *svār ...* (d).

The poor transmission of the Vāḷakhilya is probably responsible for the faulty accent of *nighoṣayaḥ* (for **nighoṣāyaḥ*)(so Old). There is also unnecessary doubling of the preverb *ní* (which does not affect the meter, however).

VIII.50.9: Read, with Gr and Old, **ávaso* (that is, *te ‘vaso*), which also repairs the meter.

The corresponding verses are structured identically, with *etāṁvataḥ* opening the first hemistich and its rhetorical partner *yāthā* opening the two pādas of the second

hemistich. In each verse we seek the same thing for ourselves that Indra provided to two clients, named in the second hemistich. There is also some matching phraseology: *etāvatas te* (a), *yáthā právo* (c), *yáthā* (d), as well as *dháne* in 49.9d and 50.9c.

VIII.50.10: Again the two versions are almost entirely parallel, with named examples of the beneficiaries of Indra's bounty given in *yáthā* clauses, including some with very close similarities in wording: *yáthā káṇve maghavan* LOC LOC... (a) / *yáthā gósarye* √SAN ... (c) / d: *gómad dhíraṇya-* (49.10d) / *gotrám hari-* (50.10d).

I differ from Ge in my interpretation of pāda b. He takes *dirghánīthe dāmūnasi* as another PN (so also Mayrhofer, *PN*, for the first but not the second), and I admit that parallelism with 49b, which contains a PN, is in his favor. However, here there is no *yáthā* marking the pāda as a different segment, and furthermore *dāmūnas-* 'domestic leader, master of the house' is never otherwise used of mortals, but almost always characterizes Agni. Since *dirghánīti-* is perfectly understandable in its literal meaning, I take this pāda as referring to Agni and as parallel to the locatives in pāda a indicating the sacrifice.

VIII.51 Indra

VIII.51.1: As indicated in the intro., this verse replicates the structure of the final verses (10) of VIII.49 and 50.

The PNs *púṣṭi-gu-* and *śrúṣṭi-gu-* have figured in the Indo-Europeanist discourse on the so-called *dāti-vāra-* governing cmpd "type," supposedly meaning 'causing cattle to thrive' and 'causing cattle to obey'. I have shown elsewhere that these glosses are quite unlikely and that the type to which they belong doesn't really exist: see my forthcoming article "Vedic Evidence for the Verbal-Governing *dāti-vāra-* Compound "Type": A Critical Reassessment."

VIII.51.2: It is difficult to understand what is going on in the first hemistich, which is filled with words apparently referring to positions of the body: *sám asādayat* 'made to sit up', *śáyānam* 'lying down', *úddhitam* 'set upright'. I have tr. all of these literally. Ge. takes the first lexeme figuratively, with *sám asādayat* meaning 'invited to a sattra (sacrificial session)'. I consider this to be a secondary sense in this verse, but because of the body-position language, I think something more literal is meant, quite possibly a revival or healing of Praskaṇva by ritual means. But without further context, it remains unclear. Zimmer (Altind. Leben 327, 328; see Macd. & Keith, Vedic Index 395) thinks the passage refers to exposure of the elderly, but we would need more evidence than this enigmatic snatch of text.

Ge and Old suggest that Dasyave Vṛka is the same person as Pārṣadvāṇa and the sacrificial patron of Praskaṇva. (Dasyave Vṛka is celebrated in dānastutis in VIII.55.1 and 56.1.) This seems reasonable but unprovable. In that case Praskaṇva is probably the ṛṣi of pāda c.

VIII.51.3: With Ge I read *aviṣyántam*, not *áriṣyantam*. See his n. on 3d. Old rejects the emendation, but since the *aviṣyantam* is found in the Khila collection and in "die gute

ind. Ausgabe des Pp.,” I think the reading is justifiable, esp. given the poor transmission of the Vāḷakhilya. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before “a man greedy for food.”

VIII.51.4: Although the first hemistich clearly describes ritual activity, its exact reference is unclear. Ge plausibly suggests that the chant is “seven-headed” (*saptāśīrṣānam*) because it issues from the mouths of seven priests. “Threefold” could refer to the three pressings of the soma sacrifice or perhaps the three fires, but neither of these interpretations imposes itself. As for the “highest footstep,” see discussion at I.21.6 and I.22.21. The highest footstep is usually Viṣṇu’s, and Viṣṇu does stride his three steps in the immediately following (and twinned) hymn, VIII.52.3. As elsewhere, the “highest footstep” seems to be the celestial counterpart of the ritual ground on earth, and the same types of ritual activities are performed there as on earth.

Ge suggests that the referent of *sá* in c is the chant, not Indra, but the *yásmai ... sá* construction virtually demands that the referent of *sá* be the same as that of *yásmai*, which cannot be the *arká-*. Indra is the most likely referent of both (though Viṣṇu might be barely possible). Note that no god’s name appears in the verse, leaving the reference apparently deliberately undefined. However, *paúṃsya-* in d is almost always a characteristic of Indra’s, and both the preceding and following verses (3, 5) open with definitional relative clauses, like that of 4ab, where the relative pronoun is explicitly identified as Indra in the main clause (3c, 5b *índram tám*), which imposes the same identification here.

VIII.51.6: After the three verses whose *yá- ... sál tám* constructions refer to Indra, the same construction now identifies Indra’s client.

VIII.51.7: Notice the over-the-top piling up of particles and similar items in c: *úpa-upa íd nú ... bhūya íd nú*, with the actual topic postponed till the next pāda.

The lexeme *úpa √ prc* generally has a sexual connotation (see disc. I.40.6), and given the barren cow and the going dry of ab, ‘becomes engorged’ better captures the contrast than Ge’s anodyne “nimmt ... zu und zu” (increases).

VIII.51.8: The final pāda is identical to 4d, save for the final word, which serves as subject. The identity of *pārthivaḥ* here isn’t certain. It cannot be Indra, who is the subject of the preceding clauses and whose action in c grounds and precedes the birth of the ‘earth-dweller’ in d. The idea may be that Indra’s cosmogonic actions in c allow the creation of the humans on earth, which has just been separated from heaven. This interpretation is supported by the following verse.

VIII.51.9: A syntactically problematic verse, which has produced multiple interpretations, not all of which can be treated here. It is further complicated by the fact that three different related stems to the highly charged *arí-* word are found in it: *ārya-* (a), *arí-* (b), and *aryá-* (c).

I take ab as an independent nominal possessive clause, with Indra the referent of *yásya*. The clause follows nicely on 8d: since Indra’s cosmogonic deeds led directly to the birth of the earth-dwelling people, it is said in 9ab that all of them, Ārya and Dāsa alike, belong to him.

The expression *tiráś cid aryé* in c resembles a number of passages containing *tiráś cid aryá-*, including several in VIII: 33.14 *tiráś cid aryám sávanāni* ... and 66.12 *tiráś cid aryáh sávanā*. In such passages Indra is urged to pass over the pressings (and so forth) associated with the stranger and come to our sacrifice. I believe that the same thing is being urged here. This requires supplying a verb of motion and also assuming a word haplology of some sort, such as **(aryám/aryáh) aryé* (so also Ge, though we differ on much of the rest of the interpretation).

Unlike all other interpretations known to me (including Thieme *Fremdling* 70–71 and two alternatives given by Scar, p. 308), I take d as a separate clause because *tubhyét só* seems very much a clause-initial sequence. Note that verse-final *rayíḥ* echoes the last word of b, *aríḥ*.

VIII.51.10: *arkám āṇṛcuḥ* matches the same expression in 4a, where it had cosmogonic implications. Presumably the association adds luster to the more mundane efforts of the current poets.

VIII.52 Indra

VIII.52.1: This verse is almost identical to 51.1 in its first half, save for Manu's patronymic; the structure of the second halves is very similar, with locatives expressing the various sacrificers, past and present, where Indra has enjoyed or will enjoy the sacrifice.

VIII.52.2: The pattern of the first verse is continued here.

VIII.52.3: A series of relative clauses without a main clause. It cannot be connected with the next verse because the relative pronoun has a different referent there.

VIII.52.4: This verse is structurally a mess. It seems at first to have made the same shift of the referent of the relative pronoun from Indra (vs. 3) to Indra's client (vs. 4) as was made in the preceding hymn in vs. 6: *yásya stómeṣu* "in whose praises" refers to the praiser. But the resumptive pronoun *tám* refers *not* to the praiser but to Indra, as the phrase *tám tvā* makes explicit, and the single praiser of 4a, implicitly in the 3rd person (though see Scar 225, who supplies "Zu mir"), corresponds to the 1st pl. *vayám* in c.

Ge (followed by Scar 225) takes *vāje* as part of the voc. phrase in b: "du im Kampf Sieghafter, Ratreicher." This is possible, I suppose, and even favored by the pāda boundary, but I take it as one of those locative absolutes without expressed participle, like common *dhāne* "when the stake (is set)."

VIII.52.5: On *īśānakṛt* see I.61.11. Here the point is that Indra does what masters are supposed to do: give.

In c *áyāman* is universally taken (as far as I know) as 'not on a journey', but it makes much more sense as a derivative of $\sqrt{yā}$ 'beg', indicating that even without prompting Indra should do the right thing by us.

VIII.52.6: Although this hymn does not at all correspond to its predecessor (VIII.51) to the same degree as VIII.49 and 50, this verse shows real response to 51.6: *yásmai tvám vaso dānāya* [2ND SG. VERB] (a) / *sá rāyás póṣam* [3RD SG. VERB] (b) / ... *havāmahe* (d).

VIII.52.7: Though the verse starts like its counterpart, 51.7, with *kadā canā* [2ND SG.], the verses go off in different directions.

The elements in the second hemistich can be variously distributed. Like most interpreters I take *hāvanam* as the mortals' call to the gods and the subject of *ā tasthau*, but I take *indriyām* as modifying it, meaning (unusually for this stem) 'destined for / appropriate to Indra' (so, approximately, Old), while Ge instead makes it the goal and supplies "name": "... bis zu deinem indrischen unsterblichen (Namen) im Himmel..." This is not impossible, but I do not understand why our invocation would go to Indra's *name*. I supply *bhūvanam* or similar with *amítam*.

The vocative "fourth Āditya" (*túrīyāditya*) is somewhat surprising, but as Old suggests it must identify Indra as fourth, after the standard trio Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman. Why Indra is called an Āditya in this particular context is not clear to me.

VIII.52.8: Another "improper" relative in ab, where the pious man who is the referent of *yásmai* is then implicitly identified with the emphatic fronted "us" (*asmākam*) in cd.

VIII.52.9: The verse deploys a number of words for verbal offerings: *mánma* (a), *bráhma* (b), and *medhāḥ* (d). In c a feminine term needs to be supplied in the phrase *pūrvīr ṛtasya bṛhatīḥ* "the many lofty ____ of truth." I have supplied *gírah* 'songs' from vs. 8, as it also shows up with *pūrvīḥ* elsewhere (VI.34.1, VIII.96.10, IX.85.11, X.29.5) -- though oddly when we get *pūrvīḥ* ... *bṛhatīḥ*, it's with *īṣaḥ* 'refreshments' (VI.1.2, IX.87.9), which wouldn't fit here because it is not a verbal product. But note *gíro bṛhatīḥ* with the same verb in III.51.1 *índraṃ gíro bṛhatīr abhy ànūṣata*. Ge supplies 'words', which would also work semantically, though he doesn't specify which feminine noun he thinks it is (*vācaḥ* perhaps?).

VIII.52.10: I don't really understand the idiom *sám √dhū* 'shake together'. Its intent seems to be 'produce, create', but the semantic mechanism is unclear to me. It's possible that *sám* occurs with *√dhū* here only because of the *sám* in the second hemistich. A straight 'shake out' or 'shake loose' could more easily develop to 'produce, create'. Though cf. *sám √dhū* in I.10.8 (where I do tr. 'shake loose').

In pāda a *rāyo bṛhatīḥ* seems to require *rayi-* to be fem., as occasionally elsewhere (but not so often as generally thought). I wonder, however, if the *bṛhatīḥ* has been borrowed from 9c: *pūrvīr ṛtasya bṛhatīr anūṣata*, which is structured in parallel to 10a *sám índro rāyo bṛhatīr adhūnuta*. It is even possible that *bṛhatīḥ* in 10a doesn't modify *rāyah* but refers to the same object as found in 9c ("lofty songs" vel sim.). This might solve the just-discussed problem of *sám √dhū*: perhaps there are two objects of "shake together" -- something like "shook together riches and lofty (songs)."

VIII.53 Indra

VIII.53.1: On *rāyāḥ* see VIII.46.6.

VIII.53.3: Ge takes *vísveṣām* as referring to the soma drops (“... den Saft des Honigs all der Somasäfte”), and this interpretation has the advantage of providing a plural referent in the main clause for plural *yé ... índavaḥ* in the relative clause. Nonetheless, I take it instead as qualifying *naḥ* ‘us’, to indicate the totality of the Ārya sacrificial community, near and far, as described in cd (and also 4cd). As indicated in comments on the previous Vāḷakhilya hymns, improper relatives abound, with mismatch between number and person, and so the lack of a plural referent for *yé ... índavaḥ* would not be problematic. However, Ge’s interpretation is certainly possible.

VIII.53.4: The “all” of b is undefined. I tentatively think it refers to us (that is, the entire Ārya community), but Old suggests it is the soma drops of 3cd. Ge doesn’t specify in the tr., but refers to the *vísveṣām* of 3 in his n.

I know nothing about the Śīṣtas.

VIII.53.5: Ge tr. *mitāmedha-* as “die die Gedanken aufrichten,” but I do not see how a transitive reading of *mitā-* would work in a compound so constructed.

VIII.53.6: I supply “lifetimes” (*āyūṃṣi*) in c, because *āyus-* is the standard object of *prá √ tr*. Ge assumes that the object is the referent of the following relative clause (*yé ta ukthínaḥ ...* (“Fördere fein ... die, welche als deiner Lobsänger...”). This is possible, but ignores the usual idiom.

What it means to “purify (Indra’s) resolve” isn’t clear to me, but the phrase occurs elsewhere (cf. VIII.12.11, 13.1). In any case the father of the patron Dasyave Vṛka is Pūtakratu (see VIII.56.2, also 4), so this is a pun.

VIII.53.7: If read with what follows, the relative clause in pāda a is even more irregular than those we have already met in the Vāḷakhilya. However, there is a simple solution. The identical pāda occurs as V.35.1a, where it clearly modifies *krātuḥ* in b: *yás te sādhiṣṭhó ‘vasa, índra krātuḥ tām ā bhara* “Your resolve to help that best brings success, Indra, bring that here.” Since *krátum* is found in the last pāda of the preceding verse, 6d, I take the relative clause of 7a as dependent on the *krátum* in 6d. Unfortunately this straddles a pragātha boundary, but I find it hard to believe that the *krātu* association played no role in the repetition of this pāda. It is even possible that the somewhat odd *bhāreṣu* in 7b was influenced by *bhara* in V.35.1b (though see 8d).

VIII.53.8: Ge takes *ājīm √ yā* as a phrasal verb (“mache ich ... einen Wettlauf”) that can take an accusative (“einen Wettlauf um...”). I do not see any other way to construe *bráhma*, though I am a bit dubious about the construction.

The opening of c, *tvām íd evá tām* is an inflated version, with tonic 2nd ps. pronoun, of *tām tvā*, which is found several times in this group of hymns (our 2c; also 51.6c, 52.4c). This inflation seems to have driven the preverb *sám* into post-verbal position (*áme sám*).

Old and Ge accept the Kashmir reading **matīnām*, but Narten (1960: 132 n. 34 = KISch 22 n. 34) makes a convincing case that the transmitted *mathīnām* is correct and

means ‘robbings/plunderings’. This works well with *vājayúḥ*, *aśvayúḥ*, and *gavyúḥ* in this verse, as well as *bhāreṣu* in 7b.

VIII.54 Indra

VIII.54.1: As Old points out, the accent on *gr̥nánti* is unnecessary. It may have been borrowed, with the pāda, from VIII.46.3, where the accent is correct because the pāda is part of a relative clause.

VIII.54.2: *īndram* in pāda a, apparently 3rd ps., is co-referential with the 2nd sg. subject of *māndase* in the relative clause of b, but this kind of slippage is common.

VIII.54.4: In pāda a it would also be possible to supply ‘hear’ from 3d (governing *hāvanam*, as it did *hāvam* in 3d), with *āvantu* the verb only of b.

VIII.54.6: I take pāda a as a nominal clause, with b separate, in order to account for the unaccented verb in b following *hí* in a. This requires taking *ājipate nṛpate* as predicated vocatives, a rare but still attested construction; see, e.g., I.15.2. This should also require *naḥ* at the end of pāda a to be construed with that clause, which the publ. tr. does not do. I would now add “for us” after “lord of men” and in the second clause make “us” parenthetical. Ge takes ab as a single sentence, which avoids the predicated vocative but has an unaccented verb in a *hí* clause. Old mentions the problem but decides that the lack of accent can be attributed to faulty transmission of the Vālakhilya. This is of course possible.

Both Old and Ge accept the Kashmir *ā bhakṣi* for *ā vakṣi*, though Old admits that the latter also works. I do not see the need to change the text.

Although VIII.54 has little in common with VIII.53, note 6cd ... *hótrābhir utá devāvītibhiḥ, sasavāṃso* ... and 53.7c ... *hótrābhir utá deváhūtibhiḥ, sasavāṃso* ...

VIII.54.7: With Old, Ge, Thieme (*Fremd.* 26), I read *aryáḥ* against Pp. *aryé*.

In b *īndra* can stand for either *īndrah* or *īndre*. Either will work; I have chosen (with Ge) the locative, but see Thieme’s “Indra ist das Leben der Leute.”

VIII.55 Dānastuti

VIII.55.3: Though this vs. continues the list of gifts begun in vs. 2, it is entirely in the accusative, while vs. 2 is in the nominative. There is no verb governing vs. 3, and I simply tr. as part of the list.

In the publ. tr. “ewes” should be in parens.

Ge. tr. *āruṣṭīnām cátuḥśatam* as “hundertundvier rötliche (*Schafe*)” (my italics), which makes one wonder about his barnyard experience. Wikipedia tells me that there does exist something called the Armenian red sheep (or Armenian mouflon, etc.), native to Iran and Armenia. But since the gifts celebrated in dānastutis are domestic animals, this information doesn’t seem helpful. There is also something called the California red sheep, but this hybrid was only developed in the 1970s and half a world away from Dasyave Vṛka. On the other hand, “black” sheep are often more brownish than black and

in certain lights could appear reddish. There is also a (recent?) breed of Indian sheep known as Bannur or Mandya, some of which appear (on Google Images) reddish.

VIII.55.5: Ge takes *sāptā-* as “der treuen Freundschaft,” presumably as a derivative of *sāpti-* ‘team’ (see his sim. derivation in VIII.41.4 and my comm. thereon). But it does not make sense to deny a numerical value for *sāptā-* here, since it is found in clearly numerical sense in nearby VIII.59.5 (Vālah.) *trībhīḥ sāptébhiḥ*.

VIII.56 Dānastuti

VIII.56.4: Old and Ge opt for the Kashmir Khila reading, nom. sg. *pūtākratāyī*, but it hardly makes sense that Dasyava Vṛka would be giving away his mother. It makes better sense to take the Saṃhitā reading *pūtākratāyai* (for **pūtākratāyyai*), dat. (for gen.), “(the female one) of Pūtākratāyī,” namely her daughter and Dasyava Vṛka’s sister, who would be a more likely gift-in-marriage.

yūthyām is probably a faulty reading. The Khila has *yūthyām*, but Ge’s suggestion, *yūthyā*, seems plausible.

VIII.56.5: I suggest reading **brhāt-sūro* here, that is, a bahuvrīhi meaning ‘possessing a lofty sun’. The point is the usual one, that Agni is another form of the sun, and his flame as it rises is like the sun. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before “having his own sun aloft.”

VIII.57 Aśvins

VIII.57.1: Ge and Old both suggest reading **yuktvā* for *yuktā*, and Ge further suggests *rāthe nā* for *rāthena*. Although such emendations are legitimate in the poorly transmitted Vālahilya, I see no reason to change the text if we can make it make sense as it stands.

VIII.57.2: Once again Old, Ge, and Re are in favor of various emendations (for which see the relevant discussions), but it is possible to make sense of the text, with the only alteration from assuming that *dadr̥śe* stands for a dissimilated **dadr̥śe*.

VIII.57.3: I do not know who the bull (*vṛṣabhāḥ*) is; Old suggests Indra, Ge Agni.

VIII.58 Fragment

VIII.58.1: As indicated in the publ. intro., this verse probably treats the Tānūnaptra. Although Ge suggests that the *yām* and *yāḥ* simply show the free use of the relative pronoun for general subordination, tr. both as ‘wenn’, I think *tātra* in d is the correlative of both: the Sacrificer has a compact with both the sacrifice itself (ab) and the priest who carries it out (c).

As Old points out, *āsīt* should no doubt be read as accented *āsīt*; the sketchy transmission of the hymn no doubt accounts for these errors.

VIII.58.3: As Old points out, *adhijajñe* should be accented (*-jajñé*) and *huve* should not be.

VIII.59 Indra and Varuṇa

VIII.59.1: I do not think it nec., with Ge, to supply a new verb with *prá* in b, since \sqrt{sr} regularly appears with *prá*.

I supply *rādhase* with *mahé*. This phrase is frequent, esp. in VIII (I.139.6, III.41.6, VIII.2.29, 24.10, 45.24, etc.), and *rādhas-* is a favorite word in the Vāl.

VIII.59.2: The Khila *ābhyām* should be read for *āstām*.

pāré can be read with both genitives, *rājasah* and *ādhvanah*, separately (so also Ge) and is positioned between them.

Despite the morphological peculiarity of *sísratuḥ* (on which see Old, Narten [see Kü's ref.], Kü 553), I see no reason to substitute the Khila *tasthātuḥ* with Old, Ge. Both Narten and Kü endorse the nonce form *sísratuḥ*.

VIII.59.3: On Kṛśa and a possible resonance with the “seven voices” of this vs., see comm. ad X.40.8.

The du. *śubhás páti* (generally voc.) is found over 20x in the RV, always of the Aśvins, save for vss. 3 and 5 in this hymn. Its appearance here suggests that the phraseology was adapted from an Aśvin hymn. The Kṛśa passage just cited is also in an Aśvin hymn. The configuration of ab, with *vām* at the end of the a-pāda, following *kṛśásya* might indicate that the original statement began with *kṛśásya*, with *vām* in Wackernagel's position. The detachable opening of the pāda, *satyám tád indrāvaruṇā*, would have been prefixed to fit the Aśvin phrase into the I+V context.

VIII.59.4: On the incomplete clause with *dhattam* see publ. intro.

VIII.59.6: The three gifts in ab seems to show a developmental sequence: they first have an inspired thought, which develops into thought (in the form) of speech, which is then heard.

With Ge (and Old) I read the Khila *tāni chándhāṃsi* for *yāni sthānāni*, which makes things considerably easier.

End of Vālahilya

VIII.60 Agni

VIII.60.3: Most take *yákṣ'yaḥ* as a deriv. of \sqrt{yaks} ‘appear, display’, *yákṣa-* ‘apparition’, hence Ge's ‘wunderbar’. I am taken instead by Old's suggestion (considered also by Re) that it incorporates the *si*-impv. *yakṣi* ‘sacrifice!’ regularly addressed to Agni, and my tr. reflects this. At the very least it is likely to play on \sqrt{yaj} , given its proximity to *yájiṣtha-* (1d, 3c) and *yajñésu* (2d).

VIII.60.4: I take *ádrogham* adverbially with Gr and (apparently) Re, while Ge supplies an acc. of the 1st sg. pronoun to serve as goal for *ā vaha*: “(Zu mir), der ohne Falsch ist, fahre ...” The accent, against adj. *adroghá-*, may support an adverbial interpr.

hitāḥ is ambiguous: it can belong either to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’ (see *súdhītā* in c) or \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’, and both may be meant. It also plays off immediately preceding *dhītūbhiḥ*, though it cannot belong to $\sqrt{dhī}$.

VIII.60.5: *ṛtāḥ* here is one of only two masc. forms of this extraordinarily common neut. stem, the other of which also qualifies *kavīḥ* (IX.62.30). (Gr’s three masc. acc. *ṛtām* are actually neut., and the apparent du. masc. *ṛtā* appears in X.106, a hymn constructed of gibberish, in vs. 5, which I refused to tr.) In these two passages it must be a secondarily adjectivized application of *ṛtā-* ‘truth’, facilitated by its past participle shape (and origin). Hence the special-effect tr. ‘entruthed’. Its appearance here may also be motivated in part by the semi-palindromic *trātar ṛtās*. The form *ṛtās* is unusual also because of its irregular sandhi with following *kavīḥ*, on which see comm. ad VII.18.2. Curiously the other example of this phrase in IX.62.30 shows the standard sandhi *ṛtāḥ kavīḥ*.

The trio *kavī-*, *vedhās-*, and *vīpra-* recurs from vs. 3. There Agni was both *kavī-* and *vedhās-* attended to by *vīpras*; here his attendants are *vīpras* and *vedhāses*, while he remains a *kavī-*.

VIII.60.6: On the metrical shape of *dīdīhi* see comm. ad IX.108.9.

VIII.60.8: On *tarāṇi-* see comm. ad III.11.3. The adj. modifies pl. *pāyú-*, referring to Agni’s flames, also in IV.4.12. Here I would alter the tr. to “(ever) advancing.”

VIII.60.9: I am a little uncertain why/how Agni protects us with hymn(s) (*gír-*), which are what we usually offer to him. Ge and Re soften the expression by tr. ‘word(s)’, but that is not what *gír-* means. Perhaps Agni’s “hymns” are the crackling noises of the fire, or else the instrumentals express cause: “protect us by reason of (our) hymns.” I prefer the former of these solutions. (See 18a below.) The various instrumentals cannot directly take up the *pāyúbhiḥ* of 8d, because *pāyú-* is masc. and all four number instrumentals (*ékayā*, etc.) are unambiguously feminine, as is *gír-* when it finally shows up in c.

VIII.60.11: A verb like ‘bring’ needs to be supplied with the first hemistich based on the numerous passages containing *ā bhara* governing *no rayīm* (e.g., I.79.8 *ā no agne rayīm bhara*); cf. also 18cd below.

On *upamāte* see VIII.40.9.

The publ. tr. “very glorious” is a careless error for “self-glorious,” misreading *svāyaśastaram* as **súyaśastaram*. I am evidently not alone in this, as the SV reads this instead. If this were the correct reading the accent should probably have been **suyāśastaram*, given forms like *suśrávas(-tama)-*.

VIII.60.12: Ge and Re take *vardha* as intransitive/reflexive “wachse du,” “renforce toi,” but active forms of *várdha-* are about as reliably transitive as Vedic verbs get.

VIII.60.16: The sense of *sutyájam* is disputed. I ascribe to it the same metaphorical meaning as ‘abandon’ acquires in English, namely acting without constraint. This fits nicely with *áhrayas-* ‘unabashed, immoderate, unrestrained’. A fire blazing up out of control is presumably meant; in the next pāda it manages to split a rock -- a sudden glancing allusion to the Vala myth, in which Agni usually has no role.

VIII.60.18: In a hymn of rare clarity, this verse provides a sudden stumbling block. Re’s comment, “Galamatias [gibberish] en *dānastuti*,” does not provoke optimism. My interpr. is very far from the standard ones. The problems arise from the grammatical and semantic interpr. of *suṣāmāṇi* and of the hapax *cikītvānā* and the construal of *sacate* and of *túbhyam*.

The differently accented *suṣāman-* is a PN, and both Ge and Re take *suṣāmāṇi* as such here (so also Mayr. PN) -- Ge as a nom. (“eine der rätselhaften Nominativformen auf *i*”) and Re, more sensibly, as a loc. Because of the accent difference and because a PN does nothing for us, I prefer Gr’s suggestion that it has real lexical value (‘good melody’ or ‘having good melody’), though I confess I do not understand why it would have this particular accent. It modifies loc. *śárman*: a “shelter made of good melody” would either be the protective power of the sung portion of the rite or the protection given by the “singing” fire (see vs. 9 above, with Agni’s hymns).

As for *cikītvānā*, most interpr. take it as an instr. modifying *kétena* and derived in some way from \sqrt{cit} . Old takes it as a deformation of the instr. of the pf. part. *cikītuṣā*, which is metrically impossible in the cadence; others set up a nonce stem *cikītvān-*. By contrast I think *cikītvānā* should be divided into two words: *cikīt vānā*. The first belongs to the stem *cikīt-* ‘perceptive, observant’ (4x) found only otherwise in the nom. sg. (likewise *cikīt*), twice of Agni (VIII.102.2, X.3.1). This would be its vocative, differing only in its lack of accent. What remains is *vānā*, which can be the neut. pl. of *vāna-* ‘(piece of) wood’ (see 15a above), which is found here in a possessive constr. with dat. *túbhyam*. In external sandhi we should, of course, have expected **cikīd vāna*, but I think the multiple exx. of *cikītvān*, *cikītvās*, etc., could have produced a redactional change, once voc. *cikīt* was no longer clearly understood. (In the publ. tr. an asterisk should precede “O perceptive Agni” as well as “pieces of wood.”)

Taking *túbhyam* as part of an independent clause solves another problem in the other interpr., for there is no good way to construe it with pāda a. Ge must take it as an honorary gen. with *śárman* (“in deiner Obhut”), but though the dative can express possession in predicative usage, I do not think this is possible in attributive usage. Re construes it instead with *sacate*, “(le poète) t’obéit,” positing what I consider an unprecedented case frame (dat. only) and meaning for *sacate*. (The parallel he adduces, V.43.15, is to be taken differently, and in fact Re does not tr. it in parallel fashion himself.)

With *túbhyam* belonging to another clause, *sacate* is free to be construed with the instr., as it regularly is. The instr. in question is *kéta-* ‘will, intention’, which is regularly governed by *ānu* \sqrt{i} ‘follow’ (IV.26.2, etc.), semantically very close to ‘keep company with, be accompanied by’; cf. also *keta-sāp-* (V.38.3) ‘serving the will’.

Ge renders *iṣanyáyā* as ‘nach Wunsch’, hence presumably to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘desire’, but it seems arbitrary to separate it from the verb stem *iṣanyá-* ‘send, impel, drive’.

VIII.60.20: The voc. *āghṛṇīvaso* is taken lit. by Ge and Re (‘Glutreicher’ and ‘riche en ardeur-de-feu’ respectively). But *āghṛṇī-* is an epithet exclusively of Pūṣan, and it is highly unlikely that it would be used only here, in this awkward compound, without that reference. So it must mean ‘who has the goods of Pūṣan’ -- presumably the cows and other domestic stuff that are appropriate to this last pragātha.

VIII.61 Indra

VIII.61.1: The *ca* in pāda a is subordinating, as the accented verb (*śṛṇāvat*) shows. See Klein DGRV I.245-46.

Ge, flg. Sāy, suggests that the twofold speech (*ubhāyaṃ vācaḥ*) is Gesang and Vortrag. This is certainly possible, though I wonder if it might be refined to words and melody – that is, not separate performances of songs and recitations, but words set to music – accounting for the grammatical singular.

VIII.61.4: On *āprāmi-satya* see Scar 388, inter alia. With him and others (see already Gr) I take the first member as derived from *prá √ mī*, but in the common idiom ‘confound’. In my view the compound concerns a regularly expressed anxiety about Indra – does he exist? See, e.g., VIII.100.3 *néndro astīti néma u tva āha* “‘Indra does not exist,’ so says many a one.” Our compound addresses this by calling him one “whose reality cannot be confounded.” Ge’s “der sein Versprechen nie bricht” assumes a meaning ‘promise’ for *satyá-* that I don’t think is justified for the RV. Scar’s “dessen Wahrheit unwandelbar ist” is closer to mine, but I don’t think his rendering of the first member is sufficiently pointed.

VIII.61.6: Although *paurá-* is generally a PN in the RV (see Mayrhofer, *Die Personennamen in der Rgveda-Samhitā* s.v.), reflecting the patronymic it is morphologically, here it cannot be so meant. Among other things, Indra cannot be a descendent of Puru! In this passage it puns on *purukīt* in the same pāda, as well as *purūvaso* in 3a, *purū* in 8a. Ge’s tr. takes account of this word play (“Mehrere der Rossherde”), but I don’t think that it should be construed with a genitive as he takes it. I take both genitives (*ásvasya ... gāvām*) with *purukīt* (so also Scar 76) and interpret *paurá-* as ‘stemming from / related to much(ness)’, that is, ‘muchness itself’; “multiplicity ... multiplier” is an attempt to capture the pun in English without undue awkwardness.

In c Ge (also Old) takes *dānam* as subject: “bei dir bleibt die Gabe niemals aus,” but the verbal forms to *√ mṛdh* are otherwise always transitive. Old cites VII.59.4 as parallel, but the parallelism is only apparent and the verb there is also transitive.

VIII.61.7: The two verbs in ab, *éhi* and *vidā*, seem to conform to the quasi-serial-verb construction (on which see A. Yates 2014 [UCLA IE Conference proceedings]), but *hí* makes trouble for this assessment and trouble in general for the interpretation. Since *hí* triggers verb accentuation, the first imperative should be accented *éhi* (that is, *ā + ihí*), not *éhi* (that is, *ā + ihi*), as Old points out. He suggest that *éhi* is parenthetical. This is possible, though ad hoc, but this still leaves the function of *hí* in question. It could be interpreted in the mode of Brereton 2012, as marking the first of two imperatives (in this case *vidā*, if *éhi* is parenthetical) as the basis of the action of the second. Such an

interpretation is barely possible here; however, it seems excessively complex, since it requires banishing the truly first imperative *éhi* from structural consideration. My own ad hoc suggestion is that *hí* is over-represented in this part of the hymn (2a, 2d, 3c, 5c, 6c) and has been inserted here without its usual function and without triggering verbal accent. But this is of course not a satisfying solution, though it does allow the QSV analysis to be maintained.

For impv. *vidā* against Pp subj. *vidāh*, see comm. ad IX.19.6. Here the parallel impvs. *éhi* and *vāṛṣasva* reinforce an impv. interpr.

For the hapax *céru*- see EWA s.v. An association with \sqrt{ci} ‘perceive’ seems possible. Ge is uncertain, tr. ‘seeking’, but in n. suggests ‘traveling’ (to \sqrt{car}).

Morphologically *vāṛṣasva* is somewhat problematic: Lub takes it as the medial perfect imperative to a subjunctive stem, Kü (474) more cautiously as a “thematically built” imperative. It is worth pointing out that a properly built pf. mid. impv. would come out as **vāṛṣkṣva* and would be multiply ambiguous. Thematicization would be a good strategy under these circumstances. For further disc. of this set of “thematic” perfect imperatives see my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems” (Fs. Lubotsky) on the perfect imperative. As is generally noted, this imperative cannot be separated from the medial participle *vāṛṣānā-*, which in two of its three occurrences also appears with *úd*. Following Neisser (1893, also Gotō 1987), Kü (474–77) assigns these forms to a root $\sqrt{2} varṣ$ ‘sich ermannen, sich (tatendurstig) erheben’ (associated with the present *ṛṣāyāte*, which however appears to be a denominative, not a root formation) separate from $\sqrt{1} varṣ$ ‘regnen’ and translates our passage rather like Ge’s “Ermannen dich...” I think this separation is unnecessary and also ignores the *āṛṣasva* in 3a. I find the liquid semantics of $\sqrt{varṣ}$ ‘rain’ not only possible in all the *úd* $\sqrt{varṣ}$ passages but productive of a striking image: ‘bubble/boil up’, expressing Indra’s irrepresible excitement and energy.

VIII.61.9: Thematically and lexically connected with the preceding verse (8) despite straddling the pragātha boundary. In 8c we identify ourselves as *vīpravacas-* ‘having inspired speech’, and in 9ab it is said that either a *vīpra* or a non-*vīpra* might offer his *vācas-* to Indra, with good results either way. Although this seems like a non-RVíc sentiment (esp. after 8c), since ordinarily only good poets (like us) are meant to achieve success, perhaps the “inspired poet” is being implicitly contrasted with a non-inspired but still skillful poet. In the other occurrence of *avīprā-* in the RV (VI.45.2), Indra “places vitality even in the uninspired,” so perhaps, alternatively, here even the uninspired poet achieves success simply by dedicating his product to Indra and acquiring luster by this contact.

The accusative of the offering with \sqrt{vidh} is a bit unusual, but not unprecedented (see, e.g., I.189.1), and Ge’s rather deviant tr. “die Rede recht gemacht hat” and his alternative suggestion that *vācaḥ* represents *vācasā* at the end of the pāda are both unnecessary.

On the apparent bad cadence produced by *āvidhat*, see remarks ad II.1.7, where Arnold’s suggestion to read a long augment is adopted.

The apparent subj. *mamandat* certainly can work as a subjunctive in context and is so rendered in the publ. tr. However, note that it immediately precedes *t''vāyā*, beg. with *t-*, and we might be dealing with an unetymological doubling from an underlying

**mamanda* *t''vāyā*. The final syllable of the verb would then be light, but this doesn't cause major metrical problems. Nonetheless, I'm inclined to stick with the subjunctive. On the other hand, on the basis of VII.18.21 and VII.33.1, I now think it is possible that *prā mamanda(t)* should be interpr. as transitive, with 'you' [=Indra] supplied as object, perhaps as haplology from **tvā tvāyā* as I suggest ad VII.18.21. For the motivations for this reinterpr., see disc. there. The altered tr. would be "... will exhilarate / has exhilarated (you) in devotion to you." On the other hand, the intrans. interpr. in the publ. tr. makes slightly more sense in this context -- and forms of $\sqrt{ma(n)d}$ can be either trans. or intrans., so the current tr. could be maintained.

The voc. *ahamsana* is surely rightly explained (Old ad V.75.2, AiG II.1.327, III.437) as a univerbation of a VP *ahām sanā* "I shall win" (see V.75.2 for another instantiation of this phrase). (AiG II.1.327 suggests *ahām saneyam*, but the thematic subjunctive matches the compound better.)

VIII.61.10: Ge tr. *yādi* as 'So', which does not seem legitimate to me. It might be possible to read it as **yād ī*, even without a following cluster (see Jamison 2002) "when he will hear my call," but I don't see that this appreciably improves sense.

VIII.61.11: Kulikov (339–40, flg. Gotō) does not allow a passive reading for medial forms of \sqrt{man} , but aside from Gotō's dictum I see nothing against such an interpretation, which fits the passage better than a reflexive one.

The hapax *ārāya-* is plausibly taken as a negated form derived from the root $\sqrt{rā}$ 'give, bestow' by Mayrhofer EWA s.v. *rayí-*.

jālu- (i.e., *jādhu-*) is also a hapax with no agreed-upon etymology or meaning. Ge leaves it untr. and Old simply comments "dunkel." See EWA s.v. for references to previous discussions and suggestions. I wonder if it is not related to *jāthāra-* 'belly', with MIA voicing of intervocalic obstruent between vowels (cf. Pkt. *jaḍhara-* 'belly' cited in EWA s.v. *jāthāra-* [though not registered in Turner]), with "belly" as the designation of a greedy, voracious person.

The point of the verse seems to be that we don't want to get a bad reputation for being selfish by grabbing Indra to be our exclusive companion.

VIII.61.12: The second member of the hapax compound *ṛṇā-kāti-* belongs with *kāmakāti-* 'desiring desires', and I therefore produce a more volition tr. than the usual 'Schuld fordernd'.

The interpretation of the second hemistich depends on the interpretation of *bhṛmām*. Gr takes it as 'error', Ge as 'impatience' (Ungeduld), and see EWA s.v. for other suggestions. I consider it a derivative of \sqrt{bhram} 'whirl', and see it here as qualifying the *vājīn-*, the prize-winning horse. The point is that a good charioteer recognizes a good horse even when it's going so fast it becomes a whirling blur. And this fast horse is the one that the knowledgeable charioteer wants and will obtain. Ge's interpretation is very different: "Der Gewinner ... versteht die Ungeduld, die den Sieggewohnten erfasst." He takes *bhṛmām* as a noun, the object of *védā*, and the referent of the relative pronoun in d. Since he considers that rel. pronoun the subject of *násat*, he must account for acc. *yām* by assuming attraction to *vājīnam* from expected nom. **yāh*. My interpretation avoids this unappealing change and also accounts better for the position

of the particles *íd ū*, since *vājínām* belongs to the main clause not the relative clause, by my reading. Moreover, *násat* should be a subjunctive, but his tr. fails to register that.

VIII.61.13: Pāda b would literally be “make lack of fear of that for us,” which is overly stilted.

Pāda c reprises 5ab.

VIII.61.14: Old takes *rādhaspate* as a predicated vocative, presumably with at least *rādhaso máhaḥ* and possibly *kṣáyasya* dependent on it. Ge (whom I follow) supplies a “lord” for those dependent genitives, which may amount to the same thing.

VIII.61.15: The sandhi form *índra* that opens pāda a can be either vocative or nominative. Because of the 3rd ps. verbs of cd, I take it as nominative.

VIII.62 Indra

VIII.62.3: Gr, Ge take *áhita-* as ‘useless’ (untauglich), the negation of what I think of as a later specialized sense of *hitá-* as ‘useful, beneficial, friendly’, which is not, as far as I know, found in the RV. In his n. Ge allows the possibility of connection with \sqrt{hi} ‘spur on’ (which is Sāy’s view), and this seems the better choice. Parallel phraseology supports it: IV.7.11 *hinvé árvā*, V.36.2 *árvato ná hinván*, plus the numerous exx. of \sqrt{hi} + *ásva-*, *átya-*, and other words for horses. Ge’s cited parallel, VI.45.2 *anāsúnā cid árvatā* “even with a steed lacking speed,” also provides support.

I use the “be about to” sense, always possible for desideratives, to tr. *siṣāsati*, rather than ‘desires to win’. The question is not whether Indra wants to win – of course he does – but that he is about to win despite unfavorable circumstances. The ‘about to’ sense also works better with the future part. *kariṣyatáḥ* in d.

VIII.62.5: The interpretation of this verse rests on whose mind (*mānas-*) is at issue. Ge. considers it to belong to the mortal worshiper and makes it the object of *kṛṇóṣi*: “Da du ... selbst des Kühnen Sinn (noch) kühn(er) machst ...,” which also entails interpreting plain *dhṛṣāt* as a comparative. By contrast I consider the mind to be Indra’s and take pāda a as a separate nominal sentence. This has the advantage also of putting *yád* in b in a more acceptable syntactic position. In V.35.4 the *dhṛṣán mánaḥ* is unarguably Indra’s; the full expression in I.54.3 *dhṛṣató dhṛṣán mánaḥ* “the bold mind of the bold one” also refers to Indra.

As for the rest of the verse, I take the gen. participles *saparyatáḥ* (c) and *pratibhūṣataḥ* (d) as genitives of benefit. This has the slight disadvantage of positing different referents for these two participles and for *dhṛṣatáḥ* in a, but it would hardly be the first time that a RVic verse contained genitives referring to different entities, and there is considerable distance between *dhṛṣatáḥ* and the others.

VIII.62.6: As Ge suggests, the object of Indra’s gazing should be the soma, parallel to the wells (*avatān*) of the simile. As he also suggests, the *avatān* can simultaneously refer to soma-springs (Somabrunnen), and so I have tr. the word twice, in simile and frame.

Ge construes the gen. phrase *dākṣasya somīnaḥ* with the gerund *juṣṭvī*. This is probably correct; my “make X [acc.] of Y [gen.]” goes suspiciously easily into English, but in Sanskrit the construction would probably involve a double accusative. I would thus change the publ. tr. to “Finding pleasure in the skillful provider of soma, he makes (him) a partner ...”

VIII.62.8: Ge takes the dat. *devātātaye* with cd: “dass du für die Götterschaft mit Übermacht den Vṛtra erschlägst.” This has some immediate appeal, but I am reluctant to adopt it because both the hemistich-break and the *yād* intervene. Moreover, the use of present tense *hāṃsi* suggests that the Vṛtra-smashing continues in the present day and is perhaps separate from the primal act performed for the benefit of the gods in mythological time.

VIII.62.9: There are various ways to configure the nominals in the first hemistich, *sāmaneva vapuṣyatāḥ ... mānuṣā yugā*, and their relation to the verb *kṛṇāvat*. Most interpreters assume (I think correctly) that *kṛṇāvat* takes a double accusative here (“make X into Y”), but which is the X and which the Y? Ge takes *mānuṣā yugā* as the first object and *sāmaneva vapuṣyatāḥ* as the second: “Er soll die menschlichen Geschlechter gleichsam zu anstaunenden Versammlungen machen,” but does not explain how masc. *vapuṣyatāḥ* can modify neut. *sāmanā*. Old discusses the passage at length, but in all four translations he suggests as possible he also takes *mānuṣā yugā* as the first object. However, this phrase is almost always an accusative of extent of time “through the human generations” (I.144.4, II.2.2, V.52.4, VI.16.23, VIII.46.12). If we take it that way here and thus exclude it from one of the two accusative object slots with *kṛṇāvat*, the remaining two nominals can each take one of the slots. The point then is that generation after generation people/gods marvel at Indra, and all these people oohing-and-aahing are like big festive parties.

VIII.62.11: The full specification of the subject of the 1st dual verb *sām yujyāva* as *ahām ca tvām ca* is noteworthy, since generally the subject is reduced by gapping, as in VII.88.3 *ā yād ruhāva vāruṇas ca nāvam* “When we two, (I) and Varuṇa, mounted the boat ...” VIII.34.16 *indraś ca dādvahe* “We two, (I) and Indra, took ...,” VIII.69.7 *ūd yād ... gṛhām indraś ca gānvahi* “when we two, (I) and Indra, go up to his house....” (Of course all those examples involve 1st ps. exclusive, rather than inclusive as here.) The increasing emphasis in this hymn on partnership between god and human discussed in the publ. intro. accounts for the explicit “both I and you” here.

VIII.62.12: *satyām id vā u* is found as a unit at V.73.9, and I therefore think that *tām vayām, indram stavāma* should be detached from both what precedes and what follows. See also expressions like *satyām tād* (III.39.5, VIII.59.3), *satyām it tād* (VI.30.4), introducing a separable statement of truth.

VIII.63 Indra

VIII.63.1: The two parallel perfects *ānaje* and *ānajé*, each final in its hemistich, require two different functional interpretations, the first passive, the second transitive, with a

double accusative. Kü (95–96) recognizes more or less the same two functions (patientiv and agentiv-reflexiv) for this perfect stem, but curiously claims that the perfect to this root is found only in Maṇḍalas I and X, though offering no alternative interpretation of these forms here.

Various referents have been suggested for the *venā*:- Indra (Old), Soma (Ge). I favor Agni, for the following reasons. First, the actions of ab and cd, whose correspondence is signalled by the identical verbs, take place in the divine realm in ab and in the human one in cd, where Manu directs his action to the divine. This situation suggests a ritual scene, and the Vena, who is the target of both acts of smearing, should then be a middleman between the divine and human in the ritual. This figure can only be Agni or Soma. As for the rest of the vocabulary, *pūrvyā*- can be used of Agni, Soma, and Indra, but is most regularly Agni. Likewise Agni is often the object of $\sqrt{aṇj}$; cf. esp. III.14.3 *yāt sīm aṇjānti pūrvyām havírbhiḥ*. And Agni several times opens doors (e.g., I.128.6, III.5.1, VIII.39.6). With Agni covertly mentioned in this verse and Soma overtly in vs. 2, the whole ritual scene is set.

VIII.63.2: The sense of *māna*- here is disputed. Ge takes it as “Melodie,” explained ad I.39.1 as via “Tonbemessen, Intonation”; Old “Himmelshaus.” Although my interpretation of *māna*- as ‘measure’ shares a root etymology with Ge’s (at least as he sees it, but cf. EWA s.vv. *māna*-², *māna*-³), namely $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’, I take it in a fairly literal sense — the measure of heaven is the distance to it — and as an acc. of goal. See also 7d.

As far as I can see, *úd* \sqrt{sad} occurs only here in the RV. Ge takes it as “make a pause,” but gives no grounds for this interpretation. Although already in the BYV Saṃhitās this lexeme can mean ‘go out, (tr.) put out [of fire]’, here a literal meaning ‘sit up’ fits the context very well. The pressing stones are raised up in preparation for pressing; note that the *grāvan*-, also ‘pressing stone’, are *ūrdhvā*- ‘erect’ in X.92.15, a situation also embodied in the compound *ūrdhvā-grāvan*-.

The *ádrayaḥ* in d are no doubt pressing stones, as the publ. tr. has it, but I now think that there is a second possible reading, as ‘mountains’. Soma famously grows on the mountains (see the epithet *giri-śthā*- for example), and the mountains can be said to sit up “as if to measure heaven.” For a similar comparison between *ádri*- and the height of heaven see X.63.3. I would now emend the tr. to “The stones (/mountains) ...”

VIII.63.3: *stuṣé* could alternatively be 1st sg. ‘I shall praise’. I interpret it as an infinitive, with Ge, because there has been so far no personal reference to the poet. But this is not a strong argument, esp. since “we” make an appearance in vs. 4.

The mention of the opening of the Vala cave may allude to the dawn, and therefore to the dawn that is happening at this sacrifice now.

VIII.63.4: *vakṣāṇi*- is derivationally ambiguous: Gr takes it to $\sqrt{vakṣ}$ ‘grow, increase’, Ge to \sqrt{vah} ‘convey’, though not with entire confidence (“Wortführer (?)”), AiG II.2.207 allows both. Both are possible in the realm of RVic discourse. I opt for $\sqrt{vakṣ}$ because the expression is parallel to *kavivṛdháḥ* ‘strengtheners of poets’, but I certainly don’t rule out a derivation from \sqrt{vah} .

Another ambiguous word is *hóman-* in c; this stem can mean either ‘invocation’ (to $\sqrt{hū}$) or ‘pouring, oblation’ (to \sqrt{hu}). Gr takes it to the latter, Ge, apparently (‘Darbringung’) to the former. I agree with Ge: the trope of pouring out praise is common in the RV.

VIII.63.5: The syntactic deployment of *várasya* is disputed; see Old’s discussion for various possibilities. I follow Ge in taking it as dependent on *krátum*.

It also seems necessary to supply a verb with ab. I import *anūṣata* from cd, with *svāhā* the cry that the sacrificers cry out; however, Ge’s ‘entsprechen’, utilizing the preverb *ānu* present in pāda a, is also possible, though he must take *svāhā* as a syntactic absolute (“unter Svāhāruf”).

Ge takes *śvātrām* as the content of the call (“... haben ... den Drang eingeschrien”), but \sqrt{nu} ordinarily takes as object the being towards whom the cry is directed, and I therefore take *śvātrām* as referring to Indra. (This standard construction of \sqrt{nu} does make some trouble for my interpretation of *svāhā* as construed with supplied \sqrt{nu} in ab, but perhaps the fact that *svāhā* expresses the cry itself makes the difference. See comm. on I.6.6, however.)

Note the phonological echoes: *ā(d ū) nú ... ānu* (a) / *anūṣata* (c).

VIII.63.6: I see no reason to attenuate the identification of Indra with the *adhvarā-* that the grammar seems to demand, by a contrivance like Ge’s “den die Preislieder als (Gegenstand) des Gottesdienstes kennen.” See I.178.4, where Indra is identified with “the laud of the sacrificer” (*yájamānasya śámsaḥ*), and the immediately following verse (63.7d), where he is identified with peaceful dwelling (*kṣáyaḥ*).

VIII.63.7: The second hemistich has been subject to various interpretations. See, inter alia, Old’s discussion, also Thieme (*Fremdl.* 42–43). The primary points of difference are the case/number of *vípāḥ* (gen. sg. or acc. pl.) and of *aryáḥ* (gen. sg. or acc. pl.), the sense of *māna-* (as also in vs. 2), and the syntactic structure of the final pāda. I opt for gen. sg. *vípāḥ* (as Old points out, the acc. pl. should be accented *vípaḥ*), acc. pl. *aryáḥ*, and the same sense for *māna-* as in vs. 2, namely ‘measure’ – in this case the measure, i.e., the sheer size, of Indra. I construe both genitives (*vípāḥ* and *mānasya*) with *barhāṇā*, and take the last two words *sá kṣáyaḥ* as a separate clause, as the position of *sá* might suggest – contra all other interpretations I am aware of. It makes sense that Indra should be identified as “peaceful dwelling,” because he has killed the strangers and thus brought peace to the Five Peoples.

VIII.63.8: As noted in the publ. intro., “the turning of the wheel” (*cakráśya vartaním*) recalls the later designation for a universal monarch *cakra-vartin* ‘turner of the wheel’. The association of *cakráṁ* with \sqrt{vrt} ‘turn’ is found elsewhere in the RV (*cakráṁ ná vṛttám* I.155.6 = IV.31.4 = V.36.3; and a number of VPs, e.g., I.164.11 *várivarti cakráṁ*, II.11.20 *āvartayat sūryo ná cakráṁ*), but this seems the passage most implicated in power and sovereignty.

VIII.63.9: Pāda a contains a textual problem: whether to read the transmitted *vyódana* (-e [so Pp.] or -aḥ, out of sandhi) ‘moistening/moistener’) or to emend to *vyòdaná* (i.e., -é)

‘rice-porridge’, the food associated with the Emuṣa myth that is treated virtually only in this part of VIII (the *odanām* in 69.14; 77.6, 10). See Ge and Old ad loc. I follow Ge in the emendation; it is very difficult to make sense of the ‘moisten’ interpretation, and the rarity of *odanām* might have led it to be changed. In the publ. tr. there should be an asterisk before “to the rice-porridge.”

VIII.63.10: Supplying ‘praise-hymn’ or the like as object of *dádhānāḥ*, which goes back to Sāy, is supported by VII.73.1 *prāti stómaṃ devayānto dádhānāḥ*.

As Ge points out *yusmābhiḥ* may refer either to the gods or to the other singers. On the basis of 11, I think the latter is more likely (so also Ge), although note the gods in 12d.

On the non-**o*-grade in kinship terms as 2nd compound members in the RV (apropos *dákṣa-pitarāḥ* here), against *-pitār-* in later Vedic, see J. Lundquist, “Does *tvátpitārāḥ* = εὐπάτωρ?” IEL 9 (2021), esp. 133–36.

VIII.63.11: Ge takes *ṛtvíyāya dhāmane* as referring to the Maruts (as the “pünktlichen Geschlechten” [timely race], a phrase that doesn’t make a lot of sense to me) or Indra. On the basis of V.48.1 *priyāya dhāme ... sváksatrāya sváyavase* “or the self-ruling, self-glorious one ... for his own dear establishment,” I take this as referring to the establishment of Indra at the sacrifice, governed by the sacrificial order, which the singers are hoping for. This establishment is then stated as accomplished in 12c *yáḥ ... dhāyi* “who has been established ...”

ṛkvabhiḥ reminds us of the insistent *arká* of the 2nd ṛca (4c, 5c, 6c); the same verb *√nu* ‘cry out’ is repeated here, from 5c.

VIII.63.12: I have no idea what the mountains have to do with anything and why they and the Maruts should be in agreement. (Ge takes *sajóṣāḥ* only with the mountains, but this doesn’t help.) Since there is in fact no overt ‘and’, it is possible that the Maruts are being referred to as mountains (“... the Rudras, ‘mountains’ in their profusion, are of one accord...”).

The relativization in cd is somewhat shifty: the *yáḥ* should refer to Indra, who is the first member of the compound in the main clause *índrajyeṣṭhāḥ* ‘having Indra as chief’.

VIII.64 Indra

VIII.64.4: I take *kṣáyo diví* as a nominal sentence, parenthetically inserted, rather than interpreting *kṣáyah* as a 2nd sg. verb form, as most others do. See Old on the two possibilities. Although it makes some complications for the syntax, I prefer the nominal interpretation both because *kṣáya-* is, as Old says, a favored noun in this group of hymns and because a verbal *kṣáyah* should be a subjunctive and I do not see what the subjunctive would be conveying here. (Ge tr. it as a straight indicative, which avoids the difficulty but contravenes the morphology.) Stating that Indra’s dwelling is in heaven makes clear why we command him to “go forth” in order to “come here.”

VIII.64.9: *dānā-*, so accented, regularly means ‘giving’, not ‘gifts’; I would alter the tr. here to the somewhat stilted “your acts of giving.”

VIII.64.10: On c as a quasi-serial-verb construction see Yates 2014 (Proc. 25th UCLA IE Conf.) Also 12c.

VIII.65 Indra

VIII.65.5: The morphological identity of the forms *gr̥ṇīṣé* and *stuṣé* is disputed. Ge takes them as 2nd sg. passives (favored also by Old), though he mentions the possibility that they are 1st sg. -se forms in his n.; Lub identifies them as 1st singulars. I take them as infinitives rather than 1st sgs, primarily because they are accented. However, it is possible that a finite verb would bear the accent after the accented initial voc. *índra*, and that the second form would be accented contrastively, so 1st sg. is certainly not excluded. Since the “you” of the publ. tr. (/ “dich” of Ge’s tr.) is not overtly expressed, either interpretation fits the text.

VIII.66 Indra

VIII.66.1: The nominative plural pres. part. *gāyantaḥ* in c and the 1st singular *huvé* in d are grammatically incompatible but conceptually harmonious: this is the usual situation where the poet speaks both for himself and for the group of officiants he represents. Ge takes abc together and supplies a 1st plural verb (rufen wir), while I assume that the *huvé* of d has domain over the whole verse, with the plural participle in c a grammatical interruption.

VIII.66.2: My tr. of pāda b sounds in English like a loc. absol. or a relative clause, but is simply an attempt to keep the pāda together in tr. The acc. *susíprám* of course simply picks up the rel. prn. *yám* that opens the verse.

Ge tr. *āḍṛtyā* as “fürsorglich” and so must assign it to a separate root $\sqrt{dṛ}$ ‘pay heed’. I instead take the form to $\sqrt{dṛ}$ ‘burst, tear’ (a possibility Ge registers in his n.). See EWA s.v. *DAR*^f for the likelihood that the later *ā* $\sqrt{dṛ}$ ‘pay heed’ forms developed as semantic specializations of ‘tear out’.

VIII.66.3: The first hemistich contains two hapaxes with which Indra is identified. The meaning and etymology of neither of them can be certainly determined.

The first one, *mṛkṣá-*, is the easier, because a root etymology suggests itself (though without imposing itself) and because the adjective qualifying it, *ásvya-* ‘belong to a horse, equine’, narrows the semantic field. If the form belongs to the root $\sqrt{mṛj}$ ‘wipe, groom’, a *mṛkṣá-* can be a curry comb (so Ge, EWA s.v. *MARJ*, both with uncertainty) or other tool for grooming a horse. (The supposed root $\sqrt{mrakṣ}$ ‘comb’ to which Gr and AiG II.2.71 assign it does not exist.) Possibly connected is the hapax *mṛkṣínī-* (X.98.6), where the word seems to describe the tracks on the earth made by a hard rain – possibly envisioned as the regularly spaced impressions left by a comb. Why calling Indra a curry comb would be flattering to the god is not clear. Perhaps it’s one of those cultural mysteries like (semi-)modern Engl. “you’re the cat’s pajamas.” Or perhaps,

like the farm implement the harrow, which likewise has teeth and is pulled across land to break up clods, etc., and which has developed in English into a verb expressing the infliction of distress, the curry comb can be conceived of as a weapon.

The second hapax, *kīja-*, is harder, because there is no apparent root etymology, no similar forms attested in the RV, and, although it is also accompanied by an adjective, that particular adj., ‘golden’ (*hiranyāya-*), leaves the field very wide. Note also that, properly speaking, the velar should have yielded a palatal before *ī*, but there are enough secondary *ki/ī* forms to keep this from being a useful diagnostic. Ge suggests, tentatively, “Sporn” (spur) (sim., and similarly tentative, EWA), but gives no support. I very hesitantly adduce the later (Ep+) *kīcaka-* ‘hollow bamboo’ and suggest that *kīja* might be a ‘stake’. Note the *hiranyāyo vetasāḥ* “golden reed” in IV.58.5. Being called a golden stake seems a bit better than being a horse’s curry comb.

VIII.66.4: Since *vāsāt* is a subjunctive, strictly speaking it should be tr. “as he will wish.”

VIII.66.4–5: Note the cross-pragātha lexical agreement: 4a *purusambhṛtām*, 5c *sām bharāmasi*.

VIII.66.7: The balance of opinion (Gr, Kü, Lub, etc.) takes *apīpema* to $\sqrt{pī}$ ‘swell’, which morphologically makes sense. But Ge seems to take it rather as a redupl. aor. to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’ (“Wir haben ihn ... hier getränkt...”), though without explicitly saying so. See also the very parallel passage VIII.99.1, with *ápīpyan*. Despite the difficulties (amply treated by Kü), I prefer to associate these two forms with $\sqrt{pā}$. The transitive *-āya-* formation *pāyāyati* ‘makes drink’ is well attested in the RV. It is a little difficult to figure out what a corresponding reduplicated aorist should look like. Since $\sqrt{pā}$ is not an orthodox long-*ā* root, it doesn’t make a *p*-causative (type *sthāpayati*) and therefore would not import the *-p-* into the redupl. aorist (type *ātiṣṭhipat*). One might expect, based on its *-āya-* stem, to produce **ápīpayat* if thematic (type *dīdharat*) and **ápīpet* (type *dīdhar[t]*) if athematic, with the weak form to be expected **ápīpima*. Whether the form belongs to $\sqrt{pī}$ or $\sqrt{pā}$, the full-grade in the root syllable of this form must be secondary, and if it’s not a problem to extend the full grade to the weak form of $\sqrt{pī}$, it should likewise be unproblematic with $\sqrt{pā}$. It is true, however, that the ‘swell’ root is possible and that the forms of the perfect of $\sqrt{pī}$ and the putative redupl. aor. of $\sqrt{pā}$ would be hopelessly mixed up formally and not terribly separate semantically. For *ápīpyan* in VIII.99.1 see disc. there.

VIII.66.8: Ge takes the wolf of ab as a simile, compared with the unexpressed Indra: “Wie der wilde Wolf ... wartet er auf seine Zeiten.” But this requires taking *cīd* as a simile marker, which I am loath to do. I consider it a general statement about nature — wolves follow their own patterns, however much they appear to be acting randomly. Indra, though he is apparently uncontrollable, attends to our ritual patterns and will come when called (which is similar to what vs. 7 says -- same yesterday, same today). So, although the behavior of the wolf is a point of comparison for Indra’s behavior, it is not a simile in the narrow sense. A similar comparison but in a real simile is found in VIII.33.8 ... *mṛgō ná vāraṇāḥ, purutrā carāthaṃ dadhe* “Like a wild elephant he has

established his wandering [= his territory] in many places," where Indra is compared to a wild beast and the territory is somewhat like the *vayúna-* here.

On $\check{a}\sqrt{bhūṣ}$ with *vayúna-*, see I.182.1.

Ge takes *d* as a separate clause, apparently supplying a form of \sqrt{cit} 'appear' ("erscheine ..."), presumably based on *citráyā* and to be construed with *prá*. Although the position of *prá* is suggestive, I do not see that separating the *pādas* is necessary, since *d* fits easily with *c*.

VIII.66.9: Because *asya* is unaccented, it needs to be construed separately from *indrasya*. So also Ge.

VIII.66.10: My interpretation of *pāda a* is quite different from Ge's and starts from the rhetorical structure of the four questions in vss. 9–10. Three of these (9ab, 9cd, 10b) are negative questions, in which the negative is part of the predicate: 9a *ākṛtam*, 9c *ná śuśruve*, 10b *āstṛtam*. 10a also contains a negation, *ādhr̥ṣtāḥ*, but in Ge's tr. it is not predicated: "Was sind seine grossen, unangreifbaren Kräfte?" Furthermore his tr. implicitly equates neut. sg. *kád* with fem. pl. *táviṣīḥ*. These problems can be fixed by taking *kád* as a question marker, not an interrogative pronoun, and by assuming that the powers in question are not Indra's (as Ge takes them), but those of Indra's enemies. The implied answer to the rhetorical question is "no, there exist no powers that Indra can't assail." For *táviṣī* belonging to others, see, e.g., I.80.10 *índro vṛtrásya táviṣīm nír ahan ...*

The hapax *bekanāṭa-* is an almost textbook example of non-Indo-Aryan phonology (see Kuiper, *Aryans*), and it seems safest to take it as the name of a people, rather than in the traditional interpretation (going back to the Nirukta VI.26 *bekanāṭāḥ khalu kusīdino bhavanti*) as "Wucherer" (usurer, profiteer) as Ge does. For disc. see KEWA and EWA s.v.

VIII.66.11: *ápūrvyā* [*sic*, not, as in Aufrecht and HvN, *ápūrvya*] and *purūtāmāsaḥ* play off each other. *We* may be the latest of many, but our formulations have no predecessors – a variation on the usual theme of the "newest hymn."

VIII.66.12: Ge and Old make heavier weather of *ab* than seems necessary, motivated in part by *tvé* rather than *tvā* in *a* and the positioning of the verb in *b* rather than *a*, near to *ūtáyah*. Ge supplies a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ in *a*, "Zwar werden viele Hoffnungen auf dich (gesetzt)," and takes *hávante* as passive, "und werden deine Hilfen ... angerufen." But the stem *háva-* is overwhelmingly transitive. Old suggests taking *ūtáyah* as accusative pl., which would do even more violence to the grammar. I take the subject of *hávante* to be *āśásaḥ* 'hopes'. As for *tvé*: although $\sqrt{hū}$ ordinarily takes the accusative, I can imagine a locative *tvé* in a more distanced usage: they call towards you, but they do not actually succeed. (Alternatively the *tvé* could have been influenced by *tvé* in 13a, in the same metrical position, though metrically distracted.) I then take *ūtáyah* as a separate existential clause.

VIII.66.14: *citráyā dhiyā* occurs also in 8d, and the tr. should have been harmonized. As in vs. 8, I take the *dhī-* to be ours, rather than Indra's, as Ge takes it.

VIII.67 Ādityas

VIII.67.5: A predicative voc. in a question.

VIII.67.6: I would slightly rephrase ab as “What shield, what shelter you have for the man who has ritually labored and who presses soma.”

VIII.67.7: *ādbhutainasaḥ* is generally taken as a gen. sg., parallel to *ānāgasah* in b. But since the only other ex. of this stem modifies the Maruts in V.87.7, I think it likely that it is a nom. pl. modifying the Ādityas. Moreover there is no NOM + *ásti* construction in c as there are in a and b. There is perhaps too much machinery in the tr., to indicate that it is not the Ādityas’ offenses, but those of others, that cannot deceive or mislead them (=the gods), but given the Ādityas’ character, I think the internal structure of the cmpd would be clear to the audience.

VIII.67.8: What to supply with *mahé* is somewhat up in the air, but some equivalent of Ge’s “Glück” seems harmless enough.

I don’t understand Indra’s role here. Is the idea that Varuṇa & Co. should not be getting any ideas about tying us up, because only Indra gets to do such things? But this would run counter to Varuṇa’s role, at least in later Vedic, of binding offenders. In any case the theme of binding recurs in this hymn; cf. vss. 14, 18.

VIII.67.9: In ab I supply a transitive form of $\sqrt{mṛc}$ ‘harm’ to be construed with the cognate instr. root noun. The fact that the verb of pāda c, (*abhí prá*) *mṛkṣata*, though derived from $\sqrt{mṛś}$ ‘touch’, could technically be an *s*-formation to $\sqrt{mṛc}$ makes the generation of a verb from that root easier, and in fact we might consider *mṛkṣata* as representing both ‘harm’ and ‘seize’. Old notes the phonological play.

In its other two occurrences *aviṣyū-* has the negative sense ‘greedy’ and is clearly related to *avasá-* ‘food’, etc. (see EWA s.v. *avasá-*), but here it must be positive. I assume a portmanteau pun, combining ‘greedy’ with an association with \sqrt{av} ‘help’, resulting in ‘greedy[=eager] to help’.

VIII.67.12: Since *anehás-* is an adjective, a noun needs to be supplied with it (contra Ge, Re). I supply ‘shelter’ on the basis of VIII.18.21 (also a hymn to the Ādityas) containing *aneháh ... trivárūtham ... chardíḥ*, with the *várūtha-* and *chardís-* found in our vss. 3b, 6b. I would also slightly alter the publ. tr. to “flawless (shelter)” on the basis of my re-evaluation of *anehás-* (see comm. ad X.61.12).

VIII.67.12–13: The correlative of *yé* in 13 is *té* in 14, but this unremarkable pairing actually conceals a bit of trickery: *yé* has 3rd ps. reference, but *té* has 2nd ps. reference, with the impv. *mumócata* -- with a change in person in midstream that is not evident until the verb is reached at the end of pāda b.

VIII.67.15: The doubling of 1st pl. pronouns, *naḥ ... asmát* can be interpr. in two different ways. On the one hand, *naḥ* can be just a Wackernagel-position placeholder, doubled by the more emphatic (and case-marked) *asmát* later in the vs. Of course enclitic *naḥ* is not

technically supposed to represent an ablative, but I think that all bets are off with Wackernagel-position pronominal enclitics. Or the *naḥ* can actually be an accusative, construed with *ājaghnusī*.

VIII.67.18: On the phrase *nāvyam sānyase* see comm. ad VIII.24.26, with argument for supplying ‘life’ with *nāvyam*.

VIII.67.21: The preverb *vī* is excessively represented in this vs., with 5 occurrences (including *vīśvak*) and its usual contrastive partner *sām* in the middle. Note also the figure ... *aṃhatīm#* ... *sámhitam#*.

aṃhatīm also makes a faint ring with the same word in 2a.

VIII.68 Indra

VIII.68.2: With Old (and implicitly Ge), read as a compound *vīśvayāmate*; this requires no emendation to the Samhitā text, only the erasure of the word boundary in the Pp.

VIII.68.3: The hapax participle *jmāyánt-* is clearly built to the adverbial instr. *jmā* belonging to the ‘earth’ word (*kṣám-*, etc.). The *pári* preceding it can be read both with the verb *īyatuh* and with *jmāyánt-*. Cf. *párijman-* and EWA s.v. As for what it means for a mace to encircle the earth, it is probably a measure of its size, which then indicates that Indra’s hands are even larger because they encircle the mace.

VIII.68.4: Although the sense of this verse is fairly clear, the second half-verse displays some syntactic intricacies, namely, what I consider two conjoined NPs that interact with each other in various ways and for which there is only one overt conjunction, *ca* in somewhat anomalous position. I take the two pāda-initial instrumentals *évaiḥ* and *ūtī* as forming one NP, with both indicating qualities of Indra’s (differently Ge, who takes *évaiḥ* with the verb: “rufe ich ... mit Eifer”), and the two pāda-final genitives *carṣaṇīnām* and *rāthānām* as a second NP, dependent on either *ūtī* alone or *évaiḥ* ... *ūtī* jointly. The single *ca* connects the two instrumentals in an X *ca* Y construction. This seems to me superior to Klein’s interpretation (DGRV I.172, 192–93) as a *ca* XY construction, with the *ca* conjoining the two genitives. For *évaiḥ* as the quality of a god, not an adverb, see, e.g., X.67.11.

VIII.68.7: The accusative phrase in c, *pūrvyām ānuṣṭutim*, makes syntactic trouble here. See disc. by Old, who lays out various possibilities. Ge takes the hemistich as containing a zeugma, with (as far as I can determine) *īśe* read differently with the two pādas -- taking an accusative in c and meaning “Anrecht haben,” while taking a genitive in d and meaning “herrschen über.” But among the numerous occurrences of *īś-*, I know of none with the meaning or case frame proposed for c. (For further disc. see comm. ad VII.32.18.) Old suggests either supplying another verb (*acodat?*) or taking the phrase as an Inhaltsakk. (though in what sense of that term I don’t understand). I take it either as a haplologized **ānu ānuṣṭutim* or as an acc. of respect. (Note that Old rejects Ludwig’s suggestion to read **ānu ṣṭutim*, but this would be another possibility in my opinion. What perhaps speaks against that is the other occurrence of *ānuṣṭuti-* in nearby VIII.63.8.)

VIII.68.8: I add a parenthetical “other” in ab, because Indra’s fellowship is something we always aspire to (see vs. 11 below), and so to state baldly that no one has achieved it seems defeatist.

VIII.68.10: I take *īmahe* to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘beseech’, not ‘drive’ (contra Ge “... nahen wir...”).

There is a missing middle term between ab and c, namely what we are imploring Indra for – presumably the same help that he gave to Purumāyya.

VIII.68.14: Ge supplies ‘horses’ with the numbers of pāda a, separating them from the men of b: “... sechs (Rosse), je zwei und zwei, (und) die Herren...,” because the next verse definitely has six horses. But Hoffmann’s (1967: 233) suggestion that there are six men, who are the leaders of the horses, makes the verse less jerky and avoids having to supply both a noun (horses) and a conjunction (and).

VIII.68.15–17: The donors of the various gifts are generally in the locative here and so would be properly translated “bei,” “chez,” “at (the hands of) ...” or the like, but a series of locative tr. is simply too heavy and awkward.

I have made no effort to sort out the internal relationships among the patrons – a topic more than amply discussed in the sec. lit.

VIII.68.17: *vadhūmant-* means literally ‘having women, brides’, but Ge raises the question whether in this context it really refers to mares. I think this unlikely. Dānastutis regularly lump horses and female humans together. Very parallel is I.126.3 *śyāvāḥ ... vadhūmantah ... rāthāsaḥ*, “dusky (horses) and chariots carrying brides.”

VIII.68.18: I take the ruddy female (*āruṣṭī*) as a reference to Dawn, with the bull accompanying her as the sun. This makes sense in a dakṣinā context, since the priestly gifts are distributed at the dawn sacrifice. Ge rather as a mare.

VIII.69 Indra

VIII.69.1: It is necessary to supply a verb for ab; Ge “Traget” but I supply “chant” on the basis of the beginning of the second tr̥ca, 4ab *abhī prā ... arca*, and the insistent repetition in vs. 8: *ārcata prārcata, ... ārcata# / ārcantu ... arcata#*. Pāda a is essentially identical to VIII.7.1a *prā yād vas triṣṭubham īṣam*, where the verb governing the acc. is *ākṣarat* ‘has let flow’ (pāda b), which is not possible here. The “Triṣṭubh refreshment” is obviously the praise hymn; interestingly neither this passage nor VIII.7 is in Triṣṭubh meter.

The second hemistich is somewhat obscure, in part because, as Ge points out, it is not clear who the subject is. Perhaps the “Triṣṭubh refreshment” (that is, the praise), or the drop (that is, the soma) to which it is chanted, or the poet. (I favor the praise hymn.) The pair *dhī-* and *pūramdhī-* appears elsewhere together (VIII.92.15, X.65.13–14). Ge takes them here as names of the goddesses of religious poetry and of the dakṣinā respectively. In VIII.92.15 I take them as qualities that Indra confers on us, but here at least the *dhī-* is probably that of the poet(s). Perhaps they are a reciprocal, rather than parallel, pair: we receive plenty in exchange for insight (as in V.41.6). The interpretation

is further complicated by the fact that *ā vivāsa-* everywhere else takes an accusative, often in conjunction with an instr. of means: “seek to attract X with Y” (e.g., VIII.15.1 *īndram gīrbhīs taviṣām ā vivāsata*), but there is no accusative immediately available. (Though *vaḥ* could technically be an accusative, that interpretation seems unlikely here.) However, this is of course an Indra hymn, and in thinking about this verse again, I have concluded that Indra should be supplied here as the default object, and therefore for the publ. tr. I would substitute “With your visionary thought and with plenitude it [=hymn] is seeking to entice (Indra) here, in order to gain wisdom.” Cf. VIII.3.18 *imé hí te kārāvo vāvaśúr dhiyā, víprāso medhāsātaye* “For these bards, inspired poets, have bellowed for you [=Indra] for the winning of wisdom with their insight,” with both *dhiyā* and *medhāsātaye* in a similar context, where poets seek Indra.

On this vs. see Watkins (Dragon 237–38), where, inter alia, he persuasively claims that the vs. encodes an anagram of the poet Priyamedha’s name.

VIII.69.2: Another verse with unclear reference: neither the 2nd singular subject of *iṣudhyasi* nor the bull and cows are clearly identified, and it is complicated by the fact that there are also two occurrences of 2nd plural *vaḥ* in the verse. I take the subject to be the same as that of *ā vivāsati* in 1d, namely the praise hymn, with the common switch of persons. That the praise hymn is in reality inanimate is not in RVic discourse an obstacle to addressing it. The 2nd pl. *vaḥ* is then the same group of poets / ritual officiants as in 1a and 1c. As for the bull (*nadā-*, a and b) and the *pāti-* (c), I agree with Ge (n. 2) that it can be either Indra or soma. In the latter case, the referent is then the same as the *īndu-* ‘drop’ that was the target of the hymn in 1ab; in the latter, the same as the unexpressed object of *ā vivāsati* in 1cd. The cows are easier to account for if soma is the referent: they would then be the mixing milk as so often. If the bull is Indra, the cows may be the cows he brings us as largesse or praise hymns conceived of as cows (many words for hymn are feminine), and the sexual tinge of ab would be a nod to Indra’s hypersexuality. Probably both referents are meant.

On *iṣudhyasi* see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2020 article “Vedic *iṣudhyā-* and Old Avestan *iṣud-*, *iṣūdiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Fs. Lamberterie). Since I analyze **iṣudh-* as a root noun cmpd ‘aim an arrow’, a metaphor for aiming praise towards a divine target, the *nadām ... pātim* must refer to the god receiving praise. Indra or Soma are both possible, of course.

VIII.69.3: The first two pādas seem rather briskly to clear up the uncertainties of the previous verse, or give at least one reading thereof: soma, the cows that give the milk to mix with soma, and Indra (though not by name) are all present, and their relationships are clear.

The connection of the last half of the verse to what precedes is not clear, as Ge also points out. The birth is likely to be that of soma, but why are we now concerned with “the clans of the gods”? I tentatively assume that the gods are awaiting their invitation to the soma-drinking in their usual abodes. Somewhat later in the hymn (11b) all the gods partake of the soma.

There is number discrepancy between pl. *triśú* and sg. *rocané*, as also in the identical pāda in I.105.5b. On the basis of expressions like I.102.8 *trīṇi rocanā*, V.69.1 *trī rocanā*, I.149.4 *trī rocanāni* the two words must be construed together and a truncation of

rocanéṣu must be assumed. I don't quite know why, but Bloomfield (RR ad I.105.5) points out that *rocané diváḥ* is a frequent cadence, and it therefore may have imposed itself formulaically in this phrase. Also the alternation between *trī* and *trīṇi* and *rocanā* and *rocanāni* in the formula may have made an alternative *rocané* to *rocanéṣu* seem acceptable. In fact loc. pl. *rocanéṣu* is only attested once.

VIII.69.4: Although this verse belongs to a different *ṛca*, it seems to provide an alternative resolution to the puzzle of vs. 2, somewhat different from that given in 3ab. Here Indra is definitively identified as a *gópati*- 'lord of cows', paraphrasing 2cd *pátim ... ághnyānām dhenūnām*.

Ge takes *yáthā vidé* as "wie er bekannt ist," but this tag phrase regularly refers to the traditional way of producing poetry or performing ritual. See, e.g., I.132.2, VIII.13.14, IX.86.32.

satyásya sátpatim is probably a pseudo-pun, given that by many accounts (including ours) *sát-pati*- derives from *sáts-patí*-, with the first member a reduction of *sádas*- 'seat, settlement'. See EWA s.v. If *sát*- belongs to *√as* (as some think), it is a real pun.

VIII.69.6: Pāda c is presumably a reference to the Vala cave, as Ge points out.

VIII.69.7: Another elliptical 1st dual construction; for disc. see VIII.62.11.

Ge and Hoffmann, inter alia, take *bradhnásya viṣṭápam* to refer to the height or top of the sun. The phrase occurs also in IX.113.10. *bradhná*- in VIII.4.13–14 seems to refer to soma. Since *viṣṭáp*- several times occurs with *samudrásya* (VIII.34.13, 97.5=IX.12.6, IX.107.14), something liquid makes sense, rather than wandering around on top of the sun. Furthermore, at least in IX.12.6 (and probably IX.107.14) the "sea" in this expression is clearly soma. I also think that it works better as acc. of extent, rather than as goal, since the goal is the *grhām*.

For the ceremonial aspects of the second hemistich see publ. intro. Note that *sákhi*- is an integral part of the "seventh step" mantra at the wedding ceremony: *sakhā saptapadī bhava* "Become a comrade of the seventh step" (ŚGS I.14.6, etc.; see Jamison 1996: 121). Contra Hoffmann (1967: 255) I separate *trīḥ* from *saptá*, and consider the former to refer to drinking soma at the three pressings (so also Ge). I also take the cardinal *saptá* as if it were the ordinal *saptátha*-. For the corresponding verse, see 16 below.

VIII.69.9: It is likely that all three of these obscure words, *gárgara*-, *godhā*-, and *píṅgā*-, are musical instruments, but further specification is difficult. The *godhā*- may be crafted from some part of the monitor lizard also so called. See X.28.10.

The two intensives, *sanīṣvanat* and *canīṣkadat*, are both hapaxes (though cf. equally hapax *kānīṣkan* in VII.103.4), and are probably subjunctives, despite the zero-grade root syllable of *canīṣkadat*. So Schaeffer (38, 199). The preceding clear subjunctive *svarāti* sets the category, as Schaeffer (38) points out.

VIII.69.11-12: I do not understand why Varuṇa is mentioned specially. Perhaps because of the waters of 11d and the rivers of 12b?

VIII.69.12: I take *sudevā-* as a bahuvrīhi, as *su-*compounds with this metrical shape and accentuation generally are (contra Ge's "ein guter Gott"). The gods mentioned in 11b may be part of Varuṇa's retinue.

VIII.69.13: Interpretations of this verse vary, and *cd* is characterized as "dunkel" by both Ge and Old. I take the verse as a series of relative clauses referring to (unnamed) Indra, leading up to the proclamation of Indra in 14ab. The relative clauses are interrupted by an exclamatory *tád id vápuḥ* "just this is the marvel!" in *c*.

Ge takes *takvāḥ* as a PN (rejected by Mayr. *PN*; see also EWA s.v. *TAK*), but I see no reason to separate the stem from *tákvan-*, *takva-vī-*, and *takvavīya-*, all of which seem to refer to the movements of birds of prey.

I take *upamā* (so Pp., or *upamāḥ*) in the same way as in I.31.15, viz., as a root noun compound 'measure'. See disc. there.

VIII.69.14: Ge takes *ohate* as reflexive, but I prefer a passive interpretation here.

The second half of the verse segues into the Emuṣa myth prominent in this part of VIII. For disc. see publ. intro.

VIII.69.15: Note the extreme diminutivization in *arbhakó ná kumārakāḥ*, signalled by the two *-ká-*suffixes. Presumably the point, in this account of Boyhood Deeds, is to emphasize how small and weak he was to accomplish such deeds.

Both Ge and Old are troubled by *vibhukrátu-* as a qualifier of the buffalo. Old goes so far as to suggest it should be nominative, but was attracted into the accusative by the preceding accusatives (which, note, are not even adjacent or in the same *pāda*). This seems unlikely (and unworthy of the usually punctilious Old). Ge also manoeuvres the adjective into referring not to the *krātu-* of the buffalo, but rather to that of the father and mother: "Er kochte das Büffeltier für Vater und Mutter, das ihrem Verlangen genügte." I do not understand how he is interpreting the *vibhu-*, nor do I see any difficulty with assigning the quality named in the compound to the buffalo: that the buffalo is formidable makes the feat of a tiny boy cooking it (and presumably first catching it) all the greater.

VIII.69.16: The first hemistich seems addressed to the present-day Indra, recalling his boyhood deeds recounted in 15ab.

The second half matches vs. 7, with the same proposition that Indra and I (=poet, in my opinion; Ge rather Viṣṇu) should become comrades (both times with *sacevahi*). The referent of the multiple accusatives in *cde* is disputed. Old suggests the sun, in part because *sahásrapād-* is used of the sun already in AV VII.41.2. Ge also considers the sun the referent of the accusatives in *cd*, "den himmlischen, tausendstrahligen, rötlichen (Sūrya)," but separates those in *e* into a separate constituent (as far as I can tell), "den fehlerlosen, zum Heile führenden (Weg) folgen," because *pāda e* is found in VI.51.16ab *āpi pānthām aganmahi, svastigām anehāsam* qualifying 'path'. I prefer to read all the accusatives together and take the path (of VI.51.16) as the referent. This also involves interpreting *sahásrapādam* as 'having a thousand steps', not '... a thousand feet'. This recalls vs. 7 "... become comrades at the seven(th) step...", and I would suggest that the "thousand step" version plays off the previous one, indicating that our comradeship will

last even longer. The path itself may be the soma (see disc. of 7) that facilitated the establishment of our comradeship; see 7c.

Also on the basis of VI.51.16 I'd here substitute "flawless" for "faultless."

VIII.69.17–18: Note the respension of 17b ... *āsate*# and 18d ... *āśata*#.

VIII.70 Indra

VIII.70.2: Pādas b and c are difficult. The superficially most natural interpretation is to take the two together, as Ge does ("in dessen Hand ... die gerngesehene Keule gelegt ward..."; so also Old), but the putative verb in this relative clause, *dhāyī* in c, is unaccented. If we take this lack of accent seriously, and I think we should, some other solution has to be found for the relative clause in pāda b, a task made all the more challenging by the disputed form *vidhartāri*. This particular form appears twice (also IX.47.4) and formally belongs to the agent noun *vidhartār-* (voc. sg. 1x, nom. sg. 4x) 'distributor, apportioner'. The *-tāri* forms are nonetheless generally taken as infinitives. Tichy (1995: 59–61), by contrast, takes them as loc. sg. of a verbal abstract (here "in dessen Hand, *wenn es ans Verteilen geht*, ein weiteres Mal die sehenswerte Keule gelegt wird" [p. 60]), and others take it as nom. sg. neut. (See disc. of these various possibilities with earlier lit. in Old and in Keydana [Inf. 196–99].) Keydana, at least for this verse, suggests that *vidhartāri* is the (infinitival?) subject of the nominal relative clause, *yāsya* its specifier, and *dvitā* a predicate adverb: "Der Hand wurde die Keule dargereicht (pāda c), *deren Austeilung ein weiteres Mal [erfolgt]* (pāda b)" (199 n. 31). I consider the form to be a locative (like Tichy), but a locative not to an abstract but to the agent noun it appears to be and coreferential with Indra in pāda a. Alternatively it could refer to a third party, who is responsible for the return of Indra's mace; this seems to be Old's favored solution: "beim (Welt)ordner," who is responsible for equipping Indra with the mace. In the absence of mythical context we cannot be certain. Though I have added the parenthetical "(in the hand of)," this tr. is an English makeshift for the German bei or French chez, which both render such locatives more efficiently. The statement in b, that the mace has been returned to Indra, is then restated in pāda c more clearly.

The datives *hástāya* and *divé* instead of the locatives that might be expected are curious. I now think that they must be interpr. in the light of the idiom *prāti √ dhā* 'aim'; would now slightly alter the tr. to "... has been positioned/aimed for this hand, like the great sun for heaven."

VIII.70.3: The identity of "him" in "No one will catch up with him ..." is not sufficiently signalled in the publ. tr. I take it to refer to the successful sacrificer (cf. VIII.31.17), who ritually strengthens and thus "has created" Indra. However, the perfect *cakāra* could instead signal mythic time; both Ge and Old believe this refers to the original creator of Indra, as in IV.17.4. The reference to Indra's birth in 4cd may support their position.

VIII.70.4: In my view this verse is structurally parallel to vs. 2: pāda a continues the previous verse; b is a nominal relative clause; and cd may or may not go with b, but have unaccented verbs. Ge (n. to 2b) and Old also consider the verses parallel, but in the case of both verses they think that bc belong together despite the unaccented verbs of c(d). In

separating b and c here I must supply a noun with the fem. adjectives *mahīr urujrāyaḥ* -- and choose ‘waters’, since pl. *āpas, apās* is common with *mahīḥ*; ‘rivers’ would also be possible, so Ge, who seems to take *mahīḥ* simply as a designation of rivers (“die breitströmenden Flüsse”) without comment.

VIII.70.5: The conjoined NPs in ab display a neat chiasmus: *dyāvah ... śatām, śatām bhūmīḥ*. This may help account for the placement of the *utā* after the second term (indeed after the entire second term: *śatām bhūmīr utā*). Although XY *utā* structures are by no means uncommon (see Klein DGRV I.344–53), they are considerably rarer than the standard X *utā* Y type.

In cd there are two parallel nominal subjects, pl. *sahāsram sūryāḥ* and du. *ródasī*, and neither matches the sg. verb *ānu ... aṣṭa* in number. Several solutions have been proposed. BR (see Old) and Gr take *ródasī* as singular, but all other examples of sg. *ródasī* (and more common *rodasī*) refer to the goddess of that name; when *ródasī* refers to the world-halves, it is always dual. Old also cites Ge Komm for the view that the sg. verb was influenced by *sahāsram*. I am inclined to assume that the sg. verb split the difference between the plural and dual subjects, and it is also possible that the construction was somehow syntactically calqued on the inherited neuter plural subject + singular verb construction (though neither of the subjects is neuter). It’s also worth noting that the root aor. 3rd du. middle of $\sqrt{(n)}as$ is not attested, and in fact, acdg. to Macdonell, *Vedic Gr.*, the only 2nd or 3rd du. mid. root aor. attested is *adhītām* (X.4.6, $\sqrt{dhā}$) -- so the poet may have been a bit insecure about what the du. form ought to be (**aśātām*? **aṣṭām*?), and the pl. *sūryāḥ* may have been too distant in the vs. to allow the 3rd pl. *aśata* to be used instead.

VIII.70.6: Ge takes the loc. *gómāti vrajé* as a loc. absolute (“wenn es sich um rindergefüllte Hürde handelt”). By using the Engl. idiom “help someone to something” I may be stretching Sanskrit syntax further than is legitimate. Though see Gr, definition 4 s.v. *av*: “jemandem [A.] wozu [D., L.] verhelfen.” Unfortunately this is the only passage he places under that rubric with a loc.; the others have datives. However, in *Rivelex* vol. I the Deep Case Frame for *av*, subsection 1d / 1da, tags a number of other possible such passages with this structure (not all of which I would so interpret).

VIII.70.7: For *étagva-* as ‘winning dappled cows’, see Thieme, *Studien* 67–68 and EWA s.v.

The second hemistich is unconnected to the first; its two rel. clauses attach to the next verse.

VIII.70.8: Though as just noted, 7cd should be construed with this verse, the main clause to which those rel. clauses should be attached is incomplete – having a referent *tām* for the *yāḥ* of 7c, but no main verb. Ge supplies “rufet,” which seems the simplest solution, extracted from the two forms of *hāvyaḥ* in cd.

Gr, Ge take *āraṇa-* as ‘depths’, presumably as a contextual antonym to *gādhā-* ‘ford’, putatively < *‘shallow’ (but see EWA s.v.). But there seems no good reason to separate *āraṇa-* from *āraṇa-* ‘alien, foreign’ and its relatives, esp. since a ford is a ‘shallow’ only indirectly. The other occurrence of *āraṇa-* (I.112.6) is not in an antonymic context; Ge renders it “in der Grube” (pit), but there is no external support for this tr.

VIII.70.9: The lexeme *ud√mṛś* is found only here in early Vedic, but like other combinations of *√mṛś* ‘touch’ + preverb, it seems to have a slightly slangy sense. Gr “jemand [A.] emporheben zu [D.],” but the sense of touch is lost. Ge “Streck fein (die Hand) für uns aus,” which fails to render both the root meaning and the preverb. My “shape us up” attempts to render both, with the sense “make us ready/worthy to receive.” The insistent *úd* here, opening pādas a, c, and d, may be meant to contrast with *ní* in the following verse (pādas b, d).

Note the alliteration: ab ... *mahé, mṛśasva* ... and esp. cd ... *mahyaí maghavan maghátaye, ... mahé#* This is the culmination of a play on *mah-* and *magha-* forms in the central part of the hymn: 6a *mahinā*, 6c *maghavan*, 8a *mahó mahāyyam*.

VIII.70.10: The lexeme *ní√tṛp* occurs only here (in all of Sanskrit, as far as I can tell). I interpret the *ní* as reversing the meaning of the root verb, as sometimes elsewhere (see Jamison 1983: 86 for some other examples) – hence ‘be unsatisfied’ < *√tṛp* ‘be satisfied’. Scar also seems to interpret the verb in this fashion (“... bist du unzufrieden”), but does not comment on why. Gr ‘verzehren’ (consume), Old ‘sich sättigen’. Since *tṛmpāti* is ordinarily construed with a genitive, I take *tvānīdaḥ* as a gen. sg., not acc. pl., as Gr and Ge take it. Scar allows either possibility, and Old favors the gen. My interpretation is thus rather distinct from Ge’s “du hast deine Schmäher satt” (have your fill of), though his also conveys a negative sense.

The girding motif of c must indicate some kind of preparation for battle, but what exactly the equipment and procedure were is not clear.

I have, reluctantly, interpreted the injunctive *śíśnathaḥ* in d as an imperative, as also in VIII.24.25. So also Ge in both passages. It would be possible here (less so in VIII.24.25) to interpret it modally “you will jab down...” or even as a timeless statement “you jab down...”

Note the play of #*tʰvám...*, #*tʰvanído ...* / ... *tuvinṛmna*

VIII.70.11: Ge takes the *sváh sákhā* to refer to the enemy’s comrade, but given the dual dvandva voc. *indrāparvatā* (3x) “o Indra and Mountain,” it seems more likely to be Indra’s. In those passages I take “mountain” as a designation of Indra’s mace.

VIII.70.12: Indra’s generous handful of cows in this final verse before the sarcastic dānastuti implicitly contrasts with the stinginess of Śara, who gives only one calf (vs. 15).

VIII.70.15: See comment on 12. The thematic connection between the verses is underscored by the presence of the verb ‘grab’ in each, but note that vs. 15, part of the hymn proper, has the older form *√grabh* (*sám grbhāya*), while the dānastuti, belonging to a more popular level of language, has the younger *√grah* (*-gṛhya*).

VIII.71 Agni

VIII.71.2: The 2nd *hí* pleonastically doubles the one in *nahí*.

VIII.71.5: I would delete “the” before “wisdom” in the publ. tr.

I consider *gántā* a possible, but not necessary, ex. of a periphrastic future.

VIII.71.6: Supply ‘give’ from 3c *rayīm dehi viśvāvāram*, with the same obj. and an adj. echoed by *puruvīram* here.

VIII.71.12: I supply “we beseech” as the verb, from the twin pragātha vs. 13c *īmahe*, despite the interruption by a clause containing nom. *agnīḥ* (13ab).

kṣaītrāya sādhasē has to be interpr. in connection with the cmpd. *kṣetra-sādhas-* (III.8.7, VIII.31.14). Ge’s interp. “zur Schlichtung (des Streites) um ein Feld” [for the settlement (of conflict) regarding a field] seems unnecessarily specific and contextually unsupported.

VIII.72 Agni or Praise of Oblations

See the publ. intro. for the general structure and manifold difficulties of this hymn. For disc. of the possible ritual details, see Old, Ge, Re, etc. For the most part I will not comment on such here.

VIII.72.2: *asya* could also refer to Manu’s companionship and be tr. “in his companionship,” but in IX the companionship of soma is mentioned (IX.61.29=66.14, 107.19; cf. also I.91.14, IV.28.1).

VIII.72.3: There are various ways to configure the places where “they seek.” I take *antār* in a pregnant sense, referring to the interior of the subject; the search expands to *jāne*, and finally to the place “beyond inspired thought” (*paró manīṣayā*). Since this phrase is also found in V.17.2, the two words must go together, whatever they are trying to convey.

VIII.72.4: *atītape* has been subject to a number of conflicting analyses (esp. passive or transitive with unexpressed subj.), but all seem to start with a 3rd sg. with anomalous ending -e. I see no reason why it cannot be a 1st sg., with the proper ending for a thematic medial reduplicated aorist. Although there are no other 1st singulars around, referents are ricocheting around everywhere in this hymn, and as indicated in the publ. intro., the vss. do not show close connections to each other.

VIII.72.6: Gr. assigns *dāmā* to an otherwise unattested long-*ā* stem and glosses it as ‘Seil’, but it could just as well be the nom. sg. masc. to an -*n*-stem **dāmán-* ‘binder’ formed to neut. *dāman-* ‘bond’ (like m. *brahmán-* to neut. *bráhma-*).

VIII.72.11: The hapax *abhyāram* is glossed by Gr “zur Hand, bereit,” and Ge and Re follow suit. Old suggests that it’s an absolutive, without specifying to what root or what it should mean. Still I think he has a better chance of being right than the others. The -*am* gerund takes vṛddhi of the root and accent on the root syllable (see, e.g., Whitney Gr. §995, and AV *abhyākrāmam*). This form could well belong to *abhí√ṛ* (as in fact Gr also suggest) and mean ‘going towards’.

VIII.72.12: The first pāda contains a lovely sound sequence: (*g*)*āva* (*up*)*āva*(*t*)*āva*(*tam*).

The hapax *rapsúdā* is difficult. Ge refuses to tr.; Old suggests a connection with the rare *lapsudín-* (TS, etc.) ‘having a beard’. Although the phonology would obviously work, the semantic connection is shaky, and *lapsudín-* has no etymology either. I favor a suggestion of Re’s, that the word here is connected with the secondary root $\sqrt{\text{raps}}$, extracted from *virapsśá-* ‘abundance’, which in turn derives from $\sqrt{\text{vīra-p(a)śu-}}$, by most lights (see comm. ad I.122.4). The first part of the word (*rapsú-*) can be seen as preserving the *-u-*, which the other forms don’t, but losing the *vī* (for which cf. *rapsśád-ūdhan-* ‘with teeming udders’ [II.34.5, of *dhenus*]). The palatal sibilant cluster (*-ps-*) was also regularized to one containing the dental sibilant (for possible parallel ex. see *rāspiná-* I.122.4, with metathesis as well). The second part of the word would be the root noun to $\sqrt{\text{dā}}$ ‘give’, in the nom. sg. fem., modified by *mahī*, indicating a vessel (perhaps *ukhā*?). Although we should expect a nom. sg. *-dāḥ*, the final may have been lost either because it was simply reanalyzed as a fem. stem with suffixal *-ā-* or because it was lost in continuous recitation (before the pāda-initial vowel of pāda c) and not restored redactionally.

VIII.72.13 The phrase *ródasyor abhiśríyam* could alternatively be rendered “excelling in glory over the two world-halves,” like similar phrases in VI.70.1, etc.

VIII.72.15: I take *kṛnvaté* as governing three different objects, *dharúṇam*, *námaḥ*, and *svāḥ*, each with a slightly different relationship with the verb.

VIII.72.17: *ā dade* is ambiguous between 1st and 3rd sg. Ge. opts for 3rd, Re for 1st, and Old waffles. I have chosen “I” but with no strong preference either way.

VIII.73 Aśvins

VIII.73.9: The curious phrase “honed with hope” is probably motivated in part by the phonological similarity in the Skt. *āsāsāḥ ... asāyataḥ*. With Re (EVP XVI), I take *asāyata* here to the root $\sqrt{\text{sā}}$ ‘whet, sharpen’, not $\sqrt{\text{(n)as}}$ as with the other forms with the same apparent stem shape. See further ad VI.33.2.

VIII.73.11: Some of the interpretive questions in this vs. are 1) whether *kím* is a neut. interrog. pronoun (as I take it) or a question particle (so Ge), and 2) what the referent of *idám* is. I supply ‘deed’, since that’s something regularly proclaimed. Ge and Re assume the referent is *ávaḥ* ‘Gnade’/‘faveur’ from the refrain. Since the refrain otherwise has no connection with the rest of the verse in this hymn, I think this solution is unlikely, but I hold no particular brief for my ‘deed’.

VIII.74 Agni

VIII.74.1: Nom. pl. part. *vājayántaḥ* (b) and 1st sg. *stuśé* (d) represents the not unusual number mixture of a singular poet speaking for and with the other ritual officiants. Cf. VIII.66.1 for similar number mismatch.

Pāda-final *vācaḥ* I take (with Ge) as a truncated instr. standing for *vācasā*. For disc. see comm. ad VIII.39.2. However, in this context, since $\sqrt{\text{stu}}$ can, though rarely,

take an acc. of the praise, it is possible (with Old and Re [though Re seems to recant in his n.]) to take it as obj. of *stuṣé* in a construction different from the dominant *agním ... stuṣé*. However, the acc. of the god praised continues in the next two verses, and I think it unlikely that this focus would be interrupted by “I speak a speech as praise.”

VIII.74.3: In ... *údyatā / havyāny aīrayat diví* the ppl. *údyatā* is essentially proleptic: “raised the oblations (so that they were) lifted up to heaven.” For a parallel phrase see X.8.2.

VIII.74.4: On the name *śrutárvan-* see comm. ad vs. 13 below. The underlying **śrutá + arvan-* proposed there, might be reflected metrically here: the pāda is 7 syllables, and a distracted reading might be possible (though is not suggested in the usual sources).

édhate is a pun. Though its general purport is ‘thrive’, it is still transparently related to *√idh* ‘kindle’, and the thriving is a result of flaring up, as of a flame.

VIII.74.9: The publ. tr. should read “Brilliant with its brilliance ...” and “at the overcoming of obstacles.”

VIII.74.10: The vs. is structured as an acc. phrase referring to Agni, with no governing verb. It is probably best to take it as loosely anticipating the rel. clauses beginning with *yám* in the other two verses of the *ṛca* (*yám tvā* 11a, 12a). That the accusatives in ab, d belong in a virtual rel. clause is signaled by pāda c with a rel. clause in the gen. (*yásya ...*).

My interpr. of pāda a differs from the standard, which takes *-prā-* as ‘fill’ and construes *ásvam ... gām* as a simile: “filling the chariot [with goods, vel sim.] (as) a horse (or) cow (does).” This conjures up an unintentionally comic picture in a physical sense, and even in the attenuated sense this interpr. presumably sketches, that a winning horse or productive cow generates goods that would fill a chariot (see Ge’s n. 10a), the structure and meaning of the phrase are muddy. I follow a suggestion of Re’s, given in his n. to the passage but not reflected in his tr., that the sequence is a reduction of **aśvapráṁ íd goprāṁ rathapráṁ* – or a means of avoiding a compd. with a dvandva 1st member (*aśva-go-ratha-prā-*) -- and that *prā-* belongs with forms like *pūrdhí* ‘give!’ (Mayrhofer’s *PAR*²).

The *u*-present *tūrvatha* here is enclosed by two occurrences of the related (*vr̥tra-*)**tūrya-* (9c, 12c) ‘overcoming of obstacles’, but though *tūrv-* does on occasion take an acc. of what is overcome (cf. the same VP in VIII.99.6 *vr̥trám ... tūrvasi*), here “overcome (Agni’s) claims to fame” is excluded by sense, since the poets shouldn’t seek to outdo Agni, and it must mean something like “help to triumph.”

In pāda d I supply **gr̥ṇánti* as the verb with nom. *kṛṣṭáyah* on the basis of the next hymn VIII.75.10 *gr̥ṇánti deva kṛṣṭáyah* (see also *girā* in the next vs. of this hymn, 11a). It is possible that this subj./verb complex governs the whole verse, save for pāda c with its 2nd pl. verb and gen. rel. cl. -- thus, “(whom) the separate peoples (hymn) as the one bestowing the chariot ...”

VIII.74.11: The hapax *cániṣṭhad*, though fairly clearly a 3rd sg. act. injunctive, is not regularly formed. Whitney (Roots) calls it “plainly corrupt”; Old discusses it at some

length and floats various possibilities. Whatever its source, it clearly patterns with the superlative *cāniṣṭhā* in the same metrical position in 8b (so Old, Re). The standard solution, which comes in various guises, has been to posit a more regularly formed verb that has been re-formed (/corrupted) because of the proximity of the splv., either at the time of composition or redactionally. This is the tack Old chooses; of the various underlying possibilities he considers, he favors an *-iṣ*-aor. subjunctive **cāniṣat* (cf. 2nd du. *caniṣtām*). See also Hoffmann (MSS 2 [1952/1957] = Aufs. 367; repeated by Narten, s-aor. 111), who considers the contamination a product of the poet.

VIII.74.13: On Śrutarvan (*śrutārvan-*), see also X.49.5. Mayr (PN s.v.) tentatively favors a cmpd. with truncated *śrut-* plus *ārvan-* ‘steed’ (see also tentatively AiG II.2.42. More likely in my view is a more conventional cmpd with 1st member ppl. *śrutá* + *arvan-* (like *śrutá-ratha-* ‘having a famous chariot’)(sim. also Old ad VIII.74.4), yielding first **śrutārvan-* and then undergoing secondary shortening, perhaps on the model of *śrutārṣi-* ‘having famous seers’ (*śrutá-ṛṣi-*). This would better account for the accent in this presumable bahuvrīhi, as well as the likely sense ‘famed / famous’ for the 1st member, rather than the ‘hearing’ appropriate to *śrūt-* (as in *śrūt-karṇa-* ‘having hearing ears’). (Is the underlying form reflected in the scansion of 4c above?) Certainly on the evidence of this dānastuti (vss. 13–15) ‘having famous steeds’ is an appropriate name for the king: the poet praises the four swift horses he receives (vs. 14) and in vs. 15 pronounces as a truth (*satyám*) that no mortal is a better giver of horses than Śrutarvan (15cd *ná ... aśvadātaraḥ ... asti mártyaḥ*).

Contra Gr, but with Ge and Re, I take *huvānāḥ* as passive.

I take *mṛkṣā* to $\sqrt{mṛj}$ ‘stroke’ and in the same slangy sense as *úd* $\sqrt{mṛj}$ in I.126.4.

VIII.74.15: As noted ad vs. 13, this final vs. is formally phrased as a truth, with *satyám id* opening the vs., and something like an oath sworn to / on the “great river” Paruṣṇi and the waters in general.

The voc. *mahenadi* (or *mahenadī*) is a hapax, with no other forms of the stem attested. Though Gr suggests an underlying stem *mahinadī*, Wack (AiG II.1.45, III.157) favors *mahā-nadī*, with the usual combining form of *mah-*. See disc. ad VIII.13.11 of similarly formed voc. *mahemate*. As with that form, the fact that *nadī-* is fem. helped trigger the analogy to the voc. of standard *-ā* stems.

The intensive *áva dedīśam* here seems to have real “intensive” force; a frequentative reading seems excluded or at least forced, as if the poet were constantly scolding the River (“I keep pointing out to you ...”). A true intensive would fit the solemn oath-like pronouncement at the close of the hymn.

VIII.75 Agni

VIII.75.1: Although it might at first seem odd that Agni’s horses best summon the gods, the horses are presumably the plumes of smoke, and as they ascend to heaven, they inform the gods of the sacrifice.

VIII.75.2: This is the only occurrence of *śrād-* outside the inherited unverbated idiom *śrād* $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘trust/put trust in’. As I have discussed elsewhere, ‘trust’ is often specifically

trust in the efficacy of the sacrifice, and I think that's the meaning being tapped here: realize our trust in the sacrifice's success with tangible results.

VIII.75.3: The pleonastically suffixed *yáviṣṭhāya-* beside the regular splv. *yáviṣṭha-* owes its suffix entirely to metrical considerations. All 15 occurrences of the stem are pāda-final in a Jagatī or dimeter line and thus provide a text-book iambic cadence. The unextended *yáviṣṭha-* is not as rigidly placed, but is still often pāda-final in a Triṣṭubh cadence.

VIII.75.5: The standard tr. take *tām* as a ref. to Agni, who is then the equivalent in the frame of *nemím* in the simile; so “bend him here as craftsmen bend a felly.” In the publ. tr. I take the frame/simile relation to be an example of case disharmony, with *ā́ namasva* intransitive/reflexive in the frame (“bend (yourself) here”) and transitive in the simile (“as craftsmen bend a felly”). This is based in part on the fact that medial forms of \sqrt{nam} (outside the 1st ps.) are intransitive, and this interpr. also makes better sense of the voc. *aṅgiráḥ* in the sg., *ā́ngiras-* is used almost exclusively of Agni and never, as far as I know, of a human poet/priest as it would be here if a poet/priest is the subj. of *ā́ namasva*. But I failed to remember that *nemí-* is said to be feminine, and therefore *tām* should not qualify it. I am still unwilling to give up my interpr., however, and would note first that at least in the RV there are no diagnostic passages where *nemí-* must be feminine, that is, no passages containing unambiguous feminine adjectives modifying it. And as a short *-i-* stem, it does not look feminine. So I would claim either that it is being treated as a masc. in this passage or that redactionally initial **tām* was changed to *tām*; there are no metrical implications.

VIII.75.7: On *ápāka-* see comm. ad I.110.2.

VIII.75.8: Ge sees cows as the referent of the fem. bathers in b, which are, in his interpr., leaving their calves behind as they bathe. Although I do not know about the bathing habits of cows before modern animal husbandry (and Google is no help here), I doubt that they abandoned their calves to go splash in the river -- and I also doubt that Ge knew much about this topic either. Moreover, having bathing cows abandoning their calves in b and non-bathing cows doing the same in c seems poetically clumsy. Rather I follow Re in taking the rosy bathers of b to be the dawns (though he still sneaks in the cows in his tr. “vaches-aurores”). As he points out, Dawn arises from her bath in V.80.5, and *usrā-* in the fem. pl. is regularly used of dawns. I think there is a hint of coquetry and teasing here: a group of girls bathing in a river, surprised by some young men, with the girls flashing a bit of skin and then running off in fits of giggles. The girls-bathing motif is fairly widespread: the Gopis and Kṛṣṇa come to mind, as well as Nausicaa and her friends in the Odyssey, and nearer to home, the Apsarases engage in water play in X.95.7–9.

VIII.75.10: The standard tr. take *nāmaḥ* as obj. of *gr̥ṇánti* and ab as a single clause (“they hymn homage to ...”). But $\sqrt{gr̥}$ doesn't otherwise take as object the content of the hymn; Gr must make up a special category (8) for this passage. And *nāmaḥ* + DAT is a well-represented construction.

VIII.75.11: The publ. tr. “...you will toil for wealth for us, for our quest for cattle” makes the two “for” phrases sound parallel, though they are not in Sanskrit (acc. *rayīm*, dat. *gāvīṣṭaye*). The intent is that Agni should work hard to obtain wealth for us, which we can use in our quest for cattle (that is, further wealth).

Pāda c is an almost comically economical etymological figure: *úrukṛd urú naḥ kṛdhi*.

VIII.75.12: This vs. relies on an untranslatable pun on the root \sqrt{vrj} ‘twist’, in two different idioms: *pārā* \sqrt{vrj} ‘shun, avoid’ (< ‘twist around’) and *sām* \sqrt{vrj} ‘twist around, encompass’ → ‘gather up’ of winnings at dice (hence my ‘takings’).

VIII.75.14: Technically speaking, the genitives *yásya ... namasvínah ... ádurmakhasya vā* depend on *sāmīm*, but it is almost impossible to render this in parsable English (“the labor of which homage-offerer or not stingy one Agni has enjoyed ...”).

VIII.76 Indra

VIII.76.1: The position and function of *ná* in c are somewhat troubling. If, as seems likely, it is the simile marker, its position should mark *marútvantam* as the simile “like one accompanied by the Maruts,” but this makes no sense, since Indra’s being accompanied by the Maruts for real is the insistent point of this hymn. It therefore must be construed with the following infinitival *vrñjase* and have an “as if” sense (so Ge), rather than participating in a strict simile structure. I attribute the flipping of the word order to the fact that simile-marking *ná* seems to be blocked from pāda-final position. See comm. ad X.21.1 and X.111.7. This phenomenon was already noted by Ge; see his n. 4a to IV.27.4. Among other exx., see comm. ad IV.1.19. The only counterexample I have found is VII.68.8. It might also be possible to take *vrñjase* as a truncation of **párvrñjase* and the *ná* as the negative, “for (him) not to avoid (us),” but there is no model for this nor any reason to assume truncation.

VIII.76.12: The last pāda presents some difficulties: the function of the ablative *indrāt*, the syntactic affinity of *pári* (preverb with *mame* or postposition with *indrāt*?), and the sense of *tanvām*. Ge takes *indrāt* as an ablative of comparison (“habe ich im Vergleich mit Indra zu klein bemessen”). His “zu klein” must render *tanvām*, which I assume he takes, with Gr, as belonging to an adj. *tanú-* ‘thin’ in the fem., rather than to the fem. noun *tanū-* ‘body, self’. But even if we were to accept this analysis of *tanvām*, it would still be a positive, not a comparative. It would be possible to take *pári* as a postposition with *indrāt* in the meaning ‘from’, but despite the positioning I am inclined to take it with the verb *mame* because *pári* $\sqrt{mā}$ is found in a very similar context in the riddle hymn, with numerology: I.164.45 *catvāri vāk párimitā padāni* “Speech is measured in four feet (/quarters).” As for *tanvām* I take it as referring to the “body” of the speech, perhaps the physical realization in sound measured out in time. Scar (667) takes the *tanvām* as reflexive: “Die ... Rede ... habe ich von Indra ausgehend mir angemessen,” which seems to treat the form as a dative. In n. 948 he does recognize the possibility that the poet sees his hymn as “Corpus.” I take *indrāt* as abl. of cause, though it could be a simple starting point: “I measure the speech (starting from) Indra.”

VIII.77 Indra

VIII.77.2: For this verse cf. VIII.32.2, 26. As in the latter, I am now more inclined to take *aurṇavābhām ahīśvām* as descriptive adjectives, rather than names, and would reverse the bracketed and unbracketed tr. there. On *ahīśū-* see also comm. ad X.144.3.

Gr takes *niṣṭúraḥ* as nom. pl., and Ge apparently follows this analysis, taking it as indicating the designated destroyers of Indra (“Diese sollen ... (deine) Niederstrecker sein”; sim. Scar 539, 642, though with more machinery). But I consider it rather a gen. sg. modifying a gapped gen. sg. referring to Indra – quite possibly by haplology from *té *te*. The only other occurrence of the stem is in the dative and modifies Indra, in a verse immediately following an Emuṣa verse: ... *ugráya niṣṭúre* “... to the strong one who lays low.”

VIII.77.3: Note both the phonological figure *khé ... khédayā* and the etymological figure *akhidat ... khédayā*. The sense ‘hammered together’ attributed to *sám ... akhidat* may seem strange, given that \sqrt{khid} means something like ‘tear (out/apart)’. I assume that the lexeme and sense here were generated acdg. to the common *sám / ví* opposition to *ví* \sqrt{khid} ‘tear out/apart’, attested in AVP XVI.73.5 and KS XVII.15 as well as Śāṅkh. Br. II.9.

VIII.77.4–6: The name *índraḥ* is identically positioned in all three verses of this tṛca, at the beginning of the final pāda.

VIII.77.4: The hapax *pratidhā-* is connected by Gr to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘suck(le)’, presumably because of the soma-drinking context. But I take it rather to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’ (so also Scar, though with different semantics). The lexeme *prāti* $\sqrt{dhā}$ means ‘set (an arrow on a bow), aim’, and from ‘aim’ to ‘shot’ seems an easy semantic path. Consider also English ‘shot’ for a quickly downed drink. (For further disc. see my 2020 Lamberterie Fs. art., pp. 486–87.) That a bow and arrows figure in the Emuṣa myth (see vss. 6–7) may support this derivation.

The other hapax in this verse, *kāṇukā* is not so easily handled. All tr. and comm. (including MM, EWA, s.v.) essentially give up. Gr calls it a “Beiwort zu *sáras-*” (the ponds in pāda b) and takes it as an acc. pl. neut., which seems reasonable, though it could also in principle be an old instr. sg. of an *-a-* or *-ā-* stem (as *pratidhā* is). Unlike some other passages containing opaque hapaxes, there is no phonological motivation visible. It resembles the hapax participle *kaṇūkayānt-* in X.132.7, but that is of no help because that form is even more puzzling than this one. It also resembles *kāṇá-* ‘one-eyed (RV X.155.1, AV+), and Edgerton (1911, *The -k-suffixes of Indo-Iranian*, 13) suggests it is derived from that word and means ‘jug’ — a jug “with a small opening and a large bulging body,” though he’s not happy about the *-u-*. I have also considered the possibility that it’s derived from a MIA form of *kárṇa* ‘ear’ and also refers to a vessel for liquids, this time because of its eared handle(s). The Eng. tr. ‘hogshead’ is an attempt to replicate the possible derivation of a word for liquid measure from a word for a part of the head. A hogshead contains a prodigious amount of liquid. One contributor to the word’s appearing here might be a pun on the vṛddhi derivative *kāṇvá-* ‘descendant of Kaṇva’,

which is several times read as *kāṇvā-* (VIII.2.40, 4.20); the Anukramanī attributes this hymn to Kurusuti Kāṇva. So, something like “(the vessels) of soma provided by the Kāṇvas.”

VIII.77.5: I have no idea who or what the Gandharva represents here. Ge suggests that it can be the Gandharva as Somabewacher or, alternatively, the sun, but the context gives no particular support to either identification. It would be desirable to connect this verse with the Emuṣa myth, but I do not see how to do that either. It should be noted, however, that the dative phrase *brahmābhyah ... vṛdhé* “to strengthen the composers of sacred formulations” is reminiscent of the dative phrase in vs. 8, an undoubted Emuṣa verse, *stoṭṛbhyah ... nṛbhyo nāribhyo āttave* “for the praisers, the superior men and their ladies, to eat.” Note in our phrase the “attraction” of the obj. *brahmābhyah* into the dat. to match the inf. *vṛdhé*. Unless we wish to interpr. the phrase as passive, “for the composers ... to be strengthened.”

On the lexeme *abhí√ṛd*, see comm. ad IX.110.5. It is generally specialized for the drilling into the cave in the Vala myth, but that seems to give us no help here.

The one clear connection to the Emuṣa myth within the vs. is the adj. *abudhná-* ‘bottomless’, which anticipates the name of the bow, *bundá-*, in the next vs.

VIII.77.6: Ge takes *bundám* in c as the object of *nír āvidhyat* ‘pierced’ that opens the verse. This requires assuming an aberrant meaning for the verb (‘abschiessen’ [shoot]), and I find it unlikely (so does Old, who also feels that the object should be the target of the verb). Instead, though it requires supplying a first object for the verb in a and a verb to govern the acc. in c, I take the three pādas as relatively syntactically independent and supply the boar as one object of *nír āvidhyat*, in addition to *odanám* in b. I take the first two pādas as shorthand for killed the boar, pierced the mountain, and got the porridge – the three signature actions in the Emuṣa story. Note that *odanám* is the object of *bhinat* ‘split’ in another condensed allusion to the Emuṣa myth in VIII.69.14. As for what verb to supply to govern *bundám*, I supply ‘took’ from yet another abbreviated version in VIII.45.4, the only other hymn in which *bundá-* is found: *ā bundám ... dade*. For a possible long-distance syntactic/formulaic relationship between 6a and 10d, see comments on vs. 10.

I take the phrase *girībhya ā* as expressing the freeing of the *odanám* from the mountains (pāda b), but it could also be read with pāda a with the sense of *ā* + abl. “all the way to,” though in that sense the ablative usually follows (see Gr s.v. *ā*), hence “He pierced the boar all the way to/through the mountains.”

As noted ad vs. 5, *bundá-* is reminiscent of (*a*)*budhná-* in the immediately preceding mysterious Gandharva verse.

VIII.77.7: *bradhna-* is otherwise a color term (‘coppery, ruddy’) or a substance characterized by that color (soma, in nearby VIII.69.7), but in this hapax bahuvrīhi, *śatá-bradhna-* it must refer to something capable of being counted, hence my ‘ruddy glints’. Gr’s ‘hundert Metallspitzen habend’, Ge’s ‘mit hundert Spitzen’ seem to stray too far from the color term. The appearance of this word here may be owing to its phonological similarity to *bundá-* (and (*a*)*budhná-*).

VIII.77.8: As indicated in the publ. intro., I take this verse as the speech of Indra's mother, picking up from the dialogue in vss. 1-2 that began (1a) *jajñānó nú* "just born," which is echoed here by *sadyó jātāḥ* ("just born right now"). In VIII.45.4 Indra took the Bunda bow just before his dialogue with his mother, and in VIII.69.14-15 he's a tiny child when he gets the porridge and cooks the buffalo for his mother and father.

I supply *odanám* 'rice porridge' as the object of *ā bhara* (and *āttave*). Note that in the summary verse 10 various foodstuffs, including *odanám*, are objects of *ābharat*.

The inclusion of 'ladies' (*nāribhyaḥ*) alongside superior men (*nṛbhyaḥ*) is quite rare in the RV. See I.43.6, where it seems to refer to humankind in general. Here it seems to have a more restricted sense and could actually refer to the gods and their wives: *nṛ-* is often used of divinities. For goddesses beside gods see nearby VIII.80.10, though it is attributed to a different poet.

The voc. *ṛbhuṣṭhira* is a little surprising. Both Gr and Ge take it as implicitly comparative: Gr 'stark, tüchtig wie Ṛbhu', Ge '... stark wie die Ṛbhu's'. I take it rather as parallel to *ṛbhuṣān-* 'master of the Ṛbhus', which is regularly an epithet of Indra, with an implicit gen. as 1st member.

VIII.77.10–11: On these verses as possible explanatory additions to the Emuṣa version given earlier in the hymn, see publ. intro.

VIII.77.10: Old and Ge (see his n. 10d) read loc. *indre* contra the Pp. nom. *indraḥ* and interpret the verse as meaning that Viṣṇu brought Emuṣa to Indra, along with the food named in pāda c. But this seems unlikely: the central fact of the myth is that *Indra pierced the boar*. Cf. I.61.7d *vídhyad varāhām tiró ādrim āstā* "He pierced the boar through the stone, (Indra) the archer." This last pāda in our vs. contains both Indra and the boar and ends with the boar's name as if as the solution of a riddle (remember that this is the only occurrence of the name in the RV), and it would seem rhetorically anticlimactic for the image merely to be one of Viṣṇu lugging the corpse of the boar, along with some food, *to Indra*. Instead it seems the encapsulation of the myth, and I would further argue that it finally closes the incomplete syntactic circle begun in verse 6. In 6a we find *nír āvidhyad giribhya ā* "(he) pierced from/to/through the mountains," with the signature verb and the signature locale (see *ādrim* in I.61.7 just quoted), but neither subject nor object. But in 10d we have both subject (reading nom. *indraḥ* with the Pp.) and object, but no verb. This seems a clever variant on ring composition, where a structure begun at the beginning of a section is completed at the end. Even if, as I suggest in the intro., vs. 10 is a tacked-on addition to the original Viṣṇu-less version of the myth found in the rest of this hymn (and other mentions in VIII), the poet has cleverly made use of the underdefined treatment in 6a to attach vs. 10 more closely to vss. 6–9 by supplying the missing pieces in 10d.

VIII.77.11: *sūmāya-* is generally analyzed as having the adverbial prefix *su-* 'good', hence 'aus gutem Stoff' (Ge). However, AiG II.2.770 reports a suggestion of Thieme's (apparently only reported in AiG, not publ.) that it's 'aus Eber(-zahn) verfertigt', with an unextended root noun *sū-* '(wild) pig, boar', which is the basis of *sūkará-* 'boar' (already RV VII.55.4) and which has numerous IE cognates. Although Mayrhofer explicitly rejects this suggestion (KEWA, s.v. *sūkará-*; EWA, s.vv. *MA Y*¹, *sūkará-*), context favors Thieme's suggestion. The boar Emuṣa was clearly a formidable opponent of Indra's, and

the use of a weapon made from the same animal to defeat it makes good sense from the point of view of sympathetic magic. Consider also the association of boars with ritual of kingship, and note, in particular, that using parts of the boar for the armor and weaponry of warriors is found elsewhere (cf. Odysseus's boar's tusk helmet and the general disc. in Jamison 1999 [Penelope and the Pigs], *ClAnt.* 18: 258–70). The unextended root noun *sū-* could be preserved in this old myth, esp. since it could be assimilated to the prefix *su-*.

My interpretation of pāda d essentially follows Scar (301, 516); see also EWA, s.v. *ARD*.

VIII.78 Indra

VIII.78.1: There seems no alternative to the problem posed by the ungoverned nouns in pāda a than Ge's – to supply a verb, probably a form of \sqrt{jus} 'take pleasure' (perhaps mid. part. *juṣānāḥ*). This verb seems particularly suitable since it can take both acc. (*puroḷāśam*) and gen. (*ándhasaḥ*). Ge, however, seems to be taking *ándhasa* as a dative (*ándhase*), contra Pp.: "(Koste) unseren Reiskuchen zum Somatrank." The nominals in pāda a cannot be the object of *ā bhara* because Indra doesn't *bring* the cake or the stalk, but enjoys them and brings objects in return to those who provided them.

VIII.78.3: *vaso* is a predicated vocative; the tr. renders the predication rather than the vocative, since the combination doesn't work in Engl.

VIII.78.4: The first pāda is somewhat puzzling, though I may have made more of the puzzles in the tr. than was necessary. The issue is the hapax *vr̥dhīkā-*. The standard tr. and comm. take this, with the Pp., as nom. *vr̥dhīkāḥ* and interpret it as an agent noun: Ge, AiG II.2.428, EWA (s.v. *VARDH*), JSK (DGRV I.350, 353), Scar (211, 584) 'Bereicherer' (though cf. Gr 'gewachsen'), parallel to the nominatives in b and c. But uncompounded *-īkā-* stems are often neuters and sometimes used in the loc., which would be possible here (*vr̥dhīké*), contra Pp. Cf. VIII.48.12 *mṛīké asya sumataú syāma* "May we be in his mercy and good grace." I was also troubled by three other facts: 1) Taking the whole verse as a single clause, as Ge does, runs into the problem that *te* in pāda a is coreferential with *tvát* in c, and the two pronouns should, in my opinion, have two different functions. (Ge, n., says *te* is pleonastic.) 2) I would prefer that *nákīm* (a) and *nānyāḥ* (c) not simply be conflated, as Ge seems to do. 3) The next verse also begins with *nákīm* (the only two occurrences of this form in the RV), which is followed by a nominal in an oblique case, in that case a datival infinitive *nīkartave* (and its parallel in b, *párisaktave*), and I would prefer that 4a have a structure that at least also involves an oblique case. A similar impulse may account for Re's apparent derivation of *vr̥dhīkā-* from the infinitive **vr̥dhé*, as reported in AiG II.2.418 (BSL 38: 80 n. 1 ["Infinitifs et dérivés nominaux dans le Ṛgveda"]). Putting all this together, I take *vr̥dhīka* as loc. *vr̥dhīké*, somewhat in the sense of *mṛīké* in the passage quoted above ("in the sphere of your increase," that is, in the abundance of your giving), with *te* dependent on it. However, on re-examination of the passage I think I may have overthought it, and an interpretation more like Ge/JSK/Scar may be less fussy – though the reservations expressed above remain. I would thus put forward an alt. tr. "No one is an increaser, nor a

good winner, not a good giver, other than you.” I must also admit that my publ. tr. requires *anyāḥ* of c to be read also with a. In my newly suggested tr., *nākīm* functions as a nominative, not merely a strong negative. See a similar use of *mākīm* in VI.54.7.

VIII.78.7: I consider the genitives in pāda b, *turāsya ... vidhataḥ* to modify Indra, whereas Ge takes them with the ‘resolve’ (*krátvaḥ*), which he considers to be the soma, of pāda a. The problem, in his view, is that *vidhánt-* doesn’t easily qualify Indra (*turá-* regularly does), but since the root *√vidh* ‘honor’ is an old derivative of *ví√dhā* ‘apportion’, taking it in its etymological sense allows it to modify the god.

VIII.79 Soma

VIII.79.1: Both *kṛtnú-* and *udbhíd-* appear to be gambling terms here. For *kṛtnú-* in a gambling context see I.92.10, for *udbhíd-* X.116.9. *udbhíd-* means literally ‘bursting/breaking out [up], effusive’ and is so attested a number of times in non-gambling passages (e.g. I.89.1, 102.9; see also the single verbal form of this lexeme in X.45.10). The semantic development here may be something like “break out of the pack / burst to the finish” → my “lucky break.” The lexeme was treated extensively by Falk (Brüderschaft 169–74) with disc. of earlier lit.; see also Arlo Griffiths, AVP 6 + 7, 114 ad AVP VI.9.5. *viśvajít-* ‘all-conquering’ can also fit the gambling scenario, as, arguably, can *ágrbhīta-* ‘ungraspable’ -- that is, who is too far ahead to be caught or caught up to.

The hymn is ascribed to Kṛtnu Bhārgava; Bhārgava is of course a fairly common patronymic, but Kṛtnu appears only here, clearly lifted from the hymn’s first pāda.

The final pāda consists entirely of the three most resonant words for poet/poetic activity: *īṣi-* ‘seer’, *vīpra-* ‘inspired poet’, *kāvya-* (standing for *kaví-* ‘sage poet’). The juxtaposition of the gambling focus of the first two pādas with the poetic lexicon of the last is striking, but sets the tone for the rest of the hymn, which catalogues the variety of Soma’s skills.

VIII.79.2: In c *īm* seems functionless. Though technically it could serve as object to *prá ... khyat* (“the blind man sees it/them”), it is much more likely that the verb is used in absolute function, to indicate the blind man’s recovery of his vision, not his sight of some particular (but unspecified) object(s). Vs. 6c also begins *prém a-VOWEL*, though there the *īm* could double the object *āyuh*. However, in both cases I think *īm* is simply introduced to avoid hiatus.

VIII.79.3: By my interpr. (and Ge’s), pādas ab contain a series of adjacent *-bhyah* plural nominals, which by sense must be sorted into dative pl. *tanūkṛdbhyah* (“for the body-makers”) and ablative pl. *dvēṣobhyo anyākṛtebhyah* (“from hateful things done by others”). The pāda break assists in splitting up these formally identical forms. A different interpr., going back to the MS (see Ge’s n. 3a) and followed by Re, however, takes *tanūkṛd-* in passive sense ‘done by oneself’ and contrastively parallel to *anyākṛta-* ‘done by others’; in this case, *tanūkṛdbhyah* is also ablative. The deliberate contrast between the root noun *-kṛt-* in the first compound and the past passive participle *-kṛta-* in the second and the usual active, transitive sense of *-kṛt-* in compounds (including the other occurrence of *tanūkṛt-*) make this interpr. unlikely. See Old for disc.; he opts for the

active sense, but considers the *tanū-* in question to belong to the doers/makers referred to by *-kṛt-*: “(den Frommen), die tätig sind sich die eigne *tanū* zu schaffen.” (Scar weakly favors this.) This seems unnecessarily complex, though the usual polarity between *tanū-* ‘self’ and *anyā-* ‘other’ is an argument in its favor.

VIII.79.4: This vs. flips the syntactic roles found in the preceding vs. In 3 Soma produces a defense (acc.) *from* (abl.) hateful things (*dvēṣobhyaḥ*); here he keeps the hateful thing (*dvēṣaḥ*, acc.) *from* (abl.) the entities protected (heaven and earth). The producer of the hateful thing is in the gen. (*aghāsyā*), whereas in 3b he (/they) were the first member of a compound, *anyā(-kṛta-)*.

The adj. *ṛjīśín-* ‘possessing the silvery drink’ is overwhelmingly an Indra word, applied to soma only once elsewhere (X.89.5, in a bait-and-switch ploy where Indra is the apparent referent until the poet springs Soma on his audience).

VIII.79.5: The most difficult verse in the hymn by far and perhaps not accidentally the middle verse. It is striking among other things for its use of indicative (*yánti*), subjunctive (*gáchān*), and optative (*vavṛjyuh*) in the same sentence, and for the juxtaposition of the two roots \sqrt{i} and \sqrt{gam} with the same subject in an if-then construction. For the latter, see Re’s disc.: he suggests persuasively that \sqrt{i} with acc. indicates the goal towards which one is proceeding, but \sqrt{gam} with acc. the attainment of the goal, though I am not at all sure this functional division holds throughout the uses of these presents in the RV.

I interpr. the verse within Ge’s general scheme: that the subject throughout is the soma priests and the thirsting man (*tṛṣyataḥ*) of c is a competing priest -- or at least someone who covets the largesse of the giver (*dadúṣaḥ*) in b that rightly belongs to the hard-working priests named in a (*arthínah*).

The sense of the pf. opt. *vavṛjyuh* in c is a bit difficult to grasp, primarily because the root \sqrt{vrj} ‘twist’, etc., so seldom appears without a preverb. I think ‘deflect’ or ‘thwart’ is what is intended. As usual, I do not think that the fact that the optative is built to the perfect stem adds any particular “perfect” nuance, though I do have to admit in this case that there are optative forms built to another tense/aspect stem, namely the root aor. (*vrjyām* 1x, *vrjyās* 3x, *vrjyāma* 1x), all in the idiom with *pári*.

VIII.79.7: With Gr I take *avātá-* as the negated ppl. of $\sqrt{vā}$ ‘become extinguished’, in the sense ‘unextinguishable, unquenchable’, also in I.38.7, 52.4, and 62.10. It is separate from the homonymous *avātá-* ‘without wind, windless’ in VI.64.4 and X.129.2 and also from differently accented *ávāta-* (\sqrt{van} ‘win’) ‘unvanquished’. Ge takes the *avātá-* forms here and in I.38.7 as ‘windless’ (as well as those in VI.64.4 and X.129.2) and in I.52.4 and 62.10 as ‘unvanquishable’. Re takes this occurrence as ‘invincible’; see his disc. ad loc. My interpr. rests partly on semantic, partly on formal grounds. On the one hand, “windless Soma” (or, as Ge has it, “ohne Wind zu machen”) makes no sense to me; on the other, though ‘invincible’ does make sense, I prefer to respect the accent otherwise found with that form, noting also that occurrences of that stem almost always appear with the participle *vanván* belonging to the same root. As for the occurrences in Maṇḍala I, *avātá-* once modifies mist (*mīh-* I.38.2), once ‘streams’ (*avánīḥ* I.62.10, with phonological play), and once Indra’s *śúṣmāḥ* (I.52.4, there tr. ‘gusts’). In all cases (even, or esp., the last) ‘windless’ does not work; the point in all three cases is, I think, that the

entity does not “go out” -- dissipate or disappear. Exactly how this applies to Soma here is less clear, but I assume that the point is that Soma is reliably present and available.

VIII.79.9: Ge’s tr. is very different: he takes *áva* not as a preverb in tmesis but as the 2nd sg. impv. to \sqrt{av} ‘help’ and *íkše* as the 2nd sg. med. pres. to \sqrt{is} ‘be master of’ rather than the 1st sg. to $\sqrt{ikṣ}$ ‘see’, hence “Hilf ... wenn du ... vermagst.” His n. 9ab allows for the possibility of the other tr., however -- the interpr. favored by Old and found in Re and in the publ. tr.

VIII.80 Indra

VIII.80.1: The particle *bád* seems to mean ‘in truth, for certain, yes indeed’ and, despite appearances, may have Avestan cognates. *baḷā* here is clearly based on it. Hoffmann (Aufs. II.355) takes the expression here as a kind of internal quotation: “nicht habe ich ja zu einem anderen gesagt: *bád*, du bist ein Erbarmer,” though the direct speech is only represented by the particle and then only indirectly. My tr. is an attempt to capture Hoffmann’s sense while sticking closer to the grammar.

VIII.80.2: Ge takes b in semi-independence of a: “... für die Lohngewinnung nicht gering zu schätzen.” This seems to be because of VII.67.5, which, however, doesn’t seem to be parallel enough to require this interpretation here.

Note the phonological similarity of the value-heavy words *marditāram* (1b), *mṛṭaya* (1c, 2c), belonging to $\sqrt{mṛḍ}$ ‘have mercy’, and *ámṛdhrah* ‘not shirking, not neglectful’.

VIII.80.3: Ge takes c as a statement “Gewiss wirst du, Indra, es für uns doch möglich machen,” while I think it continues the questions of ab. The status of *kuvíd* clauses is somewhat murky, in that *kuvíd* is clearly built to an interrogative stem, but it also generally conditions accent on the verb (as here, *śákaḥ*) giving it also the appearance of a subordinator. See Delbrück (AiS 550–51), Hettrich (*Hypotaxe*, 142–55), Etter (*Fragesätze*, 219–30). An interpretation, like Etter’s, that *kuvíd* marks an implicit indirect question such as “is it not the case that...?” seeks to capture these two somewhat contradictory features of the particle’s syntax, though a full rendering of this in tr. is often too heavy (as it would be here). For further on *kuvíd* and verbal accentuation see comm. ad II.35.1.

VIII.80.5: The emphatic interjection *hánta* is presumably originally the 2nd pl. imperative to \sqrt{han} ‘smite’ (flg. Thieme, *Fremdl.* 2–3, though EWA s.v. expresses doubts) with full-grade root – hence my tr. ‘blast it!’ It occurs only 3x in the RV, the other two in X, in direct speech contexts and in hymns identified by Arnold (*Ved. Metre*) as popular. Here it continues the slangy tone set by *baḍā* (1) and the questions in 3.

Ge supplies a verb in c: “(uns bring) ... Ruhm,” while I take the acc. neuter phrase there as a loose goal: “put ... first for ... fame.” Note that the *vājayú* qualifying *śrávaḥ* reappears in the next verse as a masc. modifying *rátham*.

VIII.80.6: The abrupt commands and almost insolent asides addressed to the great god continue the tone established in the earlier verses. Again the tr. is meant to capture this tone.

VIII.80.7: A clever image that modulates from b to c. In b a lucky female is going to an assignation with Indra, playing on Indra's known character as a hyper-virile pursuer of women. But in c this female is identified as a *dhî-* a visionary thought (embodied as a poem), a word that is of course feminine. The adj. *ṛtvīyāvatī* is suitable for both the woman in b ('conforming to her menstrual cycle') and the poem in c ('conforming to the ritual sequence'). This adjective is also found at VIII.12.10 with the same double application (though with *dhītī-* rather than *dhî-*).

VIII.80.8: The referent of *sīm* in pāda a is not made clear, and the fact that *sīm* can stand for all genders and numbers doesn't help. Given the racing theme of b (and in my interpretation c), I assume that it is our chariot, about which we have been worrying previously (vss. 4–6), though it could possibly be the *dhî-* of the immediately preceding verse.

The lexeme *apa-ā√vrj* is attested only here, and the interpretation of the pāda is made more difficult by the noun to which it is applied, *aratnī-*, lit. 'elbow', but potentially also 'corner' or 'barrier' (Schranken, see Old and Ge n.) or a unit of measure (like Engl. ell). I take it to be the body part (as does Ge tr.) and interpret it as a driving posture, with elbows turned out, indicating that the chariot racers are ready to start. For other suggestions see Ge n. and Old.

VIII.80.9: For speculation about the meaning of the "names," see publ. intro.

VIII.81 Indra

VIII.81.1: The apparent etymological play between 'handful' and 'hand' is unfortunately only found in the English: 'handful' is *grābhām*, 'hand' is (*mahā*)*hasṭī*. The phraseology seems to belong to dicing; see Lüders (Würfelspiel, 49–50). though curiously Falk (Bruderschaft u. Würfelspiel) does not discuss this passage. See also IX.106.3.

VIII.81.2: Despite Ge's appealing "an Gnaden Reichbemessenen" for *tuvimātrām āvobhiḥ*, *tuvimātrā-* is a bahuvrīhi built to *mātrā-* 'mass, size', with accent shift to final syllable (see AiG II.1.297). Ge's tr. also breaks the pattern of *tuvi-* compounds.

VIII.81.4: On the accent on *stāvāma* see disc. ad VIII.29.14.

VIII.81.5: Ge suggests that the verbs in pāda a (*prā stoṣat* and *ūpa gāṣiṣat* respectively) show that Indra is acting as Prastotar (the first assistant to the Udgātar, responsible for chanting the prastāva) and *Upagātar* (subordinate chanter, at least four of whom sing "ho" continuously in a low tone), priestly titles not found in the RV, though their functions may be. Both roles would connect him with the Sāma Veda, as does his listening to the sāman in pāda b. Old thinks rather that the priest is the subject of pāda a, but this seems unlikely in this strong Indra context.

VIII.81.6: The verbs $\tilde{a}\sqrt{bhr}$ and $(abh\tilde{i})\text{ }pr\acute{a}\sqrt{mṛś}$ are also paired in VIII.21.16 $dṛḍhā\ cid\ aryāḥ\ pr\acute{a}\ mṛśābhy\ \tilde{a}\ bhara$ “Seize hold of even the firmly fixed (goods) of the stranger and bring them here.”

VIII.81.8: I make $sānitvaḥ$ the predicate of a main clause (b) on which the relative clause (a) is dependent, because I am reluctant to take $\acute{ast}\tilde{i}$ as a mere auxiliary with the gerundive. This requires taking c as a separate sentence. Ge takes ab as a single dependent clause, with c as the main clause.

VIII.81.9: Ge, Mayr (PN), followed by Klein (DGRV I.104) and Scar (175), take $vāsaiḥ$ as a PN (“by the Vāsas”). This is possible but not necessary; as Ge (n.) reports, Sāy takes it in its usual sense, as I do.

The verb $jarante$ is taken by Gotō (150) to ‘awaken’, an interpretation I follow. Although the notion of prizes “awakening” may seem strange, since the Dakṣiṇā is distributed at the dawn sacrifice, it makes ritual sense. Others (Ge, Klein, Scar) take it rather to ‘sing’, but this requires the form to be passive (Klein “and in the morning are sung of by the Vāsas”; Ge’s tr. is actually a “‘Kompromiss’-Übersetzung,” in Gotō’s phrase [150 n. 226] “... werden ... wachgesungen,” incorporating both ‘wake’ and ‘sing’, but still as a passive). However, $járate$ ‘sing’ is always active in value.

I take ca in c as inverse “X ca Y” connecting the two adverbials; Ge, Klein as connecting the two clauses, ab and c.

VIII.82 Indra

VIII.82.4: My “here, come here!” is meant to capture the doubled preverb \tilde{a} in the sequence $\tilde{a}\ tv\ \acute{a}satrav\ \tilde{a}\ gahi$. Dunkel (1997: 21–22) claims that the first \tilde{a} is an example of “the asservative, sentence-initial * eh_1 ‘hey!’,” but the doubling nicely reflects poet’s insistent demand that Indra come here. Dunkel’s asservative particle is the null hypothesis, since it can never be disproven. See also IV.32.1.

The ca in b is baffling both as to position and function. Ge seems to take it as conjoining the imperatival clause in a with the present indicative clause in b (“Komm ... und du wirst ... gerufen...”); Klein (DGRV I.233) is disturbed by the “illocutionary difference” between the moods of the two clauses and suggests, “Perhaps the particle is merely a weak, untranslatable transitional element,” which, I’m afraid, is no help at all. Even if it is supposed to be conjoining the clauses, it is positioned wrong for this function. My instinct is that, in this hymn built of clichés, we are dealing with a truncated formula: X $ukth\tilde{a}(ni)\ ca$ (“X and hymns”). Cf. VIII.2.30 $gíras\ ca\ \dots\ ukth\tilde{a}\ ca$, VIII.33.13 $bráhmokth\tilde{a}\ ca\ \dots$ (and the converse VIII.63.2 $ukth\tilde{a}\ bráhma\ ca$), as well as the overfull VI.38.4 $bráhma\ gíra\ ukth\tilde{a}\ ca\ mánma$. Note that VIII.1.1 $múhur\ ukth\tilde{a}\ ca\ śamsata$ also contains $ukth\tilde{a}\ ca$ with ca in the wrong position and not clearly conjoining anything, though there it is easier to interpret it as conjoining two modally harmonious clauses.

VIII.82.4–5: $(n\tilde{i})\ \dots\ hūyase$ (4b) and $(pr\acute{a})\ \dots\ hūyate$ (5c), though built to identical stems, belong to the roots $\sqrt{hvā/hū}$ ‘call’ and \sqrt{hu} ‘pour’ respectively.

VIII.82.9: On *ásprta-* and the stealing of Soma, see comm. ad IX.3.8.

VIII.83 All Gods

VIII.83.2: *viṣpitá-* occurs only twice in Skt., here and in VII.60.7. In both occurrences it is the obj. of \sqrt{pr} ‘carry across, deliver’, and in both cases there is watery/nautical imagery. Its general value is clear -- a danger that is conceptually like a perilous water crossing -- but it has no good etymology. See EWA s.v.

VIII.83.5: Pādas ab appear to be a single clause with the middle part. *īśānāsaḥ* predicated to function as main verb. [Note in passing that Aufr’s typo *īśānāśo* with palatal, pointed out by Old, has been taken over uncorrected into the HvN text.]

My tr. of c roughly follows Ge’s, though I have rendered *īm* (“it”). He supplies a form of $\sqrt{naś}$ ‘reach’, on the basis of VIII.47.1 ... *ném aghám naśat* “evil will not reach him.” I am hesitant about this interpr. because it requires supplying a main verb with no support in context, but I don’t see a viable alternative. Re takes c as contrastive with ab, with *aghāsyā* parallel to *vāmāsyā* (“vous êtes...les régisseurs de la grace / non point ... ceux du maléfice”), but he doesn’t explain the syntax, esp. what he does with *yāt*, which certainly shouldn’t represent his “ceux.”

VIII.83.9: I do not understand the position of *utá* here. Although Klein cites this passage several times, he doesn’t comment on the position of *utá* except implicitly, by pointing to its interaction with *ádhā* (DGRV II.97–98).

VIII.84 Agni

VIII.84.1: I take *védyam* to \sqrt{vid} ‘find, acquire’ rather than \sqrt{vid} ‘know’, contra the standard view. I think it more likely that Vedic people (read, men) wanted to *get* a chariot rather than just know about it, and the renderings of the adj. show translators’ discomfort with the root assignment: Ge “wie ein Streitwagen denkwürdig,” Re “reconnaissable comme un char,” Klein (DGRV II.122) “conspicuous like a chariot.” None of these senses is really proper to \sqrt{vid} ‘know’. For the image, see II.2.3 and VIII.19.8.

VIII.84.2: According to Ge (probably correctly), this vs. refers to Agni’s flight and subsequent discovery and reinstallation by the gods.

VIII.84.4: This vs. lacks a verb to govern *úpastutim*. I supply a form of (*prā*) \sqrt{bhr} ‘present, bring’, which takes *úpastutim* as object elsewhere (+*prā* IV.56.5, VIII.62.1; simplex I.148.2). There is, unfortunately, no contextual support for it within the hymn, however. Ge supplies ‘make’, which is not impossible but has no contextual support, and the putative VP *úpastutim* \sqrt{kr} is not otherwise found. Re’s tr. “(présenter)” seems to agree with mine, but in his n. he claims to be supplying *vocaḥ* on the basis of vs. 5 (where the form is actually, per Pp [and most tr., incl. Re] *voce*). Although this contextual support would be good to have, oddly enough no verbs of speaking take *úpastuti-* as obj. (and, as just noted, Re’s tr. doesn’t reflect his statement in the n.).

VIII.84.7: The standard tr. take *pārīṇasaḥ* as a partitive abl. (“from whose profusion do you quicken the thoughts”). My interpr. (“in profusion”) could support an *adverbial* ablative of this neut. noun, but I think it’s also possible that *pārīṇas-* was reinterpr. as an adjective, on the basis of expressions like *rāyā pārīṇasā* (4x), originally appositives (“with wealth, with profusion”), but reanalyzable as noun-adj. “with abundant wealth” by way of noun+instr. adv. “with wealth in profusion.” If *pārīṇasaḥ* is an adjective, it can be an acc. pl. fem. agreeing with *dhīyaḥ*.

Contra the standard interpr., I do not take *yāsya te* as coreferential, but interpret *yāsya* as coreferential with *kāsya* in the main clause and take *te* separately as either dat. or gen. My supplied “(presented)” is just there for ease of English parsing: pāda c is easily interpretable as a nominal clause, “(the man) whose hymns are for you at ...” / “... whose hymns are yours ...”

VIII.84.8: The small interpretive issue in this verse is who is the referent of *svéṣu*. Ge/Re take it as Agni, while I think it’s the unidentified pl. subjects of *marjayanta*, presumably the priests (so also Scar 417). An argument for my position might be the fact that we might expect the reflexive adjective to be controlled by the syntactic subject, but it is my *sense* that this is not a hard and fast rule in Rigvedic syntax. More to the point, in my opinion, is that 6ab ... *káro, víśvā asmābhyam sukṣītīḥ* “... you will make all dwellings lovely for us” and 9a *kṣéti kṣémebhiḥ* “he [=the favored mortal] dwells peacefully in peaceful ways ...” associate dwellings with the mortal worshipers.

VIII.85–87: The Anukramaṇī names Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa as the poet of these three Aśvin hymns, and he appears by name in the first hymn, VIII.85.3–4. Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa is also the supposed poet of three Indra hymns in X (X.42–44), although there are no obvious echoes that I am aware of.

VIII.85 Aśvins

VIII.85.3–4: The Anukramaṇī identifies the poet as Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa, and a Kṛṣṇa is here identified as the caller / singer.

VIII.85.5: The phrase *chardīḥ ... ādābhyam* is tr. “shelter that cannot be cheated” in VIII.5.12, which rendering seems preferable to “undeceivable protection” here.

VIII.86 Aśvins

VIII.86.1: Following Kü (344) I take the pf. *babhūvātuḥ* as presential.

For the possible connection of the verb in the refrain, object-less *mumócatam*, with other appearances of Viśvaka and Viṣṇāpu in the RV, see the publ. intro.

VIII.86.2: The danger of imposing an after-the-fact narrative explanation onto a RVic hymn is shown by Ge’s tr. of *vīmanāḥ* here as “Betäubte” (distressed, afflicted). Although a negative reading of this compound is possible (“without a mind, with a mind [gone] away”), the only other occurrence of the word in the RV (X.82.2) is as a positive attribute of Viśvakarman, “vast in mind.” There is no reason that this sense cannot be found here

as well; the next pāda states that the Aśvins gave him insight (*dhíyam*), and the question in our pāda -- how (*kathā*) to praise the Aśvins -- need not be “how can someone with a disordered mind manage to praise them?” but rather “which of the many possible ways should someone with a capacious mind choose for praising them?” The questions in VIII.84.4–7, a hymn that belongs with ours though the Anukramaṇī attributes them to different poets (see remarks before VIII.81 in the publ. tr.), are similar.

VIII.86.3: The thematic connection between VIII.84 and our hymn suggested ad vs. 2 continues here: *edhatú-* ‘radiance’, only here in the RV, echoes *edhate* in VIII.84.9, which characterizes the successful devotee of Agni -- there tr. ‘thrives’, though ‘blazes brightly’ or sim. would be more vivid and literal.

VIII.86.4: Though Ge identifies the *vīrá-* ‘hero’ as Viṣṇāpu, as Re points out *ṛjīśín-* ‘possessing the silvery drink’ is almost exclusively used of Indra (and never of humans), and we are more likely to call upon this god than upon a rather vaguely defined mortal.

VIII.86.5: What the truth is doing here insistently in this final verse isn’t clear to me.

As Re points out, though the rare verb *śamāyá-* is derived from the root $\sqrt{\text{śam}}$ ‘labor’ (presumably as a deverbative from a 9th-class **śamñāti* [see, perhaps, *ścamnan* I.104.2]), it participates in a secondary word play between *śāma-* ‘hornless’ (I.32.15, 33.15) and *śṛṅga-* ‘horn’ -- hence the rather surprising appearance of the enigmatic “horn of truth” in b.

VIII.87 Aśvins

VIII.87.1: On the difficult word *krívi-*, see comm. ad I.30.1. Though *krívi-* is found in a discouraging variety of contexts, our passage is similar to I.30.1, in that the root $\sqrt{\text{sic}}$ ‘pour’ is associated with it.

This verse modulates rather cleverly from praise for the Aśvins (*stómaḥ*, pāda a) to pressed soma for them (*mádhvaḥ sutásya*, pāda c), pivoting on *séke* ‘at its outpouring’, which is literally applicable to the soma but, as is well known, metaphorically applicable to the praise.

VIII.87.1–2: The d pādas of these two vss. apparently begin with the same verb: 1d *pātám*, 2d *ní pātám*, but these two almost certainly belong to the two homonymous roots $\sqrt{\text{pā}}$ ‘drink’ and $\sqrt{\text{pā}}$ ‘protect’ respectively, *pace* Ge. Re’s arg. that the latter belongs to ‘protect’ seems pretty decisive: *ní* $\sqrt{\text{pā}}$ ‘drink’ is not found till the Rām., whereas *ní* $\sqrt{\text{pā}}$ ‘protect’ is quite well attested in the RV. I imagine the poet signaled the change of root by including this preverb while enjoying the etymological play (see also *píbatam* beginning 2a, 4a, as well as *pātám* 5d).

VIII.87.2: This is one of two passages in which Gr (fld. by Ge) interpr. *védas-* as ‘knowledge’ (rather than the ubiquitous ‘property, possessions’), but in fact ‘property’ works at least as well, arguably better, here. This leaves only III.60.1 with the ‘knowledge’ sense, which seems inescapable there (q.v.).

VIII.87.6: Note the *v*-alliteration in ab with repetition of *va/ā* at the beginning and end and *vip* in the middle.

vayāṃ hí vāṃ hávāmahe vipanyavo, viprāso vājaśātaye

VIII.88 Indra

VIII.88.3: Pāda c can be subordinate either to ab or to d; Ge chooses the former, I the latter, but there are no implications either way.

VIII.88.4: I construe *asi* in a with *abhī* in b and take *yóddhā* as part of the subject phrase, not predicated. Contra Ge, I also separate *majmánā* in b from the instrumentals in a, *krátvā śávasotá daṃsánā*, on the basis of both the pāda break and the position of *utá*. (Klein I.229 follows Ge by including *majmánā* in the conjoined NP, but three pages later [232] this NP is cited with only the first three members.) VIII.100.4b gives support to both of my decisions: *viśvā jātāni abhy āsmi mahnā*, with the finite form of *√as* adjacent to the preverb and a single instr. construed with this verb. See also in the immediately following hymn VIII.89.6 *tád viśvam abhibhūr asi, yáj jātām yác ca jántvam*.

VIII.89 Indra

As was noted in the publ. intro., every verse in this hymn, except the two anuṣṭubhs (5–6), has a form of *bṛhánt-* in it: 1a *bṛhát*, 2c *bṛhadbhāno*, 3a *bṛhaté*, 4b *bṛhát*, 7d *bṛhát*. The meters of these verses are *bṛhatī* or *satobṛhatī*. There is also some transformational phonological play based on this word: 2b *bhavat*, 2d *-bhāno*, 3b *bráhma*, 4a *bhara*.

VIII.89.1: A neuter word for a verbal product needs to be supplied with *bṛhát* in a; Ge suggests either *bráhma* (from 3b) or *sāma* (after Sāy). The latter is more likely, since *sāmans* are sung (cf. VIII.98.1 *indrāya sāma gāyata*, which is almost identical to our pāda), and since loc. *sāman* is found in the last verse, 7c, it produces an implicit ring.

VIII.89.2: The tr. of pāda a is meant to capture the etymological figure *abhíśastīr aśastihā*.

I take the verb *ābhavat* as the predicate, rather than as an auxiliary with predicated *dyumnī* as Ge does (“Indra bleib der Glanzreiche”).

VIII.89.3: Note *bṛhád indrāya* of 1a has been transformed into ... *indrāya bṛhaté*, with the adj. now qualifying Indra.

VIII.89.4–5: *jāyathā(h)* in 5a echoes *jáyā(h)* in the immediately preceding pāda (4d), though they belong to entirely different roots.

VIII.89.4: Ge’s suggestion (n.) that this verse constitutes the Maruts’ direct speech to Indra is a persuasive one.

VIII.89.6: Ge takes *haskṛti-* as qualifying the ritual fire – again a good suggestion. The fire’s crackling is the “laughter.” Unfortunately Ge bleaches the metaphor, tr. “der helle

Schein (des Opferfeuers),” which substitutes an unremarkable visual image for the striking auditory one.

VIII.90 Indra

VIII.90.1: Ge takes the loc. phrase *vísṽasu ... samátsu* with *hávyaḥ* and construes *bhūṣatu* in b with the accusatives in c. This is certainly possible and this disposition of the loc. may make better, or smoother, sense. However, because of the verse structure, I would prefer to keep *bhūṣatu* interpretationally in the first hemistich, and *ā√bhūṣ* can take the loc. (cf. VIII.66.7d, 8b, X.160.5). I then also supply *bhūṣatu* with the second hemistich, to be taken with the preverb *úpa* and the accusatives, since *úpa√bhūṣ* does take the acc. (e.g., V.75.8, VI.62.4).

VIII.90.2: I tr. *satyáḥ* separately from *īśānakṛt* on the basis of 4a.

VIII.90.3: The common trope of hymns as horses, teamed to bring Indra to the sacrifice.

VIII.90.5: For the sense of this verse, see publ. intro. Both Ge and Old (ad I.165.9 n. 1) suggest, tentatively, that Varuṇa is the referent of *carṣanīdhīt-*, and VII.85.3cd, in a hymn dedicated jointly to Indra and Varuṇa, supports this suggestion: *kṛṣṭīr anyó dhārayati prāviktā, vṛtrāny anyó apratīni hanti*. Here in a balanced “the one ... the other” construction, Indra’s characteristic deeds are described in d almost as in our passage, while Varuṇa’s activity in c, *kṛṣṭīḥ ... dhārayati* ‘sustains the peoples’, is expressed in a VP that is a variant of our compound.

VIII.90.6: The frame takes a double acc.: “beseech s.o. (*tvā*) for s.th. (*rādhah*), and I take the simile as implicitly having both roles filled: *bhāgām* ‘portion’ fills the 2nd acc. slot, but also evokes the god from which it is derived, *bhāga-*, to fill the 1st acc. However, Bhaga should properly be in parens. in the publ. tr.

Ge takes *śaraṇā* as a fem. adj. with *kṛtīḥ* “Du hast gleichsam ein ... schützendes Fell [Schild],” but this leaves nothing for the hide to be compared to. I think rather that *śaraṇā*, which is usually in the neut. sg., is a neut. pl., lacking semantic motivation (a not unusual situation), or, alternatively, that it has been attracted to the fem. sg. simile.

VIII.91 Indra (/Apālā)

VIII.91.2: Narten (Yasna Haptaṇhaiti, 146 and n. 45) identifies *vīraká-* as a word belonging to women’s language (Frauensprache) and thinks it should be tr. “mein lieber Held” rather than “Männlein.” But I don’t see why the diminutive of affection can’t be an element here; Apālā is also trying to domesticate him and make him more approachable. See also *kanīnaká-* in the Ghoṣā hymn, X.40.9.

The substances Apālā offers to Indra to accompany the soma form a ritually defined group of offerings elsewhere (III.52.1), the Savanīya-puroḍāśa-. For disc. see Jamison 1991: 162–63, 172–73. Note that, judging from *dhānāvantam karambhīnam / apūpāvantam ukthīnam* “possessing grain, possessing gruel, possessing cakes, possessing hymns” with *-vant-* and *-īn-* suffixes respectively, it is difficult to maintain the often

suggested semantic difference between *-vant-* and *-ín-*, with *-ín-* marking inherent possession and *-vant-* more contingent possession.

VIII.91.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the first hemistich contains pedagogical vocabulary, the contrastive “we wish to comprehend” (*ā ... cikitsāma*) and “we will not ‘recite’ you” (*ádhi caná tvā némasi*). The lexeme *ádhi* √ *i* lit. ‘go over’ (which goes nicely into Engl. in its idiomatic sense); in later Vedic it means ‘study (a text)’, which is an oral culture means ‘recite aloud’, and this appears to be its meaning here (contra most tr., incl. Ge and Schmidt). Followed directly by *cd*, where Apālā insistently asks the soma to flow “softly” (*śánaiḥ ... śanakaīḥ*), this hemistich indicates that Apālā wants to learn and understand Indra’s intentions, but she will not reveal his presence by announcing him aloud. (See disc. Jamison 1991: 164 and n. 43.)

VIII.91.4: The compound *patidvīṣ-* is usually tr. with passive sense (Ge: ‘vom Gatten gehasst’), but this has more to do with the scenario for the hymn constructed by the tr. and comm. than with the structure of the compound. Grammatically speaking we would expect an active sense: passive value is fairly rare in root noun compounds, and, as Scar points out (249), though he does not abandon a possible passive value, the other *-dvīṣ-* compounds are all active in sense. An interpretation guided by the compound structure would give ‘hating husbands’, a perhaps not unlikely sentiment in a pre-adolescent girl about to be married off in ancient India. The verse expresses the anxious excitement of a girl on the cusp of marriagability and adulthood (Jamison 1991: 170–71).

VIII.91.5–7: On the connection between hair growth and skin disease, see Jamison 1991: 146–70.

VIII.92 Indra

VIII.92.1: I separate the predicates of pādas a and b because √ *gā* ‘sing’ seems to be used in two different senses, with two different sets of preverbs: *ā* in a, *abhí prá* in b – the first “sing (s.o.) to (come to) X [acc.],” the second “sing to s.o.”

pāntam here belongs to the nominal stem *pānta-* ‘drink’, not the pres. part., but the coincidence of form may have led to some ambiguity.

VIII.92.3: The first two pādas contain a remarkable set of rhyming words: *puruhūtām puruṣtutām, ... śánaśrutam*.

VIII.92.2–3: 2c begins *índra í(tí)*, while 3a begins *índra í(n no)*.

VIII.92.3: What posture *abhijñú* designates is not clear. Ge thinks it involves bending the knees and sinking down, Scar (345) that Indra crouches down because he is so large. I think rather that, as in I.37.10, it indicates a slightly crouching position, with knees bent, for driving a chariot (note I.37.10 *abhijñú yātave* “*abhijñu* to drive”), in this case to bring the prizes to us. The word *nṛtúḥ* ‘dancer’ at the end of b is suggestive, so that *abhijñu* might instead, or also, be a dancing posture.

VIII.92.4: The first pāda of this new ṛca matches that of the first ṛca (1a): $\sqrt{pā}$ (*pāntam* (1a) / *ápāt* (4a) ... *āndhasaḥ*##.

īndor īndro is an example of the word play, much beloved in IX, between *īndu-* ‘drop’ and *īndra-*, but this case is particularly nice because sandhi allows the two words to be identical, save for the reversal of the final two sounds (*or* ~ *ro*).

VIII.92.5: *abhī prá* \sqrt{rc} picks up *abhī prá* $\sqrt{gā}$ of 1b.

VIII.92.6: The two gods are, of course, Soma and Indra respectively.

VIII.92.7: I’m not entirely sure of the sense of *āyatam* in b. Ge tr. “auf alle Lobreden Gespannten” (intent on / excited about), which makes nice contextual sense, but which I find difficult to reconcile with the other occurrences of $\tilde{ā} \sqrt{yam}$, including, in this hymn, $\tilde{ā} yamat$ in 3c and (*abhī*) ... $\tilde{ā} yaman$ in 31b. Elsewhere $\tilde{ā} \sqrt{yam}$ means ‘to hold (reins, etc.), hold fast, guide’. Here the sense may be that Indra is held (that is, kept) at the sacrifice by our songs, and there is then a contrast between his (temporary) immobility and the rousing we hope to give him (c: $\tilde{ā} cyāvayasi$).

VIII.92.8: This verse then showcases a different kind of immobility for Indra: *ānapacyuta-* ‘unbudgeable’; Indra here is not held, as it were, against his will, as perhaps in 7b, but because of his immense power he cannot be moved by lesser powers. Since in the immediately preceding verse (7c) the hope was to cause him to stir (\sqrt{cyu} [*cyāvayasi*]), it is striking that here it is asserted that he cannot be made to \sqrt{cyu} . (The relationship between these two forms should probably have been signaled in the Engl: perhaps “you rouse ... unrousable.”)

On the cmpd *avāryá-kratu-* ‘possessing unobstructable resolve’, see comm. ad IX.98.12.

VIII.92.11: Old and Ge take *āyāma* as expletive “let’s go!” and construe the rest of the verse with *jāyema* in c (“might we conquer the poems of the poet ...”). Although this is possible, it requires the poet (*dhīvant-*) in question to be a rival poet (so explicitly Old), and I wonder if we would flatteringly refer to a rival poet as “visionary.” I think rather that we are appropriating the visionary thoughts of our own poet and configuring them as steeds for victory in battle. For *dhī-* = *ārvant-* cf. VI.45.12 *dhībhīr ārvadbhiḥ ... jeṣma* “With visionary thoughts as our steeds might we conquer ...” Construing *āyāma* with acc. of goal is very similar to *āganma ... āśāsaḥ* “we have arrived at our hopes” in 13c.

VIII.92.12: Case disharmony between simile and frame, as discussed in Jamison 1982, facilitated by the syntactic ambivalence of *raṇāya-*, which has both causative and non-causative uses. Here the frame is causative, “we make you take pleasure in hymns” (*vayām u tvā ... ukthēṣu raṇayāmasi*), while the simile is non-causative, “as cows (do) in grain” (*gāvo ná yāvaseṣv ā*). For possible other exx. see comm. ad X.59.5, V.54.13.

VIII.92.13: Ge takes *anukāmā* as ‘in accord with *our* desires’, but it seems to me unlikely that we are claiming that everything goes as *we* want it; rather that man proposes, Indra

disposes, and in this case he has disposed as we had hoped. This is supported by vs. 14 also, where the desirous ones turn to Indra (for him to fulfill their desires, presumably).

VIII.92.20: I follow Scar (574–75) in taking *samsád-* here as an agent noun.

VIII.92.23: Following Kü (503), I take the act. pf. of \sqrt{vyac} as a presential stative.

VIII.92.24–25: On *kuksí-* as originally ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see Jamison 1987; also for the pun on *dhāman-* ‘foundation’, hence ‘fundament’, that is, ‘buttocks, bottom’, in vs. 24, but, in vs. 25, ‘foundation, establishment’ in the sense of ‘bestowal’; also the jocular name Śrutakakṣa in 25. For a similar jocular use of the solemn word *dhārūṇa-* in the sense of ‘belly’, see X.44.4 and comm. ad loc. It also is found in a soma-drinking context.

VIII.92.24–27: The syntagm *áram* + DAT displays surprisingly complex semantics; there is generally a relationship of benefit between the subject and the dative, but which one receives the benefit is not fixed. We can see the shift in these vss., which contain a surprising number of such constructions: 2x in 24, 3x in 25, 2x in 26, 1x in 27. In 24 the beneficiary is expressed in the dative: the soma is beneficial to these parts of Indra, but in 27 the singer, who is the subject, by his action (singing) receives the benefits expressed in the three datives. The switch is esp. clever because in 24c the dative *dhāṁmabhyaḥ* refers (by my interpr.) to a body part of Indra’s, which benefits from the soma drops, but the same dative (save for number), *índrasya dhāmane*, in 25c refers more likely (again in my interpr.) to a benefit that Indra will bestow (though the reading of 24c is also simultaneously possible). This change in focus is made clear (“repaired”) in 26c, *áram ... dāvāne* “fit(tingly) for (Indra’s) giving,” which makes explicit the implication of 25c *áram ... dhāmane*. Ge (also BI RR) supplies “we” as implicit subj. of c: “(wir sind) bereit für deine Schenkung,” but the playful parallelism with 24c seems to me to exclude this interpretation. The heavy phrase in 29 ... *rātīḥ ... dhāyī dhātṛbhiḥ* “(Indra’s) giving has been ordained by the ordainers” also establishes the link between Indra’s giving and the root $\sqrt{dhā}$. The final *áram* in 27c returns us to the situation found in 24, where the provider of benefit is the subject (“we”) and the beneficiary in the dative (“you”). I would now change the tr. to make that clearer: “We should go (to be) fit for you.” On the particular construction here, *áram* \sqrt{gam} DAT, see also comm. ad X.9.3.

VIII.92.28: Klein (318) takes *utá* as linking *śūraḥ* and *sthiráḥ* “Certainly (thou art) heroic and firm,” but this assumes that *śūra-* can be adjectival, which, *pace* Gr, I don’t. Instead, despite its position, I take the *utá* as conjoining *vīrayúḥ* and *śūraḥ ... sthiráḥ*, a variant on the complementary pairing of *vīrá-* ‘hero’ and *śūra-* ‘champion’.

VIII.92.28–29: Ge tr. *rādhyā-* as “leicht zu gewinnen,” but I take it rather as “to be realized, brought to success.” What the content of Indra’s thought is may be clarified by V.39.3 *yát te ditsú prarādhyam mánah ...* “your thought ... which is eager to give, should be realized.” The giving theme is made explicit in the next verse. His intention (the *mánas-* of 28c) is to give, and this intention will be realized, because giving (*rātí-*, 29a) has been ordained as part of his nature. Then 29c reaffirms the ritual partnership of mutual giving between Indra and his worshipers. I consider Ge’s “und doch (bist du),

Indra, bei mir” not sufficiently specific, esp. given the strong assertion of connection between us and Indra in the *tvā yujā* (31c), *tváyéd ... yujā* (32c) “with you as yokemate” found in following verses, not to mention 32c *tvām asmākaṃ táva smasi* “You are ours; we are yours.”

VIII.92.31: A difficult hemistich, whose uncertainties include the function of *abhí*, the meaning of *ā yaman*, and the grammatical identity and use of *sūrah*. Contra Gr I do not take *abhí* as another preverb with *ā√yam*. The only other example of *abhí-ā√yam* is in a gerundive in a curious idiom in an Aśvin hymn (I.34.1). Moreover, if it is a preverb, it has taken an odd position: we generally find preverbs in tmesis at the beginnings of pādas. I instead take it as governing *naḥ*. As for *ā yaman*, it needs to be considered in connection with other *ā√yam* forms in this hymn, particularly *ā yamat* in 3c (also *āyatam* 7b). In 3c the lexeme means ‘guide’, and I take it so here as well, with *naḥ* (read twice) as its object. In this interpretation *sūrah* is ablative of *svār*, rather than gen. to this stem (Gr, Old, with the latter suggesting it might be a temporal gen.) or nom. sg. to *sūra*- (Ge).

In c the referent of *tāt* is not specified. Ge thinks it’s the sun, which is certainly possible.

VIII.93 Indra

VIII.93.2: Ge (flg. Gr) takes *bāhvōjasā* as an abstract tatpuruṣa (“mit Armes Stärke”), but it has bahuvrīhi accent and the other three occurrences are clearly bahuvrīhis. I follow Old in so interpreting it and supplying *vāja*- as the head noun.

The Pp. analyses *vṛtrahāvadhīt* as containing an unaccented *avadhīt*. I prefer to read it with accented *avadhīt*, which allows the *ca* to conjoin two parallel relative clauses. Since in this interpretation the verse consists entirely of relative clauses, it must be dependent on either the preceding or following verse. Either would work, but the presence of an apparently resumptive *sā* beginning 3a favors the latter.

VIII.93.3: Slight phonetic figure: *sā ... śivāḥ sākḥā, āśvāvad ...*

VIII.93.4: The two vocatives addressed to Indra, *vṛtrahan* (a) and *indra* (c), flank that to the sun (*sūrya*, b), with the first embedded in a 2nd ps. clause with *Sūrya* as subject. Only the unambiguous reference of *vṛtrahan* to Indra saves it from being applied to *Sūrya*, but the effect is still somewhat unsettling.

The verb *udāgāḥ* reprises *úd ... eṣi* expressing the same action in vs. 1. In fact 1a *#ud ghéd abhí* is echoed by 4b *#udāgā abhí* with the actual verb *agā(h)* substituting for the intervening particles of the former.

VIII.93.4–6: I do not understand the force of the *vā* in 5a, since this verse does not seem to me a logical alternative to vs. 4. Nor do I understand the *utá-u* beginning 5c, which should not be conjoining the dependent clause of ab with the main clause of c. However Klein’s discussion (I.450) of *utá* appears to be on the right track and probably can account not only for the *utá* but also for the *vā*, if the explanation is fleshed out a bit. It seems that the three verses in this tṛca, esp. the first two, are loosely parallel to each other, esp. in their third pādas. Vss. 4 and 5 begin with a two-pāda *yād* clause (though the

two *yád*-s are functionally different), with the third-pāda main clause resuming with a *tád* that is asserted to be in Indra's domain: 4c *sárvam tád indra te váse* "all that is under your will" and 5c (*utá*) *tát satyám ít táva* "just that (comes) true for you" — with *te* matching *táva* and with *sárvam* and *satyám*, the referent and predicate respectively of the two *tád*-s, phonologically similar. Thus both the disjunctive *vā* and the conjunctive *utá* serve rhetorical purposes, marking parallel structures, even though those structures do not have parallel or contrastive content. The third verse (6) varies the structure a bit: instead of *yád* there are two *yé*-s in ab and instead of *tád* pāda c has *tān*; moreover, c is not a nominal sentence attributing all to Indra but requires Indra himself to make a move (*gachasí* 'you go'). But *sárvāms tān indra ...* semi-duplicates 4c *sárvam tád indra ...*, and the same total control is implied.

VIII.93.8: Unusual syntactically, in having three non-initial *sá*-s; what special effect is being aimed at is not entirely clear.

VIII.93.10: The contrastive *dur-gá-* ... *su-gá-* effect is not easily captured in English because "easy going" is blocked by the English idiom.

In c *ca* in the sense 'if' conditions the accent on the verb *vásah*. See Klein (DGRV I.238–56, esp. 250–51, on subordinating *ca*.

VIII.93.11: The implicitly conjoined nouns *ādís-* ('aim, intention') and *svarājya-* ('sovereignty, self-rule') do not seem to me to form a natural class. It is possible that the rendering of the former should be adjusted, to harmonize with the finite verb in 15b. The Pp. analyzes that verb as simply *adīṣṭa* without preverb, but in its sandhi situation it could also reflect *ā-(a)diṣṭa*, with the same lexeme as here. Even so, the middle voice of that verb would separate its semantics from the standard active idiom *ā √ diś* 'point to, aim at'.

VIII.93.13–15: The connection among the verses in this *trca* eludes me, though the fact that they are all set in an apparent mythic past and are joined by logical and/or temporal connectors (14a *ádha*, 15a *ād u*) suggests that they should form a thematic unit.

VIII.93.14: The positioning ... *yád ... ádha ...* is unusual, though Klein (II: 111) simply takes it as a variant of more common *ádha yád ...*

VIII.93.15: Judging from Ge's tr. of the first pāda, "Davor sei mir Bewahrung," he takes *āt* as an ablative pronoun referring to *ámah* in 14c (his "Panik," my "onslaught"), but as far as I can tell, *āt* is elsewhere only adverbial, as opposed to the fuller pronominal form *asmāt*. I also question his modal, indeed imperatival interpretation of *bhuvat* in this preterital context; thematic forms belonging originally to the root aorist stem (*ā*)*bhū-* can be either subjunctive or a secondarily thematicized injunctive. See Hoffmann 1967 passim, esp. 214–15.

VIII.93.17: The verse is syntactically incomplete, consisting of an instrumental phrase (pāda a), a vocative phrase (pāda b), and a subordinate clause with a verb in the imperfect (*ā-abhavaḥ*, so Pp.) or possibly injunctive (*ā bhavaḥ*). In order to provide a main clause

for the *yād* clause, Ge supplies “geschah es” (“it happened”). I prefer to borrow the verb of the preceding verse, *ā śuṣe*, though transposed into a past tense.

VIII.93.18: The curious hapax *bodhín-manas-*, with, per Pp., 1st member *bodhít-*, may be built on the model of semantically similar *cikitvít-* / *cikitvín-manas-*; see AiG II.2.322.

VIII.93.19: This verse presents both a conceptual difficulty (in ab) and a syntactic one (in c). As for the first, Indra should not be reaching exhilaration though his help for us, but rather through our soma. Ge sidesteps the difficulty by simply reinterpreting the lexeme *abhí prá√mand* as meaning ‘draw near’ (“ziehst du her zu uns”) without comment, but this relatively common collocation elsewhere always has the meaning expected of *√mad/mand*, a meaning that *abhí ... mandasānāḥ* in 21ab would reinforce. In order to avoid the conceptually unlikely “by what help for us do you become exhilarated?” I have supplied “coming” with the *kayā ... ūtyā* phrase – re-establishing the usual balance between what Indra bestows on his worshippers and the soma they offer him in return.

As for the syntactic problem, imperatives (here *bhara*) should not appear in interrogative sentences, and pāda c begins with interrogative *káyā*. Ge suggests that the 2nd ps. imperative here is used in analogy to the 1st ps.; in other words, since the subjunctive is perfectly at home in interrogative clauses and the 1st ps. subjunctive ultimately comes to serve as the 1st ps. imperative, its use in interrogative clauses could serve as a model for the introduction of 2nd ps. imperatives in such clauses. But I doubt that the 1st ps. subjunctive had been reinterpreted as an imperative at this era, since the full subjunctive paradigm in all three persons was still very much alive, and in fact Old comments that he does not know of other examples in the older language. To avoid the syntactic clash I assume that *káyā stoṭṭbhyaḥ*, parallel to *káyā ... na ūtyā* in a, ends the sentence, and *ā bhara* constitutes a new, abrupt imperatival clause. Old cites a similar solution, though taking *stoṭṭbhyaḥ* with the imperative not the *kayā* clause, found in Grassmann’s tr., also in Caland/Henry’s, which he dismisses as “künstliches Ueberspringen der Schwierigkeit.” This hardly seems fair, since it does in fact avoid the difficulty, and seems no more artificial than many interpretations of syntactically awkward passages. As for my division into clauses as opposed to that of Gr and Cal/Hen, although *stoṭṭbhya ā bhara* is found several times elsewhere as a syntagm (V.6.1 [and reps.], nearby VIII.77.8), pāda-final *ā bhara* is extraordinarily common and could easily be construed independently, especially since *stoṭṭbhyaḥ* would naturally pair with *naḥ* in these parallel expressions.

VIII.93.21: “Bring” can be supplied here on the basis of *ā bhara* in 19c.

VIII.93.22: Though *vītáye* is translated as if it were a loc. (“in pursuit”), it is of course a dative, and “Indra” or “you” should probably be supplied as object of the infinitive. The “wives” of the pressed drinks are, acdg. to Sāy. and followed by Ge (and me), the waters; in this soma context cows, standing for cows’ milk, are also possible, though the occurrence of waters in c supports Sāy.’s suggestion.

Pāda c is difficult, primarily because of the uncertain *nicumpunāḥ* but also because of the genitive case of *apām*. To take the latter issue first, Ge assumes the referent of the nominative phrase is Indra, as “der ... Besucher der Gewässer” (*apām*

jágmiḥ). Since *jágmi-* in the singular is ordinarily used of Indra, this identification makes sense, but *jágmi-*, like other nominals of the same formation, always takes verbal rection, and the goal is expressed in the acc. (*āhavam* II.33.11, *nṛṣādanam* VII.20.1) or loc. (*vidáttheṣu* I.89.7) – not the gen., as Ge’s tr. requires. For the baffling *nicumpuṇā* (and its mantra variants *-cuṇkunā-* and *-caṇkuna*) see EWA s.v. with lit. Mayrhofer cites there an etymological suggestion of Werba’s based on a proposed MIA form, meaning ‘always filling’. Though there is, of course, no certainty here, I have adopted this suggestion for want of anything better, though ‘gushing downward’ or Ge’s ‘sprudelnde (?)’ vel sim. would also work; consider also Old’s “vielleicht ein dem Wasser innewohnender lustrierender Genius.” In any case, meanings in this sphere do not fit Indra terribly well (as Ge’s “?” in part indicates), and, coupled with the problem of the case form of *apām*, this suggests that a different referent be sought for the nominatives in this pāda. I tentatively suggest supplying *ūrmī-* ‘wave’, regularly found with *apām*, esp. in soma contexts.

VIII.93.23: The first word of the verse, *iṣṭāḥ*, can belong either to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘desire’ (or the other $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’) or \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice, offer’ and should be read as a pun. With Ge the publ. tr. takes *īndram* as governed by *vṛdhāsaḥ* (“strengthening Indra” / “den Indra ... stärkend”). I took it so because *asṛkṣata* has a clear acc. goal in c and does not need another one. However, I am increasingly uncomfortable with this interpretation, since *vṛdhā-* otherwise takes the genitive (see nearby VIII.98.5 *sunvató vṛdhāḥ* and 6 *mānor vṛdhāḥ*), and I would now take *īndram* as another goal with *asṛkṣata*, hence “... libations, strengthening at the ceremony, have surged to Indra, to his down-stroke”).

The word *avabhṛthá-* in c is found only here in the RV. In classical śrauta ritual the avabhṛtha is the “final bath” taken by the sacrificer and his wife at the conclusion of the ritual, and it is interpreted thus here by Gr, and, although Ge doubts that it is the *final* bath, he still takes it as a “Reinungsbad.” I am dubious for a number of reasons, not least that no one should be bathing in libations (*hótrāḥ*) and that the participants in the final bath of later ritual are not gods (as Indra would be here) but mortals. Instead I think that the verbal lexeme *áva* $\sqrt{bhṛ}$, lit. ‘bear down’, provides the interpretational context for this noun. In the RV verbal forms of this lexeme sometimes take a weapon in the acc., depicting Indra’s bringing this weapon down on his opponent (e.g., I.32.9 *īndro asyā áva vādhar jabhāra* “Indra brought his weapon down upon her”; also *vájram* X.113.5), or, with an accusative of the opponent or one of his body parts, of Indra bringing down his enemy (e.g., II.20.6 *áva ... śíro bharad dāsāsaya* “he brought down the head of the Dāsa”). Here I think it refers concretely to Indra’s “down-stroke,” which is strengthened by the soma offered to him.

VIII.93.25–27: The c pādas of all three verses in this ṛca have the same structure: dat. pl. *stotṛbhyaḥ*, a form of *īndra-* (acc. 25–26, voc. 27), 2nd ps. imperative.

VIII.93.25: The verse begins with a 2nd sg. pronoun *túbhyam*, and the content of what follows, until the end of b, seems entirely consonant with Indra as the 2nd ps. referent. However, the vocative closing b, *vibhāvaso*, otherwise used only of Agni, and the fact that Indra is the 3rd ps. object of the imperative *ā vaha* in c, whose subject should be Agni, call the interpretation of the earlier part of the verse into question. Yet it is next to

impossible, in my view, that the announcing of the soma drinks in pāda a is made to anyone but Indra, and so we must reckon with a half verse that changed horses in midstream, as it were, without any poetic benefit accruing.

VIII.93.26: I do not understand Ge's assertion (n. to 26a), that this verse only makes sense if Agni is the speaker, a view shared by Old. I certainly agree that Agni is the subject: I take 26ab as dependent on 25c, where Agni is the 2nd ps. addressee, and take the participle *dādhat* of b with the objects found in both a and b, with slightly different senses ('diffuse' in a, 'distribute' in b, both with preverb *vī*).

The VP "diffuse your skill" refers to Agni's sending his light upward and outward; the "skill" in question is presumably his ritual skill, his ability to conduct the oblations to heaven.

The 2nd pl. impv. in c must be addressed to the whole set of ritual participants. Ge. insists (n. to 26c) that *stoṭṛbhyaḥ* must be read with pāda b, parallel to *dāśūṣe* "die Kleinode verteile für den Opfernden, für die Sänger," but the rigid parallelism of the c pādas in this ṛca suggests rather that it belongs with its pāda. Presumably the full set of participants are chanting on behalf of the subset of "praisers."

VIII.93.27: Again I read the verb *ā ... dadhāmi* with both pādas, with slightly different senses with the two different objects and with *te* read as gen. with pāda a and dat. with pāda b.

VIII.93.28–30: A variant of the final pāda of the last ṛca (27c *stoṭṛbhya indra mṛṇaya*) becomes the refrain of this ṛca (*yād indra mṛṇāyāsi nah*).

VIII.93.31–33: As noted in the publ. intro., the first pāda of the first verse of this ṛca provides its refrain, a slightly odd effect. Only in 31 is the refrain syntactically integrated into the verse. There are also echoes of previous verses: *śatakrato*, which ends 27b and 28b, appears as nom. *śatākratuḥ* at the end of 32b. The voc. *vṛtrahantama* of 30a is echoed by nom. *vṛtrahāntamaḥ* in 32a and voc. *vṛtrahan* in the same metrical position in 33a. The end of this hymn is very tightly constructed.

VIII.93.34: As noted in the publ. intro., this verse falls outside the ṛca structure and seems unconnected to the rest of the hymn. As Ge points out, it plays on two of the names of the Ṛbhus, *ṛbhú-* itself and *vāja-*. Note also the alliteration, esp. in pāda b: *ṛbhukṣānam ṛbhúm rayīm*.

VIII.94 Maruts

VIII.94.1–2: For the somewhat peculiar imagery of these vss., see the publ. intro.

VIII.94.2: Curiously, *vratā ... dhārayante* seems to be the only full VP with *vratā-* as obj. of a verbal form of *√dhr*, despite the common (nearly 20x) bahuvrīhi *dhṛtā-vrata-* 'whose commandments are upheld'.

There are several ways to construe the dual dvandva *sūryāmāsā* of c. Ge takes it as a separate obj. of *dhārāyante*, Re. as an additional subj. of the same verb, while I take it as the subj. of the purpose inf. *drśé*.

VIII.94.3: The first pāda has been subjected to a dizzying number of different interpretations, primarily because of the uncertain sense of the resonant word *aryāḥ* in context, which is complicated by its ambiguous grammatical identity: it can be gen. or abl. sg. or nom. or acc. pl. of *arí-* or even nom. sg. of *aryá-*. In addition to the standard treatments, see also Oldenberg ZDMG 54 (=KlSch. p. 79), Bl RR ad VI.45.33, Thieme Fremdling 74ff. I won't discuss the various suggested alternatives, but simply present my own. I take *aryāḥ* as abl. sg.; as for the immediately following *ā*, I give it a double interpr. On the one hand it is a postposition with *aryāḥ* in the meaning 'from'; the phrase *aryā ā* is found elsewhere and always in this sense (VIII.34.10, IX.61.11, X.191.1, in addition to the repetition of our pāda in VI.45.33). Any interpr. that requires *aryāḥ* to be some other case than abl. sg. needs to confront this formulaic evidence. But in my interpr. *ā* is also a preverb with *gr̥nanti*. I take the lexeme *ā√gr̥* to be built on the model of the common *ā√yaj* 'bring here by sacrifice' and mean 'bring here by song / sing here'. Our bards attract the Maruts away from the stranger (*aryāḥ*) to our soma-sacrifice.

"All the bards" (*vísve ... kārāvaḥ*) here contrasts with "all the gods" (*devāḥ ... vísve*) in the preceding verse, both sets of beings operating in the same territory, the ritual ground.

The publ. tr. fails to tr. *sádā* 'always'; it should read "... always sing them here ..."

VIII.94.4: The opening of this vs. seems unnecessarily over-annunciatory, with both *ásti* and *ayám*, each equivalent to "here is." One would have been enough.

There is some dissension about the referent of *svarājāḥ*, which cannot, of course, modify the (dual) Ásvins. Gr, flg. Ludwig, takes it as a gen. sg. referring to soma. The stem modifies the Maruts in V.58.1, and as a nom. pl. could match *marútaḥ* in b, except that the *utá* is then wrongly placed. Ge and Old are surely right that it refers to the Ādityas (as in VII.66.6), who appear individually in the next vs. and who are esp. associated with *vratā*'s, mentioned already in vs. 2. Klein (DGRV I.439), however, essentially rejects this solution for reasons that aren't clear to me and calls the issue "unresolved."

VIII.94.5: For the phrase *tánā pūtásya*, cf. I.3.4 *tánā pūtásah*, IX.16.8 *tánā punānāḥ*.

jāvant- is a hapax and is surely a truncation of common *prajāvant-*, likewise 'possessing/granting offspring', which occurs elsewhere in iambic cadences. In the IXth Maṇḍala Soma is asked on a number of occasions to bring or produce substances that are *prajāvant-*, e.g. *prajāvad réta ā bhara* "bring here semen producing offspring."

VIII.94.6: The "(drinks)" supplied in ab is not strictly necessary, since the genitives could be construed with *matsati* in c (so Ge/Re). I have supplied it because *√pā* 'drink' is the signature verb of this ṛca (*píbanti* 4b, 5a), but I am not wedded to it.

VIII.94.7–8: I take the initial *kád* in both verses as a question particle, introducing a rhetorical question. Ge, Re, and Etter (p. 236) take the *kád* in 8 as a neut. acc. interrogative adj. modifying *ávaḥ* (“which help?”), though they all take the *kád* in 7 as a question particle. I do not see the justification for violating the evident parallelism of the two verses, and I also wonder if we get a choice of the kind of help the gods are going to provide us.

VIII.94.9: With Ge and Old, I borrow *huve* ‘I call’ from 10 to govern pāda c. See also vs. 3 above with the same c pāda, there governed by (*ā*) ... *gṛṇanti*.

VIII.95 Indra

VIII.95.1: Though Gr identifies *rathīḥ* here as a nom. plural, thus a devī-type form beside the correct vṛkī-type *rathīyāḥ* found elsewhere, there is no reason not to take it as the nom. singular it appears to be, since number agreement in similes is not so strictly carried through in RV as in Classical poetics. So also AiG III.179 (though taking it as nom. sg. *used as nom. pl.*).

The image itself is somewhat striking: the songs mounting Indra as their chariot. Indra is usually the active charioteer figure.

VIII.95.2: HvN restore the sandhi in a (*asyāndhasa*) as *asya āndhasa*, but *asyá* should surely be accented, with the Pp., because it modifies *āndhasaḥ* rather than being used pronominally.

I follow Ge in supplying *vikṣú* with the fem. *viśvāsu* in c, on the basis of 3d. But other nouns are possible: just in nearby hymns *viśvāsu* is found with *samātsu* (‘battles’, VIII.90.2), *gṛṣú* (‘hymns’, VIII.92.7), and *kṛṣṭiṣu* (‘communities’, VIII.92.18), and a semantic case could be made for each of these, even the first.

VIII.95.4: Tiraścī Āṅgiraśa is the poet of VIII.95-103, according to the Anukramaṇī.

VIII.95.5: The verse consists entirely of a relative clause with no main clause, but the referent of the relative must be Tiraścī of 4a, despite the intervening matter in 4c, as the similar structures of 4b and 5a indicate: # *indra yás tvā* and # *indra yás te* respectively.

Note the interplay of *nāvīyasam* ‘newer’ and *pratnām* ‘age-old’, expressing the standard RVic poetic trope of making an old song new again. So also Ge (n. to 5cd).

VIII.95.7–9: See the intro. for the curious density in this tṛca of the ppl. *śuddhá-* ‘cleansed’, which is not normal soma vocabulary. I do not understand what ritual or conceptual feature is at issue. Ge cites Sāy’s story about the purification of Indra after his killing of Vṛtra. This may be relevant, but there is no reference to Indra’s deeds or activities in this tṛca, save for the final hemistich in vs. 9, where we find *vṛtrāṇi jighnase* “you keep smashing obstacles” – an allusion to Vṛtra but couched in present time and plural number.

VIII.95.7: Instead of HvN’s restoration *nu indram* (for *nv indram*), *nú* should of course be accented.

VIII.95.7-8: These two vss. contain successive occurrences of the pf. act. impv. built to \sqrt{mad} . 3rd sg. *mamattu* (7d), 2nd sg. *mamaddhi* (8d). Despite their apparently parallel formation, they have distinct transitivity values: the 3rd sg. is transitive, the 2nd sg. not. This difference is consistent in the usage of the two forms: the other instance of *mamaddhi* (X.96.13) is also intransitive, 10 of the other 11 occurrences of *mamáttu* are transitive (save for late X.59.2) The difference may have arisen from the fact that, while *mamáttu* is a properly formed impv. to the pf. of \sqrt{mad} with expected full grade of the root syllable, in the 2nd sg. we should expect zero grade, hence **ma-md-dhi*, which would probably simplify to **mandhi*, with the superficially unredupl. weak perfect stem *mand-*, which is reinterpreted as a secondary root. Hence *mamaddhi* must be secondarily formed. I do not understand why this would affect its valency, though.

VIII.96 Indra

VIII.96.1: I read *ātiranta* as preverb *ā* plus injunctive *tiranta* (and so better transcribed as *ā tiranta*), contra Pp. and Gr. This allows a presential, general reading for the injunctive, which will match the pf. *tasthuḥ* in c (usually presential, acdg. to Kü), and describes the general cosmic obedience to Indra, rather than a particular historical event. With Ge I take this verb as providing the framework for pāda b as well, though I consider *nāktam* adverbial, rather than the object of the verb, as Ge and Old take it.

VIII.96.2: In d “deeds” needs to be supplied, to account for the number differential between *tād* (c) and *yāni* (d).

VIII.96.3: The Pp. reads *śrútyai* in d (so also Ge, Schmidt *B+I*), but I follow Gr in taking it as *śrútyāḥ*, agreeing with *krátavaḥ* in c. Ol considers both interpretations possible and does not make a determination.

VIII.96.4: Since *yajñīyam* is not a superlative, the “the most” of the publ. tr. should be in parentheses.

VIII.96.5: The verbal counterpart to 2nd sg. *dhatsé* in the relative cl. (ab) is augmented *ānavanta* in the main clause (cd). I would therefore prefer to take *dhatsé* as a medial, preterital perfect, rather than as a present. Gr and Lu identify it as present, Ge translates it as one, and Kü (p. 275) explicitly claims that *-i*-liaison forms belong to the perfect, while those without the *-i* are presents. Nonetheless, I think we can interpret *dhatsé*, the only such 2nd sg., as a perfect, next to very common *dadhiṣé*, esp. as only this form would fit in a Triṣṭubh cadence.

The accent on main-clause *ānavanta* must result from its membership in the repeated *prá* subclauses.

I take the formulators in d as the Maruts; Ge suggests either Aṅgirasas or Maruts. Since the next *ṛca* (vss. 7–9) clearly contains the 1st ps. speech of the Maruts, and the next verse (6) has 1st ps. speech that can reasonably attributed to the Maruts, their introduction here would not be surprising.

VIII.96.6: Ge (so also Gr) takes *ávarāṇy asmāt* as temporal: “die nach ihm kommen,” whereas I interpret it spatially. Though “later than him” is possible, it seems pleonastic, in that if Indra begat them, they would *have* to be later than him. The idea is rather that they exist here on earth, below him,, and also that he begot them as subordinates. Cf. *vr̥jānemāvarāṇi* “these communities here below” (IX.96.7) and *bāndhūṁ imām āvarān* “these bonds here below” (IX.97.17), which both seem spatial, not temporal, also.

VIII.96.8: Although the med. pf. of *√ vr̥dh* is ordinarily intransitive or reflexive, *vāvr̥dhānāḥ* is here best interpreted as transitive in the frame (“increasing you,” with *tvā* in a as obj.) but intransitive in the simile (“as ruddy throngs increase,” with the nominative NP *usrā iva rāsāyaḥ*). See X.78.8 for a similar example of case disharmony.

VIII.96.9: However tempting it might be, the juxtaposed phrase *ásurā adevāḥ* is most likely not to be interpreted as an early instantiation of the Asura/Deva conflict of middle Vedic times. Instead it probably refers to human or semi-divine lords (for the former see W. E. Hale, 1986: 83) who do not have the gods on their side. Hale points out that *adevā-* is the only form in the RV so accented (contrasting with *ádeva-*), and it must be a bahuvrīhi meaning “not having gods, without gods.”

VIII.96.10: In d *tanvè* might be more comfortably rendered “for his own person” with Ge (“für seine Person”), but *tanvi* in the following verse seems to require a ‘body’ reading.

VIII.96.13–15: As indicated in the intro., the identity of the ‘droplet’ (*drapsá-*) and the purport of this *ṛca* are quite unclear. Ge takes both *drapsá-* and *kṛṣṇá-* (‘black’) as PNs and the *ṛca* as their “saga.” Since such a saga is otherwise unknown and both words have lexical meaning, such an approach does not seem to gain us much. Old’s discussion is, as usual, very sharp, but his own interpretation, that Indra is helping an embryonic version of Bṛhaspati, in the form of a drop of semen, to come to birth, also does not convince. Schmidt (1968: 112-13) rejects Old’s interpretation and suggests that it describes in mystical fashion the freeing of the soma-drop in the form of the sun, but declines to tr. the *ṛca* because of the many uncertainties. I am inclined to see it as a treatment of the ritual step of rinsing the soma in water, as I said in the publ. intro., though much remains murky.

VIII.96.16–18: These three vss. begin *tvám ha tyád*. As elsewhere with this configuration (2ND SG. PRN *ha tyád*), with a neut. *tyád* without a neut. referent, *ha tyád* seems to be strongly emphatic (see a similar sequence in I.63.4–7 and comm. ad loc. as well as ad VI.18.3). I would now be inclined to change the tr. of the three vss. here to “It was just you who ...”

VIII.96.16: The identity of the “seven” is unclear; ordinarily that number refers to rivers or priestly offices, but neither makes sense here. However, Ge (n. to 16a) points to seven enemies destroyed by Indra in X.49.8, 120.6.

Ge takes *vibhu-mánt-* (only here) as ‘die in dir einen Gebieter hatten’; this might be plausible, because Indra is characterized as *vibhū* in 11 and so creatures associated with him might possess him as *vibhú-*. But the problem is that *vibhú-/ū-* is only

adjectival, as far as I can tell, and does not have the ‘lord, master’ meaning presupposed here. Though possessive *-vant-/mant-* stems should be built to nouns, Debrunner (AiG II.2.877–78) allows for pleonastic use of the suffix with adjectives in this and a number of other cases.

VIII.96.18: Noteworthy here is the variant on the expression of Indra’s standard deed, *ṛtrám √han* and esp. his epithet *ṛtrahán-* in the phrase *ghanó ṛtrāṇām* “the bane of obstacles,” with the nominal *ghaná-* from *√han* and a pl. of *ṛtrá-*.

On *√stambh* with the waters as obj. see comm. ad II.11.5.

VIII.96.19: As indicated in the publ. intro., I interpret this verse as containing a riddle (a-c) and its answer (d), an interpretation at odds with Ge (flg. Sāy), who takes all of the verse until its last word as part of a single description of Indra. His rendering of d, “der *Ṛtratöter* ist (jedem) anderen gewachsen, so sagen sie” is grammatically impossible because *āhuḥ* ought then to be accented; *prātīd anyām āhuḥ* must be a separate clause (as Old also takes it, though with implausible semantics). In my interpretation the first three pādas present several different descriptions of Indra’s characteristics and activities. Although these descriptions are fairly transparent, they do not name Indra, whereas the first two words of pāda d, *sá ṛtrahā*, names him by his standing epithet and serves as answer to the implicit riddle posed by the first three pādas. Although this interpretation is more complex than Ge’s, it allows us to account for the odd finale of d and especially for the *anyām*, which by my rules (Fs. Beekes, 1997) should have a definite reading, “the other.” I take this “other” to be the poser of the riddle, and the unidentified speakers of d triumphantly respond to him with the solution. That the first two words of the final two verses of the *ṛca* (and the hymn) repeat *sá ṛtrahā* of 19d, followed by the actual name of the god, lends support to my interpretation of vs. 19.

I tr. loc. *sutésu* in a as if it were a genitive; “enjoyer at the pressings” would be possible, but just a little less parsable in English.

I am somewhat puzzled by the simile of b: *yó áheva revān*. Ge takes the *áhā* (so Pp.) as the comparandum with Indra and *revān* as the shared quality (“der wie die (neuen) Tage prangend ist”), but *revānt-* doesn’t mean ‘resplendent’; rather, as a derivative of *rayí-* ‘wealth’, it means ‘rich, wealthy’. Moreover, in similes, *áhā*, marked by *iva*, several times precedes the actual comparandum and serves as adverbial qualifier – e.g., I.130.2 *áhā víśveva sūryam* “like the sun through all the days” (cf. also *áheva* in VI.61.9), and so I interpret it here, though I admit it is still not a compelling image.

In c the *Samhitā* text reads *náryāpāṃsi* (as also in I.85.9), with five syllables, suggesting a word separation *nári āpāṃsi* and so analyzed by Pp. (followed by Aufrecht and HvN). But this must represent, one way or another, the collocation *náryā + āpāṃsi*, found in opposite order even in this same *ṛca* (21c *āpāṃsi náryā*, see also IV.19.10, as well as *āpāṃsi ... náryāni* VII.21.4; also the *bahuvrīhi* *náryāpas-* in nearby VIII.93.1). Grassmann suggests reading **náryāpāṃsi*, as does Old (ad I.85.9) (see also Macdonell *Vedic Reader* ad I.85.9), and this “slight emendation” (Macdonell’s words) not only fixes the morphology but also restores a more standard break (_ _ _) for the three shorts (_ _ _) found (though the latter break is by no means uncommon). However, Lubotsky apparently takes *nári* here as the loc. to the noun *ní-* (the *náryāpāṃsi* passages would contain the only locatives to this stem in the RV), and Ge adduces the somewhat parallel

case of *vṛṣṇi ... śávaḥ* (V.35.4, VIII.3.10), *vṛṣṇi paúṃsyam* (VIII.7.23). Like our *nári ápāṃsi* / *ápāṃsi náryā*, the former collocation exists alongside one with a properly formed *-iya*-adjective, *vṛṣṇ(i)yaṃ śávaḥ* (VIII.3.8 [same hymn as one of the truncated occurrences], VIII.51.10 IX.64.2). But the easy fix available to the *nári ápāṃsi* case (lengthening the vowel of *ápāṃsi*) is not available for the *vṛṣṇi* examples.

I do not know quite what to do with all this. The *vṛṣṇi* case looks to me like an artificial truncation that nonetheless was original to the text, while I'm inclined to see *nári* as a redactional change, perhaps on the model of *vṛṣṇi*. I am thus willing to follow Gr, Old, and Macdonell in emending to **náryāpāṃsi*. However, these are, to say the least, quite subjective criteria, and I am not at all convinced these views are correct. It is nonetheless possible to sketch a possible but problematic scenario for these developments. The two examples of *vṛṣṇi te śávaḥ* are nominal clauses. Cf. VIII.3.10 *tád indra vṛṣṇi te śávaḥ*, rendered in the publ. tr. "that is your bullish vast power, Indra," with *vṛṣṇi* nominally a neut. sg. to an otherwise non-existent *i*-stem adj. But it might be possible instead to take it as the loc. sg. of *vṛṣan-*, with *vṛṣṇi ... śávaḥ* "the power is in the bull." Though in a cursory look I have found no *śávaḥ* + LOC. constructions in the RV, other abstract words for power do figure in such syntagms (including in our hymn, VIII.96.3). See, e.g., V.33.6 *paprksényam indra tvé hí ójah, ṇṛmṇāni ca ...* "For, Indra, in you are strength to be nurtured and manly powers." There are two fundamental problems with this suggestion: 1) the zero-grade loc. *-ni* to *-an*-stems is not found in the RV; we find only full-grade *-anī*; 2) it is hard to construe the *te*, since the bull and 2nd ps. Indra are coreferential. "This power of yours is in (you,) the bull" is awkward and unlikely. A bolder hypothesis – bolder than I would venture – would link these two problems and reconstruct an underlying syntagm **vṛṣaṇi śávaḥ* with full-grade loc. and no enclitic pronoun. When the posited *vṛṣaṇi* reduced to *vṛṣṇi* (perhaps because of association with adjectival *vṛṣṇ(i)ya-*), *te* was introduced to maintain the metrical shape. There are no other attested examples of the loc. sg. of *vṛṣan-* in the RV to support the trisyllabic reading. In any case, in this scenario the old loc. would be reinterpreted as an endingless adjectival or adverbial element in this collocation, alternating with syntactically impeccable *vṛṣṇ(i)yaṃ śávaḥ*. With this set up, we can get *nári* on this model:

vṛṣṇ(i)yaṃ śávaḥ : *vṛṣṇi ... śávaḥ*
ápāṃsi náryā : *nári ápāṃsi*

I believe this development was redactional rather than found in the ur-text. First because *vṛṣṇi ... śávaḥ* is a plausible neut. sg. phrase, but with the pl. *ápāṃsi* an endingless *nári* is more difficult. Moreover, an abstract quality located in a being (like "strength is in the bull") is a much more likely notion than "labors are in the man." And the metrical evidence strongly favors an original **náryāpāṃsi*, though it does not entirely rule out the short vowel.

But I lay out this scenario very skeptically, primarily because of the wrong grade in the posited loc. sg. Here I would point out that the same trouble would afflict any attempt to explain *vṛṣṇ(i)ya-* as a thematic descasulative derivative from a locative by pointing to the two synchronically alternating syntagms here. Such a derivation for **(i)yo*-possessive adjectives in general has been proposed (see Balles, *Sprache* 39 [1997 (2000)] 141-67, cited from Meier-Brügger, *Indo-European Linguistics*, 283-84, for which ref. I thank JL). I do not believe that the last word has been said about this issue.

VIII.96.21: Note the full syntagm *ápāmsi náryā* responding to the *náryápāmsi* in 19c.

Gerundives occasionally take dative agents, like *sákhibhyaḥ* here. Cf., e.g., I.33.2 *stotṛbhyo hávyah*.

VIII.97 Indra

VIII.97.1–3, 4–6: All three verses of the first ṛca begin with a form of rel. *yá-* followed by voc. *indra*. Pāda 2c mimics this opening with *yá(jamāne)*. The first two verses of the following ṛca (4-6) continue this pattern, if somewhat raggedly: 4a *yác cakra*, 5a *yád*, 5c *yát*.

VIII.97.1: The relative phrase *yāḥ ... bhújaḥ* “which delightful things” has no obvious correlative expression in the main clause of cd. Ge supplies “(mit denen),” which is certainly possible and perhaps the default option. But following a suggestion of Old’s, I take the *asya* of c, otherwise unaccounted for, as the functional correlative, despite the difference in number and gender. Because it is unaccented, *asya* should be pronominal and refer to something already present in the discourse, and there are few candidates, esp. because *stotār-* doesn’t seem to take a genitive. It would not be surprising to resume the fem. expression “delightful things” simply with “that (stuff).” The masc. singular referring to the goods Indra has acquired continues in vs. 2, with the *yám ... tām* pair. I tr. *asya* “from that” rather than “of that,” since the latter doesn’t parse well in English.

In cd *stotāram ... yé ca ... vṛktābarhiṣaḥ* is a nice example of the “X and which Y” construction.

VIII.97.2: Ge tr. *ávyayam* as ‘ohne Einbusse’ (loss), rather than ‘ovine, belonging to sheep’ (contra Gr, etc.), presumably because of its initial accent (against the normal accent in *avyāya-* ‘ovine’). This seems unnecessary. The other occurrence of *ávyaya-* (IX.86.34) modifies the soma filter and Ge renders it “aus Schafwolle” without comment. In our passage he is following Sāy’s *vyayarahitam*, but *vyaya-* ‘disappearance, loss, outlay’ is not attested until the epic/Classical language, as far as I know. Furthermore, sheep fit nicely into this equine and bovine context, with the three terms *ásvaṃ gām bhāgām ávyayam* displaying a classic Behagel’s Law configuration. As for the aberrant accent, Debrunner (AiG II.2.213) attributes it to the influence of semantically identical *ávya-*.

Ge takes the locative phrase in c with ab, “Welches Ross und Rind du ... als Anteil ... bestimmt hat für den Opfernden ...” Again this seems odd and unnecessary. The locatives of c are summarized by *tásmin* in d, and contrast with *paṇaú* at the end of that pāda. Moreover the middle voice of *dadhiṣé* in the relative clause contrasts functionally with the act. imperative *dhehi* in the main clause. First Indra acquires goods *for himself*, then confers them *on others*. By placing the recipient in the rel. clause with the middle verb, Ge erases this neat voice contrast. Pāda c then seems to represent a heavy preposed NP picked up by initial *tásmin* in d.

VIII.97.3: Note the doubling of pres. *sásti* ‘sleeps’ with the adverbial gerund *anuṣvāpam*. In Jamison 1982/83 I argue that the gerund is used here because the poet wanted to use a

pres. tense of \sqrt{svap} but didn't really know one, since the various presents to this root are secondary and to some extent improvisational.

The end of the verse ... *dhehi táṃ tátaḥ* with its two final pronominals is striking, but clearly constructed as the mirror image of 2d *tásminn táṃ dhehi*. The good sacrificer of 2cd is contrasted with the godless, vowless man of 3, and it may not be entirely fanciful to suggest that the unusual word order — *tá*-forms ordinarily occurring at the beginning of clauses — is a syntactic expression of his perverse nature.

VIII.97.4: Following Ge I take *keśibhiḥ* “hairy-maned (horses)” as an appositional simile with *gṛbhīḥ*: the hymns serve as the team that brings Indra to us along “heaven’s way.”

This latter form, *dyugát* ‘heaven-going’ vel sim., is extensively discussed by Scar (106–7), who ultimately concludes that it is “unklar,” though he favors taking it as a nom. sg. modifying the soma presser (*sutāṁvān*). This seems odd: the soma-presser is the one element in this verse who is likely to stay put. I take it, with Gr and (implicitly) Old, as adverbial, referring to the movement of the hymns, as metaphorical horses, through heaven. In his note Ge endorses Sāy’s interpretation of it is a shortening of *dyugádbhiḥ*, which (as Wolff’s suggestion) Old dismisses without argument. This explanation by truncation certainly does not seem necessary, since a neuter adverb works well enough.

VIII.97.7–9: The da capo-like structure of the verses in this ṛca, with the first pāda repeated verbatim as the last one, is quite unusual.

VIII.97.7: I have chosen to read the impv. *bhāvā* in b with the two small clauses in c as well, though it is certainly possible to interpret those with Ge as straight indicative nominal clauses: “you (are) there with help ...; you (are) friendship ...”

VIII.97.10: Although they belong to different ṛcas, 10ab responds to vs. 9: in both Indra is characterized by the lexeme *abhí√bhū* ‘dominate, surmount’ (9c *abhibhūḥ*, 10a *abhibhūtaram*), with each governing an NP beginning with *vísva-*. Moreover, in vs. 9 it is said that gods (as well as mortals) have not attained (*āśata*) Indra, while in 10ab the gods appear to be the implied subject of the verbs *tataḥsuḥ* and *jajanuḥ* “fashioned and begot” – in other words, paradoxically, though they do not attain him they are credited with creating him.

The b pāda is metrically disturbed. Although vs. 10 is identified by the Anukr. as an Atijagatī (13 13 / 13 13), in fact, as HvN point out, the other three pādas are standard 12-syl. Jagatī lines, and b has 14 syllables, not 13. It also contains the 3rd pl. pf. *jajanuḥ* ($\sqrt{jān}$) with distracted root syllable, rather than expected (and attested) *jajñuḥ*. Although it might be possible to consider this form an archaic reflex of **ǵe-ǵnH-V*, the metrical problem makes this less likely – even though reading **jajñuś* does not fix the meter. Assuming the form, and the pāda, are transmitted correctly, I would suggest that *jajanur* was based on the subjunctive stem *jajana-*, found in several YV mantras in early Vedic prose (see Kü 186), and/or created to disambiguate the 3rd pl. pf. to this root from the identical *jajñur* of $\sqrt{jñā}$ ‘know’. For a passage where the confusion between the two forms reigns, see X.28.7 and comm. there.

In c there is pseudo-etymological play between *vāriṣṭhaṃ vāre*, which not only are unrelated but also belong to two different NPs, despite their adjacency. There is some

uncertainty about the position of *utá* or even what it is conjoining. Klein (DGRV I.346, 349) considers the pāda an XY *utá* construction, joining the two complex NPs that precede it, with the adjectives in d “merely strung on to the basical phrasal syntagm” (346).

The etymological figure *ugrām ójīṣṭham*, with a positive and its superlative, is reminiscent of the simplex followed by comparative in 9c / 10a *abhibhūḥ ... abhibhūtaram*. The rest of pāda d, *tavásam tarasvīnam*, almost mimics an etymological figure via phonological scrambling, although the words are of course unrelated.

VIII.97.11: There is phonetic play between *asvaran* (a; see also *abhīsvārā* 1b) to \sqrt{svar} ‘sound’ and *s’var(-pati)*(c) containing the ‘sun’ word, although the latter of course has a distracted *sv* cluster.

VIII.97.12: I use two different English tr. for *namanti*, ‘bend’ and ‘bow’, depending on the object; this is merely an English problem, as the passage adduced by Ge shows:

VII.23.20 *ā ... índram ... name girā, nemīm tāṣṭeva*.

In cd I supply ‘cry out’ (\sqrt{svar}) on the basis of 11a *sám ... asvaran* (note the *sám* in 12d) and 12b (*abhi*)*svārā*.

Ge takes *tarasvīnaḥ* as nom. pl., which is grammatically possible, but I prefer Old’s gen. sg. (an alternative also for Gr), since the same adj. modifies Indra in 10d.

VIII.97.13: The *ca* in c is one of the rare examples of subordinating *ca* in the RV, as shown by the accent induced on the verb *vavártat*; see Klein DGRV I.240–41. Its position, about which Klein does not comment, is peculiar, but it can probably be accounted for metrically. In this particular Atijagatī line (13 syl.), there is a natural break after the first two words (5 syllables), *mámhiṣṭho gīrbhūr*, and the rest of the line behaves as if it were a dimeter (8-syl.) line, *ā ca yajñīyo vavártat*, with initial preverb followed by the enclitic conjunction.

VIII.97.14: The final word in a, *enā*, is taken as *enāḥ* by the Pp., a reading followed by Gr, Ge, Old, and Lub; in this interpretation it modifies or doubles (since *ena-* is a pronominal, not an adjectival demonstrative stem) fem. acc. pl. *púrah* earlier in the pāda. I do not rule this out, but wonder whether it can be the enclitic instr. sg. *enā* to *ayám* in the meaning ‘in that way, i.e., how’. See *enā* ‘thereby’ in V.2.11, in addition to personal uses (‘with him’) in IX.96.2, X.108.3.

Pāda b collects several words that have been prominent in the characterization of Indra earlier in the hymn: *ójasā* (*ójīṣṭham* 10d), *śaviṣṭha* (*śavasas pate* 6b, *śávasā* 9c), and *śakra* (*śakra* 4a). It is esp. clever that the grammatical identities of the first two terms have been switched: *s*-stem instr. to superlative and vice versa.

Note that though cd forms a single clause with two different subjects (“all the worlds” and “heaven and earth”), the dual verb *rejete* agrees with the nearer one, the decomposed dual dvandva *dyāvā ... pṛthivī ca*.

VIII.97.14–15: Both Lü (Var. 20, 506) and Schlerath (Kö. 139) consider this sequence to be a satyakriya. I can see the point, but if it is a truth-formulation, it is a muted one. The concept is clearest in 15a “Let this truth be protective of me,” esp. since this is the last verse of the hymn. The truth-formulation itself could be either the preceding verse (so

Lüders) or the whole hymn (Schlerath allows both possibilities). In the absence of the standard instrumental *ṛtēṇa* (later *satyena*) that signals a satyakriya I am reluctant to label it as such, though certainly it is akin. Schlerath also point out that the last word of the hymn is *rājan*.

VIII.97.15: “The distillate of all mother’s milk” for *viśvāpsnya-* assumes the etymological connection between *-psnya-* and *stāna-* ‘breast’, which is now standard doctrine. See EWA s.v. *stāna-*.

VIII.98 Indra

VIII.98.2–3: Parts of these two verses reappear, verbatim or slightly modified, in X.170.4, a hymn to Sūrya: 3ab = X.170.4ab, while the first two words of 2c nom. sg. *viśvākarmā viśvādevaḥ* correspond to the inst. sg. phrase *viśvākarmaṇā viśvādevyāvatā* in X.170.4d. In our hymn the subject of 3ab is Indra, who is also the referent of the nom. sg. phrase in 2c; in X.170.4 the referent in both cases is Sūrya. Because of the verbatim correspondence of 3ab and X.170.4ab save for the identity of the subject, I think they should be translated in the same way. I therefore take *svār* in a as nominative and an implicit simile and *rocanām* in b as an accusative of goal. Ge by contrast takes *svār* in our 3a also as an accusative of goal, parallel to *rocanām*: “Im Licht erstrahlend gingst du zur Sonne, zum Himmelslicht,” whereas in X.170.4 he takes them both as nominatives: “Im Licht erstahlend kamst du als Sonne als Himmelslicht...” Although of course nothing forbids different interpretations of identical phraseology in different contexts, in situations where identical interpretations are possible (as here) it seems best not to vary the translations.

The bahuvrīhi epithet of Indra *viśvākarmā* (2c) is of course a play on the divine figure of the same name, whereas the bahuvrīhi *viśvādeva-* (also 2c) makes reference to the corporate entity the All Gods (*viśve devāḥ*). The former is simply applied directly to Sūrya in X.170.4d, whereas *viśvādeva-* has gone through some derivational shenanigans, producing a doubly (or triply) marked *viśvādevyā-vant-*.

VIII.98.4: The impv. *gadhi* is a hapax, beside *gahi*, which occurs 84 times (per Lub.). The latter is almost always pāda-final and, when internal, never occupies this precise metrical position (4th and 3rd syllables from end), but although this slight indication of complementary distribution might ordinarily not be sufficient to account for the different endings, the distribution of the two forms fits a more general pattern. The *gahi* / *gadhi* question is obviously part of a larger phenomenon, or rather two: 1) the distribution of *-hi* vs. *-dhi* in the 2nd sg. imperative, 2) the conditioning for the general loss of occlusion in voiced aspirates, esp. **dh > h*. As for the former question, various generalizations work for various defined groups of forms – e.g., that *-dhi* occurs after consonants – but other groups show fluctuation, particularly disyllabic imperatives. Re (GLV §58) suggests that in this class *-hi* should be the preference after long vowel and *-dhi* after short vowel, but that the forms “usées,” *stuhi*, *ihi*, and *gahi*, have generalized *-hi* “mieux propre évidemment à l’elocution rapide.” This is not particularly satisfactory.

The most recent discussion of the whole phenomenon that I know of is Lubotsky’s “Sanskrit *h < *dh, bh*” (*Sthāpakaśrāddham*, Professor G.A. Zograph

Commemorative Volume, ed. N. V. Gurov and Ya. V. Vasil'kov. Pp. 124-44. St. Petersburg: Orientalia, 1995 [1997], available at <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/14207>), showing his characteristic thoroughness and clarity of presentation. Dismissing previous claims that the phenomenon is dialectal since the **dh > h* change is found in grammatical forms and unlikely to be due to borrowing, he suggests that it must be due to a conditioned sound law and that apparent exceptions to this sound law must be explained on a case-to-case basis. The sound law he proposes is **-VdhV# > -VhV#*. I will not discuss how he handles exceptions to this rule in other grammatical and lexical categories, but obviously the rule defines forms like *śrudhi*, *kṛdhi*, and our *gadhi* as exceptions. Again, I will not treat all his explanations of non-conforming *-dhi* imperatives, but concentrate on disyllables with *-dhi* after short vowel. For *kṛdhī* and other forms in *-ṛ* (*vṛdhi*, *spṛdhi*), he assumes that *ṛ* blocks the application of the rule, on the assumption that the older pronunciation of *ṛ* was [əṛ] (p. 136), while for *śrudhi* he examines distributional factors. Most important for him is the fact that *śrudhi* most often shows up in the formula *śrudhī hāvam* (with lengthened final vowel) and therefore the phonological conditions for **-dh > h* are not met, because the imperative “formed a whole with the following word” and “does not normally stand *in pausa*” (p. 134). He also notes that *gadhi* “stands in the interior of a pāda” (p. 134), while *gahi* is overwhelmingly pāda-final, and that *stuhi* is also often pāda-final. (I would add that, in addition to a number of initial *stuhī*, the pāda-internal examples of *stuhi* never occupy the 4th-3rd position.)

I am in agreement with Lub that the metrical position of the form shows a strong correlation with the *-dhi* vs. *-hi* alternate and also that *kṛdhī* and other forms in *ṛ* are a special case (whatever the reason: I am not convinced that the older pronunciation was [əṛ]), since the metrical distribution of *kṛdhi* tracks that of *gahi* and other forms in *-hi*, not *śrudhi* and since a cluster **ər-dh-* should produce a metrically heavy syllable. He does, however, shift his explanatory ground for *śrudhi* and company without signaling the change. For *śrudhi* the most important factor for him at first appears to be the formulaic evidence, that it forms a phonological phrase with *hāvam*, that this phonological bonding is demonstrated by the lengthened final vowel of the imperative, and that therefore the imperative was not really in *pausa* and therefore not subject to the **dh > h* rule. But later in the same paragraph he seems to argue that its position internal to the pāda, in contrast to pāda-final *-hi* forms like *stuhi* and *gahi*, provides the conditioning and the formulaic argument is no longer foremost. Although the *śrudhī hāvam* formula is certainly pervasive, I would contend that it is the metrical position, not the formation of a formulaic phonological phrase, that is the key factor and, moreover, that the lengthening of the final vowel before *hāvam* (also *gírah*) is the low-level result of metrical factors, to avoid four shorts in the cadence. Certainly our *gadhi* is not formulaically or syntactically connected with the word that follows it: ... *gadhi priyāḥ* (“come, as dear one”). If we do want to claim that bonding with a following element kept the *-dhi* from final position, it would surely be better to focus on sequences involving enclitics (e.g. VIII.66.12 ... *śrudhī me hāvam*), which would create a phonological word ending with the enclitic. Unfortunately, such sequences are rare, compared to the *śrudhī hāvam* type.

Pāda-internal position also appears to condition the occurrence of another *-dhi* imperative, *bodhi* to *√bhū*, as I discussed some time ago (“Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change: The Vedic Imperatives *bodhi*, *dehi*, and *dhehi*,” in *Syntaxe des*

langues indo-iraniennes anciennes, ed. E. Pirart. Pp. 63–80, esp. 69–75. Barcelona: Editorial Ausa, 1997). The parallel imperatives *bodhi* and *bháva* are almost in complementary distribution, with *bodhi* once again standing internal in the pāda and *bháva* either initial or final.

The last word has not been said about this complex issue.

VIII.98.5: As in the previous hymn (VIII.97.9c, 10a), this one deploys two forms of the lexeme *abhí*√*bhū* ‘dominate’ to describe Indra – here 2a *abhibhūr asi* and 5ab *abhí ... babhūtha* – although the two hymns are ascribed to different poets from different lineages.

As for the perfect form here, Kü (344–45) remarks that the perfect of √*bhū*, both as simplex and with *abhí* and *pári*, is generally presential in value, and such a value works well here. There is another issue with this perfect. This verse contains the 2nd sg. *babhūtha* without *i*-liaison, but 11b has *babhūvitha* with the liaison. It is striking to encounter both forms in the same hymn, esp. since, as Kü points out (344 n. 618), *babhūtha* is the older, *babhūvitha* the younger form, found only once elsewhere in the RV, while *babhūtha* is quite common. Metrics must have encouraged the use of younger *babhūvitha* here, since it is final in a 12-syllable line, where the older form would not fit. The other *babhūvitha* (VIII.33.19) occurs in an Anuṣṭubh cadence, where iambic rhythm is also favored. It is worth noting that thirteen of the twenty-one occurrences of *babhūtha* are final in Triṣṭubh lines, so the insertion of the *i*-liaison simply converts this common cadential form into one appropriate to Jagatī.

VIII.98.7: With Ge I take *udā* in c as the acc. pl. neut. of *udán-*, rather than instr. sg. to a root noun *úd-* with Gr, despite Old’s championing of the latter analysis and explicit rejection of the former. See also AiG III.316 and Schindler (*Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen* [unpubl. diss., Würzburg 1972], pp. 12–13), which both affirm the nom.-acc. pl. -*n*-stem interpretation.

VIII.98.8: The simile *vār ná ... yavyābhiḥ* is syntactically ambiguous, in that *vār* can be the comparandum of either subject or object, though it probably makes better sense as an object, as Ge takes it: (a body of) water growing with floods of (tributary?) water. However, a nominative interpretation is by no means excluded, as waters not infrequently swell things and make them grow; cf., e.g., I.65.4 *vārdhantīm āpaḥ ... súsíśvīm* “The waters strengthen the lovely child.” For an overelaborate interpretation see Oberlies (*Relig.* I.521).

VIII.98.9: This verse may refer to the “Fallow-bay yoking libation,” which serves as the occasion for the first-maṇḍala Indra hymns I.61–63, 82. However, this libation is ordinarily the final act in a ritual, but is not final here.

VIII.99 Indra

VIII.99.1: The redupl. form *ápīpyan* is implicitly assigned by Ge to √*pā* ‘drink’ as a redupl. (causative) aorist: “Dich haben ... die ... Männer getränkt,” an analysis I follow. However, the majority opinion is that it belongs to √*pī* ‘swell’, which is not out of the

question. The competing claims and morphological possibilities are discussed above ad VIII.66.7 with regard to *apīpema*. Our form here could have the expected zero-grade to an athematic stem (*ápīpy-an*), and the long reduplication could be correct for a causative reduplicated aorist, although since the cluster *-py-* is undistracted here, a short reduplication might be expected (type AV *atitrasan*). However, since most of the forms of the act. redupl. aorist paradigm would not have such a cluster (**ápīpet*, etc.), the long reduplication would surely be generalized. For further disc. of the proposed formation see VIII.66.7.

VIII.99.3: The simile in the first pāda of this verse is quite problematic: not only is the image intended quite unclear, but the verbal stem *śrāya-* in participial *śrāyanta(h)* (so Pp., Gr. rather *śrāyante*) is a near hapax (only here in the RV, other instances in MS I.8.2, TĀr. IV.2.5 = ĀpŚS XV.3.7). Most tr. take it as transitive ‘cooking’ (so Ge, e.g.); Old argues that *sūryam* should be the object: “like those cooking the sun, as it were,” while Ge takes *bhākṣata* as the governing verb (“As [people] cooking use [nutzen] the sun, they enjoy [geniessen] all [the goods] of Indra” – ‘nutzen’ and ‘geniessen’ must be his alternative tr. of *abhākṣata* depending on the object). However, Narten (“Vedic *śrīṇāti*, gr. κρείων, κρέων,” KZ 100 [1987]: 270-96 = *KI Sch* 340-66, cited after latter) points out (p. 342 n. 3) that the stem is elsewhere intrans. with the meaning ‘gar werden’ and tr. the hemistich “wie gar werdende (= sich erhitzende) Leute (Anteil) an der Sonne (haben), so haben sie Anteil an allen (Gütern) des Indra,” flg. a suggestion of Hoffmann’s. The TĀ=ĀpŚS passage explicitly connects “getting done/cooked” with the sun: *sūryasya harasā śrāya* “become cooked by the glow/heat of the sun.”

The Narten–Hoffmann interpretation is followed here, though I am still somewhat puzzled both about the content of the simile and about its relevance to the frame. For the first, getting cooked does not usually require the mediation of the sun but rather of fire, so literally “having a share in the sun” at best ought to mean the “share” of the sun that is actually fire. This is not terribly satisfactory, so, with Narten we must therefore interpret “getting cooked” metaphorically (but not *too* metaphorically), as indicating heated or excited people whose state is likened to heating by the sun. But even with this interpretation of the simile, there seem far less tortuous ways to indicate that people share in Indra’s goods than to compare this to heated-up people sharing in the sun. However, the transitive interpretations do not improve the sense: Old’s cooking the sun would require quite a lot of metaphor to rescue it, and the same problem with Narten’s interpretation – that cooking doesn’t require the sun – affects Ge’s transitive version.

The only reason I can see for the sun to make this distinctly odd appearance in the simile of pāda a is to prepare us for its implicit appearance in the second hemistich. With Ge I assume that the subject of the loc. absol. in c is the sun, which is born every day, and whose “birth” at dawn sets the early morning ritual in motion, the rite at which the dakṣiṇās are distributed. Ge suggests that *jāté jānamāne* is metri causa for an āmreḍita *jāté-jāte*, but this seems unlikely. This is the only occurrence of the middle participle to *jāna-* and indeed one of the only middle forms of this rare 1st class pres. stem (most of the others are *-anta* 3rd plurals that are re-marked actives; see Jamison “Voice Fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural *-anta* in Active Paradigms”, *IIIJ* 21 [1979] 146-69). I would hesitate to suppose that a Rigvedic poet would create a new participial stem simply to avoid a metrical problem. Instead I think he is making a temporal point: the sun has

been born previous (*jāté*) and when he is *being* born again, that is, at the moment the ritual commences, we think about the goods that will come to us in the ritual.

Note that *bhākṣata* of the first hemistich is reprised by a nominal derivative of \sqrt{bhaj} , *bhāgām*, in the second, and that the “goods” that need to be supplied in ab are present as *vāsūni* in c. This interdependence of the two half-verses supports the notion that the *sūryam* of a is a pretaste of the unexpressed sun of c. The next pragātha, vss. 5–6, may show the same covert interdependence; see disc. ad 5c.

VIII.99.4: The meaning and root etymology of the first compound member *ánarśa-* are very uncertain; see EWA s.v. *arśasānā-*. It is here translated as if it belongs to a putative root $\sqrt{arś} / \sqrt{rś}$ ‘harm’; see the disc. of *ánarśani* ad VIII.32.2. By contrast, Ge’s “der seine Gaben nicht verschliesst” rests on his tentative connection of it with Lat. *arceō* ‘keep close, confine’. A contrastive pair qualifying *rātí-* ‘present’ as ‘not harmful’ (pāda a) (but) ‘beneficial’ (*bhadrá-*, pāda b) is rhetorically more satisfying than ‘not shut, closed’ / ‘beneficial’, though I confess that “not harmful (but) beneficial” seems somewhat flat-footedly obvious for a Rigvedic poet.

Whose mind is being bestirred to give in pāda d? I assume that it is Indra’s, whose gifts are celebrated in the first hemistich, as well as in the previous verse (3), with which this verse is paired in the pragātha. But Ge, followed by Gotō (1987: 276), takes it as the patron’s, supplying “(des Gönners).” Although for my interpretation I might prefer a middle form rather than the act. part. *codāyan* and although I.48.4 (not adduced by Ge) ... *yuñjáte máno dānāya sūrāyaḥ* gives some support for his tr., most instances of *dānāya* involve gods (esp. Indra) as giver, esp. in VIII, but also, e.g., I.55.7 *dānāya mánah somapāvan astu te* “Let your [=Indra’s] mind be on giving, soma-drinker.”

VIII.99.5–6: This pragātha is tightly bound lexically. Note first *vīśvāḥ spṛdhaḥ* in both 5a and 6c. But more striking are the six occurrences of the root \sqrt{tar} : *prātūrṭiṣu* (5a), (*vīśva-*)*tūr* (5c), *tūrya taruṣyataḥ* (5d), *turāyantam* (6a), *tūrvasi* (6d). In this group not a single stem is repeated: there are two different nominal stems and four different verbal stems. (See also *átūrtam* in 7d, to yet another stem.) On the formulaic use of this root and its Indo-European background, see Watkins, *Dragon* 344–46.

VIII.99.5: The lexeme *abhí* $\sqrt{bhū}$ ‘dominate’, in play in the previous two hymns (VIII.97.9c, 10a, 98.2a, 5ab), is matched by synonymous *abhí* \sqrt{as} here. See also VIII.100.4 in the next hymn.

Ge renders the phrase *aśastihā janitā* as “der die Hohnreden niederschlägt und hervorruft”; that is, he construes the 1st compound member *aśasti-* also with *janitā*, flg. Sāy’s gloss of *janitā* as *asurebhyo ‘śastīnām janayitā*, and also ascribes an aberrant meaning to \sqrt{jan} , ‘call out, evoke’. It is certainly true that the normal value of \sqrt{jan} , ‘beget’, seems somewhat out of place in this otherwise hostile context, but I am reluctant to push both the syntax and the semantics as far as Ge’s interpretation requires. I think rather that Indra’s general positive role as cosmic begetter is being alluded to, in addition to his specific role as all-victorious dominator. In fact, the paired verse in this pragātha may give us the clue. In 6ab Heaven and Earth (the underlying referents of the dual *kṣoṇī*) run after Indra “like two parents after their child” (*śísuṃ ná mātārā*), which reverses an image found elsewhere of Indra as the begetter of Heaven and Earth, as in

VIII.36.4 *janitā divó janitā prthivyāḥ*. In other words, I think we should read *janitā* in 5c pregnantly, as “begetter (of Heaven and Earth)” in opposition to 6ab, where Indra is the child and Heaven and Earth the parents. Alternatively, the pregnant usage might be “begetter (of all),” with *viśva-* borrowed from the first member of the following compound *viśvatūr*. Watkins (*Dragon*, 345) roughly follows the Ge interpretation, though with more persuasive semantics: “you smash the un-song (for the loser) and engender (it for the winner)”; presumably the parenthetic “it” should be not the “un-song,” but its denegated counterpart, *śastī-* ‘laud, praise’.

I tr. *taruṣyant-* as a pseudo-desiderative, contra Ge (Wettstreiter, sim. Gr). The stem is a hapax, and its formation isn’t entirely clear. But the most orthodox way to explain it is as a denominative to *tárus-*, ‘power/desire to overcome’; since ‘seeking’ is a standard sense associated with *-yá-*denominatives, a desiderative sense is certainly possible.

VIII.99.6: Following Thieme (KZ 92 [1978] 46), *kṣoni-* is literally a ‘shout’ or ‘war-cry’. But in the dual it evolves to refer to Heaven and Earth, presumably by way of the long semantic chain ‘(two) opposing war-cries’ → ‘opponents’ → complementary pair → the archetypal complementary pair, i.e. Heaven and Earth.

Though both duals, *pítārā* and *mātārā*, can refer to both parents, it is surely no accident that in this tender image of childhood it’s literally “the two mothers” rather than “the two fathers” who pursue the errant toddler.

With Gr and Old I read **śrathayanta* for *śnathayanta* (√ *śnath* ‘pierce’), flg. Sāy and the Kashmir ms; see Old ad loc. Although Ge retains *śnathayanta*, in his note he allows for the possibility of the variant reading. As Old points out, the rhyming *śnath* form could have been introduced because of the mention of enemies.

VIII.99.7–8: The verb *havāmahe* of 8c must be read with both verses (so also Ge) and is a mark of the unity of the pragātha. This pragātha is, furthermore, cunningly constructed, with a number of rhetorical pairs: variants on “X and non-X” are found in 7b *prahetāraṃ āprahitam* and 8a *iṣkartāraṃ āniṣkṛtam*, both pairs with the same morphological structure; adjacent rhyming agent nouns *jētāraṃ* and *hētāraṃ* in 7c join the other two agent nouns just cited, though with different accent; the negated ppl. *ātūrtam* in 7d (whose root links it to vss. 5–6) matches previously cited *āprahitam* and *āniṣkṛtam*; there are several pairs of adjacent compounds with one identical member: *āniṣkṛtaṃ sáhaskṛtam* (8a) and *śatāmūtiṃ śatákratum* (8b), as well as the pair *vásavānaṃ vasūjívam* (8d) with the first an *-āna-*formation built to *vasu-* with full-grade of the suffix (for which type see AiG II.2.275); and the second member of *śatām-ūtim* (8b) picks up *ūtī* (7a), whatever the source of the latter (see below). It may also be that the sequence in 7c ... *jētāraṃ hētāraṃ rathītāmam* playfully evokes a sequence of two comparatives in *-tara-* culminating in a superlative.

The phrase *itá ūtī* (also, as *itá ūtīḥ* I.119.8, I.130.5) cannot be separated from the compound *itáūti-* (6x). The latter has an apparent Old Avestan cognate *utaiiūiti-* ‘youthfulness’, probably containing a **yūti-* related to *yúvan-* ‘youth’. The Vedic compound clearly lost its transparency and has undergone some deformation, resulting, finally, in the folk-etymology “help from here / from then on” represented by the phrasal *itá ūtī-*. Both the compound and the phrase can co-occur with *ajāra-* ‘unaging’ as here; see

also I.146.2, X.31.7. For disc. and lit. see EWA s.v. *itáūti-*. Here in this Anhangslied it is likely that *ūtī-* ‘help’ has captured the de-compounded phrase, but that the phrase is still associated with the notion of constancy, hence my compromise “with enduring help.” Ge tr. “zu eurem unmittelbaren (immediate) Beistand,” but in n. allows “den durch Fortdauer (oder Verjüngung) Alterlosen.”

VIII.100 Indra

On the hymn in general see the publ. intro., as well as Old (*Noten* ad loc. and “Indra, Vāyu, der Vṛtrakampf und die Erschaffung der Sprache” [pp. 54–60 in “Ākhyāna Hymnen im Ṛigveda,” *ZDMG* 39 (1885): 52–90 = *KISch.* 474–512]) and Ge’s long and rather despairing intro.

VIII.100.1–2: As I argue in the publ. intro., the heavy emphasis on Indra’s designating a portion of soma at the beginning of the sacrifice for “you,” the speaker of vs. 1, points strongly at Vāyu as this speaker, rather than Viṣṇu, as Ge suggests. Old also considers it an Indra-Vāyu dialogue.

VIII.100.1: I take *ḍīdharah* as the subjunctive of the redupl. aor., whose indicative forms are generally athematic (*ḍīdhar*, etc., though cf. augmented thematic *ádīdharat* in the very late hymn X.173.3). The sequence *yadā ... ḍīdharah ..., ād íd ... kṛṇavaḥ* with aorist subjunctive in the protasis and present subjunctive in the apodosis seems a rough-and-ready attempt to express anteriority (“when you will [have] ..., only after that will you ...”) in a language that does not, as far as I can see, have either a formalized system of sequence of tense in conditionals or a standard way to express anteriority with *finite* verb forms (as opposed to participles and, somewhat later, the gerund).

VIII.100.2: Ge (followed by Klein, DGRV I.242, II.108) takes pāda c as a subordinated conditional clause with d, with the subordination marked by *ca* (i.e., “if you will be my comrade, then we will ...”). This is certainly possible, but it is impossible to tell formally if c is subordinated to d or coordinated with b (as I take it) because the accent on the verb *āsaḥ* can result from its initial position. Perhaps in favor of the Ge/Klein interpretation is the fact that both c and d contain subjunctives, while b has an imperative. On the other hand, in a related passage (also adduced by Ge), the two expressions are parallel, not in a subordinate/main clause relation: X.83.7 ... *dakṣiṇatō bhavā me, ādhā vṛtrāṇi jaṅghanāva bhūri* “Be on my right side. Then we two will keep smiting obstacles in abundance.”

VIII.100.3: Despite the gender, I take the second *satyām* in pāda b as equated with Indra, contrary to Ge, who interprets it implicitly as referring to the true praise (*stómam ... satyām*) earlier in the hemistich or to truth in general: “... ein Loblied ..., ein wahrhaftes, wenn es Wahrheit ist.” Lüders (*Varuṇa*, 639) argues convincingly that the second hemistich supports the reference of the conditional clause in b, *yádi satyām ásti*, to Indra and tr. “wenn er wirklich ist” (somewhat different tr. p. 566).

VIII.100.4: Indra clearly announces his epiphany, after the doubts expressed in vs. 3.

The opening *ayám asmi* echoes the opening words of the hymn (1a) *ayám ta emi*.

vīśvā jātāny abhy āsmi is reminiscent of vs. 5 in the preceding hymn, VIII.99.5b *abhī vīśvā asi spṛdhaḥ*, and belongs to the formula *abhī√bhū/as* found in this group of hymns. See disc. add VIII.99.5.

On *ṛtāsya ... pradīśaḥ* see Lü (Varuṇa, 566–67), who considers them to be *Lieder*.

The duplication of intensive forms in nominal *ādardirāḥ ... dardarīmi* is taken by Ge (also Lü, 566–67) as merely an etymological figure (esp. clear in Lü’s “zerschmetternd zerschmetterte ich...”). This is of course possible, but I wonder if the preverb of the nominal form does not signal more. The lexeme *ā√dṛ* is often used for breaking open cowpens and tearing out the cattle, esp. in the Vala myth (cf., e.g., III.30.21), and so Indra may be not only announcing his current actions but also alluding to his regular mythological role as opener of the Vala cave full of cows.

VIII.100.5: For my view of the complexities of the participants in this verse, see the publ. intro. I take the speaker to be Indra, the immediate addressee to be the singer (speaker of vs. 3), and the addressees of the speech recounted in pāda d to be the Maruts.

One of the first difficulties in this verse is the perennial mystery word *venā-*, which I render ‘tracker, seeker’. The word is esp. associated with X.123, to which the Anukramaṇī assigns Vena as both poet and deity. There *venā-* is singular, not plural as here. In the singular Vena appears to be identified with the sun and/or Soma; in the plural (see esp. IX.85.10–11) the word often seems to refer to poets or their hymns. That seems to be the case here: the trackers of truth are poets or their products, then probably further identified with the Maruts, who are also the referents of *sākhāyaḥ* in pāda d, in my view. The use of *venā-* to refer both to the deity and his/its praisers presumably rests in part on the reciprocal relationship between them and also perhaps on the notion that just as the deity is sought by those below him, so he also is pursuing something higher.

Both in the singular and the plural *venā-* is associated with heights. Here the trackers “mounted” (*āruhan*) to Indra; cf. the same root in I.56.2 *girīm nā venā ādhi roha téjasā*. The heights are indicated in various ways. In IX.85.9–10 a bull mounts heaven and then the Venas milk him, who is standing on a mountain (*giriṣṭhām*) in the vault of heaven (*divó nāke*), and this vault is mentioned in the remaining two verses of the Vena section of this hymn (IX.85.11–12). The vault recurs in the Vena hymn (X.123.6, 7), probably also as “the highest distant heaven” (*paramé vyòman* 5b), and there are other indications of a high position: some female figures bestride “the back of truth” (*ṛtāsya sánau* 3c, also 2c) while poets mount on the stream (*síndhum* 4c). In particular in X.123.2b we find the same phrase *prṣṭhām haryatāsya* “the back of the delightful one” as in our 5b, where Indra is seated thereon.

The question is who or what is the “delightful one.” Ge supplies “heaven,” Lü (567) simply tr. *haryatāsya* as “Himmel,” and Old (1885: 56–57) as “Weltall.” I am dubious about this rendering; although *divāḥ* is found with *prṣṭhā-* on a number of occasions, *haryatā-* never qualifies ‘heaven’, but is regularly used of soma, and in fact in X.123.2 Ge thinks that soma is the referent. However, it is perhaps difficult to imagine Indra sitting on soma’s (or Soma’s) back (such is apparently Ge’s objection in his n.), and so it is possible that this is a reference to one of Indra’s fallow bay horses *hāri-*. In V.61.2 *prṣṭhé sádah* “the seat on the back” refers to the Maruts’ seat on the back of their horses. Hence the tentative bracketed identifications in the publ. tr. “[=fallow bay / soma?].” Perhaps best is to combine these two possibilities – the real referent is soma, as signalled

by *haryatá-*, but since sitting on a liquid is hard to envision, the soma is made conceptually solid by configuring it as a horse, mediated through the common use of the color term *hári-* for soma; cf., e.g., IX.65.25 *haryató háriḥ*.

In c the Pp. reads dat. *hrdé*, followed by Ge., but I prefer the ablative since *hrdá ā* with underlying ablative is an idiom and used in similar contexts with verbs of speaking (cf. II.35.2 *imām sv āsmai hrdá ā sūtaṣṭam, mántram vocema ...* “This well-crafted spell we would speak to him from our heart”).

The possessive adj. *śísūmantah* appears to introduce a child or children that seem to have no place here. I follow Lü’s (567 n. 3) idea that the *-mant-* suffix functions here as the neut. sg. *-vát* sometimes does, as a simile marker “my comrades *like* children,” not “my comrades along with their children.” The *-mant-* for *-vant-* would of course be by rule after a stem ending in *-u-*. Considerably more problematic is the precise form: ordinarily these *-vant-* simile forms are adverbial neuters and show accent shift to the suffix, so *-vát* (e.g., *manuṣvát* ‘like Manu’, *jamadagnivát* ‘like Jamadagni’). Here we have a case form (nom. pl.) and no accent shift. However, Whitney (§1233f) allows for a sense ‘like to, resembling’ for some *-vant-* stems, and therefore, though Lü’s interpretation may be a bit over-tricky, I follow it since I think it gives better sense. Support for this interpretation is found in the parallel IX.74.1 *śísur ná ... cakradat* “like a child he has cried out” with a verb built to the same stem as in our passage *ácikradañ chíśūmantah ...*

VIII.100.6: Here the singer of vs. 3 seems to be convinced by Indra’s assertions in vss. 4–5 and promises a proper recital of Indra’s deeds, in contrast to the conditional praise of vs. 3.

I take *pārāvataṁ* in c as a vṛddhi adjective derived from *parāvát-* ‘distance’, rather than as a PN as Ge does (flg. Sāy, followed tentatively by Mayrhofer, *Personennamen* s.v.). As an adj. it works nicely with *purusambhṛtām* ‘brought together by many’, and there is no other mention of human opponents in this hymn.

VIII.100.7–9: I take these three Anuṣṭubh verses as the singer’s performance of the recital of deeds promised in 6ab, but cast in the language of dramatic immediacy – almost “you are there” – with the singer himself as the supposed witness, addressing the waters in 7ab. Ge (in his intro.) also seems to assign the verses to the singer, while Old (1885: 57 n. 2) refuses to speculate.

VIII.100.8: The stealing of the soma treated here logically precedes the outcome of the Vṛtra battle treated in 7 and 9, since Indra needed to drink the soma in order to fight Vṛtra, as is well known. I suggest that the theft is intercalated here, between two hemistichs about the *vájra-* (7cd, 9ab), not only because Rigvedic narratives are famously shattered chronologically, but also to play a trick. The *vájra-* was let fly (a in 7d (*apīpataḥ*); in the next half-verse (8ab) the unspecified subject goes at the speed of thought. The default assumption would be that it is the flying mace, but cd disappoints our expectations by introducing the bird and the familiar soma-theft.

VIII.100.9: The poet now plays another trick. The first pāda “within the sea he/it lies” (*samudré antāḥ śayate*) returns us to the Vṛtra myth and, we would think, to Vṛtra, who,

in the most famous treatment of the myth, I.32, lies ($\sqrt{śi}$, Vṛtra's signature verb there) submerged in water after his smiting (e.g., I.32.8 ... *amuyā śāyānam ... āti yanty āpaḥ* "The waters go across him lying in that way"). Here we have both the signature verb and the water – but it's the *vāja* that is lying in the water, not Vṛtra, as we discover in the next pāda. Moreover, in that pāda the mace is 'covered' (*abhīṣṭaḥ*) with water, using the same root (at least synchronically, whatever its source) as the transitive verb expressing Vṛtra's obstruction of the waters in 7b (*āvīvarīt*). Both forms of course also evoke Vṛtra himself, "obstruction" embodied. As far as I know, this image of the submerged mace receiving tribute from the waters is found nowhere else in the Vṛtra myth complex, and seems to have been invented here for the purpose of verbal trickery.

VIII.100.10–11: For the possible mythological background of these verses, as adumbrated by Old, see the publ. intro.

VIII.100.10: Ge is understandably reluctant to construe *avicetanāni* with *vādantī*, since this attributes unintelligible speech to Speech herself, but his solution, to construe the neut. pl. loosely with *niṣasāda* ("... sich bei den unvernünftigen (Geschöpfen) niederliess"), does not work syntactically. Old's mythological explanation is preferable.

VIII.100.12: For my hypothesis about the relevance of this verse to the rest of the hymn see the publ. intro. The verse is consciously modeled on vs. 2: the voc. *sákhe* in a picks up *sákhā* of 2c; *hánāva vṛtrám* in c echoes *vṛtrāṇi jañghanāva bhūri*. But, at least in my view and Old's (though not Ge's), the two addressees are not the same: Vāyu in 2 and Viṣṇu in 12. As I argued in the publ. intro. Viṣṇu may have been introduced here because his association with three may allow him to represent the Third Pressing in this hymn-length sketch of the ritual day. And, also presented in the intro., the apparent superimposition of Viṣṇu on Vāyu via the close similarity of vss. 2 and 12 may have been an attempt to integrate the newly ascendant god Viṣṇu into the older inherited religion in which Vāyu is prominent.

VIII.101 Various gods

VIII.101.1: The first word of the hymn, *īdhak* 'separately, one by one', may be stationed there to indicate that the hymn (or hymn collection; see publ. intro.) to follow praises a number of gods individually, who collectively are summed up in *devātātaye* 'for the conclave of the gods' at the end of the same hemistich.

VIII.101.2: The abstract *bāhūtā* 'arm-ness' or 'collectivity of arms' occurs twice in the RV (otherwise in I.41.2). I think it must refer to the quintessential quality of arms, namely strength (see *bāhv-ōjas* 'having the strength of arms, armstrong'). Here, in the simile I think the point is that Mitra and Varuṇa guide the chariot with their supernatural skill (*daṃsānā*) as if with physical arms, the tools that less exalted charioteers would use. The arms of the two gods are found in the next pragātha, 4d.

VIII.101.4: I take *tāsmāt* as referring to the unnamed weapon, coreferential with *yāḥ* in the rel. cl., and ascribe its ablative form to case attraction to infinitival *sāmṛteḥ*. The

weapon is probably the *śāru-* ‘arrow’ associated with the Ādityas in VIII.18.11, 67.15, 20, as Ge notes. It might therefore have been better to tr. *yāḥ* in pāda a as ‘which one’ not the animatized ‘who’.

As disc. ad IV.18.2, I would now render *sām* √*prch* as ‘consult with’ and change the tr. accordingly: “to consult.”

VIII.101.5: This verse contains two minor disharmonies: 1) the recipients of the praise song are in the dat. in pāda a (*mitrāya ... aryamṇé*) but the loc. in cd (*vāruṇe ... rājasu*); 2) the verb is 2nd plural (*prā ... gāyata*) but paired with a vocative in the singular, the hapax *ṛtāvasaḥ*. Ge separates the vs. into abc and d, supplying a verb (“(trage) ... vor”) with the former. This solves the number problem, by isolating the plural verb in a separate clause, but not the case problem. Moreover, since the hymn is composed in pragāthas, I would prefer to construe the doubled *prā* in a with the impv. *gāyata* in d, for a meta-pun on the name of the verse pairing. Chopping the verse into two clauses is not appealing, particularly since it only addresses one of the disharmonies, in my opinion the lesser one.

As for *ṛtāvaso*, Re suggests that *ṛtāvasu* [*sic*] is a simple variant of *ṛtāvan-* (or, better formulated, voc. *ṛtāvaso* is a simple variant of voc. *ṛtāvaḥ* (/ -vo) to the stem *ṛtāvan-*). This seems somewhat convincing. As a 2nd member of bahuvrīhis of the shape X-*vasu-*, the noun *vāsu-* can become semantically bleached, from ‘having X as goods’ to ‘rich in X’ and even further to just ‘having X’. Cf. the pair *vibhāvan-* / *vibhāvasu-*. The Vedic voc. in -*vas* to -*van*-stems makes the singular vocatives even more similar; to the just-cited pair, compare *vibhāvo* [before vd. sounds] and *vibhāvaso*, with the latter offering a convenient way to generate a Jagatī/iambic cadence from a Triṣṭubh. This does not solve our number problem, however; it is unfortunately altogether too artificial to suggest that a singular vocative to the -*van*- stem, *ṛtāvaḥ* (<-*vas*), was reinterpreted as belonging to a real *s*-stem and a plural voc. in *-*vasas* (/ -vaso) was built to it. The existence of clearly singular *vibhā-vaso* (4x) beside singular *vibhāvo* (1x) shows that the morphology was still intact. I would point out, however, that there is no way to produce a plural voc. to either the -*van*- stem or the -*vasu*- stem that will fit in a cadence, either Triṣṭubh or Jagatī: *ṛtāvānaḥ* and *ṛtāvasavaḥ* are both out. It is therefore possible that the hapax *ṛtāvaso* was a quick-and-dirty fix for the metrical problem. Or else it represents the not rare situation of a poet addressing himself in the singular but his fellow singers in the plural. I would also point out that *vāsu* occurs pāda-final in the next verse (6a) and du. voc. *vājīnīvasū* pāda-final in 8b. Ge, by the way, tr. *ṛtāvaso* as a PN (though allowing for the lexical value in his n.); this doesn’t help one way or the other and can, I think, be dismissed.

I do not understand the change in case from dat. to loc. either. The verb √*gā* (+/-*prā*) elsewhere takes only dat., never loc., as far as I know. It might be possible to take the locatives as functionally different from the datives -- “chez or bei Varuṇa (and) the kings.” But since Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman are an almost inseparable trio and Mitra and Aryaman are in the dative in pāda a, it is highly unlikely that Varuṇa would be functionally separate from them in this verse. And it is insulting to the grammatical knowledge of our poet even to suggest that *vāruṇe* owes its ending to a superficial matching with *aryamṇé* two pādas before, particularly since *rājasu* with a non-rhyming loc. ending follows soon after. I think the poet changed cases just because he thought he could and craved a bit of novelty. For another tricky problem of case, see 8ab below.

VIII.101.6: The identity of the three mothers of Agni, the likely referent of the acc. phrases in ab, isn't clear. Ge suggests the three Opfergöttinnen (Idā, Sarasvatī, Bharatī) of the Āprī hymns. Agni is called *trimātār-* in III.56.5, but the three are not identified there either. Since our vs. is the 2nd vs. in a pragātha whose 1st vs. concerns the Ādityas, esp. Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, I am inclined to think that these three male deities have been slotted into the “three mothers” role just here because of the coincidence of the numbers.

The Pp reads masc. nom. pl. *amṛtāḥ* in c, and Ge so tr. (“Die unbetörten Unsterblichen beobachten das Tun der Sterblichen”). Against the Pp I take it as neut. pl. *amṛtā*; the sandhi situation allows either, of course. Ge's tr. assumes that the *dhāmāni* belong to mortals, but wherever it's possible to tell, *dhāman-* is something belonging to gods. Cf. also III.55.10 *dhāmāni amṛtā*.

VIII.101.8: The apparent doubling of the du. pronouns *vām ... yuvābhyām* is complicated by the fact that at least the second one violates the usual case frame of the verb. Pāda a contains the verb *hāvāmahe* and an undoubted acc. obj., the inanimate *rātīm* ‘giving’, as well as an animate pronoun *vām*, which could be acc., gen., or dat. This 2nd du enclitic is matched by tonic 2nd du *yuvābhyām* in pāda b, which can be instr. or dat. (Note in passing that Macdonell [VGS, p. 105; VG p. 300] only allows instr. for this form, but there is at least one undoubted dat. example elsewhere, I.109.4, as well as several of nearly identical *yuvābhyām*. Cf. AiG III.464, which points out that the older instr. form was *yuvā*, which is preserved in cmpds like *yuvā-datta*.)

The only case intersection between *vām* and *yuvābhyām* is dative, but there is no standard case-frame idiom with $\sqrt{hvā}$ with the structure “call for (s.o. dat.) for (s.th. acc).” Gr classifies the passage under his no. 8, “etwas [A] erbitten,” thus eliding the pronoun(s) entirely under this rubric, though in the lemma he cites it as *rātīm vām*, including the enclitic but not the more intractable tonic form. Ge. takes *vām* as gen., and declares in his n. 8ab that *yuvābhyām* is also “in Sinn des Gen.,” which would be convenient but is remarkably cavalier about morphology. A further complication is that pāda b is a repeated pāda (=VIII.5.3 -- not registered in Bloomfield's Rig-Veda Repetitions). The case value of *yuvābhyām* in VIII.5.3 isn't entirely clear, but the context is probably compatible with a dative, but not with either instr. or gen. -- an acc. might be the best.

I confess I don't entirely know what to make of this. There are no standard uses of $\sqrt{hvā}$ that take a personal dative, though inanimate datives abound. I am inclined to take pāda a as containing a double acc. (with *vām* in acc. function): “call you two for giving.” The *yuvābhyām* in the next pāda could be the result of repeating this short pāda from elsewhere without integrating it into the syntactic frame of the rest, or show the case variation (what we might call “case creep”) observed also in vs. 5, with the poet inventing an idiom “call for s.o. (dat.)” based on other verbs of speaking, like \sqrt{vac} , which can take either acc. or dat. of the addressee.

Another slight oddity in the first pāda is the characterization of the gods' giving as *arakṣās-* ‘undemonic’. I have softened this somewhat to ‘without animus’; Ge tr. ‘ohne Falsch’, which seems more distant from the literal sense of the stem.

VIII.101.9: With Gr I take *sumánmabhiḥ* as a bahuvrīhi, contra Ge’s karmadhāraya “mit guten Gedanken” (though he allows the other alternative in n. 9b). This stem is attested in the nom. sg. masc. in VII.68.9 and therefore must be a bahuvrīhi, since *mánman-* is neut., and the parallel *durmánas-* (2x) is found only in the masc. and so must be a bahuvrīhi as well.

Against Ge, I take the second hemistich as referring to two different soma drinks, the one mixed with milk in c, the pure one in d. The offering of two types of soma is made clear in 10cd; note esp. the ‘both’ of c, *ubháyasya naḥ piba* “drink of both of ours,” which is immediately followed by the definitional d, *śúcim* [matching *śukráḥ* in our 9d] *sómaḥ gávāśīram* [matching *śrīṇānāḥ* in our 9c] “the pure soma (and) the one mixed with milk.” In 9c the present participle *śrīṇānāḥ* “*is being mixed*” (my italics) makes it clear that it is not yet ready to be offered, whereas the pure soma (in d) has just that moment been offered, as the passive aor. *ayāmi* indicates. This reflects the ritual procedure whereby Vāyu is first offered pure soma.

Assuming that my separation of c and d is correct, this adds another ex. of a predicated non-past participle to the dossier.

Note the phonetic figure *ayām ... ayāmi*.

VIII.101.11–12: As noted in the publ. intro., the banality of these vss. is a surprising aberration in RVic style. I will note that pāda-final *mahāṁ asi* “you are great,” found 5x in these two vss. (once mid-pāda), is something of a signature of the late VIIIth Maṇḍala (60.6, 19; 64.2, 95.4, 98.2), though it’s found occasionally elsewhere.

VIII.101.12: Presumably the sun’s light is ‘undeceivable’ (*adābhyām*) because the sun is witness to everything.

VIII.101.13: The referent of the fem. sgs. in this vs. is not entirely clear. Ge interprets it as the offering spoon or the butter offering, Old as the cow. I think Ge’s 2nd alternative is correct, with *āhuti-* or a similar fem. noun as the word underlying. Pāda b, “her form is created by a/the ruddy (cow),” because butter is a milk product. (Ge supplies ‘flame’ rather than ‘cow’ with *róhinyā*, but *róhiṇī* elsewhere refers to cows [see nearby VIII.93.13].) Pāda c is more or less VII.81.1a *práty u adarśy āyatī*, and since the referent there is Dawn, the simile *citréva* (i.e., *citrā iva*) must be comparing the bright butter offering (bright because it is whitish yellow or because it makes the fire brighter) to Dawn. As for the ten arms, Old and Ge both suggest that these are the arms of the five Adhvaryus. However, it seems possible to me that we’re dealing with body-part inflation, and the ten “arms” are the ten fingers (of a single priest) regularly referred to in ritual contexts.

VIII.101.14: This difficult and enigmatic vs. is found in slightly variant form in the AV in the mystical skambha hymn X.8.3, is repeated in other Vedic texts, and receives an explanation in ŚB II.5.1.4–5. The interpr. of the verse in this context here has been influenced by its later deployments, esp. the ŚB exegesis — in my opinion misleadingly. The ŚB takes it to refer to the passing of generations or races, expressed by the *prajāḥ ... tisráḥ* of pāda a, and this basic understanding is reproduced by Ge and by Re (Hymnes

spéculatifs 165, though of AV X.8.3, not the RVic passage). Old sensibly disdains tr. and explanation (“Erklärung dieser Mystik versuche ich nicht.”).

I think the vs. must be taken within its RVic context, which is ritualistic; it is paired in its pragātha with vs. 13, a depiction of the butter offering. Although in the first 3 pādas the wording is obscure, the final pāda seems to suggest the solution to the mystery, in that its first word *pāvamānaḥ* ‘self-purifying’ can hardly refer to anything but soma. (It is probably not an accident that in the reuse of this verse in the AV pāda d is quite different [*hārīto hārīṇīr ā viveśa*] and does not contain the telltale word.) The identity of the *harītaḥ* is less secure. In the publ. tr. I follow Ge in supply ‘flames’, but this is ritually problematic: soma doesn’t seem to be offered into the fire. Maṇḍala IX twice refers to *harīto dāśa* “ten tawny ones” (IX.63.9, 69.9), which appear to be the fingers of the ritual officiant. I would now emend the translation to “has entered within the tawny (fingers),” pointing out that “with the ten arms” of 13d may refer to the same phenomenon.

Guided by the clinching word *pāvamānaḥ* in pāda d, an interpr. grounded in soma ritual fits pāda a very well. The most important clue is the compound VP *atyāyam īyuh* “have made their traversal”; the lexeme *āti √ i* ‘go across’ is regularly used of soma’s trip across the filter (IX.85.9 *pāvitrām āty eti*, etc.). The three *prajāḥ* can be the three soma pressings (or perhaps the soma for the first three soma cups); soma drinks are called *prajā divyāsya rétasah* “the offspring of the heavenly semen” in IX.86.28, a hymn that contains several passages (IX.86.14, 39, 45) in which soma is “fitted into among the worlds/creatures” (*bhúvaneṣv árpitaḥ*), similarly to our pāda c *bhúvaneṣv antāḥ*.

The relevance of pāda b to the soma theme is less clear to me. By my rules, *anyāḥ* should be definite “the others” (contrary to the standard rendering “others”) and contrastive to the three offspring of pāda a. I am not sure what “the others” would be (though presumably some other set of soma drinks), nor what “settling down around the chant” would involve. As for pāda c, I’ve already pointed out soma’s position *bhúvaneṣu* elsewhere, and the towering quality of cosmic soma is also emphasized elsewhere.

I do not feel I have solved all the problems with this verse, but the lexical clues of pādas a and d seem to me to anchor it in a soma context, with this ritual context reinforced by its pragātha twin.

VIII.101.15: Note the phonetic figure in pāda d *mā gām (á)nāgām*.

VIII.101.16: According to the transmitted text, this hymn ends on a downbeat: the small-witted man (*dabhrācetāḥ*), the last word of the hymn, has taken possession (*avṛkta*) of the cow that has been so extravagantly praised in vss. 15–16, whose right to safety was proclaimed to “observant people” or “the observant man” (*cikítuṣe jánāya* 15c), the opposite of the small-witted man of 16d. This sad finale seems unlikely to me, and a small emendation to the text will change the tone entirely. Instead of *ā māṁvṛkta* at the beginning of pāda d, I suggest reading **mā mā vṛkta*. The second part, *mā vṛkta*, instead of the Pp. *mā avṛkta*, does not alter the Saṃhitā text. As for reading the prohibitive negative *mā* for preverb *ā*, note that the preceding pāda ends with *gām*, and in the sequence ... *gām mā* the pāda-spanning -m m- could well have been degeminated. The posited **mā* may or may not also contain the preverb *ā*. Since *√ vṛj* generally appears with a preverb, it probably does. Restoring **mā* also makes the pāda more parallel to 15d *mā gām* ..., which also contains a *mā* prohibitive with a cow as obj.

VIII.102 Agni

VIII.102.2: The standard interpr. are agreed that the referent of the fem. instr. phrase *īlānayā ... duvasyuvā* is some form of speech. This makes sense and is certainly not excluded. However, the only other fem. form of the participle *īlāna-* in V.28.1 refers to the ghee-filled offering ladle, and I therefore prefer that interpr.

VIII.102.7: This vs. consists of two ungoverned sentence fragments, both referring to Agni: an accusative phrase in ab, a dative phrase in c. The former could continue the syntax of the preceding vss., although the intervening *ṛca* boundary makes some difficulties. The dative phrase is entirely untethered except that it adjoins *āchā*, which ordinarily takes the accusative, and the next vs. makes a fresh syntactic start with Agni in the nominative. Ge suggests that there are two Agnis in question in this verse, but this seems to be overthinking it. I think we're dealing with two false starts, with the first perhaps simply carrying on from the previous vs.

VIII.102.8: The lexeme *ā√bhū* generally means 'stand by, be at hand'; this works fine for pāda a, but not so well for pāda b. Neither Ge's "eingehe ... in" nor Re's "s'intègre à" seems to work any better.

VIII.102.11: My construction of this vs. follows Ge's. Re by contrast takes b as a nominal rel. clause and c as the main clause. Since the verb *dīdāya* is initial in its pāda and, as a main-clause verb, could owe its accent to this position, there is no way to tell and no semantic implications. In slight favor of Ge is the fact that *√dī* is frequently construed with the loc., as it would be with *dāmeṣu ā* in b.

VIII.102.13: The standard interpr. take *jāmāyo gīraḥ* as a nominative NP (Ge "die verschwisterten Lobreden"), modified by the intens. part. *dēdīsatīḥ*. Although I see the advantages of this, it leaves the participle with little to do (Ge "die dich herausstreichen," Re "indiquant avec force (leur intention)," Scar (82) "die immer wieder auf dich hinweisen"). I separate *gīraḥ* from *jāmāyaḥ* and take it as the acc. obj. of the intens. participle. The question then is the referent of *jāmāyaḥ* 'kindred, siblings'. I tentatively suggest it is the waters, who appear in the next vs. as ritual actors. The waters are called *jāmī-* elsewhere (I.23.16). Because waters are always gurgling, they can be considered to be the deliverers of hymns.

VIII.102.14: I don't really understand this verse, but it seems to conjoin technical ritual references with an allusion to the myth of Agni's flight and his concealment in the waters -- and these two interpretive strains are somewhat at cross purposes. According to the śrauta sūtras, the darbha grass, that is, the barhis, is gathered into three or more bundles (cf., e.g., MŚS I.1.1.42, ĀpŚS I.4.10, BŚS I.2) in preparation for the sacrifice; hence pādas ab seem to depict a situation in which the preliminaries for the sacrifice have not been performed. This may well be because Agni has fled and so the regular ritual procedures have not been carried out. In c the waters in which Agni hides are said to have set down/deposited his footprint; in other words they have established him within

themselves to hide him. Agni is regularly the obj. of *ní√dhā*, for his *pādam* being set down, see VIII.72.19, III.7.7, I.72.6, etc., and for *ní√dhā* in the context of Agni's concealment X.32.6a *nīdhīyāmānam āpagūlham apsú*. But in ritual context the water's setting down Agni's footprint may refer to the sprinkling of the fire with water after it has been surrounded by barhis (see Ge's n. 14c and Hillebrandt, Rit. Lit. 110), and therefore from a ritual point of view the preparations are proceeding smoothly. The next verse gives support to this alternative.

VIII.102.16: Although the other occurrence of the med. part. *tepāná-* (VIII.60.19) is transitive, a passive interpr. works better here.

The gen. *ghṛtāsya* is best construed with *dhītūbhiḥ* "with visions/thoughts of ghee." Both Ge and Old suggest that this refers to what we would now call "virtual ghee," not the real physical substance -- anticipating the purely mental sacrifice of the last ṛca (19–21). But this ṛca (vss. 16–18) seems otherwise to depict a more standard ritual, and I think it more likely that "with visions of ghee" is a shorthand way of referring both to the physical stimulus of Agni's flame, namely melted butter, and the mental one, the hymns accompanying the libation.

VIII.102.17: It is not clear who the mothers are and whether they are, with Sāy, identified with the gods mentioned in pāda b. Re's "(tels) des mères" seems to follow this interpr., but in his n. he suggests that the mothers are the waters. The mention of the waters in vs. 14 might support this latter alternative, but given the "three (mothers)" of Agni in the preceding hymn, VIII.101.6, which I take to be the (male) gods Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman (see comm. ad loc.), I am inclined towards Sāy's interpr., though it is not clearly reflected in my publ. tr.

VIII.102.19–22: See publ. intro. for my general interpr. of these verses.

VIII.103 Agni

VIII.103.2: Ge takes the verb of ab to be *prá ... tasthau*, with the *tasthau* long postponed to pāda d and pāda c (which has its own verb) parenthetical. This seems too fussy. It is perfectly easy to supply a verb of motion with *prá* in a (so also Re, Kü 464).

VIII.103.3–4: In both these vss. *tmānā* 'by himself' contrasts with the vast number (thousands) that the action of this sole individual wins or prospers.

VIII.103.5: HvN split the hemistich between *vājam* and *ārvatā*, producing two pādas of 11 syllables each. But since the b pāda then has a bad cadence and since the pāda, minus initial *ārvatā*, is found also at I.40.4, where the iambic cadence is fine in a dimeter line, it seems best to follow the standard view that *ārvatā* belongs with pāda a, which is then hypermetric (so Old).

The famous formula "imperishable fame" (*ākṣiti śrávaḥ*) ends the second pāda.

VIII.103.7: Ge/Re take *rathyām* as an adjective with *áśvam* in the simile (e.g., Ge "Wie ein Wagenross ..."). This is possible, if it is derived from the thematic stem *rathyā-*,

rather than *rathī-*, where Gr classifies it. However, the interposition of *gīrbhīḥ* distances it from the simile, and I prefer to take it as the acc. of *rathī-* ‘charioteer’. Agni is often called the charioteer of the sacrifice (etc.), e.g., I.44.2 *ágne rathīr adhvarāṇām*, and his description as “controller of chariots” (*rāthānām yāmam*) a few vss. later (10c) seems like a paraphrase of such a formula. In that case the poetic figures are more complex than the standard interpr.: there is a metaphor (Agni as charioteer), and this metaphorical identification is then compared explicitly in a simile to a horse, which is closely connected conceptually with the charioteer -- a kind of figurative chaining.

The words *toká-* and *tánaya-* regularly appear together; cf., with the same verb as here, the acc. sg. pairing VI.48.10 *pārṣi tokām tánayam*. When ending with *-e* they are typically locatives, as shown by other parallel locatives; cf., e.g., VI.25.4 *toké vā góṣu tánaye yád apsú* (also I.114.8, VI.31.1, 66.8, X.147.3). Here, however, I think they are dual accusatives, as if elliptical duals from a dual dvandva. (That is, *toké tánaye* doesn’t mean “two progenies and two prosperities.”) The presence of *ubhé* ‘both’ serves to mark them as duals (see also I.147.1), since, given the passages just cited, the usual expectation for *toké tánaye* is locative. So also Old and Re, while Ge takes *toké* as du and *tánaye* as loc.: “(Erhalte) beiderlei Samen in der Nachkommenschaft,” a splitting of the usually conjoined phrase that seems very unlikely.

Taking *pārṣi* as the verb governing both *ubhé toké tánaye* (as VI.48.10 strongly encourages us to do) and *rādhah* in d requires slightly different interpretations of the verb. Re, almost predictably, calls it a zeugma.

VIII.103.10: I follow Old, Ge, and Re in taking *āsāva* as the voc. of a (hapax) PN, though it could be simply ‘o presser’ (*ā√su*) as Gr takes it (and perhaps implicitly Mayrhofer, since it does not appear in his PN book). There are no implications either way.

VIII.103.11: Note the playful *úditā ... nīditā veditā*, already pointed to by Old, in which the three rhyming words are grammatically entirely different: fem. loc. sg., neut. acc. pl., and masc. nom. sg. agent noun respectively. The contrastive similarity is underlined by the polarization of the preverbs *úd* and *nī*.

What is being compared to the waves (*ūrmāyaḥ*) in c? Ge supplies “Absichten” (intentions), presumably on the basis of *dhiyā* in d, but the *dhī-* of Agni should not be considered negative or hostile. Re’s suggestion, “flames,” is far more persuasive, but I think this idea should be combined with Old’s view that *ūrmāyaḥ* belongs with both simile and frame. That is, Agni’s flames are already metaphorically waves and then can be compared with real waves. Cf. the cmpd descriptor of Agni in I.58.45 *rúṣad-ūrmi-* ‘possessing gleaming waves’.

VIII.103.12: The *mā* prohibitive here takes an apparent impv. *hṛṇītām* rather than the expected injunctive **hṛṇīta*. KH (94–95) explains this as having an underlying pluti form *hṛṇītā3*, with nasalization in hiatus, hence **hṛṇītā3m̃*, which was misunderstood by the redactors and normalized to *hṛṇītām*. Although I find this explan. rather ad hoc and over-complex, I have nothing better to suggest. I do not, however, subscribe to his notion that because it is built to a pres. stem, it has inhibitive (“let him stop being angry”) rather than prohibitive (“let him not be angry”) value. There is nothing in the hymn up to this point

that would indicate that Agni has anything but benevolent feelings towards us. See IH's work, which refutes Hoffmann's assumption of inhibitive value for pres. injunc. with *mā*.

Pāda-final *eṣāḥ* is less rare than I would have predicted, though the usual position of nom. sg. *eṣā(h)* is pāda initial.

VIII.103.12–13: Both vss. end identically with *svadhvarāḥ*, but in 12c it refers to Agni, in 13d to the weakling (*kīrī-*) who is offering homage to Agni. The use of the same term for both of course implicitly spreads the power and prestige of Agni to his worshiper.

VIII.103.14: On the fem. form *sóbharyāḥ* referring to the poet, see comm. ad VIII.22.15.

Commentary IX

Since all hymns in this maṇḍala are dedicated to Soma Pavamāna, the dedicand will not be identified for each hymn.

In both the publ. tr. and in the comm., I have tried to use lower case soma for the substance and capped Soma for the god, but of course much of the point of the Soma Maṇḍala is that the two cannot be separated. So this convention is not fully workable.

IX.1–67

All hymns in Gāyatrī meter.

IX.1

IX.1.1–2: After establishing the Soma Pavamāna theme in the 2nd pāda of the 1st vs., with the command *pāvasva soma* “purify yourself, Soma,” in the 2nd vs. the poet presents Soma in an expansive role, as demon-smasher (*raṣṣohān-*) and belonging to all domains (*viśvācarṣani-*), while at the same time precisely locating him in his seat on the ritual ground. This juxtaposition of hyper-local, ritually defined technical details and the grandiosely universal is typical of the entire IXth Maṇḍala.

IX.1.2: The adj. *āyohata-* ‘metal-hammered’ occurs twice in the RV (also IX.80.2), both qualifying *yóni-* ‘womb’ and referring to something that contains soma. Old suggests that it refers to a wooden vessel that has been hewn out by a metal blade.

What the instr. *drúṇā* is doing here is unclear to me. This instr. appears 5x in the RV; in the two passages outside of the Soma maṇḍala (V.86.3, VIII.96.11) it appears to refer to an implement with which one accomplishes something -- in the latter passage a paddle to propel a boat to reach the far shore. Of the two other passages in IX, IX.65.6 *drúṇā sadhāsthām āsnuse* is quite similar to this one: “you attain to your seat *drúṇā*,” and in IX.98.2 *īndur abhī drúṇā hitāḥ*, which lacks an overt ‘seat’, the interpr. depends on which root *hitāḥ* is assigned to: $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’ or \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’. In all three soma passages I take *drúṇā* as an implement (a wooden vessel or even a pusher, a paddle) that allows soma to attain its place or (in 98.2, taking *hitā-* to \sqrt{hi}) to be impelled on its way. This is not the standard interpr.; most (see, e.g., Old’s disc.) take it as referring to the wooden cup or vessel that constitutes soma’s “seat” (e.g., Ge “an seinen Platz aus Holz”), but the instr. in such an interpr. is troubling. Re remarks “Instr. un peu rude pour *d° kṛtām*” and renders (ad IX.1.2) IX.65.6 as “placé (sur la cuve faite) en bois.” Though he further remarks “on ne peut parler qu’avec réserve de l’Instr. de matière en véd.,” an instr. of material is essentially the standard interpr. of *drúṇā* in this passage -- one that I would prefer to avoid, though perhaps at the expense of inventing another implement in the soma ritual.

IX.1.3: The aggrandizing of Soma’s role continues here, with 3 superlatives: *varivo-dhātama-* ‘best establisher of the wide realm’, *māmhiṣtha-* ‘most munificent’, and *vṛtra-hāntama-* ‘best smasher of obstacles’ -- the last of course borrowing Indra’s signature epithet, while *māmhiṣtha-* also regularly characterizes Indra. Re suggests that the three represent the three (Dumézilian) functions, but this does not seem particularly

compelling. Vs. 1 also began with two superlatives, *svādiṣṭha*- ‘sweetest’ and *mādiṣṭha*- ‘most exhilarating’, but these are restricted to soma’s ritual role, whereas the three in this vs. attribute universal powers to him.

Pāda c is identical to VIII.103.7d, found in the very last hymn of Maṇḍala VIII, just as this is found in the first hymn of Maṇḍala IX -- so they are adjacent in the Saṃhitā arrangement. But I don’t know what, if anything, to make of this. If this is more than just accident, it would suggest that the compilers selected this particular Gāyatrī hymn to begin IX on the basis of this verbal correspondence.

IX.1.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., the standard clichés of the soma maṇḍala gave way here to more novel material. The involvement of the Daughter of the Sun as purifier of soma is puzzling. Ge suggests (n. 6b) that the Daughter of the Sun, also found in this maṇḍala at IX.72.3, 113.3, is the “Dicht- oder Gesangeskunst,” on what seem to me slender grounds (mostly III.53.15, which is not at all clear). Oberlies’s notion (Relig. RV I.241, 282; II.60) that this locution indicates that Soma comes from heaven to earth at dawn is more plausible -- though it should be kept in mind that Sūryā, the daughter of the Sun, is not the same as Uṣas, Dawn. I would rather suggest that the presence of this figure in this vs., which immediately precedes two vss. metaphorically concerning ‘maidens’ (*yóṣanah*) and ‘unwed girls’ (*agrúvah*), is meant to showcase the mythological marriageable maiden par excellence: Sūryā exists essentially only to get married. Her appearance in this vs. serves as a positive model for the maidens that follow. However, this interpr. does not fit well with my interpr. of the other passages in which she appears in this maṇḍala; see esp. disc. ad IX.72.3.

The referent of *te* has occasioned some discussion. In this hymn the 2nd ps. referent is otherwise always soma, but the acc. *sómam* already appears in the vs. as obj. of *punāti*. The solution adopted by most (see Old’s disc.), which I also subscribe to, is that *te* does refer to soma, but to Soma the god, distinguishing him from soma the liquid, the ritual substance represented by the acc. *sómam*. Ge (n. 6) cites other possibilities that have been suggested -- the ritual patron or Indra -- though he himself accepts the Soma the god hypothesis.

IX.1.7: The adj. *ánu*- ‘delicate, fine’, always in the fem., is used several times of the fingers in their task of pressing soma. Because fingers are, of course, joined in the hand they are also called sisters, as here.

The ‘clash’ (*samaryé*) presumably refers to the pounding of the pressing stones.

IX.1.8: The ‘unwed girls’ are also the fingers alluded to in the preceding vs.: the pl. *agrúvah* is always so used.

In b they are clearly blowing into a musical instrument: *bākura*- is a hapax, a vṛddhi deriv. of *bákura*- also a hapax (I.117.21), used of a musical instrument one blows (*√dham*), as here. Both show non-Indo-Aryan phonology. But what does this have to do with soma preparation? and how can fingers “blow” into a pipe? Ge, ad I.117.21, suggests that the skin pipe is the “bildlicher Ausdruck für die Somapflanze”; perhaps the reference is to the stalk, and perhaps the fingers pressing on the stalk produce a noise similar to a pipe. Or -- perhaps the poet has simply gotten carried away by a picture of festivity, with unmarried girls celebrating at a gathering.

The next question is what to do with the acc. phrase in c. I find it unlikely that the “wild honey” is in apposition to the bag-pipe of b, though Ge seems to take it that way. Re supplies another verb “(elles traient),” whereas I take it as a return to the object of *hinvantī* in pāda a, with b loosely parenthetical. It is “threefold” (*tridhātu*) perhaps in reference to the three soma pressings, or to some other ritual triplet (see Ge’s suggestions n. 8c). For further discussion of *tridhātu ... mādhu* see comm. ad IX.70.8.

IX.1.9: Note the openings of vss. 7–9: 7 *tām īm* / 8 *tām īm* / 9 *abhīm(ām)*.

Pāda c is a slight variant on 1c and sketches a ring.

IX.1.10: As just noted, the last pāda of vs. 9 seems to bring the hymn to a conclusion with a reprise of the end of the 1st vs., even though another vs. follows. Indeed vs. 10 does seem to stand apart from the rest of the hymn, while picking up various elements from it. First, note that though Indra was mentioned in the ring- compositional pādas, 1c *īndrāya pātave sutāḥ*, 9c *sómam īndrāya pātave*, he was absent from the rest of the hymn and his characteristics and deeds assigned to Soma instead. But here he reasserts his role as *vṛtrá*-smasher (b *viśvā vṛtrāṇi jighnate*), posited of Soma in 3b *vṛtrahántamaḥ*, and as giver of bounties (c *maghā ... māmhate*), also posited of Soma in 3b *māmhiṣṭhaḥ*. The superlative *mādiṣṭha*- ‘most exhilarating’, describing the stream of soma in the first pāda of the hymn (1a), returns as the exhilarations of soma (*asyā ... mádeṣu*)(10a) that spur Indra on to his exploits, the signature root *√mad* having been absent for all the rest of the hymn. (This particular ring-compositional effect is obscured in the publ. tr. by my use of ‘raptures’ for *mádeṣu* in 10a.)

IX.2

For the sequence of ideas and actions in this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.2.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn begins with the quintessential command of the Soma maṇḍala: *pávasva* ‘purify yourself’, found in the previous hymn at the beginning of the 2nd pāda (IX.1.1b).

The 2nd word *devavīḥ* ‘pursuing the gods’ also matches up with the previous hymn: IX.1.4 *devānām vītīm*.

The expression “across the filter” is iconically split across the pāda break: *āti, pavítram*.

The last pāda consists of a neat double figure *īndram indo vṛśā viśa*. The play between *īndra*- and *īndu*- ‘drop’ is ubiquitous in the IXth Maṇḍala and is in fact reprised in 9a *indav indrayúḥ*.

IX.2.2: The standard tr. of (*ā*) *vacyasva* (*√vañc*) here is ‘gallop’ (Ge, Re), but the root itself means something like ‘move crookedly’ (see comm. ad III.39.1 *inter alia*). Kulikov (Vedic -*ya*-presents) devotes considerable space to this -*yá*-pres. (218–24), rather desperately attempting to account for its apparent passive accentuation (*vacyáte*). He concludes that the subject of this pres. “always refers to beings set in motion and directed by someone else, not moving on its [*sic*] own,” and was originally the passive counterpart of a posited transitive redupl. pres. ***vívankti* [double star is Kulikov’s]. I find this over-elaborate -- and since the subjects are generally horses, or entities configured as horses,

and since RVic horses have considerable agency of their own with regard to movement -- not terribly convincing. In this particular case, the verb is in the imperative, and it is difficult to see how something incapable of moving on its own could be commanded to do so. Four of the ten occurrences of this pres. stem are imperatival, three of them 2nd sg. as here. (the fourth is 3rd pl.). As discussed ad III.39.1, etc., I consider one of the nuances of this verb to be ‘coil, twist’, and here I see the soma circling and twisting its way into the cup; the preverb *pári* ‘around’ is a regular part of the description of soma’s movements around the filter and into the vessels.

I take the injunc. *sadaḥ* in the sense of an impv.; see KH (Injunk. 263) for this usage of this particular form.

On the *sa*-aor. *ádhuḥṣa-*, here in 3rd sg. mid. *adhukṣata*, see Narten (Sig.Aor. 143–44).

IX.2.3–4: These two vss. introduce the trope of “clothing,” a metaphor for mixing the soma juice with various substances: after the pressing proper the soma is mixed first with water (vs. 3) and then with milk (vs. 4), the latter accounting for the ubiquitous “cows” of the IXth Maṇḍala. Thus, though an expression “clothe himself with cows” initially strikes the inexperienced reader as ludicrous, it makes perfect sense in the tightly constructed verbal realm of the Soma hymns: clothing = mixing and cows = waters.

IX.2.4: What I don’t quite understand is why we have the rather exotic form, a causative future reflexive middle in 4c, *vāsayīsyāse* (lit. ‘you will cause yourself to be clothed’), in contrast to the straightforward *-iṣ*-aor. middle *vasiṣṭa* (‘he has clothed himself’) that corresponds to it in 3c. The need or desire to use the future must have triggered the creation of this baroque form. In this connection it is worth noting that √*vas* ‘clothe’ lacks a standard future in Vedic and, acdg. to Wh Roots, has only one occurrence in ClSk. of a future *vatsyati* -- so perhaps the causative allowed a transparent future to be built more easily. This form (repeated in the identical pāda in IX.66.13) is also the only medial form of the caus. to √*vas* ‘clothe’ in the RV. The question then arises – why is the future so desirable in this context that such morphological shenanigans had to be performed? The clue to the usage may lie in part in the sequencing of the verbs: both b and c are repeated in IX.66.13 (likewise as bc), and so the two clauses form a larger unit and must be evaluated together. The b pāda contains a pres. indic., *āpo arṣanti sīndhavaḥ* “The waters, the rivers rush,” while c contains the causative future under discussion. On the one hand, the future may be signaling that the second action (clothing in milk) will follow the first (clothing in waters); this is of course the normal ritual order. But we should also remember that the future, esp. the finite future, is relatively rare in the RV, and, curiously, it tends to have a more volitional nuance than the subjunctive, with which it competes. A good ex. of this is found in the famous and well-trodden Agni hymn I.1, where in vs. 6 *yád ... dāśúṣe ... bhadraṃ kariṣyāsi* should be rendered “what good thing you *will* do for the pious man,” indicating Agni’s deliberate choice to favor that man. Here I would suggest that Soma is bound and determined to clothe himself with milk at this point in the ritual proceedings; it is not just the next event on the menu.

IX.2.5: This vs. contains several striking paradoxes, once they have been “unpacked.” First, “the sea has been groomed in the waters,” which seems to reverse volume relations:

we would expect “the sea” (*samudrá-*) to be more larger and more extensive than the waters, but evidently the former can be contained and “groomed” (*māmṛje*) in the latter. The “sea” is of course soma, which is presumably so called on the basis of the usual aggrandizement of Soma’s cosmic associations.

Then, without transition, soma goes from being “the sea” to “the prop and buttress of heaven” -- that is, from something fluid, unstable, and in constant motion to its exact opposite: solid, fixed, steady enough to support heaven itself. Another paradox and another indication that Soma’s cosmic ambitions cannot be contained.

It is tempting to supply “earth” in b, on the basis of IX.87.2 = 89.6 *viṣtambhó divó dharúṇaḥ pṛthivyāḥ*: “the prop of heaven and buttress of the earth,” but perhaps it is better to stick with the text as we have it.

After the two cosmic identifications in a and b, in c we return to the focused reality of the ritual: the soma in the filter -- the usual toggling between the universal and the hyper-particular.

IX.2.6: Another cosmic association: Soma shines along with the sun, implying that Soma is just as bright -- though this may also be a reference to the timing of the morning pressing, at sunrise.

IX.2.7: Finite forms of the intens. -*yá*-pres. *marmṛjyá-* are ordinarily transitive, as in IX.38.3 *etám tyám ... marmṛjyánte apasyúvaḥ* “This very one [=soma] do the industrious (fingers) groom,” with the same adj. qualifying the subject as here. Though the transitivity of the verb in 38.3 is quite clear, our passage is more ambiguous -- and has been discussed at some length by Ge (n. 7), Bl (RReps ad loc.), and Re. If we wish the verb to be tr., we can supply ‘you’, as Bl suggests (also Re as an alternative). Or we can take *gíraḥ* as acc., rather than nom., and tr. “the industrious ones constantly groom the songs ...” However, I prefer to take the verb as passive (as two of the three forms of the pres. part. *marmṛjyámāna-* are) and see the vs. as an expression of ritual reciprocity: the songs are groomed by the power of Soma -- that is, the hymns recited at the Soma Sacrifice are refined and perfected by the inspiration given to the poets by Soma -- while those perfected hymns in turn adorn and beautify the soma offering.

IX.2.8: The expression *mádāya ghṛṣvaya* in the Saṃhitā text may be deliberately ambiguous. The Pp. reads dat. *ghṛṣvaye*, which is supported by IX.16.1 as well as VIII.64.12, but IX.101.8 has ... *mádāya ghṛṣvayaḥ* “(cows) avid for exhilaration,” which would allow a tr. here “we, avid for exhilaration ...” Although the publ. tr. follows the Pp. (as do Ge and Re), I think both readings may be intended.

IX.3

As discussed in the publ. intro., this hymn is unified by a simple device, the nom. sg. m. prn/pronominal adj. *eṣá* ‘this (one)’ that opens each vs. The first three vss. (and vs. 5) begin *eṣá deváḥ*; in a further two vss. (7, 8) the 2nd word *divám* is, of course, etymologically related to *devá-* and a phonological variant (*i* for *e* in the initial syllable). Only vss. 4, 6, 9, and 10 stand aside from this pattern -- and 6 and 9 have *deváḥ* in their 2nd pādas. The final vs., 10, opens *eṣá u syá* “this one here, this very one,” producing an emphatic summary with the addition of a 2nd prn.

As was also noted in the publ. intro., the maṇḍala's signature word 'purify oneself' is also omnipresent in this hymn, esp. the nom. sg. pres. part. *pávamāna-* 'purifying himself', which opens the pāda in vss. 2(c), 3(b), 4(c), 5(b), 7(c), 8(c); *pavítre* is found (mid-pāda) in 9, and once again vs. 10 marks a change and a summary, by using the finite form *pavate* (mid-c). Only vss. 1 and 6 lack a form of $\sqrt{pū}$. It might be worthy of note (if we understood how this maṇḍala had been assembled) that this flurry of repetitions is the first appearance of the part. *pávamāna-* in this maṇḍala. The overabundance of forms of $\sqrt{pū}$ may balance the lack of any overt mention of *sóma-*.

It can also be noted that the hymn is entirely in the 3rd ps.

IX.3.1: The non-literal tr. "bird on the wing" for *parṇavī-* conceals the problematic analysis of this hapax. Although Re (unconvincingly) suggests that *-vī-* is a simple doublet suffix of *-yú-*, the most likely (and generally accepted) analysis on formal grounds is as a root noun cmpd. to $\sqrt{vī}$ 'pursue', like *deva-vī-* 'pursuing the gods' in the preceding hymn (IX.2.1, itself recalling *devānām vītí-* in IX.1.3). However, on the basis of well-attested *deva-vī-* (cf. also *pada-vī-*), we expect the 1st member to express the object of pursuit -- and 'pursuing the/its wings/feathers' makes little sense. The best we can construct is an instr. relationship, 'pursuing with its wings'; see Scar 499. The situation is further muddled by the fact that the 2nd member bears a distinct resemblance to *vī-* 'bird', which finds textual expression elsewhere: cf. I.183.1 adduced by Scar, *tridhātunā patatho vīr ná parṇavī* "You [=Aśvins] fly with the tripartite (chariot) like a bird with its feathers." Scar (499–500) sketches a complex scenario whereby *pada-vī-* 'pursuing the track' was reinterp. to an instr. **padā-vī-* 'pursuing with the foot', giving rise to our cmpd., with a different body part. But I think it's simpler to assume that our poet was pursuing an imperfect pun with *vī-* 'bird', perhaps encouraged by *deva-vī-* in the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn (though we have no know way to know how these Gāyatrī hymns were ordered or by whom) and the extreme frequency of that lexeme in the IXth Maṇḍala.

IX.3.2: The expression *vipā kṛtāḥ* 'created by poetic inspiration' may seem a bit extreme -- after all soma/Soma exists and previously existed independently of the poets. But the usual RVic power attributed to the word is in play here: poetry brings to realization the gods and divine forces on the ritual ground.

The *s*-stem *hvāras-* belongs to the root $\sqrt{hvṛ}$ 'go crookedly, swerve'; in a soma context it refers to the curls and tufts of the wool on the sheepskin that serves as the soma filter, trapping the impurities in the just pressed juice. This physical reading seems preferable to the "obstacle" interpr. of Ge, Re, etc. In this regard, I would point out that the smooth, fluffy, brushed sheepskins available commercially now are misleading: sheep on the hoof, particularly the shaggy mountain breeds presumably familiar to the Vedic people, have much more rugged and irregular wool.

IX.3.3: Because of their position in the vs., the instr. *vīpanyúbhiḥ ... ṛtāyúbhiḥ* appear to be construed with *pávamānaḥ*, which is nestled between them. However, with Ge and Re I take them with pass. *mṛjyate* 'is groomed' at the end of pāda c. The medial them. pres. *pávate* is always reflexive ('purifies oneself'), not passive; when a pass. sense is required, the middle of the IXth Cl. present is used, esp. the part. *punāná-*. Or, to put it another

way, the *pávate* stem, esp. part. *pávamāna-*, is syntactically inert; as Re says (ad vs. 2), “Le mot *pávamāna* semble partout étranger à la syntaxe du v. et se distingue à cet égard de *punāná*, *pūyāmāna*, *pūtá*; les exceptions sont de pure apparence.”

IX.3.4: As often, the simile particle *iva* is “late,” following the first two words: *śūro yānn iva sátvabhiḥ*.

IX.3.7–8: These two vss. are paired; their first two pādas are almost identical:

7ab *eṣá dívam ví dhāvati, tiró rájāmsi dhārayā*

8ab *eṣá dívam vy āsarat, tiró rájāmsi āsprītaḥ*

I think this close match actually conceals an important difference in intent. Vs. 7 describes the ritual journey of the just pressed soma in the standard grandiose cosmic style -- the journey from filter to cup configured as a journey through the vast realms of heaven and the midspace. The verb *dhāvati* is pres. indicative. The vs. picks up from vs. 6, which describes the mixing of the pressed juice with water.

But vs. 8 has an augmented aorist *āsarat* (*ā asarat*, so Pp; it could technically be an injunc. *ā sarat*). I do not think this simply indicates the endpoint of the journey depicted in 7. Instead it alludes to the origin myth of soma, the bold stealing of Soma from heaven treated esp. in IV.26-27. The clue is the adj. *āsprīta-*. Although this stem is glossed as ‘invincible’ by Gr, reflected also in Re’s tr., *√spr* means rather ‘gain, win’ and even ‘recover, regain’. The other occurrence of this privative past part. is found in an Indra hymn in VIII, in a pāda almost identical to our b (acc. *āsprītam*, not nom. as here). There it also concerns Soma’s journey, but in that passage it is clear that the Somaraub is referred to: VIII.82.9 *yām te śyenāḥ padābharat tiró rájāmsi āsprītam* “That which the falcon brought to you [=Indra] with his foot across the airy realms -- the one that could not be recaptured ...” The adj. *āsprīta-* ‘not to be recaptured’ economically encapsulates Kṛṣṇānu’s vain fight against the robber *śyenā* to keep the bird from making off with the Soma confined in heaven. In our passage here the poet is identifying the (humdrum) ritual journey of soma the juice in vs. 7 with the first journey of Soma from heaven in the foundational myth of the Soma Sacrifice, making the two journeys seem as identical as possible by nearly verbatim repetition and thus investing the ritual progress with the glamour and significance of myth. Thus, although the nearly identical vss. 7 and 8 might seem evidence that the poet was spinning his wheels, in fact the repetition is doing something quite different.

IX.3.9: The mythic resonance in vs. 8 is echoed in *pratnéna jánmanā* “in the way of his ancient birth.”

IX.3.10: An elementary passive / active figure: *jajñānó janáyan* “giving birth while he is being born,” somewhat reminiscent of the reciprocal figure in IX.2.7.

IX.4

On the formal constraints in this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.4.1: The double *ca* construction especially emphasizes the imperatival function of the *-si* form *jéśi*, conjoined as it is with a standard impv. *sánā*.

IX.4.4: This vs. stands apart from the rest of the hymn, which is otherwise addressed in the 2nd ps. to Soma. Here we have a ref. to the (human) ritual participants (*pāvītārah* ‘purifiers’), and though soma appears in the vs., it is as the substance not the god, and in the 3rd ps.

On *pāvītārah* see comm. ad IX.83.2. Note in passing that this is a voc. with retracted accent; the form given by Gr for this passage, *-āras*, is incorrect.

IX.4.5–6: These two vss. share not only the refrain pāda (c) found throughout the hymn, but another one (5b = 6a), as well as a common focus on the sun.

IX.4.9: Loc. *vidharman* lit. ‘in spreading apart / in expansion’ is underspecified and its application unclear -- deliberately so, in my opinion. Once again, the ambiguity allows a blurring of the ritual and the cosmic. In ritual terms the expansion may refer to soma’s spreading across the filter or, as Ge sees it (n. 9b), in the water with which it is mixed; in cosmic terms, it would refer to the spreading of Soma across space (see, e.g., Ober [RR II.152] and VI.71.1 *rājaso vidharmanī*), becoming as extensive as heaven. Re suggests rather that it refers to Soma’s (transitive) spreading (that is, giving) of goods, but I find this less likely. For further disc. see comm. ad IX.64.9.

IX.5 Āprī

On the interaction of the genre of Āprī hymns with the Soma Pavamāna focus, see the publ. intro.

IX.5.1: The part. *prīṇān* may signal the Āprī theme, as Old suggests.

IX.5.6: The placement of the simile marker *nā* seems to make *nāktoṣāsā* ‘Night and Dawn’ part of the simile itself, rather than the frame, but, esp. given the rigid structure of Āprī hymns, where the pair Night and Dawn is one of the key words, this is not possible. We must just assume that the tendency to put *nā* after the first word of the phrase has taken over here.

IX.5.7: My interpr. of this vs., esp. pāda c, differs from the standard. I assume that *pāvamānaḥ* and *īndro vṛṣā* are two separate entities: Soma Pavamāna and Indra the bull -- and that they are identified with the two divine Hotars (*hótārā daívyā*) of b. Old, Ge, and Re all take c as an equational clause: Soma Pavamāna = Indra the bull; there is just one figure, and it has nothing to do with the two Hotars. In their favor is the fact that pāda c has reverted to nominative, whereas the duals are acc. in ab. However, I find it difficult to assume that mentioning the two major divine figures in the Soma Maṇḍala, Soma and Indra, in conjunction with a dual, is utterly unconnected with the dual divine figures in ab. Otherwise pāda c is a non sequitur. (On 9c and IX.6.2 see below.) As for the reversion to the nominative, I find this somewhat troubling, but it is enabled by the fact that in duals nom. = acc.

IX.5.9: The listing of figures in cd is puzzling. The publ. tr. follows Ge/Re, with Indra identified as the drop in c and Prajāpati as the self-purifying one in d, but I now very

much doubt that this is correct. For one thing, Prajāpati as a separate god is found at best only in X (3x); this is the only occurrence of the stem in IX, and in the only other occurrence outside of X (IV.53.2) it is an epithet of Savitar. This two-pāda sequence (9cd), *īndur īndro vṛṣā hāriḥ, pāvamānaḥ prajāpatiḥ* is a variant and expansion of 7c *pāvamāna īndro vṛṣā*, and as in 7 I think it refers to two gods, Soma and Indra. As in 7c the two gods are first identified: here the drop (rather than *pāvamāna-*) and Indra. The next word *vṛṣā* ‘bull’ appeared to qualify Indra in 7c, but could (and often does) qualify either one, and here it’s placed between Indra and *hāri-* ‘tawny’, a soma descriptor, suggesting affiliation to both. The opening of the next pāda, *pāvamānaḥ*, reasserts the Soma figure. As for *prajāpatiḥ*, I think it’s possible that it again refers to both, though I have no idea why this stem appears here. As in vs. 7c I take these pādas as listing other gods to be summoned along with Tvaṣṭar here (*tvāṣṭāram ... ā huve*, like 7b *hótārā ... huve*), with slippage into a free-standing nominative phrase. It anticipates the somewhat random listing of even more gods in 11cd. I don’t find any of this very satisfactory, but I resist the supposed identification of Indra and Soma, who are the two poles of the Soma Maṇḍala.

IX.6

IX.6.2: Pāda b *īndav īndra īti kṣara* “o drop, flow as ‘Indra’” is the strongest piece of evidence for the identification of Indra and Soma in the previous hymn (IX.5.7, 9) and is so cited by Ge (n. 7c to IX.5). As noted ad locc., I do not believe that those vss. equate the two gods; I do, however, believe that there is a (partial) equation here, on the basis of the mystical phonological near-identity of the two stems ‘drop’ (*īndu-*) and ‘Indra’ (*īndra-*), a similarity that is frequently exploited in this maṇḍala, as we have already noted. The identification of the two here also depends on the ambiguity of the goal of *kṣara* ‘flow’, namely *mādam* in pāda a. The stem *māda-* often refers to the ‘exhilarating drink’, namely soma itself, as well as to the abstract state of exhilaration. With Soma flowing to *mādam*, the former, concrete meaning is more or less excluded: S/soma can’t flow to itself. But the concrete goal is certainly available to the god Indra; cf. III.42.2 *tām īndra mādam ā gahi, barhiṣṭhām grāvabhiḥ sutām* “Come, Indra, to the exhilarating drink, stationed on the ritual grass, pressed by stones,” where the second pāda makes it clear that the concrete substance, not the abstract state, is meant. So if “Indra” substitutes for the drop here, *mādam* as concrete goal is possible. See also 9b and comm. thereon.

IX.6.4: As noted ad IX.3.3, in contrast to *pāvamāna-* ‘purifying oneself’, I consider other medial participles to *√pū* to be passive and have so tr. *punānā-* here, though there is no overt sign of passive value and both Ge and Re tr. as reflexive (also in 9a).

IX.6.5: This is a rel. cl. without a main cl., but it is easily attached to vs. 6 (relative / correlative 5a *yām ...* 6a *tām ...*). So also Re.

IX.6.7: This vs. reestablishes the line of demarcation between Soma and Indra that was blurred in vs. 2, by means of the reciprocal figure *devó devāya* “the god for the god,” with the dat. further specified as *īndrāya*.

The stem *pīpāya-* is ambiguous; it can be both intrans. and trans. (and at least once mixed: I.63.8; see comm. ad loc.). In this passage Ge takes it as intrans. (“wann seine Milch quillt”). The ambiguity is in part the result of the partial coincidence of the pf. subjunctive and the redupl. aor. injunctive (or subj.) (see Kü 301–3), and in this passage we appear to have the trans. redupl. aor. (Kü 302). Partly on the basis of VIII.1.19, Old takes Indra as the subj. of trans. *pīpāyat*. Re also considers the form “probably” transitive, though he does not specify the subject.

IX.6.8–9: As noted in the publ. intro., the theme of poetry appears in these last two vss., and I think it likely that Soma’s actions of “protecting poetic skill” and “making the hidden hymns his own” refer to the inspiration Soma, and the soma sacrifice, provide to the poets. What it means to “protect” *kāvya* (8c) is not entirely clear to me, but the preverb *ní* with *pāti* may suggest protection that involves hiding or depositing the thing in question, thus matching the hidden hymns in 9c. (*pāti* may also pun on $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’, of much more common occurrence in the Soma maṇḍala.) As I suggested in the publ. intro., I think the hymns are “hidden” deep within the poets and are stimulated and evoked by Soma and the ritual in his honor. Note also that in the next hymn (IX.7.4a) Soma the poet clothes himself (*vāsānaḥ*) in (pl.) *kāvya*.

IX.6.9: This vs. picks up various expressions from the hymn: *īndrayúḥ* (pāda a) matches up with *devayúḥ* (1b) and *asmayúḥ* (1c), thus forming a slight ring. In b *mādam ... vītāye* “(for Indra) to pursue exhilaration / the exhilarating drink” “repairs” the slightly anomalous *mādam ... kṣara* in 2ab (see comm. there) and also echoes 6b *mādāya devāvītāye*. I might therefore alter the tr. to “for him to pursue the exhilarating drink.” See also *punānāḥ* in pāda a, repeating the same part. in 4c.

IX.7

As noted in the publ. intro., the word *sóma-* does not appear in this hymn. The word is also absent from IX.3, though there the omnipresence of *pāvamāna-* and other forms of $\sqrt{pū}$ takes up the slack. In this hymn *pāvamāna-* is found only once, in vs. 5.

IX.7.1: Lü (600–601) sees this vs. as representing the heavenly ascent of Soma, but those not subscribing to all of Lü’s presuppositions will find it difficult to see that. My own interpr. is far more earthbound: the filter is both the path of the soma and its foundation. The referent of *asya* in c is probably the soma, esp. given the near match of 1c *vidānā asya yójanam* and 8c *vidānā asya śákmabhiḥ*: the *asya* in 8c must be the soma. Even though in both passages the subject of the sentence is plural and refers to drops bzw. waves of soma, the sg. *asya* must be a constructio ad sensum.

On the distribution of the 3rd pl. mid. ending *-ram* versus *-ran* see the extensive disc. by Old. Essentially *-ran* is found pāda-final and pāda-internal before consonant; *-ram* pāda-internal before vowel – but see Old for further refinements

IX.7.2: In keeping with his interpr. of vs. 1, Lü (238) sees the “great waters” (*mahīr apāḥ*) here as the celestial waters -- again not necessary, since the ritual soma is mixed with water after it traverses the filter.

mādhvaḥ could in principle be construed either with *dhārā* (“stream of honey”) or *agriyāḥ*, as in the publ. tr. Though both Ge and Re opt for the former, *mādhvo agriyām* in VII.92.2 suggests the latter, as does the parallel expression *vācō agriyāḥ* in the next vs. (3a; also IX.62.25). So Lü (238). Both Ge and Lü take *dhārā* as instr. sg. (Ge: “Mit dem Strome ...”). (Old hesitates but slightly favors instr.) This is certainly possible, though not necessary: nom. *dhārā* and nom. *agriyāḥ* can have different genders because they belong to two different NPs in apposition to each other. In any case, none of these minor differences in interpr. have any real implications.

IX.7.2–3: A verb of motion needs to be supplied with *prā* in the initial pādas of both vss.

IX.7.3: The phrase *satyō adhvarāḥ*, which I take as a separate nominal cl., but which can simply be another appositional nominative as most take it, must identify soma as, as it were, the embodiment of the ritual, the substance that must be present for the *adhvarāḥ* to occur.

IX.7.4: In principle, *kāvya* (and/or indeed *ṇṛmṇā*) could be instr. sg. (“... by his poetic skill ...”), though the standard renderings (incl. Lü 265) take it as acc. pl. There is no real way to tell, but in the similarly structured IX.94.3 *pāri yāt kavīḥ kāvya bhārate* (cf. our *pāri yāt kāvya kavīḥ*) *kāvya* should be acc. pl. because it is the frame that matches a clear acc. pl. simile in the next pāda. This is suggestive but hardly decisive.

On pāda c *svār vājī śiṣāsati* “The race horse strives to win the sun,” see comm. ad IX.74.1, 76.2. In these passages I think that the sun, with its gleaming light, represents the milk towards which the soma is aiming.

IX.7.6: On *rebhā*- see comm. ad VI.3.6.

IX.7.7: Gr takes *rāṇā* as impv. to *√ran* (them. pres. *rāṇati*), on the basis of the Pp. reading *rāṇa*, but it is better to interpr. it as instr. sg. to the root noun *rān-*, against the Pp. So already Old ZDMG 63 [1909]: 289 = KISch 305; see also Ge (n. 7c), Schindler (Rt. Nouns, s.v. *rān-*). With Ge I take it as the referent of the rel. prn. *yāḥ* that immediately follows, forming a nominal cl. (“with the joy that is ...”). The drawback to this is that the new cl. would not coincide with a metrical break -- but nominal, izafe-like clauses are not infrequently so positioned. Re also takes *rāṇā* as an instr. sg., but because he expects such a root noun to have fem. gender (see Schindler, who simply says that the gender of this noun can’t be determined), he construes it as part of the rel. cl.: “(ivresse [referring back to *mādena* in b]) qui est joyeusement [= *rāṇā*] (présente) dans ces comportements.” Although this allows clause and metrical boundary to coincide, it otherwise seems too fussy to me.

IX.7.8: As disc. in the publ. intro. and above ad vs. 1, the c pāda of this vs. forms a ring with that of vs. 1; the final vs., 9, is addressed to the two world-halves and seems extra-hymnic. As in vs. 1 the *asya* of c must refer to soma, although the subj. of the sentence is plural.

Medial forms of $\sqrt{pū}$ when construed with \tilde{a} mean ‘attract / bring here through purification’ and take the acc.; similar is $\tilde{a} \sqrt{yaj}$ ‘win / attract by sacrifice’. $\tilde{a} \sqrt{pū}$ is extremely common in IX. See also remarks on $\tilde{a} \acute{síkṣa-$ ad I.112.19.

IX.8

IX.8.1: Pāda c, *vārdhanto asya vīryām*, is structured like 1c and 8c in the immediately preceding hymn, IX.7, though here *asya* must refer to Indra, not Soma.

IX.8.2: As noted in the publ. intro., the gods Vāyu and the Áśvins, along with Indra, who was mentioned in the previous vs., are also the gods mentioned as the goal of the soma in IX.7.7.

IX.8.4: Why do the thoughts number seven (*saptá dhītáyah*)? Ge (n. 4ab) links them with the seven *dhātars* in nearby IX.10.3, while Re adds the seven *dhāman* of IX.102.2. These suggestions are reasonably plausible, though they simply displace the numerical problem. We should also note that the seven thoughts recur in the next hymn (IX.9.4), and another, unidentified, group of seven entities is found two vss. later (IX.9.6). IX.8–10 are attributed to the same poet, Asita Kāśyapa or Devala Kāśyapa (responsible indeed for IX.5–24), and he may simply have a penchant for the number seven; in our passage it would be a complement to the ten fingers (a number that of course makes sense). For *saptá dhītáyah* and ten fingers in a hemistich almost identical to this one, see IX.15.8; for further occurrences of “seven inspired thoughts” see IX.62.17 and possibly IX.66.8.

IX.8.7: The “comrade” (*sákhī-*) whom the soma is urged to enter is most likely Indra. The juxtaposition of the voc. *índo* with *sákhāyam* might be meant to evoke the phonological twin *índram*.

IX.9

On the structure and often puzzling content of this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.9.1: Some of the uncertainties in this vs. are illuminated by parallel passages, esp. IX.10.2 in the adjacent hymn. Note that Soma is identified as a poet both in pāda a, where he is in fact “the poet of heaven” (*diváh kavíḥ*), and in c in the bahuvrīhi *kaví-kratu-* ‘having a poet’s purpose’. See also below ad 6c.

The expression *pári ... váyāmsi ... yāti* (split over 3 pādas) is reminiscent of IX.111.1 *vísṣvā yád rūpā pariyāti* “when he makes the circuit of all his forms ...,” as Ge points out (n. 1b). The journey around the filter must be meant.

The two ‘granddaughters [/nieces]’ (loc. du. *naptyòḥ*) are, in the ritual context, most likely either the two pressing boards (Sāy, Ge) or the two hands of the priest (Re). Because of the similarity between this vs. and 10.2, I favor the latter because of the *gābhastyoḥ* ‘in the two hands’ of 10.2b. In a cosmic context, the dual could refer to Heaven and Earth, who are identified as Soma’s two mothers (by most interpr.) in 3. The kinship flip -- Soma and his two granddaughters [/nieces] here, Soma and his two mothers in 3 -- would not doom this identification, given the RVic poets’ love of paradox, esp. the paradox of generations.

The ppl. *hitāḥ* with which *nāptyòḥ* is construed is ambiguous, between \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ and $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’. Though both Ge and Re favor the latter, I opt for the former on the basis of *hitāḥ* in 4a and *hinṡānāsaḥ* in the parallel vs. 10.2a, both clearly belonging to ‘impel’. Either is possible, however; ‘placed’ would weakly favor the ‘pressing boards’ interpr. of *nāptyòḥ*.

IX.9.2: The parallel but oddly assorted dative phrases *kṣāyāya pānyase* “to/for the praiseworthy dwelling place” and *jānāya ... adrúhe* “to/for the race without deceit” I take as a possible elaboration on the disjunctive pair “men and gods.” Although Re wants the latter to refer to “l’être-humain,” he himself points out that *adrúh-* is generally an epithet of the gods (though see *adrúhaḥ* with ‘rivers’ in 4b). By contrast to “the race without deceit [= gods],” *kṣāya-* may refer to the ritual ground as the ‘dwelling place’ and by extension to the humans who create and inhabit it.

IX.9.3: The referent of the fem. du. here is generally taken as Heaven and Earth.

IX.9.4–6: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider this an omphalos hymn, with vss. 4 and 6 with their repetition of “7” defining vs. 5 as the omphalos. The omphalos effect is muted however, since the “message” of vs. 5 is hardly a deep mystery. For further on this sequence of vss., see publ. intro.

IX.9.4: On the “seven insightful thoughts” see also 8.4.

The subj. of *vāṡṡdhúḥ* in c must be feminine, on the basis of *yā(h)*, but the choice between the “insightful thoughts” (*dhīṡ-*) of a and the rivers (*nadī-*) of b is not clear.

IX.9.5: This vs. presents the same problem as 4c: because of init. *tāḥ*, nom. pl. fem., the subject of *ā dadhuḥ* has to be feminine, and there are several pl. feminines in play: the “insightful thoughts” (*dhīṡ-*) of 4a and the rivers (*nadī-*) of 4b. But which one (or both)? In any case, presumably the subjects of 4c and 5 are the same -- though Sāy opts for “fingers” in this vs. but “rivers” in 4c.

The unspecified dat. (or with Re loc.) *mahé* ‘for/in great ...’ has too many possibilities for its referent, and I have made no effort to choose one.

IX.9.6: The problem of the fem. referent continues here. In ab Soma, as the draught-horse (*vāhniḥ*) “sees the seven” (*saptā paśyati*); we have just had “seven thoughts” (4a), and “seven” is the canonical number of rivers, which we also encountered in vs. 4 -- so either referent (or a conflation of both) is possible here. A fem. acc. pl. *devīḥ* ‘goddesses’ is the obj. of the verb ‘satisfied’ (*atarpayat*) in the next pāda c. Unfortunately this does not clarify the reference: the pl. of *devī-* is frequently used of waters and at least once elsewhere (VII.50.4) of rivers, but at least in the singular it is quite commonly used of *dhī-* and similar words.

On the hapax *vāṡvahi-* see AiG II.2.292–93.

On the always ghastly *krívi-* see comm. ad I.30.1 and V.44.4. Esp. in the latter passage I argue that the word often seems to be used of an equine *and* that it might be a deformation or hyper-Sanskritization of *kaví-*. Both factors are present here: the first two pādas of this vs. depict Soma as a draught horse drawing (*vāhniḥ ... vāṡvahiḥ*), but we also

had occasion to note ad vs. 1 above that Soma was twice identified as a *kaví*- there. In the publ. tr. I default to a PN, but I do in fact think that the word has richer semantics, derived from both just mentioned uses, here. I do not see any way to convey that in a single tr. of the word, however.

IX.9.7: The voc. *pumas* ‘o male’ is rather stark. It is in fact the only occurrence of the voc. of this stem in the RV and the only place where the stem is used of Soma. I ascribe its use here to the contrast being drawn with the feminines in vss. 4–6 (as well, perhaps, as the two mothers in 3) and to the martial content of the vs.

As I argued already in my dissertation and the *-áya*-monograph based upon it, I consider the supposed root $\sqrt{k\bar{l}p}$ to have been extracted from the *-áya*-transitive *kalpáyati*, itself (in my view) a *-p*-formation to $\sqrt{k\bar{r}}$ with “popular” *l*. The early rarity of the thematic noun *kálpa-*, very common later but found in the RV only here and in the privative form *akalpá-* (I.102.6), supports this view. In the publ. tr. I followed the standard interpr. of *kálpa-* in this passage as ‘ritual work’ (Ge “bei den heiligen Bräuchen,” Re “les rite”), based in part on its later usage. I still think this is a possible reading. However, on the basis of my interpr. of *akalpá-* in I.102.6 (see comm. ad loc.) and the rest of the vs. here, I wonder now if they are not rather (or in addition) *martial* arrangements: the address to Soma as ‘male’ (pāda a), the statement that darkness must be fought (*yódhyā*)(b), and the intensive subjunctive of \sqrt{han} , *jañghanah* (c) all favor a more bellicose interpr.

IX.9.8: The duplication of comparatives with slightly different shapes, introduced by the particle *nū*, produces a nice phonetic figure, *nū nāvīyase nāvīyase*.

IX.9.9: As was noted in the publ. intro., ‘sun’ (*svāh*) is the last word of the hymn, resonating with the themes of shining and brightness earlier in the hymn (see esp. 3ab and 8c, as well as the darkness to be combatted in 7b).

IX.10

For the poetic structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.10.1: *svānāśah* can be both the nom. pl. masc. of the adj. *svānā-* ‘resounding’ (\sqrt{svan}) and the med. rt. aor. part. to \sqrt{su} ‘press’, in passive usage as is usual for this part. I consider the ambiguity intentional and render it twice (“while being pressed ... resounding”), but although both Ge (n. 1a) and Re (with more fuss) recognize the double identity, they render only the ‘resound’ sense that is appropriate to the simile.

IX.10.2: With Ge I take c as an independent nominal cl. Re takes c as a continuation of ab, but as Ge points out (n. 2c) c is the Fortsetzung of the image in ab: in ab the chariots are presumably competing for prizes; the prizes or “takings” (*bhāra-*) in c are what these chariots win. For the phrase in c see IX.16.5 *mahé bhārāya kārīṇah* “for the great taking of the decisive victor.”

IX.10.3: The first hemistich contains a simile embedded, as it were, in a metaphor: kings are only metaphorically “anointed” (that is, decorated, adorned) with praises; the soma

juices are somewhat less metaphorically “anointed,” since “the cows” are actually milk, which is liquid enough to anoint.

In c the poet seems silently to switch instrumental functions, while holding the structure constant: NOM. INSTR. *añjate*. In both a and b the INSTR. expresses the instrument of anointment, either metaphorical or real, but in c the INSTR. expresses the agents who perform the anointing. The “seven ordainers” (*saptá dhātár-*) are presumably the priests; the priests reappear as Hotars in vs. 7 with “seven siblings,” probably their insightful thoughts or else simply seven other priests. See below.

The relationship between kings and the genre of *prásasti-*, which I discuss in my *RV between Two Worlds* (pp. 146–48), is very clear here.

IX.10.4: The pun on *svānāsaḥ* in 1a recurs here; this time Ge and Re render it only as ‘pressed’.

IX.10.5: On my view of the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. With Ge, I supply *bhāgam* with the gen. *vivāsvataḥ* in a, as well as with gen. *uśasaḥ* in b; unlike Ge I take *bhāga-* to mean ‘portion’ (not “das Glück”) and interpr. it as referring to the radiance of the two divinities, by which Soma transforms himself into the sun (or rather a set of suns -- the radiating golden color on the sheep’s fleece filter). Re’s interpr. is quite different: he supplies “la région” with *vivāsvataḥ*, and takes *uśasaḥ* as an acc. pl., parallel to *bhāgam* and both as names of divinities (“engendrant les Aurores (et) Bhaga”). For the former he must be thinking of the common expression *sādane vivāsvataḥ* “in the seat of V,” but that expression is only in the loc. and never found in IX. As for the latter, even with his explanatory n. I don’t how this improves the sense of the vs.

IX.10.6: “The raging of the bull” must refer to the headlong journey of the soma as it is being purified, which is set in motion and accompanied by the recitation of ritual poetry -- hence the violent opening of “the doors of poetic thoughts” (*dvārā matīnām*). The continuity of the poetic tradition from the *pratnāḥ* (‘ancient’) bards to the current ones is suggested by the use of the pres. *ṛṇvanti*. I do not think, with Ge (n. 6ab), that *pratnā-* gives the present tense verb a preterital sense, and indeed in IX.73.3 *pītā ... pratnó abhī rakṣati* Ge tr. the pres. *rakṣati* with the pres. “wacht,” not a preterite.

IX.10.7: Ge and Re take the seven siblings here as the seven *dhītí-* of 8.4 and 9.4, which is quite likely -- though the priests themselves are also a possibility. Ge adduces IX.66.8 *sám u tvā dhībhir asvaran ... saptá jāmāyāḥ* “Together the seven siblings cried out to you with insightful thoughts,” which has both the 7 siblings and the thoughts -- but the referent of the siblings in that vs. is not clear. Ge there takes it as the fingers, which seems somewhat perverse, given that seven is not a canonical number for fingers -- and fingers don’t cry out. I prefer rivers, since the “seven streams” were mentioned in the previous vs.

IX.10.8: *ā dade* belongs to *√dā* ‘bind’, not ‘give’; see, e.g., Kü 242. On the idiom see comm. ad I.139.1, IX.79.4.

Ge, Re, and Kü all take b as a simile (“wie das Auge an die Sonne”), presumably with *cīd* as the simile particle. But, as I have stated elsewhere (see, e.g., comm. ad

I.173.7), I am not at all convinced that *cid* is ever so used. Here, the point is the real identification of Soma, or his eye, with the sun, not a comparison to Soma's kinship with me; see *ékam ákṣi* in 9.4, the transformation of Soma into sun(s) in our vs. 5c, and esp. the transformation of the sun's eye into Soma's eye in the next vs. (9c).

Gr identifies *duhe* in c as a 1st ps.; Ge and Re take it as 3rd sg. passive with *ápatyam* as subj. (e.g., “Die Nachkommenschaft des Sehers wird herausgemolken”), interpr. *kaví-* as a reference to Soma and *ápatyam* as the soma juice. But medial forms of $\sqrt{\text{duh}}$ are generally transitive, with the sense ‘give X as milk’, and I follow that interpr. here, with Soma the unexpressed subject/agent. I suggest that c explains a: “binding his navel to our navel” means that he makes himself our kin and indeed takes responsibility for providing us with offspring. I take *kavéḥ* as referring to the (human) poet. Soma repays our devotion and care (see esp. vs. 7) with the usual ritual rewards, including sons.

IX.10.9: Ge takes *priyā* as nom. sg. fem., with gapped “Daughter of the Sun” -- but it seems unlikely that a new character would be introduced at this point, and it makes more sense for Soma to be the one doing the looking. Better to interpr. *priyā* as a neut. pl. with gapped *padā(ni)*, as in nearby IX.12.8 *abhí priyā divás padā*. Ge (n. 9a) also allows the possibility of a neut. pl., but wants to construe it with sg. *pādam*, which he takes as a “collective singular,” a concept that I think we can do without but that seems to be encouraged by Old's remarks. (See comm. ad VI.17.1 for another such ex. proposed by Ge.) I think rather that there are two (sets of) *padā-* (sim. Re).

Ge also suggests that in this instance of INSTR. *gúhā hitám*, the phrase means “hidden *from*,” not “hidden *by*.” Without a better sense of what this vs. is intended to tell us, I prefer not to contravene the usual agentive value of the instr. For my own speculation on the hidden track, see publ. intro., which may be supported by IX.102.2, where the hidden track that soma follows seems to be in the filter.

IX.11

IX.11.1: *asmai* is only the second word in the hymn and is unaccented; therefore it should technically refer to something already mentioned in the discourse. But since soma is the topic of *all* discourse in this ritual context, no prior verbal mention is necessary. Sim. IX.70.1; see also *asya* in IX.29.1a, IX.30.1a.

IX.11.2: Pāda c consists entirely of a rudimentary etymological figure, *devám devāya devayú*. The acc. *devám* is of course Soma as god, coreferential with *páyah* ‘milk’, a metaphor for soma the substance, in pāda a; the dative *devāya* is Indra. I take *devayú* as an adverb; so also Re. It is also possible (see, e.g., Re's n.) to take it as a neut. modifying *páyah*, as Gr does -- and, it seems, Ge. In that case, *devám* would need to be a neut. adj. ‘divine’ (Ge's “die göttliche”), but the number of clearly adjectival uses of *devá-* is very low. See, however, IX.13.5 and VII.21.1.

IX.11.4: DAT *gāthám arcata* can be seen as a paraphrase of *úpa* DAT *gāyatā* in 1a, with etymological matching.

The epithet *divispṛś-* ‘touching heaven’ is almost the only departure in this hymn from the tight, earthbound focus on the ritual.

IX.11.6: Pāda c *īndum īndre* paraphrases *devām devāya* in 2c, though with a loc., not dat.

IX.11.7: Pāda b is almost identical with 3a.

IX.11.9: The *īndo- īndra-* figure appears yet again, in different cases (voc., instr.).

IX.12

Lü tr. and comm. on vss. 1–6 of this hymn (706–7), with his usual, often overblown, emphasis on the heavenly location of the elements and actions. By contrast, I tend to attribute the heavenly references to the poet’s attempt to project a cosmic dimension on the ritual confined to a small portion of the earth’s surface.

IX.12.3: On *madacyút-* and *vipaścít-* see, e.g., Scar (128 and 122 respectively).

gaurī is the loc. sg. to the *vrkī*-stem *gaurī-*, not a dual (per Gr); see AiG III.170 and comm. ad VII.103.2 (*sarasī*) and I.135.9 (*nadī*). As indicated in the publ. intro., of the possible referents for this buffalo cow, with Ge and Re (see esp. Re’s n.) I favor the hide on which the pressing apparatus is placed -- as opposed to Sāy’s ‘speech’, or Lü’s more complex speech-identified-with-the-heavenly-waters.

IX.12.5: This vs. seems to posit a distinction between two somas: one, called *sóma-*, that is in containers and on the filter and another, called *īndu-* ‘drop’, that embraces / surrounds (*pári śasvaje*) the first. What distinguishes them is difficult to discern; Ge suggests that the “nachrinnende” Soma is taken in by the pressed juice, but this doesn’t seem to make ritual sense, since the soma in the tubs and on the filter would already have been pressed as well. Lü, predictably, thinks the heavenly soma incorporates the earthly soma. Say identifies *īndu-* as the god Soma (*somo devaḥ*). Of the various possibilities, Sāy’s seems the most plausible -- that is, Soma the god encompasses all the forms that soma the substance takes in the course of ritual processing, though physically that substance is somewhat different at every stage. I also considered the possibility -- given the occasional identification and frequent juxtaposition of *īndu-* and *īndra-* -- that *īndu-* here refers to Indra, and “embrace” is a metaphor for “drink, consume.” But I’d prefer to keep *īndu-* separate from Indra.

IX.12.6: The *īndu-* here “sends forth his speech” (*prá vācam ... iṣyati*), which supports an animate reading of *īndu-* in the previous vs. Needless to say, Lü has a heavenly interpr.: *īndu* is the heavenly soma, the sea is the heavenly sea, and the *kóśa-* is the “Urquell im Himmel.” In the publ. intro. I interpr. the sea as the soma in the vessel or the mixing water. And the speech is presumably the speech of the ritual participants, prompted by the action of pressing the soma.

IX.12.7: This vs. has no finite verb; I take it as a preamble to 8, in order to capture the play between the two forms of *hinvānāḥ* (7c, 8b).

When *vānaspāti-* (lit. ‘lord of the forest’) does not mean simply ‘tree’, it generally refers to the sacrificial post in the animal sacrifice, particularly when found in the Āprī hymns. The word is not found elsewhere in IX, except in the Āprī hymn IX.5.10, where it

seems to have that reference. But here it must refer to soma. Since essentially all the plants that have been suggested as the source of soma are fairly insignificant physically, the use of *vānaspāti-* to refer to it must have seemed slightly comic (like calling a dandelion Lord of the Forest), but also a way of capturing the towering importance of the apparently lowly plant. The word is used of soma once elsewhere, I.91.6 (a soma hymn), in the phrase *priyástotro vānaspátīḥ*, almost identical to *nītyastotro vānaspátīḥ*, esp. because *nītya-* ‘own’ and *priyá-* ‘dear, own’ are near synonyms in some usages. The point, I think, is that Soma has first claim to praise.

On *sabar-* as ‘juice’, see EWA s.v. *sabardúh-* and Narten (YH 212). I construe the gen. pl. *dhīnām* with the first member of the cmpd. *sabar-dúgha-*: “... juice of insights.” I supply *pavítre* with *antár* on the basis of 5b *antáh pavítre* (cf. VIII.101.9). Ge’s “unter Liedern” does not work because *antár* doesn’t take the gen., and though Re’s “Arbres des intuitions” sounds imposing, it doesn’t make much sense. Old’s first interpr. of this pāda is close to mine, with *dhīnām* dependent on *sabar-*, though he takes *antár* as an adverb. However, he considers the obvious solution to be to take *dhīnām* with *antár*, since the gen. is possible with *antár* in the later language. Since “within/amid the thoughts” isn’t a particularly compelling addition to the passage, I prefer my own (and Old’s first) solution.

The common med. part. *hinvānā-* can be both transitive and passive, in approx. equal numbers. In this vs. it is transitive, but in the next passive.

IX.12.8: As noted just above, *hinvānā-* is used passively here, in contrast to the same form in 7c -- here referring to the priestly impulsion given to the soma on its journey of purification.

The “tracks of heaven” are, in my view, the traces of the soma on the filter; see 10.9.

Pāda c is identical to IX.44.2c, where I do not construe *vīprasya* with *dhārayā* but with something earlier in the vs. My reason there is that the *dhārā-* ‘stream’ is always otherwise only Soma’s, and so should not belong to the/a *vīpra-*. But in our passage there is nowhere to construe *vīprasya* but with *dhārayā*. I consider ad IX.44.2 the possibility that the pāda was borrowed thoughtlessly here. But there are several ways to make sense of our passage. If the *dhārā-* is Soma’s, the point may be that he is a *kaví-*, a sage, but he also has the fluency of an inspired poet, who simply pours out verbal eloquence, thus identifying Soma with both types of poet. This suggestion is supported by the next hymn, IX.13.2, where Soma is explicitly identified as a *vīpra-*, as well as his parallel identification as *vīpra* and *kaví* in IX.18.2. Or *dhārā-* can be used here metaphorically to refer to a stream of words.

IX.12.9: The impv. *dhāraya* is almost identical to the instr. *dhārayā* in 8c, though their morphology is entirely different.

IX.13

This hymn is dominated by forms of med. *pávate* (vss. 2-4, 8-9), with the first vs. containing instead med. *punānāḥ*. Only vss. 6-7 lack such forms. Perhaps coincidentally, these two vss. are the only ones containing similes.

The hymn is also constructed from bricolage and ready-made phrases, many found verbatim in other hymns. There is a certain amount of chaining between vss.; it is difficult to know if this is just a result of the assembly process (a word in one vs. suggests to the poet another such phrase, which he then attaches) or was meant as a unifying poetic device.

IX.13.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the mention of Vāyu and Indra identifies the occasion as the Morning Pressing, since those two gods receive the first soma offering of the pressing day.

IX.13.2: The publ. tr. does not make this clear, but the addressees are pl., presumably the priests.

The identification of Soma as a *vípra-* supports the suggestion ad IX.12.8 in the preceding hymn that *vípra-* refers to Soma there as well.

IX.13.3: Pāda c, with a medial part. characterizing the soma (*gr̥ṇānāḥ*), followed by the infinitival dat. *devāvītaye*, matches 2c *suṣvāṇām devāvītaye*. The pattern is reinforced by the infinitival dat. *vājasātaye* ending pāda a.

IX.13.4: The chaining continues, with *vājasātaye* likewise ending pāda a of this vs.; see also 6b.

√*pū* + ACC (here *pávasva ... íṣaḥ* [etc.]) should rightly have the preverb *ā* in the idiom ‘bring through purification’; see esp. Re’s n. In tr. I have supplied it, partly on the assumption that since this hymn is constructed of ready-made phrases, this pāda may have been adapted from a context where the previous pāda contained the *ā* in tmesis. Re also points out that the construction here can be under the influence of *pávantām ā* in 5b. I do *not* follow Re in seeing √*pū* without preverb as becoming indiscriminately transitive in IX, with the sense ‘couler’.

IX.13.5: It is difficult not to take *devá-* here as adjectival, modifying *índavaḥ*. See my reluctance to so interpr. this stem in IX.11.2, and see comm. ad VII.21.1.

IX.13.6: The inf. *vājasātaye* is found here a 3rd time (after 3a, 4a).

IX.13.8–9: The impv. *ápa ... jahi* of 8c is converted into the part. *apaghnántaḥ* in 9a. The sg. subj. of 8 is also replaced by a pl., but sg. *sómaḥ / indo* and pl. *sómāḥ / índavaḥ* alternate throughout the hymn.

IX.14

IX.14.1: The ‘decisive act’ (*kārā-*) in question is presumably the purification itself. See Re’s n. on the need to preserve this sense here, rather than giving in to Ge’s convenient “Kampfpreis” (presumably *vāja-*), which Re pronounces “un peu loin.”

IX.14.2: As noted in the publ. intro., the subjects here are the fingers, troops of five (on each hand).

The subord. *yádī* is best taken as an example of my *yád ī* -- hence “when him/it ...,” not “if.”

IX.14.3: I am disturbed by the sequence of tense -- or lack of it: the augmented aor. *amatsata* in the main, *ād*, clause does not fit well with the pres. *parīkṛvānti* in the preceding *yád* clause (vs. 2) or the pres. *vasāyāte* in the following (3c). I am tempted to make the *ād* clause the follow-up to vs. 1: “the poet flowed around and forth ...; after that the gods found exhilaration.” In that case, 3ab would interrupt the sequence of the subordinated present clauses in vs. 2, 3c, but I don’t know of other examples of this kind of alternating structure. Perhaps vss. 2 and 3 should be reversed: the *ād* clause of 3ab would then follow directly after vs. 1, and the parallel subordinate clauses in 3c and vs. 2 would be picked up by the main clause of 4ab, which also has a pres. tense verb.

IX.14.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., in this hymn the poet provides several different metaphorical versions of the same ritual act. This vs. contains two of those alternatives: in ab Soma is groomed “by the granddaughters of Viviasvant,” a reference to the fingers, which were characterized as “troops of five kinsmen” in 2ab; in c Soma makes cows like a garment (*gāḥ kṛvānó nā nirñījam*), a variant of 3c “clothes himself with cows” (*góbhir vasāyāte*). For the exact phrase see IX.107.26 and for variants without the simile particle IX.86.26, 95.1.

IX.14.6: *śrītī-* is a hapax, on which see Old. It is here an instr. sg. fem., referring to the fine fleece filter, and echoing *śrītāḥ* in 1b.

With Old and Ge I take *gavyā* as instr. to *gavyā-* ‘longing for cows’, rather than neut. pl. with Gr and Lub. Re sits on the fence.

Although *vidé* is ordinarily passive, there are a few precedents for ‘know (as) one’s own’; see VII.40.5, VIII.62.9.

IX.14.7: Here the fingers (*kṣīpaḥ*) are named directly, after the metaphors of 2ab and 5a; the verb *√mṛj* ‘groom’ recurs from 5b.

IX.15

On the structuring principle of the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.15.1: Pāda c, *gáchann índrasya niṣkṛtām*, echoes IX.13.1c *vāyór índrasya niṣkṛtām*. It is not clear to me whether a different ritual occasion is meant, or it’s simply a variant.

IX.15.2: The phrase *dhiyā yāty* (with non-vocalic -y in *yāty*) “drives with insight” in 1a is echoed by the verb *dhiyāyate* “exercises his insight” in 2a, though in different metrical positions. *dhiyāyate* also participates in another phonetic figure, with the final word of b: (*dhi*)yāyate / (*devā*)tātaye, with the same vowel pattern, but crossed consonants (*y y t / t t y*). Denom. *dhiyāyāte* is of odd formation, presumably built to the instr., which makes it seem context-generated (from *dhiyā* in 1a), but there is unfortunately another form to the stem (dat. part. I.155.1 *dhiyāyaté*), as well as a related -yú-adjective, *dhiyāyú-* (I.8.6). Still I think generation in this context is likely.

Pāda c contains another mirror-image phonetic figure: (*amṛ*)tāsa āsat(e).

IX.15.3: The ppl. *hitá-* is potentially a pun, both ‘propelled’ (\sqrt{hi}) and ‘placed’ ($\sqrt{dhā}$), though in this case the former is dominant, given the journey theme of the rest of the vs. (and hymn).

In c *yádī* is best read *yád ī*, see also IX.14.2.

IX.15.5: The *aṃśú-* here is in the first instance the shoots of the soma plant, the usual sense of this stem, but I think a possible secondary sense is the tufts of wool on the fleece filter, which can resemble shoots of vegetation. In the former case the instr. expresses accompaniment, in the latter instr. of path-along-which. See the instr. in 1a (*āṇvyā*), 2b (*pathā*), and 6b (*pāruṣā*), which all refer to the fleece along which soma journeys.

IX.15.6: In contrast to the relative simplicity of the rest of this hymn, this vs. presents a number of lexical puzzles / unusual usages.

On *pibdanā-* see comm. ad VI.46.6. As indicated there, I take the underlying verb as ‘go step-by-step, plod, trudge’. In our passage I think *pibdanā vásūni*, lit. “plodding goods,” is a jocular way to refer to cattle -- the “cows” [=milk] that Soma is rushing towards. Others (Ge, Re) simply see these as the material goods Soma is on his way to gain.

A *pārus-* is a link(age), joint, or juncture; see EWA s.v. *pārvan-* with considerable lit. as well as comm. ad IV.22.2. In this instance I think it’s abstract ‘articulation’ and refers to the 3-D patterns on the fleece filter. As indicated in the comm. to the preceding vs., I take it as an instr. of the path here. Others (esp. Ge and Re) think it refers to the knots or nodules of the soma plant that remain in the filter when the juice has flown out, but then both the singular and the instrumental are hard to explain. Note that in IV.22.2 Indra wraps himself in the *pārvāni* of a river, which I take there as tufts of foam that resemble tufts of wool.

śāda- is a hapax in the RV, but related words are found elsewhere, if rarely, in Vedic: YV texts (VS, MS, KS, ŚB, etc; see Bloomfield Conc.) contain a mantra *śādam* [*śādam* in accented texts] *dadbhiḥ* “*śād(a)* with the teeth,” in a litany listing the disposition of the parts of the sacrificed horse. There is no strong contextual evidence for its identification with a plant, much less with grass or fresh grass. However, in later Skt. *śādvala-* means ‘grassy’ and matches the fairly widespread MIA word *saddala-* ‘id.’ (Pāli etc.), and ‘grass’ is certainly compatible here, since horses crop grass with their teeth. It is also not possible to tell from the mantra whether the stem is thematic (as in our RVic passage) or a root noun. The JB contains two occurrences in a single passage of what is clearly a root noun and which is somewhat more helpful semantically than the YV exx. It is in a passage that lists several plant substitutes to press in place of soma, of which *śād* is the first: JB I.355 *śuklās śādo ‘bhiṣunuyuḥ / somo vai rājā yad imaṃ lokam ājagāma sa śātsv eva tad uvāsa / sa evāsyā saṃnyaṅgaḥ / tam eva tad abhiṣunvanti* “They should press white/bright *śād*-s. When Soma the king came to this world, he dwelled then in *śād*-s. That is his mark. Thus they press him in this way.” On this basis Soma seems to have an affinity with *śād(a)-*. However, it is not possible to tell whether the JB passage is an independent witness to this association or was constructed on the basis of the RV passage. In any case, I have no idea what aspect of the soma ritual *śāda-* is meant to refer to. I assume the descent here should be into some type of soma vessel (see *drōṇeṣu* in the

next vs., 7b). I considered the possibility that *śāda-* is meant to evoke some noun meaning ‘seat’, to \sqrt{sad} , with the MIA loss of distinction among sibilants enabling such a pun. But there is no appropriate nominal counterpart belonging to \sqrt{sad} . Another possibility, starting with ‘in / among the grasses’, is that the image is of a worn-out racehorse put out to pasture. But none of these possibilities is particularly compelling, and I’m afraid the reference must remain a mystery.

IX.15.8: The insights of b form a bit of a ring with the insight of 1a. Furthermore, ab with ten fingers and seven *dhītí-* grooming Soma is almost identical to IX.8.4.

IX.16

IX.16.1: On *oní-* see comm. ad VI.20.4, where I am unsatisfied by the current consensus that it means ‘arm’ (see EWA s.v.) but offer nothing to take its place. Here ‘arm’ works perfectly well.

Etaśa is the sun’s horse, so he would be traveling through the air. On \sqrt{tac} as referring generally to birds’ movements, see IX.32.4.

IX.16.2: Ge and Re construe *dákṣasya* with preceding *krátvā*, which is certainly possible: *krātu-* and *dákṣa-* are often associated, and Ge adduces several passages containing *krátvā dákṣasya* (III.2.3, V.10.2 -- though in both cases JPB plausibly construed *dákṣasya* with something else). But since *rathī-* ‘charioteer’ is regularly construed with a gen. (incl. *dákṣasya* IV.10.2, VI.51.6) and since *krátvā* appears without gen. in nearby 4c, I take *dákṣasya* with *rathī-*. Better might be the course suggested (but not followed) by Ge in his n. 2a: “*dákṣasya* wohl nach beiden Seiten zu verbinden.” This would yield the tr. “with the resolve of skill we accompany the charioteer of skill ...,” which seems a bit heavy.

IX.16.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the hapax *ánapta-* is difficult. Insofar as there is a standard view, it is taken as ‘unwatered, undiluted’ (Gr ‘nicht wässrig’, Ge ‘nicht verwässert’; EWA s.v. with lit.), while Re prefers ‘inaccessible’. Although the connection with ‘water’ makes the most superficial sense, esp. given its juxtaposition with immediately following *apsú* ‘in the waters’, it doesn’t make ritual sense, in that the soma *is* watered during these steps in the sacrifice, and in this very pāda the soma is depicted as being “in the waters.” My own desperate suggestion is not appreciably better, that it is formed to *napítī-* ‘granddaughter, niece’, used of the fingers that prepare the soma. Two of the six forms of this word are found in hymns by just this poet (Asita Kāśyapa or Devala Kāśyapa), IX.9.1, 14.5). The word would mean ‘without the granddaughters’ (for the accent, cf. words like *áprajā-* ‘without offspring’ and AiG II.1.239–40), that is, without their ritual ministrations. The point would be (if there is a point) that the soma speeds through the waters and would do so, even if it had not received these ministrations. I do not, however, set much stock in this suggestion, esp. since the morphology is dicey to say the least.

The phrase *apsú duṣṭára-* is found also in nearby IX.20.6, so this must be the constituency here -- and *apsú* is therefore not to be construed with *ánaptam*. As Re points out, Soma is several times called *ap-túr-* ‘crossing the waters’ (e.g., IX.63.5, 21), and the expression here redistributes the elements.

IX.16.4: In the publ. tr. I construe *punānāsya* with *pavítre*, not with adjacent *cétasā*, as Ge and Re do. I would now emend my tr. to the standard: “with the attention of the one being purified [that is, himself].” Ge comments (n. 4a), “Er weiss von selbst, was er zu tun hat,” and although I’m not entirely sure that this is what the phrase means, my publ. tr. doesn’t make much sense either and overlooks the fact that pāda b, which contains the noun, *pavítre*, on which I hang the gen. *punānāsya*, is found identically in the next hymn (17.3), as well as in IX.37.1, both times without a gen.

IX.16.5: The vs. begins *prá tvā*, reminiscent of the hymn opening *prá te* (1a), and the audience would surely assume -- not least because 2nd ps. is generally restricted to Soma in the IXth Maṇḍala (see Re’s comm. here) -- that *tvā* refers to Soma. But this expectation is repaired (or dis-repaired) by the voc. *índra* that opens pāda b. See vs. 8 below.

I take the referent of gen. *kārīṇaḥ* in c to be Indra.

IX.16.6: In c the loc. *góṣu* can be shared by simile and frame: in the frame it refers to the milk into which the soma has entered, in the simile to the cows that a champion wins in the raid or battle.

IX.16.8: Soma is addressed here in the 2nd ps., the first time since the uninsistent *te* in the first pāda of the hymn (1a *prá te* ...) and thus sketches a sort of referential ring. Throughout the rest of the hymn soma is always in the 3rd ps., and the only 2nd ps. reference is found in vs. 5, where the referent is Indra (see comm. there).

Pāda a is troublingly incomplete, with a nom. subj. (*tvám*) and an acc. *vipaścítam* but nothing to govern the acc. The pāda is identical to IX.64.25a, whose b pāda, *punāno vācam iṣyasi*, provides both a transitive verb and a referent for the acc., “being purified, you send forth speech attentive to poetic inspiration.” Although supplying a full pāda is something I would prefer not to do, I see no alternative to doing so (nor does Ge; see his n. 8a, where he expresses his reluctance; Bl, RR ad loc., as well). It is made somewhat more plausible by the appearance in nearby 12.6, by the same poet, of the relevant VP, *vācam ... iṣyati*. (See also *iṣṇán* in the next hymn, 17.5, where I supply ‘speech’ as the obj. [contra Ge, but in agreement with Re].) This is certainly a better solution than Re’s: he simply treats the acc. as a nom. and uses it as a modifier of Soma (“Toi, ô *soma*, qui comprends les mots-inspirés ...”).

IX.17

IX.17.3: The hapax *áty-ūrmi-* must be modelled on *áty-avi-* ‘beyond the sheep(’s fleece)’, 4x, including twice in the hymns of this poet: IX.6.5 and 13.1. I assume the image is, roughly, of a wave breaking on the shore, with the liquid now beyond the wave-forms on the body of water.

IX.17.5: The *áti-* in cmpd. found in 3a here gives rise to a phrasal expression with cosmic reach: *áti trī ... rocanā* “beyond the three luminous realms.”

I supply ‘speech’ as the obj. of *iṣṇán*; see comm. ad 16.8.

IX.17.8: Both Ge and Re take *ánu kṣara* as transitive (“Lass ... fließen,” “Laisse couler ...”), but forms of $\sqrt{kṣar}$ are otherwise intransitive, and here the acc. *dhāṛām* must be governed by the preverb *ánu*.

IX.18

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.18.2: The identification of Soma as both *vípra-* and *kaví-* is quite explicit here; see disc. ad 12.8.

In b Ge takes the *prá* as standing for the predicate “hat den Vorzug” and construes it separately from the *jātām*, presumably because of its separate accent. I am sympathetic, but still assume that it is loosely construed with *jātām*. The tr. should perhaps be slightly altered to “born forth from ...” On *jātām ándhasaḥ* see further ad IX.55.2.

IX.18.3–4: Note the two occurrences of *vísva-* (3a, 4a), which contrast with the *sarva-* in the refrain.

IX.18.4–7: Vss. 4–6 all (save for the refrain pāda) consist of rel. clauses headed by *yáh* and couched in the 3rd ps.; the main clause appears to be vs. 7, with the resumptive prn. *sá* and 3rd ps. verb.

IX.18.5: Both Ge and Re take *ródasī mahī* as acc. obj. of the frame, with *mātārā* as subj. (Re) or obj. (Ge) in the simile: e.g., “qui trait ces Deux grands Mondes ensemble, comme deux (vaches) mères.” In favor of this view is the fact that in VIII.6.17a, identical to our a-pāda, the dual is acc. (though in a very different context); furthermore, the position of *iva* in b might suggest that the simile consists only of the preceding word *mātārā*. However, I prefer to take both duals as part of the simile, parallel nominatives corresponding to the unexpressed subj. of the frame, Soma. Cows (or their correspondants) are the standard subjects of med. forms of \sqrt{duh} , with the obj. being the milk (or milk substitute), and therefore the accusatives of Re and Ge would be semantically and functionally anomalous. For Heaven and Earth (i.e., the two world-halves represented by *ródasī* here) as subject of medial \sqrt{duh} , see VI.70.2 *ghṛtām duhāte* “the two yield ghee as milk,” in a hymn to Heaven and Earth, which are the default referent of the many duals in the hymn.

IX.18.7: Because of the rel. cl. / main cl. structure of vss. 4–7 (see above), I would lightly emend to the tr. to “he/that one, tempestuous in the tubs, kept roaring ...,” to display this structure more clearly.

IX.19

On the imagery in the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.19.2: Note the reverse vāyav indraś ca construction, *indraś ca soma*.

IX.19.3: With Ge (but not Re), I take the pres. part. *sán* as concessive, as the nom. forms of this participle generally are -- although I'm not sure what the concession is. The most likely possibility is that "sitting down on the womb" is an odd action for a horse. The most common simile with "sit" is "like a falcon," e.g., IX.82.1 *śyenó ná yónim ... āśadam*, with the same lexical material as here. Or perhaps horses don't thunder.

IX.19.4: I am not entirely certain of the force of *ādhi*: my 'over' does not parse very well in Engl. tr. But the point is probably that the verbal part of the ritual, embodied by the fem. *dhītī*- 'insightful thought/speech' and therefore conceived of as female, is produced at the same time as the "semen" of Soma, namely the juice itself. This semen is attributed both to a bull, Soma as hypervirile adult male animal, and, if we supply *rétasi* in c for the genitives to depend on (so also Ge and Re), to a calf, presumably not yet sexually mature, who is further the son of these mothers (the words, at least by my interpr.). Ge (n. 4) calls the verse "ein Paradoxon," though he doesn't bother to explain what he thinks the paradox is. I assume that it is the identification of Soma as both bull and calf.

I further assume that the "mothers" (*mātārah*) of c are co-referential with the *dhītāyah* of a, though it might be possible to separate them -- with the mothers being the milk-mixture or some other ritual substance. Lü (247) considers the mothers distinct from the *dhītāyah* and referring to the heavenly streams, but this is a predictable result of his *idée fixe*.

IX.19.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. metaphorically expresses the complex interaction between poetry, the thoughts (*dhī*- 2c, *dhītī*- 4a, both fem.) recited at the Soma pressing, and the Soma/soma him-/itself. The (female) thoughts "yearn for the/a bull" (*vr̥ṣanyā*-) to swell (*√pi* 2c) and impregnate (*gārbhaṃ* *√dhā* 5b) them with his semen/juice, while at the same time they are Soma's mothers (4c) and themselves "give the gleaming milk" (*śukrām duhaté páyah* 5c) -- *śukrām páyah* being often a kenning for both soma juice and semen (see Gr, nos. 3 and 7 s.v. *śukrá*). So they both produce the soma/semen and become pregnant by it.

IX.19.6: Re identifies this vs. as displaying the three functions -- an interpr. that utterly escapes me.

The lexeme *āpa* *√sthā* is quite rare in the RV with a fairly late distribution: besides this passage I have found only VIII.48.11 (a "popular" hymn acdg. to Arnold), X.106.2, and X.124.8. It means 'stay/keep away'; in this context, where those who *āpa* *√sthā* are to be courted by Soma, in contrast to the *sātru*-, in whom he is urged to strike fear, it seems to refer to potential allies or members of our group who are currently staying neutral, sitting on the fence, as it were. It nicely contrasts with *úpa śikṣa* 'seek to win over, seek to entice (here)', on which see I.112.19, I.173.10.

As in II.28.6, the transmitted *bhiyásam* should be read *bhyásam*.

I take *vidā* as 2nd sg. impv., with lengthened ending, contra the standard interpr. (Pp, Gr, Old, Lub) as 2nd sg. subj. *vidās*. (Ge and Re tr. as an impv. and do not comment, but it's quite possible that they are so tr. what they consider a subjunctive.) The form is parallel to 2 impvs. in the same vs., *úpa śikṣa* (a), *ā dhehi* (b), which support an impv. reading; the pāda is repeated twice (IX.43.4, 63.11), but those vss. lack other verb forms that would support one reading or the other. Other occurrences of *vidā* are generally

better taken as impv. (I.36.14, VI.48.9, VIII.61.7) or are syntactically and semantically indifferent (I.71.7). (I take the form in V.45.1 as the instr. of a root noun.) The only clear ex. of a subj. is in IX.40.4, where sandhi preserves the final cons.: *vidāḥ sahasrīṇīr* ... I assume the almost universal embrace of the Pp subjunctive readings results from the fact that there are no unambiguous imperative forms to this them. aor. stem -- that is, forms where the sandhi does not allow a -*ās* reading -- whereas there are several other subjunctives (e.g., *vidāsi* IX.35.1). But I do not see why an impv. would be excluded on principle; Macd (VedGr §512) gives several exx. of *a*-aorist imperatives, though he states that the mood is “of rare occurrence” -- a statement he also makes (§509) about the subjunctive to the same formation, however. It’s also worth noting that KH (Injunk. 263) takes *vidó śú* ... in X.113.10 as impv. *vidá* + *u*, a reading supported by the sandhi of *śú*. On imperatival use of injunc. *vidaḥ* see comm. ad IX.20.3.

IX.20

IX.20.1: *vārebhiḥ*, lit. ‘along the hairs/fleece’ is an instr. of the path-along-which; see comm. ad IX.15.5.

IX.20.3: The sense of the injunc. *vidaḥ* here is uncertain, but my rendering in the publ. tr. as if it were a subjunctive is almost surely wrong. In general, 2nd sg. injunctives to thematic aorists have been taken as modal (see KH, Injunk. 263), and certainly Ge and Re both tr. this form as an impv. The *sá* opening the pāda supports the interpr. as an imperative substitute, since, by my rules (“Vedic ‘sá figé’: An Inherited Sentence Connective?,” *Historische Sprachforschung* 105 [1992]: 213–39), *sá* (and other nominative forms of this pronoun) are found with 2nd ps. ref. almost exclusively with imperatives. Hoffmann (loc. cit.), however, says that modal use of the various occurrences of *vidaḥ* is “nicht durchweg sicher.” Nonetheless I would now change the tr. to an imperatival “find fame for us,” because of the *sá*. I do not think that this calls my interpr. of *vidā* as an impv. in the preceding hymn (19.8) into question. See comm. there. For other occurrences of the form *vidaḥ*, see comm. ad I.42.7–9.

IX.20.5: Both Ge and Re take ab together, but I do not understand how the simile “like a king” (*rājeva*) would work with the VP (“you have entered the songs” *gírah* ... *viveśitha*). I have therefore taken the two pādas as separate clauses. The simile in pāda a then works well, since it makes perfect sense that a king should “possess good commandments” (*suvratāḥ*). The splitting of the two pādas gains further support from IX.57.3b, a pāda closely corresponding to our pāda a: *ibho rājeva suvratāḥ*, where there is no question of entering songs or any similar action and the shared quality of simile and frame must be *suvratā-*.

For further on the expression “enter songs” in pāda b, see publ. intro.

IX.20.6: On *apsú duṣṭārah* see comm. ad 16.3.

IX.20.7: On the double sense of *makhá-* see comm. ad I.18.9; in our passage the ‘bounteous’ sense prevails, though it could also be making a subtle ring with vs. 1. In 1c

Soma conquers all opponents, and here he could be secondarily called a battler as well as bounteous.

IX.21

IX.21.2: This vs. lacks a finite verb and can go either with vs. 1 or vs. 3 (or both): they all have as subj. the plural soma juices.

The lexeme *prā√vṛ* is rare and generally means ‘cover [with INSTR.]’ (e.g., X.16.7). However, here and in VII.82.6 it must mean ‘ward off’ (< ‘obstruct forward’?) vel sim.

IX.21.4: As often in the Soma hymns (see, e.g., comm. ad IX.9.1), *hitá-* is ambiguous, belonging either to *√dhā*, hence ‘placed’, or to *√hi*, hence ‘impelled’. Both Ge and Re opt for ‘placed’, and I admit that this works better with the loc. *rátthe*. But if they are merely “placed” at/on the chariot, we do not learn how they obtained the desirable things, and I therefore think ‘propelled’ is a necessary part of the scenario. Of course, it might be meant to be read both ways: “when placed at the chariot (and) propelled.”

IX.21.5: On my interpr. of this vs., see publ. tr. Both Ge and Re have quite different views. Ge takes the *asmin* to be the sacrificer (flg. Sāy.), with the *piśāṅgam ... venám* (my “tawny tracker,” his “den goldenen Seher”) “ein innerer Mahner” of this would-be stingy man. This anticipation of an Upaniṣadic-type Inner Controller seems anachronistic to me. Re simply -- in my opinion over-simplistically -- takes all elements to be soma in one form or another: the soma drops are urged to put “le (Soma) Veilleur à couleur-d’or” into the soma liquid. This endless loop doesn’t seem to get us anywhere. I do agree with Re that soma/Soma is represented by two of the elements: the drops that are addressed (*indavaḥ*) are soma the substance and the “tawny tracker” is Soma the god. The drops are urged to put Soma the god into Indra (my interpr. of the referent of *asmin*); cf., from the same poet, IX.11.6 *índum índre dadhātana*.

The subj. of the infin. *ādiśe* is, in my view, the tawny tracker (i.e., Soma), though the act of placing this Soma in Indra may be part of the instruction. On the constr. see comm. on the almost identical expression in 6b.

Loc. *asmin* is unaccented and should therefore refer to something already present in the discourse, but that does not eliminate any of the just-given interpr.: Ge’s sacrificer, in the person of the ‘presser’ (*súṣvi-*), is found in 2, my Indra in 1, and Re’s soma is ubiquitous. In fact even without the mentions in vss. 1 and 2, the sacrificer and Indra are expected personnel on the scene in any Soma hymn.

IX.21.6: The adj. *ráthya-* generally modifies either chariot horses or chariot wheels; here, with the presence of a craftsman, the latter is most likely. So also Gr, Ge, and Re.

As was just noted, pāda b *dádthātā kētam ādiśe* is almost identical to 5b *dádthātā venám ādiśe*. Nonetheless, Ge and Re unaccountably (at least to me) take the VP entirely differently here from 5b: they take *návam*, *dádthātā* as a phrasal verb “renew, make new,” with *ādiśe* filling a different syntactic role. E.g., “Erneuet, um (ihn) zu mahnen, seinen Vorsatz ...” (Sim. Keydana, Inf., 318, who shows no awareness of the parallel in the immed. preceding vs.) First, I know of no other exx. of *náva-√dhā* in the sense ‘make

new', a sense expressed rather by *náva-* √ *kṛ* (e.g., X.143.1). But, more important, the close parallelism between 5b and 6b strongly suggests that they should be interpr. the same way, with the acc. the subj. of the infinitive.

By the Ge/Re (/Keydana) interpr., in the simile the craftsman is “renewing” the wheel; by mine, he is “setting/placing” it on the chariot, with a slightly different sense of √ *dhā* than in the frame.

IX.21.7: *satáh* in c is somewhat puzzling. Both Ge and Re take it as adverbial: “in gleicher Weise,” “pareillement.” Ge makes no comment; Re adduces *sató-mahant-*, -*vīra-*. For this 1st cmpd member see comm. ad VII.104.21. As I point out there, though I think the cmpds in question contain this adverbial element, I do not think it exists as an independent word. Supposed exx. of it belong instead to the pres. part. of √ *as*, either gen./abl. sg. or acc. pl. Here I take it as the gen. sg., dependent on *matīm*. Genitives appearing with this stem generally refer to the poet (e.g., IX.64.10 *kavīnām matī*). Forms of √ *as*, incl. the pres. part., can have the extended sense ‘be real / really present’, and that is how I take it here. Cf. for a similar use in a nearby hymn IX.19.7 *dūré vā sató ánti vā* “whether he be in the distance or nearby” (used of an enemy); also IX.31.6 (of Soma).

IX.22

On the structure and thematics of this hymn, see publ. intro. Note also that the first 5 vss. begin *eté*, while the 2nd hemistichs of vss. 5 and 6 begin *utédám*. Further local chainings are discussed below.

IX.22.1: The preverb *prá*, which must be in tmesis from the verb *ahēṣata* that ends the vs., is very oddly positioned -- in the middle of a pāda (one that doesn’t even contain the verb), not adjoining a metrical boundary. I have no explanation, though it may be based on a pāda like IX.64.4 *ásṛkṣata prá vājīnaḥ*, also ending *prá vājīnaḥ*, where the preverb immediately follows its verb, a permitted position.

IX.22.2: As in the immed. preceding hymn (21.2), this vs. lacks a finite verb and can be attached either to vs. 1 or vs. 3 or both.

My supplied “(surging)” isn’t strictly necessary -- neither Ge nor Re supplies anything at all -- but it seemed to me that something dynamic was needed here, for wind, rain, and fire.

IX.22.3, 5: Note *vy ānaśuḥ* in both vss. (3c, 5b), implicitly connecting Soma’s pervasion of poetry with his pervasion of cosmic space. This repetition could also define vs. 4, the middle vs. of the hymn, as an omphalos, but that vs. doesn’t seem to do much if so. For further exx. of √ *(n)as* see ad 4–6.

IX.22.4: With Ge/Re I take *ná* as neg. with pf. *śaśramuḥ*. In contrast, Kü (524, 551) takes it as the simile particle: “... sind wie [Rennpferde], die gelaufen sind, ermüdet ...” He cites (551 n. 1141) Delbrück (Altind. Syn. 376) for this interpr., but Delbrück in fact takes the *ná* as neg.: “... sind nicht müde geworden, obgleich sie gelaufen sind.” I assume that Kü so interpr. because of the position of *ná* after the participle, but in a Gāyatrī pāda the position before the verb is also the position after the NP -- there’s not a lot of space. I

think it unlikely that the poets would ever say that the ever-running soma could get tired. Moreover, \sqrt{sram} almost always appears with neg.

IX.22.5: See remarks ad vs. 3.

The part. *vīprayāntaḥ* presumably belongs to the lexeme *vī-prā* \sqrt{i} , but note that it could also be interpr. as belonging to a denom. **vīpra-yā-* ‘behave like [/seek] an inspired poet’, which would connect this vs. further with the poetic pervasion of vs. 3. The suggested denom. stem is not attested but could of course be easily formed, and I’m tolerably sure this pun was meant. Note *vīpāscītaḥ* and *vīpā*, both in the matching vs. 3. I would now slightly alter the tr. to “going forth widely [/behaving like inspired poets].”

IX.22.4–6: More chaining: vss. 4 and 6 end with *rājāḥ*; the exact phrase in 5c is *uttamām rājāḥ*, whose *uttamām* is then picked up in 6a and augmented with *uttamāyyam* in 6c. Meanwhile, 3rd pl. pf. (vy) *ānaśuḥ* of 3c, 5b morphs into 3rd pl. root aor. *āśata* in 6b. As Old points out, $\sqrt{(n)aś}$ is also represented by the desid. *īyakṣantaḥ* in 4c.

My “that is to be higher still” is meant to capture the pseudo-gerundive form of the nonce *uttamāyīya-*.

IX.22.6–7: As noted in the publ. intro., vs. 7 stands somewhat apart from the rest of the hymn, but there is chaining here as well: 6a *tāntum tanvānām* ... is echoed by 7c *tatām tāntum* ...

IX.22.7: Both Ge and Re take *acikradaḥ* as transitive/causative (e.g., “tu l’as fait crier”), but although (*ā*)*cikrada-* looks like a typical redupl. aor. to an *-āya-* transitive, it is not so used. On the problem of this redupl. aor., see my 1983 *-āya-* book (pp. 110–11) (though I would now disavow a second \sqrt{krand} ‘race’, beside ‘roar’).

IX.23

IX.23.4: On the identification of the soma juices with the *Āyus*, see publ. intro. Both Ge and Re take *āyāvaḥ* here as adjectival (“lebengebend” and “vivaces” respectively), but this loses the connection with the *Āyus* in vs. 2.

IX.24

IX.24.1–3: The first 3 vss. are united by the use of the (secondary) root \sqrt{dhanv} ‘run’, with the 3rd pl. *-iṣ-* aor. *adhanviṣuḥ* (found only here in the RV) in vss. 1 and 2, with the complementary subjects soma drops (1) and cows (2) (or so I think: see below), and the 2nd sg. pres. *dhanvasi* in 3.

IX.24.2: Old discusses this vs. at some length and disputes the cows as subject. The problems he sees are that 1) it makes more sense for the soma drops to run than the cows (though he admits that there are some undoubted passages with the latter); 2) the shared verb would more naturally have the same subject than diff. subjects (this is not a stylistic given in soma hymns, where substances swap identities all the time); 3) the part. *punānāḥ* ‘being purified’ is better applied to soma drops than cows (though again he recognizes at

least one passage in which the part. is so used). On the basis of these arguments he suggests that *gāvaḥ* here should be interpr. as accusative rather than as the nominative it overwhelming is, with *abhī gāvaḥ* substituted for *abhī gāḥ* on metrical grounds and the soma drops again the subj. This seems both uncharacteristic and unworthy of Oldenberg. Positing “metrical” motivation for RVic anomalies is rarely successful, because the poets are flexible enough to avoid situations where they would be forced to use the wrong grammatical form because of meter. Moreover, the construction of the a-pādas of the two vss. -- PREVERB PL.NOUN *adhanviṣuḥ* -- imposes the subject role on the second noun (*gāvaḥ*, 2a), which is in the same position as *sómāsaḥ* in 1a. The only of his arguments that seems at all worth considering is the one about *punānāḥ*, though given the tendency to identify the substances, esp. the liquid substances, in the soma ritual with each other, I do not find it particularly cogent -- and as Old himself points out, c could be a separate clause with the soma drops supplied as subj. there. (Another possible argument, not brought up by Old, is that this is the only vs. in the hymn where soma [sg. or pl.] is not the subject, but I do not think that is strong enough to contravene the grammar.) He cites another possible ex. of acc. *gāvaḥ*, in VIII.41.6, where the form is easily interpr. as nom. (see comm. ad loc.). Re follows Old’s interpr; Ge does not, though in his n. 2b he suggests that the poet meant the soma drops as subject, but reversed the construction (“... er hat aber die Konstruktion umgekehrt,” whatever he means by that).

IX.24.4: Although in the publ. tr. pāda c is unequivocally applied to Soma (“you who are ...”), the text is ambiguous: the rel. cl. of pāda c, *sásnir yó anumādyaḥ*, could have either Soma or Indra (under the epithet *carṣaṇīsāh-*, which ends the preceding pāda) as antecedent. In IX *anumādya-* is otherwise used of Soma, including two vss. later (24.6) as well as 76.1, 107.11, but it applies to Indra in VI.34.2. Since Indra was just called “conquerer of territories,” the use of *sásni-* ‘winner’ for the subj. of *anumādya-* makes Indra a distinct possibility. I think the ambiguity is meant; this is another ex. of the trade-off of identities discussed ad vs. 2. See further below.

IX.24.5: The tr. of this vs. needs to be emended: because *paridhāvasi* has an accented verb, it must belong to the *yád* clause, and pāda c must be the main clause. I would now add to the tr. of c “(you are) fit ...” Alternatively, the vs. could be entirely a subordinate clause and dependent on either 4 or 6, hence, e.g., “purify yourself ... (4), when pressed by the stones you run around the filter, fit for the fundament of Indra (5),” with no alternation of the transl. of 5, but a comma, not a period, at the end of 4.

What *dhāmane* is meant to convey here is unclear, and numerous incompatible suggestions have been made -- e.g., Ge “(Eigen)art,” Re “vocation” (and see his n.). I long ago (Ged. Cowgill) suggested that this is a somewhat heavy-handed pun, with “fundament” both referring to Indra’s fundamental being and to his physical foundation, his bottom.

IX.24.6: As noted in the publ. intro., Indra’s most characteristic epithet, “Vṛtra/obstacle-smasher,” is here applied to Soma instead -- another ex. of identity trading. The gerundive *anumādya-*, which was ambiguously used in 4c for either Soma or Indra or both, may signal the blurring of identity between them here.

IX.24.7: Because of the blurring of identity just discussed, I take the predicate of *ucyate* ‘is called’ to be *sómah*, a re-assertion of the name of the god being celebrated in this hymn after the equation with Indra in vss. 4 and 6 (and with the cows in vs. 2). This re-assertion is esp. appropriate in the final vs. of the hymn. Ge/Re take *súciḥ pāvakāḥ* as the predicate instead, but this pair of adjectives already characterized the substance identically in 6c. I think the point is that “the gleaming and purified one” has the name / is called “Soma.” In favor of their interpr. is the variant in VIII.13.19 *súciḥ pāvakā ucyate só ádbhutaḥ* (which also incorporates all 3 adjectives from our vs. 6c). In that passage the adjectives do seem to serve as predicate with *ucyate*, but with a twist -- these soma-epithets are applied to the praiser (*stotár-*) there. I therefore do not think that the two similar pādas need to be construed identically -- rather that one poet (probably the one responsible for VIII.13.19) is playing with the phrase.

IX.25

IX.25.2: *hitáḥ* here fairly clearly belongs to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’, given the expressions of movement and goal in the rest of the vs. But the ambiguity between *hitá-* ‘impelled’ and ‘placed’ is common in this maṇḍala, as we’ve already seen (e.g., IX.1.2).

Both Ge and Re take *dhármaṇā* to be Soma’s: “nach deiner Bestimmung” and “selon (ta) nature” respectively. However, I take it to refer to the statute or ordinance of the *ritual*, in particular that which establishes Vāyu as the first recipient of the soma drink: *dhármaṇā* is used in this exact sense here as well as in IX.63.22 and I.134.5; see disc. ad the latter passage.

IX.25.3: Soma is given Indra’s epithet *vṛtrahán-* as in vs. 6 of the preceding hymn (IX.24).

IX.25.4: There is disagreement about what it means for Soma to “enter all forms” (*vísṁvā rūpāṇy āviśán*): Ge thinks that it refers to the various stages of soma preparation, while Re that it refers to the divine forms, that is the gods, whom Soma enters when he is drunk. I slightly favor Ge’s explanation, since Soma only reaches the gods in the last pāda.

IX.25.6: On *ā pavasva ... pavítram* see disc. ad IX.70.10.

IX.26

On the rhetorical structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. The tr. replicates the fronting of the acc. pronoun ‘him’ throughout, though in vs. 6 *tám tvā* is represented just by “you,” not “that you.”

IX.26.2: The phrase *dhartár- diváḥ* (also in opposite order) “supporter of heaven” is well established and used elsewhere in IX of Soma (IX.76.1, 109.6); it is of course the default interpr. here, shared by Gr, Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. inter alia. However, the *ā* in the middle of the phrase (*dhartāram ā diváḥ*) is troubling. It should not be a preverb in tmesis, since it is not adjacent to a metrical boundary and is not in a pāda with a finite verb (nor is there an appropriate verb anywhere in the vs.). The standard use of *ā* in such positions

is as an adposition, and in particular, in the position before an abl., with the meaning ‘all the way to’. Cf. for this exact expression *ā divāḥ* I.92.17 “all the way to heaven,” of a *ślóka*- ‘signal call’ whose noise goes to heaven. I therefore think there is a syntactic and semantic pun in this vs.: the first reading is “supporter of heaven” with a gen. *divāḥ* (and the *ā* essentially elided), but the second is “all the way to heaven” with an abl. *divāḥ* governed by *ā*. This latter reading indicates that the lowing of the cows found in pāda a (*gāvo abhy ānūṣata*) goes not only to Soma on the ritual ground but also to heaven, where the heavenly Soma is found -- as is made clear in the next vs. That the material going to heaven is noise reminds us of I.92.17 with the same expression.

IX.26.3: On the anomalous acc. sg. *vedhām* to *vedhās*- see Old ad loc.; AiG II.2.225, 725, III.283, 285. Re’s suggestion that it may recall “l’origine lointaine *vī-dhā*” is best ignored, since Aves. *vazdah-* rules out a vrddhi of *-i-* in the initial syllable of *vedhās*- (as Re surely knew). Note that the correct pl. to the *-as*-stem, *vedhāsaḥ*, is found in vs. 6.

For the relationship between *ādhi dyāvī* here and *ā divāḥ* in 2c, see immed. above.

IX.26.4: On this vs., and esp. pāda b, see Old’s detailed and sensible disc.

The rare and curiously formed word *bhurīj-* (4x), without clear etymology, is always dual, and the gloss ‘arm’ (flg. Sāy’s *bāhu-*), or perhaps better ‘hand’, works reasonably well in the various contexts. In IV.2.14 it appears in a vs. with other body parts and in a context where artisans are at work; in VIII.4.16 a razor is being sharpened; in IX.71.5 it qualifies the fingers, which are assembling a chariot. Here the context is rather like IX.10.2, which has du. *gābhastyoḥ*, belonging to a stem unambiguously meaning ‘hand’. In this passage it’s important to note that *bhurī(joḥ)* is in the same metrical position as *bhūri(-)* in 3c and 5c and that *bhurījor dhiyā* is close to a phonological approximation of *bhūridhāyasam* (3c).

There is some difference of opinion on how to construe *vivāsvataḥ*. Re supplies “(dans le domaine),” presumably on the basis of the fairly common phrase *vivāsvataḥ sādane*. Old’s interpr (flg. Pischel), that it depends on *dhiyā*, is the one I adopt: it has the merit of not requiring anything to be supplied, and *vivāsvataḥ* depends on *dhī-* in IX.99.2 *vivāsvato dhīyaḥ*, where the thoughts themselves are impelling soma (*hinvánti*, like our *ahyan*). Ge’s interpr. is more complex: he takes *dhiyā* independently with *ahyan* in pāda a (“Ihn haben sie ... durch ihre Kunst zur Eile getrieben”), but with *vivāsvataḥ* dependent on it with *saṃvāsānam* in b (“der sich (in die Dichtung) des Vivasvant kleidet”), thus reading *dhiyā* twice (see his n. 4b). I think this double reading is essentially correct -- though I see no reason to put the second “in die Dichtung” in parens, nor do I think that the *dhiyā* construed with *ahyan* in pāda a should lack the dependent genitive.

Though Gr classifies *saṃvāsāna-* (2x) with *√vas* ‘dwell’, the later consensus (in addition to the usual, see Gotō, 1st Kl., 295 n. 698), patently correct in my view, is that it belongs with *√vas* ‘wear’, which has a well-attested med. root pres., whose med. participle is esp. common. On ‘hymns’ etc. as garments, see the passages cited by Old.

IX.26.6: With Old I take *girāvīdh-* as a pun, with the first member both instr. sg. of *gír-* ‘song’ and loc. sg. of *gírī-* ‘mountain’ -- both meanings being entirely appropriate to soma. Ge opts for the 1st in his tr. (though he recognizes the 2nd in n. 6b); Re for the 2nd. Scar (516–17) tentatively accepts Old’s double interpr.

IX.27

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn, like the immediately preceding one, is unified by the simple device of a pronoun (here *eṣā* ‘this one’) repeated at the beginning of each vs. and rendered as such in English. Unlike the preceding hymn there is no switch of person at the end.

IX.27.1: On the meaning of the root $\sqrt{tuś}$ see comm. ad VIII.38.2.

IX.27.3: The root-noun cmpd *viśva-víd-* is ambiguous, between ‘all-knowing’ and ‘all-acquiring’ (see Scar 489). In this context, given *svar-jít-* ‘winning the sun’ (2b) and *satrā-jít-* ‘winning completely’ (4c), ‘acquiring all’ seems to work better; however, the very next hymn contains two instances of the same cmpd (IX.28.1, 5), where ‘knowing all’ is favored.

IX.27.5: This vs. rather subtly contrasts the cosmic Soma, who is in heaven (*ádhi dyávi*)(ab), with the ritual substance in the filter (*pavítre*, c). See comm. ad IX.26.2, 3 in the preceding hymn.

On the formation and sense of *hāsate* see Narten (Sig.Aor. 285–86).

IX.27.6: The last vs. of the hymn splits the locational difference found in vs. 5: Soma here flows in the midspace (*antárikṣe*), between the heavenly Soma and the soma on earth on the ritual ground.

On *śuśmī* see comm. ad 29.6.

IX.28

Like the last hymn, this one has *eṣā* beginning every vs. Although the hymns share some vocabulary and themes (as which Soma hymns do not?), they are not twinned.

IX.28.1: *hitáh* is taken by all standard interpr. (Gr, Ge, Re) to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’, as also by me, presumably because of the verb of motion, *ví dhāvati*, that provides the finite verb in the vs. But it could, of course, belong to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’. This alternative interpr. is almost encouraged by vs. 4bc *daśábhīr jāmbhīr yatáh | abhī dróṇani dhāvati* “(Soma,) held by the ten siblings, runs to the wooden cups,” where a ppl. of static position (*yatáh*) precedes the same verb of motion.

On *viśva-víd-* see comm. ad 27.3. Because of *mānasas pátiḥ* (note close sandhi) “lord of mind,” I interpr. the cmpd as ‘all-knowing’ here.

IX.28.2: For c *viśvā dhāmāny āviśán* Ge reasonably cfs. (n. 2c) IX.25.4a *viśvā rūpāny āviśán*, but then goes the further step to “*dhāman = rūpā*” and tr. our passage “alle seine Formen annehmend,” for which I see little or no justification. Yes, the stems in the RV with well-established distinct meanings, and I see no reason to erase that distinction. Ge’s interpr. has implications for vs. 5, for which see below.

IX.28.5: The c pāda, *viśvā dhāmāni viśvavít*, has the same neut. pl. acc. NP as 2c and the third word is phonologically similar to 2c *āviśán*. There are in principle three ways to

construe *viśvā dhāmāni*: 1) as a 2nd object to *arocayat* in a (“made the sun shine (and) all the domains”); 2) as the goal of *āviśān*, supplied from 2c (“entering all domains”); 3) as the object of the root noun *-víd-* extracted the cmpd. *viśva-víd-* or as further specification of the 1st member of that cmpd. (so, either “all-knowing, (knowing) the domains” as in the publ. tr., or “knowing all, (viz.) all the domains”). Like the publ. tr., Re chooses the first version of 3), and this seems the most rhetorically satisfying, while Ge opts for a variant of the second version of 3, while being forced to the further step of interpr. *dhāmāni* as “forms” (“all Formen vollständig kennend”) on the basis of his interpr. of 2c.

IX.28.6: On *śuṣmī* see comm. ad 29.6.

IX.29

IX.29.1: The metrical structure encourages construing *ójasā* with *sutásya* -- so Ge “wenn der Bull mit Kraft ausgepresst ist.” However, I think it likely that the *ójas-* expressions are otherwise identical, but *dhāman-* and *rūpā-* are both well-established belongs to Soma, rather than the pressers, and have therefore taken it with the participial VP in c. Re seems to take it with the verb of pāda a: “Ses jets ont coulé en avant ... d’une force-formidable.”

Note the unaccented *asya* in the first pāda, allowable because the referent is unmistakable. Cf. *asmai* in IX.11.1a and IX.70.1a.

IX.29.3: The construction in pāda a is clarified by IX.94.5 *viśvāni hí suṣāhā tāni túbhyam* “for all these things are easy to conquer for you,” with a full dative prn. rather than our ambig. enclitic *te*. The *tāni* is clearly specified by *viśvā vásūni* in 4a, anticipated by the voc. *prabhū-vaso* in our b.

IX.29.5: *áraruṣaḥ* in pāda a can be gen. or abl. sg. Either of them can fit the syntax: as abl. it can be construed directly with *rākṣā* (“protect from ...”) and be parallel to *svanāt* in b; as gen., it can be dependent on *svanāt* and part of the gen. NP *samasya kásya cit*. Ge follows the 2nd path (“vor dem Schnauben eines jeden Geizhalses”), while Re (and I) the 1st. I do so partly because an abl. simply gives more oomph -- protection from a non-giver seems more critical than simply from the sound of one -- but primarily because of the word order: the audience hearing a form that could be abl. immediately after *√rakṣ* would naturally take it as an abl. It’s possible that they would revise their opinion on encountering a 2nd abl. followed by a gen. sg. to which *áraruṣaḥ* could belong, but it’s also possible (likely even) that they would see no reason to reinterpret. *áraruṣaḥ*.

The subordinate cl. in c does not fit with the main cl. very well, as the awkwardness of the publ. tr. shows. The problem is the verb: what is wanted in context is a modal in a purpose-type clause (“so that we will/may become free of insult”); this would work well with protection from the “sound” in pāda b. But *mumucmāhe* is resolutely pf. indicative (or redupl. pres. indic.; see Kü 380 and nn. 677, 678). Both Ge and Re supply material to smooth the transition, Re with a pres. part. attached to ab: “(nous plaçant) là où nous soyons à l’abri de la nocivité” -- thus also sneaking in the desirable modality. Ge starts a new sentence with c, supplying as main cl. “da wollen wir sein.” Kü avoids supplying anything, but sneaks in futurity in parens: “da wir von der

Schmach befreit (worden) sind.” I don’t have a good solution and so stick with the awk. publ. tr.

IX.29.6: This is the 3rd hymn in a row, all attributed to Āṅgīrasa poets, with a form of *śuṣmín-*, *śuṣma-* in the final vs. Also in the next hymn IX.30, also an Āṅgīrasa hymn, vss. 1 (*śuṣmín-*) and 3 (*śuṣma-*). As noted in the publ. intro. to IX.30, the word is not characteristic of Āṅgīrasa poets elsewhere, even in the IXth Maṇḍala, although there are numerous hymns attributed to them in this maṇḍala (besides our IX.27–30): IX.4, 35–36, 37–38, 39–40, 44–46, 50–52, 61, 67 [part], 69, 72, 73, 83, parts of 97 and 108, 112). Of these, only IX.50.1, 52.4, attributed to Ucātha Āṅgīrasa, contain members of this word family. In hymns attributed to Āṅgīrasa poets outside of IX, the words are found only in X.43.3 (Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa), VIII.96.8 (Tiraṣci Āṅgīrasa), and -- most noteworthy -- VIII.98.12, 99.6, the only two hymns outside of IX attributed exclusively to Nṛmedha Āṅgīrasa, the poet of our IX.27, 29.

IX.30

On *śuṣma-* (vs. 3) and *śuṣmín-* (vs. 1), see ad IX.39.6.

IX.30.1: Unaccented *asya* in the first pāda of the hymn is exactly like that in IX.29.1a.

IX.30.2: It is not clear how to interpr. *indriyám* in the phrase *vagnúm indriyám*, as also in similar expressions: I.92.1 *ślókam indriyám*, VIII.52.7 *hāvanam ... indriyám*. Most take it to mean “Indra-like,” that is, presumably, loud, powerful (e.g., Ge “ein indrahafte Geschrei”). I think it more likely that it identifies the cry as “destined for Indra, appropriate to Indra.” Indra is always the special target of invocation in the Soma maṇḍala and VIII.52 is an Indra hymn. Of course, both senses could be meant.

IX.30.3: The idiom *ā√pū* ‘attract (X) through purification’ is found here in tmesis (see also 29.6). Here the *ā* opening the first two pādas is immediately followed by the accusatives that it, as it were, licenses, while the impv. *pavasva* appears in the 3rd pāda with *dhārayā*, which is also appropriate in the intrans./reflex. usage of *pāvate* without preverb (see 4ab).

Re points to the contrast (or at least juxtaposition) of *nṛ-* (*nṛ-sāhyā-*) and *vīrā-* (*vīrā-vant-*) here, though I would not follow him in seeing them as expressions of two of the Three Functions.

IX.31

IX.31.1: The phrasal verb *cétanam √kṛ* ‘make manifest’ may be a means of avoiding the problematically ambiguous *cetáyati*.

IX.31.3: Both Ge and Re (also Scar, 336) supply a verb (“blow”) for the winds in pāda a. This seems unnec. to me: although *√ṛṣ* generally has liquids as subj., it can have a broader sense ‘rush’, and even “flowing winds” would be well within the RVic metaphorical domain. It might, however, better capture the word order to tr. “For you the favoring winds, for you the rivers rush.”

IX.31.5: The accent on the main verb *duduhré* results from the fact that it follows the voc. *bábhro* that opens the pāda and is thus the first real word in the pāda.

IX.32

IX.32.2–3: The *ād* that begins both these vss. does not seem to have its usual “(just) after that” sense.

IX.32.2: On Trita as the archetypal soma-presser and his “maidens” (*yóṣanaḥ*) as the fingers, see disc. ad IX.37.4.

IX.32.3: This vs. contains two similes (ab and c respectively), each a bit trickily constructed. In the first, the caus. redupl. aor. *avīvaśat* has two slightly different senses in simile and frame: ‘makes bellow’ in the simile: it is the flock (*gaṇām*) that is making the noise, stimulated by its lead goose (*haṃsāḥ*); ‘makes bellow(ed)’ in the frame: it is the thought/prayer (*matīm*) of someone else (*vīśvasya*) that Soma causes to be heard. This double sense is the counterpart to that of the caus. to *√śru*, both ‘make hear’ and ‘makes heard’. My interpr. here is different from that of Re, who takes both acc. as goal of the sound (“... vers (sa) troupe, ... vers la prière ...”); Ge’s is close to mine, though he doesn’t seem to recognize the slight difference in the function of the object. On this aor. stem, see my *-āya-Formations*, 111, 166. Another ex. with the same sense is found in nearby IX.34.6; see comm. ad loc.

In the second simile, in c, it is not syntactic variation but a pun on the root of the passive *ajyate* that is at issue: this form can belong either to *√añj* ‘anoint’ or to *√aj* ‘drive’, and both are appropriate to the context. Soma can be “anointed” by cows’ milk or driven together with the cows (that is, the milk). The ‘steed’ to which Soma is compared could likewise be both anointed (/groomed) and driven.

IX.32.4: Although *mṛgá-* generally refers to a wild beast in general in the RV and in later Skt. comes to mean specifically ‘deer’, here it seems close to the meaning of Aves. *māraṇa-* ‘(large) bird, bird of prey’. Cf. the almost identical pāda IX.67.15 *śyenó ná taktó arṣati* “Like a falcon launched in flight, it rushes.” The participle *avacākaśat* ‘looking down’ also fits a bird better than an earth-bound beast; cf. esp. X.136.4 *antárikṣeṇa patati vīśvā rūpāvacākaśat* “He flies through the midspace, gazing down on all forms,” in the famous Muni hymn, which also contains an instance of *mṛgá-* as ‘bird’ (X.136.6). See also comm. on *takva-vī-* ad I.134.5, 151.5. It must be admitted, however, that it is not only birds that *√tac*; see X.28.4 *kroṣṭā varāhām nír atakta kákṣāt* “The jackal sprang on the boar from out of the underbrush.” However, there the attack is presumably an airborne pounce, so bird-like. Images on the web of jackals pouncing support this notion.

As for what the *mṛgá-* is looking down on, it is surely the two worlds, a notion going back to Sāy., which would fit the bird’s-eye view. Ge suggests other possibilities in n. 4a, but not with great conviction.

IX.32.5: Both Ge and Re seem to make heavier weather of *hitām* than seems called for. Ge (n. 5c) suggests that the acc. is attraction from nom. **hitāḥ* and tr. “Er ist wie ein

angesporntes (Rennpferd) in das Wettrennen gegangen.” Re allows it to be acc. but not to modify *ājīm*, requiring him to invent a second acc. phrase: “Elles sont allées [Re seems to have nodded on the number of the verb *āgan*; it cannot be the 3rd pl. of the root aor. to $\sqrt{gā}$, which is (*ā*)*gur*, but must be 3rd sg. to the root aor. of \sqrt{gam}] dans l’arène comme (pour rejoindre le *soma*) mis en branle (par les prières).” I don’t understand the fuss: *ājī-* is masc. (the supposed fem. ex. in I.116.15 is not), so *hitām* is grammatically fine. And I see no reason why a contest can’t be set, as a prize is. Perhaps it is their apparent conviction that *hitām* has to belong to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ that impelled them to these unconvincing makeshifts, or perhaps they believe that *yāthā* as a simile marker does not behave like *nā* and *iva* but requires a pseudo-clausal structure. But see the exx. in Gr’s no. 4 s.v. *yāthā* (col. 1083).

IX.33

IX.33.1: *vānāni* must be read with both frame (wooden [cups]) and simile (woods / forest, into which the buffalo go).

IX.33.2: A different word for wooden vessel (*drōṇa-*) substitutes for *vāna-* here.

IX.33.4: On the three voices, see publ. intro.

IX.33.5: Fem. *brāhmī-* is found only here (fortunately!). It is generally taken as a word play based on *yahvīh* in the next pāda (see Old with lit.; AiG II.2.412), which is surely correct. But it seems further assumed that it is derived from the adj. *brahmān-* and is adjectival (AiG II.2.421; cf. Gr ‘heilig, andächtig’, Re ‘vouées à la Formule’; Ge’s ‘Beterstimmen’ is less clear). Given its accent I think it’s more likely a nonce fem. form of the noun *brāhman-* ‘formulation’, in order to assimilate its gender to the cows. It might even be based on a putative **brāhmnī-*, like *rājan-* / *rājñī-*, with simplification of the impossible cluster **-hmn-*.

IX.33.6: See comm. ad IX.40.3 on the repeated pāda b. I might now consider tr. “for us all around” rather than “for us ... from every direction.”

IX.34

IX.34.2: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is almost identical to IX.33.3; the only difference is that the soma is plural (*sutāḥ ... sōmāḥ*) in 33.3 and sg. (*sutāḥ ... sōmah*) here, which also necessitates a sg. verb (*arṣati* for the pl. *arṣanti* in 33.3).

IX.34.3: Acc. *vīṣāṇam* is one of the two forms (also X.89.9) of this stem with suffixal *-ā-* in the strong stem, against the overwhelming prevalence of *-an-*. See Old. Assimilation to the dominant pattern of *-n-*stems (*rājāṇam* type) is not surprising; what is perhaps surprising is how well *vīṣan-* resisted the analogic pressure.

IX.34.4: On Trita, see comm. ad IX.37.4.

Ge interpr. the *rūpañh* with which the soma is anointed as its colors (“mit seinen Farben”). However, (*sám*) $\sqrt{a}ñj$ is specialized in IX for cows (that is, their milk). Cf. IX.86.47 *yád góbhiḥ ... samajyāse*, IX.72.1 *sám dhenúbhiḥ ... ajyate*; without *sám* there are multiple passages, e.g., *góbhir añjānāḥ ...* (IX.50.5, etc.), *góbhir ajyase* (IX.85.5), and, esp., nearby IX.32.3 *átyo ná góbhir ajyate*. I therefore think that our passage must refer to “forms” of milk; so also Re in his n., though unusually for him he does not supply it in tr. (which is simply “de formes-concrètes”). That this vs. is sandwiched between two vss. that contain the verb ‘milk’, 3c *duhanti*, 5b *duhaté*, further supports this interpr., though in both 3 and 5 the milk is not literal milk, but soma itself.

The publ. tr. does not reflect the possible pun on *sám ... ajyate* that was noted in IX.32.3 just cited, where *ajyate* could also belong to \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’, hence a 2nd reading “is driven together with the forms (of milk).”

IX.34.4–5: The final words of these two vss. are the phonologically similar *háriḥ* and *havīḥ*, both referring to soma -- though one is masc. nom. and the other neut. acc.

IX.34.5: On the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. Needless to say, this vs. is catnip for Lü; see his disc. p. 606.

IX.34.6: I take *avīvaśat* here as trans./caus, as in nearby IX.32.3 -- an interpr. shared by Ge and Re (“... a fait mugir ...”), though Re takes the same form in 32.3 as non-caus. with acc. of goal. See comm. there.

IX.35

IX.35.2: Two heavy cmpds in the voc., each with a 2nd member apparently derived from an *-áya-* trans./caus. governing the first member in the acc.: *samudram-īñkhaya* ‘setting the sea to swaying’, *viśvam-ejaya* ‘setting all in motion’. Of course the final *-m-* of the 1st member also serves to break the hiatus between the vocalic stem-final of the 1st member and the vowel-initial verb stem. It’s also notable that verbal forms of *ejaya-* are not found in the RV; they first appear in KS (XI.6 [prose], XXXV.14 [mantra]). (My statement in the *-áya-* monograph, p. 108, that the first attestation is in ŚB is wrong, relying on the notation in Whitney’s Roots.)

IX.35.3: I take *vāryam* as an Inhaltsakk.

IX.35.4: The first pāda contains a notable word play. Judging from the number of parallels, the default obj. of \sqrt{is} ‘send’ in IX is ‘speech’; cf. IX.30.1, 64.9, 25, 95.5, and esp. IX.12.6 *prá vācam índur isyati*, a pāda identical to ours, save for one consonant: *vācam* versus *vājam*. Although an emendation to **vācam* has been suggested here (see Old, who rejects it), a word play is far more likely. The poet knew (and knew his audience knew) the idiom *vācam* \sqrt{is} , but substituted the nearly identical *vājam*, which is to be construed with *sīśāsan* ‘desiring to win’ later in the vs. -- *vājam* being a common obj. to forms of \sqrt{san} ‘win’ and in fact found in the root noun cmpd *vāja-sā* in b, immediately after the desid. part. This root noun cmpd “repairs” the apparent *vājam*

problem, and in the next vs. the poet provides the expected *vācam*, 5a *vācam-īṅkhayām*, a 2nd repair strategy.

Ge assigns *vidānāḥ* to √ *vid* ‘know’ (“der sich auf die Vorschriften, auf die Waffen versteht”), while Re (though see his n.) and the publ. tr. take it to √ *vid* ‘find’ (as a root aor. part.). I now think either (or both) is/are possible, but that in either case *vratā* and *āyudhā* are not separate objects as Ge/Re take them, but an equational phrase (as in the publ. tr.). That is, Soma’s commandments *are* his weapons. On the formidable nature of Soma’s *vratā*-s, cf., e.g., IX.53.3 *āsya vratāni nādhīṣe* “The commandments of this one cannot be ventured against.” As an alt. tr. here I would add “knowing his commandments to be his weapons.”

IX.35.5: Reprise of the *-īṅkhayā-* cmpd from 2a. *vācam-īṅkhayā-* occurs once elsewhere, in IX.101.6, where it modifies *samudrāḥ*, which is the first member of the cmpd in our vs. 2, a small web of formulaic associations.

IX.35.6: *dādhāra* here is the only intransitive form of this perfect; see Re’s n. and Kü (261). The root √ *dhṛ* is prominent here (see the immed. following phrase *dhārmṇas pāteḥ* ‘master of support’) and echoes *rāyó dhartā* in 2c.

The last word of the hymn, *prabhūvasoḥ* (“of the one who brings outstanding gifts”) is the gen. of the name of the supposed poet of this hymn, Prabhūvasu Āṅgīrasa, who is also assigned the next hymn, IX.36. Of course the name in the Anukramaṇī could well have been generated from the final word of this hymn.

IX.36

As noted in the publ. intro., every vs. but the final one has a form of √ *pū* ‘purify’ beginning a pāda (though, interestingly, never the vs.), with each one different: 1b *pavītre*, 2b *pāvasva*, 3b *pāvamāna*, 4c *pāvate*, 5c *pāvatām*. This pattern is reminiscent of the “versified paradigm” of the first hymn in the RV, I.1. And the abrupt cessation of the pattern in the last vs. is of course also typical of RVic style.

IX.37

For the rhetorical structure of the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.37.3: Note the slight reversed phonetic figure: a ... *divāḥ*## b ... *vi dhāv(ati)*.

IX.37.4: On the sense of this vs., see publ. intro. As indicated there, there is much disagreement about the referents. To my disc. there I will only add a few comments. Relevant for the whole vs. is IX.26.5 *tām sānāv ādhi jāmayo, hārim hinvanti ādribhiḥ* “Him do the siblings [=fingers] impel with the stones on the back (of the filter),” which contains both *jāmayāḥ* and *sānu-* as here, with the ‘siblings’ being the fingers and the ‘back’ the filter. The ‘back’ (*sānu-*) in soma hymns is basically always the filter, whatever else it may cosmically represent. Moreover, Trita is an archetypal soma-preparer; for this role see, inter alia, Ge’s n. to IX.34.4 and Ober I.197–98, esp. on the similar role that Ōrita fulfills atq the haoma pressing in the Hom Yašt. In at least two other places in IX his ‘maidens’ (*yōṣanaḥ*), the fingers, are involved: see in the next hymn. IX.38.2 *etām trītasya yōṣanaḥ, hārim hinvanti ādribhiḥ* “This tawny one do the

maidens of Trita [=fingers] impel with the stones” and almost identical IX.32.2. That the b pāda in these vss. with “Trita’s maidens” as subj. (in pāda a) is identical to the one in IX.26.5 just quoted with *jāmāyaḥ* as subj. (in pāda a) imposes the chain of identifications “Trita’s maidens” = “siblings” = “fingers.” Therefore, though it may be Trita’s back in some sense [he owns and deploys the filter] it’s surely also his fingers, here called *jāmī-*, not Soma’s or anyone else’s (as has been suggested by others), and though they may stand for various things (Dawns, heavenly rivers, whatever -- again based on various scholars’ suggestions), they start out as fingers.

IX.38

Like IX.37 with *sá* opening every vs., every vs. in this hymn begins with a form of the *eṣá-* pronoun. The pattern here is both more complex and more emphatic: there is case variation (vss. 2 and 3 have acc. sg. *etám*, the rest nom. sg. *eṣá*), and in all vss. but vs. 2 the initial pronoun is followed by the appropriate form of *syá-/tyá-*: *eṣá (u) syá*, *etám tyám*, a phrase that means ‘this very (one)’.

IX.38.1: The two nominatives *vṛṣā* ‘bull’ and *ráthah* ‘chariot’ are juxtaposed, each qualifying Soma. I consider them separate characterizations, with Soma as both bull and chariot; so also Oberlies (RelRV II.71, 229). Ge takes *vṛṣā* as modifying *ráthah* (“Dieser bullenhafte Wagen”), while Re sneaks in a parenthesis to avoid identifying Soma with a chariot: “le-célèbre (*soma*), taureau, (cheval attelé au) char.” If taking them as independent seems too radical, Ge’s solution takes fewer liberties with the text than Re’s.

IX.38.2: As noted above, this is the only vs. where the initial pronoun is not followed by a form of *syá-/tyá-*, though *tritásya* starts promisingly, with *tR*, and ends with *-sya*. See further on this vs. ad IX.37.4.

IX.38.3: The phrase “ten tawny ones” (*haríto dáśa*) helps define the “maidens of Trita” (*tritásya yóṣanaḥ*) in the previous vs. as the fingers: “ten” is the giveaway.

IX.38.4: It may be that the adj. *mānuṣa-* here should be rendered more restrictively as “stemming from Manu,” referring to only those clans that participate in Ārya sacrificial culture.

IX.38.5: It is tempting to read *diváh* as abl. with *áva caṣṭe*: “looks down from heaven”; however, *diváh síśuḥ* “child of heaven” is found elsewhere (IV.15.6, VI.49.2). It is certainly possible, however, to read *diváh* with both: “the child of heaven looks down from heaven.” The word is well positioned to look both left and right.

IX.39

IX.39.1: The hymn opens with a mirror-image phonetic figure: *āśúr arṣa*.

The voc. *bṛhanmate* ‘having lofty thought’ puns on the name of the poet given in the Anukramaṇī, Bṛhanmati Āṅgīrasa -- or more likely provided the name.

On the direct speech in pāda c of this vs., see publ. intro. The speech itself consists only of the word *devāḥ*. The place identified by this speech is soma's goal, where the gods will partake of it.

IX.39.2: The phrase *pariṣkṛṇvānn āniṣkṛtam* is not as much of an etymological figure as it first appears: in the 1st word, the preverb *pari* is cmpd with the *s*-mobile form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$, while the 2nd is the negated form of the somewhat enigmatic lexeme $\acute{i}ṣ + \sqrt{kṛ}$ (the latter without *s*-mobile), on which see comm. ad VII.76.2. As disc. there, the pseudo-preverb $\acute{i}ṣ$ may derive from the root noun $\acute{i}ṣ$ - 'refreshment', and our passage here contains that noun. The phrase *yātáyann iṣaḥ* "arranging refreshments" in b functions almost like a paraphrase, or repair, of the putative phrase $\acute{i}ṣ$ - $\sqrt{kṛ}$ "prepare refreshment" → "put in order, set to rights."

IX.39.3: The med. root pres. part. *cákṣāṇa*- cmpd with *ví* is found only here. By contrast the bahuvrīhi *vicakṣaṇá*- 'having a wide gaze, wide-gazing' occurs nearly 20x in Maṇḍala IX alone (including nearby IX.37.2). The two words are distinguished only by the length of the penultimate syllable (and accent). The cmpd is found almost entirely pāda-final (either in Gāyatrī or in Jāgati), whereas the part. here opens the pāda. However, nothing would prevent *vicakṣaṇáḥ* from taking that position, as it indeed does in IX.97.2 (Triṣṭubh), so the distribution cannot be purely metrical. See also Re.

IX.39.5: The suppressed object of *āvívāsan* is probably the gods (so already Sāy) or Indra in particular (supported by pāda c), but there is no reason to supply this obj. in tr.

IX.39.6: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. forms a notional ring with vs. 1, with both containing direct speech in a ritual setting in their respective pāda c's. The speech is more clearly marked in vs. 1, with *íti brávan*, than it is here. Both the speaker(s) and the addressees are also unclear here. It is likely that the former are the officiating priests, the subjects of the 3rd pl. *hinvanti* in b and quite possibly of *anūṣata* in a (so Ge, Lü 602), though Re thinks rather of the soma drinks. As for the addressees of the 2nd pl. impv. *sīdata*, I think the soma drinks are most likely, as in the identical pāda in IX.13.9, which is preceded by a nom. pl. *pávamānāḥ* identifying the subject. However, the soma referent in our b pāda is sg. (*hárīm*) -- though this is not really problematic, given the ubiquitous variation between sg. and pl. soma(s) in these hymns. However, it could also be addressed to the gods arriving at the ritual ground (so Sāy), the gods whose location was specified in 1c.

IX.40

IX.40.2: Both Ge and Re treat *ruhat* as modal, parallel to the clear aor. subj. *gámat* in the following pāda (e.g., "... soll ... besteigen, ... soll ... gehen"). But *ruhat* belongs to a clear them. aor. *áruhat*, and its zero-grade root syll. would preclude a subjunctive in any case; formally it must be an injunc. I take the sequence of verbs as referring to different stages of the ritual process, one that has just occurred, one that will now occur. KH (Injunk. 222) in fact suggests that the transmitted injunc. *ruhat* might represent a redactional error for *'ruhat*, an augmented aor. in this sandhi context. Hoffmann's suggestion of course

results from his idiosyncratic and restrictive views on the function of the injunctive; in my opinion injunc. *ruhat* would work fine here as an immed. past, preceding soma's departure for Indra. (Maur's tr. [84] is sim. to mine.)

IX.40.3: The expression *asmábhyam ... víśvataḥ* "for us all around" in b I take as a heavy specification of enclitic *naḥ* in Wackernagel's position in pāda a. Most take *víśvataḥ* as qualifying "wealth." The fact that this pāda (*asmábhyam soma víśvataḥ*) appears 3x (also IX.33.6, 65.21) suggests that *víśvataḥ* goes with 'us'; on the other hand, that all three occurrences involve the acquisition of wealth or other good things somewhat undercuts that argument.

On *mahām* see AiG III.251.

IX.40.4: On subj. 2nd sg. *vidāḥ* see comm. ad IX.19.6. As noted there, I think this is the only actual example of *vidāḥ*. The other supposed exx. are actually 2nd sg. impv. *vidā* with lengthened final; their sandhi position is ambiguous and so the forms could represent *-āḥ* as well as *-ā*, and the Pp. analyses them as the former. It is in fact not beyond the realm of possibility that the original reading here was also **vidā*. An impv. would fit the context better, with immediately preceding (4b) and following (5a) impv. *ā bhara*. It is possible that the original sequence **vidā sahasrīṇīḥ* was interpr. as having a degeminated double *-s s-* (**vidās s...*), which was then restored. The meter would be unaffected. The almost identical pāda, IX.61.3 *kṣārā sahasrīṇīr īṣaḥ, īs* transmitted with an impv. with lengthened final. Note also impv. *vardhayā* in 5c. An alt. tr. here would then be "find refreshments ..." Curiously, both Ge and Re tr. as impv., though they register no discomfort with the subjunctive.

IX.41

IX.41.1–2: These two vss. are somewhat illuminated by IX.73.4–5, containing some very similar expressions: 73.4d *padé-pade pāśīnaḥ santi sétavaḥ* "At every step there are snares that bind"; 73.5bcd ... *saṃdāhanto avratān / ... āpa dhamanti ... tvācam āsīknīm* "...burning up those who follow no commandment, they blow away ... the black skin." Cf. also *bhūrṇayaḥ* in 73.4b, corresponding to *bhūrṇayaḥ* in our 1a, and note also that *āpa dhamanti* in 73.5c with "black skin" as its obj. resembles *ghnāntaḥ ... āpa* in our 1c, also with "black skin" as object.

IX.41.1: This vs., consisting entirely of a rel. cl., is not resumed by a main cl. Vs. 2, which might be configured as the main cl., is couched in the 1st pl., not the 3rd pl. like vs. 1, and it also has a very different tone. There is no reason, with Re, to supply an anodyne introductory cl. "(Je chante les *soma*)" to provide a main cl. -- in fact, the abruptness of the expression and its incompleteness enhance the sense of violence.

As I indicated in the publ. intro., I think the unexpressed subj. is the soma juices. Many soma hymns begin with the soma rushing forth after its pressing, often compared to a horse or a bull charging; here the soma drinks are also likened to cattle, but stampeding cattle, and this uncontrollable mob tramples the enemy. So the poet has taken a standard opening trope and "weaponized" it, as it were.

This enemy is identified as the “black skin” (*kṛṣṇām ... tvācam*). For this phrase as a designation of non-Ārya “without commandments” (*avratā-*) see I.130.8 and IX.73.5 (in the latter *tvācam āsīknīm*; see above). The term *avratā-* is found in the next vs. (2c).

IX.41.2: As was just noted, *avratām* in c suggests that this vs. belongs conceptually and rhetorically with vs. 1, because *avratā-* elsewhere qualifies those “with black skin.” However, as I also indicated ad vs. 1, I do not think vs. 2 is the main clause on which the rel. cl. of vs. 1 is dependent: “we” are not likened to stampeding cattle in vs. 1, but rather the soma juices are. HPS (*Ved. vratā*, 94 n. 193) rather trickily suggests taking 2ab as parenthetic, with c returning to the soma juices of vs. 1, modified by the part. *sāhvāṃsaḥ*. I see no reason for this: the victory of the soma juices in 1a is reconfigured as *our* victory.

With Old, Ge, Re I take the gen. *suvitāsya* as the gen. obj. of *manāmahe* and construe *āti* with *sétum* (contra Gr, who takes it with *manāmahe*). In IX *āti* regularly refers to the journey of the soma “beyond” the filter, which here is represented by *sétum*. Re cites other passages containing \sqrt{man} with gen., but it must be admitted that this particular form, *manāmahe*, otherwise resolutely takes the acc.

sétu- is found 5x in the RV; its only two occurrences in IX are here and in IX.73.4 cited above. The word does not yet have its later meaning ‘bridge’, but a sense closer to its root etym. to $\sqrt{sā}$ / *sí* ‘bind’ (with 2ndary full-grade *se* built to the zero-grade): ‘fetter, bond, (or here) snare’. Ge and Re instead take it as a dyke or dam (Damm and digue respectively), but these seem to be an attempt to split the difference between the root etymology and the later sense ‘bridge’. Certainly in other RVic passages the sense ‘fetter’ vel sim. is inescapable, e.g. VIII.67.8 *mā naḥ sétuḥ siṣed ayām* “Let this fetter here not bind us,” with cognate verb, where Ge tr. “Fessel.” As for what physical object the *sétu-* refers to here, I think it is an image of the twisty curls of a sheep’s fleece, which can be seen as fetters or nooses.

durāvyām, modifying *sétum*, is assigned to a stem *dur-āvyā* / *durāvia* by Gr, misrepresenting the accent, inter alia. As Old points out, however, the stem is really *durāvī-*, a root noun cmpd. (see now Scar 497), and it must mean ‘difficult to pursue / follow’. Since *sétu-* here refers to the curls of the sheep’s fleece (in my view), these curls can be conceived of as the tracks that the liquid would follow as it’s being strained through the fleece, tracks that can be difficult to pursue. So the acc. phrase *sétum durāvyām* jams two different but evocative images into one. Note also that *suvitāsya ... durāv(i)yam* is something of a phonetic figure, with the semantically contrastive adverbial prefixes *su* and *dus*, but different verbal roots (\sqrt{i} and $\sqrt{vī}$) -- though internal sandhi provides \sqrt{i} with an apparent initial *v* matching *vī*.

IX.41.5: Old takes *uṣāḥ* as acc. pl. (so also AiG III.283) and the object of *ā ... pṛṇa* in the simile (so presumably “as the sun [fills] the dawns with its rays”; cf Oberlies Rel.RV I.238). Although an acc. pl. *uṣāḥ* is morphologically possible (like rare gen. sg. *uṣāḥ*), the simile thus produced does not make sense to me, and despite the parade of citations of supposed parallels that Old provides, no passage has anything remotely like that. I follow Ge in taking *uṣāḥ* and *sūryaḥ* as parallel nom. sg., both participating in the simile. Re seems to take as nom., but pl., for no obvious reason.

IX.41.6: The last pāda begins with a mirror-image figure: *sārā rasā*, though the last vowel is obscured in sandhi: *rasēva*.

IX.42

IX.42.1: Like the 1st vs. of the last hymn, also by Medhyātithi Kāṇva, this vs. is syntactically incomplete -- unless we want to take the pres. participles (*janāyan* a, b; *vāsānaḥ* c) as predicated, which in this case I don't. In this case, vs. 2 can easily pick up the participial vs. 1 and provide a predicate.

IX.42.3: Acdg. to Kü (471), the medial part. of the pf. of √ *vṛdh* is always presential, though both Ge and Re tr. as preterital. My “ever-increasing” makes it sound like an inten., but of course the heavy redupl. *vā-* simply belongs to the pf. of this root.

Note the *v*-alliteration in ab: *vāvṛdhānāya tūrvaye pāvante vājasātaye*.

IX.42.4: The adj. *pratnā-* ‘age-old’ is repeated here from 2a, linking the “age-old thought” (= hymn) with soma’s “age-old milk.”

p-alliteration in ab: ... *pratnām it pāyaḥ pavitre pāri* ...

IX.42.5: Somewhat less insistent *v*-alliteration: *viśvāni vāryā ... devām ṛtāvṛdhah*.

IX.42.6: This vs. contains almost the same elements as IX.41.4. Our desired rewards are *gómat*, *vīrávat*, *ásvāvat*, *vājavat*, which match 41.4 except that *híranyavat* substitutes for *vīrávat* there. We also want *bṛhatīr īṣaḥ*, like the *mahīm īṣam* of 41.4. The soma is described as *sutāḥ* in both, though the vocatives are different: *indo* versus *soma*. But the big difference is that 41.4 has the preverb *ā* with *pavasva*, which licenses the accusative complements, while our passage does not. We must simply supply it here, I’m afraid.

IX.43

IX.43.1: The phonological near-identity of instr. pl. *góbhiḥ* and *gīrbhiḥ* allows them to be conceptually assimilated to each other, and note that *vāsāya-* ‘clothe’ is frequently also used with *góbhiḥ*: e.g., IX.8.5 *sām góbhir vāsayāmasi* (also IX.2.4, 14.3, 66.13).

IX.43.2: *gīraḥ ... pūrvāthā* “hymns in the ancient way” is reminiscent of 42.2 *pratnéna mánmanā* “with the age-old thought.”

IX.43.3: Medhyātithi’s signature. Mention of the poet’s name is a relative rarity in the Gāyatrī hymns of IX, acdg. to Oberlies (Rel.RV I.549).

IX.43.4: On *vidā* versus *vidā(h)*, see comm. ad IX.19.6.

IX.44

IX.44.1: *mahé táne* “for great extension” is found also in VIII.26.2, 46.25, where it appears to refer to the extension of the family line. This is possible here, esp. if *naḥ* is

construed with it, as in the publ. tr. Ge suggests that it refers to the extension of lifetime (“zu grosser Lebensdauer(?)”) and Re to the ritual continuum, but as Re points out in his n., it could also simply describe, physically, the extension of the stream of soma. If that interpr. is chosen, the tr. should de-couple *naḥ* from the phrase: “... rush forth for us for (your) great extension.”

The referent of the simile *ūrmīm ná bíbhrat* is suggested by IX.96.7 *ūrmīm ná síndhuḥ*.

IX.44.2: The stem *júṣṭá-* with expected ppl. accent occurs only here in the RV, beside well-attested *júṣṭa-* with unexpected root accent. The latter form is generally construed with the dative of the beneficiary (“enjoyable to X”), save for the late X.125.5 (Vāc) *júṣṭam devébhir utá mānuṣebhiḥ* (though this phrase has a traditional ring), with instr. as here.

The usual uncertainty about the root affiliation of *hitá-* in IX: to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ or $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place’? See disc. ad IX.1.2, etc. On the basis of finite *hínve* in the next pāda, undeniably belonging to \sqrt{hi} , one could argue either way: as a root repetition or as a pun. Both Ge and Re take it to \sqrt{hi} , the latter with some disc. in his n.; I concur, primarily because of phrases like *dhiyēṣitá-* (I.3.5, III.12.1, 60.5, 62.12) ‘sent by the thought’, *dhiyā jūtá-* (IX.64.16) ‘sped by the thought’, even though the doubling of ‘impelled’ seems crude for a RVic poet.

Ge and Re also construe *víprasya* with *dhārayā* (e.g., “grâce à la coulée du (prêtre)-inspiré”). In the publ. tr. I instead take it with the two types of speech in pāda a, *matī-* and *dhī-* and assume that it has been displaced to c in order to contrast with *kavīḥ*, referring to Soma there. In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the very common instr. *dhārayā* generally appears alone and refers to the physical stream of the soma liquid, not metaphorically to words or the like. However, the identical pāda IX.12.8c gives me pause, as in that vs. there is no alternative way of construing *víprasya* except with *dhārayā*. I think it possible that IX.12.8 is a clumsy borrowing of this pāda, but see comm. ad loc., where I consider the possibility that there is a way to interpret *víprasya dhārayā* phrasally.

IX.44.4: In b I take the mid. part. *cakrāṇāḥ* with a self-beneficial / reflexive sense, contra Ge and Re.

With Ge I take the subj. of c to be the priest, not Soma with Re.

IX.44.5: The first hemistich has no finite verb. Ge somewhat arbitrarily supplies a verb (“empfehlen”) with which to construe the two datives *bhāgāya vāyāve*. If we are to supply a verb, it seems best to be guided by the context in which pāda a is repeated, in IX.61.9a, where the following pāda contains *pavasva*. Re’s “(qu’il se clarifie)” seems to reflect this, though he does not mention the repeated pāda in his n., where he suggests other possibilities. (That *pavasva* appears in the immediately preceding vs. 4 in our hymn might also support supplying it here.) The publ. tr. simply takes ab as a nominal expression, with the datives of pāda a construed with *sadāvṛdhaḥ* ‘growing ever stronger’. The drawback to my interpr. (and to Re’s) is that there’s no clear function for *naḥ*, which both Re and I fail to tr. in its hemistich (Ge uses it as object of “empfehlen”). I take *naḥ*

as the fronted Wackernagel-position obj. of *ā yamat* in c, assuming that the whole vs. is a single clause.

Ge's rendering of *vīpravīra-* as "der die Männer beredt macht" cavalierly ignores both accent and the morphology of the first member. It must rather be a *bahuvrīhi*, as the publ. tr. and Re's "qui a pour hommes-utiles les orateurs" recognize.

IX.45

IX.45.1: As noted in the publ. intro., *nṛcākṣā* in b may form a ring with *vicākṣase* in 6b, the last vs. of the hymn. For similar phraseology within a single vs., cf. IX.86.23 *tvām nṛcākṣā abhavo vicākṣaṇa*. *nṛcākṣā* also resonates thematically with the following *devāvītaye*, with the *nṛ-* *devā-* contrast.

IX.45.2: The word order in this vs. is quite jumbled, and there are several alternative ways to try to fix it. The one taken by the publ. tr. follows Ge in taking pāda b as parenthetic. Unlike Ge's tr. (though it is the 2nd alt. in his n. 2c), the publ. tr. uses this strategy to allow *devān* in c to be the goal of the verb in a (*aṛṣābhī*); cf. nearby IX.42.5 *abhī viśvāni vāryā, abhī devān ... aṛṣati* and in the immed. preceding hymn IX.44.1bc ... *aṛṣasi / abhī devān*, where the verb ends the hemistich and the preverb begins the next pāda, both reasonable positions for those elements. The latter passage (by the same poet as ours) might help explain the postposed preverb in the middle of the pāda here: *sā no aṛṣābhī ...*, which is otherwise odd.

However, taking *devān* as goal still leaves the rest of pāda c, ... *sākhibhya ā vāram*, unaccounted for. In the publ. tr. I take the *sākhibhyaḥ* as dat. doubling *naḥ* in a, with an independent adverbial *ā vāram* "at will" (which, however, is usually in the opposite order *vāram ā*). But this ignores the striking parallel cited by both Ge and Re, I.4.4 *yās te sākhibhya ā vāram* (and cf. II.5.5 ... *tiṣṭbhya ā vāram*), rendered in the publ. tr. as "who is your choice from among your comrades." Although it is always possible that the parallel is a false one, I now think I cannot ignore it and I suggest that this phrase provides a second goal to *aṛṣābhī*, with *sākhibhya ā vāram* to be construed together (as in I.4.4) referring to Indra, who was mentioned in the parenthetic pāda b. (Indra is also the referent in I.4.4.) Indra is of course soma's particular target among the gods, the best drinker of soma. I would now take this phrase as specifying soma's goal of choice: the juice rushes to the gods, but esp. to Indra – and would alter the tr. to "rush to the gods, to your choice [=Indra] from among the comrades," with *sākhibhyaḥ* referring to the gods in general. Although *sākhi-* in IX generally refers to poets or hymans in general (cf., e.g., IX.97.43), the ABL *ā vāram* idiom could overrule this. This interpr. unfortunately requires (or at least suggests) that *sākhāyaḥ* in vs. 5 has a different referent.

IX.45.4: I am not certain what the simile depicts, what it means for a horse to "step beyond the chariot-pole (*dhūr-*)." Re suggests that the *dhūr-* is being used here as a pole to mark the limit of the racecourse, but I do not know of another example of *dhūr-* in this sense. It's possible that the simile depicts the moment when, as a horse is starting to pull a chariot, it's been hanging back from its tackle and now it pulls on it and pushes beyond it, but my ignorance about the interaction between horses and their tackle makes this interpr. uncertain. Note also that *dhūram* here phonetically echoes *dūrah* 'doors' in 3c.

IX.45.5: As noted ad 2c, if we take *sākhibhyaḥ* there as referring to the gods, *sākhāyaḥ* here is probably not picking up that referent, but likely refers to the human poets.

IX.45.6: Both Ge and Re take *vicākṣase* as transitive ‘reveal’, but as Re notes, *vī√cakṣ* is ordinarily intransitive, and I see no reason to willfully ignore this usage. As noted in the publ. intro., the verb forms a ring with *nṛcākṣāḥ* in 1b.

IX.46

IX.46.1: Note the unusual position of *iva* after the full simile, not its first word.

IX.46.2: The simile “adorned like a maiden with her patrimony” (*pāriṣkṛtāsaḥ ... yóseva pítṛyāvatī*) is presumably the first mention in Sanskrit of the major source of *strīdhana* or ‘women’s property’ listed in the dharma lit., namely what a bride receives at her wedding, esp. from “mother, brother(s), and father” (see Manu IX.194, though there the wedding is divided into two phases and the property from her three types of natal relatives is counted separately, adding up to five of the six types of *strīdhana*). Since these gifts would take the form of jewelry – and since the bride would be especially dressed up for her wedding -- the simile here highlights the special sparkling appearance of the soma juices. Alternatively this might be a reference to the institution of the *putrikā* or “appointed daughter,” who in the absence of sons is made the virtual son and heir of her father, with any children she bears owing their ancestral offerings to him rather than to their paternal grandfather. Oberlies (Relig. RV I.522) calls the maiden in this passage an Erbtochter and seems to be thinking of this institution, and Re may be as well, though his comment (“le **pítṛya* ou héritage paternel pouvait donc revenir à la fille”) is vague and may reflect a lack of knowledge of the standard sources on *strīdhana*. I think the “adorned bride” interpr. is far more likely and fits the ritual situation better. This view goes back to Wackernagel (1916 = KISch [1953]: 464–65) and is also championed by H-P Schmidt (Women’s Rites and Rights, 1987: 32).

IX.46.3: With Ge and Re, I take *kārmabhiḥ* as referring to the various ritual acts at the Soma Sacrifice. Oberlies (Relig. RV I.534) instead sees these as Indra’s deeds, after the weakened god has been reinvigorated by soma: “... lassen den Indra mit [=zu] seinen Taten wachsen.” This seems farfetched to me, given how frequently forms of *√kṛ* are used for ritual activity.

IX.46.4: Old is inclined, flg. BR, to emend voc. *suhasṭīyaḥ* to **suhasṭīyāḥ*, derived from the stem *suhasṭīya-*, hence a masc. nom. pl. referring to the priestly officiants. Re follows him, remarking rather scornfully “il est peu probable que l’auteur ait voulu désigner par ce Voc. ... des entités féminines, à la rigueur toutefois les « doigts ».” But see Ge’s quite sensible n. suggesting that the fem. refers to the fingers, which are frequently assigned ritual agency in the IXth Maṇḍala. Note that the ten fingers (*dāśa kṣīpaḥ*) explicitly occur two vss. later (6b).

śukrā ... manthínā is a discontinuous dual dvandva. The phraseology matches III.32.2 *gāvāśīram manthīnam ... śukrām ... sómam*; cf. *góbhiḥ śrīṇīta* in c.

IX.47

IX.47.1: Both Ge and Re take *mahāḥ* as a nom. sg. masc. to them. *mahā-* (so also Gr), referring to Soma. With immed. flg. *cīd* the phrase is taken as “already great” (“schon so grosse,” “si grand (fût-il déjà)”), as an implicit contrast with the verb, (*abhy*) *āvardhata*, which indicates that he has grown (further) despite his already large size. This if of course possible. By contrast I take *mahāḥ* as acc. pl. m. to *māh-*. My reason for this is the preverb *abhī-* in the few occurrences of *abhī√vṛdh*, the lexeme takes an acc. complement even in the middle. Cf. II.17.4 *vīśvā bhūvanābhī ... abhy āvardhata* “he [=Indra] grew strong over all the worlds.” As to who or what these great ones are, perhaps the gods, since the phrase *mahó devān* is not uncommon. Given that Soma here is being assimilated to Indra – who is the standard subject of both *mandānā-* (I.80.6, etc. etc.) and *vṛṣāyāte* (cf., e.g., IX.108.2) – asserting his mastery over the (other) gods wouldn’t be surprising.

IX.47.4: On the disputed interpr. of *vidhartāri*, see comm. ad VIII.70.2. As I disc. there, I interpr. the form not as an infinitive (with many), but as the loc. of the agent noun that it is morphologically. Here I envisage Soma in the role of a facilitator: he wants the *vīpra* (presumably the human poet) to get a dakṣiṇā from the patron (/apportioner: *vidhartār-*), and sets about making that happen.

In c *yādī* is much better read *yād ī*, with the enclitic acc. prn. *ī* doubling the obj. *dhīyah*. It is difficult to construct an “if” reading.

The subj. of *marmṛjyāte* is unspecified and unclear; it could either be Soma as *kavī* or the human *vīpra* – or both.

IX.47.5: This vs. has a number of difficulties, both morphologically and syntactically. The most immediate is the first word *śiśāsātū* (Pp. rightly *śiśāsātuḥ*). Gr takes it as a nom. sg. m. adj. built to the desid. (so already Sāy.; cf. AiG II.2.667), fld by Old, Re, and the publ tr.; the alternative solution is to interpr. it as a 3rd dual perfect-like form built to the desid., as suggested by Ludwig, fld. by Ge (see his n. 5a), Ober. (Relig. RV I.537), and Heenen (Desid. 239 + n. 264). I would be more sympathetic to the du. pf. interpr. if there were a clear way to get a dual subject. But the only indication of a subject in this vs. is contained in the 2nd sg. *asī* at the end of the vs., and the attempt of Ge et al. to invent a dual subject is exceptionally clumsy: by their interpr. Soma, the 2nd sg. referent in *asī*, is on one side or faction, and there is another side that ought implicitly to contrast with Soma’s side, but somehow doesn’t in his tr. Acdg to Ge, the two sides are racehorses (*ārvant-* in b) and “Beutemacher” (the victors in raids in c). Since the putative desiderative pf. is already anomalous, the contextual melt-down and the multiplying of invisible actors make this an unattractive solution. So, better to deal with the alternative morphological anomaly, a desiderative adj. in *-tu-* apparently formed to the desid. verbal stem; this adj., as a singular, can easily qualify the sg. subj. of *asī*. Debrunner (II.2.666–67) cites a few such forms in *-tu-* that could be associated with a them. pres. stem (though all with suffixal accent, i.e., *-tū-*). He suggests that our form is an Ersatz for the *-u-*adj. *śiśāsū-* (1x I.102.6), and this seems to me the right path to take, though the details aren’t clear. I would tentatively suggest that it is a blend – or, perhaps better, a remarking – of

the two verbal adj. suffixes available to desiderative stems: the normal pres. part. act. in -*ant-*, well attested to this stem (*śiṣāsant-*, -*at-*), and the verbal adj. suffix -*u-* specific to the desid. (as in *śiṣāsú-* just cited). It might be possible to image the addition of the -*u-* suffix to the weak form of the pres. part. *śiṣāsat-*. Unfortunately this founders on the accent, which cannot easily be explained; this is the only advantage of the pf. du. explanation, which would have the correct accent.

Even assuming that *śiṣāsátuḥ* is a desiderative adj., construed with gen. *rayīṇām* in the same pāda, we are not out of the woods, and I am not satisfied with the publ. tr. or with the suggested tr. of Old and Re. The three pādas of the vs. have an apparently parallel structure, esp. the last two. All three contain a gen. pl. – *rayīṇām* ‘of riches’ (a), *árvatām* ‘of chargers’ (b), and *jigyúṣām* ‘of winners’ (c); the last two pādas also contain loc. pls., *vājeṣu* ‘at prize contests’ (b) and *bhāreṣu* ‘at raids’ (c). Pāda b is also marked as a simile, with the simile marker *iva* following the whole simile, not the first word (as also in the last hymn, IX.46.1b). Are all three pādas truly parallel – and in particular should *śiṣāsátuḥ* be understood in b and c, as in a, where it governs *rayīṇām*? Both Old and Re understand *śiṣāsátuḥ* with all three pādas, but take the genitives of b and c in dative function (identifying the groups for which Soma wishes to win riches), not parallel to *rayīṇām*. Cf. “Du bist der Erstreber von Reichtümern, wie für die Renner beim Gewinn der Preise, (so) für die Sieger in den *bhāra*.” This neatly solves the problem that the gen. pls. of b and c refer not to a substance (wealth) one might strive to win, but to animate beings that might be striving to win it themselves, so the morphologically parallel forms do not seem to be semantically or functionally parallel. My own solution in the publ. tr. is, I now see, considerably inferior to the Old/Re one: I take b with a, but not c, making ‘chargers’ a substance Soma seeks to win and also eliding the simile. I would now reject this interpr. For c in the publ. tr. I made the gen. pl. a partitive: “you are among those / (one) of those who are victorious ...” Although this interpr. seems a little artificial, I think it’s possible, and I would now interpr. b in the same way – with the whole vs. meaning “Desirous of winning riches, you are (one) of those who are victorious in the raids, as if (you were one) of the chargers at prize-contests.” Alternatively, I would substitute a version of Old/Re: “You seek to win riches for those who are victorious at raids, as if for coursers at prize-contests,” though this seems more awkward.

In any case, the vs. is problematic on several counts and I doubt that any of the suggested interpr. captures the poet’s intent.

IX.48

As noted in the publ. intro., vss. 3–4 concern the stealing of Soma from heaven (“Somaraub”), a story not otherwise characteristic of IX but treated in detail in IV.26–27. I now think it possible that vss. 1–2 also allude to the same myth, though very obliquely. Details in the comm. to the relevant vss. Our poet, Kavi Bhārgava, also treats this myth in IX.77, one of his Jagatī hymns.

IX.48.1: Ge and Re take *cārum* as referring to Soma, as it, admittedly, often does. I interpr. it rather as a 2nd obj. of *īmahe* ($\sqrt{yā}/ī$ ‘implore, beg for’. (Ge takes the verb to $\sqrt{yā}$ ‘go’ [“nahen wir”], while Re takes it to ‘implore’, but with a single obj.) Either interpr. is possible; I find myself more sympathetic to that of Ge/Re than I originally was, though I am far from disavowing the publ. tr.

The possible allusion to the Somaraub in this vs. is quite muted, but I wonder if the depiction of Soma “bearing his manly powers among the seats of great heaven” (*sadhástheṣu mahó diváh*) could refer to Soma when he is being kept captive in heaven in the myth. A very slight piece of evidence for this is that Kṛṣānu, the archer in the Somaraub story (see IV.27.3), is located *sadhástha ā* “in the seat” in X.64.8, but I would put little or no weight on this.

IX.48.2: This vs. is couched in the acc. and entirely dependent on vs. 1, qualifying Soma.

Contra Gr, the cmpd *sāmvr̥kta-dhr̥ṣṇu-* must be a bahuvr̥hi; cf. esp. Old and Scar (504).

The cmpd *mahāmahivrata-* is unusual in having three members, esp. since the first two are etym. identical. With AiG II.1.236 it’s best to take *mahā* as ‘very’ (cf. also Schmidt, *vrata* p. 100).

There is somewhat stronger evidence for a Somaraub connection in this vs. than in vs. 1. In particular Soma is said to be “eager to break a hundred strongholds” (*śatām pūro ruruḥṣāṇim*); in IV.27.1 these same (or similar) strongholds guarded him (*śatām mā pūra āyasīr arakṣan*) before he was rescued, and so he would be eager to break out of them. Note the phonological similarity between *arakṣan* and *ruruḥṣāṇim*; the latter is a hapax, with in fact no other desid. forms built to the root *√ruj* elsewhere in Skt., so the echo may have been deliberately constructed.

If pāda c refers to Soma’s desire to break out of confinement, it’s possible that *sāmvr̥kta-dhr̥ṣṇu-* also refers to this confinement: ‘having his bold(ness) encoiled’, with *dhr̥ṣṇu-* a quality of Soma – rather than my original interpr., that Soma had encoiled the *dhr̥ṣṇu-* of another. Note that Soma is qualified by *dhr̥ṣṇu-* in the immediately preceding hymn (IX.47.2). The use of the idiom *sāmvr̥kta-* ‘encoiled, encircled’ could reflect the circular fortresses.

A connection between the 100 strongholds in this vs. and the explicit Somaraub allusion in the next vs. was suggested by Hillebrandt, but unfortunately rejected by Old—too fastidiously I think.

IX.48.3: The *ātaḥ* ‘from there’ that begins this vs. was used by Hillebrandt as evidence for the mythological connection between vss. 2 and 3, persuasively in my view, contra Old.

IX.48.3–4: The phrases *suparṇāḥ ... bharat* (3c) “the falcon brought” and *vīr bharat* (4c) “the bird brought” are directly reminiscent of IV.26, where the 3rd sg. (*a*)*bharat* occurs 4x in 4 vss. (4–7), incl. 4cd *suparṇāḥ ... bhārat* and 5a *bhārat ... vīḥ*, with the same subjects as here.

IX.49

IX.49.1: The first pāda of this vs. (*pāvasva vr̥ṣṭīm ā sú naḥ*) seems syntactically backward, in that we might expect *ā sú naḥ* to open the clause. A cursory glance through the *sú* passages in Lub does not turn up a similarly egregious deviation from left periphery behavior. The solution arises from reading the expression in light of 3c, *asmābhyam vr̥ṣṭīm ā pava*, which is an exact paraphrase with flipped word order. The full

dative pronoun *asmābhyam* takes initial position there, while its enclitic equivalent *naḥ* is final in our pāda; the verbs occupy the opposite positions: initial in 1a, final in 3c. The obj. *vr̥ṣṭīm* is identically positioned in the center of the two verses. In 3c the preverb *ā* is more normally positioned than here, right before the verb (... *ā pava*), but, on the other hand, the verb there is morphologically quite anomalous. Thus both pādas have something wrong with them, but their aberrancies can be understood with reference to each other.

IX.49.2: The intent of this vs. is pretty clear, though the expression is a bit contorted: presumably our offering of soma will bring cows as a reward, but how the cows will come “by a stream” of purified soma is unclear. I imagine them in single file, but I don’t think that’s what’s meant.

The adj. qualifying cows, *jānya-*, is generally interpr. as pregnantly ‘belonging to other people’ (Ge “die Rinder anderer Leute,” Re “les vaches de l’étranger,” enshrined in Gr’s gloss 2a ‘fremden Leuten ausgehend’), but as I disc. ad IV.55.5, in all clear passages *jānya-* means ‘stemming from one’s own people’. Here it may be proleptic: cows will come here that will by virtue of coming here belong to us.

Note that *ūpa naḥ* is somewhat displaced, though not as much as *ā sú naḥ* in 1a.

IX.49.3: On c see the disc. ad vs. 1. The verb here, 2nd sg. impv. (*ā*) *pava*, is the *only* act. form to this extraordinarily well-attested Class 1 pres. stem and is obviously truncated from *pávasva*, in order to fit this exact paraphrase of 1a (see comm. above) into the allotted syllables (*asmābhyam* being a syllable-hog compared to *naḥ*). It may help that *dhāva* in 4b is almost a rhyme. Like many morphological anomalies, *pava* can be accounted for through sensitivity to the larger context.

IX.49.5: *rocāyan rúcaḥ* is a nice cognate acc. construction.

IX.50

IX.50.1: The b pāda consists of a single simile; as in nearby IX.46.1b and IX.47.5b, the simile particle *iva* occurs after the 2nd word in the simile, not the 1st – though here the simile consists of 3 words and so *iva* is non-final.

The c pāda contains a bold image: “spur on the wheelrim of the music” (*vāṇāsya codayā pavīm*). Perhaps not surprisingly, both Ge and Re flatten the image by redefining the verb and one or both of the nouns. Ge’s “Schärfe die Spitze der Rede (des Pfeils)” takes *paví-* as ‘point’, though in all clear cases it refers to a part of a chariot wheel (see EWA s.v. and Sparreboom, Chariot p. 131 with lit.), the tire or wheel rim, while the verb *codayā* means ‘impel, spur on’, not ‘sharpen’. His alternative ‘Pfeil’ assumes that *vāṇá-* is a variant of *bāṇá-* ‘dart’. Re’s “Aiguise la pointe de la parole-rhythmé” follows Ge; he justifies ‘sharpen’ with ref. to IX.17.5, but the verb there also means ‘spur on’ and has (in my view) speech as obj. Old is having none of this: he sensibly and firmly says that *√cud* is esp. common of the impelling of a chariot [this is not entirely true] and he sees no reason to take *paví-* in anything but its usual sense. To explain the image he suggests that the operation (that is, presumably the playing) of the *vāṇá-*, which he takes as a musical instrument, is conceived of like the driving of a chariot, whose wheel is therefore being

metaphorically impelled. This seems correct in its main outlines. The image blends the concrete (the chariot) and the metaphorical (music), both potential objects of \sqrt{cud} , in a phrase with the latter as dependent genitive. For \sqrt{cud} + ‘chariot’, cf. X.29.8 *rátham ... yám .. codáyāse*; the substitution of *paví-* is simply part for the whole. As for \sqrt{cud} + ‘speech’ (vel sim.), cf., e.g., III.62.10 *dhíyo yó naḥ pracodáyāt*.

IX.50.2: The first two pādas of this vs. vary and further specify the opening image in vs. 1 *út te súṣmāsa īrate*, with the same verbal lexeme though no longer in tmesis (*prasavé ta úd īrate*##) and the identification of the sound that rises as “three voices” (*tisró vācaḥ*). The loc. *prasavé* ‘at your stimulus’ can also be seen as a semantic version of *codayā* ‘spur on’ in 1c.

The three voices, found also in this same context in IX.33.4, are either the voices of the three priests, Hotar, Adhvaryu, and Udgātar, or their three types of ritual speech, ṛc, yajus, and sāman.

Both Ge and Re take *makhasyú-* in the realm of gifts and bounty: “eine Gabe heischend” and “généreuses” respectively. I consider it a pun, referring both to combat and to bounty. Interestingly, for the most part within IX, derivatives of *makhá-* are associated with *vāc-*: besides this one, IX.64.26 *vācam ... makhasyúvam* and IX.101.5 *vācás pátir makhasyate*. Here it could refer to some sort of competition among the three voices/priests in addition to the association of ritual activity with bounties.

IX.50.3: Just as vs. 2 picks up and varies vs. 1, vs. 3 chains with vs. 2: the loc. “on the sheep’s back” (*ávye ... sānavi*) of 2c is immediately followed by “on the sheep’s fleece” (*ávyo vāre*). Given the sandhi of the first ‘sheep’ (*ávya éṣi*) and the juxtaposition of the two phrases, one might at first consider going against the Pp in 2c to read *ávyaḥ*, matching the same apparent form in 3a. However, it is a curious fact of the morphology of these formulae that the loc. phrase containing ‘back’ (*sānavi*, *sāno*) always has the loc. *ávye* to the ‘sheep’ adj. *ávya-*, while the phrase containing *vāra-* ‘fleece’ always has the gen. *ávyaḥ* to the ‘sheep’ noun *ávi-*. To capture this the tr. of the two phrases in vss. 2-3 should be switched: “on the sheep’s back” and “on the fleece of the sheep” – though this is hardly a momentous change.

IX.50.4: It is possible to see 4 as chaining with 3: 3c *pávamānam*, 4a *ā pavasva*, though the ubiquity of the *páva-* stem makes this unremarkable even if true.

On *ā pavasva ... pavítram* see disc. ad IX.70.10.

IX.50.5: The first pāda, *sá pavasva madintama*, is almost identical to 4a *ā pavasva madintama*. This is somewhat reminiscent of the near identity of 1a and 2a.

As noted in the publ. intro., I consider *aktúbhiḥ* a pun. The first reading would be as etym. figure with *añjānáḥ* ‘being anointed’; cf. III.17.1 *aktúbhir aṇyate*, VI.69.3 *añjantv aktúbhiḥ*. But well-attested *aktúbhiḥ* is otherwise a temporal designation, ‘with/through the nights’, e.g., I.50.7 *áhā mímāno aktúbhiḥ* “measuring the days with the nights.” In this case perhaps it would refer to the Atirātra soma sacrifice.

IX.51

IX.51.2: The ritual impv. here, *sunótā* ‘press!’, is in the 2nd plural and therefore contrasts with the singular *punīhi* ‘purify!’ in 1c, though they occupy the same slot in the vs. The subj. of the impv. in vs. 1 is the Adhvaryu (voc. *ādhvaryo*), while the priestly subjects here are unspecified.

IX.51.3: I assume the gods in b are a different and more inclusive group than the Maruts in c, though *devāḥ* could just anticipate *marútaḥ*.

IX.51.4: The publ. tr. takes the pres. part. *vardháyan* as the predicate of the vs., though it might be possible to take *sutáḥ* instead (“You, the strengthening one, are pressed ...”). Although a predicated ppl. *sutáḥ* would better conform to RVic syntactic patterns, predicating the pres. part. seems to produce better sense: it provides the reason why the gods (and) the Maruts consume soma in vs. 3.

IX.52

IX.52.1: As was pointed out in the publ. intro., two parallel governing compounds, *sanád-rayiḥ* ‘gaining wealth’ (1a) and *maṃhayád-rayiḥ* ‘readying wealth’ (5c), open and close the hymn. The former also resonates with the adjacent expression across the pāda boundary, *bhārad vājam*. This phrase cannot help but remind us of the personal name *bharādvāja-*, which is of course in form also a governing compd. This stem is primarily confined to Maṇḍala VI, which is attributed to this ṛṣi and his family, but it would surely be known throughout RVic circles. Note also that some vss. and hymns in IX are attributed by the Anukramaṇī to Bharadvāja or a Bhāradvāja: Bharadvāja IX.67.1–3, Vasu Bhāradvāja IX.80–82, Rjīśvan Bhāradvāja IX.98 (jointly with Ambarīṣa Vārṣāṅgira), 108.6–7.

The grammatical identify of the *bhārat* part of this phrase can be questioned. The standard view (Gr, Ge, Re, Lub, KH [Injunk. 123], Lowe [Partic. 281]) is that it is a 3rd sg. injunc., with Soma as its subj. This requires a shift of ps. from 3rd (ab) to 2nd (c), given the 2nd sg. impv. *arṣa* in c. Of course such switches, even within a vs., are common. But it is made somewhat more difficult by the preverb *pāri*, which opens the vs. and would most naturally be construed with *arṣa*, a point also made by Old. Of the numerous *pāri* √ṛṣ passages in IX, cf., e.g., IX.69.2 ... *pāri vāram arṣati*. By contrast *pāri* is barely attested with √*bhṛ* and then only with middle forms, as far as I can see. If *pāri* (in a) is in tmesis with *arṣa* (in c), a finite verb in between (that is, putative *bhārat* in b) would have to be parenthetical at best. Re’s attempt to have it both ways (“*pāri* porte sur *arṣa* ... à travers *bhārat*”) simply shows the desperation required. I therefore follow Old, as well as AiG II.2.164, in taking *bhārat* as a form of the pres. part. *bhārant-*. Both Old and AiG consider it a neut. sg. (which it is of course in form) used adverbially, but as Old acutely remarks, an adverb taking an object is problematic (and we might expect accent shift to **bharát*, though adverbial accent shift is controversial). I would analyze it slightly differently: in order to produce a phrase modeled on the compd *bharād-vāja-* (AiG also evokes the PN here), the poet used the weak (neut.) form to stand for the nom. sg. masc. (expected **bhāran*). In this he would be supported by the well-attested nom. sg. of the redupl. pres. *bībharti*, namely *bībhrat* built to the weak stem of the participle, which serves for both masc. and neut. Maṇḍala IX contains several occurrences of this form; cf.

for the phraseology here IX.44.1 ... *bībhrad arṣasi*. I also find suggestive the two exx. of *bībhrad vājram* (VI.20.9, 23.1) “bearing the mace,” with *vājram* a phonological multiform of *vājam*; since these are both in the Bharadvāja maṇḍala, they are likely meant to evoke that name. See comm. ad VI.20.9.

IX.52.2: The apparent 2nd ps. / 3rd ps. switch recurs in more acute form here. The vs. opens with 2nd ps. *táva*, which surely refers to Soma, but the finite verb in this single-clause vs. is (apparently) *yāt*, a 3rd sg. One solution is to substitute a slightly different subj. in place of Soma – so Ge, flg. Sāy., who suggests *rāsaḥ* ‘sap’ (sim. Ober. II.231). Another is simply to ignore the problem, as Re and the publ. tr. do. I don’t have a solution (beyond the just mentioned avoidance of the issue), but I somehow think that the isolated and minimalist *yāt*, the only supposed injunctive to this well-attested root pres., is perhaps the artificial result of formulaic cut-and-paste. As Ge (2c) points out, our pāda *sahásradhāro yāt tánā* is reminiscent of IX.34.1 (*prá svānó dhārayā tánā*, and in fact *tánā* quite often follows *-ā*. If our pāda was somehow based on one containing the very well-attested instr. *dhārayā*, but with the substitution of the nom. bahuvrīhi *sahásra-dhāra-*, the final *-yā* of the underlying instr. would get detached: x x x **dhārayā tánā* → *sahásradhāro *yā tánā*, and then this truncated form could have been given morphological identity by extruding (geminating) a *t* from the initial of *tánā* (**yā tánā* → *yāt tánā*), with no metrical implications. On geminations and degeminations in the RV, see my several forthcoming articles. However, even I find this explanation overly tricky, and it also deprives the vs. of a verb (though *arṣa* could be supplied from the preceding vs.), so I do not push this possibility strongly.

IX.52.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the “pot” that is to be kicked is mostly likely an stingy patron, as Ge suggests. The whole vs. has a slangy and informal feel.

The problematic pāda is b. On the one hand, if we take the voc. *indo* seriously, this leaves *ná* badly positioned for a simile marker: it should follow *dānam*. But if *dānam* is supposed to be a simile, the expression is pretty slack: if *dānam* is ‘gift’, we want Soma to push the gift itself, not something compared to a gift. For both reasons Ge suggests that *ná* marks not a standard simile but an Utprekṣā, and, even so, that *ná* is in the wrong position. Re’s tr. seems to follow this view, though it’s somewhat hard to square with his comm. Old suggests emending *indo* to *indro*, which allows *ná* to be properly positioned for a simile and also produces a reasonable, if not particularly interesting simile, “give (him/it) a shove, as Indra (does) a gift.” My solution is quite different and, once again, perhaps over-tricky, but I think it captures the tone of the vs. better. I take *dāna-* not as ‘gift’, but rather as the med. root aor. participle to √*dā* ‘give’. The immediate problem with this is, of course, that that form should rather be accented **dānā-*. But given that the RV attests both *dāna-* and *dānā-* meaning ‘gift, giving’, sometimes in parallel formations (e.g., VI.53.3 *dānāya codaya* versus VIII.99.4 *dānāya codāyan*), it would not be surprising if the accent had been changed redactionally to match *dāna-*, which stem accounts for most of the acc. sg. forms (cf. esp. *dānam invati* I.128.5, *dānam invan* V.30.7). As for the sense, although medial forms of √*dā* are rare outside of the idiom *ā* √*dā* ‘take’, those that occur seem to mean ‘give of oneself / one’s own store’; cf. V.33.9 *sahásrā me cyāvatāno dādānaḥ* “(when) Cyavatāna was giving a thousand of his own to

me.” Taking *dānam* as a participle referring to the stingy patron of pāda a allows *nā* to be a negative and therefore properly positioned.

IX.52.4: The main cl. of ab lacks a finite verb; the preverb *ní* suggests several possibilities. Ge supplies *tira* on the basis of IX.19.7 *ní súṣmam ... tira* (his “halte,” my “undermine”), which is certainly possible. However, on the basis of *nijaghní-* in the next hymn, IX.53.2, as well as the two forms of \sqrt{vadh} in the immediately preceding vs. (52.3 *vadhaír vadhasno*), I prefer a form of *ní√han* (/ \sqrt{vadh}). Nothing depends on the choice, as long as the intent is hostile.

Ge construes *jānānām* in b with voc. *púruhūta* “du vielgerufener der Menschen,” which may be correct, given IX.64.27 as well as the nom. phrase *puruhūtó jānānām* in IX.87.6. (I therefore entertain the alt. tr. “o much invoked of the people.”) But on that basis he should construe *eṣām* in a with the same voc., since IX.64.27 has the same phrase, ... *eṣām, púruhūta jānānām*, where there is no other obvious way to interpret it and Ge takes the *eṣām* with *jānānām*. But here he construes *eṣām* separately, with *súṣmam*. Both Re and I take both genitives with that noun, IX.64.27 notwithstanding.

All of us must face the problem that the rel. cl. in c, which most naturally refers to the blustering people of ab, is in the sg. (*yáḥ ... ādīdeṣati*). This must simply be a constructio ad sensum, or rather the picking out of a particular referent in the group of hostile men mentioned in ab.

IX.52.5: The two numbers in ab, *śatām* and *sahásram*, participate in meaningless syntactic variation. Both must ultimately express an instrumental relationship to the verb; in the first the instr. is directly expressed by *ūtíbhīḥ*, but in the 2nd the instr. must be assumed (“[with] a thousand”) and the enumerated substance is expressed by a partitive genitive. It’s a clever little slippage and barely noticeable. See Old’s disc.

IX.53-60

The next 8 hymns, the last ones before the lengthy hymns assembled from *ṛcas* (IX.61–68) that end the dimeter collection, are attributed to Avatsāra Kāśyapa. All of them contain four vss., and a number of them are structured such that the first three vss. form a unity, with the last vs. stylistically or thematically contrastive or completive. See esp. IX.53–57. Old tends to analyze them as a *ṛca* with *Schlussvers*, which is strictly accurate, but I think the point is the interplay of 3+1.

IX.53

On the rhetorical indirection in this hymn, see publ. intro. as well as more detailed comments below.

IX.53.1: The first pāda of this vs. lacks a syllable. It is also identical, save for the last word, the verb, with nearby IX.50.1a *út te súṣmāso īrate* (attributed to a different poet, Ucathya Āṅgīrasa) -- with the disyllabic *asthuḥ* here replacing the *īrate* of IX.50.1 and thus responsible for the metrical truncation. The sense of the two verbs *úd īrate* and *úd asthuḥ* are essentially identical: ‘arise/have arisen’. One can speculate that either Avatsāra Kāśyapa, a tricky poet, is calling attention to the opening of his poem by the manipulation and metrical truncation of the unimpeachable phrase found in IX.50.1, or

that he wanted an aorist and there is no aor. clearly related to the pres. *īrte*, *īrate* (though of course there are aor. forms to its ultimate root \sqrt{r}). Given the near identity of the two pādas, it might have been better had the publ. tr. rendered *śúsmāsaḥ* in the same way in both instances, although the two different tr. work better contextually.

As was noted in the publ. intro. and as Ge also points out, this vs. might be more appropriate to Indra, and in particular the voc. *adrivāḥ* ‘possessor of the stone’ in b is otherwise used almost exclusively of Indra: there are nearly 50 occurrences, of which only one, besides this one, is addressed to anyone but Indra (Varuṇa in VII.89.2). There is in fact nothing in this vs. that imposes or even invites the identification of the 2nd ps. referent as Soma; we only assume it (correctly in my view) because this is a soma hymn.

The syntax of c is slightly unusual, in that the obj. of *nudāsva* is a nominal relative cl. *yāḥ parispṛdhaḥ* “(those) who are the challengers all around,” with the main cl. referent (**tāḥ* ‘those’) gapped. (See also 3c below.) Generally the gapping of the antecedent to nominal relative clauses is found in “X and which Y” constructions, not when the rel. cl. is not conjoined. It’s worth noting that this pāda is very close semantically to IX.52.3a in the immediately preceding hymn: *carúr ná yás tám īñkhaya* “Who is like a pot, give him a shove,” but there the nom. rel. clause *carúr ná yāḥ* that defines the obj. of the main verb does have an expressed antecedent *tám* in the main cl. Note that, IX.52 is also attributed to Ucathya, like IX.50, and both hymns contain expressions on which Avatsāra seems to be ringing changes.

On *parispṛdh-* see Scar 666.

IX.53.2: This vs. sits somewhat oddly in a soma hymn, and its subject, and indeed its general aim, are not clear until the 3rd pāda.

It begins with a fem. instr. demonstr. *ayā* without expressed referent, and as Re points out, a number of fem. referents are possible. However, the verb that begins c, *stávai* ‘I will praise’, makes *dhī-* ‘insightful thought’ (or some other reference to a verbal product) quite likely, and the phrase *ayā dhiyā* is in fact fairly common (I.166.13, V.45.11 [2x] [in the hymn adjacent to Avatsāra’s V.44 though V.45 is not attributed to him], VI.71.6, VIII.13.8, 93.17). The supplying of *dhī-* here is supported by the contrastive cmpd *dūdḥī-* ‘having bad insight’ in the next vs. (3b). On the basis of the Avestan parallel, fem. instr. *vācā* ‘with speech’ is also a possibility; see below.

Between *ayā* and *stávai*, however, is an image of conflict and contest, with the nom. verbal noun *nijaghnīḥ* ‘slamming down’, the instr. *ójasā* ‘with strength’, and the loc. phrase *rathasaṃgé dhāne hité* “when chariots clash and a prize is set” – all contributing to a picture of violence seemingly inappropriate to a ritual context. It would be most applicable to Indra, who is the usual subj. of *ní√han* (e.g., VII.18.18 *ní jahi vájram indra*), or perhaps to a militant Soma. So the 1st ps. verb *stávai* ‘I will praise’ that opens the next pāda is a surprise: it is instead the inoffensive poet who has been assimilated to an aggressive warrior or contestant, and it is his act of praising that is implicitly compared to smiting down a rival on the field of conflict. Again Avatsāra seems to have deliberately misled us.

However, the situation is more complex. Ge (n. 2a) tellingly cites a strikingly similar Avestan passage from the Hom Yašt, Y 10.2 *uparəmcit tē hauuanəm / vaca upa.staomi huxratuuō / yahmi niyne narš aojanḥa* “The upper (part of the) mortar I praise with speech, o you of good insight [=Haoma], in which it [=haoma] is pounded down

with the strength of a man.” This passage clearly refers to the pressing of the haoma, using the lexeme *ni√gan*, exact cognate to our *ní√han*, and also contains the instr. *aojaṇha* ‘with strength’, identical to our *ójasā*, as well as the 1st sg. verb ‘I praise’ (*staomi* to the same root as our 1st sg. *stávaṇ*) and an instr. of speech *vaca* (instead of our proposed **dhiyā*, though in fact fem. instr. *vācā* could fit in our passage just as well). This Avestan parallel must indirectly provide the solution to our puzzle: why is the mild-mannered priest-poet depicted in a scene of such violence? Because the pressing of soma is inherently an act of violence. Our b pāda provides a metaphorical scenario of contest, but *nijaghnír ójasā* in pāda a simply describes, with the same vocabulary as the Avestan passage, the powerful pounding of the soma stalks. To enhance this interpr., ‘pounding down’ would be better than ‘slamming down’ for *nijaghnīḥ*.

IX.53.3: Because ‘commandments’ (*vratá-*) are especially associated with Varuṇa and Mitra, the beginning of this vs. might also direct the audience to the wrong referent for initial *ásya*. However, commandments are the property of a number of gods, and nothing else about the phraseology strongly suggests a referent other than Soma. In any case any doubt about the referent is settled by the beginning of b, *pávamānasya*.

Pāda c is constructed almost exactly like 1c, with a rel. clause serving as obj. of the main clause imperative, here *rujá*, without expressed antecedent in the main cl. In this case, however, the rel. clause is not nominal but has a full SOV structure: *yás tvā pr̥tanyáti*.

IX.53.4: As indicated in the publ. intro., this final vs. is characterized by specifically somic vocabulary (*madacyútam*, *índum*, *matsarám*), in contrast to the more equivocal vss. that precede it.

IX.54

On the riddling structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. Each of the first three vss. begins with a form of *ayám*, with implicit reference to soma.

IX.54.1: Unfortunately it is difficult to render in tr. the initial position of *asyá*, matching that of *ayám* in vss. 2, 3, which therefore makes the overall structure of the hymn less clear in English. Perhaps “Of this one – following his age-old brilliance ...”

áhrayaḥ in b is assigned to a stem *áhrī-* by Gr and taken as a nom. pl.; so also Ge “die nicht Schlüchtern” as subj. of *duduhre* (referring to the fingers or the soma-pressing priests). This stem is otherwise unattested, and the root from which it is presumably derived is set *√hrī*, which attests a root noun *hrī-* (VS+), whose nom. pl. should properly be **-hriyaḥ*. AiG III.187 suggests that the form is an old error for **áhrayāḥ*, nom. pl. to the well-established them. stem *áhraya-*, shortened to match *páyah*, which immediately follows across the hemistich boundary. I instead follow Re’s suggestion, that it actually belongs to an *s*-stem *áhrayas-* (see also EWA s.v. *HRAV*⁴) and, as a neut. acc. sg., modifies *páyah*. Although the underlying *s*-stem **hráyas-* is not attested, neither is the supposed underlying *i*-stem **hrí-*, and as an *s*-stem neut. the form would be morphologically impeccable and require no emendation (unlike Wackernagel’s suggestion). The accent would match that of the likewise bahuvrīhi *án-āgas-*, though it must be admitted that such cmpds generally have suffixal accent (e.g., *a-cetás-*, *a-rādhás-*); however, the existence of

better attested *áhraya-* and *áhrayāṇa-* could have induced initial accent. Another ex. of *áhrayas-* is probably found in X.93.9, q.v. As for sense, $\sqrt{hrī}$ means ‘be modest, shy’, and the negated *áhraya-* ‘unrestrained, immodest, immoderate’; the primary use of that adj. is with *rādhas-* ‘bounty’ (V.79.5, 6, VIII.8.13, 54.8, 56.1), to express a desire for large, that is immoderate, quantities of it. Cf. also VII.67.6 *réto áhrayam*, also adduced by Re, with *rétas-* ‘seed, semen’, a substance rather like *páyas-*. In our passage the point would be that a more than satisfying abundance of (soma-)milk was milked. If *áhrayaḥ* is not a nom. pl., the subj. of *duduhre* is not expressed, but priestly officiants would be the obvious subj., often not overtly expressed in Soma hymns.

IX.54.2: Ge takes *dhāvati* as transitive, with *sārāṃsi* and *pravátaḥ* as obj. (“dieser lässt Seen, sieben Ströme zum Himmel fließen”), but the thematic pres. to $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘run’ (as opposed to $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘rinse’) is only a verb of motion with acc. of goal, not a causative. Ge’s interpr. is not shared by others: besides Re, cf. Lü (153), Gotō (1st Kl. 183), Scar (229), all of whose interpr. are very like mine.

IX.55

The first three vss. of this hymn all contain a form of the stem *ándhas-* ‘stalk’. On this word see comm. ad IV.1.19; the tr. of Ge (“Trank”) and Re (“jus”) are misleading.

IX.55.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is unusual in its reference to agriculture (see Ober RdR II.118), in particular to ‘grain, barley’ (*yáva-*) in pāda a. Perhaps the fact that soma is a plant, and that its stalk (*ándhas-*) is prominent in this hymn, accounts for the implication that Soma has the ability to provide us with grain and its accompanying fruitfulness (*puṣṭá-*). It may also be an oblique ref. to the occasional mixing of soma with grain; see the enigmatic expression in IX.68.4.

IX.55.2: According to the opinio communis (Ge, Re, Lü 204 [of IX.61.10], Klein DGRV I.402), *jātām ándhasaḥ* in pāda b (and the same expression in IX.61.10) contains a substantivized neut. ppl. *jātām* ‘birth’ with dep. gen. (e.g., Ge “die Geburt deines Tranks”). However, IX.18.2 *mádhu prá jātām ándhasaḥ* “the honey born from the stalk” suggests that ‘honey’ (vel sim.) should be supplied here as well, with *ándhasaḥ* an abl. of source, though Re specifically rejects IX.18.2 as relevant for this passage.

The function of the two *yáthā* clauses is not altogether clear. I assume that they refer to the two prerequisites for the soma sacrifice: the verbal portion with its praise of the god Soma and the physical production of the ritual substance soma. With both accomplished, the god Soma can take his place on the ritual ground.

On injunc. *sadaḥ* as a functional impv. see comm. ad IX.2.2 and KH (Injunk. 263).

IX.55.4: As Re points out, *jīnāti* must belong to $\sqrt{jyā}$, so *jīyate*, which is ambig. between $\sqrt{jī}$ and $\sqrt{jyā}$, surely belongs to the latter as well. The tr. should be slightly emended to “who overpowers but is not overpowered.”

The standard interpr. of the syntactic structure of the passage (Ge, Re, Ober RdR II.168, as well as the publ. tr.) takes pādas a and b as all part of the rel. cl. introduced by initial *yáḥ*, with c as the main cl. and Soma as the subject both of ab and of c. This

involves a shift in person, from 3rd (ab *jināti ... jīyate ... hānti*) to 2nd (c *pavasva*). Of course such shifts are commonplace in the RV, and in this case the *sá* introducing c is used by most tr. as a pivot (“as such”). However, the presence of *sá* is fully explained by its regular use with 2nd sg. impvs. (see my “*sá*figé” article) and need have nothing to do with the shift of person. I do think the standard interpr. of the vs. is probably right (even without the *sá* pivot), but I would point out that it’s not the only syntactically possible analysis: the rel. cl. could encompass only pāda a, with b as the main cl. The accent on the verb in b, *hānti*, would be accounted for by its initial position in the pāda. The vs. could then be rendered “Who overpowers and is not overpowered, he smashes his rival on just confronting him. Purify yourself ...” The referent of the 3rd ps. in ab could still be Soma, but it could instead be the person for whom Soma purifies himself, with the happy results on the battlefield that arise from possessing the purified soma.

IX.56

IX.56.1: The problem in this vs. is how to construe neut. *ṛtām brhāt*. Is it an acc., and if so, is it a goal, like *vājam* in the next vs. (“rushes to the lofty truth”), or an expression of the way loosely construed with *pāri* (“rushes around the lofty truth”)”? Or is it a nom. and therefore appositional to *sómaḥ*. Ge (and to some extent Re) seem to follow the “way” interpr., as does Lü (582) in his first rendering. But he then rejects this (on somewhat contorted grounds) and, flg. Ludwig, goes for a nom. apposition (or nominal predicate). On the basis of IX.107.17, 108.8 (see also 66.24), I also opt for the appositional interpr. Vs. 2 also contains a nominal apposition, *dhārā apasyúvaḥ*, at least by my analysis.

IX.56.2: This vs. consists entirely of a dependent cl. and can most conveniently be attached to the preceding vs.

As noted above I take pl. *dhārā apasyúvaḥ* as a nom. in apposition to sg. *sómaḥ*. Re explicitly calls it an “Acc. interne,” tr. “(en) cent jets actifs,” but internal to what? Ge’s tr. is similar to Re’s, but he doesn’t commit himself as to case. That *dhārāḥ* is definitely nom. in the next hymn, IX.57.1, also with *vājam* as goal, gives some support to my interpr. here.

āvisán in c is most likely the nom. sg. pres. part. it is universally interpr. as (incl. in the publ. tr.), modifying *sómaḥ* in a. However, it is technically possible that it is a 3rd pl. injunc. *ā-visán* with the pl. *dhārāḥ* of b as its subj. It would be accented on the verb stem because it is still part of the *yád* clause. This would anchor *dhārāḥ* as nom. and produce a tr. “When Soma rushes towards the prize (and) (his) hundred hardworking streams enter fellowship with Indra.” I do not advocate for this interpr., which seems too fussy, but I do point out that nothing in the grammar of the vs. precludes it.

IX.56.3: Note that *yósan-* and *kanyā-* appear together in the same vs. and in fact the latter is explicitly compared to the former. It is not clear to me whether they are meant here to refer to different types or lifestages of a young girl / maiden.

IX.56.4: An elementary type of variant ring composition, with *pāri srava* responding to *pāri ... arṣati* in vs. 1.

IX.57

IX.57.1: On the similarity of this vs. to IX.56.2 in the preceding hymn, see comm. ad loc.

IX.57.2: The neut. pls. of ab, *priyāṇi kāvya*, *viśvā* offer several different possibilities for construal. The publ. tr. takes *priyāṇi kāvya* in pāda a separately from *viśvā* in b, with the former the goal of *abhī ... arṣati* and the latter the obj. of *cākṣāṇaḥ*. The oft-repeated pāda *abhī viśvāni kāvya* (IX.23.1, 62.25, 63.25, 66.1), identical to our pāda a with *priyāṇi* substituting for *viśvāni*, supports my interpr. of the phrase in our pāda a as goal. As for the interpr. of *viśvā* in b as obj. of *cākṣāṇaḥ*, this rests on slightly shakier grounds: the *viśvāni* in the repeated pāda might suggest that our *viśvā* belongs with pāda a, and it is also not clear that the participle *cākṣāṇa-* when uncompounded can take an obj. On the one hand we have cmpd *praticākṣāṇa-* with obj. in IX.85.12 *viśvā rūpā praticākṣāṇaḥ* “gazing upon all his forms” (cf. II.40.5 with *abhī* and *viśvam*); on the other, in I.128.3 uncompd *cākṣāṇa-* is used absolutely (cf. also X.74.2). I am therefore open to the possibility that all three neut. pls. serve as goal, producing an alt. tr. “towards all the dear (products) of poetic skill does he rush, being observant.” However, I am tolerably certain that both Ge and Re are wrong, in their different ways. Ge takes the whole acc. phrase as obj. of *cākṣāṇaḥ* (“auf alle lieben Dichterwerke achtend”), thus ignoring the evidence of the repeated pāda and opting for the participle as the governing element, despite the uncertainty of its ability to take objects. Re seems to take *abhī* in tmesis with the part. *cākṣāṇa-*, not with *arṣati*, thus taking the acc. phrase with *abhī*, as the repeated pāda strongly supports, but making *abhī* the preverb to $\sqrt{cakṣ}$: “Regardant en direction de tous les arts-poétique.” But, though *abhī* does occur regularly with $\sqrt{cakṣ}$, it is also extremely common with $\sqrt{ṛṣ}$, esp. in IX. Since tmesis of preverb and participle is quite rare, given a choice between construing a preverb in tmesis with a participle or with a finite verb, the latter must be preferred unless there are serious semantic drawbacks.

IX.57.3: Pāda b has been variously interpr., primarily because of *ibha-*. On this word see comm. ad VI.20.8, IV.4.1 and Old’s detailed refutation of the Pischel-Geldner gloss ‘elephant’ (reflected in Ge’s unlikely tr. here ‘Königselefant’) in his n. on this passage. Gr, flg. BR, suggests reading **ibhe* for *ibho*, an emendation that Old considers possible, and Re suggests *ibho rājā* is a “composé ouvert” for **ibharāja-* ‘roi possédant des vassaux’. I do not think we need to change the text, however. Working with the meaning ‘vassal’ for *ibha-* (as is now generally accepted), we can first note that *ibha-* and *rājan-* are a complementary pairing (cf. I.65.7, IV.4.1) expressing a power differential: the king has power over his vassals, who give their fealty to him. This type of relationship between unequal parties is one governed by *vratā-s*, command(ment)s issued by superiors and binding on inferiors (see Brereton 1981). The adj. *svratā-* ‘having good commandments, keeping commandments well’ can therefore technically apply to either side of the equation: the superior issuing the *vratā* or the inferior following it. Elsewhere in the RV the word is only applied to the superior (who is more apt to draw the interest of the RVic poet than the inferior): the Ādityas (VI.49.1), patrons (*sūrī-* I.125.7, 180.6), and in this same phrase *rājeva svratāḥ* (IX.20.5) of Soma compared to a king. In our passage I suggest that the other pole, the inferior, is included in a disjunctive choice “vassal (or) king.” The vassal is *svratā-* because he obediently follows the *vratā-* imposed by the

king. My only hesitancy about this interpr. is that it implicitly compares Soma not merely to a king, as is standard, but also to a vassal. I can only suggest that the poet was too pleased about tapping into the inherent ambiguity of *suvratá-* to worry about a potentially unflattering comparison, or that the manipulation of soma by the priests, here represented by the Āyus in pāda a, entails a kind of vassalage and domination.

The simile particle comes only after the 2nd word. This is in part because the simile has been adapted from IX.20.5 (not to mention the numerous other exx. of *rājeva*), where the *iva* is properly positioned. But note also that we have encountered a number of other examples of “late” simile particles in this maṇḍala (see comm. ad IX.3.4, 46.1, 47.5, 50.1).

IX.58

On the curious structure and contents of this hymn, see the publ. intro.

IX.58.1–3: The first word of the refrain, *tárat*, is grammatically ambiguous. It can be a 3rd sg. injunc. and is so taken by, e.g., Gr, Ge, Lub, and Lowe (Part. 281); certainly the same form in the same position in IX.107.15 *tárat samudráṁ* “he crosses the sea” is most probably a finite injunc. However, flg. one of Old’s possibilities, with AiG II.2.164 and apparently Re (judging from his tr. “en traversant”) I prefer to take it as a neut. sg. pres. part. in adverbial usage, in part because beginning and ending this short pāda-length refrain with two finite verbs, one injunc., one pres. indic., seems clunky: *tárat śá mandī dhāvati*. For another pāda-initial form in *-at* that I take as a participle see disc. of *bhārat* ad IX.52.1.

As to what Soma is crossing, it is most likely the waters (cf. *ap-túr-* IX.61.13, 63.5, 21), as suggested by Ge, Re, et al. – in this case perhaps the waters with which the stalk is swelled. Or, given IX.59.3b *viśvāni duritā tara* in the immediately following hymn, it could be “all difficult passages.”

IX.59

IX.59.1: The first hemistich is notable for its sequence of four root noun cmpds in *-jít-* ‘winning, winner’. For their possible structural role in the hymn, see comm. ad vs. 4.

IX.59.2; As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. contains three occurrences of the impv. *pávasva*, each pāda init. Each of these is construed with a dat. pl. (or abl., acdg. to Sāy.; but see the parallel Ge cites [n. 2] that speaks for the dat.). This tight repetitive syntactic structure suggests that the three datives should form a semantic set. The first two are waters (*adbhyáḥ*) and plants (*ósadhībhyáḥ*). As for the third, *dhiśánābhyah*, Ge interpr. it as “die (priestlichen) Werke” (and see his extensive n. on the word, n.2c), Re as “les inspirations (des humains).” However, in part flg. Pinault (Vedic Workshop, 2007), I take the orig. sense of *dhiśánā-* to be ‘holy place’, and in this context I think it likely that it refers to the hearths holding the ritual fires. If so, the trio of datives would refer to three vital physical elements of the soma sacrifice: “the waters” for swelling the soma stalk and for mixing the pressed soma, “the plants” representing the soma plant itself, and “the Holy Places / hearths” representing the fire into which the soma is offered. The more

attenuated interpr. of Ge and Re are not impossible, but are not as tightly bound to the substances in ab as the fires/hearths would be.

Re notes the phonetic play (*pávasv*)*ādbhyó ádābhyah* in a.

IX.59.4: The injunc. *vidaḥ* in pāda a is interpr. by both Ge and Re as imperatival, while in the publ. tr. it's taken as a general statement in the present. I am now somewhat inclined to follow the imperatival interpr. of Ge/Re ("find the sun"). On *vidaḥ* in impv. use, see comm. ad IX.20.3, I.42.7–9. What may indirectly support my original interpr., however, is a potential ring-compositional relationship with vs. 1. As noted above, vs. 1 contains a remarkably pile-up of root noun cmpds in *-jít-* 'X-winning'. There exists a very well-attested root noun cmpd *svar-víd-* 'sun-finding', which is semantically very close to the X-winning cmpds (and cf. also *svar-jít-* 4x, incl. 2x of Soma in IX). Indeed, *svar-víd-* is commonly used of Soma (13x in IX) and in a number of passages occupies this same metrical slot, the last four syllables of a dimeter pāda (in the acc. sg. *svar-vídām*, nom/acc. pl. *svar-vídaḥ*; e.g., IX.8.9), as our finite VP *svâr vidaḥ*. This slot is, of course, not available for the nom. sg. *svar-víd*, but the 2nd sg. VP here *svâr vidaḥ* is a reasonable simulacrum, with *vidaḥ* incorporating the nominative subject. Now in vs. 1 the cmpds in *-jít-* are descriptors of Soma, without modal value. If *svâr vidaḥ* here is meant as a ring-compositional variant, evoking the cmpd *svar-víd-* and reprising the X-*jít-* cmpds of vs. 1, the general meaning I assigned it in the publ. tr. may correctly capture this structural feature.

The finite verb in b presents its own problems. The Pp. reads *abhavaḥ*, though the putative augment has to be elided after *jāyamāno* in order to produce the proper number of syllables. As is well known (see, e.g., Old, Proleg. 389ff.), this elision, i.e., Abhinihita sandhi, is fairly rare in the RV, and therefore the orig. text may have had not the impf. *abhavaḥ*, but an injunc. *bhavaḥ*, which was then wrongly analyzed by the Pp. In that case *bhavaḥ* could express the same general sense as I just suggested *vidaḥ* might: "being born, you become great." However, as both Old (Noten ad loc.) and KH (Inj. 150) point out, the injunctives *bhavaḥ* and *bhavat* are not otherwise found in the RV, and therefore both scholars assume that the augmented *abhavaḥ* is the underlying form here – 'you became great', as rendered in the publ. tr.

IX.60

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.60.1: The tr. "sing forth with a song" is meant to capture the etymological relationship of *gāyatrēṇa gāyata*, but *gāyatrā-* of course refers more technically to a hymn in Gāyatrī meter – as this one indeed is.

IX.60.1–2: The chaining described in the publ. intro. here involves repeating *sahāsracakṣasam* from 1c in 2a in the same metrical position.

IX.60.2: The deriv. *-bharṇas-* in *sahāśra-bharṇas-* is somewhat puzzling: it is difficult to see what motivated its formation and indeed to fix its meaning. It is found 4x (once as a repetition), only in IX, always in the acc. sg. occupying the last 6 syllables of a dimeter line (here, IX.64.25 [=98.1], 64.26), modifying Soma (here), *vāc-* (IX.64.25, 26), *rayí-*

(IX.98.1), though the referent never appears in the pāda with the adj. and so the adj. is loosely connected with its referent at best. Here it is obviously meant to match *sahāsra-cakṣas-* ‘having a thousand eyes’ in the same metrical position in the preceding pāda, and for this reason I think it possible that this passage is the locus for its creation. But the match is not very good: though both are *-as-* stems, the suffixes (*-nas-* versus *-as-*) aren’t superimposable. The semantic match is also quite imperfect: whatever *-bharṇas-* means, it is certainly not a body part like *cakṣas-*. Since many nominal derivatives of √*bhr̥* fall in the semantic domain of ‘present, offering’ and such a meaning fits a ritual context, that seems a safe bet and would work with *rayí-*, though it fits *vāc-* somewhat less well. With a confidence whose basis is not clear, Re rejects the notion of ‘offrande’ and asserts that “le suffix *-nas-* fait décider pour «bénéfice (qu’on tire du culte sômique)»,” for reasons he fails to give. Ge by contrast tr. “Tausendaufwiegenden” with a question mark, which he then glosses (n. 2b) with “Tausendwertigen.” Insofar as the suffix *-nas-* tells us anything (and the *-n-* is not there just to supply the heavy syllable that a straight *-as-* stem *sahāsra-*bharas-* would lack), it suggests a meaning in the realm of “stuff,” material substance, esp. with regard to substances of value: cf. *rékṇas-* ‘inheritance, legacy’, *drávinas-* ‘material goods, chattels’, *ápnas-* ‘property’, all with Aves. cognates – so that ‘bringing a thousand (material) presents’ would fit reasonably in this group. AiG II.2.738 glosses *-bharṇas-* with ‘Darbringung’ and considers it probably inherited, despite the lack of non-Indic correspondents. Given its extremely limited distribution, indeed the strong possibility that it was originally created in one passage, I consider inheritance unlikely; rather, it was probably formed as a near nonce on the basis of the inherited words just cited.

IX.60.2–3: Here the chaining is slightly inexact: 2c *átí vāram* / 3a *átí vārān*, each followed by a verbal form of √*pū*.

IX.60.3: This vs. is in Puraüṣṇih meter (12 8 / 8), i.e., a Gāyatrī with an extended first pāda. This pāda is almost at the exact center of the hymn, preceded by 6 pādas, followed by 5. The positioning seems deliberate.

IX.60.3–4: Here the chaining involves only the first word *índrasya*.

IX.60.4: In addition to the chaining with the previous vs. (on which see immediately above), this vs. participates in other verbal echoes, as noted in the publ. intro. The end of the 2nd pāda *vīcarṣaṇe* forms a ring with *vīcarṣanim* at the end of the 2nd pāda of vs. 1, and the last pāda, *prajāvad réta ā bhara*, is identical to the last pāda of the first vs. of the immediately preceding hymn, IX.59.1 *prajāvad rátnam ā bhara*, with the substitution of *rétaḥ* for *rátnam*. In our case the semen (*rétaḥ*) would be both the actual semen that produces offspring and the liquid soma that mimics it.

IX.61–67

On the place of these long hymns in the structure of the maṇḍala, see publ. intro. to IX.61. All of these hymns consist of collections of *ṛcas* of varying degrees of cohesion. In fact, it is surprising how few *ṛcas* display a real attempt at thematic or lexical unity, and what they do show is often simply the byproduct of the fact that both

the lexicon and thematic preoccupations of Maṇḍala IX are comparatively limited and so similar words and themes are not unlikely to show up in adjacent verses. This lack of unity contrasts, I think (this is my unsystematic and anecdotal impression) with collections of *ṛcas* in other maṇḍalas, notably VIII.

IX.61

IX.61.1–3: This *ṛca* shows some signs of unity. The 1st two vss. are a syntactic unit, with the objects of the verb in 1c partly postponed to 2ab. The third vs. has as its verb *pári ... kṣārā*, which echoes *pári srava* in 1a.

IX.61.1: The publ. tr. fails to render the demon. *ayā* that opens the hymn; more literal would be “flow around in this pursuit (of him) ...” Ge (n. 1) considers *ayā* a kind of attraction from **asya* ‘of him’, the missing antecedent to *yāḥ* in b, but the prominent position of *ayā* should be registered. Presumably *ayā vītī* is gesturing towards the physical ritual activity happening right now.

The unnamed referent in the rel. cl. of bc is of course Indra; the “nine and ninety” are fortresses / strongholds, as in IV.26.3 ... *púraḥ ... náva sākāṃ navatīḥ śámbarasya*. This referent is postponed to the 2nd vs.: *púraḥ* opens vs. 2.

IX.61.2: As was just noted, *púraḥ* completes the acc. phrase *navatīḥ náva* that serves as obj. to *avāhan* in 1c, as the parallel IV.26.3 just cited demonstrates. But *avāhan* has another object in vs. 2, namely *śámbaram* in b, as shown by a different passage in the Indra cycle of Maṇḍala IV, IV.30.14 *āvāhann indra śámbaram*.

The third pāda of this vs. is radically incomplete, consisting only of a particle, a demon., and two acc. PNs: *ádha tyāṃ turvāsāṃ yádum*. On purely structural grounds, it would make sense to make these parallel to *śámbaram* in b, as objects of *avāhan* (in 1c). However, this structural argument runs into problems of mythological content. Although Turvaśa and Yadu *are* sometimes enemies of Indra (see, e.g., VII.19.2), at other times they are under Indra’s protection. In particular, in the Indra cycle from which IV.26.3 and IV.30.14, the parallels to our vss. 1–2ab, were cited above, T + Y are rescued by Indra: IV.30.17 *utá tyā turvāsāyádū, ... / índraḥ ... apārayat* “And Indra brought these two, T + Y, to the far shore,” just three vss. later than the smiting of Śambara. Note further that IV.30.17a is very like our pāda, a dimeter line with an intro. disyllabic connective, a form of the demonstr. *syá-* / *tyá-*, and the two names, though with a dual dvandva *turvāsāyádū* rather than two individual acc. sgs. On this basis, I’m afraid the simple solution of taking T + Y as further victims of Indra should be abandoned, in favor of supplying (or at least assuming) a positive verb to govern them, such as Ge’s (n. 2c) “errettete” or Re’s “sauva.”

IX.61.3: The Inhaltsakk. with *pári ... kṣārā* are disharmonious in formation, with the sg. noun *ásvam* (rendered in the publ. tr. as the mass noun ‘horseflesh’, perhaps a bit too vividly) in pāda a followed by two possessive adj. *gómat* and *híraṇyavat* ‘possessing / consisting of cattle (and) gold’ in pāda b, followed by a pl. NP *sahasríṇīḥ íṣaḥ* ‘thousandfold refreshments’ in c. In a we might have expected *ásvāvat* ‘possessing / consisting of horses’, to match the adjectival forms in b, but the phonologically similar

and adjacent *aśvavid* ‘horse-finding’ may have blocked it (to avoid **āśvāvad aśvavid* [though some RVic poets would have loved that phrase]).

IX.61.4–6: There are faint signs of unity in this *ṛca*: the word *pavītram* ‘filter’ is found in vss. 4 and 5, and both 4 and 6 have pres. mid. participles derived from $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’ (*pāvamāna*- 4a, *punānā*- 6a), but since this is a Soma Pavamāna hymn, this is hardly remarkable.

IX.61.4: Both Ge and Re render *pāvamānasya* as simply the epithet Pavamāna, but this loses the parallelism between the two gen. sg. pres. participles that open and close the hemistich: *pāvamānasya ... abhyundatāḥ*. I render these participles as “while” clauses, to avoid the awkward “we choose the companionship of you who are Xing.”

IX.61.5: We might fault the poet for a certain laxness of phraseology: how exactly is Soma meant to be gracious / merciful to us “with his waves”?

IX.61.6: Note the echo across the b-c pāda boundary: ... *īṣam / īśānaḥ* ...

IX.61.7–9: The *ṛca* is characterized by the mention of gods in all three vss. The Ādityas frame it (*ādityébhiḥ* 7c, *mitré vāruṇe ca* 9c), with a more miscellaneous group in between. It is also marked by initial repetition: *sām* opens pādas 7c, 8a, and 8c. This is imperfectly echoed by *sā n(o)* opening 9a.

IX.61.10–12: It is difficult to discern any particular unity in this *ṛca*.

IX.61.10: The topic of the verse seems to be heavenly versus earthly soma. See Lü 204.

On *jātām* as an adj., rather than (with Ge, Re, Lü 204, Ober II.16) the noun ‘birth’, see comm. ad IX.55.2. Another arg. for taking it as adjectival here is that the same form is clearly an adj. in 13a. As in IX.55.2, I take the missing referent to be ‘honey’ (*mādhu*) on the basis of IX.18.2.

Pāda b contains several forms requiring disc., esp. what appears in the Saṃhitā text as *bhūmy*. This is analyzed, irregularly, by the Pp as *bhūmiḥ*. Gr gives the form as *bhūmī* but identifies it as a nom. sg. to *bhūmi*-. Old refers to the considerable lit. on the form, opting for a loc. interpr. (as do all the standard tr.). Wackernagel has a curiously split opinion: in AiG I.337 (1896) he identifies it as a loc., while in AiG III.136–37 (1930) he decides instead for the nom., though referring to his former opinion – and in the same vol. (III.155) he says the same form doesn’t *have* to be a loc. (“... muss nicht notwendig as Lok. *bhūmī* gefasst werden”), but could alternatively be either a nom. *bhūmī* or an instr. *bhūmyā*. The context, with the contrast *divī śāt* “though being in heaven” with loc. *divī*, certainly favors a loc. interpr. for the form, even though taking ‘earth’ as the subject of the clause is possible: “earth took it, though it was in heaven.” In sum, I think the loc. interpr. is most likely, with an *-ī* (or *-i*) loc, to a fem. *i*-stem, like *védī* (or *vēdī*) in II.3.4 (see comm. ad loc.). A *bhūmi* with short final vowel is metrically better here (as *vēdī* is in II.3.4), but it may result from shortening in hiatus.

The neut. part. *sāt* has, in my opinion, the concessive value often found with the pres. part. to *√as*, though most tr. don't render it as such (and Re rejects this interpr.). It modifies the unexpressed *mádhu* in my view, but the neut. *ándhas-* acdg. to most others.

ā dade is another ambig. form.: it can be either a 1st or a 3rd sg. mid. pf. (or a 1st sg. mid. pres.). Gr takes it as a 1st sg. pf., as does Ge (“Den im Himmel befindlichen (Trank) nehme ich auf der Erde zu mich”), but a 3rd sg., with the soma (represented by *mádhu* or *ándhaḥ*) as subject (with Re, Lü, Ober) allows pāda c to serve as obj. of *ā dade* – Ge has to take it as an independent nominal clause – and the Gr/Ge interpr. also introduces a 1st sg. that has no other place in the context, where the 1st pl. reigns.

IX.61.11: On *dyumnāni mānuṣāṇām* see comm. ad X.42.6, as well as VI.19.6. I would now alter the tr. here slightly to “the brilliant things of the sons of Manu,” since, as I discuss ad X.42.6, I think the rivalry over *dyumná-* (pl.) is confined to the larger Ārya community.

IX.61.13–15: Again no signs of *ṛca* unity, unless the presence of cows in all three verses counts (13b *góbhiḥ*, 14b *vatsām saṃśísvarīḥ iva*, 15a *gāve*, 15b *dhukṣāsva*).

IX.61.14: The hapax tatpuruṣa *hṛdaṃsāni-* ‘gaining the heart’ is curious, in having an apparent acc. in *-am* to the neut. root noun *hṛd-*, as if to a masc. or fem. stem or to a thematic **hṛda-* (see, e.g., AiG II.1.208).

IX.61.16–18: This *ṛca* is unified by the simple device of stationing a form of *pávamāna-* at the beginning of each vs. (16a, 17a, 18a). Note also the two forms of *rása-* ‘sap’ in 17a and 18a (the two pādas are scramblings of each other: 17a *pávamānasya te rásaḥ*, 18a *pávamāna rásas táva*, with different case forms of *pávamāna-* and enclitic versus full form of the gen. sg. 2nd ps. prn.). And 16c *jyótir vaiśvānarām ...* matched by 18c *jyótir víśvam ...*

IX.61.16: The question in this vs. is how to interpr. the simile in pāda b, *divás citrām ná tanyatúm*. It has been variously rendered. Note first that in none of the available interpr. (that I know of) is the simile particle *ná* positioned in the expected 2nd position, so that conforming to the usual structure of the simile cannot be used as a criterion to decide which interpr. is correct. We have had occasion to note this issue before in Maṇḍala IX; see disc. ad IX.57.3. Re takes the whole of b as a simile, with the “thunder” matching “light” (c) in the frame; in addition he supplies a different subject for the simile: “Pavamāna a engendré la haute lumière propre à (Agni) Vaiśvānara, / comme (les dieux ont engendré) le tonnerre éclatante du ciel.” This is not impossible, of course, but introducing the gods seems unnecessary, and are they the usual creators of thunder anyway? Lü’s (266) interpr. is similar, though he allows Pavamāna as subj. of both the simile and the frame. I find Ge’s interpr. more appealing: he considers *tanyatúm* part of the frame, with the simile restricted to *divás citrām*. “Sich läuternd hat er den Donner, grell wie den des Himmels, hervorgebracht.” The c pāda provides a parallel object, rather than constituting the frame as in the Re/Lü interpr. My tr. essentially follows Ge. The “thunder” that Soma engendered is the noise produced by the pressing, esp. by the pressing stones, which is constantly remarked on. It is comparable to the thunder of

heaven. All interpr. must silently reckon with the synaesthesia introduced by the point of the comparison in the simile, *citrá-* ‘bright, brilliant, glittering, dazzling’, an adj. that ordinarily characterizes visual phenomena not auditory ones (though it’s a not uncommon transfer; cf. Engl. “brilliant tone,” etc., used of voices and musical instruments). For a similar ex. cf. VI.6.2 *śvītānas tanyatúḥ* “brightening thunder.” This synaesthetic comparison provides a lead-in to the second object, the “light belonging to all men.”

Both Ge and Re take *jyótir vaiśvānarām* as referring to Agni Vaiśvānara specifically. This is certainly possible, though it is not the soma pressing that ordinarily kindles the ritual fire. I prefer to take it more generally as shared light, perhaps localized as the sun, which would continue the heavenly theme of pāda b. Alternatively, this pāda, which is entirely in the neuter, may be nominative not accusative and refer to Soma himself. This interpr. may be favored by the matching pāda at the end of the ṛca, 18c *jyótir víśvam svār dṛśé* “(as) light for everyone to see the sun,” where the soma sap—that is, soma itself—is identified as this light. I would therefore suggest an alternative tr. of pāda c here: “(he) the lofty light belonging to all men.”

IX.61.18: I am, reluctantly, taking *dākṣa-* as an adj. here (as in IX.62.4), with Ge and Re, though it is generally a masc. noun. Alternatively a noun interpr. is possible (cf. Ober I.457 “dein Saft ist Fähigkeit”): “your sap shines forth brilliant as skill” or “... shines as brilliant skill,” though I still prefer the adjectival interpr. See Re’s disc.

Scar (237) takes *vī rājati* as ‘rules’ (“dein Saft herrscht weithin als König ...” A pun is certainly possible here, but the insistent light imagery (*dyumān* in b and the whole c pāda) suggests that the ‘shine’ sense is the dominant one.

In c Ge takes *víśvam* as the modifier of *jyótiḥ* (“... ist alles licht”); so also Scar (237). This is certainly possible, and *jyótir vaiśvānarām* in 16c might support it. But “for everyone / all to see the sun” is a locution encountered elsewhere (I.15.1, 5, VIII.49.8, X.136.1), incl. nearby IX.48.4. My interpr. is shared with Re and Ober (I.457).

IX.61.19–21: Little evidence of unity, though 19 and 20 share ‘smashing’ and 20 and 21 cows.

IX.61.21: As in 16b, the simile in b seems to consist only of what precedes the *ná*, namely *sūpasthābhiḥ*, while *dhenúbhiḥ* constitutes the frame. So also Ge, Re.

IX.61.22–24: The ṛca has something of an emphasis on combat and winning, and the Vṛtra topic introduced in 22 is reprised via phonological deformation by *vratéṣu* in 24c.

IX.61.22: A nice example where surface grammar clashes with mythological content and the latter wins. Pāda b, the complex object of *āvitha* ‘you helped’ in a, consists of an infinitival phrase with the obj. of the inf. “attracted” into the dative, while its subject remains acc.: *índram vṛtrāya hántave* “you helped Indra to smite Vṛtra.” But c, a further specification of this obj., contains an acc. sg. masc. participial phrase *vavrivāṃsam mahūr apāḥ* “obstructing the great waters.” On the surface, the only noun this can modify is *índram* because this is the only available acc. sg. masc., but of course it is Vṛtra who obstructed the waters. Though *vṛtrāya* appears in the dative, it must be the referent of the acc. participle – thus suggesting that “attraction” in infinitival phrases is a very late and

superficial phenomenon. Unless with Re we want simply to denominate it a “formule morphologiquement non adaptée au contexte.” I prefer to think that the poet enjoyed producing the syntactic misdirection.

IX.61.23: Pāda c ... *vardha no gírah* “strengthen our hymns” is the reciprocal to vs. 14a *tán íd vardhantu no gírah* “let our hymns strengthen just him.”

IX.61.24: Pāda a consists of the etymologically identical phrases *tvótāsaḥ* ‘aided by you’ and *távāvasā* ‘with your help’, both containing forms of the 2nd sg. prn. and nominal forms of \sqrt{av} ‘help, aid’.

Pāda b contains a curious verbal periphrasis, *syāma vanvāntaḥ* “may we be combatting,” with opt. to \sqrt{as} as aux. plus the pres. act, part. to *vanóti*. This expression does not seem to be conveying anything different from the opt. to the same pres. stem, *vanuyāma* (5x), e.g., X.38.3 *tváyā vayāṃ tām [śátrūn] vanuyāma* “With you might we combat those (rivals).”

As noted above, *vratá-* in this pāda may have been chosen to recall *vṛtrá-* phonologically, forming a faint ring with the $\sqrt{vṛ}$ forms in 22 *vṛtrāya ... vavrivāṃsam*. It may even be that *jāgrhi* ‘be watchful’ evokes a form of \sqrt{han} , as in 20a *jāghnir vṛtrám*; see also *jahī* in 26b.

IX.61.25–27: This *ṛca* focuses even more strongly on combat, with forms of \sqrt{han} in 25 and 26 and ‘do battle’ (*makhasyá-*) in 27. Generosity is also a topic.

IX.61.27: This vs. is rather cleverer than the two that precede it. In pāda a the nom. pl. root noun *hrútaḥ* is, in my opinion, a pun. It belongs to the root \sqrt{hvr} ‘go crookedly, curve’, and its sense was disc., e.g., by KH (Fs. Thieme [1980] = Aufs. III.753–54). He suggests that here it refers to unevennesses (Unebenheiten) in the fleece sieve (i.e., as I see it, the curvy tufts of wool), just as, in the other occurrence of this root noun (VI.4.5), it refers to the curves of a race course (see comm. ad loc.). The literal sense here then is that though the soma must navigate around the tufts on the sieve, they will not keep it from completing the course. The second sense is one referring to unscrupulous enemies—Engl. ‘crook’ is an exact semantic match—and the point is that when Soma wishes to dispense goods to us, our crooked enemies can’t divert him.

The word family that includes *makhá-* and the denom. *makhasyá-* found here displays both ‘combat’ and ‘generosity’ senses; see comm. ad I.18.9 and, for the verb, III.31.7. Here I think both are at play, and this double sense is encouraged by the context: as noted, this *ṛca* focuses on combatting enemies, and the first hemistich of this vs. states that these enemies cannot stop Soma. But the *ṛca* also concerns Soma’s giving, esp. in the last two vss.: 26a “bring wealth ... 26c “give” ... 27b “eager to give largesse.”

IX.61.28–30: The last *ṛca* continues the concentration on combat and victory.

IX.61.29: The first two pādas open with somewhat emphatic 2nd sg. genitives, the first with a fronted initially accented demonstr. + enclitic (*ásya te*), the second with a more conventional full form of the prn. (*táva*). See disc. ad IX.66.14.

IX.61.30: The nominal rel. cl. in ab has no resumptive prn. in the main cl. of c, though “with these/them” is clearly the intent.

On the construction of *dhūrvane* here, see Keydana, Infin. 247, though the arbitrary line he tends to draw between “true” infinitives and datival purpose nouns seems over-strict here.

As is shown by IX.29.5 *rākṣa ... svanāt samasya kāsya cit* (cited by Ge), *nidāh* must be an abl. (as we would expect in any case with a form of $\sqrt{rakṣ}$) with a dependent gen., the indefinite *samasya*.

IX.62

IX.62.1–3: No particular sign of unity in this *ṛca*, though all three vss. concern the journey of the soma drops across the filter and towards the milk mixture and the rest of the ritual (as do vast numbers of other vss. in IX, of course). Vss. 2 and 3 also both contain the pres. part. *kṛṇvāntaḥ* and datives of benefit.

IX.62.2: This vs. has no finite verb, just two nom. pl. participles. With its nom. pl. subj. it can be dependent on vs. 1 or vs. 3 (or both); I prefer anticipatory dependence on vs. 3 because of the repetition of *kṛṇvāntaḥ* and the parallel datives.

Note the juxtaposition of the opposites *duritā* lit. ‘ill-goings’ (pāda a) and *sugā* lit. ‘good-goings’ (pāda b), formed with two different verbs of motion (\sqrt{i} , $\sqrt{gā}$). It is difficult to capture this relationship in Engl. without awkwardness, as the literal tr. just given demonstrate.

My tr. follows Ge in taking *ārvate* parallel to *tokāya* “for our offspring and for our steed”; I am somewhat tempted to take *ārvate* as an anticipatory parallel to *gāve* in 3a, with which it forms a more natural class (“making wide space for our steed and for our cow”), but I can’t see how to do that without brutally splitting up 2c, since *kṛṇvāntaḥ* is required to govern *sugā* in 2b.

IX.62.4–6: Again no obvious signs of unity, beyond the progress through the preparation of soma. Note, however, that 4b and 5b both begin *apsú* and the opening of 6b, *āsū(śubhan)* echoes that opening phonologically.

IX.62.4: As in IX.61.18 I take *dākṣa*- adjectivally (so also Ge, Re); even more than in that passage, a noun interpr. is difficult: “... the skill, abiding on a mountain”?

The loc. *apsú* and the locatively used stem *giri*- implicitly contrast.

IX.62.5: The fluent Engl. of the tr. conceals a syntactic problem: soma should be the obj. of the verb *svádanti* in c, and the first pāda, which is entirely in the neuter, with the NP led by *āndhas*-, allows such an acc. interpr. However, the intermediate pāda (b) is stubbornly in the masc. nominative (*dhūtāḥ ... sutāḥ*). We must either take b as a parenthetical nominal clause, as Ge and I do, or take ab as entirely in the nominative (as Re may do – his structure is not entirely clear) as a separate nominal clause, and supply a resumptive pronominal acc. for c.

IX.62.7–9: The *ṛca* shows no strong signs of internal unity, save for the “sitting” found in both 7 and 8, but it does echo some of the material earlier in the hymn: *āsṛgram* in 7b matches the same verb in 1a; *āsadaḥ* in 7c recalls *āsadat* in 4c, while *sīdan yónā* (8c) is a different echo of 4c *yónim āsadat*; *arṣa* (8a) picks up *arṣanti* (3b); *svādiṣṭhaḥ* in 9b expresses the result of *svádanti* in 5c; and *varivo-víd* in 9c is a paraphrase of *kṛṇvānto várivaḥ* in 2c. It may also be worth noting that this is the first place in the hymn that the divine recipients of soma are mentioned: *indrāya* 8a, *āngirobhyaḥ* 9b.

IX.62.9: The metaphorical universe of the soma hymns makes it difficult to interpr. the phrase *ghṛtām páyaḥ*, lit. “ghee (and) milk.” In the publ. tr. I take the phrase as the ultimate goal of *pári srava*, referring to the milk with which the soma will be mixed after its trip across the filter. See the esp. explicit IX.31.5 *túbhyaṃ gāvo ghṛtām páyaḥ ... dudhré* “For you the cows have milked out ghee and milk,” which identifies the phrase as referring to substance(s) that the cows produce for soma, real dairy products. But soma is also sometimes *compared* to milk and to ghee (e.g., IX.74.4), and so the phrase can also be an appositive metaphorically characterizing the subject soma, accounting for Ge’s “Laufe du ... als Schmalz und Milch.” However, our 5c *svádanti gāvo páyobhiḥ* “the cows sweeten (soma) with their milk” suggests that the milk and ghee in this vs. are likewise firmly bovine – though see 20b below.

IX.62.10–12: In this *ṛca* all three vss. have a form of med. *páva-*: *pávamānaḥ* 10b, 11b, (*ā*) *pavasva* 12a. This is scarcely surprising in the Soma Pavamāna maṇḍala, but in fact this stem has not yet appeared in the hymn.

IX.62.10: Several items in this vs. present choices of interpr., none of which are strongly either favored or disfavored.

The first issue is *hitāḥ*: as often in this maṇḍala (cf. comm. ad IX.1.2, 44.2, etc.), it could belong either to $\sqrt{dhā}$ or to \sqrt{hi} . The presence of a verb form belonging undeniably to the latter, *hinvánāḥ* in c, cuts both ways, as the poet could either be reinforcing the sense by duplicate forms of the same root or making a pun utilizing two different roots. In a similar situation in IX.44.2, with *hitāḥ ... hinve*, I opted to take both to \sqrt{hi} (though not with any emphatic feeling about it), while here I take *hitā-* to $\sqrt{dhā}$, as a pun (again, not emphatically). The deciding factor here for me is the deictic demon. *ayám* ‘right here’, which may point to the current location of the soma, expressed by ‘established, placed’. Re also takes it to $\sqrt{dhā}$, but Ge to \sqrt{hi} .

The other uncertainty in the vs. is how to construe *āpyam brhāt* “lofty friendship”: is it the complement of *cetati* or of *hinvánāḥ* -- which brings up the further question of the function of the latter participle. Med. *hinváte*, etc., can either take an obj. or be passive; in particular the part. *hinvánā-* is about evenly split. For a nearby pass. form, see, e.g., IX.64.9; for a nearby transitive form, see IX.63.7 *hinvánó mānuṣīr apāḥ*. Both Ge and Re take it as tr. here (e.g., “die hohe Freundschaft zur eile treibend”), while I have chosen to take it as passive and to construe the acc. with *cetati*, on the grounds that I don’t know what it would mean to “impel friendship” (though such an image is well within the potential range of a RVic poet). Gotō (1st class, 139) takes it as I do.

IX.62.11: The nom. *pávamānaḥ* in b is helpful in identifying the referent as Soma, in that both *vṛṣā* ‘bull’ (and related *vṛṣa-vrataḥ*) and *aśastihā* could be (and are) just as well used of Indra.

IX.62.13–15: The first two vss. contain forms of *kaví-*. The epithet “wide-going” (*urugāyá-* 13c) may be further specified in the phrase *vīmāno rájasah* “measurer of the airy realm” (14b) -- in both cases probably a way of giving a cosmic dimension to the journey across the filter. The third vs. (15) does not participate in these commonalities.

IX.62.15: *girā jātāḥ* “born on a mountain” is in the first instance a phrasal variant of *giri-ṣthāḥ* ‘mountain-abiding’ in 4b, with *girā* showing the *i*-stem loc. in *-ā* regular before consonants (see, e.g., Lanman, Noun Inflect, 385). This interpr. is followed by Ge and Re in their tr. (see also Ober II.13). However, *girā* can also be, as Old and Ge (n. 15a) point out, the instr. sg. of *gír-* ‘hymn’; in fact Gr puts it there. The alt. given in the publ. tr. “[/begotten by a hymn]” reflects this other possible analysis; that soma is produced to the accompaniment of hymns would make this statement true in ritual logic. It is also possible that *girā* ‘by a hymn’ could be construed with *stutāḥ* ‘praised’ later in the pāda. And to make things even more complex, *stutāḥ* might also evoke *sutāḥ* ‘pressed’.

The pass. *dhīyate* in b might weakly support taking *hitāḥ* in 10a to $\sqrt{dhā}$ as well.

Pāda c is the third instantiation (always in the c pāda) of the image comparing soma installed in the wooden cups to a bird on a *yóni-*: 4c *śyenó ná yónim āśadat*, 8c *sīdan yónā váneṣv ā*, our 15c *vír yónā vasatāv iva* – and cf. in the preceding hymn IX.61.21c *sīdañ chyenó ná yónim ā*. Judging from the position of *ivā* in our vs., both the bird and the *yóni-* have become so much part of the identity of soma that only the ‘nest’ (*vasatí-*) is considered part of the simile proper – though we must keep in mind the multiple disturbances in the position of simile particles in Maṇḍala IX as disc. passim above.

IX.62.16–18: Several elements link at least two of the vss. in the trīca: the presence of *vāja-* in 16 and 18 (*vājam* 16b, *vājāya* 18b, *vājīnam* 18c) and the dat. inf. *yāṭave* in 17b and 18b.

IX.62.17: See publ. intro. for the ritual specificity of the images in this vs.

The participle “yoking” in the publ. tr. of c should properly be in parens., since it’s simply generated from the finite *yuñjanti* in b.

The uninflected numeral ‘seven’ (*saptá*) is stationed between two pl. nouns, gen. *ṛṣīṇām* ‘of the seers’ and instr. *dhītībhiḥ* ‘with visionary thoughts’. Of course seven is the canonical number of seers throughout Indian religious history, starting with the RV, but ‘seven’ is also used of *dhītí-* in IX.9.4 *sá saptá dhītībhir hitāḥ* and passages cited there. Most tr. choose to construe it with one or the other (Ge, Ober [II.72] *ṛṣi-*; Re, Lü [710], Ober [II.222] *dhītí-*), with, surprisingly (to me), more going for *dhītí-* than *ṛṣi-*. But surely its position helps signal that it should be construed with both (as Re in his n. and Ober in his 2nd tr. indicate).

IX.62.18: This vs. is notable for its 2nd ps. address to the priests (*sotāraḥ ... hinota* “o pressers, impel ...”), also found in vss. 21, 29. Ordinarily 2nd ps. in soma hymns is reserved for Soma (sg.) and his drops (etc.) (pl.).

IX.62.19–21: There is some chaining between vss. (cows/milk in 19, 20; *mádhu* in 20, 21 and two mentions of gods in pāda c in 20, 21, incl. dat. pl. *devébhyaḥ* in each). In addition, all three vss. begin with the preverb *ā* (univerbated and therefore accentless in 19a).

IX.62.20: With Ge and Re, the publ. tr. interpr. *páyo duhanti* as “they milk *your* milk” (or more emphatically, Re “traient *de toi* le lait” [my ital.]); that is, they assume that milk (*páyah*) here refers to the soma juice. See above, comm. ad vs. 9, on the ambiguous ref. of this word in the soma maṇḍala. It is also possible here that *páyah* refers to cows’ milk (see the cows in 19c), and the passage should be interpr. “they milk milk *for you* for exhilaration.”

IX.62.22–24: *gr̥ṇāná-* is found in the first and last vs. (22b, 24c); vss. 23 and 24 contain forms of *árṣa-*, *pári-*, and cows. In addition vs. 22 seems to chain with the final vs. of the previous ṛca, 21: 22a *asrkṣata* picks up 21b *sr̥játā*, and 22b *śrávase* echoes (*deva*)*śrút(tamam)* in 21c, while *madíntama-* (22b) contains the same splv. suffix as *mádhumattama* (21b), (*deva*)*śrúttama-* (21c).

IX.62.24: For some disc. of this passage see Scar 641 with n. 906. He gives *pariṣṭúbh-* an active value (“ringsum jubelnd, rauschend”) in this passage: “... zu allen, die ringsum Töne von sich geben,” in contrast to my passive “encircled with rhythm,” which follows Re’s “environnées de rythmes.” Since the cmpd modifies *īṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’, it is hard to see how they could actively produce noise, though Scar (n. 906) suggests it might refer to the cows likewise characterizing the refreshments (*gómatīr īṣaḥ*), in the form of bellowing milk streams. This seems a bit farfetched, though it does allow the form to be semantically united with its other occurrence, in I.166.11, where it modifies the Maruts, who are actively making noise. For the idiom see I.80.9 *pári ṣṭobhata* “encircle (him) with rhythm!” where it is parallel to *arcata* “chant!” See also nearby IX.64.28 *pariṣṭóbhant-*. Ge takes *pariṣṭubhaḥ* as a noun ‘lauter Loblieder’, also with active sense.

IX.62.25–27: This ṛca shows more signs of unity than others in this hymn, esp. in the 1st two vss. Both 25 and 26 contain pāda-initial *pávasva* (25a, 26c) and the variant phrases *vācó agriyáḥ* (25a) / *agriyó vācaḥ* (26b), as well as forms of *vísva-* (25c *vísṽāni*, 26c *vísṽam(ejaya)*). In 27a Soma is addressed by the voc. *kave*, while 25c contains the phrase *vísṽāni kāvya*.

IX.62.25: Both Ge and Re supply an intermediate infinitive to govern *vísṽāni kāvya*: “um alle Sehergabe zu gewinnen” and “en vue de (nous procurer) tous pouvoirs-poétiques” respectively – on what basis is completely unclear to me. I see no reason why it can’t simply be a goal, as I’ve taken it. See also comm. ad IX.75.1.

IX.62.26: Because of the accentual difference between *vācāḥ* in 25a and *vācaḥ* in 26b, we must construe the two superficially near-identical phrases *vācō agriyāḥ* and *agriyō vācaḥ* quite differently. The first is a single constituent with dependent gen. *vācāḥ*, but in the 2nd *agriyāḥ* and acc pl. *vācaḥ* belong to different constituents, despite their adjacency: *vācaḥ* is the (or rather, an) obj. of *īrāyan*.

IX.62.28–30: No overt signs of unity.

IX.62.28: The first two pādas are simply a word-order variant of IX.57.1ab *prá te dhārā asaścāto, divó ná yanti vṛṣṭāyāḥ*.

IX.62.29: Although it may not be clear from the Engl. tr., the phrase beginning “the strong one ... the lord” refer to Soma (in the acc.), not Indra (in the dat.).

IX.62.30: On the masc. *ṛtāḥ* and the phrase *ṛtāḥ kavīḥ* see comm. ad VIII.60.5, which contains the same phrase, save for sandhi variation.

IX.63

IX.63.1–3: No particular signs of unity, though the dat. *īndrāya* in 2b anticipates the three datives *īndrāya víṣṇave ... vāyāve* in vs. 3.

IX.63.4–6: Thematically somewhat unified by the journey theme.

IX.63.4: Its opening *eté asṛgram āśávaḥ* is reminiscent of the beginning of the previous hymn IX.62.1ab *eté asṛgram ... āśávaḥ*.

On *hvāras*- see comm. ad IX.3.2.

IX.63.5: The phrase *kṛṇvānto víśvam āryam* “making it all Ārya,” esp. in conjunction with *aptúraḥ* “crossing the waters,” most likely alludes to the Ārya expansion in their migration into the northern part of the subcontinent, specifically to crossing frontier rivers and laying claim to the land on the other side. This territorial expansion is implicitly compared here to Soma’s ritual journey. Since, as Ge notes (n. 5b), the Soma cult is specifically Ārya, importing this practice into new lands would be a key part of the process of Arya-ization.

IX.63.7–9: On this *ṛca* see publ. intro. In these vss. Soma is compared to the sun, and his ritual journey compared to the Sun’s daily journey across the sky. At the same time the purification of the soma is linked with Manu, the first sacrificer (vss. 7–8), and so the cosmic and the ritual are connected.

IX.63.7: It is specifically stated here that the stream of soma “made the sun shine” (*sūryam ārocayāḥ*), in other words that the ritual activity produced cosmic effects.

IX.63.8: Soma goes from affecting the sun in vs. 7 to identity with the sun in this vs, since he yokes Etaśa, the sun’s horse, and travels through the midspace as if on the sun’s

daily journey – at least in my interpr. and that of Ge. But the vs. can be interpr. in a number of diff. ways, in part because the *sūra* of the Saṃhitā text is multiply ambiguous. If its underlying form is *sūrah*, per the Pp., it can be either gen./abl. to *svâr-* (so Sāy., as well as Ge and the publ. tr.) or nom. sg. to *sūra-*; however, it could also be underlying *sūre* and a loc. to *sūra-*. (Re also allows the dat., presumably to *svâr-*, but the only clear dat. to this stem is accented *sūrē* [IV.3.8]; *sūre duhitā* [I.34.5] is actually an old gen. with close sandhi effect before dental, likewise in IX.97.38; see my Fs. Melchert article, “Sūre Duhitār’s Brother, the ‘Placer of the Sun’: Another Example of -e <*-as in Rigvedic Phrasal Sandhi,” 2010.). In any case, an underlying *sūrah* is more likely than *sūre* because of the *sūro* in the next vs. (9b), which repeats much of the verbal material in this one.

Lü (215–16) objects to Ge’s interpr. of the vs., on the basis that the sun always travels through heaven, and here the travel is through the midspace (*antārikṣena*). So in his view this cannot refer to heavenly Soma identified with the sun, but must refer to the earthly Soma, who takes the name Sūra (hence *sūrah* is a nominative for him) and yokes a horse named Etaśa after the Sun’s horse, and journeys towards heaven through the midspace. In other words, his Soma seems as if he’s trying to steal the sun’s identity by stealing his names. I confess that the subtleties of Lü’s distinctions escape me, depending as they do on his strict separation of earthly and heavenly elements throughout his *Varuṇa* vols. Re seems to adopt some version of the Lü interpr., judging from his tr. of bc “... pour qu’il aille du (domaine de) Manu (au ciel) à travers l’espace-médian,” interpr. *manāv ādhi* as if it contained an abl. *manór* before *ādhi*. (He interpr. the same two pādas two hymns later [IX.65.16bc] quite differently.) I do see the point about the midspace, however, and am willing to concede that Soma-as-Sun is not quite as high a flyer as the Sun himself. Bl (RReps ad loc.) also considers *sūrah* a nom., but in his view this expresses “the complete assimilation of Soma Pavamāna to the sun,” which is a different conclusion from Lü’s. The point is surely not whether Soma is literally in heaven, but that he has acquired and displays the salient characteristics of the Sun and is therefore identified with the Sun despite remaining in the ritual arena.

IX.63.9: Pāda b of this vs., *sūro ayukta yāṭave*, consists entirely of words repeated from the previous vs.; in addition, substituting for *étaśam* in 8a, we find an expanded horse term, *tyā harīto dāśa* “these ten tawny mares” as obj. of *ayukta*. Again Soma is being identified with the sun and his ritual journey identified with the sun’s transit; again the cosmic and the ritual are intertwined, for the ten mares are probably both the Sun’s horses (as Lü points out, p. 216 n. 4, the Sun is credited with ten yoked horses in I.164.14; cf. also *sūryasya harītaḥ* in V.29.5) and the ten fingers of the priests that press the soma, exactly so called (*harīto dāśa*) in IX.38.3.

The third pāda (*īndur īndra īti bruván*) presents another set of problems: how much of what precedes *īti* is part of the direct speech and what is the content of the speech? See Old’s clear formulation of these questions. The standard solution is to take the speech as including both words preceding *īti* and to take it as a statement of identity; e.g., Ge’s “Der Saft ist Indra” (sim. Old, Lü 216 n. 4, Klein DGRV I.407), in part on the basis of a similar TB statement (see Ge n. 9c), though I don’t think this late parallel should be given much weight. Moreover, IX.6.2 *īndav īndra īti ...*, with voc. *īndo* outside of the quotation, shows that the ‘drop’ word does not have to be included in the quotation here. In addition, the sandhi of *īndra īti* is ambig.: it can represent nom. *īndrah* with the

Pp (and the standard interpr.), but it could also be loc. *indre*, the choice made by Re (“... en disant « c’est bien (pour aller) à Indra »”). In conjunction with the journey theme of this ṛca, I find this interpr. quite appealing and have adopted it.

IX.63.10–12: No particular unity, though vss. 11–12 are concerned with wealth.

IX.63.10: The datives *vāyāve ... indrāya* of course identify this as a ref. to the morning soma pressing, where both those gods receive the soma, and also echo the same datives (in diff. order) in vs. 3.

If *gírah* opening pāda b is an acc. pl. (as seems likely), it is somewhat awkwardly placed between two reff. to soma, *sutām* and *matsarām*, ending their respective pādas (a and b). All the acc.s should be objects of *pāri ... siñcata* ‘pour in circles’, which obviously fits the soma liquid better than the songs. Probably for this reason Gr identifies the form as a voc., the only voc. to the stem, but this certainly does not improve the sense: commanding the songs to pour the soma is appreciably worse than ordering unidentified priests to pour songs as well as soma. Elizarenkova’s tr. (*Language and Style of the Vedic R̥sis*, p. 85) exemplifies this awkwardness however unintentionally: “From here make libation rounds for Vāyu, for Indra, of the pressed intoxication, *O eulogies* (or: *O eulogizers*), onto the sheep strainer!” She claims that the root noun *gír-* can be used as an agent (hence her “O eulogizers”; Sāy. and Ludwig also take it as agentive: see Ge n. 10b), but I know of no such usage of this extremely common noun. On the other hand, the trope of “pouring prayers” is not rare in the RV, though pouring them onto the fleece strainer is a bit extreme. Re solves the problem by supplying a separate verb to govern *gírah* (“émettez”), but this seems a typical cop-out on his part.

As in the previous hymn (see comm. ad IX.62.18), the priests are addressed in the 2nd pl. here (*pāri ... siñcata*). See also vs. 19, with the same verb.

IX.63.11: On *vidā* as lengthened impv. rather than subjunctive *vidā(h)*, see comm. ad IX.19.6. It is accented because it is preceded by a voc. in zero-position.

IX.63.13–15: Again no particular signs of unity. The unmixed (“clear” *śukrá-*) soma in 14 is contrasted with the soma mixed with curds (*dādhyāśír-*) in 15.

IX.63.13: As in the ṛca vss. 7–9, Soma is again compared to the Sun – but curiously no clear point of comparison between them appears in the vs. The actions attributed to Soma here – purifying himself, being pressed by stones, putting his sap in the tub – are exclusive to him and certainly not characteristic of the Sun.

IX.63.14: In vs. 5 during his journey Soma “made it all Ārya”; here he crosses these Ārya domains (*dhāmāny āryā*) on his journey to the cows’ milk. My interpr. takes this first acc. phrase as an acc. of extent, of space traversed, while the acc. in pāda c, *vājam gómantam* I take as the goal of *akṣaran*. In the next vs., 15c, *pavītram āti* “across the filter” has the same function I see for *dhāmāny āryā* here, and in fact the filter may be identified as the Ārya domains. By contrast Ge takes *dhāmāny āryā* as parallel goal to *vājam gómantam*, while Re characteristically supplies a separate participle (*āviśántaḥ* “ont occupé”) to govern *dhāmāny āryā*. The parallels he cites in the n. do not seem sufficient to me.

IX.63.16–18: No evidence of unity, beyond *vājīnam* (17b), *vājam* (18c), and the vss. are quite hackneyed, even for Soma Gāyatrī hymns.

IX.63.19–21: This ṛca has more internal unity, as well as connection to the preceding ṛca, than usual. For its external connections, see 19a *vāje ná vājayúm* picking up the *vājī*-forms just noted, *mādhumattamam* in 19c matching the same word (in the nom.) in 16a, and 20a *kavīm mṛjanti* echoing 17a *tām ī mṛjanti* (note the identical vowel pattern in *kavīm / tām ī*). As for internal connections, see *dhībhīh* (20b, 21a), *vīprāh* (20b, 21c), and *vīṣā* (20c), *vīṣanam* (221a).

IX.63.19: This vs. contains a fairly clever double meaning: the verb *pāri* √ *sic* means ‘sprinkle around / in circles’. When soma is the object, as it generally is, it refers to the sprinkling of the drops of soma; in other words, the acc. expresses the material that is being sprinkled. But here in the simile *vāje ná vājayúm*, the acc. *vājayúm* ‘prize-seeking’ refers to a horse in a race or contest, which would be the target or the goal of the sprinkling, with some type of liquid being sprinkled upon it. The word play is cleverer still, in that *vājayúm* should be read twice, both as referring to the horse in the simile and to soma, which is elsewhere modified by this word (e.g., IX.44.4 *sá naḥ pavasva vājayúh*), in the frame.

Both Ge and Re construe *vāje* in the simile rather loosely; I take it as a unmarked loc. absol. of the *dhāne hité* (“when the prize is set,” e.g., IX.53.2) type, though without overt ppl. It adds to the somewhat slant syntax of the simile versus the frame that both contain a loc. (*avyo vāreṣu* in the frame), but the locc. have different functions. In fact *avyo vāreṣu* “onto the sheep’s fleece” expresses the goal of the sprinkling and is functionally parallel to *vājayúm* in the simile.

IX.63.20: Note *kavīm* (of Soma) contrasting with *vīprāh*, the human poets who groom him.

IX.63.22–24: A form of *páva-* in each vs.: 22a *pavasva*, 23a *pavamāna*, 24a *pavase*, a pattern that is repeated in the next ṛca.

IX.63.22: As in vs. 10, the joint appearance of Indra and Vāyu signals the morning soma pressing.

On *āyuṣāk* (also IX.25.5) see the sensible disc. of Scar (589–90). Note the presence of the Āyus grooming the soma in vs. 17.

IX.63.23: On *(nī) √ tuś* see comm. ad VIII.38.2.

IX.63.25–27: This ṛca shows clear signs of unity, indeed of a monotonous sort. Like the previous ṛca, each vs. in this one contains a form of *páva-*, but in this ṛca all three are the nom. pl. part. *pavamānā(sā)h*, always opening the vs. Each vs. also contains one finite verb, an augmented form of √ *srj* (*asṛkṣata* 25a, 27b; *asṛgram* 26b). The first two vss. also contain nom. pl. *īndavaḥ* in the same metrical position (final in the b pāda). The lexeme

āpa √ *han* found in the previous ṛca (*apaghnán* 24a) also reappears here (26c *ghnántaḥ* ... *āpa*) (and in the next ṛca).

IX.63.28–30: The *páva-* sequence found in the last two ṛcas is brought to an end with the alternative pres. part. *punānāḥ* ‘becoming purified’, which opens this last ṛca. The lexeme *āpa* √ *han* also found in once each in the last two ṛcas (24a, 26c) occurs in the first two vss.: *āpa* ... *jahí* (28b, c), *apaghnán* (29a).

IX.63.30: The first pāda of this, the final vs., echoes the last pāda of the first vs.: 1c *asmé śrávāṃsi dhāraya*, 30a *asmé vāsūni dhāraya*. It is also worth noting that this 2nd sg. impv. *dhāraya* ‘secure’ is phonologically almost identical to the instr. sg. *dhārayā* ‘with/in a stream’, which ends the first pāda of this ṛca (28a) and which is found four other times in the hymn (4c, 7a, 14b, 21b), always in the same metrical position.

IX.64

IX.64.1–3: As noted in the publ. intro., this opening ṛca is marked by the identification of Soma and his attributes with a bull (*vṛṣan-*). This theme is especially dominant in vss. 1 and 2: all three pādas of vs. 1 open *vṛṣā*, with the bahuvrīhi *vṛṣa-vrataḥ* ending the first hemistich; vs. 2 is even more insistent, with two forms of the stem (or deriv. *vṛṣṇya-*) in each of the three pādas. By contrast, vs. 3 only nods at the theme: *vṛṣā* appears once in 3a, though the final word of the vs., *vṛdhi*, may be meant to echo the word phonologically.

IX.64.1: Old’s interpr. of *vṛṣā* in c as a neut. pl. adj. with *dhārmāṇi* seems both unnecessary and unlikely. I know of no other neut. forms of *vṛṣan-* (the few cited by Old are not convincing), which suggests to me that, despite its widely accepted classification as an adj., the stem is synchronically a masc. noun, which, however, can be used as an adjunct strengthener of another noun, hence “bull X” as the equivalent of “bullish X” – a usage similar to English ‘horse’ as an augmentative, meaning ‘strong, large, coarse’ (as in, for ex., horseradish). See <https://www.etymonline.com/word/horseradish> Moreover, since nom. sg. *vṛṣā* opens the two previous pādas of this vs., it seems unlikely that a morphologically different, and at the least very rare, phonologically identical form would open the third – esp. since, when a neut. adj. is required in the next vs. (2a), the deriv. *vṛṣṇya-* is employed.

IX.64.3: As noted above, the bull theme gets suddenly muted in this vs.; in compensation, as it were, other animals are introduced: a horse (a), cows and steeds (b).

Opinions vary on how to render the first two pādas, in part because of uncertainty about the verb *cakradāḥ*. Given the immediately preceding simile *ásvo ná*, the verb should be intransitive in the sense ‘roar, whinny’; this matches the usage of the simple thematic (aor.?) *krada-* in passages like IX.97.28 *ásvo ná krado vṛṣabhir yujānāḥ* “Like a horse you whinny on being yoked by the bulls.” However, the b pāda, *sám gāḥ ... sám árvataḥ*, with two acc. pl.s makes problems. Ge jury-rigs what we might call a semi-transitive usage of the verb with *sám*, “zusammenbrüllen” (‘roar [smtg] together’)(see also Ober I.518), while registering the intransitive usage in the simile parenthetically:

“Wie ein Ross (wiehernd) sollst du, der Bulle, uns Rinder und Rennpferde zusammen brüllen (brausen).” Despite the precarious nature of this solution, it may be the best one available, and I would entertain an alternative tr. “You the bull roar like a horse, (roaring) together cows and steeds.” I adopt a similar one in the publ. tr. for the very similar passage IX.90.4 *sám cikrado mahó asmábhyaṃ vājān*, with the variant stem *cikrada-*, also cited by Ge and Re, though I am not certain I subscribe to that now (see comm. ad loc.). By contrast, Re clearly takes *cakradaḥ* as a trans./caus. redupl. aor.: “Tel un cheval, fais mugir ensemble ... les vaches ... ensemble (fais hennir) les coursiers.” However, the clear intrans. sense of *krada-* with the simile in the parallel passage cited above speaks against the caus. usage; moreover, as disc. at length in my *-āya*-book (110–11), neither *cakrada-* nor the redupl. aor. *cikrada-* with apparent “caus.” redupl. shows true transitive usage until the late RV; they also seem to be essentially interchangeable.

I have a different solution for this passage (though it won’t work for IX.90.4): it is of course a commonplace that the preverbs *sám* and *ví* form a complementary pair. Here I suggest that the standard lexeme *ví√vṛ* ‘uncover, open up’ found in c has given rise situationally to an opposing expression *sám√vṛ* ‘cover, surround’ in b, with the verb gapped (or rather anticipated: *vṛdhi* at the end of c). The bull is urged to deliver cows and horses to us by confining them. The proposed lexeme *sám√vṛ* does marginally exist; see I.121.15, with *sám ... varanta* in intrans. value, as well as ppl. *sámvr̥ta-* (VIII.17.7). I thus read the verb *cakradaḥ* only with pāda a.

IX.64.4–6: No strong signs of unity. Vs. 4 does link to vs. 3 in the preceding *ṛca* through the mention of cows and horses. The c pādas of 5 and 6 both begin with a finite form of *páva-*.

IX.64.4: In addition to the link to vs. 3 just mentioned, pāda c contains a clever echo of 2a. That earlier pāda ends with the neut. *s*-stem *śávaḥ* ‘strength’; 4c ends *vīrayāśśávaḥ*, to be analyzed as two words *vīrayā āśśávaḥ* “with a yen for heroes the swift ones,” the latter being the nom. pl. m. of the adj. *āśú-*. But the final + initial vowels have entirely coalesced, and given the accentuation of both words and the underlying long final vowel of the first word, they could have been split *vīrayā *śávaḥ* with the latter entirely matching the independent *s*-stem form in 2a.

IX.64.6: The preverb *ā* that turns *páva-* into a quasi-transitive “bring by purifying oneself” immediately follows the verb, allowing *pavantām* to take a position matching that of *pávante* in 5c and *pavamānasya* in 7a.

IX.64.7–9: As just noted, *pavamānasya* in 7a chains with forms to the same stem in vss. 5 and 6. 7b *prá ... asṛkṣata* also echoes *ásṛkṣata prá*, which opens the previous *ṛca* (4a). The *ṛca* is unified by the similes comparing Soma to the Sun in vss. 7 and 9, possibly found also in the beacon (*ketú-*) of vs. 8.

IX.64.7: The root noun cmpd *viśva-víd-*, like other *-víd-* cmpds, is completely ambiguous between ‘knowing all’ and ‘finding all’ (for *viśvavíd-* itself see Scar 489 and more generally 480–93). In this context, given Soma’s bestowal of “all goods” (*viśvā ... vāsu*)

in the previous vs. (6a), as well as Soma's journey to all forms in 8b, 'all-finding' seems preferable.

The simile in c, *sūryasyeva ná rāśmayah*, is redundantly marked, with adjacent simile particles *iva ná*. There is no structural reason for this; it must result from the attempt to fit the simile *sūryasyeva rāśmayah* found elsewhere in trimeter verse (see nearby IX.69.6, also I.135.9, V.55.3, X.91.4) into a dimeter line. Or, to be more precise, to accommodate the fact that when a form of *sūrya-* opens a vs. line, it does not show distraction to *sūr'ya-*, in order to avoid placing a light syllable in 2nd position. In a dimeter line, in which this simile has to occupy the whole pāda, the failure to distract produces a 7-syllable line, and so *ná* was presumably added to fill the gap in the line. In a trimeter line that has the simile in initial position (with undistracted *sūryasyeva*), further material can be added at the end (so I.135.9, IX.69.6), and in a trimeter line where the simile follows the caesura, *sūryasyeva* can be distracted (so V.55.3, X.91.4) in that position.

IX.64.8: As noted above, it's quite possible, even likely, that the beacon in pāda a is a reference to the sun and therefore another assimilation of Soma to the Sun, as is more explicit in vss. 7 and 9. For the association between *ketú-* and the sun, cf., e.g., VII.63.2 *ketúh ... sūryasya*. Lü (702) suggests rather that the *ketú-* is lightning, without argument.

Ge renders b as "... rinnst du ... alle Farben annehmend"; similar Lü (702) "strömst du vom Himmel her in alle Erscheinungsformen." But the acc. with *abhí√ṛṣ* is always a goal (to choose just one example, cf. nearby IX.62.3 *abhy āṛṣanti suṣṭutīm* "they rush towards the lovely praise-hymn"), and I don't see where (or why) they get their alternative interpr. By my interpr. the "all forms" to which the soma rushes could be the materials the soma will be mixed with (water, milk), or everything found on the ritual ground, or indeed everything on earth and in the midspace, the "all goods" of vs. 6.

IX.64.9: Pāda b, *pavamāna vídharmaṇi*, is found three times (here, IX.4.9, and IX.100.7) in three different syntactic contexts, so this has to be the constituency: the voc. plus the loc. Re takes the 'speech' (*vācam*) from pāda a as the implicit subject of *vídharmaṇi* ("pour qu'elle se répande au loin"), but because speech is lacking in the other occurrences of the pāda, this cannot be correct. Most helpful for the interpr. is the fuller expression in IX.86.30 (also adduced by Ober II.152) *tvám pavítre rájaso vídharmaṇi ... pavamāna pūyase* "You, self-purifying soma, are purified in the filter, in the spreading expanse of space ...," where the spread of the soma liquid across the fleece filter is compared to the spread (probably of light) in cosmic space (*rájas-*).

The simile in the third pāda, *ákrān devó ná sūryah* "you have roared like the Sun-god," is abrupt in its imagery, in that roaring is not the first quality we associate with the sun. There are several ways to account for the phraseology. In Old's view (fld by Lü 258), the shared quality of Soma and Sun is not expressed by the verb, which is independent of the simile. This independence would be comparable to that found in the preceding hymn, IX.63.13, where the same simile (*sómo devó ná sūryah*) is found, with a different but equally incompatible verb phrase *ádribhiḥ ... sutáh* "pressed by stones," which is certainly not true of the Sun. This is the easiest solution. Ge (n. 9c) suggests rather that it's a condensed comparison to the Sun's horse (sim. Ober I.224). In my view, Old's interpr. is strictly correct, but I think the poet, by juxtaposing the simile with an

apparently inappropriate verb, is forcing the striking image of a roaring Sun, which both works as a kind of synaesthesia (the intense brightness of the sun is experienced as intense noise) and imposes a third intermediate term, a horse or bull, to which both the Sun and Soma are compared.

IX.64.10–12: There are some unifying features in this *ṛca*. Although this is hardly striking in the IXth Maṇḍala, all three vs. contain a form of $\sqrt{pū}$, with those in vss. 11, 12 being the identical phrase *pavitra ā* “in the filter. The word *indu-* opens the first and last pādas of the *ṛca* (10a, 12c). The cmpd *devā-vī-* ‘pursuing the gods’ in 11b is echoed by its splv. *deva-vītama-* in 12b. More subtly, the missing obj. of *srjāt* in 10c is most likely ‘wave’, found in the resumptive rel. cl. opening vs. 11, *ūrmīr yāḥ* ... For the VP *ūrmīm* \sqrt{srj} see VI.17.12 *asrja ūrmīm apām* adduced by Old.

IX.64.11: This vs. is entirely a rel. cl. and most comfortably adjoins vs. 10 (see comm. immed. above) – *pace* Lü (603–4), who attaches 11 to 12.

IX.64.13–15: Again, each vs. has a form of $\sqrt{pū}$, for what that’s worth (*pavasva* 13a, *punānāḥ* 14a, 15a). In 15a *devā-vītaye* links to the rt. noun cmpd *devā-vī-* (*deva-vītama-* in the previous *ṛca*, 11b, 12b).

IX.64.16–18: The first two vss. of this *ṛca* both contain nom. ‘drops’ (*indavaḥ*) and their acc. goal, the sea (*samudrām*); their first pādas also both contain nom. pl. pres. middle athem. participles with the extended ending *-āsaḥ*, *hinvānāsaḥ* and *marmṛjānāsaḥ* respectively. The third vs. stands apart.

IX.64.18: The opening of pāda a *#pāri no yāhi* gets remixed into c *#pāhi naḥ*.

IX.64.19–21: The undiscerning (*āpracetasah*) in 20c are contrasted with the discerning (*prācetasah* 21b) and the indiscriminating (*āvicetasah* 21c). The first vs. (19) of the *ṛca* does not participate.

IX.64.19: Etaśa, the Sun’s horse, who figured in the previous hymn (IX.63.8), reappears here. In the previous passage Soma yoked Etaśa; here he is identified as Etaśa and is himself yoked.

The interpr. of this vs. is considerably complicated by the universal (Sāy., Gr, Ge, Re, Lü 216, 269) assignment of the main clause verb *mīmāti* to $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘bellow’. This leaves *padām* in b with nothing to do. In Lü’s 2nd tr. (269) it is the place towards which Etaśa bellows (“... weihert das Etaśa-Ross dem Orte zu”), a transl. that at least does not violate the syntactic structure of the vs. Otherwise the solutions involve on the one hand plucking *padām* out of the b pāda, which remains part of the main clause, and construing it loosely in the dependent clause of c – an egregious violation of RVic syntax. So Ge: “Es brüllt das Zugross von den Sängern angeschirrt, wenn er in den Ozean gesetzt den Schritt vorwärts (tut).” And even with this trick Ge needs to supply a verb (“tut”) with which to construe *padām*. The other solutions violate RVic syntax less dramatically, but violate it they do – by making the b pāda part of the *yād* clause with c, though this would place the *yād* unacceptably deep into its clause. Lü’s 1st solution (216) is almost identical

to Ge's (including the crucial "den Schritt vorwärts (tut)") except that he takes b with c, not a. Re deals with *padām* differently, but still takes b with c: "Il hennit ... quand, attelé par les chantres, il a été placé en avant, en (son) séjour, (à savoir) sur l'océan." In addition to sweeping b into the c clause, his interpr. requires *āhitah* to take an acc. of place, *padām* ("placé ... en (son) séjour"), which is resumed by a loc., *samudré* ("(à savoir) sur l'océan"). This supposed acc. usage with *ā*√*dhā* is unparalleled.

The interpr. of the vs. is almost magically simplified by assigning *mīmāti* to a different root, √*mā* 'measure', which builds a homonymous redupl. pres. *mīmāti*, which is in fact far better attested than the one to √*mā* 'bellow'. Although many of its forms are medial, there are a considerable number of act. forms, particularly the impv. *mimīhi*. I suggest that we have here an idiom "measure (its) pace (<step)," a reasonable activity for a draught horse. I suggest a similar interpr. of the cmpd *mitā-dru-* (see comm. ad IV.6.5), where I take the 1st member as the ppl. of √*mā* 'measure'. This interpr. allows *padām* to be the obj. of the verb in the main cl. and keeps the two clauses separate. And it certainly makes as much sense for the Sun's horse to be moving at measured pace through the sky as for it to be bellowing.

IX.64.21: On *venā-* see comm. ad VIII.100.5.

IX.64.22–24: The mention of the divine recipients of the soma in vss. 22 and 24 marks this *ṛca*, though the middle vs. lacks this feature. The (human) inspired poets (*vīprāḥ*) in 23 implicitly contrast with the *kavī-* Soma, addressed in the voc. in 24. Note also that this is the third *ṛca* in a row that refers to sitting on (or coming to) "the womb of truth" (17c, 20ab, 22c), a trope found also in 11c; all four expressions are slightly different, though containing the same basic elements: 11c *sīdann ṛtasya yónim ā*, 17c *āgmān ṛtasya yónim ā*, 20ab *ā ... yónim hiranyāyam ... ṛtasya sīdati*, 22c *ṛtasya yónim āsādam*. For further on this trope see comm. ad vs. 30 below.

IX.64.23: A minor poetic echo, the rhyming openings of pāda a *tām tvā* and c *sām tvā*.

IX.64.25–27: The unusual acc. expression *vācam ... sahāsrabharnasam* is found in both 25 and 26 (in different order). For *sahāśra-bharnas-* see comm. ad IX.60.2. All three vss. contain the nom. sg. masc. *punānāḥ*.

IX.64.28–30: The contrast between the two types of soma drinks, pure and mixed with milk, are highlighted in this *ṛca*, at least in my view: 28c *sómāḥ śukrā gāvāśirah* describes them straightforwardly, while 30ab *rdhāk ... samjagmānāḥ* "separately (and) uniting (with milk)" is more cryptic.

IX.64.28: On *pari*√*stubbh* see nearby IX.62.24. It is not entirely clear to me how the *kṛp-* (form, body) of Soma would 'encircle with chant/rhythm', since its physical form should not be producing noise. More common is the association of *kṛp-* with light (esp. the light of Agni), as Re points out (cf. VI.2.6 *kṛpā ... rocase*, VII.3.9 *svāyā kṛpā tanvā rōcamānāḥ*), but in our passage *rucā* and *kṛpā* are parallel and independent. A passive sense 'encircled with chant/rhythm' (so Re) would work better in context, but that seems precluded by the use of the act. stem *stóbha-*.

IX.64.29: Pāda a contains what appears to be an etymological figure, but I consider it somewhat trickier than that. The first two words, *hinvānó hetṛbhiḥ*, are transparently related and easy to construe together, and IX.13.6 *hiyānā ná hetṛbhiḥ* “like (horses) being driven by their drivers” displays the same apparent configuration. However, the instr. in our passage is followed by a ppl. *yatāḥ* ‘held, guided’, which is regularly preceded by an instr. agent, often *nṛbhiḥ* (approx. 10x in IX), or in this very hymn, vs. 15 *vājībhīr yatāḥ* “guided by the prize-seekers.” So I suggest that *hetṛbhiḥ* is actually the agent for following *yatāḥ*, though also adjacent to its etymological kin – a fine twist on the RVic poetic trick of positioning a word between two words both of which it could be (or indeed is) connected to. A more literal rendering of the pāda would be “... impelled, by the impellers held.”

The simile in c is problematic for several reasons. To begin with, the subject of ab is singular, but the simile must be couched in the plural, given the pres. part. *śīdantaḥ*. This is less of a problem than it appears: first, this hymn and soma hymns in general regularly switch back and forth between sg. (soma) and pl. (soma drinks / drops, etc.) referring to the same substance, and this could easily be a unmarked case of that. Moreover, if the target of the simile is in the pl., it can have attracted the participle into the pl.

This raises the question: what *is* soma being compared to? and the related but more technical question: is *vanúṣaḥ* nom. pl. (and therefore the simile target) or some other case (acc. pl., abl./gen. sg.)? Because we need something to license the pl. of *śīdantaḥ* and because we need something to compare the soma to, taking *vanúṣaḥ* as nom. pl. seems the most economical solution – although this requires discounting the attractive parallel adduced by Ge, I.26.3 *śīdantu mānuṣo yathā*. In that passage *mānuṣaḥ*, which rhymes with our *vanúṣaḥ*, is gen. sg. (and the pl. impv. *śīdantu* simply agrees with the pl. subject in ab). That *vanúṣaḥ* is nom. pl. is also the judgment of Ge and Re, though with vastly different semantics. Ge “wie die wetteifernden Reiter(?)” (I have no idea where he gets the “riders,” and his question mark shows his uncertainty about it; nonetheless it was taken up by Ober [II.245] as evidence for horseback riding in the RV!); Re “(s’)asseyant au séjour du Ṛta) comme les dévots qui s’(y) asseoient.” Re seems closer to the mark, though still pretty far from it. Because of the repetition noted above (ad 22–24) of the trope “sit on the womb of truth” (4x in this hymn), it seems likely that *śīdant-* here would evoke this recurrent expression, which is certainly appropriate to the soma (drinks) that are the subject of the simile. It is more difficult to identify who or what *vanúṣaḥ* refers to. This stem, and the associated denom. verb, can have both positive and negative values, expressing various types of eagerness and craving: “striving, eager, zealous, etc.” on the one hand (hence Re’s dévots), “over-zealous, covetous, rapacious, etc.” on the other. Before identifying its usage in this particular passage, I’d like to introduce a third term into the simile. In similes involving sitting, the comparandum is often a bird – e.g., *śyenāḥ* in nearby IX.61.21 = IX.65.19 *śīdañ chyenó ná yónim ā*, as well as IX.96.23 *śakunāḥ ná pátvā* and with the pl. VIII.21.5 *śīdantas te váyo yathā* “sitting like birds” very similar to our passage. I suggest that birds are the underlying comparandum here as well, and that this underlying target is qualified by *vanúṣaḥ* ‘rapacious’, or, as I render it “raptor (birds).” This produces a more satisfying, or at least more interesting, simile than

Re's "like devotées," and it is constructed from readily available elements – though it does require more machinery.

IX.64.30: As indicated above (ad 28–30), I believe that the unmixed and mixed soma drinks are referred to here, though no interpr. I know of shares this opinion. The adv. *īdhak* (so accented) means 'separately, apart'; the form *rdhák* with final accent is found only here, and it is difficult to assess what the accentual difference means: is it just a mistake or meaningless variant? or is it meant to signal some change in grammatical function or meaning? If we can fancifully imagine an internal derivation of adverbs quasi-parallel to that of *bráhman-* → *brahmán-*, *yásas-* → *yaśás-*, perhaps *rdhák* refers to something characterized by separateness. With a further flight of fancy, we can suggest that this would be the unmixed soma, referred to unequivocally two vss. earlier as *śukrá-* (28c), and contrasting with the soma that "unites" (*saṃjagmāná-*) with milk, again straightforwardly referred to in 28c as *gāvāśir-*. Although neither of the terms in vs. 30 is elsewhere used of a type of soma, at least as far as I know, the contrastive pairing was set up at the beginning of the *trca* and could, I would assert, have been decoded by a RVic audience and applied to the more opaque expressions here. I will not discuss the alternative interpr. (Ge, Re, Lü 259, Ober I.457, II.143), which differ wildly from mine and from each other and, in the case of Ge and Re, depend on an out-of-date interpr. of *īdhak*.

IX.65

On the qualities of this hymn as a whole, see publ. intro.

IX.65.1–3: No particular signs of unity. Vss. 2 and 3 have forms of the pres. part. *pávamāna-* and 3 also the impv. *ā ... pavasva*, but esp. in this hymn, the appearance of these forms is hardly noteworthy. Vss. 2 and 3 also have *devébhyaḥ* in their b pādas, but in different cases.

IX.65.1: The identification of Soma with the Sun, noted passim above in the last two hymns, here begins the hymn.

The tr. "rosy (fingers)" is of course an unauthorized allusion to Homer's "rosy-fingered dawn" – though it is more legitimate than it might first appear. The word tr. 'rosy', *ūsri-*, is ultimately derived from the 'dawn' word; cf. the related *usrá-*, *usríya-*, both of which are color terms representing the light of dawn ('ruddy') generally applied to bovines. The next pāda, with its fem. subj. *svásāro jāmāyaḥ* "kindred sisters" is a standard way of referring to the fingers of the priests that prepare the soma (cf., e.g., IX.89.4). Thus the first two pādas superimpose two images: the ruddy Dawn(s) impelling the sun, the fingers impelling the soma – allowing each to participate in the imagery of the other. Because of the erotic relationship sometimes depicted between Dawn and the Sun, it would be better to tr. *pátim* in b as "their husband" (with Ge, Re), not 'lord' as in the publ. tr. – making one more link between the imagery of pādas a and b.

Note that Ge nodded (slightly) in tr. *mahān índum* as "den grossen Indra," enabled by the constant association between those two words in IX.

IX.65.2: The āmreḍita *rucā-rucā* evokes the single instr. *rucā* at the end of the preceding hymn, IX.64.28 (also vs. 13 of the same hymn and vs. 27 of this one).

Pāda c is characterized by alliteration of an unremarkable type: *viśvā vāsūny ā viśa*.

IX.65.3: Both Ge and Re take *devébhyaḥ* as dat. with *dúvaḥ*: “Eifer für die Götter,” “l’hommage aux dieux,” whereas in the publ. tr. I take it as an abl., “friendship from the gods.” The issue is the multivalence of *dúvas-* and its derivatives; in the meaning ‘friendship’ it generally refers to the mutually agreeable relationship between men and gods. In this context it seemed to me odd to order Soma to “bring [us] through purification” friendship *for* the gods, hence my ablatival interpr. However, a more detailed examination of the usage of *dúvas-* and the denom. *duvasyá-* shows that the offering / seeking of *dúvas-* generally goes from men *to* gods (or Agni, as the god closest to men, to gods). E.g., *devéṣu kṛṇuto dúvaḥ* “The two [= married couple] do friendly service to the gods”; III.3.1 *agnír hí devāṁ amṛto duvasyati* “For Agni the immortal does friendly service to / befriends the gods.” I therefore would emend the tr. to datival “bring ... friendship for the gods.” Like the parallel obj. *suṣṭutīm* ‘good praise’, *dúvas-* is then something that we mortals offer to the gods, but, though it originates from us, it is Soma who stimulates our production of these offerings, hence *ā ... pavasva* “bring by purifying yourself.”

IX.65.4–6: No obvious signs of unity

IX.65.6: On *druṇā* see comm. ad IX.1.2.

IX.65.7–9: Again no signs of unity.

IX.65.7: The vs. contains an address (in pl.) to priest-singers to sing (*gāyata*), with comparison to a previous singer Vyaśva (*vyaśvavát* ‘like Vyaśva’) who did the same. Why Vyaśva appears here is something of a mystery. Aside from a bare mention in an Aśvin list hymn (I.112.15), Vyaśva is found only in VIII, where he is identified as a ṛṣi (VIII.9.10, 23.10) and his descendants receive the dakṣiṇā at the end of the sacrifice (VIII.24.28–29). The adv. *vyaśvavát* ‘like Vyaśva’ is found 3x in that little group of hymns in VIII (23–26), attributed in the Anukramaṇī to one of his descendents, Viśvamanas Vaiyaśva. I don’t know why he should surface once in IX; our hymn is not attributed to him or any of his obvious relatives (rather to Bhṛgu Vāruṇi or Jamadagni Bhārgava), and there is nothing particularly somic about his appearances in VIII – though his descendents may once be called *somín-* ‘having or providing soma’ (VIII.24.29; see comm. ad loc.). He is more closely associated with the Aśvins (I.112.15 just mentioned; VIII.9.10, 26.9 [both Aśvin hymns]).

IX.65.8: The construction of the first hemistich is somewhat tricky. The rel. *yásya* must refer to soma, with the rel. cl. hanging off vs. 7. In pāda a the *yásya* qualifies *várṇam* ‘color’, which serves as obj. of *hinvánti* in b. “They impel his color” is a slightly odd locution, and it becomes odder in b, with the acc. *hárīm*. The stem *hári-* is a color term and could qualify *várṇa-* (“tawny color”), but it also is regularly applied directly to soma

(e.g., in vss. 12 and 25 of this hymn) and also identifies Indra's horse(s). Ge (n. 8b) cleverly suggests that *hári-* is to be read twice, with the second reading an unmarked simile referring to a horse of the appropriate color. This provides a more appropriate obj. for *hinvánti* ("they impel (like) a fallow bay (horse)"), while connecting the putative horse with the "tawny color" (*várṇam ... hárīm*) that is the 1st obj. of the verb.

IX.65.10–12: Again, no particular signs of unity.

IX.65.10: The function of the *ca* in b is unclear. Klein (DGRV I.256–57) discusses three possible explanations – Ge's, Re's, and one of his own – of which he prefers Re's: that *marútvate ca* conceals an ellipsis "(for the Maruts) and (for Indra) accompanied by the Maruts," which seems by far the least likely and the most cumbersome. Among other things, the Maruts barely figure in IX (though cf. vs. 20 below), and I also know of no passages containing *marútvant-* that also contain a free form of *marút-*. My solution is admittedly makeshift but simpler, that *ca* conjoins the disharmonious *dhārayā* "in a stream" and *marútvate ... matsaráḥ* "exhilarating drink for Indra." This is closest to Ge's, criticized by Klein as assuming "a harsh conjunction in pādas a and b."

IX.65.11: With Ge (n. 11a) I tentatively assume that the arms (*onyòḥ*) are Indra's, since he was mentioned in the preceding vs. But as in IX.16.1 they might belong to the officiant.

IX.65.13–15: Again, no signs of unity.

IX.65.15: A rare sign of hostility (*abhimāti-hán-* 'smasher of hostility') in these anodyne Gāyatrī assemblages.

IX.65.16–18: The *ṛca* is thematically unified by the journey of Soma and, in vss. 17–18 his conveying good things to us on that journey. Cf. esp. 17 *ā naḥ ... vāhā* and 18 *ā naḥ ... bhara*. All three vss. end in a purpose dative / dative infinitive: 16 *yāṭave*, 17 *ūtāye*, 18 *devāvītaye*.

IX.65.16: *īyate* is assigned to $\sqrt{yālī}$ 'implore, beseech' by numerous scholars, incl. Gr, Lub, and Lü (214–15: "Der König wird mit Liedern gebeten"), though Ge, Re and the publ. tr. take it to $\sqrt{yālī}$ 'speed' (so also Sāy., who glosses *gacchatī*). In favor of the latter, Re declares that *īyate* is always "il s'avance" in IX. I would also point out 1) the king is definitely traveling in pāda c (*yāṭave*, to the same root) and 2) the 'is sped' interpr. is supported by a passage like IX.26.3 *tām vedhām medháyāḥyan* "They impelled the ritual adept with their wisdom" also containing an instr. of *medhā-* with a clear indication of movement (*ahyan*). Kulikov (495–96) discusses both root possibilities without seeming to decide, though the fact that he lists it with 2yā (\tilde{y}) 'implore, request' probably indicates his choice.

śatagvīnam gāvām pōṣam, lit. "thriving of cattle that possesses hundredfold cattle" (vel sim.), redundantly codes the cattle twice (*-gvīnam gāvām*).

IX.65.18: The *s*-stem neut. *júvas-* is a hapax, contrasting with the more conventionally formed and somewhat better attested *jávas-*. The zero-gr. root syllable is of course anomalous (see AiG II.2.232, without explanation), though see nearby *dúvaḥ* (vs. 3b), whatever its source. It may owe its form (or have been encouraged in maintaining its form) by the properly formed homonymous root noun pl. (*vayo-*)*júvaḥ* (to *-jũ-*) in the same metrical position in 26a below, as well as the aforementioned *dúvaḥ* also in the same position in 3b (cf. also *ābhúvaḥ* 27a, *mayobhúvam* 28a). A somewhat similar explan. is given by Re. Given the contextual triggers in this passage, it is probably wise not to invest too much in a deep diachronic account of the anomalous root syllable.

The simile in b, *rūpām ná* (or *rūpām ná várcase*), is difficult to interpr. Ge simply renders it literally “wie Schönheit unserem Aussehen,” but it is unclear to me what the basis of comparison is. Re’s rendering goes to the opposite extreme, with a flurry of parentheses: “comme (on ajoute) la forme-concrète pour (donner) l’éclat (à une idée).” My own interpr. arises from the parallelism between vss. 17 and 18. In the former we ask Soma to bring material goods, esp. livestock. Here in pāda a we request abstract qualities, “strength and speed,” and I suggest that *rūpām ná* “as if (in) physical form” is assimilating them to the material goods of the previous vs. Re’s alt. interpr., given at the end of his n., “apporte-nous force et vitesse, tel un objet-concret,” is similar and preferable to his more elaborate first interpr.

IX.65.19–21: No clear cohesion, though vss. 19 and 20 both contain a form of $\sqrt{ṛṣ}$.

IX.65.22–24: As noted in the publ. intro., this *ṛca* is thematically unified by a listing of the many place in which soma can be pressed in 22–23; all these clauses share a single verb *sunviré* in 22b. The two vss. are followed by a summary vs. (24) expressing the hope that all these diverse soma types will bring good things to us. The *ṛca* also shows signs of formal cohesion that are rare in these Gāyatrī assemblages: vss. 22–23 consist of six pāda-length rel. cl., all introduced by *yé*, with disjunctive *vā* found in both c pādas, while 24 begins with the resumptive and summarizing correlative *té*.

IX.65.22: The first two pādas contain antonymic locations.

The location in c is taken by Ge/Re as a place name, “in Śaryaṇāvat,” but a place descriptor seems preferable, given the other locative expressions in these vss. On the word see comm. ad VIII.6.39 and Thieme, *Unters.* p. 40 n. 2.

IX.65.23: Ge and Re (see also Mayr. PN s.vv.) take *ārjīkéṣu* and *kṛtvasu* as referring to peoples. On *ārjīká-* see comm. ad VIII.7.29 and Thieme, *Unters.* p. 40 n. 2. As for *kṛtvan-*, since in its other two occurrences in the RV (VIII.24.25, X.144.3) it is adjectival, in the meaning ‘active, enterprising’, I see no reason why it should be a proper noun only here. I was tempted to tr. it “ritually active,” but this came uncomfortably close to “sexually active.”

As for *pastyā-* as ‘dwelling place’, rather than ‘river’ (Ge, Re, etc.), see comm. ad I.40.7 and IX.97.18.

IX.65.25–27: All three vss. in this *ṛca* contain a middle form of \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’ (25c *hinvānaḥ*, 26b *hinvānāsaḥ*, 27b *hinvire*, the first two passive, the third transitive. In addition the *ṛca* opens and closes with a form of *páva-* (25a *pávate*, 27c *pavasva*).

IX.65.25: *haryatō hāriḥ* “delightful tawny one” is a word play, with two semantically different stems. This same word play is the focus of a whole hymn, III.44, and obviously was a staple of RVic phraseology.

IX.65.26: On the relationship of *vayojúvaḥ* in pāda a and *sáho júvaḥ* in 18a, see comm. ad 18 above. Scar (174) hesitates between act. and pass. meaning for this hapax rt. noun cmpd *vayo-jū-*: “die Lebenskraft fördenden” / “von Kraft beschleunigten.” In the publ. tr. I opt for an intrans. + instr. value: “speeding with vigor,” though I now think passive “sped by vigor” would be even better, on the basis of the clear pass. forms in context (*hinvānāsaḥ ... śrīṇānāḥ ... mṛñjata*) as well as a passage in the immediately preceding hymn, IX.64.16 *prá hinvānāsaḥ ... dhiyā jūtāḥ* “Being impelled forth ... sped by insightful thoughts,” with the passive ppl. *jūtá-*.

IX.65.27: The pāda-final dat. *devātātaye* echoes *devāvītaye* in 18c.

IX.65.28–30: As if to make up for scanting *ṛca* cohesion earlier in the hymn, this *ṛca* is bound by bonds of iron: 13 occurrences of $\sqrt{ā}$, most construed with an acc. of a desirable object, all sharing a single verb ($\sqrt{ā}$) *vṛṇīmahe* (28b). In addition the three c pādas are identical. This refrain contains the nom. stem *pānta-* ‘drink’, not the pres. part.

IX.66

This is the second to the last of the composite Gāyatrī hymns in this maṇḍala; the last (IX.67) is attributed to a variety of named poets, while the Anukramaṇī assigns this one to *śataṃ vaikhānasaḥ* “100 Vaikhānases.” Both attributions seems to acknowledge the composite nature of these compositions, as opposed to the previous ones, which have a single poet named for the whole hymn. Still, we would be hard-pressed to assemble 100 Vaikhānases: only one, Vamra, is named in the Anukramaṇī, as the author of X.99, a hymn to Indra, and the patronymic (and its underlying base) are both absent from the RVic text.

IX.66.1–3: The *ṛca* shows clear signs of unity, esp. lexically. Not only do all three vss. contain a form of *páva-* (*pávasva* 1a, voc. *pa/ávamāna* 2b, 3c), but the stem *viśva-* is found 4x (1a, b, 2a, 3b), *kave* (3c) echoes *kāvya* (1b), and pl. *dhāmāni* in 3a echoes du. *dhāmāni* in 2b. These “domains” of vss 2–3 are thematically connected to the voc. *viśvacarṣaṇe* ‘common to all the separate peoples’, in defining the spaces over which Soma holds sway.

IX.66.1: The b pāda lacks a verb: Ge supplies (silently) “zu gewinnen,” Re parenthetically “pour (atteindre).” The pāda is found 3x elsewhere (IX.23.1, 62.25, 63.25); in two the vs. contains a form of \sqrt{srj} ‘surge’ (*asṛgram* 23.1, *asṛkṣata* 63.25) and I therefore supply that verb here.

IX.66.2: The issue in this vs. is the identify of the two *dhāmanī*, dependent on the answer to that is the function of the du. pronoun *tābhyām*, which could be instr., dat., or abl. Answering the first question is made difficult by the fact that this is the only du. form of *dhāman-* in the RV. Ge tr. “Formen” (likewise Re “formes”) and in n. 2–3 explains these as the different stages (Stadien) the soma goes through in its preparation. This interpr. fails to explain the difference between the du. of vs. 2 and the pl. of 3; nor does it account for how Soma “rules with” these forms (taking *tābhyām* as instr. as he does). Re’s interpr. of *dhāmanī* in 2 as the pure and mixed forms of soma provides a satisfactory account of the dual, but does not explain the transition to the pl. in 3 and again fails to explain how Soma rules with them. I take the term quite differently, as ‘domains’ (rather than ‘forms’). In vs. 2 the dual refers to Heaven and Earth and alludes to the split of Soma into heavenly and earthly forms, a common trope in IX: he has a home in both places. Taking *tābhyām* as abl., I see Soma as ruling from both those polarized spaces, which together contain everything. This interpr. gives *praticī* in c more content than the fairly empty renderings of Ge (“die sich (uns) darbieten”) and Re (“qui se tiennent face (à nous)”): Heaven and Earth as the two cosmic halves face each other.

IX.66.3: My interpr. of the du. *dhāmanī* in 2 as the two cosmic domains allows the contrast between that form and the pl. *dhāmāni* to make sense. We have moved from the cosmic, to the ritual, in particular to the ritual ground – and here the pl. ‘domains’ are the ritual spaces that Soma traverses and encloses. This change of venue and focus is signalled esp. by *ṛtūbhiḥ* ‘according to the ritual sequences’. Thus the themes of space and the cosmic reach of Soma that I identified as characteristic of this hymn find economical expression in the transition from the cosmic Soma in vs. 2 to the ritual Soma of vs. 3.

The main verb of this clause is *pāri ... asi*, in the formula *viśvātaḥ pāri √as* ‘surround entirely’ (on which see my 1998 “Rigvedic *viśvātaḥ sīm*, Or, Why Syntax Needs Poetics,” Fs. Watkins). Within this phrase we seem to have an embedded rel. cl. *yāni te* “which are yours,” dependent on the obj. *dhāmāni*, and embedded relatives are generally blocked in the RV. But as we have noted elsewhere (see, e.g., comm. ad VI.21.2, 22.5), nominal rel. clauses are an exception to this rule, and here the *yāni* seems to be displaying (proto-)izafe behavior. See my forthcoming “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian.”

IX.66.4–6: This ṛca does not show particular internal cohesion, but it has striking echoes of the preceding ṛca. Like vs. 1, vs. 4 begins *pāvasva*; 4b begins *abhī viśvāni* like 1b, with a different acc. pl. following; 4c *sākhā sākhibhya ūtāye* is identical to 1c, save for the final word. Vs. 5 contains *dhāmabhiḥ* echoing the two forms of *dhāman-* in vss. 2–3. Only vs. 3 is free of links to the 1st ṛca.

IX.66.4: As in 1b, I supply ‘surging’ with 4b, on the basis of their identical construction.

IX.66.5: This vs. seems to unite Soma’s two theatres of operation, as laid out in vss. 2–3, the cosmic and the ritual. His “gleaming rays” (reminiscent of the sun) spread both “on the back of heaven” (*divās pṛsthé*) and across the ritual filter (*pavítram*); the instr.

dhāmabhiḥ “through your domains” can make reference both to this combining of cosmic and ritual and also, more specifically, to the limited ritual domains expressed by the pl. *dhāmāni* in vs. 3. Re’s characterization in his n. – “Soma-soleil ...; en fait, l’image rituelle se combine avec l’image solaire” – expresses this rather nicely, though it’s hard to get it from his tr. On the likening of the soma liquid on the filter to the sun, see IX.10.5 and comm. thereon.

IX.66.7–9: No particular sign of cohesion either internal or external.

IX.66.7: This vs. contains the famous phrase *ākṣiti śrávaḥ* (or a minor variant of it) “imperishable fame,” interestingly acquired not by a human, but by Soma himself.

IX.66.8: It may not be clear in the publ. tr. that “you” and “the inspired poet” are identical.

The referent of the “seven siblings” (*saptá jāmāyaḥ*) is disputed. Ge identifies them as the fingers – and certainly *jāmī-* is regularly used of the fingers of the officiants in IX. But 1) do fingers “cry out”? and more important, 2) why then “seven”? It seems unlikely that the poet would deliberately evoke an image of disfigurement or, at the very least, incompleteness. Ober (II.73; see II.71) tries to rescue this identification by suggesting that seven and ten are “equivalent” indications of totality. But as he himself notes, a number of other groups of seven are mentioned in IX. A reference to one of these in this vs. would save us from positing an defective set of fingers. The most likely referent in my view are the seven streams, *saptá síndhavaḥ* found two vss. earlier (6a). Rivers regularly make noise in the RV, and the proximity of that very phrase in vs. 6 tips the scales for me. Another feminine group of seven is the seven insightful thoughts, *saptá dhītáyāḥ* (IX.8.4, 9.4, 15.8, 62.17). *dhīti-* also make noise, and they also (though not explicitly numbered 7) appear several vss. later doing just that: 11c *āvāśanta dhītáyāḥ* “the insightful thoughts have bellowed.” However, supplying *dhītáyāḥ* here would lead to a poetically clumsy near-redundancy: the related *dhī-*, also ‘insightful thought’, is found in the same clause, and “the seven (inspired thoughts) cried out to you with inspired thoughts” would be, to say the least, awkward. (rather than being a pleasing etymological echo, at least to my mind). Lü (246) also goes for streams, and Re, citing his treatment, seems silently to endorse it. Lü claims that Ge identifies the seven as *dhītáyāḥ*, despite Ge’s clear n. 1 “Die Finger.” I don’t see where Lü got this – I assume it’s simply a lapse.

In IX the figure Vivasvant seems to be the prototype sacrificer (see Old ad IX.99.2), perhaps in his role as father of Manu. For further on Vivasvant see publ. intro. to I.139 as well as comm. to IX.99.2, X.14.5.

IX.66.9: Since they are grooming (*√mṛj*) him, the ‘unwed ones’ (*agrúvaḥ*) are probably here the fingers, continuing the fem. pl. agent but modulating from streams to fingers (whose number is not specified here).

In b the phrase *ádhi śvāni* is problematic. It is generally taken as a root noun loc. to *√svan* ‘sound’: Gr, apparently Ge (see his n. 9b and his locative tr. “unter Gebräuse”), apparently Re (but see his hesitations in his n.), Schindler (Rt. Noun p. 51, but see below), Ober (II.73)—though Lub lists it under a stem *svāni-*, so presumably interpr. it as a nom./acc. sg. neut. Schindler’s disc. suggests a slight variation on the root noun interpr.,

with the possibility that it is used here as an adj. ‘rauschend’ modifying *jīráu*, as Gr takes it. In that case the independent *sváni*- was extracted from the compd *tuvi-sván-* ‘powerfully sounding’, an interpr. that seems over-elaborate.

Whether as root noun or an *-i*-stem, our form is equated with *sváni* in the similar pāda-final phrase *ānu śvāni* in VI.46.14. However, I have demonstrated that *svāni* in that phrase must be a verb form, a 3rd sg. passive aor., as Old suggests. See comm. ad loc. Scar, in a detailed disc. of the two *svāni* forms (676–77), suggests that our phrase, too, might contain a verb form. By his analysis pāda b is an (unsignalled) dependent cl., parallel to the *yād* clause of c, and so the accent on 3rd sg. *svāni* would be correct for a finite verb. He tr. “es putzen dich ..., während es über der Wollseihe, unter dem fließenden Wasser raschelt [und] während du ... gesalbt wirst.” This is clever, but I am disturbed by marking only one – and only the second – subordinate clause overtly. Moreover, this interpr. also must assume that there is a gapped subject to *svāni* or that it is used impersonally (both possibilities floated by Scar). None of this is impossible, but the required assumptions and syntactic twists pile up.

I am drawn rather to an old suggestion of Aufrecht’s, endorsed by Old (but rejected explicitly by Schindler and Scar) that *ādhi śvāni* rests on *ādhi *śnāvi* “on (the sheep’s) back.” Because of the morphological difficulties (the nonexistence of a loc. **snāvi* to begin with), I would not posit Aufrecht’s intermediate form, but simply assume a reduction and metathetic scrambling of *sānavi*, which occurs several times in the pāda-final phrase *ādhi sānavi* (VI.48.5, IX.31.5, 37.4, 63.27); *ādhi* is the standard post-(/pre-)position in this expression; cf. also *ādhi sāno avyāye* IX.86.3, 91.1, 96.13, 97.40 and numerous variants. The presence of *avye* at the beg. of the pāda would set the audience’s expectation for “on the back of the sheep.” The presence of the “noise” root \sqrt{svar} in the preceding vs. (8a *asvaran*) may have facilitated the metathesis, to produce a form appearing to belong to the phonologically and semantically similar root \sqrt{svan} , reinforced by *rebhā-* in the flg. pāda.

In c I take *rebhāḥ ... ajyāse* as a pun, dependent on the literal sense of \sqrt{ribh} , which, rather than being ‘sing’ as it generally is glossed, is really ‘creak, rasp’. See comm. ad VI.3.6. Here Soma is as usual ‘anointed’ (*ajyase*) with milk, and in that regard he is identified as a *rebhā-*, a ritual officiant with a particular voice quality. But as disc. ad VI.3.6, in a TS passage \sqrt{ribh} is used for a squeaky wheel, and of course the way to fix such a wheel is to “grease” it ($\sqrt{añj}$). So the unmarked comparison here is “(as) a squeaky (wheel) is greased.”

IX.66.10–12: This *ṭṛca* is thematically unified by the journey theme, reinforced by two forms of \sqrt{srj} in vss. 10 (*asṛkṣata*) and 11 (*ásrgram*), the former in an etym. figure. Note the juxtaposition of the newer *s*-aor. 3rd pl. middle and the older root aorist, with no apparent functional or semantic difference. On these two formations see Narten (*Sig.Aor.* 270–71); she claims that they were originally differentiated functionally and still are occasionally (see IX.86.4), but in almost all occurrences this difference has been lost.

IX.66.10: Soma’s acquisition of “imperishable fame” in 7c is anticipated, as it were, by his streams, likened to horses, “seeking fame” (*śravasyāvah*).

IX.66.13–15: No signs of cohesion.

IX.66.13: On pādas bc and esp. the remarkable causative future reflexive form *vāsayiṣyase* ‘you will cause yourself to be clothed’, see disc. in the comm. to the parallel passage IX.2.4.

IX.66.14: It is difficult to render the vs.-initial *āsya te* lit. “of this here you”; the demon. essentially exists as a prop for the enclitic *te* and a way to emphasize the 2nd ps. pronoun.

I do not know what the difference is between *sakhyā-* and *sakhitvā-*, or if any difference is meant. The former is far better attested and has a fuller paradigm, well distributed across cases and numbers (sg. and pl.); the latter is almost confined to the nom./acc. sg. (with 2 occurrences of the loc. sg.). In any case the vs. comes out a little flat: we want your comradeship because it will benefit us. The poet may have been trying to distract attention from this flatness by varying the derivational realization. It’s also worth noting that pāda a is also found in IX.61.29 without *sakhitvā-* in context and pāda c is found in IX.31.6 without *sakhyā-* in context.

In his endearingly crusty way, Bloomfield (RR ad IX.31.6) pronounces our vs. “arrant nonsense”: “pādas a and c, borrowed from good quarters, show that the stanza is irresponsible patchwork.” This seems rather harsh, but probably results in part from his interpr. of *īyakṣantaḥ* as the desid. of \sqrt{yaj} , rather than the now generally accepted derivation from $\sqrt{(n)aś}$; see comm. ad VI.21.3. Attributing it to \sqrt{yaj} produces a participial phrase in b that has nothing to do with *sakhyé* in a: “In thy friendship we, sacrificing with thy help, do we, O Indu, thy friendship crave” (Bl’s tr., which justifies his “arrant nonsense” judgment). Whereas a connection with $\sqrt{(n)aś}$ sets out the reason we want your comradeship—we stand to gain from it—and makes ab a unified expression.

IX.66.15: The usually idiomatic *ā pavasva* lacks the usual acc. object (“bring [X] by purifying yourself”). Perhaps the *ā* anticipates the *ā* in c, in the idiom *ā ... viśa* ‘enter’.

The question in b are whether the two datives *mahé ... nṛcākṣase* belong together and what the referent(s) is/are. Ge takes them together and identifies the referent as Indra, who appears by name in the next pāda, which would support Ge’s solution. However, as Re points out, *nṛcākṣas-* is never used of Indra, but generally of Agni or Soma. Re himself separates the datives, supplying *rāṇe* with *mahé* from the beginning of the *ṛca* (13a) and identifying the referent of *nṛcākṣase* as “le dieu Soma.” Although the first choice seems possible and even reasonable, the second is awkward: it seems odd to order Soma to purify himself for himself, even if the addressee is the substance soma (which shouldn’t actually have such agency) as distinct from the god. Given that the next *ṛca* but one (vss. 19–21) is addressed to Agni, that god seems a more likely choice. Re’s motivation in separating the two datives in b seems to be to wring the three (Dumézilian) functions out of the vs. (or, I gather, ab), but I don’t see how they would match up. In any case, a modified tr. à la Re, without reference to the three functions, is conceivable: “... for the quest for cattle, for great (joy), for the one of manly eye [=Agni].”

IX.66.16–18: The first two vss. are linked lexically and by their investment in grammatical comparison. The third is unconnected, but 18c echoes vs. 14 in the previous *ṛca*.

IX.66.16: As Re points out, *sán* here is non-concessive. Instead it seems to have a function rather like the one I identified in III.30.5 (see comm. ad loc.), namely a definitional one: where, on the basis of the description of the god's activities or qualities, he is assigned an agentive title.

IX.66.17: This vs. expands on the etymological figure and superlative phrase in 16b, *ugrānām ... ójīsthaḥ*, but with three pairs of comparatives, beginning with the *ugrēbhyaḥ ... ójīyān*, lexically identical to the splv. phrase but morphologically different. The second is also an etym. figure, of less interest than the first because it lacks morphological variation: *sūrebhyaḥ ... sūratarah*. While the third substitutes a synonymic cmpd. for the abl. term: *bhūridābhyaḥ ... māmhīyān* "more generous than those who give much." A low-key but pleasing set of variations on a phrasal theme.

IX.66.18: The sole Anuṣṭubh verse in a sea of Gāyatrīs. Note that it is the last vs. before the Agni ṛca, and so it may function as a closing or pseudo-closing vs., dividing the larger hymn into parts.

The first hemistich has received a variety of interpr., splitting into two major camps dependent in great part on the identity of *sūrah*. Ge (see his n. 18ab), Re, Ober (I.494) take it as a gen. sg. of *svār-*, one of a string of gen. dependent on *sātā* 'at the winning' – hence, "at the winning of the sun, refreshment, offspring, and bodies." There are several arguments against this interpr., however: 1) *sūrah* has to be nom. sg. to *sūra-* in 22c, and so consistency would be nice (if not entirely necessary); 2) *īsaḥ* has the wrong accent for gen. sg. (expect *īśāḥ*); 3) the standard interpr. of the sequence *ésaḥ* is *ā īsaḥ* (already Pp., though see other poss. in Ge's n. 18ab), but the mid-pāda location of *ā*, between two supposedly parallel genitives, is an odd position for a preverb / adposition / adverb, and it has no obvious function in the clause. In fact the clause has no verb and no obvious one to supply – witness the variety of suggestions: Ge "(stehst uns)," Re "(qui t'es préparé)," Ober "(hilfst uns)." I therefore follow the path generally sketched by Old (see also Lü 267 n. 4): a nominal equational cl. with nom. sg. *sūrah* to *sūra-* (note that both Gr and Lub so list the form), *tvām soma sūrah* "you, Soma, are the sun"; followed by a 2nd cl. beginning with *ā*. Though *ā* remains mid-pāda, it is initial in its clause, as we would expect. An imperative of bringing / giving / supplying needs to be supplied, with acc. pl. *īsaḥ* (properly accented) as obj. Cf. expressions like III.53.1 ... *īsa ā vahatam* ..., VI.52.16 ... *īsa ā dhattam*, and, with specifically Somian vocab., nearby IX.65.13 *ā ... īsam pávasva* "By purifying yourself, bring refreshment here." More to the point, perhaps, the immediately following vs., 19b, *ā suvórajam īsam ca naḥ* "impel hither nourishment and refreshment to us," is quite similar and could provide the missing verb.

A structurally less crucial question is the relationship between the two genitives in b, *tokásya ... tanūnām*. As indicated above, Ge takes them as parallel; Re by contrast takes *tanūnām* as a beneficial "pour nous-mêmes," independent of the genitives dependent on *sātā*. In the publ. tr. I take them as nested, with *tanūnām* dependent on *tokásya*, though I have no particular objection to the parallel interpr.

As noted above, *vṛṇímáhe sakhyāya* is a permutation of 14c *sakhitvām uśmasi*.

On *vṛṇímáhe yújyāya*, see comm. ad IX.88.1. Given the other exx. of this lexeme, I would now alter the tr. to "we choose you for yoking [/use]."

IX.66.19–21: On this *ṛca* see publ. intro. It is so insistently Agni-focused (all three vss. begin with a form of that stem, two as voc.) that the Anukramaṇī lists Agni as the deity of the three vss. But it is of course far more likely that Soma is being *identified* with Agni here. The equation and poetic merging of these two ritual gods is found elsewhere, most notably in “the hardest hymn in the RV” (V.44), which is simultaneously applicable to both gods throughout its length. Their blending is shown here by the use of both Somian and Agnian vocab.: for the latter, see esp. *puróhitaḥ* (20b); for the former, the three forms of *páva-*, one each in each vs.: 19a *pavase*, 20a *pávamānaḥ*, 21a *pavasva*. Note that after this Agni *ṛca* the word *sóma-* doesn’t appear until vs. 29 and a likely identification with Indra (as well as comparison with the sun) intervenes.

IX.66.19: Since *pavase* has an obj. *āyūṁṣi*, it would be desirable to have the preverb *ā-* which has transitivity function with this root. This is easily done: *āyūṁṣi* can be decomposed into *ā āyūṁṣi* without change to the Saṃhitā text, though it is contra to the Pp. This preverb in tmesis shows up apparently 2nd in the clause because it follows the zero-position voc. *āgne*.

IX.66.21: Here, despite the obj. phrase in b, *pavasva* lacks the expected *ā-*. It would technically be possible to take b with c: “establishing luster and an abundance of heroes for/in us, wealth and thriving in me,” which would leave *pavasva* intransitive. However, this seems artificial, and the existence of two 1st ps. pronouns in b and c, in different numbers, would be awkward. Moreover, 27c, with an independent *dádhat* clause, speaks in favor of separating b and c here.

IX.66.22–24: No strong signs of unity, though a form of *pávamāna-* opens vss. 22 and 24, but Soma as the sun in 22c returns in the theme of light and the defeat of darkness in 24bc. The adj. *vicakṣaṇáḥ* ‘visible afar’ in 23c also participates in this imagery, partly matching *viśvadarśataḥ* ‘visible to all’ in the same position in 22c -- though the Engl. tr. ‘visible’ suggests a closer connection than exists in the Skt., which has $\sqrt{dṛś}$ in 22 but $\sqrt{cakṣ}$ in 23. The light imagery in this *ṛca* may pick up on the identification with Agni in the previous *ṛca*, while the verb *jáñghanat* that closes the *ṛca* (24c) may modulate towards an identification with Indra, probably found in the following *ṛca*.

IX.66.23: *hitáḥ* in b could of course belong to \sqrt{hi} ‘impel’, though little would change if did. As it happens both Ge and Re also opt for $\sqrt{dhā}$ here.

IX.66.24: With Lü (266), I take *ṛtām bṛhāt* as a nom. in apposition to Soma, rather than another acc. obj. to *ajījanat* as Ge/Re do. Either of course is possible; there are several passages in which an identification of Soma with *ṛtā* seems likely. See comm. ad IX.56.1. But I would certainly accept an acc. interpr. as alternative.

IX.66.25–27: Each vs. opens with a form of *pávamāna-*, which also connects it with the preceding *ṛca* (see above). An even stronger link to the previous *ṛca* is the gen. intens. part. *jáñghnataḥ* in 25a, which picks up the same stem (in the nom. *jáñghanat*) at the end of the immediately preceding pāda, 24c. As for internal unity, note the free phrase *háres candráḥ* in 25b, which is transformed into the cmpd. *háriscandra-* (only here in the RV,

though prominent as a PN beginning in the Br.) in 26c. Superlatives also figure in the last two vss.: *rathītama-* 26a, *śubhrāśastamaḥ* 26b, *vājasātama-* 27b.

IX.66.25: With Ge and Re, I supply ‘darkness(es)’ (*tāmāṃsi*) as obj. of *jānghanataḥ* on the basis of 24c.

I supply ‘drops’ with *candrāḥ* on the basis of III.40.4 *candrāsa índavaḥ*, though Ge’s “Güsse” and Re’s “coulées de *soma*” certainly fit the context, too. My “drops” is indirectly supported by the additional descriptor *jīrāḥ* ‘lively’, which is most commonly found in the cmpd. *jīrā-dānu-* ‘having lively drops’, with a different word for drop.

Note the play *jīrā ajirā-*. The cmpd *ajirā-śocis-* is a bit difficult to fit into context. The 1st member *ajirā-* means ‘quick, nimble, agile’, and the whole bahuvrīhi occurs once elsewhere of Agni, VIII.19.13, where I tr. “of nimble flame.” How this would apply to drops is not entirely clear; I assume it refers to the propensity of drops, esp. moving drops, to catch the light. It is also possible that *ajirāśociṣaḥ* is gen. sg. and modifies Soma, rather than nom. pl. modifying the drops. This would not appreciably change the image.

IX.66.26: The Indraic cast of this vs. is quite clear, and I therefore think that Soma is being identified with Indra here (as he was with Agni in the trca 19–21). To begin with, the splv. *rathītama-* is generally used of Indra (e.g., VIII.45.7); *marúd-gaṇa-* ‘having the Maruts as his flock’ is of course characteristic of Indra (e.g., VIII.89.2) and also expressed by other, similar but better-attested epithets like *marút-vant-*. Moreover, the stem *śubhrā-* ‘resplendent’ in the masc. pl., here in the instr. pl. *śubhrébhiḥ*, is almost always used of the Maruts (e.g., I.167.4).

The problem in the vs. is the splv. *śubhrāśastamaḥ* in b. The interpr. reflected by Ge and Re stems from Old, who sees it as a haplology from **śubhrā-śasta-tama-*, i.e., the splv. to a ppl. cmpd. Old himself doesn’t provide a gloss, but on the basis of a cmpd. like *kavi-śastá-* ‘praised by poets’ it should presumably be something like ‘most praised by the resplendent’, though neither Ge’s “über die anderen Schönen als der Schönste gepriesen” nor Re’s “par rapport aux (êtres) beaux, il est le plus célébré (quant à son fait d’être) beau” reflects this presumption; that is, they do not take the 1st member as agent. Nor does the accent of the cmpd (either reconstructed or as attested) match that of *kavi-śastá-*, though admittedly it does match the standard *devá-hita-* type. And the instr. *śubhrébhiḥ* seems an odd choice – we would expect a gen. pl. with the splv. of course; the anomalous instr. is surely responsible for the knots that Ge and Re tie themselves into, as well as Ge’s cryptic (or disingenuous) n. 26b “*śubhrébhiḥ* Instr. = Ablat. in Verbindung mit Superl. = Komparat.” The publ. tr. represents a very different analysis, which I now think must be wrong: as the splv. to a root-noun cmpd. ‘proclaiming splendor’, but, as I realized all along, the accent is wrong (expect **śubhra-śás-(tama-)*), and it is difficult to argue that the accent got misplaced because the word structure was misunderstood, esp. given the root noun cmpd splv. in the next vs., *vāja-sā-tama-* with correct accent. In addition, *śubhrā-* is an adj., ‘resplendent’, not a noun ‘splendour’, and √*śams* doesn’t take any form derived from √*śubh* as obj. So I now would reject the publ. tr. and return to Old’s haplology – though with a semantic interpr. different from the Ge/Re complex. I would take the 1st member in agentive value, as is usual in such cmpds: “most praised by the resplendent (ones),” with the usual number neutralization. The reference is to the

Maruts. What then of the independent instr. *śubhrébhiḥ*? Either it doubles the 1st cmpd member, whose function in the cmpd may have become unclear because of the haplogy – hence “most praised by the resplendent (ones), by the resplendent ones.” Or it may be an instr. of accompaniment: “most praised by the resplendent (ones), *along with* the resplendent ones.” This would reflect the fact that the Maruts both praise Indra and receive praise themselves. This dual role of the Maruts, both praising and praised, is the subject of “poetic repair” in V.52, the first of Śyāvāśva’s Marut hymns. See comm. ad loc and reff. given there. Although I slightly favor the former explanation, English is better served by the latter, and I would now substitute the 2nd tr. just given; “most praised” should also receive an asterisk.

Unfortunately “gold-glittering” for *hāriścandra*- obscures its relationship to *hāreś candrāḥ* in 25b “of the tawny one, the glittering (drops).”

IX.66.27: In this vs. we seem to have returned to the identification of Soma with the sun, as shown esp. by *raśmībhiḥ* “with his rays” – this instr. pl. being reserved almost exclusively for the sun’s rays (see, e.g., nearby IX.61.8 *sūryasya raśmībhiḥ*). The image is of the sun / Soma pervading space, with Soma’s rays being the traces of the golden liquid as it spreads across the filter.

IX.66.28–30: No particular evidence of unity, except for an emphasis in the 1st two vss. on the technicalities of soma-preparation.

IX.66.28: This vs. has two passively used participles, *suvānāḥ* ‘being pressed’ and *punānāḥ* ‘being purified’, which contrast with the agency implicitly accorded to Soma Pavamāna, “self-purifying” Soma. This more agentive participle returns in the final vs. (30b), just before we ask Soma for his favor.

The repetition of *īnduḥ* (pādas a and c) is somewhat clumsy, but the 2nd occurrences enables the usual word play with adjacent *īndram*.

IX.67

On the structure and authorship of this hymn and their implications for RVic studies more generally, see publ. intro. as well as Old.

IX.67.1–3: Attributed to Bharadvāja, the *ṛca* shows elementary unity by positioning *tvām* at the beginning of each vs.

IX.67.1: Gr derives *dhārayú-* from *dhārā-* ‘stream’ and glosses ‘strömen’, an idea that goes back to Sāy. Ge follows suit (“der hervorsprudelnde”), though in n. 1a he entertains a derivation from $\sqrt{dhṛ}$, which underlies Re’s “le mainteneur” (see his n.) I also think that $\sqrt{dhṛ}$ is the correct etymon. There would be no reason to shorten the final of *dhārā-* (though *dhāra-pūta-* ‘purified by streams’ (?) and *dhāra-vākā-* ‘recitation for the streams’ (?) do give me pause), while there is a well-established relationship between *-ā-yā-(ti)* verbs and *-ā-yū-* adjectives (type *devayā-* / *devayū-*). Though it has a different accent and a different functional profile, *dhārāyati* is a very common verb, and it is easy to imagine the creation of a *-yū-* nominal to that stem. However, if it is derived from *dhārā-* ‘stream’, the sense should not be of the type given by Gr and Ge, but rather ‘seeking streams’, as is

standard with *-yu-*formations to nouns. The idea would be that the soma, once pressed, goes forth to seek the ritual waters.

IX.67.4–6: The Kaśyapa ṛca: it lacks cohesion across all 3 vss., though 4 and 5 share “rushing across the fleece”; ‘rush’ (*ārṣa-*) also provides a link to the last vs. of the preceding ṛca, 3b, as does the verb *acikradat* (4c), which echoes *kánikradat* (3b).

IX.67.5: The preverb/preposition *ví-* is insistent, with 4 occurrences in the vs.
Re sees the three functions here, but that seems something of a stretch.

IX.67.7–9: Elementary sign of cohesion in the Gotama ṛca: a form of *páva-* in every vs.

IX.67.9: On *úsrayaḥ* as ‘rosy (fingers)’ see comm. ad IV.65.1.

The publ. tr. contains a grammatical error: *asvaran* should of course be ‘they cried’ not ‘they cry’.

IX.67.10–12: This, the Atri ṛca, shows very tight cohesion. To begin with, Pūṣan, under his name (vs. 10) or characteristic epithets (*kapardín-* vs. 11, *āghṛṇi-* vs. 12), appears in every vs., in particular as the recipient of the pressed and purified soma in vss. 11–12. Since, as noted in the publ. intro., Pūṣan is rarely found in IX, devoting a ṛca to him here is striking, and the assumption that he wants soma is esp. anomalous, since in the hymn devoted to Indra and Pūṣan (VI.57) Indra’s desire for soma is explicitly contrasted with Pūṣan’s for porridge (VI.57.2).

More evidence for strong cohesion: the third pāda of each vs. is a refrain: *ā bhakṣat kanyāsu naḥ* “He [=Pūṣan] will give us a share in maidens.” The connection of this refrain with soma is, to say the least, not straightforward. Ge (n. 10–12) suggests that the idea is that Pūṣan, as a thank-you for the soma, will give maidens as compensation for the poet (Dichtersold) or as a guest-gift (Gastgeschenk). This is certainly possible, though the quid pro quo isn’t evident to me in the text; nonetheless it conforms to the dānastuti concept. Ober refines this somewhat by identifying the maidens as brides (e.g., I.320), but at least in his vol. II he takes *Soma* as the subject of the refrain (“[D]er [Soma] gewähre uns Anteil an den Jungfrauen”; II.51 n. 240). Simply on the basis of rhetorical structure, this seems unlikely: in the vs. containing the first appearance of the refrain (10) there is not even indirect reference to Soma; the only possible subject is Pūṣan, and there is unlikely to be a switch in subject in the refrain in the following two vss. By contrast, Gr identifies the maidens here as daughters, presumably implying that this expression is a twist on the “give us sons” wish so often expressed. Though I appreciate Gr’s attempt to save Pūṣan from being a pimp, I doubt that any Rigvedin would wish [at least out loud] for a passel of daughters

The last two vss. of the ṛca are simple variants of each other. Both begin with *ayām* referring to soma; both contain a dative expression identifying Pūṣan as the recipient of the soma; their b pādas both begin *ghṛtām ná pavate*, with a disyllable qualifying *ghṛtām* following.

IX.67.10: The publ. tr. presents the journeys as ours, reading *naḥ* with both *avitā* and *yāmani-yāmani*. Ge and Re instead assume the journeys are Pūṣan’s: e.g., “Unser Gönner

ist Pūṣan, der auf jeder Ausfahrt Böcke als Rosse hat.” Since one hymn devoted to Pūṣan, I.42, is almost entirely devoted to Pūṣan’s protection of us on the journey and on the path and in the short Pūṣan cycle in VI (VI.53–58) the god is several times asked to lead or direct us (e.g., VI.53.2) and to clear paths for us (VI.53.4, 54.1–2), I think it likely that the focus here is on *our* journeys.

IX.67.11: *kapardín-* is used of Pūṣan in VI.55.2, though it is also applied to a few other gods in the RV, notably Rudra (I.114.1, 5).

IX.67.12: *āghṛṇi-* is an epithet exclusive to Pūṣan. On the word, see comm. ad VI.53.3.

That Pūṣan is addressed in the 2nd ps. here, while the refrain remains in the 3rd ps., might be taken as evidence for Ober’s identification of Soma as the subject of the refrain – since soma is in the 3rd ps. in this vs. However, refrains tend to operate in syntactic independence from their vss., and, as I argued above, once the refrain is set, it is unlikely to change referents.

IX.67.13–15: Little evidence of unity in the Viśvāmitra ṛca, though the falcon (*śyená-*) as image of Soma occurs in both 14 and 15. More generally, both 14 and 15 depict the rapid and dramatic movement of soma into the ritual receptacles.

IX.67.13: Soma is obviously “child of the speech of the poets” (*vācó jantúḥ kavīnām*) because ritual speech sets in motion the preparation of soma.

IX.67.14: What is the “armor” (*várma*) that soma “plunges through” (*ví gāhate*)? Ge (n. 14ab) suggests that the image is of a warrior clothing himself in armor, that is, the wooden cup, but he doesn’t construe *várma* with the verb, but takes it as loosely descriptive with a verb used absolutely (“er taucht in seinen Panzer unter”). Re also thinks the *várma* refers to the cup (“la paroi [wall] de la cuve” acdg. to his n.), but has the courage to construe it with the verb: “il plonge dans (le récipient, sa) cuirasse.” But *ví* is not “dans.” I think it refers instead to the filter, whose fleece both represents his armor and a substance that soma must get *through*, hence the slightly off-balance image. Note first of all that the same verb, though with different preverb, is used precisely with the filter a few vss. later in this hymn: IX.67.20 *pavítram áti gāhate* / ... *vāram avyáyam* “he plunges across the filter, the sheep’s fleece.” As for the fleece as Soma’s armor, see the very full expression in IX.98.2 *pári śyá svānó avyáyam ráthe ná vármāvyata* “This one, being pressed, has engirded himself in the sheep’s fleece, as a man on a chariot does in armor.” Ober (II.77) also considers the armor to be the fleece. The same identification, though with a different word for armor/sheathing is found in X.101.7 *āṃsatra-kośa-*.

IX.67.16–18: This ṛca, ascribed to Jamadagni, is unified first and foremost by its meter, Dvipadā Gāyatrī, the only representative of this meter in the hymn – and in fact in all of the RV (see Arnold p. 244). There is no particular unity in lexicon (though note *mandāyan* 16a and *madántamaḥ* 18a), but the ṛca does mention the two gods who receive the first soma oblation, Indra (16) and Vāyu (18).

IX.67.19–21: This is the last *tr̥ca* of the hymn, attributed to Vasiṣṭha. The 1st two vss. are variants of each other, couched in 2nd and 3rd ps. respectively: their first pādas differ only in their initial disyllable, with the rest identical: ... *tunnó abhīṣṭutaḥ*; their second pādas both depict the journey to and across the filter, both beginning *pavíttram*. The third vs. stands apart, though the identification of Soma as ‘demon-smasher’ in 20c is thematically linked to the plea in 21 that Soma “smash away” peril.

IX.67.22–27: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. are a self-contained purificatory spell, with all vss. ending with an act. impv. belonging to the pres. *punāti*: all 2nd sg. *punīhi* (*naḥ*) except 22c *punātu* (*naḥ*). The means of purification is, in the first instance, the filter (*pavíttra-*), which of course literally means ‘instrument (*-tra-*) of purification’. The *pavíttra-* is mentioned in vss. 22–25, with other, non-physical means of purification added (e.g., the sacred formulation vss. 23–24), with these means appropriate to the gods who wield them (Savitar’s ‘impulsion’ [*savá-*] vs. 25). The first agent of purification is Soma Pavamāna himself (22), then Agni (23–24), then Savitar (25). The three – Soma, Agni, and Savitar – then appear together in 26, and in the final vs. (27) it opens out to all the divinities. The rhetoric is pretty flat, but the structure is a pleasing example of repetitive variation.

IX.67.22: The nominal rel. cl. *yáḥ potā* seems to be another ex. of the embedded, pseudo-izafe construction discussed elsewhere, though in this case there is a resumptive pronoun beginning the continuation of the main cl. The structure is: ab beg. of main cl. marked by *sáḥ*, no verb; c rel. cl. *yáḥ potā*, followed by rest of main cl., with verb, but introduced by a repetition of *sáḥ*: *sá punātu naḥ*, or, more schematically:

ab *sá* NOMINATIVE NP /

c. *yáḥ* NOM. NP, *sá* VERB

with the two *sá* hunks together forming the main cl. A sort of hybrid construction.

In the publ. tr. I take *pavítreṇa* in b with *pávamānaḥ* in a, unlike Ge and Re, who construe it with *punātu* in c (e.g., “qu’il nous clarifie avec le filtre”). Their interpr. is supported by the INSTR. *punīhi naḥ* constr. in 23–24, 26 (and variant in 25), and since I no longer consider *yáḥ potā* an embedded rel. clause and therefore have no need to consider ab entirely separate from the resumptive *sá* phrase in c, there is no syntactic obstacle to this interpr. I’d be inclined, however, to read *pavítreṇa* with both: “The one who purifies himself through our filter (/purifier) today, the limitless one who is the purifier, with the filter (/purifier) let him purify us.”

The agent noun *potár-* (also *pótar-*) as if to an aniṭ root is surprising, esp. in juxtaposition to the instrument noun *pavíttra-* and, a few vss. later, the god *savítár-* to the parallel root $\sqrt{sū}$. We would of course expect **pavítár-* -- a form we almost get in RVic *pavītár-* and do get in AV *pavítár-*. The problem is identical to that posed by the priestly title *hótar-*, derived from $\sqrt{hvā}$ / *hū* ‘invoke’, so we expect **hávítár-* -- although in that instance interference from the likewise ritual verb \sqrt{hu} ‘pour, libate’, whose agent noun should properly be *hótar-*, helps explain the discrepancy. AiG II.2. 672 explains *pótar-* by suggesting that it is an inherited word and no longer closely tied to the verb from which it was originally derived. This seems backwards to me – wouldn’t inherited and isolated words be more likely to maintain their expected phonological shape? And, judging from this passage, *potár-* (so accented) has not lost its connection with $\sqrt{pū}$. However, a few

pp. later (AiG II.2.676) the much more plausible scenario is proposed, that *potár-* / *pótar-* has followed *hótar-*, which owes its shape to the interference just noted, and *stotár-* ‘praiser’. Sim. EWA s.v. *pótar-*.

IX.67.23: The image of the filter stretched out in Agni’s flame is striking, but I don’t know exactly what the picture is meant to be – in contemplating the fire do we have a vision of a purifying apparatus? Or is the expression simply a fancy way of saying “the purifier that is your flame”? The beginning of the next vs., with *pavítram arcivát*, would support the latter suggestions.

Ge takes *bráhma* as obj. of *punīhi*: “... mit der [=pavítram] läutere unsere feierliche Rede.” But 1) this would break the pattern of *punātu* / *punīhi nah* “purify us” in vss. 22, 24, 26) by demoting *nah* from object; 2) *bráhma* as a means of purification is found in the next vs. in the cmpd *brahmasavañh*. The fairly strict rhetorical patterning of these vss. therefore imposes (at least to my view) an instrument-of-means reading on *bráhma*, and I see no reason why it can’t be part of the definitional preposed rel. cl. *yád te* “what is your ...,” parallel to *pavítram*. *yád* would be appropriate to both, since they are both neut., and they are then both picked up by instr. *téna* in c. That *bráhma* has been postponed till the beginning of c is not surprising, given the long NP containing *pavítram*. The new cl. begins mid-pāda with *téna*, since *sāl tām* forms regularly take init. position in pāda / clause, the mid-pāda position here suggests that it begins a new cl. and *bráhma* is not part of it. Like Ge, Re makes *bráhma* somehow oblique, but I don’t really understand what he’s trying to convey: “clarifies en notre Formule.”

IX.67.24: This vs. has both physical and conceptual purifying instruments: the flame-sieve of 23 and the *bráhman-* also introduced in 23, which, in the cmpd *brahma-savá-*, also provides a transition to Savitar and his impulsions in vs. 25.

IX.67.25: In addition to the introduction of Savitar, we also get a slight rearrangement in word order. The conjoined phrase *pavítrena savéna ca* would not fit in the slot right before the impv. in c, a position it occupies in 23c, 24b, 24c, 26c, so the final enclitic *nah* is converted to a full prn. *mām* and placed in initial position. This prn. also has to be read as distracted *māām* to achieve 8 syllables. I wonder why the poet didn’t just use *asmān*, which would fit the meter and better match *nah*. One of the only instances in which I think I could compose the vs. better than the poet – though “me” (both tonic *mām* and enclitic *mā*) serves as insistent obj. in vs. 27.

IX.67.26: Initial *tribhīh* matches initial *ubhābhyām* in 25a. Since *ubhābhyām* was further specified by a bipartite NP *pavítrena savéna ca* (25b), I would like to see three instr. in this vs., each correlated with one of the three gods mentioned. And this is how I have rendered it, with *várṣiṣṭhaih* connected to Savitar (and Soma), *dhāmabhih* with Soma, and *dákṣaiḥ* with Agni. By contrast, Ge and Re construe *várṣiṣṭhaiḥ* with *dhāmabhih*, which they consider to be of three types (that is, “with the three highest *dhāmans* ...”; Re “avec les trois positions les plus éminentes”) – although in their notes both come close to espousing a position close to mine. Possibly in their favor is the fact that *soma* is unaccented in b, and if *várṣiṣṭhaiḥ* is followed by a sub-clausal break, the voc. *might* (or might not) have been accented. In the publ. tr. I read *várṣiṣṭhaiḥ* both with Savitar’s

savañh, which has to be supplied, and with Soma's *dhāmabhiñ*, and tr. the latter slightly differently: "through Soma's domains."

IX.67.27: This last vs. of the purificatory spell is in a different meter (Anuṣṭubh) and makes reference to a larger variety of personnel – both often signs of finality.

IX.67.28–29: It's not clear why we return to purely Soma vss. at this point, but the aoristic summary in 29 (*úpa ... áganma bíbhrato námañ* "up to him have we come bearing homage") is another typical hymn-ender, summarizing the hymn that precedes.

IX.67.29: The hapax *āhutī-vṛdh-* could be either passive (as in the publ. tr., also Ge) or act. 'strengthening the oblation' (Re). Scar (514) considers both possibilities and opts, weakly, for the former. Either could certainly work in context. The long final vowel *-tī-* is found only here, versus the standard *āhuti-*. This can either be a metrical lengthening of the stem vowel, since **āhutī-vṛdham*, with 3 (or actually 4) light syllables in a row, would produce an unacceptable cadence. Or it can be an instr. sg. to the *-tī-* stem (see inconclusive disc. in Scar.), which would clinch the interpr. of the cmpd as passive 'strengthened by the oblation'. I weakly favor the latter.

IX.67.30: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is extremely puzzling and my tr. and interpr. are at best speculative. Old's comments are useful in clearing away the detritus of the more fanciful interpr., but neither he nor the other standard comm. have cracked the code: see Ge's n. 30a with lit. The syntax and the sequence of events are quite straightforward: someone's axe has disappeared (contra Gr, *nanāśa* must belong to 'disappear', not 'reach'; the 'disappear' association is now generally agreed upon), and Soma is asked to bring it back through his purification (the common idiom *ā√pū*). But whose axe? and why an axe in this context? and what does a rat have to do with it?

To begin with the 1st question: most take *alāyyasya* as a PN ("the axe of Alāyya"), which saves trouble but doesn't help us in deciphering the verse. Gr derives it from *√lī* and tr. 'sich nicht duckend'; Mayr (EWA s.v.) simply pronounces it "unklar." I suggest that it belongs to *√rā* 'come to / be at rest', with an *l*-form like *ilāyati* (see Narten, "Ved. *ilāyati* ...," 1968; Jamison, *-āya-*, 48–49, EWA s.v. *RĀ*³). I would interpr. it as a gerundive like *-pāyya-* (*√pā* both 'drink' and 'protect'), as well as the more numerous extended stems of the type *śravāyya-*, whose *-ā-* does not belong to the root. A parallel negated form (though again not to a *ā*-root) may be found in *atasāyya-* 'unshakeable'; see comm. ad I.63.6. I suggest that *alāyya-* means 'not able to be brought to rest, not to be stilled'.

This may not seem to advance us very far, but this word must be evaluated in conjunction with *paraśúñ*, on which it depends. The *paraśú-* is frequently associated with Agni; cf., e.g., I.127.3, IV.6.8, and VI.3.4, in all of which Agni is compared to an axe. The other common word for axe, *vāśī-*, is also characteristic of Agni: he carries it (VIII.19.23) and possesses it (*vāśīmant-* X.20.6). Agni's axe must be his flame, and of course fire is always in motion, never still. I therefore suggest that *alāyya-* refers to Agni, the axe to his flame, and the pāda declares that his flame has disappeared or been lost. This may refer to the famous myth in which Agni runs away from his ritual duties and has to be coaxed back by offering him a better deal – or it may simply record a ritual

disaster: the sacrificial fire has gone out. In any event Soma is taxed with bringing him back in pāda b.

If my interpr. of the first pāda is anywhere near correct, it pleases me to fancy that this is the first (very indirect) textual evidence to Paraśu Rāma.

The real puzzle in this vs. is pāda c, which presents *ākhúm* as an apparently parallel object to the *paraśú-* that Soma is supposed to bring back. Both Ge and Re find this relatively easy to deal with because they take it as a simile, marked with *cid*. But as I have noted in a number of places, there are no clear instances of *cid* as a simile marker, and here it is also not clear what similarity the poet might be trying to point to (that moles live hidden seems to be the best guess). My own suggestion is hardly better than this (if that). The *ākhú-* is probably a ‘mole-like rat’ since there are no true moles in the subcontinent (see Katz, JAOS 122 [2002], “How the Mole and Mongoose Got Their Names,” esp. 301–2). The word is found only here in the RV, which complicates the interpr., but it has become fairly common by middle Vedic. In particular, the *ākhú-* is associated with Rudra; already in VS III.57, TS I.8.6.1 the *ākhú-* is Rudra’s victim / portion at the Tryambaka ritual. I therefore think it is *possible* (no more than that) that Soma is being asked also to bring Rudra back, in the form of his totem animal. Of the few hymns dedicated in full or in part to Rudra (there are only 3 dedicated to him alone), 2 (I.43, VI.47) are Soma-Rudra hymns, so there is some association between the two gods, whose rationale unfortunately escapes me.

Why this vs. ended up in this hymn I have no idea – except as a composite hymn it may have attracted various vss. that were floating around, and since it addresses Soma and uses a standard Somian verb (*ā√pū*), the hymn may have seemed as good a place as any to stash this vs. It clearly has nothing to do with the two Soma vss. that preceded nor with the added summary vss. that follow. It also appears to be a younger vs., given the *-l-* form and the non-RVic word *ākhu-*.

IX.67.31–32: On the import of these two vss., see publ. intro. They are obviously secondary additions to the hymn, promising great benefits to anyone who studies the previous vss. of the hymn.

Commentary IX.68–114

IX.68–86

The trimeter portion of the IXth Maṇḍala begins with IX.68, and the Jagatī section goes through IX.86.

IX.68–70: The theme of these three hymns, particularly insistent in the first and last, is the difference between and ultimate unity of earthly and heavenly Soma.

IX.68

On the architecture and thematics of this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.68.1: The position of *ā* in b is distinctly odd, breaking up the simile *gāvaḥ ... nā dhenāvaḥ* and not even placed at a metrical boundary; indeed, the pāda has an unusual break (˘ / – ˘) after late caesura. It is all the more puzzling because *ā* has no apparent function in the vs.: *√syand* does not otherwise appear with *ā*, and the usual nominal cases to which *ā* serves as adposition are absent. Perhaps it's a clumsy attempt to convert the simile *gāvo nā dhenāvaḥ*, which fits well at the end of a dimeter line (see VI.45.28 and nearby IX.66.12), into a Jagatī cadence. It's also worth noting that a more conventional order ... / **ā gāva nā dhenāvaḥ*, with *ā* at the metrical boundary and the simile unbroken, would produce both a worse break and an impossible cadence. So perhaps this was the best the poet could do – though why does he need an *ā* in the first place?

Old suggests (ad II.3.3) reading **barhiṣ-śādaḥ* with restored sibilant cluster. However, of the six occurrences of this cmpd a heavy second syllable would make the meter worse in II.3.3, V.44.1 (bad breaks), though admittedly the other 4, which open the vs., might be somewhat improved by a heavy 2nd syllable. However, the evidence of the break should weigh more heavily than that of the opening. See Scar's disc. p. 570 and esp. n. 806.

The mirror-image sequence (*par*)*isrú(tam) usrí(yā)* is rather nice.

usríyāḥ in d can be either nom. or acc. pl. (see Old, who doesn't decide). Flg. Ge and Re, I take it as an acc. pl. fem., taking part in a double acc. construction with *nirníjam* *√dhā* "assume X as garment." As Ge points out (n. 1d) this is a paradox: the (masc.) soma drops are likened to cows (b) and provided with udders (c), but clothe themselves in cows(' milk) in d. By contrast, Scar (675) takes it as nom. pl., which is certainly possible, but less poetically fruitful.

IX.68.2: *ā váram* "at will" may recall *vāram* (in the common Somian phrase *ávyo váram*, etc. "sheep's fleece") referring to the filter.

IX.68.3: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. significantly enlarges Soma's domain: in vs. 2 he circles around the filter at the ritual; in vs. 3 he journeys across the two world halves, Heaven and Earth -- and in fact makes them swell up with his "imperishable milk" (the soma juice itself, presumably).

ākṣitā is most likely instr. sg. with *pāyasā*, on the basis of IX.31.5 *pāyaḥ ... duduhré ākṣitam*, though Old suggests the possibility that it would be dual nom./acc. Although this would make reasonable contextual sense -- the two imperishable worlds --

it would need to be fem. and therefore **ākṣite*. Old floats the possibility that the preceding dual adj. *sākaṃvīdhā* could have influenced the ending. But on the whole, since *pāyas-ākṣita-* is found elsewhere, it seems best to stick with that grammatically acceptable alternative.

The root affiliation of the intens. part. *vivēvidat* is disputed. Though Gr assigns it to √*vid* ‘find’, Ge, Re (explicitly in his n.), Lü (228–29) take it to √*vid* ‘know’ (“Der ... genau kennt”; “qui discernes”). I follow Schaef (183–84) (and Gr) in taking it to √*vid* ‘find’; the point, I think, is that at every soma-pressing Soma re-finds and re-defines the domain he crosses, here encompassing the whole universe. It should be noted that the middle part. to this same intens. stem also governs *rājasī* in I.72.4 *ā rōdasī bṛhatī vēvidānāḥ*, though I tr. it ‘ever possessing’ there. See comm. ad loc.

IX.68.4: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. carries on and develops the themes of vs. 3. In that vs. Soma moves across the two worlds, implying a horizontal axis, while here, in my view, we shift to the vertical -- with Soma’s head in heaven and his foot(print) on earth. This vs. is much discussed by Lü (228–32), who also emphasizes the cosmic, but because he always strictly separates the heavenly and the earthly soma, I think in a way he misses the point.

My image of the vertical Soma depends on taking *padām* in b as his ‘footprint’, but this is not the standard interpr. in this passage, where *padām* is generally taken simply as ‘place’ vel sim. (Ge Stätte, Re séjour), with Ge further specifying it as the cup. His identification of the *padá-* with the cup then leads Ge to a somewhat aberrant tr. of *pinvate* (‘overflow’: “... macht ... seine Stätte überquellen”). But the middle voice of *pinvate*, contrasting with act. *pinvat* in the previous vs. (3b), encourages a self-beneficial (*/*-involved) interpr. of the verb, as does the instr. *svadháyā* ‘by his independent power’ -- which supports my interpr. of *padām* as referring to Soma’s own footprint.

And what does it mean that he “swells his own footprint”? I connect this with *vājáyann apáh* “stirring the waters” in pāda a. Here I would agree with Lü that these are the heavenly waters, and I further suggest that these waters, stirred up by the heavenly Soma and fallen from heaven as rain, are what swells his footprint and the earth on which it’s emplaced. This rain may also be indirectly alluded to in pāda c. The grain that ornaments the soma plant is probably, on the one hand, a reference to the variety of soma drink into which grain is mixed (see IX.55.1 and comm.; also Ober II.55), but I think it also likely alludes to the fecundating power of rain and the vegetation it produces.

There are two finite verbs in d, both accented (adjacent ... *násate rákṣate* ...), with no overt mark of subordination. With most interpr. I take the *násate* clause as implicitly subordinated, with *rákṣate* beginning the main cl., but contrastive verbal accent of adjacent verbs could as easily be invoked (and would make little diff. in interpr.: “he joins ... he guards ...”). Lü makes much of the last clause, and in fact takes *śírah* as subj. of *rákṣate* (which seems unlikely on rhetorical grounds), but I think the sense is fairly straightforward: even while soma is being pressed by the fingers at the earthly ritual, he keeps his head safe in heaven.

IX.68.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., this is an omphalos vs., which provides the solution to the paradoxes set up in the earlier vss. of the hymn, albeit in veiled form -- veiling that has kept its actual contents obscure (and may still do).

The first half is fairly clear, until almost the end: it refers to the birth of Soma, here called both a *kaví* and “the embryo of truth” (*ṛtásya gárbhaḥ*) (see further below). This embryo was deposited, presumably at its birth or even its conception, “beyond the twins” (*yamá parāḥ*). Given the two previous vss., which contain duals that refer to the two world-halves, Heaven and Earth (so identified by Ge and Re, e.g.), the most sensible interpr. of “the twins” here is as a reference to the same pair -- esp. since H+E were referred to by the fem. of the ‘twin’ word in 3a (*yamyā*) (in addition to 3c *mahī apāre rājasī* and 4a *mātārā*). But this interpr. is somewhat clouded by the fact that the next pāda (5c) contains both a dual phrase *yūnā ... śántā* and a dual verb *ví jajñatuḥ*. It is of course the default interpr. that all three of these duals (the two NPs and the verb) should refer to the same pair. What is somewhat baffling to me is that Ge (followed by Re) decides that this pair is the Aśvins (see esp. his n. 5bc). The Aśvins do not otherwise appear in this hymn, and indeed Re outlines firm grounds to reject this identification in his hesitant n.: “la participation des Aśvin au cycle du Soma étant faible et le contexte cd insuffisamment précis.” (Curiously, though Ge’s more overreaching mythological interventions often stem from Sāy., Sāy. in this case provides the far more sensible interpr. of the two as Soma and Sūrya.) I think the Aśvins can safely be dismissed as candidates for the dual reference (so also Lü 275). Let us then return to the more likely referent for *yamá* in b: Heaven and Earth. Pāda b seems simply to be saying that Soma (or part of Soma) was deposited as an embryo beyond Heaven and Earth, giving him cosmic reach indeed.

The trickier pāda is c. The presence of a dual nom./acc. and a dual verb of course invites the former to be taken as subject of the latter, and the standard interpr. understandably follow this path, with the sg. subj. of ab supplied as obj. of the verb -- e.g., Ge “Als Jünglinge haben sie ihn zuerst ausfindig gemacht.” This is obviously possible, and it need not involve identifying the two youths as the Aśvins; Heaven and Earth could be the pair in question. However, the dual NP raises several questions. For one thing, are Heaven and Earth really young? And even if so, what does this have to do with the action in question. Further: why *śántā*? The pres. part. of *√as* in the nominative is usually concessive, but “although being young” doesn’t make much sense here. I assume Ge’s “Als” is his only recognition of the participle; Re’s “jeunes encores” must be his (see also Lü’s “Als sie jung waren,” 275). But none of these renderings really accounts for why the participle is there, or for why H+E are identified as youths.

I have a less straightforward interpr. of this pāda -- inspired in great part by Ge’s interpr. of pāda d, which he takes (n. 5d) as depicting the two births of Soma, the heavenly and the earthly. I think these two forms of Soma are already present in pāda c, in the *accusative* phrase *yūnā ... śántā*, and the subj. of the dual verb *ví jajñatuḥ* is Heaven and Earth, not overtly present but referred to as the *yamá* in b (as well as in vss. 3–4). Under this interpr. the participle *śántā* has a reason to be there: it is an existential in a predicated proposition after *ví√jñā* ‘recognize’ -- rendered in the publ. tr. by “that there were two youths.” And of course it makes sense that Heaven and Earth would be the first to notice this, because the two births were located in those two places. It also makes sense that the two forms of Soma would be identified as ‘youths’, since they were recently born.

Following Ge on pāda d, the first mentioned birth “deposited in secret” (*gúhā hitām*) is the heavenly one (picking up *nīhito yamá parāḥ* in b), while a bit paradoxically

(because of the *úd* ‘up’), the one “held aloft” (*údyatam*) is the earthly one, referring to the ritual presentation of the soma.

Given this interpr. of the 2nd hemistich, it is quite possible that pādas a and b refer to these two different births: the poet born with skill and mind (a) would be the earthly Soma, equipped for his ritual role, while the one deposited beyond the twins (b) would obviously be the heavenly one.

IX.68.6: The famous Somaraub, i.e., the stealing of Soma from heaven effected by a falcon and treated esp. (though obscurely) in IV.26–27, is rarely mentioned in Maṇḍala IX, as Ober (II.162) points out. Here it serves to bring the heavenly Soma to earth, to join with and super-charge the earthly, ritual Soma—the difference between the two Somas having been treated in vs. 5.

As noted in the publ. intro., the omphalos vs. 5 is encased in lexical rings. Here *vividuḥ* responds to *vivévidat* in 3c (and both relate semantically to *víjjñatuḥ* in the omphalos vs., 5c), *aṃśúm* (6d) and its semantic doublet *ándhas* (6b) to *aṃśúḥ* in 4c, *pariyántam* (6d) to *pariyán* (2c) (cf. also *pariprayántam* 8a), and *suvṛdham* (6c) to *sākaṃvṛdham* (3b).

In addition to lexical rings, there is chaining: 6c *marjayanta* is picked up by 7a *mṛjanti* (with no semantic or functional difference between the stems or the voices: *marjayanta* is an -*anta* replacement); 6a *manīṣīṇaḥ* ‘possessing inspired thoughts’ by 8b *manīṣāḥ* ‘inspired thoughts’.

IX.68.7: The fingers of the pressers are found both here in pāda a and in 4d, though with different lexical realizations and different functions in the vs. There is also an exact, though mirror-image, responsion: *yató nṛbhiḥ* (4d): *nṛbhir yatāḥ* (7d). On the other hand, *hitám* in 7b almost surely belongs to *√hi* ‘impel’, while *hitám* in 5d belongs to *√dhā* ‘place, deposit’.

IX.68.8: Ge (see his n. 8a) takes *vayyām* as the PN of a hero aided by Indra to whom Soma is compared: “(einem zweiten) Vayya.” Although a hero of that name does exist, his presence seems limited to passages where he is mentioned with the better attested Turvīti (I.54.6, II.13.12, I.19.6) or, once, in a list of clients of the Aśvins (I.112.6). The du. form in II.3.6 *vayyè* (or *vayyā*; see comm. ad loc.) belongs to a separate stem *vayī-* ‘weaver’. Despite Ge’s energetic attempt to justify it, the introduction of a minor hero from the Indra cycle makes no sense here (any more than his introduction of the Aśvins in vs. 5). I therefore adopt Re’s suggestion (disc. in detail in his n.) that *vayyā-* here is a deriv. of *vayā-* ‘branch, twig’, which could easily describe the soma, esp. as the pressed juice is circling the filter (see immed. preceding *paiprayántam*) and leaving its twigs behind.

On the other hand, Ge’s explan. of *susamsādam* ‘keeping good company’ is persuasive; it refers either to the gods and priests or to the water and the milk (or, I would add, both).

The standard tr. (not, however, Scar [608]) construe *divāḥ* in c with *vācam* in d; cf., e.g., Re “... lance la voix (venue) du ciel,” which is then further interpr. as thunder (see Ge’s n. 8d, Ober II.209). But I prefer to take *divāḥ* with immed. preceding *ūrmīnā* for several reasons: 1) a pāda boundary and the verb intervene between *divāḥ* and *vācam*;

2) the *ūrmí-* from heaven is found in IX.49.1 *apām ūrmīm divás pári*; 3) the formulaic VP *íyarti vācam* (II.42.1, III.8.5, 34.2, IV.21.5, etc.) does not otherwise appear with a source of the speech specified. Surely the point here is that when the soma is being ritually prepared he/it inspires ritual speech.

IX.68.9: Here again the standard tr. supply ‘speech’ as obj. of the chained *íyarti*, as is very probable, but make *diváh* dependent on this gapped obj. (e.g., Ge “(die Stimme) des Himmels”); again I construe *diváh* elsewhere, here with *rājāḥ* ‘realm’. For the phrase cf. *divó rājāḥ* I.62.5, 110.6. The further point here is that the ritual speech inspired by Soma is impelled all the way to heaven.

The VP *várivo vidat* “finds wide space” (d) responds in sense (and partially etymologically) to *urú jrāyaḥ* “wide expanse” in 2c.

IX.68.10: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. functions as an extra-hymnic summary vs., signalled by the initial *evā*, which often begins summary vss. It is distinguished from the rest of the hymn by being in Triṣṭubh not Jagatī. Its 2nd hemistich also reaches beyond Soma: in c we call on Heaven and Earth, and d is addressed in the 2nd pl. to the gods in general, not to Soma. This pāda has the feel of a refrain, though it is found only once elsewhere, at X.45.12. However, its major elements are found in various permutations in other passages, e.g., I.85.12 *rayīm no dhatta vṛṣaṇaḥ suvīram*. For a similar finale see the next hymn, IX.69.10. On the reason for the focus on Heaven and Earth see comm. on that vs. and on IX.70 passim.

IX.69

IX.69.1: The first pāda of this vs. has an overt subject, *matīḥ* ‘thought’, as does the last, *sómaḥ*. The intervening pādas have only similes to which the missing subject is compared. In my view both the thought and the soma are possible in b and c, and the double reading is deliberate. Ge (1b) suggests that Indra is another possibility in b, but introducing Indra seems gratuitous.

The referent of init. *ásya* in d is uncertain. Since *sómaḥ* is the overt subject of the pāda and is performing his action “under the commandments of this one” (*ásya vratéṣu*), it might seem that soma is excluded as a referent. Re suggests a priest, Ge the singer or the sacrificer, or perhaps soma, Old (fld by Schmidt, *vrata* 76) soma, with the *ásya* reflexive. Since most forms of *vratá-* in IX are specifically Soma’s (e.g., IX.53.3 *ásya vratāni nādhīṣe, pávamānasya* ... “The commandments of this self-purifying one cannot be ventured against”), that seems the likeliest solution here, esp. as no ritual personnel have been mentioned as yet. However, I think it likely that we’re dealing once again with the double identity of soma/Soma: heavenly Soma the god has *vratá-*; earthly, ritual soma obeys them.

The verb of d, *ísyate*, is assigned by Ge (fld. by Kulikov 459), to \sqrt{is} ‘desire’; among other things this requires interpr. *vratéṣu* in a very forced manner, as ‘work’: “Zu den Werken dieses ist der Soma erwünscht.” Better is the ascription to \sqrt{is} ‘send’ (e.g., Gr, Re, Lub). The verb is unaccented, but (*pace* Gr, Wh Rts, Lub) it probably does not belong to the same stem as the act. transitive *-ya*-pres. *ísyati* (once 1st sg. mid. *ísyē*

IV.33.1, also transitive), but rather to a separate pass. stem with underlying accent **iṣyáte*. It is functionally parallel with *úpa sarji* ‘is/has been released’ in b.

IX.69.2: The accent of the two adjacent verbs *prcyáte sicyáte* suggests that the first clause is implicitly subordinate. The two subjects of vs. 1, the thought (*matí-*) and soma, are both found here (soma as ‘honey’ [*mádhū*]), but each as subj. of one of the verbs, rather than, as in vs. 1, as simultaneous subjects of verbs without overt subjects. Most tr. take *úpa ... prcyáte* as ‘is fertilized, impregnated’ vel sim; see the full treatment in Kulikov 152 and n. 372. Because the actions of the two verbs in the pāda are presented as complementary, I prefer the more physically explicit ‘is engorged’: as the thought is filling up and swelling with eloquence, as if with liquid, the liquid soma is being disgorged, poured out.

With the Pp as well as most tr. (see inter alia Ge’s n. 2b), I take *mandrājanī* as a karmadhāraya, *mandra-ājanī-*, rather than the equally possible bahuvrīhi *mandrá-ajanī*. But its sense, as a metaphorical reference to the tongue, is best illuminated by the bahuvrīhi (obviously based on a karmadh) *mandrá-jihva-* ‘having a gladdening tongue’.

The stem *saṃtaní-* is found 3x in the RV (here, V.73.7, IX.97.14), always with regard to loud noise. It seems generally to be assumed that it’s derived from $\sqrt{\text{tan}}$ ‘stretch’ (though Gr [s.v.] ascribes it to his 2 *tan* ‘thunder’ not 1 *tan* ‘stretch’, that seems to be a mistake: see his comment under 1 *tan* + *sám*) – hence tr. like Re’s “concert.” It is true that the ppl. *saṃtata-* to $\sqrt{\text{tan}}$ ‘stretch’ is a later (ŚS) tech. term describing “stretched and continuous recitation” (see Re’s Vocabulaire, Sen’s Dictionary of the Vedic Rituals, both s.v.), hence applied to sound, and ‘a stretching together’ for *saṃtaní-* could perhaps refer to strings sounded in unison. But a more likely root is ready to hand: $\sqrt{\text{tan}}$ ‘thunder’, the *s*-less form of $\sqrt{\text{stan}}$ ‘id.’, which can be used metaphorically of the sound of ritual speech, etc. (e.g., VI.38.2). I therefore render *saṃtaní-* as ‘thunder, thundering’ in all three occurrences. The preverb *saṃ* probably contributes its frequent intensifying sense ‘entirely’.

The sense of the simile *praghnatām iva* is not entirely clear. *prá√han* occurs only three times in the RV: here; in the enigmatic hymn, X.27.1, where, however, it has the fairly clear violent meaning ‘smite, smite off’, as it does in a number of passages in the AV; and in the negated root noun cmpd *áprahan-* (VI.44.4) also meaning ‘not smiting’. But here it must refer to the noise (“thundering,” *saṃtanīḥ*) produced by the action of *prá√han*, not the associated violence (*pace* Scar 689, who places it in the ‘zuschlagend, losschlagend, kämpfend’ realm). Perhaps *prá√han* here refers to the beating of drums, or perhaps it is an early reference to the practice of hunting with “beaters” driving the game in the direction of the shooters. On the whole, the former is more likely; we know essentially nothing about hunting practices in ancient India, and furthermore it’s not clear to me that the beaters themselves would make much noise, though the flushed game might, in combination with any dogs the beaters had with them.

IX.69.3: Ge plausibly suggests that the wives Soma is seeking (*vadhūyúḥ*) are the waters and the milk.

The ritual action referred to in b is quite clear, but the referent of the metaphorical subject is harder to decode. The act in question is the sluffing off of the twigs and other detritus as the juice runs across the filter, as is clear from the more explicit passage in the

immediately preceding hymn, IX.68.2 *upāruhaḥ śrathāyan svādate hāriḥ* “loosening his shoots, the tawny one becomes sweet,” whose verb *śrathāya-* is of course derivationally related to our verb *śrathnīté*. The problem is that the subject is feminine, *napṭīr āditeḥ* “the granddaughter (/niece/descendant) of Aditi.” As Ge (flg. Sāy.) notes, the actual referent is most likely the soma plant. But the words for soma plant (*aṃśū-*) and soma stalk (*āndhas-*) are m. and n. respectively. The best gender match would be *śadhi-* ‘plant’, but the soma plant is never so called, as far as I know, and the word is very rare in IX, where the few occurrences do not refer to the soma plant. I can only suggest that the sexualized image of the plant loosening its garments, combined with the surrounding feminine imagery (esp. 3a, 4ab) encouraged the use of an explicitly female subject – and perhaps an underlying fem. *śadhi-* was conjured up. But I am not particularly satisfied with this. Old suggests instead that the referent is the cow, “die ... ihren Verschluss locker macht d. h. Milch gibt.” Though this would solve the gender problem, it would distance the passage from the parallel in IX.68.2.

The subject is all the more puzzling because the female in question is (possibly – see below) identified as the descendant of Aditi. Now Aditi is of course famous for her motherhood, but her children are also famously sons. Brereton (*Ādityas*, 234–35) thinks that Aditi is here because of the reference to ‘truth’ (*ṛtā-*), with which she is associated elsewhere, but does not address the question of the gender of Aditi’s offspring here. Again I have no good explanation, but see below for another way of construing *āditeḥ*.

The referent of the dat. part. in the phrase *ṛtām yaté* is also disputed. Ge, I think plausibly, takes it as the soma juice, which, having shed the detritus of the plant in the filter, can flow to its goal. Lü (484 n. 1), fld. by Re, thinks rather of the mortal offerer, which is certainly possible. The issue is made more complex by the parallel in IX.74.3, whose b pāda ends, like here, *āditer ṛtām yaté*. One troubling feature is that in both cases the standard interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) construes *āditeḥ* with what precedes, although it is found in the repeated phrase and therefore might be expected to belong with what follows. Moreover, the referent of *ṛtām yaté* in IX.74.3 is no more – indeed less – clear than it is here. It could be soma or it could be the mortal worshiper. In IX.74.3 I suggest, somewhat unsatisfactorily, that it could be read both ways; here I think soma as referent makes better sense. In IX.74.3 I also suggest that we should take the repeated phrase seriously and construe *āditeḥ* to the right, not the left, yielding “for him who goes to the truth of Aditi.” If we do that here as well, we are spared the problem of why the plant is the descendant of Aditi, though without a genitive of relationship, “granddaughter” is oddly underdefined. Nonetheless I suggest a possible alternative tr.: “The granddaughter loosens (her garment [=shoots of the soma plant]) for him who goes to the truth of Aditi.” Of course it would be possible to read *āditeḥ* twice, both with what precedes and with what follows.

IX.69.4–5: There is considerable chaining between these two vss.: *pāri ... avyata* (4d), *pāri vyata* (5b); *niktām* (4d), *nirṇijānāḥ* (5b), *nirṇīje* (5c), all referring to Soma’s clothing himself in milk. On the connections with the next hymn, see comm. ad IX.70.1.

IX.69.5: The 2nd half of this vs. once again portrays Soma as reaching through the midspace to heaven. On the technicalities see Ge’s long n. 5cd.

IX.69.6: The form *prasúpaḥ* to the hapax root noun cmpd *prasúp-* is potentially multivalent; it has been analyzed as a nom. pl., modifying the soma juices, an acc. pl. obj. of *drāvayitnávaḥ* ‘causing to run’, or as an abl. infinitive (see Ge, Re, Old; Gr takes it as nom. pl.). Although most interpr. think it has to be one or the other, I see no reason why this ambig. form can’t be read twice in the passage: I take it as both acc. pl. and abl. sg. Re’s view is similar to mine, in that he wants it to serve as acc. pl. with the causative adj. as well as nom. pl., but he suggests this is the result of “haplologie à distance,” which seems unnec. to me. There are numerous examples of poets exploiting morphological ambiguity to allow a word to have two (or more) different functions in a clause.

With Ge I take the “stretched string” as a reference to the filter.

The final pāda is uncertain. Both Ge and Re take *dhāma* as the subj. of *pavate*, though with different interpr. of the resonant word *dhāman-*: “Ohne Indra läutert sich kein Ding”; “Sans Indra, nulle structure (sômique) ne se clarifie (valablement).” However, I find it unlikely that a *dhāman-*, whatever it refers to, can purify itself, and I am reluctant to take *pavate*, which in its overwhelming number of uses is reflexive, as a passive. Instead I take Soma as subject, as he essentially always is (incl. in vs. 3), with *dhāma* as the object of a transitive self-beneficial, a slight expansion of the usual reflexive usage. The sense (whatever the interpr. of *pavate*) is of course that the ritual soma-pressing is pointless without Indra, the archetypal soma-drinker, to consume the product. I think it possible that *dhāman-* ‘domain’ here refers to the filter, as in IX.63.14.

IX.69.7: The “bulls” of b (*vīṣa-cyuta-*) are generally and persuasively taken as the pressing stones (Ge, Re), but it is also possible that it’s a reference to Indra, given 6d. The presence of Indra gives impetus to the ritual preparation, just as his absence robs it of motivation.

IX.69.8: The *naḥ* in pāda a was omitted in tr.; it should read “bring us (wealth) ...”

Soma is addressed in the sg. (voc. *soma*), but the rest of the clause is couched in the pl. (“you [pl.] are ...”: *yūyám ... sthana*), with the common vacillation between the sg. substance / god and the pl. juices / pressings.

IX.69.10: The last pāda of this vs., like the 2nd half of the final vs. of the previous hymn (IX.68.10cd), enlarges the divine range beyond Soma (and Indra). It is addressed to Heaven and Earth, along with the (other) gods – the same set of divine personnel found in X.68.10cd. The focus on Heaven and Earth in both IX.68.10, and this vs. may have to do with the theme of heavenly versus earthly soma explored in these two hymns, esp. IX.68. The theme is continued in IX.70, which focuses even more on Heaven and Earth in the hymn itself, not merely the summary vs.

IX.70

On some of the difficulties in the hymn see publ. intro. Much of the problem lies in the fact that the referents of many of the crucial elements are not identified and are not easily supplied from context; it is worth noting, for example, that the word *sóma-* does not appear till vs. 7c. Framing the whole as an extended treatment of the relationship between the earthly and the heavenly soma aids in interpr. The insistence on the word *ubhé* ‘both’ (vss. 2-5) noted by Ge (n. 2–5) may underline this double vision.

IX.70.1: The opening pāda of this hymn shows the power of the ritual *hic et nunc*: the 2nd word, *asmai*, is unaccented, which indicates that the referent is something already in the discourse. This “something” is of course soma/Soma, both present on the ritual ground and the acknowledged dedicand of the hymn. There is no need for a prior mention. See also IX.11.1a and with *asya* IX.29.1a and IX.30.1a.

The first pāda has 11 syllables and a Triṣṭubh cadence, though the rest of the hymn (until the final vs. 10) is Jagatī. The SV parallel reads *duduhrire*, which would provide the extra syllable and the Jagatī cadence. Nonetheless Old cautions against adopting this reading too hastily, as the SV arrangers may have corrected the original RV reading (Noten ad loc., and esp. Prol. 278). See also X.44.7.

As noted in the publ. intro. (and see Ge’s n. 1), this vs. surely concerns the heavenly soma, whose real (*satyām*) milk mixture is produced for him in distant heaven. I do not think this necessarily requires the cows of pāda a to be the celestial rivers, as Lü predictably does (250); it may involve the interplay between earthly cows and heavenly milk.

The making of Soma’s garments was something of a preoccupation of the previous hymn, IX.69, esp. vss. 4–5, using some of the same phraseology, though the hymns are attributed to different poets from different lineages. Note esp. IX.69.5c *divás pṛsthām ... nirñije kṛta* “he has made the back of heaven for his raiment” and our 1c *catvāri anyā bhūvanāni nirñije, cārūṇi cakre* “he made the four other dear worlds for his raiment” (in my tr.), both with ACC *nirñije* √ *kṛ*. Both Ge and Lü (438, 566) take *bhūvanāni* here as “beings” (Wesen), while Re attenuates it to “essences,” but given the cosmic imagery of IX.69.5, I think that it more likely refers to Soma’s clothing himself in “worlds.” Furthermore, I am not at all sure that the substances that Ge (n. 1c, partially flg. Sāy.) considers the referent of *bhūvanāni*, namely (various) water(s) and milk, would be called *bhūvana-* in Vedic. Although German *Wesen* can cover ‘nature, essence’ in addition to ‘being’, I doubt that *bhūvana-* has the same semantic range. It does give me pause, however, that in the next vs. (2c) Soma wraps himself in the waters.

There is another problem in this little phrase – one of my own making. By my rules (“Vedic *anyā-* ‘another, the other’: Syntactic disambiguation,” in *Sound Law and Analogy* [Fs. Beekes], ed. A. Lubotsky, 1997: 111–18), 2nd position *anyā-*, the position *anyā* takes here, should be definite. I have so translated it (“the four other ... worlds”), though I cannot identify which four other worlds these would be. Neither five (1+4) or four is a standard number for cosmic divisions in the RV. The standard tr. take it as indefinite (e.g., Ge “vier andere schöne Wesen”), and I admit that an indefinite reading is less problematic (though scarcely *un*problematic). Perhaps the presence of a numeral in first position may displace *anyā-* to the right, or perhaps it even performs a quasi-definitizing function. The quantifier *viśva-* always occurs with non-initial *anyā-*, though usually pāda-final (1997: 112, 114). In any case I would now favor an alternative tr. “He made four other dear worlds to be his raiment,” though in the absence of an understanding of what the “four” are—no good solutions have so far been suggested—a definite interpr. remains a possibility.

Though Ge renders *ṛtāḥ* as “nach den Regeln,” Lü (438, 566) is surely right that *ṛtā-* here refers to hymns (Kultlieder), which are in some sense true speech. Re points out the presence of both *satyā-* (b) and *ṛtā-* (d) in the vs.

IX.70.2: The phrase *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* recurs in the same position in vs. 4 and must have the same referent. (See also IX.108.4, 110.4.) What that referent is is disputed. Unlikely is Lü's interpr. (237), fld. by Re, that it refers to a celestial seat: Soma separates Heaven and Earth in order to make a place for himself, from which he can create the heavenly streams. Ge tr. "Göttertrank," and (n. 2a) equates this with the heavenly Soma. In this I think he is correct, with *amṛta*- here the nominalized neut. '(drink) of immortality', hence the neut. form of the adj. *cāruṇaḥ*. (On supposed masc. *cāruṇaḥ* in VIII.5.14, see comm. ad loc.). The subject who seeks the share of the heavenly Soma is of course earthly Soma. He has the power to separate H+E because of his *kāvya*- 'poetic skill'; recall that earthly Soma was born as a *kavī*- in IX.68.5a, and it may be that what earthly Soma has going for him that heavenly Soma does not is his way with words and kinship with the human poet.

The lexeme used to express the separation, lit. the "loosening," of Heaven and Earth is *ví√śrath*. The same root is used in IX.68 and IX.69 to characterize Soma's sluffing off of his stems and twigs on his journey across the filter (IX.68.2b *śrathāyan*, IX.69.3b *śrathnīte*). Although the action here is very different from that in those two passages, it is worth noting that the same root, a not particularly common one, is used.

The instr. *maṃhānā* is a bit difficult to fit into context. The stem ordinarily means 'liberality, generosity'. Ge (Lü) tr. "bereitwillig," following Gr's gloss, Re "avec majesté." If we stick with the base meaning 'liberality', I think it's possible to extend it to 'lavishly' – as in "sprinkle liberally with salt," etc. Here it would refer to the generous amount of Soma's covering.

In d *yādī* must surely be decoupled into *yād ī*, as seems to be tacitly recognized by all the standard tr. "If" would not work in context.

I do not really understand the last pāda, in part because it is unclear who the subj. of *vidūḥ* is. Ge (n. 2d) tentatively suggests either the waters or the gods, Sāy. (fld. by Lü) the priests; Re's tr. implies the waters, but he alternatively suggests priests in his n. Since no priests and no gods have been mentioned so far, and the waters are found in the main cl. to which this subordinate cl. is attached, the waters seem the most likely candidate. But what is the point? Does Soma get to appropriate the waters as his garment when they come near because they know he's there (because of his fame) and recognize his seat? And which Soma are we talking about – earthly (which I weakly favor, because the waters are likely to be the ritual waters) or heavenly? The problem is compounded by the verb: the pf. *véda* is generally stative ('know'), but my tr. (and those of others) implicitly assumes a dynamic change of state, 'recognize' vel sim.; see Ge's "in Erfahrung bringen," Re's "elles eurent (re)connu (son) siège." A more stative interpr. would be possible if *yād* is rendered 'since', not 'when'. I confess to puzzlement.

IX.70.3: The dichotomy between the earthly and the heavenly continues here, with Heaven and Earth being replaced by their proxies, gods and men – implied in b by "both races" (*janúṣī ubhé*) and explicit in c in *ṇṛmṇā ca devyā ca*. The *ketú*- in pāda a also has double reference in my view: on the one hand, *ketú*- can be used of the beacon(s), that is, the ray(s), of the sun (e.g., I.50.3, VII.63.2); on the other hand, in two of the very few other occurrences of this stem in IX (IX.86.5–6) Soma's *ketávaḥ* circle around the filter, an apparent reference to the glinting soma drops. So we have a joint reference to the heavenly Soma as sun's rays and the earthly soma sparkling in its ritual progress; the two

together can pervade the two races of gods and men (b) and purify what is associated with them (c).

In d *manánāḥ* is problematic. It is a hapax, and assuming it is an *-ana*-stem, it shows aberrant accent, since such stems either have root or final accent (on the accentuation of such stems in general see AiG II.2.180–82 and on the rarity of this accent pattern 182; cf. 187 for neut. nouns with this accent). It's generally taken as a primary deriv. of \sqrt{man} in the meaning 'thoughtful'. My 'zealous' rests on an invented connection with *manā-* 'zeal', which in fact rests on nothing beyond my feeling that 'thoughtful' doesn't particularly fit the context, and in any case there are many ways to express 'thoughtful' that would not involve creating a nonce stem with a peculiar accent. But I hold no brief for my own stab in the dark and simply think that we are all missing something. On the other hand, it's likely that there is a primary or secondary connection to \sqrt{man} 'think', so most tr. fall within acceptable limits.

IX.70.4: In the first pāda we are firmly in the realm of earthly ritual soma: the grooming by ten is a clear reference (clear to those familiar with soma rhetoric) to the fingers of the presser at their task.

The question is what is happening in pāda b, and determining this depends in part on the analysis of *pramé*. This is almost universally taken as a dative infinitive or quasi-infinitive to *prá* $\sqrt{mā}$ 'measure forth'. Cf., e.g., Ge "... (fließt er), um unter den mittleren Müttern als Richtschnur zu dienen" and see, in addition to Old and Re, Lü (242–43), Scar (377–78), Keydana (Inf. 201). There are several problems with the dominant analysis: 1) the lexeme *prá* $\sqrt{mā}$ 'measure forth' is not otherwise found in the RV, except in the late X.130.3, 7, where it has been generated to *pratimā-*; 2) it is not at all clear what the pāda is supposed to mean or refer to. The standard view is that "the middle mothers" are the rains (e.g., Ge, Re; middle because they are in the midspace), but this doesn't actually help with the sense – nor does Lü's interpr. as (guess what!) die Himmelsflüsse. In fact plural "mothers" in IX, and mostly elsewhere, generally refers either to cows or to waters. None of those who favor 'rains' provides evidence for mothers=rains in the RV, and rain would be out of place in this context. Nor do I see what the "measuring" would consist of.

I suggest instead that *pramé* belongs to $\sqrt{mā}$ 'bellow' (a possibility considered, but not favored, by Scar). Although *prá* does not appear with this root in the RV, it is attested with other verbs of roaring; cf. nearby IX.77.1 *eṣá prá kóṣe ... acikradat* "This one has cried out in the bucket." Soma's propensity for noisemaking is often highlighted, indeed in this very hymn; see in the next few vss. 6b *nānadat* 'roaring again and again', 7a *ruvāti* 'bellows' (and by implication 5c *śúṣmeṇa* 'with his blustering'). Under this analysis of *pramé* the pāda can make sense in the ritual context established by pāda a: the *prá* opening b invites a verb of motion to be supplied ("[goes] forth"), depicting the journey of Soma after his pressing, which was treated in pāda a. He bellows on this journey, as he passes first among the waters and then the cows [=milk]. The "midmost mothers" are, in my view, the waters with which he mixes before reaching the milk – "midmost" because of their position between filter and milk.

As for *sácā*, as disc. ad IV.31.5 *sácā* is generally a pleonastic marker of a loc. absol. Here though I do not interpr. *madhyamāsu mātṛṣu* as an absol. construction, I would still consider *sácā* essentially functionless, just pleonastically accompanying the

loc. phrase. If we want to assign lexical value to it, however, it could express Soma's bellowing *in company* with the mothers: waters also frequently make noise.

In c the earthly soma is still at issue – here protecting the commandments (*vratāni pānāḥ*) of the heavenly Soma, once again designated *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* as in 2a; see comm. ad loc. A similar relationship between the earthly soma and the commandments of the heavenly Soma is found in the previous hymn, IX.69.1d.

IX.70.5: The repetition of a passively used part. to \sqrt{mrj} , intens. *marmṛjānā-*, matching *mṛjyāmāna-* in the opening pāda of the previous vs. 4a, situates us in the same ritual context as that vs. Again Soma sets out on his journey beyond the filter, through the territory that here is configured as “between the two worlds” (*ubhé antā ródasī*).

Forms of the root $\sqrt{hr̥s}$ sometimes take dat. infinitives; cf. VIII.19.19 *āgne hār̥sasva dātave* “O Agni, be roused to give” (sim. IV.21.9). Contrary to the standard tr., I therefore construe *indriyāya dhāyase* with *har̥sate*. The adj. *indriyā-* lit. ‘Indriyan, relating / appropriate to Indra’ has personal reference here (as also in the same phrase in IX.86.3): “for Indra’s suckling.”

On *śurúdh-* see, inter alia, KEWA, EWA both s.v., Thieme 1941 (=KISch 338–49), Scar 63, 464. The etymology is disputed, in part because the segmentation of this disyllable is unclear: *śur-údh* or *śu-rúdh-*. The former is supposed to be parallel to a putative **iṣ-údh-* found in the denom. *iṣudhyá-*, but I have suggested a different etym. for that word: see comm. ad I.128.6 and my 2020 “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūdiia-*: The Aim of Praise” (Fs. Lamberterie). The latter segmentation is favored by Thieme, who derives it from **(p)śu-rúdh-* ‘das Vieh mehrend’. Scar (464) objects that we would then expect **sū-rúdh-* (like *anū-rúdh-*, *vī-rúdh-*), but that is precisely what needs to be read here (see already Gr); otherwise the cadence is the very bad – ~ ~ ~ x. No other forms of the stem occur in the cadence; of the other 9 attestations, 5 are found after an early caesura, where a heavy first syllable would change the standard break ~ ~ ~ to a still very common – ~ ~; the other 4 occur after a late caesura ending with a heavy syllable, where – / ~ ~ would definitely be less acceptable than the normal – / ~ ~ produced by reading a light first syllable. On the whole I am inclined to accept Thieme’s etymology, at least in preference to one based on a 2nd member *-udh*, and to assume an original **sū-rúdh-*, at home here and possibly in the 5 forms after early caesura, whose first syllable was ultimately shortened by analogy to compds in *su-*.

IX.70.6: Both Ge and Re assume that the *ná* in a is wrongly placed and that the simile really targets *usríyah* (though they both somehow work the two mothers into it). I think rather that *mātārā ná* is the complete simile and the “two mothers” are being compared to the gapped goal “Heaven and Earth.” Cf. IX.97.13 *nadáyann eti pr̥thivīm utá dyā́m* “roaring he goes to H+E” to our *nānadad eti*. The “two mothers” as stand-ins for H+E are found in our little group of hymns in IX.68.4 *sá mātārā vicáran*.

The 2nd hemistich is difficult to sort out because it is unclear how to distribute the series of acc. sgs. in c: *ṛtām prathamám yát s^uvar̥ṇaram*. I take all three together, with *ṛtām* modified by *prathamám* and further specified by *yát svàr̥ṇaram*, a nominal izafe-type construction, all as obj. of *jānán*. Ge (and Re) take everything up to *yát* as obj. of *jānán*, but *svàr̥ṇaram* as obj. of *avṛṇīta*. Lü (396) has *ṛtām* as obj. of *jānán*, *yát svàr̥ṇaram* as obj. of *avṛṇīta*, and *prathamám* as adv. All three take *svàr̥ṇara-* as a place name: for Ge

a place famous for its soma, for Lüders the Himmelsquell of soma. But, as disc. ad IV.21.3, *svàṇnara-* is a name only in VIII; otherwise it seems to refer to a “realm of solar glory,” different from Heaven and Earth, as shown by IV.21.3 and X.65.4, where Heaven and Earth and various other places appear parallel to *svàṇnara-*.

However we distribute the accusatives, each of us has to decide what this hemistich is trying to say, and I would not say that any of us has succeeded in this. With regard to my own interpr., I tentatively suggest that once again its subject is the earthly, ritual soma; in his cosmic journey to and through Heaven and Earth he recognizes the sun as “the first truth” and chooses it as his alter ego, his cosmic doublet, which resounds to his own glorification. In this paraphrase I realize that it is unclear why this is the “first” truth, and I therefore consider it possible that *prathamām* is adverbial, as Lü takes it – and suggest an alternate tr. “first recognizing the truth that is the realm of solar splendor ...” But all this is very sketchy.

IX.70.7: Once again the *nirṇíj-* (see above, ad vs. 1), here firmly anchored in the ritual here-and-now as the sheepskin filter. The bovine skin (*gavyáyī tvák*) either refers to the milk mixture or the cowhide on which the pressing apparatus is set up.

IX.70.8: Although the med. part. *punāná-* is generally passive or at least used absolutely, as opposed to reflexive *pávamāna-* ‘self-purifying’, here it must be reflexive-transitive, with *tanvām*. The construction is in fact proleptic: “purifying his body/himself (so that he/it is) spotless.”

On the isolated *-iṣ-*aor. *adhāviṣṭa* and its deriv. from $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘run’ not $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ‘rinse’, see detailed disc. by Narten (Sig.Aor. s.v. *dhāv*), also Ge n. 8b, Re n.

In the publ. tr. I interpr. “threefold” (*tridhātu*) as a reference to the soma at the three soma pressings, even though the three pressings are actually not terribly prominent in this maṇḍala. The same phrase is found in IX.1.8 and similar ones at VI.44.23, IX.86.46. However, this is not the standard, or even a standard, view. Sāy. thinks it refers to three additives with which the soma is mixed: water, sour milk/curds (*dadhi*, not an additive in the RV soma ritual), and milk (*payas*), though at IX.1.8 he suggests rather three (later) soma vessels: *droṇakalāśa*, *ādhavanīya*, and *pūtabhṛt*, none of which is found in the RV (though *dróṇa* and *kalāśa-* individually are both soma vessels). Ge in both passages (IX.1 n. 8c, IX.70 n. 8d) suggests soma juice, milk, and water. Re tr. “est fabriqué de trois manières,” but does not pronounce on what they are. Since *mádhu* ‘honey’ is normally a stand-in for *sóma-* in this maṇḍala, “the honey is made threefold” (*tridhātu mádhu kriyate*) seems to refer to a three-part division of the soma itself. However, the similar phrase in IX.86.46, *mādaḥ pári tridhātuḥ ... arṣati* “the exhilarating drinks rushes around threefold,” gives me pause, in that it seems to refer to a single incident of soma’s rushing and is difficult therefore to parcel out to the three pressings. I therefore think that Ge’s suggestion that it refers to a liquid made up of three parts—soma juice, water, and milk—is probably correct, certainly at IX.86.46 but probably here and in IX.1.8 as well. “Three-backed” (*tripṛsthá-*) in nearby IX.71.7 may belong here too and also perhaps the three heads (*trīn ... mūrdhnāḥ*) of IX.73.1.

IX.70.9: The last pāda is a nice ex. of what appears to be a semi-gnomic expression.

IX.70.10: Pāda b is oddly phrased: it contains the idiom *ā pavasva*, which ordinarily means “attract X-ACC here through your purification” (see comm. ad IX.7.8 and passim), but though it has an acc. (*jaṭhāram*), it would seem quite odd to say “attract Indra’s belly here through your purification.” It seems rather to be a variant of 9b *īndrasya hārdi ... ā viśa* “enter the heart of Indra.” And the lexeme *ā pava^{te}* does seem to have a variant construction with acc. of goal. Cf. *ā pavasva ... pavītram* IX.25.6, 50.4 “purify yourself in(to?) the filter.”

IX.71

On the structure of this hymn see publ. intro. As indicated there, it is structured as a series of more or less concentric responsions. These include *āsādam* 1a / 6b; *nī riṇīte* 2a / *ā ... riṇānti* 6c; *vārṇam ... asya tām* 2b / *vārṇo asya sá* 8a; *girā* 3c / 6c; *násate* 3c / 8d – as well as others less narrowly lexical. However, these responsions don’t seem to define an omphalos.

The hymn continues the preoccupation with the clothing and coverings that Soma assumes in the course of the ritual preparation, particularly in the first two and last two vss.

IX.71.1: The first pāda poses difficulties if *dákṣiṇā* is taken as a nominative., with Sāy, Old, and apparently Re, requiring the hemistich to be chopped up into very small clauses and across the pāda boundary (acdg. to Old, *ā dákṣiṇā sṛjyate / śuṣmy āsādam, véti / druḥāḥ rakśásah pāti jāgrviḥ*) and soma not to be the subj. of passive *ā ... sṛjyate*, against standard phraseology. The syntactic difficulty disappears if, with Ge, we take *dákṣiṇā* as an instr., leaving soma as the subject throughout. This leaves us with the question of what is meant; since *dákṣiṇā* is not otherwise found in IX (though *dákṣiṇāvant-* occurs once, IX.98.10), we are on our own. I suggest that, since *dákṣiṇās* are distributed at the Morning Pressing, this is a reference to that ritual moment.

Once again there is a question of Soma’s *nirṇīj-* as in recent hymns (see comm. ad IX.69.4–5, 70.1). The phrasing here—*nábhas páya, upastíre camvòḥ ...*—is esp. reminiscent of IX.69.5d *upastāraṇam camvòr nabhasmāyam* “... an underlayer made of cloud in the two cups” and makes it quite likely that “cloud (and) milk” (that is, cloud = milk) are the underlayer here as well. In his tr. Ge makes them both to be both the headdress (*opasām*) and the underlayer and in n. 1cd suggests that the milk is the headdress and the cloud the underlayer. But, as Old points out, the close sandhi of *nábhas páyah* speaks against separating them syntactically, and *opasā-* can simply be construed with *kṛṇute* without a second object; cf. VIII.14.5 *cakrāṇā opasām divi* “making himself a headdress in heaven” (though Old thinks this passage is not typical). My tr. is closest to Re’s; Old’s notion that the poet heaped up all the items he had to mention higgledy piggledy (not his term), without sorting them, seems unlikely.

IX.71.2: In b the question is whether he *removes* his *asuryāṃ vārṇam* (Ge, WEHale 95) or *reveals* it by letting it spill down (Old, Re, Scar 686, as well as publ. tr.). The lexeme *nī√rī* here (*nī riṇīte*) is used twice in Dawn hymns (I.124.7, V.80.6) when she “lets her breast spill over” (*nī riṇīte āpsah*), in other words, when she reveals her body. The same usage is surely found here, with even more justification for the liquid imagery, since soma is indeed a liquid. Presumably with the “covering” (*vavīm*), i.e., the twigs and the

like, removed (pāda c), the golden color of the juice shows brightly – a color that could easily be associated with lordship. As Old points out, Soma is several times identified as an *ásura*-, incl. in nearby IX.73.1, 74.7. I see that in the publ. intro. I say that “Soma shed his original form and color” in this vs.; I now no longer believe that he sheds his color.

In c *pitúḥ* has two competing analyses, each of which is grammatically possible. Ge (flg. Sāy, fld. by Hale 95, Scar 341, 686) takes it as the nom. sg. to *pitú-* ‘food’ (Ge “... kommt er als Speise”). Although grammatically impeccable, this interpr. is thematically dubious: *pitú-* is not otherwise found in IX and soma is never identified as *pitú-* elsewhere. Preferable is the analysis as gen. sg. of *pitár-* ‘father’ (Re, Lü 211, publ. tr.). As Lü points out, *niṣkṛtá-* ‘rendezvous’ generally takes a gen. of the being(s) being met, so ‘of [=with] the father’ would met the expectations for such a genitive. With Lü (though without necessarily accepting all of the Lü baggage that goes with it), I think it likely that the father here is Heaven (the standard Father Heaven), once again an indication of the cosmic ambitions of the ritual Soma.

The ‘floating’ (*upaprút-*) substance he makes into his garment is universally, and convincingly, taken to be the milk mixture.

IX.71.3: This vs. is characterized by an accumulation of finite verbs, esp. in the 2nd hemistich, which contains five: ... *modate násate sādḥate ... nenikté ... yájate*.

The cloud in b can be read in two ways, ritually as the milk mixture (see *nábhas páyaḥ* in 1c; also *nabhasmáyam* in IX.69.5d, both as ‘underlayer’; also Ge’s n. 3b), but cosmically as a rain cloud. This latter sense connects nicely with the verb *vṛṣāyáte*. Soma, as often, is depicted as acting like a bull, but this verb can also be associated etymologically or folk-etymologically (on the likely etym. connection see EWA s.v. *vṛṣan-*) with *√vṛṣ* ‘rain’ (see Re’s n.). Gr and Lub both classify this form with *vṛṣāya-* ‘(make) rain’, while Ge tr. it “... wird er wie ein Bulle” (sim. Re). I consider it a pun, like the sim. form *vṛṣāyase* in X.44.4; see comm. ad loc.

Pāda c is more intricately structured than at first appears. On the one hand all three verbs, *modate násate sādḥate*, appear to be construed with the final instr. *girā*; cf., e.g., Re’s “Il jubile, caresse, réussit grâce au chant,” as well as the publ. tr. However, only the central verb *násate* is regularly construed with an instr.; *modate* is found once (X.30.5) with an instr., while the relatively rare medial *sādḥate* ‘succeeds’ generally lacks complements. Moreover, when *násate* takes the instr., it appears with the preverb *sám* – as it does in fact in vs. 8: *sám INSTR násate sám INSTR*, with the *sám* insistently repeated. In our pāda I would suggest that there is a ghostly trace of this *sám* in the opening sequence *sá modate*, which could reflect an older or underlying **sám modate*. Though this would have metrical consequences, they would be slight, since the quantity of pāda-initial syllables is always indifferent. This posited **sám* cannot be read with the immediately following verb *modate*, since *√mud* never appears with *sám* in the RV (although the rt noun cmpd *svādú-sammud-* [so accented] is found twice in AVŚ), but “skips” to the 2nd verb in the sequence. The repeated *sám* in 8d can then be interpr. as a type of poetic repair.

The verb *nenikté* ‘washes’ is of course etym. related to *nirṇíj-*, the word for garment that figures so heavily in these hymns (incl. in the immed. preceding vs., 2d), but their developed meanings are too divergent to allow the connection to be represented in Engl.

pārīman- is a hapax, but, as is generally agreed (see EWA s.v., Re's n.), it most likely belongs to $\sqrt{p\tilde{r}}$ 'fill'. It may have been formed on the model of better attested *vārīman-* 'broadness', which ends the next vs. and occupies the same metrical slot. Both these words function in much the same way as *tānā* 'in its full measure/extent', which ends vs. 2.

IX.71.4: The first hemistich contains two untethered genitives, *sāhasaḥ* and *mādhvaḥ*. The first of course evokes the common phrase *sūnū- sāhasaḥ* "son of strength," and 'son' is easily supplied (see Old, Ge n. 4a, etc.). *mādhvaḥ* is more problematic. In fact Ge identifies it instead as a nom. pl. fem. (presumably to a stem **mādhū-*? though we might expect trisyllabic reading *mādh^uvaḥ*), referring to the Apsarases, who in IX.78.3 (which contains the other ex. of the phrase *harmyāsya sakṣāṇīm*) do prepare the soma. Despite this parallel, his suggestion has little to recommend it: the Apsarases are not otherwise called 'sweet, honied', and *mādhv-* is so typed as a synonym/descriptor for soma and its gen.-abl. *mādhvaḥ* so well attested that it is hard to image how an audience could force the fem. pl. interpr. on this word with so little to go on. In the publ. tr. I sneaked it in as parallel to *sāhasaḥ*, but this is not very satisfactory. Old suggests supplying *rāsam* 'sap' or *ūrmīm* 'wave', both of which appear with dependent *mādhvaḥ*, with *rāsa-* more common. I would now tr. "(sap) of honey" (so also Re, Scar 39).

Ge (n. 4b) plausibly suggests that the "secure house" (*harmyā-*) is the plant's husk.

The second hemistich depicts a somewhat outlandish situation: cows preparing their milk on the "head" (*mūrdhān-*) of Soma. IX.93.3 contains a similar picture: cows preparing Soma's head with milk, using both *mūrdhān-* and *śrīṇanti* as here. Both clearly refer to the mixing in of the milk; if the mixing involves pouring the milk into a vessel containing soma, the upper surface of the soma could be considered his "head."

With Ge (fld. by Scar 39), contra Pp., I read dat. *suhutāde* not *suhutādaḥ*. The dat. would refer to Indra, while the *suhutādaḥ* as nom. pl. would modify the cows, who are not typically eaters of oblations, or as abl.-gen. sg. would have no obvious referent. See Old's efforts in that direction.

On *vārīman-* see disc. of *pārīman-* in vs. 3.

IX.71.5: On *bhurīj-* see comm. ad IX.26.4.

Though chariot-making is a common trope and regular comparandum in the RV, it is not usual (at least as far as I can recall) to compare the preparation of soma with the assembling of a chariot. It may appear here because the thus-prepared Soma is about to follow the track of the cow, at least in my interpr.

The grammatical identity of *jīgāt* in c is disputed. It appears to be, and is usually taken as, an injunc. to the redupl. pres. *jīgāti* (Gr, Macd [VGr, p. 342], Lub, Hoff. [Inj. 271 n. 12, but hesitantly]; by implication Ge and Re), but Old (and by implication Lü 252) suggests that it's a nom. sg. pres. part. and, on the grounds of *pānt-* and *yānt-*, sees no difficulty with this analysis. But, of course, for a redupl. pres. the weak form of the participial suffix is expected even in "strong" forms, and is in fact found in participles to other redupl. pres. to roots in *-ā*, $\sqrt{dā}$ and $\sqrt{dhā}$, with well-attested nom. sg. m. *dādat-*, *dādhat-*. Though I accepted Old's word (as I so often do) in the publ. tr., I now think *jīgāt* is better taken as an injunc., though this need not change the actual tr.: "As he goes, he

extends ...,” with implicitly subordinated 1st verb in a two-verb sequence. “He goes, he extends ...” is of course also possible.

The interpr. of the rest of the hemistich is uncertain, due to differing opinions about the sense and syntactic position of *padám*. With regard to its sense, *padá-* is of course multivalent: ‘footprint, track, place’ and ultimately ‘word’. As for its syntax, does it belong in the main clause beginning in c, modified by *apīcyām*, with *yád* in d beginning a new cl., or does it belong to the *yád* cl. of d? Ge follows the latter tack, with two NPs, *góḥ apīcyām* and *padám*, in two separate clauses: “er stürzt sich auf das Geheimnis der Kuh, wenn die Andächtigen(?) seine Stätte bereitet haben,” with *padá-* = ‘place’. The Geheimnis der Kuh is the milk (n. 5c). There is nothing impossible here, but the adj. *apīcyā-* ‘secret’ invites association with *padá-*, on the basis of the semantics of the formulaic phrase “hidden track,” which is found in IX in IX.102.2 *gúhā padám* and IX.10.9 *divás padám ... gúhā hitám*. Both Re and Lü take *apīcyām padám* together, but Re interprets *padám* as ‘word’ (“le mot secret de la vache” – though ‘word’ for *padá-* is barely found in the RV if at all) and Lü as ‘place’, which he further specifies, in his usual style, as the “Milchflut im Himmel.” On the basis of the formula just cited, I prefer ‘track’, with the verbs of motion in c indicating that Soma is following this track (which, on the basis of 102.2 I think is the track through the filter) to his rendezvous with the milk.

matútha- is a hapax whose formation is unclear, but a derivation from \sqrt{man} ‘think’ is the default (see EWA s.v. *MAN*¹). It merits no mention in AiG (at least acdg. to the index thereto), but see Re’s plausible suggestion that it is connected to *mántu-*.

IX.71.6: Act. trans. (*ā*) *riṇanti*, with priests vel sim. as subj. and soma as obj., contrasts with medial (*nī*) *riṇīte* in 2, with soma as subj. and a self-involved, reflexive-type meaning.

I supply ‘stall’ as the goal in the simile on the basis of passages containing *āpi* \sqrt{i} with *pāthah* as goal (I.162.2, II.3.9, III.8.9, VII.47.3). It is not necessary, however.

IX.71.7: A complex vs. esp. in the 2nd hemistich.

In the publ. tr. I take *pāda* a as a nominal sentence with *pārā* as predicate: “far away is ...” I now think a verb of motion, almost surely from \sqrt{i} , should be supplied: “Away (goes) the ruddy poet ...” The lexeme *pārā* \sqrt{i} is matched by *parāyatī(ḥ)* in *pāda* c, by my analysis (for which see below). The reference is once again to Soma’s journey from the filter to the rendezvous with the milk.

“Three-backed” (*tripṛṣṭha-*) is probably to be interpr. like *tridhātū* in nearby IX.70.8. Pace Lü (708–9) I very much doubt it refers to his threefold heavenly Soma.

Pāda c lacks a syllable, which is not easily recovered. This simply adds uncertainty to an already problematic *pāda*. The subject is *yātīḥ*, taken by all (incl. me) as a *-ti*-stem deriv. to \sqrt{yam} ‘hold, control’. It should in origin be a fem. abstract ‘control’ vel sim., but like other exx. of the formation has acquired a personal agentive sense (on which transference see AiG II.2.637) – hence my ‘marshall’ (for awk. ‘holder-fast, controller’).

More puzzling is *parāyātī* (Saṃhitā), beginning with what its underlying form is. The Pp gives *parāyātīḥ*, which is accepted by all the standard interpr., but also possible in this sandhi context would be *parāyātī* and *parāyātīḥ*. The standard view is that the form is

composed of *parā* and the selfsame *-ti*-abstract *-yāti-* that immediately precedes it and that it also is a nom. sg. masc. referring to Soma – hence Ge’s “abseits lenkend(?),” Re’s “poussant en arrière,” etc. But the lexeme *parā* √*yam* doesn’t exist in the RV – or anywhere else for that matter. What does exist, and fairly commonly, is *parā* √*i* ‘go away, depart’. In fact in the pres. part. it is used once of the Dawns, the same Dawns who appear in our pāda d: I.113.8 *parāyatīnām ānu eti pāthah* “She [=current Dawn] follows the troop of those who go away [=previous Dawns].” I suggest here that we have an acc. pl. fem. pres. part. It should be accented **parāyatīs*, but it is not difficult to imagine that its accent could have been retracted redactionally to match preceding *yātiḥ*. This pres. part. then modifies *pūrvīr uṣāsaḥ* in the following pāda and is part of the simile *rebhó ná* in that pāda. I take *rebhā-* ‘hoarse-voiced (singer)’ (on which gloss see comm. ad VI.3.6) here as referring to Agni as often (incl. I.113.17, in the hymn just cited). Like Agni, Soma ‘radiates’ (√*rājati*). With Lü (708) and Gotō (1st cl., 268 n. 612) I take the verb to √*rāj* ‘shine’, not, with Gr, Ge, Re, to √*rāj* ‘rule’.

IX.71.8: On the responsions between 8a and 2b and between 8d and 3c, see comm. ad locc.

On the basis of 9b, “the glittering form” seems to be appropriated from the sun.

The sequence of tense in b is somewhat troubling. The main cl. contains a pres. *sédhati*, which seems to express a general truth. The condition on this truth is expressed by the subordinate *yātra* cl., but we should then expect either a pres. “when he lies down” or an aor. or pf. of the immed. past “when he has lain down” – as I in fact tr. *āśayat* -- but this is not a normal use of the imperfect.

Properly speaking we would expect the acc. pl. to be accented **srídhaḥ*, as it normally is. Formally this should be an oblique sg., but that analysis simply doesn’t work in context.

IX.72

In contrast to the contorted thought and metaphorical flights of the first few hymns in the trimeter group (IX.68-71), this one is relatively straightforward, with the major exception of vs. 3.

IX.72.1: The accent on *īráyati* and its juxtaposition with another finite verb, *hinváte*, marks the former as implicitly subordinate.

On the hapax *pariprī-* see Scar 337–38.

IX.72.2: The subordinating *yád* appears fairly late in its clause in b, though what precedes it all belongs to the predicate (though consisting of two NPs).

In c *yádī* must clearly be dissolved into *yád ī*, esp. given the parallelism between the subordinate clauses of b and cd.

IX.72.3: Although the major problem in this vs. is the impossible hapax *vinamgrsāḥ* in c, the puzzlement begins with b. What does it mean that Soma goes “across the dear bellow of the daughter of the Sun” (*sūryasya priyām duhitús tiró rávam*), and in particular what is the daughter of the Sun doing here? She is found twice elsewhere in IX in the full phrase *sūryasya duhitár-*: at IX.1.6, where she purifies the soma, and IX.113.3, where she

brings soma in the form of rain, as well as, most likely, named only as *duhitār-* in IX.97.47 (for which see below). Ge (see esp. n. 3b to IX.113.3) considers her “die Rede- und Gesangeskunst selbst,” on the basis of a dubious reading of III.53.15 (see comm. ad loc.), and so in our passage he interpr. her bellow as the song of the priests, which the noisy soma “übertönt” (n. 3b); Re partially follows him by supplying “au chant des prêtres” to gloss “à la chère rumeur de la Fille du soleil” in his tr., but supplies a verb of motion with *tírah*: “(passant) outre,” though without comment. But Ge’s interpr. requires that *tírah* ‘across’ when construed with a noun referring to noise can mean something like “(sing) over, drown out.” But when independent, *tírah* always governs an expression of space, e.g., in IX *tírah rájāmsi* “across the realms” (IX.3.7–8), *tírah pavítram* “across the filter” (IX.68.2, 109.16). Tellingly, *tírah* is once used with an acc. of noise, calls, but these are conceived of spatially, as the calls of other sacrificers which the Aśvins should travel across to arrive at my sacrifice: VII.68.2 ... *gantam havíṣo vītáye me / tiró aryó hávanāni* “come to pursue my offering / across the calls of the stranger.” There is, however, another, idiomatic, use of *tírah*, with the root $\sqrt{dhā}$ in the meaning ‘hide (oneself), disappear’. An example is found in the next hymn, IX.73.3 *mahāḥ samudrām vāruṇas tiró dadhe* “As great Varuṇa, (Soma) has hidden himself in the sea.” Another is found in conjunction with the word *duhitār-*, identified above as another example of daughter (of the Sun) by most (incl. Ge, Re): IX.97.47 *tíro várpāmsi duhitúr dádhānaḥ* “hiding himself in the forms of the daughter (of the Sun).” In that passage I identify the “forms of the daughter (of the Sun)” as the milk, so called because it is white and gleaming like the Sun; in other words, this is yet another version of the mixing of soma with milk. And I now further suggest that that is what we have here as well – that we should supply a form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ to produce the same idiom we find more clearly in the next hymn and in IX.97.47. The sticking point is then *rávam*: what does it mean to “hide himself in the *bellow* of the daughter of the Sun”? I would suggest that it is an example of standard RVic breviloquence as well as synaesthesia. The “bellow” refers to the characteristic sound of cows, who were already mentioned (*gāh*) in the preceding pāda, so the phrase “the bellow of the daughter of the Sun” collapses the sound and the visual appearance associated with the milk=cows. I would now tr. the hemistich “Not stopping, he goes beyond (the filter) toward the cows, hid(ing himself) in the dear “bellow” of the daughter of the Sun [=milk].”

There is comparatively little sensible to say about the hapax *vinamṛśá-*, though it is possible to indulge in speculation. Perhaps the only truly sensible thing to note is that it is a partial anagram of the patronymic of the poet (Harimanta) Āṅgīrasa: (*vin*)*amṛśa-*, and such phonological associations often drive the appearance of problematic forms. Sāy. glosses it *stotā* ‘praiser’ on the basis of context and a rather perfunctory stab at etymology. Ge renders it ‘arm’ on the basis of Naigh. 2.4 and, again, context: the mention of the fingers in the following pāda would support that interpr. But the word as we have it does not look analyzable acdg. to Indo-Aryan morphological structure: save for the initial *vi* there is no sign of internal structure, and segmenting the *vi* does not produce anything that looks promising on the surface. As Ge points out (*pace* Old), the context is erotic. The initial *ānu* certainly belongs with *jōṣam* in the standard idiom *ānu jōṣam* “according to (one’s) pleasure,” with unaccented *asmai* intervening in Wackernagel’s position. But with Ge (n. 3c) I would now also read it with *abharat* in the erotic idiom *ānu √bhr* ‘penetrate sexually, stick (one’s penis) in’, as discussed in my 1980 “A Vedic Sexual

Pun: *ástobhayat*, *anubhartrī*, and RV I.88.6” (*Acta Orientalia* 42) – though in that article (p. 59 n. 4) I more or less discounted this passage. Acdg. to this reading, *asmai* would be Soma and the recipient of the sexual act, while the *vinamgrśá-* is the sexual actor. As noted in the publ. intro., erotic contexts often contain slang and twisted expressions that we cannot access.

At this point we leave the realm of even shaky evidence and enter that of pure speculation. Although the word we have cited is *vinamgrśáh*, in its sandhi context it might also begin **dvi-*: *abharad vinamgrśáh* could be a degemination of *abharad* **dvinamgrśáh*, of the type I have recently discussed in several publications (esp. “False Segmentations and Resegmentations in the Rigveda: Geminatio and Degeminatio,” 2021, Fs. Pinault; also “Hidden in Plain Sight: Some Older Verbal Endings in the Rig Veda, 2019, Fs. Yoshida). There are no metrical implications. If we segment off *dvi-* ‘two, bi-’, *namg-* (*/ nanig-*) could be analyzed as a metathetic taboo deformation of *nagná-* ‘naked’, of a type that the ‘naked’ word has often received across Indo-Europea. A compd with the meaning ‘having two naked ...’ could refer to the arms of the presser (per Naigh. cited above, which cites *vinamgrsau* as a dual and glosses *bāhū*) or to the pressing stones, and the sexual act would be the violent pressing itself. (If there is anything to this, the phrase *nībāhubhyām coditáh* “driven by the two arms of men” in 5a might be a reparative paraphrase.) Even by this flight of fancy I cannot figure out what to do with *-rsa-*, whose lack of ruki is another peculiar, non-Indo-Aryan-looking feature. And just to throw in another off-the-wall suggestion, in my 1980 article I suggested that the *anubhartrī-* of I.88.6 was a veiled reference to the musical instrument, the *vīnā-*, and the beginning of our word *vinam(-grśa)-* could be a play on that. None of this is worth much, which is why I leave the word untransl.

Having pronounced the word uninterpretable, Re simply ignores it in his tr., though curiously provides a fem. subject, presumably the daughter of the Sun: “elle lui offrait ses charmes,” a tr. of extreme erotic delicacy.

IX.72.4–5: These two vss., in the center of the hymn, are constructed in parallel. To begin with, the post-caesura portion of 4d and 5b are identical: *pavate sóma indra te*. Both vss. also begin with a sequence of AGENT/INSTR. + past part. expressions: 4a has the compds *nī-dhūto ádri-sutáh*, while 5a has the analytic expressions *nībāhubhyām coditó dhārayā sutáh*, with the 1st member of the 1st phrase (*nī-*) and the 2nd ppl. (*sutá-*) repeated. The last of the phrases contains a non-agentive instr. *dhārayā* ‘in a stream’ that nonetheless fits the morphological template. The two vss. diverge otherwise, though the beginnings of 4c and 5c, *púram(dhivān)* and *āprāḥ* respectively have an etymological connection that would no doubt be clear to the audience. As noted in the publ. intro., no particular message seems to be conveyed by this omphalos-like structure, unless it is to put the abruptly addressed Indra in the center of the action. It is also the case that this is the first instance of $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’ in the hymn, and the quintessential IXth Maṇḍala med. verb *pāvate* ‘purifies himself’ appears in these two matching phrases and in vss. 7–9 (7d *pavate*, 8a *pavasva*, 9d *pavamāna*).

IX.72.4: Although both Ge and Re tr. *-dhūta-* as ‘shaken’, I prefer the more technical soma-ritual sense ‘rinse’. On $\sqrt{dhāv}$ ($\infty \sqrt{dhav}$ $\infty \sqrt{dhū}$) ‘rinse’ as a semantic

specialization of the same root meaning ‘shake’, see EWA s.v. *DHAV*¹, Gotō [1st Cl. 186–89]). This root complex is distinct from $\sqrt{dhā}v$ ‘run’. See further ad vs. 8 below.

Both Ge and Re take *pradīvaḥ* with what precedes; this is entirely possible and impossible to determine. Not much rests on it.

IX.72.5: On 3rd sg. *ajais* and its AV replacements, see Narten (Sig.Aor. 119–20).

IX.72.6: There is a sharp split of opinion on the grammatical identity of *punarbhūvaḥ*. Gr, Scar (361), and the publ. tr. – as well as, probably, Ge (his “immer aufs neue” is not totally clear) – take it as a nom. pl. fem. with the cows and the thoughts; Re and Lü (224–25), the latter cited verbatim by Ober (II.149), as gen. sg. masc. dependent on *sādane* and referring to Soma. Not surprisingly Lü is esp. adamant and sees the whole vs. as a depiction of Soma’s “Aufstieg in den Himmel,” where he is reborn. I am open to either grammatical analysis. The word order might favor the dependence on immed. preceding *sādane* and thus the gen. sg. interpr. On the other hand, the two other attestations of *punarbhū-* are fem. (though neither is pl.), and in conjunction with *saṃyātaḥ* ‘in uninterrupted array’, it could describe the constantly new, but always similar, sequence of milk-mixtures and hymns in the soma ritual. However, it is possible to adopt the gen. sg. interpr. without subscribing to the journey to heaven: Soma can be considered reborn or regenerated because the pressing has rendered a new substance from the plant. I would therefore entertain an alt. tr. “The cows and thoughts ... go together to him in the womb of truth, in the seat of the regenerated (soma),” though I favor the fem. pl.

IX.72.7: The first pāda gives a classic description of Soma as a pillar reaching from earth (specifically the ritual ground) to heaven, as the support of the latter.

In d *cāru* is probably adverbial, although, since *cāru* in the gen. appears four times with *amṛtasya* ‘(drink of) immortality’, it’s possible that we should supply neut. *amṛtam* here and tr. “purifies himself (as the drink of immortality) dear to the heart.”

IX.72.8: This is the first time in the hymn that Soma appears in the 2nd ps.; the previous 2nd ps. address was to Indra (4d, 5d). It is also the first appearance of the 1st ps. ‘we’ of the human worshippers.

The nasal pres. *dhūnoti* is generally considered to express only the ‘shake’ meaning of the root complex $\sqrt{dhā}v$ ($\infty \sqrt{dhav} \infty \sqrt{dhū}$), on which see comm. ad vs. 4 above, while *dhāvati* is considered the only pres. to ‘rinse’. Therefore the pres. part. *ādhūnvaté* should mean ‘shaker’ here. Gotō (187) seems to see in this passage a sort of play on words with *-dhūta-* in 4a, tr. “dem Preisenden und dem ‘Schüttelnden’ hilfreich seiend,” with ‘shaker’ in quotes. But I think the nasal pres. was available in a context like this to express the specialized ‘rinse’ sense; I find it difficult to believe that *-dhūta-* in 4a and *ādhūnvaté* here are meant to belong to different roots, esp. since they both refer to humans’ ritual activity in preparing soma. Note that this is the only form of *dhūnoti* that appears with *ā*, which is the standard preverb with *dhāvati* ‘rinses’. The preverb here may be participating in a type of repair: the compd. in 4a *nī-dūta-* does not have the preverb, quite possibly because **nrādhūta-* by losing the syllabic quality of its 1st member would be hard to parse and lose the symmetry with *nībāhubhyām* in 5a. The nasal pres. may

have been used here so the root syllables of the two forms could be matched (*dhū*) and also to avoid confusion with *dhāvati* ‘runs, streams’, which is quite common in IX.

IX.73

On the key to this hymn, see publ. intro. Old argues that it is a hymn for rain, but I don’t see that (nor does Ge), despite the presence of Varuṇa. Both Ge and Old properly remark on the repeated phrase *sām asvaran*.

IX.73.1: As noted in the publ. intro., I consider it significant that the repeated phrase *sām asvaran* never has an overt subject, allowing for double ref.: the soma streams roaring as they cross the filter and the priest-poets accompanying this journey with hymns. I therefore would reject the various subjects supplied here by various tr.

I interpr. *drapsāsya dhāmataḥ* as a species of gen. absol., though it could be dependent on one of the implicit subjects of the verb, namely the soma streams.

I am not entirely sure what b is telling us. In the immediately preceding hymn (IX.72.6) as well as elsewhere in IX, the “womb of truth” (*ṛtāsya yóni-*) is the place where the soma and the milk mix; the verb *sām aranta* “have joined together” invites us to interpr. this as expressing that mixture here as well. If so, then what are the “ties of lineage” (*nābhayah*)? I would tentatively suggest that it refers to the ultimate kinship of cow and bull (that is, of milk and soma). This may be supported by a passage in the next hymn, IX.74.4, where soma, after this mixture, is referred to as “the navel of truth” (*ṛtāsya nābhiḥ*). It is also possible that it’s a reference to the unexpressed double subject that “sounded in unison” in the preceding pāda – that is, the roaring soma streams and the singing poets. Their “ties of lineage” would be based on their joint vocalization, and they meet and join together on the part of the ritual ground where the soma is readied for offering to the gods. Others of course have different opinions: for Ge it’s gods and men, for Lü (234–35, fld. by Re) the heavenly and earthly soma.

In c, acdg. to Ge and Re, the *ásura* created (*cakre*) for himself three heads, either (Ge; see also WEHale 79) so he could seize the soma (probably; see Ge’s n. 1 cd) or (Re) so he could be more easily seized. By contrast, I interpr. *cakra ārabhe* as a periphrastic caus.: “made/caused his three heads to be seized,” with the *ásura-* = Soma, as also in the next hymn, IX.74.7; note also his *asuryām vāṇam* in nearby IX.71.2. It would help, of course, to know what the “three heads” are, but I suggest that since *mūrdhán-* is often a ‘peak’, it may be the same as Soma’s three backs (see the bahuvr. *tripṛsthá-* twice nearby in IX.71.7 and 75.3). As for these expressions of triplication, see the speculations ad IX.70.8. Whatever the identity of the heads, I think the point is that, after the various stages of preparation, Soma is making himself available for ritual use, allowing himself to be “seized” and distributed into the cups. This interpr. is supported by 3d, which contains the acc. inf. *ārabham*, matching *ārabhe* here.

In d note *satyāsya* opening the pāda, which contrasts with *ṛtāsya* in the same position in b. Although I am given pause by IX.89.2 *ṛtāsya nāvam* (like our *satyāsya nāvah*), I think the two genitives must be interpr. differently. I suggest that it is Soma who is *satyá-* here: ‘trusty’ as in the publ. tr., or even ‘really present’, referring to the prepared soma on the ritual ground. Sāy’s notion that the boats are the soma cups is quite plausible, though Ge (n. 1d) prefers the hymns.

IX.73.2–4: Ge considers these vss. “doppelsinnig,” with ref. both to the priest-poets and the soma juices. This seems quite reasonable, and his individual notes are worth the attention.

IX.73.2–3: The three even-numbered pādas 2d, 3b, 3d all end with an augmented 3rd pl. redupl. aorist: *apīparan*, *avīvipan*, and *avīvrdhan* respectively.

IX.73.2: As Ge (n. 2a) points out *ahēṣata* can be either transitive (‘have propelled [soma]’) or intransitive/passive (‘have surged / been propelled’); both usages are paralleled in IX – see the passages cited by Ge. Moreover, as he also points out (and see again his cited passages), *mahiṣā-* ‘buffalo’ can refer either to soma or to the priests. Thus, to spell out the two senses: “the buffalos [=soma streams] have been propelled / the buffalos [=priests] have propelled (the soma).” The choice of both a noun subject and a verb form that allow double interpr. is unlikely to be accidental, esp. in this hymn of floating reference.

In b the subj. *venā-* can elsewhere refer either to soma (though usually in the sg.) or to priest-poets; see comm. ad VIII.100.5. The unexpressed element in the pāda is the obj. of *avīvipan* ‘have set atremble’. Both speech and soma (streams) are appropriate objects. If soma (streams) are the referent of the subject *venāḥ*, then speech is likely the object. Cf. IX.96.7 *prāvīvipad vācā ūrmīm nā sīndhur, gīraḥ sōmaḥ* “Like a river its wave, self-purifying Soma has sent the wave of speech, the hymns, pulsing forth.” If the priests are the subject, then soma is most likely the obj. Although there are no transitive forms of \sqrt{vip} that take soma as obj., note that in nearby IX.71.3 soma is the subj. of the intrans. *vēpate* ‘he trembles’.

In the 2nd hemistich again the unexpressed subj. can be priest-poets or soma streams. Both can “give birth to chant” – the priest-poets directly, soma by inspiring ritual speech -- and both can strengthen Indra’s body.

As Ge (n. 2c) appositely points out, *arkā-* can refer to the roar of the rushing soma, but it can of course also refer to the hymns of the poets. In c pāda-final *íd* seems relatively functionless: “just the chant / the chant alone” does not seem to add to the sense – unless it somehow underscores the double reading just suggested. Perhaps it’s simply there to convert a putative Triṣṭubh cadence to a Jagatī.

IX.73.3: Again, the subject of the verb in pāda a is unexpressed. On the basis of *pavītravant-* ‘provided with the filter’, one might expect that the referent is the ritual officiants, but note that the other occurrence of this -*vant-* stem in IX, at IX.101.4, modifies *sōmāḥ*. Again, I think both readings are meant.

On *tiró dadhe* see comm. ad IX.72.3. Though Ge and Old take it as transitive (Ge “... hat den Ozean verborgen (?)”), Re and Lü (268) interpr. it as reflexive ‘hid himself in x’, correctly in my view; Old explicitly rejects the reflexive interpr., but the middle voice makes this the more likely one. Old is motivated by his unconvincing interpr. of the hymn as a rain charm. In the ritual context the “hiding” refers to the post-pressing mixing of soma with water: the soma disappears into it.

In d *śekuḥ ... ārabham* “they have been able to seize” responds to 1c *cakra ārabhe* “caused to be seized.” Their connection would have been clearer in the publ. tr. if they were tr. with identical renderings of $\tilde{a}\sqrt{rabh}$, rather than “to take hold of” here. I would

therefore emend the tr. to “have been able to seize.” The questions then are what is the referent of *dharúṇeṣu* and how does it relate to *ārábham*? In the flanking hymns, IX.72.7 and 74.2 sg. *dharúṇa-* is the soma itself. I am inclined to take the pl. here as referring to the soma configured in parts – in particular to the ‘heads’ of 1c, which soma caused to be seized (by my interpr.). The shared verb *ā√rabh* certainly encourages this identification. The point would be that only the insightful know how to separate soma from the cleansing waters. This interpr. requires that *ā√rabh* can take a loc. of what is grasped, in addition to the more common acc. (as in 1c). For a passage with such a loc. see I.168.3 and comm. thereto. By contrast Ge takes the *dharúṇa-* not as parts of soma but as instruments in which to seize him, namely the soma cups (n. 3d; apparently fld. by Lü [268]). The use of the stem *dharúṇa-* in the sg. to refer to soma makes his interpr. difficult to sustain.

IX.73.4–5: See comm. on IX.41.1–2 on the similarity of phraseology in these two pairs of vss. These vss. usher in the use of ritual speech against a variety of enemies.

IX.73.4: The first hemistich seems clearly (at least to me) to contrast the ritual soma streams on earth (a) with those in heaven (b), though curiously it does not seem to have caught Lü’s attention. That pl. *asaścátāḥ* elsewhere (IX.57.1, 62.28) explicitly modifies *dhāráḥ* ‘streams’ makes that identification in b quite likely. See also IX.74.6 in the next hymn, with similar phraseology, where ‘streams’ is also the likely referent of *asaścátāḥ*, and at least one reading involves a contrast between earthly and heavenly soma.

As pointed out also by Ge and Re, the mention of spies in c extends the Varuṇa identification from the preceding vs.

The binding snares in d are surely the curls of the sheep’s wool of the filter that can obstruct the progress of the liquid.

IX.73.5–6: These two vss., almost in the center of the hymn, have a similar structure. Their first pādas are nearly identical: ABL ABL *ádhy ā yé samásvaran* “Those who sounded in unison from X X.” The second pādas simply further describe the unspecified subject of the first pādas, while their second hemistichs present what happens to evil beings as a result of the sounding in unison of the first. See also Old on the symmetry of the vss. and how this affects their interpr.

IX.73.5: With Sāy. and Re but contra Ge, I consider the father and mother of pāda a to be Heaven and Earth, matching that same pair in d. The reference is to the earthly and heavenly soma of 4a and b, which “sound in unison,” though also including the priest-poets, as disc. in the publ. intro. They marshall their joint power, embodied in the *māyā* associated with Varuṇa, against those “without commandments” (*avratān*); *vratā-* are of course esp. associated with Varuṇa, and by virtue of their presence in both heaven and earth can banish enemies from both places.

Note the return of *√dham* ‘blow’ from 1a. In its earlier occurrence this root simply expressed the action of the drop (*drapsāsya dhámataḥ*), but here the verb has been weaponized, as it were, against enemies.

IX.73.6: Ge interpr. *māna-* as “Tonweise” and then imposes a musical-mode interpr. on the whole 1st hemistich, an interpr. that infects Re as well. With Old I find this “zweifelhaft.” In the publ. tr. it is rendered ‘edifice’; for *māna-* as some sort of building see VII.88.5, where JPB tr. ‘mansion’. Because of the structural parallelism with 5a (see comm. above), I would prefer that this abl. phrase refer to a place. The “ancient edifice” can be both soma’s seat in heaven and the place, or seat, on the ritual ground where soma mixes with the milk and the priest-poets sing their hymns. For a similar phrase see I.107.5 *pratnām sadhāstham āsadat* “he [=Soma] has taken his ancient seat.”

As for *ślōka-yantra-*, in my view it simply expresses the fact that sound – both the sound of the soma streams and the sound of the hymns of the priest-poets – guides and accompanies the soma along the journey of its preparation.

I am less certain about what to do with *rabhasāsyā mātavaḥ*, in part because the exact nuance of the fairly rare word *māntu-* is not clear. (Old’s disc. here seems off the point.) Although in cmpds (*sumāntu-*, etc.) it seems to have the quasi-infinitival sense ‘... to think about / contemplate’ (see AiG II.2.663), as a free-standing noun it generally is glossed as ‘counsel, counselor’ corresponding to Old Avestan *mantu-* (e.g., Gr, AiG II.2.663). This works reasonably well for *mātavaḥ* in X.63.8 (All Gods), but the other two passages containing *māntu-* (I.152.1, X.32.4) are too obscure to shed any light – though ‘counsel, counselor’ is not entirely excluded. The poss. deriv. *mantumant* (3x, always voc., never accented) is compatible with a sense ‘possessing (wise) counsel’ in all three passages (esp. VI.56.4), though the case is not overwhelming, given the semantic independence of vocatives. Since *rabhasā-* is elsewhere used of the pressed soma drinks (I.82.6 *sutāso rabhasāḥ*), I take sg. *rabhasāsyā* as referring to soma here as well, but this leads to a possible contradiction: if the soma streams are one of the subjects of *ā ... samāsvaran*, then how can they be counselors of themselves / -ves? The phrase would work better if it applied only to the priest-poets who form the other part of the subject of the verb. Since *ślōkayantra-* also works better if it applies only to one part of the subject, namely the soma streams, I now think that pāda b involves a non-overtly conjoined NP: “those with a signalling call for their reins [=soma streams] (and) the counselors [=priest=poets] of the wild one [=Soma].” I would therefore emend the tr. to what was just suggested. This is the closest we have come to specifying who the subj. of the repeated verb is, though both NPs are so opaque that nothing much is given away.

IX.73.7: The first hemistich now begins to solve the riddle of the double reference, by situating the poets in (or at) the filter, purifying their speech like the soma streams that cross the filter.

I do not know why the Maruts appear here, esp. as spies – quite distinct from Varuṇa’s spies in 4c, as Ge (n. 7d) also asserts. Ge’s explanation for bringing in the Maruts is dependent on his musical mode interpr. of vs. 6 and therefore not helpful.

I would change the tr. of *svāñcaḥ* in d to “of lovely outlook” (from “well directed”). See comm. ad VI.15.10.

IX.73.8: The subject here is of course Soma, though tricked out with Varuṇian vocabulary (see, e.g., Lü 402–3).

It is not clear what the three filters (*trī ... pavitrā*) are; the phrase recurs in IX.97.55 with equal lack of clarity – though there all three don’t have to be fitted into the

heart. The three filters here recall the three heads of 1c, though I do not think the referents are the same.

IX.73.9: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs., esp. its first hemistich, provides the solution to the implicit riddle of the hymn, by associating “the thread of truth” (*ṛtásya tántuḥ*) both with the filter and therefore the soma streams on their ritual journey and with the tongue tip and therefore the priest-poets’ hymns. See disc. there. Note also that *ṛtásya tántuḥ* forms a slight ring with *ṛtásya yónā* in 1b.

The vs. is very similar to IX.83.1, a mystical hymn also treating the filter and attributed to the same poet.

*pavítram te vítatam brahmaṇas pate, prabhúr gātrāṇi páry eṣi víśvátaḥ
átaptatanūr ná tá āmó aśnute, śṛtāso íd váhantas tát sám āśata*

The filter is outstretched for you, o lord of the sacred formulation. Advancing,
you circle around its limbs on all sides.

A raw one, with unheated body, does not attain it [=filter]; only the cooked ones,
driving along, have attained it entirely.

Note esp. *pavítram ... vítatam* matching our *vítataḥ pavítra ā*, *prabhúr* matching our *áprabhuh*, and the emphasis on attainment, *ná ... aśnute, ... sám āśata*, matching our *anínakṣanta āśata*. For further disc. see also the publ. intro. to IX.83.

In d *padāti* must be a double marked subjunctive to the root aor, which is otherwise only middle. The model for its creation is not clear to me.

IX.74

Curiously, a much translated hymn, found in Doniger 121–24, Maurer 85–88, despite its difficulties.

IX.74.1: Contra the standard tr. (Ge, Re, Lü [265], Doniger, Maurer), I take b with c, not with a, since the logical relation between a and b is weak and there are two ostensibly different subjects, while c follows from b. In b Soma, configured as a racehorse, seeks to win the sun, which in its brightness is the cosmic equivalent of the milk that is the goal of the ritual soma’s journey (see also IX.76.2). In c he “keeps company with” (*sacate*) the semen of heaven (*dívó rétasā*). On the cosmic plane this is the rain; in the ritual it is the water with which the soma is mixed after filtering and before the mixing with milk – though here the two acts of mixture, with water and with milk, may be conflated, with rain/mixing water referred to as *payovídh-* ‘milk-strong’. For a slightly clearer passage see IX.84.5. The fact that the verbs of b and c, *síṣāsati* and *sacate*, recur in the climactic vs. 7 (see below) supports my view of the structure of this vs.

In d most tr. take *sumatí* as ours (e.g., Doniger “with kind thoughts we pray ...”), whereas I assign it to Soma. In general *sumatí-* can belong either to mortals or to gods, and very little is at stake here – though I still favor my interpr.

IX.74.2: The soma plant as pillar connecting heaven and earth and filling the midspace (ab) gives way to the plant as sacrificer (c)—an abrupt conceptual transition somewhat jarring to modern sensibilities.

In b Re supplies both the world and the filter as complement to *paryéti*. This seems reasonable, though the verb would have slightly different senses: “encompass (the world)” / “circle around (the filter).” I would now favor making this explicit in the tr.

The standard tr. take *āvītā* as instr., with a variety of interpr.: Ge “nach dem Herkommen” (sim. Scar 509), Re “par le processus-rituel” (sim. Maurer), Doniger “by tradition.” I take it rather as a fem. du. modifying *ródasī* (so Gr Nachtr.).

Pāda d contains the only ex. of *sām √ dhṛ* in the RV (and one of the few in Vedic). I would now be inclined to give it a more literal tr.: “the poet holds together ...” The poet in this case is of course Soma.

IX.74.3: Pāda b is problematic, and it shares some of its difficulties with IX.69.3, which ends identically: *āditer ṛtām yaté*. See comm. ad loc. In both cases the standard tr. (incl. my publ. tr.) take *āditeḥ* with what precedes, despite its being in the repeated phrase. The other problem is the referent of the dat. part. in the phrase *ṛtām yaté*. Is it Soma, as Ge (and the publ. tr.; also probably Maurer) take it, or the mortal worshiper (Re, flg. Lü; Doniger)? Determining this depends in part on deciding what “the wide pasture-land of Aditi” means. It is possible that it refers to the expanse on the ritual ground between the filter and the place where the soma meets the milk, in which case *ṛtām yaté* could refer to the soma traversing this expanse, as in the publ. tr. However, in the other two passages containing *gávyūti-* in IX (IX.78.5, 85.8), “wide pastureland” is the reward for mortals. See esp. IX.78.5 *urvīm gávyūtim ābhayaṃ ca nas kṛdhi* “make wide pasturage and fearlessness for us.” In the other passage, IX.85.8, the phrase occurs with *sárma sapráthaḥ* “extensive shelter/protection,” which is found exactly in our vs. 1d. I therefore now inclined to think that this pāda concerns the mortal worshiper – *but* this causes problems with the 2nd hemistich, which consists only of two rel. clauses, whose referent must be Soma. If *ṛtām yaté* does not refer to Soma, there is no antecedent in the first hemistich (or in the following vs.) for the double *yáh* of c and d. Re gets out of this by supplying “(C’est le *soma*),” which does the trick but contravenes the apparent structure of the vs.; Doniger simply tr. part of d as a main cl. I find myself torn and take refuge, as often, in double reading – suggesting that at least one referent of *ṛtām yaté* is Soma, and therefore there is at least a partial antecedent for the *yáh*-s of cd.

While fiddling with pāda b, I also wondered if we should take the pattern of repetition seriously and construe *āditeḥ* with what follows, rather than what precedes. Although *urvī- gávyūti-* is found several times elsewhere – in addition to here and the two passages in IX just cited, also V.66.3, VII.77.4 – it is nowhere else associated with Aditi. And Aditi, as mother of Varuṇa among others, is associated with *ṛtā-*, so “for him who goes to the truth of Aditi” would not be a jarring expression, though its exact sense is hard to pin down. I therefore suggest an alt. tr. “wide is the pasture-land for him who goes to the truth of Aditi.” See also IX.69.3.

As multiple comm. have remarked, Soma is both associated cosmically with rain and in the ritual preparation drips like rain from the press and off the filter.

All the standard tr. render *itāūtīḥ* with the older, now obsolete tr. ‘helping from here’ vel sim., rather than ‘eternal, ageless’, on which see comm. ad VIII.99.7 and EWA s.v. However, in this passage it certainly plays off *itáh* ‘from here’ in the previous pāda in the same metrical position; note the pattern c *itá u(sr)í(yo)* / d *itāū(t)i(r)*, with the vowels

ũ ... i replicating the 2nd half of the word. This pattern is also anticipated by (*gávy*)*ūtīr* in b (though in a different metrical slot).

IX.74.4: This vs. sets out the identification between soma and rain most clearly (which is, nonetheless, not all that clear). In pāda a the “embodied cloud” (*ātmanván nábhaḥ*) is, on the one hand, a cloud, which produces rain (called ghee and milk); on the other, it must refer to something from which soma (called ghee and milk) is produced – most likely the soma plant, with Ge (n. 4). The milk (*páyah*) here seems not to refer to the actual milk mixture.

The word *ātmanvánt-*, which I render ‘embodied’ (others ‘living, breathing’), is found only three times in the RV, once in another Kakṣīvant hymn (I.116.3 to the Aśvins) and once in another Aśvin hymn, I.182.5. In both those passages it refers to a boat, and I suggest ad I.182.5 that this describes a boat with a cockpit, a substantial body. Here it would indicate that the cloud had enough substance (“body,” as in the Engl. metaphor) to yield significant amounts of liquid, and it may also sketch the rounded contours of a cloud.

In b, with most, I take soma to be the referent of *ṛtásya nābhiḥ*. See comm. ad IX.73.1.

The subj. of cd are in the first instance the priests, but in d esp. there is a double reading, with the Maruts pissing rain, as the priests “piss” down streams of soma by their ritual activity.

On *péru-* see EWA s.v.; ‘swelling’ is based on Lü, Phil.Ind. 751ff. -- see reff. in EWA.

IX.74.5: A variety of identifications have been suggested for the various elements in this vs. See the various tr.

In pāda a *sācamāna ūrmīṇā* “keeping company with the wave” echoes 1c *divó rétasā sacate* “keeps company with the semen of heaven,” though here the presence of the subj. *aṃśúḥ* ‘plant’ seems to anchor the expression to the ritual, without cosmic dimensions. In the ritual realm it probably refers to a slightly different part of the ritual from the one depicted in 1c, despite the presence of water in both cases. There it most likely referred to the mixing of the soma juice with water, after the pressing. Here because of *aṃśúḥ* I think it refers to the initial soaking of the plant before pressing. This is supported by b, where it, namely the soaking water, swells the skin (*pínvatī tvácām*) – the skin being, in my view, the outer surface of the plant. The adj. *devāvī-* modifying ‘skin’ usually modifies soma itself (see Scar 498), referring to the juice’s journey after pressing to the place where it will be offered to the gods. Here the various moments in the ritual are collapsed: it is not the skin, but the juice pressed from the skin, that seeks the gods.

However, in b the skin may also be the waterskin=cloud from which rain is produced (see, e.g., V.83.7) and in that case the plant of a could also be a cloud, roaring with thunder.

The 2nd hemistich is bookended by verb forms of $\sqrt{dhā}$: #*dádhāti ... dhāmahe*#. This etymological connection cannot easily be captured in English because each verb has an idiomatic sense: the first for the setting of an embryo, i.e., impregnation; the 2nd in the middle in the sense of ‘acquire’. Both ritual and cosmic readings are available here.

It is not clear to me whether Aditi here has any meaningful connection with the Aditi in 3b or is simply a reference to the ritual ground.

IX.74.6: The first pāda, *sahāsradhārē ‘va tāḥ asaścatāḥ* is an abbreviated version of IX.73.4ab *sahāsradhārē ‘va té sām asvaran, ... aśaścatāḥ*. As in that vs. the earthly soma streams in the filter (a) are contrasted with (b) those in heaven (“the third realm” *ṛtīye ... rājasi*, comparable to 73.4b *divó nāke*), though the latter are also probably rain.

The interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is complicated by the unclear hapax *nābhah* in c. Numerous suggestions have been made about its meaning: clouds (von Schröder, etc.; see Schindler), openings (Old, fld. by Maurer), teats (Ge), spurts (Re), springs (Lü 285, Doniger); for disc. see Schindler, Rt Nouns, s.v. *nābh-* and EWA s.v. *NABH*. Before focusing on the sense, it’s useful to observe that *nābh* is a favorite phonological configuration for this poet: see nearly matching 4a *nābho*, in the same metrical position as our *nābho*, as well as 4b *nābhīr* likewise in that position. We can also, at least in my view, eliminate the supposed root noun *nābh-* in I.174.8 from consideration and potential connection, since I take *nābhah* there as a verb form. See comm. ad loc. With many (e.g., tentatively EWA), I connect *nābhah* here with the root \sqrt{nabh} ‘burst’, and suggest that it has the adjectival sense ‘bursting’; the underlying noun subject is surely ‘streams’ again, referring to both the heavenly soma and the rain. The union of those two with the earthly soma is described in d. Why “four” is not entirely clear. Our passage might be illuminated by IX.89.5 *cātasra īm ghṛtadūhaḥ sacante* “four, yielding ghee as their milk, accompany him” if there is any illumination to be gotten from that passage. Cf. also I.62.6, VIII.100.10, both with fem. ‘four’ and varieties of liquid nourishment. The most likely explanation for the “four” is suggested by Ge’s tr. of *nābhah* as “Zitzen(?)” (see also his n. 6c). Although I do not think that *nābh-* means ‘teat’ directly, I think the number four suggests that the streams here are likened to them: cows generally have four teats.

Another similarity between this passage and IX.89.5 leads me to alter the publ. tr. here. The four in our passage are *nīhitāḥ* ($nī\sqrt{dhā}$), which, with Re, I tr. “hidden.” But this ppl. is paralleled in IX.89.5 by the fuller phrase *samānē antār dharūṇe nīṣattāḥ* “set down within the same support,” with an almost synonymous ppl. cmpd *nī-ṣatta-*: $nī\sqrt{sad}$, also characterizing the four. There I take *nīṣatta-* in its literal sense and suggest that the “same support” might be the udder itself. I now wonder if *nīhitāḥ* should also be taken literally here and mean “the four, deposited (in the udder), bursting ...”

IX.74.7–8: These two vss. seem to resolve the situation set up in vs. 1, esp. 1bc: the racehorse that was striving to win the sun (=milk) there (1b) has achieved this goal and “keeps company” with ritual speech and labor, as it did in 1c (and 5a) with more physical features of the ritual process. The repetition of the desid. *sīṣāsati* from 1b in 7a and the resolution of the desid. into an achieved state via a pf. part. *sasavān* (8b) signal the relationship between vss. 1 and 7–8 – as does the repetition of *sacate* from 1c (/sācamānaḥ 5a) in 7c.

IX.74.7: As just noted, *yāt sīṣāsati* is identical to *yād ... sīṣāsati* in 1b, and *śvetām rūpām* “white form” seems the equivalent of *svār* ‘sun’, the obj. of *sīṣāsati* in the earlier vs. – both referring to the milk mixture. It might be possible to take *yād* here as neut. rel. with

rūpām and tr. “he makes for himself the/a white form that he is striving to win,” although I’m not sure that’s an improvement. In any case, I think the point is that Soma has attained the milk he was striving for.

Pāda b seems something of a non sequitur, and it may be that *bhūman-*, which has a range of senses, should be tr. differently (Ge tr. Natur) – although in the preceding hymn, IX.73.5, in the phrase *bhūmano divás pári* it clearly means ‘earth’. Perhaps it contrasts with *diváh* in d and should be tr. “Soma ... knows the earth” – the point being that the earthly Soma is fulfilling his ritual tasks, which will enable him to make contact with the heavenly soma and bring it as rain from heaven in d. Note that this is the first time that the word *sóma-* appears in the hymn, and the only occurrence outside of the extra-hymnic vs. 9.

As just noted, *sacate* reprises the same verb in 1c and its equivalent participle in 5a *sácamānah*. In both those cases soma was “keeping company” with a physical element of the ritual, namely water. Here the instr. express the human activity in the sacrifice: *dhī-* ‘insight’, perhaps better here ‘insightful/visionary thought’ – that is the hymn – and *śámī-* ‘ritual labor’. This acknowledgement of the human contribution to the soma sacrifice is also found in the next vs.; otherwise it is absent from the hymn, except passingly and enigmatically noted in 4cd. Through most of the hymn Soma is presented as the only actor and agent of the ritual.

The problem in this pāda is *pravát*, which has received various analyses. See esp. the possibilities laid out by Old, as well as the nn. of Ge and Re. Of the choices, I prefer the nom. sg. Since the stem *pravát-* is fem. this requires reading *sā / īm* against Pp *sāḥ / īm*, but this actually improves the reading, since with the masc. prn. we would expect *sā īm* in the Saṃhitā text (cf., e.g. IX.88.2). I take *sém abhí pravát* as a self-contained, almost parenthetical clause: it explains what precedes in the same pāda, namely that the hymns and physical ritual labor of the sacrificers are the way to approach Soma.

And this in turn will lead to his producing rain in d, by splitting open the cask of heaven. This “splitting” (*áva darṣat*) is perhaps thematically related to the “bursting” down from heaven (*nābhaḥ ... avó diváh*) in 6c, if that’s what *nābh-* means. It is difficult to render the *áva* in the lexeme *áva darṣat*, but *áva* is a Lieblingswort of this poet: see 1a, 4d, 6a, as well as *avāḥ* in 6c – all presumably in service of the “rain down from heaven” theme.

IX.74.8: This is the triumphant realization of the quest set in motion in vs. 1. The race horse (*vāḥ*) of 1b reappears here having won (*sasavān*) at the finish line (*kārṣman*) what it was seeking to win (*síṣāsati*) there – namely the milk, here given a very full expression: *śvetām* [recurring from 7a] *kalásam góbhīr aktām* “the gleaming white tub anointed with cows.”

This first hemistich plus pāda c is the actual end of the hymn, and so this successful resolution of vs. 1 provides a thematic ring. Pāda c reintroduces the human ritual personnel, who propel Soma in his guise as racehorse—thus allowing the priest-poets to take some credit for the successful conclusion of the sacrifice, after having been shut out for most of the hymn. Pāda d is a snatch of a dānastuti, and vs. 9 seems an afterthought tacked onto the hymn. Or such is my analysis; most of the other tr. attempt to link the second hemistich with the first, syntactically and thematically. Most radically Ge (fld. by Doniger), who makes d dependent on *sasavān* in b, with c a parenthetical

intrusion. Maurer, by contrast, makes d the obj. of c, which does less violence to the order of elements but is still, to my mind, unsatisfactory. Among other things soma is the usual object of \sqrt{hi} in IX, which contains multiple exx., and so making the cows (somehow) the object violates formulaic expectations. Cf. esp. IX.106.11 *hinvanti vājīnam*, with soma identified as a *vājīn* as here.

On *sasavān*, which should be read with a heavy root syllable, see comm. ad X.29.2.

It is easy to understand the attempts of others to link d with *something* else in the vs., because it consists only of a dative phrase (*kakṣīvate śatāhimāya*) and a gen. pl. (*gónām*). However, as I just remarked, this pāda seems to be an abbreviated dānastuti, with the dāna specified and no stuti given, but the poet and would-be recipient emphatically named. In such circumstances condensed phraseology is not surprising. Ge appositely cites as parallel I.126.2 *śatām kakṣīvān āsurasya gónām* “A hundred cows of the lord (have I,) Kakṣīvant, (taken).” In our passage the “hundred” is cleverly tucked into the adj. *śatāhima-*, which otherwise presumably expresses Kakṣīvant’s proleptic *wish* for a 100-year lifespan; it seems unlikely that he is already that old.

IX.74.9: As I just noted, this vs. seems to be an extra-hymnic afterthought and is stylistically and thematically detached from the rest of the hymn. It is the only one containing 2nd ps. reference, which is insistently carried here by four vocc. (a *soma*, b *pavamāna*, c *madintama*, d *pavamāna*), an enclitic prn. *te* (a), and an impv. (d *svādasva*). It also contains only the 2nd naming of soma (cf. 7b) and the only forms of the root $\sqrt{pū}$, as well as other standards of the somic lexicon (a *rāsa-*; b *āvyo vāram*, *vī√dhāv*; c \sqrt{mrj} , *madintama*; d *indrāya ... pītāye*). In other words, all the clichés – maddeningly absent from the rest of the hymn – are trotted out, like a global example of poetic repair, as if to say, “if you were too dim to figure it out, *this* is what it was about!” It is not possible to decide whether Kakṣīvant himself added this magic decoder ring or whether it was appended secondarily. IX.74 is the last of the 9-vs. trimeter hymns, so it could have originally been an 8-vs. hymn to which the clarifying vs. was added. The fact that vs. 8 is in Triṣṭubh in an otherwise Jagatī hymn might indirectly suggest that, since final vss. are sometimes in a different meter from the rest of their hymn and, if we remove vs. 9, vs. 8 would be the final vs., ending with Kakṣīvant’s plea for dāna. But it is certainly possible to imagine Kakṣīvant having his little joke by supplying the key to the hymn in an appendix vs.

IX.75–79

This next group of hymns is attributed to Kavi Bhārgava, also the poet of the Gāyatrī hymns IX.47–49. They are refreshingly free of the puzzles and contortions of the first set of trimeter hymns.

IX.75

IX.75.1: The opening *abhī priyāṇi pavate ... nāmāni* is reminiscent of IX.62.25=66.1=107.23 *pāvasva ... abhī vīśvāni kāvya* “purify yourself towards all products of poetic skill,” where in all cases I take the *abhī* ACC phrase as goal. See comm. ad IX.62.25. The point is that Soma in the course of his ritual preparation aims his

journey towards the place where the hymns are being recited – in this case the hymns mentioning his names and epithets. Like the other RVic gods (esp. Indra), Soma “grows strong” on praise. In contrast, Ge thinks that the “names” are “die Formen oder Phasen des zubereiteten Tranks”; sim. Lü (526) “Erscheinungsformen.” I don’t see why the physical needs to replace the verbal here, esp. given the emphasis on the verbal, and indeed on names, in the next vs.

On *cánohita*- see comm. ad III.2.2.

Properly speaking, *yahvāḥ* should be part of the main cl., in order for *yéśu* to take its proper place in the rel. cl. A slightly revised tr. would be “Delighted, the youthfully exuberant one purifies himself towards his own dear names, upon which he grows strong.”

The 2nd hemistich implicitly contrasts the heavenly soma with the earthly, ritual one of ab, as so often.

The adj. *vīcakṣanaḥ* ‘wide gazing’, characterizing Soma, is a partial match for acc. *vīṣvañcam* ‘facing in many directions’, used of the sun’s chariot.

IX.75.2: The publ. tr. contains a clear error — ‘father’ instead of ‘lord’, for *pātiḥ* in b — a regrettable lapse. It should be corrected to “speaker and lord,” and “father” in the publ. intro. should likewise be changed.

Old finds “tongue” as a descriptor of Soma “bizzarr,” but given how much emphasis is placed in IX on Soma’s noise-making capabilities and association with speech, I don’t see why. This vs. depicts Soma as the origin and controller of speech and name-giving, while in vs. 1 (ab) in complementary fashion he aims towards and is nourished by the names given him by others, or so I interpr. it.

As Ge points out, cd is (partially) illuminated by I.155.3cd, whose d pāda is identical to ours: *dādāhāti putró ávaram páram pitúr, nāma tṛtīyam ádhi rocané divāḥ* “The son [=Viṣṇu] sets in place the lower and the higher (names) of the father and the third name in the luminous realm of heaven.” In both cases the entities in question in the c pāda are surely Heaven and Earth (so for our passage both Ge [n. 2cd] and Re). The “luminous realm of heaven” must be the realm beyond the nearer sky; the “third realm” (*tṛtīye rājasi*) appears in the preceding hymn (IX.74.6), though the same geographical area may not be in question. In any case Soma’s ability to name these cosmic entities emphasizes his global mastery of speech, and the paradox of the son naming his parents makes the wonder all the greater.

IX.75.3: The same phrase *ṛtasya dohānāḥ* is found in I.144.3. In our passage I think it refers both to the cows=milk and to the poets.

On *tripṛṣṭhā*- see disc. ad IX.70.8, 71.7.

I take *vī rājati* with both ‘shine’ and ‘rule’.

IX.75.4: On *cánohita*- see comm. ad III.2.2.

In IX.98.9 Ge suggests that the world-halves (*ródasī*) are the jaws of the soma-press, which could account for their being called his mothers (*mātārā*) here.

On *samáyā* (*vī dhāvati*) see comm. ad I.113.10.

IX.75.5: Ge (n. 5c) insists that *āhanāso vīhāyasaḥ* is gen. sg. with *te*, rather than nom. pl. with *mādāḥ* (Gr, Re, publ. tr.). That is of course possible, but the difference is fairly minor whether the phrase modifies Soma or his exhilarating drinks.

IX.76

As noted in the publ. intro., the martial tone is reminiscent of that of another of Kavi Bhārgava's productions, IX.47, though there is little or no overlap in phraseology.

IX.76.1: On *pājas-* see comm. ad I.58.3. For a god making or assuming his *pājas-*, see, with medial forms of $\sqrt{kṛ}$, IV.4.1 *kṛṇuṣvā pājaḥ* (of Agni) as well as IX.88.5 *vṛthā pājāmsi kṛṇute nadīṣu*, identical to our passage except with a Triṣṭubh cadence, and, with $\tilde{a}\sqrt{dā}$, IX.68.3 *pāja ā dade*. Presumably in our passage and 88.5 it depicts the swelling of the soma stalks in the waters.

IX.76.2: The participial phrase *svāḥ sīśāsan* “striving to win the sun” is a match for *svāḥ yád ... sīśāsati* in nearby IX.74.1 “when he strives to win the sun” (also IX.7.4), where I suggest that the sun stands for the gleaming milk with which the Soma will unite at the end of his ritual journey. This association would be emphasized in our passage by *gāviṣṭiṣu* ‘in the cattle raids’, with cattle standing for milk, as usual. For further on sun=milk see comm. ad vs. 4.

As Ge points out (n. 2d, not reflected in his tr.), *ajyate* has a double sense, since it can be the passive both of \sqrt{aj} ‘drive’ and $\sqrt{añj}$ ‘anoint’. Both are appropriate here.

IX.76.3: The extreme dislocation of hemistich-initial *indrasya* from *jaṭharēṣu* on which it depends must result from the desire to match the initial *indrasya* of 2c.

The simile-marking particle *iva* is late here, since the simile must consist of *vidyūd abhréva*.

On the quasi-independence of *śásvataḥ* in the NP *vājān ... śásvataḥ* see comm. ad X.48.1.

IX.76.4: The hapax rt noun cmpd *ṛṣi-śāḥ* ‘vanquishing the seers’ (or, as Scar [600] suggests as an alternative, ‘unter den Ṛṣis siegreich’) is, on first glance, a surprising collocation, since we generally expect \sqrt{sah} to take more obvious enemies as object. Yet, of course, poetic competition is an important feature of RVic culture, and the rest of the vs. asserts Soma's dominance in this competition – esp. the final, decisive *āsamaṣṭa-kāvyah* ‘whose poetic skill is entirely unattainable’, but also his role as “father of thoughts” (*pītā matīnām*), and his ability to make “the vision of truth” (*ṛtāsya dhītīm*) bellow (presumably louder than the other ṛṣis can). The point of the cmpd might be clearer if tr. “vanquishing the (other) seers”; as Scar points out, Soma is elsewhere identified as *ṛṣi-*.

āsira- in c is a hapax. It is plausibly derived from \sqrt{as} ‘throw, shoot’: see, e.g., Gr., AiG II.2.361, as well as, more hesitantly, EWA s.v. *As*² — with a metaphorically transferred meaning ‘ray, beam’ < ‘missile, spear’; cf. Engl. ‘shaft’ for both shaft of a spear or similar weapon and shaft of light. Say. glosses it first with *kṣepakeṇa* to $\sqrt{kṣip}$ ‘throw’ and then with *raśminā*, the more usual (also metaphorically transferred) word for the sun's rays. Gr's gloss combines the literal and the transferred sense in

‘Strahlengeschoss’, while Ge (“Strahl”) and Re (“rayon”) render only the transferred sense. Mayrhofer (EWA 144–45) is more tentative: he questions the connection of the word to the ‘throw’ root, and his gloss also expresses doubt about the transferred meaning: “‘Strahl’ (<‘*Geschoss’ [der Sonne]?).” On both etymological and contextual grounds – what does it mean to “be groomed by the lance/ray of the sun”? – it is worth asking what this hapax is doing here. Acdg to Lü (704), the sun is the heavenly *pavitra-* and so naturally its beam(s) would perform the purification of soma. Although I agree that the sun can sometimes be equated with the filter (see, e.g., IX.83.2), I doubt if that’s what’s going on here. For one thing, the root \sqrt{mrj} is not generally used for purification across the filter (though it can be; cf. e.g., IX.86.6, 107.11), but refers rather to the ritual operations involving water (esp.) and milk; cf., e.g., IX.68.9 *adbhir góbbhir mrjyate* “he is groomed with waters, with cows.” Moreover, the parallelism with *raśmí-* is not as exact as is implied; most importantly *raśmí-* is almost always plural, whereas our form is sg., and soma is never “groomed” with/by even pl. *raśmíbhiḥ*.

Bearing in mind that I interpret “seeking to win the sun” in 2b as expressing Soma’s intention to unite with the milk mixture (metaphorically the sun), as well as the fact that \sqrt{mrj} ‘groom’ can be construed with an instr. referring to the waters and milk used to prepare the soma, we can now consider a different interpr. of *sūryasyāsireṇa*. It does not depict the sun’s (single) ray as filter, but the “sun’s shaft” (or even “sun’s shot”) as the milk infused into the soma – referring either to the sun’s light (‘shaft’) as gleaming milk or the infusing itself (‘shot’). The latter would have the merit of requiring fewer semantic steps by simply using the literal meaning of the root in an extended sense; cf. English ‘shot’ used of a small amount of usually powerful liquid, generally alcohol, also (for slightly different reasons) used of espresso. Once this interpr. is considered, the reason for the creation of the hapax becomes apparent (at least to me). The technical term for the milk mixture is *āśír-* (see nearby IX.75.5); our *ásir-* is phonologically very close, and I would suggest that it was created as a pun on the standard term. In fact the phonology might be closer still: the Samhitā text reads *sūryasyāsireṇa*, which is resolved by the Pp. into *sūryasya ásireṇa* (the extra syllable is metrically necessary); **āsireṇa* would also be possible. However, unfortunately I think this latter reading unlikely because it would convert the standard break after late caesura, two light syllables, into a far less common one with heavy - light. Another factor that may have contributed to the creation of this hapax is the presence of *ṛṣi(-ṣāḍ)* in the same metrical position in the preceding pāda, with *ṛṣi-* a scrambling of *ásir-*.

Not much changes in the tr., though I would now emend it to “He who is groomed by a “shot” [a shaft] of the sun [=milk] ...” However, this analysis shows once again that when encountering a hapax we should not just seek a plausible meaning and a plausible etymology, but try to figure out *why* the hapax was introduced in the passage, which often opens the way to better understanding of the other two questions.

IX.76.5: The *sá* in c with 2nd ps. reference (*sá ... pavase*) violates the rule that such reference is found only with imperatives. (See my “Vedic ‘sá figé’: An inherited sentence connective?,” *Historische Sprachforschung* 105 [1992] 213–39.) I think it likely that it has been modeled on the numerous *sá (...) pavaśva* exx. in IX (15 by my count, e.g., nearby IX.72.8=107.24); an imperative would in fact work better with the *yáthā* purpose cl. in d. The indic. *pavase* may have been substituted because **pavaśva* would produce a

very abnormal break. An almost identical pāda is found in IX.97.32 *sá índrāya pavase matsarāvān*, inexpertly adapted to Triṣṭubh (note the bad cadence [though see comm. ad loc.]).

The splv. *matsaríntama-* is somewhat oddly formed, with the possessive suffix *-ín-* added to an adj., with no change in sense. The stem occurs 4x (once in a repeated pāda), always at the end of a pāda. AiG II.2.340 considers it the equivalent of **matsara-tama-*, based on *madín-tama-*. Given the metrical unfavorability of the stem **matsaratama-*, this seems a plausible explan.

IX.77

The word *sóma-* is absent from this hymn, although four of the five vss. (all but c) open with a nom. sg. masc. referring to the soma and inviting that word.

As mentioned above, Kavi Bhārgava briefly treats the Somaraub here (vs. 2) and in his dimeter hymn IX.48 – a myth otherwise rarely mentioned in Maṇḍala IX.

IX.77.2: The gen. obj. of *ā yuvate, mádhvaḥ*, is hard to interpret; it certainly doesn't seem likely to be a partitive.

I don't know what to do with the particle *āha*, which is oddly positioned in the middle of a pāda interrupting an NP. Re's "d'un coeur, ah! rempli de crainte" is appealing, but *āha* doesn't ordinarily have such an exclamatory value (though see comm. ad VII.20.2), as far as I can see – and it's a little too conveniently superimposable on our (both French and English) "ah!"

IX.77.3: Both Ge and Re take *pūrvāsa úparāsaḥ* as temporal designations: the earlier and later drops. If so, it is hard to understand how we can order both types (esp. the earlier ones, which should be beyond our control) to run. I prefer to see them as spatial. For such a usage cf. V.31.11 *pūrvam karad úparam* "(what is) in front ... he will put behind."

As has long been known (see Old, citing Barth., as well as EWA s.v.), *ahī-* is etymologically identical to Aves. *azī* (OA, YA), which characterizes cows – contra Gr's 'Schlange'. It's not clear to me why Ge and Re seem so uncertain about it, esp. as Ge cites Aves. *azī* in n. 3c.

IX.77.4: As noted in the publ. intro., the vs. seems to contain a paradox, whereby the masc. Soma conceives an embryo, most likely of himself. See Ge's n. 4c.

The hapax *urubjá-* is puzzling. Gr's suggestion that it derives from a phonological deformation of **ud-ubjá-* seems reasonable, esp., as Mayrhofer points out (EWA s.v. *UBJ*), with the interference of *urú-*. Verbal forms of *úd√ubj* are found in AVŚ and TS.

IX.77.5: Soma is notably identified with Varuṇa and Mitra in this vs. – the former because he cannot be deceived by the crooked (*hurúg yaté*), the latter because (implicitly) he mediates between the ritual communities (*vijána-*).

With Mayr. (EWA s.v. *híruk*), I take *hurúk* to \sqrt{hvar} 'go crookedly' (also in a moral sense). The expression *hurúg yaté* contrasts with *rtám yaté* "going to truth" in the same metrical position in nearby IX.69.3, 74.3 and four other times.

IX.78

A remarkably straightforward hymn. Oberlies tr. it in Relig. RV II.125.

IX.78.1: Pace Gr, who identifies it as fem. nom. sg., the adj. *tānvā* is most likely acc. pl. n., parallel to *riprām*. On the basis of IX.14.4 *jāhac chāryāṇi tānvā* “leaving behind the stems that belong to his body,” *śāryāṇi* should be supplied, as indicated by Ge (n. 1c) and Re.

IX.78.2: A causal rendering of *hī* in c, as in the publ. tr., is somewhat jarring: it is hard to see how cd provides the causal basis for pāda b or for ab together. Moreover the thousand horses in d is a surprising number to be crowded into the soma cups and the identity of those horses is not clear. Although the standard tr. (Ge, Re, as well as Ober [II.125/160] and the publ. tr.) all take c and d as parallel and both under the domain of *hī*, I would now separate c and d, with d a main clause for which c supplies the causal basis. The amended tr.: “because there are many courses for you to travel, there are a thousand fallow bay horses sitting in the cups.” The point here, I think, is that the poured soma forms multiple rivulets as it crosses the filter, and these separate drippings of soma are conceived of as horses as they go into the cups.

A minor question in d is the grammatical identity of the rt. noun *camūśadaḥ*, which can be gen. sg. or nom. pl. Both Ge and Re take it as gen. sg., referring to Soma; the publ. tr. and Oberlies as nom. pl.; Scar allows either and doesn’t decide. In fact it doesn’t really matter and the other attestations, both sg. (1x) and pl. (4x) refer to soma (drinks), which in this case could be either the metaphorical horses or a supplied “you [Soma].”

IX.78.3: As noted in the publ. intro., the Apsarases, who are rarely mentioned in the RV, unusually stand here for the waters with which the soma is mixed. Although “sitting within ... have streamed” seems slightly contradictory, it must be that they first streamed and then took their seats in the cups. This could be conveyed by a tr. “The Apsarases ..., (now) sitting within, streamed towards Soma.”

On the phrase *harmyāsya sakṣāṇim* “conquerer of the secure house,” found also in IX.71.4, see comm. ad loc.

Pāda-final *sakṣāṇim* echoes *manīṣiṇam* at the end of pāda a, in addition to participating in another phonetic figure with b and d, as noted below.

In d it is unclear what *ākṣitam* modifies, since both *sumnām* and *pāvamānam* are possible. Both Ge and Re take it with the former (e.g., “une faveur impérissable”), while Ober (II.125) and I take it with the latter. Although “imperishable favor/grace” might seem closer to the famous expression “imperishable fame,” word order favors the connection with *pāvamānam*, as does an expression like IX.26.2 *sahāsradhāram ākṣitam* “the imperishable one of a thousand streams,” definitely referring to soma. I would note, however, that the word order argument may be weak, since *ākṣitam* may have been placed in final position for the phonological echo of pāda-final *akṣaran* (b) and *sakṣāṇim* (c). The stem *ākṣita-* is also almost always pāda-final (15 out of 18 occurrences). Of course, it would be possible to read the adjective with both acc.

IX.79

IX.79.1: I take the loc. *brhāddiveṣu* in b as referring to the gods, who inhabit lofty heaven (so also Ober II.60; see also alternative in Ge’s n. 1b). I take it as referring to the destined recipients of our pressed soma. The standard view is rather that it is a personal name and refers to the human pressers, to be construed with *suvānāsaḥ* (e.g., Klein DGRV I.241 “being pressed among the Bṛhaddiva’s”). But this PN is only certain in a single passage in the late RV, X.120.8–9, in the sg.; elsewhere, and esp. in the plural, the stem refers to gods or other heaven-located substances. Cf., e.g., II.2.9 *amṛteṣu ... brhāddiveṣu*. Mayr (Pers.Nam.) considers the PN possible here (“vielleicht”), but does not commit to it.

The real puzzles in this vs. are found in the 2nd hemistich, which has been much discussed, esp. by Old. See also Ge, Re, and Hoffmann (Aufs. 363). Before considering the problems of interpr., we should first note that pāda c is metrically disturbed: it has only 11 syllables in this Jagatī hymn, and in order to produce the proper Jagatī cadence the final *ó* in the pāda-final sequence *iṣó árātayaḥ* must be read long, despite its position in hiatus. (A Triṣṭubh cadence for this 11-syl. verse is excluded.) There is no obvious way to fix either the undercount or the anomalous long *o*. Note in particular that nothing can be added in the opening *ví ca náśan na(h)*, because it is an opening of 5 and the enclitic *naḥ* must be part of it, since pronominal enclitics never follow the caesura. So a potential easy fix is impossible: to read **náśan[ta] na(h)*, with the verb matching *naśanta* in b but having undergone a species of haplology. (For a different possible fix, see below.) It is therefore possible that pāda c is corrupt in some way. On the other hand, the poet may have wanted to draw attention to the similar openings—x x *náśan na(h)* and x x *naśanta*—by this metrical disturbance.

In order to approach the sense of the hemistich there are a number of clues we should note: 1) the near-coincidence of verbs: (*ví*) *náśan* / *naśanta*; 2) the accent on the first verb, which must result from the subordinating use of *ca* as ‘if’ here; 3) several parallels, which unfortunately pull in different ways. See esp. X.133.3 *ví śú víśvā árātayo, aryó naśanta no dhíyaḥ*; also II.35.6 *nārātayo ví naśan nānṛtāni*. A feature that we might expect to be a clue, the different voices of the two verbs, act. (*ví ...*) *náśan*, med. *naśanta*, does not turn out to be helpful, since *-anta* replacement is always a possibility in 3rd pl. injunctives, and *naśanta* also immediately precedes *sániṣanta* and could have adapted itself to that verb. The two passages just cited, with (*ví ...*) *náśanta* and (*ví*) *náśan* respectively and at least possible identity of meaning (see below), demonstrate the problem with using voice as a criterion.

Old’s analysis of the situation, incl. the close parallel in X.133.3, is acute, and he suggests several quite different solutions, without, however, deciding for one. His first question is whether the two verbs belong to the same root. If so, the likely one is \sqrt{nas} ‘reach, attain’, but, in his opinion, this makes trouble for pāda c; moreover, in X.133.3, which he considers an abbreviated reworking of our passage and in a way its oldest commentary, an affiliation with \sqrt{nas} ‘disappear, perish’ makes better sense for the first part of the clause (“all hostilities will disappear”). Old’s first stab at interpr. thus assumes that the two verbs belong to different roots, with ‘disappear’ in pāda c and ‘reach, attain’ in d: “Hinweg mögen schwinden von unsrer Nahrung die Kargheiten: so mögen denn die Geizigen [Akk.] treffen.” This interpr. must take *iṣáḥ* as an ablative sg., *aryáḥ* as an acc. pl., and supply *árātayaḥ* in c as the subj. not only of *ví ... náśan* in c but also of *naśanta* in d. What doesn’t seem sufficiently represented in his interpr. is the subordinating value of conditional *ca*. Old’s second alternative interpr. takes into account the missing syllable in

c (though not the problematic quantity of *o* in hiatus). He suggests remedying the undercount by inserting a negative after the caesura: *ví ca náśan *ná na ...*, which would avoid the problem of an enclitic following the caesura we noted above. In his emended pāda there would be an opening of 4; accented neg. *ná* would immediately follow and host the enclitic. Haplology would easily account for the transmitted text. The sequence with negative would be very like II.35.6 cited above: “hostilities shall not reach [him].” This solution is very clever, and it would allow both verbs to belong to the same root, ‘reach, attain’. He paraphrases (but doesn’t tr.) it as “die *árātayaḥ* sollen nicht uns treffen; wir wollen die *arí* treffen.” But the problem once again is that he does not represent the conditional *ca*. “If the hostilities do not reach us” is significantly worse than his paraphrase. He himself is disturbed by the unusual position of *ná* (though I think that could be acceptable) and the fact that X.133.3 clearly means something different, perhaps because this passage was misunderstood by the poet of X.133.

My own—quite uncertain—interpr. is that the two verb forms belong to different roots, just as I take the single verb *naśanta* in X.133.3 as a pun involving the same two roots. But, unlike Old’s first alternative, I think the *first* verb is ‘reach’ and the 2nd ‘perish’. I take *iśāḥ* as acc. pl. (as do Ge, Re, Hoffmann, Klein, and Ober, in their diff. interpr.), even though root-accented **iśaḥ* is expected (though ending-accented acc. pl. in this stem is not rare). I then supply ‘refreshments’ as subject of *naśanta* in d, with *aryáḥ* gen. sg. depending not only on this supplied subj. but also on the *árātayaḥ* of c. The point is: if the stranger’s hostilities go after our things, theirs will be destroyed as well. It is also possible that the subj. of *naśanta* in d is the same *árātayaḥ*: if their hostilities come after us, those hostilities are doomed. As I just said, I don’t have a high degree of certainty about the correctness of this interpr. Those produced by the others just named, which all assign both verbs to ‘reach, attain’, are certainly not out of the question. Unfortunately I can’t endorse either of Old’s alternatives, however.

IX.79.1–2: The opening of this vs. *prá no dhanvantv índavaḥ ...* echoes that of vs. 1 X *no dhanvantv índavaḥ, prá* but with the preverb in tmesis relocated to a more standard, pre-verbal position.

Although (*a*)*codásah* (1a) and (*mada-*)*cyútaḥ* (2a) obviously belong to different roots (\sqrt{cud} , \sqrt{cyut}), they have similar semantics, ‘impel, urge on’ and ‘arouse, set in motion’, and similar phonology. So the negated *acodás-* ‘without impulsion, without being impelled’ and positive *mada-cyút-* ‘arousing exhilaration’ (by my interpr., but see below) function as a virtual polarized pair, describing the drops as not themselves needing any impetus to move, but providing impetus to others. A pseudo-etymological figure.

IX.79.2: The rt. noun compd *mada-cyút-* (on which see also above) is taken by Ge as having passive semantics (“rauscherregt”), in contrast to the active transitive semantics of my ‘arousing exhilaration’ and Re’s “mouvant l’ivresse.” Scar (128–29) allows both for the compd in general, without deciding on particular passages. Since, all things being equal, rt noun compds to roots with transitive value tend to display that (type *vṛtra-hán-*), and most of the other *-cyút-* compds are transitive (*acyuta-cyút-* ‘shaking the unshakeable’, *parvata-cyút-* ‘shaking the mountains’), a transitive interpr. seems to me the default. For the five attestations of *madacyút-* in IX, all modifying soma or soma drops, as here, a

transitive interpr. is the more natural: soma is, after all, what produces *máda-*. However, the cmpd. elsewhere also modifies Indra or similar entities, who are more likely to *be roused* to exhilaration than to rouse it (e.g., I.51.2), and the passive value should be allowed there. Indeed in I.81.3, by my interpr., there are two potential referents (Indra / soma) and two different readings of the cmpd.

Pāda b poses problems: what is the disjunction signaled by *vā*; where does the rel. cl. with *yébhiḥ* begin; what is the referent of *yébhiḥ*; how should *dhánā* be construed? Ge starts the rel. cl. with *yébhiḥ*, leaving the disjunctive phrase *dhánā vā* in (or attached to) the main cl. Since there is nothing in that cl. with which to construe *dhánā* he must supply a verb parallel to *dhanvantu*: “... sollen rinnen ... oder die Kampfpreise (gewinnen).” Sim. Klein, DGRV II.205. There is nothing objectionable about this solution – ‘win’ regularly takes *dhána-* as obj., and in fact soma or its equivalent is sometimes the subj. Cf., e.g., IX.65.9 ... *te ... víśvā dhānāni jigyúṣah* “of you [presumably = soma] having won all the stakes” (though it’s worth noting that the exact half-vs. is found in VIII.14.6, applying to Indra). But nothing in the context invites or supports supplying a verb here. Re’s solution is more economical, in using *dhánā* as an alternative subject for *prá ... dhanvantu*, though running forth is less natural action for stakes to perform. Ober (II.248) also takes the disjunction as belonging to the main cl., but with *dhánā* as an alternate goal for the running drops: “... sollen vorwärts laufen oder hin zu den Siegespreisen.” All of them, Ge (/Klein), Re, and Ober start the rel. cl. with *yébhiḥ* and make its antecedent *dhánā*. By contrast, I take all of pāda b as the rel. cl. (the position of *yébhiḥ* is of course perfectly compatible with this), with *dhánā* a 2nd acc., of goal (rather like Ober), with *junīmāsi*. The antecedent of *yébhiḥ* is then the soma drops, which give us (and the horses) the energy to race to the prizes.

Ge, Re, and Ober take c with d. This is certainly possible, but I prefer taking it with b, to express the potential hazards and dirty-dealing facing our horses in this race.

IX.79.3: Both *ārāti-* and *arí-* return from 1cd, but given the uncertainties in that passage, the return is not terribly useful.

What is most notable here is the carefully balanced construction of ab, with double *utá* opening the pādas, the following parallel but contrastive gen.-abl. expressions *svásyā ārātyā(h) ... anyāsya ārātyā(h)*, and finally the similarly parallel but contrastive nominal clausettes *arír hí śá(h)* and *víko hí śah*. It is (almost) impossible to escape concluding that the poet was contrasting two similar but very distinct sources of hostility. Unfortunately, Thieme (Fremd. 45–46) does escape this conclusion, deciding that the two gen. phrases and the two annunciatory nominal clauses are merely a way of generalizing to “everybody.” His tr. simply ignores the signposted construction of the two pādas and jumbles the parallel phrases together. This was not Thieme’s finest hour. Without an *idée fixe* to prove (as was the case of Th), the construction imposes an analysis: a hostile person belong to our side is an *arí*, one on the other is a wolf. Now elsewhere in Indo-European and indeed elsewhere in the RV, “wolf” can be used of a human who is outside social boundaries, an outlaw (see, e.g., my “Function of Animals in the RV, 2016: 208–9). Here the outlaw is contrasted with the *arí-*; with Th. I take him as a “stranger,” but, against Th., as a stranger who belongs to the larger Ārya community, who is “one of ours.” For a clear presentation of this view of the *arí-* as a member of the same culture, see JPB, Ādityas, pp. 150–54, esp. 152, in great part flg. Dumézil contra Th. The hostile

person outside of that community, the “other,” is a wolf. With Th. again, I’d say that the ultimate intent of ab is universal, to counter the threats from any possible source, but this universality is achieved by an implicitly conjoined contrast between the two opposites that make up the whole, a merism.

By my rules (“Vedic *anyá-*, Fs. Beekes 1997), *anyá-* here should be definite because it is in non-initial position – hence “the other.” This works well with the interpr. just elaborated, that the two contrastive phrases define the whole.

One further syntactic issue: what is the gen.-abl. in *svásyā árātyā(h) ... anyásyā árātyā(h)* doing? Ge supplies “protect” to govern an abl., on the basis of VIII.71.1 *pāhí víśvasyā árāteḥ*. This is certainly possible – and is endorsed by Old. However, because of the starkness of the expression, which underlines the contrasts between each matching element, I am reluctant to introduce any extraneous words and take the two phrases as independent gen.-abl. in loosely causal/circumstantial usage. Not very satisfactory, I admit.

IX.79.4: On this vs. see publ. intro.

The first pāda is problematic. The standard interpr. is that Soma’s navel is tied either to the navel in heaven (Ge, Old, Ober [II.13], Kü [242]) or Soma’s navel in heaven is tied to our navel (Re). E.g., Ge: “Du, dessen höchster (Nabel) an den abel im Himmel geknüpft ist.” Before even considering what this would really mean, there is a simple grammatical problem: this interpr. (and those of the others) requires masc. *paramāḥ* and *yáḥ* both to refer to fem. *nābhi-*. Disc. of this gender clash is remarkably cavalier. Old suggests that *nābhi-* may be masc. here; Ge (n. 4ab) registers this suggestion but also suggests that the synonym *bāndhu-* could be supplied in substitution (not a bad idea, though *bāndhu-* is rare in the RV and doesn’t seem to show up in the vicinity of *nābhi-*). The push to have two forms of *nābhi-* in this pāda is clearly based on very similar IX.10.8 *nābhā nābhim na ā dade* “He has bound his navel to our navel” and the idiom *sám / ā √ dā* ‘tie’ with two forms of ‘navel’, on which see comm. ad I.139.1. There is another slight problem, that the rel. prn. *yá(h)* is rather too deep in its clause, if the whole pāda forms the rel. cl., as in most interpr.

I don’t have a good solution to this pāda. I would first point out that init. *diví te* matches up with init. *prthivyaś te* in b, and at least the disturbance in word order in the pāda may result from the desire to locate heaven and earth in parallel positions. Otherwise, instead of assuming a masc. *nābhi-* I supply ‘form’ with the masc. *paramó yáḥ* in the publ. tr., but there is no particular support for this, and if I was thinking of *rūpá-* at the time, this doesn’t work because *rūpá-* is neut. There are no masc. nouns that are regularly qualified by *paramá-*, while *nābhi-* is qualified as *paramā* (with a fem. form) in X.61.18. The upshot is – I’m fairly sure my rendering is wrong, or at least not right, and I’d be inclined to go with the standard, despite the distressing gender clash: “It was in heaven, to its navel, that your highest (navel) was bound.” As to what this means, presumably it is another instantiation of the “heavenly soma” trope: no matter that the physical plant is earthbound (as in pāda b), it has a heavenly analogue. One thing that is clear is that *ādadé* belongs to *√ dā* ‘bind’; see comm. ad I.139.1 and Kü 242.

Fortunately the rest of the vs. is relatively straightforward. The “fingers” that grow on the earth are the parts of the plant: if soma is ephedra intermedia (which grows in the Himalayas), it has slender upright shoots that could be conceived of as fingers.

IX.80

IX.80.1: The rhyming verbs *pavate* and *havate* take identical positions in pādas a and b respectively. See also 2d *pavase*, 3a *pavate*, 3b *śrāvase* in the same position.

Pāda c compares soma to a thunderstorm, producing a roar like Bṛhaspati's while flashing forth (*vī didyute*) like lightning.

In pāda d the value of *nā* is disputed: is it the simile particle or the negation? The problem prompted a 5-pg. digression by Old on the positioning of the two elements. He comes out strongly for the simile marker here, a view shared by Ge, Re, Kü (250, 503), and the publ. tr., while the negative is favored by Lü (99 and n. 2), Ober (II.216), and Schmidt (B+I 79)(with Ge considering it in n. 1d). Lü recognizes that the position favors the simile particle, but prefers the negative since there's no obvious element to supply to fill out the simile. Ge suggests that subj. to be supplied is either the soma vessels or the gods, with both Old and Re favoring the gods, who came on the scene in pāda b. I think instead that it is the waters with which the pressed soma is mixed; this would fit the comparison to 'seas'. Cf. I.173.8 ... *sāvanā samudré* "the pressings in the sea," which I also think refers to the mixing water. (Of course *sāvanāni* could also be the subject of *vivyacuḥ*, but this would require supplying an obj.)

On the full grade of *vivyacuḥ* (for expected **vivicuḥ*) see Kü 503 n. 1000. One might also note that the expected form would yield a terrible cadence. Acdg. to Kü, the indic. pf. to *vyac* is always a presential stative, and he considers the indic. necessary in this context to express that value. Otherwise, the full-grade 3rd pl. could belong to the plupf. (here as injunc.); cf. the augmented plupf. *avivyacuḥ* (X.56.4). Kü considers the injunc. excluded here, but in fact I think it's quite possible: "they have enveloped the pressings," parallel to *vī didyute* 'has flashed forth' in c, and might alter the tr. in to the preterital one.

IX.80.2: On *āyo-hata*- see comm. ad IX.1.2.

IX.80.3: On *kuṣī-* as 'cheek', not 'belly', see comm. ad III.36.8, VIII.92.24. Here the context is not diagnostic and might in fact slightly favor 'belly', esp. given vs. 1 of the next hymn (IX.81) by the same poet, which contains *jaṭhāram* 'belly'. However, the preponderance of evidence for 'cheek' elsewhere is pretty strong.

IX.80.4–5: Both vss. open with *tām tvā*, echoing *yām tvā* beginning vs. 2.

IX.80.4: Pādas a and b share a verb, *duhate* in b. Each pāda contains a contrastive pair: *devébhyaḥ* ... *nāraḥ* "the men for the gods" and *sahāsra(dhāram)* ... *dāśa (kṣīpaḥ)* "thousand(-streamed) ... ten (fingers)."

IX.80.5: The first two pādas have the same structure as 4ab: they share a verb form of *√duh*, *duhānti* in b, with two different subjects, *hastīnaḥ* (a) and *dāśa kṣīpaḥ* (b) again. The "stones" of 4c (*grāvabhīḥ*) return, but with different lexical realization (*ādribhīḥ*).

IX.81

IX.81.1: *īm* in c anticipates *śūram* in d.

IX.81.2: With Old I see “of gods” (*devānām*) in the phrase “the double birth of gods” as pregnant for “of gods (and men),” very much as a pregnant dual like *dyāvā* “two heavens” or *pitarā* “two fathers” implies its opposite number. As Old points out, the locational adverbs in the next pāda *amūta itás ca* “from yonder and from here” strongly suggest heaven and earth as their spheres. Ge considers “gods and men to be the sense, but, in order not to supply a 2nd gen. pl., he achieves this by way of the unlikely “(heavenly and earthly) gods,” that is, gods and men. Ober (I.391) thinks that the double birth is of Devas and Asuras, but this is anachronistic.

IX.81.3: The vs. contains a play on *vāsu*, which further puns on the poet’s name. In pāda a the acc. *vāsu* refers to the material goods we ask Soma to provide for us, while in c the dative *vāsave* appears to refer to a good person, the recipient of Soma’s aid. Since the Anukramanī attributes this hymn (along with IX.80 and 82) to Vasu Bhāradvāja, the recipient is presumably the poet himself. (Because Re has a particular, and peculiar, view of *vāsu*, his tr. does not reflect the pun.)

pārā sicaḥ ‘pour away’, which appears only here in the RV, must play on the very common soma verb *pāri √ sic* ‘pour around, pour in circles’, of the circular motion of pouring the soma juice onto the filter. See *pāri √ i / pāri √ yā* of soma’s journey around the filter in vss. 1–2 of the next hymn (IX.82), attributed to the same poet.

With Old I read **sucetúnā* (also in V.65.3) for transmitted *sú cetúnā*. The former cmpd. is pretty well attested, while *cetú-* doesn’t otherwise exist. And in both instances the phrase/cmpd. is pāda-final, which would put an independent particle *sú* in an unusual location: it otherwise generally takes Wackernagel’s position.

IX.81.4: Ge, Re, and Ober (I.526) take *surātáyah* as referring to a separate group of divinities (e.g., Re “les (divinités) aux beaux dons”), but there is no such corporate entity as far as I am aware. In other passages the stem simply modifies the gods in general (X.65.4) or the Maruts (X.78.3). Here I think it applies to the listed gods as a group, and as a summary adj. was stationed at the end of a pāda, here matching the position of **sucetúnā* at the end of 3c in the previous vs.

IX.82

IX.81.1–2: As Ge points out (nn. 1d, 2d), ghee (*ghṛtā-*) in these two vss. stands for the milk mixture.

IX.82.1: The simile in b is also found in X.43.2 *rājeva dasma* (with voc.), as Ge (n. 1b) points out. The simile is likely to be self-contained, not a necessary part of the rest of the clause, contra Ober (II.214–15), who sees it as expressing a peculiar trope, “der ‘brüllende’ König.”

IX.82.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. marks a departure from the first two conventional vss., with richer imagery, esp. in the first pāda. The first hemistich must

refer to the soma plant, growing in the mountains. The god of the thunder(storm), Parjanya is his father because rain produces plants. The qualifier *parṇín-* means, in the first instance, ‘feathered’ (e.g., VIII.5.33 *váyah ... parṇínah* “feathered birds”), but of course *parṇá-* ‘feather’ has already undergone widening in the RV to mean ‘leaf’ as well, and so it must be interpr. here.

The scene shifts back to the ritual ground in cd: the two additional ingredients of prepared soma, water and milk, are found in c, with the pressing stones in d (the actual order of ritual preparation would be the reverse, of course).

In c *utá* is in an unusual position and its function is unclear. Klein (DGRV I.380–81) simply describes the situation as involving “nonparallel clauses and weak nexus,” remarking further that cd “bears little cohesive relationship to ab,” though that’s what he thinks *utá* is connecting. Ge and Re both tr. as “also,” and the publ. tr. follows this interpr., which seems more likely than Klein’s near-null hypothesis. Perhaps contributing to its unusual position is the parallelism of *abhí gā utáśaran*# and 1b *abhí gā acikradat*#, with the verbs trisyllabic *śaran* and quadrisyllabic *acikradat* respectively. The *utá* supplies the necessary extra syllable and, by coalescing with the augment, the heavy antepenult needed for the cadence.

In d “unite with the stones” may be a little strong: better “come together with.”

IX.82.4: Since *śéva* in pāda a must be a vocative morphologically, its accent is unexpected in this pāda-medial position. There are two factors that might have contributed to it, which, however, cancel each other out. On the one hand, the point of contact between the simile “like a wife to her husband” and the frame is this very adj. ‘kindly’, and so an underlying fem. nom. sg. **śévā* must also be assumed. This overlap between an expected nom. and the voc. addressed to the correspondent of the wife, namely Soma, may have led to the anomalous accentuation. On the other hand, if the simile was felt to be a self-contained clause, *śéva* would begin a new clause or at least a new syntactic unit. I’m not sure that either is sufficient, but I weakly favor the second.

The voc. phrase in b, *pájrāyā garbha*, likewise causes a problem, though not of accent: *garbha* is properly unaccented, and its dependent gen. *pájrāyā(h)* shows the expected shift to initial accent in this pāda-initial voc. phrase, from the suffixally accented stem *pajrā-*. The question is the referent of this fem. *pajrā-*. Ge, Re, Ober (I.530) take it as a PN (e.g., “O Kind der Pajrā”). It is certainly true that *pajrā-* can be a PN (see Mayr [PN], though he doesn’t include this passage in his list), but usually in the pl. of a family of poets. It is never otherwise found in the fem., and it would be very strange (in my opinion) for a named *mother* to be specified in this kind of context, unless she is a goddess. Far more likely is Sāy.’s identification of the referent as the earth. The stem *pajrā-* as an adj. means ‘sturdy, steadfast’, a reasonable description of the earth. Earth as Soma’s mother would fit nicely also with 3a, which names Parjanya as his father. The rains generate the plant, but it grows in the earth.

The standard interpr. of *prá carā* in c is as 2nd sg. impv. addressed to Soma, and this is certainly possible. But I think it is equally possible that, in this 1st ps. context, it’s a 1st sg. subjunctive, and the contents of the poet’s direct speech announced in immed. preceding *brāvīmi te*. This is how it is rendered in the publ. tr.

The *sú* in c is in an unusual position, but it is in the same position as *sú* in the preceding hymn, IX.81.3, attributed to the same poet. There Old suggested (and I

followed) reading it with the following noun as cmpd. **sucetúnā*. I follow the same path here, reading **sujīváse*, though this time without Old's imprimatur. The case here is not as strong. With regard to IX.81.3 the putative cmpd *sucetú-* exists independently, while the transmitted stem *cetú-* does not. Here the opposite is true: the infinitival dat. *jīváse* is quite well attested, whereas *sujīváś-* is not found. This gives me pause about the emendation, but even without it, I think that *sú* should be read with *jīváse* and with its lexical value, not merely as a particle: "... to live well."

IX.82.5: In b *paryáyā(h)* is the augmented impf. to $\sqrt{yā}$, so correctly Gr, Ge. But Re in a rare grammatical lapse seems in his n. to take it as a subjunctive (presumably to \sqrt{i}), but that form should be (and is) *áyah*.

IX.83

On the structure of this hymn and my interpr. of its enigmatic contents, see the publ. intro. Here I will not treat in detail the interpr. of others.

IX.83.1: As indicated in the publ. intro. and above, ad IX.73.9, this vs. is very like the last vs. of IX.73, a hymn also focused on the filter, both physical and mystical.

The identity of the 'limbs' (*gātrāṇi*) in b is not entirely clear. I take it as referring to the metaphorical limbs of the filter, though the visual picture thus conjured up is imperfect, unless the fleece filter comes not only from the back but from the legs of the sheep. I do not think it is the limbs of the soma-drinkers, with Re.

I take *tād* in c to be the filter, again both physical and mystical. As I say in the publ. intro., "raw" versus "cooked" in this hemistich refers to the transformation effected on the soma plant by its ritual preparation, even though "cooking" is not technically involved. The pl. in d is presumably the soma drops or drinks, as opposed to the mass sg. in c referring to the as-yet-unprepared plant.

IX.83.2: The identification of sun and soma, with the rays of the sun across the sky (the cosmic filter, as it were) compared to the tracks of soma across the ritual filter.

The \bar{i} of *pavītár-* is anomalous and may in fact be suspect. The stem only occurs twice in the RV, the other time at IX.4.4, where the \bar{i} is not metrically guaranteed. In our passage, as Gr. points out, the SV [also JB] reading *pavitāram* is metrically better. The stem with \bar{i} is confined to the RV, except that the repetition of IX.4.4 in SV also has the \bar{i} (as opposed to the SV rep. of our passage). The expected *pavitár-* is found in the AV and later. Given extremely common *savitár-* to the parallel root $\sqrt{sū}$, it is hard to understand how *pavītár-* acquired its unetymological \bar{i} . I tentatively suggest that it is a metrical analogy to the far more common *pavitra-*, with heavy 2nd syllable because of the cluster. As this hymn shows, *pavitra-* occurs in the same contexts as *pavītár-*. It might also be influenced by the weak forms of the associated 9th class present (suffix *nī*), which immediately follows the form in IX.4.4: *pāvītārah punītāna*.

IX.83.3: Further identification of soma and the sun. For *pṛśni-* and *ukṣán-* used of the sun, see, e.g., V.47.3; for the sun supporting the worlds, see X.170.4 (dedicated to Sūrya) *yénemā viśvā bhúvanāny ābhṛtā* "by whom all these worlds are borne."

As indicated in the publ. intro., I take the 2nd hemistich as expressing a reciprocal paradox: the forefathers were created as masters of artifice (*māyāvín-*) by the artifice (*māyā-*) of Soma/the sun, but they also engendered him. I take the pf. *mamire* as passive, with Gr. The standard tr. (and incl. HPS, B+I, 78) take the verb as transitive, supplying *bhúvanāni* from b as obj. (I do have to concede that the pf. is otherwise generally transitive.) But under their reading I don't understand how the forefathers as possessing their own *māyā* (*māyāvínah*) needed "his *māyā*" (*asya māyāyā*) to accomplish the task.

If there is any difference in meaning between *māyāvín-* (3x) and the far better attested and more orthodoxly formed *māyín-* I cannot detect it.

IX.83.4: For my view of the Gandharva as another instantiation of soma/the sun see publ. intro. This more or less agrees with Ge (n. 4a: the sun, acdg. to Sāy.) and Re (Soma-Gandharva). I do not see this vs. as referring to the Somaraub as Ober does (II.162).

As indicated in the publ. intro., with the 2nd hemistich we return to the world of ritual and to the filter specifically.

nidhā- clearly means 'snare'; see the other occurrence in X.73.11 *nidhāyeva baddhān* "bound as if by a snare." But the semantic dev. from the presumed source *ní√dhā* is not clear. That lexeme generally means 'set down, deposit, keep safe/secure'. Perhaps 'snare' develops from this last meaning: a device used to secure an object. On this problem see detailed disc. by Scar (255). It would be nice to connect it with *ní√dā* 'bind', but pesky phonology gets in the way.

IX.83.5: The garment of cloud in b is presumably the milk in ritual terms, a real cloud for the sun identified with soma.

IX.84

IX.84.1: Acg. to Ober (I.526), this vs. is concerned with the "landerobernde Funktion (König) Somas," which makes sense. Pāda c directly asks Soma to provide us with wide space, and his epithets *vīcarsaṇi-* 'unbound(ari)ed' and *apsā-* 'water-winning' in ab belong to this conceptual realm. In d *uruksitau* 'in the wide dwelling place' may as well, if it refers to our (newly acquired) dwelling, per Ober. Re takes it rather as the dwelling place of the divine folk, but given the context Ober's view is more persuasive.

IX.84.2: The territory-winning theme of vs. 1 may be continued here, but on the cosmic level, with Soma mounting all the worlds. This is also probably a reference to Soma as the sun, as Ge suggests (n. 2a).

As noted in the publ. intro., the "knotting and unknotting" probably has both a ritual and a moral reading. Ritually it presumably refers to soma's passage across the woolly tangles of the sheep's fleece filter. But Ge cites as potential parallel IX.97.18 *granthīm ná ví śya grathitām ..., ṛjūṃ ca gātūṃ vṛjīnaṃ ca ...* "Untie like a knot the straight and the crooked way (which are) knotted up, when you are being purified," which implies a moral dimension as well, since "straight" and "crooked" are often used in that sphere.

Pāda d lacks an acc. in the frame to be construed with *śiṣakti* as parallel to *uśāsam* in the simile. Perhaps the gods in general (the *daívyam jānam* of 1d and 3d), or the three

gods named in 1b, Indra, Varuṇa, and Vāyu. Re supplies Indra, and the parallel he cites, I.56.4 *īndraṃ śiṣakti uṣāsaṃ nā sūryaḥ*, supports this suggestion, esp. since Indra recurs in vss. 3 and 4.

IX.84.3: The ritual and/or real world situation depicted in pādas a and c is unclear. In particular, in pāda a what plants does soma (+ milk) pour onto? Ober (II.42) may well be right that it depicts soma as rain, though we would still lack a ritual analogue to the plants receiving rain in the real world. Rain in this pāda would fit with the lightning imagery in c. Soma him/itself flashed forth (*vī didyute*) in IX.80.1, and “ever-flashing light” (*dāvidyutātī- rūc-*) is associated with the soma drinks in IX.64.28.

The publ. tr. construed *dhārayā* with *sutāḥ*, because this expression (IX.51.5, 72.5, 100.6, 108.5) or minor variants (IX.3.10=42.2, 10.4, 97.45) are fairly common in this maṇḍala. However, both Ge and Re take it with *pavate*, parallel with *vidyūtā* (e.g., “Der ausgepresste Soma läutert sich mit Blitz (und Regen)guss”), and this may be preferable in the rainstorm context.

IX.84.4: Notice the return of the god Vāyu of 1b in the guise of the common noun ‘wind(s)’ (*vāyúbhiḥ*) in c, juxtaposed with Indra in d.

IX.84.5: The last pāda is notable for the concentration of poet words: *vīpraḥ kavīḥ kāvyaena*, a role not otherwise attributed to Soma in this hymn.

IX.85–86

On the structure of the last two hymns of the Jagatī group, see the publ. introductions to IX.85 and 86. In brief, after a series of hymns of 5 vss. (IX.75–84), these last two have 12 vss. and 48 vss. respectively. However, they are clearly composites: IX.85 consists of three groups of four vss. apiece, IX.86 of 16 ṭṛcas. The standard principles of hymn arrangement can thus be restored.

IX.85

For the four-vs. sequences and their contents, see publ. intro.

IX.85.2: In pāda c the preverbs *abhy ā* are oddly positioned, after the caesura, and, more important, the two apparent acc. objects *śātrūn* ‘rivals’ and *bhandanāyātaḥ* ‘those seeking blessings’ are antithetical, with only the first an appropriate obj. to *jahí*. The problems disappear if, with Ge, we supply a second verb to go with the preverbs and to govern the 2nd acc. A verb of motion fits well, and \sqrt{i} , \sqrt{gam} , and $\sqrt{yā}$ all appear with this combination of preverbs, whereas \sqrt{han} does not. Ge goes for slightly richer semantics: “(komm) ... zu (Hilfe)” – without specifying what verb he supplies, but note that \sqrt{av} does not appear with those preverbs.

The identities of Soma and Indra appear to bleed into each other in the course of the vs. In ab the 2nd ps. subject is clearly Soma, on the basis of voc. *pavamāna* (a) and *priyó mādah* (b). The assumption then is that the impv. *jahí* in c is also addressed to Soma. But in d we get direct address of Indra and at the end of the pāda *he* is the subj. of a second *jahi*. Therefore pāda c, which contains no lexical clue to the addressee, could be addressed either to Soma or to Indra (or both).

IX.85.3: The blending of identities in 2cd is made explicit in pāda b here, where Soma is called “the very self of Indra” (*ātméndrasya*).

On the meaning of the secondary root \sqrt{nim} s see comm. ad VIII.43.10. There I stated my preference for maintaining the older gloss ‘kiss’, against the colorless ‘seek out’, which was suggested by Gotō and adopted by EWA, etc. However, I must admit that, at least superficially, ‘seek out’ works better here than ‘kiss’ and it is reflected in the publ. tr. But a ceremonial kiss signaling fealty is certainly possible – like kissing the pope’s ring or the widespread custom of kissing someone’s feet as a gesture of respect. So Ober (I.531–32) “Sie küssen den [Fuss des] König[s] dieser Erde.” Both Ge and Re render the phrase without interposing a bodypart, e.g., “ils baisent le roi de ce monde.” I am now inclined towards the more precise and physical “they kiss the king,” rather than the publ. tr.’s “They seek out the king.” This interpr. is made the more likely because “kissing” Soma in the ritual can well indicate consuming soma by mouth, that is, drinking it.

IX.85.5: The passive *ajyase* has, as often in this maṇḍala, a double meaning, ‘is anointed’ ($\sqrt{añj}$) and ‘is driven’ (\sqrt{aj}).

On the meaning (‘all at once’, not ‘in the middle’) and the formulaic construction of *samáyā*, see comm. ad I.113.10.

IX.85.7–8: Pādas 7c and 8a have almost identical structure:

pāvamānā abhy àrṣanti su(ṣtutīm)

pāvamāno abhy àrṣā su(vīryam)

which effects the transition from 3rd pl. to 2nd sg.

IX.85.8: The somewhat awkward tr. “constricting pressure” reflects the literal, additive sense of *pāriṣūti*:- *pāri* ‘around’ + $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel, thrust’. Maybe something like “squeezing” would sound a bit more idiomatic, though it is hard to find any English idiom that more or less represents the etymology *and* fits with the verb. Of course, narrowness and constriction are particularly feared and avoided in the Rīg Veda. Perhaps “claustrophobia” might work, though of course the -phobia part is absent; “constriction” is probably the best choice in English. It is also not clear what threat *pāriṣūti*- poses to the ritual soma, which, after all, has been subjected to serious pressing (via the phonologically similar but unrelated root \sqrt{su}) and therefore has nothing left to fear in that regard. In real world terms it of course refers to the opposite of the “wide pasturage and great, extensive shelter” that Soma is urged to rush to in pāda b. In this regard it is similar to the words *aṃhatī*-, *āṃhas*- ‘constriction, constraint’. The other occurrence of *pāriṣūti*- (I.119.6) is found in a similar context, with a contrast between constraint and wide space: *yuvām rebhām pāriṣūter uruṣyathaḥ*. JPB tr. “You give Rebha space from being besieged,” but in my opinion the sense is more particular: “you give Rebha wide space from (/out of) constriction.”

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

IX.85.9–12: As noted in the publ. intro., these four vss. treat the identification of Soma and the sun and are similar to the very enigmatic Vena hymn, X.123, which is attributed to the same poet, Vena Bhārgava.

IX.85.9: The double vision of both heavenly Soma/Sun and earthly ritual soma is clear here, with pādas a, b, d all having a celestial orientation, each containing a form of *div-/dyu-* ‘heaven’, while the filter of pāda c brings us back to the ritual. The subj. of d is probably, on the one hand, the ritual officiants, who perform the ritual action of milking (that is, pressing) the soma. But the substance obtained is “the beestings [colostrum, first milk] of heaven” (*pīyūṣam ... divāḥ*), and the next vs. makes clear that those performing the milking here are also the *venāḥ* ‘seekers’ in 10b, where they are located “in the vault of heaven” (*divó nāke*).

IX.85.10–11: The two tr. of *venā-* in 10b ‘seekers’ and 11b ‘trackers’ respectively should be harmonized. I would now tr. ‘seekers’ for both.

IX.85.10: The cosmic/natural and the earthly/ritual double vision is played out simultaneously throughout this vs. In ab the seekers milk the streams “in the vault of heaven” (*divó nāke*) but milk them out of “the mountain-dwelling ox” (*ukṣāṇam giristhām*), the earthly soma plant. In c the drop grows strong not only “in the waters” (*apsū*), presumably the ritual waters used to swell the plant, but also “in the sea” (*samudrá ā*); in d it is both “in the wave of the river” (*síndhor ūrmā*) and “in the filter” (*pavitra ā*).

On the basis of the shared verb (*duhate* in 9d, *duhanti* in 10b) the *venāḥ* here appear to be identical to the subjects of 9d, as suggested above.

Pāda b is identical to IX.73.4. As noted in the comm. thereon, there is good reason to supply “streams” (*dhārāḥ*) as the referent for the pl. adjs. *mādhujihvā(h)* and *asaścātaḥ*, which are therefore fem. acc. pl. Curiously Ge takes the former as nom. pl. m. here, though fem. in 73.4, while Ober (II.13149–50,) takes them both as nom. pl. m.; Re tr. as I do.

IX.85.11: I would now take the pf. part. *upapaptivāṁsam* as explicitly anterior to the impf. *akṛpanta*: “the eagle that had flown to the vault.”

IX.85.12: This final vs. is esp. close in phraseology to the Vena hymn, with pāda a identical to X.123.7a and pāda c almost identical to X.123.8c. Note also that *ādhi nāke asthāt* unites *ādhi ... asthāt* of our 9a and *nāke* of our 10a.

Ge takes the part. *praticākṣāṇaḥ* as transitive/causative “seine Farben alle offenbarend” (though he questions this in n. 12b); sim. Ober (II.13) “erscheinen lassend.” Re’s tr. is like mine (“regardant-en-face toutes les formes siennes”), although in his n. he considers the opposite possibility, citing passages with *prāti √ cakṣ* that supposedly have this transitive sense. But his exx. are not probative, and the middle voice of the participle makes it esp. unlikely to have this sense.

IX.86

As noted above, an assemblage consisting of 16 three-vs. units, attributed to a variety of poets and poetic groups and showing no particular unity of structure or special poetic merit. However, there is often patterned repetition both between *ṛcas* and within them.

IX.86.1–3: The first two vss. of this *ṛca* begin identically (*prá te*), and all three vss. concern the swift journey of the soma drinks, which is compared to that of swift animals. Vss. 1 and 3 share the same verb ($\sqrt{rṣ}$: 1b *arṣanti*, 3a *arṣa*; *āsrkṣata* in 2b is semantically similar) and the same goal, the *kóśa*- or ‘cask’, while vss. 1 and 2 both contain *āśvaḥ* ‘swift’. Of course none of these features is unusual in the soma corpus, so they are not strong evidence for *ṛca* unity.

IX.86.1: The rt noun cmpd *dhī-jū-* (also in vs. 4) could have two different readings, ‘sped by insight(s)’ and ‘speeding insights’; see Scar 170–71. The publ. tr. opts for the passive interpr., as does Re, while Ge chooses the transitive one. Either is possible in this ritual context, and parallels cut both ways. On the one hand, there is the parallel cmpd *dhī-jávana-* (3x), which must have transitive value; on the other, IX.64.16 ... *āśávaḥ / dhiyā jūtāḥ* ..., with *āśávaḥ* as here, supports the passive reading. And of course both might be meant.

The standard tr. (Ge, Re, also Scar 170) supply ‘horses’ with *raghujāḥ*, and this of course is quite possible. The adj. *raghú-* and its cmpds do modify horses elsewhere (e.g., V.30.14). However, the cmpds. *raghu-pátma-jamhas-* ‘having plumage (fit) for rapid flight’ (VI.3.5), *raghu-pátvan-* ‘rapidly flying’ (2x) reference flying, and various related forms reference birds: V.30.9 *raghúḥ śyenāḥ*, II.19.4 *váyo ná paptū raghuyā*. The specification of flight in these forms suggest to me that *raghú-* (etc.) was originally specialized for the swift flight of birds and then generalized to other fast things, and I therefore supply ‘birds’ in the simile. On the other hand, since vss. 2 and 3 both contain likely (*ráthyāsaḥ* 2b) or explicit (*átyaḥ* 3a) horses, *ṛca* unity might favor ‘horses’ in the simile here as well.

IX.86.2: It seems a little odd to say that chariot horses go “each separately,” since one would think that the horses would be attached to the same chariot and efficient movement would require them to pull together. But almost the same phrase occurs in X.91.7 ... *rathyò yáthā pṛthak*, though there referring to charioteers, and so the words must belong together. Perhaps it refers to separate chariots, each with its own set of horses—or that each horse in a chariot team has its own place in harness and each individually contributes to the speed of the whole?

IX.86.3: Pāda a is metrically disturbed, despite apparently having 12 syl. With Arnold and HvN, best to read **hyānāḥ* for *hiyānāḥ* (as sometimes elsewhere), to avoid a too early or too late caesura and a bad Jagatī cadence. The pāda is then a fine Triṣṭubh.

Although, as noted above, vss. 1 and 3 share the same goal, the *kóśa*-, the physical referent has changed between 1 and 3. In the former, the cask is presumably the soma vessel on the ritual ground, but in 3b it is characterized as *kóśam divó ádrimātaram* “the cask of heaven, whose mother is the stone”—in other words the vault of the sky (or the soma container in the sky). So the subject is the heavenly soma, not merely the earthly

ritual substance, even though the ritual details are re-asserted in cd. For the heavenly cask, see V.53.6, 59.8, IX.88.6. Old reports without enthusiasm a potential emendation to nom. *ádrimātā*, modifying soma, with *ádri-* the pressing stone. This would yield another Triṣṭubh pāda. However, since heaven (or at least the container of the heavenly soma) may be made of stone, there seems no reason to emend.

In the publ. tr. for ease of English parsing I moved the tr. of *svarvíd* from b to cd, but this mixes the levels: the sun-finding Soma is the one that reaches heaven, while the soma of cd is the substance purified in the sheep's filter. Better (if somewhat awkward): "... rush to the prize, as the sun-finder (rush) to the cask of heaven ..."

The phrase (*ádhi*) *sāno áv(ya)ye* "on the sheep's (lovine) back" occurs 9x in a fairly tight cluster in this maṇḍala (IX.86.3, 91.1, 92.4, 96.13, 97.3, 12, 16, 19, 40: all but this one in Triṣṭubh hymns). Given loc. *áv(ya)ye* and the loc. of 'back' in other variants of the formula (*áyve ... sānavi* IX.50.2, 70.8), *sāno* should be a loc., even though loc. **sāno/av* is not independently attested. See the inconclusive disc. in AiG III.153–54, which flirts with but does not explicitly endorse such a form. TY has persuasively argued that this form is a relic of an IE endingless full-grade loc.; another such relic is found in the phrase *vāsta usrāḥ*, on which see comm. ad V.49.3. Both of these formulaic expressions occur exclusively in cadences, which preserved the light syllable of prevocalic loc. *-*au* V from remodeling.

IX.86.4–6: The first vs. of the new ṭṛca is in part a distillation of the previous ṭṛca. The next two vss. end their first hemistichs identically: 5b, 6b GEN *satāḥ pári yanti ketávaḥ* "The beacons of the one being X circle around." But as in the first ṭṛca, this identity conceals a fundamental difference of reference, with both a cosmic and a ritual dimension.

IX.86.4: As just noted, this vs. seems to distill the first ṭṛca and is esp. similar to vs. 1. Like both 1 and 2 it opens *prá te*, and the 2nd hemistich also begins with *prá*, with *prāntár* echoing *prá ta*). Even more strikingly the first pāda matches 1a almost exactly:

1a *prá ta āśávaḥ pavamāna dhījávaḥ*

4a *prá ta āśvinīḥ pavamāna dhījávaḥ*

The only difference is the third word, and the two are phonological multiforms of each other – or rather, *āśvinīḥ* must have been formed as a variant of *āśávaḥ*, since the vṛddhi deriv. *āśvina-*, -ī is found only here in the RV (though it occurs elsewhere in Vedic), while *āśú-* is quite common. In addition, *asṛgran* (4b) and *asṛkṣata* (4c) reprise *āsṛkṣata* of 2b, and *páyasā* (4b) recurs from 2c.

However, these similarities once again mask conceptual differences.

The first question to confront is what the referents are for the fem. pls. *āśvinīḥ* in pāda a and *sthāvirīḥ* in c, and are they the same? Ge and Re both supply different nouns for the two – *dhārāḥ* 'streams' for the first (already Sāy.) and *gírah* 'hymns' for the second. (Sāy. supplies *dhārāḥ* for the second as well.) Although this split reference is perfectly possible – and at least *páyasā* 'with their milk' might favor a liquid interpretation in ab – I prefer to supply *gírah* for both. In the 2nd hemistich the passage adduced by Old to explain pāda c, I.181.7 *ásarjī vām sthāvīrā vedhasā gīḥ* "A substantial song has been sent surging to you, o ritual experts," resembles our passage very closely, with fem. *gīḥ* and with verb, adj., and voc. matching elements in cd. There is only one

fem. form to the adj. *sthāvira-*, namely the one just cited modifying *gír-*. The pleonastically vṛddhied adj. in our passage, fem. *sthāvirī-*, is a hapax in the RV – and in fact I would suggest that it owes its vṛddhi to an attempt to match that of *āśvinīḥ*. Moreover, I.181.7 passage is in an Aśvin hymn (the referents of *vām ... vedhasā*), and to my mind the unusual *āśvinīḥ* ‘destined for the Aśvins’ in the first hemistich invites us to supply a form of praise as the fem. pl. referent. We might also cite other exx. of the Aśvins’ association with praise hymns (not, I realize, unusual for Vedic gods!): VII.72.3 *stómāso aśvīnoḥ*, VIII.9.7 *aśvīnoḥ ... stómam*, VIII.9.16 *vācā aśvīnaḥ* (though none of these is fem. pl.). Thus in my view the entities “destined for the Aśvins” in pāda a are more likely to be hymns than streams.

In the first hemistich the fem. subj. (whatever it is) surges “into the support” (*dhārīmaṇi*), which I take to be the soma vessel. I supply the same loc. with *antár* in the 2nd hemistich. Cf. nearby IX.89.5 *samāné antár dharúṇe níṣattaḥ* “set down within the same support,” with *dharúṇe* an etymological and semantic match for *dhārīman-*.

As noted above, *asṛkṣata* in c repeats *ásṛkṣata* in 2b, but they are functional opposites: the first verb must be intrans. ‘have surged’ (or pass., ‘have been discharged’) with the soma drinks as subject, while our verb is trans. with the seers as subj. and hymns as obj. The intrans/pass.. function is taken over in vs. 4 by *asṛgran* in b. The aor. of *√sṛj* is overwhelmingly medial and overwhelmingly intrans./pass. in function, including the numerous exx. of 3rd pl. *ásṛkṣata*. There are only two transitive occurrences of this form, this one and one in V.52.6. In our case I think it likely that in this vs. *asṛkṣata* has been made to contrast functionally with likewise 3rd pl. *asṛgran*, which patterns with the aor. passive and therefore has more title to intrans./pass. function. Narten (Sig.Aor. 270–71) discusses the functional issues in the *s*-aor. paradigm of this root, but she holds the (to me) unlikely position that the medial forms should be fundamentally transitive (though she hedges here) and the intrans. use is secondary, despite the clear numerical superiority of the intrans. usage. I think it makes more sense to consider the transitive usage, at least here, as forced on a normally intrans. form by the pressure of *asṛgran*.

The formation of the hapax voc. *ṛṣiṣāṇa* is opaque. Gr’s gloss ‘dem Sänger freund’ reveals nothing about his analysis of the 2nd part; sim. Re’s ‘propre aux Prophètes’ without further comment. With Ge, the publ. tr. assigns the 2nd member to *√san* ‘gain, win’, hence ‘winning seers’. If we maintain that analysis, the sense might be compared to *ṛṣi-sāh-* in IX.76.4, which means ‘vanquishing (the other) seers’, in poetic competition or the like. However, given the set nature of *√san* and the persistent short vowel (-) *san-* in most of its nominal forms, this analysis is not entirely persuasive, esp. since the semantics are not absolutely compelling. AiG II.2.926 posits (without conviction) a suffix *-sāna-*, but also suggests a connection to the (pseudo-)part. *-asāna-* type (which is treated at AiG II.2.236–37), but it doesn’t fit the general profile of this group (on which see comm. ad IV.3.6). Perhaps *-sāna-* is better connected to *√sā* ‘bind’; cf. the noun *viṣāṇa-* V.44.11, which has the merit of existing and whose long vowel is predictable. Hence ‘binding seers’ or ‘having the binding of seers’ – that is, holding them fast, commanding their loyalty or attention, as in pāda c. But in the absence of any further information, accentual, contextual, or formulaic, we can’t get much further.

IX.86.5–6: As noted above, these two vss. have parallel structures in the crucial 2nd pāda. Although Ge notes this, his tr. does not reflect the parallelism of the two genitive

phrases with pres. part. *satāh*, nor does Re's. Although taking account of this somewhat complicates my tr., I think it must be done. Vs. 6 is the clearer one: the pres. part. to \sqrt{as} is, as often, concessive: *although* Soma stays fixed, his beacons (continue) to circle. A concessive sense is harder to excavate from vs. 5 – hence the somewhat awk. rendering in the publ. tr. – but I think it is rhetorically called for. In both vss. the GEN *satāh* phrase specifies the spatial position of Soma. In 6 he is fixed; he has completed his journey to the soma vessels, as pāda d tells us. Vs. 5 is chronologically earlier than 6: Soma is advancing (*prabhū-*) on his journey, which is still in progress, as he “reaches through” *vyānaśi-* the domains, i.e., the filter and subsequent locations. Cf., for *prabhū-*, nearby IX.83.1 *pāvitraṃ te vītatam ..., prabhūḥ ... pāry eṣi vīsvātaḥ* “The filter is outstretched for you, o lord of the sacred formulation. Advancing, you circle around it on all sides.” The lexeme *pāri√i* in soma contexts describes the movement of the soma juices around the filter. I think the point of both our vss., 5 and 6, is that, though Soma has moved on beyond the filter (5) and finally settled in the vessels (6), his beacons continue to circle around the filter. I am not entirely sure what that means in physical terms – perhaps the residual soma, caught as drops in the wool of the filter and glinting as the final drops drip down? or are the beacons pieces of ritual equipment? I think the former is more likely, given the reoccurrence of sg. *ketū-* in vs. 7 referring to Soma himself, but I am tolerably certain that the pl. in 5–6 distinguishes the vanguard of the soma, Soma proper, from the rest of the liquid that follows.

IX.86.5: As should be clear from the immed. preceding discussion, as elsewhere in IX I take *dhāmāni* ‘domains’ as referring to the filter and subsequent locales that the soma traverses, not, with Ge, Soma’s forms. (What Re means by “structures” is uninterpretable to me.) The physical locations on the ritual ground can also be viewed as the cosmic domains over which Soma has dominion – hence the hyperbolic statement in d, attributing universal rule to Soma.

On *vīsvasya bhūvanasya rājasī*, see the identical phrase in 28b.

vyānaśi- belongs with the redupl. *-i-* stem type of *cakrī-*, etc. (cf. weak pf. *vy-ānaś-* to $\sqrt{(n)as}$); see AiG II.2.292. It can therefore govern the acc., like other instances of this formation type, and we can easily supply *dhāmāni* from pāda a, strongly supported by the parallel later in the hymn: IX.86.15 *yó asya dhāma prathamām vyānaśe* “who has reached through his first domain,” with the medial perfect to *vī√(n)as*.

IX.86.6: The referent changes from 2nd ps. (vs. 5) to 3rd (vs. 6), although this is not clear until the 3rd sg. verbs in the 2nd hemistich.

“On both sides” (*ubhayātaḥ*) probably reflects the double reference just noted: the ritual and the cosmic, or the earthly and the heavenly. See Ge n. 6ab.

I read *yādī* as *yād ī* (with enclitic prn.), since “if” does not work well here.

IX.86.7–9: The beginning and end of this *ṛca* echo the preceding one: *ketūḥ* in 7a picks up the pl. *ketāvaḥ* in 5–6, and the end of vs. 9, *kalāśeṣu sīdati*, is identical to the end of 6. The *ṛca* traces a trajectory from the ritual journey—the filter and the cask in 7—to a cosmic one, with Soma as king (8a) traversing first earthly natural features (seas, rivers, streams, waves 8ab) and then bridging the distance between earth and heaven (8d, 9ab), ending back on the ritual ground (9d). Of course the equivalence of the ritual and cosmic

features is always in the foreground, as when in 8c he mounts the sheep's back (=the filter), which is immediately (8d) then identified as "the navel of the earth" (*nābhā pṛthivyāḥ*), with the same word for 'back' (*sānu*) used in 8c for the filter and in 9a for heaven.

IX.86.9: The rel. cl. of b lacks a verb. I think that whatever is supplied must be able to be construed with *dhārmabhiḥ* "according to (his) ordinances." My 'abide' is a slight elaboration on Ge's 'sind': "durch dessen Bestimmungen Himmel und Erde sind," which I think is fundamentally correct. This is another hyperbolic statement of Soma's cosmic power. Re's "lui à qui (appartiennent) le ciel et la terre avec les choses-à-maintenir" separates *yasya* from *dhārmabhiḥ* and finds little work for the instr. pl. to do. The two instances of *dhārmabhiḥ* (here and 5c) should be more or less in harmony.

IX.86.10–12: Following a pattern we've met earlier, the first vs. of the new *ṛca* echoes the previous one. In particular, the beginning of 10a *jyótir yajñāsya pavate* is almost identical to 7a *yajñāsya ketúr pavate*, with *ketú-* = *jyótis-* semantically and the order of the first two elements flipped. As for intra-*ṛca* connections, 10b *#pitā devānām* is picked up by 11b *#pātir divāḥ*. There is also a fair amount of repetition of vocabulary and even phraseology from earlier in the hymn (e.g., 6cd ... *mṛjyāte hāriḥ* ... *kalāśeṣu sīdati* and 11cd *hāriḥ* ... *sādaneṣu sīdati*, *marmṛjānāḥ*), but most of this involves material so ubiquitous in soma discourse that it doesn't mean much.

IX.86.10: Ge notes the parallels between our vs. and IX.75.2:

IX.75.2a. ... *pavate mādhu priyām*, ...
2cd *dádhāti putráḥ pitrór apīcyām*, *nāma* ...

IX.86.10a ... *pavate mādhu priyām*, ...
.10c *dádhāti rátnaṃ svadháyor apīcyām*

But he doesn't seem to take the parallelism too seriously. In particular, though both 75.2c and 86.10c have a dual gen./loc. to be construed with a VP in which the subject deposits / establishes a secret X [name in 75.2, treasure in 86.10], Ge takes the dual as loc. in 75.2 (where there's a parallel loc. sg. *rocané*), but gen. here ("Er bringt das verborgene Kleinod der beiden Eigenmächte")(sim. Re), with a somewhat forced interpr. of *dádhāti* as 'bringt'. Since the dual seems to have the same referent in both passages, Heaven and Earth (so both Ge and Re), and the passages are otherwise so similar, it seems to me very likely that they are structured in the same way. I therefore take *svadháyoḥ* as loc.

It's worth noting that this is the only du. form of the stem *svadhā-*

IX.86.11: I do not know why the seats are identified as those of Mitra. I doubt that Lü is correct that it is only because Mitra's seat is in highest heaven (210), much less that Mitra is at this stage in Vedic being identified with the sun (605).

IX.86.12: The vs. is structured by three pāda-initial forms of *āgre* + GEN, reinforced by *agriyāḥ* in b.

IX.86.13–15: This *ṛca* is characterized by increasingly larger claims for Soma’s cosmic reach. It has fewer connections to previous *ṛcas*, save for the echo in 15b *dhāma prathamām vyānaśe* of 5a and c, on which see comm. there.

IX.86.13: Ge identifies (n. 13a) and tr. *matāvān* as a real past active participle (“Nachdem er sich bedacht hatte ...”)(sim. Lü 243). This seems highly unlikely to me; Whitney’s statement (Gr. §960) should be noted: “Derivative words of this formation [= *távant-* sj] are found in RV., but without anything like a participial value. The AV. has a single example ... In the Brāhmaṇas also it is hardly met with.” See also Re’s n. The fact that the base, *matá-*, is not found independently as a ppl. in the RV, but only once (besides here) in the cmpd. *matavacas-* (voc., so unaccented, I.46.5), makes the building of a past active part. to it even less likely. Instead *-vant-* must have its usual possessive sense and in context mean ‘accompanied by thoughts’ (like *marútvant-*), referring to the praises given to Soma at the ritual. These act as a spur to set the soma in motion, hence the following simile.

The 2nd hemistich opens with a form of the 2nd sg prn., *táva*, followed at intervals by two voccs., *kave* at the end of c and *indra* in d, followed immediately by vs.-final *te*. It only becomes clear in d, with the 3rd ps. phrase *pavate sómaḥ*, that the 2nd ps. cannot be Soma, as it was earlier in the hymn (vss. 1–3, 4–5). The *kave* is a bit of a red herring, since it could, and often does, refer to Soma, and though Indra is sometimes so designated, other gods are far more commonly so called. The voc. *indra* at the end settles the matter, but our poet seems to tease us with other possibilities.

The image of Soma purifying himself “between the two world-halves” of course reflects the cosmic reach of the Soma, but it may also have a narrower ritual application. In IX.98.9 Ge suggests that the world-halves there are the jaws of the soma-press, which would fit nicely here. See also IX.75.4, where the world-halves are called the mothers of Soma.

IX.86.14: I would now tr. the pf. part. *jajñānāḥ* with past value, “once having been born.”

The standard tr. (and incl. Ober II.76; Lowe, Part. 158) take *svár* as nom. with the pf. part.: “having been born as the sun.” This is of course quite possible. But I would expect a goal with *abhí* √ *kram* and therefore take *svàr* as acc. in that function (see also Scar 330).

I take *nábhasā* as instr. of extent of space, rather than accompaniment (Ge, Lowe) or, even less likely, agent (Re “s’est élané par la nuée,” despite the absence of any verbal form that could be interpr. as passive).

The identify of the “age-old father” isn’t clear, and various candidates have been suggested: Sāy.: Indra; Ge (n. 14d): Parjanya or Heaven; Re: Heaven. I’m generally inclined towards Heaven, though of course bringing Heaven here is not physically possible.

IX.86.15: The gen. *asya* of pāda a could depend instead on *visé* – or indeed on both *visé* and *śárma*. Since I don’t know what ‘clan’ is in question, it is hard to determine if it belongs to Soma.

On *dhāma ... vyānaśe*, see comm. ad vs. 5. I do not think, with Ge, that the *dhāman-* refers to the first “form” of soma in the phases of soma-preparation.

In d note the play in the phrase *sám yāti samyátaḥ*, which belong to different roots ($\sqrt{yā}$ and \sqrt{yat} respectively). The latter has been rendered in quite different ways: Ge: “... gelangt er zu allen Stufenfolgen”; Re “il parcourt toutes les confluences”; Lü (702) “... geht er zu allen Treffpunkten”; Scar (404) Nomen act. ‘feste Aufstellung’. But *samyát-* is generally an adj., usually in the pl. of liquids (V.34.9 *āpaḥ samyátaḥ*, VIII.100.9); esp. pertinent are two passages in our own hymn: vs. 18 in the next *ṛca samyátam pipyúṣīm iṣam* “continuous, swelling refreshment” and, by implication, in vs. 47 *dhāṛāḥ ... samyátaḥ* “continuous streams.” On the basis of these passages, I supply “streams” here as well. See, e.g., vs. 8.

IX.86.16–18: The first two vss. of this *ṛca* begin with *prá* with a verb of motion, but otherwise there is little that unifies the *ṛca*. Nor is there much that connects with the rest of the hymn, save for 16a ... *ayāsīt ... índrasya niṣkṛtām* / 7b=32d ... *úpa yāti niṣkṛtām* and the repetition of *samyát-* in 18a (cf. 15d and disc. there).

IX.86.16: Pāda b strikes me as the quotation of a well-known general truth or proverb, providing the basis for the particular action of pāda a: Soma cannot let Indra down, because (of the old saw) “a comrade ...” It’s also worth noting that the other occurrence of *samgír-* (X.89.9) is also the obj. of *prá* $\sqrt{mī}$. Re also adduces IV.25.7 *ná ... sakhyám índraḥ ... sám grñīte* “Indra does not agree to companionship (with ...).”

IX.86.17: The publ. tr. does not make it clear that “your” is pl. (enclitic *vaḥ*) and must refer to the poet/officiants.

What is striking stylistically in this vs. is the sequence of three heavy nom. pl. fem. *-yu*-adjectives: *mandrayúvo vipanyúvaḥ*, *panasyúvaḥ*, the latter two derived from the same root. Though morphologically parallel, they are somewhat disharmonious: *mandrayú-* is a hapax, *vipanyú-* is reasonably well attested and generally modifies the human officiants (gods a few times), while the rather fewer occurrences of *panasyú-* (and the related verb *panasyá-*) refer to gods. Hence the “thoughts” of our vs. seem both to “express admiration,” as humans do to gods, and “invite/require admiration,” as gods do from humans – so the thoughts’ purposes seem to be various, both to praise the gods and be admired for their fine crafting?

I’m not exactly sure what *samvāsana-* (a hapax), lit. ‘dwelling together, joint dwelling’ is expressing here. Ge seems similarly puzzled, tr. “in den Sitzungen” with a question mark; Re’s “dans les sessions-rituelles” is more definite and appealing, but I don’t see where he gets it. Perhaps it doesn’t indicate that the thoughts are dwelling with each other but that they, as a group, are dwelling with something/one else – perhaps the soma, perhaps the milk and other non-verbal parts of the ritual machinery?

IX.86.18: Note the functional contrast between *ā ... pavasva* and adjacent *pávamānaḥ*.

IX.86.19–21: No obvious signs of unity. The instr. *manīṣibhiḥ* is found at the end of 19 and immediately afterwards at the beginning of 20. The dawn(s) and the rivers are found in both 19 and 21, but not in mutually reinforcing ways. As for external connections, the “partnership” (*sakhyá-*) of Indra and Vāyu in 20 is reminiscent of the companions/partners (implicitly Soma and Indra) in 16b. There are various lexical echoes

(e.g., *vicakṣaṇāḥ* 19a = 11b), but the limited vocab. of the Soma hymns makes this unremarkable.

IX.86.19: “Bull of the thoughts” (*vīṣā matīnām*) is a slightly odd expression, but it fits the pattern of IX.76.4 *pitā matīnām*, 96.5 *janitā matīnām*, 103.4 *netā matīnām*, though without obvious agentive content here —although Ge interpr. ‘bull’ as ‘Befruchter’.

The three genitives with *pratarītā* by all the standard accounts (incl. the publ. tr., also Ober II.53) consist of two temporal expressions (day, dawn) and a spatial one (heaven). It is not clear to me what “lengthening/extending heaven” would involve, and so, though gen./abl. *divāḥ* is almost always ‘heaven’ rather than ‘day’, I now wonder if it here refers to ‘day’. Other passages containing both ‘day’ words include III.56.6 *trīr ā divāḥ savitar vāryāṇi*, *divé-diva ā suva trīr no āhnaḥ* “Three times a day, every day, o Savitar, impel valuables to us, three times daily”; X.7.4 *dyúbhiḥ ... āhabhiḥ*; X.12.4 *āhā yād dyāvah ... āyan* — and, interestingly enough, two expressions in this very hymn, vss. 41 and 42, on which see further ad locc. The question is what, if anything, is the semantic distinction between the two ‘day’ words *div-* / *dyu-* and *āhar* / *āhan-*. In principle “daytime” (versus night time) could be distinguished from the 24-hour day. Which, then, would be which? Assuming that PIE **d̥ieṃ-* (and its descendents) referred esp. to the *bright* sky, we might expect the ‘day’ occurrences of *div-* / *dyu-* to refer to the *bright* day, i.e., day versus night, leaving *āhar* for the 24-hour day. And the numerous exx. of *nāktam* (...) *divā* (and reverse order) “by night and by day” (I.24.10, 12, 34.2, 98.2, etc., etc.) seem to bear out this prediction. We also find *div-* / *dyu-* contrasted with other words for ‘night’: e.g., in the instr. pl. *dyúbhir āktúbhiḥ* (I.34.8, 112.25, III.31.16), and in other case/no. pairs I.116.24 *dāśa rātrīḥ ... nāva dyūn*, VI.49.10 *rudrām divā vardhāyā rudrām aktaú*. However, *āhar* is also commonly found in these contexts. Cf. the compd. *ahorātrā-* ‘day and night’ and expressions like *rātryā āhnaḥ* (X.129.2), *tisraḥ kṣāpas trīr āhā* (I.116.4), *vy āktūn ... vy āhāni* (V.54.4), *rātrībhiḥ ... āhabhiḥ* (X.10.9), *āhobhiḥ ... āktúbhiḥ* (X.14.9), *āktúbhyaḥ ... āhabhyaḥ* (X.89.11). Also passages in which light is put into or created for *āhar* / *āhan-* — e.g., IX.92.5 *jyótir yād āhne ākṛnot*. An esp. telling example is X.68.11 *rātryāṃ támo dadhur jyótir āhan* “They put darkness in the night (and) light in the day.” I therefore find myself at something of an impasse, since both words are used contrastively with ‘night’, and in a passage containing both ‘day’ words assigning one sense to the one and the other to the other seems arbitrary. In any case, I now do think that *divāḥ* means ‘day’ here, and would substitute the tr. “... the lengthener of the day, of dawn, of the daytime” (having made the arbitrary choice).

On *krāṇā* see comm. ad I.58.3. In addition to the adv. sense (‘successfully, effectively’) discussed there, this old instr. can be used with true instr. value: ‘by the action’, as here. In his 1903 art. (cited ad I.58.3) Old (p. 35=Kl Schr. 1113) identifies *krāṇā* here as a neut. pl., not instr. sg.: “die Werke der Ströme, die Kufen hat er brüllen gemacht.” But by the time of the Noten he instead takes it as instr.: “durch das Tun der Flüsse.” This is in fact the standard interpr. of *krāṇā síndhūnām* here: Ge “Unter Mitwirkung der Ströme”; Re “Par l’action des fleuves”; Lü (254) = Ge, but with (?) inserted after “Mitwirkung.” But this pāda is regularly compared by these very same scholars with IX.102.1 *krāṇā síśur mahīnām*. And it is generally agreed that *mahīnām* in that pāda refers also to the rivers. But there is a split about where to construe this gen. Ge (and perhaps by implication Old) follows the pattern of our passage: “Unter Mitwirkung

der grossen (Ströme),” but Lü argues (239, 242), rather persuasively, that *mahînām* belongs rather with *śīśuḥ*, as “child of the great (rivers),” in part on the basis of *sīndhumātar-* (IX.61.7) ‘whose mothers are the rivers.’ He is followed by Re. In the interpr. of the two passages only Ge is consistent, in taking the gen. with *krāṇā* in both cases. Lü, Re, and the publ. tr. all construe the gen. differently in the two places. I now think this is wrong and a consistent interpr. should be made, but I make the opposite choice to Ge’s. In the passage here I would supply ‘child’ as headnoun for *sīndhūnām* and change the tr. to “Through his action, (the child) of the rivers ...” There are several reasons for my change of heart besides a desire for consistency. For one thing *krāṇā* is never elsewhere construed with a gen. For another, Soma is otherwise the sole subj. of *āvīvaśat* and doesn’t need any assistance in this action.

IX.86.20: Ge interpr. *pavate* as a passive, with *manīṣibhiḥ* as agent (“Von den Verständigen wird der allerste Seher geläutert”), but *pāvate* is so insistently reflexive in the Soma maṇḍala that I strongly resist a passive here. Re’s tr. is like mine, though he doesn’t comment.

Trita is the ur-Soma presser. See disc. ad IX.37.4. Here, as Ge (n. 20c) suggests, Soma re-creates him for the current pressing, to ensure that Indra and Vāyu will get their soma.

IX.86.21: The first three pādas of this vs. begin *ayām* ‘this one here’.

The thrice seven cows here are also found in IX.70.1, as Ge (n. 21c) points out. See the seven cows in vs. 25.

On pāda d see comm. on the identical pāda ad IX.72.7.

IX.86.22–24: The *ṛca* seems to be characterized by augmented imperfects, though three of the five could be injunctives instead: *ārohayaḥ* [maybe] 22d, *abhayaḥ* 23c, *avīṇoḥ* [maybe] 23d, *amadan* 24b, *ābharat* [maybe] 24c. It is also characterized by mythic allusions, esp. the Vala myth and the opening of the cowpen for the Aṅgirasas (23d) and the stealing of soma from heaven (24c), as well as the cosmogonic act of raising the sun into heaven (22d). Both this latter deed and the opening of the Vala cave are deeds usually attributed to Indra.

As for phraseology, in 22c and 23b the soma is “in the belly of Indra” (*indrasya jaṭhāre(su)* – sg. in 22c, pl. in 23b); *pavitra ā* is found in both 22b and 23a. With regard to external connections, 22d *nībhīr yatāḥ* is also found in 20b, and 23b *indrasya jaṭhāreṣv āviśān* echoes 19d *indrasya hārdy āviśān*, with a different body part.

It may also be that 22 continues the theme of 21: in 21a Soma made the dawns shine forth (*vī rocayat*), while in 22d he made the sun mount in heaven (*sūryam ārohaya divī*). The two verbs are not only identical in formation (both *-āya*-transitives) but phonologically similar.

IX.86.22: Although the Pp. analyzes *ārohayaḥ* as containing an augment (*ā/ arohayaḥ*), it could equally well have an injunc.: *ā/ rohayaḥ*. The latter would fit better with the injunc. *vī rocayat* in 21a, just disc.; the former with the other augmented forms of this *ṛca*.

IX.86.23: The augmented impf. *abhavaḥ* is somewhat surprising in this context, because, at least in the publ. tr., it seems to refer to the recent past, rather than to the mythic past of the following (*a*)*vṛṇoḥ*. Perhaps, however, it opens the telling of the Vala myth continued in d (and possibly 24ab; see below).

The augment in (*a*)*vṛṇoḥ* is quite insecure: the Pp restores it, but it is not found in the Saṃhitā text and is metrically de trop.

IX.86.24: Both hemistichs open with a distracted 2nd sg. acc. pronoun (*tʷvām*). The accusative of this pronoun is, of course, historically monosyllabic, though distraction is not uncommon in the RV. Here the distraction may have resulted from matching the distracted nominative sg. form that opened the 2nd hemistich of the previous vs., 23c.

The impf. *amadan* in b is wrongly tr. as a present in the publ. tr.: correct to “did ... applaud.” This may continue the account of the Vala myth, with the “very attentive poets” being the Aṅgirasas themselves. It seems unlikely that it is the first action of the soma-stealing myth found in c.

Once again the Pp. analyzes *ā* / *abharat*, but the sequence could instead be *ā* / *bharat* with an injunc.

IX.86.25–27: Cows (that is, the milk-mixture) are esp. prominent in this *ṛca*: there are seven in 25b (recalling the “thrice seven” that produced the milk-mixture in 21c), here called *dhenávaḥ*, with *gāḥ* in 26c and *góbhiḥ* in 27c. Other miscellaneous animals: the sheep’s fleece (*ávyē ... vāre* 25a), buffaloes (*mahiṣāḥ* 26d), a steed (*átyaḥ* 26d), as well as the tawny one (*hárīm* 25b, 27b), if that is specifically a tawny horse or, as in 31b (*vṛṣā ... hárīḥ*), a tawny bull.

25b and 27b both open *hárīm navante*, each followed by a diff. preverb to be construed with the verb (*abhí, áva*). In 27a *asaścātaḥ* recalls 18c *ásaścuṣī*.

IX.86.26: The two pres. participles to $\sqrt{kṛ}$, act. *kṛṇvān* (b) and med. *kṛṇvānāḥ* (c), provide almost a textbook example of the functional distribution of voices: in b Soma makes X (into) Y for someone else (dat. *yájyave*), while in c he makes X (into) his own Y.

IX.86.27: On the likely pun on *abhiśríyaḥ*, see Ge (n. 27ab), also Scar 547–48.

It is not entirely clear what “the third back” (*ṛtīye prṣṭhé*) refers to, but most likely the highest (third) realm of heaven. Cf., for the back of heaven in general, *divás prṣṭhé* in IX.66.5.

IX.86.28–30: As noted in the publ. intro., this *ṛca* shows a high degree of unity. To start with, every pāda but 2 (of 12), begins with a form of the 2nd sg. prn.: mostly nom. *tʷvām* (28b, d, 29a, c, 30a) but also gen, *táva* (28a, 29b, d), with the final hemistich breaking the pattern with a single acc. *tʷvām* (distracted; see comm. ad vs. 24 above) in c and a single dat. *túbhya* in d. Only 28c and 30b fail to open with such a form (and 28c has the enclitic *te* later in the pāda). In addition, all 3 vss. contain the voc. *pavamāna* (28c, 29d, 30b), and all three also have forms of *vísva-* 28b, d, 29a, 30d). Note also that *vísvasya bhúvanasya* in the first vs. (28b) is echoed by *vísvā bhúvanāni* in the last (30d), and that *vidharmaṇi* (29b) is taken up by better specified *rájaso vidharmaṇi* (30a); cf. also *távemāḥ* (28a, 29b) varied by *túbhyemāḥ* (30d).

In terms of contents, the *ṛca* insistently asserts Soma's universal rule over all cosmic elements.

IX.86.28: Ge and Re (also Ober II.43) construe *táva* with *rétasaḥ* (e.g., Ge “Von deinem himmlischen Samen sind diese Geschöpfe”). I am reluctant to do so because of the parallelism of *távemāḥ* (*! túbhyemāḥ*) just noted: all three expressions should be rendered in the same general way. In addition Ge's tr. essentially assumes *rétasaḥ* is abl., but its companion adj. *divyása* is stubbornly gen. I would therefore stick to my tr., though slightly modified for clarity to “Yours are these offspring of (your) heavenly semen.”

For ... *viśvasya bhúvanasya rājasi*, see 5d, which is identical, and 36d ... *viśvasya bhúvanasya rājase*, in an acc. + inf. phrase.

Pāda c is essentially a restatement of b.

Since *dhāma-dhā-* is an etymological figure, I have rendered it as one, rather than ‘establisher of domains’, vel sim.

IX.86.29: The cmpd. *viśva-vid-* is ambiguous here. Ge and Re both tr. as ‘all-knowing’, and that is favored by the context, since it is immediately followed by the voc. *kave* (‘sage poet’). But the cmpd recurs in the very similar pāda, 39c *tvām suvīro asi soma viśvavít*, and that vs. contains three similarly formed cmpds that surely belong to *√ vid* ‘find’: IX.86.39a *govít ... vasuvíd dhiranyavít*. There the context favors ‘all-finding’. (Scar treats the two roots *√ vid* together [489], so he is not forced to distinguish.) I suggest, as usual, that it's a pun.

IX.86.30: On the expression *pavítre rājaso vídharmaṇi* and its more succinct variants see comm. ad IX.64.9.

IX.86.31–33: After the tight structure of the preceding *ṛca*, we have returned to the lax stringing together of soma tropes. There is a lot of noise-making in 31 (b *cakradat*, c *vāvaśānā anūṣata*), which is slightly echoed in 33 (b *kānikradat*). Otherwise I see nothing particularly unifying.

As for external connections, GEN *niṣkṛtām* *√ yā* in 32d is found also in 7b and 16a, and of course much of the soma lexicon is repeated elsewhere.

IX.86.32: Although the standard interpr. of *yáthā vidé* here makes Soma subj. of the verb (e.g., Ge “wie er es versteht”), pāda-final *yáthā vidé* is a common tag (I.127.4, 132.2, etc.) with a passive reading of the verb: “as is known, in the way that is known.”

The “directives of truth” (*ṛtasya praśiṣaḥ*) are convincingly identified as the hymns by Lü (469–70), as the adj. *nāvīyas-*, a standard descriptor of hymns in the fem., suggests.

I assume that the “threefold thread” (*tántum ... trivṛtām*) refers to the three soma pressings.

IX.86.34–36: Nothing much in the way of internal unity or external connection, beyond the obvious soma themes.

IX.86.34: The publ. tr. does not make sufficiently clear (or clear at all) that *pávamāna* is a voc. Better tr. “Self-purifying one, as a great flood you run ...”

With Ge and Re I take *máhy áṛṇaḥ* “great flood” as a nom., coreferential with the 2nd sg. subj. The statement “you are the sea” (29a *tvám samudró asi*) gives semantic support to the coreferential reading, though the two words (*samudrá-* and *áṛṇas-*) are different. By contrast, Lü (204, 239; sim. Ober II.152 n. 111) takes it as acc. of extent, indicating the space that the soma traverses, with the “filters” of b parallel to it in a simile: “du durchläufst die grosse Flut, wie die strahlende Sonne die wollenen Seihen.” This interpr. requires that the *real* filter (the sheep’s fleece) that the *real* soma ordinarily traverses be part of the simile, expressing what the sun crosses, while the metaphorical filter (“the great flood”) is part of the frame, where the real soma is crossing it. This is either very clever poetics, with several levels of metaphor below the surface simile – or an indication that his interpr. is incorrect. I’m afraid that I incline towards the latter view.

The expression in c *gábhasti-pūto nṛbhiḥ* is somewhat curious, since it essentially provides two agents, or agent-like elements, for the *pūtá-* ppl.: the 1st cmpd member *gábhasti-* and the indep. instr. *nṛbhiḥ*. (Of course, the men are the agents whose hands are the instruments.) Without the ‘hand’ (*gábhasti-*) we would expect **nṛ-pūta-*, like *nṛ-dhūta-* (1x), *nṛ-ṣūta-* (1x) (which, oddly enough, both rhyme with our putative form). Re has a slightly different interpr., but it has the same configuration. His “pressé par les seigneurs à l’aide des pierres” construes *nṛbhiḥ* with what follows, the instr. *ádribhiḥ* and the ppl. *sutáḥ*, with the two instr. filling the agent and instrument slots respectively. Since *nṛbhiḥ* is stationed exactly in between the two instrument+ppl. expressions, there’s no way to tell – though it seems to me somewhat more elegant for *nṛbhiḥ* to double a cmpd. member rather than morphologically doubling another instrument. Note that *ádri-ṣuta-* is also attested (2x) and that the same *ádribhiḥ sutáḥ* as here is found in this hymn in 23a..

IX.86.35: The accumulation of \sqrt{mad} derivatives is striking: *mādvā mádyo mádaḥ*. The last, *máda-*, is of course extraordinarily common, and the 2nd *mádyo-* reasonably well established (13x). But *madván-* is found only twice.

IX.86.36: Who the seven sisters (bzw. mothers) are is a matter of dispute: Sāy.: the streams or rivers, Ge: thoughts, Re (flg. Lü 246): celestial streams/rivers. No one seems to cite the seven milk-cows (*saptá dhenávaḥ*) in vs. 25 of this same hymn, or their multiplied number (thrice seven) in 21. But in this hymn “cows” seems the mostly likely immediate referent, esp. given the image of maternal care, whatever those cows may otherwise represent (beyond the milk-mixture).

On the expression in the last pāda, see similar phrases in vss. 5 and 28.

IX.86.37–39: For the first time in this hymn (save for briefly in vs. 18), this *ṛca* shows some interest in what Soma might do for *us*, particularly in the 2nd two vss. Note in 38 first the enclitic *naḥ* and then the 1st pl. opt. *syāma*. The poet both asks for benefits directly and by implication, in the cmpds with 2nd member -*víd-* ‘finding’: *góvíd-*, *vasuvíd-*, *híraṇyavíd-*, *viśvavíd-* “cow-finding, goods-finding, gold-finding, all-finding” and the bahuvrīhi *suvīra-* ‘possessing good heroes’. If Soma finds or possesses these things, he can distribute them to us. The connection between vss. 38 and 39 is nicely signalled by the near identity of 38c and 39a:

38c ... *pavasva vásumad dhíraṇyavat*

39a ... *pavasva vasuvíd dhiraṇyavít*

where the suffix of possession (-*mant*-, -*vant*-) subtly gives way to the phonologically similar root-noun -*víd*-, suggesting that Soma possesses those things, which he can now find for us. The epithet *nṛ-cákṣas*- ‘having his gaze on men’, found several times previously in this hymn (vss. 23, 36), seems finally to take on its full lexical value in 38, where it is predicated of Soma (*nṛcákṣā asi*) and strengthened by *viśvātaḥ* ‘on every side’, to express Soma’s interest in us and our welfare. The reciprocal relationship between us and Soma is also expressed by the parallel pādas 38d and 39b, both containing *bhúvaneṣu* as the location of both us (38d) and Soma (39b).

IX.86.38: I take the -*mat* and -*vat* forms adverbially.

IX.86.39: On *viśvavíd*- see comm. ad vs. 29. Ge takes it as ‘all-knowing’ here, but the other -*víd*- cmpds in the vs. favor ‘all-finding’. Re, like me, ‘all-finding’ here, though ‘all-knowing’ in 29.

IX.86.40–42: The focus on our welfare found in the last *ṛca* is found here in vs. 41 but is otherwise muted.

IX.86.40: *vanánā*- is a hapax, though there seems to be general agreement that it means something like ‘desire’, derived from the set root \sqrt{van} ‘love, hold dear’. There is an Old Avestan hapax of the same shape (Y. 44.15) that seems unconnected, in that, contextually, the standard tr. ‘victory’ seems correct, and it should therefore be derived from *aniṣ* \sqrt{van} ‘win’. But Kellens-Pirart in their OA lexicon (1990) equate it directly with our *vanánā*- and gloss it ‘charme’ – which makes no contextual sense and can, I think, easily be dismissed. In any case it is easy to see how our form came to be built. It is the object of the verb *úd ... atīṣṭhipat* ‘made to stand up / raised up’. The next vs., 41a, has a very similar VP, *bhandánā úd iyarti*, where the verb is semantically equivalent to our verb and has the same preverb, and the nominal object is a fem. acc. pl. -*ánā*- form, which provided the template for *vanánā*-. Given this parallelism and given the fact that the phrase in vs. 41 has to do with granting blessings to us, I think it likely that the desires Soma raised in 40a are our own (so also Ge, Re), which he will fulfill in the next vs.

ví gāhate as in 8a; cf. also *āti gāhate* in 26a.

Soma is presumably “thousand-spiked” (*sahásrabhrṣṭi*-) because of the knobs, thorns, or similar extrusions on the plant.

IX.86.41: On the relation between the first hemistich and vs. 40 see immed. above.

The publ. tr. “... all blessings, consisting of offspring and easy to bear” is awkward and hard to parse. It might be better as “... all blessings, consisting of offspring – a light burden –,” with *subhāra*- used in almost jocular fashion. It can simultaneously also refer to “easy birth,” with ref. to *prajāvatīḥ*.

The unusually formed (pseudo-)āmreḍita *áhar-divi* ‘every day, day upon day’ is esp. interesting in light of the discussion of the two ‘day’ words ad vs. 19 above. It must be a substitute for the more orthodox āmreḍita *áhar-ahar* (6x) for metrical reasons: the

standard cmpd. is metrically awk. With three light syllables in a row, it certainly won't fit in any cadence and would be difficult anywhere in the vs. line but where it's always found, pāda-initial (which isn't all that great either – openings with light syllables in both 2 and 3, not to mention 1 and possibly 4, are quite irregular; see Arnold pp 194–95). It is puzzling, however, that the well-attested (47x) (also somewhat aberrantly formed) āmreḍita to the second 'day' stem here, namely *divé-dive*, was not used in our vs., since it would fit the cadence perfectly and is quite common in Jagatī cadences. In any case, at least *āhar-divi* suggests that there's no clearcut difference of meaning or reference between *āhar-* and the forms of *div-/dyu-* that mean 'day'.

In the 2nd hemistich, Soma is not asked directly for benefits, but rather urged to intercede with Indra – to beg him for our sake – for offspring and wealth. This displacement is made all the stranger by the use of a "future imperative," *yācatāt*, which properly should follow another impv. Perhaps the displacement in time that such an impv. represents – that is, there should be an intervening impv. before it – indirectly reflects the displacement in person – that is, Soma is the middleman, intervening between us and Indra. I suppose it is bad form to ask Indra directly in a hymn devoted to Soma.

There is further displacement here. The "sacred formulation bringing offspring" (*brāhma prajāvat*) that we want Soma to get Indra to give us is not a direct request for Indra to bestow offspring on us, but rather for him to inspire in us a formulation that we can then offer to him, which will, only then, result in offspring. It's a long and winding road to what we want!

The interpr. of the hapax bahuvr. *ásva-pastya-* is disputed. My tr. "consisting of horses in the homestead" essentially follows Gr's 'Rosse im Stalle habend', though it would be more lit. as 'having a homestead that has horses in it' – a *vāja-bāhu-* type cmpd. Ge's tr. "an vielen Rossen" seems to evade the issue, but his statement in n. 41c "wie später -*sālin-*" is more forthcoming: -*sālin-* means lit. 'having a house/room', but develops to 'abounding in'. Nonetheless, I find it hard to believe that a RVic poet would go to the trouble of using a fairly rare word as 2nd member, only in order to bleach it of its particular meaning. Re's "la richesse qui réside dans les chevaux" (and Ober's "dessen fester Wohnsitz Pferde sind" [I.537 n. 111]) employs an abstract sense of *pastyā-* to characterize where *wealth*'s dwelling is: it resides in – that is, is founded on / consists of – horses. Whereas my interpr. assumes a concrete homestead, which belongs to the speaker and/or his associates, that is stuffed, as it were, with horses. The difference between the abstract and the concrete interpr. is small but significant, and I continue to prefer the concrete one.

IX.86.42: This vs., too, contains the two 'day' words, gen. pl. *āhnām*, dependent on *āgre*, and the adverbial instr. expression *ānu dyúbhiḥ*. See comm. ad vss. 19, 41.

I take *prá ... cetayate* as a reflexive trans./caus. 'makes oneself perceived', contrary to the intrans. interpr. in my -*āya-* book (p. 163).

As is generally recognized, *nārā ca śāmsam* shows a species of tmesis, from the cmpd *nārāśāmsa-*.

On *dhartāri* as one of the few likely exx. of a loc. inf., see Keydana (Inf. 197–99).

IX.86.43–45: This tṛca seems more artful than most of the other, with metaphor layered upon metaphor (vss. 43, 45), varied by similes (vs. 44).

IX.86.43: The first hemistich is striking with its series of identical verbs in pāda a, with pāda b ending with the same verb: *añjāte vy añjate sám añjate, ... abhy añjate*. The first pāda lacks a syllable (rest at 4); as Old suggests, the metrical irregularity is most likely meant to call attention to the word play.

Ge, Re, Lü (239) take the various verbs as reflex., with Ge (n. 43ab) taking the subj. as the soma-drinking singers and Re as the waters. But though mid. $\sqrt{añj}$ is probably more often reflex./pass. than trans., it can be the latter, and that makes more sense here. Cf., e.g., IX.97.57 *sám añjate rūpām* “they jointly anoint his form,” and recall the many times in this maṇḍala in which soma “is anointed,” using the true passive *ajyāte* (-se) (often as a pun with ‘is driven’ to \sqrt{aj}). See especially in the next ṛca of this hymn 47c *góbhiḥ ... samajyāse*, in the same metrical position as *sám añjate* here. I supply the default Soma as obj. throughout the first hemistich; he is found as explicit (though metaphorical) obj. in the 2nd hemistich. As for the subj. of all these verbs, I agree with Re that it is the waters.

The “ox flying in the burbling up of the river” of pāda c is an ex. of the layers of metaphor just alluded to above: it compresses three different representations of Soma into a single image.

I take the subj. of *grbhñate* and referent of *hiranya-pāvāḥ* in d still to be the waters, with *āsu* functioning as reflexive. Re explicitly changes his subj. here to “les hommes.”

IX.86.44: Ge, Re, Ober (II.54) take *ándhaḥ* as nom., parallel to *dhārā* in the simile. But insofar as it is possible to narrow the referent of this word, it is used of the stalk of the soma (see comm. ad IV.1.19). I take it here as acc., construed with *āti*. This pāda, like the following one, depicts the soma juice leaving behind the solid parts of the plant, and *āti* ‘beyond’ is used in both pādas to express the material beyond which the soma juice has gone.

The simile in d, *átyo ná krīḷan*, is also found in 26d.

IX.86.45: In a *agre-gáh* echoes *ágre áhnām* in 42a; in our vs. *áhnām* appears in the following pāda, dependent on something else (*vimānaḥ*), though Re supplies it with *agregáh* as well.

bhúvaneṣv árpitaḥ also in 39b.

In d I construe *rāyē* with *okyàḥ*, although I cannot find any parallel usage. But on its own, *okyàḥ* is hard to fit semantically into the vs.; cf. Ge’s “gern bleibend” and Re’s “(ce dieu) domestique,” which seem like afterthoughts..

IX.86.46–48: The hymn ends with a ṛca no more unified than most of those that preceded it, repeating the same tropes oscillating between ritual and cosmic images.

IX.86.46: In pāda a *skambhó diváḥ* reminds us of 35d *divó viṣṭambháḥ* with a diff. lexical real

On *tridhātu*- see comm. ad IX.70.8.

Pāda c *aṃśúm rihanti matáyah pánipnatam* is identical to 31d, save for the first word, which in 31 is *sísūm*.

In d *yádi* would be best read *yád *ī*, both for sense and for meter, since an opening with light syllables in positions 3 and 4 before an early caesura is very rare (see Arnold 194).

Ge tr. *nirñījam ... yayúḥ* as “Staat machen” (make a show), based, he says (n. 46d), on *śúbham yā*. I see no reason to attenuate the sense of *nirñīj-*. As Scar (284–85) argues, this stem can be both a concrete noun ‘garment’ and an infin. ‘to array’. The infinitival usages he cites are mostly the dat. *nirñīje* (which, in all quoted cases, I take as a noun) and he is uncertain about the usage of this acc. ex. But since the analysis just proposed of *yád *ī* provides us with an acc. obj., infinitival usage seems best here.

IX.86.47: Pāda b is awk. in English. The sense is that the streams of the soma being purified go charging forward continuously, with *rámhayah* ‘charges, speedy forward movements’ subj. of *yanti*.

IX.86.48: The aggressively hostile command in pāda c comes as something of a surprise in this otherwise ritually and cosmically focused hymn.

The last pāda is the Gṛtsamada refrain from Maṇḍala II. This tṛca is attributed by the Anukramaṇī to Gṛtsamada, but perhaps only on the basis of the refrain.

IX.87–97

The section containing Triṣṭubh hymns

IX.87–89

These three hymns are attributed to Uśanas Kāvya, probably on the basis of the mention of his name in 87.3.

IX.87

IX.87.1: In b Soma is urged to run for the prize (*vājam*); in c he is then *compared* to a prize-winning horse (*śśvam ... vājīnam*), a nice ex. of how description shades into simile. It is made somewhat more complex by the fact that the simile (probably) surrounds the target ‘you’: *śśvam ná tvā vājīnam*, so that *vājīnam* could technically be part of the frame, not the simile (“... you, the prize-winner, like a horse”), though in fact *tvā* is in modified Wackernagel’s position. Soma is directly called a *vājīn-* in 4d.

IX.87.2: This vs. contains two links to the preceding hymn, despite their difference in meter: most of pāda c *pitā devānām janitā ...* is identical to IX.86.10b, with each closing with a word that conforms to its cadential template; the first two words of d, *viṣṭambhó divó*, are identical to IX.86.35d *divó viṣṭambhāḥ*, but in opposite order, with minimal metrical difference. (Our pāda is repeated in IX.89.6, while the order in 86.35 is repeated in IX.108.16.)

IX.87.3: The first hemistich contains three resonant words in the realm of poet / wordsmith / seer: *īśir vípraḥ ... kāvyena*, with *kavī-* represented by the vṛddhi deriv. This deriv. is similar, but not identical to the patronymic *kāvya-* associated with the immed. preceding *uśānā*, and by its difference in accent and in case, it cleverly plays on the full

name Uśanā Kāvya. (On the tricky morphology of the name, see my 2007 “Vedic Uśanā Kāvya and Avestan Kauui Usan: On the Morphology of the Names,” in *Verba Docenti* [Fs. Jasanoff].) As Ge suggests, the Anukramaṇī’s attribution of this hymn to the legendary Uśanas Kāvya is no doubt based on this vs.

The Engl. tr. does not make clear that “of theirs” is fem. (*āsām*) and must anticipate the cows (*gónām*) in the next pāda.

IX.87.5: In pāda b the HvN text reads *mahé vājāyām ṛtāya śrāvāṃsi*, with word break after putative *vājāyām*. But it should instead read *vājāyāmṛtāya* without break (as in both the devanāgarī text and the transliterated text of Aufrecht), to be analyzed, with Pp., as *vājāya / amṛtāya*. Undoing the vowel contraction at the caesura in this way produces too many syllables (12, with a Triṣṭubh cadence). Old is uncertain whether to opt for that analysis or for contraction over the caesura, which seems to be Arnold’s (not very clearly expressed) view (p. 192, §215 iii).

Given the importance of *vāja-* ‘prize’ (1a, 5b, 6d) and *vājín-* ‘prizewinner’ (1c, 4d)) in this hymn, the tr. of the dat. phrase in pāda b should be corrected to “for the great immortal prize.”

In keeping with my view that medial forms of the them. stem *pávate* are always reflexive, not passive, the tr. should be corrected to “purifying themselves through the filters” – esp. because of the contrastive undoubted passive *pūyámānaḥ* in the next vs.

IX.87.6: The gen. *jánānām* is best construed with *puruhūtáḥ* as (pseudo-)agent. See the same phrase, though with accented voc. *púruhūta*, in IX.52.4, 64.27 – though in the former passage I construe the gen. with another noun in the publ. tr. I now think that may be wrong.

The accentuation of the athem. part. *túñjāna-* is puzzling; the other ex. of this part. (IX.57.2) has the expected accent *tuñjāná-* as do finite forms like *tuñjánti*. There also exists a single form of a thematic med. part. *túñjamāna-* (III.1.16) also with unexpected accent on the root syllable. Gotō (1st Kl, 78) suggests this form is “metrical” for the athem. form, but does not treat the accent.

The finale of d, *abhí vājam arṣa*, is identical to the end of 1b.

IX.87.8: On the mixture of myth and ritual in this vs., see publ. intro. Given the fem. subj. prn. *sā*, the mythological allusion to Saramā would be available to the audience on the basis of the phrase *gā viveda* “found the cows”; cf. V.45.7 *sarāmā gā avindat*, .8 *sarāmā vidat gāḥ* -- though it must be admitted that *gāḥ* √ *vid* has other gods as subject elsewhere. See comm. ad V.29.3.

Notice that the pf. *viveda* returns here from 3c, which was also, if less clearly, about the Vala myth.

IX.87.9: The publ. tr. takes pāda c as a second complement of *pári yāsi* in pāda a, parallel to *rāsīm ... gónām*. By contrast both Ge and Re take c as the obj. (or pseudo-obj.) of *śíkṣā* in d: e.g., “Suche uns ... viele grosse Labsale zu erwirken.” But the lexicalized desid. stem *śíkṣa-* does not take an obj., but only a dative of benefit (see comm. ad VI.31.4), and so that interpr. seems blocked to me. However, it may be an independent nominal clause: “many are (your) lofty refreshments,” the interpr. I would now favor. Scar’s (636–37)

interpr. is similar, though he then sneaks c in as an understood obj. of *śīkṣā*: “Viel, gross sind die Labungen ... verhilf [zu diesen]” or “... verhilf uns [dazu],” which seems unnec.

All the standard interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take the last three words as a separate clause, but this short phrase poses several problems. First, *tāḥ* is a nom. (/acc.) plural fem. demonstr., but the following word, the hapax root noun *upaṣṭút*, is by all appearances singular. Several solutions have been proposed to this mismatch. Ge simply says (n. 9d) that *upaṣṭút* at the end of the hymn represents pl. *upaṣṭútaḥ*, which is not very satisfactory. He tr. “Dein sind diese Lobpreisungen.” Old has two suggestions: 1) *upaṣṭút* is adverbial: “in einer zu den *stútaḥ* gerichteten Bewegung,” citing phrases like *stutîr úpa* (I.84.2). But he gives no parallels for such adverbial formation (maybe the likewise problematic *dakṣinî*?), and it is also hard to see how this would work in context (“these are in the direction of your praise”??). 2) *upaṣṭút* is an agent noun: Soma as praiser. But he rejects this even as he suggests it. Scar (636–37) discusses previous suggestions and suggests further possibilities. Re’s solution as embodied in his tr. “Ces (avantages sont) ta louange (même),” with an equational sentence equating *tāḥ* with *upaṣṭút*, seems to me the best way to deal with the number disharmony – though in his n. Re floats several other, less compelling possibilities. The question then is what is the reference of *tāḥ*. I’m not sure what Re means by “avantages.” I think the most likely referent is the fem. pl. in the immediately preceding pāda: *īṣaḥ* ‘refreshments’, and Re’s n. gives what I consider the clue to the interpr. of the whole in his citation of the cmpd. *īṣa(h)stút*- in V.50.5 (though in fact he cites it in service of a different solution). In V.50.5 *īṣa(h)stúto manāmahe* I tr. “Let us conceive praise-songs as refreshment” (see comm. ad loc.). Here I suggest that we are announcing our praise-song as Indra’s refreshments, the counterpart to the refreshments he offers us. The publ. tr. does not convey this sense; it should be changed to “These (refreshments) are (our) praise for you.”

The retroflexion in *upaṣṭút*- is extremely puzzling, esp. given the non-retroflexed *úpastuta*- (*upastutá*-), *úpastuti*-, *upastútya*-. AiG I.237 registers the form, but simply says that sometimes -ṣ- in cmpds spreads beyond its proper domain, which isn’t terribly helpful.

IX.88

On the thematic structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. The similes that begin the middle vss. 3–5 are all further defined by the syntactic structure GOD *ná yó*. In the first two of these Soma is in the 2nd ps., but in the 3rd ps. in vs. 5.

IX.88.1: The vs. is notable for the dense repetition of the 2nd ps. sg. prn., with five exx. in the first three pādas.

The initial annunciatory *ayám* should probably be more clearly represented in the tr.: “this soma here ...”

For the metrically bad *vavṛṣé* see Kü (459) and comm. ad VI.4.7. As Kü points out, we would expect this *seṭ* root to have a pre-C weak perf. stem **vavūr*-, which would fit the cadence here much better.

The publ. tr. renders *mádāya yújyāya sómam* as “the soma to be yoked for exhilaration,” falsely giving the impression that dat. *yújyāya* modifies acc. *sómam*. I now realize that the five occurrences of dat. *yújyāya* should be taken as nouns expressing purpose, not as adjectives. Interestingly four of the five passages have as main verb a

form of \sqrt{vr} ‘choose’: VII.19.9 ... *vr̥ṇīṣva yújyāya* ..., VIII.4.15 *prá ... vr̥ṇīmahe, yújyāya* ..., IX.66.18 *vr̥ṇīmáhe yújyāya*, and our ... *vavṛṣe, ... yújyāya*. There thus appears to be a fixed syntagm X *yújyāya* \sqrt{vr} “choose/select X for yoking (/for use),” and I would now tr. this passage “... the drop, the soma, which you have chosen for yoking for exhilaration.” I would not construe it directly with the adjacent dative *mádāya*, which is a separate expression of purpose.

IX.88.2: The “yoking” theme of 1d is immediately taken up in 2a by the passive aor. *ayojí*, with concrete sense at least in the simile.

On the unexpected short vowel in the hapax *bhuri-ṣāt* (for *bhūri-*), see the not entirely satisfactory disc. by Scar (607).

nāhus- must be a PN (see Mayr. PN); it is generally, but not exclusively, found in the sg. The deriv. *nahuṣyā-* here is best interpr. in conjunction with nearby IX.91.2 *kavyaīḥ... nahuṣyèbhiḥ*, where it refers to poets. That interpr. would fit the context here as well, since the Nahusian creatures are roaring at the soma on the ritual ground. However, Nahus (and his ilk) are not only poet-ritualists, but fill a number of roles – e.g., as patron in I.122.8, 10–11. The phrase here, *nahuṣyāṇi jātāḥ* should also be compared with X.80.6 *mānuṣo nāhuṣo ví jātāḥ* and possibly with X.99.7 *nāhuṣaḥ ... sújātaḥ*, if that is the constituency (see comm. ad loc.).

IX.88.3: Both Ge and Re take *īṣṭá-* in the cmpd. *īṣṭá-yāman-* as belonging to the root \sqrt{is} ‘send’ (e.g., “[d]er seine Fahrt beeilt” and see Ge’s n. 3a). But as Old (ZDMG 62 [1908] 473–74) points out, we should then expect **īṣitá-yāman-*. (Like me, Old attributes *īṣṭá-* here to \sqrt{is} ‘seek, desire’, though his interpr. of the cmpd. differs from mine.) The parallel passages with *īṣṭáye* in conjunction with $\sqrt{yā}$ that Ge adduces in his n. (and others he doesn’t cite) all belong, in my opinion, to ‘seek, desire’, not ‘send’.

IX.88.4: In order to connect the comparison with Indra more clearly to the whole vs., I would now be inclined to tr. “Like Indra, who is the doer of great deeds, you are a stronghold-splitting smiter of obstacles,” though this now makes it less clear that Soma is being compared to Indra also in his general capacity of doer of deeds. The Sanskrit is more forgiving.

Pāda c is metrically defective; see esp. Old for disc. After suggesting, and rejecting, various fixes, he considers the possibility that the pāda ended with *hantā*, which was redactionally eliminated by word haplology, since the next pāda begins with *hantā*. This would get us the proper syllable count, though, as Old notes, the cadence would be bad, in that the antepenult would be heavy: ... *āhināmnām *hantā*#. Despite the problem of the cadence, this seems like the most attractive solution, and I would now slightly alter the tr. to “Because, like Pedu’s (horse) (you are) *the smiter of those with serpents’ names, you are the smiter of every Dasyu.”

On the serpent-smiting horse that the Aśvins gave Pedu, one of their clients, see I.117.9, 188.9. Unfortunately this is all we know about the horse’s exploits.

IX.88.5: Because the finite verb *kṛṇute* in b is unaccented, the rel. cl. must be confined to pāda a, and this in turn means that *sr̥jyāmānaḥ* is a predicated pres. participle. On the phrase in pāda b, see comm. ad IX.76.1.

The loc. *vāne* must be read twice, in both simile and frame, with different senses. Just as Agni/fire is set loose in the firewood, Soma is set loose in the wooden cup.

IX.88.6: The simile in b is somewhat odd. It is in the nom. pl., and its comparandum should therefore be the soma juices (*etē sōmāḥ*) in pāda a. But the sense of the simile, “like heavenly buckets” (*divyā ná kósāsaḥ*), doesn’t fit the soma juices, but rather the containers that hold the soma liquid. When the word *kósā-* is used in ritual context, it refers to a bucket or cask, towards which the soma is generally moving. I therefore think that the comparison here is between the heavenly *kósā-* and the sheep’s fleece filters in pāda a, from which the soma drips as if from a cloud. The third word of the simile, *abhrā-varṣāḥ* “possessing/holding the rain from clouds,” is the clue: soma is regularly compared to rain (see, e.g., Ober II.40–42) esp. as it comes off the filter, but here the comparison is to containers that are the source of rain. If this analysis is correct, a syntactic problem arises: the simile should be acc. pl. matching *vāṇy āvyā*. I suggest that pāda b is parenthetical, that it does refer to the fleece filters, and that the fact that the latter is neut. facilitated the switch to the nominative parenthesis.

The simile in c also has a slight twist, but is hardly as problematical as b. The simile particle here is positioned late, assuming that the simile consists of *samudrām sīndhavo ná nīcīḥ* “like rivers downward to the sea,” with *samudrām* corresponding to *kalāsān* in d. However, because *samudrā-* is regularly used in soma hymns as a (perhaps faded) metaphor for the waters that the soma enters, it may be that *samudrām* is not felt to be part of the simile here. Cf. the parallel passage IX.64.17 *vīthā samudrām indavaḥ / āgman* “The drops have come at will to the sea,” without overt simile marking.

IX.88.7: Ge and Re take the simile in c to be *āpo ná makṣū* (Ge: “rasch wie das Wasser”), but *makṣū* is an adverb, and so the simile would not be well formed. Re deals with this problem by supplying a participle, “(agissant) promptement comme les eaux.” I take *makṣū* rather with the imperatival clause that follows: *sumatī bhavā naḥ*. It is worth noting that *makṣū* is almost always initial, and if we detach the simile *āpo ná* it could be so here as well.

So what quality of Soma’s is being compared to that of the waters? I take it to be *sahāsrāpsāḥ*, which opens pāda b, a word whose meaning is not transparent. Sāy. glosses it *pururūpaḥ* ‘having many forms’, which is featureless enough to qualify almost anything; Ge and Re follow him. But *āpsas-* means ‘breast’, and the cmpd *dīrghāpsas-* (I.122.15), modifying a chariot, is generally rendered by ‘having a long front’ – presumably a long forward projection. Our cmpd is rendered in EWA [s.v. *āpsas-*] as ‘tausendfrontig’, but it is hard to conjure up a such a picture, particularly with reference to soma, much less the waters. More promising is the context in which the two independent forms of *āpsas-* (I.124.7, V.80.6) are found. (The third form usually grouped here, found in VIII.45.5 *girāṁ āpsaḥ*, is better segmented as *girā vāpsaḥ*; see comm. ad loc.) Both passages have a female as subject, with the VP *nī riṇīte āpsaḥ* “she lets her breast spill over,” describing a young woman (/Dawn) displaying her charms. Here the breast is conceptually a liquid, and it seems to refer to the pliant flesh, breast tissue, that spills out of her garment (a metaphor alive in 21st c. US). Starting from this picture of a liquid or liquified breast, I suggest that *-apsas-* in our cmpd. refers to forward projections,

esp. those that could appear in a liquid – in short, ripples – which fits both the waters and the soma reasonably well.

The final simile of the vs., “like a sacrifice that conquers in battle” (*ṛtanāṣāṇ ná yajñāḥ*) is unusual; the other 8 occurrences of the cmpd. *ṛtanāṣāḥ*- qualify gods, the qualities of gods, or a hero. However, the purport of the simile is not difficult to construct: if we mortals perform the sacrifice correctly, it will attract and gratify the gods, particularly Indra, who will provide the divine aid needed to prevail in battle. Note that *ṛtanāṣāt* forms a ring with *bhurīṣāt* in 2a.

The retroflex initial of *-ṣāḥ*- in this cmpd is the result of the assimilation of *-s-* to the retroflex final in the nom. sg. *-ṣāt*; see Schindler (Rt. Nouns p. 48): 5 of the 9 forms of this cmpd are nom. sg. The retroflex is then spread throughout the paradigm (acc. sg. 3x, gen. sg. 1x) and also into the deriv. *ṛtanāṣāya*- (III.37.1). On the variable length of the root syllable in the oblique (*-ṣāham* 1x, *-ṣāham*, *-as* 3x), see Scar (612–13).

IX.88.8: This vs. is identical to I.91.3, also a Soma hymn. Unfortunately the publ. tr. of the two vss. differ in pāda b. In I.91.3 I tr. “lofty and deep is your domain.” I now think this should be harmonized with the tr. here “yours is his lofty, deep domain.” The vs. attributes to Soma some of the salient characteristics of the three principal Ādityas overtly in a, c, d, and it seems unlikely that one pāda would deviate from this pattern. Both Varuṇa (I.123.8, IV.5.4) and (more often) Varuṇa + Mitra (I.152.4–5, VII.61.4, X.10.6, X.89.8) possess *dhāman*-. Here Soma’s *dhāman*- can be identified with that of just-mentioned Varuṇa (so the publ. tr.) or anticipate Mitra (pāda c) in addition to Varuṇa.

On *dakṣāyya*- see comm. ad I.91.3.

IX.89

IX.89.1: The explicitly conjoined loc. phrase *mātúr upásthe vána ā ca* “in the lap of the mother and in the wood” is a bit puzzling; the *ca* implies that the two terms belong to a natural or reasonably comprehensible constructed class. Ge (n. 1d) suggests that “mother” refers to the earth, that is, (he further specifies) the surface of the ground or the Vedi, while “wood” refers to the wooden cup. The latter is quite likely, but I prefer Ge’s 2nd suggestion for the former – that “mother” here refers to Aditi. The phrase *upásthe ādīteḥ* is found 3x in IX (26.1, 71.5, 74.5) as well as 2x in X. Although the exact referent is not entirely clear (see JPB, Ādityas 238–41), it obviously refers to something on the ritual ground or to the ritual ground itself. Aditi is of course the archetypal mother, so “of the mother” is an easy substitute “of Aditi” in the phrase. The referent would be more specific than simply “of the earth,” which could cover a lot of ground, as it were. Alternatively, if the mother = earth, this could be a reference to the soma plant growing on the earth, but the ritual setting of the vs. seems too insistent to allow that – though see 2d.

IX.89.2: Pāda a could also mean “the king has donned his garment of the rivers,” but IX.86.33, which also opens *rājā síndhūnām*, where the constituency is clear, eliminates that possibility.

Note the chiasmic *#rājā ... rájīṣthām#* opening and closing the first hemistich.

Pāda d contains one of the paradoxes beloved of RVic bards. The identities of the subj.s and obj.s of the two *duhé* are disputed. Old, for ex., thinks that Father Heaven yields Soma in the first clause, while Soma yields Dawn in the second – because *pitúr jām* in X.3.2 refers to Dawn. But this seems to take us too far afield: the strict parallelism of the two mini-clauses—*duhá īm pitā / duhá īm pitúr jām*—sketches a closed loop, and introducing an entity not already implicit in the discourse seems unlikely. Ge’s interpr. (n. 2d) seems closer. The subj. of the first *duhé* is in my opinion Heaven (*dyaúṣ pitā*), with half of his name represented by *pitā* and the other found earlier in the simile *divó ná vṛṣṭīh* “like the rain from heaven.” This simile is also the clue to the identity of the object: soma as rain. Then this soma/rain is the subject of the 2nd *duhé*; it yields soma itself, in the form of the plant whose growth is due to rain. This soma(plant) or the soma juice itself can also be reckoned as the “offspring of his father,” namely of Heaven. This could be a reference to the heavenly soma or simply to the soma juice assimilated to rain.

IX.89.3: Gr, Ge, and Old (flg. Lanman, Noun Inflec. 414) take *mádhvaḥ* as a nom. pl. Lanman and Gr (supplying *drapsās* or sim.) identify it as masc. (Old says nothing further), while Ge seemingly as a fem., since he supplies “Milchkühe.” This gender switch (and adjectival interpr.) is unnec.; in all cases of supposed masc. or fem. pl. *mádhvaḥ* (see the list in Gr) the form can be interpr. as a gen. sg. to the neut. noun. In our passage Re supplies a pl. subj. “streams” on which gen. *mádhvaḥ* depends: “(Les coulées) de miel ...” But I simply take it as a gen. of material, dependent on *siṃhám* (“lion of honey”). The compd. *mádhū-prṣṭha-* ‘honey-backed’, lit. ‘having a back of honey’ (in my interpr., contra Gr/Ge ‘having honey on his back’) supports my interpr., and note that 6d contains a *mádhvaḥ* that is universally taken as gen.

As subj. of *nasanta* I supply cows or waters, probably the former, since they appear in c and implicitly in d.

Ge seems to take *ayāsam* with *pátim* rather than *siṃhám*, but given that the adj. appears in the same pāda with the lion and given that another animal, the horse, is described as *ayāsam* in the next vs. (4a), “unbridled lion” seems more likely.

IX.89.5: The *cátasrah ... ghṛtadúhaḥ ... nīṣattāḥ* “four (fem.), yielding ghee as milk, set down ...” is highly reminiscent of IX.74.6 *cátasro nābho níhitāḥ* “four hidden (lit., ‘put down, deposited’) (streams) bursting out ...” See comm. ad loc., where, flg. Ge, I suggest that “four” is a metaphorical reference to the four teats of a cow’s udder. In our passage I don’t understand what “set down within the same support” (*samāné antár dharúṇe*) refers to, unless it’s the placement of the teats in/on the udder, which would be the *dharúṇa-* here. I also don’t know if there’s a secondary reference to some piece or pieces of ritual equipment from which (pitcher with 4 spouts? 4 pitchers?) the mixing milk is poured, or if an actual cow is stationed nearby. But here, as in IX.74.6, I think the immediate physical referent is to the streams of milk that emerge from the teats, rather than their source(s).

The *īm* in c was omitted from the tr., where it presumably expresses the goal of *aṛṣanti*. I would now tr. “They rush to him while being purified ...” The parens. around “him” in the next pāda can be erased, since that pāda also contains *īm*. The concentration of forms of *īm* in this hymn should also be noted: 2d (2x), 4c, 5a, 5c, 5d.

IX.89.6: The placement of *utá* in b is unexpected: it should not break up the NP *viśvāḥ ... kṣitāyaḥ*, which it is conjoining to the two nominal expressions in pāda a. We would expect #**utá viśvāḥ kṣitāyaḥ*. Perhaps the metrically distasteful initial two light syllables prompted a flip. Klein (DGRV I.330–31) does not discuss this placement in his treatment of the passage.

Pāda c *ásat ta útso gr̥naté niyútvān* is somewhat puzzling, at least on the literal level: “your wellspring will be possessed of a team for the singer.” Ge’s rendering, “Dein Quell sei freigebig ...,” is overly free, but it probably captures the sense fairly closely. The semantic pathway is clearer in Re’s “Que ta source ... procure un attelage (de biens).” Cf. III.49.4 ... *vásubhir niyútvān* “teamed with goods.” Perhaps the tr. should be altered to “will provide teams (of goods) ...” Although *niyútvant-* is also found in the preceding hymn (IX.88.2), its use there seems unconnected with this one.

IX.89.7: The dat. *indrāya* opening pāda b echoes the dat. *indriyāya*, which closes the preceding vs. (6d). It is also piquant that Soma adopts “Vṛtra-slayer” (*vṛtrahān-*), Indra’s own epithet, when he acts on behalf of Indra.

The two aims of Soma’s purification *abhí devāvītim* and *indrāya* “towards pursuit of the gods” and “for Indra” are grammatically non-parallel.

IX.90

IX.90.1: The fut. part. *sanīśyān* in b potentially contrasts with the desid. part. *sīśāsan* in 4c, though I have tr. them the same, and it is not clear whether they are expressing truly different nuances. Nonetheless the future part. here could be tr. “being about to win the prize.”

IX.90.2: As Re also notes, the vs. is strongly marked by *v*-alliteration, esp. in c: ... *vīṣaṇam vayodhām* (a), ... *avāvaśanta vāñīḥ* (b), *vānā vásāno váruṇo* ... (c), *ví ... vāryāñi* (d). Note also the parallel root-noun cmpds *vayo-dhām* (a) and *ratna-dhā(h)* (d), which latter also alliterates with *dayate*. For *vayo-dhā-* see also vs. 6 below.

IX.90.3: This vs. also shows alliteration, this time of sibilants, esp. in pādas a (*śūragrāmaḥ sāravīraḥ sáhāvān*) and d (*āṣālhaḥ sāhvān pṛtanāsu śátrūn*). It also contains forms from three different roots meaning (roughly) ‘conquer, win’: *√ sah* (*sáhāvān*, *āṣālhaḥ sāhvān*), *√ ji* (*jētā*), *√ san* (*sánitā*).

IX.90.4: *ābhayāni* in pāda a is the only neut. pl. to this stem. The idiom *ābhayaṃ √ kṛ* is quite common (and cf. *ābhayaṃ-kará-* 1x). This idiom is formulaically connected with “broad pastures”; see esp. VII.77.4 *urvīm gávyūtim ābhayaṃ kṛdhī naḥ* “create broad pastureland and fearlessness for us” and nearby IX.78.5 *urvīm gávyūtim ābhayaṃ ca nas kṛdhi* “Make wide pasturage and security for us.” I have supplied ‘places’ because of the association with pasturage.

The apparent transitive value of *sám cikradaḥ ... vājān* “you have roared together prizes ...” is anomalous, but hard to avoid. The idiom is similar to IX.64.3 ... *cakradaḥ ..., sám gāḥ ... sā árvataḥ*. See disc. ad loc. In that passage I found a way to avoid a transitive reading in the publ. tr., but in the comm. consider a transitive alternate. In our

passage here the publ. tr. has a transitive reading, but it would also be possible to make *mahāḥ ... vājān* another object of *sīśāsan* and tr. “Striving to win the waters, also the dawns, the sun, the cows, and great prizes, you have roared at them all together.” Note *vājam sanīṣyān* in 1b, and see the disc. ad vs. 1.

IX.90.6: Note that the VP *vāyo dhāh* “impart vitality” reprises the cmpd. *vayodhām* in 2a in the same metrical position.

In d *sūktāya* was omitted from the tr., which should be changed to “impart vitality to our well-spoken speech” or, perhaps less likely, “... to our hymn [*sūktā*], to our speech.”

IX.91

IX.91.1: As discussed in several places in the comm. (see lexical list), the root $\sqrt{vañc}$ refers to a number of types of non-linear motion: undulate, curl, coil, etc., with these meanings also distributed among the derivatives of the root, esp. *vākvān-*. Here my tr. ‘billowing’ refers to the motion of the waves of the liquid soma; cf. X.148.5 *ūrmīr nā ... vākvāḥ* “billowing like a wave.”

The publ. tr. doesn’t adequately represent the two divergent derivatives of \sqrt{man} ‘think, bring to mind’, *manótar-* and *manīṣī-*. The latter, by itself, means ‘possessing inspired thought, inspired thinker’. The former, a rarer derivative, means, in my view, someone who pays mental attention, a ‘minder’. See comm. ad II.9.4. I would emend the tr. here to “the minder, the foremost inspired thinker with his insight.” The point here, I think, is that Soma not only has inspired thoughts of his own but pays attention to those of the human celebrants.

The ten sisters are, as usual, the fingers of the officiant.

IX.91.2: The main clause of this vs., pādas ab, contains a predicated aor. part., *svānāḥ*, while the rel. cl., pādas cd, may contain a predicated intens. part., *marmṛjānāḥ*. However, given the *prā* opening c, it’s quite possible that we should supply a verb of motion “(go) forth” as the main verb, with the part. simply a modifier (“the drop [goes] forth, being groomed ...”). However, I prefer the publ. tr., which does supply ‘go’ but as an oblique expression of purpose. Alternatively *prā* may actually belong with the part. *marmṛjānāḥ*, as Gr takes it – though there’s only one other possible ex. of *prā* \sqrt{mrj} that I know of, at X.96.9.

On *nahuṣyā-* see also IX.88.2.

IX.91.3: Both Ge and Re take *īrte* as transitive (‘set in motion’, e.g., “... met en branle ... le blanc lait”), but this medial stem is standardly intrans., and the milk here can be, as so often in IX, the goal of Soma’s motion.

In c *vaco-víd-* could of course also mean ‘who finds speech’. See Scar (487), who allows both senses for the stem and tr. the occurrence here as “der die Reden findet.” In this ritual context there is little difference between ‘knowing speech’ and ‘finding speech’.

Pāda d cannot be separated from IX.10.5 *sūrā āṇvaṃ ví tanvate* “the suns stretch out across the fine (fleece).”

IX.91.4: The syntax of the 2nd hemistich, esp. pāda d, is clotted and has been variously interpreted. Ge takes the problematic *upanāyām* as obj. of *vr̥ścá* (as I do), but considers the referents of *yé ... eṣām* to be the *vājān* of b: “... der sie sich holt, mögen sie nah (oder) fern sein.” Sāy.’s interpr. (see also Ge’s n. 4d) seems a more sensible version of Ge’s: he glosses *upanāyām* as ‘master’ (*svāminam*) and takes the plurals to refer to demons. Re seems to make *upanāyām* an appositive or parallel to the pl. *yé ... eṣām*, which he (semi-)configures as the obj.: “Fends ... (les démons) qui sont près (ou) loin, le chef de ces (démons).” All of them take *ánti durāt* as a constituent, “near (or) far.” But the contrastive expression “near (or) far” generally matches cases (or adverbial equivalents thereof): ablatival *ántitaḥ (...)* *dūrāt* (II.27.13, etc.) or locative *ánti dūrē* (I.79.11, etc.; see esp. IX.19.7 *dūrē vā sató ánti vā*, IX.67.21 *yád ánti yác ca dūraké*). Our passage, by contrast, has locative *ánti* and abl. *durāt*, and I therefore separate them and assign them to different syntactic units. I take *yé ánti* as a minimalist rel. cl. “who (are) near,” while *durāt* is construed with *upanāyām*. I take the latter as meaning ‘leader’, like simplex *nāyá-* (2x: VI.24.10, 46.11), and the whole sequence *dūrād upanāyām eṣām* to mean lit. “leader of those from afar” (rendered in English as a rel. cl. “... the one who lead ...” for the sake of intelligibility). Cf. for directional *durāt* with $\sqrt{nī}$ VII.33.2 *dūrād índram anayann ā ...* “From a distance they led Indra here.” In other words, I interpret *upanāyām* as the obj. of the impv. *vr̥ścá* at the beginning of c, and it is preceded by a brief nominal rel. cl. *yé ánti*, whose referent in the main cl. is *eṣām*. Nominal rel. clauses seem to be exempt from the prohibition on embedding that is evident for full relative clauses. It may be so positioned to allow *ánti* to be adjacent to *durāt* though belonging to different clauses.

Lowe (Part. 289) claims that *tujánt-* is a Caland adj. meaning ‘eager’ rather than a participle ‘thrusting’, but the passages, esp. this one and I.61.6 (with two exx.), favor a more dynamic rendering, and in particular *tujatā vadhéna* “with your thrusting weapon” recalls IX.57.2 *tuñjāná āyudhā* “brandishing his weapons,” with an undoubted participle. I don’t actually see what is gained by reclassifying these forms as Caland adjectives.

IX.91.5: It is not entirely clear what to supply as the referent for the rel. in c; Re ‘les succès,’ Ge the *vājān* from 4b. Pāda c closely resembles IX.63.11 *yó dūṇāśo vanuṣyatā* “which is difficult to attain by one who craves it,” with instr. *vanuṣyatā* matching our *vanuṣā* and a different lexicalization of the ‘difficult to obtain’ (*duṣ-* $\sqrt{naś}$ *sah*) compd. The referent in that passage is *rayí-* ‘wealth’, and note also the compd *bṛhád-rayi-* (only 1x) and the regular use of *bṛhánt-* as a modifier of *rayí-* (e.g., nearby IX.97.21). I therefore supply a pl. form of *rayí-*, though Ge’s *vāja-* would also work.

IX.92

IX.92.1: The injunc *sarji* would probably be better tr. “has been sent surging,” per IH.

In c *āpac chlókam indriyām* seems illuminated by X.94.1 (one of the pressing stone hymns) *ślókam ghóṣam bháráthéndrāya* “you bear your signal-call, your cry to Indra.” The *ślókā-* ‘signal call’ is the audible sign to Indra that soma is being prepared for him; in our passage I assume that the noisy journey of the soma after the filtering produces this *ślókā-*, just as the noise of the pressing stones in X.94.1 serves that purpose.

The lexeme *prāti* √*juṣ* sometimes seems to mean what the simplex does: ‘enjoy’ with an acc. of the substance enjoyed, as in I.101.10 *uśán havyāni prāti no juṣasva* “(Indra,) being eager, take pleasure in our oblations” (cf. VII.34.21). But sometimes this idiom takes a personal object, with the subject giving enjoyment to the object – a reversal of the usual situation. See III.33.8, VII.54.1, 2. In the latter hymn, we find in vs. 1 the dyadic *yát tvémahe prāti tán no juṣasva* “When we entreat you, favor us in return,” which suggests that *prāti* √*juṣ* comes as a response to a request of some sort. In vs. 2 *pitēva putrān prāti no juṣasva* “Like a father his sons, favor us in return,” the acc. *putrān* in the simile shows the case of the obj. of the verb, which the enclitic *naḥ* conceals. The personal acc. is also found in our passage: *prāti devāṃ ajuṣata práyobhiḥ*. As these tr. show, I have generally tr. this idiom ‘favor in return’, but ‘favor in response’ might be better. I confess, however, that neither ‘in return’ or ‘in response’ quite works in our passage.

IX.92.2: Note that this vs. contains the three most resonant “poet” terms: *kaví*, *ṛṣi*, *vípra*-. The first applies to Soma, the other two to the seven seers who approach him.

In b I take *kavíḥ* as a pred. nominative or an embedded quotation, providing the name that Soma has acquired – though it must be admitted that we might expect an acc. Both Ge and Re take *kavíḥ* as an independent descriptor (though see Ge’s n. 2b, where he allows the possibility of my interpr.). The name Soma assumes is, for them, “Soma” itself, or so I understand it. By my interpr. Soma gets called “Kavi” because of the noise he makes on his journey; at the end of the journey he becomes (like a) “Hotar” when he sits down (/is installed) in the cups – another human ritual participant. Ge (n. 2b) suggests that he has just become the Soma-drink (by virtue of the pressing?) and thus takes on the name.

IX.93.3: The periphrasis in c *bhuvát ... rántā*, with the aor. injunc. (∞ subj.) to √*bhū* + root-accented *-tar-* stem, must be signaling some special nuance. Ge tr. “Er pflegte ... zu verweilen” (is accustomed to); Tichy (168–69) cites his tr. with apparent approbation and characterizes the use of this periphrasis as expressing “eine gewohnheitsmässig wiederholte Handlung.” Her own rendering (pp. 314, 336) is “er pflegte bei allen Darbietungen der Seher haltzumachen.” My own “is one to take his rest” is close to this view, but lays more emphasis on the agentive aspect of the *-tar-*stem.

There is also the question of which sense of √*ram* is found here, the orig. ‘(come to) rest’ or the developed ‘be content, enjoy’. Re opts for the latter (and see his n.): “qui se complaît ...,” but given the emphasis on Soma’s taking his seat (vss. 2–3), it seems best, with Ge (/Tichy), to operate with the first.

Having been called *kaví*- himself in 2b, Soma now finds himself in the midst of all *kāvya*- -- presumably mostly the poetic effusions of the ritual participants, but also the sounds that he made on his journey that afforded him the *kaví*- title. This joining of different types of *kāvya*- may account for the ‘all’.

Ge’s rendering of pāda d is quite free: “Der Kluge macht die fünf Völker zu seinem Gefolge.” Tichy’s (336) is more accurate: “überall bei den fünf Völkern nimmt der Weise seinen Platz ein.” A proper interpr. of this pāda must first recognize that the lexeme is not *ānu* √*yat*, *pace* Gr: there are no other exx. of this supposed combination in the RV (nor any other registered by Mon-Wms). Instead *ānu* must be construed with the

immediately flg. noun, not the verb: we must be dealing with the fairly common expression *jānām ānu* (I.50.3, 6, 120.11, etc.), though with flipped order, “through(out) the peoples.” The finite verb *yatate* then has its normal sense ‘take one’s place, ‘arrange oneself’; here the point is that Soma is common to the whole Ārya community, whatever limited place he occupies on the ritual ground.

I render *dhīraḥ* as ‘steadfast’ rather than ‘insightful, wise’, because of the emphasis on Soma’s taking his seat.

IX.92.4: As was suggested in the publ. intro., this vs. may constitute a weak omphalos. In particular, the purport of the first hemistich is not clear to me: what does it mean to say “the gods are in your secret”? Re supplies ‘domain’ with *nīnyé*, but doesn’t elucidate. Ge floats two possibilities in his n. 4a. The first, which he says is illuminated by IX.95.2, is that the gods are Soma’s secret, which only he can reveal. This is not quite what IX.95.2 says; there Soma reveals the hidden names (*gūhyāni nāma*) of the gods, with an acc. pl. not a loc. sg. I am more convinced by his 2nd proposal, that we supply loc. *nāmani* with *nīnyé*, and interpr. it to mean that Soma’s “secret name” is *amṛta*- ‘immortal’ (‘ambrosia’), a word indeed regularly used for soma. Since this word is also, of course, a standard descriptor for the gods, they are/exist, in the verbal sense, “in your secret (name).” Although the loc. *nāman(i)* is not found in the RV, this seems an accidental gap. The multistep mystery—1) figure out what, if anything, to supply with *nīnyá*: *nāmanī*; 2) solve for what the “secret (name)” is: *amṛta*; 3) then apply the resultant name to the gods—is worthy of an omphalos. To make the tr. clearer I would substitute “it is in your secret (name [= (drink of) immortality]) that all these gods [= the immortals] are ...”

IX.92.5: Re tr. pāda a “Que cet (acte) de Pavamāna se réalise donc ...” I would prefer this rendering of *satyām* to the “true” of Ge and the publ. tr., but it is even harder to square with the augmented impf. *ākṛnot* (c) (and probably augmented *prāvat* in d, since \sqrt{av} has no injunctives) that expresses the content of the *satyām* (“true” is bad enough). Perhaps the poet is suggesting that some have expressed doubt that Soma accomplished the deeds described in cd, even though *kārú*-s are agreed that he did, and that he (our poet) wants them to be true. This covert skepticism might well be justified, since all the deeds in cd are attributed elsewhere to other gods. On the other hand, see nearby IX.94.5, where Soma is urged to “make broad light” (*urú jyótiḥ kṛnuhi*).

Another word for poet or the equivalent, *kārú*- ‘bard’, is added to the trio in vs. 2.

I do not know if we should see a difference in nuance between the augmented impf. *ākṛnot* in c and the injunc. aor. *kar* in d; the latter is in the same clause as the (probably augmented) impf. *prāvat*.

The stem *abhīka*- ‘close quarters, face-to-face’ is elsewhere used in contrast to ‘wide(ness)’, VII.85.1 ... *uruṣyatām abhīke*, X.133.1 *abhīke cid ulokakṛt*, and this contrast is evident here as well, with the positive *ākṛnod ulokám* ending c, and the negative *kar abhīkam* in d.

As Old points out, *kar* would be better as a heavy syllable; he suggests underlying **karr* (< **kar-t*). See comm. ad VII.75.1.

IX.92.6: Pāda a contains one of the few technical references to the animal sacrifice in the RV. See the almost identical expression in IX.97.1.

Note that *satyá-* returns here, where ‘true’ or ‘actual, real’ would both work.

IX.93

This hymn is attributed to Nodhas Gautama, the skillful poet of I.58–64. This hymn does not particularly display his verbal agility, but its last pāda (5d) is his refrain, found in I.58.9, etc.

IX.93.1: Notice the alliteration in b: *dása dhīrasya dhītāyo dhānutrīḥ*.

The stem *dhānutar-* occurs 3x in the RV, twice as a fem. pl. *dhānutrīḥ* (here and III.31.16), once as a masc. du. *dhānutarau* (IV.35.5). Although it is not strictly relevant to our occurrence here, the surprising short suffixal vowel in that strong form requires comment. The form occurs after an early caesura, thus producing a break of three light syllables. Such a break is by no means uncommon (see Arnold, p. 188), but a reading **dhānutārau* would produce Arnold’s “normal” break (light light heavy). Old (Noten ad loc.) tentatively suggests that if the form is corrupt, it was altered because it was perceived as a comparative in *-tara-* or a cmpd with *-tara-* ‘crossing, overcoming’. Old’s suggestion is tentatively accepted by Wackernagel (AiG III.199), Gotō (1st cl., 179 n. 311). The misparsing of the form would of course be aided by the fact that it is built not to the root, like most agent nouns, but to an enlarged pres. stem **ghan-u/-va-*, which has spawned a secondary root √*ghanv*. See, e.g., EWA s.v. *DHAN*¹, Goto 178–80 with nn. By contrast, Tichy (*-tar-*stems, 58–59) adduces nearby IV.38.4 *sānutaraḥ*, which is not originally a *-tar-*stem, but which, like *dhānutarau*, modifies a horse. She suggests that since beside the comparative *sānutara-* (whatever its source: see my comm. ad loc.) there exists an (independent) fem. agent noun *sānutrī-* (I.123.2, X.7.4), *dhānutarau* was backformed to the parallel fem. agent *dhānutrī-*. The suggested string of causation here seems stretched too thin.

As for our fem. pl. form, both Ge and Re take *dhānutrīḥ* here as effectively transitive, with objective genitive *dhīrasya*: “die den Weisen ablaufen lassen”; “animatrices du (soma) habile.” But neither of the other occurrences of this stem have such a sense; they simply mean ‘running’; Gotō (179 and n. 313) concurs with the intrans. reading I see here. The fact that an intrans. form of the pf. to √*ghanv*, *dadghanve*, is found in the next vs. (2b) supports this interpr. Another (weak) support is the case of the supposed obj., since root-accented *tar-*stems ordinarily take acc. However, there are enough counterexamples that this is not a clinching argument.

Ge takes *dása* with *dhītāyaḥ* “die zehn Gebete,” but, despite the pāda-boundary, I think it goes with the sisters=fingers in pāda a, as usual. It has been drawn into b because of the alliteration.

Contra Old, Ge, Re, and Schindler (Rt. Nouns), I analyze *jāḥ* as a nom. sg. (with Gr), not an acc. pl. (Ge allows for the nom. sg. alternative in n. 1c). In their interpretations, “the children of the sun” refers to the insightful thoughts of b. But this is a distinctly odd way to refer to thoughts, and no convincing parallels are given. Ge’s interpr. of the phrase “daughter of the sun” as a reference to hymns I have discussed (and dismissed) ad IX.1.6 and esp. IX.72.3. Moreover, pāda c describes Soma as dashing around these children, but in IX *pāri* + VERB OF MOTION normally, perhaps exclusively, refers to Soma’s journey around the filter. I do not know what it would mean for him to “dash around” thoughts, much less “children of the sun.” As a nom. sg., *jāḥ* in the phrase

“offspring of the sun” makes perfect sense as a description of Soma; Soma’s similarity to and often identification with the sun is well attested, and the use of kinship terms to model such similarity/identification is also well known. If, nonetheless, we want to interpr. *jāḥ* as an acc. pl., I would take it as a reference to the milk; cf. comm. ad IX.72.3, where I explain “daughter of the sun” there as referring to the milk because of their shared gleaming color.

IX.93.2: In d *sām* √*gam* is of course a euphemism of sex, a theme already broached in c.

IX.93.3: The tr. “prepare” for *abhī śrīṇanti* in b does not harmonize well with the simile *vāsubhir ná niktaḥ* “as if with freshly washed goods.” Nor does the interpr. put forth by Narten (“Ved. *śrīṇāti* ...,” KZ 100 [1987] = KISch 340ff., at 349), “vollkommen machen” (complete, perfect). The developed sense of the root noun *śrī* ‘excellence, splendour, beauty’ and esp. the rt. noun cmpd *abhiśrī* ‘excelling in splendour’ (etc.) seems to have affected the meaning of the verb, and I would now tr. something like “they beautify his head ...,” which is not far from ‘bring to perfection’.

IX.93.4: Ge takes *vāvasānāḥ* in b to ‘desire’ (√*vas*), but the same form in the same metrical position in 2b to ‘bellow’ (√*vās*). Given the formal identity of the participles, I think they should be rendered in the same way (‘bellowing’; Ge’s n. 4b recognizes this alternative). But the proximity of *uśatī* ‘desiring, eager’ in our pāda c teases us with the other root, and it is quite possible that our form should be taken as a pun. For a similar conjunction see IX.95.3–4.

The hapax *rathirāyātām* (3rd sg. mid. impv., with Old, etc., not gen. pl. pres. part., with Gr) is baroque in formation. It’s worth noting that 3 of the 11 forms of its presumed base *rathirā*- ‘charioteer, chariot rider’ are found in nearby IX.97 (vss. 37, 46, 48) with a further occurrence in IX.76.2.

IX.93.5: The vs. shows a number of metrical disturbances; see Arnold p. 317, Old ad loc., HvN p. 649. Arnold suggests reading **māsvā* in pāda a, which would fix the cadence. Pāda b has an opening of 3; note, however, that the apparently bad cadence *viśvāścandram* with four heavy syllables is not in fact a problem, since all cmpds in -*ścandra*- are better read **-candra-* (see comm. ad I.165.8), yielding the light antepenult required. On the metrical shape of *vātāpyam* see immed. below and comm. ad I.121.8. Pāda c has 10 syllables. Pāda d, the Nodhas Gautama refrain (I.58.9, etc.), has an unusual break.

The adj. *vātāpyam* presents problems of both form and meaning. There are three (or more) possible scansions of this stem—*vāatāpya*- (or *vaatāpya*-), *vātaāpya*-, and *vātāpīya*—each of which has its champions. See comm. ad I.121.8. The sense of the stem is likewise in doubt. It seems obviously related to the voc. *vātāpe* ‘o friend of the wind’ in I.187.8–10, and in I.121.8 Ge tr. “... den Windbefreundeten,” in X.26.2 “die mit dem Vāta befreundet (?) ist.” However, in our passage and in X.105.1 he suggests a different analysis entirely, since (acdg. to his n. 5b to our hymn) that sense “will hier nicht passen.” His alternative involves the ppl. *vāta*- to √*varī* ‘long for, crave’ (otherwise attested only as 2nd cmpd. member), with the sense “whose friendship is desired” (dessen Freundschaft begehrt ist). The question is somewhat hard to decide (if it needs to be

decided: a pun is also possible, as displayed in the publ. tr.). On the one hand, giving up the connection with *vātāpi-* (whatever its underlying accent would have been: *vātāpe* has voc. accent) is unappealing. Moreover if the scansion should be *vāata-*, this would favor ‘wind’, which can be so scanned, whereas the root syll. of the ppl. should not be distracted. (However, that scansion is declared by Old to be the least likely one.) Ge’s certainty that “wind-befriended” wouldn’t work here is also open to question. We are asking for wealth – and “wind-befriended” wealth could be wealth that comes quickly, on a powerful gust of air. All this favors the “wind” analysis. *But* there is another consideration: accent. The cmpd is clearly an adj.; just as clearly it has a neut. noun *āpya-* ‘friendship’ as 2nd member. Therefore it should be a bahuvrīhi “having X friendship” / ‘having the friendship of X’. If the 1st member is the ppl. to \sqrt{van} , it should be accented **vātā-* (though it actually never appears accented elsewhere). This would allow an analysis *vātā-āpya-* with expected first-member bahuvrīhi accent (of the *sutā-soma-* type). But ‘wind’ is accented *vāta-*, and so, if it contains ‘wind’, the cmpd. must be analyzed with 2nd member accent, *vāta-āpya-*, which is not standard bahuvrīhi accent. Nonetheless, weighing these contravening factors, I favor ‘wind-befriended’ as the 1st reading, with Ge’s ‘whose friendship is sought’ as a 2nd punning reading—though I cannot explain the accent.

Although pāda d is the Nodhas refrain and therefore tacked onto the hymn in some sense, note that *dhiyā* responds to *dhīra- dhītī-* of 1b.

IX.94

This hymn is attributed to Kaṇva Ghaura, the poet of I.36–43.

IX.94.1: Note the unaccented *asmin* in pāda a, referring to Soma, who is the default referent even without a previous mention in the hymn.

The vs. contains three similes, each of which presents at least some interpretational challenges to the audience. The first two are in ab and match the frame “the thoughts contend over him” (... *asmin ... spārdhante dhīyaḥ*), which presumably refers to the thoughts produced by poets at different and competing rituals (see Ober I.407 and n. 64). The second simile, in b, is the easier to interpret: “like clans over the sun” (*sūrye nā vīśaḥ*). Like the competing thoughts that each seek to appropriate Soma, different clans all seek to secure their place in the sun, a symbol, acdg. to Ober (I.457), of *Leben* and *Lebenskraft*, of *Lebensraum*.

The first simile, *vājīnīva śubhaḥ*, reads slightly askew. It should mean “as adornments (contend over) a prizewinner” – but what would that really mean? The passages adduced by Ge in n. 1a are not helpful, and no one else that I know of attempts to elucidate it. I think the poet has deliberately misdirected us. To begin with, although the loc. *vājīni* appears to match *asmin* in the frame as the object of contention, I think that may not be the case or may not *only* be the case. The vs. begins with *ādhi*, which therefore appears to be in tmesis with *spārdhante* in b, but there is only one other instance of *ādhi* \sqrt{sprdh} in the RV (VI.34.1, where – I must admit – it seems to have the sense attributed to our passage: ‘contend over’ with loc. *indre* as the object of contention). The word *ādhi* is more often an adposition, most commonly with the loc., and so I think it is here. Although *ādhi* is separated from *vājīni*, what intervenes is Wackernagel’s position material: subordinating *yād*, which frequently takes 2nd position, and the enclitic *asmin*,

which would lean upon it. So effectively *ádhi ... vājīni* can be a prepositional phrase interrupted by the interpolation of those two Wackernagel's position words. Under this interpr. the prizewinner is no longer the object of contention but the locus of it. Now as to *śúbhaḥ*: this root noun is quite well attested (over 40 occurrences, incl. the common voc. *śubhás páti-*), but only two attestations are plural – our passage and V.54.11, which describes the many appurences and adornments found on the Maruts and their equipage, incl. pāda b *vákṣassu rukmā maruto ráthe śúbhaḥ* “your breasts brilliants, o Maruts, on your chariot charms” (per the publ. tr.). The *śúbhaḥ* here are ornaments of some sort, quite possibly sparkly or otherwise eye-catching, that jazz up the chariot to which they're affixed. I suggest that our loc. (*ádhi ...*) *vājīni* fulfills the same function as *ráthe* in V.54.11, and that the *śúbhaḥ* in our passage are not vying *over* or *for* the prizewinner, but, located *on* him, they are vying with each other to best catch the eye of observers.

The phrase that opens the 2nd hemistich, *apó vṛṇānāḥ* “choosing the waters,” is a little odd. The waters are surely the ubiquitous waters for mixing found regularly in IX, but why would Soma “choose” them? In a soma context we would expect rather *apó *vasānāḥ* “clothing himself in the waters”; this exact phrase opens the pāda in IX.78.1, 86.40, 96.13, 107.4, 18, 26, and with acc. sg. of the participle IX.16.2, 109.21. I suggest that our poet is knowingly playing on this standard formula, using a different root but identical formation to throw the expression off-kilter. Note that *vasāna-* (nom. pl.) is found in the same metrical position in 4c. The identical expression, *apó vṛṇānāḥ*, is, however, found in V.48.1; on this opaque passage see comm. ad loc.

Interpretation of the third simile in the vs. is complicated by the fact that it is unclear which part of the clause to construe it with. The frame consists of an acc. *mánma* ‘thought’ (→ ‘poem’), which is compared to *vrajám ná paśuvárdhanāya* “a stable for raising livestock.” But where these acc. expressions fit in the sentence is disputed: Ge (see n. 1d; also Tichy, *dvitā* 222 = KISch 213) takes *mánma* as a second obj. with *vṛṇānāḥ*. But the simile then makes little sense: although Soma might well “choose a thought,” choosing a stable is a different proposition. By this interpr. the domain of the comparison would only be the acc. *mánma*; it could not fit with the verb (despite Tichy's odd “wie (man) eine Hürde ... [wählt]”). Although such similes, detached from the syntax of the rest of the clause, do exist, syntactic integration, esp. of non-nominative similes, is more usual and desirable. By contrast, Old takes the acc. as the obj. (or semi-obj.) of *pavate*. This latter suggestion seems particularly unlikely, given the stereotyped use of *pavate* in IX, and Old's rendering shows how he struggles to make it work: “er verwirklicht durch sein Sichreinigen das *m*°, wie (man) einen Stall ... (reinigt).” Differing from both these interpr., following a remark of Re's in his n. (“*mánma* dépendant librement de *kavīyán* ...”), which is not entirely reflected in his tr., I take it with the act. denom. part. *kavīyán*. The stem *kavīyá-* occurs only twice in the RV (and nowhere else), once as an act. part. (here), once as a middle part. *kavīyámāna-* in I.164.18. Nothing therefore forbids us from assuming a direct obj. with the act. form, as I have done here. The content of the simile, which compares the building of a stable or livestock enclosure to the composing of a poem, rests on the commonality often asserted in the RV between physical and mental craftsmanship and thus fits nicely with the verb.

IX.94.2: The nom. part. *vyūṛṇvān* in pāda is sg., while the finite verb *prathanta* in b is pl. Old and Ge attribute this to anacoluthon, with the nom. of pāda a coreferential with the dat. *svarvīde* in b, while acdg. to Tichy (loc. cit., n. 35) the participle is the predicate of pāda a (“Partizip im Nominative an Stelle eines Verbum finitum”). With Re, I instead take pāda a as a continuation of vs. 1, with a new construction beginning in b.

The referent of *amṛtasya* in the phrase *amṛtasya dhāma* is not clear. Ge: the drink of immortality, Re: the immortal principle, Lü (257) and Tichy (loc. cit.): immortality. By contrast I think it may refer to the sun (as I also suggest in the nearby passage IX.97.32); the immediately following description of Soma as ‘finder of the sun’ (*svarvīd-*) supports this interpr. “Disclosing the domain of the sun” may refer to the Dawn-like behavior of Soma at the morning pressing (see Ge’s n. 2b “Wie bei Sonnenaufgang”), or to his plunging into the milk mixture that is often assimilated to the sun – probably the latter. The adv. *dvitā* ‘once again’ expresses the regular repetition of the sacrifice.

IX.94.3: This vs. does not contain a main cl., simply a subord. *yād* cl. in ab, extended by a participial expression in cd. The vs. can depend either on the previous vs. or the following one – or (though in my view less likely) the part. *bhūṣan* in c can be the predicate of the main cl.

The cadence of pāda a is bad; Gr suggests reading subj. **bharāte*, which would fix the problem, but as Old comments, this is “natürlich ganz unsicher” – esp. since both the opening and the break are likewise irregular (see HvN metrical comm. ad loc.).

Note the emphatic return of the poet, with *kavīḥ kāvya* in pāda a picking up *kavīyān* in 1a.

Pāda b and the simile it contains raise some problems. First, the nom. subject *śūro nā ráthah*. The stem *śūra-* is of course a masc. noun ‘champion’, here juxtaposed with another such noun, *rátha-* ‘chariot’. Re renders them as distinct subjects: “tel un héros, (tel) un char-de-guerre,” but I think a blended “champion chariot” works better. The phrase also presents another possibility, which Old flirts with but ultimately dismisses: *śūrah* is phonologically almost identical to *sūrah*, the gen. sg. of *svàr-* ‘sun’, and the “chariot of the Sun” (*sūrah* [...] *rátha-*) is found elsewhere (I.50.9 [see comm. ad loc.], V.31.11; also *sūrah* [...] *cakráṁ* “(chariot-)wheel of the Sun” I.174.5, VI.56.3). Although I do not propose emending *śūrah* to **sūrah*, I do think that phrase is lurking in the background, esp. given the presence of the sun in 2b (*svar-*[*vīde*]) and, if I’m correct, also 2a.

Assuming this double reading of the subject of the simile helps interpr. the rest of pāda b. Ge and Re take *bhúvanāni víśvā* “all the worlds” as belonging to the frame, as a parallel obj. to *kāvya* in pāda a (e.g., “Quand le (*soma*) poète porte autour de lui les pouvoirs-poétiques (et) tous les mondes ...”). This leaves the acc. slot of the simile unfilled: Re leaves it blank, while Ge supplies “(die Feinde?).” I instead put *bhúvanāni víśvā* in the simile, matching *kāvya* in the frame. This interpr. is facilitated by the “chariot of the *Sun” reading that I think is implied here, since the Sun’s daily chariot journey across the heaven puts all worlds in his jurisdiction. Soma’s journey across the ritual ground gives him the same kind of control over poetic skill and its products, both his own and those of the officiants. It may also be that “all the worlds” can secondarily be re-read into the frame. The *bhúvanāni* that stretched out for sun-finding Soma in 2b

(presumably both the cosmic worlds and the worlds of the ritual ground) fall into this control in 3ab.

As pointed out by Old inter alia, in c the transmitted *mártāya* is best emended to **márt'yāya*, since a four-syllable reading is called for.

The dual focus on the cosmic and the ritual continues in c, where Soma exerts himself “among the gods” (that is, in his cosmic dimension) on behalf of glory for the mortal, presumably the priest or poet. The expression (*yáso*) **márt'yāya bhūṣan*# may play off *amítāya bhūṣan*# (III.25.2, 34.2) “exerting oneself for the immortal (one).”

The rt. noun cmpd *puru-bhū(-tama)-* is otherwise used of the Aśvins (4x); I interpr. it to mean ‘appearing in many places’ (see comm. ad IV.44.4). The apparent loc. pl. occurrence here has been variously and only tentatively interpr.; see Ge, Re, Ober (II.229), Scar (362). Given the context, in a participial clause headed by *bhūṣan*, I suggest that our *purubhūṣu* does not in fact belong to *puru-bhū-* but rather to an otherwise unattested *puru-*bhūṣ-* -- hence **puru-bhūṣ-ṣu*, with the geminate sibilant simplified to -*ṣ-*. Although a root noun to the secondary root √*bhūṣ* is not found elsewhere, it would not be difficult to generate in this context.

IX.94.4: In pāda a the Pp reads *śriyé* for the Saṃhitā *śriyá ā*. Ge concurs, but Re tr. “... est issu de la gloire,” with an apparent ablative – which is how I interpr. the form. The lexeme *nír* √*i* ‘come out, come forth’ generally takes an abl., and the gesture towards a versified paradigm (*śriyé* ... *śriyás* [a], *śriyam* [b]) speak in favor of the abl.

The pl. subj. of c may be the singers, the only plural entity overt in the vs. so far. So Sāy. and by implication (see his n. 4c) Ge. However, I think that Re is correct is supplying instead “les sucs-de-soma,” since *vasānā-*, common in IX, is applied only to soma. The interchange between sg. and pl. in reference to soma and its streams/drops, etc., is of course ubiquitous in this maṇḍala.

The final pāda is quite unclear and its interpr. depends in part on identity of the ref. of the loc. *mitádrau* ‘of measured pace’. Ge and Re both take it to be Soma. Acdg, to Ge, the loc. is to be construed with *samithā* (“Die Kämpfe um ihn, der einen festen Schritt hat ...”), but as far as I am aware, *samithā-* is not found with a loc. elsewhere. Re makes this loc. into a loc. absolute, by virtue of supplying a near paragraph of extraneous matter, which has a whiff of desperation in it. My interpr. begins with the fact that of the 5 occurrences of the stem *mitádru-* the two other singular ones both refer to Agni (IV.6.5, VII.7.1). I therefore suggest that he is also the referent here. The “encounters” (*samithā*) that are to be realized (*bhāvanti satyā*) take place *at* the ritual fire; the loc. is simply recalling us firmly to the ritual ground. The encounters in question I take to be the encounter of the soma streams/drops (etc.) with the gods who are to consume them – or possibly the encounters with the water and milk mixtures.

IX.95

This hymn is attributed to Praskaṇva Kāṇva, the poet of I.44–50, the group of hymns that follow those of Kaṇva Ghaura, the poet of immediately preceding IX.94.

IX.95.1: Ge takes the participles in b (*sīdan* ... *punānāh*) as implicitly predicated (“er läutert sich und setzt sich ...”), but there seems no reason to do so. They are surely

parallel to the part. in pāda a (*srjyāmānaḥ*) and detail the various circumstances under which Soma keeps roaring.

The verb in b, 3rd sg. mid. *janayata*, seems to be a true middle with self-involvement of the subj. -- “he generates (his own) thoughts through his own powers.” – not dependent on the purely formal 3rd pl. -*anta* replacement *janáyanta* (see my “Voice fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural -*anta* in active paradigms,” *III* 21 ([1979] 146–69). The self-involvement of the subj. is even clearer in the near-twin passage I.95.4 *vatsó mātṛ janayata svadhābhiḥ* “The calf [=Agni] begets his (own) mothers with his own powers.” See comm. ad loc.

IX.95.2: The opening of this vs., *háriḥ srjānáḥ*, echoes 1a ... *hárir ā srjyāmānaḥ*#. I do not know if the root aor. part. here is meant to convey anterior value, as opposed to the pres. pass. part. in 1a, or if it’s just a variant.

For the infinitival use of the dative of this rt. noun cmpd *pravāc-* see Scar (470).

IX.95.3: Pada b *prá manīṣā īrate sómam ácha* “The inspired thoughts press forward to Soma” is the intrans. equivalent of 2b *íyarti vācam* “He [=Soma] directs his speech,” with act. transitive redupl. pres. *íyarti* corresponding to its weak form, medial intrans. *īrte*. This connection is obscured by the Engl. tr.

The deployment of *ca*, first conjoining two preverbs enfolding their joint verb (c ... *úpa ca yánti sám ca*), and then in the next pāda conjoining a new preverb, but with a different verb (d *ā ca viśanti*), is a striking effect. The contrastive preverbs in c of course account for the accent on the main-cl. verb *yánti*.

IX.95.4: The ‘back’ (*sāná*) is the back of the filter; the fuller expression is *sāno ávye* “on the sheep’s back,” as in nearby IX.97.3 *mṛjyate sāno ávye*. On this latter phrase see disc. ad IX.86.1.

Ge renders *vāvasānám* as “dem Verlangenden” (to *√ vaś* ‘desire’), in contrast to Re and the publ. tr., which take it to *√ vās* ‘bellow’. In actual fact it is probably a pun. On the one hand, in this vs. Soma is strongly typed as bovine (a: *mahiṣám* ‘buffalo’, b: *ukṣānam* ‘ox’), which favors ‘bellow’. On the other, the end of the previous vs. contains a reciprocal expression from *√ vaś*: 3d *uśatṛ uśántam* “(they) desiring, (him) desiring.” So both roots are in play here and equally applicable to Soma. For a similar situation see nearby IX.93.4 and comm. thereon.

For Trita as the archetypal soma-preparer, see comm. ad IX.37.4. Here Soma is identified with Varuṇa because of Varuṇa’s (developing) association with water and the sea. See Lü (52, 268), Ober (II.100 and n. 406).

IX.95.5: The Upavaktar priest prompts the Hotar to speak. On this priestly title and its relationship to the Maitravaruṇa priest, see Minkowski, *Priesthood in Ancient India*, 118–27. It may be no accident that this priestly title, found only 3x in the RV (IV.9.5, VI.71.5, and here), occurs directly after a mention of Varuṇa.

IX.96

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. Although the larger structure involves a series of independent four-vs. hymns, there are a number of echoes across these hymns, noted below, that may have influenced their being grouped together

IX.96.2: The publ. tr. doesn't make it sufficiently clear that "without resting" qualifies the "tawny (horse)."

Ge and Re construe gen. *índrasya* with the chariot, while I take it with the comrade – and Ober vacillates (comrade II.100, chariot II.204). Since *índrasya* is positioned between chariot and comrade, word order doesn't help. In my view 'comrade' is inherently relational and generally needs to be defined with reference to another being or beings, as comrade to *someone*, hence my tr. See also nearby IX.101.6 *sákhéndrasya*, which both Ge and Re construe together.

IX.96.3: The phrase *dyām utémām* raises a number of questions. First, what is *utá* conjoining? Although it is tempting to suggest "heaven and this (earth)," this would produce the pragmatically unlikely "causing ... this (earth) to rain." Moreover, there are numerous exx. of *pr̥thivīm dyām utémām* "earth and this heaven" (III.32.8, 34.8, X.88.3, 9, 121.1). It seems that the last part of that phrase, containing only the second NP, has been extracted from the fuller expression and inserted here, with the *utá* pleonastic, or loosely conjoining the participial phrases *kṛṇvānn apáh* and *varṣāyan dyām utémām* despite its position within the NP. On the clash between the near deictic *ayám* 'this here' and heaven, which is generally qualified by the distal deictic *asaú* 'that yonder', see disc. ad VIII.40.4 – also for the fem. gender that *dyām* must show here. In all cases of fem. *dyaúh*, I think the ultimate source is the misunderstanding of dual "Heaven and Earth" / *ródasī* passages with a dual fem. adj. modifying.

Ge tr. d as implicitly comparative, "mach uns die Bahn noch breiter als breit," presumably because of the abl. *uróh*. But *ā* with preceding abl. almost always expresses the source and is not used with a comparative. The few passages, grouped in Gr's 7) "vor andern, d.h. in höherm vorzuglichern Grade als andere" (p. 169), that do show something like that sense (several in that category are best interpr. otherwise) depend on *ā váram* "the choice from among ..." Moreover, *varivasyá-* does not have a comparative sense 'make wider space' but merely 'make wide space'. In our passage the point seems to be that Soma is already positioned in a wide place, from which he can act to provide us with the same.

IX.96.4: As Old points out, *bṛhaté* is a masc./neut. form apparently modifying two (or at least one) fem. nouns, *svastáye sarvátātaye*. Re takes it as a third term: "pour ... le haut (rang)," but in his n. he acknowledges the Old/Ge acceptance of gender mismatch here, noting also that that interpr. produces two pairs of paired datives, the negated violence words in pāda a and the positive *-tí*-abstracts in b. In my view pattern may trump gender here. It's also worth noting that the cadence produced by *bṛhaté* is bad, and it would be fixed by a fem. **bṛhatyai*, so it is possible that *bṛhaté* was introduced redactionally – but why?

IX.96.6: Though the syntax is kept absolutely constant – nom. sg. + gen. pl. – there is a shifting functional relationship between the head noun and its genitive in the seven

phrases here: the first two are roles Soma performs for the group identified by the gen., the next three a particular, and superior, individual token from the group (though the third pairing, “seer for/of the inspired poets,” is ambiguous between the first type and the second), and the last is sort of a negative version of the role he plays for the group.

In the phrase *padavīḥ kavīnām* (see also vs. 18) the gen. pl. may depend on the first cmpd. member, “blazer of the poets’ trail,” as sometimes elsewhere.

IX.96.7: In pāda a, along with Ge and Re (see also Old’s comm. ad loc.) I read *ūrmīm* twice, with both simile and frame; *vācāḥ* so accented should be gen. sg., not acc. pl., and is therefore not parallel to the two acc. pls. in b, *gīraḥ ... manīṣāḥ*.

The standard tr. interpr. the *vṛjānā* phrase as obj. of *antāḥ pāsyaṇ* (e.g., Re “Regardant à l’intérieur ces sectes (de fidèles) proches”). I instead take the part. in absolute usage (“looking within”; cf. I.132.3) and construe the acc. with *ā tiṣṭhati* ‘(sur)mounts’. This makes some spatial sense: if they are ‘below’ (*āvarāṇi*) it is easy to mount them.

Re and Ober (II.211) think that pāda d refers to copulation. Cf. esp. Ober’s “Der Bulle besteigt die Kühe, [die Kopulation] kennend.” Although “mount” is a standard Engl. term for animal copulation, I am not at all sure that *ā√sthā* serves the same function, and I would esp. wonder about using the locative for the female participant(s). And I also doubt that it would need to be added that the bull knew how to do it!

IX.96.8: Ge takes *iṣanyān* in d to mean ‘desiring’ (“nach den Kühen verlangend”) as in the sim. passage he cites, III.50.3. But this verb stem always means ‘drive, send’ (see Re’s n. ad loc.) and is, one way or another, derived from *iṣṇāti* ‘impels, sends’.

IX.96.8–9: Although these two vss. belong to two different hymns within the larger structure of IX.96, it is notable that the a-pādas of both end with a form -*vātaḥ*; it is not impossible that the hymn consisting of 9–12 was attached here because of this concatenation, esp. given that the etymological figure in 8a is repeated in 11c of the other hymn. But the -*vāta*-forms belong to two different roots: 8a (/11c) *āvāta*- to *√van* ‘win, vanquish’ and 9a *devāvāta*-to *√vanī* ‘love, cherish, long for’. The root affiliation of *āvāta*-is assured by the etymological figure in which it’s found, *vanvānn āvātaḥ* “vanquishing but unvanquished” (cf. also VI.16.20, 18.1, IX.89.7 as well as the two occurrences in this hymn, 8a and 11c). But *√van* is an aniṭ root, and we might expect a ppl. *-*vata*-, which does not occur; -*vāta*- is only phonologically proper to the seṭ root *√vanī*. Gotō (1st Kl. 283–84 with n. 656), fld. by EWA (s.v. *VAN*), suggests that *āvāta*- (and, per EWA, other apparent seṭ forms of *√van*) are analogic to the synonymous, rhyming but seṭ root *√sanī* (*sātā*-, etc.). I certainly think the parallel forms of *√sanī* may well have contributed, but I think it’s a mistake to discount potential confusion and conflation of forms of *√vanī* and *√van*, esp. since under certain circumstances ‘love, long for’ and ‘win’ can shade into each other.

IX.96.9: In addition to its echoing *āvāta*- in 8, *devāvāte* is reminiscent of *devātāte* in 3a.

My “for Indra’s exhilaration” is a somewhat loose rendering of the double dative *indrāya ... mādāya* “for Indra, for exhilaration.”

IX.96.11: As Ge (see n. 11c) and Ober (I.311 with n. 791) point out, the first hemistich depicts the Vala myth, with “forefathers” (*pitáraḥ*) a reference to the Aṅgirasas – made clearer by a similar but more explicit passage in the next hymn, IX.97.39. This mythic episode – the forefathers opening the Vala cave with the help of soma – provides the model for the appeal in c, for Soma to open the *paridhī-* (*paridhīm̐r̥ āporṇu*): *paridhī-* is used explicitly of the barriers of the Vala cave in I.52.5. But as Ge suggests (n. 11c), the poet here is calling on Soma to open up the livestock pens and provide us with the animals therein.

IX.96.12: As pointed out in the publ. intro., this vs. is strongly marked as a hymn-final vs., with complementary *yáthā* ‘even as’ (ab) and *evā* ‘in just this way’ (cd) clauses, bringing this 4-versed hymn to a close. The matches between clauses are more explicit than in some such structures: the two finite verbs, impf. *āpavathāḥ* and impv. *pavasva*, match exactly save for tense/mood, and the root noun cmpd. *vayo-dhāḥ* of pāda a is recast as a syntagm *dráviṇam dádhanah* in c with the same root $\sqrt{dhā}$.

The final pāda consists of two brief clauses, both somewhat aberrant. The first contains an idiom I have not found elsewhere, *sām* $\sqrt{sthā}$ + LOC. My tr., “stand side-by-side by Indra,” is meant to capture this slightly off expression. The second clause, “beget/generate weapons,” is syntactically fine but semantically odd.

IX.96.12–13: The first vs. of the new hymn (13a) begins *pávasva* (see also *pavasva* in 14a), just as the last vs. of the previous hymn ended with *pavasva* (12c). Again, this concatenation may have led to the attachment of 13–16 at this point. Of course, *pávasva* is hardly a rare form in this maṇḍala.

IX.96.14: The *pavasva* in this vs. is construed with an acc. phrase, *vṛṣṭīm diváḥ*. Ge treats it as if it were a straight transitive: “Läutere ... den Regen ... herab,” while Re supplies a participle to govern the acc.: “clarifie toi (nous donnant) la pluie.” It is possible that something like Re’s solution is correct: that we should supply the preverb \tilde{a} to form the lexeme $\tilde{a}\sqrt{pū}$ ‘attract through purification’ (see comm. ad IX.7.8); on occasion (see, e.g., IX.13.4 and comm. ad loc.), \tilde{a} is missing, but the passage seems to require it. However, here I suggest that something different is going on: it is not that we want Soma to bring rain through his purification, but to *become*, *turn into* rain. See IX.97.44, 108.10

IX.96.15: I don’t know what *íd* contributes in b, beyond inducing accent on the verb *táratī*.

The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Ober [I.232]) take “(the milk) of Aditi” as the frame, with the simile limited to *páyo ná dugdhám*, e.g., “Tel le lait trait, (le lait) d’Aditi est fort.” I find this puzzling because Aditi has little to do with soma and has no reason to figure here. (On the phrase “in the lap of Aditi” in IX, see comm. ad IX.89.1.) Instead I think that it is soma that is being compared to the milk milked from Aditi; in other words, Aditi belongs to the simile. Since she is the archetype of motherhood, the milk of Aditi would be esp. rich and nurturing – “mother’s milk”; indeed this might be a reference to the beestings or “first milk” (*pīyūṣa-*), with which soma is often compared (see comm. ad IX.85.9).

Old, Ge, and Re all make more of the gender mismatch in the simile *urv ìva gātúḥ* than I think is justified. Since the target of the simile is milk (*páyah*), and milk is neuter, I see no problem with attributing the neut. *urú* to its “attraction” to the neut. *páyah*, even though, given the position of *ná*, the simile should rightly be “like a broad way” rather than “broad like a way.” The masc. *suyámaḥ* in the next simile may result from the more animate quality of the content of the simile itself, the draught-horse.

IX.96.16: The bahuvrīhi *sv-āyudhá-* ‘having good weapons’ echoes the odd command that ends the previous hymn in this structure, 12d *janáyāyudhāni* “beget weapons!” This echo may have contributed to the attachment of 13–16 at that point in the text.

Soma’s goal in b, “the dear hidden name” (*gúhyaṃ cāru nāma*), has a surprisingly large number of possible referents. Lü (526) suggests the sun, Ge (n. 16b) *amṛta*- the drink of immortality. I would add Soma’s own name (see IX.92.2, 4 and comm. thereon), or the cows on the basis of IX.87.3 *apīcyāṃ gúhyaṃ nāma gónām*, or the gods, as in the immed. preceding hymn IX.95.2 *devānām gúhyāni nāma*, or Indra on the basis of IX.109.14 *bībharti cārv índrasya nāma*.

IX.96.17–18: These two vss. outfit Soma with the lexicon of poetry, with 17c concentrating on *kaví-* and 18a on *ṛṣi-*, though with *kaví-* returning in pāda b

IX.96.17: I don’t know what the Maruts are doing here.

In c I have rendered the nom. pres. part. *sán* concessively, in its usual value, but it’s not exactly clear what the concession would be. Perhaps the contrast is between Soma as poet – so emphasized by *kavīḥ ... kāvyaena kavīḥ* -- and the less than melodious sound indicated by the root \sqrt{ribh} ‘squawk, rasp’ (see comm. ad VI.3.6, IX.66.9).

IX.96.18: The publ. tr. does not render the rel. *yáḥ* since the rel. cl. is entirely nominal. It is not clear how far it extends – perhaps the first hemistich, perhaps through pāda c, perhaps only the first pāda – since Soma is nominative both in the rel. cl. and in the main cl. The main cl. must constitute at least the last pāda because the finite verb *rājati* is unaccented.

The phrase *padavīḥ kavīnām* is found also in 6a.

What the referent of the “third domain” (*ṛtīyaṃ dhāma*) is is unclear. Lü (273), not surprisingly, has precisely mapped the spatial geography and considers the third domain to be heaven (1 earth, 2 midspace, 3 heaven), with the fourth, in the next vs., the *samudra-*, which is higher than heaven. I think it more likely that these are ritual references, quite possibly to locations on the ritual ground that Soma traverses on his journey (see *dhāmāni āryā* in IX.63.14 and comm. thereon). If “gaining the sun” (*svarṣāḥ*) refers to Soma’s uniting with the milk mixture (assimilated to the sun because of its gleaming whiteness), then the third domain, which comes after, might be the vessels near the ritual fire. If the *dhāman-* are not spatial but temporal, this could be a ref. to the third pressing. Ge (n. 18c) takes it as reference to the forms or phases of soma; Re tr. ‘structure’ without further elaboration.

As generally noted by tr. (Ge, Re, also Scar [72]), pāda d involves a play on the names of the Anuṣṭubh and Virāj meters. The publ. tr. fails to register the pun on *virājam*, well captured by Scar “Soma herrscht nach Art eines Grosskönigs.” I would now

substitute a fuller (if more awk.) tr.: “Soma, as rhythm [/ the Anuṣṭubh meter], rules as wide-ruling one [/regulates the Virāj (meter) according to rule].” This tr. assumes that *virājam* represents not only the acc. sg. of the rt. noun cmpd. *virāj-*, but also the nom. sg. pres. part. **virājan* to the them. pres. *rājati*. This seems preferable to trying to construe it as an acc. sg. in the sense ‘wide-ruling’, and the interchange of final nasals would be fairly trivial for a pun. Scar. (72 n. 97) notes that the lexeme *ānu* √*rāj* is used in II.43.1 also of regulating meters, there Gāyatrī and Triṣṭubh. The preverb *ānu* also has to be read with *ṣṭúp*, as a cmpd decomposed and flanking *rājati* (*ānu rājati ṣṭúp*), for the meter name. The technical references to meters here may be the culmination of the *kavī-* / *īṣi-* theme of 17–18.

IX.96.19: I follow Ge in interpr. *vibhītvān-* as ‘spreading (wings)’, an interpr. that Old finds at least possible and that Re accepts. It is noteworthy – though I’m not sure where it gets us – that the Avestan Hom Yašt in Y. 9.14 contains the phrase *vībərəθuuantəm āxtūirīm* supposedly “with pauses and repeated four times,” describing the recitation of the Ahuna Vairiia prayer, with the equivalent of our *vibhītvān-* (*-vant-*) and *turīya-*. But the contexts are so different that it is hard to know what, if anything, to make of it – though if there’s a covert reference to recitational styles here it would continue the technical poetic vocab. of 18d.

The stem *govindú-* ‘cow-finding’ is found only here in the RV and nowhere else in Skt. (though *govinda-* is of course quite common later). As Re notes, it is a play on *indu-* ‘drop’ and is immed. doubled by the synonym *drapsá-*.

The weapons of 16a (and 12d) return here.

I follow Lü (273) and Re in taking *samudrām* in c as part of a double acc. phrase with *vivakti* in d: “declares the sea to be the fourth domain” – rather than as taking it as a 2nd obj. with *sācamānaḥ* as Ge does (“... der Meerflut sich gesellend”). Accepting Lü’s interpr. of the syntax does not, however, require accepting his view that this is the heavenly ocean, higher than heaven. Again, I think it’s a ritual ref. – perhaps to the waters that accompany him in pāda c.

IX.96.20: Soma’s journey from the filter (vs. 17) and across the domains on the ritual ground (vss. 18–19) reaches its end when he enters the two cups, presumably ready for the gods to consume.

IX.96.20–21: Again these two vss. belong to separate mini-hymns, but they are clearly concatenated: *kānikradat* “constantly roaring” in 20d is repeated in the same metrical position in 21b (and cf. *krāndan* in 22d), and 20d *camvòr ā viveśa* “he has entered the two cups” is immediately echoed by 21c *camvòr ā víśa* “enter the two cups” (and cf. 22b *kalásām ā viveśa*).

IX.96.22: Given the play on names of meters in 18d, it’s quite possible that *sāman-* is a technical term here.

Although *eti* has a goal in its pāda (at least in the simile) and should therefore be read as a lexical verb of motion, it may also be functioning as an auxiliary in a periphrasis *krādann eti* “keeps roaring,” which would be an analytic expression functionally equivalent to the “intensive” (that is, iterative-repetitive) *kānikradat* in 20d, 21b.

IX.96.23: The same double reading may apply to *eṣi* in pāda a, which has a goal (again in a simile), but also could be read with the part. *apaghnán* “he keeps smiting rivals.”

śakunó ná pátvā “like a flying bird” seems closely modeled on 19a *śakunó vibhṛtvā* “a bird spreading (its wings). In itself the expression is a bit puzzling. If the bird is “flying” it should not already be “sitting” (*sīdan*), and it seems unlikely that *pátvan-* is meant to distinguish it (as ‘flightful’) from a flightless bird like a dodo.

IX.96.24: A last pāda-init. form of \sqrt{k} *rand*, *ácikradat* in d.

IX.97

On the structure of this, the longest hymn in the RV, see publ. intro. It consists of ṛcas with varying degrees of cohesion.

IX.97.1–3: No obvious cohesion in this ṛca, though it ends with a clan refrain.

IX.97.1: As Re points out, init. *asyá* is reflexive or pseudo-reflexive, referring to Soma.

Gr attributes the instr. *preṣā* to a root noun *préṣ-* (< *pra-ís-*). Scar (59–60) discusses the form extensively, pointing out that a root noun analysis is dispreferred because of the accent on the ending: root nouns generally keeping the accent on the root even in the oblique. An instr. to a putative them. stem *preṣá-* is possible (at least accentually distinct from *preṣa-* I.68.5).

Almost identical to IX.92.6a, pāda d contains one of the few technical references to animal sacrifice (other than the horse sacrifice) in the RV.

IX.97.3: The comparative (*yaśástaraḥ*) with gen. pl. (*yaśásām*) is a mixed construction: we would expect either a splv. or an abl.

On the disputed etym. of *kṣaita(-vant)*- see comm. ad VI.2.1. As was noted there, both *kṣaita-* here and *kṣaitavant-* there are associated with *yáśas-* ‘glory’.

The final pāda is the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, and the Anukr. attributes this ṛca to Vasiṣṭha himself, rather than one of the Vasiṣṭhids responsible for vss. 4–30.

IX.97.4–6: As Re points out (ad vs. 6), the key to this ṛca is the dative of purpose: 4b *dhánāya*, 5b *mádāya*, 5d *mahaté saúbhagāya*, 6b *bhārāya*.

IX.97.5: Ge and Re take *ánu dhāma pūrvam* as referring to an earlier mode of praise (e.g., “nach der früheren Weise”), but *dhāman-* in soma hymns tends, in my view, to refer to the physical domain(s) of the ritual ground, which Soma typically travels across in the course of his ritual preparation. See, e.g., the exx. in the immediately preceding hymn IX.96.18–19 and comm. thereon).

IX.97.6: Like the first ṛca, this one ends with the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain. The ṛca is attributed not to Vasiṣṭha himself, but to one Indrapramati Vāsiṣṭha, who is not known from elsewhere.

IX.97.7–9: This *ṛca* is attributed to Vṛṣagaṇa Vāsiṣṭha, whose given name was obviously extracted from vs. 8. All three vss. contain wild (or semi-wild) animals: a boar in 7d, geese in 8a, and a “sharp-horned” (*tigmāśṛṅga-*) one in 9c, a descriptor of *vṛṣabhā-*s generally.

IX.97.7: In the expression *kāvyaṃ uśāneva* the first word is the acc. obj. of *bruvāṇāḥ*, but it is also of course a play on the patronymic of Uśanā, the differently accented *kāvya-*.

In d the publ. tr. takes *padā* as neut. pl., based on IX.12.8 *abhī priyā divās padā, ... arṣati* “Soma rushes towards the dear tracks of heaven,” adduced by Re. However, it is also possible and, I now think, desirable to interpr. it as an instr. sg. “along the track.” I would not interpr. the instr., with Ge, as “mit dem Fusse.”

On PREV *etī rébhan*# see IX.96.6=17, IX.97.1 (this hymn) and with *emi* VII.18.22; “snorting” or “grunting” would be a better rendering of *rébhan* in the boar context.

IX.97.8: My interpr. of this vs. differs from the standard because I don’t interpr. anything here as a PN, unlike Ge and to a lesser extent Re. In particular, *ṛpāla- manyú-* is taken as PN by Gr, Ge, Re, Mayr (PN); Ge and (waveringly) both Old and Mayr (PN) also so interpr. *vṛṣagaṇa-*. As for the former, *ṛpāla-* is also found in the cmpd. *ṛpāla-prabharman-* (X.89.5, where it is adjacent to *āpānta-manyu-*, with *-manyu-* as here), both adj. applying to Soma. There is no question of a PN there. It is also likely to be related to *ṛprā-* (VIII.2.5), also of Soma. See comm. ad loc., where I accept Mayr’s (EWA s.v.) suggestion that *ṛprā-* means ‘sharp’. The other part of the dyad, *manyú-*, is of course a well-attested common noun ‘battle fury’. I see no obstacle to interpr. the phrase as “sharp battle fury,” referring to Soma’s martial progress across the ritual ground.

In the standard tr. the geese of *pāda* a are in an unmarked simile, and the real subj. is *vṛṣagaṇāḥ*, which is either a PN (Ge) or a descriptor of officiants (Re: “Les (officiants formant) un groupe mâle”). But again, nothing stands in the way of taking the geese as the subj., modified by *vṛṣagaṇāḥ*; after all, geese come in flocks! In my view the geese are, metaphorically, the singers (so not too far from Re), who attend the ritual in a flock. The point of comparison is the noise they make; cf., e.g., IX.32.3 *ād īm haṃsō yāthā gaṇām, vīśvasyāvīvaśan mātīm* “just as (the lead) wild goose (sets) its flock (to honking), he has made the thought of everyone bellow.” The last two vss. here (7–8) contrast the harsh noise made by Soma (compared to a boar, 7d) with the equally harsh noise of honking geese, representing the ritual singers. This may be far from the mellifluous singing we imagine, but, as I have long argued, the root *√ribh* ‘rasp,’ etc. and its deriv. noun *rebhā-* also do not flatter the sound of the singers: they describe the squawking of birds of prey and the creaking of a wagon, inter alia (see comm. ad VI.3.6, IX.66.9). Although the principal image here is of noisily honking geese, the migratory travels of the geese (going from nearby us to their [winter?] home) provide a secondary image. Because in real life the honking of geese is generally perceived as they cross the sky in formation, the two images go together.

Ge and Re take c with ab, with *pāvamānam* another goal (beside *Ṛpāla Manyu*) of *ayāsuḥ*. I take it rather with d, and I think the 2nd hemistich softens and repairs the uncompromising tunelessness of the noise in ab, by revising the depiction of the singers. They are now “comrades,” and they speak forth (*pra √vad*, with double acc.) to Soma “songful music” (*āṅguṣyām ... vāṇām*). Ge and Re take *āṅguṣyām* as modifying

pávamānam, and in their favor the two words are adjacent. But the only other occurrence of that stem modifies *sāman*- ‘melody’ (I.62.2) and to bleach it to ‘preislichen’ (for which there are already numerous other synonyms) seems unfortunate. I would suggest that the prominent initial position of *ānguṣyām* in c, far from its head noun at the end of d, results from this intention to re-cast the harsh image of ab and do so as soon as possible.

In any case the *vāṇá*- is *durmārṣa*- ‘difficult to forget’ or, perhaps ‘to neglect’; the choice may depend on whether it’s a hauntingly appealing melody or so raucous that one can’t avoid it.

IX.97.9: This vs. presents a number of puzzles, esp. in pāda b.

The verb in pāda a, *raṁhate*, should be intransitive. I construe the acc. *jūtīm* loosely, as indicating the pace or speed at which Soma moves, which is compared to that of Viṣṇu, who is regularly modified by *urugāyá*-, though the adj. is not exclusive to him.

The phrase *vīthā krīlánt*- is also found in IX.21.3. It’s also worth noting that *vīthā* is also found with several instances of *pājas*- ‘face, dimension’ disc. below (IX.76.1=88.5, 109.21).

The problems in pāda b center on the root affiliation of the verb *mimate* and the function of *ná*. The phrase in question is *mimate ná gāvaḥ*. The pāda is incisively and persuasively discussed by Old, with whose analysis my own is in general agreement. To begin with *ná*, both Ge and Re take it as neg., but as Old points out, its position is against that. I think that it is the simile marker, but, unusually, marking the verb that precedes it as to be read in two senses, rather than marking a nominal phrase as the simile, as is its overwhelming use.

This brings us to the verb. Given the presence of cows, our first impulse is to think ‘bellow’; cf., e.g., IX.33.4 *gāvo mimanti dhenávaḥ*. But, though $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘bellow’ does have the requisite redupl. pres. stem *mīmā*-/ *mím*-, it is only active, as Old also points out. I therefore think that *ná* here signals that *mimate* is an imperfect pun: it gestures towards ‘bellow’, but cannot belong to ‘bellow’ because of the middle voice. (Old also thinks the pun is present.) This accounts for my “as they seem to bellow” in the publ. tr. The root to which the verb actually belongs is $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’, which also has a redupl. pres., which, however, is generally middle. The voice of the verb in our passage thus favors $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘measure’, though $\sqrt{mā}$ ‘bellow’, at least initially, seems to fit the context better. What can ‘measure’ contribute? This question was ingeniously answered by Old: the cows, i.e., the milk mixture, “teilen ihm das Mass zu.” They “give him their measure,” that is, provide him further physical substance as he travels through the stages of his ritual preparation.

This image is continued in c, by the VP *parīṇasām kṛṇute*. Although the acc. is generally taken as a substantivized neut. to a them. adj. *parīṇasá*- derived from the noun *pārīṇas*- ‘fullness, profusion’ (so Gr; see AiG II.2.137), I consider it still an adj., with which we should supply *pājas*- ‘face, dimension’. This has good support in IX; cf. IX.76.1 = IX.88.5 *vīthā pājāmsi kṛṇute* “he deploys his full dimensions at will” and with a different medial verb IX.68.3 *pāja ādade* “he assumed his full dimension” (see also IX.109.21). The added milk allows him to expand and attain ample size or measure. On the association of cows/milk with *parīṇas(a)*- see VIII.45.24 *gó-parīṇasa*-, characterizing soma drinks. In the comm. ad VIII.45.24 I suggest that the 2nd cmpd member is *parīṇasá*- as here (hence a 2nd occurrence of that stem), not *pārīṇas*- (per Gr, etc.).

Acđg. to Ge (n. 9cd), Re, Lü (267), pāda d depicts Soma as sun and moon. This may well be, but I wonder if the source of the contrastive image is not the Overnight (*atirātrā*) soma ritual.

IX.97.10–12: This ṛca is attributed to Manyu Vāsiṣṭha, with the name possibly extracted from the previous ṛca, where *manyú-* in 8a is taken by some as part of a PN (see comm. above).

All three vss. contain a hemistich beginning *índuh* (10a, 11c, 12c); the verb *pavate* appears in all three (10a, 11b, 12a), though this is hardly unusual. In addition there is the presence of Indra (10b, 11c) or the gods in general (12b), as well as shared vocabulary: hemistich-final *mádāya* (10b, 11d), $\sqrt{p}ṛc$ ‘infuse’ (11a, 12b), $\#devó devásya$ (11d) / $\#devó devān$ (12d). The net result is an impression of unity, despite the lack of a striking shared theme and the unremarkable nature of the shared material.

IX.97.10: The sense and derivation of *gó-nyoghas-* are disputed. Ge tr. “der die Kühe würdigt” and tentatively connects the 2nd member with what he cites as *ny òhate* in V.52.11. I do not construe *ní* with *ohate* in that passage (see comm. ad loc.), in part because \sqrt{uh} does not otherwise appear with *ní*. The sense he attributes to the cmpd is also rather jarring. He is followed in both sense (“respectant les vaches”) and derivation by Re., who adds to the dossier of parallels I.180.5 *gór óheṇa*, which, however, is too riddled with uncertainties (see comm. ad loc.) to provide good evidence. By contrast Old considers BR’s conjectured emendation **gó-nyokas-* ‘accustomed to cows’ (?—he doesn’t gloss) very likely. He rejects the view that the cmpd as transmitted contains an *s*-stem *oghas-* ‘flood’, related to later Vedic *ogha-*, *aughá-* ‘flood’ (even though he states that if we stick with the transmitted text he would tr. “auf den die Kuh(milch) hernieder flutet”). This dismissal of a potential **oghas-* is shared by Mayr (EWA s.v. *ogha-*): “RV 9,97,10 *gónyoghas-* ist nicht für ein ved. **oghas-* ‘Strömung’ verwertbar.” Mayr instead tentatively follows the Ge/Re interpr. (s.v. *OH*), “vielleicht ‘die Kühe preisend’ od. dgl.” I am puzzled by this blanket rejection, esp. from Mayr, who cites (s.v. *ogha-*) with approbation Narten’s positing (YH 221) of an Indo-Iranian root $\sqrt{*uag}^h$ ‘fliessen’, found in *ogha-*, *aughá-*. Admittedly, there is no independently attested *s*-stem **óghas-*. But consider the semantically and morphologically parallel *gó-arṇas-* (4x) ‘having a flood of cows’, with the well-attested *s*-stem *árṇas-* ‘flood’. It is easy (at least for me) to imagine that an *s*-stem **óghas-* was coined in analogy to *árṇas-* for just this cmpd.

IX.97.11: The 2nd hemistich contains three pairs of phonological and (partly) etymological figures: $\#índur índrasya$, $\#devó devásya$, *matsaró mádāya*#, with the 1st two presenting matching nom.+gen. grammatical figures.

IX.97.12: The first pāda is alliterative: ... *priyāṇi pavate punānāḥ*, while opening of the 2nd is an etymological figure that matches the one opening 11d.

The referent of *priyāṇi*, the obj. or goal of *abhí ... pavate*, is uncertain. In the pub. tr. I supply ‘tracks’, on the basis of 7c *padā ... abhy èti*, as well as IX.12.8 *abhí priyā divás padā ... arṣati* “he rushes towards the dear tracks of heaven.” However, as noted above, I no longer think *padā* in vs. 7 is an acc. pl., and I am also more moved by Ge’s cited parallel, IX.75.1 *abhí priyāṇi pavate ..., nāmāni* “he purifies himself towards his

own dear names.” But cf. also IX.57.2 *abhí priyāṇi kāvya ... arṣati*. I would now be inclined to supply ‘names’ (“he purifies himself towards his own dear names”), since Soma’s progress across the ritual ground to his names is a trope (see comm. ad IX.75.1). But since there are a number of other referential possibilities for the construction *abhí priyā(ṇi)*, it might be best simply to tr. “towards his own dear (things).”

Pāda c is also puzzling: the phrase “clothing himself in his foundations” (*dhārmāṇi ... vāsānaḥ*) is not immediately interpretable, and there are no illuminating parallels (at least that I have found). The adverbial *ṛtuthā* “according to the ritual order” suggests that the process of “clothing himself” involves following the orderly steps of the sacrifice – which in turn suggests that Soma is making his progress across the ritual ground, encountering first the waters, then the milk, before arriving at his destination. I therefore think that the “foundations” here are the waters and the milk – his supports, the materials of which the soma drink is built. But this cannot be demonstrated.

IX.97.13–15: No particular signs of cohesion in this ṛca, which is a collection of soma tropes. If there is any unifying theme it is movement, with *eti* (13b), *eṣi* (14b, c), *arṣati* (13d), *arṣa* (15d); for other repeated lexical items also *pariṣicyāmānaḥ* (14d), *pāri ... siktāḥ* (15d). Also the final vs. (15) begins with *evā*, the common hymn-ending summary particle – an effect that is muted in the publ. tr.

The poet is supposed to be Upamanyu Vāsiṣṭha, presumably following up on the Manyu to whom the last ṛca was attributed.

IX.97.13: The part. *nadāyan* here (as well as the other 2 forms of this stem) is universally taken as a trans.-caus. ‘causing to resound’ with Heaven and Earth as obj. As I argue in my *-āya*-book (60–61), all 3 passages are better taken as intrans. In this vs. the focus is on the noise that Soma makes; see esp. the parallel part. *abhikānikradat* ‘constantly roaring’. And so intrans. ‘bellowing’ fits this pattern. Note also IX.70.6 *mātārā ... nānadat eti* “he goes bellowing to his two mothers [=Heaven and Earth,” with the same config. of participle to $\sqrt{nad} + eti + H+E$.

IX.97.14: On *saṃtaní-* see comm. ad IX.69.2.

IX.97.15: As was noted just above, the hymn-summary quality of the *evā* opening this vs. is not sufficiently represented. I would now alter the tr. to “Just in this way purify yourself ...”

The etym. figure *madiró mādāya* is reminiscent of *matsaró mādāya* in the previous ṛca (11d), and pāda-final *mādāya* is prominent in the first part of this hymn (5b, 10b, 11d, 15a).

The identity of the ‘water-grabber’ (*uda-grābhá-*) is unclear. The best suggestion, in my view, is Ge’s: Vṛtra. This interpr. entails an implicit identification of Soma with Indra here, but this is not unprecedented: see for ex. the passages in which Soma is called *vṛtra-hán(tama)-* (IX.1.3, 24.6), and note that in the 1st vs. of this ṛca (13c) Soma’s voice is compared to Indra’s. Sāy. suggests ‘cloud’, but why would Soma be fighting a cloud? Old has an ingenious, ritually oriented solution, whereby *udagrābhá-* does not identify the (to-be-)vanquished enemy, but rather the type of weapon Soma is using (the gen. thus depending directly on *vadhasnaḥ*) – namely the ritual ladle (Wasserschöpfer). He uses the

power of water to vanquish an unexpressed enemy, namely “die feindlichen Mächte.” Although Old rejects the possibility that *udagrābhá-* refers to Vṛtra, in part because too much would need to be supplied, in fact by his interpr. the hostile object itself would have to be supplied. His solution also does not mesh with passages like I.165.6 *vísvasya śátror ánamam vadhasnaíḥ* “I bowed with my weapons (those) of every rival,” which has the exact syntactic configuration of our passage.

The expression in pāda c, “encompassing the glistening color,” presumably refers to Soma’s incorporating the gleaming white milk – rendered clearly, if non-literally, by Ge’s “weisse Farbe annehmend.”

IX.97.16–18: This *ṛca* does seem to have a controlling theme and metaphor, esp. in 17–18 -- the passage through the filter, beginning in 16. Navigating among the curly tufts is compared on the one hand to the triumphant progress of the Aryas (vs. 17) and to a sort of moral progress in discriminating between the crooked and the straight (18). Each vs. also contains a form of the impv. *ghanva* ‘run’ (16d, 17c, 18d).

The Anukramaṇī names Vyāghrapād (‘Tigerfoot(ed)’) Vāsiṣṭha as the poet, a colorful name with no precedent in the text.

IX.97.16: The vs. contrasts easy travel (a: *supáthā sugāni*) with difficult travel (c: *duritāni*); the contrast is signaled by *su-/ duṣ-*, while two different roots for ‘go’ serve as 2nd cmpd. member, $\sqrt{gā}$ (or \sqrt{gam} ?) versus \sqrt{i} .

The part. *ḥṛṇván* in b should be supplied to govern *supáthā sugāni* in a.

Pace Ge and Re, I do not think *naḥ* should be construed with the ger. *juṣṭvṛ*; it is simply in Wackernagel’s position and goes better with *supáthā sugāni*.

For the loc. *uraú* see III.54.9 *uraú pathí*.

For *ghanéva* see comm. ad I.63.5.

IX.97.17: As Re hints, *śamgáyī-* is a species of univerbation of the common expression *śám* + DAT “weal, luck for X.”

The 2nd hemistich of this vs. is very difficult. Decoding it is made somewhat easier by recognizing the governing image: the progress of the Soma in and around the tufts of wool on the sheepskin filter. The Soma is urged to ‘pull apart’ *ví√ci* the *bándhūn* ‘bonds’; *bándhu-* is multivalent here. It refers on the one hand to the physical bonds that exist between the wool tufts, blocking Soma’s progress. It is notable that in VS 23.36 *ví cinvantu* has *lóma* ‘hair’ as object, and refers to the separation of the hair of the sacrificial horse to mark the lines along which the flaying knives are to follow. But *bándhu-* can also refer to bonds of kinship and therefore to kin-groups. Here the 2nd sense of *ví√ci*, ‘discriminate’, is probably in play, as Soma as representative of Ārya progress makes strategic alliances among these groups.

Ge follows this 2nd interpr. still further by emending the unclear (*indo*) *vāyūn* to **indav *āyūn*, tr. “indem du ... diese nächsten Freunde [= *bándhūn* sj], die Āyu’s, aussucht.” In my opinion emending to Āyus doesn’t help much, and I don’t think *vāyūn* is as hopeless as he finds it – though I don’t think the path that Old and Re follow is a convincing one either. They both take it, reasonably enough, as belonging to the extremely well-attested stem *vāyú-* ‘wind’, and Old suggests that these winds might be rain-bringing, thus relating to the *vṛṣṭi-* desired in the first hemistich. But this takes us far

from the fleece filter and the images it produces. I suggest instead that it is a nonce formation to the pseudo-root $\sqrt{vā}$ ‘weave’ (on which see, e.g., EWA s.v. *ō*, esp. p. 276), meaning ‘webs’ and again refers to the tangled non-linear paths through the fleece. In this context the ‘weave’ sense would be available to the audience. Re hints at a connection with ‘weave’ in his n., but his tr. doesn’t reflect it.

One of the curious features of this hemistich is that it is the simile that contains the word that is closest to the actual physical object under discussion – namely (*)*stúka*- ‘curl’, very close to ‘tuft’. Before discussing the meaning further, I should comment on the form. The stem of this word is generally given as fem. *stúkā*-, and there are certainly clear fem. forms (acc. *stúkām* AV VII.74.2; also by implication the poss. adj. *stukāvín*- RV VIII.74.13, although the latter could show lengthening at morpheme boundary [cf. *dvayā-vín*- and AiG II.2.917–18]). But nothing forbids us from interpr. *stúkā* here as a neut. pl. to a them. *stúka*- (so already Old), which immensely aids the interpr. of the passage, since a nom. ‘tuft, curl’ compared to the subject Soma and commanded to run is close to senseless. One can interpr. the relationship between fem. *stúkā*- and neut. *stúka*- in one of two ways. Either the neut. stem was so common in bahuvrīhis modifying females – e.g., *viṣita-stukā* ‘with unloosened curls’ of Rodasī in I.167.5 – that the 2nd member was reinterpr. as fem. Or, again because of its presence in bahuvrīhis modifying females, the originally fem. 2nd member was interpr. as *-stuka*-, with the fem. gender appropriate only when a fem. was so characterized by a bahuvrīhi containing it. Either way, I think we can confidently assume a neut. acc. pl. here, parallel to *bándhūn* and *vāyūn*. Soma is urged to pull apart the *bándhūn* “like straightened curls/tufts.” That *vītā*- means ‘straight, straightened’ is clear from IV.2.11 cited by Ge: *cīttim ācittim cinavad ví vidvān, pṛṣṭhēva vītā vṛjinā ca mātān* “Insight and lack of insight will the knowing one [=Agni] distinguish, like backs, straight and crooked, (like) mortals,” where it is contrasted with *vṛjinā*- ‘crooked’, with both acting as object of $\sqrt{vī}\sqrt{ci}$ as here. Cf. also the bahuvr. *vītā-pṛṣṭha*- ‘straight-backed’, *vītā-vāra*- ‘straight-tailed’ (though for the latter see comm. ad VIII.46.23). This adj. is likely derived from the root $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’, as Gr suggests, but seems synchronically distinct from the other uses of the ppl. to this root. Gr gives it a separate lemma. Old suggests that *stúkā ... vītā* refers to “Kammwolle” or worsted wool, that is (I learn from the internet), wool yarn that has been combed rather than carded; carded yarn is fuzzier than worsted yarn. Whether this technical interpr. is correct or not, it’s clear that the curls or tufts in question are easier to navigate than those that are not *vītā*-.

IX.97.18: The “straight versus crooked” theme is continued here, and in fact the expression *vītā vṛjinā ca* “straight and crooked” cited from IV.2.11 in the immed. preceding comm. is lexically renewed (/clarified) by *vṛjūm ca ... vṛjinām ca*, with a better attested and unambiguous word for ‘straight’, *vṛjū*-. Again, Soma’s progress across the tufted filter is the topic, made clearer by the use of *gātú*- ‘way’. Both Ge and Re (also Ober II.60) take the verb $\sqrt{vi}\sqrt{śya}$ only with pāda a and supply a new verb (‘discriminate’ or the like) with b, relying perhaps too heavily on the model of IV.2.11. I think literal unknotting is what’s at stake – finding a way between the entangled wool tufts. Ge further suggests (n. 18a) that the unknotting refers to getting rid of the stalk of the plant in the soma press, but the filter makes far more sense.

The two images in d seem oddly incoherent together: *máryaḥ ... pastiyāṁvān* “a man in his prime in possession of a dwelling place,” but a passage adduced by Ge (n. 18d) demonstrates that the young man and the house go together: I.91.13 *márya iva svá okyè* “(take pleasure) like a young man in his own home.” Perhaps the point of the house-proud *márya*- is that a man in his prime, perhaps roughly the equivalent of the later *gr̥hastha*, should have achieved the goals of a mature life: a house and household; Soma is implicitly likened to such a man after he has been purified and acquired the water and milk that make him the fully prepared ritual substance, and the *pastyā-* itself is the ritual ground. Ge’s parallel also neatly provides indirect evidence for the semantic equivalence of *pastyā-* and *okyā-* ‘home’ and therefore against the interpr. of *pastyā-* as ‘river’ (often indeed by Ge; see, e.g., IX.65.23, though he tr. it here as Haus). See comm. ad I.40.7.

X.97.19–21: Attributed to Śakti Vāsiṣṭha, who, unlike most of the other Vasiṣṭhids named by the Anukr. for this hymn, has other vss. attributed to him: VII.32.26, IX.108.3, 14–16. The ṛca is more concerned with the gods’ consumption of soma than previous ones; note the “divine conclave” (*devátāte*) in 19a, the invitation to the gods to come to the sacrifice to drink soma in 20d, and the pursuit of the gods (*devāvītim*) in 21a. The final verse of the ṛca (21) also begins with a hymn-summarizing *evā* and the type of plea for benefits that often end a hymn. The first two vss. of the ṛca also contain forms of √*dhanv*: impv. *dhanva* (19b) and *dhanvanti* (20c), thus continuing the repeated impv. *dhanva* of the previous ṛca – with this concatenation suggesting a reason for attaching this ṛca here.

IX.97.19: Pāda b *pári ṣnúṇā dhanva sāno ávye* is identical to 16d *ádhi ṣnúṇā dhanva sāno ávye* save for the preverb.

IX.97.20: The publ. tr. dispenses with the rel. prn. in pāda a, as tr. the hemistich as a rel. cl. seemed clunky.

Note the alliteration of ab *araśmāno yé arathā áyuktā, átyāso ná sasrjānāsa ājaú*.

IX.97.22–24: Karnaśrut Vāsiṣṭha, a name that has no source in the text and is not otherwise found in the Anukr. This ṛca depicts Soma as a king on a royal journey, and associates him with the resonant words *ṛtá-* (23b, 24d) and *dhárman-* (22b) / *dharmán-* (23c) and the traditional roles they imply.

IX.97.22: I read *yádī* in pāda a as *yád ī* ‘when him’. Note the parallel *īm* in pāda c, before a vowel (*īm āyan*), while our *ī* occurs before *m* (*ī mánaso*) and could in principle represent a degeminated **īm mánaso* (though I don’t think this is nec.). As Ge (n. 22ab) implies, the point of this pāda is that the ritual speech of the priest-poet essentially creates the sacral drink soma [/god Soma] from the mere juice of the soma plant.

I do not, however, follow Ge’s interpr. (in the same n.) of b, as meaning that this speech was roused by the prospect of the dakṣiṇā. I am in fact tempted to follow Old’s rather despairing comment, “Der mystischen Verbrämung dieses Gedankens in b weiss ich keine Deutung abzugewinnen.” He finds the other three pādas clear, with the sense that when speech has fashioned soma (or the milk streams, also possible in Old’s opinion), the milk streams stream to the soma. Accepting this as the overall intent of the verse, I think there is some sense – at least structural sense – that can be wrung from b.

To begin with, we must focus on the *vā*. Insofar as I can follow his rendering Ge implicitly interprets the *vā* as loosely contrasting the fashioning from the mind of the seer with that fashioning under the circumstances set out in b, but his tr. seems to me not really German (“So oft ihn die Rede aus dem Geiste des schauenden (Sehers) heraus formte oder bei der Entscheidung angesichts des besten Stückes Vieh”). Klein’s rendering (DGRV II.147), which seems to follow the structure envisioned by Ge though with somewhat different content, does not seem to me to be English either: “When speech (arising) from the mind of the seer fashioned (it., viz. soma) or in the establishment (of the worship) in the presence of the best cow.” Re at least tries to impose some parallelism between a and b, taking *dhármaṇi* in b as an infinitive that is roughly parallel to the finite verb *tákṣat* in a: “Quand la parole (née) de l’esprit du Voyant eut façonné (le soma), ou (quand il s’agissait d’) établir (le sacrifice) en présence du plus puissant bétail.”

None of these basically clausal or pseudo-clausal interpr. seems to me correct (or even parsable). I instead think that the domain of *vā* is only pāda b, and that it is conjoining two locative phrases: *jyēṣṭhasya ... dhármaṇi* and *kṣór áṇīke*. If I am correct, we are dealing with an example of inverse *vā* (X *vā* Y), rather than the standard X Y *vā* – a pattern that Klein (DGRV II.139) considers rare but existent. In our case *vā* is inserted in the middle of the first, complex member, giving a pattern X *vā* X’ Y Y’. But at least *vā* would be doing its usual job, conjoining parallel nominal expressions, each consisting of a loc. plus dependent gen. Here each would define the conditions or locations under which the fashioning of pāda a occurred. The first of the choices is “on the foundation of the preeminent one”; in the publ. tr. I suggest that the preeminent one could be either Agni or Indra, both of whom are elsewhere characterized as *jyēṣṭha*-. I now think this is incorrect. Instead I would invoke the two other expressions in IX with loc. to *dhárman*- + GEN, both *ṛtásya dhárman* (IX.7.1, 110.4) “on the foundation of truth.” Although *ṛtá*- does not seem to be qualified as *jyēṣṭha*- elsewhere, “preeminent truth” is hardly a jarring expression in RV discourse. Here “on the foundation of preeminent (truth)” would refer physically to the ritual ground and conceptually to the truth that governs the sacrificial enterprise. See also comm. on the next vs.

The other loc. expression is harder to interpr. I will start by saying that I accept the interpr. of *kṣú*- as ‘cattle’ (< **pśu*-), going back to Bloomfield (IF 25 [1909]), rejected here by Old, but reaffirmed by Thieme (ZDMG 95 [1941] 347 = KISch 51), and now generally accepted (see all tr. cited above, as well as EWA s.v.). But what does “face-to-face with the cattle” (publ. tr.) or possibly “at the forefront of cattle” / “in front of cattle” mean in context (or even, indeed, out of context)? I have two suggestions, though neither of them makes a neat disjunctive pair with the first loc. phrase. The stronger suggestion is that this is a temporal expression, referring to dawn. The stem *ánīka*- is several times used in this way; cf. VI.47.5 (with loc.) *uṣásām áṇīke* “at the forefront of the dawns,” V.76.1 *uṣásām áṇīkam* “the face of the dawns.” Esp. apposite for our passage is I.124.11 *yuníkté gávām aruṇānām áṇīkam* “She [=Dawn] yokes the forefront of the ruddy cows,” with the cows a reference to the reddish rays of dawn. Since Dawn and her rays are frequently assimilated to cows and *ánīka*- is used to indicate the moment of the appearance of dawn / dawn’s rays, a shorthand expression “at the forefront of the cattle” could, it seems to me, be a way of saying “at dawn.” This would make the two locative phrases conjoined by *vā* conceptually non-parallel (though still syntactically parallel), but

I think this looseness is within acceptable limits, as offering two alternative ways of identifying the circumstances of the fashioning of Soma by speech: “on the foundation of preeminent (truth) or at the forefront of cattle [=dawn].” I would now emend the tr. in that way. Alternatively “in front of cattle” could refer to the place on the ritual ground where Soma encounters the milk mixture – which milk then comes to him. This would more narrowly define the location than the first locative phrase, which gives the whole ritual ground as the locus. The 2nd possibility provides a better set of parallels with *vā* – both locational – but I prefer the 1st because of the use of *ánika*- with dawn elsewhere.

IX.97.23: Since $\sqrt{pū}$ does not appear with *prá*, it’s best to supply a verb of motion with the *prá* opening pāda a and take b (with *pavate*) separately. Note the alliteration in pāda a ... *dānudó divyó dānu(-pīnvāh)*.

This vs. identifies Soma as ‘truth’ (*ṛtām* b) and also contains in c the possessive internal deriv. *dharmán-* to *dhárman-*. If I am correct that *jyēṣṭhasya ... dhármaṇi* in the immed. preceding vs. 22b should be interpr. “on the foundation of preeminent (truth -- *ṛtásya*), both resonant words, *ṛtá-* and *dhárman-/dharmán-*, were already implicitly present in the previous vs. In 23 Soma is then depicted as the embodiment of these words (cf. Ge’s “das (verkörperte) Gesetz” for *ṛtām*), and they define his kingship (*rājā* in c, also in 24b). Unfortunately it does not seem possible to signal the *dhárman-/dharmán-* connection in English tr., but ‘possessor of the (royal) mandate’ may be too specialized for the latter. Perhaps better ‘founder, foundation-giver, institutor, maintainer’. On Soma as “truth” see also IX.107.15 and IX.108.8.

The ten reins are presumably the fingers of the presser, as is usual for ten anything in IX.

IX.97.23–24: These two vss. each contain the injunc. (/subj.) aor. *bhuvat*, which in both cases I tr. as an immed. past: “he has become.” After considerable disc. with IH, I now think that this particular form can also express a generic or habitual role or behavior of the subject, which IH felicitously renders with the colloquial “he be-s X.” I am therefore now inclined to alter the tr. of both vss. to “he is the king ...” / “he is, now as before, the wealth-lord ...” In the absence of a non-colloquial Engl. habitual/generic, “is” will have to do.

IX.97.24: The two words making up the VP in d, *ṛtām bharat*, appear also in vs. 23, though not together (*ṛtām ṛtāya* b, *bhāri* d). As is pointed out by KH (implicitly: Injunc. 122 and esp. n. 34) and Ober (II.121), this appears to be an Indo-Iranian phrase, and it thus invests Soma with yet more traditional dignity. The pāda thus deserves a more solemn tr. than I gave it in the publ. tr. – perhaps “the drop bears the dear truth that is well worth the bearing.”

Although the morphological means are different, the lexical duplication in both *rayipātī rayīṇām* (c) and *ṛtām bharat súbhṛtam* (d) gives the end of this ṛca a stately and archaic air.

IX.97.25–27: Like the ṛca 19–21, this one focuses in great part on the gods as drinkers of soma and the desire to bring them to the ritual; the “pursuit” (*vītīm*) of Indra and Vāyu in 25b is reprised in *devā-vī-* ‘pursuing the gods’ in 26a, while the gods are mentioned twice

in 27ab. The final vs. also begins with the typical hymn-summarizing *evā* as three times elsewhere in this hymn (vss. 13–15, 19–21, 34–36). The poet is named as Mṛḍka Vāsiṣṭha, who is also the poet of X.150. In the latter hymn his name is clearly drawn from the dat. *mṛḍikāya* found in the refrain of every vs., but there is no such basis here.

IX.97.26: The publ. tr. omits the enclitic *naḥ*; it should be revised to “Pursuing the gods for us while ...”

Ge takes *kṣāyam* in b as an Inhaltsakk. (“... sollen ... ein Haus ... herströmen” (sim. but more elaborate, Re). But a dwelling place is a particularly unlikely object to “stream,” and I prefer to see it as goal (as also Scar 398).

The hapax in d, *diviyāj-*, has (at least) two possible meanings: ‘sacrificing at day(break)’ as I take it, and ‘sacrificing (to the gods) in heaven’ (so Ge, Re). See Ge’s n. and Scar (398–99). There is nothing in the context that tips the balance one way or the other; I prefer the temporal reading because the other one requires more material to be understood. The word also appears in a metrically disturbed pāda; as it stands it has 12 syllables and a cadence (– ∼ ∼ ×) that is bad for both Triṣṭubh and Jagatī. Old suggests the possibility of reading the 1st member of *diviyāj-* as a monosyllable, either **divyājah* or **dyuyājah*, which would at least produce an 11-syl. line, and these possibilities are disc. in more detail by Scar without a firm conclusion.

IX.97.27: The summary *evā* might be more emphatically rendered as “in just this way” or sim. The “conclave of the gods” (*devātāte*) returns from 19a. As Ge points out, the whole hemistich is almost identical to IX.96.3, save for *evā* in place of *sā naḥ* and *devapānaḥ* for *indrapānaḥ*.

The ppl. in the periphrasis in d, *smāsi hitāḥ*, could belong either to √*dhā* or to √*hi* (so Sāy.). It is actually not clear to me which one Ge favors from his “denn wir sind in grossem Wettstreit begriffen” (and his n. 27c doesn’t entirely clarify). Re clear chose √*dhā*: “Avec ambition [*mahās cid?*] nous nous sommes en vérité placés dans la compétition.” I favor √*hi*: I think the point is that we are “driven” / “hard-pressed” in the hostile encounter, and we need divine help – which we will only get once they have partaken of our soma. But there are several logical steps missing in every interpr.

IX.97.28–30: Attributed to Vasukra Vāsiṣṭha, who is not otherwise known – though a Vasukra Aindra is supposedly responsible for the devilish trio of hymns X.27–29. The *ṛca* is marked by the repetition of *ā pavasva* in the 2nd hemistich of each vs. (28d, 29c, 30d) expressing the various good things we want Soma to bring us through his self-purification. The root √*srj* ‘surge’ is also prominent in the 2nd two vss. (29a, 30a).

IX.97.28: The opening of the vs., *ásvo ná kradaḥ*, is very close to 18c *átyo ná kradaḥ*. The first hemistich contains three animals, incl. the fairly rare lion. Ge, fld. by Re, identifies the bulls as the priests.

IX.97.29: I take the hapax *sanitra-* in its full lexical value, as a ‘means of winning’, rather than the bleached Spende, Gabe (Gr), Lohn (Ge), le bénéfice (Re) that prevails. On the accent of the word (and other *-tra*-stems to set roots), see AiG II.2.701–2, which also glosses the word as I do: ‘Mittel des Gewinnens’, flg. Ludwig.

IX.97.30: On *asasṛgram* see comm. ad X.31.3 and Kü 555.

I take *áhnām* as a 2nd, unmarked simile dependent on *sárgāḥ*, rather than supplying a different headnoun, as Ge and Re do. They are surely both right that “the surges of/from heaven” are the rains. As for “the surges of the days,” this could either refer to the passage of time or to an abundance of light; I favor the former.

In b *ná* should be read as both the simile particle and the negation; see Old.

Pādas b–c show a clever chaining of significant vocabulary. In b Soma is compared to a king who doesn’t violate his alliance, with *mītrá-* in its common noun usage. But d contains the part. *yatānā-* ‘taking one’s place, being put in place’, and *√yat* is an action esp. associated with the god Mitra. Cf., e.g., VII.36.2 *jānaṃ ca mītró yatati* “Mitra puts the people in their place” (sim. III.59.1). Although Mitra is not explicitly present here, the lexical continuity might evoke him. It is indeed possible that it is Mitra’s intentions (or those of the alliance itself) acdg. to which Soma takes his place, rather than “ours” as in the publ. tr.

The vs. ends with yet another term relating to social life, namely *vís-* ‘clan’; as king, Soma would exert himself on behalf of this social unit.

IX.97.31ff.: As noted in the publ. intro., the *ṛca* divisions seem to continue in this 2nd half of the composite hymn, although the Anukr. attributes the remaining vss. to just two poets, Parāśara Śāktya (31–44) and Kutsa Āṅgīrasa (45–58), an apportioning that does not conform to the presumed *ṛca* division (splitting the *ṛca* 43–45 between the two). Both poets are known from elsewhere: Parāśara Śāktya is the poet of I.65–73 and Kutsa Āṅgīrasa of I.94–98 and I.101–15.

IX.97.31–33: The first vs. of the *ṛca* contains a form of *√sṛj*, thus concatenating with the previous *ṛca*. Both the first (31) and last (33) vss. contain a reference to the sun, and I see one in the middle vs. as well; see comm. ad 32.

IX.97.31: The skeleton of pāda a, (*prá te*) *dhāṛā (mádhumatīr) asṛgran*, is identical to 29a (*śatām*) *dhāṛā (devájātā) asṛgran*.

The publ. tr. renders *pāvase* as if it were an imperative; correct to “you purify yourself.”

I take “domain of cows” (*dhāma gónām*) in c to indicate that Soma is the substance into which the milk is mixed. Since the milk is sometimes identified as the sun, his swelling of the sun in d may refer to Soma’s providing more body and amplitude to the milk.

As often, *arká-* can be read as a pun.

IX.97.32: The “domain for the cows” is echoed here by the “domain of the immortal one” (*amṛtasya dhāma*). As with the same phrase in IX.94.2 (q.v.), I suggest that the immortal one is the sun, and perhaps specifically milk as representative of the sun. The role of the sun in the surrounding vss. (31d, 33d) supports this interpr. For alternative interpr. of the phrase, see comm. ad IX.94.2. In our passage Re (sim. Lü 467) suggests that it is actually nom. and refers to Soma, but in IX.94.2 it must be an acc. obj. (also acdg. to Re).

The cadence of c is bad as transmitted, but can be easily fixed by reading **matsarā-vān* with the common lengthening of the stem vowel -a- before -vant- and -van-; see Old, in agreement with Arnold. The stem is a hapax, and it is clearly a morphological variant of *matsarín(-tama)-* (4x), with a different possessive suffix. In fact, our pāda is a nonce Triṣṭubh adaptation of the Jagatī line IX.76.5 *sá índrāya pavase matsaríntamaḥ*. For further disc. see comm. ad IX.76.5. The interchangeability of -vant- and -ín- for metrical purposes speaks against the two possessive suffixes having crucial functional differences.

The initial *sá* in both our pāda and the one on which it is based does not follow my rules for *sá* 2nd-ps. reference. On this aberrancy see comm. ad IX.76.5, where it can be motivated. That pāda was then simply borrowed (and slightly altered) here.

IX.97.33: The form *cakṣi* (also VII.3.6) is in both of its occurrences pretty clearly an impv., but its formation is something of a puzzle. It appears to be a -*si* impv. (so Baum, *Imperative*, 46, 107, with no disc.), but it has none of the standard supports for such a form. Not only does it not have an *s*-aor. subjunctive, but it has no aorist forms at all, and almost all the occurrences of its well-attested root pres. are medial. And of course, assuming it belongs to $\sqrt{cakṣ}$, the form would have to be degeminated from **cakṣ-si* (though that would not be hard). The parallel passage IX.71.9 has a medial injunc. to the marginal thematic stem (see KH 122 n. 33): *divyāḥ suparṇó 'va cakṣata kṣām*. I have no explanation for this aberrant form; it is true that the proper med. impv. to the root pres. *cakṣva* (3x) would not fit this metrical slot, but that doesn't seem reason enough to invent *cakṣi*.

IX.97.34–36: All three vss. concentrate on ritual speech and on the noisy approach of both cows and poets to Soma. This theme takes up 32d, where Soma impels his own speech in concert with the productions of the poets. The final vs., 36, begins with hymn-summarizing *evā*.

IX.97.34: On the “three voices” (*tisró vācaḥ*) see comm. ad IX.33.4, 50.2.

The parallel expressions in c and d -- ... *yanti* ... PTCLE contrast the progress of ritual substance (milk) and ritual speech (thoughts). As elsewhere, *vāvasānāḥ* could belong to both $\sqrt{vās}$ ‘bellow’ and \sqrt{vas} ‘desire, be eager’ (cf. IX.93.4, 95.4). Given the emphasis on noise in this ṛca, the former is probably primary, but both can be meant – hence my tr. “bellowing eagerly.”

IX.97.35: The first two pādas of this vs. are variants of the last two of the previous vs. (34cd), with the repeated *yanti* of 34 gapped, and redistribution of some of the lexicon: the two participles in 34cd, *prchāmānāḥ* and *vāvasānāḥ*, switch positions, with each paired with a more natural subject (cows bellowing 35a, poets asking 35b), and the thoughts of 34d are relegated to the instr. in 35b with their producers, the *viprāḥ*, taking over the subject role in 35b, again a more natural configuration. We can consider 35ab as a complex poetic repair of 34cd.

IX.97.36: The hymn-summary *evā* could once again be rendered more forcefully: “in just this way” vel sim.

IX.97.37–39: I do not see any signs of unity in this *ṛca*. All three vss. contain a participle of $\sqrt{pū}$ in passive function, *pūnānā-* in 37, 38, *pūyāmāna-* in 39, but this is hardly remarkable in the Soma maṇḍala.

IX.97.37: In pāda a *vīpraḥ ... matīnām* reprises *vīprā matībhiḥ* of 35b in concatenary fashion. For further on this phrase see below.

Gr, Ge, and Re, as well as Lü (439), take *ṛtā* as neut. pl., but this disturbs the syntax, and the tr. all must supply a verb to govern it. I suggest that it is instead the instr. sg. Re explicitly rejects this possibility on the grounds that it would be morphologically isolated. If he means that it would be the only such instr. to this stem, he seems to be correct, but given that the *-ā* instr. to them. stems is in retreat, this isolation would not be surprising. If he means that them. neuters don't have instr. in *-ā*, this is not correct: Lanman (Noun infl., 335) considers them more frequent than to the masc. and counts 77. Whether all his exx. would hold up under closer scrutiny is irrelevant: 77 would be difficult to reduce to 0.

The standard tr. also construe gen. pl. *matīnām* with *ṛtā*, whatever sense they ascribe to *ṛtā*, e.g., Ge “die rechten Wege der Gedanken,” Lü “zu den Wahrheiten der Gedanken.” They may be correct, and I could revise my tr. accordingly: “In accordance with the truth of the thoughts, Soma ...” However, the association of *vīpra-* with *matī-* is very strong – I just noted it in 35b in the previous *ṛca*, and the two words occur in the same pāda numerous times: I.82.2=VIII.25.24 *vīprā ... matī*, I.86.2 *vīprasya ... matīnām*, II.24.13 *vīpraḥ ... matī*, III.5.3 *vīpraḥ ... matīnām*, III.30.20=50.4 *matībhiḥ ... vīprāḥ*, IV.3.16 *matībhir vīpraḥ*, V.80.1 *vīprāso matībhiḥ*, VII.78.2 *vīprāso matībhiḥ*, IX.63.21 *matī vīprāḥ*, IX.85.7 *vīprāṇām matāyaḥ*, IX.107.24 *vīprāso matībhiḥ*, X.6.5 *vīprāso matībhiḥ*, X.25.10 *matīm vīprasya*, X.64.16 *matībhiḥ ... vīpraḥ*, X.123.1 *vīprā matībhiḥ*; cf. also IX.71.3, X.11.6 *vépate matī*. I therefore construe *matīnām* with *vīpraḥ* in the publ. tr., as a loosely descriptive gen.

In cd the phrase *mithunāsaḥ ... adhvaryávaḥ* is taken by Ge (fld. by Re) as referring to the pair (or presumably multiple pairs, given the pl.) of Adhvaryu and Hotar. Although at least I.83.2, which he adduces for this sense, does seem to refer to that pair of two priests, in the dual, I think the pl. here instead refers to rivalrous priests at competing sacrifices, which must be implicit in Ge's rendering, given the pl. They could be pairs of Adhvaryu and Hotar or (more likely in my opinion) just multiple Adhvaryus, each performing in a separate sacrifice.

IX.97.38: The interpr. of this vs. is fairly straightforward, except for the 2nd part of pāda a, *sūre nā dhātā*. I have treated this simile at length in my Fs. Melchert article, “Sūre Duhitár's Brother, the ‘Placer of the Sun’: Another Example of -e <*-as in Rigvedic Phrasal Sandhi,” 2010. I will not repeat the disc. here but will summarize the conclusions. The major problem in this simile is what to do with the apparent loc. *sūre* ‘in the sun’ (to *sūra-*; or possibly, but less likely, dat. to *svār*); this has led to some outlandish and unpersuasive interpr. of the phrase. I argue that *sūre* is actually the old gen. to *svār*, from **sūraz* before voiced dental stop, as in the well-known *sūre duhitā* “daughter of the sun” in I.34.5. I start with an archaic formula **sūre dhātā* “placer of the sun,” with the two words separated here by the simile particle *nā* and the true interpr. obscured. The “placer

of the sun” is most likely Indra, and Soma is being compared to him in his cosmogonic role: filling the two worlds and revealing them.

The word order in the 2nd clause of b, *ví śá āvaḥ*, is worth noting. Both preverb in tmesis and *śá* seek 1st position, and *śá* overwhelmingly occupies 1st position, as a glance at Lubotsky shows. Perhaps to maintain *śá*’s 1st position tendency, often when a clause has both a preverb and *śá*, the preverb will remain in position before the verb (e.g., I.105.4 *śá tát dūtó ví vocati*; also pāda d in this vs.: *śá ... prá yaṃsat*). But it seems from a rapid survey that when a preverb is in tmesis, it regularly wins 1st position over *śá* -- e.g., III.59.2 *prá śá ...*, VIII.20.16 *abhí śá ...* -- with Wackernagel’s position material imposed between—e.g., *prá vaḥ śá ...*, VIII.21.10 *ā tú naḥ śá ...*. Our brief clause shows this PREV *śá* order.

As Old suggests, in c *priyā* is governed either directly or indirectly by the 2nd member of the cmpd. *priya-sāsaḥ* ‘winning dear things’: “those winning dear things (win) dear things.” The effect is rather like the type *gaṇānām gaṇapati-* “troop lord of troops” (II.23.1), though the means are different. As for *priya-sāsaḥ*, its stem is given as them. *priya-sā-* by Gr., and it would have the doubled nom. pl. ending familiar from *devāsaḥ*, etc. However, it seems possible (and in my opinion desirable) to interpr. it as belonging to a root noun *-sā-*. The rt. noun nom. pl. to *-ā-* stems is ordinarily *-āḥ*, which is identical to the nom. sg. Though several cmpds in *-sā-* do have this nom. pl. (*dhanasāḥ* VIII.3.15, X.65.10; *sadāsāḥ* IV.16.21, *sahasrasāḥ* X.64.6), the nom. sg. *-sāḥ* is far more common. In a passage like this, where there are no other nom. pl. forms to support the nom. pl. interpr. (as there are in the *-sāḥ* nom. pl. passages just cited), doubly marking the nom. pl. would make sense. Scar (585) seems to be leaning in that direction, but doesn’t actually say so.

Parallel to the dative *kāriṇe ná* “as if to a victor” in the simile, we can assume “to us” vel sim. in the frame. So Ge.

IX.97.39: Pāda a contains another etymological doubling, *vardhitā vārdhanaḥ* “strengthening strengthener,” rather like the doubling of *priyā-* in 38c.

Note the allit. in c: ... *pūrve pitāraḥ padajñāḥ*.

The expression *gā ādrim uṣṇán* “burned the cows out of the rock” is, to say the least, unusual – and on those grounds disputed. A long tradition, going back to Benfey, emends the text to **muṣṇán* ‘stole’, with degemination in the sequence *ādrim (m)uṣṇán*. This emendation is accepted by, inter alia, Ge and Bloomfield (RR ad I.62.2 and Conc.). There is one strong arg. in favor of the change: $\sqrt{muṣ}$ ‘steal’ is formulaically embedded in the Vala myth (see Ge’s n. 39d and, e.g., I.93.4 *yád āmuṣṇītam ... paṇīm gāḥ* “when you two stole the cows from the niggard”). Other possible args. are inconclusive: both $\sqrt{muṣ}$ and $\sqrt{uṣ}$ have a 9th class pres., though the latter is only represented by one other form, part. *uṣṇán* in II.4.7 – but $\sqrt{uṣ}$ is a poorly attested root. The preverb *abhí* found in our passage does not appear with either root. In the end the clinching arg. seems to me to come from Old, who does not accept the emendation: the meter. The proposed change converts a good cadence into a bad one. Bl. (RR) argues “that the change from *ādrim muṣṇán* to *ādrim uṣṇán* was made by the redactor in deference to the meter.” But why would the poet have produced a bad cadence in the first place? I think it more likely that the poet was *playing* on the rhyming roots $\sqrt{muṣ}$ and $\sqrt{uṣ}$, with full knowledge that the former is the standard one in the Vala myth, and he is forcing us to invent a new and

more difficult image with the latter root. By supplying us with *jyótiṣā* he is providing us with the means to do so. Old adduces X.87.12 *jyótiṣā ... ny òṣa* “with light burn down ...,” comparable to our ... *jyótiṣā / yénā ... uṣṇán* and with a verb form of $\sqrt{uṣ}$. A poet who could deploy the “placer of the sun” formula in the manner he did in the previous vs. is surely capable of such a sly play on words.

IX.97.40–42: No particular unity detectable in the *ṛca*, though the 2nd two vss. do focus on Soma’s role in strengthening and exhilarating the gods.

IX.97.40: The verb *vāṛdhe* in d concatenates with *vardhitā vārdhanaḥ* in 39a.

Ge’s tr. of pāda a, “Der Ocean hat gebrüllt bei seiner ersten Ausbreitung,” seems to imply (though this is not a necessary interpr. of his tr.) that the *samudrá-* is a different entity from Soma himself, and his cited IX.107.23 *tvám samudráṁ prathamó ví dhārayaḥ* “You were [are] the first to to spread out the sea” (with both *samudrá-* and *ví√dhr̥*) certainly depicts them as separate. However, IX.86.29 *tvám samudró asi ..., távemāḥ pāñca pradīśo vídharmaṇi* “You are the sea, ...; yours are these five regions in your [their] expansion” (also with *samudrá-* and the *-n*-stem loc. *vídharman/-ṇi* as here) asserts the identity of Soma and the *samudrá-*. Since forms of \sqrt{krand} ‘roar’ in IX (like *ákrān* here) have Soma as their subject (incl. in vss. 13, 18, 28, 32, 33 in this hymn), the identification of Soma and the sea seems assured here.

IX.97.42: The infinitival dat. *iṣṭáye* is generally taken to mean “to hasten, for hastening” here (Ge “dass er rasch komme”; Re “afin qu’il se hâte”; Klein GDGRV I.68 “for hastening”; and cf. EWA s.v. *Eṣ²* citing Ge’s tr. for just this passage). But I am puzzled as to which root $\sqrt{iṣ}$ the sense ‘hasten’ is supposed to belong to: we have $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’ and $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send, set in motion’. It is to the latter that EWA refers this form (and I assume that the others would also connect the two), but either there has to be a de-valencing of the root (from ‘set in motion’ to ‘be in motion’ – but there are no forms to this root with intrans. value) or the form has to be covertly passive (‘to be set in motion’, hence ‘to move’). I think it belongs rather to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek, desire’ and means ‘for seeking, for the quest’. In my view all 20 exx. of *iṣṭáye* can be united under this rubric. See also comm. ad I.112.1 and VII.92.3. In this particular case Vāyu’s quest is for soma, and upon having received it, he benefits us. So the double dative *iṣṭáye rādhase ca* is a bit of a zeugma, in that these beneficial datives are for the benefit of different parties, though the satisfaction of the second depends on the success of the first.

IX.97.43–45: The *ṛca* has a superficial unity from the (over-)abundance of forms of $\sqrt{pū}$, esp. in the middle vs.: *pavasva* 43a, 44a, 44b, 44d; *pávamānaḥ* 44c; *punānāḥ* 45c (the only form of $\sqrt{pū}$ in this vs., and belonging to a different stem). Otherwise there is little to hold it together. The supposed transition between the poets Parāśara Śaktya and Kutsa Āṅgīrasa happens after vs. 44, but as noted in the publ. intro., this change of poets seems unlikely.

IX.97.43: The first hemistich introduces a note of aggression, but this quickly dissipates. The oppositional pair ‘straight’ (*ṛjū-*) and ‘crooked’ (*vṛjiná-*) recurs from vs. 18, where,

unlike here, it was a morally neutral description of the paths across the sheep's fleece filter.

I do not understand the doubling of *abhí* in pāda c, esp. since *abhí* seems to add little to this idiom.

IX.97.44: Note the (s)va repetition: *mádhvaḥ ... pavasva vásva ... pavasva ... svádasva ... pavasva*.

As in IX.96.14 (see comm. ad loc.), I take the acc. with *pavasva* as expressing a transformation of soma into the substance expressed in the acc. This use of *pavasva* with the acc. contrasts with that of *ā pavasvā* in pādas b and d, where *ā* adds the sense 'bring here by purification' and the acc. expresses the materials thus obtained.

On *sūda*- see comm. ad VII.36.3. I argue there that, contra most views, it belongs with the 'sweet' words, and in fact that in this passage *svádasva ... pávamānaḥ* in c is a virtual gloss (or poetic repair) of *sūdam pavasva* in a.

IX.97.46–48: Again very few signs of cohesion as a whole, though the 1st and last vss. have a few echoes: *rathiráḥ* (46c, 48a) and a *satyá*-X bahuvrīhi (*satyá-śuṣma*- 46c, *satyá-manman*- 48d), as well as *camū*- (46b, 48b). Also, assuming that the "daughter" in 47b is the Daughter of the Sun (as most do), both 46 and 47 have ref. to the sun.

IX.97.47: In pāda b my interpr. differs significantly from that of Ge (fld. by Re) and that favored by Old., though all of us assume that "daughter" is short for "daughter of the Sun." Ge takes *duhitúḥ* as abl. and assumes an idiom ABL X *tiráḥ* √ *dhā* "hide X from ...," an ex. of which he cites from the Kena Up., which seems a distant text from which to harvest a parallel. He takes the *vārpāṃsi* as Soma's own forms, but does not suggest why Soma would want to keep them hidden from the Sun's daughter. I instead take *duhitúḥ* as gen., dependent on *vārpāṃsi*, which Old considers the more natural construal. Since the acc. with medial *tiráḥ* √ *dhā* expresses the medium in which the subject hides himself (at least in my view: see comm. ad IX.73.3), in our passage here Soma hides himself "in the forms of the daughter (of the Sun)" – a designation of milk, since the gleaming white milk is often assimilated to the sun. I see the same idiom in IX.72.3, though more disguised: see extensive comm. there. The reference, of course, is to the mixing of soma with milk.

The following pāda provides a different but parallel image of the mixing of soma with water, with the more widespread trope of "clothing himself in."

The last pāda provides a clever multilevel play, as long as *rēbhan* is properly interpr. As I have often disc. (incl. ad vs. 8 above), √ *ribh* does not mean 'sing' as it's usually glossed, but rather expresses a variety of harsh sounds: rasp, creak, squawk, and crackle. In this pāda Soma is compared to a Hotar priest. But the quintessential Hotar is actually the god Agni, the ritual fire – and fires crackle. So the comparison is to the sound of a lively burning fire, but mediated through the priest.

IX.97.49–51: In contrast to the t̥cas with faint or no signs of cohesion, this one is over-determined. The verbal lexeme that dominates is *abhí* √ *ṛṣ*: the preverb *abhí* opens every one of the 12 pādas, and the impv. *arṣa/ā* is found in the first pāda of every vs. (49a, 50a, 51a). The part. *pūyāmānaḥ* ends the first hemistich of each vs. Most of the rest of the

material consists of acc. goals of motion. The goals in the first vs. of the *ṛca* are gods, in the first half of the 2nd vs. the substances with which Soma will be mixed, and in the rest of the *ṛca* those things that we want Soma to provide us. The result is a *ṛca* of utmost banality, enlivened by a small play of words in the last *pāda*.

IX.97.49: Old, Ge, Re identify the acc. goal in c as Pūṣan, because *dhījāvana-* ‘quickenning insightful thought’ is used in a simile comparing Soma to Pūṣan in IX.88.3 *pūṣéva dhījāvano* ‘*si soma*, which is, of course, a good arg. But Pūṣan doesn’t cut much of a figure in IX, does not really belong in this exalted company (Vāyu, Mitra+Varuṇa, Indra – though see the list in IX.81.4–5), and is not an appropriate referent for the other words in this *pāda*: *nāram ... ratheṣṭhām*. In the sg. *nṛ-* is almost always used of Indra, as are *ratheṣṭhā-* and *ratheṣṭhā-*. I am therefore certain that c, like d, refers to Indra.

IX.97.50: Ge adds “zu gewinnen” in *pādas* a and b (also d) with no textual support. And surely these garments and cows are actually references to the milk mixture, as so often in IX.

IX.97.51: Ge again supplies “zu gewinnen” in both hemistichs. I once again see no reason to do so. He also takes the rel. cl. of c (*yéna dráviṇam aśnávāma*) as dependent on *ārṣeyám*: “um ... uns den Namen eines Ṛṣi zu gewinnen, durch den wir zu Reichtum gelangen können.” This ignores the parallel *abhí*’s of cd and also assumes an embedded rel. cl. (though not all *that* embedded). Re takes *ārṣeyám* as a 2nd obj. of *aśnávāma*: “afin que nous obtenions la richesse, afin l’état de Prophète ...” This is somewhat less disruptive than Ge’s, but assumes a purpose function for *yéna* that has no good precedent, as far as I know. My own interpr. – supplying a gapped acc. ‘that’ as antecedent for *yéna* -- seems minimally disruptive and assumes that the insistent structure with *abhí arṣa* ACC continues in this *pāda*. The same interpr. is found in Hettrich (Hypotaxe, 550–51): “(fliesse uns das) zu, wodurch wir Reichtum erlangen werden.”

The interpr. of Ge and Re also minimize or ignore the only clever part of this *ṛca*, which provides a climax of sorts. With the pattern *abhí* (...) *arṣa* “rush towards ...” inescapably established, the poet produces a phonological play on this phrase in the last *pāda*: *abhy ārṣeyám*, where the acc. goal, beginning *ārṣ-*, plays on the impv. *arṣa* (the play also noted by Ge, n. 51d). *ārṣeyá-* is found only here in the RV, though it is extremely common in Vedic prose.

IX.97.52–54: The simplistic repetition of the previous *ṛca* contrasts markedly with the contents of this one, which is mind-bogglingly difficult and opaque. Old pronounces it “grösstenteils hoffnungslos.” Thematically it seems to deal with the distribution of wealth in a ritual/martial context, and it also shows signs of lexical cohesion, esp. the hapaxes *māmścatvá-* (52b) and *māmścatva-* (54b), also *vásūni* (52a, 53c), and of varied formulaic repetition: *ayā pavā pavasvainā* (52a) / *enā pavayā pavasva* (53a). My interpr. of this *ṛca*, in its many obscure details and in its entirety, is very different from the standard ones. In places it pushes the morphology, syntax, and semantics perhaps further than is warranted, and it may seem at times far-fetched. But it has, I think, a richer semantics than the other accounts, and above all it deliberately avoids the refuge taken by others, to make the difficult words into proper nouns.

IX.97.52: The *ṛca* begins deceptively straightforwardly, with a call to Soma to purify himself and bring goods. The *pāda*-final *vásūni* concatenates with the one ending 51a. Given this acc. with *pávasva* we must assume the idiom *ā pavasva* ‘bring ACC through your purification.’ The preverb *ā* may be concealed in one of the accented final long *ā*-s in the *pāda*, most likely *pavā*, which can be *pavā + ā*, putting the preverb in the standard position right before the verb, or *enā*. Or perhaps, if *enā* is adverbial in the meaning ‘here’ (so Gr, s.v. *enā*, col. 300; AiG III.524–25), it takes the function of *ā* in this lexeme. However, I am inclined, with Sāy. (see Ge’s n. 52a), to take *enā* as an aberrant neut. pl. with *vásūni* – hence ‘these goods’. See AiG III.525, which hesitatingly allows the possibility of its being neut. pl. elsewhere.

The fun begins with the next *pāda* and with the first word in that *pāda*, *māmścatvé*, as was noted above, the word appears, differently accented, in 54b, and these forms are obviously related to *māmścatóḥ* in VII.44.3. In our vss. Ge and Re take it as the loc. of a place name, coreferential with loc. *sárasī*: e.g., “dans le lac Māmścatva.” This is certainly the safest choice here, but a place name is essentially excluded for the occurrence of the related word in VII.44.3 – and of course making difficult words into otherwise unattested proper nouns is an interpretational cop-out. As discussed at length in the comm. to VII.44.3 I return to the old notion that this is a *cmpd* meaning ‘hiding the moon’. In all three passages I take it as a temporal designation, originally ‘at dawn’. This perfectly fits our *ṛca* if it depicts the beginning of the early morning soma pressing.

VII.44.3 also contains the word *bradhná-* ‘copper-colored’, found here in *pāda* c. This word can sometimes refer to soma (VIII.4.13, 14; 69.7), sometimes to Agni/fire (III.7.5, X.20.9), but sometimes, it seems, to the sun: I.6.1 and also the occurrence in VII.44.3. In our passage I think it can be all three: the sun, coppery colored at dawn, is appropriate to the early morning time period identified by *māmścatvé*, and Sūrya in X.170.1 is *vātajūta-* (like our *vāto ná jūtāḥ*). As we have often seen soma is frequently identified with the sun, and it is often urged to speed along the ritual ground (and see IX.64.16 *īndavaḥ ... jūtāḥ*). But what is most often described as *vāta-jūta-* is the fire or its flames. The ritual fire, the soma, and the sun would all necessarily be present at the dawn sacrifice. Both Ge and Re take *bradhná-* as referring to a horse, which, in my view, distorts their view of the whole vs. and indeed the *ṛca*.

In d both Ge and Re take the hapax *táku-* as referring to a horse (Renner, coursier), the same one they see as the reference of *bradhná-* in c. Ge seems to think d involves giving this horse a sort of superior groom (“ein tüchtiges Lenker”), with dat. *tákave* the indirect obj. But as was recently noted (ad vs. 49), *ní-* in the sg. is almost always used of Indra, and I think it is here as well. Soma, by virtue of being consumed by Indra at the sacrifice, brings Indra to the sacrifice and in effect bestows him upon the human worshipers, and he does so for a particular purpose. I take *tákave* as an infinitival dative of purpose: ‘to (make the) charge, to rush’ – Indra in his capacity as our supporter in conflict. Old considers, but rejects, such an infinitival interpr., in favor of what he considers the simpler indirect obj. with *√dā*.

IX.97.53: The mystery deepens in this vs.

The first *pāda* is superficially just a variant of 52a, but it poses several problems. On the one hand *pavayā* looks like an instr. sg. to a fem. *pavā*, whose more archaic instr.

pavā is found in 52a. But the accentuation is wrong: it should be **pavāyā*. AiG III.117 seems to dismiss the accent problem (sim. AiG II.2.247) and simply accept it as an instr., but Old considers other possibilities, incl. adverbial accent or analogy to *ayā* in 52a. He rejects Lanman's sugg. that it represents **pavāyā* (from **pavā* + *ayā*) on metrical grounds (bad break). I have a similar, but different suggestion that avoids the metrical problem: it represents **pavāyā*, namely instr. **pavāyā* (with the correct accent) + *ā*, the preverb we were seeking also in 52a, which again would put the preverb directly before the verb. The need for *ā* is less acute here because there's no apparent expressed obj. in the pāda, but *vāsūni* can be assumed on the basis of 52a and the 2nd hemistich of this vs. 53c. Moreover, as in 52a I suggest that *enā* may be neut. pl. and therefore there is an expressed obj.

The other problem is *enā*, which also appeared in 52a in a different position. Here, directly before *pavayā*, it appears to be an instr., filling the role of *ayā* in 52a. But *enā* should be m./n., not fem. Though Ge (n. 53a) convinces himself it is fem. (and AiG III.524 recognizes at least one possible case of a fem. *enā*), I think this is unlikely and, as in 52a, suggest that it is a neut. pl. This means that *pavayā* (*/*pavāyā*) lacks an instr. demonstr. parallel to *ayā* in 52a, but this is hardly a problem. Putting all this together, I would thus emend the tr. to “By purifying yourself with purification bring these (goods) here for us.”

The next pāda is syntactically unimpeachable: it consists of a loc. phrase governed by *ādhi* with a gen. dependent on the loc. Moreover, all the words are known and their meanings uncontroversial. The problem is what they refer to when assembled into a phrase. They specify the place (or time) that the self-purification in pāda a is to happen: “at the famous ford GEN.” Given the ritual context, it seems unlikely that a real river ford is meant; instead it must be a metaphorical place or moment in the sacrifice. Most comparable – but unhelpful – is the phrase *āpnānam tīrtham*, which I interpr. as “opulent ford,” found at X.114.7, in a mystical hymn about the sacrifice. I suggest that in our passage it refers to the place/time of the distribution of goods. I further suggest that this refers to the transfer of goods from gods to humans, hence the metaphorical “ford” for crossing the god/mortal divide. In the next hemistich I suggest that it is Indra who is distributing vast numbers of goods. The gen. *śravāyyasya* supports this view, since this adj. generally modifies *vāja*- ‘prize’ or *rayi*- ‘wealth’ (cf., e.g., IX.63.23 *rayim ... śravāyyam*), as Ge also points out (n. 53b). Ge and Re simply take *śravāyyasya* as a PN, again simply to dodge the interpretational problem. Though the publ. tr. suggests it might be the place for the distribution of dakṣiṇās, I no longer believe that the passage concerns the dakṣiṇā, since I think this is a reference to *Indra*'s distribution of goods.

The 2nd hemistich is entirely clear, except for the nom. sg. subject, the hapax *naigutāḥ*. This vṛddhi deriv. must be interpr. with ref. to its base, *nigūt-*, which occurs in the acc. pl. in the next vs., as the designation of overpowered, indeed annihilated, foes; it is also found in X.128.6 (as nom. pl.), where it refers to enemies of some sort who are repulsed and defeated by Agni. Both Ge and Re tr. as a PN in our two vss. (though Ge ‘Schwätzer(?)’ in X.128.6). EWA (s.v.) suggests an appealing interpr., as a rt noun cmpd to *√gu* (his *GAṼ*) ‘call upon’; with the preverb *nī* ‘*nieder-rufend, schmähend’ in a verbal contest. This interpr. seems to be tacitly accepted by KH (KISch 447), who tr. it in 54c as “Schmäher”; it is also presented by Scar (112–13), though hesitantly – and like Ge and Re he tr. it as a PN. (Mayr in his PN book is dubious that it's a PN.) By contrast, I find the

suggestion quite plausible; I suggest the sense ‘challenger’ for *nigūt-*. In contrast to *nigūt-*, its *vṛddhi* deriv. in our vs. designates a successful and positively viewed figure, opposed to the *nigūt-*s in the next vs. – hence my tr. ‘challengers’ challenger’ (Scar’s ‘Bezwinger der Niguts’, an interpr. that goes back to Sāy. and Ludwig [see Ge’s n. 53c]). As in 52d, I take the unnamed referent here to be Indra, though Ge (n. 53c) suggests Soma. The extravagance of the gifts and the apparent militant nature of *naigutá-* seems better suited to Indra, though a militant Soma is not out of the question.

IX.97.54: The difficulties do not let up here, esp. in the 1st hemistich. The clearest thing here is the *asya*, which presumably, because of its lack of accent, must refer to the *naigutáh* in 53cd. This same figure is also the subject of the verbs in c.

The first problem is the first word, whose very form is in question. The Pp. separates *máhīmé* into *máhi* and *imé*, with the first then a neut. sg.; Gr takes it rather as a du. *máhi*, with ? This is rejected explicitly by Old on accentual grounds: the standard du. is accented *máhi*. If it is neut. sg., it can modify *nāma*; if neut. du., *vádhatre*. I prefer the latter, despite the formal problems. Old, Ge, and Re take it as a modifier of *nāma*.

Let us now turn to *vṛṣanāma*, taken as a cmpd by Pp., despite its two accents. The simple solution here is, as has long been known, to split into two words: *vṛṣa nāma*, with *vṛṣa* a neut. agreeing with *nāma*. I take this as a naming parenthesis “‘Bull’ his name,” though I recognize that we should probably expect the masc. **vṛṣā* in that context (type *nalo nāma*). Perhaps better “‘Bullish’ is his name,” which more easily accommodates a neut. *vṛṣa*. (Before continuing I will point out that this is most likely a reference to Indra, whose presence I see also in the preceding two vss. – though Soma is possible as well.) A naming parenthesis is not the standard view, which is that “bullish name” is one member of a nominal sentence equating the dual entities (whatever they may be – see below) with this name (“these two Xs are / make up” [ausmachen] his great bullish name” – so Old, Ge, and more or less Re; Scar [112] also follows this interpr. but assumes a du. ‘great’). As that tr. shows, the standard view also has the merit of providing a head noun to the putative neut. *máhi* that opens the pāda.

Why then do I put myself in morphological difficulties, rejecting neut. sg. *máhi* and struggling with neut. *vṛṣa*? Because I don’t think that the two entities are equivalent to his name, but rather belong to him and are deployed by him under specific circumstances, as indicated in pāda b. I therefore assume a du. *máhi*, or perhaps correctly accented **máhi*, which has been redactionally changed after the passage ceased to be understood.

The next question: what are the dual entities. Ge (fld. by Scar) takes *sūṣé ... vádhatre* as a discontinuous dual dvandva: “sein Ungestüm und seine Waffe.” This is clever, but to me unconvincing. Real dual dvandvas with two dual endings that involve material or immaterial entities, rather than gods or at least animate beings, are rare. And this would contain two entities that are not associated with each other textually and do not form a natural semantic class, one of which is an immaterial power, the other a material object. If there is an alternative, we should seek it. And indeed there is: *sūṣé* can simply be the modifier of *vádhatre*. There are “two forceful weapons of death.” Old’s “diese beide *sūṣé vádhatre* implies this solution, and Re adopts it as well, though in his n. he claims that *sūṣá-* is ordinarily a masc. noun. I think rather the reverse: that it is an adj. even though its head noun is often gapped, esp. when it is the obj. of *√rc* ‘chant’ or

similar verbs and refers to a “fortifying / powerful (praise / thought – *stómam* / *mánma*, etc.).” The adjectival status of *sūṣá-* is one more reason not to assume it’s one of a pair in a dual dvandva.

The next question after this: what *are* these two weapons. I suggest that it is the two fatal activities described in c, both of which are slangy euphemisms: ‘put to sleep’ (*svāpāya-*) and ‘snow’. The caus. stem *svāpāya-* and assoc. redupl. aor. *síṣvap(a)-* are only used in this euphemistic sense of ‘put to death’, a sense that is familiar of course in the Engl. equivalent. The parallel stem *snehāya-* is found only here. It is clearly related to the IE words for ‘snow’, and, as I discuss in the *-āya*-book (91), the hostile / fatal nuance it projects in context can be derived directly from ‘snow’; the re-semanticization of the IE root to something like ‘stick together’ advocated by a number of scholars (see *-āya-*, p. 91 n. 32) is unnecessary. As I point out there, the verb ‘snow’ is also found in Engl., meaning ‘overwhelm’, though (at least decades ago) in a more or less positive sense. The verb *snehāyat* is accented presumably because it opens a new (sub-)clause.

We must now return to pāda b, which contains a disjunctive *vā ... vā* construction: *māmścatve vā pṛśane vā*. The first term, save for accent, is the same as *māmścatvé* in 52b. I confess I have no explanation of the difference in accent and treat the two as identical, as, it seems, do most interpr. – there’s too much else going on in this *ṛca* to focus on this! Since most interpr. take the form in 52b as a name, either of a place or a person (person for Scar for the form in this vs.), *pṛśane* receives the same interpr. Since I take *māmścatvé* in 52b as a temporal designation, I want to impose the same analysis on *pṛśane*. The stem *pṛśana-* is a hapax as a masc/neut., but it is at least derivationally related to the fem. *pṛśanī-* (3x: I.71.5, X.61.8, 73.2) with diff. accent (see AiG II.2.184, 197), and the adj. *pṛśanāyú-* (1x: I.84.11) is based upon it. The fem. stem is found in difficult passages, two of which (I.71.5, X.61.8) concern the cosmic incest of Heaven with his daughter, which are perhaps cryptic by design. However, all three forms seem to mean something like ‘caress, caressing’. The *-yú*-adj. is by contrast in a straightforward passage that aids the interpr. of ours: I.84.11 *tā asya pṛśanāyúvah, sómam śrīṇanti pṛśnayaḥ* “These dappled ones, eager for caresses, prepare the soma for him,” with the subject *dhenāvaḥ* ‘milk cows’. The theme is the usual one, of the erotic desire of the cows (= milk) for the bull Soma, a theme of course widely represented in IX. I therefore suggest that the loc. *pṛśane* here as a temporal designation refers to “the time of caressing” – that is, to the ritual moment in which Soma unites with the cows’ milk. Thus, pāda b names two key times in the soma sacrifice: the early morning when the sacrifice begins and the moment that the milk is mixed with the soma.

Even if my interpr. of the locc. is correct, why are these ritual times embedded in a vs. that otherwise occupies itself with deadly weapons and hostile encounters? I don’t have a totally satisfactory answer here, but if the subject is Indra, as I have suggested, he may be eliminating rival sacrificers and rival sacrifices that do not conform to the Ārya compact – or he may be deriving this strength to do battle from the sacrifice, which is simply represented by two of its temporal stages.

Pāda d displays pleasing phonological play: *cāpāmítrāṃ āpācīto acetáḥ*, where the first two sequences are mirror-images of each other: *c-ā-p-ā* vs. *a-p-ā-c*. (Note that the first *c* is actually borrowed from the end of the last pāda.) It is esp. cleverly designed because of the discontinuous verb *āpa ... aca* – the impv. *aca* needing to be extracted from *acetáḥ* (= *aca itáḥ* ‘turn away from here’). This *acetáḥ* looks superficially as if it

belongs to the stem *acetás-* ‘unperceptive’, but it does not. That sense, and the same privative+ \sqrt{cit} , is found instead in the negated rt noun cmpd. *acít-* in the acc. pl. The pāda provides an exceptionally tricky end to a dazzlingly frustrating *ṛca*.

IX.97.55–58: The rest of the hymn consists of 4 vss. Old dithers about whether this consists of an odd vs., 55, followed by a final *ṛca*, 56–58 – or a *ṛca* 55–57, with a final independent vs. 58. At least to my mind, the latter analysis is clearly superior. Vs. 58 has the “feel” of a hymn-summary vs., with the expression of “our” wish in ab, and its 2nd half consists of the Kutsa refrain. Nonetheless, there are no clear signs of cohesion in vss. 55–57, though one might point to the filters in both 55 and 56. Happily none of the vss. presents us with the desperate difficulties of the preceding *ṛca*.

IX.97.55: We meet the three filters also in IX.73.8, where their identity is not clear. Needless to say, Lü (703–4) has a cosmic explanation.

IX.97.56: Note the phonological play in d: *ví vāram ávyam samáyāti yāti*. The last bit is reminiscent of 54d, in that the phonological agreement crosscuts the word divisions: we have rhyming *-yāti yāti*, but the first *yāti* is to be segmented (*samá*)*yā áti*.

IX.97.57: The simile in b is one of the best pieces of evidence for my interpr. of \sqrt{ribh} as ‘squawk, creak,’ etc., rather than ‘sing’. The simile “like birds of prey” (*ná gṛdhrāḥ*) only makes sense if the verb that expresses the sounds of the voices of the poets (*kaváyah*) is not a mellifluous one. Both Ge and Re struggle with this. Ge reduces *rebhanti* to ‘become hearable/known’: “... werden die Seher lautbar wie die Geier” (not the first quality one thinks of for a Geier); Re simply recasts the simile: “sur sa trace ils psalmodient, comme des poètes avides (de gain).”

IX.97.58: (*bhāre*) *kr̥tām ví \sqrt{ci}* is a dicing phrase found several times in the RV. See disc. ad X.42.9 as well as Falk (Würf. 126–28).

IX.98–101

Hymns predominantly in Anuṣṭubh

IX.98

IX.98.1: On the pattern set in motion by *vāja-sātama-*, see ad vs. 12.

On *sahāśra-bharnas-* see comm. ad IX.60.2.

In the rt. noun cmpd *vibhvā-sāham* Ge, Re, and Scar (609–10) take *vibhvā-* as a PN, that of one of the R̥bhus, and also interpr. this PN as having only an indirect relationship to the 2nd member. The cmpd modifies *rayīm* (also in its other occurrence in V.10.7), and they render the phrase “wealth that surpasses that of Vibhvan” – in other words with the actual 1st member implicitly a gen. dependent on a supplied ‘wealth’ that is the implicit 1st member (suggesting a phrase **rayi-sāham rayīm* – a similar cmpd. *rayi-śāh-* does exist). Scar also suggests an alternative analysis: “unter den vorzüglichen [Schätzen] siegreich,” that is, “der beste Schatz,” as well as an even more elaborate analysis by way of the phrase *vibhvataṣṭá-rayi-* in IV.36.5 (based on Ge’s nn. to V.10.7,

IV.36.5), in which they see the Ṛbhu PN as well (but see my comm. ad V.58.4). All of this seems to me a result of over-thinking the cmpd. First of all, I think we would do well to leave the Ṛbhus out of this: they have almost no presence in the IXth Maṇḍala, and taking *vibhṽā-* here as a PN seems to complicate rather than simplify the interpr. of the cmpd. The stem *vibhvan-* is attested as an adj. meaning ‘extensive, distinguished’, and I see no reason why that meaning can’t fit this cmpd. in a more direct way than Ge/Re/Scar envision: it can either mean ‘overcoming/prevailing over (even) distinguished (wealth)’ or (more likely in my view) ‘overcoming/vanquishing (even) the distinguished (person/people)’ – that is, we want wealth so overwhelming that we can dominate our rivals.

It is possible that *vibhṽā-* does signal a pun on the Ṛbhu PN, but only as a secondary reading. One of the other Ṛbhus is named Vāja, and *vāja-* is the 1st member of a different rt. noun cmpd in this vs., also with a root meaning ‘win’ in the same semantic sphere as *√sah*: *vāja-sātama-* ‘best at winning prizes’. No one to my knowledge suggests that *vāja-* in that cmpd has the primary reading ‘PN, one of the Ṛbhus’, but *vāja-* may have enabled a pun on *vibhṽā-*. In fact, it’s worth noting that, as Scar points out (609 n. 875), *vibhṽāsāham* gives a bad cadence, and **vibhū-śāham* (as in *vibhū-vasu-* ‘having distinguished goods’) would be better. So perhaps that 1st member **vibhū-* was altered to *vibhṽā-* to allow this punning reading.

IX.98.2–3: These two vss. share vocab. and structure. Both begin *pāri śyá s(u)vānāḥ*, and both have a pāda-final *akṣāḥ* (2d, 3a), in addition to *īnduh* (2c, 3b), *dhārā(bhiḥ)* (2d, 3c). The meter in both vss. shows some disturbance, esp. in 2d and 3a, and there are several different ways to resolve these disturbances. The HvN solutions as represented by their restorations do not seem to be the most satisfactory ones. As just noted, the initial pādas of both vss. begin in the same way, but though in 2a HvN read the med. part. *svānāḥ* with contracted root syllable, in 3a they read *suvānāḥ*. It seems unlikely that in this patterned repetition in successive vss. the participles would have different metrical realizations; moreover, as Gr points out, that participle, which is quite common, is always elsewhere read *svānāḥ*. A further consideration is that by their reading 3a has a disfavored cadence: *(su)vānó akṣāḥ* (– ~ – x, with shortening of *o* in hiatus), rather than the more usual iambic cadence of dimeter vs. As for 2d they read med. part. *hiyānāḥ*; this part. appears both with and without contracted root syllable: *hyānāḥ* is found, for ex., in IX.86.3. Given contracted *svānāḥ* in 2a and (contra HvN) 3a, contraction better fits the contextual pattern. And as in 3a their reading also produces a disfavored cadence, *(dhā)rābhir akṣāḥ* (again – ~ – x). The most likely solution is given by Arnold (metrical comm., as well as p. 99 §151 (i)) and Old: distracted *akṣāḥ*, which provides the right no. of syllables even with the contracted participles and also fixes the cadence.

IX.98.2: On the instr. *drūṇā* and the phrase *drūṇā hitá-* see comm. ad IX.1.2. One of the problems with the standard interpr. of this phrase, that it refers to the wooden cup into which the Soma is poured, is that it would be out of sequence, since the vs. otherwise describes the early part of Soma’s journey across the ritual ground.

The pāda-final *avyāyam* (a) and *avyata* (b) echo each other.

The actual target of the simile in b, the nominative equivalent of Soma in the frame, is gapped, being represented only by the adjuncts *rátthe* and *várma*: “like (a man/warrior) on a chariot his armor.” In the publ. tr. “a man” should be in parens.

IX.98.3: The transmitted *akṣā* at the end of pāda a before *i-* should have appeared as *akṣār* in sandhi; the Pp. reads *akṣār íti*. Wackernagel (AiG I.1.334–35) considers it a misunderstanding of original *akṣāḥ* by the redactors.

The simile in d has the same structure as the one in 2b: gapped nominative target whose identity is signalled by an adjunct, in this case *bhrājā* ‘with flame (/flash/light)’ – most likely pointing to Agni (Ge, Re [tr.], Ober [II.56]), though possibly Sūrya, who is also associated with forms of the root $\sqrt{bhrāj}$ (alt. given by Re in his n.).

IX.98.4: The standard tr. take this vs. as a single clause, and it is certainly tempting. However, there are several problems. First, despite the *hí* the main verb *vivāsasi* is unaccented. It is true that this verb comes only at the end of the vs., while *hí* is in 2nd position in the first pāda. Old notes the problem but suggests that it’s the result of sliding into being a main clause, presumably because of distance. But the conditioning of verb accent by *hí* is a robust effect, which does not depend on proximity of the verb to the particle. Another problem is the *sá ... tvám* that opens the vs. As I have demonstrated at length (“sa figé”), *sá* (+/- *tvám*) with 2nd ps. reference is ordinarily found only with imperatives, and the desid. pres. *vivāsasi* is therefore anomalous.

On these two grounds I therefore divide the vs. into two clauses, ab and cd, with the former an equational nominal cl.: *tvám ... vásu* “you are good(s).” This may seem an outlandish or tortured expression, perhaps a cure worse than the disease. However, note that the next vs. enables just this identification: in 5b Soma is addressed as “o good one” (voc. *vaso*), of whose goods (*vásvaḥ*) we want a part. So the line between good thing(s) and a good (one) is presented as permeable, and Soma may well be both.

This interpr. solves the (lack of) verbal accent problem, but what about *sá ... tvám*. I suggest that this is a syntactically conditioned variant of **tad ... tvám ... , vásu* “you are *that*, namely good(s).” The neut. *tád* has been “attracted” to the (underlying) gender of *tvám* by the well-known syntactic rule of gender attraction of predicated pronouns in nominal equational clauses (see, e.g., Speijer, *Vedisch u. Sanskrit-Syntax*, §95b; other examples and sec. lit. citations collected in Brereton 1986: 99–191 and n. 6). On the supposed exception, which is not (*tat tvam asi* in Ch Up), see Brereton “*tat tvam asi* in Context” (ZDMG 136 [1986]).

śatātman- occurs 3x in the RV (I.149.3, X.33.9, and here); in all cases it seems to mean ‘having 100 forms or embodiments’; in X.33.9 it is almost of the “cats have 9 lives” variety. Here it presumably refers to as many varieties of wealth as we can acquire.

IX.98.5: On *vaso vásvaḥ* and its relation to vs. 4, see comm. there.

This vs. is supposed to contain the lexeme *ní√as* (#*ní ... , syāma*). Gr glosses this lexeme ‘Theil haben an [G.]’, and Ge and Re both so tr. But *ní* is found nowhere else with \sqrt{as} (in the RV or in the rest of Skt, as far as I can see), and neither the additive semantics of *ní* + \sqrt{as} nor any plausible extension of it would produce ‘have a share in’, at least to my mind. RIVELEX (I. 634, 641 n. 71) agrees with me and instead glosses it ‘jmd ist im Dienst von etw.’ (628), which would yield the not very likely “may we be in

service of your goods ... of your refreshment and favor.” I therefore think it likely that *ní* is not a part of a verbal lexeme as a preverb in tmesis. I suggest, quite tentatively, instead that it is a sort of pseudo-reduplication with the doubly marked splv. *nédiṣṭhatama-* ‘most nearest’, which it immediately precedes (#*ní nédiṣṭhatamāḥ*) or that it provides a further directional specification to that splv.: “down nearest.” I construe the various genitives with this splv. – though I recognize that this does not seem to be a standard usage. They are unlikely to go with *syāma* even in the absence of *ní*, because, as Re points out in his n. (though he tr. flg. Gr and Ge), \sqrt{as} + GEN generally means “être le lot de (qq’un),” which should produce “may we belong to your goods ...”

On *adhriḡo* see comm. ad I.61.1, VIII.22.11.

IX.98.6: This vs. is entirely a rel. cl., which is resumed by vs. 7, where *tyám* (7a) picks up *yám* (6a).

IX.98.8: This vs. presents a number of small interrelated difficulties. We can start with *pāntaḥ*. As was discussed ad I.122.1 (q.v.), forms of the shape *pānt(a)-* belong to two different stems; the better attested is the them. noun *pānta-* ‘drink’, but there are two exx. of the act. root aor. part. to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’, at I.122.4 and in our passage here. Both stems often show distraction of the root syll., and that scansion is required here. The participle is pl.; the question then is what case it’s in. Ge takes it as a voc., coreferential with *vaḥ* in pāda a, with *dakṣasādhanaṃ* the subj. of both the main cl. in ab and the rel. cl. in cd, or so I read his tr.: “Denn durch seine Gunst wird euch, ihr Trinkenden, ein kraftwirkendes Mittel, der den freigebigen Herren hohen Ruhm verschafft.” However, this is syntactically impossible: if *dakṣasādhanaṃ* is the subj. of ab, it must be neut., in which case it cannot be the antecedent of masc. *yāḥ* in c. It is also somewhat perverse not to construe *dakṣasādhanaṃ*, which always refers to soma (IX.25.1, 27.2, 101.15, 104.3), as the obj. of *pāntaḥ*. Re’s tr. suffers from a different syntactic solecism. Like Ge, he takes *pāntaḥ* as coreferential with *vaḥ*, but, it seems, as a modifier of *vaḥ* and therefore an acc. or even dat. pl.: “Pour vous en effet qui buvez (ce soma) réalisateur de la force-agissante ...”

The problems in both interpr. arise from their assumption that *pāntaḥ* must qualify *vaḥ* one way or another. But the most likely referent for the part. is “all the gods” of 7c, around which Soma circled with his *māda-* just previously, as was clearly seen (in his usual way) by Old: “(die Götter, v. 7), den *dakṣasādhana* trinkend.” If we detach *pāntaḥ* from *vaḥ*, things go more smoothly. I take *pāntaḥ* as a predicated participle with the gods as supplied subj.: “(the gods) are drinking ...”

So then, what to do with *vaḥ*? This has two possible solutions, neither of which is flawless, but both of which are better than the knots Ge and Re tie themselves in to construe it with *pāntaḥ*. In the publ. tr. I take it as referring to the poets/ritualists generally (as so often) and construe it with the rel. cl. in cd, in particular with *sūrīṣu* “among (your) patrons.” Old’s solution is similar, though he actually takes pāda a as part of the rel. cl. beginning in c, which I would prefer not to. So my publ. solution is to take *vaḥ* as being in a sort of extreme Wackernagel’s position, leapfrogging two pādas (and the main cl.) to reach its host. This seems a little extreme, but at least the main cl. is syntactically sketchy – consisting of a predicted aor. participle. A different solution is suggested by the meter of pāda a, which lacks a syllable. Old suggests reading *aś’yá*, and

Gr also lists it with this scansion. But this distracted form, if it exists at all, is extremely rare, and I think we should avoid positing it if possible. The lack of a syllable and the problem of *vah* (*vo* in sandhi) may well be connected. I suggest that the pāda hasn't been properly transmitted and *vo* is the remnant of something else entirely, though unfortunately I don't have any suggestions for what might have fallen out. The transmitted *vo* may have been modeled on *vām* in the next vs.

One remaining problem with ab: if *asyá* refers to Soma in the gen. ("with his help"), what about acc. *dakṣasādhanaṃ*, which as I just said is always used of soma. I suggest that the *māda*- 'exhilarating drink' of 7d is the referent for this adj., substituting for soma. But in fact there is no real problem even if both the gen. and the acc. refer to Soma/soma.

The 2nd hemistich is considerably more straightforward, though there is one place where I differ from the standard tr. Both Ge and Re take *svár* as nom., with the simile turning on *haryatāḥ*: "delightful like the sun" (e.g., "wie die Sonne begehrt"). I instead take *haryatāḥ* as an independent modifier of Soma and *svár* as acc., parallel to *śrávo bṛhāt*, as obj. of *dadhé*. This is another instantiation of the formula "place the sun (in heaven)," of which I saw a disguised ex. in the preceding hymn, IX.97.38. See comm. there and my 2010 Fs. Melchert article (this passage and the formula disc. pp. 163–64).

Note that since *svár* may invoke *sūrya*-, there may be indirect phonetic play between *sūrīṣu* 'in the patrons' and the 'sun' word.

IX.98.9: The referent of the 2nd ps. du. encl. *vām* is clearly the World-halves in the repeated fem. voc. phrase *mānavī ... rodasī / ... devī*. The voccs. are somewhat contradictory, identifying the World-halves as both goddesses and as related to mankind (or Manu). Ge (n. 9ab) ingeniously and persuasively suggests that the dual referent is the soma-press with its two jaws. In IX.75.4 the World-halves are called the mothers of Soma, and our passage depicts his birth as related to them. Ge supplies "son" for *vām* to depend on; Re seems to take *vām* as a dative (or datival gen.): "... est né ... pour vous deux," which loses the maternal relationship. I take the *vām* as indicating the oblique source with pass. *janiṣṭa* "was born of," which avoids Ge's need to supply a head noun. However, there is no serious semantic distinction between my interpr. and Ge's.

The final pāda lacks a verb, but contains an apparent obj. *tām* most likely referring to Soma. The negated nom. part. *ásredhan* demands a masc. sg. subj.; the adverbial neut. acc. sg. or loc. sg. *tuviṣvāni* 'very noisily / in/at the very noisy one' (?) suggests a verb of sound or speech: "I praise" (Ge) / 'he [priest] praises" (Re) would fit these conditions fine without imposing itself.

IX.98.10: The identity of "the god sitting on the seat" is unclear, though Sāy.'s suggestion (see Ge's n. 10d) that it is the Yajamāna seems unlikely. I'd suggest rather Agni, on the basis of IX.92.2 *śīdan hôteva sādane camūṣu* "taking his seat in the cups like a Hotar on his seat," since Agni is the archetypal Hotar and *√sad* is a regular part of the Agni lexicon. Of course in IX it is Soma who is regularly sitting / seated, but he cannot be the indirect object here.

IX.98.11: There is considerable phonological play, esp. in the 2nd hemistich – *apaprothantah ... prātāḥ ... āpracetasah*, but anticipated by ab *pratnāsaḥ ... pavitre ...*

The root \sqrt{pruth} uncompounded simply means ‘snort’; it is *āpa* that licenses the acc.

The rt. noun cmpd *huraś-cīt-* is found once elsewhere, in I.42.3, where the context is more diagnostic than this one. There it is parallel to *paripanthīnam muṣṭivāṇam* ‘highwayman (and) robber.’ The 1st member *huras-* belongs to the root \sqrt{hvr} ‘go crookedly’ (see, e.g., EWA s.v. *hīruk*). As often (and not only in Skt.), ‘crooked’ has moral implications; here the enemies to be banished are those who actively know/perceive the ways to go wrong *as well as* those who simply lack perception (*āpracetasah*). Since both cmpds contain a form of $\sqrt{cīt}$, it would have been better to capture this etymological play in the tr. – perhaps “those who discern the crooked ways and those who lack discernment.” Scar (123) in his disc. of this passage somehow convinces himself that the form must modify the soma drinks and is therefore not acc. pl. (as it is usually taken) but nom. pl. I don’t follow his semantic reasoning, but it did, by chance, suggest another possibility to me. Elsewhere in IX forms of \sqrt{hvr} can refer to the curly wool on the sheep’s fleece filter and the crooked path the soma must follow across the filter. So here I suggest that the morphologically ambiguous *huraścītaḥ* can be *both* nom. pl. and acc. pl. As the former, it means ‘knowing/perceiving the crooked ways (of the filter)’ and refer to the clever navigation of the soma drinks. As acc. pl. it refers to those who know morally crooked ways and deserve to be banished. I would represent this, somewhat awkwardly, in a revised tr. “discerning the crooked ways (of the filter), snorting away into the distance those who discern crooked ways and those without discernment.” Of course, since *huraścītaḥ* can serve for either, the Skt. lacks the clumsiness necessary to spell out the different Engl. readings.

IX.98.12: The hymn ends with two pāda-final cmpds whose first member is *vāja-* (*vāja-gandhīyam* [c], *vāja-pastīyam* [d]), just as its first pāda ends with the same (save for accent): 1a *vāja-sātāmam* – thus producing a satisfying ring encompassing the whole poem.

This rhetorical pattern, the pressure to produce matching 1st member *vāja-* compds, accounts for some disturbance in the cmpd formation in 12c. The cmpd in 1a is a standard rt. noun type (in the splv.). The cmpd in 12d, *vāja-pastīya-* ‘having a house with prizes in it’, is likewise properly formed: it is a bahuvrīhi of the type of *vāja-bāhu-*, *vāja-hasta* ‘having an arm/hand with a mace in it’. With this same 2nd member, see *āsva-pastya-*, *vīra-pastya-* ‘having a house with horses/heroes in it’. But the hapax *vāja-gandhīya-* in c is a different matter. Here the 2nd member appears to be a gerundive to the root \sqrt{gadh} ‘seize, secure, hold fast’, though the independent gerundive to that root is *gādhiya-* (see below). No other forms of the root have a nasal, and the source of it is unclear, since the etymology is likewise unclear (see EWA s.v. *GADH* and below). It is worth pointing out that without the nasal the cmpd (and the pāda) would end with 4 light syllables (**vājagadhīyam*) due to the distraction of the cluster *-dhy-*, and the influence of a similarly shaped root with similar meaning, $\sqrt{ba(n)dh}$ ‘bind’, might account for a nonce nasal insertion for metrical purposes.

Despite the difference in shape, it is quite clear that independent *gādhiya-* and our *-gandhiya-* are essentially identical, because the former is found primarily as a modifier of *vāja-* in the phrase ‘prize(s) to be seized’ (IV.16.11, 16, VI.10.6, 26.2). Only in IV.38.4 does it appear without *vāja-*, but in the same type of context. So our cmpd. replicates this

phrase, though with an intrusive nasal in the root syllable. Before going further, I should note the interpr. of the word(s) that prevails throughout Ge's tr. and to some extent Re's. For all attestations of the phrase *vāja-gādhyā*- Ge tr. "die deckenhohe Beute [/Gewinn]"; for the attestation of *gādhyā* in IV.38.4 without *vāja*- "bis an die Wagendecke reichende (Beute)"; and for our cmpd "der wagenhohe Lohn bringt." Re in VI.10.6 (EVP XIII ad loc.) "un prix-de-victoire emplissant le chariot" (though just "les butins" in IV.38.4 [EVP XV.162]); our cmpd. "qui a une charge de prix." To my knowledge Ge never explains how he came to this narrowly precise rendering, 'reaching to the top/roof of a cart', but Re (ad VI.10.6; XIII.131) provides us with the source for it, namely the word *gadhā* found in late Vedic (ŚSū) referring to some part of a cart, possibly the roof (see Sparreboom, *Chariots*, p. 123, with lit.). The connection seems to have been suggested in passing by Caland. See in contrast EWA s.v. *gadhā*-, where Mayr. comments "Schwerlich zu *GADH*." Given the large chronological gap in attestation between the supposed derivative (*gādhyā*- RV) and its supposed base noun (*gadhā*- Sū) and the not entirely compelling semantics, I think we can safely drop this interpr., despite its somewhat puzzling hold on Ge, and interpr. the forms as gerundives, as above.

But we must now confront the issue of the cmpd type. By accent *vāja-gandhya*- is a bahuvrīhi. Given the independent phrase "prize(s) to be seized/secured" consisting of the same two elements, we should expect the sense of the bahuvrīhi to be "possessing prizes to be secured," as in the publ. tr. "whose prizes are to be secured." But the order of the elements seems opposite to what we would expect: the 2nd member of a bv should be a noun; if there is an adj., verbal or not, it should be the 1st member. Hence we expect **gādya-vāja*-. Ge seems to ignore the problem (see his tr. above), as does Gr ('dessen Gaben zu ergreifen, festzuhalten sind'). But others try to press the cmpd into a more orthodox bv mode. See Re's "who has a load of prizes," turning *gandhya*- into a makeshift noun; differently, but responding to the same problem, Scar (457) "dessen Beute in Siegespreisen besteht (?)," interpr. *gadhya* as the noun Beute, developed from 'was es festzuhalten, zu ergreifen gilt' (n. 647). This scrupulousness about the cmpd. type is praiseworthy, but in this case I think it is misplaced. The rhetorical pattern I noted above – the ring compositional use of *vāja*- cmpds at the beginning and end of the hymn – has imposed itself, allowing a technically improper nonce bahuvrīhi to be formed with its elements in the wrong order. The cmpd with which it's paired in this final hemistich of the hymn, *vāja-pastīyam*, has the same shape: *vāja-Xⁱyam*, and though they are different types of bahuvrīhis and the 2nd member *-pastyā-* is in fact a noun, they appear superficially to be exactly parallel formations.

The formation of the hapax *vāja-gandhīya*- may have been aided by the fact that "proper" bahuvrīhis with corresponding elements are rare to non-existent. That is, examples of bahuvrīhis of the shape GRDV + NOUN are surprisingly difficult to find (at least surprising to me), though bahuvrīhis with verbal adjective 1st members are common – when the verbal adj. is a ppl. Cmpds like *sutā-soma*- 'having pressed soma', *vrktā-barhis*- 'having twisted ritual grass', *vrddhā-śavas*- 'having increased power' are ubiquitous and easily formed, but a search through Gr for bahuvrīhis with gerundive 1st members came up short. The only such cmpds I found are the hapax *avāryā-kratu*- 'possessing unobstructable resolve' (VIII.92.8), with a negated grdv., and *vāreṇya-kratu*- 'whose resolve is worthy to be chosen' (VIII.43.12) – save for *an-avadyā-rūpa*- 'possessing faultless form' (X.68.3) with the lexicalized negated grdv. *avadyā*- 'fault'.

IX.99

IX.99.1: The stem *mahīyú-* is found also in IX.65.1, also with a fem. pl. subj. There it is quite clearly the fingers of the officiants, and there is no reason why it can't refer to the fingers here as well (as indeed is the standard view). The adj. is generally rendered 'considering themselves great' vel sim., but in both passages 'seeking the great' works just as well and better fits the usual sense of *-yú-*stems (*gavyú-* 'seeking cattle', etc.). I don't see why the fingers would "pleins d'orgueil" as Re has it.

As Ge points out (n. 1c), by "glowing / bright garment" (*śukrām ... nirñījam*) the milk is meant.

"At the forefront of the inspired words" (*vipām āgre*) sets the time as the beginning of the sacrifice.

X.99.2: *kṣapā* 'by night' is somewhat surprising in the context of a soma sacrifice, since the beginning of the sacrifice is supposed to coincide with earliest morning. Sāy. deals with this problem by advancing the time into morning, glossing *ádha kṣapā* with *rātreḥ ... anantaram prātaḥkāle* "immediately following night at the time of early morning." Ober (I.405 with n. 57) suggests that sacrificers fearing the lure to the gods of their rival sacrificers get a jump on them by preparing the soma at night, but given how regulated the ritual day is, at least in middle Vedic śrauta texts but also seemingly in the RV, this premature anticipatory step seems unlikely to be ritually sanctioned. As for the soma sacrifice that does take place at night, the Atirātra, it employs previously prepared soma. I wonder if *kṣapā* should be taken not literally, but metaphorically. In the 2nd hemistich "the insightful thoughts of Vivasvant" (*vivásvato dhíyaḥ*) propel Soma on his ritual journey. Though Vivasvant seems to be the prototype Soma sacrificer (see IX.66.8 and Old on our passage), his name lit. means 'having the shining forth', and he is in some ways the image of the sun. See esp. IX.10.5, where Vivasvant is associated with the Dawns and the sun images produced by the soma poured across the filter. I suggest that here "the thoughts of Vivasvant" that give Soma a push represent the beginning of the verbal portion of the sacrifice as a metaphorical dawn, and therefore anything that happened prior to that in the ritual happened in the metaphorical night. For further on Vivasvant, see publ. intro. to I.139 and comm. ad X.14.5.

In c *yádī* ('if') should be read *yádī* ('when him').

IX.99.3: I am not certain of the referent of *asya* in pāda a. Ge and Re seems to interpr. it as Soma, implicitly dependent on *máda-*, which they take to be the referent of *tám*, on the basis of *mádo yáḥ* in b. I see the point, and it would solve the *asya* problem. But I have several objections. First, the object of \sqrt{mrj} 'groom' is unlikely to be exhilaration or the exhilarating drink (*máda-*) conceived of as separate from Soma him/itself. Moreover, in the central part of this hymn, vss. 3–5, each vs. begins with *tám*, and I find it difficult to believe that this *tám* has a different referent from the other two, which refer to Soma. And finally, vss. 6–7 each begin with *sá*, again referring to Soma, and in 7 *sá* is the subj. of *mrjyate* 'is groomed', the passive version of our *tám ... marjayāmasi* "we groom him." For all these reasons I think *tám* must be Soma, with *mádaḥ* in b equated with him. In this

case *asya* can only refer to Vivasvant, who is the only other singular entity previously mentioned.

The 2nd hemistich contains a striking conceptual reversal: the “cows” suck soma, though ordinarily it is the (conceptual) calf that sucks its mother, the cow. This may accompany another conceptual reversal: in IX “cows” are almost always a reference to the milk mixture added to the soma, but here Ge (n. 3cd) plausibly suggests that here they are the pressing stones, sucking the soma out of the plant stalks.

On the configuration of pāda d see Klein, DGRV I.95–96.

IX.99.4: The idiom *nāma* √ *bhr̥* ‘bear the name(s)’ generally means “to have that name, to be so called” (cf., e.g., I.103.4). However, I find it unlikely that the thoughts have—that is, are called by—the names of the gods (this thought is called “Indra,” that one “Agni”). Rather, I think there are two possibilities. The thoughts=hymns directed to Soma contain the names of the gods who are to drink the soma (of the type ubiquitous in IX, “O drop, flow for Indra”). A more elaborate suggestion starts from IX.109.14 *bībharti cārv indrasya nāma*, which means, in my view, not “he bears the dear name of Indra” (so, e.g., Ge), but rather “he bears the name dear to Indra,” namely “Soma.” Here, if we supply *cāru*, the passage could mean “the thoughts bear the name (dear) to the gods”; again that name is “Soma.” In this case the thoughts would not be called “Soma,” but would instead contain numerous instances of the name Soma in the hymns directed towards him. I prefer the former solution, as it does not require supplying additional material.

IX.99.5: Ge and Re (flg. Sāy.) take *ukṣāmāṇa-* to √ *ukṣ* ‘sprinkle’, not √ *vakṣ* / *ukṣ* ‘grow strong’. I prefer the latter, because even medial forms of ‘sprinkle’ are transitive (cf., e.g., V.59.1 *ukṣānte ásvān*) and this one would be passive, but ‘sprinkle’ is not excluded.

The publ. tr. of the 2nd hemistich – “Those of insightful thought hope for him to be like a messenger, (for them) to be first in his thought” – is, at the very least, awkward, but, more to the point, opaque. I now think I interpr. it wrongly. In particular, like Ge and Re (also Lü 208), I 1) take the implicit acc. obj. of *ā śāsate*, corresponding to *dūtām* ‘messenger’ in the simile, to be Soma, and 2) interpr. the verb as meaning ‘hope’. Although both interpr. can be amply justified, what they add up to is not sense. To begin with, though *ā* √ *śās* can mean ‘hope’, it can also have the more literal and additive sense ‘direct (towards)’, with a variety of objects. Particularly telling in our case is VIII.24.1 *ā śīṣāmahi bráhméndrāya* “we direct our formulation to Indra,” with a verbal product as object.

This now brings us to the simile. The skeleton of the clause means “They direct (X) like a messenger ...” Let us focus now on *dūtá-*; what can be being compared to it here? This is the only occurrence of this well-attested word or its derivatives in IX. The overwhelmingly standard referent of *dūtá-* is of course Agni; however, there is a subset of passages in which the *dūtá-* is a hymn, praise-song, vel sim. Cf. V.43.8 ... *gṛ̥ dūtó ná gantv áśvínā huvádhyai* “let the hymn come like a messenger to invoke the Áśvins”; IV.33.1 *dūtám íva vācam* “my speech like a messenger”; VI.63.1 *dūtó ná stómaḥ* “our praise-song like a messenger” (sim. VIII.26.16 *stómo dūtáḥ*). I suggest that in this hymn, so focused on the mental and verbal products of the poets, the object that “those of insightful though” (*manīśínah*) are directing is some variety of thought or hymn. Just

trolling through the previous vss. provides a number of candidates: *vīp-* ‘inspired word’ (1d), *dhī-* ‘insightful thought’ (2c), *gāthā-* ‘song’ (4a), *dhītī-* ‘insightful thought’ (4c), and *manīṣā-* ‘inspired thought’ (extracted from *manīṣín-* in our 5d). Although none of these is masc. to match *dūtā-*, the genders of simile and frame do not have to agree (note fem. *gīr-* in V.43.8, *vāc-* in IV.33.1, both cited above).

Finally, what about the purpose dat. *pūrvācittaye*? This form, occurring 8x, only in the dat., in all of its occurrences can mean “for X to be first in (s.o.’s) thoughts.” See comm. ad I.112.1. In two of its occurrences (VIII.3.9, 6.9) it is a formulation (*bráhma*) that we want to be first in Indra’s thought: e.g., VIII.3.9 *tát tvā yāmi suvīryam, tād bráhma pūrvācittaye* “I beg you for a mass of good heroes and for the sacred formulation to be first in your thought.” I suggest that this is the exact configuration we have here, *if* we supply a verbal product as the obj. of *ā sāstate*, as the parallel to *dūtām* in the simile, and as the subject of the infinitival *pūrvācittaye*. A supplied “hymn / thought / formulation” works well with all three of these nested elements and yields sense: “Those of insightful thought direct (a thought/formulation) like a messenger to be first in his thought.” I would now substitute this tr.

IX.99.6: Ge and Re (also Ober II.43) attach c to d as a new sentence, but this makes the already somewhat difficult simile in c all the more puzzling: what does depositing his seed have to do with displaying his eloquence? Whereas b and c work better together: in b “Soma sits in the cups” – that is, the liquid soma is poured into receptacles, expressed in the loc. (*camūsu*). In c this same transfer of liquid is compared to depositing seed/seed (*rēta ādādhat*) in an animal, also in the loc. (*paśaú*). So the structural parallelism between simile and frame is exact. The problem is the loc. *paśaú*, for morphologically this should be masc. or at best neut., but the image is of impregnation, and for that we want a fem. My ad hoc solution is to assume that *paśú-* here is used as a collective ‘livestock’, in reference to stock-breeding as a general practice.

IX.99.7: The sense of pāda c is not immediately apparent; its interpr. develops from an appreciation of the idiom inherent in the noun *saṃdadī-*. As discussed esp. ad I.139.1 (but see also IX.10.8, 79.4), the lexeme *sām √dā* belongs to *√dā* ‘tie’ and is used in the quite narrow idiom “tie/attach navel [ACC] to navel [LOC],” generally as a metaphor to assert or display a family tie between something human and earthly and something divine and in heaven. In Re’s words (n. to our passage): “partout dit du nombril comme point d’attache entre terre et ciel; on pourra donc ici même suppléer *nābhiḥ*” – though his tr. “quand il se reconnaît dans les (eaux que) voici, s’unissant (à elles)” reflects that interpr. only darkly, at best. The earthly/heavenly connection, in lapidary shorthand, seems to be the intent of our passage, though ‘navel’ is absent. In this particular case I would accept Lü’s constantly asserted conception of the heavenly waters and their connection to Soma. Here because Soma’s umbilical tie to the heavenly waters (represented by the prn. *āsu* fem. loc.) is well known, he plunges into the ritual waters – though Lü (23–39) identifies the two sets of waters exactly oppositely: the *āsu* are the earthly waters, and the “great waters” (*mahīr apāh*) the heavenly ones. The other occurrence of *saṃdadī-* at II.39.7 is more attenuated even than this one.

Note that *vī gāhate* here forms a ring with *prā gāhate* in 2b, which might support my view that the great waters are the ones at the ritual.

IX.100

On the structure of this hymn, or rather two twinned hymns (1–5, 4–9), see publ. intro. The hymn also has an even higher percentage of repeated and partially repeated pādas than usual in the Soma maṇḍala. See Ge’s nn. for some of them.

IX.100.1: *abhī* with lengthened final may conceal the enclitic acc. *ī*, anticipating the accs. in b. In fact, because of its position before nasal (*abhī navante*) it might represent a degeminated **īm*.

The mothers without deceit are, as noted by Ge and Re, the hymns.

IX.100.4: With Ge and Re (who follow Sāy.) I supply ‘horse’ as the headnoun on which *jigyúṣaḥ* (‘of the one having won / of a victor’) depends in the simile marked by *yathā*. This seems reasonable, even though there is little positive evidence for it. The pf. part. *jigivāms-* / *jigyúṣ-* doesn’t enter into a similar construction elsewhere, and the subj. of (*pāri*) *√dhāv* is overwhelmingly Soma. Otherwise we occasionally find cows (VIII.22.4, IX.66.6, X.145.6), but “runs like the cow of a victor” does not impose itself. In IX.87.7 we do find a steed (*ārvan-*: ... *pāri sómaḥ pavitre ... adadhāvad ārvā*), and that parallel will have to do. The simile in the 2nd hemistich, *vājīva sānasīḥ* “like a winner bringing prizes” reinforces this interpr., since *vājīn-* regularly modifies ‘horse’, but of course similes in the same vs. don’t have to have the same content.

IX.100.5: Note the matching *krátve ... kave* beginning and ending the 1st pāda.

IX.100.6–9: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss., constituting a separate hymn, echo and vary the 1st hymn, vss. 1–5.

IX.100.6: The first vs. of the new hymn matches the final vs. (5) of the previous one: 6ab *pávasva ... dhārayā sutáḥ* enlarges on 5b *pávasva soma dhārayā*, with 5c containing *sutáḥ*. The 2nd hemistichs of both vss. consist primarily of datives of the gods who will drink the soma, both beginning with Indra: 5cd *indrāya ... mitrāya váruṇāya ca*; 6cd *indrāya ... víṣṇave, devébhyaḥ* ... There is also a strong echo of vs. 4: 6a *vājasātamah* ‘best winner of prizes’ incorporates in a single word the simile in 4d *vājīva sānasīḥ* “like a winner possessing prizes.”

IX.100.7: This vs. replicates most of vs. 1 in a different order. I will cite here only the repeated elements: 1 ... *adrúhaḥ ... / vatsám ná ... jātām rihanti mātārah*
7 ... *rihanti mātārah ... adrúhaḥ / vatsám jātām ná ...*

On the repeated pāda (d) *pávamāna vídharmaṇi* see comm. ad IX.64.9 and also Ober II.152.

IX.100.8: This vs. has nothing in common with its match, vs. 2, until the end, where the two d pādas are identical: *víśvāni dāsúṣo gṛhé* “all (things) in the house of the pious man.” The two pādas are adapted to two very different themes: in 2 ‘all’ modifies *vásūni* ‘goods’ (c), which Soma will make flourish in the house of the pious, whereas in 7 the

context is darker: ‘all’ modifies *tāmāṃsi* ‘dark shades’, which Soma smashes away in the same location.

IX.100.9: The contents and phraseology of this vs. are furthest from its match, vs. 3, but as noted in the publ. tr., *dyām ca ... pṛthivīm ca* in 9ab recalls 3cd (*vāsūni*) *pārthivā divyā ca* “heavenly and earthly goods.”

IX.101

On the division of this hymn into ṛcas and the structure of the hymn in general see publ. intro. The Anukramaṇī assigns each ṛca to a different poet, in roughly reverse (conceptual) chronological order. The last ṛca plus appended vs., vss. 13–16, is credited to Prajāpati, the Middle Vedic creator god, with no patronymic. The poet of the 2nd to last ṛca, vss. 10–12, is given as Manu Sāṃvaraṇa. This poet is in fact referred to, with the patryonymic Sāṃvaraṇi, in the first Vālakhilya hymn, VIII.51.1 *yāthā mānau sāṃvaraṇau, sōmam indrāpibaḥ sutām* “Just as at Manu Sāṃvaraṇi’s you drank pressed soma, Indra ...” But even if the reference is just to a revered ancient poet, the name Manu, as the ur-man and ur-sacrificer, resonates in the context of Prajāpati. Moreover, there’s a missing step: the Anukr. attributes V.33–34 to one Saṃvaraṇa Prājāpatya, who would be the gapped generational link between Prajāpati and Manu Sāṃvaraṇa (/i). The names of the next two poets display the proper generational relationship: the third ṛca from the end (vss. 7–9) is by Nahuṣa Mānava, with his patronymic from Manu; the fourth ṛca from the end (vss. 4–6) by Yayāti Nāhuṣa, again taking his patronymic from the next poet in order. The first ṛca (vss. 1–3) does not participate in this generational chain; it is attributed to Andhīgu Śyāvāśvi, a patronymic that links him to the skilled poet of the Marut hymns of V (52–61), Śyāvāśva Ātreya (for further on this attribution see comm. ad vs. 1 below). Leaving Andhīgu aside, it seems that the Anukr. takes the hymn from a presumably contemporary poet Yayāti back through the ages (and 4–5 generations) to the primal god Prajāpati, whose primacy is signaled by his lack of patronymic.

IX.101.1–3: There is no particular unity visible in this ṛca, and vs. 1 in particular stands apart from the rest.

IX.101.1: As noted in the publ. intro. the appearance of the sacrifice-defiling dog in this vs. and vs. 13 sketches a ring. The content of the vs. and its reason for inclusion here are puzzling. Our long-tongued dog (acc. *śvānam ... dīrghajihvyām*) is clearly connected with a story widely attested in Vedic prose of an female demon, an Asurī called “Long-tongued” (*dīrghajihvī*), who licks (and thus defiles) the sacrifice. The story is found in texts belonging to all three ritual Vedas: RV: AB II.22; YV: MS III.10.6, KS XXIX.1; SV: JB I.161–63, PB XIII.6.9–10, though it is most developed in the JB, where it takes a distinctly and entertainingly sexual turn. The story is treated extensively by Oertel in a number of publs. (see reff. in O’Flaherty, JB, pp. 124–25) and tr. by Caland in *JB in Auswahl* and his ed. of PB (incl. an Engl. tr. of the JB version ad PB XIII.6.10); see also W. D. O’Flaherty, *Tales of Sex and Violence: Folklore, Sacrifice, and Danger in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (1985), 100–103. Whether the long-tongued demoness of prose is identical with or was inspired by our long-tongued dog is unclear, but at least the JB connects its account, perhaps secondarily, with our vs. After Indra set a certain Sumitra to

seduce the demoness and get her into his power so that Indra could slay her, Sumitra calls upon Indra with our vs. (quoted in the JB text I.162), which Indra then makes into his vajra, raises as his weapon (*etām anuṣṭubham vajram udyatya*), and smites her. The same vs. then figures in the immediately following story (I.162–63), in which Śyāvāśva, rather nastily tricked by his Sattrā mates, recites the verse (now named the Śyāvāśva sāman), to get himself to heaven. And this story involving Śyāvāśva himself is followed soon after (JB I.165) by one whose main character is Andhīgu (see also PB VIII.5.8–12). So at least serially Andhīgu and Śyāvāśva connect to Dīrghajihvī – remember that the poet of this ṛca is given by the Anukr. as Andhīgu Śyāvāśva.

Unfortunately nothing in the prose narratives provides any help in interpreting our vs., esp. the hapax cmpd. *purójitī*-. Both Ge and Re take the instr. *purójitī* as expressing purpose: “auf dass euer Trank zuvörderst siegē”; “afin qu’il y ait victoire de votre jus.” I do not understand the case syntax of this (instr. of purpose?), esp. as the standard *dative* of purpose appears in the next pāda (*sutāya mādayitnāve*), and, with the omission of *vah*, a similar dat. **purojitāye* would have fit this vs. line. Old takes the instr. seriously and construes *ándhasaḥ* with *sutāya*, which is certainly possible: “Durch euren vor (in lokalem Sinn) ihm gewonnenen (und ihn so beschützenden) Sieg schlägt dem berausenden Saft des *ándhas* den langzüngigen Hund, ihr Freunde, hinweg.” My own interpr. instead takes *ándhasaḥ* with *purójitī*: the “advance victory over the stalk” is by this interpr. the priests’ initial victory *over* the stalk, by pressing it for its juice, leaving it mangled and spent. This initial victory may provide the model for the violence against the encroaching dog. But I am not at all certain of this interpr.

IX.101.2–3: These two vss. are quoted in JB I.163 just after Indra’s use of our vs. 1 to kill the demoness, and the set of vss. is prescribed for the smiting of haters, rivals, demonic power, and evil. These are the only two Gāyatrī vss. in this Anuṣṭubh hymn.

IX.101.2: Rather than making c a nominal main clause (with Ge and Re), I think it better to take the whole vs. as a rel. cl., dependent on *tām*, which opens the next vs.

IX.101.3: On the impossible word *duróṣa(s)*- see comm. ad VIII.1.13. This is the only one of its three occurrences where it qualifies soma, though in Avestan *dūraōša-* is only used of haoma. Ge refuses to tr. (though he discusses it extensively in n. 3a); Re ‘difficile à mouvoir’ (see his n. for disc.).

The lengthened *ī* of *abhī* may represent *abhī*+*ī*, the enclitic acc., as I suggest for the same form in the preceding hymn, IX.100.1. In fact, just as in 100.1, it could represent a degeminated *īm* before the nasal of *nāraḥ*.

Both Ge and Re take *yajñām* as the direct obj. of *hinvanti* rather than the goal, as I do (Ge “Soma ... als Opfer”). It is certainly true that *yajñām* √*hi* is found elsewhere (see Ge’s n. 3c) and that the dat. is more often used for goal or purpose with √*hi*. Still, the sacrifice is so often the goal of motion, the goal of motion is so often in the acc., and soma is so often the obj. of √*hi* that I prefer to keep soma and the sacrifice as separate entities.

IX.101.4–6: No particular unity in this ṛca unless the mention of Indra in each vs. counts. After the difficulties of the 1st ṛca, this one is blessedly simple.

IX.101.5: On the double sense of *makhá-* and its denom. and deriv., see I.18.9, III.31.7.

IX.101.6: The phrase *samudró vācamīṅkhayāḥ* recalls the variant compds in IX.35.2 and 5: *samudramīṅkhaya* (2a) and *vācamīṅkhayām* (5a).

Note that all 4 pādas begin with *s-*.

IX.101.7–9: Again, quite straightforward and not particularly cohesive.

IX.101.7: *bhūman-* generally means ‘earth’ (as opposed to heaven) or ‘world’. Here it seems a little outside its usual patch, as a metrical driven variant of the common phrase *vīśvasya bhūvanasya* ‘of all creation’; see esp. IX.86.5 *pātir vīśvasya bhūvanasya rājasī* matching our *pātir vīśvasya bhūmanah*, but also occurrences in I.164.21, II.27.4, 40.1, III.46.2, V.85.3, IX.86.28, 36, 97.56, X.45.6, 168.2, all but one straddling a late caesura, where the two light init. syllables of *bhuvanasya* fit well; *bhūvanasya* of course fits the cadence of no Vedic meter.

IX.101.9: Both Ge and Re supply ‘wealth’ (*rayīm*), found in d, as the referent of all the previous nom. and acc. forms. I think rather of Indra. The splv. *ōjīṣṭha-* regularly modifies Indra (and never wealth). Though Ge is correct (n. 9a) that *śravāyya-* is a “beliebtes Beiwort” of wealth, Indra is hardly *unworthy* of fame, and see V.86.2b, where du. *śravāyyā* characterizes Indra and Agni. In the same vs. (V.86.2c) both gods are described as *yā pāñca carṣanīr abhī* (though variants of this pāda are usually applied to Agni alone: IV.7.4=V.23.1, VII.15.2), exactly like our c save for the number of the rel. prn. The clinching arg. against *rayí-* as the referent seems to me to be pāda d. Ge and Re clearly take the rel. cl. there as consisting only of *yéna vānāmahai*, with pāda-init. acc. *rayīm* part of the main cl.: the referent for *tām* back in pāda a and the antecedent of immed. flg. *yéna* in its own pāda. But this would be an unusual syntactic configuration for several reasons. First, there’s a rel. cl. (in c) intervening between the acc. *tām* and its distant referent in pāda a (and acc. modifier in b). Moreover, in a pāda with the structure #X REL ..., the rel. is usually postposed and the pāda syntactically self-contained – that is, the X is part of the rel. cl. The type of intra-pāda clausal break envisioned by Ge/Re is rare. Moreover, Ge and Re are required to interpr. *vānāmahai* in absolute usage (“... wir Sieger werden”; “nous serons vainqueurs”), but √*van* ordinarily takes a direct object, on occasion, in fact, *rayīm* (e.g., VI.38.1). For all these reasons I think it’s clear that *rayīm* and *yéna* in d cannot be coreferential and we need a different referent for the *tām* and *yā-* forms – with Indra the most obvious one, for the reasons just given.

In c I supply a form of √*as* with *abhī* in the meaning ‘surmount, dominate, prevail over’.

X.101.10–12: Again no particular signs of cohesion, save for the X-*vid-* ‘finding X’ compds in 10b, 10d, and 11d.

X.101.11: This vs. shows a few minor disturbances. To begin with, the employment of the preverb / particle *vī* is unclear. Gr takes it with the pf. part. *suṣvānāśah*, which it immed. follows, but √*su* is not otherwise found with *vī*. Moreover, tmesis of preverbs

with participles is fairly rare, though at least here the two forms are adjacent. Re construes it with the aor. part. *cītānāḥ* in b; here the problem is opposite: *vī√cit* is indeed an idiom, but not only is tmesis in participles rare, but the position of *vī*, if it's a preverb in tmesis, would be anomalous: mid-pāda and not only separated from its participle, but also intrusive in a constituent: *suṣvānāsaḥ ... ādribhiḥ* “having been pressed by stones.” I don't have a real solution, but I wonder if it's meant to evoke the “through/across the sheep's fleece” expression, found, e.g., in nearby IX.100.4 ... *vy āvyāyam* (cf. also IX.13.6, 49.4, 61.17, 67.5, 85.5, 97.56, 109.16). It is also possible that *vī.. cītānāḥ* somehow anticipates *vipaścītaḥ* in the next vs. (12a), but this seems a long shot.

The part. *cītāna-* is another bit of a problem. It is the only form to this part., which seems to belong to a root aor. otherwise found mostly in the well-attested pass. aor. *āceti* / *cēti*. The semantics works fine, but for a root aor. part. its root accent is anomalous (expect **cītānā-*), and in fact a root-accented zero-grade is peculiar whatever the formation. It could of course have voc. accent – but there's no place for a voc. in this 3rd ps. context. Perhaps it received its root accent redactionally in imitation of *vipaścītaḥ* in 12a.

Both Ge and Re take the verbal idiom in cd as transitive, or at least construe *iṣām* as a species of *Inhaltsakk.* (e.g., “nous ont en résonnant assemblé de toutes parts la jouissance-rituelle”). But Re's invocation of the idiom *abhī ... sām√svar* as the basis for our *abhītaḥ*, *sām asvaran* seems quite apposite, and that idiom is intrans. with an acc. of goal. See, e.g., IX.110.8 *īndram abhī ... sām asvaran* “They cried out in unison towards Indra” (sim. IX.106.11, 67.9). The conversion of the preverb *abhī* into the adverbial *abhītaḥ* would not be responsible for transitivizing the idiom. Cf., e.g., X.27.8 *hāvā īd aryó abhītaḥ sām āyan* “The cries of the Stranger came together from all sides.” I agree that *iṣām* is an unexpected goal for this idiom, but I think we have to live with it.

IX.101.13–15: The dog returns from the first ṛca in the first vs. of this one. The ṛca is also more rhetorically ambitious than those in the middle of this hymn, with an abundance of similes (13b, d, 14b, c, d, 15b). Vss. 14 and 15 end identically.

IX.101.13: Ge takes *ná* in b as the neg. (flg. Sāy.) and asserts (n. 13), contra Old, that the presence of the mortal and the dog in this vs. (and the VS vs. Old cites) is an accident. But the position of *ná* in the pāda is that of the simile particle (though at least it would immed. precede the verb), and the wealth of similes in this ṛca supports a simile reading here as well. The point of the hemistich is that, like the human, the dog is attracted to the sound of the soma ritual, particularly the sound of the soma pressing, and invades it.

The 2nd hemistich begins like 1c: *āpa śvānam ...*

The simile in d, “as the Bhṛgus did the Battler” (*makhām ná bhīgavaḥ*), refers to what Ge calls an otherwise unknown saga. The *makhā-* is found as a defeated enemy of Indra in X.171.2, a hymn attributed to one Iṭa Bhārgava, the patronymic of the victors in our vs.. Note that the denom. verb *makhasyate* occurs in our vs. 5c.

IX.101.14: The d pāda (*varó ná yónim āśadam*) is almost identical to 15d (*vedhā ná yónim āśadam*), both expressing the endpoint of Soma's ritual journey.

IX.101.15: The isolated summary vs. The cow's hide (*gávye ádhi tvací*) closely matches *gór ádhi tvací* in 11b, but the sheep's fleece is found nowhere else in the hymn, unless the *ví* of 11a gestures towards it. See comm. ad loc.

IX.102–6: The following 5 hymns are in Uṣṇih, technically 8 8 / 12 or 8 8 / 8 4 (see Arnold, p. 8). In some hymns, esp. IX.102, the latter variant prevails; that is, there is a word break before the last 4 syllables, which can seem like a syntactic afterthought. In others, the last 4 syllables are not detachable, and we must assume a 12-syl pāda; see, e.g., IX.103.2 ... *kr̥ṇute hárīḥ*, with 5-syllable finale.

IX.102

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. As just noted, the 8 8 / 8 4 variant of Uṣṇih is found throughout the hymn.

IX.102.1: On *krāṇā* as instr. see comm. ad IX.86.19. It is echoed by the instr. *krátvā* in the ring-compositional final vs., 8a. As noted ad IX.86.19, with Lü and Re (see also Tichy Kl.Sch 210) but contra Ge, I construe *mahīnām* with *síśuḥ* here.

As noted in the publ. intro., the phrase *hinvánn ṛtasya dīdhitim* in b forms a ring with the same phrase in the final vs. of the hymn, 8c. Both occurrence fill a pāda, but the repetition in 8 is followed by the 4-syl. extension *prādhavaré* (i.e., *prá adhvaré*), which needs to be integrated into the clause.

It is not entirely clear what “all the dear things” are that Soma encompasses in c, but on the basis of vs. 2 they may be Soma's domains (*dhāman-*) or places, i.e., the various stations on the ritual ground that the soma passes through.

The 4-syl. extension in this vs., *ádha dvitā*, has the look of a new syntactic unit, since *ádha* is almost always pāda/clause initial, but it also has to be integrated into what precedes.

IX.102.2–3: Trita figures in these two vss. Although the name Trita has several different referents, or at least several different roles, in the RV, in Maṇḍala IX he is the archetypal soma presser: see esp. comm. ad IX.37.4. In these two vss. there is also a play on the literal sense of *tritá-* ‘third’, which is played off against the dual *pāśyòḥ* in 2a and the numeral *trīṇi* ‘three’ in 3a. The Anukr. ascribes this hymn to Trita Āptya, a mythical figure most prominent in X.8, but this ascription is presumably based on the occurrence of *tritá-* in vss. 2–3. Trita Āptya is credited with several other hymns in the RV, incl., in this maṇḍala, IX.33–34.

IX.102.2: On *pāśī-* see comm. ad I.56.6, the only other occurrence of this stem. In both instances it is dual and seems to refer to a twinned body part. Under this analysis in this passage the body part is metaphorical, referring to the two “jaws” of the soma press, a metaphor also found in the later ritual literature. See Ge (n. 2a) on this interpr., also fld. by Re.

The syntax of the vs. as a whole is very puzzling, and the publ. tr. differs from the way Ge/Re (also Klein DGRV II.128–29) configure its parts – though I recognize the problem inherent in my old interpr. The overarching question that will govern how the details are interpr. is what to do with pāda b. In particular, is *ābhakta* the verb of the main

cl., with immed. flg. *yād gúhā padām* a self-contained nominal rel. cl. dependent on the main cl, or is *ābhakta* part of the *yād* cl., with postposed subordinator *yād*? Either of these is syntactically possible; Ge/Re opt for the former, I for the latter. Cf. for the former Re's "Entre les deux machoires de T., (le soma) a eu part au séjour (qui est) dans la cachette." Ge's tr. simply elides the *yād*: "In des Trita Kinnladen (?) hat er seine geheime Stufe erreicht."

There are several problems with this interpr. First (and perhaps least problematic): *úpa* at the beg. of the vs. then appears to be a preverb in tmesis with *ābhakta*, but *úpa* √ *bhāj* is not found anywhere else, either in the RV or elsewhere in Skt. (to judge from MonWms). For a small set of passages incl. this one, Gr allows for *úpa* with following loc. in the sense "bei, auf," and this is probably the way to go if one accepts the Ge/Re configuration—to take *úpa* as a preposition, rather than positing an otherwise unattested lexeme *úpa* √ *bhāj*. For my interpr. of *úpa* in the publ. tr., see below.

The sense that must be attributed to *ābhakta* (usually 'have a share, share in') under their interpr. is stretched. Ge simply tr. "hat ... erreicht," which is hard to reconcile with the normal usages of the root. In this he follows Gr: "(6) me. einen Ort oder Gegenstand [A.] erreichen, hingelangen," but Gr assigns this contextually generated usage to this passage alone. Re's "a eu part au séjour" is attentive to the meaning of the root, but what does the tr. actually mean?

Then there is the question of what to do with the rest of the verse after these 1st two pādas, which in Ge/Re/Klein's various renderings gets loosely attached to what precedes with no logical or syntactic connection. Cf., e.g., Klein's tr. of the whole vs.: "In the two stones of Trita (Soma) has taken for himself a place (of refuge) which is hidden, together (with) the seven orders of the worship, and dear."

My publ. interpr. starts with the other configuration of pāda b sketched above, that the pāda is a syntactic unit, a subord. cl. marked by *yād* with *ābhakta* as its verb. I further take *ābhakta ... padām* to be an instance of the rare idiom PATH + √ *bhāj* (med.) 'take to the path', found in VII.39.1 *bhejāte ... pānthām*, VII.18.16 *bhejé pathó vartaním*; see comm. ad VII.18.16. Taking *padā-* as 'track', we arrive at a tr. of b "when he took to the hidden track" – meaning, in my view, when Soma set out on his journey of ritual preparation after being pressed.

As for verse-initial *úpa*, elsewhere in IX it's almost always used with a verb of motion (usually √ *yā*) with acc. goal: cf. esp. the repeated phrase GEN *úpa yāti niṣkṛtām* "he goes the rendezvous with X." I therefore supply a verb of motion here, with the goal reached only at the end of the vs. in acc. *priyām* "his own dear (place/domain [perhaps supply *dhāma*])." The intermediate instr. phrase *yajñāsya saptá dhāṁabhiḥ* is, by this interpr., an instr. of extent of space and indicates the course of his journey, "through the seven domains of the sacrifice." The 4-syllable extension *ádha priyām*, like *ádha dvitā* in vs. 1, puts some syntactic distance between *priyām* and the rest of the vs. Here it might help indicate the arduous nature of the journey and the achievement of arriving at the goal, as my "now right to his own dear (place)" is meant to convey.

This interpr. seems to me to provide a more satisfactory account of the vs. than the other alternative. However, it has one major drawback: the *yād* clause of b is embedded within the main clause, which occupies pādas a, c (/d). If I follow this interpr., there is no way of avoiding this violation of standard practice, whereas in the Ge/Re/Klein interpr. *yād gúhā padām* is a nominal cl., which is permitted internally.

Weighing the two alternatives, I still find myself inclined to my own, though I don't have an explanation for the problematic embedding. That there appears to be a parenthetical inserted clause in the next vs. may indicate that this hymn is somewhat more lax about the combination of syntactic units than we usually meet with.

IX.102.3: This vs., too, gives the initial impression of a random series of elements strung together, which are difficult to construe with each other. Note, for ex., that ab contains five different nominal forms in four different cases, which cannot easily be connected. I take the vs. as a whole as a restatement of vs. 2, or an extension of it – describing the progress of Soma through his ritual preparation. The vs. is discussed at length by Old, in part responding to a treatment of it by Macdonell in JRAS 1893.

With *trīṇi* I supply 'filters', on the basis of IX.73.8 and IX.97.55 (see comm. ad locc.); see also the three seats (*trī śadhāsthā*) in the next hymn (IX.103.2) in the same verse with sheep's fleece filters. The same interpr. is shared by Old (tentatively) and Re, while Ge construes *trīṇi* with *yójanā* in c, which has the merit of not requiring supplied material, but the referent is fairly distant from its adj. (the basis of Old's objection to this interpr.).

The next question is on what does gen. *tritásya* depend. I take it with *pr̥sthēsu* 'on the backs' on the basis of IX.37.4 *tritasyādhi sānavi* "on the back of Trita" (with a different word for 'back'). See comm. ad IX.37.4. So also Old, while Re construes it with both *trīṇi* and *pr̥sthēsu* and Ge with *trīṇi*. The displacement of *tritásya* from its headnoun can be easily explained by the desire to juxtapose 'three' and (lit.) 'third': *trīṇi tritásya*.

The real problem in this hemistich, however, is what to do with the impv. *érayā* and the acc. *rayīm*. The verb doesn't fit easily into the ritual context nor does the acc. 'wealth'. See Old for various possibilities, none of which he particularly likes. Re makes a valiant attempt to make ab into a single cl., but the semantically and syntactically ill-suited awkwardness is apparent: "Stimule avec (ton) jet les trois (filtres) de Trita, (pour procurer) la richesse sur les (trois) dos (de Trita)." For one thing 'stimulating' or 'rousing' the filters isn't a standard (or even non-standard) action at the soma sacrifice, and his parenthetical "(pour procurer)" glosses over the fact that *rayīm* has no syntactic connection to the rest of the clause.

For this reason I reluctantly accept Ge's solution (considered but disfavored by Old), to take the impv. as part of a parenthetical clause, though I restrict that clause more than he does. He takes all of b as parenthetical: "—auf deinem Rücken bringe Reichtum her—" while I would limit it to the impv. + ACC.: "—rouse wealth!—" Although I am loath to solve syntactic problems by a wholesale positing of parentheticals, this seems the least objectionable way to deal with ab. It is not clear to me who the addressee of the impv. is, nor do any of the standard interpr. seem to worry about this question. I very much doubt that it is Soma, who is otherwise referred to only in the 3rd ps. throughout the hymn, until the final vs.; I find it unlikely that this hymn-length consistency and the dramatic contrast created by the switch in persons in the final vs. would be violated by a seemingly irrelevant impv. just here. The most likely addressee is a ritual officiant of some sort. On a possible interpr. of the short impv. phrase see comm. on the next vs.

The 2nd hemistich is, by contrast, relatively straightforward and, like 2cd, sketches the length of the territory Soma traverses, with the verb *ví√mā* 'measure out'

and *yójana-*, a measure of distance. The preverb *ví-* is in tmesis and takes its position after the verb at the beginning of the final, short pāda.

IX.102.4: The “seven mothers” (*saptā mātārah*) are presumably the rivers (contra Ge n. 4ab, who prefers *dhītī-* or ‘sisters’), which we also met in vs. 1 as the “great (fem.) ones.” Their appearance here strengthens the likelihood that *mahīnām* in 1a is dependent on *śísuḥ*; see comm. there.

On *vedhām* instead of expected *vedhāsam* see comm. ad IX.26.3.

The other two occurrences of *śriyē* in IX (IX.94.4, 104.1) are associated with birth/child: IX.94.4 *śriyē jātāḥ* and, in the next hymn, IX.104.1 *śísuṃ nā ... śriyē*. I therefore construe *jajñānām ... śriyē* together, despite their polarized positions at the two ends of the hemistich.

As Ge points out (n. 4c), *dhruvā-* can modify *rayī-* (IV.2.7 and, in this maṇḍala, IX.20.4). I therefore think *dhruvó rayīṇām* is abbreviated from *dhruvó *rayīr rayīṇām*. Unfortunately in Engl. “enduring wealth of wealths” is too awkward to be parsable, hence my “(treasure) of treasures.” Even more unfortunately the switch in the Engl. obscures the relationship of this vs. to the preceding one. In the context of this vs. the imperative clause “rouse wealth!” (*érayā rayīm*) in 3b can be reinterp. as tantamount to “rouse Soma!” since Soma here is identified as *rayī-*, in fact the best *rayī-*.

The 4-syl. addendum pāda is a self-contained subordinate clause, *cikéta yāt*, as is the identically structured *juṣānta yāt* in the next vs. (5d). The poet uses the unusual metrical pattern to his advantage in this hymn. Both Ge and Re think that ‘wealth’ is the understood complement of *cikéta*, and this would find some support in VII.95.2 *rāyās cétantī* “taking note of wealth.” However, as just disc., I consider *rayīṇām* in c as part of a phrase describing Soma. Moreover, as Ge points out (n. 4ab), *ciketa* responds to *aśāsata* ‘they instructed’ in b, and I therefore think that the point is that Soma paid attention to his mothers’ instruction.

IX.102.5: My unsignalled addition, “your,” to the nominal cl. of c is unsupported and, I’m now sure, wrong. (It mindlessly follows Ge.) As noted ad vs. 3, Soma is always in the 3rd ps. in this hymn till the final vs. And the initial *asyā* of pāda a reinforces this. I would now change the tr. to “... are his joys.”

As in the previous vs., the 4-syl. last pāda is a self-contained subord. cl., *juṣānta yāt*, with *vísve devāḥ* of b as its subj. Note that *juṣānta* picks up *sajósasaḥ* in a, which modifies *vísve devāḥ*. The etymological responsion might have been conveyed by a more literal tr., such as ‘of joint pleasure, sharing pleasure’.

IX.102.6: This vs. consists of a rel. cl., which is implicitly picked up by the following vs.

The extra four-syllable pāda here consists of a single acc. adj., which is entirely integrated into the rest of the vs., in contrast to the slight syntactic distance the metrical boundary creates in other vss. in this hymn.

IX.102.7: This vs. does not contain an overt referent for the rel. cl. of the previous vs. Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. all supply both this antecedent and a verb: “to him come.” This makes sense, but the only (indirect) support for it is *abhí* ‘towards’. I would be more comfortable if *abhí* were initial.

There are several candidates for the identity of the “two mothers of truth” *ṛtásya mātárā*. The exact phrase *yahvī ṛtásya mātárā* refers both to Night and Dawn (I.142.7, V.5.6) and to the two World Halves (VI.17.6, X.59.8). In IX.33.5 in the plural it refers to sacred formulations configured as cows. On the phrase see Lü (631), who rightly disputes Ge’s “... (Tochter) und Mütter”; Lü thinks the ref. here is to the World Halves, but gives no evidence that I could see. However, this identification is likely to be correct, in that *samīciné* in all three of its other occurrences, incl. 2 in this maṇḍala (IX.74.2, 90.4, X.44.8), is used of the World Halves.

The 2nd hemistich changes subject abruptly without a signal, beyond the change in number/gender from fem. du. (*samīciné ... yahvī ... mātárā*) to masc. pl. in cd. In fact the plural number only becomes clear with the last word, the 3rd pl. verb *añjate*; the part. *tanvānā(h)* that opens the hemistich could be du., given its sandhi position, *tanvānā yajñām* – but it would have to be masc. du. The identity of the masc. pl. is not clear, but the default, esp. given the meaning and usage of both the part. and the finite verb, would be the ritual officiants.

The fourth, short pāda superficially looks like those in vss. 4 and 5, though in opposite order—*yád añjate*—but it is not self-contained like them but belongs to the clause in c. Nonetheless, the positioning of *yád* at the beginning of the little pāda provides the same bit of distance we’ve found in most of the vss. of this hymn.

IX.102.8: As noted several times above, this is the first and only time that Soma is referred to in the 2nd ps. in this hymn, and only in the injunc, verb *ṛnór āpa* ‘you unclosed’. The switch in person is particularly noteworthy because this vs. forms a ring with vs. 1, sharing the pāda 1b, 8c—so the switch in person and the unity implied by the ring are, as it were, at odds with each other.

On *ṛnóti + āpa / ví* see comm. ad I.58.3. In our passage Soma has been made the protagonist of the Vala myth (see Ober II.217).

In the publ. tr. I tr. the verb as a preterite, but I would now be inclined to render it as a general pres. (sim. to KH’s view, Injunc. 122), as a repeated ritual action performed by Soma reenacting the Vala myth.

On the 4-syl. afterthought pāda *prādhvaré*, which is found several times in Uṣṇih or its equivalent, see comm. ad VIII.12.31–33. I argue there that it is a truncated version of the fairly widespread loc. absol. *prayaty ādhvaré* “while the ceremony is pro(ceeding).” I would now change the tr. here to “... spurring the visionary power of truth while the ceremony is pro(ceeding).” Once again the final pāda is a semi-separable unit.

IX.103

On the structure of this hymn and its relationship to the previous hymn IX.102, see publ. intro. Unlike IX.102, the variant of Uṣṇih employed here seems to be 8 8 / 12: in two of the six vss. the configuration of words makes a separable 4-syllable final pāda impossible (2c: ... *kṛṇute hárīḥ*#; 3c ... *saptá nūṣata*#), and though the other four vss. end with a 4-syllable word, only in vs. 1 does this show the syntactic distancing found throughout IX.102.

As was noted in the publ. intro., IX.102 and 103 share thematic and lexical material. A list of the most obvious includes

vs. 1: *vedhās-* / 102.4

jújoṣate / *juṣánta* 102.5

vs. 2: “three seats” reminiscent of *trīṇi* in 102.3, not to mention the two *trítá*’s in 102.2, 3.

vs. 3: *vāñīr íṣṇām saptá* / 102.4 *saptá mātáraḥ*

vs. 4b: *viśvādevo ádābhyah* / 102.5b *viśve devāso adrúhaḥ*

This pattern breaks down in the latter part of the hymn. Moreover, IX.103 is considerably more straightforward than 102, and it also possesses a different, quite salient structuring device, the fronted preverb that opens each vs.: *prá* (1), *pári* (2–6). As was also noted in the publ. intro., *pári* has less and less integral connection to the rest of the vs. as the hymn goes on.

IX.103.1: Ge takes ab as a nominal sentence, separate from c, with *vācaḥ* the nom. subj.: “... wird eine Rede angehoben.” Re takes ab independently as well, but supplies a 1st ps. verb, which introduces needless complications. Although I was tempted by Ge’s interpr., there are two problems: 1) It leaves the opening preverb *prá* orphaned. Though Gr lists a *prá úd√yam* ‘die Stimme erheben’, in fact he registers it only for this passage, which does not inspire confidence in the lexeme, and furthermore having one of two preverbs in tmesis with a ppl. might be unusual. If we do not separate ab from c, *prá* can be construed with the verb *bharā* in c in the common lexeme *prá√bhr.* 2) The *vācaḥ* in b has to be resupplied in c to provide the frame for the simile *bhṛtīm ná*, whereas if there is no break, acc. *vācaḥ* is readily available.

In c the verb *bharā* can be either 1st sg. subjunctive or 2nd sg. impv. There are no implications either way. With Ge/Re/Ober I go for the 1st ps. subj.

As noted above, it is only in this vs. that a separable 4-syl. final pāda seems likely: the 3rd sg. pf. subj. *jújoṣate* forms a single-word clause, with decisive change of subject. As also noted above, this verb echoes *juṣánta* in the 4-syl. final pāda *juṣánta yát* (5d) in the twinned hymn IX.102. This echo may account for the middle voice of *jújoṣate*; the well-attested pf. subj. *jújoṣa-* is otherwise only active, while the them. aor. *juṣā-* is overwhelmingly middle. The unexpected voice of *jújoṣate* is disc. by Old and probably accounts for why Gr (also BR; see Old) interprets it rather as a dat. sg. act. part. to an otherwise unattested pres. stem, even though we should expect a weak stem **jújuṣant-*. Not to mention that such a participle would require that the stem had been reinterpr. as a present. Though this is not a difficult leap, since the subjunctive has accent on the redupl., as opposed to the finite pf., which has standard pf. accent (*jujóṣa*, *jujuṣúḥ*), nonetheless, in the absence of unambig. present forms, it seems best to assign the subjunctive to the existing pf. stem. Ge, Re, Lub all take it as a finite verb, not a part.

IX.103.2: See IX.102.3, where it’s suggested that the *trīṇi* in that vs. corresponds to the “three seats” (*trī śadhástḥā*) here and refers to the filters.

IX.103.3: As noted above, the “seven voices” (*vāñīḥ ... saptá*) remind us of the seven mothers in IX.102.4. As Re points out, Lü (681–82) identifies the *saptá vāñīḥ* as the heavenly rivers (though not mentioning this passage). If this identification is correct, it is even closer to 102.4, where we identified the seven mothers as rivers. (Gr construes *saptá* with immediately preceding *íṣṇām* [“wo weniger gut mit vāñīs verbunden”], which of

course evokes the group of the Seven Seers, much more prominent in later texts than in the RV, where they are mentioned only four times, primarily in late hymns: *saptá řṣayah* [IV.42.8, X.130.7], *saptařṣáyah* [X.82.2, 109.4]. However, in that case we might expect overt gen. *saptānām* to modify the gen. pl. *řṣīnām*. Gr's objection to taking *saptá* with *vāñīh* does not seem to have merit, since the phrase *saptá vāñīh*, without the seers, is found elsewhere.)

IX.103.4: Starting with this vs., the *pári* has no organic connection to the rest of the vs. Here I supply *arṣatī* on the basis of vss. 2–3. So also Re, KH (133).

On *viśvādevo ādābhyaḥ* as a clever variant on IX.102.5 *viśve devāso ādruhaḥ*, see publ. intro.

Ge takes injunc. *viśat* as model (“... möge sich ... niederlassen”), but with Re and KH (133–34) I take it as a general present referring to Soma's standard ritual action.

IX.104

As with the immed. preceding hymn, the Uṣṇih here is of the 8 8 / 12 form, with some vss. not allowing a 4-syllable final because the word breaks don't coincide (1c, 3c, 5c) and the others not showing a syntactic or semantic break.

For the similarities with the flg. hymn, IX.105, see publ. intro. and comm. on 105.

IX.104.3: Pāda b seems to mix two kinds of expressions of purpose: the dative infinitive (*śārdhāya vītāye*) and a clause introduced by *yáthā*, in which we expect a subjunctive. In the absence of such a verb, the *yáthā* appears pleonastic. The next pāda begins the same way, with *yáthā* followed by a dative referring to gods (*mitrāya vāruṇāya*). The dative gods appear to be exactly parallel to *śārdhāya* in b, and we would expect *vītāye* to follow as there, or at least be supplied. But instead we find the nom. *śāmtamaḥ*, which suggests that the *yáthā* in this pāda should be taken seriously and we should supply a subjunctive: “so that he (will be) most wealful for M+V.” (The publ. tr. renders b and c as more parallel than they are and should perhaps be changed.)

IX.104.4: Pāda b, *abhí vāñīr anūṣata* is a variant on the more elaborate *abhí vāñīr řṣīnām saptá anūṣata* in the immed. preceding hymn, IX.103.3c, which occupies the long pāda of Uṣṇih, rather than one of the shorter ones, as here.

IX.104.5: Because of the 2nd ps. reference of vs.-init. *sá*, which is only appropriate with imperatives, I take *devápsarā asi* as a parenthetical insertion, with *sá* to be construed with vs.-final *bhava*. This has the advantage of allowing *naḥ* in pāda a, which would have no function in ab, to be construed with *gātuvíttamaḥ* in c, where it most naturally belongs. See *asmábhyam gātuvíttamaḥ* in two nearby hymns IX.101.10 and IX.106.6. My interpr. of b is supported by the parallel vs. in the twinned hymn, IX.105.5, which has no intermediate clause and has the same configuration #*sá naḥ* ... / *bhava*# with polarized vs.-init. and vs.-final elements as here.

The Anukr. credits this hymn to Parvata Kāṇva and Nārada Kāṇva or, alternatively, to “Kāśyapa's two Apsaras daughters Śikhāṇḍinī”: *śikhāṇḍinyāv apsarasau kāśyapyau*. It seems likely that this second – unusual – ascription is based on a misparsing of the cmpd. *devápsarā(h)*.

IX.104.6: On *sānemi* see comm. ad VII.38.7.

I do not understand why *kṛdhī* is accented.

IX.105

As noted ad IX.104, this hymn has a very palpable twinned relationship with 104, though extensive exact repetition is avoided. What follows explicitly traces the parallels and the variations.

IX.105.1: The init. voc. *sākhāyaḥ* in 104.1a is postponed in 105.1a till after *tām vaḥ*. The 2nd pāda begins with the same middle participle, *punānā-*, but in diff. case forms: 104.1b dative, 105.1b acc. The rest of b is identical save for the preverb: 104.1b *prā gāyata*, 105.1b *abhī gāyata*. The final pādas begin identically, *śísuṃ nā*, but go their own ways.

IX.105.2: Pāda a in both hymns has both the calf (acc. in 104, nom. in 105) and its mothers (both instr.), as well as the init. preverb *sām* and a simile particle (*nā* in 104, *iva* in 105). The b pādas are quite different. The c pādas begin with the same two words, *devāvī- māda-*, acc. in 104, nom. in 105. Again the rest of the c pāda diverges.

IX.105.3: The a pāda in 105 decomposes *dakṣa-sādhana-* in 104 to *dākṣāya sādhanah*. The two *yāthā*'s beginning 104.3b and c are replaced by *ayām*'s (also in a). The rest of b consists of the same dative purpose expression as in 104.3b. A superlative plus dative of benefit is found in both c pādas: 104.3c *mitrāya vāruṇāya śāmtamah*, 105.3c *devébhyo mādhumattamah*.

IX.105.4: The first two pādas of this vs. in the two hymns diverge from each other. The third pāda contains cows and color (*vārṇa-*) in both hymns and refers metaphorically to the same ritual action in both, the mixing of the soma with milk, but the metaphors differ as do the verbs. It is in this vs. that the two hymns are most distant from each other.

IX.105.5: The first pāda in each begins *sā no*, followed by a GEN.PL. + *pate* voc. expression, with deaccented gen. pl. The second pāda begins with voc. *indo*, followed by the compd. *devā-psaras-*, in the splv. in 105, but the simple nom. sg. in 104. See disc. ad 104.4 for the parenthetical nature of 104.4b. The structure of c in both is *sākheva sākhye ... bhava*. In 104.5c in between we get a splv., perhaps a delayed match to the splv. in 105.5b. The filler in 105c is different.

IX.105.6: The two versions redistribute some of the lexical material, while keeping other parts constant. Both begin the verse with *sānemi* and end it with *asmād ā*; only the two syllables in between differ. Both b pādas end *kām cid atrīnam*; 105 borrows *ādevam* from the c pāda of 104, while 104.6b begins *rakṣāsam*, not found in 105. The *āpa ... dvayūm* found at the beginning of 104.6c appears at the end of 105.6c. What precedes has no parallel in 104.6.

The sequence *pāri bādhaḥ* was emended to *paribādhaḥ*, here as well as in VIII.45.40 (see comm. there) by BR, fld. by Gr and Old, with Ge skeptical but not entirely opposed (see his n. 6c). I suggest in both passages instead to assume a haplology

of the impv. *bādhasva* in a putative sequence *pāri *bādhasva bādhaḥ*, a suggestion made also by Re on our passage here, as it turns out. In our passage we must also assume the gapping of **yuyodhi* with *āpa*, based on 104.6c *āpa ... dvayúm ... yuyodhi*.

IX.106

On the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. See also Old's assessment of the Uṣṇih variants, by ṛca.

IX.106.1–3: All three vss. in this ṛca contain final 4-syllable sequences that could be syntactically distanced from what precedes, hence a likely 8 8 / 8 4 Uṣṇih type (so also Old). In vs. 1 this piece is *svarvídaḥ*, the signature word that recurs in the same metrical position in 4 (as *svarvídā*) and 9.

Vss. 2 and 3 are also lexically linked: *sānasí-* (2a, 3b), *jaítrasya* (2c) / *-jít* (3d).

IX.106.1: As Re points out, the exact nuance of *śruṣṭí* is hard to pinpoint, but Ge's recessive adverb "willig" does not seem sufficient. Re also adduces II.3.9 *śruṣṭí ... jāyate*, similar to our *śruṣṭí jātāsaḥ*. I interpr. both passages to mean that the right ritual birth happens because of a/the god's attention to the process (Tvaṣṭar in II.3.9, Indra here).

IX.106.2: Both Ge and Re take *jaítrasya* as a noun 'victory', but with Gr I supply Indra as the referent for this vṛddhi adj. This would provide a thematic reciprocity between vss. 1 and 2: in 1 the soma drops are born because of Indra's attentive hearing (in my interpr.), while here Soma repays Indra's attention with his own.

IX.106.3: The etym. figure *grābhám grbhñīta* seems to belong to dicing vocab.; see comm. ad VIII.81.1 and Lü (Würfelspiel, 49–50).

Ge seems to take *grbhñīta* as opt. (which, of course, it can be), but this reading makes it even less compatible with the already loosely connected injunc. *bharat* conjoined by *ca* (see Klein, DGRV I.233). The publ. tr. takes both verbs as preterital injunctives, but I would now be inclined to see them, with KH (Injunk. 124), as general presents describing a regularly recurring situation: Indra's behavior when(ever) he is under the influence of soma. Hence "he grabs ... and he carries ..."

On the phrase *sám apsujít*, which constitutes an independent 4-syl. pāda in all 3 occurrences (here, VIII.13.2, VIII.36.1–6), see comm. ad VIII.13.2 and Scar's views cited there.

IX.106.4–6: Old classifies this ṛca as a third variety of Uṣṇih in which the last four syllables are technically separable but form part of a larger Jagatī pāda with the 8 syllables that precede. Although there is not the same semantic or syntactic distance as with some Uṣṇih vss., I'm not sure that Old's distinction between the two types is nec. As for ṛca unity, all three vss. concern themselves with Soma's ritual journey and the paths he takes. See esp. *pathi-* in 5c and 6c and the deconstruction of the bahuvrīhi *sahásra-yāman-* in 5c into the VP *sahásraṃ yāhi*, with the addition of *pathibhiḥ* to substitute for the noun *yāman-*. In this figure there's a nice little phonological interchange: *sahásrayāmā* : *sahásraṃyāhi* The dat. *indrāya* is also found in both 4b and 5a.

IX.106.7–9: Because of the distribution of word boundaries, the first two vss. of this *ṛca* make a separate 4-syllable *pāda* impossible (7 ... *soma naḥ sadaḥ*; 8 ... *amṛtāya kām papuḥ*), though vs. 9 ends with the signature *svarvīdaḥ*. Therefore this must be the 8 8 / 12 Uṣṇih variety. No striking thematic unity.

IX.106.7: On imperatival *sadaḥ*, see comm. ad IX.2.2.

IX.106.9: The pair of cmpds. *vr̥ṣṭí-dyāvo rīty-āpaḥ* is found in the same order in the dual in V.68.5 *vr̥ṣṭídyāvā rītyāpā* of Mitra and Varuṇa. In our passage the 2nd cmpd is unaccented and therefore a voc.; in V.68.5 it is accented and nom. Old suspects that our form should also have the accent, but of course there's no way to tell. (In any case the publ. tr., for simplicity, renders them as if both nom.). The more pressing question is what kind of cmpds they are. There is, of course, a vast lit. on the subject, interpr. these (and others) as verbal governing cmpds with the verbal element as first member. The Paradebeispiel in Vedic is *dāti-vāra-* 'giving choice things', and the type is regularly connected with the Greek βωτι-ἀνειρα 'nourishing men' type. See comm. ad V.58.2. This is not the place to treat this topic at length (see now my forthcoming *dāti-vāra-* paper), but it's worth pointing out that the two cmpds in our passage (and V.68.5), which figure prominently on the very short list of Vedic *dāti-vāra-* cmpds., almost surely don't belong to that type or show its semantics. Although AiG II.1.320 analyzes them as having a verbal 1st member governing the second, and cites parallel transitive VPs *riṇānn apāḥ* 'making the waters flow' (e.g., IX.109.22) and *varṣāya-dyām* 'making heaven rain' (V.63.3, 6; IX.96.3) (with, note, quite different transitive verb forms), the two cmpds formulaically belong more closely to intransitive idioms. In particular, the *-tí-*stem first members *rītí-* and *vr̥ṣṭí-* are found with the genitives *apām* and *diváh* twice *in the same passage*: VI.13.1 *divó vr̥ṣṭír ... rītír apām*; IX.108.10 *vr̥ṣṭím diváh ... rītím apām*. In other words, the two cmpds. only appear together (V.68.5, IX.106.9); independent syntagms of the same two elements are also found together. These two pairs are therefore formulaically matched, and this matching strongly suggests that the cmpds should be interpr. in the context of the free phrases and do not have transitive, governing value. Scar (526) provides a plausible first-pass analysis of *vr̥ṣṭí-dyu-* as a bahuvrīhi orig. meaning 'der Himmel mit Regen hat', but I do not follow him in developing it into 'den Himmel regnen lassen'. A similar analysis would produce for the other cmpd. 'having the waters with their streaming'. In other words, a bv of more or less the *vájra-bāhu-* type, 'having an arm with a mace' (in the mode of J. Schindler). I would now emend the transl. to "having the heaven with its rain and the waters with their flowing."

IX.106.10–12: In all cases it's possible to detach the last four syllables, but Old considers this *ṛca* to belong with those in which those syllables are integrated into a Jagatī line. As for thematic unity, all three vss. concern Soma's journey (but then what vss. do not?), and the 1st two mention the sheep's fleece filter. All three also concern the role of the verbal portion of the ritual and Soma's relation to it: he is "at the forefront of speech" (*ágre vācāḥ*) in 10c and begets speech (*vācam janáyan*) in 12c, while insights (*dhī-*) are used to impel him in 11a and thoughts (*matí-*) sound towards him in 11c.

IX.106.13–14: The last two extra vss. do not allow a detached 4-syllable unit, because the word boundaries don't coincide.

IX.106.13: The well-loved pun *haryatā*- 'delightful' and *hāri*- 'tawny, fallow bay' is found here.

IX.106.14: The fem. instr. *ayā* opening this final vs. seems to fulfill the same role as *evā* in other hymn-summary vss. Both Ge and Re supply a noun with it (Laütering / clarification), but though the use of the fem. seems to invite something more than a semi-adverbial 'in this way', the model of hymn-summary vss. seems to me to outweigh that consideration.

IX.107–8: The next two hymns consist of pragāthas made up of various mixed lyric meters: in 107 mostly Br̥hatī (8 8 / 12 8) alternating with Satobr̥hatī (12 8 / 12 8), in 108 mostly Kakubh (8 12 / 8) alternating with Satobr̥hatī.

IX.107

IX.107.1–3: The first metrical unit in the hymn has a third vs. appended to the pragātha with a 2-pāda configuration of 12 8, identified by the Anukr. as Dvipadā Virāj Bhurij. Arnold (248, E72) analyses vss. 2-3 as simply an extended Satobr̥hatī (12 8 / 12 8 / 12 8). See Old (Proleg. 104–5) on the types of extensions of pragāthas, incl. this one. Since vs. 3 simply hangs off vs. 2 and need not be syntactically independent, the "extension" suggestion is quite plausible.

The vss. are knitted together by lexical repetition and variation. A sample of the lexical evidence: *apsú* is found in 1c, 2c; *uttamám* (1b) is picked up by *úttaram* (2d); the three instr. pl. *ádribhiḥ* (1d), *ávibhiḥ* (2a), *góbhiḥ* (2d) echo each other – the first two phonologically, the 2nd and 3rd semantically.

IX.107.1: The vs. begins with a most unusual sandhi: *pārītó śīñcatā*. Ge (n. 1a; cf. ZDMG 65: 307) suggests that it is Prakritizing. Old and Re, less dramatically, consider it to be based on IX.63.10 *pārīto vāyāve sutām*, where the sandhi of *itās* is correct. (Ge also cites this vs.) Re points out that that vs. ends with *śīñcata* and suggests that the unusual sandhi here "résulte de l'assemblage des extrémités du v. 63,10." Although the invocation of 63.10 seems apposite, it doesn't entirely explain the sandhi we find here. The *-o* of *pārītó* can be explained as the adoption of this word sequence from its position before vd. C in 63.10, but the retroflexion in *śīñcatā* does not follow. In fact, in 63.10, though *śīñcata* occurs after *-u* (*vāreṣu śīñcata*), there is no ruki-induced retroflexion over morpheme boundary (nor do we expect it). Instead I think we must explain the retroflexion as an effect of the preverb *pāri*. By far the greatest number of the retroflexed initials of this root occur immediately after *pāri*, esp. the passive stem (*pari*) *śicyá*- (15 exx.), but also the ppl. *pāriṣikta*- (8x); see also, in the next hymn (IX.108.7), our exact 2nd pl. act. impv. *pāri śīñcata*. There is also retroflexion after the preverb *ní* (5+), and after the particles *tū* (2x) and *hí* (1x). All of these are contact-induced, unlike our example, where the preverb is separated from the verb. Under these circumstances, there is ordinarily no retroflexion (see *pāri ... śīñcata* X.32.5, *pāri ... siktāḥ* IX.97.15). However, here I think either the

numerous exx. of *pāri* √*ṣic* in IX (15+) imposed distant retroflexion here where it was phonologically unmotivated, or an unretroflexed initial was changed redactionally under the influence of *pāri* *ṣiñcata* in the next hymn.

IX.107.2: The 2nd hemistich of this vs. is intricately interwoven with constituents overlapping; see Old's sensible treatment at loc. The initial loc. expression consists of *suté cit ... apsú*, with *tvā* interspersed in modified 2nd position. This *tvā* is not to be construed with the nearby verb *madāma* (pace Gr), because *māda-* without preverb is almost never construed with an acc.; here that verb goes with the instr. *āndhasā*. The *tvā* finally finds its governing verb form in the participle *śrīñāntaḥ* beginning pāda d; it is so distant from it, with parts of two different constituents in between, because it took Wackernagel's position in the clause. The adj. *úttaram* at the very end of the vs. modifies it: the soma is "higher" or "better" at this point presumably because the mixing with milk, the last step depicted, improves it.

IX.107.3: Both Ge and Re make this vs. a separate cl., supplying a verb ("fliesst," "coule"), generated from *pāri* *srava* in 2a, suggested by the init. *pāri* in 3a. This is certainly possible, but since this vs. is an afterthought to the pragātha, I take it as dependent on vs. 2, specifically 2ab, simply stringing together more descriptors of soma.

Note *cákṣase ... vicakṣanāḥ*.

IX.107.4–5: Both vss. describing Soma taking his seat (4c, 5b). There is also concatenation between pragāthas: the final word of 5, *vicakṣanāḥ*, matches that of vs. 3, the final word of its metrical grouping. And the first word of vs. 4, *punānāḥ*, is reprised as the beginning of 6 (and echoes the same participle in the 2nd position in 2a).

IX.107.5: Gr, Ge, Re all take *dhūtāḥ* to √*dhū* 'shake', but given *apsú dhūtā-* in IX.62.5, X.104.2, I prefer √*dhū*, *dhāv* 'rinse'.

IX.107.6–7: The c pādas of these two vss. are identically constructed: *tvām vípro* [6] / *kavír* [7] *abhavo* SPLV. Vs. 7 repeats the word *vípra-* along with *ṛṣí-* in 7b, so the pragātha seems to have a preoccupation with the varieties of poet.

IX.107.6: The impv. *mimikṣa* probably belongs to √*myakṣ* 'provide, etc'. See Kü (387–88).

IX.107.7: The two splvs ending the a and c pādas show a nice phonological relationship: (*gātu-*) *vít-tama-* and (*deva-*) *vī-tama*, with interchange between long vowel + single cons. and short vowel + geminate in otherwise identical phonetic sequences, an effect reminiscent of MIA quantitative trade-offs.

IX.107.8–9: The 2nd hemistich of vs. 8 and the first of vs. 9 have a refrain-like structure reminiscent of the echo pādas in Atyaṣṭi, which is unusual for this meter: 8cd ... *harítā yāti dhārayā, mandráyā yāti dhārayā*##; 9ab ... *góbhir akṣāḥ, ... dugdhābhir akṣāḥ*##.

IX.107.8: Since *ásvayā* is fem., the tr. should be emended to “with a golden mare.” See Ge’s disc. (n. 8cd) and dismissal of Roth’s proposed emendation (also rejected by Old), to bring out the comparison of the stream of soma to the urine stream of a horse, which, as Ge points out, is still possible without emendation.

IX.107.9: Both instances of *akṣāḥ* should probably be read with distracted 2nd syllable, to provide the right no. of syllables in b and the right cadence in both pādas. In addition, pāda a is metrically deficient, even with this distracted reading. We expect a 12-syl. pāda in the Satobṛhatī that provides the 2nd vss. of the pragāthas in this hymn; the Anukr. simply identifies the vs. instead as a Bṛhatī, which should have an 8-syl. pāda in this position. Even without distracted *akṣāḥ*, it would have 9 syllables, and with the distraction 10. Best to consider it a deficient Satobṛhatī, which is the vs.-form expected, than an over-abundant Bṛhatī. As for ways to make up the deficiency, see Old. A distracted reading of *anūpé* would provide at least one more syllable as well as a standard 4-syl. opening; however, neither etym. (**anu-Hp-á*; see EWA s.v.) nor the other occurrence of the stem (X.27.23) favors this distraction. Old rather exasperatedly suggests that the metrical disturbances in this vs. (see also the Triṣṭubh cadence of c in a 12-syl. pāda) may result from “mangelhaftes Formgefühl des Vfs.”

IX.107.10–11: Little overt cohesion. The adv. *tiráḥ* ‘across’ referring to the filter is found in both vss. (10b, 11a). And the part. *s(u)vānā-* in 10a echoes the occurrences in vss. 3 and 8.

IX.107.10: With Ge, Re, KH (133), in the publ. tr. I supply a verb in ab. I now think this may be unnec. The impetus was the apparent change of person between the first hemistich and the second: with voc. *soma* in pāda a but a 3rd ps. verb (*viśat*) with Soma as subj. in c. However, as in vs. 12 the 3rd-ps. verb may result from attraction to the simile (*jāno ná purí ... viśat* “as a man enters a fortress”), and the underlying person could be 2nd throughout; see *dadhiṣe* in d. It is hard to convey the change in Engl. but something like “O Soma, while you are being pressed by the stones here across the sheep’s fleeces, as a man enters a fortress, as tawny one (you enter) into the two cups. You have established ...” KH (133) argues that the changes of ps. mark pāda c as parenthetic, allowing it to be interpr. in his “general” sense. This sense should be possible even without branding the pāda as a parenthesis.

IX.107.12–13: No particular signs of cohesion. River(s) appear in both vss., but with different words (*síndhu-* 12b, *nadī-* 13d). *jāgrviḥ* in 12c echoes the one in 6a.

IX.107.12: The first hemistich of this vs. is structured exactly like the more expansive 10a–c above: with a vocative *soma* in the 1st pāda and a following 3rd ps. verb (*pipyē*), which owes its 3rd ps. to attraction to the simile surrounding it, *síndhur ná ... árṇasā*. Ge (n. 12b) explicitly attributes the 3rd ps. *pipyē* to “Attraktion an den Vergleich,” though he keeps the 2nd and 3rd ps. strictly separate in vs. 10. The 2nd ps. in the publ. tr., “you have swollen forth,” should, strictly speaking, be in parens.

Ge and Re make heavier weather of the 2nd hemistich than I think nec. or desirable. Because they strictly break the syntax at the end of b, they need to find

something to do with the instr. phrase that opens c, *aṃśóḥ páyasā*, which then leads them to interpr. *jāgrviḥ* as (unprecedentedly) transitive, which then leads them to supply an obj. for it – way too much machinery for something that can be far more simply interpr. The impetus for all this, the instr. phrase in c, can easily be taken as part of the simile/frame construction starting in b, with *páyasā* corresponding to *árṇasā* in the simile.

Now, as to their transitive *jāgrvi-*. To be fair, it is not only the instr. phrase at the beginning of the pāda but also the apparent ineptness of the simile *madiró ná jāgrviḥ* that lead them to their baroque interpr. The problem with the simile is that it seems to be a straight description of Soma, not a simile: the apparent meaning “wakeful like an exhilarating drink” or “like a wakeful exhilarating drink” is a fine literal (or as literal as we get in the RV) characterization of soma. Both *madirá-* and *jāgrvi-* regularly modify Soma, the latter even in vs. 6 in this same hymn. As Ge says (n. 12c), “*ná* als Vergleichswort macht Schwierigkeit.” And so both scholars search for ways to make this a *real* simile, which requires both words to be given senses they don’t ordinarily have. They take *madirá-* as referring to alcohol or some inebriating drink other than soma – even though it is never so used in the RV. And then, though *jāgrvi-* only means ‘wakeful’ in the RV as far as I can tell, including in vs. 6, they take it as expressing the effect that this other drink has on its drinkers: making wakeful, invigorating. And this all adds up to “Avec le lait de ta tige, toi (qui rends l’homme) vif comme (fait l’alcool) enivrant ...” / “Mit der Milch des Stengels munter (machend) wie der berauschende (Branntwein) ...” Although I realize that the simile is awkwardly comparing soma with a standard description of itself, the cure suggested by Ge/Re seems worse than the disease. I have several, not particularly satisfying suggestions for why we get a simile here. It may be that it is part of a simile chain: soma compared to a river, which in turn is compared to soma. See VII.103.7ab (the frog hymn), where the frogs are compared to brahmins, who are in turn compared to frogs. Or else the animatized Soma the god is compared to soma the drink. But in any case, I prefer to accept the simile at face value, however clumsy, rather than erecting a fantastic superstructure by reinterpreting standard somic descriptors.

IX.107.14–16: Like vss. 1–3, this pragātha has a two-pāda addition (vs. 16), also 12 8. Both 14 and 15 contain the part. *pávamāna-*; all three vss. contain forms of *samudrá-*, *samudríya-*, while 16 repeats the phrase *rājā devāḥ* from 15b. In 16 *haryatāḥ* recalls the same word in 13a, and *vīcakṣaṇāḥ* those in 3b, 5d. The voc. of this stem is found in vs. 24.

IX.107.15: On Soma identified as “truth” (*ṛtām*), see IX.97.23, IX.108.8, and Lü 581–82. Although *ṛtām bṛhāt* could be an acc. goal here, the parallels, esp. the identical pāda in the next hymn, IX.108.8, support a nom. identification. In IX.97.23–24 Soma is also identified as a king (*rājā* 24b) as here and as ‘possessing *dhárman*’ (*dharmā* 23c), reminiscent of *dhármaṇā* here.

The Pp. analyses *árṣan* opening c as injunc. *árṣat*, while the publ. tr. assumes a nom. sg. pres. part. *árṣan*. Either is of course possible, but the parallelism with vs. initial *tárat* may support the finite verb interpr., as Old points out. So an alt. tr. would be: “he rushes ...” See Hoffmann (117) on this vs.; he is surely right that the two injunctives

should receive the same interpr., rather than Re's indic. pres. *tárat*, modal *árṣat*, and Hoffmann's "general" pres. interpr. seems apt here for both.

IX.107.17–18: No particular internal cohesion, but a number of ties with other parts of the hymn. The Āyus are found in 17d as the groomers of Soma, while in 14a they were identified with him. The verb *arṣati* (17c) returns from 15c (see also 4b, 5c), and *avyata* (18d) from 13a. The phrase *apó vásānah* (18c) is also found in 4a, and see disc. of the rest of 18c below.

IX.107.17: The enclitic *ī* in d could stand for **īm* in this sandhi position before *mṛjanti* with degemination.

IX.107.18: Soma as *úttara-* is also found in 2d, where it is also associated with cows: *śrīṇanto góbbhir úttaram* "preparing you [*tvā* 2c] with cows as the higher (oblation)"; see comm. there. I supply 'oblation' in both instances because of 1b *sómo yá uttamám havíḥ*.

IX.107.19–20: This is the first and only place in the hymn in which the 1st person is found. The speaker's eagerness for fellowship with Soma, who is addressed directly, and his admission of his troubles give an intimate and almost confessional tone. Both vss. have the 1st sg. prn. *ahám*, a form of *sakhyá-*, a form of *dív-* 'day', and the voc. to *babhrú-* 'brown one' and are tightly connected, also structurally (see disc. ad 20).

IX.107.19: The indic. pf. of *√ran* is presential in value; see Kü (413). The form here echoes *raṇyati* in 18b.

The lexeme *ní√car* (or *ní áva√car*) is found nowhere else in the RV or later. The context clearly requires a negative sense; I've used the colloquial English idiom "get (s.o.) down," meaning 'discourage, demoralize'. There are two ways to interpr. *áva* at the end of the pāda. With Gr (and implicitly Ge and Re), I take it as a 2nd preverb with *caranti*. Since *ní* and *áva* both mean 'down', it reinforces by variation, hence my "—way down." As Ge reports (n. 19c), Ludwig takes *áva* rather as the impv. to *√av* 'help', accented because it starts a new clause. This is perfectly possible and would fit the context, but I prefer the more unusual semantic doubling of the preverbs in this emotional context.

There are various suggestions about what to supply with *purūṇi*: Sāy. *rákṣāmsi*, fld. tentatively by Ge ("böse Geister?"), Re "choses (dangereuses)." Leaving it open seems to me the better solution: the poet is besieged by multiple things he cannot even name.

In the last pāda it is Soma who is urged to "go past the barriers" (*paridhīn*); we might have expected the poet to ask Soma for help in getting past them himself (but see next vs.). For Soma's journey past the *paridhīn* Ge and Re cite IX.96.11 *paridhīm̐r āporṇu* "open up the barriers." In both passages the *paridhī-* are presumably obstacles to Soma's progress on his ritual journey, perhaps the tufts of the fleece filter.

IX.107.20: This vs. is identical in conceptual structure to 19. The first hemistich expresses the 1st-ps. speaker's constant close relationship to Soma, using the word *sakhyá-* 'fellowship' and an "every day" expression (*divé-dive* in 19b, *náktam utá ... divā*

in 20a). The 2nd iteration is more intimate than the first: in 19 the poet simply rejoices in his fellowship, but in 20 he is “at your udder for fellowship” (*sakhyāya ... ūdhani*, suggesting a mother/child suckling relationship).

As for this *ūdhanī*: because this occurrence is followed by the phrase *ghṛṇā tāpantam* “scorching with its heat” and because *ūdhar / ūdhan-* is found in V.34.3 in opposition to *ghṛaṃsá-* ‘heat’, Re suggests that the two passages need to be interpr. in conjunction with each other. For Re this means rejecting the existence of an independent (*ūdhar / ūdhan-* meaning ‘cold’ (accepted by Ge, EWA, and me), since ‘cold’ does not work in our passage. But I do subscribe to the two *ūdhan-* view—see comm. ad VIII.2.12—with the one here belonging to the dominant ‘udder’ stem. I simply consider the mention of scorching heat in the next hemistich to be coincidence.

The 2nd hemistich matches that of 19. In 19 the poet complains about his afflictions and then invites Soma to pass beyond the barriers. In this vs. the escape presumably effected by Soma in 19 provides the model for the one made by “us.” Just as Soma was to go “beyond the barriers” (*paridhīṃr āti*) so did we fly (*paptīma*) “beyond the sun” (*āti sūryam*)—far beyond it (*pārah*). The sun scorching with its heat, described in c, corresponds to the many things that got me down in 19c, and in both d pādas these troubles are overcome, passed beyond. Soma’s presumably successful journey beyond the barriers—barriers that are probably ritually related (see above)—makes it possible for us to overcome our own difficulties with triumphant flight.

IX.107.21–22: Lexical cohesion: *mṛjyāmānaḥ* opening 21a echoed by *mṛjānāḥ* opening 22a; *pāvamāna* 21d, 22a, c; *aṛṣasi* 21d, 22d.

IX.107.21: Both Ge and Re construe *samudré* with *mṛjyāmānaḥ* (e.g., “Im Meer sauber gemacht”), but surely our passage can’t be separated from IX.12.6 *prá vācam índur iṣyati, samudrásyādhī viṣṭāpi* “The drop sends forth his speech upon the surface of the sea,” a passage adduced by Ge (n. 21b) without comment.

IX.107.23–24: Both vss. contain the impv. *pāvasva* (*/ pavasva*), and the mention of the sea in 23 is balanced by the earthly and heavenly realms in 24. Still, little evidence of cohesion.

IX.107.23: The injunc. *ví dhārayaḥ* in c, in conjunction with *prathamāḥ*, invites a dual reading, both cosmogonic in the past and the ritual present. Hoffmann doesn’t cite this passage.

IX.107.24: Notice the number disharmony in *pārthivam rájo, divyā ca* “the earthly realm and the heavenly (ones).”

IX.107.25–26: No particular signs of cohesion.

IX.107.25: Pāda c is a clever twist on 17ab *índrāya ... marútvate sutāḥ* “pressed for Indra and the Maruts.” In 17 the recipients of the soma are straightforwardly expressed, but in our vs. the expression is oblique. Indra is present not directly, but in the adj. *indriyá-* ‘Indriyan, suitable for/associated with Indra (and Indra’s powers)’, which modifies the

soma drops identified as horses. The adj. *marútvantaḥ* also modifies these drops/horses. On the one hand, I think this is meant to associate the Maruts with Indra, as usual, and identify them as the prototypical recipients of soma; on the other hand, however, the drop-horses are metaphorically associated with the Maruts in full gallop on their regularly described journeys. The double sense would be better conveyed by a transl. “the exhilarating courses, accompanied by the Maruts, fit for Indra along with the Maruts ...”

The fem. stem *medhā-* of course means ‘wisdom’ and is so interpr. here by everyone (incl. me). But its explicit coordination with *práyāmsi* “pleasing offerings” (*medhām abhí práyāmsi cá*) invites, to my mind, a secondary reading associating it with *médha-* ‘ritual offering/meal’. For other possible conflation of *medhā-* and *médha-* see EWA s.v. *médha-*.

IX.107.26: *apó vásānaḥ* returns from 4b, 18c, along with the verb *árṣa-*, ubiquitous in this hymn.

gāḥ ‘cows’ needs to be read with both c and d. In the former it is the referent of the hapax *mandánāḥ* (whose sense is, however, easy to divine) and the obj. of the caus. redupl. aor. ‘causes to bellow’; in the latter it is the obj. of *kṛṇvānāḥ* and the target of the simile: “making the cows as if into his garment” (a simile that of course depends on a metaphor: cows = milk). I consider the *ná* to be displaced – we might expect **nirṇíjaṃ ná*. This pāda, in this order, is also found in IX.14.5; for variants on the phrase without simile particle see IX.86.26, 95.1, all adduced by Ge (n. 26d).

IX.108

On the structure of the hymn see publ. intro. It consists of pragāthas alternating Kakubh (8 12 / 8) with Satobṛhatī (12 8 / 12 8). The Anukr. attributes the hymn to seven different poets, but the vss. assigned to them generally violate the pragātha division, which, as the publ. intro. indicates, is often reinforced by syntactic structure. The Anukr. also identifies vs. 13 as Gāyatrī Yavamadhyā, but it can be analyzed as a reasonably well-behaved Kakubh.

IX.108.1–2: There is syntactic dependence between the two vss., at least by my reading: 2ab depends on vs. 1, while 2cd consists of a new cl., with a change of person. The Anukr. attributes the two vss. to Gaurivīti Śāktya; there is some support for this, in that V.29 (one of the three other hymns attributed to him [also X.73–74]) has an allusion to the myth involving Etaśa, the sun’s horse (V.29.5), who appears in our 2d.

IX.108.2: This vs. presents us with a syntactic trap of sorts. It appears to consist of a standard REL / COREL construction, with 2a beginning *yásya te* and 2c beg. *sá*. And indeed the rel. and the *sá* are coreferential; however, the grammatical person has changed from 2nd to 3rd. I therefore prefer (contra Ge/Re) to attach 2ab to the previous vs., in which Soma is also 2nd ps. Pāda b acts as a transition from Soma as 2nd ps. to Soma as 3rd ps., with *asyá* referring to him, but the parallelism between the two “drinking” expressions keeps it within the syntactic domain of the rel. clause.

I have silently converted *yásya* into *yád*, since “upon drinking of which – of you -” is unparsable, or at least exceptionally awk., in English.

The gerund *pītvā* in a is echoed by the *i*-stem loc. *pītā* in b.

On the unexpected accent of *suprāketa-*, as opposed to *supraketá-* (4x), see Old, who has no good explanation (nor do I).

IX.108.3–4: Vs. 4 is clearly syntactically dependent on vs. 3, with a series of three rel. cl. introduced by *yéna* referring to Soma, the 2nd ps. subj. of 3.

IX.108.4: Although pāda a treats the mythological past—the opening of the Vala cave (Navagva) and Dadhyañc’s presumably similar exploit (see his connection with cow pens in X.48.2)—the verb is present tense *aporñuté*, where we might expect an impf., a pres. injunc., or a pf. The two parallel *yéna* clauses have perfects. Hoffmann does not comment on this usage.

The pf. *āpiré* in b takes the partitive gen. *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* in c. As in the other occurrences of this phrase (IX.70.2, 4, 110.4) with Ge I take this as a reference to the heavenly soma, with the nominalized neut. *amṛta-* ‘(drink) of immortality’. See comm. ad IX.70.2 and, on supposed masc. *cāruṇaḥ*, VIII.5.14. Re supplies instead ‘principe’: “au beau (principe) immortel.” This is the only finite med. form of the well-attested pf. to $\sqrt{āp}$, beside two occurrences of the part. Kü. (118) asserts that the medial forms have the “inattingent” sense ‘have success’ (implicitly interpr. our form here without the partitive gen. obj.), but he does not cite this passage. Ge (n. 4c) seems to suggest something of the same thing as an alternative, but making *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* dependent on *sumné* as he suggests does not seem to me to work. Although it might seem circular for the poets to acquire a share of (heavenly) soma through (earthly) soma, this is exactly the point also of IX.70.2. See comm. ad loc

I cannot detect the semantic nuance between $\sqrt{āp}$ ‘acquire’ (*āpiré* b) and $\sqrt{(n)aś}$ ‘attain’ (*ānaśúḥ* d). In this passage the first has a more material object, the second an immaterial one, but this distribution does not hold elsewhere.

I take the pl. *śrávaṃsi* as distributive: each one of the pl. subj. acquires his own *śrávaḥ*.

IX.108.5–6: The 1st hemistich of vs. 6 is a relative cl. in the 3rd ps. dependent on vs. 5, also in the 3rd ps. The 2nd hemistich of 6 switches to 2nd ps.

IX.108.6: Ge suggests that pāda a concerns the Vṛtra myth and b the Vala myth, based primarily on *āpya-* ‘watery’ as a descriptor of the cows in the former. This does not seem to me sufficient evidence, esp. because *āpya-* is not elsewhere used in connection with the Vṛtra myth. In his n. (6b) Ge appears amenable to a unitary interpr. of ab, as only depicting the Vala myth, as I also take it, though why the cows are ‘watery’ isn’t clear to me. Ge’s alternative explanation, involving X.67.5, does not seem terribly strong. It suggest it may be connected with the waters used in the ritual preparation of soma; see vs. 7.

On *abhí√tan* see comm. ad VIII.6.25.

IX.108.7–8: Once again the 2nd vs. is syntactically dependent on the 1st in this pragātha: 8ab is couched in the acc., continuing the acc. phrase in 7bc, and 8cd is a rel. cl. whose antecedent is the acc. phrase.

IX.108.7: This vs. contains two sleight-of-hand manoeuvres. The first involves the simile and frame with *pári śīñcata* ‘sprinkle around’. This verb ordinarily takes an acc. of the liquid sprinkled; see for ex. the immed. preceding hymn with the same lexeme: IX.107.1 *pári ... śīñcata sutām* “sprinkle around the pressed (drink).” But the acc. in the simile, *ásvaṃ ná* is the target of the sprinkling, not the liquid. So although the cases agree (implicitly: there is no expressed acc. in the frame), they have different syntactic functions (the opposite of my “case disharmony”). So Ge explicitly (n. 7a). For horses as obj. with \sqrt{sic} , see IV.43.6 *sindhur ha vāṃ rasáyā śīñcad ásvān* “The Sindhu River sprinkles your [=Ásvins’] horses with the Rasā.”

The 2nd sleight of hand follows immediately. Both the verb and the string of acc. that follow demand the obj. **sómam*, but instead we find the near rhyme form *stómam* ‘praise’. Rather than emend this to the easier reading (as Old seems inclined to do, along with numerous others; see his comm.), it is better to accept the implicit equation of the two ritual elements: the offered liquid and the offered words. This is not the only place in the RV where this trope is found.

IX.108.8: On Soma as truth see IX.97.23, 107.15.

IX.108.9–10: These two vss. are syntactically independent but linked by the theme of rain.

IX.108.9: The impv. *didīhí* in b is accented because it follows the pāda-init. complex voc. phrase *īśas pate*. On the impv. and its twin *dīdihí* with switched quantity, see Old ad loc. The well-attested redupl. formation(s) to $\sqrt{dī}$, a perfect transitioning to a redupl. pres. (see, e.g., my “The Vedic Perfect Imperative” [Fs. Lubotsky, 2018]: 58–59), show a long \bar{i} in the root syllable only in the impv. *didīhí* (1x accented, 11x unacc.); the weak forms otherwise show only *dīdi-*, incl. the competing impv. *dīdihí* (1x accented, 17x unacc.). They are mostly distributed metrically: *dīdihí* is found almost exclusively in final position in a Jagatī or iambic dimeter line; *didīhi* regularly takes final position in a Triṣṭubh line. But a few examples of both forms are found in metrically unfavorable places. E.g., in VIII.60.6 *dīdihí* occurs after a 5-syl. opening; although HEAVY LIGHT is an attested break, LIGHT LIGHT (**dīdihí*, to an unattested stem form) would be better. Likewise, our form, found after a 4-syl. opening, presents an unusual LHL break, though neither **dīdihí* nor **dīdihí* would give the most favored break. (Old states that we would expect **dīdihí* here, but does not suggest emending because there are several other exx. of LHL breaks in this hymn.) It is also worth noting that *didīhi* is found several times in the curious phrase ... *sām īṣo didīhi (naḥ)*# “illuminate our refreshments entirely” (III.3.7, 54.22, V.4.2), and our passage contains the voc. *īśas pate* “o lord of refreshment,” so that the presence of *īśaḥ* may have triggered the *didīhi* variant here. As for the source of the variation, it’s possible that transposing the Jagatī/iambic-final *dīdihí* into a Triṣṭubh cadence may have led to an almost mechanical balancing of quantities (on the model of alternations like *vavardh-* / *vāvrđh-*), and then both forms were sometimes used outside of their original places (including *didīhi* in Jagatī/iambic cadences, with the addition of final *naḥ* [III.3.7, V.25.2]), though this seems too convenient an explanation.

The notion that “the middle bucket” (*kóśa- madhyamá-*) is the rain cloud goes back to Sāy. and makes good sense, esp. given the explicit rain in the next vs. (10c). It is

possible that the impv. *didīhí* ‘illuminate’ in the first hemistich is meant to evoke lightning in this context, although it is not otherwise found in this usage, as far as I can tell.

IX.108.10: On this usage of *ā√vañc* see comm. ad IX.2.2. This same phrase *ā vacyasva* (...) *camvòḥ* is found in IX.97.2.

I take *viśām ... viśpātiḥ* to be a syntagm like *gaṇānām ... gaṇápatim* “troop-lord of troops” (II.23.1), with the simile *váhnir ná* interposed. The expression in II.23.1 also has an interposed word, though just a Wackernagel enclitic *tvā*. Ge takes the *viś-* words as part of the simile, “wie ein zu Wagen fahrender Clanfürst” (and folds the gen. pl. *viśām* into its headnoun). He suggests an alternative (n. 10b) closer to mine, though again with the gen. elided: “wie ein Wagenross, du der Clanfürst.” And, with the aid of parentheses, Re gets three separate NPs out of it: “tel un chef de clan, (maître) des clans, conducteur (du char).”

The syntagms *vṛṣṭím diváh ... rītím apām* exactly replicate the problematic compds *vṛṣṭi-dyāvo rīty-āpaḥ* in nearby IX.106.8. See comm. there. Whether there is any direct functional relationship between the compds and the syntagms, the two sequences must be considered together. As for these two acc. phrases in context here, the publ. tr. considers them to be the self-product of soma’s purification (“purify yourself into ...”), but it’s also possible that the *ā* that opens the vs. should be understood here as well, with the meaning “attract through purification” – hence “attract through purification the rain of heaven and the streaming of waters.”

IX.108.11–12: These two vss. are syntactically independent but both concern Soma as bull (*vṛṣabhá-* 11b, *vṛṣan-* 12a).

IX.108.11: The accentuation of *diváh* poses problems. *Pace* Ge (n. 11b), who considers *diváh* a gen. sg. with unusual accent, I take it as acc. pl. (flg. Old, in turn fld. by Re and Lü 202). Given the correctly accented gen./abl. sg. *diváh* in the immediately preceding vs. (10c), it is hard to believe that the poet would get the accent wrong, esp. in this exceptionally common form. As Old suggests, *√duh* takes a double acc. here. On *diváh* as acc. pl., see also AiG III.226–27.

IX.108.12: On the “threefold” (*tridhātu*) nature of Soma’s clothing, see comm. ad IX.70.8.

IX.108.13–14: The main cl. in these two vss. consists of the first two words of 13, *sá sunve* “he is pressed,” followed by a series of rel. cl. that fill the rest of 13 (four *yáh* clauses, all nominal, with a single predicate *ānetā* and four dependent genitives) and all of 14 (three *yásya* clause, one *yéna*, with one finite verb for the *yásya* cl. and one for the *yéna*).

IX.108.14: The nom., acc., voc., and gen. pl. of *marút-* do not fit any standard RVic cadence. It is not surprising then that though instr. *marúdbhiḥ* and dat./abl. *marúdbhyaḥ* are regularly found in cadences, the other forms are almost entirely absent. Pāda b has a nom. pl. in the cadence (made worse by the fact that the word is preceded by a light

syllable, (*yá*)*syā*. VII.32.10 has the same sequence, also in a double *yásyā* construction. Most of the few other cadential forms are found in dimeter vs. (e.g., VIII.3.21, VIII.7.30).

IX.108.15–16: No particular signs of cohesion, but see the ring compositional elements connecting vs. 15 to the 1st vs. of the hymn.

IX.108.15: As pointed out in the publ. intro., the beginning of vs. 1, *pávasva mádhumattama, índrāya soma ...*, recurs here, framing the vs., which begins *índrāya soma* and ends with the pāda *pávasva mádhumattama*.

IX.109–14

These last hymns in the maṇḍala are composed in a variety of meters; the first three are assorted; the last three are in paṅkti.

IX.109

IX.109.1–3: No particular signs of cohesion, beyond the mention of Soma's divine recipients in vss. 1–2. Vs. 3 begins with a possibly summary *evā*.

IX.109.4–6: All three vss. contain the impv. *pavasva*. Vss. 5–6 both contain *śukrá-*, also found in 3. And *pīyūṣaḥ* in 6 reprises the same word at the end of 3.

IX.109.6: On Soma's expansion (*vídharman(i)*) see comm. ad IX.4.9, 64.9.

IX.109.7–9: Unlike the previous *tr̥ca* with repeated *pavasva*, each vs. of this *tr̥ca* has a different form or $\sqrt{pū}$: 7 *pávasva*, 8 *pūtaḥ*, 9 *punānáḥ*. The person switches from the 2nd sg. that has prevailed throughout the hymn to 3rd ps. in vs. 8.

IX.109.7: The morphological identity of *mahā́m* is uncertain: it could be acc. sg. (m.) (see AiG III.251, etc.) or gen. pl. to *mā́h-* (so Gr) – or, in my opinion, nom. sg. masc. to *mahā́nt-*. Most (Old, Ge, Re, Lub) take it as an acc., supplying ‘fleece’ or ‘back’, hence “along the great (fleece) of the sheep.” For detailed disc. see Old ad loc. and ad II.24.11. Although this is certainly possible, the filter is not usually so described. A similar problem arises with a gen. pl. interpr., acdg. to which it would modify *ávīnā́mi* “of the great sheep.” Since the most likely entity to be called ‘great’ in this vs. is Soma (cf., e.g., *mahā́n samudráḥ* in vs. 4, I think it likely that the form is nom. sg. In this sandhi position (before vowel) we would expect *mahā́m̐* (cf., e.g., IX.66.16 *mahā́m̐ asī*), but I suggest that the *anunāsika* was redactionally changed to *m* because the form was reinterp. as a gen. pl. modifying immed. following *ávīnā́m*.

IX.109.8: It is not certain how to construe *vísṽāni* with *kṣarat*, and how this is decided will also determine what to supply with the adj. Forms of $\sqrt{kṣar}$ ‘stream’ without preverb generally do not take an obj. or an *Inhaltsakk.* (though cf. IX.35.3, 61.3, 86.37 for the latter), though it is found with an acc. of goal or extent of space (e.g., IX.33.2, 63.14). In vss. 16, 17 in this hymn, *akṣāḥ* has intrans. value, though in vs. 16 with accusatives of the space traversed. If we take the verb in that sense, *vísṽāni* could pick up *vísṽā ... dhā́ma* in

vs. 4, with the sense “stream to/across all (domains).” However, the phrase *viśvāni drāviṇāni* “all goods” might give us pause, and suggest that *kṣārat* here takes an Inhaltsakk., “stream all (goods).” There is no way to decide, and both may be meant. Ge, Re, and KH (123) all opt for the latter.

IX.109.9: In all clear cases *urāṇá-* is passive, ‘being chosen’ (see comm. ad IV.6.3). Gr, Ge, and Re all take it as trans. with *prajāṃ* as obj., but there is no reason why this acc. can’t be taken as an obj. of *kārat*, parallel to *viśvāni drāvaṇāni*.

kārat opening the 2nd hemistich rhymes with *kṣārat* in the same position in vs. 8. Nonetheless they are morphologically divergent, with *kārat* a subjunctive and *kṣārat* an injunc. Despite their parallelism *kṣārat* is unlikely to have modal value anticipating *kārat*; KH (123 and n. 26) convincingly takes *kṣārat* in “general” sense.

IX.109.10–12: Once again, three different forms of the root $\sqrt{pū}$: 10 *pávasva*, 11 *punánti*, 12 *pavítre*, all hemistich-initial. The washing/grooming of Soma as horse is found in vss. 10 and 12. The phrase *krátve dáksāya* (10) is repeated from vs. 2, though in different metrical position.

IX.109.13–15: The adj. *cāru-* ‘dear’ occurs in 13 and 14. The gods as recipients of soma figure in 14–15.

IX.109.14: This vs. presents a double ambiguity. On the one hand *cāru índrasya nāma* can mean either “the dear name of Indra” (as Ge/Re take it) or “the name dear to Indra”; the question is whether the name Soma bears is “Indra,” as the first alternative implies, or “Soma,” with the second. I prefer the second, since constructing a plausible reason why Soma would be called Indra is difficult: Ge’s (n. 14) “er wirkt in Indra and führt so dessen Namen” doesn’t seem sufficient to me.

The second ambiguity is located in the 2nd hemistich and has two parts: what/who is the referent of *yéna* and who is the subj. of *jaghāna*? The Ge/Re interpr. seems to take the referent of *yéna* to be “the name Indra” and the subj. of the verb to be Soma (though neither is explicit about it). I recognize that this would be a pleasing paradox, since Indra is the default agent in this formula. But I wonder if instead Indra is the subj. of his signature verb, and *yéna* refers to soma, with the name equivalent to the substance.

IX.109.16–18: Vss. 16 and 17 contain the sequence *akṣāḥ sahásra(-dhāraḥ / -retaḥ)* in the same position in the vs. All 3 vss. concern Soma’s journey. The various phrases with agentive instr. in 17 and 18 reprise and reshuffle those in 15: *góbhiḥ śrītásya* (15) is echoed by *góbhiḥ śrīṇānaḥ* (17); *nṛbhiḥ sutásya* (15) gets divided and refitted into two phrases, *nṛbhiḥ yemānāḥ* and *ádribhiḥ sutáḥ* (18).

IX.109.18: On *kukṣí-* ‘cheek’ see comm. ad III.36.8, VIII.92.24.

IX.109.19–21: No particular signs of cohesion, though assembled from the usual assortment of soma clichés.

IX.109.19: This vs. repeats *vājī* from 17, *tiráḥ pavítram* from 16, and *sahásradhāraḥ* from 17.

IX.109.21: for *vīthā pájase* see comm. ad IX.76.1. The phrase here is a truncated version of what is found in IX.76.1 and IX.88.5.

IX.109.22: An extra vs. in a different meter. Old suggests either 12 8 or 8 4 8, HvN either 12 8 or 8 12. Although the opening of the vs. contains 5 syllables and could therefore be a Dvipada Virāj pāda, the following finite verb *tośate* is unaccented and cannot start a new pāda.

IX.110

On the rare meters and their deployment in the hymn see publ. intro. Likewise for its thematic structure and its connections to the previous hymn, IX.109. It is probably not an accident that the six middle verses, in a meter otherwise not found in the RV (see Old, Proleg. 130), are the conceptually challenging ones, flanked by three vss. at the beginning and three at the end that are fairly straightforward. An omphalos structure signalled by meter.

IX.110.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the opening of this hymn is a variant on the opening of the immediately preceding one, IX.109.1, adjusted to fit the meter: IX.109.1 *pári prá dhanva ...*, IX.110.1 *páry ū śú prá dhanva*

The primary reading of the verb *īyase* is, no doubt, ‘you speed’, with the standard interpr.; however it may also have a secondary reading as the passive to *√yā* ‘implore, beseech’.

IX.110.2: The b pāda consists of two words ending in -e, which are construed together by the standard interpr. (e.g., Ge “im grossen Reiche des Wettstreits”). But since -*rājya*- is thematic and a loc. sg., this requires *mahé* to belong to the rare and secondary them. stem *mahá-*, rather than the primary and very well-attested root stem *máh-*. I prefer to separate the two words and take *mahé* as the dat. to that stem. There are four other occurrences of clear dat. *mahé* in IX.108-110 (including our vs. 7), each with a different head noun: *ávase* (108.14), *kṣáyāya* (109.3), *dyumnāya* (109.11), *vājāya* (110.7). Both because that last phrase appears in our hymn and because of the *vājān* in c of our vs., I supply ‘prize’, though other datives are possible.

IX.110.3: I tr. b as if *vidhāre* has verbal rection, with *páyaḥ* as obj.: “in spreading your milk.” In this I follow Ge (“wenn du mit Kunst deine Milch verbreitest”), but I now think that this is wrong. Although *vidhāre* is a hapax and so its usage elsewhere cannot be compared, I doubt that the loc. of such a stem could be so used (and Bartholomae’s datival infinitive, mentioned by Old, seems morphologically very unlikely). Instead I think it is used in the same sense as loc. *vidharman / -ni*, found 7x in this maṇḍala (3 are identical), incl. the immed. preceding hymn (IX.109.6). In all these passages it refers to the spreading or expansion of the soma liquid as it passes across the filter, and metaphorically to other expansions through space. See comm. ad IX.64.9. If *páyaḥ* is not dependent on *vidhāre* it is most likely a 2nd object to *ājījanat* (as Re takes it, though not

in the same way I will suggest). Ge (n. 3b) adduces IX.34.3 *duhānti śákmanā páyaḥ* ‘They milk out its milk with their skill,’ where *páyaḥ* refers to the soma juice milked from the plant, not to the cows’ milk with which it is mixed. I think *páyaḥ* has the same referent here, and the hemistich means “by your skill you have begotten (your) milk as the sun in your expansion.” What this means is that the soma juice (=milk) takes on the look of the sun as it goes across the filter, golden-colored with rays (=rivulets of juice) spread across the fleece.”

The 2nd member of the hapax *gó-jīra-* is universally (Gr, Ge, Re) interpr. as transitive, governing the 1st: e.g., Gr ‘die Kühen zueilend’. But *jīrá-* both independently and as 1st cmpd member (e.g., *jīráśva-* ‘having lively horses’) is never transitive, but simply means ‘lively, nimble’. One occurrence of the independent adj. is also generally taken as transitive: I.48.3 *jīrá ráthānām* with a supposed objective gen., but see comm. ad loc. Since I do not see attributing an otherwise unattested usage to the word in just this cmpd, however convenient, we must find an alternative path to sense, made more difficult by the fact that there are no other X-*jīra-* cmpds and this one is a hapax. The cmpd modifies the somewhat shadowy goddess Puramdhi, who is associated with plenty and esp. with plentiful gifts. Cf., in this maṇḍala, IX.93.4 *rathirāyātām uśatī puramdhiḥ ... dāvāne vāsūnām* ‘Let Plenitude come eagerly on her chariot ... for the giving of goods.’ In our cmpd I suggest an instr. relationship between the first member and the second: “lively with cows,” capturing both her quickness (as indicated by her “hastening” here and the eager journey in 93.4) and the presumed accompaniment of a profusion of (living) cows as gift. This type of cmpd — NOUN + INTRANS. ADJ. — seems relatively rare and the relationship between the two members is quite variable. See AiG II.1.233–38. It is also possible, as suggested as a last-ditch alternative by Ge (n. 3c), that the cmpd is an inversion of a straightforward bahuvrīhi **jīrá-go-* ‘having lively cows’ (like *jīráśva-* cited above). Though a fem. instr. sg. **jīrá-gavā* should not have been difficult to build, it is noteworthy that there are no instr. sgs. to the ‘cow’ word in the RV (for V.30.7 see comm. ad loc.).

IX.110.4–6: A very challenging tṛca, esp. the last two vss.

IX.110.4: Though the meter changes here, vss. 3 and 4 are knit together by initial *ājījanaḥ*. Here the obj. is left unspecified and presumably re-supplies the obj. of 3.

Re notes the play between *ām̐ ṛtasya* and *amṛtasya*, which might suggest that the *anunāsika* sometimes inserted after final vowels at the end of a pāda to prevent coalescence with the following initial vowel is not merely a redactional addition, as Old (Proleg. 470) asserts.

Ge (n. 4b) identifies *amṛtasya cāruṇaḥ* as a reference to the drink of immortality, namely soma. In this I think he is correct; see comm. ad IX.70.2. However, he also wants it to be a type of partitive genitive (“eine Art von Genit. partit.”) dependent on *ājījanaḥ*; it is difficult to imagine what sort of partitive gen. could be construed with ‘beget’. I see no reason why this gen. cannot depend on *dhárman* as *ṛtasya* does (Sāy.’s solution).

IX.110.5: I don’t quite know what to do with *śrávasā*. Ge and Re bleach it into an adverb (rühmlich, glorieusement), which I am reluctant to do, but it also seems unlikely that it was Soma’s fame that enabled him to do this drilling. Perhaps it is shorthand for a

famous *deed*, referring to this very act of drilling, or it simply characterizes Soma without reference to the action at hand. It may also be a sly allusion to a well-known formula: the adj. *ákṣitam* ends the hemistich, and *śrávas ákṣitam* (in sandhi *śrávo ákṣitam*) is of course the most famous Indo-European verbal formula.

I seem to have misdistributed the elements in pāda b. Because of their proximity I construed *janapānam ákṣitam* together (“inexhaustible drink for men”), but *ákṣitam* most likely goes with *útsam* (as well as notionally with *śrávasā*; see above), because “inexhaustible wellspring” is itself a minor formula: see I.64.6 and VIII.7.16 (both polarized at beginning and end of pāda as here and both obj. of \sqrt{duh} ‘milk’, with Maruts as subj.) as well as III.26.9 *útsam ákṣīyamāṇam* “a wellspring never becoming exhausted.” In the first two quoted passages the phrase must refer to the sky or some feature in it, which the Maruts milk for rain (the third passage characterizes Agni in a somewhat opaque metaphor).

Thus the hemistich seems to compare Soma’s drilling towards the drink for men (which also must be soma) with drilling for (rain)water in the sky. Or so I would take it; Ge, Re, and Lü (384) do not separate pāda b into simile and frame, as I do, but take the whole phrase together with *ná* marking it as some sort of approximative – e.g., Ge: “gleichsam einen unversieglischen Born ..., der von Menschen getrunken wird.” I prefer to distinguish two separate entities being compared, and I suggest that the “drink for men” (*janapānam*) is the earthly ritual soma, while the inexhaustible wellspring contains the heavenly soma. How would Soma be drilling for the ritual soma? what kind of action does this involve? I suggest tentatively that it might refer to the pressing of the juice out of the plant.

But there is another factor to take into consideration: the lexeme *abhí√ṭrd*. In all clear cases (VIII.77.5 is impenetrable) the object of this verb is the Vala cave or the contents thereof, cows or “prizes” (referring to cows). There are a number of such passages: II.24.4 (where in another part of the vs. the Vala cave is referred to as an *útsa*-), III.31.5, VI.17.1–3 (on vs. 1 see comm. ad loc.), VIII.103.5 (metaphorically of Agni), X.74.4. If we plug this stable association into our passage, we need to ask another question: what could stand for the cave full of cows here? And the obvious answer is the container that holds the milk mixture.

What this adds up to is a set of overlapping and partly contradictory images: the ritual soma drink being drilled out of the plant, but also the inexhaustible wellspring standing for not only heaven which contains the heavenly soma, but also the metaphorical Vala cave containing the milk mixture (remember that *útsa*- is used of the Vala cave in II.24.4) – both of which could be drilled out for their respective contents. I would suggest that this welter of images is responsible for the oddly tentative and indefinite presentation of the action, first with the āmreḍita-ed preverb *abhy-ābhi*, which I render as “ever closer” (which I now think is not so good) and Ge as “immer wieder” (Re with “toujours” and Lü not at all). I now think it is object-distributive, as it were: there are several targets of the drilling. I do not quite know how to convey this in English. This is reinforced by the indefinitizing *kām cid* characterizing the *útsa*-. “some kind of wellspring, some wellspring or other,” which would be appropriate if *útsa*- in the simile is meant to call to mind both the heavenly holder of the heavenly soma and the Vala cave full of cows.

I would now emend the publ. tr. to “Because you with your reknown have drilled through to the drink for men as if through now to this inexhaustible wellspring [=the

container of heavenly soma], now that one [=the container of milk compared to the Vala cave].” An unfortunately awkward unpacking of a very dense couple of pādas.

And this is only the first hemistich; the final pāda poses its own difficulties, consisting of another condensed simile cum frame.

Both Ge and Re take the whole pāda as the simile, comparing Soma to an archer. Both have to supply a considerable amount of material, including an object for *bhāramāṇaḥ* and a verb and another object to construe with *śāryābhiḥ*; cf., e.g., Re’s “tel (un guerrier) tenant (l’arc) en ses deux mains (perce la cible) avec les flèches.” His “perce” and, more clearly, Ge’s supplied “das Ziel durchbohrt” pick up *abhi tatārditha* in pāda a, but ‘drill through to’ is an odd action to perform on a target, and as I just said, a lot has to be supplied. (Kü’s interpr. [216] supplies less but also connects less with the rest of the vs.: “wie einer, der mit Pfeilen etwas (=den Bogen) in seinen Händen trägt.”) My interpr. of the pāda depends on a double reading of *bhāramāṇaḥ*, as both passive (in the frame) and self-beneficial transitive (in the simile). I also read *gābhastyoḥ* in both simile and frame. Some material has to be supplied, but less than in the Ge/Re interpr., and it also has the merit of connecting the arrows and the hands: Old points to X.61.3 *śāryābhiḥ ... gābhastau* “with arrows in his hand” as a potential clue to our passage. To deal with the frame first: this participle is found in passive usage, also with soma as subj., in I.135.3, 6 *adhvaryúbhir bhāramāṇā ayaṃsata ... śukrāḥ* “the gleaming (soma drinks), being carried, have been guided by the Adhvaryus” (or “being carried by the Adhvaryus, have been guided ...”). The agents there are the priests, and here I would take the *gābhastyoḥ* in the frame as referring to the priest’s hands that bring the soma forward. In the simile I take med. *bhāramāṇaḥ* as self-beneficial and supply ‘booty’ (or some other desirable material benefit) as the object. Such a usage is found in IX.79.2, containing one of the few medial forms of $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ in IX: *vayāṃ dhānāni viśvādha bharemahī* “May we always bear away the stakes.” Here the material borne away was clearly won by the arrows in the winner’s hands. I have recast the simile as passive in English, but more literally the tr. would read “while being carried in the (priest’s) hands, as (someone) with arrows in his hands carries away (booty).” If I am correct, this is an implicit example of my “case disharmony in similes,” though neither the passive subject nor the transitive direct object is actually expressed.

IX.110.6: This vs. seems to follow from vs. 5; it begins *ād* ‘just after that, because of that’, which signals temporal or logical nexus – though what that nexus is remains unclear to me. The indefinite *ke cid* of pāda a also echoes the *kām cid* of 5b, but, again, the reasons why escape me. The vs. isn’t as desperately difficult as 5 but it has more than its share of problems.

The part. in pāda a, *pāśyamānasah*, is one of the few medial forms to this extremely well-attested pres. stem. The same phrase *pāśyamānāsa āpyam* is found in VII.83.1. In both passages it describes the subject(s) as “seeing” (that is, contemplating?) the friendship between themselves and another being or beings, in this case Soma. So much is reasonably clear. Also reasonably clear is what action they took or have taken: they (have) roared to him (*īm ... abhy ānūṣata*).

Who the subjects are is harder to determine and in part depends on the grammatical identification of the rt. noun cmpd *vasurūcaḥ*. This is ordinarily taken as a nom. pl. and either a qualifier of the other nom. pl. *divyāḥ* or as implicitly conjoined with

divyāḥ as a joint subject. For the former, cf. Re’s “certains (êtres) célestes, brillants (de l’éclat des) Vasu”; for the latter, e.g., Scar’s (457) “gewisse Leute, deren Pracht [für uns] Gut bedeutet [und auch] Himmlische (?)”

As for *vasurūcaḥ*, I prefer to take it as gen. sg., dependent on *āpyam* and referring to Soma (a possibility mentioned by Scar). The next hymn (IX.111) has several forms of *√ruc* referring to Soma: instr. sg. of the rt. noun *rucā* (IX.111.1a) and the pres. stem forms *rocate* (1d), *rócamānaḥ* (2g), and in IX.111.2a it is said of Soma *vido vāsu* “you found that good (thing).” Moreover, most of the forms of the uncmpd rt. noun *rūc-*, found here as 2nd member of our hapax cmpd., appear in IX (10 out of 13), again in connection with Soma. In other words, the default association of *-rūc-* would be with Soma, not some indefinite set of beings. (For various interpr. of the sense of this cmpd. see esp. Scar 457–58; my ‘radiant with goods’ is hardly the only one, and many involve a PN in one way or another.)

If we accept my interpr. of the grammatical identity of the cmpd., this leaves us with *ké cid ... divyāḥ* “some heavenly ones, these heavenly ones and those ones,” as the subj. of *abhy ànūṣata*. Because of the close connections between vss. 5 and 6, it would be desirable to interpr. the indefinitizers in both vss. in the same way. In vs. 5, as I argued, *kām cid* signals that there’s more than one referent for *útsam*. I think we should pursue the same interpretive strategy here. In other words, we should expect that *divyāḥ* should have several different referents appropriate to the context. Unfortunately *divyāḥ* and *abhy ànūṣata* point in different directions: the verb is generally used of cows, or entities configured as cows – primarily hymns, priestly voices, and the like. But these would not generally be qualified as ‘heavenly’ – though see IX.86.4, where I supply “hymns” with *divyāḥ*. The adj. also qualifies ‘drops’ on occasion (IX.86.1) and soma itself, so perhaps the heavenly Soma here. And another well-established referent is ‘waters’ (VII.49.2, 103.2; cf. X.98.5), “heavenly waters” being rain. These are all possible, but not particularly compelling, referents here, esp. because they would have to be contemplating friendship with Soma as well as roaring to him. What *divyā-* does not generally seem to qualify is heavenly beings in the form of gods (except possibly in contrast to *pārthivāḥ* - ‘earthly’ [=humans?]), which seems to be the default interpr. of the standard tr. (including mine); my remark in the publ. intro. about “the gods’ yearning for soma” in vs. 6 is therefore probably incorrect. I’ve reached an impasse. Although I think I’m asking the right questions, they don’t produce satisfactory answers.

My interpr. of the final pāda differs from the standard, which takes *devāḥ savitā* as solely constituting the simile: “he uncovers a desirable thing like god Savitar.” But this seems pretty flat. Moreover, the simile particle *ná* is to the left of both parts of the putative simile (... *ná devāḥ savitā*). A better constructed simile would include the portion to the left of *ná*, namely *vāram*. And I think it does: in my view *vāram* is a perfect pun; the word means both fleece (filter) and desirable object. In the frame, the first reading is the filter: Soma uncovers the fleece – that is, the juice passes beyond it; “desirable thing” is the reading in the simile, and in fact a 2nd reading in the frame. The tr. should be slightly emended to “He uncovers the fleece (/desirable thing) as the god Savitar uncovers a desirable thing.”

IX.110.7–9: Considerably clearer than the previous trca.

IX.110.7: Ge and Re take *naḥ* as the obj. of *codaya* in c, but I think rather *dhíyam* from b, with *naḥ* genitive. Cf. III.62.10 *dhíyo yó naḥ pracodáyāt*, VI.47.10 *codáya dhíyam*.

IX.110.8: The phrase *yád ukthyâm* in pāda a appears to be an izafe-like embedded attribute of the preceding accusative phrase, object of the verb *nír adhuḥṣata* in b. See my 2022 “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto Izafe” (Fs. Mark Hale).

IX.110.9: On *niṣṭhā-* see comm. ad III.31.10.

IX.110.10–12: This very straightforward final ṛṇa concerning the ritual preparation of soma harps on the root $\sqrt{pū}$, with *punānāḥ* 10a, *pāvamānaḥ* 10b, *punānāḥ* 11a, *pavate* 11b, and *pavasva* 12a.

IX.110.11: Note the alliteration in c: *vājasánir varivovíd vayodhāḥ*. The first word *vājasániḥ* forms a ring with *vājasātaye* in vs. 1a.

IX.110.12: The c pāda also shows alliteration: *s^u vāyudhāḥ sāsahvān soma śátrun*.

IX.111

On the characteristics of Atyaṣṭi meter see comm. ad I.127–39, the only series of Atyaṣṭi hymns in the RV, which are attributed to our poet’s father Paruchepa.

IX.111.1: To achieve 8 syllables in pāda c we need to read *sūrah* as trisyllabic, as Old points out – a fairly rare scansion for this word.

On “all forms” see comm. ad IX.64.8.

Ge (n. 1fg) suggests that the “versifiers with their seven mouths” refers to the Aṅgirasas, since the same word *saptāśya-* is used of Bṛhaspati with ref. to the Aṅgiresas in IV.50.4 and with direct ref. to Aṅgira in IV.51.4. This is quite plausible, given that the next vs. concerns the Vala myth – but the phrase must simultaneously apply to the current ritualists.

IX.111.2: As indicated in the publ. intro., at least the 1st part of this vs. touches on the Vala myth (as did 1g), but with some twists. In pāda a “that good thing of the Paṇis” (*tyát paṇīnām ... vāsu*) must be the herd of cows concealed in the Vala cave. The only other ref. to the Paṇis in IX is IX.22.7 ... *paṇībhya ā vāsu gavyāni dhārayaḥ* “You secured from the Paṇis the good things of cattle,” which specifies the *vāsu* (there pl.) as bovine.

As indicated in the publ. intro., problems arise in pāda b, with the verb *marjayasi*. The morphology of this form is absolutely clear, as is the normal sense of this well-attested *-āya*-formation: it is transitive and active (save for a fair number of mechanical *-anta* replacements, which are also transitive). The clarity of its form collides with the expected sense: if Soma is the subject (and who else would it be?), Soma is normally the object of $\sqrt{mṛj}$ (or subj. of passive forms). We do not expect Soma to be the groomer, not the groomee (as it were). It is somewhat distressing to observe fine RVic scholars override the morphology in order to obtain their desired sense. Re simply renders it as reflexive (“tu te nettoies”) without comment; even the usually severe Old, after some

disc. of previous suggestions, simply declares that here (as, acdg. to him, often) the active “im ungefähren Sinn des Mediums steht.” Ge, however, holds the line (see his n. 2b rejecting Old’s suggestion), and tr. it as an absolute, without obj. (“mit den Müttern machst du im eigenen Haus sauber”), suggesting that it depicts a child cleaning along with its mother -- producing the somewhat comic image of Soma as an especially tidy child. He then takes back his admirably austere approach to the morphology by remarking “Natürlich ist die saubere Herstellung des Soma gemeint ...” I think it must be meant as a real transitive, and the object to supply lies ready to hand: the *vásu* (so also Gr under $\sqrt{mrj} + sām$ 4), i.e., the cattle, of the Paṇis, which can also stand for the milk to be mixed with the soma juice. Here Soma acts as agent in the preparation of this milk “in his own house,” that is, the ritual ground. He performs the grooming along with the mothers (b), immediately specified (c) as “the insights of truth” (*ṛtásya dhītibhiḥ*), the hymns accompanying the ritual.

After this preparation (/grooming) of the milk, the soma is mixed with it and acquires vitality thereby (fg). On the possible sense of *tridhātu*- see comm. ad IX.70.8. It may refer to three ingredients but exactly which ones aren’t clear; in the publ. tr. I suggest that they are identified with the three forms of ritual speech, as casually suggested by Re, although I am not sure I stand behind that view now.

As for pāda d, both Ge and Re take *sāma* as part of the frame, not the simile, which for them consists only of *parāvato ná* (e.g., “Wie aus der Ferne (kommt) dieser Gesang”). Ge (n. 2d) suggests it’s the sound of the trickling soma. By contrast I take *sāma* as part of the simile and suggest that it could refer to the song with which Brhaspati/Indra and the Aṅgirasas opened the Vala cave. The *sāman*- is not a prominent feature of the Soma maṇḍala, occurring only once elsewhere (IX.96.22).

I take *yātra* as standing for *yāsmīn*, as the loc. regularly found with \sqrt{ran} , so it need not refer to a place or time. Both for the loc. with \sqrt{ran} and for the *sāman*- as locus of pleasure, cf. I.147.1 *ṛtásya sāman raṇāyanta devāḥ* “the gods delight in the melody of truth.”

IX.110.3: There appears to be a pun on *raśmībhiḥ* in b; the word means both ‘reins’ and (metaphorically) ‘rays’, and in fact the extended meaning is more common in the RV than the original literal one. Here both Ge and Re render only the sun’s rays sense (e.g., “avec les rayons (solaires)”), and this sense is certainly there, prompted by Soma’s eastern journey in pāda a, as well as the comparison to the sun in 1c. Cf., with the same verb, V.37.1 *sām bhānúnā yatate sūryasya* “He aligns himself with the radiance of the sun.” But the repeated phrase *darśatō rāthaḥ* (b, c) “chariot lovely to see” suggests that the ‘rein’ sense is also here. But the distinction is somewhat muddled in practice, since the “heavenly chariot” of c is most likely the sun, with which Soma is being identified.

Pāda f contains a non-overt Vāyav Indraś ca construction: *vājraś ca yād bhāvathaḥ* “when (you) and the mace become ...” The 2nd du. verb *bhāvathaḥ* presupposes a 2nd ps. Soma (expect voc. *soma*), conjoined with the nom. *vājraḥ* by *ca*.

IX.112–114

On these three paṅkti hymns that close the maṇḍala, see Old (Proleg 202): “Diese Paṅkti-lieder werden durch das Versagen der Anordnung, durch ihren von den übrigen Pavamānaliedern sich weit entfernenden Inhalt und durch die Characteristica der Sprache

und des Metrums als Zusätze erwiesen.” Among other things, all share the refrain *īndrāyendo pári srava* “O drop, flow around for Indra” as the fifth pāda of every verse.

IX.112

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn has no apparent connection with soma except for the refrain.

IX.112.1: The first word of the vs., the hapax *nānānām*, is an adjectival derivative built to the adv. *nānā* ‘various’, used as an adverb (though for simplicity I have tr. as if an adj.). As Thieme suggests (Unters. 54), it’s a rhyme form to *samānā-* ‘same’, and *nānā* and *samānā-* appear together contrastively elsewhere (cf. II.12.8, III.54.6 adduced by Thieme). In our passage it also provides a polarized mirror-image to the word ending the hemistich: *#nānānām ... jānānām#* with reversed vowel quantities (*ā ā a ... a ā ā*) but matching consonantal structure (save for the initial), though the necessary distraction of the last syllable of *jānānām* disturbs the pattern somewhat.

Pāda c provides a nice example of chiasmus, with the nom. agents at each end and the acc. goals, with similar shape, in the middle: *tákṣā riṣṭām rutām bhiṣák*.

IX.112.2: On the vs. see esp. Old’s comm. It is couched somewhat as a riddle, though the solution is included in the vs.

IX.112.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. contains informal nursery words for father (*tatā-*) and mother (*nanā-*). The latter is not found elsewhere in the RV or indeed elsewhere in Skt. (though similar forms are well established in other IA lgs and in Iranian), while the former is found twice in the Apālā hymn (VIII.91.5–6) and is widespread later (also in the vṛddhi voc. *tāta*). Of course *nanā* plays off the immediately following *nānā(-dhiyaḥ)* beginning pāda c, as well as *nānānām* opening the hymn.

For *upala-prakṣīṇī* I’m afraid in the publ. tr. I gave in to my baser inclination towards an alliterative colloquialism: “pushing a pestle.” In fact, *upala* is of course not a pestle, but the upper millstone of a hand mill, and the standard tr. are more accurate at least for the first member: Ge “... füllt den Mahlstein auf”; Re “... alimente la meule”; Doniger (235) “a miller with grinding stones.” The 2nd member, *prakṣīṇī*, is obscure. The older association with $\sqrt{pṛc}$ ‘mix’ (see Gr, Old’s citation of Pischel, and AiG I Nachtr. 118) seems unlikely on both semantic and morphological grounds. Similarly the connection (see AiG II.2.346, citing but rejecting Re) with *upaprakṣé* ‘in copulation’ in V.47.6, which appears to be an *s*-enlarged form of $\sqrt{pṛc}$ and again not a good semantic fit. Thieme’s etym. (cited in EWA I.220 [s.v. *ūpara-*] and II.185–86 [s.v. *prāṣṭi-*]) connecting it with a PIE **plenk-* ‘dance’, with verb forms only in Balto-Slavic (these forms differently explained in LIV), is too gossamer to consider. I do not have a good alternative, but suggest a possible derivation from $\sqrt{kaṣ}$ ‘scratch, scrape’, a reasonable characterization of the action of manipulating the upper stone on a handmill (see YouTube). Whatever its ultimate source (see EWA s.v.), verb forms to $\sqrt{kaṣ}$ begin to appear in the AV and it is also widespread in MIA and NIA (see Turner nos. 2970–73, 2979), often associated with testing on a touchstone (perhaps requiring motions similar to manipulating a handmill). Though it does not seem to show up with *prā*, this combination would not seem surprising. We probably need to assume a zero-grade thematic noun **kṣ-*

ā- ‘scraping’ (vel sim.) from which the *-īn*-stem was derived. All of this is very tenuous, but at least provides another possible source to evaluate. In any case I would now tr. this pāda as “mama scrapes away with a millstone.”

IX.112.4: In TS (etc.) *ūpa mantrayate* means ‘summon, invite near’, but also seems to have the sense of persuading by tricky, hence ‘beguile, seduce’. I base my interpr. of *hasanā-* on the frequent transitive-causative value of the *-ana*-suffix; here something that provokes laughter, that is, a joke. Ge/Re simply laughter, Old specifically the laughter of a woman.

IX.113

On the structure and thematics of the hymn see publ. intro.

IX.113.1: Pāda a lacks a syllable – no obvious fix. Distraction to **śarīyaṇāvatī* would produce three light syllables at the beginning of the pāda, which would be highly unusual, and the stem is not otherwise found distracted. On the word see comm. ad VIII.6.39.

IX.113.2: Although in the idiom *ā pavasva* the preverb *ā* generally governs an acc., with the meaning “bring X through your purification,” here it seems identical in usage to the simplex.

On *ārjīkā-* see comm. ad VIII.7.29. The appearance of *śaryaṇāvant-* (vs. 1) and *ārjīkā-* in two successive vss. recalls their appearance in the same vs. in VIII.7.29 (see also *śaryaṇāvant-* in the preceding hymn VIII.6.39).

Note the appearance of both *ṛtā-* and *satyā-* in the phrase *ṛtavākena satyéna*. Contrary to Ge/Re, who take them as two parallel entities, I construe them as a single NP with *satyā-* as adj. The interpr. of Ge and Re may be supported by vs. 4, where *ṛtā-*, *satyā-*, and *śraddhā-* are treated separately and in series, following the order in which they are found here. I therefore propose an alternative possible tr. here “With speech of truth, with what is real, with trust ...”

IX.113.3: The buffalo (*mahiṣā-*) that is the object of all 4 clauses should be the rain, perhaps configured as the heavenly soma. It is not clear to me what the Gandharvas (c) have to do with the production of rain and its transformation into soma sap.

Pāda b has 9 syllables. Old half-heartedly suggests reading *duhitā* with slurring (Verschleifung) of the 1st two syllables, but then remarks that the author of this hymn is “kein exakter metrischer Techniker.” On the other hand, since most MIA forms of ‘daughter’ are disyllabic (Pāli *dhītā* / -tar-; Gāndhārī *dhida*, Pkt. *dhū(d)ā*, *dhī(d)ā*, etc.) and disyllabic readings are found in the AV and in several gāthās in the AB (etc.) (see AiG I Nachtr. 37 and EWA s.v. *duhitār-*), a disyllabic reading in this popular hymn seems perfectly likely.

IX.113.4: As noted ad vs. 2, the first three pādas of this vs. pick up the series *ṛta(-vākena) satyéna śraddhāyā* and devote a pāda to each – each one as obj. of *vādan* ‘speaking’ and the first two also incorporated into bahuv. vocatives: *ṛta-dyumna*, *satya-karman*.

IX.113.5: This vs. strikes me as very nearly doggerel. Although RVic poets enjoy indulging in etymological figures – and are skilled at deploying them – those in pādas b and c seem to display neither imagination nor skill: b *sām sravanti samsravāḥ* (the pāda missing a syllable, to make it worse), c ... *rasīno rāsāḥ*. Moreover, after the solemn use of *satyā-* ‘reality, what is real’ in vss. 2 and 4, the cmpd *satyāmugra-* in pāda a seems to have downgraded the word to an adverb (so AiG II.1.67, 237) in a word with the banal sense ‘really strong’ (AiG II.1.37 ‘wahrhaft kräftig’, 237 ‘wahrhaft gewaltig’; sim. Ge/Re) and that awkwardly uses the neut. adverbial acc. as first member (so AiG II.1.67), to provide a makeshift hiatus-breaker. And there is also an apparent lapse in grammatical agreement, with sg. *punānāḥ* in d modifying the plural subjects of bc, even though pl. *punānāḥ(h)* would have been metrically identical. Ge and Re rescue the poet from this lapse in different ways: Ge construes d with the refrain (as he does in other vss: 2, 4, 6), but given that the refrain serves not only for this hymn but for the previous and following hymns and is generally independent syntactically, this seems unlikely. Re implicitly takes the subj. of d from the genitive phrases of pādas a and c.

In c *rasīnaḥ* could be either gen. sg. or nom. pl., and either would fit. Gr and the standard tr. (including mine) take it as gen. sg., presumably because the other two occurrences of *rasīnaḥ* (VIII.1.26, 3.1) are. A gen. also makes the phrase less pleonastic: “the juices of the juicy one” is marginally better than “the juicy juices.”

IX.113.6–7: On the relationship between these vss. and their function in the hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.113.6: Despite the hemistich boundary and the tr. of Ge/Re, I take *grāvṇā* in c with *vādan*, immediately preceding it in b, because the *grāvan-* regularly “speaks” elsewhere (cf. VIII.34.2, X.36.4 *grāvā vādan*, V.37.2 *grāvāṇaḥ ... vādanti*). Ge and Re need to supply material in order to construe it with pāda c.

IX.113.8–11: In addition to the fifth pāda refrain found throughout the hymn (as well as IX.112 and 114), these four vss. add a refrain in the fourth pāda: *tātra mām amṛtaṁ kṛdhi* “there make me immortal,” each time serving as the main clause for a set of *yātra* clauses.

I.113.8: The standard view of *avaróḍhanam* is that it defines a closed or fortified place (Ge “der verschlossene Ort des Himmels”; Re “le rempart du ciel”; Doniger [133] “where heaven is enclosed”) – deriving *róḍhana-* from *√rudh* ‘confine, hem in’. But I take it instead to the other *√rudh* (*/ruh*) ‘grow’ and interpr. it as ‘means of ascent’, exactly like *róḥaṇaṁ divāḥ* in I.52.9 (q.v.). So my vision of heaven is a more welcoming place, that extends a ladder down for us to make the ascent.

IX.113.10: Re renders *kāmā nikāmās ca* as “les désirs (avoués) et les désirs-secrets”; although *ni-* might suggest something hidden or deposited in secret, but the related bahuvr. *nikāma-* (8x) seems just to mean ‘desirous’ without any special nuance.

The phrase *bradhñasya viṣṭāpam* is found also in VIII.69.7, where I take it to refer to the surface of the soma (see comm. ad loc.), but *bradhñá-* ‘coppery colored’ can also refer to the sun (see comm. ad VII.44.3, IX.97.52) and in fact to both simulataneously,

with soma identified with the sun. What the phrase is trying to convey here is totally unclear to me.

As Old and Ge (n. 10c) point out (see also Doniger (134 and n. 5), *svadhā-* and the root $\sqrt{t}p$ ‘satisfy’ are associated with offerings to the Pitars (dead ancestors).

IX.114

IX.114.1: Acdg to Ge, it is Soma’s *mānas* that the poet will satisfy, while Re takes the *mānas* as the poet’s. Re is no doubt correct; cf. VIII.61.9 *avīpró vā yád ávidhad, vípro vendra te vācaḥ* “If without inspiration or if inspired, someone has dedicated his speech to you, Indra ...”

IX.114.2: The Anukr. ascribes this hymn to Kaśyapa Mārīca, along with the previous one (IX.113), along with several others in IX and a few in other maṇḍalas.

Maṇḍala X

X.1-7

The first seven hymns of X are dedicated to Agni and attributed to Trita Āptya, a mythological figure regularly mentioned in the RV (on whom see, e.g., Macd., Ved.Myth. 67–69), with an Avestan counterpart Ōrita, who is closely associated with Āθβiia, a variant of our Āptya. For further disc. see publ. intro. to X.8, which really belongs to this series, despite being assigned to a different poet. All seven hymns are in Triṣṭubh and contain seven vss.

X.1 Agni

X.1.1: The well-attested 3rd (also 2nd) sg. *aprāḥ* is generally taken (correctly in my view) as belonging to an *s*-aor. (so, e.g., Wh Root, and see disc. by Narten 173). Re, however, suggests that it might be a root aor. form with the 3rd sg. *-s* borrowed from the precativum – an explanation that seems too contorted for whatever advantage the analysis might bring.

The referent of the “seats” (*sádmāni*) is disputed; see Ge’s n. 1d. It seems likely to have multiple referents: the dwelling places of gods and men (so Ge) in a cosmic sense, but the ritual hearths in a more localized sense.

X.1.2: As noted in the publ. intro., nom. sg. *jātāḥ* is the signature word of this hymn, occurring in the 1st 3 vss. and in vs. 6. In all but vs. 2 Ge and Re render it as a adjunct qualifier of Agni, not as a clause predicate, but here they both predicate it (“Du bist ... geboren”; “Tu es né ...”). I prefer to interpr. the four occurrences identically: as a temporal designation “just born / at his/your birth.”

Ge (n. 2d) takes the “mothers” of d to be the kindling sticks, but these should ordinarily be dual (though not always: see Re’s collection of exceptions). Re’s plants is probably correct: dispersed among the plants (2b) he emerges from them (2d).

The phrase ... *pári támāmsy aktūn*# reminds us teasingly of VI.4.6 ... *pári támāmsy aktāḥ* “anointed (he leads us) around the dark shades” (adduced by Ge [n. 2c]), with phonologically similar but etymologically and semantically separate final terms. In the latter passage there is a verb (*nayat*), but here I think we need to supply a minimal verb of motion.

X.1.3: Agni is here identified with Viṣṇu—the point of comparison being Viṣṇu’s three strides that take him to highest heaven. In a Viṣṇu context *pádam* ‘step’ is the obvious word to supply with *páramam*: cf. I.22.20, 21 *víṣṇoḥ (...)* *paramám pádam* (also I.154.6), though *pāṭhaḥ* ‘pen, fold’ is also possible (III.55.10 *víṣṇuḥ ... páramam pāti pāṭhaḥ*). There is no such stable lexical association with *trītya-*, though it must refer to Viṣṇu’s third step or the place where that step reached in heaven. With Re I supply ‘seat’, which can be adapted from *sádmāni* in 1d. In any case I suggest that the three strides of Viṣṇu are implicitly compared here to the three fire-hearths of Agni; his furthest is the place of the offering fire (later Āhavanīya), which is the furthest point of the ritual journey of Agni.

Although in an Agni context, instr. *āsā* would lead us to expect a statement about Agni’s eating the oblations with his mouth – or the gods eating the oblations by Agni’s mouth (see, e.g., II.1.14 *āsā devā havír adanty āhutam*), the poet has tricked us, at least acdg. to my interpr. of the passage. Instead this is the (collective) mouth of the poets, who make their poetry into milk for the infant Agni.

X.1.4: The two actions of ab and c are deliberately framed as reciprocal: ... *tvā ... prāti caranti* “they proceed towards you” and *tā īm prāty eṣi* “you go towards them.” This suggests that they are happening at the same time, and I therefore am not convinced by Ge’s explicit (n. 4c) and Re’s implicit interpr. that “having other forms” (*anyārūpāḥ*) refers to the vegetation that feeds him in ab growing up again fresh and green and affording Agni a new home. Rather I think that these “other forms” are those that the kindling wood acquires as it burns. See *anyād vārpaḥ* in I.140.7 and comm. thereon.

Note that *caranti* in 4b is a scrambling of *arcanti* in 3d in the same metrical position.

In c *īm* doubles *tāḥ*—probably to identify *tāḥ* as acc. pl., since the fem. pl. in the 1st hemistich to which it refers was nom. and the form is ambiguous.

X.1.5: The āmreḍitas *yajñāsya-yajñasya* (b) and *devāsya-devasya* (c) make it impossible to construct a pāda with a properly situated caesura; see Old.

This vs. is couched entirely in the acc. Any verb of praising or reverent approach could be supplied; the *abhy ārcanti* of 3d is a good candidate. Note that there was no expressed object to that verb there, so that this vs. can serve as deferred obj.

The 2nd hemistich contrasts Agni’s role among the gods (c) and humans (d) by virtue of contrasting qualities he possesses; the *tú* connecting the two phrases therefore seems adversative (see Ge’s “aber”), as discussed in detail by Klein (RVic *tú* and *sú*, 1982: 6).

X.1.6: Klein (DGRV II.112) takes *ádha* as connecting vss. 5 and 6, as “a weak discourse continuative ‘(and) so’,” introducing the imperative clause in 6. This seems unlikely because of the odd mid-pāda position of *ádha*—and because Klein has to *supply* the impv. for 6ab: “(let) that one, Agni, (come hither).” I don’t actually know what to do with *ádha*, but an interpr. like Re’s “de vêtements (qui sont autant de) parures” that takes account of the position seems preferable. I might suggest “donning (now) garments, now ornaments.”

The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Klein cited above) take ab as a separate clause in the 3rd ps., each tr. supplying a different verb. Then in the 2nd hemistich they switch to the 2nd ps. impv. This is not necessary, and in fact I think the poet is tricking us again: the initial *sá* invites the audience to expect a 3rd ps. clause, but of course it is also regularly found with 2nd ps. impvs., as I demonstrated at length long ago. Only when we get to the final pāda and the *si*-impv. *yakṣi* do we realize that the latter syntactic situation obtains. Ge (n. 6ab) argues that the Kasuswechsel between nom. *agnīḥ* (b) and voc. *rājan* (d) requires assuming an elliptical clause in ab, but I don’t consider this a valid argument: clauses with 2nd ps. reference regularly have nominatives referring to the 2nd ps. subject, even, I think, their own names (though I don’t have a parallel ready to hand).

X.1.7: Ge (n. 7ab) argues persuasively that *ā ... tatántha* has a double sense here: in the frame it has the intrans. sense ‘stretch through/across’ with an acc. extent-of-space (*dyāvāprthivī*), while in the simile it is transitive, referring to the propagation of the parents (*mātārā*) through their offspring.

X.2 Agni

X.2.1: The phrase *devāṃ ūsatāḥ* in pāda a reprises *ūsatāḥ ... devān* in the last hemistich of the previous hymn, X.1.7.

On *vidvān* with acc., see Re’s n.; as he points out, this pf. part. is generally used absolutely (as it is in 3c, 4c), but does occur with the acc., less often with the gen., in contrast to the finite forms of the pf.

Re separates c from d and supplies the impv. phrase “sacrifie aux dieux” (from *devān ... yaja* in ab) with *tébhiḥ*. Although the instr. fits a bit awkwardly with the d pāda, I don’t see the necessity for Re’s solution.

X.2.2: In three of its four occurrences *mandhātār-* is the name of a (legendary) poet or other ritualist (I.112.13, VIII.39.8, 40.12), but here it seems to have full lexical value as the designation of a ritual function. As disc. in the publ. intro., the elements from which this agent-noun cmpd is made, *mán(a)s* + $\sqrt{dhā}$ are the same as those in the name of the supreme god in Avestan, Ahura *Mazdā* “Lord Wisdom,” with its exact Vedic cognate *medhā* ‘wisdom’ (see here also Scar 257). What priest and/or god this figure might represent has elicited various suggestions; see Old, Ge (n. 2b), Re. It is also possible that it simply qualifies *draviṇodāḥ*; see Old, Ge (n. 2b). I will not add to the speculations.

The “wealth giver” (*draviṇodās*) has a prominent, if vaguely defined, role in the Ṛtugrāhas, where he is the recipient of 4 of the 12 cups (cups 7–10), associated with the priests Hotar, Potar, Neṣtar, and, later, Achāvāka respectively. See pub. intro. to I.15 and I.15.7–10, II.37.1–4. As indicated in the publ. intro. to I.15, he seems to have been added to the rota in order to bring the number of cups to 12.

I take *svāhā* as adverbial, rather than as a 2nd obj. to *kṛṇāvāmā* as Re does. A similar usage is found in the first vs. of the Ṛtugraha hymn II.36.1; see also I.13.12.

The verb in c, *kṛṇāvāmā* is accented because the cl. in pāda c is implicitly subordinated to d.

X.2.3: The publ. tr. renders the acc. inf. *právoḍhum* as a purpose inf. with pāda a, with *yác chaknāvāma* a rel. cl. dependent on the *tád* that follows it (for reference, the pāda reads *yác chaknāvāma tád ānu právoḍhum*). Sim. Ge and Re. But this is syntactically problematic for two reasons: 1) purpose infinitives are generally in the dat.; in fact *vólhave* is found 9x in that usage (while *právoḍhum* is found only here); 2) by this reading *yác chaknāvāma* is embedded in the matrix clause. These two issues disappear if we construe the inf. with *śaknāvāma*: $\sqrt{śak}$ regularly takes an acc. infinitive. I therefore would emend the tr. to “we have come along the paths of the gods, so that we will be able to convey (the oblation) along it.” I supply ‘oblation’ because *havyá-* is several times the obj. of the dat. inf. *vólhave* (I.45.6 = III.29.4, IV.9.6, V.14.3); in our passage *hávīṃṣi* in 2c is available to serve as obj. Thus *yád* and *tád* are not coreferential pronouns but have different functions, with *yád* a subordinating conjunction introducing a purpose cl. (for *yád* introducing purpose clauses with subjunctive, see Hettrich, Hypotaxe 386–93). A couple of minor issues to clear up. First, despite my emended tr. “along it,” *tád* cannot pick up *pánthām* directly, because of difference of gender. I take it, rather loosely, as a reversion to the neut. referring to the course of the journey. As for *ānu*, which I take as a postposition, Gr takes it as a 2nd preverb with the infinitive; Macd (VGS 464) asserts that if an infinitive has two preverbs, both are accented (citing as one ex. our *ānu právoḍhum*). However, the lexeme *ānu prá* \sqrt{vah} would occur only here, and it makes more sense to construe *ānu* independently, in the same manner as *pánthām ānu* “along the path” in the last vs. of the hymn (7c). Of more interest is

Macd’s claim (VGS 336–37) that the *-tum* infinitive “expresses the purpose with verbs of motion ...” (though he allows it also with \sqrt{arh} ‘be able’ and \sqrt{ci} ‘intend’), while it is the *-am* inf. that is found with $\sqrt{\acute{s}ak}$ (inter alia). So under this description our infinitive could be construed with pāda a, because it contains a verb of motion. However, his lack of other exx. of $\sqrt{\acute{s}ak}$ + *-tum* is likely only the result of the extreme rarity of *-tum* infinitives in the RV (on which see VGS 195). Though we do have a verb of motion in pāda a (\acute{a} ... *aganma*), it is different from Macd’s “go ... to do X” example because the verb of motion here has a different complement, “go along the path.”

X.2.4: I’m not entirely sure what \acute{a} *prṇāti* means here; ordinarily it has the literal sense ‘fill’. Both Ge and Re push it further in this passage than I think can be justified: “wieder gutmachen” and “compense” respectively. My ‘fulfill’ is meant to convey that Agni will fulfill the conditions of the *vratāni* and make up for our lapses.

X.2.4–5: These two vss. have the same structure: in the first hemistich we mortals, because of our general stupidity (*áviduṣṭarāsaḥ* 4b, *pākatrá mānasā dīnádakṣāḥ* 5a), mess up our obligations to the gods, particularly the sacrifice. The c pādas begin *agnīṣ ṭád* and end with a participle of knowing (*vidvān* 4c, *viṇān* 5c) and an assurance that Agni will put everything to rights. Ge breaks the parallelism by taking *yád* in 5a as a neut. rel. prn., picked up by *tád* in c, as obj. of *viṇān*, whereas in 4a he renders *yád* as a subordinating conj. I think the parallelism should be respected, which requires “when/if” for both *yád*s and objectless participles in c.

X.2.7: The b pāda naming Tvaṣṭar as the begetter of Agni solves the riddle implicitly posed in 6b, which contained the generic etymological figure *jānitā tvā jajāna* “the begetter begot you.” The rather pedestrian repetition in our pāda, *tváṣṭā ... tvā ... jajāna*, does not put this in the category of the best of RVic riddles.

The part. *pravidvān* here takes an acc. obj., as *vidvān* does in vs. 1, contra vss. 3 and 4.

X.3 Agni

The hymn seems to have an omphalos structure, which I had not recognized at the time of the publ. tr. The middle vs., 4, is more than sufficiently contorted and baffling to count as a central enigma. The structure is marked (though not excessively marked) by lexical rings: most importantly, *arati-* is found in the 1st two and the last two vss. (1a, 2c; 6d, 7b); the verb *ví bhāti* (1c, 2d) is matched by *ví ... bhāti* in 6d; *bhānū-* in 2c returns in 5d; *rúṣadbhiḥ* in 3d = the same in 6c.

X.3.1: Just as the first vs. of X.2 echoed the last vs. of X.1, there is concatenation with the preceding hymn here as well: *ví bhāhi* in c repeats the last words of X.2.7.

The voc. *rājan* is jarring in this 3rd ps. description of Agni, but it can hardly be addressed to anyone else (though Old flirts with the possibility of another entity), esp. given that the same voc. is definitely addressed to Agni in X.1.6 and (the next hymn) X.4.1. It is always possible in Agni contexts to imagine a bifurcation between the physical fire and the god Fire, here with the former described and the latter addressed.

In c *brhatā* produces a bad cadence, with no possible fix.

The final pāda is chiasmatically structured, with initial *ásiknīm* ‘black’ the obj. of the final participle *apājan* and the middle two words *eti rúṣatīm* to be construed together. This

configuration confounds word-order expectations: we would normally construe the elements in order, yielding “he goes to the black (*ásiknīm eti*), driving away the luminous (*rúsatīm apājan*). It is only the audience’s awareness of the standard trope about the banishment of female night by female dawn and of the usual dawn context of Agni hymns that allows them to redistribute the elements to produce a more semantically and pragmatically satisfactory result – a nice ex. of the tension between syntax and sense and of how poets learn to exploit it. Note also that the discontinuous phrase “driving away the black one” is iconic of its action, driving away or apart.

X.3.2: The first hemistich of this vs. “repairs” the last pāda of vs. 1, by depicting Agni’s adversarial relation with Night and his benevolent paternal one with Dawn, though neither of the females is named and the hemistich introduces new themes. This contrasts with the rather pedestrian repair strategy in X.2.6–7, which involves exact repetition of the riddle that needs solution, with the solution slotted in.

Pāda b is superficially self-contradictory or at least sketches a tangled parentage, in that Agni “begets” (*janāyan*) someone who is the child of a different father (*pítúr jā́m*). But of course the two fathers can be reconciled: Heaven may be the stable father of Dawn, who is regularly called *divó duhitā́*, but Agni at his daily kindling gives birth to her every day.

As Ge (n. 2cd) points out, Agni is identified with the Sun; the “spoked wheel of Heaven” (*diváh ... aratíh*) in fact is the sun; cf., e.g., II.2.2. The gen. *diváh* in d can also be seen as a sly way to resolve the identity of the “lofty father” (*bṛhatáh pítúh*) of Dawn in b, sneaking in the word Heaven (in the gen. as the father phrase is in b) in a different context.

X.3.3: The masking of identities continues in this vs. The Sun and Dawn appear only as m. *bhadrá-* and f. *bhadrá-* in pāda a and with roles suggesting incestuous relations in b (*svásar-* ‘sister’, *jārā-* ‘lover’). But finally in c we get an actual name: the first occurrence of *agní-* in this hymn.

From the publ. tr. it would appear that another name, or at least unmasked identity, is found in d, where I tr. “prevailed over the night.” But in fact the word I tr. as ‘night’, *rāmá-*, merely means ‘dark’ and is quite rare (though fem. *rāmī-*, *rāmyā-* are better attested, and also clearly refer to night). So *rāmám* here is like *ásiknīm* in 1d and *kṛṣṇām* in 2a in referring to night by a color term. (I would now emend the tr. to “prevailed over the dark.”) This pāda is a recasting of 2a (as Ge, n. 3d, also indicates), with lexical substitution: *abhí ... asthāt* for *abhí ... bhūt*, *rāmám* for *kṛṣṇām ... énīm*, *rúśadbhir várṇaiḥ* for *várpasā*. But the ‘night’ term has become more masked, by being masc., not fem. as in 1d, 2a.

X.3.4: A difficult vs. (Ge n. 4: “Dunkle, offenbar gekünstelte Strophe”). As noted above, it is properly situated to be the omphalos vs. in a hymn that is organized by that structure. Ge thinks the vs. has to do with the day-sun and the night-sun, for which he refers us to I.115.5. For my rejection of the concept of the night-sun see comm. ad I.115.4–5.

Decoding the vs. works best by considering the constituents one by one; the syntactic structure is relatively straightforward (at least as I see it – see Ge’s comm., however, and the different deployment of elements by Ge and Re). The vs. is dominated by two long gen. phrases, both referring to Agni: ab *asyá ... agnéh sákhyuh śívásya* “of this one ... Agni, our kindly companion” (I do not take *bṛhatáh* in this phrase; see below) and c *īḍyasya vṛṣṇo bṛhatáh* “of the lofty bull worthy to be invoked” (I did not take *svásah* in this phrase, though I’m more open to it now; see below). The first depends on the nom. *yāmāsaḥ* ‘journeys’ (again, as I take it). As for

the predicate of ab, I take it to be a predicated pres. part. *índhānāḥ* ‘kindling’. This participle, so accented (as opposed to *idhānā-*), is ordinarily, though not invariably, transitive, and is so interpr. by Ge, Re, and me. The expression “his journeys kindling X” is what I meant (rather loosely) by synesthesia in the publ. intro.: in the ordinary way of things journeys can’t “kindle” anything, though metaphorically it is possible even in earthbound English (e.g., “his European travels kindled his interest in architecture”). Agni’s journeys can refer to the ascent of his smoke towards heaven (this possibility supported by vs. 5 and see my interpr. below of 4cd), or perhaps the spreading of the fire over the firewood outward from its place of kindling, or the movement of the ritual fire to the east and the place of the offering fire.

What object do these journeys kindle? The only acc. in the vicinity is *vagnūn* ‘calls’, though it appears to be part of a simile. In the absence of a corresponding acc. in the frame, I originally thought (see below for revision) that the *nā* here doesn’t mark a standard simile but contributes an “as it were” sense (sim. Ge gleichsam, Re pour ainsi dire). Before trying to determine what the *vagnūn* are, we must tackle *bṛhatāḥ* in the simile complex *bṛható nā vagnūn* (assuming it’s part of the simile: neither Re nor Ge does, but how do they account for the position of *nā*?). It can be either acc. pl. masc., modifying *vagnūn*, or (abl./)gen. sg. dependent on it. There are arguments for both: *bṛhánt-* sometimes qualifies sound (*rāva-* VII.33.4, IX.97.36; *gīr* V.43.8, *gīras* III.51.1; cf. also *bṛhád-uktha-* (3x) and the Gṛtsamada refrain *bṛhád vadema*). But in order to make the comparison work we need to know who the *vagnūn* belong to / emanate from, and that suggests a gen. sg. The stem *bṛhánt-* is common in this hymn, with a number of different referents: 1c ‘beam’, 2b ‘father’ (=Heaven), 4c (also in our vs.) Agni as bull, 5b Sun=Agni. In the publ. tr. I suggest that it here refers to the pressing stone, and the *vagnūn* are the sounds of pressing. Pressing stones are regularly said to be noisy and to have voices (cf., e.g., X.76.6 and esp. X.94), and *vagnú-* is associated with the pressing stone in I.84.3; it is said to speak ‘loftily’ (*bṛhát*) in V.25.8, X.64.15=100.8, 70.7. And see its association with the kindled fire in X.70.7: *ūrdhvó grāvā bṛhád agnīḥ sámiddhaḥ*. In our passage the point would be that the kindling of the fire “kindles” (that is, signals the start of) the soma pressing and thus the noise of the pressing stone. (For the record, Ge thinks the *vagnūn* are the sounds of the burning fire, Re the voices of the human chanters. Both are also possible, but I think the pressing stone suggestion has better textual support.)

I now also see that there is a way to rescue a “real” simile interpr., by means of a double reading of the part. *índhānāḥ*. As I said above, this part. is generally transitive, but sometimes passive. For the former, cf., e.g., II.25.1 *índhāno agnīm vanavad vanuṣyatāḥ* “Kindling the fire, he will win against those who seek to win”; for the latter I.143.7 *índhānaḥ ... vidátheṣu dīdyat* “... while being kindled, shining at the rites.” If we take it as passive in the frame, the journeys themselves are being kindled (that is, set in motion), while in the simile they kindle the voices. So I suggest an alt. tr. “his journeys, being kindled, are as if kindling the voices of the lofty one [=pressing stone].” The Engl. “as it were” cannot be avoided, but the frame / simile relationship in the Skt. is better structured. This would be an extreme ex. of my “case disharmony in similes.”

So much for the first hemistich. In the 2nd one let us first turn to the gen. phrase in c. The last word of that pāda, *svāsaḥ*, is generally interpr. (Gr, Ge, Re) as a gen. sg. to a cmpd *svās-* ‘having a good mouth’, which does appear in IV.6.8 of Agni. However, I think it more likely to be the nom. pl. m. of *svá-* ‘own’, referring to the *bhāmāsaḥ* that immediately follows in the next pāda (though ‘having a good mouth’ is also possible, and I would now accept a tr. “of the lofty bull worthy to be invoked, having a good mouth”). I take the remaining gen. phrase with cd, while Ge/Re take it with the gen. phrase in ab. The journeys (*yāma-*) of ab reappear in the loc.

sg. *yāman* to a different stem, and just as the gen. phrase of ab depended on *yāmāsaḥ*, I here attach it to *yāman*.

Beyond this I am pretty baffled. The focus of this bafflement is *aktú-*. This is a well-attested word for ‘night’, though it does have or acquire a (probably secondary) association with *√añj* ‘anoint’. In our passage Re takes it as ‘ornaments-brilliants’, which makes the interpr. easier, though he admits this sense is, at best, rare. Moreover, I would add, in a hymn that has used three other words referring to ‘night’, one each in the previous three vss., it seems perverse to assume that a more common word for ‘night’ doesn’t mean that in this context (it’s also found in nearby X.1.2 in the clear meaning ‘night’). The problem posed by *aktávaḥ* is acute enough to cause Old to make what seems to me an uncharacteristic lapse in grammatical judgment: he suggests that it stands for gen. *aktóḥ*. Now it is true that the phrase *yāman aktóḥ* is found pāda-final in III.30.13 and VI.38.4 (though in neither case do I construe *aktóḥ* directly with the loc.), but making *aktávaḥ* a makeshift gen. seems a really bad idea to me, and Old doesn’t try to justify it. Ge suggests instead a word haplology of *yāman *aktór aktávaḥ*, which is slightly better but still leaves us with *aktávaḥ* to deal with. As noted above, he does so via the “night-sun”: “seine Strahlen sind bei Ankunft (der Nacht) als Dunkel erscheinen.” My publ. tr. makes little (actually, no) sense; I have no idea what I thought it meant at the time: “the nights appear as his own beams.” I would now suggest a new one, with the terms reversed, rather like Ge’s though with a different image in mind.: “his own beams appear (like) the nights.” The somewhat counterintuitive image is of the smoke arising from the fire, which, though it comes from the beaming brightness of a burning fire, turns dark as it rises. For similar passages describing the mingled brightness of the flames and darkness of smoke see II.4.5 and VI.6.4 and comm. on both.

X.3.5: This vs. consists entirely of two rel. cl.; it can easily be attached to the following vs. (or the preceding one).

The ‘beams’ (*bhāmāsaḥ*) of the previous vs. return here, but once again in unexpected form. In vs. 4 they appear like nights, that is, presumably, dark – which is not what we expect of lights (the word is after all a transparent deriv. of *√bhā* ‘shine’). Here they “purify themselves” (*pavante*), while being compared to sounds (*svanā nā*). The verb is of course the signature verb of soma preparation: the medial participle *pavamāna-* gives the functional title to the Soma of the IXth Maṇḍala (Soma Pavamāna “self-purifying Soma”). It would be impossible to use this verb in a RVic context without calling soma immediately to mind. The subj./verb combination thus already conjures up a discordant image: beams of light purifying themselves like soma liquid. But the simile adds another layer of complexity and dissonance, for the subject is being compared not to soma but to sound. So we have two incompatible entities (light and sound) identified with each other and each performing an action – purification -- that is uncharacteristic of either. Ge simply translates the phrase word-for-word (“Dessen Strahlen rein werden wie die Töne”) without comment; Re makes the connection with soma, which I think is unavoidable. The cleverness of the poet is to put the image further off-balance, comparing the beams to the sounds of soma when it is being purified. Cf. IX.41.3 *śṛṇvé vṛṣṭer iva svanāḥ, pavamānasya śuṣmīṇaḥ* “A roar like that of rain is heard -- the roar of the self-purifying tempestuous one,” where the more natural genitival relationship between the roar and the self-purifier is found. So that accounts for the simile, but what is “the beams purify themselves” meant to convey in the frame. I think it must be read in the context of the previous vs.: there the beams were dark as the nights, because surrounded with smoke; here the purification would involve getting free of the smoke

and rising up brightly, amidst the roar of the blazing fire (hence the term of comparison). This compressed expression seems to me a prime example of synesthesia, as noted in the publ. intro.

The gen. phrase that constitutes b, *rócamānasya brhatāḥ sudívaḥ* “the lofty one, shining, bringing the good day,” technically belongs with the rel. *yásya* in pāda a and therefore refers to Agni. But I think it is also a reference to the sun, or Agni identified with the sun, and that it functions almost like a gen. absol.; see Ge’s tr. as a “wenn” cl. (though without comment) as well as the “when” cl. in the publ. tr. This would be another reference to the dawn sacrifice, the overall setting of this hymn.

In cd Agni’s radiant beams, *bhānū-* (a different derivative to the same root $\sqrt{bhā}$), reach heaven and implicitly join the sun’s *bhānū-* there; cf. 2c where Agni “props up the radiance of the sun” (*bhānūṃ sūryasya*). On the connection between Agni as Svarbhānu and the sun, see my extensive treatment of the Svarbhānu myth in my 1991 book, *The Ravenous Hyenas and the Wounded Sun*.

X.3.6: The first half of this vs. continues and indeed amplifies the “sound” theme, but restores a more natural subject/verb relationship: Agni’s “snortings resound” (*śúṣmāsaḥ ... svanayan*). Note that the verb here and the noun *svanāḥ* in 5a are transparently related. We can think of this as an ex. of poetic repair. It is also worthy of note that the subj. *śúṣma-* is represented in IX.41.3 cited above concerning the roar of the self-purifying soma: *svanāḥ ... śuṣmīṇaḥ*.

The vs. also exploits the literal sense of *aratī-* (‘spoked wheel’, hence fireplace, hence ritual fire) to elaborate the journey theme found already in vs. 4, with wheel rims (*-pavi-*) and teams (*niyúdbhiḥ*). On this vs. see Thieme, Unters. 31–32, 34.

The bahuv. *dadrṣānā-pavi-* has a medial pf. part. as 1st member. On this rare type see AiG II.1.43–44 and on its accent AiG II.1.292.

In the publ. tr. I follow Ge in supplying ‘flames’ with the instrumentals of cd. I now think it should rather be ‘beams’ (*bhāma-*, 4d, 5a) or ‘radiant beams’ *bhānū-* (5d) because the somewhat incompatible adjectives *rúṣadbhiḥ ... rébhadbhiḥ* “luminous and crackling” continue the synesthetic effect associated with ‘beams’ earlier, in vss. 4 and 5. The presence of the verb *ví ... bhāti* also supports supplying a nominal derivative from the same root. Perhaps best *bhānúbhiḥ*, echoing the same instr. pl. in 5d. Cf. also X.1.1 *bhānúnā rúṣatā*.

IX.3.7: The poet then turns the journey theme to his own advantage in this final vs., but asking Agni to bring us something good when he comes.

IX.4 Agni

On the imagery in this hymn, see publ. intro.

IX.4.2: The warmth of the pen in the simile is presumably an indirect reflection of the warmth of the fire in the frame.

On *rocanéna* expressing extent of space, see comm. on identical pāda, III.55.9.

X.4.3: All the images in this vs. seem to depict natural fire in a landscape rather than the ritual fire. The ‘mother’ of ab is probably, as Re takes it, Mother Earth. In both c and d the fire ranges freely in the natural world, consuming whatever fuel it finds.

On *jénya-* see comm. ad I.128.7. Even though Agni is called *jénya-* elsewhere, here the word surely belongs to the simile, with *tvā* intervening in modified 2nd position. Cf. IX.86.36 ...

śísuṃ, nāvam jajñānām jényam ... “the new-born child of worthy birth.” Although the *śísu-* here could be a human child, the appearance of other domestic animals in the similes of 2–3 suggest that it too is an animal.

The hapax denom. *sacanasyāmāna-* receives rather bleached renderings: Gr ‘hulldreich, hülfreich sein’, Ge ‘getreulich’, or Re’s somewhat richer ‘se sentent heureuse’. But its base should mean ‘having joint delight’, and I think the point here is that the mother desires delight for both of them.

As Narten (YH, 121) persuasively argues, in both Vedic and Avestan the desid. of \sqrt{ji} ‘win, conquer’ does not have an aggressive or battle-oriented sense, but simply means ‘seek (food, livelihood)’. She tr. this passage “du wünschst (Nahrung) zu gewinnen wie losgelassenes Vieh.”

X.4.4: This vs., the middle one of the hymn, functions as a notional omphalos vs. It begins by suggesting a mystery beyond our knowledge (ab) and continues with a paradox (c), signaled by the oppositional *śáye* ‘lies still’ / *cáratī* ‘moves’. But the paradox is easily understood, and the vs. just signals where an enigma would be inserted, rather than actually presenting a challenging one.

The pres. part. to \sqrt{as} in the nominative usually functions concessively (“although being ...”), but I do not see that meaning here. “Although being the clanlord, he licks the young woman” would suggest that Agni is doing something beneath his dignity or even shameful—which would be appropriate to our contemporary attitudes (sexual politics, abuse of power, “me too”), but I doubt its application to Vedic mores. The *sán* may owe its existence here to a more mundane reason: meter. The stem *viśpāti-*, in nom., voc., and acc., regularly comes at the end of 8 or 12 syllable pādas, providing a good iambic cadence, but it does not fit a Triṣṭubh cadence. I suggest that a pleonastic *sán* was added to provide a proper finale.

X.4.5: The fem. ‘old ones’ (*sánayāsu*) are of course the plants, which, old and dessicated, easily catch fire.

The problematic pāda is c, *asnātāpo vṛṣabhó ná prá veti*. The simile / frame structure is both formally and semantically / pragmatically flawed. The standard view (i.e., Ge/Re and the publ. tr.) is that the meaning of the pāda is more or less what is found in the publ. tr.: “(Although) not a swimmer, he pursues the waters like a bull.” As Ge points out (n. 5c), the thirsty bull or buffalo is a well-known image in the RV. But this assumes that ‘waters’ is part of the simile as the shared term; yet the simile particle follows ‘bull’ (*vṛṣabhó ná*), with ‘waters’ preceding – which is not the placement we expect. Moreover the form of ‘waters’ is wrong: it should be acc. (*apáh*) but the accent tells us it must be nom. *āpah* when extracted from sandhi. There are a few occurrences of nom.-for-acc. forms to this stem, but the vast majority are properly distributed. Such are the formal problems. The semantic-pragmatic one may be worse: there is no ritual, mythological, or natural-world scenario in which Agni/fire “pursues” water. The closest we come is the myth of Agni running away from his ritual duties and hiding in the waters, but I find it hard to wring this out of this expression. Likewise Agni as Apām Napāt (vaguely suggested by Tichy, Agent nouns, 146); that figure doesn’t behave as he would need to here. There is a very minor rite of aspersion of the hearth, which Ge sees in a couple of RVic passages (VIII.39.10, 102.14), but again this does not seem a compelling explanation here. Ge in his n. suggests an alternative structure: that the waters belong only to the simile, and another object should be supplied for the frame: Agni pursues (firewood), as a bull does waters. This

solves the pragmatic problem, but makes the formal structure of the simile even worse, since the *āpaḥ* is not part of the frame at all: we really should then have *āpo *ná vṛṣabhāḥ*. Moreover, what then is the point of *asnātā* ‘no swimmer’?

I will suggest a much trickier solution, which depends on a pun made possible by the sandhi coalescence in *asnātāpaḥ*. The accepted analysis of this sequence is *asnātā āpaḥ*, going back to the Pp. But the second element could, of course, be *āpaḥ* as well – and *āpaḥ* is a perfectly good word: neut. sg. *s*-stem ‘work, task’. I suggest that in the frame we read *āpaḥ* -- “(Agni) pursues his work” – and, secondarily, in the simile *āpaḥ* -- “as a bull pursues waters.” This pun would help account for the “wrong,” nominative, form of ‘waters’, which needs the initial accent to enable the pun. Rigvedic poets are willing to tamper with morphology if it is in the service of word play. It would also put the acc. in its first reading as ‘work’ firmly in the frame, not the simile, thus accounting for the position of *ná*. The ‘no swimmer’ is a little joke: since Agni has nothing to do with the waters in the simile, he is of course no swimmer; only the bull would qualify. I would also point out that there is a fairly well-established expression *viver āpāṃsi* (I.69.8, VI.31.3, etc.; see comm. ad locc.) “you toil(ed) at your labors.” Although the two verbs belong to different roots, *√viṣ* ‘toil’ and *√vī* ‘pursue’, *prá veti* in our passage is close enough in meaning and form to *√viṣ* in that expression that they could be assimilated to each other. I realize that this interpr. is quite intricate, but it solves both formal and semantic problems. I therefore propose to emend the tr. to “No swimmer, he pursues his task, as a bull does waters.”

As Ge (n. 5d) points out, *prá √nī* seems to refer to conveying the ritual fire to its new hearth in the east.

X.4.6: For the striking image in pāda a, see publ. intro.

X.5 Agni

On the structure and contents of this mystical hymn see publ. intro.

X.5.1: My interpr. of the first hemistich differs crucially from the standard (Ge, Re, Lü [*passim*], Doniger [117], Köhler [*Kavī* in R̥gveda, 121, 319–20]) in taking pāda a as a nominal clause and assuming a change of subject in b. All the others, save for Ge, assume an identification between Agni and the sea; Ge like me considers the sea to be the sea in the heart and “der Urquell der dichterischen Erkenntnis” (n. 1a). My major reason for separating the pādas is that the sea is sometimes identified with the heart, and therefore the abl. *hṛdāḥ* in b should be, in my opinion, coreferential with nom. *samudrāḥ* in pāda a. For the identification see IV.58.5 *hṛdyāt samudrāt*, 58.11 *antāḥ samudré hṛdy āntar āyusi*; cf. also VIII.102.4–6 *agnīm samudrāvāsasam* “Agni whose garment is the sea” and X.45.3, which relates Agni’s birth/kindling in the sea. I therefore think that Agni is within the sea but distinct from it. We also see separation between the sea (of poetic inspiration) and an agent who performs *ví √cakṣ* in X.177.1 *samudré antāḥ kavāyo ví cakṣate* “The sage poets espy it within the sea.” I do have to admit, however, that the 2nd phrase in pāda a, *dharūṇo rayīṇām* “foundation of riches” is used of Agni in I.73.4, X.45.5; on the other hand this phrase is not limited to Agni, modifying Indra in X.47.2; see also VII.34.24. Interestingly, X.47.2 resembles our passage phrasally, in that it is preceded by a numeral qualifying *samudra* — there as a compd., here as a free phrase: X.47.2 *cātuḥsamudraṃ dharūṇaṃ rayīṇām* / X.5.1 *ékaḥ samudró dharūṇo rayīṇām*. I don’t quite know what to make of this, beyond the apparent use of the sea or seas as an extreme measure of wealth.

In b the two hidden ones (*nīnyóḥ*) who serve as his mothers could be the two kindling sticks, Night and Dawn, or Heaven and Earth. On this as an enigma, see Ge's n. 1c. The naming of the two world halves (*ródasī*) in nurturing roles in 4c may determine the matter, at least by the middle of the hymn.

If the gen./loc. du. *nīnyóḥ* belongs to the stem *nīn(i)yá-*, we should expect **nīnyayoh* (AiG III.99); our form would simply show haplology, with the distracted syllable maintaining the syllable count. (The stem shows distraction in some other forms, not simply the gen.-loc. du., so this can't be the only reason.) Lanman (Noun infl. 392) suggests rather a stem **nīñ-* (see also Old), but there seems no reason to multiply entities here and the formation would be distinctly odd.

As Ge (n. 1d) also thinks, the wellspring (*útsa-*) in d must be the sea of pāda a; presumably the "hidden track of the bird" (*nīhitam padām véḥ*, a phrase found elsewhere [I.164.7, III.5.5–6, 7.7; IV.5.8]) here is the trace of the mystical fire—though Lü (614), Re favor the sun. Again the intent is to locate the enigma of Agni in the sea of poetic inspiration within the poet. X.45.2–3, which treats Agni's birth (see above), also has the wellspring (2c), the sea (3a), and the udder (3b) together in a similar context.

X.5.2: As indicated in the publ. intro., the first half-vs. describes the mating of the flames of the nascent fire, configured as both male and female. So also Ge and Re.

The med. root part. *vāsānāḥ* properly must belong to the root pres. to \sqrt{vas} 'wear', and *vāvasāné* in 4c supports this association. However, in sense it seems closer to \sqrt{vas} 'dwell'. A similar conundrum is posed by *saṁvāsāna-* in IV.6.8, which is assigned by Gr (and others, e.g., Ge) to 'dwell', even though that root is otherwise active and has no root forms. There the preverb *sām* could have triggered a middle form or at least a nonce reinterpret. of a form belong to 'wear', and I take it as a pun. (See comm. ad loc.) Although the participle in our passage is not cmpd with *sām*, *saṁānām* 'same' with which it's construed, as well as the immediately following *sām* (*jagmire*), could exert the same influence. I therefore take it as a pun here as well.

The 2nd hemistich seems an elaboration on and restating of 1d.

X.5.3: This vs. revisits the birth of Agni alluded to briefly in 1c. Here again we have dual parents, here clearly identified as feminine – though this does not narrow down the possible sets of referents already noted above.

The two fem. *-ín-*stems that open the vs., *ṛtāyínī māyínī* seem designed to be contrastive. Although *māyā-* has not acquired the generally negative sense of 'illusion' that it often has later, it does refer to power derived from supernatural manipulation or tricks or some variety of artifice, the opposite of *ṛtā-*, the truth that encapsulates the real and enduring structures of the cosmos. These combined skills of Agni's mothers would endow him with an extraordinary range of powers. The twinning of these two words is clear from the fact that the hapax *ṛtāyín-* is clearly modeled on the well-attested *māyín-*; see AiG II.2.343, 842.

There is much disagreement about the meaning and the grammatical and lexical identity of the part. *vīyāntaḥ* in d. Gr assigns it to \sqrt{vi}/i with the sense 'durchwandern'; Ge to the same lexeme but with the somewhat bizarre gloss 'abschneidend' (cutting off, snipping). (He also thinks it's anacoluthon for du. fem. *vīyatī-*, on the pl. see below.) Köhler (320) agrees with the assignment of Gr/Ge but with the sense "einzeln zum Nabel ... gehen," connecting pāda c with d, rather than with ab as most do. Re calls it a "forme baroque" of *vāyantaḥ* 'weaving'. The most persuasive suggestion is Old's, though he falls short of endorsing it— that it belongs to the root

pres. of $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$ ‘pursue’. Although the weak pre-V forms of this pres. are transmitted with initial cluster $vy-$, they are almost all to be read with distracted $v'y-$; cf. for this exact nom. pl. part. IV.5.5, VI.1.4, VII.27.5, all pāda-final as here (only the form in I.127.5 is not distracted). Old is reluctant to ignore the “transmitted spelling” (“überlieferte Schreibung”), but since the original oral version would have had distracted $v'iy-$, it is only the later redaction that imposed that form, and it can easily be the result of misunderstanding of the sense of the passage (not difficult, as the various versions demonstrate). The assignment to $\sqrt{v\bar{r}}$ is supported by the fact that this root is part of the characteristic lexicon of Trita Āptya; note X.2.2, 4.5, 6.2, 3, 8.5, 7.

Assuming that the form is indeed a nom. pl. m. pres. part. (*pace* Gr), it must be predicated, since the previous subjects were fem. dual. The most likely subject to supply here is the *kavāyaḥ* of 2c, as Old (tentatively), Re, and Köh do. They, the human poets, “pursue the thread of the poet”; this sg. *kavī-* must be Agni, and the human poets are following his lead and model in their own work. Threads and weaving are of course standard images for the materials and activity of a poet; see the famous passage VI.9.2–3, in which the apprentice poet confesses his ignorance of thread and weaving, that is, of his own craft, but he learns this craft from Agni.

X.5.4–5: Note the phonological echoes in 4c *vāvasāné*, 4d *vāvṛdhāte*, 5a *vāvasānó*. The two med. participles in 4c and 5a are in the same metrical position and (besides the ending) differ only in the identity of the sibilant.

X.5.4: The ‘over-cloak’ is interpr. by Sāy. (fld. by Ge) as plants, stars, etc.—an appealing interpr. In one of the other two occurrences of *adhīvāsá-* (I.140.9; the other in the Aśvamedha hymn, I.162.16, is irrelevant), it refers to the ‘over-cloak’ of the Earth, which Agni consumes – so vegetation there as well. However, I think it possible that it refers here (also?) to the smoke that envelops the two world-halves as the fire flares up.

My interpr. of d is entirely different from the standard; Gr, Ge, Re, Lü (469) all take *vāvṛdhāte* as intrans./reflex. – e.g., Ge “... stärkten sich.” (Doniger’s tr. [117] is like mine.) And certainly the preponderance of occurrences of the med. pf. have this sense. However, some forms of the med. pf. are transitive. Cf. esp. VII.7.5 *dyaús ca yám pṛthivī vāvṛdhāte* “whom [=Agni] Heaven and Earth have made strong,” which is exactly parallel to our passage, with the same subjects and the same object. The form is medial because of the self-involvement of the subject: they act as parents of the child in question. In our passage the point is that, whether H+E are the original parents of Agni (see 1c, 3b), they nurture him as he grows in the space between them. If the verb is taken as intrans./reflex. the connection between Agni’s birth and the self-strengthening of H+E is unclear. Ge (n. 4cd) says “Agni’s Geburt gereicht Himmel und Erde zum Segen”; Lü considers the actions of ab and cd reciprocal: H+E bring Agni hymns and refreshments (though in fact their involvement is not overt in ab), and he gives them rain in return, with honey and ghee a poetic expression of rain. But Ge’s explan. is vague and generic, and Lü’s forces an interpr. on ab that is not supported by the text.

Ge (fld. by Lü) takes the two instr. *ghṛtaír ánnaiḥ* and the gen. *mádhūnām* as parallel, while I (along with Re) construe the gen. with *ánnaiḥ*.

X.5.5: The part. *vāvasānāḥ* could belong either to \sqrt{vas} ‘desire, be eager’ or $\sqrt{vās}$ ‘bellow’, and either would work in the passage. The former is favored by most (Gr, Ge, Re, Lub), but Kü (479–80) assigns most forms of the stem to ‘bellow’.

The “seven ruddy sisters” (*saptá svásṛ āruṣīḥ*) are generally and plausibly taken as Agni’s flames, though why seven? I doubt if it has anything to do with the seven boundaries (*saptá maryādāḥ*) of the next vs. (6).

The honey from which Agni carries them up is, acdg. to Ge (n. 5ab), again plausibly, the ghee that fuels the fire. (Re’s “soma” is less plausible, even though *mádhu* is more often used of that substance.) If “honey” is what fuels Agni’s flames and that “honey” is actually ghee, this provides support for my transitive interpr. of 4d, where H+E strengthen Agni “with ghee” *ghṛtaīḥ* as well as with *ánnaiḥ ... mádghūnām* “with foods of honey(s).”

In the publ. tr. the placement of *drśé kám* makes it sound as if it’s to be construed with the abl. *mádghvaḥ* (“... from the honey to be seen”), but I meant it to go with the sisters. An emended tr. “... from the honey, to be seen” (with comma) or perhaps more explicitly “from the honey, (for them) to be seen” will disambiguate.

The 2nd hemistich is difficult, and I will emend my publ. tr. in several ways. In c the question centers on the value of the med. pf. *yeme*, but also involves the grammatical identity of *purājāḥ*. In the publ. tr. I take the latter as a fem. acc. pl. referring to the flame-sisters, which is therefore the object of a transitively used *yeme*. However, *purājāḥ* can also be a nom. sg. m., as Gr, Ge, and Re take it. Re (in a n. erroneously located in the nn. to vs. 4) points out undoubted nom. sg. *prathamajāḥ* in 7c also referring to Agni, and this seems to me good evidence for a nom. sg. here as well. The flame-sisters can still be understood as obj. of *yeme*, but need not be—and, I now think, should not be. I would now take *yeme* as intrans./reflex. ‘hold oneself in check, hold still’ and with the presential value Kü (396–97) attributes to most of the forms of this pf. (though not this one). I think the point is that, once the fire has flared up, it becomes fairly stable in that position. I would now tr. “he holds himself there within the midspace.”

Pāda d is considerably complicated by the presence of the hapax thematic gen. *pūṣanāsya*, which differs from the divine name *pūṣán-* not only in stem but also in accent. It is hard not to associate this form with the divine name, but whether it is a secondary thematization based on ambig. forms like acc. sg. *pūṣānam* (with unexplained accent shift) or a thematic *-á-* derivative of the name cannot be determined. (See Old’s sensible disc.) And context is of no help.

The word *vavṛí-* ‘cover’ appears in the preceding hymn, X.4.4, where Agni’s ‘cover’ lies still as he moves about eating it. In that passage the cover seems to be the firewood that fuels him. That interpr. does not work here, because Agni is already positioned in the midspace and so the covering he seeks should be located in that vicinity. What sort of covering could that be? I think the most likely identification is a cloud of smoke rising through the sky, assimilated to the clouds naturally found in the midspace. In V.19.1 Agni emerges from one *vavṛí-* (probably the wood) only for another to appear, quite likely smoke, and *vavṛí-* seems also to be used of actual clouds (e.g., I.164.7, 29).

So far so good. But what, if anything, is the connection to Pūṣan? Here I have only a very tentative suggestion to make, linking this enigmatic passage to an equally baffling one. In VI.56.3 Pūṣan is said to have set the golden wheel of the sun down “in(to) the gray cow” (*paruṣé gávī*). In the publ. intro. to that hymn I suggest that this may be a “a naturalistic reference to a cloudy dawn twilight, with the sun rising through it.” If Pūṣan is associated with a gray phenomenon that masks light and brightness and is found in the midspace, the same association may be alluded to here.

X.5.6: On the general purport of the vs., see publ. intro.: in the 2nd hemistich Agni, who was born in the first vss. and rose through the midspace in the subsequent ones, now reaches heaven, at least as I interpret it. However, the first hemistich is puzzling. I have no idea what the seven boundaries are, but it is of course in keeping with the theme of the hymn that they were created by the Kavis. Ge has what seems to me an overly schematic interpr. (n. 6); see Köh's disc. (322) of some of the possibilities.

I take Agni to be the referent of both the hapax *aṃhurá-* 'narrow (one)' and *skambhá-* 'pillar'. Although Ge's notion (n. 6c) that it refers to the Weltpfeiler is surely in the background, the image, I think, is of fire rising vertically as a narrow flame, to join heaven and earth.

X.5.7: See publ. intro. for the cosmogonic aspects of this vs., which contains the only occurrences of the name Agni in the hymn.

With JSK (DGRV I.171) I take the *ca* in d as an inverse *ca*.

X.6 Agni

X.6.1–3: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn begins with annunciatory *ayám sá* "Here he is," presumably gesturing towards the offering fire on the ritual ground, and the rest of the first 3 vss. consists of rel. clauses, one per hemistich, dependent on *sá*. The meter of the hymn is unusual, in that it contains a large number of Pentad (and other 10-syllable) vss. amid the Triṣṭubhs. See Arnold 239, 318 and Old ZDMG 60 (1906): 751–52 (review of Arnold) = KISch 226–27. Because of the fluctuating meter, it is not always clear which forms we should distract – e.g., in 2d *átyo* is read distracted (*at'yo*) by Gr, Old (hesitatingly), HvN, but Arnold prefers the disyllabic reading. The first gives a Triṣṭubh, the 2nd a Pentad line. The stem *átya-* is more often disyllabic than trisyllabic, but there are undoubted exx. of the latter. In any case it is well to be wary of the distracted readings enshrined in HvN.

X.6.1: Ge (n. 1cd) considers *paryéti* 'circles around' a representation of the *paryagnikarāṇa*, the circular tour around the fire or an offering (the sacrificial beast) with a firebrand; Re rather a circuit of heaven.

A nice figure involving adjacent verbal forms combined with *pári*, *paryéti párivītaḥ*, with the first describing Agni's action of encircling, the 2nd his being encircled.

X.6.1–2: Note the concatenation: *yó bhānúbhiḥ* (1c, 2a), *vibhāvā* (1d, 2a, with the latter etymologically doubled by the immediately cognate verb *bhātī*). Perhaps to draw attention to the shifting meter, the concatenated items are in different metrical positions.

X.6.2: Ge takes *sakhyā* as a dat. on the basis of I.156.5 *ā yó vivāya sacáthāya daívyah*, without explaining how the morphology would work. Despite superficial similarity the two passages have very different structures; see comm. ad I.156.5. There *ā ... vivāya* takes a dat. inf. as complement; here it is construed as usual with a goal/obj. in the acc., the pl. *sakhyā*.

Another type of concatenation: *áparihvṛtaḥ* recalls *paryéti párivītaḥ*.

On the reading of *átyah* see above.

X.6.3: This vs. locates Agni as the controller of both the ritual and the natural world, which meet on the ritual ground at the dawn sacrifice: on the one hand, Agni controls "the pursuit of the

gods” (*devā-vīti-*, a cmpd that picks up the verb *ā ... vivāya* from the previous vs.); on the other, the kindling of the ritual fire is thought to cause Dawn to dawn. The somewhat awk. tr. “every effort to pursue the gods” for *devā-vīti-* was meant to avoid the more literal “every pursuit of the gods,” which makes it sound like the gods are pursuing their hobbies or playing cribbage or crocheting.

As indicated in the publ. tr. I take the chariot as a symbol of the sacrifice, as so often.

The root $\sqrt{\text{ska}(m)bh}$ ‘prop’ seems an odd choice in the context, and the oddness is conveyed by the publ. tr.; ‘fixes’ or ‘piles’ might be less jarring.

X.6.4: Another concatenation between vss.: *sūṣaiḥ* ending vs. 3 and *sūṣébhiḥ* opening vs. 4. In this case they are not only in different metrical positions but also exhibit different forms of the same case (instr. pl.), which is emphasized by their cross-verse-boundary juxtaposition.

Note *jigāti* (b), *jigharti* (d) – again the echoing forms are located in different metrical positions.

Both Ge and Re, in different ways, try to split *ā jigharti* from other occurrences of this verb meaning ‘sprinkle’ that have Agni as obj. Cf. esp. II.10.4 *jígharmy agnīm havīṣā ghr̥tēna*, which could hardly be clearer. Ge suggests that \sqrt{ghr} in our passage is an older form of \sqrt{hr} ‘take’; Re gives the lexeme *ā√ghr* the sense ‘attirer à soi’, with the sense of the preverb *ā* dominant. But he doesn’t say what happens to the “recessive” ‘sprinkle’ portion, which shouldn’t be entirely lost: for example, the common lexemes *ā√yaj* ‘attract here through sacrifice’, *ā√pū* ‘attract here through purification’ still maintain the sense of the base verb. Nor does he attempt to account for the two straightforward examples of *ā√ghr* with Agni as object: II.10.5, X.87.1, where ‘attirer à soi’ does not seem to be in question. (In II.10.4, 5 he tr. both verbs [+/- preverb] as ‘j’arrose’, but in X.87.1 he argues for ‘attirer à soi’ for no compelling reason.) I see no reason to decouple our *ā jigharti* here, or the other two passages that are superficially difficult to interpret with the ‘sprinkle’ meaning: IV.17.14 and V.48.3, from the standard literal usage. And in fact keeping all the passages together leads to richer semantics and produces the kind of paradoxical reversal so beloved of RVic poets. In all three of the anomalous passages, Agni is subject (undeniably here, by my interpr. in the other two passages). If in the standard usage of the verb, Agni is the object, being sprinkled with ghee by the priests, in the anomalous passages Agni switches roles: he sprinkles rather than being sprinkled. In two of the passages he is also identified as the Hotar (here) or being like the Hotar (IV.17.14), so that part of the standard model is maintained (priest sprinkles ...) even as it’s being disrupted by the promotion of the usual object to subject. But what would it mean in real-world terms for Agni to ‘sprinkle’? I suggest that he releases a stream of sparks, which could appear to be bright droplets of ghee. Notice that here he sprinkles the gods with his tongue, that is, his flame, from which the sparks would pour out. For further disc. see comm. ad IV.17.14 and V.48.3.

X.6.5: On the analogic hyper-feminization in the loc. sg. *usrām* see comm. ad VI.3.6 and AiG III.213.

The verbal configuration and pāda boundary in the sequence *índram ná réjamānam, agnīm* seem to favor an interpr. of the simile “... Agni, trembling like Indra.” But this is unlikely pragmatically: Indra is not a trembler! So with the other standard interpr. (going back to Sāy.) I take the participle only with Agni, even though it appears before the pāda boundary. The simile is off-kilter for another reason: it is not a poetic comparison but the equation of two real-world

actions: “bring Agni *as you do* Indra,” referring to Indra’s usual appearance at the dawn sacrifice. RVic similes don’t ordinarily have this function.

X.6.7: Gr reads distracted trisyllabic *mah'nā* here as in IV.2.1. Given the fluctuation between 10- and 11-syllable lines in this hymn, that distraction is not necessary, though it is possible. For discussion of the trisyllabic form see comm. ad I.123.4.

X.7 Agni

X.7.1: Ge takes the *urú- śáṃsa-* as Agni’s, but it makes more sense, with Re, to interpr. them as ours—reciprocally exchanged for the wide space given us by Agni. (This is supported by 2a.) I take the instr. as an instr. of price. The phrase corresponds to the (presumably) *bahuvr. uruśáṃsa-* ‘of wide/broad praise/pronouncement’, ‘widely praised/praising’ used of both gods and, less commonly, of singers. The phrase presumably refers to a laud that is widely disseminated.

X.7.2: In b *góbhir áśvaiḥ* is an instr. of specification with *rādhah*.

The lexeme *ánu* √(n)aś is fairly rare. In most of its occurrences it has the idiomatic sense ‘be equal to’ (II.16.3, VII.99.1, VIII.69.18, 70.5), but in some, like here (=I.163.7), I.52.13, and IX.22.6, it does not seem to differ appreciably from the simplex.

Despite my tr. “from you,” *te* is of course not an abl., but I wanted to make clear that it was a subjective, not objective genitive.

Ge interpr. *dádhānah* in d as passive, modifying Agni. This requires a change of subject in the middle of the hemistich and a predicated participle, predicated of a 2nd ps. subj. None of these interpretive moves is impossible, but the combination is unnecessarily complex, esp. since the part. *dádhāna-* is frequently transitive and since a nom. sg. subject is readily available in the *mártaḥ* of c. Re agrees with my syntactic assessment, but supplies ‘you’ as the obj. of *dádhānah*. But √*dhā* in the middle frequently means ‘appropriate, make one’s own, acquire’, and here it can take *bhógam* as obj.

The stem *matí-* and the ppl. (-)*jātá-* are found in the 1st and last pādas of the vs., emphasizing the closed loop of reciprocity depicted in these first two vss.

X.7.4: Despite its 1st member accent, the hapax *nítya-hotar-* must be a karmadhāraya; see Old and AiG II.1.189, 266, who do not explain the accent but simply stipulate it. As Ge points out (n. 4b), the free syntagm *hótā nítyaḥ* is found in nearby X.12.2, which further supports a karmadhāraya interpr. I tr. the phrase there “constant Hotar,” rather than “own Hotar” as here. The stem *nítya-* can mean both, and here the emphasis on Agni’s actions in the house of a particular man seems paramount—though “as his constant Hotar” would also work here.

Pāda c seems designed to mislead the audience. On the one hand, the *yám* (b) ... *sá* (c) construction is the standard relative / correlative one, and *sá* should therefore be coreferential with *yám*, namely the mortal worshiper. But the adjectives qualifying the subject of c are better suited to Agni than to the mortal: *ṛtāvan-* is far more often used of gods, esp. Agni, than of mortals, including in the immediately previous hymn (X.6.2); *rohíd-aśva-* occurs 5x in the RV, 4 of them clearly of Agni; *puru-kṣú-* is used several times of gods, including Agni (e.g., III.25.2), but usually modifies ‘wealth’ (*rayí-*), never humans. I think the poet is tricking us by playing syntactic expectations off against lexical ones, in the service of the reciprocal exchange of

identities between god and mortal that was the theme earlier in the hymn. The pāda *could* simply modify the subject of pāda b, namely Agni, yielding an alternate tr. “Whomever you, as his own Hotar-priest, safeguard in his house, (you) the truthful one, possessed of reddish horses [=flames] and much livestock, for him ...” But the *sá* in c would nag at the audience (I hope), since *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. only occurs with imperatives. So the listener would ultimately have to conclude that the referent is the worshiper, but now endowed with many of Agni’s qualities. With the reading of c with the mortal as subj., in the publ. tr. I supplied the impv. *astu* from d. However, it could be simply mean “whomever you safeguard, that truthful one is/becomes possessed of ...,” without requiring a modal verb to be supplied.

The instr. phrase in d, *dyúbhiḥ ... áhabhiḥ*, also confounds expectations. The standard temporal opposition is of course “days and nights,” with various lexical realizations, but here we have two different words for day. On *áhar-* versus *div-* for ‘day’ see comm. ad IX.86.19.

X.7.5: *prayógam* in pāda a is a much discussed hapax (see esp. Old); *pace* Gr it surely belongs to *pra √ yuj* ‘hitch up, harness’, referring to the initiation of the sacrifice. I’m taking it quite loosely as an adverbial acc. of purpose.

Although the Pp. reads augmented *ajananta* in c, the form could easily be the injunc. *jananta*, despite the parallel augmented *asādayanta* at the end of the next pāda. Both verbs are -*anta* replacements in otherwise act. paradigms.

The somewhat odd expression “gave birth to him with their arms” of course refers to the Āyus’ priestly activity in producing the fire.

X.7.6: This vs. urges a reflexive loop on Agni: to sacrifice to himself by himself. This is almost iconically represented by the hermetic circular repetitions and doublings: the extremely alliterative and etymological figure *diví deva devān* in pāda a repeated by *deva devān* in c; the three 2nd ps. verb forms to *√ yaj*, two identical: *yajasva* (a), *áyajah* (c), *yajasva* (d); and the semantically similar pair *svayám* ‘(by) oneself’ (a), *tanvām* ‘self, (own) body’.

X.8–9

These two hymns are attributed to Triśiras Tvāṣṭra (the second with the alternative attribution Sindhuvīpa Āmbarīṣa). The poet’s name is a transparent adoption from the mythological material in X.8.7–9, and this hymn, and by default the next, belong with the Trita Āptya hymns X.1–7. See Old (Proleg. 233–34) and publ. intro. to X.8.

X.8 Agni

As was just noted, this hymn belongs with the Trita Āptya Agni cycle, X.1–7. The Agni portion of the hymn ends with vs. 6, so it would fit the sequence by showing a smaller number of vss. than the first seven hymns, all with seven vss., as Old points out. There are also lexical reminiscences between this hymn and the previous seven: *ketú-* (1a, also X.1.5, 2.6); *vibhāvan-* (4b, also X.6.1-2 and a number of *ví √ bhā* forms in X.3); *veṣi* (5b), *veti* (7d)—cf. forms of *√ vī* in X.2.2, 4.5, 5.4, 6.2, 3; *sácase* (6b), *sacasyāmānaḥ* (7c)—cf. X.3.3, 5.1, 4, 7.1.

X.8.1: Although the act. pf. *vavárdha* (etc.) is usually transitive, there are undoubted intrans. occurrences (see Kü 470), and it is hard to interpr. this pāda in any other way.

For the buffalo, Agni, and the lap of the waters see also X.45.3 and VI.8.1, neither of which is much help.

X.8.2: The single form of the pf. to \sqrt{mud} in the RV, *mumóda*, is taken, convincingly, by Kü (384) as presential and stative.

On the various forms of the root \sqrt{srev} ‘abort’ see EWA s.v. and comm. ad III.29.13.

The stem *śīmī-* and the adj. deriv. *śīmīvant-* (sometimes to be read **śīmivant-* as here) is generally taken as an irregular derivative of $\sqrt{śam}$ ‘labor’. EWA (s.v. *śīmī-*) suggests a process of “laryngeal umlaut.” I wonder if instead it comes from the semantically similar root $\sqrt{śram}$ ‘labor, become weary’, via a Middle Indic form built to a zero-grade **śrm*, with development of syllabic **r* to *i* (though we might expect *u* because of the labial).

In c I supply ‘oblations’ with *údyatāni* (so more or less Ge and Re), but rather than interpr. *kṛṇvān* as describing an action separate from *úd* \sqrt{yam} (e.g., Re “préparant ... (les mets) offerts”) I see *údyatāni* $\sqrt{kṛ}$ as the equivalent of a periphrastic causative ‘make (to be) raised/lifted’; the morphological caus. to \sqrt{yam} , *yāmayati*, is rare and specialized in its usage (see my *-āya-*, 164–65). For a very close parallel to our passage, see VIII.74.3 ... *devātāti údyatā / havyāni aīrayat divī* “who raised to heaven the oblations lifted up among the conclave of the gods,” with the oblations overt.

X.8.3: The sense and the referents in this vs. are much disputed; see Ge’s extensive and somewhat dogmatic notes, Re’s comments, and Lü (594–96) discussion, in part a refutation of some of Ge’s views. I think it is useful to consider the vs. in the context of nearby X.5, which depicts the birth and growth of Agni, esp. in vss. 1, 3–5.

In the 1st pāda in the expression “the head of his two parents” (*mūrdhānam pitróḥ*), the two parents are generally agreed (esp. Ge, Re) to be Heaven and Earth. But see disc. of X.5, where not only cosmic parents (H+E, Night and Day) were considered, but also the two kindling sticks. Sāy. suggest these last as possible referents here, in addition to H+E – a suggestion dismissed by Ge (n. 3a), but one that I think is well worth considering. The fire “seizes” their head, which can be a metaphor for the fire “catching” (note the similar English metaphor). At the same time it can refer to H+E, and his seizing their head can refer to the fire’s ascent up towards the sky.

The main cl. in b (note the unaccented verb *dadhire*) has no coreferential pronoun to pick up the rel. *yāḥ* of pāda a; we must simply supply *tām*. As the gramm. number (pl.) of the verb makes clear, the subject is not the two parents, but must be unidentified priests. No plural beings have been previously mentioned in the hymn. The phrase *sūro árṇaḥ* (“the sun’s undulating flood”) both asserts the identification of Agni with the sun, a cosmic connection that pervades the hymn, and depicts the fire on the ground as both bright like the sun and in constant wave-like motion.

In c there is a lively debate among the aforementioned commentators about the referent of the fem. pl. *áruṣīḥ* ‘ruddy ones’—dawns, flames, or flames standing for the cows of the Dakṣiṇā (for the last, see Ge’s n. 3cd). Given that the same *áruṣīḥ* are found in X.5.5, where they are generally agreed to refer to flames, this same identification seems likely here. As in X.5, the flames rise higher as the fire goes stronger. The lively debate continues with regard to the bahuvr. *ásva-budhna-* ‘having horses as ground’, a hapax but in clear relationship with *ásva-budhya-* (3x). Since the latter always qualifies some kind of wealth (see comm. ad I.92.7–8), Ge believes that the adj. here must refer metaphorically to the Dakṣiṇā, but making this work requires mental contortions that do not seem worthwhile. Here I think the ‘horse’ is actually

Agni: the flames have the fire as their base or foundation, even as they and the rest of the fire rises. Agni is regularly compared to a horse (e.g., IV.2.8, VI.3.4, VII.3.2).

In d these flames “find pleasure in their own bodies” (*tanvò juṣanta*), a description of the seemingly rapturous movements of flames.

X.8.4: The two hemistichs of this vs. seem thematically disjunct. The first has to do with Agni’s timebound daily appearance, the second with his role as a creator of alliances. I do not see any connection between them. These distinct themes are reunited in vs. 6; see comm. there.

The āmreḍita *uṣā-uṣaḥ* of course preserves the archaic gen. sg. of *uṣás-*, representing **uṣ-ṣ-as*.

Both the referents and the grammatical identity of the dual gen.-loc. *yamáyoḥ* are disputed. Among the suggestions are Day and Night, the Áśvins, and even Yama and Yamī, whose famous dialogue is found two hymns later (X.10). It is also unclear whether the form is a gen. dependent on *vibhāṇā* (Ge), gen. dependent on a supplied noun (Re: le maître), or loc. and dependent on nothing. As for the first, favored by Ge, *vibhāvan-* doesn’t take the gen. (I.69.9, cited in his n. 4b, is not an ex.); since supplying a headnoun (with Re) is arbitrary, a loc. reading seems the best choice. I opt for that, with the loc. as a temporal marker: by day and by night.

The apparent causal relationship between pādas a and b, signaled by the *hí* in pāda a, is rather difficult to interpr., and I would now somewhat change my tr. and the interpr. that lies behind it. In b the publ. tr. renders *abhavaḥ* as “have become,” but (per IH) augmented imperfects should not have this “perfect”-type sense, but rather mean “you became.” I now think this pāda means that (in the primordial past) Agni assumed the role of (/became) the far-radiant one at the two twilights, namely dawn and the onset of night (“at [the time of] the twins”), a role he continues to have. He did so *on the grounds* (*hí*) that he always—every dawn—goes at the forefront of the dawn. The contrast between the pres. *éṣi* in the *hí*cl. and the augmented imperf. *abhavaḥ* in the main cl. is not problematic: the *hí* clause describes a regular recurring action, still happening in present time but repeated from time immemorial, whereas the main cl. asserts the result of this recurrent action, a distinct event in the past (“you became”), though Agni maintains this role in the pres.

The *hí*cl. says nothing about night, just dawn, whereas I claim that Agni is *vibhāvan-* at night as well as at dawn. The two twilights are regularly assimilated to each other in Vedic, including in ritual time: the daily Agnihotra is to be performed at the rising and setting of the sun. And of course the illumination of the fire is even more evident at night than in daylight.

As was said above, the 2nd hemistich of this vs. embarks on an entirely new theme. It also strikingly introduces the ritual enactment of the formation of an alliance (*mitrá-*), a ritual that persists to the present day in Hindu wedding ceremonies: the seven steps taken by the parties to the alliance towards the northeast from beside the ritual fire. (See reff. in publ. intro.) This general description of the formation of alliances seems to introduce the next vss. (5–6), in which Agni becomes, or becomes identified with, other divinities or divine roles. If this is the intent, I find it somewhat puzzling, because the insistent *bhuvah* ‘you become’ of 6–7 implies a transformation of Agni into the various entities, not an alliance with them. But perhaps the point is that Agni keeps his own identity even when fulfilling the various roles, which is more like an alliance than straight transformation, but still doesn’t seem to me to be the same thing at all.

X.8.5–6: As just noted, these last two vss. in the Agni portion of the hymn introduce a series of roles that Agni fulfills. All four pādas of vs. 5 and the first one of 6 begin with the injunc.

bhúvah ‘you become’. Listing a set of roles Agni performs and/or a set of divinities with which he is identified is fairly common practice; see, e.g., the lengthy list in II.1; what is novel is that these might be considered alliances—see comm. immed. above. Note that the repeated *bhúvah* has an entirely different function from *abhavaḥ* in vs. 4. Here *bhúvah* refers to the regular assumption of a role in the present; *abhavaḥ* referred to a single event in the past. In this interpr. of *bhúvah* I part ways with Hoffmann (214–15), who takes such usages of the (secondary) injunctives *bhuvās*, -at as expressing “resultative Konstatierung”: as a result of an action in the past, the situation holds now and in the future (that is, “became and now is,” with emphasis on the “is”). Here, therefore, he tr. *bhuvah* as “bist,” not “wirst”: “Du (Agni) bist das Auge ...” In our passage, at any rate, I think the point is not that Agni became each of these entities and remains so, but that he takes up these roles from time to time and then moves on.

X.8.5: Verbal forms of the root $\sqrt{vī}$ are not construed directly with the dative, but have a direct obj. in the acc. In pāda b I have supplied “your tasks” as a generic object, though I do not have particular parallels in mind. A common object of $\sqrt{vī}$ is ‘gods’, enshrined also in the cmpds *deva-vī-* and *devā-vīti-*, and supplying “gods” as object would also be possible here.

X.8.6: This vs. reunites the separate strains of the Agni portion of the hymn: the birth and growth of Agni up through the cosmos (vss. 1–4ab) and the various roles he assumes (vss. 4cd–5). This may account for some ill-assorted phraseology. In particular the two terms in the overtly conjoined phrase *yajñāsya rájasaś ca* “of the sacrifice and of airy space” do not form a natural class, to say the least, and the fact that the gen. depends on *netā* ‘leader’ makes it somewhat worse. “Leader of the sacrifice” makes perfect sense and is in fact found elsewhere (I.196.2, III.15.4, both of Agni, as well as fem. *yajñāsya netrī* IV.56.2). But what does it mean to be “the leader of *rájas-*”? Several different solutions have been proposed, none particularly satisfactory. Sāy. interpr. *rájas-* as a reference to waters, which would improve the sense but has no support and doesn’t fit the context. Ge takes the 2nd term as if expressing extent of space (“der Führer des Opfers und durch das Dunkel”), whose awkwardness speaks for itself (less awk. but no better supported in KH’s [215 n. 204] “der Führer des Opfers und der Führer durch die Finsternis”). Re in his n., calling the phrase a sort of zeugma, supplies “mesureur” as the headnoun with *rájasaḥ* (without argument); similarly Klein (DGRV I.68), also calling it a zeugma, supplies instead “pervader.” Tichy (-tar-stems 352) decouples the two terms, taking *ca* as ‘auch’: “Du wirst zum Führer des Opfers, auch im Luftraum.”

My own, very tentative, suggestion rests on the return of the theme of the birth and growth of Agni. In the first vss. of the hymn (esp. vs. 1; see also nearby X.5 and comm. there) Agni is kindled and goes forth and up (1a), with his first location on leaving the earth being the space between the two world halves (1b), until he reaches heaven (1c). Here again, I would say, the sacrifice of our pāda a locates his origin on the earth, but the *rájas-*, the realm between earth and heaven, is also found in pāda a and the whole of the *yátrā* clause of b, which qualifies *rájasaḥ*. Pāda b makes it quite clear that Agni has reached that location. He then arrives at heaven in pāda c. The twist in my interpr. is to take *rájasaḥ* not as genitive, but as ablative: “he is leader of the sacrifice and from the airy realm.” I realize that this is a trick, possibly a cheap one: *rájasaḥ* looks as if it’s entirely parallel to *yajñāsya* and in the same case, but my reading gives it an alternative case interpr., which is morphologically entirely legitimate but pushes the syntactic envelope. The point would be that the *rájas-* is only a waystation on Agni’s journey towards heaven and he leads the sacrifice from the *rájas-* to heaven.

My interpr. of c is also different from most, though not as radically. I take *sácse* as intrans./pass. ‘you are accompanied’, while most take it as an underlying transitive in absolute usage (e.g., Ge “du ... das Geleit gibst”; sim. KH, Tichy). It is certainly true that *sácate* regularly takes an acc. (“accompany X”), and here we might even (re-)supply *yajñám* (“accompany [the sacrifice]”) from pāda a. However, in nearby X.7.1 *sacemahi* is used in the same pass./intrans. I suggest here. I would also point to the *nīyúts* that accompany him or help him accompany others: *nīyút-* is used especially of Vāyu’s teams; they are literally wind-horses, and I see these breezes wafting Agni upwards towards heaven.

X.8.7–9: On this appended account of the Trita-Viśvarūpa myth and possible reasons for its attachment to the end of the preceding Agni hymn, see publ. intro.

X.8.7: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. may be subject to two simultaneous readings, as an account of the beginning of the Trita-Viśvarūpa conflict and as a description of the establishment of the third (=Āhavanīya) ritual fire on the ritual ground. To assemble the evidence for the latter reading first, note first the appropriateness of *tritá-* as a designation for this fire; on *tritá-* for the third fire, see X.46.6. This entity is located *vavré antár* “within a/his covering.” Although this phrase can be used for the Vala cave in that myth (see below), it could also refer to the kindling wood or the plants within which Agni is concealed. Note that the related stem *vavrí-* is found in this sequence of Agni hymns in similar usage (X.4.4 of the wood, X.5.5 of his smoke; cf. also, e.g., V.19.1). “Seeking a visionary thought” (*ichán dhītím*) can refer to the ritual fire’s response to the hymns chanted at its kindling, and under this reading the father can be Heaven. In pāda c the real tipoff to the Agni reading is *pitrór upásthe* “in the lap of his parents”; not only does this phrase recall *mūrdhānam pitróḥ* in 3a, but, more importantly, *pitrór upásthe* (also *upásthe mātúḥ*) is regularly used of the ritual Agni’s location (cf., e.g., I.31.9, 146.1, III.5.8, 26.9, VI.7.5, etc.). The audience would be primed to perceive an Agni reference here. As for the hapax *sacasyámāna-*, although Ge and Re both take it to mean ‘seeking help’, surely its derivation from the root √*sac* ‘accompany’, via a putative **sácas-* ‘accompaniment, companionship’, suggests rather a sense ‘seeking companionship’, and it echoes *sácse* ‘you are accompanied’ in the immediately preceding vs. 6b (see disc. there). The verb *veti* in d also echoes *véṣi* in 5b. All of this suggests that a reading that continues the Agni focus of the first 6 vss. is eminently possible.

However, equally possible and supported by the vss. that follow is a reading that feeds into the Viśvarūpa myth. As I noted in the publ. intro., the Indo-Iranian myth of the slaying of the three-headed serpent-dragon has been assimilated into the Vala myth, and we see the telltale Vala signs beginning in the first pāda with the phrase *vavré antár*: in 2 of its 3 other occurrences (IV.1.13, V.31.3; not VII.104.3) this refers to the confinement of the cows within the Vala cave. The b and d pādas specify the means with which Trita (in this vs. the hero of the myth) effects the cows’ release. In the standard versions of the Vala myth, Indra-Bṛhaspati opens the cave not by brute force but by verbal means, singing or reciting an open-sesame. In b Trita seeks the visionary thought (*dhīti-*) derived from his poetic ancestry that will provide this open-sesame; in d he “speaks his own familial weapons” (*jāmi bruvāṇā āyudhāni*). In other words the weapon he uses to release the cows is speech—poetry—which he has inherited from his forefathers, a point made more explicit by *pítryāny āyudhāni* in the next pāda (8a). The same phrase, in the sg., is found in VIII.6.3, again describing the deployment of words as weapons. Pāda c is a bit harder to interpr. in a Vala context: perhaps Trita is seeking the companionship of the cows, or the association (=herd) of cows; “in the lap of the two parents” could in this context mean “in the

space between heaven and earth.” Ge (n. 7c) suggests, rather loosely, that it refers to the whole world. (In general, the reconstructions of the story behind these vss. by both Ge and Old are fanciful and not very helpful.)

One loose end is the referent of *asyá* opening the vs. I take it as inherently reflexive and explicitly contrastive with *pitúḥ ... párasya* at the end of the hemistich. Trita—whether referring to Agni or to the slayer of Viśvarūpa—employs his own resolve while also seeking to conform to the ancestral ways.

X.8.8: The transition from the Agni hymn to the Viśvarūpa saga is complete here, and without the double Agni/Trita reading that complicated the transition verse, 7, this vs. presents straightforward narrative. However, another conceptual disjunction is introduced: as the Indo-Iranian myth requires, the monster is actually attacked, struck, and slain, using the quintessential verb of violence, \sqrt{han} (*jaghanvān* [c]). But the plot of the Vedic Vala myth unfolds differently, and the Vala myth, with the release of the cows, is what we encounter in d.

As noted above, the “familial weapons” (*jāmí ... āyudhāni*) of 7d are reprised here with the semantically almost identical *pítryāny āyudhāni* (pāda a), reinforced by (*abhy*) *āyudhat* in b. Indra is also introduced as the setter-in-motion of Trita Āptya’s action, preparatory to making him the agent himself in the next vs. The replacement of the old Indo-Iranian hero by the new Power God of Vedic is deftly managed in this set of three vss.: Indra absent in vs. 7, Indra obliquely responsible for the action in vs. 8; Indra himself the actor in vs. 9.

On the phrase “three-headed, seven-reined” used of Agni in I.146.1 and on the lexical substitution of *-śíras-* for *-mūrdhán-* in the “three-headed” compound, see publ. intro.

X.8.9: The desid. stem *ínakṣa-* to $\sqrt{naś}$ ‘reach, attain’ is a secondary replacement of the old desid. to the root, *íyakṣa-* (on which see comm. ad VI.21.3), presumably because the older form lacked transparency and was being attracted into the orbit of \sqrt{yaj} ‘sacrifice’. See Heenen (Desid., 78–79) on the late distribution of *ínakṣa-* and on its formation. As he points out, the lack of initial *n-* in the redupl. (not **nínakṣa-*) shows that it is a secondary adjustment of *íyakṣa-* via the introduction of the initial consonant of the full-grade root.

The publ. tr. has a complex interpr. of *āvābhinat* with a double acc. “split (the heads [acc.]) off the victim (acc.),” with “the heads” to be supplied. I now think this is unnecessary: *áva* \sqrt{bhid} simply takes an acc. of the victim (I.54.4, II.11.2, 18, etc.). Although I would prefer to sneak the sense ‘split’ into the rendering, I’m afraid ‘cut down’ has to suffice, and I would emend the tr. to “... cut down the one ...” Ge does “decapitate” (enthauptete), while Re’s interpr. is truly baroque: “l’abattit-en-le-transperçant.” Here the *áva* ‘down’ contrasts with the *úd* in *udínakṣantam* ‘trying to reach up’, of the vaunting ambition of Viśvarūpa.

The mid. part. *mānyamāna-* ‘thinking himself’ is used in a pregnant sense. This participle is generally used with a complement that indicates a false view the subject holds about himself, e.g., VI.25.5 *yodhó mānyamānaḥ* “thinking himself a fighter.” Here I think the false view is that he has the qualities of his opponent, Indra.

Gen. pl. *gónām* must be a partitive-type gen. with *ācakrānāḥ* (so Ge and Old, *pace* Re), but, as often, without partitive sense: surely the point is that Indra got *all* the cows.

X.9 Waters

This hymn is an Anhang on the Agni collection that opens the maṇḍala. Along with X.8 it is attributed to Trisíras Tvāṣṭra (with an alternative poet Sindhudvīpa Āmbarīṣa also named for

this one), but as discussed above, X.8 clearly belongs with the earlier Agni hymns X.1–7. This hymn, however, has no clear points of contact with the ones that precede, and it has a different divine dedicand and a different meter: Gāyatrī (1–7) and Anuṣṭubh (8–9) rather than Triṣṭubh. (The Anukr. analyses vs. 5 as Vardhamāna [6 7 / 8] and 7 as Pratiṣṭhā [8 7 / 6], but both are resolvable into perfectly fine Gāyatrīs.) Ge’s textual presentation assumes that it is in ṛcas; Old dithers. That vss. 6–9 are identical to I.23.20–23 but the ṛca boundary should fall between vss. 6 and 7 makes a strict ṛca division unlikely, but vss. 1–3 do seem to stand apart from the rest. See publ. intro.

X.9.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is very compressed for what it seems to be expressing. It opens with a lexeme that is found a number of times elsewhere: *āram* √ *gam* DAT. Cf. I.187.7, VI.63.2, VII.68.2, VIII.92.27, as well as the cmpd. *aram-gamā-* (2x). The idiom seems to mean “go/come (to a place), ready/fit for DAT., with the dative expressing one of several functions: “fit to benefit someone, serve as something, or derive benefit from something” (sim. Re). The shifting relationship of benefit expressed by *āram* in general is discussed in the comm. ad VIII.92.24–27. For the first sense of this particular idiom, “fit to benefit someone,” see VIII.92.27 *āram gamāma te vayām* “let us go (to be) fit for you.” The second, “serve as something, lit. be fit to be something,” is found in I.187.7 *āram bhakṣāya gamyāh* “you should come, fit (to be) (our) portion,” in a vs. and a hymn addressed to Food. For an example of the opposite relationship, with the dative providing the benefit to the subject rather than receiving it, see VI.63.2 *āram me gantam hāvayāyāsmāi* “Come fit for this summons of mine,” where the Aśvins benefit from the singer’s call by arriving in order to drink the soma promised in the next pāda. A similar situation is depicted in VII.68.2, also addressed to the Aśvins: *āram gantam haviṣo vītāye me*. Here I would alter JPB’s tr. to “Come fit for the pursuit of my oblation.” Because the cmpd. *aramgamā-* lacks the full syntagm, it is not possible to be certain which of the senses it has. Both occurrences modify Indra, both times in the collocation *aramgamāya jāgmaye*, which I tr. “who comes fittingly, who comes regularly.” But Indra could be coming to benefit us (by giving, e.g.) or to be benefited by us (by soma or praises, e.g.) – or, indeed, both. As for the sense expressed in the full syntagm in our passage, *tāsmā āram gamāma*, it must be the first, “fit to benefit someone.”

The next problem in the vs. is what to do with *vah*. Re pronounces it “explétif” and does not tr. it; Ge’s rendering seems to reflect a view like Re’s: “Dem möchten wir euch recht kommen ...,” in which tr. I don’t really understand the use of *euch*. As noted in the publ. intro., on the basis of the motherly image in vs. 2, I assume that the poet is claiming “you,” that is, the waters, as our mothers, and as their sons (or under their auspices) we wish to be beneficial to the person referred to by *tāsmāi*. The further twist is that it is for the house of that very person that the waters (re)vivify “us.” As noted in the publ. intro., the general view that this is the house of the sacrificer seems reasonable, but it is hard to extract from the abbreviated phrasing. What the waters are doing when they “animate and beget us” is not clear.

X.9.6–9: As indicated in the publ. intro. and also in the above intro. to the hymn, these vss. are identical to I.23.20–23, verses to the waters appended to a hymn otherwise following the sequence of the Praūgaśastra. The only departure is the omission of I.23.20d *āpaś ca viśvābhesajīh* “and the waters are healing for all” (lit. “possess all healing remedies”) in its equivalent vs. X.9.6 (which has only 3 pādas), but this is somewhat made up for by the last pāda

of our vs. 5, *apó yacāmi bheṣajām* “I beseech the waters for a healing remedy.” For comm. on the individual vss. see the comm. to the equivalent vss. in I.23.20ff.

X.10–19

On these hymns loosely organized into a Yama cycle, see publ. intro. Although the Anukr. assigns them to a number of different poets, they all touch on some aspect of Yama, the realm of the dead over which he presides, or the funeral that precedes mortals’ entry into that realm. See esp. Old (Prol. 232–33) on the close phraseological connections among X.10–13 and in favor of their further connection to X.14–18 [19].

X.10 Yama and Yamī

This remarkable dialogue is one of the most famous hymns in the RV (in the rather limited circles in which *any* hymn in the RV might gain fame), and it has been tr. and discussed by numerous scholars. Recent treatments include that of Susanne Schnaus in her *Die Dialoglieder im altindischen Rigveda* (2008: 163–201) and Bodewitz’s generally negative response to it (IJ 52 [2009]), as well as parts of W. Knobl’s 2009 Leiden diss., notably parts of the chapter “Mind-reading the Poet,” reprinted from StII 24 (2007). The comm. here will make no attempt to discuss / refute / concur with the various points of view found in the many treatments, but primarily set forth my own, esp. when it differs from the standard versions of Ge and the like. (Schnaus cites previous views quite fully, so her disc. can be usefully consulted, and Bodewitz adds additional reff.) Although Re’s treatment in EVP (XVI.122–23 [1967]) is scanty, he gives a complete tr. with nn. in *Hymnes spéculatifs* (1956: 55–57 + 238). The hymn is also found in the AV, at the beginning of the collection of funeral vss. in XVIII (AVŚ XVIII.1.1–16) and so is available in Whitney’s rather antiquated tr.

The hymn, esp. Yamī’s speech, contains a large proportion of perfect optatives (*vavṛtyām* 1a, *dadhīta* 1c [probably; see Ged. Elizarenkova p. 160 and n. 12], *viviśyāḥ* 3d, *riricyām* 7c, *mimīyāt* 9b [probably]; cf. also *bibhryāt* 9d [to a redupl. pres., but similar in Gestalt]; Yama’s speech: *papṛcyām* 12a). On the pf. opt. as characteristic of women’s speech, see my 2008 Ged. Elizarenkova article “Women’s Language in the Rig Veda?” On the usage of the pf. opt., see my 2009 “Where Are All the Optatives?” There are attempts to interpret the pf. opt. with a special nuance added by the pf.—e.g., Knobl’s claim (n. 10 p. 110 of “Mind-Reading” = p. 50 of diss.) that it refers to “unreal possibility,” though he tr. more as a past potential “I would have liked to make the companion turn” for *vavṛtyām* 1a, “I would have yielded ...” for *riricyām* 7a—but as I demonstrated in my 2009 article, these attempts are misguided. Given the distribution of optatives across paradigms, the perfect optative is ordinarily the only optative attested to its root and simply expresses general optative value.

It is also remarkable how many kinship and quasi-kinship terms are deployed in this hymn (3 in the first vs. alone), but “sister” and “brother,” the two terms that name the relationship between the protagonists, are postponed until vs. 11. As noted in the publ. intro., it is also eminently worth paying attention to the grammatical categories of voice and number, esp. the almost studied avoidance of the 1st du (“we two”), which, again, is the operative paradigmatic slot that describes the two participants in the dialogue.

There is a considerable amount of concatenation between vss., esp. where one of the speakers twists the words of the other.

X.10.1: The vs. is Yamī's, and she speaks of herself in the 1st ps. (*ā ... vavṛtyām*), but the rest of the vs., including the apparent references to Yama, are in the 3rd ps.

The grammatical identity of *sakhyā* is debated. Ge pronounces it a dative, which would work well contextually but is morphologically excluded. Old (and most others) take it as an acc. pl. neut., an interpr. reflected in the publ. tr. But I now am more inclined to see it as an instr. sg., also an old view (so already Wh's tr. of the AV vs., flg. Lanman *Noun Infl.* 336), recently upheld by Schnaus. It would be an instr. of cause, and I now emend the tr. to "on the grounds of partnership."

The 2nd pāda poses a number of separate problems. The first is that the nom. sg. pf. part. *jaganvān* is masc., though the speaker of vs. 1 must be Yamī. The part. can therefore not modify the subject of pāda a, but must have the same referent as acc. *sākhāyam* in the first pāda, namely Yama. Technically speaking it could modify the likely masc. subj. of c (masc. reference confirmed by *dīdhyānaḥ* in d), but it seems best to take b as a separate clause with a predicated pf. participle (so most interpr.; see esp. Old) and *cīd* marking a concessive clause(tte).

The adj. *purū* and the noun *aṇavām* disagree in number. With most, I supply a neut. pl. noun with *purū*, viz. *rājāṃsi* 'realms'; cf. III.58.5 *tirāḥ purū cīd ... rājāṃsi*, and the reasonably numerous passages in which *tirāḥ* is construed with *rājas-*.

The larger question that this pāda raises is where did Yama go, and is he now separated from Yamī or did she come along? On the one hand, *ā √ vṛt* 'turn here' in pāda a implies that he is somewhere else and she wants to bring him back; on the other, it is hard to believe that the dialogue that follows in the rest of the hymn was conducted at long distance; it has too intimate and claustrophobic a feel. So he must have made a quick return. Some have suggested that he crossed from immortality to mortality, but there is no other evidence for that. Perhaps it's simply a matter of a mental journey: many a wife has said to many a husband, "are you even listening to me? you seem like you're a million miles away."

In the 2nd hemistich Yamī presents her strongest juridical argument for their incest, though it is a bit anachronistic. Her phrasing is also remarkable for its distancing effects. The argument is the one familiar from later Hindu dharma and religious practice, that a son should beget a son, so that his own father will receive ancestral offerings from his grandson: the three-generational paternal lineage. (It is anachronistic here because, in the absence of other humans, no such religious expectations and societal structures can yet exist.) In her formulation only the grandfather (*pitūh*, that is, the father of the unidentified subject) and his grandson (*nāpātām*) appear overtly; the central actor, the male of the middle generation, who is by implication Yama, is merely the understood subject of the 3rd sg. verb *ā dadhīta*. The only identity he is given is the archaic ritual title *vedhāḥ*, which adds to the solemnity of the quasi-legal prescription she is asserting. It is also worth noting that though the verb here seems to have the primary sense 'provide, establish', *ā √ dhā* in the active can also mean 'impregnate' and in the middle (of a female) 'conceive', so the procreative sense of the lexeme is lurking.

In d *pratarām* is generally rendered as 'future' or the like (Ge: Zukunft), but I think it's a little more pointed: it's not merely a temporal designation but refers to the extension of Yama's own line.

X.10.2: On Yama's first appearance, he picks up—and rejects—the overture Yamī made in her first pāda, by echoing her etymological figure *sākhāyam sakhyā* with *sākhā sakhyām*, while emphatically expressing the rejection (*nā ... vaṣṭi*). Although he speaks of himself in the 3rd ps.,

sākhā ... vaṣṭi, he does implicitly accept Yamī's designation of him as 'partner, companion', by using the same noun stem. He also introduces the first overt 2nd person, in the enclitic *te*.

The second pāda of this vs. is difficult and disputed—as well as being crucial, since it gives Yama's first and strongest argument against the proposed incest and the one that depends not on fear of detection by the gods (cd) but on some sort of apparently universal principle. The argument is structured (in part) by the opposition between *sá-* 'like' and *vīṣu-* 'different'. The standard interpr. is that *sālakṣmā* refers to someone of the same kinship lineage (in this case a sister) and *vīṣurūpā* to a woman of a different lineage, so that she is available for marriage. The idea is that though Yamī belongs to the former class, she will behave like one of the latter. See Old's clear paraphrase "dass ... die Schwester ... werde wie eine Frau aus anderm Geschlecht." This interpr. is favored by the subj. *bhāvāti* 'will become', which implies a transformation or pseudo-transformation. However, I am bothered by the other part of the opposition between the two bahuvrīhis, *sālakṣmā ... vīṣurūpā*. Yama is contrasting not only 'like' and 'different' but also 'mark(s)' and 'form', but the standard interpr. assumes that the 2nd part is held constant: same family / different family. The stem *vīṣurūpa-* is used several times in the fem. dual of Night and Dawn (I.123.7, I.186.4, VI.58.1), who are in fact sisters but have different bodies, different physical form. I therefore suggest that here the contrast is not between kin / non-kin, but rather between someone who is kin to him, but has a different—viz., female—shape. Yama is rejecting a *sakhyām* 'partnership' that involves such a pairing because its outcome in sex is inevitable. The subjunctive *bhāvāti* fits my interpr. less well than the standard one, I admit; it must be a sort of deliberative subjunctive rather than depicting a transformation, But it recognizes that both parts of the two crucial cmpds contrast, not just the first members.

There are two factors that complicate things. The first is that, though on the surface *sālakṣmā* looks like a straightforward fem. like *vīṣurūpā*, its stem must be *sālakṣman-*, and our form can't be simply taken as fem. without question. Ge makes much of this (n. 2b) and suggest that it's a neut. pl. with a singular verb. His insistence on this point is connected with the fact that similar expressions in neut. and masc. are used in the animal sacrifice, already in the early YV mantra collections (see details in the n.), and he wishes to see the adjectives here used of Yamī as applications of the words in technical usage in animal husbandry. Bodewitz also makes an enthusiastic detour through the animal sacrifice to produce yet a different interpr. of this pāda. However, Old sensibly argues that the phraseology was borrowed *into* the animal sacrifice ritual from the RV and not vice versa, and since he is content to take *sālakṣmā* as a fem., so am I.

In c the two genitives, *mahāḥ* and *ásurasya* can be construed together ("the sons of the great Lord, the heroes"), as Ge and Re take them. It doesn't seem to me to make a good deal of difference. The Lord (or great Lord) may well be Dyaus. As to the group identity of his sons, I agree with Old in choosing not to try to narrow it down. Ge's (n. 2c) assertion that they must be the Aṅgirasas seems unduly restrictive; surely the point is that *all* the gods potentially perform surveillance.

X.10.3: As is generally noted, Yamī picks up Yama's words, specifically his verb *vaṣṭi*, which he used in his rejection of her proposal in 2a. She begins her vs. with emphatically fronted *uśānti ghā*, which we might render in idiomatic Engl. as "They *do too* want it." She not only takes his verb, but she provides it with a more powerful subject: the immortals (a generalizing of the group he referred to in 2cd). She keeps his *etád* at the end of the pāda. We might also note that because of the fronting of the verb the subj. (*té amṛtāsaḥ*), incl. the demonstrative *té*, is displaced to the middle of the pāda, with the *té* taking somewhat unusual non-initial position. Here it

teasingly echoes the enclitic *te* in 2a, which, as was just noted, is the first overt 2nd ps. in the hymn.

In b *tyajās-* is a hapax, though clearly (*pace* Bodewitz, who takes it as a thematized adj.) a possessive secondary derivation of the well-established *s*-stem neut. *tyajas-* to \sqrt{tyaj} ‘leave (behind), abandon’. Ge thinks *tyajās-* is the personified fault, that is, the living result of the blameworthy act of incest. But surely Yamī is not going to pitch it in that negative way. Re’s suggestion (EVP XVI.122) that it is analogous to *rēknas-* ‘legacy’ to \sqrt{ric} ‘leave behind’ is more illuminating. (In the earlier Hymnes spéc, he instead tr. as ‘un survivant’.) I take *tyajās-* as the personified ‘legacy’, who embodies what the father left behind. This personification finds a bizarre analogue in modern-day American English academic terminology: in the (controversial) practice of elite colleges and universities offering preferential admission to children of alumni, a practice called “legacy admissions,” the students so admitted are known as “legacies.”

The gen. *ékasya cit ... mártasya* is the clearest indication we have that Yama is, or will become, mortal. It of course contrasts with *amṛtāsaḥ* in pāda a.

Pāda c is the first time in the hymn in which the 2nd ps. and the 1st ps. appear together. The 2nd sg. enclitic *te* returns from 2a (with shifted reference: in vs. 2 it refers to Yamī, here to Yama), in a similar phonological context: 2a *ná te*, 3c *ní te*. But the 1st ps., used of herself by Yamī, is—oddly—plural: *asmé*. She is still practicing the distancing characteristic of the speech of both of them in the opening of the hymn, but creeping closer to intimacy, at least pronominal intimacy.

The injunc. *ní ... dhāyī* is almost universally taken as modal; e.g., Ge: “Dein Sinn soll sich unserem Sinne fügen,” but this is far from necessary. (KH doesn’t treat this vs.) I think rather that Yamī is asserting that Yama’s mind is *already* fixed on—or indeed in—her, whether he acknowledges it or not; two vss. later (5a) she claims that their sexual relationship was determined long ago, and here she seems to say that he is mentally prepared for, perhaps already eager for it, and now he should take the next step to the bodily relationship. If the sense is “your mind is fixed *in* me,” the entering of the body she demands in the next pāda has already been accomplished mentally.

The last pāda is the most direct expression of what she’s been hinting at so far encountered. It also contains the first 2nd sg. verb (probably; see below), the pf. opt. \tilde{a} *viviśyāḥ* ‘you should enter’. But until we come to the verb at the end of the pāda, her statement seems entirely parallel to her first juridical argument for incest given in 1c. Like that one, this contains two (quasi-) kinship terms, *jāni-* ‘wife’ and *pāti-* ‘husband’, and the optative should give it the same legally prescriptive force as 3rd ps. \tilde{a} *dadhīta* in 1c. We expect 3rd ps. “a husband should enter the body of his wife,” and so the “as husband, *you* should enter ...” comes as a shock. She may also be splitting the difference, as it were: I wonder if *viviśyāḥ* can also be read as a nonce perfect *precativē*, in the 3rd sg. Precatives are of course only built to aorist stems, but the athematic *-yāḥ* in the aor. entirely substitutes for the ordinary opt. 3rd sg., expected **-yāt* (see my “Where Are All the Optatives?”), and so I think this 3rd sg. prescriptive force could carry over to the pf. here. In this way Yamī can both maintain her tone of legalistic authority and make a direct personal appeal. Her statement here is reminiscent of Lopāmudrā’s (less explicit) ones in I.179.1–2: 1d *ápy ū nú pātnīr vṛṣaṇo jagamyuḥ* “Bullish (men) should now come to their wives”; 2d *sám ū nú pātnīr vṛṣabhir jagamyuḥ* “Wives should now unite with their bullish (husbands).”

On the gen. ending *-ur* in *jányuḥ* (found only here) borrowed from the kinship terms, see Old inter alia.

X.10.4: Yama simply ignores Yamī’s arguments in the previous vs. and changes the subject. This change is signaled by the lack of concatenation: for the first time in the hymn no words from the previous vs. are carried over into the next. He also shows himself to be as adept at distancing as his sister, until the very end of the vs. In the 1st hemistich, as he poses rhetorical questions about what they should or should not do, he uses the 1st person, but the 1st person *plural*: *cakṛmā* “should we (pl.) do?”; *rapema* “should we (pl.) murmur?” So for the first time they are both subjects of the same verbs, but the expression is grammatically skewed.

His first argument, in pāda a, is the “no precedent” one. Interestingly he doesn’t actually make the argument, leaving the main cl. verb-less and in the air. We expect “*(should we do it) now?” – and this verb is supplied by almost all tr. and comm. (The exception is Bodewitz, who think the *kād* clause includes b, but his tr. is so contorted that it demonstrates by itself that that is a bad idea.) The verb we would expect, corresponding to the pf. *cakṛmā* in the dependent clause and parallel to the opt. *rapema* in b, would be the pf. opt. **cakriyāma*. I would suggest that since at this point in the hymn Yamī “owns” the pf. opt., he would avoid using that form; it’s only towards the end, when he’s essentially won the argument, that he uses a pf. opt. (12a).

His second argument has to do with public versus hidden. Just as their behavior should stand up to the public visual scrutiny of the gods (2cd, also 8ab), so should their words be truths not only when spoken out loud (*vādantaḥ*), but also in the quiet intimate register (*√rap*) that (he seems to imply) the gods might not overhear. Like most, I think that b is a rhetorical question like the incomplete one in b introduced by *kād*.

His clinching argument is found in cd, though in a sense it’s just a restatement of what they both know—that they are siblings by virtue of their parents, the Gandharva and the Apsaras (“watery maiden” *āpyā ... yósā*).

In d *sā no nābhiḥ* is a fine ex. of the “attraction” of a demonstrative in an equational clause to the gender and number of the predicate, a phenomenon quite familiar in Vedic prose (on which see, e.g., Brereton “*tat tvam asi* in Context”). Here the referent of *sā* is the gender-mixed dual pair of Gandharva and maiden; we might expect **tā no nābhiḥ* if this syntactic rule hadn’t been applied. For another ex. see X.11.8 and comm.; for an equational rel. cl. that does not show this attraction see VI.41.3 and comm.

The standard tr. take *sā no nābhiḥ* and *paramām jāmi tām nau* as parallel phrases, expressing essentially the same thing; e.g. Ge: “die sind unser Ursprung, das ist unsere höchste Blutsverwandtschaft.” By contrast, in the publ. tr. I adopt a clever suggestion of Bodewitz’s (p. 265), that *tād* in the second phrase means ‘therefore’, and the second phrase thus draws conclusions based on the first. This conclusion is that their kinship is of the highest, that is, in this case the closest (full siblings), and that precludes any other relationship they might have, esp. a sexual one.

The final word of the vs. is *nau*, the 1st dual enclitic. This is the first time in the hymn that we meet a 1st dual, perhaps not accidentally in unaccented, hence syntactically recessive form. But its appearance here is striking; even in this same pāda the 1st ps. was first represented by the pl. enclitic *naḥ*. Yama has finally acknowledged, however indirectly, that this is between the two of them alone.

X.10.5: Yamī immediately counters Yama’s triumphant assertion that their highest relationship is blood kinship, by substituting what is (for her) implicitly an even higher relationship. Since they shared a womb (thus acknowledging their full siblinghood), they were created from the first as a married couple, a household pair (*dāmpatī*), lit. ‘two lords [/lord and lady] of the house’. As

in 1d with her deployment of the inherited ritual title *vedhāḥ*, she utilizes an archaic, inherited, and resonant word for the married pair, which gives dignity and prestige to her claim. (On the use of *dāmpatī* and its lexical replacements, see my 2019 “The Term *grhastha* and the (Pre)history of the Householder,” in *Grhastha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*, ed. Patrick Olivelle. Pp. 3–19.)

She is also quick to pick up his newly introduced *nau*, placing it in pādas a and b.

The sequence of nom. sgs., *janitā ... tvāṣṭā savitā viśvárūpaḥ*, raises the question of how many agents were involved, and, in particular, is the god Savitar separately named here beside Tvaṣṭar or is the stem *savitār-* used here as a descriptor (‘the impeller’)? With most interpr. I opt for the latter. Among other things *asyā* in c presupposes a singular referent. Tvaṣṭar is, of course, most closely associated with the procreation and the shaping of embryos; see, e.g., X.184.1 *tvāṣṭā rūpāṇi pīmśatu* “let Tvaṣṭar carve the forms,” in a pregnancy charm. In nearby X.2.6–7 there is an implicit riddle that posits the generic “begetter” as the one who “begot you” (X.2.6b *jānitā tvā jajāna*), immediately solved in the next vs. by Tvaṣṭar (X.2.7b *tvāṣṭā ... tvā ... jajāna*) in the same words. See comm. ad X.2.7.

Note that *viśvárūpaḥ* in b echoes *viśurūpā* in 2b, though there doesn’t seem to be a close thematic relationship. In light of nearby X.8.7–9 (q.v.), the brief treatment of the Trita-Viśvarūpa myth, it is striking that Tvaṣṭar is credited here with ‘possessing all forms’. In that myth Tvaṣṭar is the father of the three-headed monster Viśvarūpa; cf. X.8.9 *tvāṣṭrāsya ... viśvárūpasya*, with the patronymic. See also comm. ad V.42.13.

As Re (Hymnes spéc., 237) points out, Yamī’s invocation of Heaven and Earth as witnesses is a clever ploy, since they are a famously incestuous pair and thus provide a divine charter for the action she wants to take (see further 9c). Her phraseology, *vēda nāv asyā prthivī utā dyaūḥ*, is strongly reminiscent of the refrain in the famous hymn I.105, *vittām me asyā rodasī* “Take heed of this (speech) of mine, you two world halves” (see comm. ad I.105.1). Both her adaptation of that refrain (or some formula that lies behind both) and her statement in c, *nākir asya prā minanti vratāni* “no one transgresses his commands,” which echoes similar expressions in, e.g., I.69.7, II.38.7, set a verbal imprimatur of formulaic authority on her speech, which is of course all the more important because, as a woman, she does not have that authority by nature.

Note that in our phrase even an explicitly conjoined subject (with *utā*) consisting of two (non-neuter) singular nouns can take a singular verb.

X.10.6: Yama’s answer is somewhat confusing, I think because he pretends to respond to her claim in 5a but really does not. What does he mean by “this first day” (*asyā ... prathamāsyāḥnaḥ*)? He *seems* to be asking about their time in the womb, about which she spoke in 5a; so Ge (n. 6a): “Der erste Tag ist der ihrer Zeugung.” But the implication of his question “who knows about this first day?” is that no one does: it belongs to the time before time, at the first creation (as presented, e.g., in X.129). He has substituted one (unknowable) time for a knowable one. This twisting of temporal reference makes it seem as if her claim about their birth is unsubstantiated, in fact unsubstantiatable—whereas, in fact, Tvaṣṭar their creator at least should know, along with the other gods. Surely the birth of Yama and Yamī does not go back to the primordial past.

I would change the rendering of the verbs in b to “who saw it; who proclaims it here.” The first again calls into question the possibility of a witness of primal events; the second raises suspicions about anyone who claims to know or have seen the first day—in this case, Yamī by implication, since she made apparently authoritative statements about the action of the god

Tvaṣṭar in 5a.

To her invocation of the *vrata-* of Tvaṣṭar in 5c he counters with the *dhāman-* of Mitra and Varuṇa and thereby mobilizes the ethical rigor of those two gods at the center of the RVic moral universe and the ceaseless scrutiny they are known to exercise over humans. He will return to this in 8ab.

Pāda d presents some difficulties. On the one hand, the analysis of *vīcyā* is disputed; on the other, *√brū* can take the acc. of the addressee or the acc. of the subject spoken about: which semantic role does *nīn* fill and who does the acc. pl. refer to? To answer the second set of questions first, I take *nīn* as the topic of discourse (“speak about superior men”), and I take its referent not to be mortal men (of which, remember, there are none at the time), but rather, as so very often with this stem, of gods. Here Yama raises the very issue discussed above ad vs. 5: how does she, a woman, have the right to speak about superior males, in fact the most superior of all: gods? And she is not just a woman, but one characterized as *āhanās-*. Whatever the exact meaning and etymology of this word (on which see comm. ad V.42.13), it is associated with rampant sexuality. In this context that characteristic would make Yamī even less qualified to engage in discourse about the gods, esp. the divine upholders of ethical principles. Yama’s insulting address to her—this is the first voc. of the hymn—is meant to delegitimize her participation in the dialogue. He further emphasizes this with the instr. *vīcyā*. Here I follow the old interpr. (see Ge n. 6d) as a fem. instr. to an otherwise unattested *-āñc* stem, **vyāñc-* ‘going apart, aside’; supplying the instr. **vācā* we get “with (speech) going aside, with deviant (speech).”

It is worth noting that *āhanās-* is found in V.42.13, modifying Tvaṣṭar, in a snippet of text that implies incest between Tvaṣṭar and his daughter – the same Tvaṣṭar who was responsible for making Yama and Yamī a married couple, according to her (5ab).

X.10.7: If I am correct that Yama’s intent in vs. 6 was to disqualify Yamī from participation in the dialogue on the grounds of her gender and sexual avidity, he was successful. Her measured unemotional legalistic arguments for their coupling give way in this vs. to an expression of naked desire. For the first time in the hymn their names appear, and they are nearly juxtaposed (*yamāsya mā yamyām*). And she speaks of ‘desire, lust’ (*kāma-*), not duty, divine preference, or personal history. As W. Knobl points out (p. 119 n. 42), the first pāda consists of a wonderful repetitive phonetic figure, which, I would add, seems iconic of the wave of desire that overcomes her: *yamasya mā yamīya(m) kāma* ... (My presentation of the figure is somewhat different from Knobl’s: he omits the final vowels and also doesn’t include the 2nd syllable of *kāma*.)

Pāda b contains a nice play: Yamī expresses her desire “to lie together in the same *yóni*,” here a ‘place’ or ‘nest’, but of course, since *yóni-* can refer to the womb (see esp. in the miscarriage and birth charms X.162.1, 2, 4, 184.1), they did lie in a *yóni* before their birth. In vs. 5 she refers to the same place with *gárbha-*, but the latter word more often means ‘embryo’ than ‘womb’.

Pāda c reprises the wife/husband pairing found in her vs. 3d, though with a different word for ‘wife’ (*jāyā-* rather than *jāni-*), along with the contested place, the wife’s body (*tanvām*) as object in both. But the agency has switched: in 3d the husband was urged to enter the body of his wife, while here the wife is the subject, yielding her own body to her husband (*jāyā ... pátye*). I do not know why she expresses it as a simile here.

The word for ‘yield’, another pf. opt. *riricyām*, belongs to the root *√ric* ‘leave (behind)’ and may be meant to evoke *tyajásam*, the personified ‘legacy’ built to *√tyaj* ‘abandon, leave’. See my

invocation of *réknas*- ‘legacy, heritance’ ad vs. 3 above.

The problematic pāda is d (with its near repetition 8d). There are almost as many interpr. as there have been readers of this hymn, and I cannot rehearse them here. Most interpr. start from the assumption (voiced or taken for granted), which I share, that this is a piece of erotic slang. Unfortunately of course such expressions are almost impossible to interpret in the absence of a sufficient body of texts containing such material – which the RV does not provide us. My interpr. starts with the observation that *ví√vr̥h* is a violent verb, with the literal sense ‘tear off, tear apart’. The lexeme is reasonably well attested in the RV; cf., e.g., VI.45.9 *ví dṛ̥ḥh̥ṇi cid ... vr̥há* “Tear apart even the strongholds.” But in this context a purely violent interpr. is unlikely, esp. since it’s an activity that Yamī herself suggests that she and Yama could do together: this is the first, and indeed the only, 1st dual verb in the hymn, *ví vr̥heva*. But of course as a general rule the erotic incorporates much of the violent, and so the most sensible way to approach this expression is to assume that the violence of *ví√vr̥h* has been repurposed for an erotic charge. Riffing around in modern English provides us with several useful parallels. On the one hand there’s a specifically erotic expression “tear up the sheets,” referring to energetic or violent sex. There’s also the expression used in the publ. tr., “let ’er rip,” with the dummy object ’er (for her, but without gender implications). Like “tear up the sheets,” the verb in this expression has the same literal meaning (‘tear, rip’) found in *√vr̥h*, but it also has a wider sense, which may allow us to understand the curious simile in our pāda concerning chariot wheels. One of the reasons that there are so many, and so many implausible, interpr. of this pāda is that it’s hard to figure out what chariot wheels have to do with sex—with many fanciful notions concocted to connect them. I would actually suggest that they don’t; what the simile is capitalizing on is a secondary meaning that seems to be shared by verbs of this nature (at least Engl. ‘rip’, ‘tear’; Skt. *√vr̥h*), namely reference to extreme speed. In English in addition to “let ’er rip” we have “tearing hurry,” “tear off to,” “on a tear.” These verbs seem to inhabit the intersection between violence and speed, here mediated by sex. So, while Yamī’s *ví vr̥heva* is proposing, on the one hand, that the two of them engage in passionate vigorous sex (type “tear up the sheets”), her simile compares this sex act to the speed of a rushing tearing chariot. The Free Online Dictionary defines “let her/something rip” in part as “to do something without inhibition or restraint, typically with great enthusiasm or force” and specifically as “allow an engine to go as fast as possible. An American colloquialism dating from the first half of the nineteenth century, this term presumably was first applied to locomotive or steamship engines.” Note the connection with the speediest vehicles of their respective days. So Yamī’s verb is already a metaphor and her simile adds another level of figurative distance.

The pāda is not only conceptually challenging, but also grammatically. The noun *cakrá-* is of course neut.; its dual should be, and several times is (X.85.11, 12, 16), *cakré*, and so our form *cakrá* should be neut. pl. In the first part of the simile, *ráthyeva*, the sandhi should be dissolved into *ráthyā iva*, again a neut. pl., rather than expected du. **ráthye*. A neut. pl. reading is not impossible here, but it seems pretty clunky. The human pair was surely envisioned in the simile as a matched set of wheels belonging to this light two-wheeled vehicle (on the construction of the chariot, see Sparreboom pp. 10–11), turning rapidly in perfect synch as the chariot tore (/dashed) along the way. Assuming more than two wheels gives us a very different and more plodding picture. Fortunately VIII.5.29 contains the phrase *ubhā cakrá* “both wheels,” which is emphatically dual in sense, and I think we must reckon with the same pseudo-masc. form here. As for *ráthyeva* it is possible that it should be resolved into *ráthye ’va*, with the truncated simile particle to be read occasionally in the RV and generally in MIA. For *va* for *iva*, see Gr’s list p.

221 and for a similar du interpr. of *-eva* as *-e 'va* see Macd., VG p. 259.

There is some difference of opinion about whether the wheels are in the nom. or the acc. Without reproducing the terms of the debate, I will simply opt for the nom.: the speeding, whirling wheels are compared to the two energetic lovers.

X.10.8: Yama does not respond directly to Yamī's erotic break, but simply repeats, more strongly, his warning from 2cd about the ever-vigilant divine witnesses.

His pāda a shows a nice syncopation in *ná tiṣṭhanti ná ní miṣanti*, where *ná Cī* is answered by *ná Cī*, but the rhyming *miṣanti* is postponed a syllable.

The fronted *anyá-* in c and later in the hymn (10d, 12c, 13c, 14a) provides prime evidence for the indefinite value ('another', not definite 'the other') of this stem in initial position. On which see my "Vedic anyá- 'another, the other': syntactic disambiguation," Fs. Beekes (ed. A. Lubotsky), 1997, pp. 111–18. It is a particularly cruel usage because there *are* no other males available for Yamī to pick from.

In c Yama picks up the 2nd level of metaphor in her 8d—the chariot wheels—by urging her to “drive off straightaway” (*yāhi tūyam*). He rejects her 1st dual opt. *vṛheva* in favor of a 2nd sg. impv. *vṛha* + instr., with the instr. referring to her hypothetical other partner, removing himself from the situation entirely. He also repeats his insulting voc. *āhanah*.

X.10.9: With her approach to intimacy (reaching its high point in the 1st du verb of 7d) so decisively rebuffed, Yamī abruptly returns to distanced discourse: this vs. is entirely couched in the 3rd ps., though both their names appear, juxtaposed, in d. She is the 3rd ps. subject of all three verbs, all optatives: a *daśasyet*, b *ún mimīyāt*, d *bibhryāt*. The optatives in this case are not prescriptive, as in some of her earlier uses (1c, 3d) but, like her 1st ps. opt. in 1a and 7c, express desire or potentiality.

The redupl. form *mimīyāt* in b could technically belong to the redupl. pres. of $\sqrt{mā}$ or the pf. of $\sqrt{mī}$, but most (incl. Kü 369) assign it to the latter, as do I. For one thing it fits into Yamī's pattern of perfect optatives. Unfortunately the lexeme *úd $\sqrt{mī}$* is not otherwise attested, which has opened the possibility of all manner of contextual translations, which abound in the lit. I think it should be interpr. in light of the conventional formula Yamī pronounced in 5c, using the same root: *nákir asya prá minanti vratāni* “No one transgresses his commandments.” Old adduces a striking parallel containing *prá minanti* and the eye of the sun that illuminates the sense of our passage: V.59.5 *sūryasya cákṣuḥ prá minanti vṛṣṭibhiḥ* “They [=Maruts] confound the eye of the sun with their rains,” depicting the sun's loss of vision behind a veil of rain. Here Yamī is asserting that at least for a moment (*mūhur*) she too could transgress / confound one of the iron laws of nature, the inescapable sight of the sun, which misses nothing as it transits the sky. Here she is implicitly countering Yama's statement *ná ní miṣanti eté* “they never blink” (8a) about the “spies of the gods” (*devānām spásah* 8b): the sun is the quintessential spy (cf. X.35.8 *spáḥ úd eti sūryah*). I tr. “trip up” to capture the *úd* and also register the fact that this idiom is out of the ordinary.

In c she makes clear why she invoked Heaven and Earth as witnesses in 5d. The “couple” (*mithunā*) is a 3rd ps. reference to themselves, Yama and Yamī, and she asserts that they have the same kinship relationship (*sābandhū*) as H+E—the point being that H+E are both siblings and an incestuous couple.

In d *bibhryāt* is not a pf. opt., but it is the next best thing, a redupl. athem. opt. that matches *mimiyāt* in b (and perhaps, as JL suggests, to avoid the anomalous redupl. of the pf. *jabhṛ-*). The

pāda has very rich semantics with a number of overlapping readings available to the VP *bibhṛyād ājāmi*. First, note that she has reached back to 4d, where Yama used their *jāmi* ‘kinship’ as an argument against her. (In our vs. I tr. *ājāmi* as ‘unbrotherly’, not ‘non-kindred’ vel sim., because the latter lacks punch in English.) I see at least three readings for her statement here: 1) she would happily bear (=endure physically) the “unbrotherly” sexual act; 2) she would happily bear (=assume the burden, mentally) the guilt associated with this act; 3) she would happily bear (=give birth to) the living result of this act (though ironically any child from this union would be super-related to both parties!).

X.10.10: Once again Yama fails to answer her, but goes off on a tangent of his own; in fact it’s not entirely clear to me what he’s trying to say, esp. in b. His speech begins portentously: the first 6 syllables of pāda a are heavy, and the repeated long *ā*’s, punctuated by *g(h)*’s, draws attention to the ponderous pace: *ā ghā tā gachān út(ā)ā (yu)gā(ni) ...* He prophesies that latter generations (*yugā-*, another word sketching a kinship connection) will come when kin will do the unkindred/unbrotherly act (*jāmāyaḥ kṛṇāvann ājāmi*), using both his *jāmi-* (4d) and her *ājāmi* from the previous vs. But what is his point here? It almost sounds as if he’s predicting the debased behavior of the Kali Yuga (and *yugā-* might support this view), behavior that he refuses to have anything to do with. But the notions of cyclical time and the four ages of progressively worse actions and circumstances are foreign to the RVic conceptual universe, as far as I know. Perhaps they, or something like them (minus the cycle), were circulating in some form at the time – after all, a sequence of ages showing progressive decline is also found in Greek mythology as early as Hesiod and, more to the point, the Avestan Yima, Yama’s counterpart, presided over an age of peace and prosperity (see Videvdāt 2), which was also followed by decline (see Skjaervo’s art. on the myth of Jamšid, Encycl. Iran. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/jamsid-i>, inter alia).

His suggestion to Yamī in c, to make her arm a pillow for her lover, may strike us as bizarre, but it has a parallel in V.61.5 *dór vīṛāyopabārbrhat* with a different word for ‘arm’ (*dós-* rather than *bāhú-*) and a different word for the male, but the same very rare intensive stem (*úpa bārbrh-* (on which see Schaef. 157–59). Note the phonetic play with labials and *h* in the pāda: *upa bārbrhi vṛṣabhāya bāhúm*. I would also suggest that Yama is twisting Yamī’s *bibhṛyāt* from the previous vs. (9d); Re, flg. Pisani, in fact assigns the form to $\sqrt{bhṛ}$, an idea that has little to recommend it. As for the shape of the impv. *bārbrhi*, a properly formed impv. to this stem should be **bārbr̥dhi*; Old suggests reading **bārbr̥hi* in part for metrical reasons. Whether we want to follow Old’s suggestion, the somewhat simplified form shows how derivationally shallow the intensive is.

X.10.11: As noted in the publ. intro., this is the first time in the hymn that the words “brother” and “sister” appear, tellingly in a context that questions the meaning and worth of the very terms. We can interpret the first pāda in two ways simultaneously. On the one hand, a brother is supposed to provide a refuge for his sister; if he does not, he’s not a proper brother. On the other hand, she seems to be saying, “why get hung up on our sibling relationship, when I have a more important relationship to worry about?– I need a husband!” In this connection it’s worth remembering that in later Sanskrit *nātha-* can mean simply ‘husband’. So she’s saying both “you’re not behaving like a good brother” and “who cares about ‘brother’? It’s not the most important relationship we have to each other.” The 2nd pāda continues this line of thought. Acdg. to most interpr. (with which I concur), “if Dissolution will come down” (*yán nīrtir*

nigāchāt) refers to the non-continuance of the human race after the twins if they don't do something about it. In the face of this potential catastrophe why is he worrying about the word and relationship “sister”?

Her brief return to logical argument in the first hemistich is followed by an emotional pitch resembling her first erotic break in 7a, picking up *kāma*- from there and reusing his \sqrt{rap} from 4b. Her final appeal to him is made in the impv., *pipṛgdhi*, rather than the opt. she has previously favored, and an impv. to a redupl. pres. stem. Note also that for the first time both bodies (*tanū*-) are in question, whereas in 3d and 7c it was only the body of the wife.

The destabilization of the dialogue is also signaled by the switch of grammatical categories: for the first time in the hymn Yamī uses the subjunctive (a: *asat ... bhāvāti*, b: *nigāchāt*) and the imperative (d: *pipṛgdhi*) – categories that had been exclusively Yama's (subj.: 2a *bhāvāti*, 6d *bravaḥ*, 10a *gachān*, 10b *kṛṇāvan*; impv. 8c *yāhi*, 8d *ví vṛha*, 10c *úpa barbhī*, 10d *ichasva*). Her legalistic logical optatives give way to longings and demands.

X.10.12: And Yama in return steals *her* grammatical category! He answers her pres. impv. with a *perfect optative* built to the same root $\sqrt{pṛc}$, *papṛcyām*, his first use of this category (though see below). Moreover, as has often been remarked, the first pāda of his reply is hypermetric by three syllables (assuming, as we should, distraction of the two forms of *tanū*-, on which see Knobl n. 80 p. 131 [Mind-Reading] = p. 71 diss.). Although various scholars have suggested emendations to render the vs. an ordinary Triṣṭubh, we should surely resist that urge, as argued persuasively and at length by Knobl (Mind-Reading, pp. 130–35 = diss. 70–75) and already by Old. To begin with, the pāda almost exactly repeats her 11d; the crucial deviations are emphasized by the awkwardness of the meter, which signals the climactic emotional force of his response. What Yamī wants is a simple repetition of her appeal, with person shift. That is, responding to her words

tanū vā me tanūvaṁ sām pipṛgdhi
“Mingle your body with my body.”

she wants

**tanū vā te tanūvaṁ sām papṛcyām*
“I would mingle my body with your body.”

This desired echo would follow her wording and her metrical form exactly, but of course he refuses. His negation would necessarily add another syllable, the *nā*, but I suggest that just one additional syllable would not sufficiently demonstrate how far his reply fails to mirror her appeal—hence the addition of three, *nā vā u*, to introduce the echo (note also that the enclitic *te* flips its position to modified 2nd). The rare (in the RV) and solemn particle *vai* (‘verily’ or the like) also draws attention to his deliberate, rather pompous style and the finality of his rejection. And the too-many-syllables here is in keeping with the too-heavy-syllables in 10a discussed above. Moreover, the additional syllables at the beginning of the pāda have a complex relationship with what follows: *nā vā u te* is a scrambling of *tanūvā*, which opens 11d: the *t* from *te*, *na* flipped to *an*, *vā u* likewise flipped – the result is *t-an-u-vā*. This point is made also by Knobl, pp. 133–34 = 73–74. He also suggests that *nā vā u* could also stand for **nā vā u*, with the nom. sg. of *nī*- ‘man’: “As a man [and not as your brother] could I have commingled with you” (pp. 134–35 = 74–75), though the absence of the indep. nom. sg. *nā* in the RV (and indeed until quite late) makes this suggestion less compelling. Moreover, it seems psychologically out of character: throughout their dialogue Yama has shown no desire for, or even human/brotherly sympathy towards, Yamī.

A brief word on the redupl. pres. versus perfect to $\sqrt{pṛc}$. I wonder if these two supposedly

different tense/aspect stems don't belong to the same paradigm, distributed phonologically, with forms with root-final velars taking *i*-redupl. and those with root-final palatals *a*-redupl. The former include only *pipṛgdhi* (1x, here) and *pipṛkta* (1x), the latter *papṛcāsi*, *papṛcyām* (here), *papṛcyāt*, each with one occurrence, plus two occurrences of the mid. part. *papṛcānā-*. The system would be reminiscent of *sīṣakti*, *sāścati* and would belong to a redupl. pres. If *pipṛgdhi* / *papṛcyām* do belong to one paradigm, Yama's repetition and deviation from repetition would be more pointed, but if *papṛcyām* belongs to a redupl. pres., he then would not have appropriated her grammatical category – though it's the moral equivalent thereof.

In b Yama takes her verb *nigāchāt* from 11b and puts a nasty spin on it. Although the VP here, *svāsāraṃ nigāchāt*, is usually rendered rather staidly (e.g., Ge "... der zur Schwester geht"), it is hard not to see this idiom as a sexual one, as Re comments (in EVP, despite his restrained "qui a commerce avec sa soeur" in Hymnes spéc.) – even if a specific sex act, as in the same English idiom 'go down on', is not meant.

In c Yama urges her for the third time (8c, 10d) to find some other undefined sexual partner.

And in d he brings the discussion to a firm end. His *nā te (bhrātā subhage) vaṣṭi etāt* almost exactly repeats his first words, in 2a *nā te (sākhā sakhyām) vaṣṭi etāt*. The repetition is ring compositional, but a striking use of this device. It not only defines the compositional unit by the poet for the audience (us), but Yama uses this boundary-setting repetition to close off the dialogue, to shut down the communication between him and his conversation partner. In other words, ring composition is deployed by a fictional character to limit a fictional debate, as well as by the poet to delimit a self-contained poetic unit—it functions both within the fictional space and outside of it, at the same time.

X.10.13: After he has so decisively shut her off with his defining ring, it is no wonder she produces the sputtering outburst in 13a. Her first pāda is also considerably too short, 7 syllables rather than 11, so with 4 syllables lacking, almost balancing the 3 he added in 12a. In this case as well, Knobl (110–15 = 50–55) argues strenuously and persuasively for letting this pāda stand in its truncated form, rather than pursuing various emendation strategies proposed by previous scholars to fill the pāda out, and once again he is following the lead of Old (Noten, though in the Proleg. Old had himself considered emendation). Her initial reaction is all the more powerful for its brevity, a pure eruption of frustration, exasperation, and anger.

It also contains the striking doublet *bató bata*, found only here in the RV. The latter word *bata* is found as an interjection later (Br+, also Pāli *vata*), the accented stem *batá-* nowhere else but here. There are two exactly opposite schools of thought on these words: 1) *bata* is the voc. of *batá-* and later pressed into service as an interjection; 2) *batá-* represents the nonce substantivization of that interjection. Despite the eminence of the scholars who hold the latter view (incl. Wackernagel, Old, Knobl, and Bodewitz [p. 279]; see the reff. in Knobl pp. 111–12 = 51–52 + nn), I am strongly inclined towards the former. I find it hard to believe that Yamī gave violent vent to her emotions by saying "INTERJECTION, you are (an) INTERJECTION." Knobl's artificially constructed and barely parsable "*A LAS, alas*, you are, Yama!" (111=51) demonstrates the difficulty better than I could, but consider also some hypothetical exx. "Argh! you are an argh, Yama!" or "Yikes, you are a yike, Yama!" I think instead that we're dealing with a pejorative slangy designation, and I see no reason why the voc. of such a designation couldn't get turned into a swear word or an emphatic particle. Most exclamations are downgraded content words, often verbs (damn! blast!), but not limited to verbs (hell! shit!), in a

process akin to the well-known and widespread process of grammaticalization of content words and morphemes. I find it hard to imagine the opposite process, as the argh and yikes examples show. For noun as exclamation one of the best parallels I can think of in contemporary English is the exclamation of frustrated disappointment “rats!” popularized by Charlie Brown in the comic strip Peanuts; synchronically this is surely perceived (via folk etymology) as derived from the rodent, though its history complicates the picture: it is probably from “drat” or its predecessor “(G)od rot.” Consider also how “God” or “Christ” gets used in modern-day English as mere interjection without any blasphemous intent or the use of “the devil” “to make a statement stronger” (funkyenglish.com: <https://funkyenglish.com/idiom-speak-devil>); see also <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/What+the+devil%3F> and <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/what-where-how-why-the-devil> . Some website examples: “what the devil are you talking about” “where the devil have you been?” Cf. also expressions like “the devil he did,” an example of which from Jane Eyre I unearthed on the internet. In any case the initial *b-* of *bata* marks it as belonging to a different stratum of discourse from that usual in the RV. We have no way to know what the word actually meant, but English “jerk” inhabits the right register.

Note that, flg. a suggestion of Georges Pinault, Carmen Spiers in her 2020 EPHE diss. (“Magie et poésie dans l’Inde ancienne: Édition, traduction et commentaire de la Paippalādasamhitā de l’Atharvaveda, livre 3”), pp. 571-72, apropos AVP III.39.1 (a hymn “après une fausse couche”) suggests that *patam* in that vs. is a *p*-form of *batá-*. She translates the line *dhruveṇāśvinā patam bharāmi* “[Même] avec un cavalier solide, je porte un raté” / “[Even] with a solid rider, I bear a runt.” The vs. is confined to the Paippalāda and is beset with problems; given the uncertainties of the text, this can only be a suggestion.

Yamī’s 2nd pāda is, by contrast, hypermetric, though only by one syllable: it has a good Triṣṭubh cadence, but 12 syllables. It would have been easy for her to make a standard Triṣṭubh, just as it would be easy for us to fix it now: either *evá* or *te* could be eliminated with no detriment to the sense. But once again metrical disturbance calls attention to the message; I suggest that her *naívá te* ... is meant to match his 12a opening *ná vaí u te* ... [note that *ná vaí* and *naívá* are anagrams], though on a slightly lower discourse level—*evá* being a much much more ordinary RV particle than the elevated *vaí*. After her disordered outburst in pāda a, she demonstrates that she can speak as formally and collectedly as he can. This is also conveyed by the 1st pl. *avidāma*. Knobl (116=56) thinks that this plural contains “a multitude of divine peers” along with herself, but I think rather that she is speaking for herself alone but deploying the plural majestatis, as it were – giving herself a detached and authoritative persona, which coolly passes judgment on Yama’s failings. (Queen Victoria’s supposed statement “we are not amused” captures the right note.)

Her last move in her effort to reposition herself in the dialogue is to appropriate one of his ploys: the indefinite *anyá-*, here in the feminine of *his* as-yet-unidentified new lover. She has washed her hands of him. The creeper / tree pairing for a delicate and clinging woman and a sturdy man is of course a trope that persists through the rest of Sanskrit high literature; this is the first example of it, to my knowledge.

X.10.14: Yama gets the last word, at least technically, but it seems anticlimactic, not the clincher he may have envisioned. In the first hemistich he simply repeats and elaborates her 13cd with gender switch, and in c he seems to promise that there’s another man out there who has the *mānas* that he, Yama, does not. I’m again not sure what he’s trying to say: is he condescendingly

recommending something outside of her power (find another man) and then reassuring the little lady by saying it'll all be fine? Is he not the least embarrassed to admit that he lacks *mānas*?

In any case, I find his rhetorical form more appealing than his message: his a and c pādas contain parallel reciprocal structures:

anyām ... tvām / anyāḥ ... tvām

tāsya ... tvām / sā ... tāva

In both structures the case forms are arranged chiasmically, ACC ... NOM / NOM ... ACC // GEN ... NOM / NOM ... GEN, while the stems have A ... B / A ... B order. Each of these structures has paired particles, *ū/u* in pāda a, *vā* in pāda b. Pāda c is once again metrically disturbed, with 12 syllables and this time the Jagatī cadence appropriate to that number of syllables. Arnold suggests emending the final *tāva* to *te*, which would give a Triṣṭubh. Once again Old resists – properly. The accented disyllabic *tāva* is needed to balance its disyllabic partner *tāsya* at the beginning of the line; moreover, the final *sā vā tāva* makes a nice little figure. Note also that *tvām* is not to be read distracted in either pāda – this unusual scansion is perhaps deployed in the first pāda to make it more equivalent to acc. *tvām* and in the second to match *sā*.

Both of his neatly packaged structures have conceptual problems, however. Pāda b, which he repeats verbatim from Yamī's 13d, is appropriate only for the first part of pāda a, *anyām ū sū tvām*, with the female “you” (Yamī) compared to the creeper; in Sanskrit art poetry the man (the masc. nom. *anyāḥ* of the 2nd part of a) would never be compared to a creeper wrapping himself around a stalwart female.

In c, rather like his 4a, Yama starts a thought that should require a 2nd verb, which he omits, leaving the thought incomplete. Once again this may be because the required verb is problematic. Here he addresses Yamī with the impv. “seek” (*ichā*); the paired clause beginning *sā vā* “or he ...” should have a 3rd sg. impv. (*ichatu* vel sim.: “or let him seek ...”), but since the subject, the *sā*, has only a hypothetical and at best future existence, it is hard for Yama to give him orders. Hence his final pāda (“it will all be fine”) is undercut by his inability to construct credible reassurances. The hymn ends at an impasse.

I have always been puzzled by the anodyne *ādha kṛṇṣva saṁvīdam sūbhadrām* “Then make yourself a very happy compact” that ends the hymn and Yama's speech—which I took as his condescending advice to find a new lover and arrange things with him. But I now see that it should be read in conjunction with Yama's own *sām √ vid* in X.14.4, where he comes to an agreement / makes a compact with two distinct groups of beings, the Aṅgirasas and the Pitars, with whom he will share the new realm of the ancestors. In our passage Yama seems to be foreseeing a time when Yamī will have to negotiate such an agreement with someone quite distinct from herself (as Yama is not) and indeed quite possibly someone belonging to an entirely alien breed, namely a mortal. The root noun *saṁvīd-* is also found in a Vākh. fragment, VIII.58.1 (q.v.), where a sacrificial *saṁvīd-* is made between the Sacrificer and the officiating priests.

X.11 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., it's long been recognized that this hymn shares some phraseology with X.10, even though they have nothing in common thematically. See esp. vs. 2c *rāpad gandharvīr āpyā ca yōṣaṇā* with X.10.4c *gandharvó apsv āpyā ca yōṣā*, and for *rāpat*, X.10.4b *rapema*, 11c *rapāmi*. The hymn is also characterized by alliteration and etymological and morphological figures.

X.11.1: All 4 pādas of this vs. show alliteration, some mixed with etymological figures or use of identical stems in different case forms:

- a: *vṛṣā vṛsne duduhe dōhasā diváh*
- b: *... áditer ádābhyah*
- c: *vṛṣvaṃ sá veda váruṇo ...*
- d: *... yajñíyo yajatu yajñíyān ...*

With Ge and Re, I take the subject of the first hemistich to be Soma, of the second Agni. Old instead sees Agni as subj. of the whole. The focus on milking in ab makes Soma more likely than Agni; as Ge points out, the pressing of soma is elsewhere likened to milking. The paradox of a bull, a male, giving milk is of the type much loved by RVic poets.

There is a certain amount of disagreement about where to assign the genitives *diváh* and *áditeh*. Ge takes *diváh* with *páyāmsi*, Re with *vṛṣā*, with Old I attach it to *dōhasā*, on the basis of word order and pāda boundary, though Ge's solution is also possible (and not terribly different in sense). Old takes *áditeh* with *páyāmsi*, while I follow Ge and Re in supplying 'son' for the gen. to depend on. Again word order favors this interpr. Cf. also VII.60.5 ... *putrá áditer ádabdhāh* (sim. II.28.3). The problem is that neither Soma nor Agni is generally classified as an Āditya (though for Agni see Brereton, Ādityas, 221–31); Ge's n. 1b attempts to argue that Soma is the youngest son of Aditi, but his arguments aren't particularly strong. But perhaps being "undeceivable" (*ádābhya-*) is sufficient to make a divinity an honorary Āditya.

In d most interpr. take *yajñíyān ṛtūn* as the obj. of *yajatu* ("let him sacrifice to the sacrificial ṛtu's"); I take it as an acc. of extent of time (a possibility Ge mentions in n. 1d). In favor of the former interpr., Re argues that *yajñíya-* is almost always used of divinities. Acknowledging this, I might suggest an alternative tr., taking the two acc. pls. separately: "Let the one worthy of the sacrifice sacrifice to those worthy of sacrifice [=gods] throughout the ritual sequences." On the sequential offerings see comm. ad I.15 and the publ. intros. to I.15 and II.36.

X.11.2: Note the sequence of paired alliterative words in b: *nadásya nādé pári pātu me mánah*, the first pair also being an etym. figure.

As in vs. 1, the first hemistich seems to concern Soma, the 2nd Agni.

As noted above, pāda a *rāpad gandharvīr ápyā ca yóṣaṇā* is a variant of X.10.4c *gandharvó apsv ápyā ca yóṣā* "the Gandharva in the waters and the watery maiden" and must be interpr. in that context. The version in X.10 is surely the original—it provides one of Yama's most important arguments against incest—with ours a playful adaptation. The most crucial deviation is the substitution of fem. *gandharvī-*, found only here in Vedic, for masc. *gandharvá-*. (The replacement of *yóṣā* by *yóṣaṇā* is a more or less automatic adjustment from a Triṣṭubh to a Jagatī cadence.) So the question is whether the two feminine designations refer to one female or two; another way to phrase this is what is the function of the *ca*?s In X.10.4, of course, it conjoins the "watery maiden" with the Gandharva and is properly positioned to do so. If the Gandharvī and the watery maiden here are two separate individuals, *ca* can be doing the same thing. This is Old's view. The presence of a singular verb (*pātu*) in b, to which they should be the subject, is not actually an obstacle: see the conjoined subject in X.10.5 with singular verb (see comm. ad loc.). However, it's trouble enough to figure out what to do with *one* female here; there's no obvious role for two. Ge and Re both take the two feminines as referring to one individual, but deal with the *ca* in different ways. Ge takes *ca* as subordinating, with domain over the whole pāda despite its position, and tr. "Wenn die Gandharvin, die Wasserfrau, flüstert." This is rightly rejected by Klein (DGRV I.262), in favor of Re's solution, that when the original pāda

was adapted here, the *ca* came along for the ride, losing its function (“*ca* irrationnel”). While also taking the two feminines as referring to one individual, I suggest a slightly different solution. In borrowing the pāda, the poet has repurposed the *ca*, no longer needed to conjoin the two nouns, into a sentential coordinator, introducing the 2nd clause.

The sense of this opaque hemistich is cleverly illuminated by Ge (n. 2ab). The Gandharvī watery maiden is a designation of an Apsaras; in IX.78.3 the waters mixed with the just-pressed soma are called Apsarases. In b the “bellow of the bellowing (bull)” is the sound of the pressed soma; noise is often a prominent part of the description of the soma pressing. The idea here is that the gentle murmuring of the (female) waters moderates the clamor of the (male) bullish soma and insulates the mind of the poet against it.

Aditi returns in pāda c (from 1b), but it is not clear what her relevance is in either vs. (Brereton [Ādityas, 224] considers *āditi-* here to be personified Innocence used as a designation for Agni himself; I am not convinced, esp. as Aditi in 1b was in relation to Soma.) For further spec. on the reason for Aditi’s presence here, see below.

In this pāda *naḥ* is universally taken as the obj. of *nī dhātu* “let her set us down” and *iṣṭāsya* as the ppl. to *√iṣ* ‘desire’: Aditi is to establish us in the midst of everything we want. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr., and it may well be correct at least in part. But it seems a trivial and frivolous use of Aditi, and I wonder if there’s not another possible, perhaps dominant reading. The lexeme *nī√dhā* is regularly used of the establishing of Agni as Hotar (e.g., I.45.7, V.4.3), and *agnīm hótāram* is the catchphrase of the omphalos in this hymn, in the next two vss., 3d and 4d. Moreover, the referent of “eldest brother” (*bhrātā ... jyeṣṭhāḥ*) in the next pāda (2d) is taken by most to be Agni. Therefore I suggest that Agni could be supplied as the obj. of *nī dhātu* with *naḥ* a dative of benefit: “Let Aditi set (Agni) down [/install (Agni)] for us.” In this case *iṣṭā-* could belong to *√yaj*, and the phrase would mean “in the midst of what has been / is sacrificed,” that is, in the middle of the ritual ground. For somewhat similar passages of Agni, see I.69.4 *mādhye nīṣattaḥ ... duroṇé* “set down in the middle in the dwelling,” VI.12.1 *mādhye hótā duroṇé* “in the middle in the dwelling,” as well as nearby in the mystical X.5.1 *útsasya mādhye nīhitam padām veḥ* “the track of the bird has been set down in the middle of the wellspring,” also, despite superficial appearances, of Agni. If this suggestion is correct, then the point may be that Aditi is involved in the establishment of both primal ritual divinities, Soma (1b) and Agni (2c).

Ge (n. 2d) convincingly explains the use of *bhrātā* for Agni in d: “Der älteste (Amts)bruder des Priesters, insbes. des Hotar, ist Agni.” But I wonder if there’s a more pointed reason for the word ‘brother’ here. When our poet borrowed X.10.4c for his pāda a in this vs., he erased the male Gandharva, father of the twins, by making him into a female Gandharvī; he may be indirectly restoring the brother here.

But what is Agni doing to or for us? Ge (n. 2d) thinks that he is deciding what reward we should receive, Re that he is stating our desire (from c) explicitly. I think it is both more general and more pointed. The lexeme *ví√vac*, in verbal forms entirely limited to the aor. stem *vóca-*, almost always has the sense ‘provide a decisive answer to a question’; see I.105.4, IV.5.12, VI.18.3, 22.4, X.28.5, 88.17. Sometimes it’s a question with two alternative answers.; e.g., VI.18.3 *ásti svin nú vīryam tát ta indra, ná svid asti tát ṛtuthā ví vocaḥ* “Does that heroic power now exist for you, Indra, or does it not? You will declare [=decisively answer] that at the proper season”; sometimes the questions are about impenetrable enigmas, on which a mortal seeks enlightenment, as in I.105.4 *yajñām pṛchāmi avamām, sá tát dūtó ví vocati / kvārtām pūrvyām gatām, kás tát bibharti nūtanah* “I ask the nearest one [=Agni] about my sacrifice. Will the

messenger [=Agni] declare [=decisively answer] this: ‘Where has my earlier “truth” gone? Who bears it now?’” Although in our passage no questions are explicitly posed, this is the last pāda before the omphalos vss., the ordinary locus of enigmas, and I would suggest that now that Agni has been installed (2c; see above), he will provide us with decisive instruction about the mysteries that concern us—esp. because “He knows everything, as Varuṇa does, through his insight” (1c *vísvaṃ sá veda váruṇo yáthā dhiyā*). Perhaps Aditi is the installer in c in order to connect Agni with her most eminent son, Varuṇa, distinguished by both knowledge and ethical stature. I would therefore emend my tr. of d to “Our eldest brother (Agni) will be the first to instruct us.”

X.11.3–4: As indicated in the publ. intro., these two vss. form the omphalos of the six-vs. Jagatī portion of this composite hymn. Their 2nd hemistichs match each other: #*yád ī(m) ... , agnīm hótāram ...*, and both vss. end with a form of *jan* (3d *jījanan*, 4d *ajāyata*). Both also play the ritual present against the mythic past: in vs. 3 the *cīd nú* points to the ritual present, but Manu belongs to the mythic past; in vs. 4 the fetching of the drop by the falcon in ab is mythic past, but the verb in c (*ṽṛṇāte*) is present. As noted in the publ. intro., the 1st hemistichs of the vss. treat the introduction of the ritual substances fire (3ab) and soma (4ab) respectively. This toggling between present and past leads to a strange collection of verbal stems and tenses.

X.11.3: The first of the omphalos vss. It also contains the alliterative and etymological figures *uṣā uvāsa* (b) and its echo *uśántam uśatām* in c (though of course the phrases belong to two different roots, \sqrt{vas} and $\sqrt{vaś}$ respectively).

The publ. tr. omitted *bhadrá* in pāda: correct to “... auspicious Dawn ...”

X.11.4: Some alliteration that crosses the pāda boundary in ab: *vibhvām vicakṣaṇām, vír*.

Based on the parallelism with 3c and on the sense, *yádī* in 4c should be read *yád ī*, not as a lengthened form of *yádi* ‘if’. The *īm* in 3c precedes a vowel, *ī* in 4c a consonant.

The verb *ābharat* in b is read by the Pp. as augmented *ā abharat*, but in fact it could just as well be an injunctive. An injunc. would give more flexibility in putting together the temporal relations of the rest of the vs. I am now tempted to read it with presential value “does the bird ... bring,” to conform with the pres. in c. The injunctive would also allow both the mythic past and the ritual present meanings simultaneously. On taking c with ab, rather than d, see immed. flg. remark.

In the publ. tr., contrary to the standard interpr. I take the *yád* clause of cd with ab and take *ádha dhīr ajāyata* as a new independent sentence. This disposition of clauses was made in great part in response to the awkwardness of having a pres. *ṽṛṇāte* in the subordinate cl. and an augmented impf. in the main cl.—which, strictly speaking, should yield the unharmonious “when the Aryan clans choose ..., a thought was born.” Most interpr. take c with d and tr. *ajāyata* as an aoristic-type recent past: e.g., Klein, DGRV II.105 “When the Aryan clans choose the wondrous Agni as Hotar, then a (poetic) thought has been born.” But (per IH) augmented impfs. should not express such a value. I therefore stick to the publ. tr. (save for substituting a presential reading for *ā bharat*). Note that the *yád īm* clause in 3cd is also subordinate to a main cl. in ab, so that my interpr. here reinforces the parallelism of the two vss.

The *dhī-* that was born in d harks back to 1c, where Agni knows everything “with his insight” (*dhiyā*). Thus the very end of the omphalos sees the creation of the quality that allows Agni to instruct us authoritatively.

X.11.5: The opening of b, *hótrābhir agne*, is a scrambling of the repeated phrase of the omphalos vss., *agním hótāram*, which likewise opens the even pāda. Another partial repetition from the omphalos vss. is *mānuṣaḥ*, echoing *mānave* of 3b and connecting the current ritual to Manu's first establishment of it.

It is not immediately clear what *vā* in c is conjoining, but I am persuaded by Klein's suggestion (DGRV II.184–85) that the nominal expression in b, *hótrābhiḥ ... mānuṣaḥ svadhvarāḥ* is equivalent to a temporal cl., with the bahuvr. *svadhvarāḥ*, lit. 'having good ceremonies', functioning as the predicate "(when) you have/conduct ..."

X.11.6: Pāda b has chiasmic alliteration: *īyakṣati haryatō hṛttā iṣyati*. The 2nd two terms (*hṛttāḥ* and *iṣyati*) appear to be abbreviated versions of the 1st two (*haryatāḥ* and *īyakṣati*).

As noted in the publ. intro., this last vs. of the Jagatī hymn is esp. crammed with matter and subject to simultaneous and overlapping readings. As Re points out, the vs. contains 7 finite verbs, of which 6 are pres. indic. (only the first is exceptional, the impv. *īraya*). For none of them is the subject identified (save for epithets or descriptors). Suggestions for the identities of the subjects vary widely; I will not list them all, but give what I consider the primary referents in each case – but as indicated in the publ. intro., the studied vagueness as to identity is surely meant to invite the audience to interpr. each statement as applicable to both Agni and Soma (or vice versa).

I take the/a priest as the subj. of the impv. in pāda, prompting a fellow officiant. I also favor the kindling sticks as the referents of *pítārā* among the usual pairs (Heaven and Earth, Day and Night) suggested. The vs. seems to be the climax of the ritual activity prepared for in the earlier parts of the hymn, and kindling the ritual fire would be the first critical event.

Ge follows Yāska in interpr. *ā* as a simile particle; I am quite skeptical, even though I think *jārā ā bhāgam* is an implicit comparison. The most helpful parallel is I.134.3 *prā bodhayā pūraṁdhiṁ, jārā ā sasaṭīm iva* "Awaken Plenitude as a lover (awakens) her who sleeps," with the same sequence *jārā ā* followed by an object referring to the female of the pair. (Cf. also X.39.2 *ūt pūraṁdhīr īrayatam*, which contains our verb and *pūraṁdhi-* as in I.134.3.) Although *bhāgam* is obviously not feminine, I wonder if it's not erotic slang, something like "piece of luck" for a girl he "got lucky" with.

In b I take the subj. to be Soma, primarily because, although *haryatā-* can be used of Agni, it more often modifies Soma. The desid. *īyakṣa-* has Soma as subject a number of times. As complement to *īyakṣati* I perhaps over-hastily supplied 'cows', on the basis of a passage like IX.78.1 *apā vāsāno abhī gā īyakṣati*, of Soma. I now would be inclined to leave it in absolute usage ("the gladdening one is yearning ..."). As for *iṣyati*, this verb regularly takes 'speech' as obj. with Soma regularly as subj. (IX.12.6, 30.1, 64.9, 25, 95.5), and this seems a fairly safe obj. to supply, esp. since it is followed immediately by *vīvakti*.

In c *vāhni-* 'draught-horse' is used of both Agni and Soma; here I would favor Agni as the primary referent on the basis of *vīvakti*. Although this verb obviously belongs to the redupl. pres. and therefore does not contain the preverb *vī*, it cannot help but recall to the audience *vī vocatī* (2d), the verb that introduced the omphalos verses and means something like "provide decisive instruction." Agni was the subject of that verb, and I think his role as instructor is reprised here.

On *makhā-* see comm. ad I.18.9. The stem is not particularly associated with either Agni or Soma, and the verb doesn't help. I tentatively assign the phrase to Agni partly because the

identities seem to switch pāda-by-pāda rather than clause-by-clause, and partly because Agni does more actual labor at the sacrifice.

As to d, the denomn. *taviṣyá-* occurs 3x in the RV; the other two occurrences have Soma as subj. The cl. *vépate matī* is used of Soma in IX.71.3. So Soma seems the likely primary referent of this pāda.

X.11.7: Although the isolated form *ákṣat* is identified an aor. subjunctive to $\sqrt{(n)as}$ by Gr, see Narten's disc. (sig-aor. 160). She interpr. it as a nonce present injunctive analogically created beside the (likewise isolated) *-is*-aor. Whether her model is correct (I am dubious because the *-is*-aor. is a hapax), I concur with her grammatical analysis: a subjunctive in the generalizing *yáḥ* cl. does not fit well with pres. *śṛṇve* in the main cl. I would now emend the tr. to "whatever mortal attains ..." Note that *ákṣat* echoes *íyaksati* in 6b and they belong to the same root; although they belong to two different hymnlets, I think it's possible that well-attested *íyaksati* influenced the form of nonce *ákṣat*.

In b I supply "all" on the basis of VIII.2.34 *vísṣvā yó 'ti śṛṇve* "who is famed beyond all things."

In d the lexeme *ā ... bhūṣati* has elicited a range of contextual translations all assuming that *dyūn* is the object: Gr "eine Zeit hinbringen, verleben" [spend time], Ge "sieht er den (kommenden) Tagen entgegen" [look forward to, await], Re "il fortifie ses jours"—none of which resembles the usual employment of $\sqrt{bhūṣ}$. This idiom normally takes a loc. and means 'attend upon / to'. Cf., e.g., VIII.99.2 *tvé ā bhūṣanti vedhāsaḥ* "The ritual adepts attend to you." I take *dyūn* as an acc. of extent of time, as often, and supply 'you' with *ā ... bhūṣanti*, like the explicit *tvé* in just-quoted VIII.99.2 or the implicit one in I.43.9; alternatively we might supply loc. **sumataú*, picking up the *sumatīm* in pāda a, similar to X.160.5 *ābhūṣantas te sumataú nāvāyām*—yielding for our passage "he tends to (your favor) through the days."

X.11.8: Much of the 1st hemistich resembles I.95.8 *sā devātātā sāmitir babhūva*: see our ... *eśā sāmitir bhāvāti devī devéṣu* ... In I.95.8 I take *sāmiti-* as a reference to Agni: "he has become the meeting point with the assemblage of gods" (so also, e.g., Ge), an allusion to Agni's role as ritual intermediary between gods and men. I now think our passage has the same sense and reference and would emend the tr. to "When (you)/he will become the divine meeting point among the gods, the one worthy of the sacrifice." There is a problem with this interpr. that does not confront I.95.8, namely that Agni, supposedly the referent of *sāmitiḥ*, is addressed in the voc. in the 1st hemistich (*agne ... yajatra*) and is the 2nd ps. subj. of the parallel *yád* cl. in c (*yád vibhājāsi*). I suggest that this is an extreme example of the well-known "attraction" of grammatical categories in nominal sentences with pronominal subject; see disc. above at X.10.4. In that ex., *sā no nābhiḥ* "that is our umbilical tie," the referent of fem. sg. *sā* is actually the mixed gender dual pair of the Gandharva and the watery maiden," so a dual masc. (representing a masc.+fem. pair) has been "attracted" into the fem. sg. to match the gender and number of the predicate *nābhiḥ*. In I.95.8 just quoted, the fem. sg. *sā* matches *sāmitiḥ* in gender, though the referent is Agni. In our passage we would have not only that gender attraction but also, I suggest, "person attraction," from 2nd to 3rd. On the other hand, a less radical revision of the publ. tr. might follow the Ge/Re path to something like "when this divine assembly [=the sacrifice probably] will take place / take its place [*bhavāti*] among the gods ...," but this loses the parallelism with I.95.8 and also removes the focus from Agni. In addition *yajatā-* ordinarily modifies gods, not inanimate entities.

X.11.9: The use of *mākiḥ* with a 2nd sg. subj. with clear referent (you=Agni) would be unusual. In fact, Re takes the first clause as 3rd ps., only the second as 2nd: “Que nul des dieux ne soit à l’écart, sois (toi-même) ici!” Although the publ. tr. reflects the 2nd ... 2nd interpr. of Ge, I am now inclined towards Re’s 3rd ... 2nd, at least as an alternative: “Let no one of the gods be absent; you should be here!” The reason is that I now think that *mākis* only has 3rd ps. ref. (for possible counterexx., which I explain otherwise, see I.147.5 and X.100.7). In this behavior it is like *nākis*, which likewise has only 3rd ps. reference (for potential counterex., see VI.67.10 and comm. thereon). The gen. pl. *devānām* here also is easier to construe with “no one” than as an independent constituent. The big stumbling block is, of course, *bhūḥ*, which looks like an undeniable 2nd sg. Re suggests it might have been attracted by the flg. *syāḥ*, which is possible. I think it might be a nonce (pseudo-)precativ, like *dhāyīḥ* in I.147.5.

X.12 Agni

On the structure of this curious hymn, see publ. intro.

X.12.1: The first hemistich cannot be interpr. without ref. to I.185.10, which contains the other occurrence of them. *abhiśrāvā-*, there in the dat.: *ṛtām divé tād avocam pṛthivyā, abhiśrāvāya prathamām sumedhāḥ* “I of good wisdom have spoken this truth to Heaven and to Earth to hear first.” Like our passage that one contains a form of *prathamā-* and one of *ṛtā-*. In I.185.10 the dative is (quasi-)infinitival; I agree with Ge (n. 1ab) that our *abhiśrāvē bhavataḥ* is a periphrastic construction, even though, as Re points out, the loc. *abhiśrāvē* is not technically an infinitive.

Note the polarized and contrastive vocabulary: H+E both “speak” and “hear” and the two resonant and contrasting words *ṛtā-* and *satyā-* both appear in the hemistich. I think the point here is that H+E are the major physical cosmic entities; as such, they both embody and oversee the natural laws that control observable reality (*satyā-*); hence they “speak what is real” (*satya-vāc-*). This quality of theirs gives them title to be the first to hear *ṛténa*, that is, to hear what is in accordance with the deeper conceptual truths that govern the relations among things, beyond this observable reality. This *ṛtā-* is conveyed at the sacrifice, which is initiated in the 2nd hemistich.

In c *mārtān yajāthāya kṛṇvān* “setting / causing mortals to sacrifice” can be considered a periphrastic causative (see Zehnder, Periphras. Kaus. 18 and passim; Keydana, Inf. 262–63). The morphological caus. to √*yaj*, *yājayati*, is not attested until Vedic prose and should not exist in the RVic period because it would be a double transitive, a type that is blocked for *-āya-* transitive/causatives at this time (see my *-āya-*, esp. 186–89).

In d the standard tr. construe *pratyāñ* with *svām āsum*; in fact, Ge and Re seem to take it as part of a phrase with the part. *yāñ* in the meaning ‘returning’ (e.g., Ge “wieder in sein Leben zurückkehrend”). Ge (n. 1d) claims, without giving evidence, that *pratyāñ* is “verstärktes *prāti-*.” But *pratyāñc-* means ‘facing towards’, ‘face-to-face’; I see no passages with a semantic component ‘again’. In the publ. tr. I re-supply *mārtān* from c; cf. the passages in which Agni is *pratyāñ víśvā bhūvanāni* “facing towards all beings” (II.3.1, X.88.16). Alternatively Agni is regularly described as *viśvātaḥ pratyāñc-* “facing in all directions” (I.144.7, II.10.5, VII.12.1, X.79.5), and that might be the expression underlying this one.

This leaves *svām āsum yāñ* as the phrase to be interpr. The stem *āsu-* is fairly common in this set of hymns: *āsum* 14.12, 15.1, *asutīp-* 14.12, *āsunīti-* 12.4 (this hymn), 15.14, 16.2. Interestingly, at least in usage, in these funeral hymn passages the word implicitly refers to a new/other life, at least to a change of state, as in X.14.12 ... *asmābhyam ... pūnar dātām āsum adyēhā bhadram* “Let these two here today grant a fortunate life again to us”; X.15.1 *āsum yā*

īyūḥ “(the forefathers) who went to (their next) life ...” In our passage, with Agni as subject, “going to his own (next/other) life” must surely refer to the rekindling of the ritual fire at every dawn sacrifice (this is also Ge’s view, n. 1d), with this kindling referred to in the next vs., 2c.

X.12.2: Agni having initiated the mortals’ sacrifice in 1cd now turns to his sacrificial role with regard to the gods. The opening of the two segments, 1c *devó yán mártān* and 2a *devó devān*, emphasize the parallelism. Our pāda a lacks a syllable; Arnold and HvN supply a rest at syllable 5. I suggest that omitting a syllable in the opening draws attention to the parallelism, since the subord. conj. *yád* isn’t nec. in 2a.

For *devān paribhūḥ* see V.13.6 *ágne nemír arāṁ iva, devāṁs tvám paribhūr asi*.

Ge takes *prathamāḥ* in b with *cikitvān* (“als erster Kundiger”), but *cikitvān* is ordinarily a syntactically inert final qualifier like *vidvān*. I take *prathamāḥ* instead as part of the verbal complex (“(as) first convey”), parallel to *prathamé* in 1a, also of ritual activity (so also Re).

For *hótā nityaḥ* see *nitya-hotā* in nearby X.7.4.

X.12.3: A difficult vs. Note also that three of the four pādas (a, c, d) end in monosyllables, *gór*, *gur*, and *vāḥ* [underlying *vār*] respectively, a striking stylistic effect.

The difficulties begin at the beginning, with *svāvṛj-*. The old interpr. (Gr, AiG II.1.220, Wh AV XVIII.1.32, etc.) is that it is a cmpd of *su-ā-vṛj-*, but Old gives good arguments against this (first *v* is consonantal, unexpected accent). Old’s candidate for first member, *sva-*, is now the standard (e.g., Ge n. 3a, Scar 502); he takes it as a bahuv. “wobei bz. wovon eigene (d.h. eignen Besitz schaffende) Aneignung stattfindet.” This interpr. was adopted in AiG II.2.29 and is one of the alternatives given by Scar in his analysis, which begins with *sva* + fem. rt. noun cmpd **āvṛj-* (so accented). The problem is that though such a bahuvr. might account for the accent we have, in the interpr. of the passage, even by those who offer a bahuvr. interpr. of the form, it generally comes out as a determ. cmpd (Old “angeeigneter Besitz,” Scar “eigener Besitz”), which, as far as I can tell, should be accented **svāvṛj-* (and cf. *svavṛj-*). If it is interpr. as a bahuvr., a neut. modifying *amṛtam*, it seems as if the meaning should be opposite to what we expect: “the immortal drink having the own possession of the god” rather than what the sense should be: “... being the own possession of the god.” In other words, as far as I can see, grammatically speaking the drink should *possess* the god, not be his possession. Ge, Re, and Scar (2nd alt.) all produce a bahuvrīhi-type interpr., but in all cases with the backwards interpr. I just constructed (e.g., Ge “... in der eigenen Gewalt des Gottes steht”). The phrase could, I suppose, be twisted to make *devāsya* a subjective gen., but getting to this interpr. involves too many steps, to my mind. There is also the problem that root noun cmpds. generally only have two members, and even in PREVERB + ROOT idioms often gap the preverb if cmpded with a further 1st member. (See my 2020 “Vedic *iṣudhyá-* and Old Avestan *išud-*, *išūdiia-*; Fs. Lamberterie.) I wonder if, rather than a cmpd, we originally had a syntagm **svā āvṛk* “own possession/acquisition,” with fem. root noun cmpd., which underwent expected vowel contraction to **svāvṛk*, with the double accent then simplified to *svāvṛk* when it became interpr. as a cmpd. This does not in fact change the interpr. or tr. of the clause.

We are not yet finished with the problems of this pāda. All standard interpr. take the *yádī* towards the end of the pāda as subordinating the whole pāda to the main cl. in b. This clause lacks a verb, but *svāvṛk* can serve as the predicate: so, more or less, “If/when the immortal (drink) from the cow becomes the possession of the god, ...” This is, in fact, syntactically (barely) possible. However, there is an alternative, which I think works better in the passage: to

take *yādī* (or rather *yād ī*) as an izafe-like marker qualifying *amṛtam*: “the immortal (drink) which is from the cow.” As often, I read *ī* as the enclitic prn., variant of *īm*, though I’m not exactly sure what it is doing here, perhaps doubling *amṛtam*. I would point out, however, that it fills a rhetorical role: pāda a ends *yād ī gōr* #, pāda c ends *yájur gur* #; without the *ī* the match would be less exact.

What substance are we dealing with? *amṛtam* suggests soma, but the addition of the cow as source makes this unlikely. I think it is ghee, the ordinary ritual offering to Agni. Ge thinks it is the rain and therefore identical to the *divyām ghṛtām vā* “the heavenly ghee, the water” in pāda d, but this seems rather reductive to me: it is more interesting to have two substances, earthly and heavenly, assimilated to each other rather than simply being the same. (See publ. intro.) And it’s also hard for me to understand how Agni would possess the rain.

In any case the beings born from this substance (*áto jātāsaḥ*) uphold the two worlds. Who these beings are is debated. I think it is likely the gods, who make their appearance at the beginning of c. They are “born” from the ghee because the ritual oblations feed and sustain the gods. Med. pres. *dhārayante* is based on the *-anta* replacement *dhārāyanta* and need not be credited with a medial sense. The identical form (with accent) appears in vs. 7.

In the publ. tr. pāda b is set in quotation marks, to indicate that I thought that it constituted the *yájus*, the sacrificial formula, that is mentioned in pāda c. This interpr. was inspired by Re’s idea that d is the actual *yájus*. I am now not at all sure that this interpr. works, though I would like to identify an internal formula here.

On my interpr. of d as an early ex. of the water cycle, see the publ. intro. Unlike Ge, who identifies the *gauś* ‘cow’ of pāda a with the *énī* ‘speckled cow’ of d, I think they are quite distinct and the sources of earthly and heavenly ghee respectively. Since heavenly ghee is water (*vā*), namely rain, the speckled cow may be a raincloud.

X.12.4: As noted in the publ. intro., Heaven and Earth, called to witness in vs. 1, receive the same call in this vs., which ends the 1st portion of this hymn: *dyāvābhūmī śṛṇutam* in b responds to 1ab *dyāvā ... kṣāmā ... abhiśrāvé bhavataḥ*.

In pāda a the standard interpr. of the sequence *várdhāyāpaḥ* is as *várdhāya + āpaḥ*, with the latter belonging to the *s*-stem neut. *āpas-* ‘work’, and this is undoubtedly correct. However, I see a potential pun here, with *āpaḥ* ‘waters’ also to be read in *várdhāyāpaḥ*. This *āpaḥ* would be nom. for acc. *apāḥ*, as sometimes elsewhere. For exactly the same pun see nearby X.4.5 and comm. thereon. By my interpr. both ‘work’ and ‘waters’ are the obj. of the infinitival *várdhāya*. The “work” of H+E is the creation of rain (see Ge’s n. 4a), that is, “waters.” This was made quite clear in the immed. preceding pāda, 3d, which ends with *vāḥ* ‘water’, and is probably also represented by the ‘honey’ (*mādhvā*) in 4d (so also Ge).

Pāda c seems to be an elaborate way of describing the passage of time (so Ge), appropriate to the use of the cmpd in the funeral hymns to come (X.15.4, 16.2). Re’s more convoluted interpr., which seems to conceive of the days as a sort of psychopomp, seems unnec. On *āsu-* see comm. on vs. 1. On the conjunction of *āhar-* and *dív-/dyú-*, both in the meaning ‘day(time)’, see nearby X.7.4 *dyúbhiḥ... áhabhiḥ*.

X.12.5–8: On the possible thematic connection of these apparently disordered vss., see publ. intro.

X.12.5: The pf. *jagr̥he* is quite likely a pun. The form is ordinarily assigned to $\sqrt{gra(b)h}$ ‘grasp’, for good reason. Grasping is a standard action of Varuṇa’s and fits the worried atmosphere of this vs. However, it could also belong to $\sqrt{gr̥h}$ ‘complain’ (Aves. *garəz*) and is so taken by Re and Insler (1968: 223).

My interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is completely different from the standard tr. See, in addition to Ge and Re, Old’s extensive disc. and Schmidt (*Vrata*, p. 88). I will not detail my divergences from these interpr. As noted in the publ. intro., I suggest that Varuṇa’s enigmatic and inexplicable hostility to us (ab) is contrasted with Mitra’s more reliable support for us: even when angry, or being shift, he still presents himself loud and clear (like a signal call) and provides good things (like a prize). The contrast between Mitra, our helper and advocate, and the easily annoyed Varuṇa is found more clearly in 8cd.

My disagreements with other tr. begin with the standard interpr. of *juhurānāḥ*, which is generally taken as transitive with *devān* as obj. (e.g., Ge “indem er die Götter verführt”). Because the other three exx. of this med. part. are intrans./pass., I find this interpr. unlikely on syntactic grounds, and it also then requires the construction of a complex and not very plausible backstory as to how and why Mitra would lead the gods astray (see Old, Ge’s n. 5, HPS’s n. 88). I take the form as intrans. and as a pun involving $\sqrt{h̥r}$ ‘be angry’ (on *juhur-* forms to this root see Insler 1968, EWA s.v. \sqrt{HAR}) and \sqrt{hvar} ‘go crookedly’. The point is that even when Mitra is angry (like Varuṇa) and/or following a not entirely straight course, unlike Varuṇa he can be understood and he remains favorable to us.

What then to do with *devān* if it’s not the obj. of *juhurānāḥ*? I construe it loosely with *ślōkaḥ* just across the pāda boundary. Such enjambment is found in this same vs. between pādas a and b: ... *kād asya, āti vratām cakṛma* ... A *ślōka-* is a signal call that goes up and/or out: cf., in the next hymn, X.13.1 *vī ślōka etu pathyā*. For its place among the gods see III.54.11, for its journey to heaven I.190.4. Although the verb of motion is lacking here, it is easily supplied and could perhaps be extracted from the gen. pl. *yātām*.

The function of *āpi* in this pāda is disputed. I take it as ‘also’, introducing a 2nd simile, that of Mitra as *vāja-* ‘victory prize’.

X.12.6: On the sense and placement of this vs., see again publ. intro. Again my interpr. of the vs. is quite different from the standard. As I say in the publ. intro., I think that Yama’s name was “difficult to contemplate” (*durmāntu*) while he was still an immortal, because of the taint of incest, spelled out in pāda b. But after Yama chose offspring over immortality (see X.13.4 in the next hymn), which choice involved committing incest (never directly mentioned in the text), instituted the sacrificial compact between men and gods, and established the kingdom of the dead, his name became *sumāntu*. In other words, Yama’s history is a sort of Felix Culpa: his offense was indeed a sin and cost him his immortality, but the results, esp. for us humans, were happy.

Pāda b is a direct quote from X.10.2, where Yama describes what the offense, the “partnership” that Yamī is urging on him, would consist of. See comm. ad loc. for my interpr., very different from the standard. It is quoted here to indicate what offense is associated with his name, such that the name should not be thought of.

In c the name “Yama” is overtly mentioned, since that name can now be brought to mind without ill effect because of the good consequences of Yama’s actions, here esp. tied to the sacrifice. The name is absent from pāda a.

X.12.7–8: These two vss. belong together, but their connection is somewhat obscured by an accumulation of clauses. Both begin with a *yásmín* rel. cl. (each with a different loc. referent); in vs. 7 this rel. cl. extends over the whole hemistich, as the accent on *dhāráyante* in b shows. The main cl. to which both rel. cl.s correspond is postponed till 8b, where the correlative of the two *yásmín*s is the unemphatic *asya*. In the meantime, the 2nd hemistich of vs. 7 interposes two parenthetical clauses. The point of the larger structure (7ab / 8ab) is that where the gods do what they do and what they want is completely unknown to us. Ge's nn. are esp. illuminating on the structure and what it conveys.

X.12.7: Though formally a med. present, *dhāráyante* is clearly based on the *-anta* replacement *dhāráyanta*, like the identical form in 3b, and need have no middle semantic nuance. Unlike the form in 3b, there is no expressed obj. here, however, and Gr, for ex., takes it as reflex./intrans. (See also Wh, AV XVIII.1.35 “maintain themselves.”) Since, however, all other forms of *dhāráya-* have an object, expressed or unexpressed, this seems unlikely. In the publ. tr. I supply *urvī* on the basis of 3b; similar objects with *dhāráya-* are found elsewhere (e.g., *pṛthivīm utá dyām* V.62.3, *ródasī* VI.17.7). However, *√dhṛ* takes a wide variety of objects, and in this sacrificial context it might instead be something more tied to the ritual. But, since the parenthetical insertion in c has to do with the gods' arrangements for the sun and moon, a cosmic object seems likely.

As noted above, cd is a parenthetical interjection; c presents the gods' primal act of establishing the qualities of sun and moon, while d describes the current behavior of sun and moon after that original act. The verb in c, *ádadhuh*, is accented because it's positioned between its two contrastive predicates: *sūrye jyótiḥ ... māsy áktūn*.

In d I interpr. *dyotanīm* as a reference to Agni, in accordance with Sāy's comm. ad AV XVIII.1.35 (see Ge's n. 7d). The point is that the ritual fire remains at the center of the alternating brightness and darkness as the sun and moon, day and night, perform their regular daily round, a comment appropriate to the ritual context of the first hemistich.

X.12.8: Another ex. of enjambment in this hymn: *apīcyè*, which begins pāda b, belongs with pāda a, modifying *mánmani*. The poet is playing games with us: *ná* immediately follows this first word of b and is thus in standard simile-marking position, but here it opens its clause and must be the negative.

On the thematic ring that cd forms with vs. 5, see publ. intro.

X.12.9: This vs. repeats X.11.9, likewise the final vs. See comm. there.

X.13 Soma Carts

On the structure and contents of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.13.1: In the publ. tr. I take *pathyā* as a nom. sg., with most (see Old explicitly), but I now think the instr. (rejected by Old) is an alternative possibility: “as if along a path.”

X.13.3: On my interpr. of this vs., see publ. tr. As noted there it contains the obscure root noun *rūp-* also found in an impenetrable context in IV.5.7; see comm. there. In both passages it is associated with a form of the root *√ruh*.

X.13.4: This is the vs. that I take as the charter for Yama's choice, his Felix Culpa. See publ. intro. The puzzling part is pāda c. Assuming that the gods are the subj. of c, as most do, their action of making Bṛhaspati into their sacrifice must be meant to contrast with Yama's own actions with regard to the sacrifice, but figuring out how takes some reflection. Pāda c seems to depict a closed loop: the gods make one of their own the sacrifice, a phrase somewhat reminiscent of the famous statement in the Puruṣasūkta X.90.16 *yajñéna yajñám ayajanta devāḥ* and even more reminiscent of the less famous statement in X.124.6 *havíṣ tvā sántam havísā yajāma*. Thinking about those passages may help us with this one. In both X.124.6 and X.90.16 I take the VP ACC *√yaj* as meaning "sacrifice to ACC": "with an oblation let us sacrifice to you [=Soma], though you yourself are an oblation" and "the gods sacrificed to the sacrifice with a sacrifice." (For X.90.16 the standard interpr. is probably "the gods sacrificed the sacrifice ...," i.e., "... performed the sacrifice" – but X.124.6 supports the former reading.) I wonder now if the same blurring of identity between the recipient of the sacrifice and the sacrificial substance is not found in our passage, with Bṛhaspati filling both roles: "They made sacrifice to the seer Bṛhaspati as the sacrifice." My discussion of the other two passages in my 2016 "The Divine Revolution of R̥gveda X.124" (Gs. Staal) sees them as depicting the original establishment of the sacrifice. As I said there (p. 297):

These two statements express a kind of endless loop, an inescapable reflexivity: the object of worship and the means of worship are identical (sacrifice and sacrifice, soma and soma). This tight internal and grammatical circularity is situated within a larger, though not explicitly expressed, circularity: in X.90 it is the gods—the ordinary object of worship—who are performing the sacrifice. In X.124 ... in vs. 6, when Indra tells Soma "we will sacrifice to you," clearly Indra and unspecified others, again presumably gods, are performing the sacrifice, but Soma is a god and Indra is thus promising that the gods will sacrifice to one of themselves. What I am groping towards saying here is that X.124 is "about" the primal instituting of the sacrifice, which in its first instantiation was a closed circle—created by the gods to worship themselves.

The relevance of these passage to our vs. is, in my view, that Yama *breaks the circle*. By choosing death he ceases to be one of the immortals who sacrifice to themselves. The agent and object of sacrifice are no longer identical, nor are the object of worship and the means of worship. The stasis of the reflexive loop gives way to the dynamic interchange between two separate entities, gods and men, with reciprocal roles and complementary duties – the ideal model for R̥gvedic people.

Pāda c thus expresses the previous situation, when the gods sacrificed (to) one of their own. The next question is – why Bṛhaspati? I don't have an entirely satisfactory answer, but since Bṛhaspati is associated with the sacred formulation (*bráhman-*) and is in fact called the formulator (cf. X.141.3 *brahmāṇam ca bṛhaspátim*), he represents the crucial verbal portion of the sacrifice, which was especially the topic of vs. 3. Note that in the next hymn he is associated with the *īkvans*, lit. those 'possessing the *īc-*, the versifiers'.

Pāda d needs to be read in the context of X.10, the Yama/Yamī dialogue. In that hymn much is made of bodies (*tanū-*): Yamī urges Yama to enter her body (X.10.3d *tanvām ā vivíśyāḥ*); she wishes to yield (*√ric*) her body to him (X.10.7c *tanvām riricyām*); and finally she orders him to mingle his body with hers (X.10.11d *tanvā me tanvām sám pipṛgdhi*), a command he refuses (X.10.12a *ná vā u te tanvā tanvām sám papṛcyām*). Yamī also asserts that the gods

want what he will leave behind as the one and only mortal, his (personified) legacy (X.10.3b *ékasya cit tyajásam mártasya*). Thus in our passage it is telling that once Yama has chosen death and unchosen immortality (that is, has become a mortal), he leaves behind his own body, using the same word *tanū-*, in the form of offspring. This VP also telling uses the same root *√ric* (and the same stem, the perfect) as Yamī did in her expressed desire to yield her body to Yama, in the phrase in our pāda d, *tanvām prāīrecīt*. The semantic nuances of the two occurrences of the *√ric* differ, but the echo must be deliberate.

X.13.5: On this vs., too, see the publ. intro.

X.14 Yama

The hymn has been much tr.: Macdonell, VRS and Hymns from the RV; Re, Hymnes spec; Doniger; Maurer; it is also excerpted in Lanman's Reader and much of it, scrambled, is found in the funeral vss. of AVŚ XVIII.

X.14.1: Note the phonetic figure in cd ... *-am saṃgámanam jānānām, yamām rājānam ...*

X.14.3: The first hemistich consists of three (apparently) parallel NPs, with a nom. sg. PN associated with an instr. pl. The 2nd two names are of course familiar, Yama and Bṛhaspati, implicitly paired also in X.13.4, but *mātalī* occurs only here in the RV. This word is also formally anomalous: a presumable masc. in *-ī* (devī, not vṛkī, type; though Sāy. takes it to an *-in-* stem, the accent is wrong). The name is found twice more in the AV (VIII.9.5, XI.6.23, in addition to the vs. parallel to this one, XVIII.1.47). The AV passages provide no help in determining who Mātālī is or what group of beings he belongs to. The more interesting of the AV passages, XI.6.23, simply adds to the mystery: there he “knows a chariot-bought immortal remedy” (*yān mātalī rathakrītām amṛtam véda bheṣajām*), which Indra causes to enter the waters. In the Mahābhārata Mātali, with short *i*, is the name of Indra's charioteer, but this semi-agreement from a much later text is also unhelpful. Charpentier suggested that *mātalī* is a short form of *mātariśvan-* (endorsed in KEWA [s.v. *Mātariśvā*], viewed more skeptically in EWA [s.v. *mātalī*]). Although Mātariśvan is associated with Bṛhaspati (see HPS, B+I 72–77), identifying Mātālī here with Mātariśvan does not seem to get us anywhere.

It is more useful to approach the problem by way of the associated instr. pls. Here we first confront two issues: 1) are they instr. of accompaniment or agents with the pf. part. *vāvṛdhānāḥ* ‘having been strengthened’, or indeed a mixture of the two; 2) are the instr. proper names or descriptors. As for 1), both Ge and Re (Hymnes spec.) tr. as a mixture: the first two as accompaniment, the last as agent (e.g., Re “Mātālī avec les Kavya, Yama avec les Angiras, Bṛhaspati que les chantres ont invigoré”). They must assume that since *vāvṛdhānāḥ* is sg., it can only modify one of the nominatives, but this is of course not the case: a series of singulars can take a singular verb. Most of the rest of the numerous tr. of this hymn take all three in only one way or only the other: Macd (VRS), HPS (B+I 56), Maurer (249) as accompaniment, Doniger (43) as agent. The publ. tr. takes all as accompaniment, but I now think this is incorrect: the mutual strengthening (using the same root *√vṛdh*) that is depicted in pāda c supports an agentive reading. Moreover, the Aṅgirasas are famous for their use in the Vala myth of their verbal power to effect change, and both *kavyá-* and *ḥkvan-* suggest similar deployment of words. I might therefore consider emending the tr. to “Mātālī having been strengthened by the poets ...,” etc. I

am only given (slight) pause by the fact that the next two vss. (4–5) contain instr. pls. of accompaniment.

As for the question of proper names versus modifiers, although *āṅgīras-* is without doubt a PN, I see no advantage in interpr. the other two in that way (*pace* the standard inter.: Ge and Re [only for *kavyāñ*], Macd, HPS, Doniger, Maurer), since both are transparently associated with words for poetry and appear elsewhere in non-naming function (*īkvan-* is esp. well attested). Because the role of the Aṅgīrases in verbal activity was well known, they can take their place in this company of wordsmiths without further specification.

None of this gets us closer to identifying Mātālī, and this task is initially made more difficult by the three-into-two problem. As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn in part concerns the *pitryāṇa-* ‘way of the forefathers’, which leads to the realm of the dead; this way is contrasted with the *devayāna-* ‘way of the gods’. The gods and a group of others, presumably mortals or perhaps specifically the forefathers, are contrasted in pāda c, and this two-way contrast is continued by the *anyé ... anyé* “the ones ... the others” construction in d. But the first half of the vs. presents us with a division into *threes*. How are we to reconcile this discrepancy? I don’t entirely know, but I suggest that we focus now on the middle of the trio: Yama and the Aṅgīrases. Bṛhaspati is of course a god, but Yama is a boundary-crossing figure: he started as an immortal, but chose death and became a mortal, as we were explicitly told in the preceding hymn X.13.4. The Aṅgīrases also have a somewhat equivocal status: Gr describes them (s.v. *āṅgīras*) as “Wesen zwischen Göttern und Menschen, die also Vermittler zwischen beiden ... erscheinen”; cf. also Macd (Vedic Myth. 143) “it seems probable that the Aṅgīrases were originally conceived of as a race of higher beings intermediate between gods and men.” If both Yama and the Aṅgīrases inhabit an in-between realm, with one pole, Bṛhaspati, being a god, this defines the other pole, Mātālī, as a mortal and representative of the Pitars, the forefathers. This structural argument is the best way I can see to try to get at the identity of Mātālī; the conclusion may be supported by the fact that the *kavyās* are associated (/identified) with the Pitars in the next hymn, X.15.9. As for the *īkvan*s who strengthen (or accompany) Bṛhaspati, this stem is sometimes (though by no means always) used of the Maruts (e.g., I.87.5, V.52.1, 60.8), who are of course gods. Acdg. to this distribution, each pair of nom. + instr. would consist of a different set of beings: mortals/Pitars at one end and gods at the other, with the pair in the middle starting from the divine but transitioning to the human. This intermediate set will then “caucus” with the mortals, and the three-into-two problem is solved. But, as the next vss. show, Yama is tasked with integrating this diverse population.

My observation (if it is correct) that the antithesis of the gods is a heterogeneous group consisting of mortals/Pitars and former (/semi-) gods may account for the fact that only the gods are named in the following pāda; the others are represented only by the rel. prn. *yān ... yé*. There are two moieties, but only one is a unity with a single designation.

I follow Re (Hymnes spec. and EVP) in taking *svadhā* in the funeral hymns as the ritual exclamation preferred by the Pitars, a minor phonological modification of the gods’ *svāhā*. Although it is homonymous with the rt. noun cmpd. *svadhā-* ‘autonomous power’ and must be derived from it, it is synchronically distinct (though, e.g., Scar, 264–65, does not separate them). I do not see the necessity for a 2nd lemma *svadhā* “Opfertrank,” as given by Gr.

X.14.4: The non-god group, defined in the last vs., is assembled here: Yama with the Aṅgīrases, the Pitars, and, indirectly, the *kavyās*. Although the publ. tr. identifies the Aṅgīrases with the Pitars—most other tr. leave it unclear—I now think two different groups are meant, both

appearing in vs. 3, with *pitṛbhiḥ* designating the *kavyaīḥ* of 3a, which is then reprised in the cmpd. *kaviśastāḥ* ‘pronounced by kavis’ in c. I also think that *saṃvidānāḥ* has the technical meaning ‘come to/make an agreement’, here depicting the fusion of the two groups of non-gods. See the use of *saṃvid-* in the final pāda of the Yama/Yamī dialogue, X.10.14 and comm. there. I would therefore emend the tr. to “coming to an agreement with the Aṅgirasas and the forefathers.”

I did not know how to handle the *hī* in pāda a (and so I essentially ignored it, in tacit agreement with most every other interpr.). Ordinarily when *hī* appears in an imperative clause, it provides the grounds for a following imperative, but here the action of the immediately following impv. clause logically preceeds the action of the first: “sit here; let the mantras bring you here.” However, I now see that the next impv., addressed to Yama as is the first, can fit the pattern: “sit here ... and (then) become exhilarated,” with the middle impv., in the 3rd ps., a parenthetical intrusion.

X.14.5: The standard tr., incl. the publ. tr., take *vairūpā-*, the only occurrence of this stem in the RV, as the name of another group of beings. I now think this is wrong; rather I think it’s a vṛddhi deriv. of the poss. cmpd. *vīrūpa-* ‘having different form(s)’ and it continues the theme of the heterogeneous composition of the denizens of Yama’s realm. Here it may refer to the Pitars, who are, as I argue above, originally distinct from the Aṅgirasas, or perhaps to the whole group, containing both Aṅgirasas and Pitars. I would emend the tr. to “become exhilarated here along with those of different form [or better perhaps, to capture the vṛddhi: with the descendants of those of different form].” Although Gr (and others; see Mayr PN s.v. *vīrūpa*) identifies several occurrences of *vīrūpa-* as names of singers related to the Aṅgirasas, only in the deriv. *vīrūpavāt* in a list of seers in the uninspired and seemingly late hymn I.45.3 do we need to interpr. it as a PN. In that passage it is adjacent to *aṅgirasvāt* and may result from misinterpr. of earlier passages. The *vairūpā-* here should be considered in conjunction with Yama’s use of *vīśurūpa-* in X.10.2 to describe Yamī in arguing against their having incestuous sex. See comm. there.

In the Avesta, *vīuuant-* is also the father of *yima-*; in Y.9.4 he is identified as a mortal. Where on the human-divine spectrum Vedic Vivasvant lies isn’t entirely clear. Ge, on the basis of X.17.2 (q.v. with Ge’s n. 2a) claims that he is a mortal, though that vs. is quite opaque; Mayr (PN s.v. *vīvasvant-*) suggests rather that he is, like Yama, “dem Mittelbereich göttlicher und sterblicher Wesen zugehörig,” which seems more plausible. See also Gr’s “Name eines Gottes oder Halbgottes.” As for the accent fluctuation between *vīvasvant-* (here and elsewhere) and the more common *vīvasvant-*, the preverb-accented form is found three times in this group of hymns (here, X.17.1–2) as well as twice elsewhere, while the root-accented form is much better attested and more widely distributed; nonetheless, the two accentual forms do not seem to require semantic separation. Thieme (MSS 44 [1985 Fs. Hoffmann] 243; see EWA s.v. *vīvasvant-*) attributes the *vīvasvant-* forms to spread from vocative accentuation.

With Ge (explicitly, n. 5c), Re (Hymnes spec.), Gonda (Ved. Lit. 238), as well as Whit (AV XVIII.1.59), I take pāda c as a parenthesis, with Yama as the subj. of the gerund *niśādya* in d, because the structure of vs. 5 is a mirror-image of vs. 4. In 4 Yama is first urged to sit on the grass strew (a: ... *yama prastarām ā ... sīda*) and then to become exhilarated (d: *mādayasva*); in 5 he is urged to become exhilarated (b: *mādayasva*) after having sat down on the barhis (d: *barhīṣy ā niśādya*). This pattern would be disturbed by making Vivasvant subj. of the gerund in d, as Macd (VRS), Doniger, and Maurer do. Old considers both possible and the uncertainty perhaps

intended. The position of the rel. expression *yáḥ pitā te* would not tell against an interpr. with Vivasvant as subj. of d, since it is of the izafe type.

X.14.6: This last vs. of the first portion of the hymn opens out to further populations with equivocal status on the human-divine spectrum; in addition to the already familiar Aṅgiras and Pitars, there are the Navagvas, the Atharvans, and the Bhṛgus. In this it resembles the final vss. of hymns that mention a wider range of divinities than the rest of the hymn treated.

The publ. tr. has the erroneous Atharvaṇas, which should be corrected to Atharvans.

X.14.4–6: As noted in the publ. intro. it is well worth remarking that Yama and his companions can come *back* to our sacrifice; they are not permanently confined to the realm of the dead. Moreover, beyond the difference in the ritual call for gods and forefathers, the crucial parts of the sacrifice seem identical or at least parallel: it is called a *yajñá-* (5d) and the recipients are called *yajñíya-* (5a, 6c); there is a grass strew, identified as *barhís*, for the visitors to sit on (4a, 5d); it has both mantras (4c) and oblations (*havís-* 4d); the appropriate response of the consumer of the oblation is exhilaration (*√mad*, 4d, 5b) as in the soma sacrifice, and this oblation indeed appears to be soma, since its recipients are *somyá-* (6b). The tight association of Yama with the sacrifice is also emphasized in vss. 13–15.

X.14.7: The remarkable alliteration of *p* and *r* in the first hemistich has been noted, inter alia, by Macd (VRS ad loc.), Watkins (Dragon, 291): *préhi préhi pathíbhiḥ pūrvyébhir ... pūrve pitāraḥ pareyúḥ*.

It is of course striking that Varuṇa the god is mentioned in connection with Yama and the rites of the dead.

X.14.9: The vs. opens with repeated 2nd ps. impv. of *√i* with different preverbs, followed by a 3rd impv. to a different verb but with repeated preverb: *ápeta vīta ví ca sarpata*. This pattern plays off *préhi préhi*, which opens vs. 7, likewise with a 2nd ps. impv. to *√i* (sg. instead of pl.) and repeated preverb *prá*. The difference in pattern is iconic: the sequence in vs. 9 uses divergence to depict diverse directions of movement, while that in 7 is focused on a single forward movement.

The rest of the verse is framed by the dat. demon. *asmaí* (opening b) ... *asmaí* (closing d), referring to the dead man.

My interpr. of the instr. in c differs from all the standard renderings, which take the three as parallel; cf., e.g., Macd “distinguished by days and waters and nights.” But, using the more lit. sense of the ppl. *vyākta-*, I not understand what it would mean for a place to be “anointed/decorated with days and nights,” whereas “anointed with waters” is straightforward and makes the place sound quite appealing. I take *áhobhiḥ ... áktúbhiḥ* as the usual instr. of extent of time “though the days and nights”; cf. nearby *rātrībhiḥ ... áhabhiḥ* (X.10.9) with different lexical realization of ‘night’. The two temporal terms flank the instr. that is actually construed with *vyāktam*, namely *adbhiḥ* ‘with waters’. This positioning is likely to allow *áktúbhiḥ* to adjoin (*vy*)*áktam* because of their (folk-)etymological connection.

X.14.10: The publ. tr. should probably be changed to “run beyond,” since the dogs seem to be guarding the entrance, not attacking.

On *suvidátra-* see comm. ad II.9.6, as well as comm. on *durvidátra-* ad X.35.4.

X.14.11: The first hemistich displays tricky and ever-changing phonetic play, which partly crosses and partly conforms to morphological boundaries: *rakṣitārau, catur(-)akṣau pathi-rākṣi nṛ-(c)ākṣasau*.

X.14.12: *udumbalā-* occurs only here in the RV (and later only in dependent passages); Ge, Re (Hymnes spec., but see n. in EVP), and Macd refuse to tr., but the view that it is a color term derived from the udumbara tree (*udumbāra-*, already Saṃhitā prose), already given by Gr, seems a solid hypothesis.

X.14.13–15: See comm. ad vss. 4–6.

X.14.14: The standard tr. take *prá tiṣṭhata* as an intrans. verb of motion, “go forth”; however, although this stem is indeed usually intrans., *prá √sthā* in the ppl. *prásthitaṃ* refers to an oblation that has been ‘set forth’. Cf., e.g., II.36.24, 37 *prásthitaṃ somyám mādhu*, and this is simply the transitivized version of that idiom. Cf. also I.15.9.

The subj. *yamat* (*√yam*) of course echoes the name of its subject Yama, as Old, Ge, Macd, etc. point out.

X.14.16: On this vs. see the publ. intro. As noted there, it is only loosely connected to the rest of the hymn (by the name Yama), and its meaning and referents are completely obscure, though the syntax is not. Various interpr. have been advanced by the various tr. Ge (nn. 16a, 16b) thinks the *trikadrukebhiḥ* refers to three days in the Soma sacrifice and here is used to indicate extent of time; the six broad ones are the regions through which the dead man’s soul flies and the lofty one is his goal. In the absence of anything else compelling, this interpr. is thinkable – though once we get to the meters, all bets are off.

The “six broad (fem.)” are found elsewhere, without providing illumination for our passage. VI.47.3 *ayám śal urvîr amimîta dhîro, ná yābhyo bhúvanam kác canāre* “This wise one [=Soma] measured out the six broad (realms), from which no world is at a distance.” There ‘worlds, realms’ seems a reasonable guess for the referent, though what feminine underlies it is unclear (perhaps pluralized *pṛthivî-*? for further spec. see comm. ad X.128.5). In that passage the six feminine entities are followed by a single neut. (*bhúvanam*) as here (*ékam ... bṛhát*), but there’s no evidence that the world in VI.47.3 is lofty. X.128.5 contains a voc. phrase *dévîḥ śal urvîḥ*, with the six broad goddesses asked to provide broad(ness) for us; there is no hint of who these six goddesses are. However, in all these cases I now bow to the majority opinion (already Gr, def. 14 s.v. *urî-*) that the six broad females are the three heavens and the three earths (or some other sixfold division of the cosmos) and would alter the tr. to “the six (world-spaces) are broad ...”

X.15 Pitars

A repetitive and somewhat tedious hymn, which, however, makes it perfectly clear that the Pitars receive the same type of ritual treatment as the gods. See also comm. ad X.14.4–6. Despite (/because of?) its monotony, it is found in Macdonell, VRS, and is tr. by Maurer.

X.15.3: Note the etymological figure of *suvidátrām avitsi* “I have found those good/easy to find,” assuming that *suvidátra-* is derived from *√vid* ‘find’ as I do.

On *nāpāt-* and the various speculations on its referent, see publ. intro. I find plausible Old's suggestion that it refers, at least in part, to the grandson of each of the Pitars, whose duty would be to perform ritual for his grandfather, a duty found throughout the history of Hinduism but already well embedded in the RV. Re (EVP 16.125) cites Yamī's words in X.10.1, where she argues that Yama should have sex with her because his duty was to provide a grandson for his father: *pitúr nāpātam ā dadhīta*; the juxtaposition of the two kinship terms there is strikingly reminiscent of the situation in our passage.

X.15.4: Ge, fld. by Macd and Maur, supplies a verb in pāda, the impv. "come." I don't see the need for it, since the pāda can be interpr. easily as a nom. sentence.

X.15.6: *viśve* in b has 2nd ps. ref., to the subject of the impv. *abhi grṇīta*; we might expect it to be a voc. and therefore unaccented. However, as it turns out there are no unaccented forms of *viśva-*; even in the rare voc. phrase "o All Gods," *viśve* is positioned at the beginning of the pāda and therefore accented. Cf. I.3.7=II.41.13, VI.52.7 *viśve devāsaḥ*; also in I.23.8=II.41.15 *viśve māma śrutā hāvam* "all of you, hear my call" (preceded by pāda-init. voc. *dévāsaḥ*). I therefore think that *viśve* is a functional voc. here, despite its position, which would invite a deaccented **viśve*. This saves us from an awk. "As all, greet this ..."

X.15.7: The referent of the fem. gen. pl. *aruṇīnām* is disputed; see, e.g., Ge's n. 7a. Most opt sensibly for 'dawns' (Old+), though Ge chooses 'wool' (! – and he has the nerve to call 'dawns' "forced" [gezwungen]).

The 2nd pl. act. impv. to $\sqrt{dhā}$ is represented here by both *dhatta* and *dadhāta*. Both probably belong to the redupl. pres., though *dadhāta* could also perhaps belong to the pf. (It has an anomalous strong stem, whichever it belongs to.) See also *dadhāta* in 4d and *dadhātana* in 11d. Although the distribution is far from perfectly complementary, the two forms seem to have positional preferences: *dadhāta(na)* is mostly pāda-final, while *dhatta(na)* is mostly medial, a distribution displayed in this hymn – but there are a number of counterexamples.

X.15.8: On the med. pf. to \sqrt{vah} see Kü (485), who considers it generally "affektive oder possessiv," but here "inattinent und subjektsresultativ," tr. "die nachgefahren sind ihrem Somatrunk."

The med. part. *saṃrarāṇāḥ* is universally assigned to $\sqrt{rā}$ 'give', either with the sense 'sharing' (Macd, Maur) or bleached to 'together with'. For the latter see Kü (421), who considers the orig. sense of *sām* $\sqrt{rā}$ to be 'gegenseitig spendierfreudig', but developed to 'vereint, gemeinsam (mit)', and in practice a synonym for *saṃvidānā-*. As noted in the comm. ad X.14.4, I think *saṃvidānā-* there has richer semantics than 'vereint', maintaining the sense of 'coming to an agreement', so it is hardly a model for such bleaching. For the part. here I have a different interpr. entirely: I consider it a haplology of a putative **saṃrarāṇānā-* to \sqrt{ran} 'enjoy', hence 'jointly enjoying with'. There are several possible objections to this interpr.: 1) the perfect to \sqrt{ran} is rare and does not have medial forms; in answer to this, I would point out that *sām* triggers medial inflection in numerous roots; 2) \sqrt{ran} is not otherwise found with *sām*, but again such nonce lexemes with *sām* are easily formed; 3) there are several med. participles *saṃrarāṇā-* (VI.70.6, VIII.32.8) that undoubtedly belong to $\sqrt{rā}$ and mean 'jointly bestowing' vel sim. However, in the latter ex. (VIII.32.8) there is verbal play with a redupl. form of \sqrt{ran} that opens the trīca (*rārāṇaḥ* VIII.32.6); see comm. ad loc. Although I recognize the cumulative strength of

these objections, our passage seems to call for the “joint enjoyment” sense I give it; cf. the parallel semantics and syntax of the type *sajūṣ-*, *sajóṣas-* + INSTR similarly formed to a verb of enjoyment. Moreover, as just noted $\sqrt{rā}$ and \sqrt{ran} can be played off each other.

X.15.9: I take *hotrāvíd-* (also V.8.3) as ‘knowing the priestly functions’, rather than Macd’s ‘knowing oblations’ (and sim. for other interpr.). Though either would fit the context reasonably well, I prefer the former: the Pitars, who in life were surely ritualists, knew their jobs and have returned to the ritual to see them carried out. For a similar use of *hótrā-* see nearby X.17.11 in this same set of hymns.

The cmpd. *stóma-taṣṭa-* is found 3x in the RV, twice modifying *matí-* in nearby passages, III.39.1, 43.2. In form it is of course of the common type *devá-kṛta-* ‘made/done by the gods’, with a passive ppl. and, generally, the agent or instr. of the action as 1st member (see two exx later in the hymn: 11a voc. *ágniṣvāttāḥ*, 14a *agnidagdhá-/ánagnidagdha-*)—though alternative functions of the 1st member are also possible. In the two passages in III, modifying ‘thought’, an agentive/instrumental ‘fashioned by praise’ is contextually odd, and so I render it with a datival 1st member, ‘fashioned for praise’ (so already Gr). Here, since the cmpd modifies the Pitars, interpr. the cmpd is tricky. The standard view (see, hesitatingly, Old; more confidently Ge n. 9b, Re, Macd) is that it is an inversion of **taṣṭa-stoma-*, a bahuv. that would mean ‘having praises fashioned (for them)’, with the instr. *arkaīḥ* an instrument/agent ‘by songs’ (Macd, Maur) or a kind of secondary predicate to *stoma-* (Ge “die ihre Loblieder zu Preisgesängen formten”). But this type of inverted cmpd, of the type *putra-hata* = *hata-putra*, does not exist at this period, as Old and Macd admit. I think we must interpr. the cmpd here within the formal parameters of this well-established type in the RV, esp. since, as Re says, “le même composé sous 3.39.1; 43.2 a sa valeur normale.” I suggest that the Pitars are “fashioned by praise” because they would not keep existing (in the next world) if they weren’t continually remembered on earth. This is simply a variant on the standard notion that the paternal line must be continued, in order for male descendants, embodied in the grandson, to perform rituals in honor of their forefathers (see disc. ad vs. 3 above, inter alia), rituals later including the Pitryajña and the various Śrāddha rites, inter alia. Here we can envision the Pitars’ bodies literally being fashioned by praise, in a way reminiscent of the famous story in the MBh (I.41ff.) in which the ascetic Jaratkāru comes across his ancestors (*pitarāḥ*) hanging upside down in a cave, emaciated and with the single blade of grass from which they are suspended about to be gnawed through by a rat. When he tries to save them by offering him a portion of his austerities, they berate him for his celibacy and their consequent lack of descendants and order him to find a wife and beget children. The thirsting and panting of the Pitars in our pāda reminds us of the emaciation and deep hunger of Jaratkāru’s unfortunate ancestors in the MBh story. The continued existence of the Pitars in Yama’s realm depends on continual praise and oblations offered to them in this world. (I might add here that, as often, interpretational attempts to ignore clear morphological or syntactic evidence because it doesn’t fit easily into the context may yield a superficially “easier” interpr., but can conceal more interesting conceptual connections.)

I interpr. *satyāḥ* in d in this same general conceptual sphere: the Pitars are ‘real’ – really here (on the ritual ground) or really (still) existent because of our ritual activity.

On *kavyā-* as a designation of the Pitars, see disc. ad X.14.3, 4.

X.15.10: On *satyāśaḥ* see disc. of *satyā-* in the previous vs. By my interpr. their “eating and drinking the oblations” is what keeps them *satyā-*.

X.15.11: Since *āgni-ṣvāttāḥ* is a voc. (by accent), the publ. tr. should rather read “O forefathers, sweetened by Agni.”

X.15.14: In d the meter would be improved by reading *suvarāḍ* (so, tentatively, Old) or even *suva(r)ṛāḍ*. But Old rejects a proposed *suvārāḍ* for **suvar-rāḍ*, and “Sun-king” does not fit the context very well, unlike the same transmitted form in VIII.46.28. See Scar 450.

X.16 Agni

Re treats this Agni hymn out of order in EVP XIV (pp. 37ff.). It is found in Lanman’s Reader and tr. by Doniger and by Maurer.

X.16.1: On *cikṣipah* as the redupl. aor. to √*kṣā* ‘burn’, see Ge (n. 1b) and my -*āya*- (140 n. 71).

X.16.1–2: The pādas 1c and 2a are as close as they can be, save for the contrastive subjunctives, pres. *kṛṇavāḥ* in 1c and aor. *kārasī* in 2a. Their main clauses (1d and 2b) are likewise strictly parallel and both contain a “future” impv. in -*tāt*, both built to the pres. stem:

1c *yadā śṛtām kṛṇavó jātavedo, áthem enam prá hiṇutāt pitṛbhyaḥ*

2a *śṛtām yadā kārasī jātavedo, áthem enam pári dattāt pitṛbhyaḥ*

Although the publ. tr. makes a distinction between the pres. and aor. subjunctives here (“when you will make him” versus “when you will have made him”), I am not at all sure this is correct, as modal forms to tense-aspect forms generally don’t reflect the putative functions of the indicative of the same T/A stem, as I have discussed at length in various publications. The composer may simply have been aiming to vary the expression; note that in the opening of the two pādas the two words are flipped, with no metrical or syntactic effects. As for the metrical difference between the pres. and aor. subjunctives, the L L H break produced by *kṛṇavó* is more common than the three L’s of *kārasī*, but the latter is certainly not unusual.

Note the doubling of enclitic acc. *īm enam* in 1d and 2b, on which see my 2002 “Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*” (Fs. Cardona), p. 302 and n. 18.

X.16.2: The hapax rt. noun cmpd *vaśa-nī-* is another ex. of conflict between form and context. Rt. nouns in such cmpds generally have active/transitive value, and in particular -*nī*-cmpds all mean ‘leading X’ (e.g., *senā-nī-* ‘leading an/the army’). However, such an interpr. here of the phrase *devānām vaśanīḥ* would produce “leading the will of the gods,” which most interpr. obviously judge unacceptable and therefore for this -*nī*- cmpd alone give it passive value – e.g., Old “in der Götter Willen gegeben” (sim. Ge, Re, Maur). Scar (290) at first hesitates between act. and pass., but reaches an acceptable active sense “den Willen (der Götter) ausführend” (carry out, execute). My interpr. also maintains the active sense of the root noun, taking *vaśa*-adverbially, as I do in the same syntagm in X.84.3 *vaśī vāsam nayase* “Exerting your will, you lead at will.”

X.16.5: With the standard interpr. I take *svadhābhiḥ* in the usual RVic meaning of *svadhā*-‘own / independent power’, rather than the specialized usage of this stem in the funeral hymns for the ritual cry appropriate to the Pitars, corresponding to *svāha* for the gods; see comm. ad X.14.3. But I do wonder if there is a low-level word play here: the dead man proceeds motivated by the *svadhā* cry.

There is much discussion about the sense of pāda c, esp. what *śeṣaḥ* is referring to. (For disc. see, e.g., Ge's n. 5c, Maur's n., Ober I.501.) This *s*-stem neut. means literally 'what is left (behind)' but in all its other RVic occurrences it refers specifically to one's posterity, that is, descendants. So, e.g., Re "Que ... il accède à (sa) descendance." Although the preoccupation with continuing one's lineage is of course ubiquitous and quite prominent in this Yama cycle (cf., e.g., X.10.1, 3; 15.3, 9) in particular, I do not see that meaning here. Rather pāda c seems to depict the preliminaries to the action in d: the dead man (re-)uniting with his own body in the realm of the Pitars. In c he acquires his new life ("clothing himself in (new) life"; *āyur vāsānaḥ*), which I take to be a new spiritual/non-material life, and this incorporeal being sets out, presumably on the Pitṛyāṇa, the *āsunīti*- "(the way) leading to (the other) life" (cf. vs. 2), to follow his *śeṣaḥ*, his 'remains', which (somewhat like this Engl. word) refers to the physical remains after the cremation, which have already gone to the realm of the Pitars. Once he finds them, he can reunite with them. In somewhat similar fashion, Ober (I.501), flg. Sāy (see Ge's n. 5c), takes *śeṣaḥ* as a reference to the bones, but he also takes it as the subj. of *ūpa vetu*, so that what's left of the physical body follows the dead man to the afterlife (rather than vice versa): "Im Lebenskraft sich kleidend soll das Übriggebliebene (= die Gebeine) sich hinwenden [zu dem, was ins Jenseits gegangen ist]." But this is grammatically impossible: *śeṣaḥ* is neut., but the nom. part. *vāsānaḥ* is masc., so *śeṣaḥ* must be acc. and the object / goal of *ūpa vetu*.

X.16.6: *agadā*- here may mean 'free of disease, healed', as per most interpr. and as in the other RVic occurrence of the stem (X.97.2). However, it may preserve the "speech" aspect of the root \sqrt{gad} . See disc. ad X.97.2; also *vigadā*- X.116.5.

X.16.7: On the various potential meanings ('anger', 'flame', 'grasp') and associated etyma of *hāras*-, see EWA s.v. Here I prefer 'flame' (so also Ge) because of Agni's actions, but 'anger', or indeed 'grasp, grip' would also work in context; see Mau "in his grip," or Re's more elaborate "(dans son élan) d'emportement." There is obviously also a phonological and folk-etymological association with the immed. flg. intens. part. *jārhr̥ṣāṇa*- 'bristling'. Most of the other occurrences of *hāras*- are found in X.87, a hymn to Agni Rakṣohan: vss. 5, 10=14, 16, 25, in all of which 'flame, blaze' is appropriate. In VIII.48.2 'anger' seems more likely; in IX.10.6 opinion is divided, but I opt for 'rage; in X.158.2 opinion is also divided, but I take it as 'flare, flame'. In II.23.6 JPB tr. *hārasvant*- as 'grasping' (sim. HPS B+I 106 'packend'), which is plausible, though Ge produces the portmanteau 'wutentbrannt'.

X.16.12: In addition to the four forms of *uśánt*-, this vs. contains a nice rhyming figure: a ... (n)i *dhīmahi* #, b ... *idhīmahi*, as Re points out.

X.16.14: The verb of c, *sám gama* (Saṃhitā), is somewhat peculiar; restoring *sám gamah* with Pp. we get an active rt. aor. subjunctive, even though *sám* \sqrt{gam} is ordinarily middle (though not entirely: cf., e.g., X.6.2 *sám ... jagmúḥ*, though there the subjects are joining together in something else). The subjunctive is also unexpected, esp. as it's correlated with impv. *harṣaya* in d. The standard tr. (incl. mine) simply tr. *sám gama(h)* as an impv., but properly speaking it should be tr. "you will join together" vel sim.

X.17 Various divinities

On the ragtag structure of this hymn, see publ. intro., which also needs a slight correction: the Pūṣan vss. are 3–6. The first 6 vss. are found in Lanman's Reader

X.17.1–2: On the obscure mythology sketched in these two vss. see publ. intro. I will not further speculate here on what lies behind them. The Sanskrit itself is relatively straightforward.

X.17.2: Since *mithuná-* often refers to a complementary gender pairing, *mithunā* here may provide more, if slight, evidence for Yama and Yamī as the referents.

X.17.3: The preverb *prá-* in tmesis with *cyāvayatu* (the lexeme *prá√cyu* is quite well established), follows its verb, somewhat unusually. I suggest that this is to allow it a secondary perceptual connection with the immediately following pf. part. *vidvān*: *prá√vid* is also a well-established lexeme, and although the part. is most often found without preverb, it does occasionally occur with *prá-*; cf., e.g., X.2.7 *pánthām ánu pravidvān pitṛyāṇam* “knowing the way along the path leading to the forefathers,” concerning exactly this journey to the other world. The configuration *prá* + PART with the same sense and the same subject and in the same pāda-final position is found in both 5d and 6d *prajānán*. The presence of this same structure, with lexical replacement (*√jñā* for *√vid*), in the first (3c) and last (5d, 6d) pādas of the Pūṣan section creates a defining ring.

The adj. *suvidātra-* ‘easy/good to find’ is used of the Pitaras three times nearby in this cycle, X.14.10, X.15.3, 9, but here it seems used exclusively of the gods.

X.17.4: There is a technical gender clash in pāda a: *āyus-* is a neut. *s*-stem (distinct from the stem *āyú-*, with masc. nom. sg. *āyúḥ*), but *viśvāyuh* is a masc. nom. sg. to the stem *viśvāyu-*. We should properly expect *āyur *viśvāyu* with neut. adj., but either *āyuh* reflects a nonce masculinization, or a surface matching of *-uḥ* endings led to the phrase we have.

Note the alliteration in *pāri pāsati ... pūṣā ... pātu prāpathe purástāt*, also pointed out by Re.

X.17.5–6: The *p* and *r* alliteration noted in 4ab continues here: 5d *āprayuchan purā ... prajānán*, 6ab *prāpathe pathām ... pūṣā, prāpathe ... prāpathe pṛthivyāḥ*, 6cd *...priyātame ... párá ... prajānán*.

On *prajānán* of 5d, 6d forming a ring with *prá vidvān* see comm. ad vs. 3.

X.17.7–9: As noted in the publ. intro., these vss. to Sarasvatī show a connection to the Pitaras in vss. 8–9. I wonder if the insertion of this sequence of vss. into this ill-assorted hymn was also facilitated by the concatenation of *sukṛtaḥ* ‘those of good ritual action’ in 7c with the same word in 4c and also perhaps because the insistently repeated pāda-init. *sārasvati-* (7a, b, c, d, 8a, 9a) echoes *s^uvastidā-* beginning 5c.

X.17.7: The injunc. *dāt* at the end of d is multiply ambiguous. I take it as a functional subjunctive, but it could also be presential ‘gives’ or past ‘gave, has given’. I do not see a way to decide, esp. since the other two verbs in the vs. are pres. (a: *havante*) and augmented impf. (c: *ahvayanta*).

X.17.11–13: Expiation for spilled soma; see Ge n. 11–13.

X.17.11: The phrase *ānu saptá hōtrāḥ* is rendered in the publ. tr. “according to the seven priestly functions,” in agreement with Ge and Ober (II.73), though Kü (572) has instead “nach den sieben Opfergüssen,” flg. Gr. The phrase “seven priestly functions/offices” is also found in III.4.5 *saptá hotrāṇi*; the problem of course is that the stem there is the neut. *hotrá-*, while here we have the fem. acc. pl. to *hōtrā-*, which ordinarily means either ‘oblation’ or ‘invocation’ (see comm. ad IV.48.1). However, *hōtrā-* does display the sense ‘priestly function’ in later Vedic.

X.18 Funeral hymn

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. It has been much translated: Re, Hymnes spec.; Macdonell, Hymns from the Rigveda; Doniger; and it is found in Lanman’s Reader.

X.18.2: Assuming that this vs. is addressed to the living relatives of the dead (as described in vs. 3, which repeats 2b as 3d), the voc. *yajñīyāsaḥ* at the end is somewhat surprising, since this stem is used almost exclusively of gods in the RV. However, in the AV the word is used of humans after they have “wiped off” defilement onto something else or otherwise physically removed it, thus becoming *yajñīyāḥ śuddhāḥ* (e.g., AVŚ XII.2.13, 20, in the same hymn that contains many of our vss. [XII.2.21–25 ≅ X.18.1, 3–4, 6, 5]). Wh tr. ‘fit for sacrifice’, that is, presumably cleansed of taint and pure enough to take part in sacrifice to the gods. The phrase *śuddhāḥ pūtāḥ ... yajñīyāḥ* is also found several times in the AV, as Old points out: in AV VI.1.27 = XI.1.27 of waters; also of waters in XI.1.17 and, in an expanded phrase, of soma shoots in XI.1.18; the waters would be used to effect the purification.

X.18.3: The successful “invocation of the gods” *devāhūtiḥ* also signals their turn towards the *yajñā-*.

X.18.6: Old makes a good case for construing *āyuh* with *ā rohata*, esp. as in the later funeral rites a hide is spread out to step on (see Ge n. 6 as well as Old). Others (Re, Wh AV XII.2.24) take *āyuh* with *vṛṇānāḥ*.

Contra all the standard interpr., I supply an instr. (“with the wives of the gods”) on the basis of II.31.4 *tvāṣṭā gnābhiḥ sajōṣāḥ*, VI.50.13 *tvāṣṭā ... jānibhiḥ sajōṣāḥ*. In our context, which depicts Tvaṣṭar as providing good birth(s) (*sujānimā*), the presence of females would make good sense; see also the auspicious women in the next vs. It is also the case that there are almost no exx. of sg. *sajōṣas-* without an instr. (in the pl. the subjects are “in concert” with each other), so the “absolute” reading of most tr. is unlikely.

X.18.7: What the referent of *yóni-* lit. ‘womb’ is is not clear: the renderings range from “place of mourning” (Macd) to “marriage bed” (Doniger; cf. Re’s “la couche (conjugale)”). Given the auspicious character and appearance of these women, the latter might seem more likely. Recall also Yamī’s expressed desire *samāné yónau sahaséyyāya* “to lie together in the same womb” with Yama, for incestuous sex, in the dialogue that opens this Yama cycle (X.10.7). However, since this vs. immediately precedes the one in which the widow is recalled to life, it seems quite possible that these auspicious wives have come to adorn her for her second marriage. They may serve the same function as the non-widowed women (sometimes further specified as possessing living sons) who play various parts in the marriage ceremony as outlined in the Gṛhya Sūtras (e.g., ŚāṅkhGS I.11.5, 12.1; ĀśvGS I.7.21; GGS II.4.6, JGS I.22).

X.18.8: This is of course the famous vs. that hints at a momentary, pseudo-suttee, with the widow lying briefly beside her dead husband, before being called back to life and a new marriage. It has, not surprisingly, been much discussed; see esp. Thieme, “Jungfrauengatte” (1963, in the section on “Wiederheirat der Frau,” esp. 187–92 = KISch 452–57), who sees the ceremony as a symbolic rebirth of the widow, thus rendered ritually free to marry again. The vs. is addressed to the widow and presumably spoken by a priest or other religious functionary – or perhaps by the new husband-to-be, who would most likely be the dead man’s brother. The first hemistich is dramatically phrased, esp. with the abrupt impvs. that begin and end it: *úd īṣva nārī* “Arise, woman!” and *éhi* “come here!” But the second half, esp. the last pāda, sounds like stilted legalese: *pātyur janitvām abhī sām babhūtha*, lit. “you have come into being towards the wifehood of a husband ...,” while pāda c seems to contain technical terms from marriage ritual: *hāstam* √ *gra(b)h* ‘grasp(ing of) the hand’ and *didhiṣú-*, the desid. (pseudo-)participle sometimes meaning ‘wooer’. I think we should take this stilted phrasing serious and perhaps see here an actual citation of legal language from this early period. For further on *didhiṣú-* see my forthcoming “What Would a Vedic Law Code Look Like? “Overslaughting” in Vedic and Dharma Literature: Ritual, Mythological, and Legal Continuities and Disjunctions” (Bühler lecture, Univ. of Vienna, May 2022).

MLW suggests that *janitvām* could also be a pun: **jánī tvām* “you are a wife,” a clever idea that might help account for the awkwardness of the phrasing.

As Thieme points out (188–89=453–54 and 188/453 n. 3), tr. (including the publ. tr.) that render *hasta-grābhā-* as if it were a participial bahuvrīhi (the equivalent of **grbhītā-hasta-*) ‘having grasped (your) hand’ < ‘possessing your grasped hand’ cannot be correct, on the grounds of both accent and order of elements. It must be a tatpuruṣa: ‘grasper of the hand’ / ‘grasping the hand’ –Thieme’s “Handergreifer” –as a technical designation of a legitimate bridegroom (cf. later *pāṇi-grāha-*, etc.; also, e.g., AV V.17.8 for the connection of *hastam* √ *gra(b)h* with the legitimate *pāti-*). I would therefore now alter my tr. to “... as wife of one who grasps your hand [=bridegroom], who intends to have you, of a/your (new) husband.” On the technical meaning of *didhiṣú-* see Thieme, 189–90=454–55 as well as my forthcoming art. cit.

X.18.9: There is some dissent about who the subject of *ādadānāḥ* is in pāda a, who the referent of *tvām* is in pāda c, and whether they are the same. See esp. Old’s disc.: Caland thinks that the two are the same and the referent is the dead man’s son (or some lineal descendant). The son seems the likely subj. of the participle, but I am convinced by Old’s arg. that the *ātra* locating “you” (*tvām*) “there,” as opposed to “we here” (*ihā vayām*), is powerful evidence for a disjunction between the dead man and the living, and “you” must therefore be the dead man. (See *ātra* in 12 and esp. 13d, where it is associated with Yama.) The second hemistich is thus probably direct speech uttered by the son as he takes the bow, reassuring his father that, even though dead, he will share in the victories of the living, achieved by his bow. This would be better signaled in the publ. tr. by emending to “Taking the bow from the hand of the dead man, (his son says), ‘you there and we here—may we win ...’”

X.18.10: Two words for ‘earth’ occur here, *bhūmi-* and *prthivī-*; likewise in the next vs., *bhūman-* and *prthivī-*.

The earth to which the dead man (or more likely his bones) is consigned is depicted as two benevolent female figures, mother and young girl (though probably already of marriageable

age). In this gentle and enfolding context it's a bit of a surprise to encounter the priestly pitch: the soothing embrace of the earth is only for the man who gave sufficient Dakṣiṇās (priestly gifts) (*dákṣiṇāvant-*) during his ritual lifetime.

X.18.11: Note the phonetic play between the initial and final words of the first hemistich: #*ucchvāñcasva ... sūpavañcanā*# —noted already by Re. The 2nd word of course also echoes the one that begins its pāda, *sūpāyanā*.

X.18.12: *ucchvāñcamānā ... tiṣṭhatu* appears to be a periphrasis: “stay/keep arching up.”

As has been noted frequently in this comm., an imperative clause with *hí* followed by another impv. clause gives the grounds on which the 2nd impv. cl. can take place. Here the clauses are reversed: pāda a logically follows b, which contains *hí*: once the houseposts are erected, the earth can stay arched up.

Even in the pl., *grhá-* can refer to a single house(hold), presumably because it can consist of a number of individual structures.

Note the phonetic figure *grháso grṛtaścúto*.

X.18.13: I do not understand the function of *te* in pāda a. It could be a (vague) beneficial dative: “For you I prop up the earth from you.” Or perhaps it's an anticipatory doubling of the full 2nd ps. prn., abl. *tvát*. In that case we would need to allow occasional ablatival value for the enclitic, and though that's not out of the question since enclitic pronouns don't always seem to be tied to strict case functions, I prefer the former. The tr. should then be slightly emended to that given above.

On the ring created by *mā ... riṣam* with 1d *mā ... rīriṣaḥ*, see publ. intro.

X.18.14: On the status of this vs. in the architecture of the hymn and on its disputed meaning, see publ. intro. As noted there, my interpr. of the vs. is quite different from the standard (see esp. Old's disc. of various previous suggestions). Unlike most, I do not see this as the poet predicting his own death and burial and therefore restraining his speech in anticipation of that event. For one thing, this attitude doesn't ring true for a Rigvedic poet. Moreover, as noted in the publ. intro., the vs. is defined as extra-hymnic by the ring created between vss. 1 and 13 as well as by its different meter and its absence from the commentarial tradition. It also can easily be interpr. within the genre of hymn-final meta-reflections on the hymn that precedes. So rather than seeing it as the poet's elegiac and sombre reflection on his own eventual death, I interpr. it as the usual proud, indeed boastful assertion of the poet about his own verbal skill.

The principal syntactic shift that enables my interpr. is a different construal of *mām*: this acc. is well nigh universally taken as the obj. of *ā dadhuḥ*, but I see it rather as bound to *pratīcīne* ‘facing’. The stem *pratyāñc-* (with its derivatives) frequently takes an acc., ‘facing X’, and *mām* is well positioned, in the middle of the NP *pratīcīne ... āhani*, to fulfill this role (though it could be interpr. as occupying Wackernagel's Position, but with tonic *mām* rather than enclitic *mā* because it precedes a vowel-initial word). As for the obj. of *ā dadhuḥ*, I supply the remains of the dead man who is the subject of the rest of the hymn; what's likely to be as light as a feather but the ashes and leftover bones of someone cremated? I would also add here a note on the sense of *pratyāñc-*, etc.: the standard tr. must take it as qualifying a day in the vague, but hopefully distant, future, but in fact *pratyāñc-* (& co.) is very much “in your face”—generally referring to

something in the immediate vicinity, locationally or temporally (see, e.g., the exx. in X.28.4, 9). So by the usual interpr. the poet would be anticipating his death in the very near future.

In the 2nd hemistich by my interpr. the poet asserts his mastery over the speech appropriate to the occasion, the speech that occurred to him (/ faced him) when confronted with a commission for funeral vss. Although the standard interpr. take *vācam* √ *grabh* to mean ‘restrain speech’ (that is, go silent), in fact on what little evidence we have for similar idioms it is more likely to mean ‘speak, pronounce’ – the French idiom “prendre parole” might be cited here. Cf., e.g., X.145.4 *nahy āsyā nāma gr̥bhnāmi* (in a co-wife hymn) “I do not grasp [=mention] her name”; sim. I.191.13 *sārvāsām agrabhaṃ nāma* “I have grasped [=spoken] the names of all.” In VIII.6.10 *ahām íd dhí pitúṣ pári, medhām ṛtasya jagrabha* “Because it is just I who have acquired the wisdom of truth from my father,” the poet grasps and uses the “wisdom of truth” acquired from his father—he certainly doesn’t restrain it. In our passage the poet seems to see speech as a spirited horse that needs to be grasped and controlled by his own power, as a horse needs to be controlled by its halter. Of the various interpr. out there, mine is closest to that of Lanman (Skt. Reader, p. 386) flg. Whitney. Lanman remarks, “The stanza seems to express the poet’s satisfaction at having made a good hymn at the right time and place and with as good skill as a skilful horseman has” and cites Whitney’s tr. “I’ve caught and used the fitting word, / As one a steed tames with the rein” (I cite only the tr. of cd).

X.19 Cows

As discussed in the publ. intro., it is not clear why this hymn is attached to the end of the Yama cycle, but Old convincingly demonstrates (Prol. 231ff.) that it cannot belong to the following group of Vimada hymns (X.20–26), which is clearly demarcated. On p. 238 with n. 1 he considers the possibility that X.19 is an interpolation, but such an assumption is too uncertain to pursue. See also his remarks in the Noten.

MLW suggests an intriguing reason for attaching this hymn at the end of the funeral hymns: “I wonder if the return of the cow is connected with the end of the day and so metaphorically with death. It reminds me of Thomas Grey, Elegy written in a country churchyard

The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
The lowing herd wind slowly o’er the lea,
The plowman homeward plods his weary way,
And leaves the world to darkness and to me.”

The “meaning” of the hymn is carried by its phonology—the jingle-like repetition of forms of *ní* √ *vṛt* ‘turn back’ and riffs based on this lexeme and the series of rhyming words built with the same suffix that dominate the middle vss. It gives us a glimpse of a different type of deployment of verbal means: intensive patterned repetition as spell.

X.19.1: Ge renders *revatīḥ* as “die ihr unseren Reichtum bildet.” This is surely the right implication: the cows aren’t so much rich in themselves as the foundations of our wealth. But such a tr. is awfully heavy for a single-word voc.

X.19.2: Note the impv. *kuru*, one of three forms of this 8th class pres. in the RV; see disc. ad X.51.7.

X.19.4: The accumulation of *-ana*-nominals in pādas a–c is impressive. Besides the incantatory repetition of *-anam*, there are further phonological echoes in pādas a *yán niyānaṃ nīyāyanam* and c *āvārtanam nivārtanam*.

X.19.5: The *-ana-* pile up continues (with c = 4c), but in pādas a and b the near rhyme form (*ud*)*ānaḍ* is in fact a verb.

X.20–26

As was noted just above ad X.19, Old (Prol. 231–32) demonstrated quite clearly on internal grounds that these hymns belong together, thus supporting the single authorship assigned to them by the Anukramaṇī. The hymns are characterized by unusual meters and puns on the poet's name Vimada; the poet is identified as Vimada in X.20.10, 23.7 and the family of Vimadas in X.23.6. Moreover, three of these hymns (X.21, 24, 25) show the signature lines *vī vo mādē* and *vivakṣase*. The seven hymns are dedicated to five different divinities, starting, as usual, with Agni followed by Indra.

X.20 Agni

On the opening vss. of this hymn, see publ. intro. The hymn is in a variety of meters, and these meters are metrically ragged. For details, see, e.g., the metrical comm. of HvN.

X.20.1: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs., consisting of a single pāda, is adapted from X.25.1 to provide an auspicious beginning to the Vimada series. The sequence from which it's adapted contains two 8-syl. pādas *bhadrām no āpi vātaya, māno dākṣam utā krātum*; the 2nd and 3rd terms of the tripartite NP in b have simply been lopped off here, producing an awkward 10-syllable line that reads as prose.

X.20.2: As also noted in the publ. intro., the first two words of this vs. are identical to the opening of RV I.1. Although *agnīm īle* is found elsewhere as a pāda-opener (I.44.4d, III.27.12c, VIII.43.24c=44.6c), nowhere else does it open a hymn (or even a vs.) except here (leaving aside the mangled auspicious motto of our vs. 1) and I.1.1. It is therefore hard not to see this as a conscious echo of I.1, which in turn might suggest that a RV collection already existed in some form when Vimada composed this hymn and that I.1 inaugurated it. The metrical disturbance—pāda a has 9 syllables—may call attention to *agnīm īle* as a quotation.

Ge and Re (also Sāy., Gr.) take gen. pl. *bhujām* as referring to the gods as 'enjoyers' of the sacrifice and construe it with *yāviṣṭham* (e.g., Ge "den Jüngsten der (Opfer)geniesser"). But of the fairly numerous occurrences of the root noun *bhúj-* (incl. the infinitival dat. *bhujé*) this would be the only agentive one, as opposed to the standard sense in the non-infinitival occurrences 'enjoyment, delight'. I therefore follow Schindler (Rt. nouns s.v.) in seeing the same sense here, construing the gen. as a secondary complement to *īle*. Gr allows acc., gen., or dat. with *√īḍ*, and although the gen. is quite rare, we must reckon with it at least in VII.24.5 (q.v.). Moreover, note that acc. pl. *bhújah* is found in nearby X.22.13 with the undoubted sense 'benefits, delights'.

In b the question is whose *śās-* is at issue. I take it as Agni's: he is difficult to restrain because he holds the command, but at least by implication Ge and Re take it as belonging to those who would try (and fail) to restrain the fire (e.g., Re "difficile à tenir sous un

commandement”). This is certainly possible, though I favor my interpr. because it would associate the *śās-* with the authority of Mitra.

Ge points out the etymological figure *durdhārītum* (b) / *dhárman* (c), which is difficult to render in Engl.

As usual, *dhárman-* is problematically ambiguous. I take it as referring to the physical foundation, the fireplace, where the flames are found; see my interpr. of *dharmāṇaḥ* in the next hymn, X.21.3. By contrast both Ge and Re take it as immaterial: “Befehl” and “l’ordre-corrélatif” (whatever that means) respectively. Such senses cannot be excluded, but I don’t see what they would contribute here.

The fem. pl. *énīḥ* is much discussed: see Old for various older interpr., as well as Lü (391). I follow Ge and Re as seeing it as a description of the mottled or dappled flames. They “honor the sun” by reaching towards heaven, where the sun is the heavenly counterpart of Agni. As for “the udder of their mother” (*mātúr ūdhaḥ*), I take it to refer to the fireplace itself, or perhaps, with Ge (n. 2cd), the kindling sticks.

X.20.3 As with the rhyming *śāsā* in 2b, there is some dispute about whose mouth is referred to by *āsā* in pāda a. Re takes it as Agni’s, and it is of course true that Agni is considered the mouth of the gods. But in conjunction with *vardháyanti* ‘they make increase’, it makes more sense, with Ge (n. 3a), to think of the priests, who increase Agni by blowing on him and/or by reciting praise hymns to him.

The identity of the 1st member of the bahuvr. *kṛpānīla-* is also disputed. EWA (s.v.) throws up its hands. Ge renders it “Nestbereiter,” suggesting (n. 3a) that it is a *trasá-dasyu*-type cmpd, but this assumes the existence of a root $\sqrt{kṛp}$ ‘prepare, arrange’, an *r*-form parallel to $\sqrt{kṛp}$. But as I have shown (-*āya*-form. 124–25; see also my 2009 “Indo-Iranian Priestly Title” [Fs. Salomon] 112–13), $\sqrt{kṛp}$ is a secondary root, backformed from the *p*-causative to an *l*-form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘do, make’ and barely exists in the RV outside of the causative system. Better is the prevailing assoc. of the 1st member with *kṛp-* ‘body’; the apparently thematic *kṛpá-* can be accounted for as Re does, by pointing out that the athematic form would produce the “impossible” $\sqrt{kṛbnīla-}$ (actually surely the even worse $\sqrt{kṛmnīla-}$). But most who identify the first member as *kṛp-* bleach the meaning to ‘beauty’—so, Gr “in Schönheit oder Glanz wohnend,” Re “le nid de la beauté-formelle.” I take *kṛp(a)-* in its standard sense of ‘body’, in agreement with its Iranian cognates; no RVic passages require or even invite ‘beauty’, and all but one are used of Agni. Here I think the sense of the cmpd is ‘whose nest is his body’: that is, in my view, the physical concentration of the fire is the lower part at and around the firewood, which can be considered the nest out of which the leaping flames and beams of light fly upward, as expressed by *bhāsāketu-*, the parallel cmpd in the next pāda.

The teeth in a row would be the regularly spaced flames. Note the figure *-nīlam* (*l* - *nīdam*) (a) / (*śre*)*ṇi-dan* (c), with the flipping of retroflexes.

X.20.4: The phrase *gātúr eti* recurs in 6b. I take it as a non-literal idiom somewhat similar to French “ça marche”—that is, because of Agni, things “go well” for both the *arí-* and the *vís-*, specifically because “Agni has reached the ends of heaven,” that is, his light and his smoke have opened the way for the oblations and praises offered by both *arí* and *vís-* to reach the gods and set in motion favorable reciprocal action. In this context it is tempting to interpr. *arí-* as Ge’s “hohen Herr” or Re’s “l’homme privilégié” rather than Thieme’s Fremdling; Thieme (Fremdling

37–38) sees the pairing as a contrast between the wandering stranger and the settled peoples, but it might rather be meant to include the leader and the common people alike.

By my interpr. pāda c further spells out the benefits Agni’s arrival in heaven will provide for the people of pāda a: as “bright-shining poet” (*kavīḥ ... dīdyānaḥ*), Agni, in the form of flame and light, conveys the praise-hymns suggested by ‘poet’); as cloud (*abhrām*), Agni, in the form of smoke, conveys the oblations. I take neut. *ābhram* as nom., though Ge/Re take it as acc. – Ė as goal parallel to *divó ántān* in b, Re as obj. of *dīdyānaḥ*, though he admits that this part. is ordinarily intrans. I see no obstacle to taking it as nom.

X.20.5: This vs. seems in a way to explain or comment on vs. 4.

The injunc. *juṣat* seems to be one of the sporadic act. forms built to this predominately mid. stem. I do not see a need to take it, with Lub. (Conc. 569), as a *t*-less medial **juṣa* remarked with secondary *t* (of the *aduhat* type).

X.20.6: I consider pāda b a reprise of vs. 4, prompted by the same idiom *gātúr eti*. Because (in my opinion) Agni is identified with peace, oblation, and sacrifice, men should obey his injunctions and sacrifice accordingly, for things to go well for them.

In d I would now tr. “the gods (come) to Agni,” depicting the reciprocal journey to the sacrifice. So Ge.

X.20.7: As Ge remarks (n. 7), “Dunkle Str.” Its sense turns on the interpr. of the verb *iṣe*. Opinion is split on the root affiliation and morphology of this form. Ge (n. 7a) discusses possibilities but ultimately opts for a *-se* form to \sqrt{i} ‘go’; Re’s “j’aborde” seems to reflect the same analysis, though in his n. he cites Old’s ‘send’ with some approval. Old and Scar (607) assign it to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘send’. The form must be considered in conjunction with the two other forms of the same shape in IV.23.6 and VI.22.5; see comm. ad locc. In all three passages a long-vowel form **iṣe* fits the meter better; in all three cases I analyze it as a 3rd sg. pf. to $\sqrt{iṣ}$ ‘seek’ (Sāy. also interprets it as ‘seek’). The verb then takes two parallel objects, *agnīm* and *dúvaḥ*. For the latter, cf. III.2.6 *agne dúva ichámānāsaḥ*. The tricky part is that Agni is represented in the object phrase twice, first as an object himself and second as the gen. dependent on *dúvaḥ*, namely *pūrvasya sévasya* “of the kindly ancient,” with both acc. objects discontinuous, spread over two pādas, and interwoven (*yajñāsāham ... agnīm* and *dúvaḥ ... pūrvasya sévasya*). This may reflect the twisty sensibilities of the poet Vimada; see comm. ad X.21.1 in the next hymn.

The hapax rt noun cmpd *yajñā-sāh-* is taken by Old, Ge, and Scar (607) as having an obj. relationship—e.g., Scar “der über das Opfer herrscht.” But the long final vowel of the first member is puzzling; Scar suggests it’s due to metrical lengthening, but in a cmpd whose 1st and 3rd syllables are already heavy and whose fourth syllable is also heavy in context (*yajñāsāham dúvaḥ*), metrical lengthening hardly seems necessary. Scar also toys with the possibility that *yajñā* is an instr. and even cites a semantic parallel: V.3.5 *sá yajñéna vanavad deva mártān* “he [=client of Agni’s] will vanquish mortals by sacrifice, o god (Agni).” This seems the better interpr. (though not the one Scar chooses) and is also represented by Re’s “qui domine par le sacrifice.”

On Agni as stone-born, see I.70.4 and the parallels adduced by Ge ad loc. (n. 4a).

X.20.8: *vísvét* in b (*vísvét té vāmá ā syuh*) is troublesome, since it shouldn’t properly represent the masc. nom. pl. *vísve* that seems to be called for here. Taking the sandhi seriously, as *vísṣvā* +

íd with a neut. pl., complicates the interpr., leading to Re’s implausible “Les seigneurs quels qu’ils soient ... (et) toutes choses (leur appartenant) ...” Roth (see Old and Ge n. 8b) simply interpr. it as irregular sandhi of the nom. pl., and I agree; I think it may have been influenced by I.40.6 *vísvéd vāmā vo aśnavat* and VI.1.9 *vísvét sá vāmā dadhate tvótaḥ* (passages also adduced by Old, who notes the frequent association of *vísṣvā* with *vāmā(ni)*). In both the just-cited passages *vísṣvā* is a neut. pl. modifying likewise neut. pl. *vāmā*. Here the form of *vāmā* (Saṃhitā; *vāmé* Pp.) is of course not neut. pl., but the association may have led to the irregularity.

The phrase *vāmā ā√as* has the ring of a fixed, slightly slangy expression; it contains the only loc. of the stem *vāmā-*, which may signal that it doesn’t belong to the high discourse register of the RV. Ge’s “im Glück sein” strikes the right note; my “be in the money” is meant to capture the register difference—I didn’t quite have the courage for “be in clover.”

Note that *vārdhantaḥ* echoes *vardháyanti* in 3a, also with ritualists as subj.

X.20.10: The vs. is presented as a typical meta-summary final vs., opening with *evā*, with the poet, naming himself, as subject. However, the verb in this summary is *ā vakṣat*, which clearly belongs to the *s*-aor. subjunctive of *√ vah*, though we ordinarily expect an aor. in this context. Both Ge and Re in fact tr. it as preterite: “hat ... dargebracht” and “il a convoyé” respectively. Without directly addressing this issue, Old suggests that *vimadāḥ ... ā vakṣat* may be an echo of the characteristic refrain *ví vo máde ... vívakṣase* found in X.21, 24, and 25, though of course *vakṣat* and *vívakṣase* are etymologically and semantically entirely distinct.

The Pp. analyses *ābhāḥ* as containing an augmented *abhāḥ*, but it could just as easily be *ā bhāḥ* with an injunctive

X.21 Agni

On the meter and the metrically defined split refrain, see publ. intro. and immed. below.

X.21.1–8 (etc.): The first pāda of the refrain, *ví vo máde*, is of course the poet’s name *vimadā-* split by a Wackernagel’s enclitic (*vaḥ*) into preverb *ví* and loc. *máde*, with the preverb to be construed with the verb that forms the 2nd pāda of the refrain, *vívakṣase*.

This verb, *vívakṣase*, has been variously interpr., with root affiliations suggested to *√ vah*, *√ vakṣ*, and *√ vac* and various morphological analyses; see, e.g., Old, Ge (n. 1cd), and recently Heenen (Desid. 219). Most likely is the interpr. as desid. to *√ vac* with the *-se* 1st sg. ending generally specialized for verbs of praising (*stuṣé*, etc.).

In the publ. tr. I take *vaḥ* as the object of praise; I now realize that *vaḥ* should be dat., with the gapped object of praise being Agni. I would alter the tr. to “I wish to proclaim (him) to you (all)” or, since Agni is addressed in the 2nd ps. through most of the hymn, the awkward “I wish to proclaim (you=Agni) to you (all).” The referent of *vaḥ* may also be the priests rather than an audience of gods.

X.21.1: The hapax *svāvṛktibhiḥ* has elicited elaborate, and to me not terribly convincing, rather legalistic interpretations; cf., e.g., Ge’s “aus eigner Berechtigung.” I do not think the word can be interpr. without considering its near twin, *suṣṛktibhiḥ*, which instr. pl. occurs 18x (in addition to other case and no. forms), almost always pāda-final as here. *suṣṛktī-* means ‘well-twisted (hymn)’ and refers to particularly fine products of poetic skill deployed at the sacrifice. See comm. ad I.61.2. Here I think ‘hymns’ must be the underlying referent as well, but here the hymns “have their own twists.” I do not think it is fanciful to interpr. this as a reference to the

twisted construction of all the vss. of this hymn, with the split refrain twining around a pāda (=e) isolated from the rest of the content of the vs. For the phrase “choose ($\sqrt{vṛ}$) Agni X-*vṛktibhiḥ*” here, cf. V.25.3 *suṇvṛktibhiḥ vareṇya* “you [=Agni] worthy to be chosen with well-twisted (hymns).”

The simile particle *nā* seems, at first, both misplaced and functionless, since it seems to target *agnīm* as the simile—and we are not choosing (someone/something) *like* Agni, but choosing Agni himself. However, the real target of *nā* is *svāvṛktibhiḥ*, and the order of the two words has been flipped because, as far as I can tell, simile-marking *nā* is blocked from pāda-final position (though *iva* is not; see, e.g., 3b). See disc. ad VIII.76.1 and X.111.7 and for other exx., III.10.5, IV.1.19, and X.127.8; the only counterexamples I have found (in the vast numbers of simile-marking *nā*) is *apó nā* in VII.68.8 and the syntactically complex ex. in X.95.3, spoken by the manic Purūravas. This phenomenon was already noted by Ge; see his n. 4a to IV.27.4. Even construed with *svāvṛktibhiḥ*, *nā* doesn’t mark a conventional simile, but rather, in my opinion, draws attention to the implicit word play with *suṇvṛktibhiḥ* and the joke about the way this twisty hymn is constructed.

X.21.2: Because *svābhū-* is used of patrons (*sūrī-*) in VII.30.4, this referent seems to be assumed here (e.g., by Ge), leading to the further interpr. of *ásva-rādhās-* as ‘bestowing horses’ (e.g., Ge “die Rosseschenker”). But *śumbhānti* ‘they beautify’ invites an officiant, an active participant in the ritual, as subj.; I therefore tr. “who receive bounty in horses.”

X.21.3: I take the suffix-accented *dharmāṇaḥ*, lit. ‘possessing *dhárman-*’, as I did its root-accented base *dhárman* in the last hymn (X.20.2), namely as referring to something physical and material, viz. the foundation out of which the flames leap up. Both Ge and Re give *dharmān-* here an immaterial and conceptual sense: “den Satzungen getreu” and “(... représentant) la loi (incarnée)” respectively. They then both assume that the referents are the priests, sitting beside the ritual fire. This is certainly possible and would follow from *śumbhānti* in the previous vs. However, as in X.20.2 I prefer to see the subjects here as the flames, which have the fireplace and the lower part of the fire as their foundation and sit upon it.

My interpr. simplifies the interpr. of the simile in b. Since by the Ge/Re interpr. the subjects are masc., the fem. part. *siñcatīḥ* requires them to conjure up water-pouring women who have no other function but to justify the fem. pl.; moreover the instr. pl. *juhūbhiḥ* is underutilized. By my analysis the flames are fem.: see *éñīḥ* in X.20.2, which both Ge and Re also take as a reference to flames, and therefore the fem. *siñcatīḥ* is fully justified. (Note that the adj. *dharmāṇaḥ* in pāda a can be fem. as well as masc.; see, e.g., Macd VGS p. 67 n. 5; AiG III.263.) And the simile is also semantically richer: as elsewhere, *juhū-* can be ‘tongue’ as well as ‘ladle’, and “tongues of flame” is a RVic metaphor as well as an English one; further the flames dipping and rising can look as if they themselves are pouring, like women pouring with ladles. Although like Ge and Re, I do invoke a group of women with ladles, they are suggested by the inherent feminine of the frame.

As Ge (n. 3c) points out, pādas c, e recall vs. 9ab of the previous hymn, X.20.

X.21.4: The preverb *ā* is doubled, appearing in both c and e, perhaps because of the disruption created by the interspersed refrain in d.

X.21.5: Ge takes instr. *átharvanā* as the agent with *jātāḥ* (“von Atharvan erzeugt”). This saves him from trying to construe the instr. independently (as Re and I do), and passages like VI.16.13 *tvām ... átharvā nír amanthata* “You, Agni, did the Atharvan churn forth ...” support this interpr. However, *jātá-* is an extremely common ppl. and I know of no other passages with an agent. Moreover, the Atharvan is associated with poetic vision at least in I.80.16 (*dhī-* in that case).

KH (215) takes *bhúvat* here as “resultative Konstatierung,” tr. as a pres. “(Agni) ist der Bote Vivasvants,” but the mention of Vivasvant and Yama seems to put the action in the mythic past.

X.21.7: Both Ge and Re take *mānuṣaḥ* as nom. pl. and subj. of *ní sedire*. I now see that the publ. tr. “blazing for Manu” is unlikely and would now agree with Ge/Re and change my tr. to “They—the sons of Manu—installed you ... ghee-faced, blazing, most observant with your eyes.”

X.21.8: On the plants as Agni’s wives, see reff. in Ge’s n. 89d.

X.22 Indra

On the meter of this hymn, which is unique to it, see publ. intro. and Old, Prol. 117. For the structure and contents see publ. intro.

X.22.1–2: As noted in the publ. intro., these two vss. are responsive—the first posing a question and the second replying to it. Note the point-by-point responsion esp. in the first pāda of each:

kúha śrutá índraḥ kásmin adyá
ihá śrutá índro asmé adyá

Note that the pāda break (after *adyá*) does not coincide with the syntactic break (which should come after *índraḥ*) but does coincide with the end of word-for-word responsion.

X.22.1: In b I read *jáne* twice; on the one hand it belongs with the interrog. loc. *kásmin*, “among what people?” further specifying the first interrog. *kúha* “where?” But it also belongs with the following simile *mitró ná*, because “an ally among the people” *mitrá- jáne* is a fixed phrase, found also in the next vs., 2c, as well as II.4.1, VIII.23.8, X.27.12, 68.2; see my 2001 disc. in “The Rigvedic Svayamvara” (Fs. Parpola), 311–13. The phrase often is a reference to Agni, and though in n. 16 in the op. cit. I assert that there is no reference to Agni in our two vss., I now think it’s possible that Agni is covertly present here. Among other things, Agni is both likely to be in a dwelling place of seers (1c) and famously goes into hiding (1d). In addition to this possible ref. to Agni via formula, an identification with Mitra is also overtly suggested.

The intens. form *cárkṛṣe* to the root $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘celebrate’ belongs to the reasonably well established intens. stem (*carkar-* / *carkir-*), which is ordinarily act. and tr. (with gen. obj.) and which serves as the only pres. stem to the root. Medial *cárkṛṣe* is found 3x, once as a 1st sg. with the same sense as the act. (X.74.1), twice as a 3rd sg. in passive value (here and X.105.4). The 1st sg. clearly belongs with the 1st sg. *-se* forms to verbs of praising and the like, such as *stuṣé*, as well as the verb of the Vimada refrain *vívakṣase* disc. above ad X.21.1. But the 3rd sg. passives are harder to account for. Note however that *stuṣé*, which is overwhelmingly 1st sg. and transitive “I praise,” is used as a 3rd sg. pass. in I.122.7, 8. It is possible that, since accented *-sé* forms can be interpr. as dative infinitives, the functional voice neutralization in infinitives (“to praise / to be praised”) allowed a reinterpret. of the form, which subsequently could be used as a 3rd sg. mid. with a value more appropriate to the middle. On *cárkṛṣe* see Schaeffer 108–9,

though I would not endorse the Rasmussen source for the forms or the Oettinger stative that are both presented as explanations there. The 3rd sg. passive interpr. is reinforced by the responsive verb in 2b, *stáve*, a *t*-less 3rd sg. in passive sense. See also disc. of *stoṣi* in vs. 4 below.

X.22.2: In addition to the exact match of 2a with 1a (see above), there are other signs of responson: c repeats the “ally among the people” phrase, slightly rearranged, from 1b; the verb of b, *stáve* ‘is praised’, is semantically a match with both *śrūyate* of 1b and *cárkṛṣe* of 1d; while the verb of d, *cakré*, echoes *cárkṛṣe* phonologically.

As Ge points out (n. 2cd with reff.), *yáśas- jáne(ṣu)* is another fixed expression, and I therefore read *jáneṣu* here twice, with *mitró ná* and *yáśas cakre*.

On *īcīsama-* see comm. ad I.61.1.

X.22.3: A vs. without a finite verb (or even a predicated part.). It most likely consists of a single rel. cl., introduced by *yáḥ* in pāda a, with four separate NPs as predicates, but in the absence of a finite verb, the structure cannot be determined for certain: it could, for ex., have an unsignaled rel. cl. (ab) / main cl. (cd) structure, “who (is) the lord ..., (he is) the bearer ...”

The fluidity of structure is also on display in the first hemistich: are the two genitive expressions #*maháḥ ... śávasaḥ* (a) and #*mahó nṛmṇásya* both dependent on *pátih*, as I take them (so also Tichy), or does the latter depend on *tūtujih*, as Ge has it? (Not much depends on this.)

In pāda a *śávaso ásāmi* reminds us of the hapax bahuvr. *ásāmi-śavas-* (V.52.5). *ásāmy āḥ* also concatenates with the same phrase ending the previous pāda, 2d.

The 2nd hemistich is a classic case of case disharmony between frame and simile: the agent noun *bhartā* takes gen. *vájrasya* in the frame (c), but acc. *putráṃ* in the simile (d). See Ge’s n. 3cd and Tichy (-*tar*-stems, 366, 369–70). Of course, because of its suffix accent, the gen. is the “correct” case complement for *bhartár-*, but as is well known, the distribution of gen. and acc. compliments with agent nouns (suffix-accented versus root-accented) is far from perfect.

X.22.4: A difficult vs. that begins the transition to the Kutsa / Śuṣṇa myth, starting with the two horses of the Wind, which figure in that story (cf., e.g., I.174.5-7, I.175.4, VIII.1.11). Ge considers it the speech of Uśanā, though I do not. For most of the vs. the action is carried nominally, by the aor. part. *yujānāḥ* (a), agent noun *syántā* (c), and aor. part. *srjāmāḥ* (d), all referring to Indra, to whom the voc. *vajrivaḥ* in b is also addressed. As it unfolds, it therefore resembles vs. 3, though with some participles to provide dynamic action and a 2nd ps. reference.

But pāda d also has a finite verb, *stoṣi*, which considerably gums up the works. Wh (Roots) and Macd (VGS) assign this form to the root pres. of \sqrt{stu} , so presumably consider it a 2nd sg. indic. pres., but neither of course tr. it. The current consensus (Ge, Tichy [*tar*-stems, 116–17], Baum [Impv. 58]) seems to be that it is a 2nd sg. imperative with the horses of pāda a as obj.: e.g., Ge “so lobe (die Rosse).” Baum further identifies it as a -*si* impv., and it is certainly the case that \sqrt{stu} has an *s*-aor. that builds the characteristic subjunctive (*stoṣat*, etc.) that regularly patterns with -*si* imperatives. The problem is the meaning this analysis requires: is it likely that the poet is urging the great god Indra to *praise* some other god’s *horses*?! much less the roads (*ádhvanaḥ* immed. flg. *stoṣi*) that would provide a nearer acc. object (see Old). As Old, who surveys the various previous suggestions, sensibly says, “Das Natürlichste ist doch, dass I. gepriesen wird.” This is the insistent theme of the first two vss., with *cárkṛṣe* ‘is celebrated’ and *stáve* ‘is praised’ in addition to the three forms of $\sqrt{śru}$ ‘be famed’, and vs. 3 contains a good sample of what this praise would consist of. And of course this hymn is dedicated to Indra. With

Old (“Liegt vielleicht *-i* als Endung der 3. Sg. med. vor ...?”), I consider this yet another morphological manipulation of the root \sqrt{stu} , in this case a pseudo-passive aor. built to a sigmatic stem, a variant on *stáve* in 2b and confected much like *cárkṛṣe* in 1d. Recall that that form is 3rd sg. and passive (“is celebrated”) but was created beside the identical 1st sg. *-se* form with transitive value (“I celebrate”). The root \sqrt{stu} has a well-attested 1st sg. *s*-aor. *ástosi* with transitive value “I have praised”; the identical (save for augment) *stosi* here could show the same switch to 3rd sg. and passive value.

There is, however, a further complication: as noted above, Indra is addressed in the voc. in pāda b, so he should be in the 2nd ps., not 3rd. Given the serious semantic problems created by taking *stosi* as 2nd sg. act. impv., as outlined above, I do not consider this a serious objection, for several reasons. First, switching between persons is quite common in the RV, even in a single vs. Moreover, since four vss. in this hymn contain the same pāda-final voc. *vajrivaḥ* (10b, 11b, 12d, 13d), it is quite possible that *vajrivaḥ* here is a redactional replacement for something else (nom. **vájrivān*? though the fact that this stem is only attested in the voc. makes this less likely). In any case, apart from this voc., the rest of the vs. is perfectly compatible with 3rd ps. ref., just like the previous vs.

The voc. *vajrivaḥ* brings up another issue: what is this formation? We should of course expect a *-vant*-stem to be **vájra-vant-*. AiG II.2.892 considers it analogical to *adrivant-* ‘possessor of the stone’, another epithet of Indra, very common (49x) and likewise attested only in the voc. *adrivaḥ*, almost always at the end of 8/12-syllable pādas. And certainly some influence from this stem is quite likely (though it’s worth noting that there are no exx. of *adrivaḥ* in Maṇḍala X). However, I think that the very common possessive stem *vájrīn-*, meaning the same thing as *vajrivaḥ*, must have been the driving factor. Adding a pleonastic *-vant-* (or rather the voc. *-vaḥ*) would convert the voc. *vájrīn* (41x) into a form friendly to the cadence of 8/12-syllable pādas, where the trisyllabic case forms of this stem (*vájrīnam*, etc.) are regularly found (though here I have to admit that *vájrīn* is fairly rare in Triṣṭubh cadences). Note that nom. *vájrī* is found in 2b.

Since acc. pl. *ádhvanaḥ* is unlikely to be the obj. of a putative transitive “praise” (see above) and since *srjāná-* is overwhelmingly passive, it must express an acc. of extent of space (so also Ge “die Wege entlang”).

X.22.5: On the possible metrical restorations in pāda a see Old.

I’d now be inclined to tr. “you came,” not “you have come,” given the mythological content of the vs. However, if Ge is right (I’m dubious) that this is the speech of Vāta, “you have come” would be better.

The phrase *devó ná mártyaḥ* “(neither) god nor mortal” seems to lack one of its negatives; however, *nákiḥ* has simply been postponed till the next pāda. See IV.17.19 *nákir devāḥ ... ná mártāḥ* with the expected underlying order.

X.22.6: On the unusual morphology of the name Uśanā, see my 2007 “Vedic Uśanā Kāvya and Avestan Kauui Usan” (Fs. Jasanoff).

The unexpected initial *g-* of abl.-gen. *gmāḥ* to the ‘earth’ word is plausibly explained by Wack (AiG III.243) as dissimilation from *jmāḥ* because of the surrounding *ca*’s in the repeated phrase to which it is confined: *divás ca gmás ca*.

On the isolated *prkṣase*, whose root affiliation and grammatical identity have been disputed, see esp. Narten’s extensive disc. (SigAor. 175–76), where she affirms Ge’s assignment

to \sqrt{pras} ‘ask’ and identifies it as an *s*-aor. subjunctive, whose root vocalism she interprets with ref. to that of similarly non-conforming *ḍṛkṣase* (Sig.Aor. 146), on which see comm. ad I.6.7.

X.22.8: The privative cmpds. applied to Śuṣṇa are all presumably culture terms: *akarmán-* meaning that he doesn’t perform rituals, *amantū-* that he follows the wrong counsels, *anyá-vrata-* that he follows the commandments of other gods than ours, *ámānuṣa-* that he doesn’t belong to the descendants of Manu. In other words, he is non-Ārya. But the stark renderings in the publ. tr. are, I think, rhetorically more effective.

X.22.9: The 2nd hemistich contains the standard theme of competing sacrifices, vying to attract Indra to them—a theme established by vss. 1–2. The usual lexeme $\sqrt{hvā}$ ‘invoke in competition’ is replaced by the more vivid $\sqrt{nū}$ ‘bellow in competition’. For the former idiom, with *purutrā* as here, see, e.g., II.18.7 *purutrā hí vihávyo babhūtha* “for you have become the one to be competitively summoned in many places.” Note the figure #*purutrā ... pūrtáyah*.

X.22.10: I dealt with this vs. in detail in my 2009 “An Indo-Iranian Priestly Title Lurking in the Rig Veda? An Indic Equivalent to Avestan *karapan*” (Fs. Salomon). I will not reproduce the disc. here. The gist involves the reinterpr. of the hapax *kārpāṇé* here (and X.99.9 *kṛpāṇé*) as a garbled reflex of the priestly title found in Avestan *karapan-* (always to be read as a disyllable). In the Avesta the *karapans* are associated with *kauuīs* and with *xšaθra-* ‘lordly power’, and these same associations are found here and in X.99.9—here *kavīnām* in c, which I take as a proto gen. absol., and *kṣatrā-* in the cmpd **kṣatrā-śavas-* (accepting Ludwig’s emendation of *nákṣatraśavasām* to **ná kṣatrā...*), as Old and Ge (n. 10d) do.

My interpr. also involves taking *kārpāṇé* as the dat. to an athem. stem, rather than as a thematic loc. to a word referring to a sword or sword fight (as most take it), and in reading *yád ī* rather than *yádī*, with *ī* referring to the enemy Śuṣṇa.

The vs. depicts (however darkly) Indra’s pursuit and discovery of Śuṣṇa along with his entourage of warriors whom he urges on in the battle, in company with the priestly figures who benefit from Śuṣṇa’s killing.

Although my interpr. is hardly secure, the others available make even less sense. For the details of my interpr. and args. against previous one, esp. *kārpāṇé* as ‘sword fight’, consult the art. cit.

X.22.11: This vs., or the first hemistich, is scarcely less obscure than the immediately preceding one, because of the hapaxes *dānāpnas-* and *ākṣāṇé*.

Before tackling these words, we should get some handle on the syntax; fortunately there is a model near at hand: 13a *asmé tã ta indra santu satyã* “for us let these of yours be(come) real, o Indra” is very similar to our pāda a *makṣū tã ta indra ...*, hence my tr. “right away these things (became) yours,” though it diverges from 13a in some particulars. See below.

As for the problematic words, let us begin with the 2nd. Old gives a rather despairing survey of possibilities, displaying enthusiasm for none of them; AiG II.2.272 calls it “ganz dunkel,” though (p. 119) Ge’s interpr. (see below) is noted. Gr assigns it to a dubious root $\sqrt{akṣ}$ ‘erreichen’ as a pf. part.; sim. Wh Rts. (with “?”). But the currently prevailing view, if we can qualify it as such since it’s basically the only one around, is that of Ge, set forth in ZDMG 71 (1917) 25 and reprised in his n. 11b—that it is a thematic vṛddhi deriv. of a dvandva of *ákṣa-* ‘axle’ and *anī-* ‘axle pin’, meaning “im Kampf um Achse und Achsnagel”; see also Spareboom

(Chariots, p. 19) and the measured recognition given in AiG II.2.119 and EWA p. 41. Although I have to admit that an axle pin figures as a point of contention in a Śuṣṇa context in I.63.3, I am not convinced by this interpr., which loses a good deal of its cogency if the near-rhyme *kārpāṇé* in vs. 10 does not mean “im Schwertkampf” but refers to a priestly officiant. My own rendering “on gaining control” is based on deriving it from the root $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘rule over, possess’, which underlies the secondary IIr. root $\sqrt{*kṣāi}$ (extracted from the pres. **kṣH-āiati*; see, e.g., EWA s.v. *KṢAY¹*), found in Vedic $\sqrt{kṣi}$, pres. *kṣáyati*. Relics of the root $\sqrt{kṣā}$ are found in cmpds like *ṛbhukṣā-* ‘master of the Ṛbhus’ (an occurrence of which is found in the next hymn, X.23.2), possibly *divákṣā(s)-* ‘heaven-ruling’ (*pace* MM op. cit.). I suggest that we also find it here in what I analyze as an *-ana-* nominal *kṣā-ana-*, cmpded with the preverb *ā*. Although *ā* doesn’t otherwise appear with $\sqrt{kṣi}$ (just $\sqrt{kṣi}^2$), here it may perform something of the same function it does with $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘attract here’ and $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘attract here by purification’, locating the action in the immediate place and time—hence, with the context fleshed out, *ākṣāṇá-* “on bringing (his possessions) under your immediate control.” The accent is also not what we might expect: most *-ana-* nominals have root accent; however, there are a certain no. of exx. with final accent, and we might also invoke the accentuation of *kārpāṇé* in the previous vs. (explaining *obscurum per obscurius*, I realize). The presence of etymologically related *kṣatrá-* in **kṣatrá-śavas-* in the previous vs. might lend some support to my analysis here, which, I recognize, hangs by a thread.

As for *dānāpnas-*, I have slightly changed my analysis from the one reflected in the publ. tr. There the implicit analysis is that it’s a genitive of a tatpuruṣa (‘property for giving’) dependent on *ākṣāṇé*: “on gaining control (?) over his property for giving.” I now think it must be a bahuvr., as both Gr and Ge take it – but both of their renderings are vague and gloss over what the literal meaning and the intent of the cmpd must be (Gr “Fülle [*āpnas*] von Gaben [*dānā*] habend,” Ge “der du freigebig lohnest”). I now reject my tatp. analysis for three reasons: 1) tatp.s with ordinary noun as 2nd member are quite rare at this period, and in particular I have been unable to find any certain tatp.s in the RV with an *-as-* stem as 2nd member; though compds with *-as-* stems abound, they are overwhelmingly bv.s. 2) acdg. to the standard rules of tatp. accent, we should expect final-syllable accent (**dānāpnás-*) whatever the underlying accent of the 2nd member (see, e.g., Wh Gr. §1267, Macd VG §91). I therefore now take the form as gen. *dānāpnasaḥ* modifying *te* (or, contra Pp, as dat. *danāpnase*, likewise modifying *te*: either constr. can express possession). As for the literal sense of the cmpd., I have no idea how Ge analyzed the cmpd, since his tr. bears only a hazy relation to either of the members. But Gr’s assumption that the first member is *dānā-* and means ‘gift(s)’ needs to be challenged: *dānā-*, so accented, means ‘giving’, not ‘gift’, which is *dāna-*. I therefore interpr. the cmpd. *dānāpnas-* as ‘possessing (Śuṣṇa’s) property for giving’; in other words, Indra takes possession of Śuṣṇa’s belongings in order to redistribute them to us. I would now alter the tr. to “Right away, on gaining control (of it), these things [that is, Śuṣṇa’s possessions] (became) yours, Indra, who had (/acquired) his property for giving (to us).” The *tā* is a neut. collective referring to the *āpnas-* of Śuṣṇa. The same sense is echoed in 13a.

In c *dambháyaḥ* echoes *dambhaya* in 8d.

X.22.12: Note that the voc. phrase *śūra vajrivah* (of 10b, 11b) has been broken apart and redistributed to 12a / 12d.

The hapax *akudhryāk* is plausibly explained by Old as a cross between *akútra* and *sadhryāk*. KH (56 with n. 43, further disc. 54 n. 32) reads *mā kudhryāk* (also *mā kútra*, not *mākútra* in I.120.8), flg. Pischel, but contra Old, who argues against Pischel, Ge, etc. I do not

understand the Pischel/Hoffmann objection to the privative, and *akudhryāk* fits the striking privative pattern in vs. 8: *akarmā ... amantūḥ ... āmānuṣaḥ ... amitrahan* (and 13 *apādī ... ahastāḥ*). Certainly the expressed wish “let them not go nowhere (/to a non-place)” (i.e., end in futility) seems to me stronger than “let them not go somewhere else” (KH’s “Nicht sollen ... die guten für uns (bestimmten) Hilfen irgendwohin geraten”). On the other hand, I also don’t see any reason to follow Ge’s separation of a and b into two clauses (fld. by Scar 23); *asmé* as dat. of benefit (/non-benefit) can easily be construed with the *mā* cl. of pāda a.

X.22.13: As noted ad vs. 11, 11a and 13a follow the same pattern. Both have an unidentified neut. pl. *tā*, which is attributed to or of Indra (*te indra*); in 13a the attribution is overt, with 3rd pl. impv. *santu* and neut. pl. *satyā*, in the expression “be real(ized) / come true.” The question is what is the referent of *tā*; it can’t be anything in the immed. neighborhood because both *abhīṣṭayaḥ* in 12b and the *upaspīśaḥ* of 13b are fem. Ge takes it as a dummy “that,” referring to the wishes about to be expressed (“... soll sich das von dir ... bewahrheiten: ...”), conveniently ignoring the plural; Scar (667) follows suit but nods to the pl. with “Bei uns soll dies [alles] sich bewahrheiten.” Both ignore the strong parallelism between 11 and 13; taking it into account, I think the *tā* here, as in 11a, refers to the belongings of Śuṣṇa that Indra will distribute to us. Indra’s welcome affectionate gestures (*upaspīś-* ‘caress’) that bring benefits / enjoyments (*bhūjaḥ*) are part of the package.

X.22.14: This vs. provides a tricky end to the Śuṣṇa saga in this hymn. The vs. opens with two adj. *ahastā ... apādī* “handless (and) footless.” Both adj. are characteristically used of Vṛtra, most notably in the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32.7 *apād ahastāḥ*, also III.30.8, just *apād-* in V.32.8. In this monster-killing story we are primed to apply these adj. to the enemy, but neither of them is exclusively used of monsters and, more to the point, they are fem. here. The fem. referent quickly appears: it is the earth (*kṣāḥ* [on this form, see, e.g., AiG III.242]), who grows strong (*vārdhata*) when Indra is dispatching Śuṣṇa. The switch is easily made, since *apād-* is not confined to demonic referents: indeed Heaven and Earth are *apādī* in I.185.2 (also Dawn [I.152.3, VI.59.6]). Nonetheless, as Ge (n. 14) points out, the plotline is something of a reversal: it is usually Indra who stretches out the earth after having killed various demons. I don’t have any explanation for this little act of independence on the part of the earth.

The adv. *pradakṣiṇī* can elsewhere be used in the context of the animal sacrifice (see IV.6.3) and here seems to invest Indra’s killing of Śuṣṇa with ritual overtones. On the formation of the word, see comm. ad V.36.4.

Note the phonetic echo #śúṣṇam ... śísṇathaḥ#

X.22.15: On *vasavāna-* see comm. ad V.33.6.

The pres. part. *sán* is definitely non-concessive here, unlike its usual usage.

X.23 Indra

The publ. intro. states that Indra’s beard is mentioned in vss. 1 and 3, which latter should be corrected to 4.

X.23.1: *vájradakṣiṇam* ‘having the mace in his right (hand)’ recalls the adv. *pradakṣiṇīd* referring to Indra’s circumambulation of Śuṣṇa before killing him at the end of the last hymn (X.22.14).

The preverb *prá* is in tmesis with (/from?) the part. *dódhuvat*, not the finite injunc. *bhūt*, cf. nearby X.26.7 (same poet) *prá śmáśru ... dūdhot* and II.11.17 *pradódhuvac chmáśruṣu*.

In d the part. *ví ... dáyamānaḥ* (likewise in tmesis) appears without obj., but since *váṣu* is frequently the obj. of this verb (e.g., I.10.6, VIII.103.5) and it is found in the next pāda (2a), it seems reasonable to supply it here (or, otherwise, tr. the part. as absolute). The two instr. *sénābhiḥ* and *rādhasā* I take as expressing the qualities that allow and encourage Indra to distribute largesse: on the one hand, his weapons (*sénābhiḥ*), the martial prowess that allows him to capture goods, and, on the other, his generosity (*rādhasā*), the cultural practice and habit of mind that cause warrior chieftans to redistribute the goods thus won to their underlings.

X.23.2: Old pronounces the first pāda “sehr dunkel,” and I am certainly in agreement. See his typically incisive presentation of the difficulties. My publ. tr. essentially follows Ge’s, analyzing it as an “X and which Y” construction without the “and.” Both the X (*hárī*) and the Y are asserted to be Indra’s (*asya*). By this analysis, the nominal rel. cl. expressing Y consists of a neut. pl. rel. *yā* modifying *váṣu*, which, though ambig. as to number, would be pl. here. The verbal element is a predicated dat. inf. *vidé* ‘to be found’, and the loc. *vāne* refers, as often at least in Maṇḍala IX, to the wooden cup that contains soma. Hence Y, “the goods to be found in the wooden (cup),” is a complex and oblique way of referring to soma. All of these interpr. can be questioned, and in fact on returning to the pāda, I now find myself tempted by a suggestion of Old’s, that we should read **yāvane* for *yā vāne*, a datival -*van*-stem to *√yā* ‘drive’. Old’s rendering of this possibility is “seine *hárī* (sind dazu da) zu fahren, Güter zu erlangen.” My Engl. tr.: “Now are his two fallow bays to drive (/be driven), to find/acquire goods.” The advantages of this interpr. are 1) the anomalous “X and which Y” without overt conjunction is eliminated; 2) so is the very indirect way of referring to soma; in particular, I know of no other instance in which *váṣu* is used of soma. The disadvantages are pretty serious, however: in addition to requiring emendation (though only the zapping of a single accent; see the emendation in the previous hymn, X.22.10d, involving the addition of a single accent), *yāvan-* is not found in the RV as a deriv. of *√yā*, whose ordinary datival infin. is *yātave*. Nonetheless, since the proposed interpr. produces a more satisfactory account of the pāda in context, I would now change the tr. to the one suggested above.

KH (215) interpr. *bhuvat* as an injunc. expressing “resultative Konstatierung.” But surely the poet meant it to contrast with the undoubted injunc. *bhūt* in the previous vs., also pāda final (1c). I therefore take it as subjunctive, which will harmonize nicely with the new interpr. of pāda a above: Indra’s horses are to be driven to find or acquire goods; once the goods are acquired, Indra will distribute them. Pāda b expresses the same complementary characteristics as 1d: Indra is martial (here *vṛtrahā*), and he is, consequently, generous (*maghaír maghāvā*) (see also Ober II.169).

In c Indra is identified with the three Ṛbhus; these craftsmen and demi-gods-come-lately seem to have little in common with the martial Indra on display in the rest of the hymn so far (and to come), but Ge (n. 2d) plausibly suggests that the deed Indra boasts of in d (in what is taken, rightly in my opinion, as Indra’s own words), “I whet down” (*áva kṣṇaumi*) is an action typical of the Ṛbhus “als Werkleuten.” This pāda is compared by Ge (n. 2d) with V.33.4, but see comm. ad loc., where I assert that the two passages have less in common than is generally thought.

X.23.3: An oddly disjointed vs., despite its apparently straightforward content, which, as in vs. 1, associates Indra with his *vájra*-, his fallow bays, his chariot, and his generosity. The problems are the following, in order of appearance (not magnitude): 1) the acc. *vájram* is governed by nothing, though we expect a verb like ‘took’ (e.g., V.29.2 *ādatta vájram*); 2) *híraṇya*- is generally a noun ‘gold’, not the adj. ‘golden’, which is *híraṇyāya*-, elsewhere used of *vájra*- (e.g., I.85.9); 3) the *íd* seems functionless; 4) the main clause begins with *áthā rátham* at the end of pāda a, with the main cl. verb coming at the beg. of c, *ā tiṣṭhati*, but most of b is a rel. cl. qualifying *rátham*, which is, therefore, clearly embedded in the main cl., although this type of embedding is almost entirely absent from the RV; 5) *ví sūribhiḥ* at the end of b has no obvious connection either with the preceding rel. cl. nor the main cl., and in fact the two words have no obvious connection with each other. Fortunately the 2nd hemistich, after the main verb, is troublefree.

The one that troubles me most is 4), but I see no way around the embedding. I do not have solutions for the other problems either. For 1) and also 3), with a bit of creative fiddling, we could find a verb concealed or hinted at in pāda a to govern *vájram*: interpr *yadā* as *yadā* + *ā* and in *íd áthā* see a gesture towards **dattá* or **ādatta* or **ādatthā(s)* (which would fit the phonological traces best, but a 2nd sg. would be out of place in the 3rd ps. context) – but a pres. or at best an injunc. is called for, not an impf., and in any case the phonological overlap is too slight. So I abandon attempts to pull a verb out of a hat, so to speak. As for 2) I’m afraid we just have to accept *híraṇya*- as a nonce adjective or as a separate specifier of the mace; perhaps the *íd* is signaling this: “the mace, that very piece of gold”?

As for *ví sūribhiḥ*, Ge supplies ppl. *hūtāḥ* with *ví*, hence “competitively invoked by the patrons,” as an adjunct to the rel. cl. He is followed by Klein (DGRV II.78–79). However, Ge’s parallels (n. 3b) are not strong; moreover *sūri*-s in the pl. seem always to be a happily harmonious group attached to our side, not rivals nor patronizing rival ritualists. Hence I think Ge’s “von den Opferherren um die Wette (gerufen)” is pure invention (and his interpr. of *ví√hū* different from standard). Instead I suggest, quite tentatively, that *ví* is in tmesis with (/from) the verb of the rel. cl. *váhataḥ*, which it immediately follows, and ends the rel. cl. As for the semantics, remember that Indra’s fallow bays are *vívrata*- in 1b; moreover, due to the echo of the poet’s name Vimada, *ví* is a Lieblingswort in this hymn: cf., in addition to the ex. here, 1b *vívratānām*, 1d *ví ... dāyamāno ví*, 5a *vívācaḥ* and the *vi*-sequences in 2a *vidé*, 6c, 7c *vidmā*, and the poet’s name in 6a and 7b. Although *ví√vah* is (later) specialized for marriage, I don’t think we should try to find that sense here: the *ví* is simply there to echo the poet’s name. If *ví* ends the rel. cl. of 3b, then *sūribhiḥ* belongs to the main cl.: Indra mounts his chariot along with them. The position of this instr. is somewhat anomalous, but so is everything else in this vs.

X.23.4: Another disjointed and puzzling vs., with the problems concentrated in pāda a and its relations (or lack of relations) with b. The major questions are what case and number *yūthyā* is and whether pāda a is an independent cl. or parallel to b. Ge takes *yūthyā* as fem. nom. sg., modifying *vr̥ṣṭiḥ*, and the pāda as an independent nominal cl.: “Auch dieser Regen ist als sein unzertrennlicher Genosse dabei.” My publ. tr. instead begins with a neut. acc. pl. *yūthyā*, favored by Old (who, however, doesn’t tr. or discuss further), and takes pāda a as a shadow version of b, with *vr̥ṣṭiḥ* equivalent to *índraḥ* and *yūthyā svā* to *śmāśrūṇi*, as obj. of *pruṣṇute*: “as rain he (sprinkles) all things belonging to his herd.” Both Ge and I have to explain what the apparently intrusive “rain” is doing here. Ge (n. 4a) suggests that it’s not really rain, but soma (often called rain in IX), which drops or is sprinkled on Indra’s beard. Under my interpr. it’s Indra who’s identified with rain, via his association with *vṛṣan*- ‘bull’ (as [semen-]sprinkler). Since *yūthá*-

‘herd’ seems generally specified for the female members of the herd, pāda a would be an oblique way of referring to Indra’s powers of insemination (cf. for the insemination of the *yūthā*- III.55.17 ... *vr̥ṣabhāḥ* ... *yūthé ní dadhāti rétaḥ*). In favor of this interpr. is the strong association of *yūthā*- / *yūthyā*- with the various hyper-male animals derived from √ *vr̥ṣ*: *vr̥ṣṇí*- ‘ram’, a rhyme with *vr̥ṣṭí*- (I.10.2 *yūthéna vr̥ṣṇíḥ*), *vr̥ṣan*- (e.g., IX.15.4 *yūthyò vr̥ṣā*; cf. I.7.8, IX.76.5, 77.5, 96.20), and *vr̥ṣabhā*- (III.55.17, IX.110.9). In other words, the “rain” here is, by etymological and phonological association, homologized to semen and to Indra as semen. Nonetheless, I am not entirely convinced by my own arguments, primarily because I don’t know what to do with *sácā*. This adv. can be a pleonastic marker of a loc. absol. (esp. *suté sácā* / *sácā suté*; see comm. ad IV.31.5, VI.26.4), but there’s no loc. absol. to be pleonastic to in this pāda; Ge’s tr. seems to do a somewhat better job of accounting for the *sácā*, and I would therefore consider an alt. tr. of the type “The rain [=soma] is, in association, his [=Indra’s] own flock-mate” (with apologies for “flock-mate”). Then in the next pāda he sprinkles this “rain” on his beard.

There is another possible way of accounting for *sácā*. As I just said *sácā* is very common with *suté* when the latter is a loc. absol.: “when (the soma) is pressed.” Pāda c contains an occurrence of *suté*, which is generally (incl. by the publ. tr.) construed with *sukṣáyam*, as “having a lovely dwelling in the pressed (soma).” But this phrase modifies *mádhu* ‘honey’, which in such contexts is ordinarily *identified* with soma, not situated within soma (though cf. *sómam* ... *mádhumantam* ... *sutám* in the next hymn, X.24.1). So it is possible that *suté* is a loc. absol., and the pāda means “he pursues his track down to the well-situated honey when (the soma) is pressed.” And in this case, given the somewhat lax constraints on word order elsewhere in the hymn, *sácā* in pāda a might anticipate the loc. absol. in c. (Note that *suté* can be taken as a loc. absol. whether or not we take this further riskier interpretational step with *sácā*.)

The preverbs that open c and d and the actions thus defined are complementary: *áva* ‘down’ and *úd* ‘up’. As far as I can tell, this is the only instance of *áva* √ *vī* in the RV (or indeed elsewhere), and it seems to have been contextually created. Gr’s elaborate gloss “Speise [A.] in sich aufnehmen, verzehren” is thus unnec. and misleadingly specific.

X.23.5: It is possible that the bad meter of pāda a is iconic of the enemies with bad speech.

Note the *vī* in *vívāc*-.

śávaḥ returns from 2c.

X.23.6: As disc. in the publ. intro., *vidmā* (also in 7c) is a near-anagram of *vimadā*-.

As Old points out, in the 2nd hemistich *yád* belongs at the end of the c pāda.

X.24 Indra (1–3) and the Aśvins (4–6)

As noted in the publ. intro., this “hymn” actually consists of two separate, three-vs. hymns, with different dedicands and different meters. The first three vss., to Indra, are in Āstārapaṅkti, like X.21 and X.25, and like them contains the Vimada split refrain (on which see comm. ad X.21.1–8). Vss. 4–6, to the Aśvins, are in Anuṣṭubh. Renou (minimally) treats this hymn in EVP XVI.76.

X.24.1: On the loc. *camū* see AiG III.188.

X.24.2: The etym. figure *śácīpate śacīnām* should be tr. “o power-lord of powers,” with a pl.

X.24.4–5: On the obscure myth alluded to in these vss., see publ. intro., Old, and Ge’s n. 4–5. I have nothing to add. The fem. dual *samīcī* to the stem *samyāñc-* is found reasonably commonly elsewhere in the RV, of Night and Dawn (I.96.5, II.3.6, III.55.12) and of Heaven and Earth / the two world-halves (I.69.1, II.27.15, III.30.11, 55.20, VIII.6.17, X.88.16). Neither of these pairs makes sense as a referent in this context. The dual *samīcī* may refer to the fire-churning sticks in III.1.7, though not to magical ones. As Ge points out, the Aśvins churn out golden fire-churning sticks as embryo (or churn the embryo out of them) in a birth charm, X.184.3 *hiranyāyī arāṇī, yām nirmānthato aśvīnā / tāṃ te gárgham havāmahe, daśamé māśi sūtave* “The one that the Aśvins churned out of the two golden kindling sticks, that embryo of yours we call, to be born in the tenth month.” Although this passage makes it likely that *samīcī* refers to *arāṇī* here as well, it doesn’t help as much as it might, particularly because the double acc. in X.184.3ab is hard to interpr.

X.24.4: Although this vs. begins the new hymn(let), the du. voc. *śakrā* encountered at the beginning may be a link to the preceding one, since *śakrá-* is overwhelming sg. and an epithet of Indra, the dedicand of the 1st 3 vss.; it is used of the Aśvins only once elsewhere (II.39.3), once of the Maruts, and once in the fem. modifying *várūtrī*. In the 1st part of this hymn, Indra is called *śacīpate śacīnām* with a different deriv. of the root *√śak*.

The possessive stem *māyāvīn-* occurs only 3x in the RV, beside very well-attested *māyīn-*. I wonder if it is used here in order to evoke the name *aśvīn-*, which is not found in this hymn, where the dedicands are only called Nāsatyā (4c, 5c).

The exact repetition of the verb in main cl. (*nír amanthatam*) and dep. cl. (*nirāmanthatam*) seems clumsy—a view shared by Re (“phraséologie faible”).

X.24.5: Since *√krap* usually (insofar as there is a “usual” for this rarely attested root) takes the acc., *samīcyór niṣpātantyoh* may be a loc. absol.: “All the gods mourned when the two joined (churning sticks) flew forth.”

The preverb *nīs* is found with *√pat* only here in the RV (though it does appear marginally in the AV), and it seems likely that it’s used here to match the two occurrences of *nīs* *√math* in the previous vs. It may therefore refer to the same action—the churning out / birth of the two *samīcī*—though they must have gone somewhere, since the gods ask the Aśvins to bring them back.

X.24.6: The obscure myth of the last two vss. is abruptly dropped here, though the Aśvins remain the addressees. The theme of going away and coming back again is the semantic connection to what precedes; note esp. *púnar* in 5d and 6b.

X.25 Soma

The Āstārāpankti meter and the Vimada refrain go together, as in X.21 and 24.1–3.

X.25.1–3: The c pādas of these three vss. begin with *ádhā*.

X.25.2: There is a difference of opinion as to whether *hṛdispśaḥ* is gen. sg. modifying *te* [=Soma] (Gr) or, more likely, nom. pl. qualifying the unexpressed subj. (Sāy., Ge, Scar [669, uncertainly]; Old likewise waffles). The next question is the referent of the subj.: Sāy., endorsed by Ge (n. 2a), thinks priests; Old suggests several possibilities, but seems to favor *kāmāḥ* of pāda

c, as I do. As Old points out, it makes sense for the desires first to “sit” on the ritual ground and then “spread out” in search of goods.

Finally, there is the referent of *dhāmasu*: Ge: Soma’s forms, Re: Soma’s structures, Scar: his seats. The last seems the most likely – or, to be more precise, the various places where soma is purified, including heaven; cf. IX.86.22, 66.3, etc., as well as IX.28.2 cited by Ge.

X.25.3: The sense of the two clauses in this vs. (ab and c, e) cries out for the first to be a conditional clause to the second: “if I transgress ..., be merciful.” Re yields to this temptation, if only with a parenthetical “(si).” For a parallel passage with such subordination, cf. VIII.48.9 (likewise to Soma), containing the same VPs in both subord. and main cl. as here: *yát te vayám pramināma vratāni, sá no mṛṇa* “If we will confound your commandments, be merciful to us.” In our passage it seems uncharacteristically bald for the poet to trumpet forth his transgression, rather than wrapping it into a conditional. At best we might reconfigure it as a question: “Do I ...?” though there is no overt sign of a question. I suggest we’re dealing with a different phenomenon. As is well known, in a subset of passages the coordinate conjunction *ca* actually marks a subordinate, conditional (“if”) clause (see, e.g., Gr *ca* IV., coll. 428–29; Klein DGRV I.238–56); this usage is also found in a few instances of RVic *céd*, continued into the later language. In these *ca* / *céd* clauses the verb is accented. Now *utá* ‘and’ is similar to *ca* in many of its usages (see, e.g., Klein DGRV I.293). I think we have here a nonce use of *utá*, which opens the first clause, in the function of subordinating *ca*, though without inducing accent on the verb. I would therefore change the tr. to “And if I transgress ...”

On *pākyā* see comm. ad vs. 5 below.

In pāda e *abhí cid vadhāt* seems untethered to the rest of its pāda. Gr registers a special usage of $\sqrt{mṛḍ}$: “**abhí** jemand [A.] gnädig wovor [Ab.] bewahren.” But this would be the only occurrence of $\sqrt{mṛḍ}$ with *abhí* in the RV, and in fact $\sqrt{mṛḍ}$ never otherwise appears with a preverb or with an abl. Ge also construes the phrase with *mṛṇā*, though not in the exact same sense as Gr: “doch verzeih uns wie ein Vater seinem Sohne auch ohne Strafe.” I think it better to supply a separate verb, with appropriate semantics, that can be construed both with *abhí* and with an abl. Verbs meaning ‘protect’ come immediately to mind: both $\sqrt{pā}$ and $\sqrt{rakṣ}$ fulfill both conditions, and forms of both appear in this hymn: *pāhi* with abl. in 8e, *rakṣasi* in 6a. Re obviously responded to the situation as I do, supplying a parenthetical ‘protect’ with the phrase: “(nous gardant) même de la mort-violente,” though he makes no comment.

X.25.4: The *dhītí*- ‘insights’ and *krātu*- ‘resolve’ here may reprise the *mānas*- ‘thought’ and *krātu*- of vs. 1b, though there is no equivalent to the *dākṣa*- ‘skill’ of the trio in 1b—unless *śákti*- ‘powers’ in 5a counts.

The simile in c, e is a little off kilter, but presumably the idea is that one has to hold beakers steady to keep the liquid inside from spilling—esp. important if it’s precious soma.

X.25.5: If *śákti*- is the third member of the trio of vs. 1, as just suggested ad vs. 4, it might be best, with Re, to ascribe those powers to the insightful humans, rather than to Soma: “Grâce à leurs capacités ... les-célèbres (hommes) ... ont ouvert ...” This interpr. requires finding another way to construe the gen. phrase referring to Soma (*táva ... gṛtsasya ... távasaḥ*). Re seems to take it with *níkāmāsaḥ*: “dévoués (à toi) ...” This is tempting, but no other forms of *níkāma*- are construed with a gen. (or any other case). So, although I’d entertain an alt. tr. “Through their

powers these insightful ones, devoted to you who are clever and strong, open ...,” I think it runs into syntactic difficulties.

The rare word *gṛtsa*- opening pāda c may participate in two different verbal plays. On the one hand, *gṛtsa*- is elsewhere the opposite of *pāka*- ‘naïve, simple’; cf. IV.5.2 *pākāya gṛtsaḥ* and in particular nearby X.28.5 *gṛtsasya pākas tavāsaḥ* ..., almost identical to our pāda c *gṛtsasya dhīrās tavāsaḥ*. Although *pāka*- is not found in our vs., see *pākyā* in 3a. In addition *Gr̥tsamada* (*gr̥tsamadā*-) is the name of poetic family of Maṇḍala II; note here in cd the polarized #*gṛtsa(sya)* ... *māde*#. Since the poet expressly associates himself with the great poet Kakṣivānt in vs. 10, a concealed mention of another bardic family would not be surprising.

Ge (n. 5) suggests that the vs. is a description of the dakṣiṇā, playing off the Vala myth.

X.25.6: The two forms of *sām* (*samākṛṇoṣi*, *sampāśyan*), neither of which is strictly necessary, may be meant to contrast with the persistent *vī* of the Vimada refrain.

X.25.7: On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

X.25.8–9: These two vss. both begin *ī vām*; vs. 8 contains a comparative to a root noun cmpd (*kṣetra-vīttara*-) and 9 a superlative to a root noun cmpd (*vṛtra-hantama*-).

X.25.8: The ‘resolve’ (*krātu*-) of vss. 1 and 4 returns here, but belonging to Soma, not us.

Ge and Re construe *mānuṣaḥ* quite differently. Ge takes it as an abl. with the comparative *-vīttara*- (“Ortskundiger als der Mensch”), and Scar (482–83) and the publ. tr. follow; Re. as a gen. with the first member *kṣetra*- (“Toi qui connais le territoire de l’homme mieux (que tout autre)”). Since Re ends up having to supply an abl. with the comparative, Ge’s interpr. seems more economical.

X.25.9: The “us” of pāda a are identical to the referents of the 3rd pls in c, e, or rather the 3rd pls are a subset of us (namely, the warriors).

X.25.10–11: The last two vss. of the hymn each contain two annunciatory *ayām*-s, opening the a and c pādas. This repetition is not well signaled in the publ. tr., which should probably have made use of “this one” or “this one here” despite the heaviness of that effect.

X.25.10: Note the complementary injunctives, med. intrans. *vardhata* ... act. trans. *vardhayat*.

On the presence of Kakṣivānt here see publ. intro. and also comm. on vs. 5 above.

X.25.11: In the publ. tr. I take *saptābhyah* as a dat. of benefit with the VP of pāda e, more or less parallel to *vīprāya dāsūṣe* in pāda a, with *ā vāram* an independent adverbial. This interpr. is quite different from those of Ge, Old, and Re, all of whom construe the phrase of c together, with *saptābhyah* an abl. with *vāram*, as in I.4.4=IX.45.2 ... *sākhibhya ā vāram* “the choice from among the companions” (on IX.45.2 see comm. ad loc., which rescinds the publ. tr.). Pāda e is then a separate cl. I now see that they are right and I am not: besides the striking parallels adduced there is also the fact that e begins with the preverb *prā*, which suggests (though it doesn’t require) that a new cl. begins there. I would now emend the tr. (starting with pāda c) to “this one is the choice of the seven; he will advance ...” I still don’t know who or what “the seven” are.

X.26 Pūṣan

Tr. and comm. by Re in EVP XV.152–54. As Old points out, the meter is very ragged.

X.26.1: The first hemistich of this vs. plays on the frequent ambiguity of the stem *niyút-*, which can refer both to Vāyu’s teams, with which he drives to the sacrifice, and to our “teams” of poetic thoughts, which drive to Vāyu and the other gods. See disc. in comm. ad VII.90.1. In this passage I think both senses are found simultaneously, with *mānīṣāḥ* both nom. and acc., in the first case coreferential with *niyútaḥ* and in the second expressing the goal. Ge opts for the first, Re the second.

The du. *dasrā* refers to Vāyu, under the epithet *niyúdratha-*, and Pūṣan. Pace Gr (and Old’s qualified endorsement), there seems no reason to emend to sg. *dasró*. The impv. *aviṣṭu* is sg. because a series of sg. subjects can take a singular verb. For Vāyu and Pūṣan together and with similar phraseology, cf. VII.39.2 *vāyúḥ pūṣā svastāye niyútvān*, where *niyútvān* modifies Vāyu.

The bahuvr. *niyúdratha-* ‘having a chariot with teams’ is a hapax, and despite the additional semantics was probably formed beside the standard *niyútvant-* ‘having teams’ to provide an iambic cadence; the *-vant-* stem in the nom. *niyútvān* is fairly common in the cadence of Triṣṭubh lines (III.49.4, VI.40.5, 60.2, VII.39.2, IX.89.6). For the syntagm underlying the compd see I.135.4 *rātho niyútvān* (cf. III.49.4).

X.26.2: Both Ge and Re manage to wring a good deal of sense out of this puzzling vs.; unfortunately they do so by construing the unaccented verb in c (*ā vamsat*) in the rel. cl. that begins with *yāsya*; cf., e.g., “Dessen Grösse ... unsereins, der Sänger, durch seine Gedichte gewinnen möchte ...” (Re sim.). Even Old, who usually holds the line on such things, speculates that *vamsat* might be a Nebensatzverb despite its lack of accent, citing his disc. (ZDMG 60 [1906]: 737–38) of a handful of cases (not incl. this one) that he so analyzes. It is a tempting solution to a sticky little problem, but when we ignore such a dominant syntactic practice for interpretational convenience, I fear we risk returning to the early emendation-happy days of Western RVic exegesis. And in almost all of Oldenberg’s cases that I’ve checked, another solution is possible; cf., e.g., disc. in the comm. ad I.141.5, IV.17.19, though also cf. VI.17.10. As often in the RV, I think the poets deliberately push us to go beyond an obvious, but grammatically problematic interpr. to another, more complex one that conforms to the rules. In this case, too, a different interpr. is possible, though I have to admit that it is somewhat inelegant: the relative cl. occupies only the first hemistich and is an expression of possession. Pūṣan has greatness, the friendship of the wind (here Vāta, but reflecting the partnership with Vāyu in vs. 1), and this people here – presumably the Ārya or the subset engaged in the ritual, but possibly referring to the speaker himself, as Re suggests (“cet homme que voici [moi-même]”). By this interpr. pāda c is the corresponding main cl., and we can supply “him” as obj. of *ā vamsat*, the antecedent of *yāsya* in ab.

On the interpr. and metrical shape of *vātāpya-* and their interaction see detailed disc. ad IX.93.5. In origin it appears to be a bahuvr., and in its other three occurrences (I.121.8, IX.93.5, X.105.1) I take it as adjectival. But here in the publ. tr. I take it as nominal: “the friendship with the wind [/sought-after friendship].” So also Re (“l’amitié digne d’être gagnée”), with expressed reluctance similar to mine. It might be an adj. modifying *mahitvām*, as Ge takes it (“Dessen Grösse, die mit dem Vāta befreundet(?) ist”), but the tr. is hard enough to parse as it is.

In d I would change the tr. of *cīketa* to presential “takes cognizance.” On the anomalous accent on the redupl., see Kü (174).

X.26.3: The interpr. of this vs. is hampered by the hapax *psúraḥ* in c. As Schindler succinctly and despairingly notes (Rt Nouns s.v.), its stem, meaning, and etymology are all unknown. To begin with the first, it can either be an acc. pl. (or abl./gen sg., though this is unlikely syntactically) to a root noun *psúr-* or acc. sg. to an *s*-stem *psúras-*. It hardly matters, but since its root syllable doesn’t really fit the profile of an *s*-stem, I opt (as most do) for the root noun. As for the meaning, its syntax helps narrow that down: assuming it is an acc., it’s the obj. or goal of *pruṣāyati*, which also appears in the next pāda, with an acc. goal *vrajām* ‘enclosure’. Therefore *psúraḥ* should either be something that gets sprinkled on (as in d), or a liquid that gets sprinkled: $\sqrt{pruṣ}$ and *pruṣāyá-* admit both types of acc., though the goal is more common (however, consider the rt. noun cmpd. *ghṛta-prúṣ-* 6x ‘ghee-sprinkling’). Re suggests the meaning ‘nourriture(s)’ on not very strong grounds, but the semantic field of object or goal of sprinkling remains fairly wide open. As for etym., a connection has been suggested with *psáras-* ‘delight’, which is itself not entirely clear (see Old, Ge n. 3c, AiG II.2.58) and therefore helps little. But save for an offhand remark by Old (“das Wort vielleicht gewählt wegen Anklang an *pruṣāyati*”), the most obvious explanatory factor has been ignored: the phonological context. I suggest that *psúraḥ* was not “chosen” because of its “Anklang an *pruṣāyati*”; rather it was *generated* from *pruṣāyati* as a deliberate phonological deformation, a distant metathesis: *pruṣ-* → *psur-*. And this phonological manipulation was inspired by the subject of the vs. and the hymn, namely Pūṣan. That the fairly rare verb *pruṣ(āyá)-* is found twice in this vs., prominently repeated at the end of pādas c and d, is probably owing to its near rhyme with the god’s name: *pruṣ* : *pūṣ*. The metathesized *psur(aḥ)* shows a different phonological relationship with the name, with Pūṣan’s first two consonants adjacent in the initial cluster *ps-* with the vowel (*ū*) between them flipped. In other words, we need not seek an independent etymology for *prúṣ-*; its etymology is contained in its context and is skin-deep.

X.26.4: For ease of parsing I tr. cd as a new cl.: “(you are) the means to ...,” but since *sādhana-*, at least, is masc., they are more properly rendered as acc. predicates to *tvā* in pāda a (as Ge/Re do it). Best to tr. “We would contemplate you, o Pūṣan, / as both the means to realize our thoughts ...” The construction is resumed by the nom.s in vs. 5.

X.26.5: On *prátyardhir yajñānām* see VI.50.5 *abhyardha-yájvan-*, also of Pūṣan, and comm. ad loc.

The gen. *ráthānām* may limit the first member (*aśva-*) of the preceding cmpd. *aśvahayá-*, so, less literally, “driving the horses of chariots / driving the chariot horses,” as in Ge’s “der die Wagenrosse antreibt.” Alternatively – and perhaps better – the independent gen. *ráthānām* may independently limit the 2nd member of the cmpd. *-hayá-* (cf., e.g., VI.45.14 *hinuhi rátham*), and be functionally parallel to the 1st cmpd member *aśva-*, another way of avoiding a three-member cmpd. I would now propose an alternative tr. “driver of horses and chariots,” though this unfortunately does not capture the syntactic mismatch. On Pūṣan as charioteer, see VI.55.1, 2 and, if I’m right (see comm. ad loc.), VI.56.2–3.

Both of these phrases show the RVic avoidance of over-complex compounds, with what would in later times be the 1st member instead a genitive in a syntagm. In the first, even the presence of the preverb *práti* seems to have interfered with cmpding, as in the root-noun cmpds

with direct object first members. See comm. ad I.124.7, as well as the immed. following remarks on pāda d.

The cmpd *yāvayat-sakhá-* differs by accent and therefore by sense from the fairly common adjectival X-*ayát*-Y type with 2nd member object—particularly relevant exx. here being, on the one hand, *yāvayád-dveṣas-* (2x) ‘keeping away hatred’ and, on the other, *drāvayát-sakha-* ‘setting its comrades to running’ (X.39.10) and *mandayát-sakha-* ‘exhilarating its companion’ (I.4.7). As a karmadhāraya, our form should mean ‘the warding-off companion, the companion who wards [smtg] off’, and the gen. *víprasya* expresses who he is companion to, hence literally “the warding-off companion of the inspired poet” (Ge “der abwehrende Freund des Beredsamen”). But the other cmpd with this caus. stem as first member, namely *yāvayád-dveṣas-*, probably gives the hint as to what Pūṣan wards off: “hatred” (*dvēṣas-*). On Pūṣan’s partnership with mortals see I.138.2, 3, 4, VI.48.18, 57.1.

X.26.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. is extremely obscure, beginning with the hapax *ādhīṣamāṇā-* that opens it. My current interpr. differs considerably from the publ. tr. and attempts to find a coherent theme in the four disparate pādas.

Before tackling the sense of this 1st hemistich, it will be useful to pay attention to its structure. The first hemistich of the next vs., 7ab, consists of two nom.+gen. phrases, with the first ending GEN *pátih#* and the 2nd GEN *sákhā#*; the last pāda of the preceding vs., 5d, ends GEN ...-*sakháh*. On the basis of this parallelism I supply *sákhā* as the head noun of pāda b.

As for *ādhīṣamāṇāyāḥ*, its morphological analysis is, at least in part, quite clear: it’s the fem. gen. sg. of a them. middle participle, implying a verb **ādhīṣate* (or *-ta*), which, however, is not attested elsewhere. It is also generally (and at least superficially plausibly) assigned to the root $\sqrt{dhī}$ ‘think’ with preverb *ā*. Wh (Rts) tentatively classifies it as a desid. to $\sqrt{dhī}$, but in the Gr (§897) as a participle to “an a-form of an s-aor. of $\sqrt{dhī}$ ”; the latter is also the analysis of Macd (VG §527) and of Gr (“zu Aor. *dhīṣa-*,” which does not exist). See also Scar (274), who tr. “sich sehnen” but does not venture a morphological analysis beyond associating it with the lexeme *ā* $\sqrt{dhī}$. Re invokes the rt noun cmpd *ādhī-* ‘care, worry’ (see Scar 274–75) and tr. (in good Re baroque fashion) “qui songe-avec-nostalgie.” I can’t get any further than this, at least by conventional means.

But in a perhaps pardonable indulgence of fancy, perhaps also in keeping with the imaginative phraseology of the hymn, I can confect an alternative. The desiderative stems to $\sqrt{dhā}$ ‘place (etc. etc.)’ are *dīdhiṣa-* and *dhīṣa-*, the former confined to the RV (except for adj. deriv.), the latter late RV+. I suggest that our *dhīṣa-* is a third, if nonce, desid. to $\sqrt{dhā}$, perhaps built on the model of $\sqrt{āp}$: *īpsa-* (AV+) :: $\sqrt{dhā}$: \rightarrow *dhīṣa-*, which is a good match both phonologically (roots with *ā*) and semantically (both [sometimes] meaning ‘acquire’). In particular, the lexeme *ā* $\sqrt{dhā}$ in the middle can mean ‘acquire’, hence here ‘desiring to acquire’. There’s a very telling specialization of the desid. of $\sqrt{dhā}$, found in the *u*-adj. participial substitute *dīdhiṣú-* to the first desid. stem listed above. Besides the literal ‘desiring to acquire’ sense, it can be specialized in a marriage context to mean ‘desiring to acquire (a wife)’ = ‘suitor, wooer’. This is famously found in the funeral hymn X.18.8, where the man ready to remarry the widow is so designated. It is also used of our own dedicand, Pūṣan, in the striking (and somewhat mysterious) statement VI.55.5 *mātúr dīdhiṣúm abravam* “The wooer of his mother [=Pūṣan] I have spoken to.” Despite Old’s dismissal of the relevance of that passage: “... hilft nicht weiter,” I think it brings us closer to a solution. Recall that at least once Sūryā, daughter of the Sun, has Pūṣan given to her, presumably in marriage: VI.58.4 *yām devāso ādaduḥ sūryāyai*,

kāmena kṛtām “whom [=Pūṣan] the gods gave to Sūryā, (him) prompted by desire.” Note the astonishing reversal of the usual marriage procedure: ordinarily the maiden is given to her new husband (the institution known as *kanyādāna*- in later Skt. legal texts), but here the *husband* is given to the *wife*. This is presumably because of Sūryā’s participation in Self-choice marriage. She is the protagonist of a widespread if fragmentary myth of Svayaṃvara marriage in the RV; see esp. my 2001 “The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara? Formulaic Evidence” (Fs. Asko Parpola). ”

Putting all this together, I suggest that in our passage Pūṣan is presented as the husband (*pātiḥ*) of Sūryā, as in VI.58.4, and she is described as “... her seeking to acquire [a husband],” that is, as a female wooer, complementary to the masc. *didhiṣū*- just discussed, in allusion to her active role in the Svayaṃvara. I would now change the tr. of the first pāda of this vs. to “the husband of her who wooed (him).”

So much for the first pāda of this maddening vs. Let us move to the second. Here the issue is the meaning and reference(s) of the them. nominal *śucā*-, found only here in Vedic. Though Gr glosses the stem as ‘rein, hell’, both Ge and Re interpr. the two forms in light of the well-known later use of forms of the root $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$ in the semantic realm of pain or grief: Ge: “(der Tröster [consoler]) der Trauernden und des Trauernden (?)”, with the explanation (n. 6ab) that Pūṣan is the benefactor of widow and widower; Re: “Epoux ... de celle qui souffre et (ami) de celui qui souffre.” But this sense is unknown to the RV (except possibly in I.125.7, q.v.), as Re admits, further conceding “La traduction proposée est donc fort douteuse.” The role of consoler of the emotionally bereft also doesn’t seem to me to lie in Pūṣan’s ambit as presented elsewhere in the RV. We should therefore try to interpr. *śucāyās ca śucāsya ca* in terms of the RVic meanings of $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$, namely ‘blaze, gleam, etc.’, and with regard to Pūṣan’s usual activities and associations.

In order to do this, first recall that structural considerations lead me to supply *sākhā* in pāda b (see above): Pūṣan is then the comrade / companion of the male and female here referred to. Let us also remember Pūṣan’s standing epithet *āghṛṇi*- ‘glowing, fiery’, on which see comm. ad VI.53.3, putting him in the realm of the bright and blazing. Pūṣan’s marriage to Sūryā obviously associates him with the sun, and in VI.58.3 he has “golden ships” (*nāvaḥ ... hiraṇyāyīḥ*) that wander in the midspace and “with which you travel on a mission of the Sun” (*tābhīr yāsi dūtyāṃ sūryasya*). (The next vs. concerns his marriage to Sūryā.) But perhaps most telling is the 1st vs. of that hymn, VI.58.1, which ascribes possession of the two day-halves (*āhanī*) to Pūṣan, “one of which is gleaming, the other belongs to the sacrifice” (*śukrām te anyād yajatām te anyād*). Although this passage is difficult and its meaning disputed (see comm. ad loc.), it is clear that Pūṣan is associated with something *śukrá*- (to the same root as our problematic words), with the daily round of time, and with the sacrifice. I therefore think that the *śucā*- forms here should be interpr. in that context. For the fem. *śucāyāḥ* I suggest that the most likely referent is Dawn, who is regularly described by forms of $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$ elsewhere: e.g., *śukrá*- I.123.9, IV.51.9; *śucí*- I.134.4, IV.51.2, 9, and various cmpds like *śukrá-vāsa*-. As for the masc. *śucāsya*-, although Pūṣan’s association with the sun (see above) might suggest Sūrya as the referent, the overwhelming connection between both verbal and nominal forms of $\sqrt{\text{śuc}}$ and Agni is, in my opinion, the deciding factor—a mere glance at the various stems in Gr, with his identifications of the referents, should suffice to show this. Our pāda b then depicts Pūṣan in association with two glowing, blazing entities connected to the early morning sacrifice: Dawn and Agni, the ritual fire. Or such is my more sober assessment of the meaning and reference of pāda b.

However, I will suggest an alternative, which is far less grounded but which may allow us to interpr. the vs. as a unity. As will be set out immed. below, I now wonder if the garments in pāda c and d are the wedding garments of Sūryā the bride in pāda a. In the wedding hymn (X.85), where Pūṣan figures in several roles, a number of vss. are devoted to the wedding journey of Sūryā, mustering a variety of cosmic and ritual elements to correspond to parts of the vehicle and its equipage. Twice, derivatives of √*śuc* are found in the dual in this role: X.85.10 *śukrāv anaḍvāhāv āstām, yád áyāt sūryā gṛhām* “The two gleaming/blazing ones were the two draft-oxen when Sūryā went to her home” and X.85.12 *śúcī te cakré yātyāḥ* “The two gleaming/blazing ones were your two wheels as you [=Sūryā] drove.” Who these two are and whether they are the same pair in both vss. is unclear; they owe their genders (masc. and neut. respectively) to the gender of the entities they’re identified with (m. ox and n. wheel respectively). I now suggest that in our passage the phrase *śucāyāś ca śucāśya ca* refer to the same paired entities that we meet in the wedding hymn. As for their identities, they could still be Dawn and Agni, or Heaven and Earth, or some other gendered pair. The point is that they fill the role of attendants on Sūryā’s wedding procession, a procession that Pūṣan leads (X.85.26).

Penetrating the sense of the second hemistich is even more challenging than the first, if that is possible. Old, Ge, and Re have essentially nothing to say about it, and I’m afraid I have nothing to add, at least in my levelheaded mode. I don’t know why garments suddenly intrude here, both being woven (c *vāsovāyāḥ*) and being washed (d: *ā vāsāṃsi mārṃjāt*). Are the sheep in the gen. pl. in c the beneficiaries / recipients of the garments, as Ge and Re seem to think (e.g., “tissant le vêtement pour les brebis”) or, as I think, the material (wool) from which the garments are made. Among other things, why would sheep be wearing clothes? or, rather, what flights of metaphor are required to produce the image of “sheep” wearing “clothes”? Given that elsewhere in the hymn a gen. can depend on a first cmpd member (5b *aśvahayó ráthānām*; see above), limiting *vāso-* by *āvīnām* here seems perfectly possible, hence my “... garments of sheeps’ (wool).” But if the garments aren’t for the sheep, who are they for (if anyone/-thing)? Here is where my level head loses its equilibrium again. If, as I’ve argued for pāda a (fairly convincingly) and for b (rather less so), this vs. concerns the marriage of Sūryā, then the *vāsas-* can be her wedding garments. Her auspicious *vāsas-* comes up early in the wedding hymn: X.85.6 *sūryāyā bhadrām íd vāso, gāthayaiti páriṣṛtam* “Sūryā’s auspicious garment goes adorned with a song.” I suggest that in our pāda c Pūṣan is the weaver of this lovely bridal dress (*vāsovāyāḥ*). Much later in the wedding hymn there a few stark vss. (28–30) again devoted to the wedding garment, now stained with blood from the deflowering of the bride. This is both a cause for rejoicing and a menacing transformation, and it needs to be purified and set right. I suggest that this is what happens in our pāda d, where Pūṣan keeps rubbing the garments to clean them. In X.85.35 the purification is expressed by a different verb, *śudh* (and covers not only the garment but also the wedding feast with its slaughtered cow; see comm. ad loc.): *sūryāyāḥ paśya rūpāṇi, tāni brahmā tú śundhati* “Behold the forms of Sūryā! But the brahman makes them clean.” But I suggest the same purification is expressed here in d by *ā mārṃjāt*.

This is the only occurrence of the preverb *ā* with the very well-attested root √*mṛj*, but this is hardly the worst of our problems.

X.26.7: As Ge (n. 7c) points out, the shaking-the-beard motif is found in the same poet’s hymn X.23.1, 4 of Indra, whom it better befits. Perhaps the repeated *ināḥ* (a, b) evoked the Indra trope.

X.26.9: Pāda b is identical to 1d, a not very inspired form of ring composition.

X.27–29

These three hymns are attributed to Vasukra Aindra and contain some of the most challenging poetry in the RV. All three hymns are dedicated to Indra.

X.27 Indra

On the structure and the challenges of this hymn, see publ. intro. See also Ge's extensive intro. In the publ. intro. (2nd para. p. 1413) the statement "Here verse 10 contrasts the suitor of a blind girl ..." should be corrected to "verse 11."

X.27.1–2: On the functional equivalence of subjunctive and 1st sg. injunctive in these two passages (esp. *pacāni ... nī śiñcam*), see KH 247, 249.

X.27.1: The hymn begins with a form of \sqrt{as} (subj. *ásat*), and \sqrt{as} is rather overrepresented in the early parts of the hymn: *asmī* in c, *satya-* in d, plus *āsam*, *āsan*, *satáh*, and *sántam* in 4. In particular, *ahám asmī* in c is a strong, basically unnecessary statement (i.e., either *ahám* or *asmī* would have done), so it may be asserting the epiphany of Indra, or in addition the real existence of Indra (which, as we know, can be doubted), or be a strong form of *aham-kāra*.

The lexeme *abhí* \sqrt{vij} is found only here (in the noun *abhivegá-*) and in the med. aor. *abhí vikta* in I.162.15, a verse often repeated in the mantras of the Áśvamedha. The root \sqrt{vij} expresses various forms of physical agitation; I.162.15 expresses the hope that a blazing hot cauldron not *abhí vikta*. I tr. 'topple over' there, but I am now more sympathetic to Ge's 'boil over'. Here the noun *abhivegá-* seems to express a tremendous burst of physical and mental energy on Indra's part, for which Ge's "Bestreben" seems a too pallid rendering—hence my figurative "boil over" in quotes (as in the Engl. phrase "boil over with rage"). Its expression is oddly oblique, however, with Indra relegated to an enclitic *me*, in what is literally "There will be boiling over of me," which I have adjusted to a more direct phrasing. I don't know why Indra's agency is displaced.

The lexeme *prá* \sqrt{han} barely exists in the RV; besides this agent noun it is found only in the negated *áprahan-* (VI.44.4) and *praghnánt* (IX.69.2), as well as *abhipraghnánti* (VI.46.10). *prá* is fairly common with verbs of violence; see *prá ... kṣiñām* in 4d.

X.27.2: In this vs. the singer promises Indra a lavish sacrifice in the 2nd hemistich, to follow his great victory in the first. But curiously, though we expect the great victory to be achieved by the help of Indra, there is no mention of Indra's involvement; the battle is presented as the act of the singer alone.

The opening verbal complex should be read *yád+ṛ+íd* rather than *yádṛ+íd*. Note that 3c begins *yadā* and 4a with *yád*.

The supposed root $\sqrt{śuj}$ appears only here and in nearby X.34.6, both times in the pāda-final phrase *tanvā śūśujāna-*. Given its isolation, it seems best to consider it a nonce confection, quite possibly a deformation of *śūsuvāna-* 'puffing (oneself) up' to $\sqrt{śvā}$ / *śū* 'swell' (so Insler, p. c.). A form of this part. is found in the next hymn, also by Vasukra, in the same metrical position in X.28.9 (and the other two nom. sg.s of this part. are also pāda-final: IV.27.2, VII.20.2). Accounting for the *-j* is difficult; perhaps there's some contribution from *tūtujāna-* (\sqrt{tuj} 'thrust'), whose part. is reasonably well attested, but there is no clear textual connection between them. As for the phrase, there is a template of pāda-final *tanvā* MED. INTENS./PF PART, all with heavy

redupl., which could have contributed to its creation; cf. *tanvā śāśadāna-* I.123.10, 124.6, *tanvā jārbhurāṇa* II.10.5, *tanvā vāvṛdhānā* X.54.2. Also, in opposite order, #*śuśruṣamāṇas tanvā* IV.38.7=VII.19.2.

X.27.3: This vs. seems to be the Vedic version of “there are no atheists in foxholes.”

As Old and Ge both point out, pāda c is very similar to IV.24.8a *yadā samaryām vyāced ṛghāvā* “When the ballsy one [=Indra] surveyed the clash,” but with masc. nom. *ṛghāvā* rather than neut. acc. *ṛghāvat*. Indeed both scholars suggest emending the occurrence in IV.24.8 to *ṛghāvat* to match this one (see comm. ad loc., where I reject the emendation). I think rather that this is a nice ex. of the conscious manipulation of formulaic language.

There is mismatch between the singulars of abc and the plural of d, but I think this simply reflects a universal tendency to neutralize number in phrases with indefinite reference, of the English type “anyone ... they.”

X.27.4: As noted ad vs. 1, this vs. is heavily laden with forms of \sqrt{as} : 1st sg. impf. *āsam* (a), gen. sg. part. *satāḥ* (by my interpr.; see below) and 3rd pl. impf. *āsan* (b), acc. sg. part. (*ā*) *sāntam* (c). This emphasis on \sqrt{as} may indirectly reflect the common anxiety about the actual existence of Indra and about the likelihood of his showing up at our sacrifice (epiphany). All but *satāḥ* have heavy first syllables in *ā* (if we count the preverb in c); I suggest that this is meant to contrast with *ābhūm* ‘nullity’ in c (also 1d), built to the other verb of existence ($\sqrt{bhū}$), with its anomalously lengthened privative.

As in vss. 1 and 3, in this speech of Indra’s half the vs. describes people’s proper positive reactions to him (ab), while the other (cd) depicts the punishments he inflicts in the reverse situation—though each half is somewhat complicated.

In the first hemistich the question is the relationship between the peoples in pāda a and those in b. In pāda a Indra talks about his sojourn in foreign parts among unknown peoples; in b some people are said to have been bounteous to Indra under these circumstances. Are the generous folk in b the same as the unknown ones in a, or different? Ge suggests that they are different; it is only when Indra is away (“wenn er fern sei”) that people (by implication us) recognize his value and sacrifice to him (“seien die Menschen mit Opfer freigebig”) – the “absence makes the heart grow fonder” argument. This seems perfectly possible – or would be, save for the participle *satāḥ*, at least acdg. to my analysis. Ge obviously takes it as the adverb *satāḥ*, found as the first member of the hapax cmpds *sató-mahant-* (‘entirely great’ VIII.30.1) and *sató-vīra-* (‘entirely heroic’ VI.75.9) and supposedly sometimes independently; here he renders it as “gleich” (sim. Klein, DGRV II.202 “equally”). However, with Gr and Lub I take it as a gen. sg. of the pres. part. and in general doubt the existence of an independent adverb *satāḥ*; see comm. ad VII.104.21, IX.21.7. Here, by my analysis, it modifies *me* and means ‘really present’, as often; that is, Indra was recognized by the people in the distant communities as really being there, and *they* were generous to him, in comparison with the folks around here – so the communities in pāda a and the subjects of *āsan* in b are the same. For the gen. with *maghāvan-* see nearby X.33.8 *maghāvā máma*. It is rather a nice twist that *maghāvan-*, a standing epithet of Indra, is here used of people who play the role of *maghāvan-* towards Indra.

It should be noted that Old suggests an entirely different interpr. of b, though taking *satāḥ* as Ge does: “Sagt Indra: damals waren alle “*maghāvan*” mir gleich, d.h. sie waren mir alle nichts wert, und ich vernichtete sie alle (cd)?” This requires us to assume that Indra would put

“bounteous” in scare quotes and mean the reverse, which type of antiphrastic irony seems foreign to Indra’s straightforward personality.

If I am correct about who the liberal benefactors are in b, Indra is comparing us, the people here, unfavorably with unnamed and unknown strangers who know Indra’s true worth. I think that this is conveyed in part by the preverb *ā* next to *sántam* in c, referring to the unsatisfactory *ābhú-* who is here. The pres. part. *sántam* is doing several jobs in this pāda by my interpr.: as just noted, when combined with *ā* locates the *ābhú-* as “being here” (not in distant parts), but like many forms of *sánt-* (though not *satāḥ* in b) it is also concessive and in that function is construed with *kṣéme* ‘at peace’ (“although being at peace”). This is in some sense a pregnant expression: the other 4 occurrences of loc. *kṣéme* are found in the phrase *kṣéme (...)* *yóge* “at peace and at war” (V.37.5, VII.54.3, 86.8, X.89.10; *yóge* lit. ‘at the hitching up [for war]’). The point here is that Indra ambushes the *ābhú-* not only when he is at war, as we’d expect, but even when he is not.

The publ. tr. renders *vét* as ‘truly’ because I was at the time persuaded by Klein’s (DGRV II.201–2) view that *vā* here is the equivalent of *vaí* (see *vā u*) in the next vs., 5a. I am now less persuaded. As Klein points out (see also Ge n. 4c), the pāda begins like V.34.5 *jināti véd amuyā hānti vā dhūniḥ*, with a real *vā ... vā* construction, and Klein does suggest that ours is “partially borrowed” from there. I now think a “partial borrowing” of a *vā* passage precludes a *vaí* interpr., and I also suggest that the contrast between the happy outcome of ab and the dire fate meted out in cd is worth an “or” or its equivalent – here “but.” I would therefore now omit “truly” in the tr.

Note the phonological echo of the two verbs *jināmi ... kṣiṇām*.

The contents of pāda d are unclear, though the grammar and lexicon are unproblematic. Ge implies that the victim in d is the same as the one in c, but this ignores the potential mythological resonances the phrasing of d evokes. The only other occurrence of the striking gerund *pādagīhya* in the RV is in IV.18.12, which also contains the same main verb: *yāt prākṣināḥ pitāram pādagīhya* “... when you destroyed your father, having grasped him by the foot.” IV.18 is the famous account of Indra’s fraught birth, ending with his sudden killing of his unnamed father. It is hard to believe that our poet did not have this passage (or a similar account) in mind. The location “on the mountain” (*pārvate*) also connects with another, more famous piece of Indra mythology, the killing of Vṛtra, who was confining the waters inside the mountain; cf. I.32.2 *āhann āhim pārvate śisriyāṇām* “He smashed the serpent resting on the mountain.” Although I am not claiming here that pāda d refers to the slaying of Vṛtra (who, after all, didn’t have a foot to be grasped: cf. I.32.7 *apād ahastāḥ ...* “footless, handless”) or of Indra’s father, I do think that Indra is reaching into his own lore to suggest, formulaically, what happens to those he targets.

X.27.5: Both *vṛjāna-* and *pārvata-* return from the previous vs., but in somewhat different usage. I do not agree with Ge (/Sāy.) that *vṛjāna-* here refers to battle. Rather, Indra is asserting that he is not geographically or socially limited: he will go where he wants to (*yād ahām manasyē*), and one single community can’t own him no matter how good their sacrifices are (see 4ab).

The bahuvr. *kṛdhu-kārṇa-* ‘of stunted ear’ is found only here in the RV, but twice as fem. *kṛdhu-karṇī-* in the AV (XI.9.7, 10.7). On the accent see AiG II.1.297, 300. It is tempting to compare the mysterious Old Avestan hapax *kərədušā* (Y 29.3 in the famous Lament of the Soul of the Cow), which has received almost as many interpretations as there have been interpreters (which I will not canvass here). That (the first part of) the word may be the equivalent of Vedic *kṛdhú-* was suggested by Narten (*Die Aməša Spəntas* 88 n. 8) and adopted by Kellens-Pirart

(though Narten and K-P differ on the morphological analysis); Insler has a different explanation of *kərəd-* but suggests that *-uṣ-* is the (daevis) word for ‘ear’, which is well attested in YA (though since the stem is *uṣ-*, it would have to be a byform). As far as I know, it was Martin West who, putting these two interpr. together, suggested that it is actually a compound of *kərədu-* + *uṣ-* ‘small-eared’ (which he reconfigures into an *n*-stem with the suffix *-an-*) [acdg. to my notes this is found in his “The Querulous Cow” in *Iran* 45 (2007), but I don’t currently have access to that article]. I find the compound interpr. appealing – that it is not represented as a compd in the text is not surprising, since it would have lost its transparency quite early – though I don’t think the *n*-stem addition is necessary: it can be simply an instr. sg. to the root noun byform “with stunted ear.”

As for the dust stirring in d, both Old and Ge appositely adduce I.63.1, where just after Indra was born the turbulence he created made everything, even the mountains (*giráyaś cid*), stir in fear like dust-motes (*bhiyā ... kirānā naíjan*). Here Indra boasts first that his roar will strike fear even in the nearly deaf, and then that his actions will make everything as unstable as dust-motes.

X.27.6: The person changes from 1st to 3rd but the boasting about Indra’s ability to punish non-sacrificers (as in 1cd) continues, at least by my interpr. The speaker may be Indra himself, affecting the 3rd ps., or the singer depicting Indra. The time remains the here-and-now, as indicated by *nv átra* of pāda a and *ū nú* of d. The meaning and construction of the vs. are much disputed, beginning with the first word, the subjunctive *dárśan*, so read by the Pp (hence a 3rd pl.), a reading followed by Ge, Klein (DGRV II.185), and Kü (290), while Gr takes it as 3rd sg. *dárśat* out of sandhi, as does Scar (89, 314) with an indef. subj. (“man”) and as do I, though with Indra as implicit subj. (Old hesitates.)

The next question is the relationship between the various acc. pl. phrases in ab, *śṛtapāṁ anindrān bāhuṣādaḥ śárave pátyamānān*, and the relationship of those to the ... *vā yé* clause of c. In my opinion *śṛtapāṁ anindrān bāhuṣādaḥ* go together, despite the pāda break after *anindrān*, so that *anindrān* modifies both the other acc. pls. The phrase describes people who eat and drink without offering a portion of the comestibles to Indra; all the other cited interpr. take *anindrān* only with *śṛtapān*, which leaves *bāhuṣādaḥ* hard to account for.

The next two words, *śárave pátyamānān*, clearly belong together because the same expression is found also in VI.27.6. The question is what does it mean, and in particular what does the participle mean and what root does it belong to? The standard view (Ge, Klein, Scar) is that it belongs to \sqrt{pat} ‘fly’, though in the meaning ‘fall’ (e.g., Ge “die ... meinem Geschoss verfallen sind”), but there are two problems with this: 1) that root does not have a stem *pátya-*, which instead is the well-attested semi-denom. pres. stem to *páti-* ‘lord’; 2) in the RV \sqrt{pat} ‘fly’ has not yet developed the ‘fall’ sense, which is still limited to \sqrt{pad} . So the form must belong to *pátyate* ‘is lord’, where Gr puts it. Kü clearly accepts this analysis and tr. the phrase “die dem Geschoss gehören,” but this must rest on a passive interpr. of the stem ‘be ‘belorded’ to, belong to’, which is not otherwise found. An indirect clue to its sense is provided by the preceding context when compared to a parallel passage: VII.18.16 contains *śṛtapām anindrām* (as in our pāda a), followed by *śárdhantam* ‘vaunting himself’—so the man who defiantly consumes without offering to Indra is also boastful (and he is duly defeated in that vs.). I think *śárave pátyamāna-* expresses something similar to *śárdhant-*: the men “act (like) the lord, play the lord” – that is, they pretend to power—but they do so “for an arrow,” which is, perhaps, a paltry weapon to boast about.

As for the rel. cl. in c, I consider it part of an “X and which Y” construction, except, of course, that it is “X *or* which Y” and, because of the fronting of *ghīṣum*, the *vā* precedes the rel. prn. In any case, the clause describes yet another set of unsatisfactory people engaged in insulting behavior. With Ge (n. 6c) and Kü, I take the “ardent comrade” to be Indra.

All of these groups are to be run down by the wheel rims in d, with the pf. opt. *vavṛtyuḥ*. As I demonstrated at length (“Where Are All the Optatives? Modal Patterns in Vedic,” Kyoto conf. 2007, publ. 2009), the pf. optative does not have a specifically “perfect” nuance. And this passage, with its *nú*, is a good demonstration of this, since a perfect-type interpr. “should *have* now rolled over them” doesn’t work very well.

X.27.7: The singer now addresses Indra directly, with the first pāda containing three 2nd sg. verbs (*ābhūḥ*, *aúkṣīḥ*, *ānaṭ*), but the glorification of Indra and the celebration of his destruction of his enemies continues.

The 2nd sg. root aor. *ābhūḥ* plays off *ābhúm* ‘nullity’ in 1d and 4c; *ābhūr u* is also picked up by mirror-image *u āyur* later in the pāda. Likewise, the polarized verbs in pāda b #*dárśan nú ... nú darṣat*# echo 6a *dárśan nú* to a distinct root. (Note that only the final form makes it clear that the verbs are 3rd sgs. not pls.) The pāda is completely symmetrical: *dárśan nú pūrvo áparo nú darṣat*.

The phonetic and grammatical figures and resonances with forms in earlier vss. may mark this vs. as a finale; the topic changes in the next vs. by my interpr. (see publ. intro.).

As is universally pointed out (Old, Ge n. 7b, KH 164 with n. 112, Kü [by implication] 502, 230), pāda b is reminiscent of VI.27.4–5, esp. 5cd *vṛcīvato yád dhariyūpiyāyām, hán pūrve árdhe bhiyásāparo dārt* “when he [=Indra] smashed the Vṛcīvants in the front division, and the rear division shattered from fear,” which anchors *pūrva*- and *ápara*- in our passage as spatial, not temporal, designations. (Note that the next vs. [6] in VI.27 contains the other occurrence of *śárove pátyamāna*- [found in our vs. 6], where it is the doomed Vṛcīvants who “play the lord for an arrow”; the two passages obviously have a close connection.)

The du. *pavāste*, found also in AVŚ IV.7.6 (=AVP II.1.5), in context clearly means something like cover (Gr Zeltdecke, EWA s.v. Decke, Hülle, Wh AV covers; see Ge’s n. 7c). EWA compares OP *pavastā*- ‘the thin clay envelope used to protect unbacked clay tablets’, as well as MP and NP *pōst* ‘Haut, Fell’. Obviously if the OP comparison is correct, the OP form had to have undergone semantic development after the introduction of writing (which is certainly possible). I wonder, though, if an etymon closer to home might be more likely—such as a lexeme *pra* √ *vas*, to √ *vas* ‘clothe’, which has been through MIA sound laws (**pavattha*) and then incompletely re-Sanskritized. Unfortunately √ *vas* is not found with *prá* elsewhere in Sanskrit or, as far as I can tell, in MIA, but the combination would not be hard to create, with the sense of stretching fabric “forth” over something.

I assume that Indra is the subj. of d, though the verb is not 2nd ps.

X.27.8–10: On the theme of these vss., see publ. intro.

X.27.8: Several different scenarios provide possible models for interpr. this vs.; see the various ones sketched by Old, as well as the one presented in detail by Thieme (Fremd. 12–14). (Ge makes no real attempt at interpr.) Mine differs from all of these and turns on a potentially controversial interpr. of *sahágopāḥ* in b. As I say in the publ. intro., the cows (here standing, in my view, for the erstwhile followers of Indra) are grazing in the pasture of the stranger (pāda a),

“roaming with their cowherd” (b *sahágopāś cárantīh*). This tr. might better be “with their cowherds”: I think the point is that the cows have found other leaders to follow, leaders summed up in the word *arí-* ‘stranger’. The appeal – or appeals – of these alternative leaders are found in pāda c, where (in my view) their inviting messages come at the cows from all sides, trying to attract the cows to a new herd. (Thieme thinks these are the cries of the owner of the grain of pāda a, trying to shoo away the trespassing cows; Ge, who construes *aryáh* in pāda a with the cows, not the grain, probably thinks the *arí-* is calling them back, but he doesn’t discuss.) In d their *real* own lord (*svápati-*), that is, Indra, is, in my opinion, losing patience with his wayward herd; the pāda is a veiled threat: if the cows continue to follow others and “eat their grain,” Indra will stop finding pleasure in them and treat them as he has the other apostates and non-sacrificers who figured earlier in the hymn (1cd, 6, 7b).

On the *svá-* as referring to the cows, not the lord, in the cmpd *svápati-* see disc. ad X.44.1.

X.27.9: No doubt the speech of Indra, his patience exhausted. (Old suggests that it is all “zornige Ironie.”) He announces his plans (ab) to “round up” (*sám ... váyam*) the straggling herds in one broad pasture, all those who had been eating the grass and grain of (other) people. The phrase *yavasādo jánānām ... yavādaḥ* responds thematically to 8a *yávam ... aryó akṣan*, and in my opinion the *jána-* here are the equivalent of the *arí-* in 8a. Ge (n. 9a) suggests that the grass-eaters are livestock and the grain-eaters are men, corresponding to the four-footed and two-footed in 10b, but admits that it’s the cattle that eat grain in 8a.

Note the mirror-image figure *váyam yava-*.

The 1st sg. *váyam* in the subord. clause corresponds to subjunctives in the main cl. (*ichāt ... yunajat*). Although it ought technically to be an injunctive, it seems to belong to a small class of 1st sgs. ending in *-am* that function as subjunctives (see KH, Injunkt. 247–48; Lub also identifies it as a subj.). See also the clear 3rd sg. subj. *váyat* to the same stem in the next hymn, X.28.9.

It is difficult to see how cd fits with the rest of the vs. (and the sequence in general). Ge (n. 9cd) sees it in terms of a division into the defeated and the victorious in war: in the former case, a yoked horse, having lost its charioteer in the battle, seeks to be released from its yoke, while the victorious forces have their pick of the captured horses of the other side, which they can then yoke for their own use. This seems too elaborate and fanciful a scenario, esp. since (in my view) there’s no hint of a battle scene in these vss. until 10cd. This scenario is favored, however, by an interpr. of the pf. part. *vavanvān* in d as ‘victor’, belonging to \sqrt{van} ‘win’ (so Gr, Ge, Klein DGRV II.88, Tichy 1995: 10, Kü 450), but I take it rather to $\sqrt{vaní}$ ‘desire, love’. This root forms a pf., mostly with long redupl. (*vāvān-*), but to sequester the forms with short redupl. (as here) and assign them all to \sqrt{van} ‘win’, as Kü does (447–51), seems unjustified, since variation in the quantity of the redupl. vowel is found in unified stems (type *vāvṛdh-* / *vavárdh-*, etc.). I interpr. it as a participle used absolutely (“the one who desires to”). In this sense it nicely balances *ichāt* in c: the subject of each clause desires the opposite of his current state. But what is this all about? I tentatively suggest that the big round-up of the scattered and confused animals that Indra performs in ab is physically and mentally chaotic. The herd animals (standing, as I suggested above, for Indra’s straying erstwhile followers) want what they don’t have: those who have followed a false doctrine now wish to be released from it; those who became detached from all doctrine need to be brought back (“yoked”) to proper belief.

X.27.10: As noted in the intro., the elaborate phraseology of pāda a, *átréd u me mamsase satyám uktám* “And just then you will consider this truly spoken by me,” sounds like a truth formulation – or perhaps Indra is simply saying, “now you’ll finally believe me!” But I am again not entirely sure what the content, presumably found in pāda b, is telling us and why it should be esp. important. So far the talk has only been of cows, though as I’ve argued “cows” standing for humans. But I do not see what Indra’s vow to bring together, to mingle, humans and animals is about.

We should first consider the lexeme *sám √srj*. Pace Klein (DGRV I.171) it certainly doesn’t mean ‘release’, and also *pace* Ge I doubt if it here means “durcheinander bringen” (muddle, confuse). The lexeme is fairly common, and generally means ‘bring smtg [ACC] together with smtg [INSTR]’: wife with husband (X.85.22), me with splendour, offspring, etc. (I.23.23, 24), a mother cow with her calf (I.110.8), etc. The process is orderly and seems designed to match entities that belong together. The only places where there is a nuance of muddle and confusion is in the nominals *sámsraṣṭar-* and *samṣṛṣṭa-jít-*, both found in the same vs., X.103.3, where Indra sends forces pell-mell into battle and then conquers them. It is possible here that we have traces of both senses, the orderly matching and the chaotic collision. On the one hand, the last hemistich of the previous vs. (9cd) depicts a set of complementary matches: the yoked animal finds its unyoker; the man who wishes to finds an unyoked animal to yoke. In this way Indra brings together (*sám √srj*) in orderly fashion the human agents and the animal objects to effect the desired pairing. The statement may also be a more general claim about Indra’s ability to mete out just deserts, as it were, to match reward / punishment to behavior – his favorable treatment of people who sacrifice to him and his vengeance on those who don’t.

And there may be a faint nod to the other, sending-into-battle sense of *sám √srj*, since the 2nd hemistich of the vs. threatens a chaotic battle scene with bad matches. The man who “does battle with women (as weapons/comrades)” (*strībhīh ... pṛtanyāt*), and against a bull (*vṛṣaṇam*) at that, is not producing appropriate pairings; he is disastrously over-matched and he will be defeated and his possessions distributed to those on the winning side. Women as weapons are found in V.30.9 (and less clearly in I.104.3); whether in either passage the women are actual women or “girly men” (or something else entirely, quite possibly rivers in V.30.9 and I.104.3), the outcome is clear. The “women” are inappropriate in a battle context, and anyone who employs them will fail. V.30.9 is very clear: *strīyo hí dāsā āyudhāni cakré, kīm mā karann abalā asya sēnāḥ* “Because the Dāsa made women his weapons, what can they do to me? His armies lack strength.”

X.27.11–12: The last two vss. of the first half of the hymn change topic once again, to a stark contrast between an improperly, indeed fraudulently, arranged marriage, and one where the marital arrangements conform to social and legal norms and lead to a happy outcome. I have discussed these vss. at some length in my 1996 “Vedic *mení*, Avestan *maēni*, and the Power of Thwarted Exchange,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20 [Fs. P. Thieme]: 187–203, esp. 197–200; for vs. 12 see also my 2001 article on the RVic svayaṃvara cited below.

X.27.11: As I discuss in the first art. cited just above, I think this vs. describes a legal situation treated in some detail in the later dharma texts (see, e.g., MDŚ IX.72–73, VIII.205, 224)—namely, the “flawed girl given in marriage.” Acdg. to the dharmic materials, if a man contracts marriage with a girl who is flawed in some way, physically or morally, and the girl’s father, who arranged the marriage, knew about the flaws but did not inform the potential bridegroom, he (the

groom) can annul the agreement and abandon the girl. But if the father made the flaws known before the marriage was arranged, the groom has no recourse. I see this legal provision reflected here—uncannily similar (if obscured by the obscurity of RVic style)—one of the pieces of evidence that some of what we find in later dharma materials already existed, as formulated law, in the Vedic period, in striking detail, and such legal anticipations often concern marriage and family law.

By my interpr., the first hemistich concerns the second situation, the “full disclosure” scenario, whereby the girl’s flaw, in this case blindness, has been declared to the bridegroom in advance. In b we have a rhetorical question concerning the groom: if he knows her to be blind (*tām vidvān ... andhām*), will he still want her and/or does he have any right to be angry at the father? This double question is enabled by the fact that *abhí√man* has two, almost opposite, senses: ‘desire’ and ‘be hostile’ (both from ‘set one’s mind on X’, which action can have several different purposes). For the first see X.86.9, the Vṛṣākapi hymn, where Indrāṇī says about the monkey’s sexual advances *avīram iva mām ayām, śarārur abhí manyate* “This noxious creature has designs on me, as if I lacked a man.” (There’s probably an admixture of the second sense here as well: the monkey is disrespecting her.) Cf. also IV.20.5 *máryo ná yóṣām abhí manyamānaḥ* “setting my mind on him [=Indra] like a dashing youth on a maiden,” which is less equivocal. Verbal forms of *abhí√man* in the meaning ‘despise, be hostile’ are first found in the AV—e.g., AVŚ VI.6.1 *yó ‘smān bráhmanaspaté, ‘devo abhimānyate / sárvaṃ tām randhayāsi me, yájamānāya sunvaté* “which(ever) godless one is hostile to us, every one (of them) shall you make subject to me, the sacrificer and presser.” But the noun *abhímāti-* ‘hostility’ and derivatives are already well embedded in the RV. (On the unetymological length of the root syllable in *abhímāti-* [versus *matí-*], see AiG II.2.630 [with lit.] and EWA s.v. *matí-*.) The implicit answers to these rhetorical questions are 1) the suitor will probably no longer be interested once he knows she’s blind, but 2) because the father was upfront about the problem, the suitor has no cause to be angry at him.

The second hemistich, by contrast (and in my interpr.), concerns the opposite situation, when the father has not been candid about his daughter’s defects. I supply a notional **ávidvān* ‘not knowing’, referring to the person indicated by *katarāḥ*. I also take the *katarāḥ* ‘which (of two)’ seriously. The “two” are identified in pāda d *yá īm vāhāte yá īm vā vareyāt*: “(the man) who will marry (lit. ‘convey’) her or (the man) who will woo her.” Here “woo” refers to a technical stage in the arrangement of a marriage, when a friend or relative of the groom comes to the maiden’s house to formally ask her father (or appropriate male relative) for her to be given in marriage, on which see, e.g., my 1996 *Sacrificed Wife*, pp. 221–22.

I discussed the problematic word *mení-* in the first article cited above. As the title already suggests, I derive it from the root *√mi* ‘exchange’ and consider it the embodiment of thwarted exchange, which can be mobilized to punish those who don’t abide by the rules of this most Indo-European and Indo-Aryan institution, reciprocal exchange. Here the girl’s father has flouted the conventions governing marriage exchange, and the injured party has the right to employ *mení-* against him. The only question is whether the wielder of *mení-* should be the bridegroom himself or his proxy, who, in coming to the household for the wooing, would have become aware of the problem first. In the cited 1996 article and in the publ. tr. I tr. the verb governing *mením, prāti ... mucāte*, as ‘unleash’ (*√muc* ‘release’). A recent art. by Maté Itzész, “The Interpretation of *prāti ... mucāte* in Ṛgveda X.27.11c” (IJ 58 [2015]: 203–15), takes up this very question. He convincingly shows that this lexeme in early Vedic means “put on, take on, assume”; although he essentially accepts my general interpr. of the vs. and of the sense of *mení-*, he suggests that the

verb in pāda c means not ‘unleash’, but ‘take on’—that is, assume the responsibility for punishing the violator of exchange relations, namely the girl’s father. I think this must be correct, given the strength of his case for the meaning of the lexeme elsewhere, and am happy to alter the translation to “which of the two will assume the (responsibility for punishing) violated exchange”; I am glad that this improved understanding of the verb does not materially affect the meaning of the passage. While altering that tr. significantly, I’d also change “who marries” to “who would marry” and “who woos” to “who would woo.”

X.27.12: A sunny contrast to the previous vs. The bride has no flaws, hidden or disclosed; she was obviously much besought (*maryatāḥ* ‘from among the young bloods’) and has made a good marriage; the wedding is celebrated publicly in front of the people (*jāne cit*), and she is surrounded by the gifts and adornments that in later texts constitute much of *strīdhana*- (‘women’s property’: e.g., “what is given at the [wedding] fire [and] on the wedding [journey]” MDŚ IX.194 *adhyagnyadhyāvāhanikaṃ dattaṃ*, describing two of the six types of *strīdhana*). Flg. Ge (n. 12cd) I have argued elsewhere (“The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara: Formulative Evidence,” Fs. Parpola [2001]: 303–15; relevant pp. 309–13) that this vs. depicts a self-choice or Svayaṃvara marriage, with the phraseology in d *svayām sã ... vanute* (standing for *vṛñīte*) the major piece of evidence, though there are other lexical clues. See the art. cit. for details.

Ge (n. 12cd) takes *vanute* as the verb of the subord. cl. beginning *yád* “... wenn sie schön geschmückt ... ihre Gefährten ... gewinnt.” He attributes the lack of accent on *vanute* to the fact that the verb is in a different pāda from the subordinator. But in my view *yát supésāḥ* is a brief nominal cl., and pāda d is an independent main cl.

X.27.13–24: As discussed in the publ. intro., the second half of this hymn is essentially independent of the first, though the two halves are thematically connected by the notion of the proper reciprocal relations between man and god and man and man. The focus in the second half is on the sacrifice. As was also noted in the publ. intro., this part of the hymn, esp. the last 6 vss., can be close to impenetrable. The first 6 vss. are essentially riddles, esp. the first 2 (13–14). This half of X.27 is lexically and formulaically similar in many respects to the following hymn, X.28, also a Vasukra product.

X.27.13: As Ge states (n. 13), this vs. almost certainly describes the fire and the wood that feeds him/it, esp. the kindling stick. Each pāda sets out a different image, each of which is compatible with the behavior of physical fire. That pāda d is nearly identical to X.142.5d (with *ānv eti* in our passage corresponding to *anvēṣi* in the latter) in an Agni hymn provides clinching evidence for the referent as fire.

In b I take *śīṛṣṇā śīraḥ* as a sort of false *āmreḍita* ‘head upon head’, rather than construing them separately as Ge does: “mit seinem Kopf hat er (ihm) einen Kopf angesetzt.” The *āmreḍita*-type reading would be facilitated by the existence of a plethora of real *āmreḍitas* to this stem: *śīṛṣṇā-śīṛṣṇā*, *śīṛṣṇé-śīṛṣne*, *śīṛṣṇāḥ-śīṛṣṇaḥ*, all pāda-initial as our phrase is. The image is that of multiple flames, each looking like a head, one on top of the other, which collectively look and act like a shield. As Old points out, *śīṛṣṇā śīraḥ* is found in AVŚ VI.49.2 immed. fld. by another such figure *āpsasāpsaḥ* “breast with/upon breast,” also of fire. Both phrases are construed with the participle *ardāyan* ‘causing to shake (violently)’ (on this stem, see my *-āya-* book, p. 107). Here also the reference is probably to flames and an interpr. “violently shaking head upon head,

breast upon breast” works at last as well as Whitney’s “exciting head with head, breast with breast,” with real instr.

Note the body-part polarization of *pattāḥ* ‘from the foot’ with the ‘head’ phrase, as well as the repetition *pratyāñcam ... prāti*.

The fem. entity that the seated fire destroys when it is “erect in his lap” (*ūrdhvām upāsi*) is most likely a piece of kindling wood; *samīdh-* is feminine. The image is sexualized, as is the one in pāda d, where the fem. element is represented by the earth instead.

X.27.14: This vs. also concerns the ritual fire, but it is somewhat more challenging than the previous one; see the publ. tr. Part of the difficulty is that the two hemistichs seem to apply to two different phases and aspects of the ritual fire: ab to its creation, cd to the offering of an oblation into it. The second hemistich is identical to III.55.13ab, which gives some help in interpr. it.

The first hemistich contains separate descriptions of the two crucial pieces of paraphernalia used to kindle the fire. Both the shapes of the pieces of wood and the process of kindling are sexualized. The lower *araṇi*, the “mother” of pāda b, lies flat and motionless on the ground; it has a hole in it called, tellingly, the *yoni*. The upper *araṇi* is not directly in contact with the lower one: rather they are connected by an upright rod known as the *mantha* or *cāt(t)ra*, which serves as a spindle. The bottom end is inserted into the *yoni* and the rod is rapidly turned back and forth (by hands or by cords) to create the friction that produces the fire. See Re’s *Vocabulaire du rituel védique* and Sen’s (derivative) *A Dictionary of the Vedic Rituals*, s.v. *araṇi* and *araṇī* respectively, esp. Re’s description of the *cātra*: “tige à forme de pénis dont une extrémité ... vient s’assujettir sur la yoni ...” Various YouTube videos are also quite instructive.

In our passage pāda a is devoted to the *cātra* (not a RVic term), the rod or churning stick, which is homologized to a tree, but a peculiar one: it is lofty (*bṛhān*) but does not provide shade (*achāyāḥ*), the rendering I now prefer over “without a shadow,” and lacks foliage (*apalāśāḥ*). In other words, it is wooden like a tree, and upright like a tree, but otherwise lacks tree-like characteristics. It is also, in a different image, called a ‘steed’ (*ārvā*); this might be because of its rapid movements, but I think it more likely reflects the cords bound around it by which the turning is effected. This is clear from I.28.4 in the playful hymn comparing Soma preparation to domestic cookery; that vs. contains the only form of the noun *mānthā-* in the RV, clearly naming the churning stick: *yātra mānthām vibadhnāte, raśmīn yāmitavā iva* “When they bind the churning stick on both sides like reins to control it,” with a slight slippage between the one bound (the stick) and the bindings (the reins) in frame and simile (see comm. ad I.28.4). Like a horse by reins, the churning stick is directed and controlled by the cords bound around it.

As for the lower *araṇi-*, this is clearly the mother who stays still in b (*tasthaú mātā*), while the embryo that eats when set loose (*viśito atti gārbhaḥ*, also in b) is obviously the nascent fire already consuming firewood.

As was noted above, the 2nd hemistich is identical to III.55.13ab; see comm. there for additional remarks. The subj. of both verbs (*mimāya* in c, *ní dadhe* in d) must be the *dhenú-* in d. It is she who “licks the calf of another” (*anyāsyā vatsām rihatī*), which indefinite (note initial position) “other” is surely the mother of pāda b, namely the lower *araṇi-*. It is a rather nice reversal that the ritual fire, which is often identified with tongue(s) and which sometimes is the agent of the verb *√rih*, is here the one being licked. The *dhenú-* is in turn the oblation being poured into the just kindled fire or rather the producer of that oblation, most likely the *īḍā* on the basis of III.55.13c. While her “udder” (*ūdhah*) refers to the contents of her udder, the oblation

itself. On the phrase *káyā bhuvā* see comm. ad III.55.13, where I reject Ge's interpr. "in which world?" in favor of "with which form?" referring, in my view, to the precise form that the oblation takes: in III.55.14c *Idā* "swelled with the milk of truth" (*ṛtāsya ... páyasāpinvata*), and milk (of truth, or just milk) may be what is meant here as well.

X.27.15: As often in the RV, numerology sows confusion. However, by focusing on the place of this vs. in the hymn and also on the action depicted within it, I think we can achieve a certain level of understanding, without necessarily being able to identify the groups presented in order as consisting of seven (a), eight (b), nine (c), and ten (d). If, as I argue in the publ. intro., this part of the hymn concerns the mystery of the sacrifice and the creation of its central focus, the ritual fire, this vs. seems to depict the coming together of four distinct groups from the four cardinal directions for cooperation; I suggest this cooperative enterprise was the primal institution of the sacrifice. Just as the classical śrauta sacrifice requires the mutual but complementary endeavors of different groups of priests drawn from the three ritual Vedas and thus belonging to different śākhās, here we seem to have the joining of distinct groups of beings, each perhaps with its own function. That they come from south, north, west, and east marks the action as universal or at least as involving the entire Ārya community. *Pace* Ge (intro. to hymn) I do not think this depicts "den Aufstieg der Götter und Erzväter zum Himmel."

Various identifications have been suggested for the four groups. Although I think their identities are less important than the regularly increasing sequence of numbers and their representation of all points of the compass, it is of course tempting to try to name them. The hardest to identify is the eight. Old's suggestions are perhaps the least risky: the seven seers, the Navagvas, and the Daśagvas, with the parenthetical question "(wer die acht?)." It is more interesting to try to match the groups with their directional sources. The "seven heroes" (*saptā vīrāsaḥ*) come from the south; if these are indeed the Saptarṣi and if the Saptarṣi were originally human seers who got divinized (both big if-s), this might make sense ritually, since the Southern Fire (*dakṣināgnī-* [not yet so called in the RV, but already AV]) is used for offerings to the Pitars (see, e.g., Keith, *Relig. & Philos.* 288–89). The problematic eight might be the Ādityas; although the number of these gods fluctuates (see Macd. *Ved. Myth* 43–44), it is once clearly stated in the RV that Aditi had eight sons (X.72.8 *aṣṭau putrāso āditeḥ*). The eight come from the north, which is the quarter of the gods, which would be appropriate for the Ādityas.

The identification of the nine and their function is complicated by the fact that the identity of their only attribute (*sthivimānt-* 'possessing *sthivī*') is unclear. Nonetheless, Ge's "sacks," or some object that can contain grain, seems pretty safe. In the only occurrence of the independent noun (X.68.3) Brhaspati strews cows from the Vala cave "like grain from *sthivī*" (*yāvam iva sthivibhyaḥ*), which seems diagnostic. The nine come from the west, which is the place of the Gārhapatya fire (also not yet named in the RV, but clearly already part of RVic ritual) and the place where the offerings are prepared. Hence the grain sacks make sense. As for the ten in the east, traversing, or perhaps better "coming through," the back of the rock (*sānu vī tiranti āśnaḥ*) sounds like a depiction of the Vala myth. Note that the same lexeme *vī√tṛ* is found in the Vala passage just cited, X.68.3 (a point made by Ge n. 15c). Since, inter alia, the Vala myth involves the release of the *dawn* cows, the east is the appropriate direction.

X.27.16: This vs. returns to the creation of the ritual fire and seems to follow directly from 14b, after the interruption of vs. 15 (and 14cd). The placement of 16 may result from a trivial concatenation: the group of ten in 15d is picked up the first word of 16, *daśānām* 'of the ten',

though the ten here must be the fingers of the ritual officiant, which is not a possible referent for *dāśa* in 15d in my opinion. Ge (n. 16a and hymn intro.), by contrast, considers the ten to be the same in 15d and 16a and identifies *kapilā-* as the name of the Ur-Ṛṣi, whose birth is depicted here. This seems to take us too far afield, away from the focus on the primal sacrifice. The word *kapilā-* appears only here in the RV; although in the Śvet. Up. (etc.) it is likely the name of a seer (see, e.g., Macd/Keith Vedic Index s.v.), there is no reason not to see our occurrence as a color term (supposedly ‘ape-colored’ ← *kapí-*; see EWA s.v.). It also appears as a color term later. Here I assume it’s a reference to the just-kindled fire, or perhaps better, to the kindling stick being manipulated by the fingers of the priest to produce fire (see vs. 13 above).

Both the mother and the embryo in 16c (*gārbham mātā*) are identical to the same figures in 14b, in my opinion, though the scene in 16cd is logically prior to that in 14b: the embryo has not yet been released to eat, that is, the fire has not yet been kindled. It is still held in the belly of the mother (the lower *aráñi-*). The two participles in b, *ávenantam tuṣáyantī*, depict this stasis: the fire seeks after nothing, while the mother is still and content (very like *tasthaú* ‘she stayed still’ in 14b). The ten fingers are just starting the process of kindling (16ab).

Ge renders *vakṣāṇāsu* as “an ihren Brüsten,” which implies that the *gārbha-* has already been born. But III.29.2 (which he adduces), with strikingly similar phraseology, strongly suggests that the babe is still in the womb: *aráñyor níhito jātávedā, gārbha iva súdhito garbhínīṣu* “Jātavedas, placed within the two fire-churning sticks, like an embryo well placed within a pregnant (belly).” Despite the pl. *garbhínīṣu* in that passage (and the publ. tr. [JPB] “within women with child”) I now think *garbhínīṣu* there presupposes a gapped *vakṣāṇāsu*, like here, and since pl. *vakṣāṇā-* can be a pl. tantum, it refers here to a single belly. Some plural forms of *vakṣāṇā-* do refer to multiple bellies (see, e.g., I.162.5, X.49.10), but most do not (e.g., V.42.13).

The standard interpr. of *tuṣáyantī* is transitive (e.g., Ge ‘es stillend’; see also Old), but the zero-grade vocalism favors an intransitive interpr., which is just as possible in context and in fact, as was just noted, echoes *tasthaú mātā* in 14b. See my *-áya-*formations, pp. 50–51.

X.27.17: This vs. follows from 16 (note the *vīrās(aḥ)* in both) and probably depicts the primal sacrifice (sim. Ge., intro. “das Tier- und Somaopfer”). The very similar I.164.43, adduced by both Old and Ge, supports this view: *ukṣāṇam pīśnim apacanta vīrās, tāni dhārmāṇi prathamāny āsan* “Heroes cooked a dappled bullock. These were the first foundations (of the rite).”

The dice of pāda b must serve a ritual purpose. Although the more famous instance of dicing in śrauta ritual is in the Rājasūya, where the newly installed king plays dice with representatives of the four varṇas (see, e.g., MŚS IX.1.4.21–25), there is also dicing in the Agnyādheya, the initial installation of the ritual fire for a new Ahitāgni (=śrauta sacrificer), where the sacrificer dices (with his sons in some versions) with a cow for the stakes. See, e.g., Keith, *Relig.&Philos.* 317; Hillebrandt, *Rit. Lit.* 108; and in detail Falk, *Würfelspiel* 136–63; from the śrauta sūtras, e.g., MŚS I.5.5.6–16. Such a ritual context makes sense here, at the first establishment of the institution of sacrifice and the creation of the sacred fire, and the players would, most likely, be the representatives of the four quarters who assembled in vs. 15. Just as the four varṇas in the Rājasūya dicing match represent the totality of Ārya society, here involving the groups coming from the four cardinal directions would create the same type of universality. In the Agnyādheya the cow, once won, is killed and divided among the brahmins after offering portions to the Pitars. It is possible that the “fat ram” (*pīvānam meṣām*) serves the same purpose here.

The second hemistich must depict the establishment of the soma sacrifice in particular, given the telltale terms *pavítravantā* ... *punántā* “provided with filters ... purifying.” But the passage is difficult to interpret because the identity of “the two” (*dvā*) who are the referents of these words is entirely unclear. Ge does not hazard a guess (and in fact does not raise the question). None of the usual dual suspects—Heaven and Earth, Night and Dawn, Sun and Moon, the Ásvins, Mitra and Varuṇa—makes any sense here, or at least any sense I can grasp. Since these two must be parties to the creation of the sacrifice, they should be part of the groups we first encountered in vs. 15. Since in the next vs. (18) the harmonious cooperation of this amalgamated assemblage breaks down and they split into two halves, I wonder if 17cd anticipates the break-up, even though the two halves are still working together here: they agree on soma but will split on cooking.

Ge (flg. Gr) takes *dhánum brhatīm* as the obj. of *punántā* (“... den hohen Quell ... zu läutern”), which he further qualifies (n. 17c) as “Den Quell des Soma, d. h. die Somapflanze oder den Somasaft.” But *dhánu-* does not, in my opinion, ever mean ‘source’ or the like, but refers to a type of place, a plain or steppe, and is related to *dhánvan-* ‘wasteland’; see EWA s.v. *dhánu-*, despite his hesitations. In particular the stem is found in I.33.4 in the “schism” passage that we will discuss below at our vs. 18, where it most likely refers to a similar location. I construe *dhánum* with *carataḥ* “the two roam the steppe” (thereby interpr. the latter as a full lexical verb, not an aux. with the part. *punántā*). The “lofty steppe” may refer to the high elevations where the soma plant grows. Although my interpr. leaves the participle without an overt object, it is child’s play to supply “soma.”

X.27.18: By my reading, in this vs. the groups that had come together so harmoniously in order to establish a common sacrifice clash disastrously over the way the sacrifice should be performed. Note the polarized verbs *sám jagmíran té* “they came together” (15b) and *ví āyan* “they went apart” (18a). This vs., esp. the first hemistich, is strongly reminiscent of the “schism” passage I.33.4–10, which depicts a split, quite possibly in the Ārya community, dividing into sacrificers and non-sacrificers, with the sides going off in different directions and Indra intervening on the side of the sacrificially orthopractic. In our vs. they “went apart in opposite directions” (*ví ... víṣvañca āyan*); in I.33.4 in almost the same words *viṣuṇák te vy āyan*. Moreover, in I.33.4 they depart *dhánor ádhi* “from the (high) steppe,” the place where our people were roaming in 17c. In addition, our people depart “shrieking” (*krośanāsaḥ*), while in I.33.7 the two groups are polarized as (acc.) *etān rudató jákṣataś ca* “those wailing and those laughing”; though the two roots for the negative sound effect, $\sqrt{kruś}$ and \sqrt{rud} , are different, they seem to amount to the same thing. In I.33 the divisive issue seems more serious than here: it pits the *āyajvan-* ‘non-sacrificer’ (4d, 5b) against the *yājvan-* ‘sacrificer’ (5b), who is also a presser and a praiser (7d). Here the doctrinal issue is cooking versus non-cooking (shades of Lévi-Strauss!) – in ritual terms, perhaps the cooking of a sacrificed animal (as in 17a *meśám apacanta*) and therefore the question of whether to perform animal sacrifice itself (so Ge, intro.), or perhaps simply the issue of offering any type of oblation into the ritual fire, which “cooks” it. The latter is perhaps supported by the second hemistich, where Savitar pronounces the sole victor to be the fire, which consumes wood and ghee (*drvānnah ... sarpíranah*), the latter of course as an oblation.

The doctrinal dispute is expressed by two subjunctives to the same root but different stems, them. pres. versus *s*-aor.: *pácāti ... nahí pákṣat*. Narten (Sig.Aor. 167) ingeniously attributes this difference to aspect: those who will cook (*pácāti*) will occupy themselves with it

over time (imperfective), while those who will not cook (*nahí pákṣat*) won't even begin to do so and therefore reject the activity envisioned as a whole (perfective). As an account of this passage alone, the analysis would be convincing, but since, in general, modal forms to tense/aspect stems fail to display whatever aspectual value such stems have (as I have discussed in a number of publications), I am dubious. And it can be noted that a pres. subj. *pácāt(i)* would not easily fit any metrical slots in the second part of this pāda, whereas *pákṣat* allows a neat cadence. The publ. tr. should be emended to reflect the 2nd subjunctive, however: “for the other half will not cook.”

I do not understand why Savitar is the bearer of the message, but the content of the message is clear: only Agni will win, and Agni will win only if we make regular correct offerings into him. This section of the hymn (vss. 13-18) concerned with the establishment of the original ritual fire and the sacrifices associated with it thus concludes with a strong and satisfying assertion of the centrality of the sacrifice.

X.27.19–24: On the difficulties of this last section of the hymn and possible interpr. thereof, see publ. intro.

X.27.19: Ge (intro.) convincingly identifies the vision depicted here as the year, or possibly old age. The image of the wheel-less cycle favors the former. In the famous riddle hymn (I.164) the year is configured as a wheel (generally the wheel of the sun), with the various temporal divisions marked on that wheel; see, e.g., vss. 2cd, 11–13, 48. Here the wheel-less (*acakráyā*) self-powered (*svadháyā*) turning seems a further, deliberately innovative development of the year=wheel trope. The phrase *acakráyā ... svadháyā* is also found in IV.26.4 (see Ge's n. 19b), used of the flight of the falcon that stole the soma from heaven, but that passage seems to have nothing to do with this one.

The horde (*grāma-*) here may be the constituents of the year, i.e., the seasons, months, and days. W. Rau (“Earliest Literary Evidence for Permanent Vedic Settlements,” *Inside the Texts*, ed. M. Witzel, 1997, 203–6 [proceedings of 1989 conf.]) argued that *grāma-* means in the first instance “a train of herdsmen roaming about with cattle” and secondly “a temporary camp of such a train,” and that the later standard sense ‘village’ is not found in Vedic. Certainly here the first meaning, a roving band, fits the context well (as also, e.g., in I.100.10, II.12.7, III.33.11), but I would dispute the strong form of his claim, or rather assert that the word (and its deriv. *grāmyá-* RV 1x) can contrast the domestic with the wild—e.g., the beasts *āraṇyān grāmyāś ca yé* in the Puruṣasūkta X.90.11; the safety and security of the settlement as opposed to the wilderness in the Araṇyānī hymn (X.146). Whether these settlements were “temporary” or not, they project all the associations of “village” in context. (Interestingly only one of the many passages Rau cites is from the RV [III.33.11 just cited].)

In c *yugā* (lit. ‘yokes’) surely refers, as often, to generations; the question is how to construe the gen. pl. *jānānām* and the likely gen. sg. *aryāḥ*. Ge and Th (1941: 109 = KISch. 34) take them as parallel and implicitly conjoined (though in slightly different senses), e.g., Ge “die Geschlechter des hohen Herrn (und) der anderen Leute.” However, I think it likely that *yugā jānānām* is a variant of the common expression *mānuṣā(ni)* [*/manuṣyā*] *yugā(ni)* “human generations [/lifespans],” and I take *aryāḥ* as dependent on that whole phrase. The “peoples of the stranger (*arī-*)” I would take here to refer to the Ārya as a whole.

The lexeme *prá √ sac* seems to occur only here in the RV (since *sákṣvā ... prá* in I.42.1 belongs to *√ sah*; see comm. ad loc.). Th takes it in hostile sense (“sucht heim” [afflicts]), but

(with Gr and Ge) I think it has a neutral and essentially additive value, with the negative sense confined to *praminānāḥ* in d.

That participle (*praminānāḥ*) by my interpr. participates in a complex set of relationships with the rest of the hemistich. To begin with, although the *yugā* phrase of c is properly construed with *sīśakti ... prā*, it should not be forgotten that a similar phrase serves as obj. to *prā √ mī* in what seems to be a fixed formula, used of Dawn: I.92.11 [=I.124.2] *praminatī manuṣyā yugāni* “diminishing the generations of men.” If that is a formula (or something close to it), it would come to the audience’s mind here, even if the actual syntax separates the verb and its usual object.

But there is plenty more for *praminānāḥ* to do in its own pāda, where I think it is used in two different senses in two different constructions, one with *sīśnā*, one with *nāvīyān*. (Note that the participle is strategically located between them, adjacent to each.) This view seems to be essentially Ge’s: though he makes no comment on the construction, he tr. pāda d with two different participial phrases (“die männlichen Glieder alsbald schwächend, (selbst) sich verjüngend”). Let us now note that our *praminānāḥ* is one of the few middle forms to this root; that voice is confined to a few forms of the participle, including one in the vs. (10) immediately prior to just-cited I.92.11 in a similar context concerning the effect of time on human lifetimes. One of the senses of the middle part. is to ‘exchange’ or ‘transform’ forms; see esp. V.42.13 *rūpā minānāḥ* of Tvaṣṭar’s transformations in the belly of his daughter and Th op.cit. 108–9=33–34. Th interpr. our form here in that way: “... sich verwandelnd in einen neuen.” I think this is fundamentally correct, though I do not follow Th’s view that the referent is the sun—rather it is the year that constantly renews itself. I also think that it is correct only for part of the passage: there is a third use of *praminānāḥ* packed into this tiny verbal space. By Th’s interpr. *sīśnā* is an instr. sg.: “mit Hilfe des Schwanzes,” a curious expression he makes no effort to explain. For others, however, it is the neut. acc. pl. (see Ge’s tr. above), and so I take it, as the obj. of *praminānāḥ* in its other usage. Here *√ mī* ‘diminish’, rather than *√ mī* ‘exchange’, is again at issue. The question is what sense of *sīśnā-* is found here: ‘tail’ (as in I.105.8, where mice chew on their own tails) or (slang for) ‘penis’, as Ge takes it, found also presumably in *sīśnā-deva-* ‘having the phallus as divinity, phallus-worshiper’ (2x). Ge (n. 19d) thinks the sense is “die Zeugungskraft vermindernd,” and this is certainly possible. But I wonder if real, though metaphorical, tails are involved: diminishing—docking—their tails is an image of shortening their lives. The history of the English word ‘curtail’ is instructive here since ‘tail’ figures twice in its formation: first as a loan word from French for an animal with a docked tail (curtal), then folk-etymologically adjusted to align it with ‘tail’. And from the physical docking of tails the word expanded to cover all sorts of shortenings and restrictions.

I take *sadyāḥ* usually ‘in a single day, immediately’ to mean ‘at the same time’, referring to the two different actions expressed by *praminānāḥ*. Although I do not know of other occurrences of this word in this sense, it seems a reasonable semantic extension.

X.27.20: This vs. is essentially impenetrable, though the grammar is straightforward. It seems to continue the gloomy reflections in the previous vs., but beyond that it is difficult to say. (Though as will be clear from what follows, I say a great deal about it.)

Interpreted in the context of vs. 19, the two yoked oxen (*etaú ... gāvau ... yuktauú*) ready to drive off could be a reference to a different temporal phenomenon inflicting its unavoidable harm on the vulnerable human. In great part the interpr. depends on the interpr. of *pramarā-*, the being to whom the oxen belong. The word occurs only here; Gr, Ge, Debrunner (AiG II.2.65, 88,

though in latter loc. with ?), and Kü (365: “Fortsterben”) take it to mean ‘death’, but I am skeptical. *prá√mṛ* is not found in the RV; indeed the root ‘die’ does not occur with any preverb there. There are some nominal forms later, but the closest in time, *pramārá-* in AVŚ XI.8.33, is in such an obscure context that ‘death’ is not only not assured, but doesn’t make sense there. I suggest instead a connection with *√mṛ* ‘crush’, which is characteristically construed with *prá*; for the conspectus of passages see Scar (390–91). Assigning it to a *seṭ* root might account for the *guṇa* rather than *vrddhi* in the root syllable if to an old **o*-grade, inter alia. Although interpr. the form as “the Pulverizer” or “the Crusher” doesn’t get us any closer to a referent, some constraints on the meaning of the passage are removed if the referent is *not* Death. It could be another way of referring to the year, which was the subject of the previous vs., or an anticipation of “old age” in the next one (21d). The two oxen belonging to it could be day and night, the regular recurrent time periods that draw us through the year and that the poet wishes to delay for a moment. I favor this general interpr., though see below for more detail.

On *prá sedhīh* see Narten (Sig. Aor. 267).

With most I assign *mamandhi* to *√man*² ‘stay, wait’, distinct from *√man*¹ ‘think’, pace Kü’s efforts to revive the notion that it’s a specialized form of the latter (364–66; abandoned in LIV²) and his tr. “bedenke.” See also Old’s comments on this vs.

The second hemistich is considerably harder than the first. For Ge (intro.) the point is that the waters and the sun also stay by the poet in his race with old age. But it is hard for me to see that in the actual wording, and there is no evidence that I can see for a race (Wettlauf). Ge (n. 20b) bases himself on passages in the JB (III.183) and PB (XIV.3.13) where a wager is made between Viśvāmitra and some others about driving a pair of oxen pulling a laden cart up a steep bank (not a race either, as far as I can see), and he suggests that Old Age and Death are here running a race with the living human. Acdg. to him (n. 20c), in pāda c Death and the waters have the same goal, but the waters win. I see no connection between the JB/PB passage and this one, save for the presence of two oxen (though *anaḍvāhau* in JB; no word for oxen in PB)—hardly a major piece of evidence, since draught-oxen come in pairs. Old Age and Death do not make an appearance in the Brāhmaṇa passages, and we have no wager, no laden cart, and no steep bank here. Much less any race.

Although I don’t have a solution to the meaning of the hemistich, I can point to certain structural considerations that weigh against the usual construction of the two pādas and may open the way to a more satisfactory interpr. To begin with, most tr. (Ge, Klein [DGRV I.227–28], Kü [365]) take the two pādas as two separate clauses; e.g., Ge “Auch die Gewässer erreichen sein Ziel, auch hinter der Sonne ist die Vernichtung zurückgeblieben.” But the two supposed clauses would be conjoined by *ca*, which is usually a subclausal conjunction (Klein [327] describes it here as showing a “looser degree of nexus”), and the verb in the 2nd clause would be a predicated pf. part. *babhūvān* parallel to a finite form in c. Neither of these is impossible, but the combination of the two factors suggests we might take a second look at structure. In fact, the *ca* can be read in its usual subclausal value if it is conjoining an NP in pāda d with one in c – most likely a nom. connected with *āpaḥ*. We have two choices for this nom. phrase: either *sūras ca markāḥ* “and the harmer of the sun” (with gen. *sūraḥ* to *svār-*) or just *sūras ca* “and the sun” (with nom. *sūraḥ* to *sūra-*). I opt for the latter (note that the same poet uses nom. sg. *sūraḥ* in X.29.5), with *markā ūparaḥ* then a pred. nom. with *babhūvān*. By this interpr. this pf. part. is not the predicate of a clause, but an adjunct descriptor of one of the conjoined subjects (*sūraḥ*) of the main clause, whose verb is *vī naśanti*.

This reinterpr. of the syntax provides a more satisfying structure than the standard interpr., but it doesn't get us considerably further towards sense. We must now turn to the referent of *asya* in c, the meaning of the VP *ví√naśanty ártham*, and the sense of the hapax *marká-*, of the multivalent *úpara-*, and of the two together. The first question is perhaps the easiest: for unaccented *asya* we need a referent already in the discourse, and the most likely is *pramaráśya* in pāda a. This is in fact the apparent view of all the interpr. However, I suggest that the 1st ps. speaker might be an additional referent.

Now the VP. The lexeme *ví√naś* takes a variety of object types with slightly different meanings of the verb: 'penetrate', 'reach through to', 'reach', 'achieve'. Here of course "reach his goal" works perfectly fine. But before trying to decide what his (= *pramara*'s) goal is, let us consider another very common idiom involving *ví√naś*, which regularly takes *āyus-* 'lifetime' as its object – including an instance in this very hymn, X.27.7 *vy ù āyur ānaṭ* "you have traversed your lifetime." Normally this is a positive idiom: someone who has done this has achieved a full lifespan and escaped having his life cut short. But considered in the context of old age there is a definite downside: if you have achieved your full lifespan, then it's over; you're dead (or about to be). I suggest that this idiom is implicated in the phrase *ví√naśanty ártham*. A full lifespan is a goal, one of many. The speaker of ab may have achieved this goal; this is why the Pulverizer's oxen are yoked and ready to convey him. He begs for just a moment of delay.

Now what would be the Pulverizer's goal? If he is the Year, then presumably the year's end – and its beginning – the moment when cyclic time resets. If he is Old Age, then presumably just the end, i.e., the end of life.

The next question (and a harder one): why is it that the waters and the sun reach this goal? I find the waters difficult to fit into this context, the sun less so. Like the other signals of recurrent time that I see in this passage—the year, day and night—the sun marks the passage of the days. In X.37.2, adduced by Ge (though not for quite the same reason), the daily unstoppable activity of the sun is described: *viśvāhód eti sūryaḥ* "always the sun rises." In fact, our own poet Vasukra describes the sun as sending everyone to their *ártha-* (X.29.5). And in its own journey between the solstices it too reaches the turn of the year. The waters, though – they are not usually temporal markers. It may simply be because they, like the sun, are in constant motion; the full pāda from X.37.2 just quoted reads *viśvāhāpo viśvāhód eti sūryaḥ* "Always the waters (are in motion); always the sun rises," with the same association of waters and sun as here, as Ge (n. 20cd) points out. But perhaps this is a reference to a regular yearly cycle of water: the monsoon rains or the spring snow melt from the high mountains. The *cid* 'even' may indicate that the waters are a somewhat surprising addition to the statement, which fits the sun better.

Before leaving pāda c, we should consider the form of the verb *naśanti*. Though it used to be classified as a 1st class. them. pres., *náśa-* is now universally analyzed as a root aor. subjunctive, and I think our act. 3rd pl. should also be taken as a subj., even though the standard view of the grammars (Wh, VGS) is that the 3rd pl. act. subj. ending is only secondary *-an*.

The last issue we need to take up is the phrase *marká úparaḥ*. *marká-* is a hapax, found nowhere in Skt. but here, but the differently accented *márka-* is reasonably well represented after the RV, as a purohita of the Asuras (see, e.g., Macd&Keith, Ved. Index s.v. 2. Marka). For him and his co-purohita Śaṇḍa offerings are drawn at the First Pressing of the soma sacrifice, and then the two are immediately driven away; see, e.g., TS VI.4.10, ŚB IV.2.1, and mantras in VS VII.16–17 (with extensive parallels in other texts; cf. Vedic Concordance). Although I am certain that our *marká-* does not represent the mythico-ritual figure of later Vedic, as Old remarks, "*marká* trennt man ungern von *márka*, der später als Purohita des Asuras begegnet." And both

must be derived from the root \sqrt{mrc} ‘harm’. (For the corresponding Old Avestan *marəka-* and YA *mahrəka* see EWA s.v. *MARC*.) As Ge points out (n. 20d), the sun is sometimes associated with the root \sqrt{mrc} (see AB IV.10, AVŚ XIII.1.40 [Rohita hymn]), though I would not say the association is strong.

The adj. *úpara-* has several values: temporal (‘later’ versus *pū́rva-* ‘earlier’), locational, both horizontal (‘behind’ versus *puráh* [*sánt-*] / *pū́rva-* ‘in front’) and vertical (‘lower, hence nearer=earthly’ versus *pára-* ‘further’). Here the temporal value seems excluded since ‘later/future’ is incompatible with *babhūvān* ‘having become’. The horizontal dimension doesn’t make sense either, but, given the sun’s heavenly locus, the vertical dimension does. Some light is shed on this by a snatch of V.44.2 describing Agni’s flames as *úparasya yāḥ svāḥ* “which are the suns of the lower (realm).” I suggest that here too we have the common identification of (heavenly) sun with (earthly) fire, and here the fire as destructive force. Though it is also possible that the sun itself is seen as destructive to humans in its role as marker of time.

After nearly 2000 words of discussion of this vs., containing barely 20 words, I feel I have a somewhat better handle on its meaning and its place in the hymn, but hardly a solution. I would emend the translation of cd to “Even the waters will reach this one’s goal – and the sun, having become the Harmer below.”

X.27.21: This vs. is not appreciably more intelligible than the last, but it does seem to mark some kind of turning point, with the introduction of “fame” (*śrávaḥ*) at the beginning of the 2nd hemistich beginning to dispel the gloom.

In order to identify the referent of the *vájra-* in pāda a it is important to determine what happened to it—that is, what action *vívṛtta-* depicts. Ge thinks it means ‘divided, split into pieces’, tr. the phrase as “der vielmals zersplittet wird,” and compares a RVic passage with a different verb and plural *vájra-* and a Brāhmaṇa story about Indra’s *vájra* splitting into three pieces. But the lexeme *ví√vṛt*, which is quite common in the RV, never means ‘split, divide’. It either means ‘turn aside’ (e.g., V.53.7) or simply ‘roll along, roll through’ (e.g., VI.9.1), often of wheels or entities so configured (e.g., I.185.1). When transitive, it means ‘unroll’ in opposition to *sām√vṛt* ‘roll up’ (e.g., V.48.2). It is surely a mistake to ascribe a unique meaning to a lexeme in a passage where one of the only clues we might have is the use of that lexeme elsewhere. Whatever the *vájra-* refers to, it has been rolled out or turned aside, not split. The adv. *purudhā* does not have to mean ‘in many pieces’ or the like, but ‘in many ways, in many places’.

The opening of the vs. with its annunciatory *ayám só vājraḥ* “Here/this is the mace that ...” is striking and should give us some clue about the referent. Either the *ayám* is pointing to something in the immediate vicinity, in place and time, of the poet, or it is making a particularly strong connection between the *vájra-* and something else in the discourse. I think the former, the hic-et-nunc usage we often find in a ritual situation, is unlikely, because there is no other indication of immediacy in the context. I therefore think it refers to something in the preceding vs. – quite possibly the Pulverizer in 20a. Indeed *vájra-* is the subject of a form of *pra√mṛ* in III.30.6 *prá te vājraḥ pramṛṇānn etu śátrūn* “let your mace come forth, pulverizing the rivals,” which seems to me as close to clinching evidence as we’re likely to get in this maddening passage.

Thus the mace, the Pulverizer, has been deployed (rolled out, *vívṛtta-*) in many ways or places; where this deployment has taken place is indicated in the next pāda, which seems to me a variant on and expansion of 20d “the sun, which has become the Harmer below.” Here the action unfolds “below [the X] of the lofty sun,” in which the sun maintains its usual heavenly position,

but the theatre of action is underneath it, again the realm of human activity. To get any further in interpr., we must identify the “X.” The fairly rare word *pūriṣa-* (7x, plus *pūriṣín-* 5x and *pūriṣyā-* 1x) is found twice in this hymn, close together: the 2nd occurrence is *pūriṣam* two vss. later (X.27.23d), also pāda final. And it is worth noting that the intervening vs. contains a phonologically similar form in the same location, *pūruṣādaḥ* (22b), seemingly to tie the three vss. together. On the general semantics of *pūriṣa-* see comm. ad I.163.1. Unfortunately the presence of two forms of the word in proximity here doesn’t help in the interpr. of either. The acc. in 23d must be either the object or the goal of a form of *√ vah* ‘convey’, probably a goal, since *pūriṣa-* appears sometimes to be a place. See, e.g., the other two passages with abl. *pūriṣāt*, where it is conjoined with *samudrāt* (I.163.1, IV.21.3). The usage of the occurrence in vs. 23 does not appear to be closely connected with the one here, as discouraging (and counterintuitive) as that may be. Here the association is with the sun in heaven. Now in the riddle hymn in I.164.12 the possessive deriv. *pūriṣín-* is used of a heavenly body (vel sim.) “in the further half of heaven” (*divāḥ ... páre árdhe*), which is *pūriṣín-* ‘possessing overflowing fullness’. Most interpr. take this as a ref. to the sun (or to the year)(see, e.g., Ge ad loc.), though the publ. tr. (JPB) identifies it as the moon. If it is the sun, our phrase would be the syntagm underlying *pūriṣín-*, with gen. *sūryasya* dependent on the noun *pūriṣa-*: “the overflowing fullness of the sun.” I suggest that this “overflowing fullness” is a reference to its rays, the overwhelming torrent of heat and light coming from the sun, which in some situations, like this one, can be dangerous and harmful.

Meanwhile the pulverizing *vájra-* is inflicting its destruction.

As for the second hemistich, we should first note two things: 1) pāda c *śráva íd enā paró anyád asti* is very similar to nearby (though attributed to a different poet) X.31.8 *naítāvad enā paró anyád asti* “There does not exist another of such kind beyond that”; 2) *ávaḥ* ‘below’ (as in pāda b) and *parāḥ* ‘beyond, above’ are paired elsewhere: I.164.17, VI.9.3, X.17.13, 67.4; cf. also *avástāt ... parástāt* X.88.14, 129.5 and pairings of *ávava-* ‘lower’ and *páraḥ* I.164.17–18, 43, VI.9.2. Our passage seems to be contrasting the mayhem and devastation happening below the sun (b) and something else that is found beyond or above it (c). And that something else is fame (*śrávaḥ*). I now think that we have here a little whiff of the inherited Indo-European trope of inevitable death and “imperishable fame.” In the sublunary (or in Vedic terms sub-solar) world, the Pulverizer – Time as a *vájra* – keeps pulverizing, but beyond it we can look forward to *śrávaḥ*. I would now significantly emend my tr. of c to “But there exists something else beyond this – just fame.”

The last pāda develops this thought, but it presents difficulties of its own. The principal curiosity is that it contains the only *plural* of the abstract noun *jarimán-* ‘old age’, namely nom. pl. *jarimāṇaḥ*. It is difficult to imagine what a plural of such an abstract would imply, and both Ge and the publ. tr. don’t try: we render it as a singular, “das Alter,” “old age.” But I now think it should be taken seriously, and not by transforming it into a covert possessive adj., “aged (ones),” however tempting. But I am stumped – does it refer to the old age(s) belonging to generation after generation / cohort after cohort of humans? I think this the most likely of several not very good possibilities. From time immemorial the old age characterizing the current population has crossed to the other world, where fame awaits, but there is always more old age in this world because there are always more people growing old. I am not entirely convinced by this interpr., but I don’t now see a better one. And I do not see how to render it into English effectively, so I reluctantly stick to the singular of the publ. tr. One curiosity: if pādas c and d are closely connected, as seems likely and if imperishable fame is at issue, there is a significant departure

from the standard IE ideology, which generally connects *early* death and eternal fame, not old age.

With Gr I interpr. *avyathī* as an instr. sg., here used as an adverb – in the publ. tr. “unwaveringly.” In keeping with my new interpr. of the pl. *jarimāṇaḥ* I wonder if it is meant *not* to express a resolute unhesitating progress (as implied in the publ. tr.), but rather to indicate that there is no gap between the various old ages as they cross.

X.27.22: As indicated in the publ. intro., I think that this vs. concerns the fire, esp. the ritual fire. As I say there, the unpredictability of fire’s appearance from the places where it lies latent seems to negate the inexorable progress of time as depicted in vss. 20–21, and though fire can be frightening and destructive, it also makes possible the sacrifice, which is the bridge between the human and the divine and between this sub-solar realm and the desirable one beyond. In this way it makes the sacrifice the implicit solution to the despair induced by the destruction wrecked by time. This is, of course, only one possible interpr. of the vs., and not all of the vs. fits it well. Ge (intro.) has an entirely different take: that the singer needs Indra’s protection, because the arrows of death are threatening everywhere. I find this hard to detect. In his n. 22 he suggests the following associations: the tree is the bow, the cow the bowstring, and the birds the arrows. This is not impossible, I suppose, but I’d expect at least some clue that archery was the suppressed theme and that there are two levels of extreme metaphors. For me, “held in check in every tree” (*vrkṣé-vrkṣe nīyātā*) refers to fire’s immanence in all wood; “the cow will bellow” (*mīmayad gaúḥ*) to the roar of a kindled fire, and the “man-eating birds” (*váyah ... pūruṣādaḥ*) to the flames, which are capable of destruction. On the role of the cmpd *pūruṣādaḥ* in knitting together vss. 21–23 phonologically, see comm. ad vs. 21.

The second hemistich expresses the common contrast between the fear that destructive fire (forest fire and the like) inspires and the ritual activity that takes focuses on it, esp. the soma sacrifice to Indra. I would be inclined to replace my “though” with “while.”

X.27.23: Old limits his comment on this vs. to noting its “absolute Dunkelheit,” a disheartening description for anyone who takes it up. However, on the whole it seems somewhat more penetrable than the vss. that precede it. Ge (intro.) suggests that it picks up from vs. 15, which I think is essentially correct. Since in my view vs. 15 concerns the primal institution of the sacrifice, I take that to be the topic here as well, with, as in vs. 15, cooperation between groups depicted as essential to establishing this institution. Ge by contrast takes it as depicting the creation of the world. He gives extensive notes on this vs., but I do not find them persuasive and will not for the most part engage with them.

By my interpr. *māna-* and *kṛntātra-* are two successive stages of the laying out of the ritual ground. First the ground must be measured ($\sqrt{mā}$: *māne*), and then the boundaries of the ground must be defined. I consider this to be expressed by *kṛntātra-*. Now this fairly rare stem, presumably derived from $\sqrt{kṛt}$ ‘cut’, is found once elsewhere in the RV, describing a landscape feature, in the Vṛṣākapi hymn, X.86.20, where it is conjoined with *dhānva* ‘wasteland’ and I tr. ‘chasm’ (perhaps better ‘cleft’). But the word has an abstract sense in AB V.16 *yad ratham̐taram̐ syāt kṛntatram̐ syāt* “if it were to be the Ratham̐tara, there would be cleavage (of the Stomas)” (tr. Keith), with regard to the choice of sāmāns in a particular ritual sequence. I see such an abstract sense here: the “cleaving” involves the tracing of the boundaries. Recall that in classical śrauta ritual this is done with a *sphya*, a wooden sword (see, e.g., Re, Vocab. du rit. véd., s.v.), presumably making a shallow trench. Why the subjects “come up” (*úd āyan*) from this activity is

unclear to me, unless it is a sort of pun: since the *kṛntātra*- can also be a cleft or chasm in the earth, the shallow trench can be conceived of as a deep space from which its makers must climb out.

Pāda c presents a paradox: three entities ‘along the water / adjacent to water’ (vel sim.; *anūpā*) heat the earth (*trāyas tapanti pṛthivīm anūpāḥ*), with the heating and the water apparently incompatible. Ge renders *anūpāḥ* as “Büffel,” commenting (n. 23c) that the certain attested meanings of *anūpā*- are “am Wasser wohnend, Marschland, Küstenland; Büffel.” But he gives no reff. for the last (or indeed for the others), and I can find no Vedic exx. for Büffel. Instead the only other ex. in the RV, *anūpé* at IX.107.9, must be a place, not an animal (I tr. “at water’s edge”), and the deriv. *anūpyā*- in the AV (I.6.4 ≅ XIX.2.2) is found in a list of waters from different sources, including “waters from marshy places.” See also ŚBK III.1.1.7 ... *yó vā asyāḥ pṛthivyā āpy anūpè ‘nyātrānyatra khānen naivāpò ‘bhivindét* “... who, even though he would dig in place after place in marshy (land) of this earth, should not find water.” (Cf. EWA s.v., esp. with ref. to the Pkt. *anūva*- ‘marshy place’.) On this basis I think we can assume that the three *anūpāḥ* in our passages are locales, not animals, and that they are places that can be configured as marshy or damp in some way. Leaving this last qualification aside for the moment, the best candidates within the context of my interpr. are the three fires or fire places on the ritual ground, which certainly “heat the earth.” But why “marshy” or “damp” or “adjacent to water”? This is harder: all I can suggest is that they are so called because liquid oblations are poured into them or perhaps (though I think less likely) that the hearths are adjacent to where these oblations are kept before they are poured.

The final pāda contains not only the difficult *pūrīṣa*- (see comm. ad vs. 21) but also a hapax with non-IA phonology, *bṛbūka*-. Several clues—and several questions—emerge from the pāda: the subject / verb structure is clear: *dvā vahataḥ* “two convey,” though the identity of the “two” is not. The rest of the pāda consists of two apparently acc. sg. masc or neuts: *bṛbūkam* and *pūrīṣam*. Are the two to be construed together, in which case *bṛbūkam* is an adj. (so Gr’s tentative ‘dicht, dick’)? are they parallel but separate objects of *vahataḥ* (so Ge: “zwei führen das Wasser(?), den Wasserquell her”)? or is one the object and one the goal of *vahataḥ*. I tentatively opt for the last.

As for *bṛbūka*-, although it is a hapax, it patterns phonologically with a few other words: 1) a PN in a dānastuti (VI.45.31, 33), the sacrificial patron named *bṛbū*-, presumably from a non-Ārya family but assimilated into Ārya society; 2) *bṛbād-uktha*-, a bahuvr. modifying Indra in VIII.32.10, q.v. I adopt in my tr. there a suggestion of Weber’s that it means ‘of stammering speech’, which might be a little joke at Indra’s expense (strong but tongue-tied). I suggest that Indra is also the referent here, and that he is being conveyed to the sacrifice—the default expectation, since this is an Indra hymn and Indra hymns hope for and anticipate the epiphany of Indra at the sacrifice (see next vs.). The “two” that convey him would then be his usual pair of fallow bays, who are regularly the subj. of dual forms of √ *vah* (see, e.g., nearby X.23.3, as well as I.84.2, 165.4, X.96.6).

The other acc., *pūrīṣam*, is then the goal to which Indra is being conveyed. For the basic semantics of this word see comm. ad I.163.1, where I tr. ‘fertile ground’ to reflect the range of “fruitful, loose rich earth, bottom land, as well as overflowing fullness.” I take it here to refer to the sacrifice and would now alter the translation to “to the fertile ground (of the sacrifice).” It thus continues the metaphorical semantics of *anūpāḥ* ‘marshy places’ as a designation of the ritual fires. Both *anūpāḥ* and *pūrīṣam* express the luxuriant richness and overflowing fertility of well-watered places—esp. piquant since the ritual ground is dominated by fires.

X.27.24: As the hymn limps to the end, there comes no blinding moment of clarity – even though, as pointed out in the publ. intro., this final vs. appears to be propounding an instructive truth. The first half of the vs. addresses someone in the 2nd sg., and so the first question to arise is – who? Ge clearly thinks it is Indra, the nominal dedicand of the hymn, and I am inclined to agree, though I think it is possible (no more than that) that it is the singer or another mortal. If Ge is correct (intro.), the poet is urging Indra to come out of hiding, as the sun does. This would follow appropriately on the last pāda of vs. 23, where, by my interpr., Indra is being conveyed to the sacrifice, and would express the usual hope for an epiphany of that god on the ritual ground.

My current interpr. of the vs. differs in certain respects from the publ. tr., beginning with the first phrase: *sā te jīvātuh*, which I would now render “This is living for you.” By this I think the singer means not only that Indra’s epiphany on the ritual ground is the way he conducts his life (/ is his job), but also that in some sense it provides him with life and refutes the doubts about Indra’s existence that are expressed from time to time in the RV and the wavering devotion to him complained about in vss. 1–4 of this hymn.

The gender of *jīvātu-* is somewhat at issue. Here it seems to agree with fem. *sā*, but in X.60.7 we find *ayám jīvātuh* “here/this is life,” as if masc. However, AiG II.2.668 points out that the same vs. contains the phrase *ayám mātā* “here/this is the mother,” so in that context *ayám* is not diagnostic of a masculine. Gr and Old also explicitly identify *jīvātu-* as fem.

This means that the following *tāsyā* cannot be coreferential with *jīvātuh*. With Old I take it as referring to the content of the knowledge Indra is supposed to have, which is stated in what follows. I take the actual content of the knowledge to be the model given in cd, that of the (rising?) sun freeing itself from concealment, while pāda b is the advice itself: don’t keep yourself hidden. This pāda is very similar to VII.100.6 *mā várpo asmád āpa gūha etád, yád anyárūpaḥ samithé babhūtha* “Do not hide away this shape from us, when you have appeared in another form in the clash,” though the addressee is Viṣṇu, not Indra and the word for ‘clash’ is different (*samithé* rather than our *samaranyé*, which recalls *samāraṇa-* twice in vs. 3). In our case I don’t think that “another form” (*anyárūpa-*) is at issue, just that Indra should not conceal himself at all—though of course Indra’s notorious shape-shifting might also be referred to.

As for the model in cd, we should first address the phonologically problematic word *busa-*, a Vedic hapax, which, like *bṛbūka-* in vs. 23, shows non-IA phonology. The word is possibly related to a later, identical word for ‘chaff’, also found in MIA and NIA, as well as some NIA words for fog and drizzle (see EWA s.v.). In our context ‘mist, fog’ makes good sense, since the sun is often concealed by such while it is rising, but often breaks through it with beams of light.

In d *pādú-* is another word isolated in Vedic. Contra Old, I very much doubt it means ‘shoe’ (despite later *pādukā-* ‘shoe’). Bad enough for the sun to have a foot—a shoe seems an image too far! As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the idea is that, as the sun rises out of the mist, a sunbeam shoots down towards the earth, as if shaking itself free of a garment of mist or fog. On this as a possibly optimistic final note, see publ. intro.

X.28 Indra

In addition to Ge, there are tr. by Doniger (146–48) and Schnaus (Dialoglieder, 203–32). Both Old and Ge provide lengthy introductions and assessments of the general sense and tone of the hymn. None of these treatments convinces me (esp. the true and false Indras of Old and Ge), and I will not engage with them in detail.

This hymn is half the length of the preceding one, and serves as a sort of complementary companion piece, with Indra ostensibly offering simple instruction appropriate to the intellectual level of the artless and naïve, rather than framing it in the deep obscurity of most RVic revelations, incl. those in X.27. However, of course, this “simple instruction” is not so simple after all, though it is couched in the form of abbreviated animal fables, like those used in the Pañcatantra and such texts for the instruction of the callow young. The hymn is also tightly structured as an omphalos hymn. I have discussed the hymn in detail in a number of publications, in addition to the publ. intro. See, for a brief characterization, the Brereton–Jamison Rigveda Guide (2020), esp. pp. 152–53. For the structure, see my 2004 “Poetry and Purpose in the R̥gveda: Structuring Enigmas,” in *The Vedas: Texts, Language, and Ritual* (ed. A. Griffith and J. Houben), 237–49, and pp. 80–83 in my 2007 *The Rig Veda between Two Worlds*; for the animal fables, my 2009 “The Function of Animals in the Rig Veda, RV X.28, and the Origins of Story Literature in India,” in *Penser, dire et représenter l’animal dans le monde indien* (ed. Nalini Balbir and Georges-Jean Pinault), 197–218. I will not reproduce all of these discussions in what follows.

Like the early vss. of X.27, the hymn is a dialogue, mostly between Indra and the poet-sacrificer, but introduced by the Sacrificer’s Wife, a controversial role in the late RV, as I have discussed at length elsewhere. As disc. below, esp. ad vs. 1, I think the brief presence of the Sacrificer’s Wife here places this hymn in the group that obliquely addresses the introduction of this ritual role in the late RV. As in other such hymn Indra seems to favor this innovation. I do not entirely understand why this complex hymn is introduced by this fleetingly present female, but as I suggested above it may be to call attention to the new ritual model that involves a Sacrificer’s Wife and perhaps to set the stage for the animal stories, simple instruction adapted perhaps for the limited intellect of the woman.

X.28.1: This vs. is clearly spoken by a woman, because the kinship term *śvāśura-* ‘father-in-law’ in the phrase *māma ... śvāśuraḥ* only refers to the father-in-law of the wife, given the patrilocal bias of in-law terminology. There is no symmetrical usage for in-laws of the husband. See Macd/Keith Vedic Index s.v. *śvāśura*, where they assert that “not till the Sūtra period does it include the ‘father-in-law’ of the husband.” (Schnaus, 207–8, suggests that the singer, as son-in-law of Indra, speaks this vs. and that a daughter-in-law does not appear in the hymn, but she fails to understand the asymmetry of the kinship terminology.) The speaker should be the wife of the sacrificer/singer, the male who assumes the role of dialogue partner with Indra in the rest of the hymn. And her father-in-law is presumably Indra: after she marks the surprising absence of her father-in-law, Indra appears, and this is unlikely to be a coincidence. But we should keep in mind that the identification Indra=*śvāśura-* is only implied, not stated. (See also the disc. below ad pāda c of the roasted grains [*dhānāḥ*].) The female speaker vanishes after the first vs. and is not referred to again. The vs. is also, in my view, typed as women’s speech by the concentration of perfect optatives: *jakṣ(ī)yāt ... papīyāt ... jagāyāt*. On the pf. opt. as such a marker, see my 2003 “Women’s Language in the Rig Veda?” (Ged Elizarenkova), pp. 160–64, esp. 161.

The phrase *viśvaḥ ... anyó arīḥ* is variously interpr., the different readings being driven in great part by likewise variable interpr. of the controversial word *arī-*. For a summary of the various suggestions for this phrase see Schnaus, Dialoglieder, 204. The most natural interpr. of the three words is as a single unit, “every other *arī-*,” and this is completely compatible with both the context and the view of the meaning of *arī-* that I follow (see comm. ad IX.79.3), namely that of a stranger who is nonetheless a member of the larger Ārya society. In context, if all *other arīś*

have come, we must conclude that her father-in-law is also an *arí-*. Further, if her father-in-law is Indra (see immed. above), then Indra also must be part of the *Ārya* community – and in one sense who embodies the *Ārya* better than Indra?! Why then is he a ‘stranger’? Given Indra’s busy and peripatetic life as the most active god of the Vedic pantheon, I think we can assume that the standard model of the patrilocal joint family, with the father-in-law living with and presiding over his sons and their wives and families (as exemplified, e.g., in the *Purūravas* and *Urvaśī* hymn, X.95.4), did not hold in this case, and Indra was at best an occasional (and not always reliable) visitor.

This first clause contains a *hí*, which is quite unlikely to have its usual causal value: **“Because every other stranger has come, my father-in-law has not come.”* One doubts that Indra is avoiding the sacrifice because he doesn’t like the guest list. Hettrich (*Hypotaxe*, 177) ascribes an “adversative” value to *hí* here, which is plausible, though I am not entirely certain how it would develop from the usual sense of *hí*. Perhaps because of the otherwise universal attendance of *arís* depicted in pāda a, the absence of the father-in-law is all the more noteworthy.

In b the poss. 1st ps. prn. *māma* is triply emphasized: by being a first-position tonic pronoun followed by two emphatic particles *íd áha*. It is not clear to me why “*just my* father-in-law” has this emphasis: if this soma sacrifice follows the standard later *śrauta* model, implicit also in the RV, of having a single sacrificer (and so a single Sacrificer’s Wife), the absence of other fathers-in-law would need no remark, since no other daughters-in-law should be participating in the sacrifice. It is all the more striking because our 1st-ps. female speaker disappears from the hymn after this 1st vs.

The three pf. opts. in the 2nd hemistich are ordinarily interpr. as expressing past irrealis “he should have Xed.” I have argued at length against this interpr. of the pf. opt. in general; see esp. my 2009 “Where Are All the Optatives? Modal Patterns in Vedic,” in *East and West: Papers in Indo-European Studies*, ed. Kazuhiko Yoshida and Brent Vine, 27-45. I will not repeat the arguments here in detail; suffice it to say that the attested pf. opts. are almost always the only optative stems to their root system and therefore presumably simply express pure optative value, since they are not contrastive with pres. or aor. optative stems. Although in context here, past irrealis could work (“he should have eaten,” e.g.), in fact a straight opt. sense “he should eat / be eating” fits better: the sacrifice is in progress, and her father-in-law, not yet arrived, should be eating and drinking *now*.

As Old points out, *jakṣīyāt* is problematic for two reasons: the form should be **jakṣyāt* and the transmitted form produces an over-length pāda. Both problems can be solved by reading **jakṣyāt* and explaining the transmitted form as a redactional change induced by pāda-final *papīyāt*. This is no doubt the correct solution. I do wonder, however, if this form could be another, indirect piece of evidence of women’s speech, with the pseudo-distraction of the cluster -*kṣy-* to -*kṣīy-* reflecting the svarabhakti vowel sometimes found in Pāli optatives like *jāniyā-* beside *jaññā-* (see, e.g., v. Hinüber, *Überblick*, §440; Geiger/Norman, *Pali Gr.*, §129A (1), etc.). A MIA-type form would reflect women’s lower speech register, and the overlength of the pāda would call attention to it.

The roasted grains (*dhānāḥ*) that provide the food portion of the sacrificial meal may provide more indirect evidence that Indra is the father-in-law in question, because *dhānāḥ* are a fairly rare part of the ritual menu and are (almost?) always associated with Indra and, esp., his two fallow bays, which are given *dhānāḥ* to eat in III.35.7, with *dhānāḥ* offered to Indra generally in conjunction with his horses (I.16.2, III.35.3, 43.4, III.52.7). They are also associated with the Third Pressing (see, e.g., III.52.6), which is in large part the domain of the Sacrificer’s

Wife, as I have discussed at length elsewhere (SW/SW, esp. 132–46). This may be the explanation for the question I raised above: why does the Sacrificer’s Wife speak the first vs. of the hymn? She would be esp. active in the Third Pressing, when *dhānāḥ* are employed in an offering to Indra, and this establishes an association between women and *dhānāḥ*, found also in the Apālā hymn (VIII.91.2), on which see my Ravenous Hyenas 161–65. The most prodigious use of *dhānāḥ* in the Third Pressing is in the Hāriyojana graha, the cup for “yoking the bay horses,” in which the roasted grains are liberally mixed with the soma (see, e.g., Hillebrandt, Rit Lit. 133 and MŚS II.5.4.2–7). Note that our vs. ends ... *púnar ástaṃ jagāyāt* “he should go home again”: Indra’s departure for home is the action that would immediately follow the yoking of his horses. On the Hāriyojana in the RV, see I.61.16, 62.13. Thus the female speaker is talking specifically about the behavior Indra should exhibit at the Third Pressing, where she plays an important role.

The third of the three pf. opts. we have been discussing is *jagāyāt*, a puzzling form (see Kü 161-62). It is the only pf. form to the root $\sqrt{gā}$ in Vedic (save for a single, unconnected med. form in JB; Kü 162), which builds a very well-attested redupl. pres. *jīgāti* and an also well-attested root aor. *ágāt*. Moreover, as Kü also points out, the full-grade root syllable is morphologically aberrant; we should expect **jagīyāt*, which would match *papīyāt* to parallel root $\sqrt{pā}$, which ends the preceding pāda. The form is all the more surprising because it follows two pf. indic. forms to the synonymous root \sqrt{gam} in the same vs., likewise pāda final: *ājagāma* (a), *ājagāma* (b). The 3rd sg. pf. opt. to \sqrt{gam} , *jagamyāt*, is metrically identical to *jagāyāt* and would therefore fit the cadence, and that form is well established in the RV, with 4 independent occurrences, one in a repeated pāda with 8 occurrences. Moreover, another form of that opt. paradigm, the 1st sg., occurs in the phrase “go home,” like here: I.116.25 #*ástam ... jagamyām*#. Since all circumstances conspire to place **jagamyāt* at the end of our vs., the fact that it is avoided in favor of a form to a non-existent pf. stem with the “wrong” grade of the root demands an explanation. The poet must be calling special, even frenzied, attention to the form – but why? I suggest that he is forcing us to recognize the speech in vs. 1 as *woman’s speech*, and doing so by this concentration of pf. opts., the first two legitimate (more or less, though see remarks on *jakṣīyāt* above) and the last a bit of a monstrosity. He seems to be conveying that his female speaker *had* to use a pf. opt. and, lacking one, she made it up, rather incompetently, on the fly, producing something that no *man* would say. Had he used the innocuous and well-formed *jagamyāt* the sociolinguistic point would have been lost, since men in fact use this opt. all the time. Now how did our hapless female produce the form? Probably starting with the redupl. pres. *jīgā-(ti)*, which only requires vowel-substitution in the redupl. to get a perfect stem. (For another woman using the opt. to a redupl. pres. as the moral equivalent of a pf. opt., see Yamī’s *bibhīyāt* in X.10.9 and comm. there.) There are no modal forms to this pres. stem (nor would we expect an opt., at least by my rules) and also no (pre-C) zero-grade forms to the root at all (only pre-V part. *jīg-at-* 1x, 3rd pl. root aor. *ag-uḥ*), so our female speaker would have been on her own for ablaut and would have chosen just to reproduce the full-grade stem *jīgā-* → *jagā-* before the optative suffix.

I realize this is a small point, which is entirely elided in translation and which even the most punctilious philologists focus their lenses on only in order to comment on the morphological disruptions of the form. But if we evaluate the form in context—in the context not only of linguistic form but of “content,” I think it tells us a great deal about how the poet is setting up his hymn and what he wants us to take away from it.

X.28.2: Indra now makes his appearance at the sacrifice and takes the speech. His first hemistich is in high-register Rigvedic rhetorical style, in sharp contrast to the first speaker. As often in such discourse, the subject is not identified. Old (fld. by Schnaus 205–6) suggests that the pf. *tasthau* is 1st sg., which would match 1st ps. *pāmi* in c and constitute an *ātmastuti*. However, the *sá* that opens the pāda makes that interpr. impossible. In my treatment of “*sá* figé” (HS 105 [1992] 213–39) I show that Rigvedic forms of the *sá/ tá*m pronoun with 1st ps. reference are vanishingly rare (see esp. pp. 217, 230–31), and in particular there is only one ex. in the whole RV with sg. *sá* and a 1st ps. verb. The standard view (Gr, Ge, etc.) that *tasthau* here is 3rd ps. must be correct. Who then is the referent? Although those who take it as 3rd ps. (Ge, Doniger, etc.) are not explicit, I infer that they think it’s Indra praising himself in the 3rd ps. However, parallel passage with the same rhetoric point in a different direction: to Soma. For pāda a cf. the almost identical X.86.15 (also cited by Ge n. 2a) *vṛṣabhó ná tigmásṛṅgo ’ntár yūthésu róruvat* “Like a sharp-horned bull constantly roaring within the herd,” whose referent is Soma (see also *tigmásṛṅga-* by itself in IX.97.9) —in addition to numerous occurrences of the intens. part. *róruvat-* in IX (e.g., IX.86.7, 91.3, in both of which the part. modifies *vṛṣā* ‘bull’), also characterizing Soma. As for b, passages like IV.54.4 ... *prthivyā váriman ... vārṣman diváh* (cf. also III.5.9) suggest that we should supply *diváh* with *vārṣman* here (contra Ge, though he partially concedes in n. 2b). For Soma as referent in this type of phrase see VI.47.4 *ayám sá yó varimāṇam prthivyā varṣmāṇam divó ákṛmod ayám sáh* “This is the one [=Soma] who created the expanse of the earth; who created the height of heaven is this one here.” There is one major piece of counterevidence to my claim that ab refers to Soma: a similar phrase in the next hymn, also by Vasukra: X.29.7 *sá vāvṛdhe várimann ā prthivyāh* “He has grown strong on the expanse of the earth.” The subject here is presumably Indra, though it is not excluded that it could be, or could be in addition, Soma. Weighing all the evidence, I find the strong association of pāda a with Soma and the association of the phraseology of pāda b with Soma elsewhere stronger on balance than X.29.7c, though I acknowledge that it is somewhat awkward.

Although this is not strictly relevant to the interpr. of this passage, both of the *-man*-stems in this passage show a curious distribution. Here we have the endingless locatives *vārṣman* and *váriman*, both root accented. Both are identified as neuters by grammars and lexica, but in fact both stems are found in the RV only in the loc. (*váriman* 5x, *vārṣman* 5x) and so their gender is not assured – though of course root-accented *-man*-stems *should* be neut. They both have suffix-accented stems attested beside them, *varimán-* and *varṣmán-*, identified as masc. and both having clear masc. forms (e.g., acc. *varimāṇam*, *varṣmāṇam*). But these suffix-accented forms do not have the expected poss. adj. sense of, e.g., the Paradebeispiel *brahmán-* to n. *bráhman-*, but seem identical in meaning to the root-accented forms. I have no explanation (beyond positing a cyclic ‘height’ >> ‘having height’ → ‘height’, which may be correct but is not very satisfactory).

From this showy high-style evocation of cosmic Soma, in the 2nd hemistich Indra switches to a balder and more idiomatic presentation of the expected tit-for-tat: my protection for your soma. The first hemistich has no further purpose, I’d say, than to establish Indra’s rhetorical superiority and to cloak the soma he is demanding in exalted language.

In c Ge takes *vṛjāṇeṣu* as referring to troubles in battle: “(Kriegs)bedrängnissen,” but *vṛjāṇa-*, a deriv. of √ *vṛj* ‘twist’, means in the first instance ‘enclosure’ and, by metaphorical development, a group of affiliated people (the same development seen in Engl. expressions like “circle of friends”), and then simply community. It is so used in the previous hymn, X.27.4–5, also spoken by Indra.

On *kukṣí-* as ‘cheek’, not ‘belly’, see my 1987 “Linguistic and Philological Remarks on Some Vedic Body Parts” (Ged. Cowgill), pt. II “*kukṣí* (and *āsyā*),” pp. 71–81, where I argue for the sense ‘cheek’ on the basis of the consistent dual number of this word and its association with the head and its parts in both RVic passages and YV body part litanies, as well as a telling ŚB passage.

X.28.3: It is generally assumed, correctly in my view, that the sacrificer/singer now enters into dialogue with Indra; Indra’s voc. *jaritar* in the next vs. (4a) essentially guarantees this. He briskly and perhaps a bit testily answers Indra’s possible implication that the sacrificial arrangements for the god have been inadequate. In 2d, in exchange for his protection (2c), Indra demanded a *sutásoma-* ‘one who has soma pressed / has pressed soma’, in the form of a *bahuvrīhi*, and 3ab responds to that, with a full VP utilizing the same words decomposed: *sunvānti sómān*. The speaker makes sure to note that not only has the soma been pressed, but Indra drinks it (*píbasī*)—implicitly linking this statement to his wife’s phrase in the opt. *sómam papīyāt* “he should drink the soma” in 1c. His wife’s words about food, *jakṣīyād dhānāḥ* “he should eat roast grains” (1c), are also echoed, though not lexically, by 3c *pácanti te vṛṣabhāṁ átsi teṣām* “They cook bulls for you. You eat them.” As noted above ad 1c, the roasted grains are associated with the Third Pressing and the Wife and are appropriate in her speech; the cooked bulls are perhaps more masculine. (See the cooked bulls in the preceding hymn, X.27.2, 3.)

Although adjectival *tūya-* appears only here, against 21 occurrences of the adv. *tūyam*, there seems no reason either to emend it or (as Ge does) to render it as an adv. despite its clear acc. pl. form.

The identity and function of *yán* (in sandhi before *m*) in d is disputed. Does it represent the subordinating *yád* (so Pp, Schnaus p. 207, implicitly Doniger), or the masc. nom. sg. pres. part. *yán* to *√i* (so Old, flg. Keith), or both (Ge n. 3cd). I find Ge’s interpr. the most appealing and it is reflected in the publ. tr. “coming when you are summoned.”

The instr. *prkṣéna* is construed by Ge with his pres. part. *yán*: “mit Ungestüm kommend,” but this would be an unusual sense for *prkṣá-*, which generally means ‘strengthening, nourishing; strengthening nourishment’; see comm. ad II.34.3. Gr takes it as a PN; but, although it seems definitely to be a name in II.13.8, there seems no reason to interpr. it as such here. (See Mayr PN, s.v., where he accepts it for II.13.8, but hesitates about this passage.) Schnaus (206–7) takes it as an adj. qualifying the (non-overt) personal agent of *hūyámānāḥ* (“von einem Kraftvollen herbeigerufen”). I see it rather as the nominalized ‘nourishment, food’ and a real instrument instrumental, with *√hū*. Cf. IV.34.6 ... *námasā hūyámānāḥ* “being summoned with reverence.”

X.28.4: Indra’s instruction proper begins here. He introduces it with an injunction to his interlocutor to pay close attention to it, using the fronted near-deictic *idám*. To convey its force, the pāda might be better tr. “This (speech) of mine – mark it well.” There follow three tiny vignettes of counter-intuitive events, one per pāda, the second two (c, d) hinting at animal stories, each barely summarized by its climactic act. The first (b) describes in unequivocal fashion a physical impossibility: flotsam floating upstream. This provides the framework within which to interpr. the more ambiguous animal scenes not only in this vs. but in the vss. to come. The overall lesson of all these condensed episodes appears to be that, using the tools and skills appropriate to its species, the weak can best the strong. This may seem like a strange message for Indra to be conveying, since his strength is so overwhelming that he doesn’t need stealth or cunning to prevail. But perhaps it is his hint to the mortal singer/sacrificer that though he is far

weaker than the god, his device—the sacrifice—can be appropriately wielded to exert some control over the god, just like the fox over the lion.

In c Ge (fld. by Doniger) tr. the sense we expect: “Der Fuchs hat von hinten den Löwen beschlichen.” Unfortunately this is not what the Skt. says: Ge’s “von hinten” renders *pratyāñcam*, which does not mean “from behind” but quite the opposite: “facing towards.” Moreover, the adj. qualifies the lion and is neither an adverb nor a modifier of the fox. Schnaus (209–10) faces the problem more squarely, tr. “Der Fuch hat den gegen ihn gewandten Lösen beschlichen” and suggesting that instead of using its usual craftiness and slyness, the fox is engaging in direct confrontation with the lion. Although this admirably reflects the meaning and morphology of *pratyāñcam*, to my mind it doesn’t quite capture what’s likely to be going on: direct confrontation is not what the verb *atsār* ‘crept up on’ implies, and direct confrontation is also unlikely to end well for the fox. My own tr., “the lion, his opponent,” is, I admit, a cop-out. I now think it’s possible that the mismatch between *pratyāñcam* and *atsār* may be the point of the passage: though the lion is directly facing the fox, the latter still manages to creep up on him by stealth and take him by surprise by attacking him frontally. The most widespread fox in India, the Bengal fox, preferentially inhabits open grassland or scrub forest and is nocturnal, both of which could mask its stalking. I would now tr. the pāda “The fox crept up on the lion, (though) he was facing him.”

Note that *atsāḥ* (underlying *atsār*) echoes *ātsi* in 3c, to two entirely different roots. (Noted also by Schnaus, 210.)

Pāda d also depicts a weaker, smaller animal (the jackal) taking on a stronger one (the boar), though here the method of hunting seems to be one standard for the jackal— judging from the Wikipedia description of the way golden jackals, which are widely distributed in India, hunt: “Once prey is located, the jackal conceals itself, quickly approaches its prey and then pounces on it. ... They hunt rodents in grass by locating them with their hearing before leaping into the air and pouncing on them.” The root √*tak* seems to be esp. used for the swooping of birds, and our verb *nīr atakta* here may express precisely an airborne pounce. Google “jackal pouncing” for impressive images of a jackal in midflight.

Another phonetic figure, *atakta kākṣāt*, also noted by Schnaus, 210.

X.28.5: Once again the singer/sacrificer echoes Indra’s words, this time picking up Indra’s pf. impv. *cikiddhi* with a 1st ps. form to the same stem, *ciketam*, while substituting *etād* for *idām* to refer to Indra’s speech. He, perhaps disingenuously, emphasizes the intellectual gap between himself, a simple man (*pāka*-), and Indra, the clever one (*gṛtsa*-) who knows (*vidvān*). As disc. in my 2009 “Function of Animals” (pp. 216–17), the *pāka*- regularly seeks instruction or enlightenment from someone who is *gṛtsa*- or more knowledgeable (*vidúṣṭara*-) or discriminating (*vīcetas*-)(see, e.g., I.31.4, IV.5.5). As I also argue there, the animal fables with which Indra has already begun are the appropriate vehicle for the instruction of such a man – and, quite possibly, for his wife, as I suggested above.

The other quality the singer attributes to Indra, strength (*tavās*- ‘strong’), seems unconnected with Indra’s intellectual attainments, but it’s worth noting that *gṛtsa*- and *tavās*- are paired elsewhere (see III.1.2 and nearby X.25.5 two vss. after an occurrence of *pākyā*, X.25.3; see comm. ad X.25.5). Perhaps the idea is that the two qualities together define an ideal, someone with both brains and brawn (in the Engl. phrase).

The verb *ciketam* is most likely a pf. injunc in modal usage; so KH (246), Kü (175), though in n. 186 Kü allows the possibility that it is a subjunctive with 2ndary ending, and Lub identifies it as a subj.

On the lexeme *ví√vac* see comm. ad X.11.2, where I argue that it means ‘provide a decisive answer to a question’, a sense that certainly fits our context. For our particular phrase see VI.18.3 ... *tád ṛtuthā ví vocaḥ* “you will announce that at the proper season,” also of Indra. The injunc. here seems to have modal or future sense. *Pace* KH (263) I do not think it is a “hortative injunctive,” the functional equivalent of an impv. Rather the singer expects Indra to instruct him, but to do so at the time the god deems appropriate.

The timing is, in my view, expressed by the adv. *ṛtuthā* ‘seasonably, at the proper time’—contra the standard view (Gr, Ge, Doniger, Etter [Fragesätze, 204], Schnaus) that it means ‘truly’ / ‘richtig’ in this context. The base *ṛtú-* is of course synchronically completely distinct from *ṛtá-* ‘truth’ and means ‘right time, season’ (see EWA s.v.) both in terms of the regulation of time and, in ritual context, of the proper order of ritual acts, the ritual sequence. The adverb derived from this stem, *ṛtuthā*, should not switch its semantic allegiance to *ṛtá-*, and even in conjunction with the roots *√vid*, *√vad*, and *√vac* (despite Gr’s meaning 5) “in rechter Weise, der Wahrheit gemäss”) it refers to timely knowledge or timely speech.

What the singer expects Indra to expound to him, expressed in pāda d, is quite obscure, since it both lacks a verb and is couched in metaphor, indeed several metaphors. The subject is Indra’s chariot pole (*dhúr-*), “that part of the yoke which is placed on the shoulders of the animals drawing the chariot or cart” (Macd/Keith Ved Index s.v.), “Anschrirwerk, Gestänge; means of harnessing a horse to the car, pole, forecarriage” (Sparreboom, Chariots 132, citing KEWA s.v. *dhūḥ*). Because the two draught animals are attached to either end of the *dhúr-* with the chariot’s shaft between them, the two sides can be imagined as “halves” (*ārdha-*). Moreover, with a perfectly matched team, the *dhúr-* would be exactly parallel to the ground, but its actual angle is determined by the comparative heights of the two animals whose shoulders it’s attached to. Therefore, one side of the pole may be higher or lower than the other. See *uttarā dhūḥ* in the next vs. as well as VIII.33.18 and a similar phrase in X.102.10. In the latter two passages, esp. VIII.33.18, the chariot pole and the two yoked animals are a metaphor for marriage, with the higher end of the pole (just a little bit higher) ideally representing the husband. Although I do not think this is the primary sense here or in the next vs., it may be lurking, given the presence of the Sacrificer’s Wife in vs. 1.

Here instead I think the question has to do with who or what Indra plans to team up with. The word “half” invites us to consider a number of standard oppositional pairs: heaven/earth, gods/men, Ārya/non-Ārya, men/women, humans/animals, but I think in this case the answer is narrower: which sacrificer will fill the other side of the yoke? It is the usual worry that Indra will attend someone else’s sacrifice.

The adj. *kṣemyā* is the closest we come to a verb or verb substitute in the rel. cl. It is found only here in the RV, though it appears in other early Vedic texts: once in an impenetrable passage in AVŚ XII.2.49, more helpfully in passages in MS (III.2.2) and TS (V.2.1.7) concerning the Agnicayana, in which wanderers (*yāyāvarā-*) are contrasted with *kṣemyā-* ‘stay-at-homes, those at rest’. In my view, the singer is asking which sacrificer or group of sacrificers the (other end of) Indra’s chariot pole will rest upon. Ge (fld. by Doniger) takes *kṣemyā-* rather as ‘peaceful’, an interpr. he explains (n. 5d) as indicating that his pole is looking not for battle, but for peace. This seems to me misconceived: though the base noun *kṣéma-* can mean ‘peace’ as well as ‘repose, rest’, the war/peace dichotomy does not fit the context. Moreover, interpr. it as

‘resting upon’ gives the acc. *árdham* something to (quasi-)govern it, whereas a “peaceful chariot pole” leaves *árdham* entirely up in the air (Ge supplies “geht”).

X.28.6–7: With vs. 6 we arrive at the paired responsive vss. that form the omphalos of this tightly structured hymn in its exact center. Both vss. are spoken by Indra in my opinion, though most (e.g., Ge and Doniger, flg. Sāy.) divide them between Indra (6) and the sacrificer (7). The vss. begin identically: *evā́ hí mām tavasám* and continue with Indra’s extravagant self-praise, his *ātmastuti*. I disc. these vss. and their place in the hymn in my Animals art. (pp. 241–43), where I suggest that the vss. constitute the technical epiphany of Indra that was hoped for in vs. 1.

X.28.6: I take the subj. of *vardháyanti* to be the mortal sacrificers, harking back to the pl. subjects of *sunvánti* ‘they press’ and *pácanti* ‘they cook’ in vs. 3, where the singer affirmed that ritual offerings were being made to Indra. Cf., e.g., VIII.16.9 *índraṃ vardhanti kṣitáyah* “Indra do the separate peoples make strong”; alternatively it could be the soma drinks or the hymns or some other ritual offering, as in IX.46.3 *eté sómāsa índavaḥ ... índraṃ vardhanti* “these soma drops strengthen Indra.” In any case the subject belongs to the human realm, in my opinion. The *evā́* ‘in this way’ may be a blanket reference to these ritual activities as well as a ref. to those activities in vs. 3. I also take *tavásam* as a proleptic adj., the result of the action expressed by *vardháyanti*.

Indra’s response to the singer’s question about the chariot pole is given in pāda b in his typical hyperbole: his chariot pole is higher than lofty heaven. This would, in fact, not be a good arrangement for a yoked team. As disc. immed. above, the ideal position for a *dhúr-* is parallel to the ground or at most a bit asymmetrical (favoring the husband in the marriage metaphor). But here Indra’s end of the pole would be so high that it would be closer to perpendicular, which would make hitching up the other draught animal and driving the chariot quite challenging. But Indra of course does not aim to be a team player, but to assert his overwhelming superiority, and he may even have found the singer’s question about the location of his *dhúr-* somewhat insulting.

The *úd-* ‘up’ (in *úttara-*) in b is complemented by *ní* in the hostile verb *ní śísāmi* “I ‘grind down,’” an idiom found elsewhere (cf. VI.18.13, X.48.4 adduced by Ge n. 6c). In all three cases the obj. is neut. *purū́ sahásrā* “many thousands,” which phrase is also found in other contexts (I.62.10, IV.28.3, V.37.3, X.23.5). Interestingly, only in X.23.5 is a referent directly supplied: neut. pl. *ásívā* ‘the hostile’, but in IV.28.3 it is likely the Dasyus mentioned in the first hemistich, who are the referents of the gen. pl. part. *yātām* ‘of those going’ that depends on *purū́ sahásrā*. In any case in all three cases the object to be supplied to ‘grind down’ is enemies.

X.28.7: As noted just above, this vs. is generally assigned to the singer. I find this unlikely: I do not believe that the singer would— or could—claim for himself, in cd, the two signature actions of Indra, the killing of Vṛtra and the opening of the Vala cave, esp. with Indra on the scene. Even less likely is Old’s take, based on his belief that the hymn contains both a true and a false Indra; by his interpr. the false Indra praises himself in vs. 6, while the true one does so in vs. 7, though addressing the false Indra as “Indra” ironically.

There is one very good reason for the standard view: the vocative *indra* in pāda b. I recognize this as a stumbling block – but not as major a one as putting cd in the mouth of anyone other than Indra. I suggest that in b Indra is ventriloquizing the gods calling on him for help “in every action” (*kárman-karman*; that is, in every battle), that is, saying “o Indra” again and again. Although it is not strongly parallel, cf. a passage like V.40.3 *vṛṣā tvā́ vṛṣaṇaṃ huve, vājriṇ*

citrābhir ūtibhiḥ / vṛṣann indra vṛṣabhir vṛtrahantama “Bullish I call upon you, the bullish, possessor of the mace, with your bright help. / Bullish Indra, with your bulls, best smasher of Vṛtra.” I think it also possible that in ātmastutis the self-praiser can address himself, rather in the manner of the poets’ self-address discussed in my 2005 “Poetic Self-Reference” (Fs. Skjærvø), though I have not yet found parallels. I realize that my solution is ad hoc and not strongly supported, but it saves us from worse.

The pf. *jajñūḥ* in pāda a echoes *jajāna* in the immed. preceding pāda, 6d. The 3rd pl. in our pāda is of course ambiguous, however, as it can belong to either $\sqrt{j}an$ or $\sqrt{j}ñā$ ‘know’. (Though the 3rd pl. to $\sqrt{j}an$ is *jajanur* in VIII.97.10 (q.v.), the weak forms of the pf. to that root generally have *jajñ-*, including 3rd pl. act. *jajñuḥ* I.159.3, *jajñūḥ* VII.62.4.) Flg. Sāy., Ge and Don. take the form to $\sqrt{j}ñā$, while Gr (in Nachtr. col. 1761; it’s missing in the orig. lexicon) assigns it to $\sqrt{j}an$, and this interpr. is fld. by Lub and Schnaus (p. 214). (Curiously Kü does not cite or disc. this passage.) Because it immed. follows *jajāna*, the initial audience interpr. would surely be as a form of $\sqrt{j}an$, and it is only as the hemistich unfolds that $\sqrt{j}ñā$ might seem like a more appropriate contextual reading, since the gods are more likely to *know* Indra as something than to *beget* him. However, $\sqrt{j}an$ does not have to refer just to physical birth but can also refer to the metaphorical creation of someone in a new role or behavior; see VIII.97.10 with the unambiguous *jajanuḥ* just discussed, where Indra is fashioned and begotten for ruling: ... *tataksur índram jajanuś ca rājāse*. The agents in VIII.97.10 are unexpressed but are probably the singers (so Sāy.) or other officiants (see Ge’s n. 10b); obviously Indra already existed, but their actions fit him for ruling. The gods in our passage also have the capacity to shape Indra’s behavior to their own ends, and I therefore think $\sqrt{j}an$ is a possible root affiliation and *jajñuḥ* here is a pun.

The 2nd hemistich is strongly alliterative, esp. pāda c: *vádhīm vṛtrám vājreṇa ... , vrajám ... vam*. The VP *vádhīm vṛtrám* reproduces the alliteration of the more common formulaic variant *áhann áhim* by other means, with lexical substitution in both terms. The 1st sg. *vádhīm* is of course grammatically “wrong” – we expect **vádham*, but it has been mechanically generated to the extremely common *iṣ*-aor. (*á*)*vadhīs*, -īt. The 1st sg. is only found once elsewhere, in I.165.8 in the same phrase #*vádhīm vṛtrám*. Our pāda is identical to IV.17.3 except for the 3rd sg. *vádhīt* found there and has simply been transposed here, with the minimal substitution of the final of the 1st sg. ending -*m* for 3rd sg. -*t*. Note that the expected form **vádham* (which, however, is not actually attested) is metrically identical to *vádhīm* and could easily have been used.

An even greater grammatical solecism is found in the next pāda, *ápa ... vam*. Just like pāda c, this one contains an unmistakable formula, here the one for the opening of the Vala cave: *ápa* $\sqrt{v}r$, which otherwise never shows up in the 1st sg. If it did, we should expect the injunctive to the root aor. to be **varam*. The formulaic content of the pāda (for *vrajám* in this context, see I.92.4 *vrajám ... ví ... āvar ...*; for the injunc. in the formula, e.g., II.14.3 ... *ápa hí valám vaḥ*) allows the audience easily to interpr. the fairly monstrous form *vam* as a nonce 1st sg. root aor. to $\sqrt{v}r$. The 2nd/3rd sg. instantiations of the formula involve monosyllabic *vár*, which is always (5x) pāda final and therefore realized as *vaḥ* in pausal sandhi. Based on this pausal form, where the -*r* of the root is not found on the surface, a monosyllabic 1st sg. has been confected, marked only by substitution of the 1st sg. -*m* for -*h*. Unlike *vádhīm* ∞ **vádham*, *vam* ∞ **varam* differ in metrical shape and the expected form would not fit here. I wonder if the easily interpretable—and unnecessary—*vádhīm* in c was used to set the stage for the less transparent *vam* in d.

X.28.8: This may be the most peculiar vs. in this peculiar hymn. It is a one-off, belonging neither with the responsive ātmastuti vss. 6–7 nor with the dialogue or animal fable vss. that surround them. It is universally (beginning with the Anukr.) and I think rightly assumed to be the speech of Indra. It presents itself as a de-contextualized narrative of some actions of the gods in the past. Ge (fld. by Doniger) thinks the point is that the gods can distinguish the good from the bad—supposedly exemplified by cd esp., where they collect the good wood for making their vehicles (“zu ihre Wagenbau”) and burn up the bad. I see no trace of that scenario in the vs. itself.

Instead I generally follow the interpr. of Pischel (Ved. St. I.179ff.), that this vs. depicts the primal institution of the sacrifice. As he says (179–80), “Die Götter werden hier dargestellt als das Holz zum Opfer schlagend und es dann auf die *vakṣānās* d.h. den *yonī* legend, wo Agni entflammt wird.” The same original establishment of the sacrifice was treated in the previous, related hymn, by my interpr. See esp. X.27.15, in which various groups come together in this enterprise; the first pāda of that vs., *saptā vīrāsaḥ ... úd āyan* “seven heroes came up” (and cf. c *nāva ... āyan* “nine came”) is similar to our *devāsa āyan* “the gods came,” with *abhī ... āyan* in the next pāda. In X.27 the emphasis in the sacrifice-instituting vss. is on the creation of the ritual fire (13–14, 16), and our vs. here depicts the gods cutting the firewood with their axes and placing it in the “belly” – here, in my opinion, the hearth where the fire will be kindled. The same loc. pl. *vakṣānāsu* is found in X.27.16, also concerning the first kindling of the fire, though with slightly different referent: there it refers to the belly of the lower kindling stick (see comm. there).

The instr. pl. *vidbhīḥ* is found only here. It is universally, and I think correctly, assigned to *vīś-* ‘clan’, though it could in principle belong to the very marginal *vīś-* ‘work’. On the stages of the phonological development of *vīś+bhīs* to *vidbhīs*, see the disc. in my 1991 (MSS 52) “An Ox, a Cart, and the Perfect Participle,” pp. 83–84. But who are these accompanying clans? Acdg. to Sāy., the Maruts, and Pischel follows him. Ge rather “mit ihrer Dienstmännern,” fld. by Don. (“servants”), but this seems a reductive interpr. of *vīś-* particularly in its RVic attestations. Oberlies (I.336), who interpr. the vs. as a depiction of the clearing and settling of new land, takes *vidbhīḥ* as referring not to beings (human or divine) but to places where such beings settle (“mit den Niederlassungen”), which seems to be reflected also in Schnaus’s (215–16) “durch die Siedlungen,” with her identification of the form as “Instrumental der Raumerstreckung.” Again I think a comparison with the similar material in X.27 is illuminating: in X.27.15 the original institution of the sacrifice and the establishment of the ritual fire were accomplished by the cooperative labor of different groups. We seem to have the same picture here: the (various) gods, each with his own *vīś-*, that is, his kin-group and followers, come together in this enterprise.

In contrast to simple *āyan* in pāda a, pāda b contains *abhī ... āyan*. I supply “ritual ground” as the goal of *abhī*.

The interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is hampered by (at least) two uncertainties: 1) the referent of *sudrvām* ‘having / made of good wood’ and 2) the meaning and referent of *kṛpīṭa-*. With regard to the first, despite my publ. tr. ‘good wood’, *sudrú-* must be a bahuvr.; see its other occurrence, VII.32.20, where it modifies fem. *nemí-* ‘felly’, which is ‘made of good wood’. Ge here (n. 8c) supplies *vrkṣá-* (m.) as referent, ‘(tree) having good wood’, and develops a scenario in which the gods load these good logs into their wagon (“in dem (Wagen)inneren niederlegten”), leaving behind the stuff that’s only fit for burning. I do not find the fact that *sudrú-* is a bahuvr. fatal to Pischel’s (and my) interpr., as Old and Ge seem to; we just need to find a suitable referent, either masc. or fem. The *vána-* ‘wood’ of pāda b won’t work, because it’s neut., but something like *samídh-* (fem.) ‘kindling (stick), firewood’ or *idhmá-* (masc.) ‘id.’

certainly would, and in fact the latter might be suggested by the bahuv. *svidhmā-*, with the same structure as *sudrū-*, in the phrase *svidhmā ... vanādhitih* “wood pile provided with good kindling” (I.121.7, by my interpr.). I would therefore slightly adjust my tr. to “depositing the (kindling) consisting of good wood ...”

Ge’s interpr. of c requires that *vakṣānā-* refer to some part of a wagon, the wagon-belly/innards, that is, presumably, the cargo bed. This is a leap, since there is no sign of a vehicle in this vs. and the stem *vakṣānā-* is not otherwise so used. Admittedly the stem isn’t used elsewhere directly for ‘hearth’ either, but see X.27.16 just cited, where it appears in the same context of the kindling of the ritual fire. Moreover, the apparent root noun cmpd *vakṣaṇe-sthā-* in V.19.5 has the ritual fire as referent and should mean “(Agni,) standing in the belly [=on the hearth]” (though see the formal issues raised by Scar 654–55).

Another piece of evidence in favor of interpr. this pāda as the primal establishment of the ritual fire is the verbal lexeme, *ní√dhā* lit. ‘set down’, which is often used of the installation of the ritual fire; see I.45.7, III.27.10, VIII.19.17, etc. etc. A particularly succinct version is found in V.21.1 *manuṣvāt tvā ní dhīmahi, manuṣvāt sām idhīmahi* “Like Manu, we would install you. Like Manu, we would kindle you,” where the kindling immediately follows the installation, as I think it does in our cd. See also *ní√dhā* in the preceding hymn, X.27.14, and *súdhita-* in the same hymn, X.27.16, both of the ritual fire.

kīpīṭa- is a hapax. Given the context, the standard renderings ‘Buschwerk, Gestrüpp’ (EWA s.v. < Neisser), ‘Dürrholz’ (Ge), ‘thicket or firewood’ (Kuiper, Aryans 14), ‘scrub wood’ (Don.) are perfectly reasonable, but all of them assume a sharp contrast between whatever this word refers to and the “good wood” of pāda c, hence the deprecatory nuance of the glosses. But there is no evidence for a contrast in the context; it’s simply been read into the passage by the interpr. In fact, *kīpīṭam* could in principle refer to the same thing as *sudrvām* in the previous pāda – not the same underlying word, because of the difference in gender: *sudrvām* must be masc. or fem., *kīpīṭam* must be neut. if it is the subject of a nominal clause consisting only of *yātrā kīpīṭam* – but the same real-world referent. Interpr. it is severely hampered not only by its isolation but also by the fact that it has no etymology and no derivational web. I do not have a solution, but I would point to one clue that has not been utilized heretofore: the parallelism with Vasukra’s preceding hymn X.27, esp. the vss. concerning the installation of the ritual fire and the establishment of the sacrifice (X.27.13–18), which we have already invoked in the disc. of this vs. With regard to *kīpīṭa-* I would point to X.27.16 with *kapilā-*, meaning (in my interpr.) ‘the brownish one’ and referring (in my interpr.) to the nascent fire or to the kindling stick; our *kīpīṭa-* could be a hyper-Sanskritization of that stem – or conversely, *kapilā-* could be a MIA development from *kīpīṭa-*. I would be more comfortable with this hypothesis if the accents weren’t different (and if the quantities of the medial *i*-vowel matched), but it is perhaps not an accident that these two phonologically similar RVic hapaxes are found in adjacent hymns in similar contexts. If they are connected (and actually even if they’re not), the *kīpīṭa-* can refer to the just-kindled fire or the kindling stick that produced it, with the subj. of *dahanti* the god-priests.

X.28.9: We here return to the précis of animal fables last encountered in vs. 4, one per pāda. Most (Anukr., Ge, Don.) assign the vs. to Vasukra, though Old (intro.) agrees with me that Indra is the speaker. He is continuing his instruction in the medium appropriate to his simple (*pāka-*) audience. Like the stories summed up in vs. 4, these depict the surprising success of a weakling confronting (or pursuing) a stronger opponent. For possible parallels/sources of these stories,

esp. the first about the hare and the razor, see esp. Old, Ge n. 9a, and my 2009 “Function of Animals,” pp. 216–17.

In the first story “the hare swallowed the razor coming towards [/facing] it.” Note first that *pratyāñcam* recurs from 4c, a verbal sign of ring composition, marking out the intermediate vss. (5–8) as an extended omphalos. It is not clear from the bare summary how the hare fared: did the swallowed razor tear him apart internally (as real-world knowledge would lead us to predict), or by the clever ploy of swallowing it did he eliminate its threat? It is only in the larger context of the following stories that the latter, the favorable outcome, seems the likelier (if unrealistic) one. It is a story I certainly wish we had the whole of—the elements so ill assorted and the climactic action so dramatic. Although I will not speculate about the plot behind the summary, I do wonder if it’s not a disguised cosmological reference. As I say in my 2009 article (p. 216 n. 34) “it is tempting to see in the hare/razor story an astronomical allusion to the well-known later conceit of the hare in the moon, already found in Vedic (SB X1.1.5.3 and JB 1.28). If the razor is curved, it could represent the new moon, which the hare of the full moon absorbs (‘swallows’).” If this lunar image lies behind it, the lack of injury inflicted by the razor would make sense.

The middle two pādas (b, c) are distinguished from the rest by the 1st ps. speaker (b: *vy ābhedaṃ*, c: *randhayāni*, with the verbs in the impf. and subj. respectively). Although all-powerful Indra is the putative subject and agent of both, the theme of the victory of the weak over the strong is maintained: in b Indra uses an inferior instrument (a clod of earth) to split what should have been impregnable, a rock; is this an early variant on the children’s game rock–paper–scissors? In c, in a more standard Indraic act, he uses his power to render the strong subject to the weak. In b the breaking into the Vala cave seems indirectly referred to; *√bhid* is regularly used for this action (see e.g., II.24.3, VIII.14.7, X.62.2). And though in the standard story Indra does not use an earth clod, his instrument is another seemingly ineffectual one, namely a song, a formulation. In c the root *√ra(n)dh* plus acc. and dat. (as here) is a stereotyped construction regularly used of Indra’s subjecting an enemy (acc.) to a client-beneficiary (dat.) (see I.51.6, II.11.19, etc. etc.). The use of 1st ps. expressions employing typical Indra phraseology in these two pādas reinforces my view that Indra is the speaker of this vs.

Note the phonological figures in c and d: *bṛhāntaṃ cid rhaté randhayāni, vayad vatsó vṛṣabham ...*

The dat. *rhaté* is a hapax, clearly employed here to function in opposition to *bṛhāntaṃ*. Its general meaning is easy to extract from context, since it must be a semantic opposite to *bṛhānt-* ‘lofty’—hence, ‘weak’, ‘low(ly)’, or the like. Its etymology is unclear (see EWA s.v.), and since it is situated between *bṛh-* and *radh-* its phonological shape may have been manipulated to fit the context, esp. given the possibility that the medial *-h-* might represent MIA loss of occlusion. Old suggests a connection with *√arh* ‘be worthy, deserve’ (with “small, low” assumed [“sei er noch so klein”] but not overt: a twist on “the deserving poor”). Though the phonology works, I am less convinced by the semantics. The old connection with *√raṇh*, *raghú-* ‘quick’ (Gr; see EWA) is even more problematic semantically; more attractive is Mayr’s suggestion of *√ra(n)dh* in intransitive usage, ‘subject to, subordinate’, so that *rhaté randhayāni* would be a disguised etymological figure. I would myself suggest a connection with *ārbha-* ‘small’ (or even *ardhá-* ‘half’), which would work well semantically. But there is no way to go further here. As for its morphology, Lowe (Participles in RV, 285 and n. 108), flg. Rau (2009: ... *Caland System*, 90), takes it as a Caland adjective, like, in fact, *bṛhānt-*. But given its isolation, nothing prevents it

from belonging to an athematic root formation or a Vith class pres. or thematic aorist, which is otherwise unattested.

The verb of d, *váyat*, is one of the rare subjunctives to $\sqrt{vī}$ ‘pursue’; cf. the 1st sg. injunc. *váyam* in the preceding hymn, X.27.9, and comm. there.

X.28.10: In this vs. the strong are depicted as getting into trouble by themselves, without any direct intervention of the weak. In the first three pādas three different powerful animals, an eagle (or other large bird of prey: *suparṇá-*), a lion, and a buffalo, all get trapped; the implication is that in the arrogance of their power they weren’t paying attention. The traps and snares were, however, surely set by comparatively weak humans, and so the overall theme persists.

With most (Old, Ge, Lü [KlSch 515], Don 147, Kü 548, Scar 297) I see the *suparṇá-* in pāda a as another trapped victim. Schmaus (pp. 218–19) suggests rather that the bird has his talon firmly fixed in a prey animal, indeed in the lion of the next pāda—reviving, unaware, the view of Pischel rejected by Old. She sees the mismatch of predator (bird) and prey (lion) in ab as a continuation of the weak-versus-strong theme of the previous vs., and parallel to the pairing of buffalo (c: strong / victim) and lizard (d: weak / predator) in the 2nd hemistich.

The two middle pāda, b and c, once again resemble each other—this time by having a large mammal trapped, using the same ppl. of the same root \sqrt{rudh} (*ávaruddhaḥ* b, *niruddhāḥ* c) compounded with the semantically equivalent preverbs *áva* and *ní*, both ‘down’. I have no idea why the 2nd form, *niruddhā-*, is accented on the suffix, not the preverb, contrary to the usual rule (see, e.g., Macd. VGS p. 462) embodied by *ávaruddha-* in the preceding pāda – esp. since the other occurrence of this form is accented on the preverb, *nírudhha-* in I.32.11. For another suffix-accented form in this hymn, see *avasṛṣṭá-* in 11c.

The acc. *paripādam* in b is somewhat surprising: a loc. “entrapped *in* a snare” would be more comfortable. See disc. of the stem and of the case syntax by Scar 297–98. The simplest solution seems to be that reflected in Ge’s “wie ein in die Fusseschnelle (geratener) Löwe,” with a dynamic reading of the ppl. *ávaruddhaḥ*—hence my “into.”

On the sandhi of *godhā* in vss. 10 and 11, see Old, Scar 271, and disc. below ad 11a. The word is discussed at length by Lü (ZDMG 96 [1942] 23–50 = KlSch. 490–517, treating this passage pp. 48–49 = 515–16) and Scar (269–72). Lü’s identification of the animal as a monitor lizard, a large lizard widely distributed in the subcontinent and, though terrestrial, also at home in the water, is quite convincing, and his treatment covers vast textual and linguistic ground.

My interpr. of d differs radically from the standard, but is close to Old’s and Scar’s (270). The standard (Ge, Lü [KlSch 515], Don 147, Kü 548, Schnaus 218–19) sees the *godhā* as seizing the foot/leg of the buffalo and dragging the hapless animal away: e.g., Ge “Ein Krokodil wird ihm dann das Bein wegschleppen.” This interpr. founders, in my opinion, on three points: 1) the rendering of *ayátha-* as ‘foot, leg’; 2) the interpr. of dat. *tásmai* as a possessive; 3) the necessity of reconciling this interpr. with the almost identical repetition of this pāda in the immediately following one, 11a, with the substitution of pl. dat. *tébhyaḥ* for sg. *tásmai*. To start with 1): *ayátha-* is found only in these two almost identical pādas 10d, 11a. Although ‘foot’ is the standard interpr., the *-átha-* suffix normally forms abstracts shading into nomina actionis (see AiG II.2.171–73), such as *vakṣátha-* ‘growth’. The best comparandum for our form is *carátha-*, also built to a verb of motion. It is found 5x in the dat. *caráthāya* in (pseudo-)infinitival usage “for moving, to move”. (The 8 [or 9] non-dative forms are morphologically and metrically somewhat troubled [see comm. ad I.66.9, etc.] and are best left out of account here.) If *carátha-* means ‘movement, moving’, then the most likely sense of *ayátha-* is similarly abstract ‘going’, or

concretized to ‘a going, a way’, as Old suggests (‘Gang’), in rejecting the ‘foot’ interpr. Scar (270) also brings up the usual abstract function of *-átha-* as a problem for ‘foot’ and accepts Old’s re-interpr. Scar also points out that this reinterpr. makes it easier to accommodate the dative, since with ‘foot’ we would expect a genitive or perhaps “in partitiver Apposition” an accusative. Although the dat. can be used for possession in Vedic, this use is restricted to existential predication “(there is) a foot to him / he has a foot,” in my experience. Rendering *ayátha-* as ‘foot’ also complicates the interpr. of 11a, for there it would not be the buffalo’s foot that was grabbed, but that of the stingy people who taunt brahmans. Although interpreting 11a requires a certain metaphorical latitude, eliminating the “foot” at least removes an extra layer of metaphor.

If the lizard is not dragging the buffalo by the foot, what is it doing? Let us now focus on the verb *karṣat*, which belongs to the root $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ (though see other spec. by Scar 270, which he ultimately rejects), an item of agricultural vocabulary whose primary sense is ‘plough’, not ‘drag’. The form itself is synchronically an injunctive to the 1st class pres. *kárṣati* (see, e.g., Gotō, 1st Kl. 112–13; no RVic forms are accented, but see AV XV.13.7 *kárṣet* [though the passage is obscure]), whatever its history may be: the existence of both 1st and 6th cl. presents hint at a root formation in its past. In my opinion the fact that the form is injunctive is crucial to the interpr. of these two vss., because the transition from vs. 10 to vs. 11 takes us from Indra’s narrative animal fables to the current situation pitting non- (or bad) sacrificers against good ones. The injunctive in 10d, found in a narrative verse couched in the past, is to be read as a preterite, but the one in 11a has modal/future value: it is a warning that what happened to the buffalo can happen to you! The functional ambiguity of the injunctive provides an ideal pivot.

And what did happen to the buffalo? Here I think Old is essentially correct: the lizard ploughed a way for the trapped buffalo, ostensibly to free it, but “in Wirklichkeit wohl, wie v. 11 zu ergeben scheint, zu seinem Unglück” – presumably by opening a way for the buffalo that led to a place where the lizard could more easily gain control over it (perhaps a body of water? the buffalo was already “thirsty” *tarṣyāṁvān*). The root $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ ‘plough’ is quite apposite: because the monitor lizard has a long, heavy, dragging trail, its tracks show a distinct furrow-like ridge between its footprints (google ‘monitor lizard tracks’). The characteristic tracks of this large lizard would presumably be familiar to any human who lived in proximity to it.

(As an aside, a google search for monitor lizard hunting turns up the title “Giant lizard versus buffalo.” There are a number of videos on YouTube of komodo dragons attacking and killing water buffalo. Unfortunately the lizard in question is the Indonesian komodo dragon, the largest monitor lizard species and not of course found in the subcontinent – but still ...)

X.28.11: With this vs. we return to the outer ring, with its concern for proper modes of sacrifice matching that of the first 3 vss. of the hymn. As was just noted, this return is effected by pivoting on the almost identical pādas 10d / 11a, using the ambiguity of the injunctive *karṣat* to transition from the narrative past to the ritual present. The fate of the thirsty buffalo in 10cd serves as a cautionary example for the greedy men depicted in 11ab. Although an actual monitor lizard is not bringing them to ruin, the point seems to be the one cited from Old above: although it appears that an easy path has been created for these heedless people, as there was for the thirsty buffalo, it leads to disaster. They think that they can satisfy themselves directly, by eating luxury food (oxen) that others would offer in sacrifice to the gods and, thereby, to the brahmans who perform the sacrifice. But this gluttony and disrespect for gods and brahmans destroy their strength and their bodies.

As I said just above, the first pāda needs to be interpr. metaphorically: the greedy men are not being led astray by a real lizard. However, Scar (270–71) makes the attractive suggestion that *godhā-* in this pāda (though not 10d) is a pun on *go-dā-* ‘cow-giver’ (5x), primarily an epithet of Indra (III.30.21, IV.22.10, VIII.45.19). If Indra is lurking in the background of this word—and identified as the one who provides the bovines in the first place—the expression in pāda a would not be metaphorical and the warning would be more acute: Indra has the power to prepare a path to perdition for those who offend him and wrongly eat the oxen he gives (some of which in turn should be sacrificed to him). I would now slightly emend my tr. to “The monitor-lizard (/the cow-giver [=Indra]) will plough ...”

If Scar’s suggestion is accepted, it may also provide a solution to the problematic sandhi variation in the two occurrences of *godhā-*. In 11a the word appears in hiatus followed by a vowel-initial word: *godhā ayátham*, suggesting an underlying nom. sg. form *godhās* with final -s. But in 10d it appears before *tásmai*; if the nom. sg. ended in -s, we should find *godhās tásmai*. So the form in 10d must lack the ending -s, as it does also in its other occurrence (in a different meaning) in VIII.69.9; such is the Pp analysis too. The apparent -s of the form in 11a (so also Pp) needs an explanation: if it is a pun on *godā-* it may owe its -s to the influence of that word. In its four nom. sg. attestations the form is always underlying *godās*. Curiously, though the pun is Scar’s idea, he only mentions the possibility of morphological influence of *godāh* on the form of *godhāh* glancingly in a footnote (271 n. 380) as an alternative to his favored explanation, which is both more complex and less plausible.

The offending action that leads to the downfall of the subjects is “mocking the brahmans with food” *brahmāṇaḥ pratipīyanty ānnaiḥ*. Exactly what that means is unclear; Ge (n. 11b) points out that it must be the opposite of *pratiśīkṣanty ānnaiḥ* in the next hymn (X.29.5), also by Vasukra. Unfortunately that phrase is at least as obscure as this one, so it does little to illuminate our passage. I think they “mock” either by words (“we’ve got food and you don’t – nyah nyah nyah”) or, more likely, by actions—in the latter case by ostentatiously consuming food that was meant for sacrifice, some of which would have been distributed to the officiating priests, had it been sacrificed. Their eating is expressed by the same root *√ad* used for Indra’s (proper) eating of the sacrificial animals in 3c: *pācanti te vṛṣabhāṃ āsi tēṣāṃ* “they cook bulls for you. You eat of them,” here echoed by *ukṣṇāḥ ... adanti* “they eat oxen.” See also X.27.6, where the non-sacrificers “drink the cooked milk oblation and serve the foreleg without offering to Indra.” The specific mention of the brahmans here is reminiscent of the two fierce AV hymns against interfering with “the Brahman’s cow” (in Whitney’s title), AVŚ V.18–19 / AVP IX.17–18, promising dire penalties to those who do so. The first hymn begins (AVŚ V.18.1 = AVP IX.17.1 [the latter wo/ accents]) *naítām te devā adadus, túbhyaṃ nṛpate áttave / mā brāhmaṇásya rājanya, gām jighatso anādyām* “The gods did not give her to you to eat, o king; do not seek to eat the cow of the brahman, which is not to be eaten, o Rājanya.” The overt hostility between varṇas in the AV hymns, which is especially characteristic of the AV, is absent from our passage, but similar disaster is in store for our unidentified subjects.

The extent of their mockery, indeed their blasphemy, is expressed by the ppl. *avasṛṣṭān* ‘released’ in c. Although the lexeme *áva √sṛj* has a number of applications, a particular ritual use is in play here. The sacrificial animal is “released” (*áva √sṛj*) from the post to which it was tied immediately before it is sacrificed. See the stereotyped usage of this lexeme in the Āprī hymns, where the *vānaspāti-* ‘lord of the forest’, that is, the post, “releases” the animal, generally referred to as “the oblation” for taboo reasons, for sacrifice to the gods. Cf., e.g., I.13.11 *áva sṛjā vanaspate, déva devébhyo havīḥ* “Release, o Lord of the Forest, the oblation to the gods, o god”

(very sim. also 142.11, II.3.10, III.4.10=VII.2.10, X.110.10). The very next action in the Āprī hymn template is the sacrifice itself. An even clearer instance of the usage of this lexeme is found in a non-Āprī hymn, X.91.14, where a list of sacrificial animals, including *ukṣāṇaḥ* ‘oxen’, are *avasṛṣṭāsa āhutāḥ* “released (and) offered.” Although the qualifier ‘released’ might suggest that the animals have been let loose and are roaming free, in fact they are on a narrow path to ritual death. In other words the offenders in our vs. have snatched and themselves consumed the sacrificial animals on the point of being offered to the gods – they have invaded and hijacked the sacrifice. (Ge [n. 11c] also recognizes that *avasṛṣṭā-* describes specifically Opfertieren, but, referring only to a gṛhya sūtra passage, seems to think it refers to animals that had been bound for sacrifice but were then actually released without being sacrificed.)

On *simā-* see esp. Old ad I.95.7, where he considers all the relevant passages incl. this one—which he renders “sie (und keine Andern).” The Pp interpr. the Samh. *simā* as sg. *simāḥ*, but *simé* with pronominal nom. pl. ending is the better reading. See Old’s disc. ad I.95.7.

Pāda d depicts the comeuppance that the arrogant eaters bring on themselves—their role in their own downfall emphasized by both *svayām* and *tanvāḥ*, as well as by the middle voice of the part. *śṛṇānāḥ*, the only middle form to this stem. Most take *tanvāḥ* as gen. sg. dependent on *bālāni* (“breaking the powers of (their) body”). This is possible, but because of the number disharmony (one body / plural subjects) and the acc. pl. *tanvāḥ* in the matching contrastive vs. 12b, I take it as an acc. pl. parallel to *bālāni*. However, as to my first argument, the sg. instr. *tanvā* in clear pl. context in the companion hymn X.27.2 *tanvā sūśujānāḥ* “puffing themselves up in body / with their body/-ies” renders that consideration less cogent.

X.28.12: The arrogant, impious, but ultimately self-defeating behavior of the actors in vs. 11 is contrasted here in the first hemistich with the good sacrificers, who bring themselves success. The hymn ends with an address to Indra, asking for bounty for “us” – presumably those who perform sacrifice in ab.

The standard interpr. of pāda a involves two etymologically near-identical instr.: *śāmībhiḥ suśāmī* “by ritual labors, by good ritual labor.” For a poet of the skill of Vasukra this seems an exceedingly flatfooted way to end this tour-de-force hymn. It also leaves the verb *abhūvan* with surprisingly little to do. Ge (n. 12a) suggests that the verb has the pregnant sense common for *√bhū* in the Brāhmaṇas, namely ‘thrive’ – a sense he also claims for *ābhūḥ* in the preceding hymn, X.27.7—where, however, the straightforward “came into being” fits the context better. I suggest in contrast that *suśāmī abhūvan* is a pseudo-/proto-*cvī* construction, a type found in the RV only in *akhkhalī-kṛtyā* in the Frog hymn, VII.103.3. Here the base noun would be the well-attested indeclinable *śām* ‘weal, luck’. This form in fact is regularly compounded with *√bhū*, in the adjectives *śambhū/-bhū-*, *viśvá-śambhū-*, with the splv. *śāmbhaviṣṭha-*. There are also a number of examples with finite forms of *√bhū*: e.g., I.90.9 *śām no bhavatv aryamā* “Let Aryaman be weal for us” (see also I.189.2, II.3.8.11, III.17.3, etc.). But, as the tr. shows, this VP does not mean “become lucky,” but “be luck for” – that is, the subject transfers the luck to the dative recipient. In order to indicate that it’s the subject that possess or acquires the luck, in this late RVic hymn it would not be surprising to improvise with the *√bhū* version of transitive *√kṛ* in the nascent *cvī* construction. Though I do not know of other examples with a root noun (or whatever we want to call *śām*) as base in the *cvī* type, it is not unlikely that various experiments were tried as the construction was emerging. That the resulting *śām-ī* coincides with the stem of the noun *śāmī-* ‘labor’ is, for Vasukra, a happy rhetorical result. By my interpr., then, *śāmībhiḥ suśāmī* is a punning expression, since the two *śām*-s are unrelated. Rather than the pedestrian

doubling assumed by other interpr., we see here yet another example of Vasukra’s poetic artfulness.

On *hinviré tanvāḥ* see comm. ad X.65.2.

The *ukthaiḥ* that ends b contrasts with identically placed *ánnaiḥ* in 11b, characterizing the tools of the bad sacrificers.

The last hemistich is addressed to Indra. Note the framing: *#nṛvát ... vīráḥ#*, two words that can be applied to both humans and to gods, but here applicable to Indra. The poet may be underlining the relationship between superior humans and Indra, the qualities they share. “Speaking like a man” (*nṛvát vādan*) may also refer to the verbal instruction Indra has given in the middle of the hymn, which were composed in the human style.

The nom. *vīráḥ* may simply double the subject, in which case the pāda should be rendered “(As) hero, in heaven you have established your fame and name.” But far more likely is that standard interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) that *vīráḥ* is the actual name, which reverts to the nom. in quoted speech, though *nāma* is in the acc. See a similar ex. in I.103.4.

X.29 Indra

This last hymn attributed to Vasukra does not let up on the enigmas or the splashy poetic displays. In fact, vs. 1 is a leading contender for the most complex and trickiest single verse I have encountered in the RV. Unfortunately the tight control of structure exhibited in the preceding two hymns, esp. X.28, is not encountered here, so that we cannot use structural clues to help untangle the mysteries of the hymn.

X.29.1: As I have treated this vs. at extraordinary (perhaps wearisome) detail in my 2015 Fs. Gerow article (“Śleṣa in the Ṛgveda? Poetic Effects in RV X.29.1,” *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 19: 157–70), I will simply insert most of the text of that article here. In it I argue that the verse anticipates techniques well known from Classical Sanskrit poetry, such as bitextuality, ambiguity of reference, and other types of punning, while serving to sketch a larger ritual situation than the verse appears to depict on the surface.

Although the various poetic effects operate simultaneously, I will first treat them separately under some of the following rubrics: phonological patterning, syntactic reversal, syntactic ambiguity, lexical ambiguity, dual reference, bitextuality, and thematic allusion. I will be as explicit as possible about the mechanisms, to the point, I fear, of tedium.

The hymn begins with a striking phonological and morphological sequence. The first four syllables, ending with the caesura -- *vāne ná vā* – are a near phonological chiasmus, with initial *vā* matching final *vā*, and *ne ná* echoing each other internally. This pattern is rendered particularly salient by the unusual sequence of four monosyllables following the initial disyllable: *vāne ná vā yó ní*. Or apparent monosyllables: we will see below that there are several ways to construe this sequence besides the monosyllabic interpretation of the Padapāṭha. The opening calls attention to itself also by the unbalanced *vā* ‘or’ syntactic construction, where *vāne* ‘in the wood’ and *ná* ‘not’ are the apparent non-parallel disjunctive possibilities set up by ‘or’.

The rest of the pāda sets up a syntactic puzzle. The last two words are both finite verbs, *adhāyi cākān* (or better *ní adhāyi*), but their order is the opposite of what Ṛgvedic syntax would dictate. In the first verbal lexeme *ní adhāyi*, the finite verb is unaccented but immediately follows the relative pronoun *yāḥ*, which should trigger verbal accentuation (that is, **ní adhāyi*) if that verb belongs in the relative clause, while the second finite verb *cākān* is accented, though it appears to be a main clause verb. (The accentuation of a main-clause *cākān* is less problematic

than the non-accentuation of a subordinate clause *adhāyi*, because *cākān* in this interpretation would resume the main clause and so possibly count as syntactically initial.)

One solution (going back to Baunack 1886: 377; see Oldenberg, *Noten* ad loc.) has been, as in Geldner's translation, to switch the functions of the two verbs, i.e., to interpret *ní adhāyi* as the main verb and *cākān* as the verb of the subordinate clause. Thus, "[he] has been deposited who takes pleasure ..." For Geldner and other interpreters of earlier eras, a period that subscribed, explicitly or implicitly, to the notion of free word order in Vedic, the order of the verbs assumed here would be unusual but not really problematic. But in the more regulated RVic syntax of our time we expect neither embedded relative clauses nor—worse—embedded main clauses. But the Baunack/Geldner interpretation, which construes the initial locative *vāne* with the final *cākān* ("[he/it] has been deposited who takes pleasure in the wood or not"), requires that the main clause verb *ny ādhāyi* be embedded in the discontinuous relative clause *vāne ná vā yāḥ ... cākān*. (Even English, which embeds relative clauses with abandon, would have serious trouble with an embedded *main* clause, as here; note that a literal English translation of the proposed interpretation of the pāda is unparseable: "Who in wood or not -- he is deposited -- takes pleasure.")

As it happens, I think the embedded-clause interpretation is the correct one. But not because I believe that embedded clauses were generally licit in R̥gvedic discourse, but because I believe that they were not. This is a deliberate syntactic violation, and it is also a syntactic-semantic pun. The clause "(he) has been set down/deposited" is literally "set down" (that is, embedded) in the middle of the relative clause; its *meaning* replicates its *syntactic position*. The grammatical embedding is, as it were, iconic of the "setting down" of the referent in the main clause. I do not know if there is a technical term, either in Sanskrit or in the larger literary world, for this type of rhetorical figure, but even if it does not fit into a particular named category in literary theory, in my opinion it displays a remarkably sophisticated consciousness of how grammatical form can be made to follow and mirror semantic function.

There is a way to avoid the verbal accent problem while retaining the relative clause: by interpreting it as a nominal relative clause: *vāne ná vā yāḥ* "who is in the wood [=Agni] or not." What follows this putative nominal relative clause, the two verbs *ny ādhāyi cākān*, would then be taken as two parallel verbs in the main clause: *ny ādhāyi cākān* "he has been installed (and) takes pleasure." The accent of *cākān* would then be explicable according to the resumptive verb condition alluded to above. This seems to be Ludwig's solution, cited by Oldenberg (*Noten*, ad loc): "Der im Holze oder auch nicht im Holze (weilt), wird niedergelegt, er wars zufrieden." This is possible but not particularly elegant.

This pāda has not yet yielded all its secrets, however. Let us return to the string of monosyllables discussed above: *ná vā yó ní*. In the Geldner interpretation (which I generally follow, as the primary reading), which is based on the Pp. analysis, this sequence is, in translation, "not / or / who / down," each with its separate function in the syntactic complex. But different interpretations are made possible by unverbating adjacent syllables in different combinations, and even if these were not meant by the poet as the *dominant* reading these alternatives add an elusive (but I would claim, deliberate) resonance and thematic nuance to the overall "meaning" of the verse.

Let us begin at the very beginning of the line, with *vāne ná*, where we could read the two ostensible words as one, the instr. sg. *vānena* (with erasure of the second accent). As this reading doesn't seem to buy us anything thematically, I will not discuss it at length. Nonetheless, it opens the poem with a possible ambiguity and sets the stage for the following multiple readings.

Proceeding then from left to right, the first two apparent monosyllables *ná vā* could be combined and read as a form of *náva-* ‘new’. What would this contribute to the verse? Note that the first actual nominative in this verse is *stómaḥ* ‘praise-song’ in pāda b; the two verbs in pāda a lack overt subjects. Given that ‘praise-song’ is the subject of pāda b, it would not be surprising if a semantically related noun, such as ‘hymn’, ‘song’, ‘praise hymn’, were the underlying subject of the verbs in pāda a, and ‘new(er)’ is a regular qualification of hymns and songs in the RV, expressing the crucial goal of the RVic bard: to attract the gods to the sacrifice by producing a strikingly novel verbal composition generated from traditional materials. True, if *návā* is to modify it, the noun should be feminine, as opposed to masculine *stóma-*, but such feminine nouns are easy to find (e.g., *gír-*, *dhī-*, *dhītí-*, *matí-*, *stutí-*, etc.); fem. *návā-* in fact modifies *gír-* in II.24.1 (*ayā ... návayā mahā girā* “with this great new song”). Although I do not believe that “new (hymn)” is the primary intended subject of pāda a (*pace* Lanman, Noun inflection 505, flg. Roth), given the lack of overt subject in that line the audience would be pardoned for falling into such a trap, especially as “has been set down/deposited” is certainly a possible predicate for such a subject. See nearby X.31.3 *ádhyāyī dhītīḥ* “The insightful thought has been set in place,” also in ritual context (additionally, e.g., I.162.7, 183.6). And I venture to say that the poet consciously laid this trap.

Combining the next two words, *vā yó*, gives us several possibilities, one of which has a long interpretational pedigree. Yāska (VI.28) follows this unverbated reading *vāyó*, interpreting it as a patronymic, ‘son of a bird’ (*veḥ putrah*), i.e., presumably a vṛddhi derivative of the root noun *ví-* ‘bird’. Yāska is followed by Sāyaṇa and by Oldenberg. Sāyaṇa’s gloss of *vāya-* spells out the implications of the vṛddhi at some length (couched in the accusative because he rewrites the aorist passive as a transitive present): *śakuniḥ sve nīḍe vāyam ātmīyaṃ putraṃ nyadhāyī nidadhāti śisukam ajātapakṣam* “a bird places in its own nest the *vāya*, (viz.) the son of its own self, its little chick whose feathers haven’t grown.” Here is Oldenberg’s translation of the first pāda with the vṛddhi interpr.: “Wie im Wald ein Vogel (weilt), ward er (im Wald = Holz) niedergelegt, fand (daran) Befriedigung,” interpreting *ná* as the simile marker, not the negative, and also doing away with the somewhat awkward *vā* ‘or’. See also the explicit vṛddhi reading in Klein’s (DGRV II.208-9) preliminary translation “As the son of a bird (dwells) in the wood, he (i.e., Agni) has been set down (in the wood).” But this is just Klein’s pūrvapakṣa; he rejects the “bird” reading and accepts the Śākalya / Geldner interpretation with *vā yó*.

Not surprisingly the proposed simile is a fairly common image, as in IX.96.23 *sīdan vāneṣu śakunó ná pātvā* “sitting in the woods like a flying bird.” The entity compared to the bird must be Agni, a comparison often made in the Ṛgveda. Although this interpretation is tempting and, by eliminating the supposed relative pronoun *yó*, would also eliminate the problem of verb (non-)accentuation in a subordinate clause discussed above, there are some problems with it in turn. The primary one is the fact there is no independently attested stem *vāyá-* ‘bird’ to which *vāyó* would be the nom. sg. in sandhi -- only the archaic paradigm *ví-* (nom. sg. *vés* as well as synchronically regular *vís*) and a marginally attested collective neuter *s*-stem *vāyas-* with short vowel, generally assumed (see AiG II.2: 227) to have been reinterpreted from the identical root noun nominative plural. The only ‘bird’ word with long vowel in the initial syllable is the transparent vṛddhi derivative with thematic suffix *vāyasā-* (I.164.52 and later), built to the *s*-stem. Although a putative thematic vṛddhi derivative to *ví-*, namely **vāyá-*, would probably be theoretically possible (see AiG II.2: 127-28 on vṛddhi derivatives to *i*-stems, but there are no examples given of root nouns in *-i*), it seems preferable not to invent an otherwise unattested stem for just this passage. Moreover, at least in Oldenberg’s rendering (see also Klein’s

pūrvapakṣa), the simile is supplied with a different verb (weilt / dwells) from the frame (ward ... niedergelegt / has been set down), a serious violation of Ṛgvedic simile structure (see Jamison 1982). Nonetheless, I do not reject the possibility that a “bird” reading is one of the several recessive alternatives hidden in this syllabic sequence.

But a reading *vāyó* suggests another possibility, though it requires the elimination of the accent -- namely the vocative of the god Wind, Vāyu. As with *nāvā* I am not suggesting that this is the primary reading, but a secondary possibility that actualizes some underlying themes. Why a fugitive reference to Vāyu might be appropriate here will be discussed below.

Let us finally turn to the last two monosyllables, *yó ní*. Read together, with elimination of the second accent, they produce the word *yóni* ‘womb’ in both literal and extended senses. The fireplace at the sacrifice is often called a *yóni* and the ritual fire / god Agni is established therein (generally with the lexeme *ní√sad* ‘sit down’, sharing the preverb *ní* with our *ní√dhā*, e.g., VI.16.41 *ā svē yónau ní śīdatu* “let him [=Agni] sit down in his own womb”). Since one of the few things that is clear about this verse is that it at least partially concerns the establishment of the ritual fire in its fireplace, a subsurface reference to *yóni* is entirely apt.

We can map these various possible readings as follows. (Asterisks mark forms where one accent has been erased. Combinations of the listed variants are also possible, e.g., *vāne nāvā *yóni*.)

vāne ná vā yó ní (per Padapāṭha)

* *vānena vā yó ní*

vāne nāvā yó ní

vāne ná vāyó ní (per Yāska, etc.)

*vāne ná *vāyo ní*

*vāne ná vā *yóni*

I find it hard not to see embryonic śleṣa or bitextuality in the six superimposable possibilities of this six-syllable sequence, most of which subtly underline the thematics of the verses as a whole.

Such are the verbal intricacies of the first pāda, but several larger questions about it remain not only unsolved but as yet unposed. Chief among them is the identity of the unexpressed subject of the two verbs, and this will lead us to the larger question of reference in this verse, which is generally quite coy about the identities of the entities contained therein. For the first pāda the verb *ny ādhāyi* is the major clue, for the lexeme *ní√dhā* is a standard technical expression for the installation of the god Agni as ritual priest (see Geldner, n. 1a, with numerous parallels cited). Combined with the initial word *vāna*- ‘wood’, a substance not surprisingly associated with fire and the deified Fire, circumstantial evidence strongly points to Agni as subject. This surmise finds some support in the priestly title Hotar found at the end of pāda c, since Agni is regularly identified as a Hotar and identified with the human Hotar.

But pāda c also raises problems with this identification, because the nom. sg. *hótā* at the end of the pāda is matched in case, number, and gender by *índraḥ* earlier in the line. There is nothing explicit in the pāda to disjoin the two nominatives, though an audience’s general knowledge of the Vedic context should produce strong opposition to equating Indra and the Hotar. Nonetheless, Scarlatta (302 n. 430) tentatively suggests the possibility, among many others floated, that Indra is being referred to as Hotar here. (I find this very unlikely.) Sāyaṇa also takes *hótā* as a qualifier of Indra, but interprets it not as the priestly title, but as a transparent -tar-agent noun to *√hū / hvā* ‘call’, glossing it *āhvātā*. This contrasts with his gloss of *hótar*- when he is comfortable with a priestly reading – e.g., referring to Agni in I.1.1 *hotāram ṛtvijam / devānām yajñeṣu hotṛnāmaka ṛtvig agnir eva*.

The identification of Indra and Hotar can be blocked, but this produces a different conceptual disharmony. It would be technically possible to divide the pāda into a nominal relative clause (*yásyéd índrah*) and a nominal main clause (*purudīṇeṣu hótā*), with *hótā* [=Agni] as the referent of *yásya*. This seems to be Scarlatta's (302) preferred solution: "... er, dem Indra ja zugehört, an vielen Tagen der Hotr ..." But, the implication, that Indra belongs to Agni, is at least as hard to accommodate within the R̥gvedic conceptual universe as that Indra is the Hotar. We will return to the syntax of this pāda below.

So, we have implicit reference to Agni in pādas a and c and explicit reference to Indra, who is also the dedicand of the hymn, in pāda c. What is the relationship of the two gods here? This question is further muddled by pāda d in the phrasal etymological figure *nṛṇām nāryo nṛtamaḥ* "the manly one, best man among men." Although the phrase is in the singular, it is actually applicable to either Indra or Agni -- or both. The adjective *nārya-* is generally typed for Indra when it modifies a god, but (*nṛṇām ...*) *nṛtamaḥ* is used of both gods (though somewhat more often of Indra). Out of ca. 50 occurrences of *nārya-*, about 8 apply directly to Indra, including one in verse 7 of this same hymn; it is also used of a few other gods, also of legendary heroes and of humans, as well as of inanimate objects and forces. Indra and Agni are almost the only referents of the approximately thirty independent occurrences of *nṛtama-* (with or without *nṛṇām*), though a few characterize human heroes or the Maruts. The absolute numbers are skewed towards Indra, however, because the word is found in a common Viśvāmitra refrain (14x: III.30.22, etc.). For Agni, cf., e.g., ... *nṛtamo yahvó agnīḥ* (III.1.12, IV.5.2); for Indra, e.g., X.89.1 *índram stavā nṛtamam yásya mahnā*. Of course the splv. phrase (undistracted: *nṛtamasya nṛṇām*) occurs in the next vs. (2b) clearly referring to Indra, but I don't think this requires the phrase here to apply exclusively to Indra. Thus, the final pāda seems designed *not* to resolve the puzzle set up by the juxtaposition of Indra and (Agni) Hotar, but to allow both gods to be evoked by the descriptive phrase in the singular. Note that this phrase shows an embedding reminiscent of the embedding in pāda a, with the two halves of the superlative phrase (*nṛṇām ... nṛtamaḥ*) surrounding the adjective *nāryaḥ*. If the superlative is more likely to refer to Agni and the adjective to Indra, interspersing the words in this fashion further blurs the separate identities of the two gods. What makes this double application especially nice is that the various derivatives of *nṛ-* 'man, superior man' select different manly qualities in the two gods: Indra's superior manly heroism, but Agni's closeness to men, as the god who lives in their dwellings and mediates between them and the gods. (Recall also that in the final vs. of the previous hymn, X.28.12, Indra speaks *nṛvát* 'like a man'.)

The final word of the verse, *kṣapāvān*, does little to resolve the duality. In modern times the standard reading of this adjective is 'protector of the earth' bleached to simple 'protector' (*kṣa-pāvant-*, with the first element a zero-grade from of the archaic noun *kṣám-* 'earth'). Although this word (thus accented also in I.70.5; with initial accent, *kṣá-pāvant-* 3x) is clearly used of Agni in three of the four other occurrences (I.70.5, VII.10.5, and VIII.71.2; in III.55.17 the referent is ambiguous, but the most likely candidates are Agni and Soma), there seems no reason that an adjective with such a meaning could not equally describe Indra. But the word displays what we might term morphological śleṣa, as it can also be analyzed *kṣapā-vant-*, with the first element containing the word *kṣáp-* 'night'. Such an analysis has ancient roots, as Sāyaṇa's gloss shows (though with unjustified additions to its semantics): *rātriparyāyeṣu somabhāgaḥ* "having a share of soma in the rounds of the (Ati)rātra [=Overnight] ritual." With a suggestion of Scarlatta (303), we could analyze *kṣapāvant-* as based on a syntagm with original predicative instrumental (*kṣapā* "[he is] with night"), which was then provided with a *-vant-*

possessive suffix. Scarlatta (303) also suggests other ways to incorporate *kṣáp-* ‘night’, e.g., by haplology from **kṣápā + pā-* ‘protecting by night’ (his reconstructed initial accent reflects a posited adverbial accent shift from inst. *kṣapā*; see p. 303 and n. 452). The exact details matter less than the fact that the Vedic audience could likely see a pun in this word, between *kṣa-* as a combining form of *kṣām-* ‘earth’ and *kṣap-* ‘night’ (for another poss. ex. see I.70.5, 7 and comm. thereon). An analysis involving ‘night’ would favor Agni as referent, since fire is depicted in the RV as man’s defense against encroaching night and, in particular, the kindling of the ritual fire is associated with the return of daylight and the defeat of night.

If pādas c and d can both be read as applicable simultaneously to Indra and Agni, we might reconsider pāda a, where we identified only Agni as the subject of the verbs in that line. Could Indra also be lurking in that pāda as well? I think it possible, on the basis of the odd phrase *vāne nā vā yāḥ ... cākān* “who takes pleasure in the wood or not.” Agni as fire certainly does “take pleasure in the wood” throughout the RV, burning his way through both ritual and profane versions of that substance. But Indra is not likely to get any satisfaction from wood. If Indra is a potential subject of the verbs in pāda a, he may be “set down” at the ritual ground as the recipient of the dawn sacrifice whose epiphany is much desired. In this case, he could be the subject associated with the disjunctive negative “or not.”

Ambiguity of reference also clouds pāda b, which we have yet to deal with. Unlike the other pādas, the general message of this one is fairly straightforward: *śúcīr vām stómo bhuraṇāv ajīgaḥ* “The gleaming praise-song has awakened you two, o bustling ones.” The problem is posed by the vocative *bhuraṇau*. First, so far there has been at most one being referred to in the hymn, namely the unnamed subject of the verbs in pāda a, so where do we get a dual 2nd person? The general context allows us to surmise who the dual might be. On the one hand, as we saw above, the verb *ny ādhāyi* is likely to have Agni as its subject on the basis of multiple parallel passages and the technical ritual sense of the verb; on the other, the hymn is dedicated to Indra, as the audience would of course be aware. Thus the enclitic *vām* ‘you two’ and the vocative *bhuraṇau* ‘o bustling ones’ could easily identify the pair Indra and Agni. Such an identification is supported by the second hemistich discussed above: the presence of both Indra and (Agni) Hotar in pāda c and the epithets applicable to both those gods in pāda d, as well as by the possible lurking presence of Indra in pāda a, as was just suggested. But the adjective *bhuraṇa-* is only found in the dual (3x total; only voc. so unaccented), and the other two duals are addressed to the Aśvins. Moreover, the phraseology of pāda b has reminiscences in explicitly Aśvin contexts. Those gods are twice objects of the verb *ajīgaḥ* (III.58.1, VIII.67.1); III.58.1 is an especially close parallel: *uśāsa stómo aśvínāv ajīgaḥ* “The praise-song of Dawn has awakened the Aśvins.” So, although the pragmatics of our hymn suggest that Indra and Agni should be the referents of the 2nd ps. dual in pāda b, the larger formulaic system suggests the Aśvins instead. Indeed, this is Sāyaṇa’s view – one that causes him some distress (*tad asādhū*), given that the first ṛc of a sūkta dedicated to Indra should not be in praise of the Aśvins.

Can these competing referents be reconciled? I would argue that they can, or rather that throughout this verse we are meant to hold distinct referents in our minds simultaneously and superimpose them upon each other: Indra upon Agni, and Indra and Agni upon the Aśvins. Simultaneous reference is quite common in the R̥gveda. This practice is not quite equivalent, at least in scale, with composing a poem that narrates the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa simultaneously, but it arises from the same impulse – to encourage multiple readings, rather than forcing the audience to choose one. I would further argue that in our verse these multiple readings are in service of a larger project: evoking the dawn sacrifice and its attendant divinities

in a verse that makes almost no overt reference to this ritual complex. The gods associated with the dawn ritual are Agni, whose kindling initiates the sacrifice, the Aśvins, Indra and Vāyu, the pair who receive the first offering, and of course Dawn herself. And, although only Indra is mentioned by name in the verse, (almost) all the others are indirectly present here: Agni, because of his characteristic vocabulary (pādas a, cd), the Aśvins, because of their formulaic evocation in pāda b, and Vāyu, in the śleṣa identified in pāda a discussed above. Note that it is the vocative of his name, *vāyo*, that floats to the surface in the reanalysis of pāda a. This is probably no accident, as it evokes the well-known conjoined address to Indra and Vāyu, *vāyav* [voc.] *īndraś* [nom.] *ca*, an archaic construction found in dawn-ritual hymns inviting the two divinities to soma drinking (e.g., I.2.5, 6).

But where is Dawn? She may be evoked by the parallel to pāda b just cited: *uṣāsa stómaḥ ... ajīgaḥ* “The praise-song of Dawn has awakened...” The *śúciḥ* ‘gleaming’ modifying *stómaḥ* in our verse can also be a stand-in for Dawn’s light; see I.134.4 .. *uṣāsaḥ śúcayaḥ*..., etc. But more importantly she appears overtly at the beginning of verse 2: *prá ... asyā uṣāsaḥ* “At the forefront of this dawn here...” Thus, the poet skillfully sets the stage for the dawn sacrifice in verse 1 using none of the standard tropes, but rather by śleṣa and lexical and formulaic evocation. Only then, in verse 2, does he straightforwardly introduce the dawn and proceed to the sacrificial performance that is to draw Indra to our ritual ground. If it is poetic cleverness and linguistic indirection that lure Indra, the poet will certainly succeed.

There remain a few loose ends, concentrated in pāda c. The pāda lacks a verb and, as we saw above, the referent of the rel. *yásya* is unclear. Here I follow Ge in supplying *cākān* from pāda a as the verb and the *stómaḥ* of b as the referent of the relative. I diverge from Ge in taking *īndraḥ* and *hótā* (=Agni) as separate subjects of the supplied *cākān*; Ge nudges pāda-final *hótā* into the next pāda. Ge makes the nice point (n. 1a) that *cākān* can take both loc. and gen. complements, with the first in pāda a and the other in pāda c – though in the midst of all the other poetic complications this effect is hardly noticed.

Pāda c also contains the hapax *purudína-*, with the ‘day’ element (-*dína-*) found otherwise only in *madhyāṃdína-* ‘midday’ and *sudína-* ‘day-bright’ (?), on which see EWA s.v. *madhyāṃdína-*. Since *sudína-* is an adj., *purudína-*, with the same accent, probably is too; so Gr “vielleicht ein *vieltägiges Fest*,” EWA ‘viele Tage enthaltend’. It is thus likely that this is the temporal designation of some ritual (a sattra? or just a soma sacrifice, but reckoning in the days of preparation?), but the exact ritual reference escapes me. Nonetheless the tr. should probably be altered to “at (rituals) of many days.”

In the publ. tr. I limited the number of alternatives presented for the sake of (semi-)intelligibility.

X.29.2: This vs. lacks the verbal tricks of vs. 1 but is discouragingly enigmatic nonetheless.

The multiple days of the sacrifice indicated by *purudíneṣu* in 1c may also be reflected in the expression *asyā uṣāsaḥ ... áparasyāḥ* “of this dawn and a/the later one.” With Old and Ge I take this gen. phrase as a temporal expression; I construe the genitives loosely with the repeated *prá*, which seems associated with the two temporal alternatives (*prá ... asyā uṣāsaḥ prāparasyāḥ*). The *prá* is otherwise difficult to account for; it should not be a preverb with *syāma* in b because *prá √as* means ‘be preeminent, surpass’, which does not fit the context—pace Ge’s “bei deinem ... Antanzen ... den Vorrang haben,” which suggests that we’re hoping for front-row seats. On the temporal genitive see Delbrück, AIS §113, which mentions *uṣāsaḥ* specifically. Gr construes *uṣāsaḥ* with *nṛtaú* (see s.v. *nṛtí*), and Ge (n. 2b) suggests this as an additional syntactic

connection on the basis of I.92.4, where Dawn is compared to a dancer. However, Indra most definitely dances elsewhere (cf. V.33.6, where Indra's *nṛmṇāni* appear in the same pāda, with the same word play as here), and I think his "dance" here is his much-desired epiphany.

Like 1d, pāda b contains a sequence of three *nṛ* forms, including the repetition of the splv. phrase *nṛṇām nṛtama-*, though in a different order and a different case. But the third word *nṛtaú* 'at the dance' is not etymologically bound to this phrase, as *nārya-* in 1d is (though it surely is by folk etymology).

As Ge says (n. 2c), the 2nd hemistich presents a "dunkler Sagenzug." The problem (or one of them) is *triśoka-*. This word is always a PN, seemingly of a human ṛṣi/poet. In I.112.12 he is one of the many clients aided by the Aśvins, in a series of vss. that name men of similar ilk, like the far better known poets Kakṣīvant (vs. 11) and Bhāradvāja (vs. 13); in VIII.45.30 he is aided by Indra. In both cases the aid he receives allows him to drive cattle up or out (of a mountain in VIII.45.30), in a Vala-like denouement. VIII.30 is also attributed to Triśoka Kāṇva by the Anukr, probably on the basis of his appearance in vs. 30. And in AV IV.29.6 he appears in an overstuffed list (vss. 3–6) of clients of Mitra and Varuṇa that includes many of the best-known RVic poets. (In vs. 6 he finds himself between Medhātithi and Uṣanā Kāvya.) What is this rather recessive poet/hero doing here? As indicated in the publ. tr., I think there is a pun here, and that in addition to the man's name, *triśoka-* is a reference to Agni, who, of course, is represented at the ritual by three fires, hence 'having three flames' as an epithet. (Three of the five occurrences of *śoka-* are connected with Agni.) A reference to Agni could continue the theme of vs. 1, the establishment of the ritual fire. But it doesn't get us much further with the Sagenzug, and in fact I now think that the Agni identification is a red herring planted by the poet.

For the Sagenzug we should start further along, with a name we know better: Kutsa. Kutsa is famous for his association with Indra in the battle against Śuṣṇa, in which exploit Uṣanā Kāvya also figures. Kutsa regularly rides on Indra's chariot. See, e.g., IV.16.11 *yāsi kútsena sarátham* "you [=Indra] drive on the same chariot with Kutsa" (sim. V.29.9, also with *sarártham ... kútsena*). It is this phrase that I think underlies the puzzling relationship between the main clause and the relative clause, with the latter having as subject *rátho yáh* "which chariot" (nom.), which has no apparent antecedent in the main cl. If *kútsena* belongs to the main clause and allows us to supply the phrase **sarátham kútsena*, then the antecedent is covertly there, though locked in an adverb, which, moreover, is unexpressed in the text. (Construing differently, though with more or less the same sense, Ge: he takes *kútsena* with the rel. cl. and supplies **ráthena* in the main cl.: "... auf dem Wagen, der durch Kutsa der Gewinnende werden sollte." On the difference see below.) But Indra not only travels on the same chariot with Kutsa, he sometimes "conveys" (√*vah*) him: V.31.8 ... *ávaho ha kútsam* "you conveyed Kutsa" or they are "conveyed" together: V.31.9 (next vs., same hymn) *indrākutsā váhamānā ráthena*. Now √*vah* provides the verb of the main clause in this hemistich: *ánu ... ávahat*. The subject of this verb is Triśoka, who may or may not also stand for Agni, as noted above – but the subject I would really like to see here is Indra – and I do not see any way to make *triśoka-* an epithet of Indra beyond arbitrary fiat.

There is also the problem of the verbal lexeme: *ánu-ā√vah*, which occurs only here in all of Skt. as far as I can see. Ge also feels (n. 2c) that decoding the hemistich depends on understanding the sense of that lexeme.

And a further problem is the 100 men whom Triśoka conveyed, for which I know no mythological precedent.

I can make some further headway but am far from understanding the whole. Looking at the Trisoka passages elsewhere we can situate him in a web of associations that point to the episode of Indra's slaying of Śuṣṇa with the help of Kutsa and the counsel of Uśanā Kāvya. Trisoka is linked to Kutsa at least marginally, since I.112, which contains one of the few attestations of *trisoḥka-*, is attributed to Kutsa; Trisoka is directly linked to Indra because Indra aids him in VIII.45.30. On the basis of AV IV.29.6 we can also connect him to Uśanā Kāvya. The phraseology of our passage also points to this same episode, as outlined above. It is almost as if Trisoka is a kind of Zelig figure (from the movie of the same name), a nearly anonymous minor figure absorbed into a well-known plot. Perhaps the 100 men he conveys are reinforcements or auxiliaries for the combat, and the *ānu* of *ānu-ā √ vah* means 'convey in addition'. But if this is an variant of and expansion on the more familiar Śuṣṇa slaying tale, this is its only occurrence, as far as I know, and we will never know more about it.

Even if this is all true (and in fact it doesn't fit together very well), what does this contribute to this vs. and this hymn? I remain mostly baffled. One clue to the contribution it makes is the switch from mythological past to potential future: the verb of the main cl. is (most likely) an augmented impf. (so Pp.), though technically it could also be an injunc., *ā vahat*. The verb of the following rel. clause is subjunctive, made even clearer by being periphrastic (*āsāt sasavān*). So the mytho-historical snippet in the main clause must be serving as model for the present: the chariot journey in the main clause led to success and victory (the killing of Śuṣṇa, if I've identified the myth right), and so the chariot with which we're currently concerned will be victorious too. I would suggest that current chariot is the one on which Indra is traveling to our sacrifice – for the epiphany that seems to be the topic and goal of this hymn. (Note that if I am correct about the division between mythological past and ritual present, this provides more support for my view that *kútsena* belongs to the main cl., despite the preceding pāda boundary [*pace* Ge], since Kutsa belongs to the myth, not our current ritual.)

Here and in two other occurrences (VII.87.2, IX.74.8), the nom. sg. of the pf. part. to *√ san* should be read with a heavy root syllable, reflecting, one way or the other, the seṭ root. On this issue see KH (Aufs. 544–46), who weighs the merits of **sasāvān* and **sasanvān*; I would favor the former.

X.29.3–5: These three vss. present themselves technically like an omphalos structure, with the two outer vss. (3, 5) responsive, with their vs.-final *ānnaiḥ* and forms of *√ śak*. This would define vs. 4 as the omphalos, and, rather cutely, it also has a form of *ānna-*, but the recessive *ānne* beginning 4d. However, in terms of content this doesn't work: vss. 3 and 4 pattern together, and vs. 5 change the subject, so, although the structure of the three vss. is promising and they are found in the middle of the hymn, I don't think that's what's going on. Instead it's better to concentrate on the similarities of the first two of these vss. (3–4), where the poet peppers Indra with questions about when and how Indra will come to our sacrifice and what will induce him to choose our sacrifice (over those of competing sacrificers).

X.29.3: In pāda a the publ. tr. renders *rāntyo bhūt* as if it were a gerundive periphrasis ("is to be enjoyed by you"), but since *rāntya-* is built to the *-ti-* stem *rānti-*, the tr. oversells its verbal nature. I'd now emend to "... is / will be enjoyable to you." The injunctive *bhūt* is functionally ambiguous.

In b the verbal lexeme (*abhí ... ví dhāva*) is construed with a double acc. *dúraḥ gírah*. I think it likely that *dhāva* selects a different preverb for each acc.: *abhí* for the goal *gírah* 'hymns',

ví for the doors, through which Indra is to run. *ví* is regularly associated with ‘doors’ elsewhere, esp., but not only, with the lexeme *ví√vr* ‘open’.

But the doors of what? I think it likely that they are the same as the enigmatic “divine doors” (*dvāro devāḥ*) found in the Āprī litanies, generally in vs. 5 (I.188.5, VII.2.5, etc.) or 6 (I.13.6, 142.6). In the Āprī context the doors open up for sacrifice (e.g., I.13.6 *yāṣṭave*) or for the gods to come through (e.g., I.142.6 *prayaí devébhyaḥ*). See esp. III.4.5 *abhīmāṃ yajñām ví caranta pūrvāḥ* “They [=gods] proceed through the many (doors) towards this sacrifice,” with *ví* and a verb of motion, as here. The doors are discussed in detail by van den Bosch in his comprehensive treatment of the Āprī hymns (IJ 28 [1985] 95-122, 169-89), with the doors disc. pp. 104-6, incl. a survey of previous lit. Though the disc. is useful, I cannot follow the au in taking them as real doors, “special gates ... erected for this sacrificial performance” (p. 105) of, in his view, an archaic domestic animal sacrifice. Instead I think they must be the conceptual doors that give the gods access to our ritual ground, that open up for them when we perform sacrifice, and that, when conceptually shut, keep the divine and mortal spheres safely separate.

Note the phonological play *dúro gíro ... ugró*, with parts of the 1st two words combined in the third.

Pāda c poses some questions, beginning with the first word, *kád*. Is it a lexicalized ‘when?’ (per publ. tr.) or the neut. nom./acc. sg. of the interrogative prn/adj. ‘what/which?’ (per Ge, Old [ZDMG 50 (1896) 430 = KISch 8])? I now favor the latter against my previous tr. The final word of the pāda is also problematic: *manīṣā* in the Saṃhitā text. Since *d* begins with a vowel (*ā*), the underlying form should be *manīṣāḥ*, and this is the interpr. in the publ. tr. The presence of an indisputable *manīṣāḥ* at the end of the next vs. (4d) might support this reading. However, the Pp. reads *manīṣā* despite the resulting hiatus; on this reading see Old’s various reff. starting with the Prātiśākhya, which favor the form in hiatus. I now see that I should accept this sg. form, though in fact it will not make much difference in my interpr. (which will change considerably for other reasons). In the publ. tr. I took it as nom. pl.; I now interpr. it as nom. sg., though it could also be an instr. sg. (so Gr).

To understand the pāda we need to consider the meaning and use of the keyword *vāhas-*. (As for its form, I have no opinion on the lengthened grade in this word and some other derivatives of the root *√vah*.) Gr glosses it ‘Darbringung’, which is adopted in EWA (s.v. *VAH*, p. 536); Ge renders it “Anziehungskraft” (force of attraction), I’m not sure on what grounds. (In fact Ge makes no comment on this vs. whatsoever.) The word is discussed at length by Old in the art. cit. above (“Vahni und Verwandtes,” ZDMG 50 [1896] 423-33 = KI Sch 1-11) with his customary acuity: he situates it within the well-known RVic conceptual equation of the sacrifice with a chariot. He notes the fact that *vāhas-* is primarily – and widely – found as a 2nd cmpd member in bahuvrīhis whose first member is a word for ritual speech: *ukthā-vāhas-*, *gír-vāhas-*, *stóma-vāhas-*, etc. Old’s interpr. (429=7) of such cmpds is “dass das Loblied als mystischer Wagen oder als Gespann den Priester zu Erfolg und Gewinn hinführt, oder dass der Priester es dem Gott als Gespann ausrüstet, der Gott mit diesem Gespann zum Opfer fährt.” His 2nd suggestion seems to me the one most generally in play: the poet’s hymn serves as the vehicle that brings Indra to the sacrifice. Two (III.30.20, 53.3) of the uncmpd occurrences of *vāhas-* involve poets making a *vāhas-* for Indra. Cf., e.g., III.30.20 ... *matībhis túbhyaṃ vípra, índrāya vāhaḥ ... akran* “The inspired poets have made a vehicle for you, for Indra, with their thoughts.” Although *vāhas-* is not cmpd here, it does appear in the same pāda, and probably the same case, as *manīṣā*, a word for ritual speech, though not one cmpd with *-vāhas-* elsewhere.

The syntax of the pāda is compressed; there is no verb and no Indra, but the phrase *arvāg ūpa mā* “near by, to me” suggests that “me” is the goal, and we need a verb of motion (cf., e.g., VII.72.2 *ā naḥ ... ūpa yātam arvāk* “drive here near to us”) or perhaps better a form of \sqrt{vah} with *īndram* as supplied object and *mā* as goal. I also now think that initial *kād* should, with appropriate (if silent) adjustment in gender be construed with *manīṣā* as well as *vāhaḥ*, thus equating the two words, as if in a cmpd **manīṣā-vāhas-* ‘having inspired thought as vehicle’. Putting all this together I would now emend the tr. to one of the following: “What vehicle, (what) inspired thought (will come) nearby to me?” or “What vehicle, (what) inspired thought (will convey you) nearby to me?” I favor the latter, even though it requires supplying more, because the poet is deliberating about how best to craft his *manīṣā* to bring Indra to him.

The lexeme $\sqrt{śak}$ is uncommon in the RV and does not seem to have a settled sense or even a settled case frame. I would now change my “would compel” to “would empower”; in other words the poet by the offering of both praise and food would give Indra the power (as well as the inclination) to reward the poet. This rendering also conforms better to the one for the desid. *pratiśīkṣanti* in 5d.

X.29.4: The poet’s questions continue in this vs., and indeed, like 3c, it begins with *kād*. As in that pāda *kād* here can be either ‘when?’ or ‘what/which?’. Either would be grammatical, since *dyumnām* is neut., but despite the apparent parallelism with 3c I prefer ‘when?’ here (contra Ge, Old), since we’re not choosing between various *dyumnā*-s that Indra has to offer, but hoping that he will arrive with *dyumnā*- to bestow. Moreover, *kād* in b cannot be ‘which?’ but should be ‘when?’ or at the very least a question particle as Ge takes it, so intra-vs. parallelism supports the ‘when?’ interpr.

My interpr. of pāda a differs from those of Ge and Old because of divergent interpr. of the final phrase *tvāvato nṛṇ* and divergent morphological analyses of the final word *nṛṇ*. The same phrase is found in II.20.1; see esp. Old ad loc. Both Old and Ge (and indeed a number of scholars; see in general AiG III.211–12) see a morphological multivalence in *nṛṇ* to which I am highly resistant (see comm. ad I.146.4, IV.2.15, 21.2): I think it can almost always be interpr. as the acc. pl. it appears to be, while Ge allows gen. pl. as well (e.g., here and in II.20.1) and Old takes it in those two passages as gen. sg. (and elsewhere even as nom. pl.). There is, in my view, strong pressure to take it as acc. pl. here. On the one hand the same form is a clear acc. pl. in 2c, and there are also two perfectly formed gen. pl. (1d, 2b, as often, better read **nṛṇām* to repair the cadence; see Old) and a nom. pl. *nāraḥ* in 5d, so the poet must have had the conventional paradigm in his head. Against a gen. singular reading is the nom. pl. *nāraḥ* in 5d, who appear to be the same people as our *nṛṇ*. Moreover, 3c, our pāda 4a, and 4b all have the same conceptual structure in my view: all three contain an acc. goal referring to us or our side: 3c *mā*, 4a *nṛṇ*, 4b *naḥ*, and all three are questions about when or how Indra will come to us—though only the last has an overt verb of motion, *āgan*.

In b we return first to the question of *whose* hymn, *what kind* of hymn will attract Indra (as in 3c): *kāyā dhiyā karase*. But the next question, which continues into the next hemistich, is about the timing of Indra’s advent.

In c I take *satyā-* as ‘actually present’, with reference to Indra’s epiphany, rather than the standard ‘true ally’ construed with *mitrāḥ* in the simile.

The dat. *bhṛtyaī* is ambiguous: it can either refer to our bearing offerings for Indra (as I take it) or to his support for us (or, indeed, both). There are no other dat. occurrences to this

stem, but the two acc. sg. *bhṛtīm* (VIII.66.11, IX.103.1) both refer to our offerings to the gods, and since the next pāda refers to such offerings I favor that interpr.

Ge's interpr. of d is entirely different from mine: "da eines jeden Sinnen auf Speise gerichtet sein wird." He thus takes *manīṣāḥ* in an entirely different sense from *manīṣā* in 3c (a vs. that also contains *ánna*-), which speaks against his interpr. In my view, the poet is returning to the issue of competing sacrifices, which is implicit in the urgent questions he's been raising. Now he makes it explicit: admitting that the sacrifice of someone else (*samasya*) will also feature both food (*ánne*) and *manīṣā*-, the two items he promised Indra in 3cd. This admission seems a bit like a strategic blunder – though surely Indra knows it already – but (again implicitly) the poet is asserting the superiority of his own offerings. My interpr. requires loc. *ánne* to refer to the ceremony of food offering, not just to the food itself, but this doesn't seem like too much of an expansion.

The unaccented pronominal stem *sama-* (13x, excluding reps.) is generally taken as a straight indefinite 'someone, anyone', but it's worth noting that it's almost always found in clear pejorative context, of unspecified opponents. English 'some' can develop the same sort of negative sense – e.g., "some guy" in contexts like "Some guy was Xing ..." generally refers to someone doing something disapproved of ("some guy was making trouble" rather than "some guy was helping an old lady"). For the RV cf. passages like I.176.4 *ásunvantam samam jahi* "Smite anyone who doesn't press (soma)." For the three passages that appear to have neutral sense (VI.27.3, VIII.21.8, and X.54.3), see comm. ad locc.; all three are best interpr. negatively.

X.29.5: Another vs. studded with puzzles. The first pāda seems to consist of several interlocked similes anchored by *préraya* 'send forth', with Indra the unnamed addressee of this impv. in my view (versus Ge [n. 5ab]: self-address of the poet). The first simile consists of nom. *sūrah* (*pace* Gr, who takes it as gen. to *svār*-, but in agreement with Ge, KH [139], Scar [252]) and acc. of goal *ārtham* "send forth (as) the sun (sends forth X) to the task/business," with the direct object – who or what is being sent there – unexpressed. But it is not difficult to supply the object, since this is the common trope of the dawn / sun / Savitar dispersing humans to their tasks in the morning (cf., e.g., I.113.6, VII.63.4). In the 2nd simile, by my interpr., the only expressed element is the goal, *pārām* 'far shore'. I supply "boat" as the direct object being sent there, in keeping with the literal meaning of *pārām*, though the others cited above simply take it as the goal in the frame (e.g., Klein DGRV I.122 "Impel forth over to the other side ..."). In his n. 5ab Ge does introduce the possibility of a boat and cites the telling passages II.42.1. *íyarti ... iva nāvam*, X.116.9 *síndhāv iva prérayam nāvam* "I send forth (speech) like a boat on a river." Although the position of *ná* might seem to speak against my interpr., as has been discussed elsewhere (VIII.76.1, X.21.1), *ná* 'like' is blocked from pāda-final position and flips with the simile word in those circumstances. In any case the direct object of the frame is, by general agreement, the gapped masc. pl. prn. **tān*, which would serve as antecedent of the rel. *yé* in pādas b and cd.

These two clauses (b and cd), conjoined by *ca*, presumably define the groups of humans who will benefit from Indra's nudge and who have in some way earned his helpful push. The 2nd rel. cl. (cd) works very well in this scenario, depicting the humans' ritual activity. But b is a different matter.

The interpr. of b is considerably complicated by the hapax root noun cmpd *janidhā(h)* 'wife providers' (?). By form this can be either nom. or acc. pl., but neither choice contributes helpfully to the interpr. Before tackling the wife problem, it's useful to determine the referent of

asya. This is generally taken to be Indra (Ge, Old, Klein, Scar, but not KH), but Indra must be referred to in the 2nd ps. in cd, given the enclitic *te* and the voc. phrase *tuvijāta ... indra*. As indicated above, I also think that Indra is the addressee of the 2nd sg. impv. in pāda a. Although switch between persons is not unusual even within a single vs. in the RV, it would, I think, be unusual to have a 3rd ps. sandwiched between two 2nd ps. in the same vs. The case for the Indra ref. of *asya* is based on the larger context: if men are trying to fulfill Indra's wish (*asya kāmam*), they deserve his aid, just like the ritualists in cd. But I find the reference sandwich too problematic and think that b is actually less parallel to cd than it appears (or indeed should be). Instead it seems to be a recasting of one of the similes in pāda a: just as the sun sends people to their task(s), so (in b) do people pursue each his own desire. The sg. *asya* would be individuating the various different *kāma*- the plural subjects have.

So what do the *janidhā*- have to do with this, and are they being compared with the subjects, the *yé* who go to the *kāmam*, or with the object, the *kāmam*? Most opt for the former, while the publ. tr. reflects the latter. Before attempting to adjudicate the case identity, we should make a stab at figuring out what the cmpd might mean. I will start with an outlier suggestion, that of KH, which I wish I could adopt but which seems an impossible interpr. His tr. of b (139) is “der einem (*asya*) auf den Wunsch eingehen wie ein zum Eheweib bestimmtes Mädchen (?).” Unlike the standard interpr. noted above, he does not take *asya* as a reference to Indra (as far as I can see), but as a sort of indefinite. But it is his interpr. of *janidhā*- as a nom. sg. fem. “zum Eheweib bestimmtes Mädchen” that is more radical, since it assumes a passive sense of the root noun *-dhā*-, which would be unprecedented for *-dhā*- cmpds (and in fact questionable for most root noun cmpds). But it would yield some sense in the pāda: those fulfilling the wish of the unidentified *asya* would be likened to a new bride fulfilling the wish of her husband. However, I think this interpr. has to be rejected because of the twisting of the root noun cmpd, which is esp. unlikely given the existence of the parallel cmpd *jani-dā*- ‘giving wives’ (IV.17.16, of Indra). Conforming to the standard model of root noun cmpds, the first member should be the obj. of the root noun – as in cmpds like *dhiyaṃ-dhā*- ‘creating thought’, *ratna-dhā*- ‘creating / establishing / providing treasure’, etc., as well as the just-cited *jani-dā*-. What would a bride-creator/establisher/provider be? Ge suggests “Ehestifter” (matchmaker), which makes literal sense, but I do not know of any evidence for such a role in Rigvedic society (not that we would necessarily have it). Nonetheless, the publ. tr. adopts a version of this, “providers of wives,” with the further assumption that men go to such people to fulfill their wish (for a wife). I now think this was an ill-thought-out translation of desperation, though I don't have much better to replace it with. I now think Gr's ‘Brautführer’ / Scar's ‘Brautwerber’ are closer to the mark and have some connection to what we know about the mechanics of ancient Indian marriage. As I have discussed elsewhere (see esp. SacWife 221–23 and passim), a prospective bridegroom does not seek the hand of a maiden himself, but sends “wooers” (*varā[ka]-*) to the prospective bride's family to arrange the match. These wooers are already found in the RVic wedding hymn X.85.14, and the institution is treated more straightforwardly in the gr̥hya sūtras. The wooers can reasonably be considered ‘arrangers/providers of the bride’, and they would perform this task “at the desire” (*kāmam*) of the bridegroom. I now therefore would tr. the pāda “(those) who pursue each his own desire, like bride-providers (=wooers) at his (=bridegroom's) wish,” with *asya kāmam* used in two different senses and syntactic functions (the one in the simile being adverbial) and *janidhā* nom. rather than the acc. of my publ. tr.

After this, the interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is comparatively uncomplicated. As noted above, this clause must express the ritual actions directed at Indra that attract his aid. As in the

previous two vss., which treat the same matter, food is a crucial element: pāda-final *ánnaiḥ* matches that of 3d, with loc. *ánne* in 4d somewhat recessive, since it describes the ritual of the rival sacrificer. The previous two vss. also showcase the verbal portion of the ritual, with *manīṣāḥ* (3c, 4d). In our vs. *gíraḥ* is substituted. The use of a form of $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$ ‘be able’, here the semi-lexicalized desid. *śikṣ* with *práti*, a combination found only here, also recalls vs. 3 *ā* ... *śakyām* – though the two uses of *śak* are slightly different. In 3d the object is Indra, who is empowered by the ritual offerings to (display) generosity; here it is the hymns that are empowered, to be offered to Indra.

X.29.6: The worst is now over, and the hymn drifts to its conclusion with no more than normal difficulties.

My interpr. of the first hemistich differs considerably from Ge’s, and there are arguments in favor of each—though ultimately I favor my own. The points of difference are 1) what is predicated of what, 2) how *mātra*- ‘measure’ is used and what it refers to, 3) what root *súmita*- belongs to: $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$ ‘measure’ or $\sqrt{\text{mi}}$ ‘fix’, 4) what the instrumentals in b are doing and who do these qualities belong to.

Ge’s tr. is “Die beiden sind für dich reichliche, gutbemessene Massstäbe: der Himmel an Grösse, die Erde an Weisheit.” He thus takes *mātre* as predicated of Heaven and Earth, with *te* a dative enclitic. That is, “the two (=H+E) are a measure (/measuring rods / standards) for you.” For him *súmite* also belongs to $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$ and forms an etymological figure with *mātre*: “the two well-measured measures.” As he indicates in his n. 6ab, only Heaven and Earth are vast enough to serve as measuring standards for Indra. By contrast I take *mātra*- as a measure, that is, a unit of mass (like “a measure of grain”) and, further, the container that would hold that mass (in a phrase like “quart measure,” the “measure” may be the amount of liquid in a quart or the cup that holds it). So H+E are conceived of as very large, hollow containers.

I take *súmite* to $\sqrt{\text{mi}}$ ‘fix’. Syntactically *mātre* is the subject and *súmite* ‘well fixed’ is its predicate, referring to the standard cosmogonic deed of Indra’s, propping apart Heaven and Earth. Cf., e.g., III.30.4 *táva dyāvāprthivī párvatāso, ánu vratāya nímiteva tastuh* “It is following your [=Indra’s] commandment that heaven and earth and the mountains stand (/stay) like (pillars) implanted. By my interpr. *te* goes with the instr.s in b, but occupies standard Wackernagel’s position.

And the instrumentals name Indra’s powers, which he used to fix the two world halves. For Ge, by contrast. they are the measuring standard for Heaven and Earth respectively (“Heaven in greatness, Earth in wisdom”). There is something to be said for both interpr., though *majmánā* works better for him than *kāvya*- does. The former, *majmán-*, is generally associated with Indra, and it is often the instrument he uses to effect his deeds (e.g., I.55.5, I.130.4), thus supporting my position, but it can also be the standard by which Indra is judged (III.32.7, 46.3 [both cited by Ge]), supporting Ge’s. That “greatness” would be an appropriate standard for evaluating both Indra and Heaven is easy to accept; it is harder to see how *kāvya*- ‘poetic skill, sagacity’ could be a shared standard for Indra and Earth, since I’m not aware of passages in which Earth is credited with mental capacity of this sort. But *kāvya*- can be used as an instrument, even in cosmogonic contexts. Cf. the following passage, which describes the separation of Heaven and Earth; though the deed is attributed to Soma, the action is one of Indra’s standard ones: IX.70.2 *ubhé dyāvā kavyenā ví sísrathe* “through his poetic skill he [=Soma] has loosened both, Heaven (and Earth), from each other.” Although *kāvya*- is more generally associated with Soma (as here) or Agni, recall that Indra in the Vala myth opens the cave through his verbal skill, not his physical power.

In balance, therefore, though I find Ge's interpr. appealing in many ways, I think the evidence points rather in the direction of my own. And in particular, despite the suggestive interlacing of NOM. INSTR. NOM. INSTR. in b, the two instrumentals are Indra's means – the complementary physical power and verbal skill displayed in the Vṛtra and Vala myths respectively – and are used to fix both entities, Heaven and Earth, with no association of one of the instr. with one nom., and the other with the other.

The two pādas of the 2nd hemistich are constructed as parallels, each hoping that one of the substances offered to Indra will be acceptable to him. Given the parallelism, initial dat. *vārāya* "for your liking" should correspond to loc. *svādman*; cf. Ge's "nach deinem Wunsche ... nach deinem Geschmack." Although this is surely the intent, the use of the loc. is somewhat odd.

X.29.7: *āmatra*- in pāda a appears to be playing off *mātra*- in 6a, and since *āmatra*- is a large liquid measure, this may make it more likely that my interpr. *mātra*- in 6 is also one.

Note that *satyā*- from 4c and *rādhas*- from 3d, both used in reference to Indra, are reprised here in one cmpd.

Flg. Ge's cited parallel, VII.21.6 *abhī krátvendra bhūr ádha jmán* "Become preeminent through your will, Indra, on the earth," I supply a participial form of 'be/become' with *abhī* in d.

The *nr* theme of vss. 1–2 returns here with *náryah*, doubled by and contrasting with adjacent *paúmsyaiḥ*.

X.29.8: The first pāda here is almost identical to VII.20.3 *vy āsa índraḥ pṛtanāḥ svóajā(h)*; see comm. ad loc. Bloomfield (RReps ad VII.20.3) works himself into a state of near apoplexy because of differing translations of the two pādas, esp. different renderings of *pṛtanā*-, which he declares always means 'battle'. Although the two pādas are too similar to be chance resemblances and although I agree with Bl that *pṛtanā*- should be interpr. in the same way in both, I differ from him on two points. 1) I do not think that *pṛtanā*- in general only means 'battle'; rarely, as here (in my view, contra Ge), it seems to refer to the battlers themselves. (For the contribution of the root noun cmpd *pṛtanā-śāh*- to such a reinterpret. see comm. ad III.24.1.) 2) I think the choice of two different but phonologically similar verbs, *vī√as* (VII.20.3) and *vī√(n)as* (here), shows that the poet of the derivative pāda (probably our Vasukra) meant to vary the sense, not reproduce it. In VII.20.3 Bl takes *vy āse* as lit. 'threw himself through', but pregnantly 'pervaded', with our *vy ānaṭ* also meaning 'pervaded'. For the verb in VII.20.3 I prefer 'dispersed', for the one here 'penetrated'. The point here is that Indra has taken position in the middle between the armies, which marshall themselves (pāda b) competing to secure his patronage and help in battle for their side.

Pāda c is somewhat unclear. Ge, who interpr. both instances of *pṛtanā*- in this vs. as 'battle', tr. *ā ... rátham ná pṛtanāsu tiṣṭha* as "Besteige den Wagen wie in den Schlachten," with the simile consisting only of *pṛtanāsu*. But the position of *ná* speaks against that (and this is not a situation like that in 5a where *ná* is flipped because it's barred from pāda-final position [see comm. there and ad X.21.1], though I admit that **pṛtanāsu ná* would not work metrically). My interpr. takes *pṛtanāsu* as the frame and *rátham* as the simile, both construed with *ā ... tiṣṭha*. Since *ā√sthā* can take either acc. or loc., this is an example of case disharmony between simile and frame, of the type discussed in my 1982 IJ article "Case disharmony in RVic similes." The point is that Indra shows himself superior to both sides in the battle – he mounts (perhaps 'surmount' would be better here) them like a chariot. So in fact he does not tip his favor to any

side (despite the competition implied between the hosts in pāda b), but takes control of them all. The metaphorical chariot made up of the *pṛtanā*-s he will then drive (pāda d) to his own advantage (and perhaps ours, given his benevolent *sumatī*). The middle voice of *codāyāse* expresses the same self-involved action as the same form in VI.46.13, where Indra spur on his own steeds.

For *sumatyā* and suggested substitute reading *sumatī* see Old ad I.31.18.

Commentary X.30–60

X.30–34

These five hymns are attributed to Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, whose name is, intriguingly, non-Indo-Aryan phonologically (see Mayr. PN s.v.). He figures in the AiB and KauṣB as the son of a dāsī (see Kuiper, Aryans p. 7 and passim), and in the Ten Kings Battle a “famous old” Kavaṣa (*śrutām kavāṣam vṛddhām*) gets drowned (or at least dragged into the water) by Indra (VII.18.12). This does not seem to have kept him (or his supposed namesake) from dedicating a hymns or parts thereof to Indra (X.32; see its publ. intro.; X.33.2–3 per Anukr.). The subjects of the hymns in this collection are heterogeneous, and the last one (X.34) is the famous “Lament of the Gambler.” Much less famous, but very appealing is X.33, which we can call “Lament of a Singer.”

See Ge’s detailed intro. to this hymn group. It should also be noted that Old suggests that the Vasukra hymns (X.27–29) and the Kavaṣa hymns may form not two series but one on the basis of phraseology etc. (see Prol. 234).

X.30 Waters

On the ritual background of this hymn, see publ. intro. and Ge’s and Old’s intros. to the hymn. The hymn treats the ceremonial fetching of the waters for the preparation of soma and their installation on the ritual ground. Re tr. and comm. EVP XV.127ff.

X.30.1: Ge and Re take *devatrā* and *apāḥ* as separate goals of *prá ... etu* (Ge: “Götterwärts soll der Weg ... gehen, hin zu den Gewässern ...”). I have consolidated them (“... the waters that are among the gods”) to avoid the duplication and also because in c the wellspring (*dhāśi-*) belongs to Mitra and Varuṇa.

On *dhāśi-* see the various reff. in Comm. Lexicon. I basically follow Janert. Re quotes Janert’s tr. of this vs., commenting rather acidly “traduction védique <<typique>> des exégètes modernes,” though he doesn’t explain his disdain. With Ge I construe c with ab; both Old and Re take it instead with d, which in turn leads them to consider *dhāśīm* in c to be coreferential with *suṣṛkṛīm* in d. Re tr. c as “la puissante projection (émanée) de Mitra (et) de Varuṇa.” The *dhāśi-* of Mitra and Varuṇa is also found in IV.55.7, where it is not as clearly tied to water as it is here (at least acdg. to Janert and me: Ge tr. “Schöpfung”), but I take it there as the repository of waters in heaven that produces rain. In any case, whether one takes *devatrā ... apāḥ* in ab separately or together, the conceptual location of the waters to be fetched for this sacrifice appears to be in heaven, not whatever terrestrial water source is actually going to be tapped. This conflation of the earthly element and its heavenly counterpart is of course a standard move of the RVic poet, and in the first vs. of this hymn it frames the action to come as more significant than a little expedition with a bucket down to the river.

The root affiliation of the 1st sg. subjunctive *rīradhā* is disputed. Gr and Lub assign it to *√randh* ‘be/make subject’, and I follow them; Old, Ge, Re, Janert all prefer *√rādh* ‘(make) succeed’. At first glance ‘make succeed’ is easier to fit into the passage than ‘make subject’, but there are several arguments in favor of the more difficult interpr. ‘make subject’. First, although a causative system, with pres. *randhāya-* and redupl. aor. *rīradha-*, is very well established in the RV for *√randh*, the *-āya-*transitive *rādhaya-* to *√rādh* is first found in the AV, the corresponding redupl. aor. *arīradhat* first in TS (1x). So the default interpr. of *rīradha-* in the RV would be to *√randh*—although it must be admitted that the other 8 exx. are in *mā* prohibitives: this is the only

occurrence in positive context. Second, the case frame here, ACC *suṇṛktīm* + DAT *prthujrāyase*, is exactly that found with the causative forms of $\sqrt{\text{randh}}$, but the dative is foreign to $\sqrt{\text{rādh}}$. Those who favor $\sqrt{\text{rādh}}$ must therefore resort to makeshifts in rendering the verb (Ge, Janert) or the dat. (Re). In my view “making the hymn subject to DAT” indicates that hymn’s composer recognizes the superior power of the entity denoted by the dative and sends it to do service to that entity.

Who or what then is the referent of *prthu-jrāyas*? In its other occurrence (III.49.2) this *s*-stem bahuvr. modifies Indra, but though Sāy and Re supply Indra here, there is no contextual support for him here (or Janert’s Agni). The uncmpd *jrāyas*- refers to space generally, and here the most likely entity to “have broad expanse” is a body of water, whose size would dwarf and humble the hymn approaching it (another argument for *rīradha*- ‘make subject’). I do not have a candidate for the underlying noun, which should be masc. or neut. sg. – rather than the fem. pl. of *apāḥ* (b) and fem. sg. of *dhāsīm* (b), both of which also refer to this water source. Perhaps *samudrām* found in 3a.

X.30.2: In the publ. tr. I take *bhūtā* as an injunc., with the clumsy tr. “since you have become provided with oblations ...” I would now change my grammatical analysis to imperative (with Ge, Re), in the well-known construction in which an impv. in a *hī* clause followed by another clause with an impv. provides the grounds for the 2nd impv. I would therefore emend the tr. to “Become provided with oblations, (and then) go ...” Although on general grounds we might expect the priests’ fetching of the waters to precede their providing themselves with oblations, in fact vs. 3b explains the sequence: the Adhvaryus must sacrifice to Apām Napāt “with an oblation” (*haviṣā*) so that that god will release the waters to them.

In agreement with Ge, Re, Lü (296), contra Sāy. (Soma), I take the ruddy eagle to be the sun. Ge (n. 2c) points out that that phrase is esp. appropriate for the morning and/or evening sun (which often appears red), times prescribed in the later Soma sacrifice for the water-fetching.

Gr, Ge, Re, Lub all assign *āsyadhvam* to the root $\sqrt{\text{as}}$ ‘throw’, flg. the Pp analysis *āsyadhvam*. I am persuaded, however, by Old’s connection with $\sqrt{\text{sā}}$, *si* ‘bind’. Note first that an undoubted 2nd pl. impv. to this stem is found in vs. 11 of this hymn (*vīsyadhvam*), and that $\sqrt{\text{sā}}$ is found in nearby X.28.10 *āsiṣāya* ‘caught’ (in a Vasukra hymn, a collection that Old considers verbally connected with the Kavaṣa hymns [see Prol. 234]). As Old points out, $\sqrt{\text{as}}$ has no medial forms in the RV, and he also suggests that $\sqrt{\text{sā}}$ ‘bind on, harness’ would be the opposite to the better attested *āva* / *vī* $\sqrt{\text{sā}}$ ‘unbind, loose’.

X.30.3: On the *haviṣ*- see comm. ad 2a.

X.30.3–4: The referent of *tāsmāi* in d must be Apām Napāt, or at least all discourse signs point to him. It is striking that he receives honeyed soma in 3d, while in 4cd Indra is strengthened for his *vīryā*- by honeyed waters (*mādhumatīr apāḥ*), even though Indra is of course the usual recipient of soma, esp. in the context of his heroic deeds. The slight paradox is surely meant. (See, however, the passages cited by Ge in n. 4d, which associate the waters with Indra’s strengthening.)

X.30.4: By accent *dīdayat* in pāda a belongs to the redupl. pres. that is emerging in the RV by reinterpr. of the old presential perfect *dīdāya*. The act. pres. part. *dīdyat*- (8x) is unambiguous testimony to this present stem. Besides redupl.-accented *dīdaya*- (2x in addition to this passage), the stems *dīdāya*- with pf. accent (6x) and *dīdaya*- (unaccented, so ambig., 5x) are also found.

All of these should be subjunctives (whether pf. or pres.), and indeed, save perhaps for this one, all of them are at least compatible with and generally best interpr. as subjunctives (see Narten “Vedisch *dīdāya*...” [1987 = KISch 368–79], n. 5, as well as my 2017 “Vedic Perfect Subjunctive,” 316–18)—including the two other redupl.-accented *dīdayat* occurrences (VIII.6.24, X.95.12). However, our form works better as a general present: it is characteristic of Apām Napāt to shine without fuel in the waters; it is not an action that an offering of Soma (3d) will/should bring about. Cf., from the only hymn devoted to Apām Napāt in the RV, II.35.4 *dīdāyānidhmaḥ ... apsú*, with the indicative presential pf. *dīdāya* in identical context. That the parallel rel. cl. in our 4b contains an unambig. indic. pres. *īlate* also supports an indic. interpr. I don’t quite know what to do about this conflict between function and form, but think it at least possible that the shifting nature of the verbal system of $\sqrt{dī}$ allowed a nonce interpr. of *dīdayat* as thematic injunc. On the averbo of this root both in the RV and in later Vedic, see the above cited art. by Narten.

X.30.5: On the ritual act expressed by pāda d, see Ge’s n. 5d.

X.30.6: For a similar use of *sām* + med. pf. of \sqrt{cit} see X.92.4, 10 *sām cikitrire*.

X.30.7–9: These three vss. constitute a direct address to the waters, with the content kept fairly consistent across the vss. In each vs. the waters/ivers are urged to “propel” (*prá* \sqrt{hi}) their wave (*ūrmím*) to Indra. Vss. 7–8 share the pres. impv. *prá hiṇota* (7c; note the retroflexion) / *prá ... hiṇota* (8a), the acc. phrase *mádhumantam ūrmím* “honeyed wave” (7c, 8a), and a dative referring to Indra (*tásmā índrāya* 7c; *asmai* 8a). Vs. 9 has streamlined the expression to *ūrmím prá heta* (9b), with aor. impv., no ‘honeyed’ (though there are other descriptors of *ūrmím*), and Indra tucked into a cmpd. *indrapānam* ‘Indra’s drink’ (9a). I doubt that there is any functional difference between pres. impv. *hiṇota* and rt. aor. impv. *heta*; instead the poet is seeking variety in the third iteration of the command.

X.30.7: Gr (fld. by Lub) assigns *ṛtābhyah* to the fem. noun *ṛtā-*, glossed (by Gr) “Arbeit, Werk oder Bewegung,” found in V.48.2. But it surely is simply the fem. dat. pl. ppl. to \sqrt{vr} ‘enclosed, blocked’, as in IV.19.5=42.7 *tvām ṛtām ariṇā indra síndhūn* “you made the blocked rivers flow, o Indra,” referring to the same mythological deed, but with masc. acc. pl. modifying *síndhūn*. The ppl. interpr. is assumed by Old, Ge, and Re.

X.30.8: Pāda b is a full-pāda izafe-type construction, a nominal relative clause containing two appositives, embedded within the acc. phrase of a and c. See my “Proto-proto-izafe” (Fs. Mark Hale).

X.30.9: Pāda b contains a short rel. cl. characterizing the acc. *ūrmím* and embedded within the acc. phrase, begun in pāda a and continuing in cd. The structure of the vs. is thus parallel to vs. 8; however, the rel. cl. in this vs. has a finite verb — *yá ubhé íyarti* — and thus violates the general prohibition against non-nominal embedded clauses. I would explain it here as modeled on the licit izafe-type in 8b, while driven by the poet’s desire to vary the pattern in the last of the three-vs. sequence. See comm. above on X.30.7–9.

The identity of the “both” that the wave rouses is disputed. Both Ge and Re supply “worlds” (that is, Heaven and Earth), and this is certainly a possible pair. Ge (n. 9b) additionally

suggests both races (gods and men), which I follow in the publ. tr., or even the two streams (*dhārā-*) found in the next vs. (10a). The referent of *ubhé* must of course be either fem. or neut. Though the overwhelming number of instances of *ubhé* probably refer to the two worlds (fem. *ródasī*, etc.), there is a subset of passages referring to the two races (neut. *jánmanī*, *jánasī*), and this makes more sense to me in context (though I don't have strong feelings about it).

Pāda c lacks a syllable, and the word in the affected part of the pāda, *ausānām*, is a hapax. The current standard view of this word (Ge, Re, EWA s.v. *usānā-*) is that it's a vṛddhi deriv. of *usānā-*, named as the plant from which soma is derived once (repeated) in the ŚB (III.4.3.13=IV.2.5.15): *vṛtró vai sóma āsīt tasyaitác chārīraṃ yád girāyo yád āsmānas tád eṣósānā nāmaúśadhir jāyata iti ha smāha śvetāketur aúddālakis tām etád āhītyābhīsunvanti* "Soma was really Vṛtra. This is his body, namely the mountains and the rocks. There is born the plant called Uśānā – so says Śvetakeu Auddālaki. Having brought it [=plant] here, they press it." Although this is certainly suggestive, I am reluctant to hang too much on a single passage in a later brāhmaṇa, with the content attributed to Śvetaketu—esp. since, acdg. to Macdonell/Keith (Vedic Index, s.v. Śvetaketu), "All the references to Śvetaketu belong to the latest period of Vedic literature." The major exception to the embrace of this etym. is Old, who (like Gr) suggests rather that it belongs to \sqrt{vas} 'be eager, desire' and that the transmitted form represents *ā-usānā-*, with the preverb in hiatus providing the missing syllable (sim. Arnold) and showing shortening to *a-* in hiatus. There are several potential drawbacks to his scenario. First, \sqrt{vas} does not otherwise appear with *ā-*; however, other verbs of desiring (e.g., \sqrt{kan}) occur with this preverb, and nonce spread here would not be surprising. Second, the pres. middle part. *usānā-* is quite rare, compared to the very well-attested act. *usānt-*, which in fact is found twice in this hymn in the twinned expression *usānt- usātī-* ("desirous [m.] / desirous [f.]") in 2b, 6b (as well as the single *usātī-* in 15c). When it occurs, *usānā-* also means 'eager, desirous', and that could be the sense here as well—describing the waters' eager pursuit of Indra. Or, it could show a nonce passive value developed in opposition to the act. *usānt-* pairs, "being desired." Despite the minor problems with this idea, it seems stronger to me than the other, and I would now emend my transl. from "stemming from the uśāna-plant" to "being eager."

Ge and Re (and Gr by implication) take *tritāntum* as a modifier of the acc. *ūrmīm* that dominates the vs. (see Old for doubts). But this doesn't make a lot of sense—how would a wave have three threads?—and it also leaves *pāri* with nothing to do. In contrast, I take *tritāntum* with *pāri*, specifying the location of the action of the participle *vicārantam* referring to the 'wave', and I supply *yajñām* as the referent of *tritāntum*. Both Ge (n. 9d) and Re cite *saptā-tantu-* as a parallel, and this adj. modifies *yajñā-* in its two occurrences (X.52.4, 124.1). The three threads here are presumably either the three fires or the three soma pressings.

X.30.10: This vs. is paradoxical in content: the waters, feminine in both grammatical gender and personal qualities, are here depicted as powerful, martial, and commanding—no longer the lovely and yielding young women of earlier in the hymn.

The intens. part. *āvárṇātātī-* in pāda a is glossed by Schaeffer (192) with 'sich schlängeln' (meander), but given the rest of the vs., I think a more dynamic movement is envisioned: strenuously whirling, roiling, or the like.

The "two streams" of the bahuvr. *dvidhārāḥ* are plausibly identified by Ge (n. 10a) as the two varieties of ritual waters, the Vasatīvarī and the Ekaḍhanā (on which see, e.g., Re Vocab. du rituel s.vv.).

In b the waters are compared to ‘cattle-raiders, (those) fighting when cattle (are at stake)’ (*goṣu-yúdh-*; see Scar 441), a hyper-masculine and violent role, as is seen in its two other occurrences (I.112.22, VI.6.5).

niyavám is a hapax, but despite Ge’s refusal to transl. it, it is plausibly derived from *ní* √*yu* ‘team up, harness’, with well-attested root noun compd *niyút-*, etc. See Gr, Old, Re. The publ. tr. accepts BR’s suggestion (reported by Gr) that it’s an adverbial acc. ‘in teams’; so, apparently, also Scar (441), though with a closer connection to the part. *cárantīḥ*: “in Niyut-Formation wandelnden (Wasser).”

The paradoxical nature of this vs. comes to the fore in pāda c—and presents us with a translational problem created by English. The waters are called the *jānitrīḥ* and the *pātnīḥ* of existence (/ creation / the world), *bhūvanasya*, using the fem. gender equivalents of m. *jānitar-* ‘begetter’ and *pāti-* ‘master, lord’. In Sanskrit the derivational relationship between the masc. and fem. terms is clear, and this relationship establishes the tension between the active power and authority inhering in the usual masc. forms and the counter-expectations created by the feminine derivative. The audience would also be aware of masculine equivalents of these phrases: *bhūvanasya yāḥ pātiḥ* (V.51.12; sim. IX.31.6, 86.5, X.128.7; note also the one other fem. *bhūvanasya pātnī*, of Dawn in VII.75.4), *bhūvanasya pitāram* (VI.49.10; no ex. of *bhūvanasya jānitar-* is found in the RV). In my opinion the poet is covertly asserting that the female waters are equivalent in power to their male counterparts, hence my tr. “begetters and masters of existence.” But this tr. elides the feminine markers in the Skt. Although English does have the corresponding gendered terms, they would distort the sense. For *pātnī-* we have ‘mistress / lady’, but these give the wrong impression: the waters are not the girlfriends / kept women (=mistresses) of existence but the commanders of it, and “ladies of existence” is nonsensical. For *jānitrī-* we could try ‘genetrix’, but this is too lexically specialized, and ‘mother’ has the wrong nuance: the waters are not nurturing existence but creating it. In the end I opted for the masculine terms, but something is lost in translation.

X.30.11: This vs. is a partial reprise of vs. 1. The “yoking of truth” (*ṛtasya yóge*) here echoes the “yoking of mind” (*mānasaḥ ... práyukti*) in 1b. In 1a a way is made for the *bráhmaṇ*, while here the waters impel it (b).

Ge, flg. Sāy., interpr. *devayajyā* as a functional dative, parallel to *sanáye* in b, but there’s no reason it can’t work as the instr. it appears to be (see Old, Re), either as a true instrument or as instr. of accompaniment, indicating the time when the waters’ action is to take place.

The loc expression *ṛtasya yóge* “at the yoking of truth” in c also establishes a temporal connection between the loc. and the action of the main verb: the waters are to “unloosen their udder” (i.e., be poured forth) at a particular moment in the ceremony.

X.30.12: Because the verbs of pādas a–c are accented (a: *kṣáyathā*, b: *bibhrthá*, c: *sthá*), they must all be in the domain of *hí* in pāda a, with d the corresponding main cl.

On my tr. of *pātnīḥ* as ‘masters’, not ‘mistresses / ladies’, see above ad 10c.

The waters in general and their powers and characteristics elevate the riverine goddess Sarasvatī in d as their divine representative.

X.30.13: With Ge and Re (contra Old), I take this vs., consisting of a *yád* clause (a) with three following participial adjuncts, each a pāda length, as dependent on the main cl. of 14. Vs. 13 describes the approach of the waters, 14 their arrival and installation.

On 3rd pl. mid. ending *-ram* in *adṛśram* see the extensive disc. by Old ad IX.7.1.

Pāda a is metrically disturbed in all its parts—concisely summarized by HvN as “Uncommon opening ... Uncommon break ... Rare cadence” (what’s left?!). Arnold suggest switching the order of the last two words to **āyatīr ādṛśram*, which would give a Triṣṭubh cadence but do nothing for the rest of the pāda; Old counsels against this metathesis on formulaic grounds, adducing VII.81.1, VIII.101.11 ... *adarśy āyatīḥ*##

Pāda c *adhvaryúbhir mānasā saṃvidānāḥ* “(the waters) allying / united in mind with the Adhvaryus” echoes 6cd *sām jānate mānasā sām cikitre, adhvaryāvo dhiṣānāpas ca devīḥ* “They are agreed in mind and they perceive alike -- the Adhvaryus, the Holy Place, and the divine waters.” In our vs. the *dhiṣānā* is absent, but is probably represented by the place where the waters will be deposited. See also *apām nāptrā saṃvidānāsaḥ* in 14d.

Pāda b contains the redupl. pres. part. *bībhratīḥ*, which echoes the finite *bībhṛtha* of 12b; pāda d has the 1st class pres. part. *bhārantīḥ*. All three have the same referent/subject (waters). Although Re remarks “Distinction nette entre *bībhrat* (aussi 12*b*) et *bhārant d*,” I don’t see it, and Re’s tr. don’t help – at least don’t help me (“vous portez-en-vous” 12b, “qui (com)portent” 13b, “apportant” 13d). Ge tr. all with “bringen.” It’s worth noting (see Ge’s n. 13d) that d is identical to III.36.7 save for the gender of the participle. It could therefore have just been patched in here, without much attention to the resulting contrast between the present stems of *√bhr̥*.

X.30.14: *revātīḥ* reprises the voc. in 8d, 12a as well as *rāyāḥ* ... *pātnīḥ* in 12c.

The voc. *sakhāyaḥ* referring to the Adhvaryus can express relationships in several directions: the Adhvaryus can be comrades of each other, comrades of us, and – given the emphasis on the agreement between the waters and the priests in vss. 6 and 13 – comrades of the waters.

In d the part. *saṃvidānāsaḥ* is most naturally interpr. as nom. pl. masc., modifying the Adhvaryus. But because the same part. (ending in *-ās*) was nom. pl. fem. modifying the waters in the immed. prec. vs. (13c), there is contextual pressure to take it as acc. pl. fem., modifying adjacent *enāḥ*, with the extended ending *-āsaḥ* unusually employed in this paradigmatic slot. See esp. disc. by Old (as well as Ge’s n. 14d, Re’s comment). I think it likely that it is applicable to both (though my publ. tr. only reflects the fem. acc.), esp. given the emphasis on universal harmony in these vss.

X.30.15: *devayajyā* is repeated from 11a, though as nom. rather than instr.

X.31 All Gods

On the structure of the hymn and the obscurity of some of its contents, see publ. intro.

The early vss. of the hymn have a surprising number of perf. optatives (2a *mamanyāt*, 2d *jagrbhyāt*, 4a *cākanyāt*, 4c *anajyāt*), though the conditions that usually prompt such clusters – women’s or low-register speech – are not found. If Old is correct that the Vasukra (X.27–29) and Kavaṣa (X.30–34) collections are a unity (see ad X.30–34 above), we could invoke X.28.1 with its pf. opt. cluster (see comm. ad loc.) – though there they are in the mouth of a woman. I do not understand the phenomenon in this hymn, though see the pf. subjunctives in X.32.1.

X.31.1: Old and Ge take the gen. *devānām* in the phrase *devānām ... śāmsaḥ* as a subjective genitive, but I don’t see why. Although the gods may help us, they don’t ordinarily praise us; the subjects of active transitive forms of the root *√śams* are humans or their counterparts. In asking

that the laud of the gods seek us out, we are expressing the usual hope that poetic inspiration and its product, the hymn, will come to us at the right moment for producing praise for the gods.

The stem *turá-* ‘strong, overpowering’ is almost always used of gods. Here in the phrase *vísvebhis turaiḥ* it substitutes for *devaiḥ*, which already appeared as gen. *devāñām* in the previous pāda, to establish the All Gods as the nominal dedicands of the hymn.

The bahuvr. *suśakhāyaḥ* in c reminds us of the emphasis on comradeship and harmony in the previous hymn, esp. voc. *sakhāyaḥ* in X.30.14.

X.31.2: With most (Gr, Old, Lub, EWA s.v. *MAN*², though not Ge or Kü [364–66, with extensive disc. with lit.]; Re uncertain), I take *mamanyāt* to a separate root \sqrt{man} ‘stay, wait’, whose other two verbal forms are found in this limited group of hymns: X.27.20 (Vasukra), X.32.8 (Kavaṣa). See also comm. ad X.27.20. Among other things it is distinguished from \sqrt{man} ‘think’ by its active voice. Unlike Gr, I do not take the form here as caus. in value (zum Stillstand bringen, festhalten). I think the point rather is that if the poet proceeds along “the path of truth” (*ṛtasya pathā*) by composing good poetry, he will receive his just reward and should simply wait for it in this location. I do not know what the *pāri* contributes: it goes too easily into English as ‘wait around, hang around’, meaning (originally) ‘in the general vicinity’.

I also don’t know what the *cīd* is doing.

Although *ṛtasya pathā* is found in the next pāda, adjacent to the instr. *nāmasā*, I take the former phrase with pāda a. The pāda-opening sequence *ṛtasya pathā nāmasā* is also found in I.128.2 and X.70.2, but in both cases the first phrase is better construed with the preceding pāda and *nāmasā* with what follows.

Note that the redupl. desid. opt. *vivāset* is the moral equiv. of the redupl. opts. elsewhere in the vs., *mamanyāt* and *jagṛbhyāt*. See above.

Most supply “gods” as the obj. of *ā vivāset*; this is certainly possible, but *dráviṇam* in the preceding pāda presents itself as well. If so, the point is that the poet will win his share by performing his ritual duties properly. How to do that is outlined in the 2nd hemistich.

Note that the partial anagrams *nāmasā* and *mānasā* occupy the same post-caesura metrical position in pādas b and d respectively.

X.31.3: The first pāda of this vs. indicates that the advice in 2cd has been successfully followed. In my opinion the rest of the vs. sustains this ritual theme.

On the plupf. *asasṛgram* (also IX.97.30), manifestly based on the well-attested pass. aor. *asṛgram* with the same passive value, see Kü 555. In our passage the showcasing of unusual pf. forms may have contributed to its appearance, but that situation is not found in IX.97.30.

With Ge (see his n. 3b) I take *tīrthé ná dasmám* as a minor example of case disharmony in similes of the type discussed in my 1982 IJ article “Case Disharmony in RVic Similes.” Both the loc. and the acc. function as goal.

I take *dasmá-* as a reference to Agni, a common but far from exclusive referent of this stem. This identification may be facilitated by a pun: Agni is often called a ‘guest’ (*átithi-*), a stem phonologically similar to *tīrthá-* ‘ford’. Cf. the voc. phrase VIII.74.7 ... *dásamātithe* “o wondrous guest” of Agni.

With Ge I take *ūmāḥ* ‘helpers’ as the gods. The stem is only used of gods, as Gr points out.

Although *sūṣā-* is an adjective ‘fortifying, powerful’ (on which see comm. ad IX.97.54), it is often used of praise songs or chants, generally with the headnoun gapped. And that is surely

its use here: the poet has been honing his verbal skill and has now achieved his goal, a powerful hymn. For *abhí√(n)as* with a verbal product as obj., cf. VI.49.8 *abhy ānaḍ arkām* “he has attained the chant,” adduced by Re.

I take gen. *suvitāsaya* as a dative purpose gen.: “the hymn of good faring” is the hymn that will afford us good faring.

On *nāvedas-* as the product of false segmentation of **bhūtana vedasaḥ*, see Schindler Fs. Knobloch, summarized in EWA s.v.

X.31.4: Each of the four pādas in this verse is a self-contained clause, which, each by itself, is reasonably easy to interpret (or, rather, to translate). It is, however, very difficult to figure out how they fit together and what their referents are. This shiftiness is surely deliberate; in fact, I see the poet laughing at us in the last pāda, which begins *só asmai* “he to him,” with two pronouns whose referents are completely opaque even though they should be available from the preceding discourse. The poet does strew clues throughout the vs., but some of these seem to be red herrings, inviting us to identify the wrong referent. And of course, as often in the RV when straightforward reference is evaded, several different referents may be simultaneously meant.

We are on firmest ground—comparatively firm anyway—in the first pāda. Both *nītya-* and *dāmūnas-* point to Agni; the latter is mostly an epithet of Agni, the former regularly modifies him. (On *svāpati-* and *nītya-* in this passage see comm. ad X.44.1.) Moreover, at least by my interpr., Agni is the *dasmá-* on whom the gods have converged in the previous vs. (3b). Old also points to the similarity of our pāda, with *cākanyāt*, and X.29.1a where Agni is the presumed subj. of *cākán*. The question here is what Agni is supposed to take pleasure in, since there is no complement to the verb. Ge supplies the *sūṣá-* (my “fortifying [hymn],” Ge’s “Ansporn” [which he identifies with praise; see his n. 3c as well as n. 3 at the bottom of the pg.]) from the preceding vs. 3c. This makes sense and would emerge from context, but there are other possibilities: Old favors the sacrificer, and the publ. tr. follows him (though I now reject that). The complement of the pf. *cākán-* can be either a thing (like hymns [X.91.12] or wealth [II.11.13]) or a person or persons (e.g., Kutsa [I.33.13], the patrons [X.147.3]), so that either of the just cited suggestions is in principle possible. However, I now favor Ge’s *sūṣá-*.

The rel. clause in b presents us with several puzzles, though the subject and verb, *savitā jajāna*, are straightforward: “Savitar begot / created.” The first puzzle is the referent of the dative rel. prn. *yásmai*, the second the object to be supplied with the verb (if any). The most obvious referent for *yásmai* would be an entity in the preceding pāda, and there is only one (at least overt): Agni. Old again suggests the sacrificer instead, and the publ. tr. follows. Once again I have developed serious doubts and now think the obvious solution—Agni—is probably the right one, or at least the initial reading.

As for the object of *jajāna*, Ge thinks it is the *sūṣá-*: the Ansporn = Loblied. (Klein [DGRV II.15, 184] follows Ge’s interpr. of both pādas.) This would simplify matters by repeating the supplied material of pāda a, but I am (or was) a bit dubious about the sense: did Savitar create the hymn? This is not part of his usual remit; in fact Savitar seems to have very little to do with begetting or creating. The only passage I’ve identified in which Savitar is the subject of a form of *√jan* is IV.53.2 *ājjanat savitā sumnām ukthyām* “Savitar has given birth to praiseworthy benevolence,” which doesn’t seem relevant here. However, I think Ge’s idea can be rescued and indeed considerably enhanced—if we see it as a diabolical pun, or set of puns, on the part of our poet. The word *sūṣá-* is not, of course, derived from *√sū*, the basis of Savitar’s name, but they are phonologically similar, with an initial sibilant followed by long *ū*, and they can

therefore be poetically associated, with Savitar ($\sqrt{sū}$) giving birth to a $\acute{sūṣā}$ -. This would be enabled by another diabolical pun. There are two roots $\sqrt{sū}$: 1) ‘impel’, the source of Savitar’s name and actions; 2) ‘give birth’. They are etymologically distinct, and their verbal systems also don’t overlap. But the agent noun Savitar could in principle be derived from either one. I suggest that the poet is playfully associating him with the 2nd root ‘give birth’, and then lexically substituting the semantically (almost) identical pf. of \sqrt{jan} for the pf. *sasūva* ‘gave birth’. The proposed underlying VP “gave birth to a $\acute{sūṣā}$ ” would thus rest on three puns, two phonological ($\acute{sūṣā}$: $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’; $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’ : $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’) and one semantic ($\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’ : \sqrt{jan} ‘beget’). The outcome also has the merit of making Savitar the subject of the gender-appropriate ‘birth’ root: $\sqrt{sū}$ has the mother as subject, while \sqrt{jan} generally has the father or a father-like figure. (Note the occurrence of $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘give birth’ in 10a *sūta*, with female as subj. This root was clearly in the poet’s head.)

I would now retract the publ. tr. and return to Ge’s interpr., though it is, I hope, on a firmer footing: “Our own proper lord and master of the house [=Agni] should find pleasure (in the hymn)—(Agni) for whom the god Savitar gave birth (to it).” (For a full re-tr. of the vs., see below.) (For the substitution of ‘proper’ for ‘constant’, rendering *nūtya*- see comm. ad X.44.1.)

On to the 2nd hemistich. The first issue that confronts us is that pāda c, with *vā* in 2nd position, seems to be presented as a disjunctive clause. But what is it disjoined from and what are the two opposing choices? Because it is a main clause, it seems unlikely to be directly connected with the preceding rel. clause (b), and because its verb is in the optative it seems likely to be the parallel to pāda a with its optative. This suggests an interpr. of a, c as “Agni should take pleasure (in the hymn), or Bhaga and/or Aryaman should anoint (him/it) with cows.” The pressure of the discourse leads to an interpr. of the obj. *īm* here as something already known to us from the parallel clause, that is, either Agni or the (supplied) hymn.

These are both possible choices, and we will return to them – but first we should consider the 2nd hemistich on its own. If we do so, we get an interpr. that directly conflicts with the one just offered and that identifies a very different referent for both *īm* in c and *só* in d. The phrasology points strongly to Soma. In pāda c the VP “anoint with cows” (*góbhiḥ √ añj*) is a fairly common phrase in both active and passive; though a few other entities get so anointed (e.g., Agni V.3.2, Mitra and Varuṇa I.51.8, music VIII.20.8), it is overwhelmingly used of Soma (e.g., IX.10.3, 32.3, 45.3, 50.2, 85.5, 86.47, 96.22, 103.2, 107.22), referring to the mixing of milk with the just-pressed soma juice. Similarly in d *cāru*- modifies a number of different entities mostly connected with the ritual (*yajñā*- itself, e.g., VII.84.3, *adhvarā*- I.19.1, *ghṛtā*- X.96.1, etc.), but it is extraordinarily common with *sóma*- (e.g., IV.49.2, X.39.2, etc.) and other words for soma (e.g., *sutā*- I.137.2, *indu*- IX.109.8). If we put this phraseological evidence together, Soma seems the obvious referent: “Bh + A should anoint him [=Soma] with cows; he [=Soma] is pleasing ...” (with the referent of *asmai* still unclear). But there’s no real place for Soma, even in this ritual context. Indra does not appear in this hymn; there is no mention of pressing or ritual drinking. Certainly in this verse no rhetorical space has been created for Soma. I therefore think that this is another of the poet’s jokes – a deliberate red herring: everything points to Soma, except that Soma makes no sense when the vs. and hymn as a whole are considered.

Let us now return to the possibilities identified above. I now think that the referent of both *īm* (c) and *só* (d) is the hymn, $\acute{sūṣā}$ -, covertly present in each pāda, though overtly absent from all four. The phrase “anoint (the hymn) with cows” is unusual, but interpretable; it means to reward the hymn (or rather its poet) with the gift of livestock. (In one of his shifting interpr., Old suggest something similar: that Bhaga and Aryaman are bestowing Kuhbesitz on the sacrificer

[whom he takes as the referent of *īm*].) This brings us back to 2ab, where the poet awaited his material reward “along the path of truth,” on which see comm. ad loc.

As for the last pāda, though as noted above, *cāru-* is esp. characteristic of Soma, it applies to a variety of referents, incl. verbal products (e.g., *matí-* VI.8.1, *ṛtá-* IX.97.24.), and so *śūṣā-* is certainly possible. As for *asmai*, since it’s unaccented it must be someone already in the discourse, and, though Bhaga and Aryaman are closer, Agni has dominated the vs. and is the god whose delight in the hymn is sought. Pāda d closes the circle with pāda a: the sentiment we wanted to produce in Agni has arisen.

I would now re-translate the verse in this way: “Our own proper lord and master of the house [=Agni] should find pleasure (in the hymn)—(Agni) for whom the god Savitar gave birth (to it). / Or Bhaga (and) Aryaman should anoint it [=hymn] with cows. It [=hymn] seems dear to him [=Agni] and so it should be.”

A few final notes. First I still don’t see why pāda c should be disjunctively related to pāda a, since the two actions (Agni’s delight in the hymn / the anointing of it with cows) do not block each other. Perhaps it’s simply a way to shift our attention to a different way of thinking about the hymn. Kü (95) takes the *vā* as disjoining the two gods: “Bhaga oder Aryaman ...,” but though this would solve the problem, *vā* is wrongly positioned for that. IH has suggested a different, and appealing, explanation for the *vā*, as providing a further enhancement for the hymn if Agni does not find the pleasure in it that we hope for in pāda a; anointing it with cows might make it more appealing. IH’s modified tr. of the relevant parts of the vs.: “Our own proper lord and master of the house [=Agni] should find pleasure (in the hymn ... / Or **[if he doesn’t find pleasure in it as is, then]** Bhaga (and) Aryaman should anoint it [=hymn] with cows. It **[i.e., the cow-anointed hymn]** seems dear to him [=Agni] and so it should be.” The anointment with cows would, on the one hand, refer to the material reward for the poet, as disc. above, but also to the ghee that would be poured into the ritual fire.

As Kü (95–96) points out, the pf. *anajyāt* should have a long initial vowel, like the rest of its stem (*ānájé*, etc.). The superficially peculiar redupl. of this pf. is similar to that in the indic. pf. *ānaśma* ($\sqrt{(n)aś}$) in 3c and would be even more like it (and to the pf. opt. in pāda a *cākanyāt*) if it were **ānajyāt*. These phonological similarities may help account for this surprising pf. opt. cluster.

X.31.5–6: On these two responsive vss. as a likely omphalos, see publ. intro. The connections between the two vss. make Ge’s assertion (intro. to hymn) that the first five vss. have no relationship to the rest of the hymn unlikely. The evidence for the interdependence of vss. 5 and 6 includes the three different words for ‘earth’ (*kṣāḥ* 5a, *bhūman-* 6b, and by implication *pṛth(i)vī* via *paprathānā* 6a [the three being reunited in vs. 9]) and the three hemistich-initial *asyā* (5c, 6a, 6c). The theme of the whole world as the ritual ground is what unifies their content.

X.31.5: By my interpr. this vs. depicts the fundamental exchange relationship between mortals and gods, taking place on the ritual ground conceived of as the earth itself. Here meet the gods and the mortal ritualists, esp. the poet. The gods possess livestock (b) and prizes (d) to distribute, and are eager to receive the praise of the singer (c), which will motivate their generosity. In my view the singer is the same poet who was honing his craft in order to receive his material reward already in vs. 2 and whose fortifying hymn was to be anointed with cows (same image as here) in 4c.

In pāda a I read *kṣāṇh* in both simile and frame, in slightly different senses. In the frame it doubles init. *iyām*, which by itself can pregnantly refer to “this (earth)” (a usage very common in Vedic prose, but already developing in the RV); in the simile it has the extended sense of ‘place’, a place proper to someone or other (here the dawns), that is, their particular “world.” (I would now erase the parens around “(the place)” in the publ. tr.) As indicated in the publ. intro., I take pāda a as willing the identification of the sacrificial ground with the earth itself, or, rather, the reverse: the whole earth should become the sacrificial ground. The sacrificial ground is referred to as “the earth/place of the dawns” because the dakṣiṇās are distributed at dawn (as is often emphasized in Uṣas hymns) and this vs. focuses on the rewarding of the singer for his praise. Ge (n. 5ab) also sees this as a reference to the dakṣiṇā. For the rhetorical move to identify the place of sacrifice with the whole world, see the responsive question-and-answer exchange in the riddle hymn, I.164.34–35, in which the vedi is identified with “the farthest end of the earth” and the sacrifice with the navel of the world: I.164.35 *iyām védīḥ páro ántaḥ prthivyāḥ, ayām yajñó bhūvanasya nābhiḥ*.

The word order in this pāda is somewhat unusual, with the annunciatory deictic *iyām* immediately followed by the discourse pronoun *sā* in the same case, number, and gender, with the referent *kṣāṇh* postponed till the end of the pāda. Although init. *iyām* is not infrequently separated from its referent in this way (e.g., V.57.1 #*iyām ... matīḥ*#), the interposition of the *sā* is found only in I.186.11 *iyām sā vo asmé dīdhitiḥ* ..., as far as I can tell (though it is somewhat more common in the masc. phrase *ayām sā*). In order to reflect this unusual order, in addition to assigning the dynamic ‘become’ sense to the precative *bhūyāḥ*, I would now slightly change the tr. to “This (earth) – she should become like the “earth”/place of the dawns.”

Ge takes bc as dependent on pāda a, whereas I connect them with d. But there is little actual difference in sense between the two.

In b I suggest in the publ. tr. that either gods or patrons could be the referent of *kṣumántaḥ*. Though this is certainly possible in principle, I now think that the gods are the intended referents, both because of the larger context of the hymn and because in c only the gods are likely to partake of the praise. For *kṣumánt-* in a Dawn/dakṣiṇā context, see X.11.3, where Dawn herself is called *kṣumátī* in a vs. concerned with the ritual distribution (*vidátha-*).

In c Ge disjoins *asyá ... jaritúḥ*, taking *asyá* as referring to Agni, an objective gen. with *stutím*. I am sympathetic to his arg. (n. 5c), that it should be coreferential with the two *asyá*’s in vs. 6, but I’m not sure that that’s strictly necessary. However, an alt. tr. would be “the singer’s praise of this one [=Agni].” Ge also takes *jaritúḥ* as an abl. – again possible, but not necessary.

X.31.6: This vs. is somewhat more opaque than its twin, vs. 5, and returns us to the Agni focus that was missing (or muted, if *asyá* in 5c refers to Agni) in that vs. However, the theme of the sacrificial ground as the whole world and of the dakṣiṇā as manifested there is strongly present in the first half of the vs.

As Ge says (n. 6b), the “foremost cow” is probably the dakṣiṇā herself. She has been produced from / transformed from the *sumatī-* of Agni (assuming that referent for *asyéd*). In this context Agni’s “good favor / benevolence” involves his benignly engineering the benign cooperative meeting of gods and mortals for their mutual benefit, symbolized by the gift cow. This *sumatī-* spreads out to encompass the whole world, which is now entirely the place of the sacrifice and, esp., of the distribution of dakṣiṇās.

As noted in the publ. intro. and above ad vss. 5–6, in addition to its participial function I take the mid. part. *paprathānā* as representing the third term for ‘earth’, namely the transparently related *pr̥th(i)vī*. See vs. 9.

I assume that *asyā* in c refers to the same entity as the one in pāda a, and further that that entity is Agni. (These assumptions are not universally shared; for ex., WE Hale [Asuras, p. 73] suggests that *asyā ... āsurasya* refers to Dyaus, though he gives no reasons.) In any case, proceeding from my assumptions, the womb is presumably in the first instance Agni’s hearth or fireplace, as it is so often in Agni hymns, thus again situating us on the ritual ground – but, I would say, further extended to include Agni himself. The two hemistichs contrast the psycho-physical dimensions of Agni: in ab he expands (flatly) to cover the whole world; in cd he concentrates within his enclosure (the fireplace) and indeed within himself the gods – if that is the referent for *sānīlāḥ* ‘those of the same nest’, as seems likely (so Ge, also Sāy.) – though it could refer to his flames (see comm. ad X.99.2). So Agni is both spread wide and contracted into a tight spherical enclosure.

Pāda d contains two morphologically isolated forms, both derived from *√bhr̥* ‘carry, bear’, which form an etymological figure. The *-ana*-noun *bhāraṇa-* is transparently formed, but not found elsewhere in Vedic (save for the synchronically distinct fem. *bhāraṇī-*, the name of a nakṣatra). The middle part. *bībhramāṇa-* is likewise transparently formed, to the redupl. pres. *bībharti*, a form of which is found in 8b, but it is an isolated thematic form; we should expect athem. **bībhrāṇa-*, which is not attested. Our form is in fact doubly isolated, because the redupl. pres. is otherwise only active; it is only the 1st cl. pres. *bhāra-* that has a sizable number of middle forms. Gotō (1st Cl. 227), fld. by. Lowe (Part. 253), explains *bībhramāṇa-* as modeled on *paprathānā-* at the end of pāda a. This hypothesis may be possible but it does not seem to me to be strong: although the two participles are isosyllabic, they are otherwise manifestly distinct— with one athem., the other them., one a pf. with redupl. in *-a-*, the other a pres. with redupl. in *-ī-*, one with final accent, the other with initial.

By creating these two forms, the poet seems to be signaling a special effect, but for what purpose escapes me. I do wonder if *bībhramāṇa-* is meant to secondarily evoke the root *√bhram* ‘move unsteadily, flicker’. Although verb forms to this root only begin to be attested in very late Vedic, the noun *bhramā-* ‘flickering’ (of fire) appears three times in the RV. And the theme of the next vss. will be the constant motion of Agni, contrasted with his fundamental stability.

Both *sānīla-* and, even more so, *yóni-* in c define this as a birth context, which carries over into d, so that the ‘bear (offspring)’ sense of *√bhr̥* is strongly favored in the two forms in d. The *bhāraṇa-* ‘carrier’ is presumably the womb of pāda c, and the point would be that all the gods (assuming they’re the *sānīlāḥ*) are carried and contained in the same womb, namely Agni(‘s). The publ. tr. (“being borne in the same burden”) is maladroit and misleading; I would now tr. “being carried in the same carrier” or even “being contained in the same container.”

X.31.7–10: On my view of the contents of these vss., see publ. intro.

X.31.7: The cosmic question that begins this sequence, pādas ab, is identical to X.81.4ab, in one of the two hymns to Viśvakarman (X.81–82).

On *itāūti-* see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

With Ge, I take *jaranta* as intrans. ‘become old’; Gotō (1st Cl., 152) thinks the stem can have either intrans. or trans. value and here favors the latter: “die vielen Morgenröten machen die Tage (mit sich) alt.” I think this unlikely. Although the trope of the dawns making us (etc.) age is

well established, that doesn't seem to be what's at issue here. For one thing, I don't know what it would mean for the dawns to make the *days* age. More importantly, as indicated in the publ. tr., the contrast here seems to be the unchanging solidity of the cosmic structures Heaven and Earth and the ever-changing nature of time.

X.31.8: As indicated both in the publ. intro./tr. and in comments above, I consider this vs. to refer to Agni, a view I share with Ge (see his intro. to the hymn, though his nn. 8b and 8c seem to retract this), but there is absolutely no direct evidence for it, I fully admit. There are no overt referents, only pronouns (*enā́ a*, *sá b*, *īm d*), a 3rd sg verb without overt subject (*kṛṇuta c*), and a metaphorical identification (*ukṣā́ b*). I base my view in great part on the rest of the hymn, which is more clearly Agnaic; although this is an All God hymn, it doesn't have the list structure of some All God hymns, but seems to focus on a single entity.

The vs. seems to follow logically from vss. 5–6, esp. 5a, in which the ritual ground becomes the whole earth, and 6ab, in which the good favor of Agni, spreading out, becomes “the foremost cow throughout the land.” If the place of sacrifice is now coterminous with the entire world, then, as 8a says, nothing else exists beyond it. And of course the most conspicuous entity on the ritual ground is the ritual fire, which is now conceived of as an ox—perhaps the transformation of the *gauḥ* in 6b into something more gender-appropriate for Agni—that bears both Heaven and Earth. That is, the fire flames up to support heaven and, like a pillar, to connect it with earth. Agni is elsewhere unambiguously called an *ukṣán-*; see the passages so identified by Gr (e.g., I.146.2).

Pāda c is, as Ge says (n. 8c), “dunkel,” and we will return to it. In d the entity is in motion, being conveyed, and is compared to the sun on its journey. The identification of Agni with the sun is of course a RVic commonplace. As for the conveying, I suggest that this is a reference to the carrying of Agni eastward on the ritual ground, to establish the new offering fire. Since the ritual ground is now the size of the earth, this would involve a considerable journey.

Pāda c: first note that the adj. *svadhāvan-* is used more often of Agni than any other god, even Indra (again see Gr's lemma). However, both ‘skin’ and ‘purifier, filter’ are initially hard to associate with Agni. The latter (*pavitra-*) is of course a standard piece of Somic vocabulary, attested almost exclusively in Maṇḍala IX. However, Agni's association with the root $\sqrt{pū}$ ‘purify’ is also strong, by way of the epithet *pāvaká-*, which in the sg. masc. is almost limited to him. This may be the link between Agni and the *pavitra-*.

Agni's association with ‘skin’ is much harder to establish. I can only tentatively suggest that his flames, or their visible outline, could be so construed—though I cannot find a passage that indicates that. I will adduce the bahuvr. *pāvaká-śocis-* (10x, all of Agni) ‘having pure/purifying flames’, which might provide the missing semantic link.

Both Ge and Re adduce a number of passages that might bear on our interpr. of this vs. One they didn't mention is the Soma hymn IX.83 (q.v.), which has two striking similarities with this one. 1) The middle vs., an omphalos, is very like our pāda b: IX.83.3b *ukṣā́ bibharti bhúvanāni vājayúḥ* “The ox, seeking the prize, bears the worlds,” with *ukṣā́*, *bibharti*, and a different expression for the cosmos. 2) The controlling mystical metaphor of the hymn is the *pavitra-* ‘filter’. Although I definitely do not think that Soma is the referent in our vs. here, I do suggest that some of the phraseology and conceptual structure of this vs. has been informed by IX.83 or something very like it.

And that's as far as I can get.

X.31.9: As noted above, this vs. reunites the three words for ‘earth’ found in vss. 5–6: *kṣām ... pṛthivīm ... bhūma*.

The vs. opens with the semantically impenetrable *stegāḥ*, whose range of glosses shows the despair with which it has been met by interpr. These include frog, fly, reed, arrow, ploughshare, little worm, and, my choice, snake. See EWA s.v. It is found only here, in the AV (somewhat garbled) repetition of this vs., AVŚ XVIII.1.39, and as both *stegā-* (TS V.7.11.1, etc.) and *tegā-* (VS XXV.1; also KS and MS) in a mantra from the Aśvamedha, (*s*)*tegān dāmṣṭrābhyām*, associating parts of the sacrificed horse with external entities. Oberlies (MSS 53 [1992] 123–24) plausibly derives it from the root \sqrt{tij} ‘be sharp, stick’ < IE $\sqrt{*(s)teig}$, whose *s*-mobile is well established outside of Indic. But he identifies its referent as a ‘reed’ (Schilfrohr), which makes no sense as a subject of our *eti* ‘goes’ (he is concerned with the YV mantra, not our vs.). Oberlies also reports a suggestion of Thieme’s, starting from the same root etymology, that it refers to a snake (presumably as striking with its fangs). The mantra *stegān dāmṣṭrābhyām* “the *stega*-s with its 2 fangs” would fit the snake well, the horse less so: in my sampling of horse dentition on the web I can’t find anything obvious in a horse’s mouth that comes in twos and would be sharp – maybe the canines? (Although note that in RV X.87.3 the word, also in the dual, seems to refer to the upper and lower jaws.) As noted in the art. cit., Agni is elsewhere compared to a snake; cf. I.79.1 *āhir dhúnir vāta iva dhrājimān* “a snake, tumultuous, swooping like the wind.” The point of comparison is presumably the twisting and unpredictable progress of a wild fire across open land, esp. when fanned by wind. Note that both our passage and I.79.1 compare the fire to the wind as well as to a snake.

In b with Re I take *ví ... vāti* as having double sense: in the simile, with *mīham* as obj, it means ‘blow away’; in the frame, without obj. but with acc. of extent, it means ‘blow across / far and wide’.

I do not understand the presence of Mitra and Varuṇa in pāda c. Although Agni is sometimes identified with Mitra and/or Varuṇa (see, e.g., II.1.4 for the two individually), the overlap in functions that enables such identification is not visible here, at least to me.

The part. *ajyāmānaḥ* is also found in the next vs. (10a) in the same metrical position; there I take it as double-sensed, both ‘being anointed’ and ‘being driven’, and esp. given the emphasis on Agni’s movement in this vs., the second sense should be present here as well.

In fact I think this double sense interacts with pāda d. Like Ge, the pub. tr. takes *agnīḥ* as part of the simile *agnīr vāne nā* “like a fire in the forest.” But of course the simile marker *nā* is wrongly positioned in that case. I now think that only *vané nā* constitutes the simile proper, and that there are two fires, one in the simile, one in the frame. The one in the frame belongs with Mitra and Varuṇa in c and with the ‘being anointed’ sense of *ajyāmānaḥ*: when Agni, the ritual fire, is anointed with ghee in the functions of Mitra and Varuṇa, he lets loose his flame, which is fed by the ghee. The fire in the simile is the forest fire, driven by the wind (see *vāta-codita-*, *vāta-jūta-* ‘spurred/sped by the wind’), with the 2nd sense of *ajyāmānaḥ*. I would therefore now emend the tr. of cd to “where, being anointed as M+V, Agni has let loose his flame, as a fire in the forest, being driven (by the wind), lets loose its flame.”

X.31.10: With Ge (and despite Old’s doubts) I take this vs. as depicting the kindling of the ritual fire, with a focus on the kindling apparatus. In this it resembles vss. 13–14 (esp. the latter) of X.27, showing once again the connection between the Vasukra and Kavaṣa hymns that Old noted. As in X.27.14 the equipment and the process are both sexualized and, paradoxically, desexualized – or, better, de-fecundized. In X.27.14a the rod that connects the two kindling

sticks is described as a tree without leaves or shade, in other words a barren object (see comm. ad loc.). Here in pāda a I think the same entity, the rod, is identified as a barren cow (*starī-*), which nonetheless, paradoxically, gave birth (*sūta*). This identification is surprising because of the rod's phallic shape, and in fact I think the same piece of equipment is depicted as phallic in d—but dizzying layers of paradox should not surprise us in contexts like this. In both X.27.14a and here the rod is barren because it is the mere connector of the two kindling sticks, but it is also productive through its interaction esp. with the lower *araṇi*. Its giving birth in our pāda happens while, and because, it is *ajyāmānā*: “being driven” by the priests rapidly turning it back and forth (see descrip. ad X.27.14) – but also “being anointed,” perhaps with drops of ghee, as Ge (n. 10a) suggests, or with sparks from the friction.

The barren cow / friction stick remains the subject of b. She is described as *svāgopā* ‘having her own herdsmen’, probably the priests who manipulate the stick, per Ge (n. 10b). The opening of this pāda, *vyāthir avyathīḥ* with its X and negated X, surely expresses another paradox, but its contents are not entirely clear, and I am now certain that the publ. tr. “though faltering, did so unfalteringly” did not capture it. I now follow (more or less) Old’s suggestion that *vyāthir avyathīḥ kṛṇuta* contains a double acc. constr., rather like 8c, also with *kṛṇuta*. And I think further that in addition to the paradox expressed by the positive and negated nominal forms of *vyath*, there has been a flipping of values. Generally ‘falter, waver’ is a negative notion, evidenced by the number of passages in which it is proudly asserted that *nā vyath* “he/they do not falter.” However, in terms of the fire kindling, it is desirable to set the inert kindling materials in motion, in the very type of wavering motion that nascent flames and smoke would show. I therefore now take *avyathīḥ* as a fem. acc. pl. to the *i*-stem *avyathī-*, referring to the ‘non-wavering’ (i.e., inert) kindling materials, the referent per haps being f. *samīdh-* (see comm. ad X.27.13), and the *vyāthīḥ* as the second (neut. *-is*-stem) acc. with *√kṛ*. Although *avyathī-* is ordinarily a good quality, here it is not. I would now emend the tr. to “she set the unmoving / unwavering (kindling materials) to wavering / to a wavering course.”

Pāda c expresses the usual beloved paradox of the son being born before his parents. As Ge (n. 10c) says, this must mean that Agni as a god and an elemental substance existed before his particular birth as the ritual fire right now.

Pāda d returns us to the birth scene, with a different and more sexualized image, one that restores the expected gender relations. The cow here (*gaūḥ*) is presumably the lower *araṇi*, conceptualized as female, which lies flat on the ground. It has a hole in it, called the *yoni* (see disc. ad X.27.14). This fecund cow contrasts with the barren cow (*starī-*) of pāda a, but may be assimilated to “the foremost cow throughout the land” of 6b.

The interpr. of the pāda turns on the word *śamyām*. In this form it can be either the loc. sg. of *śamī-* (AV+) ‘śamī tree’ or the acc. sg. of a *śamyā-*, not found elsewhere but quite likely the same as *śamyā-* (III.33.13, AV+) ‘yokepin, peg’. In an item of homely usage, it would not be surprising for the accent to be insecure. If it is the latter, it is the obj. of ‘swallowed’ (*jagāra*); if the former, the obj. of that verb must be supplied. Ge tr. it as the acc. (“so hat die Kuh den Pflock verschlungen”), though in his extensive n. 10d he seems to favor the loc. Both on syntactic grounds—if there’s an available object, we should take it—and poetic grounds I favor the acc. This expression is then a different sexualized depiction of the kindling of the fire; here the lower *araṇi* “swallows” (that is, takes into its hole, the *yoni*) the friction stick, the rod that is inserted in the lower *araṇi* and set to whirling to produce the friction and the sparks that will set the kindling material afire. The peg is clearly phallic; the image is of sexual intercourse. It’s worth noting that the AV has an occurrence of *śamyā-* in a sexual context (VI.138.4). Conceptualizing the rod as a

phallus“repairs” the disharmony of pāda a, where it was seen as female—though, it is true, a failed female, a barren cow.

I am completely baffled by the end of pāda d, the seemingly unconnected dep. cl. *yád dha prchān* “if/when they will ask.” This appears to be the effective end of the hymn, since the last vs. (11) is a pseudo-dānastuti. I can float two speculative accounts of this clause, neither of which I find particularly compelling. As I say in the publ. intro., the clause may hark back to the question posed in vs. 7, which began the treatment of the space/time conundrum, which finds its resolution in Agni. “When/if they will ask” sketches what precedes as the answer to such questions and thus provides closure to the hymn. Alternatively, it may provide the transition to the seemingly unconnected vs. 11: when “they” (unidentified) ask, “they” (also unidentified) reply (*āhuḥ* 11a). But since I don’t really understand why vs. 11 has been appended to this hymn, I can’t get any further.

X.31.11: As is frequently noted (Old, Ge, Re, Lü 618), this vs. bears a clear resemblance to I.117.8, in a Kaksīvant Ásvin hymn:

1.117.8 *yuvām śyāvāya rúsatīm adattam mahāḥ kṣṇásyāśvinā kṇvāya /
pravācyam tād vṛṣaṇā kṛtām vām yān nāṣadāya śrávo adhyádhattam ||*

In the publ. (JPB) tr.:

You two gave a bright (body) to Śyāva Kaṇva [/ Kaṇva, the Dark One] of the great flood (?), Ásvins.

That deed of yours is to be proclaimed, o bulls: that you bestowed fame upon the son of Nṛṣad [=Kaṇva].

Given the coincidence of vocabulary, there can be no doubt that the two passages are deeply interrelated, though they throw less light on each other than we might hope. I think it likely that Kaṇva is not only called Śyāva (‘dusky’) in both passages, but also Kṣṇa (‘dark’) in this one, and therefore, rather than seeing a dusky horse (Ge’s “der dunkelbraune Renner”) as the subj. of our pāda b, I take that pāda as depicting Kaṇva’s own triumph. Pāda c then depicts the payoff for the same Kaṇva under another epithet, *kṣṇá-*, semantically equivalent to *śyāvá-*: the “gleaming udder” of riches / honors swells for him, with a nice contrast between the bright udder and the dark recipient. Who is this Kaṇva? I can only assume that here he is a poet, indeed the poet of this hymn – perhaps adopting a more Indo-Aryan name than the phonologically aberrant Kavaṣa, but one still phonologically relatable to it – and associating himself with the great mass of Kaṇva poets elsewhere in the RV. If Kaṇva is our poet, then we can make sense of pāda d, a sense already suggested by Re: no one other than himself swelled his *rtá-*, that is, “nul ne l’a aidé dans la composition poétique.” He therefore deserves all the prizes and accolades he has received.

I doubt that the Kaṇva of I.117.8 is the same person; rather our poet has appropriated that “dunkle Sage” to outfit himself with a pedigree and a back-story. The *āhuḥ* “they say” may be a way of distancing this story from factual truth.

I would now slightly emend the tr. to “And they say that Kaṇva is the son of Nṛṣad, and (that) the dusky one, as prizewinner, took the stakes. / The gleaming udder swelled for the black one, (but) no one (else) made the truth swell for him there.”

X.32 Indra

See the publ. intro. for the structure of the hymn, esp. the clear division into two parts (vss. 1–5, 6–9) by meter and subject matter. Ge’s reconstruction of the mise-en-scène of this hymn at the beg. of his intro. to the hymn seems fanciful.

X.32.1: The first hemistich of this vs. is difficult and disputed, the second reasonably straightforward. In the first half it is clear that Indra's two horses are coming or have come to the place of sacrifice. Unclear are the exact sense of the pseudo-part. *dhiyasānā-*, the morphological analysis, root affiliation, and function of *sakṣāṇi*, and the identity and role of the *varā-*.

With regard to the first, see comm. ad V.33.2, which contains the only other occurrences of the stem. In contrast to the standard rendering 'aufmerksam' (etc.), I give the stem more complex semantics, in part encouraged by the larger context of both passages, the rarity of the form, and its unusual morphology, which sets it apart from standard participles to $\sqrt{dh̥}$. In both passages the part. modifies Indra, who in both instances is on his way to the sacrifice. I take the stem as meaning 'being conjured up', that is, 'being brought (to epiphany) by our *dh̥-* [poetic vision]'. In other words, the appearance of Indra at our sacrifice is under our mental control: our visions and the hymns they give rise to can literally "materialize / realize" Indra on our ritual ground. In our passage this conceit may provide the theme for the five "journey" vss. of the first part of the hymn. As disc. in the publ. intro., the standard Indra journey trope is overlaid with a different and almost contradictory journey theme, that of the bridal procession, in which the bride leads the husband rather than the standard vice versa. I now suggest that the "bride" in this scenario is the (fem. gender) *dh̥-* (see also Ge n. 3cd). It is she who leads Indra to us, in a role reversal that gives power not only to the bride-as-*dh̥-*, but also to us, who created her. Although the word *dh̥-* does not appear in this hymn (nor *dh̥t-*, though see X.31.3), I would argue that it is signaled by the very rare pseudo-participle found prominently in the first pāda. See also *dīdhaya* in 4a.

Now *sakṣāṇi*. Although it could be derived from either \sqrt{sah} or \sqrt{sac} , an affiliation with the former is more likely on semantic and lexical (other *sakṣ-* forms to this root) grounds. Flg. Baunack, both Old and Ge (n. 1a) take it as an infinitive in imperatival usage, presumably a loc. inf. to an otherwise unattested *n*-stem **sakṣān-*, and Lub also classifies it as an inf. to \sqrt{sah} . In the publ. tr. I took it as a loc. to such a stem, but not in infinitival usage: "in the power of ..." But I now find neither locative interpr. convincing, esp. because there exists an *i*-stem *sakṣāṇi-* of the appropriate shape, but no **sakṣān-* (though of course an *n*-stem probably underlies both *sakṣāṇi-* [8x, excluding this passage] and *sakṣāna-* [1x]). I return to the view that our *sakṣāṇi* represents an irregular shortening of dual *sakṣāṇī* in pāda-final position, a view that dates back to BR and is also held by Gr, Delb (AiS 416), and Lanman (Noun Infl. 390). The dual *sakṣāṇī* is found in VIII.22.15 modifying the Ásvins, also on a journey, and the very similar *-in*-stem *prasakṣín-* (like our *prá ... sakṣāṇi*) has a dual *prasakṣīṇā* modifying Indra's *hárī* in VIII.13.10 (followed immediately in the next pāda by *gántārā*, like our *gmántā*). Despite Old's contemptuous dismissal of the dual interpr., I find it less problematic than the loc. infinitive one and would now emend the tr. to "The two overpowering (horses) of the one being conjured up [=Indra] are come." Although the shortening would be irregular, it may have been facilitated by the short *-i* ending pādas c and d.

The first evidence of the bridal motif is found in pāda b, with the 'wooers', both acc. and instr. (*varébhīr varān*). This first evidence is also the first evidence of the role reversals the characterize this motif in the hymn. The wooer is already a defined role in the RVic wedding; see in the wedding hymn, X.85.8–9. As I have discussed elsewhere (Sac Wife 222–23 and passim), the function and behavior of the wooer are most clearly set out in the grhya sūtras. The wooer or wooers are proxies for the bridegroom, who go to the house of the prospective bride and perform the formal wooing of the girl in discussion/negotiation with her family. This always involves

their journey *to* the bride, but here they—or at least some of them— stay put, and Indra, the pseudo-bride, comes to them. I am a bit puzzled by the plethora of wooers, in two different cases, and am not certain of their identities, but I am now inclined towards the solution sketched by Ge in his n. 1b, that they represent two different groups. The acc. *varān* are the priests and ritual personnel, who are wooing Indra with their *dhī-* and sit awaiting his arrival. The instr. *varébhiḥ* are the wooers who accompany Indra, the gods or specifically the Maruts. I am not sure why wooers would come along with Indra in this scenario, unless (most likely) the image is of the standard model of wooing, with Indra as bridegroom accompanied by his posse of wooers, coming to woo the *dhī-*. The poet thus superimposes the two models one upon the other, leaving his audience off balance. I would now slightly emend this part of the tr. to “... are come, along with the wooers, to the (other) wooers (who are) taking their seats in front.”

The part. *prasīdataḥ* is taken by Gr and Ge as a gen. sg. modifying Indra, but Old points out that word order favors taking it as an acc. pl. with *varān*. I would add that it is not only word order but sense. *prá √ sad* in the RV does not have its widespread later sense ‘be/make pleased’. It is quite a rare lexeme and seems specialized in the sense of taking a forward position at the ritual (e.g., IV.1.13, V.60.1). Here the participle locates the acc. *varān* as stationary on the ritual ground, as opposed to the approaching *vará-* in the instr.

In c *ubhāyam* probably refers to both oblations and praise, as Sāy. and Ge suggest (Ge’s n. 1c).

On the pf. subj. *jujoṣati* and *búbhodati* see my 2017 art. on the perfect subjunctive (Fs. García Ramón). As I argue there, there is no reason to assign any anterior value to them (of the ‘will have enjoyed’ type). The pf. subjunctives here may help explain the poet’s penchant for the pf. opt. in X.31 (see above).

X.32.2: This vs. is blessedly straightforward, a rarity in this poet’s oeuvre.

As Ge (n. 2cd) suggests, the pl. subjects of cd are probably not Indra’s horses, despite the verb *vāhanti*, because it is difficult to interpr. d with horses as subject— not to mention that Indra’s two horses figured prominently in vs. 1, so the switch to pl. would be jarring. Instead, as Ge says, the subj. is probably the singers or their praise hymns. This fits nicely with my interpr. of vs. 1 and the situation more generally—that the poets have the power to make Indra appear at their sacrifice, to convey him there, through their poetic vision.

vagvaná- is a hapax, with a very rare suffix (AiG II.2.905), though clearly, if irregularly, derived from *√ vac*. Its creation here may owe something to *vagnúnā* in the next vs., 3c. The negative interpr. (‘chattering’) is entirely dependent on context. It is most likely an adj. modifying acc. pl. *arādhāsah*, but as Ge (n. 2d) points out, the latter could instead be a gen. sg. dependent on a substantivized *vagvaná-*: “the chatterings of the ungenerous one.” It hardly matters. It does matter that what the presumed subjects, the poets, are overcoming is something verbal.

X.32.3: This is the omphalos vs., in the exact middle of the first part of the hymn, and, as often, it overtly signals that it contains enigmas—here by the whole 1st pāda. After which follow three “wonders,” one per pāda; I do not consider all three to hang together as a single story, though cd present two views of a single situation. The topsy-turvy quality of each of the *vāpūṃṣi* recalls that of the animal fable vignettes in X.28, another sign of the connection between Vasukra and Kavaṣa.

The verb *adhīyati* (Pp. *adhi-īyati*) is plausibly taken by Old as a nonce thematization of the root pres. to \sqrt{i} , like nonce thematized *bībhramāṇa-* in the previous hymn (X.31.6). For the semantics of *adhī* \sqrt{i} see comm. ad IV.17.12. The wonder in this pāda—the son knowing the birth of his parents—is a variant on the theme found in the last hymn, X.31.10, of the son being born before his parents. I do not think it needs to be interpr. in the context of the 2nd hemistich.

As already noted, these two pādas present two different views of the same thing: (c) a wife conveying her new husband on the wedding journey rather than vice versa; (d) a bridal procession arranged for the bridegroom, not as is usual for the bride. Both of them can be interpr. in light of my suggestion (above ad vs. 1) that our *dhī-* is the bride who will bring Indra to our sacrifice. In c she is the wife and Indra the husband; in d the bridal procession is for Indra. This is also succinctly stated by Ge (n. 3cd): “Der Gemahl ist Indra, die Frau, die ihn heimführt, ist die Dichtung; seine Fahrt zum Opfer ist ein Hochzeitszug.” For \sqrt{vah} in the specialized use of ‘convey (home), marry’ see, e.g., V.37.3 *vadhūr iyám pátim ichánty eti, yá īm váhāte máhiṣīm iṣirām* “Here she goes, a bride seeking a husband who will take her home as vigorous chief wife” (sim. in a nearby Vasukra passage, X.27.11). In V.37.3 in the following pāda the chariot sounds loudly (*ā ... ghoṣat*); if that pāda is connected to what precedes, this may refer to celebratory noisemaking from bystanders and could be reflected in our *vāgnunā sumāt* “amid the uproar.” Numerous passages show *vahatú-* as specifically for the bride, including X.85.14 (wedding hymn) *vahatúm sūryāyāḥ* and, as obj. of \sqrt{kr} , the notorious X.17.1 *tvāṣṭā duhitré vahatúm kṛṇoti* “Tvaṣṭar is making a wedding for his daughter.” The *íd* in our *pumsá íd* emphasizes the oddness of making a *vahatú-* for a male. Despite the gen. *pumsáh* of the Pp., we should probably read dat. *pumsé*, as Old also suggests. As X.17.1 just cited shows, *vahatúm* \sqrt{kr} takes a dat.; see also X.85.20.

X.32.4: In the publ. tr. I render *abhí ... dīdhaya* “I ponder,” on the basis of III.38.1 *abhí ... dīdhayā* (see also IV.33.9), but I now think that it should be interpr. in conjunction with *dhiyasānāsya* in 1a and the underlying *dhī-* that I consider the bride figure in this multi-verse conceit. Ge’s characterization of the action here (n. 4a) is close to my understanding of *dhiyasānāsya* in vs. 1: “Der Dichter *sieht im Geist* [my ital.], wohin die Brautfahrt Indra’s geht, zu der Opferstätte.” I would now change the tr. slightly to “Just this dear seat do I envision ...”

I read *abhí* in pāda with *dīdhaya* but also supply it with *śāsana*, an unorthodox silent repetition in the rel. cl. suggested by the *abhí* in d, introducing the third subject of *śāsana*. For *abhí* $\sqrt{sās}$ meaning ‘direct (to a goal)’, cf. VI.54.2 *yó gṛhāṁ abhiśāsati* “who [=Pūṣan] will direct (us) to the house(s).” In the simile in our passage *vahatúm* ‘bridal procession’ serves as the obj. corresponding to “(us)” in VI.54.2. The goal of both simile and frame is “this seat” (*tād ... sādhasatham* of pāda a), expressed by *yād* in the rel. cl. The frame lacks an expressed object. Ge supplies “(deine Fahrt),” with the 2nd sg. poss. prn. presumably referring to Indra, who was addressed in the 2nd sg. two vss. before (vs. 2). I supply “(their journey),” referring to the cows, who, in the form of milk to be mixed with soma, are converging on the ritual ground. Ge (n. 4b) also thinks these are Somakühe, but I don’t see how these cows would direct Indra’s journey, as Ge has it.

The identities of the subjects of the other two pādas, also making their way to the seat, are unclear. Ge (n. 4b) suggests “sonstige Opfer (c) und Lied (d).” In particular (n. 4c) he sees “the foremost mother of the flock” (*mātā ... yūthāsya pūrvyā*) as the *Idā*, on the basis of V.41.19 *īlā yūthāsya mātā*, but we should perhaps also bear in mind *pūrvyā bhūmanā gauḥ* “the foremost

cow throughout the land” in the immediately preceding hymn (X.31.6), which we identified as the dakṣiṇā, arisen from Agni’s good favor.

In d *vāṇāsya saptādhātuḥ ... jānaḥ* “the sevenfold people of the music” is compared by Ge (n. 4d) with IX.103.3 *vāñīr ṛṣīṇām saptā* “the seven voices of the seers” – in both cases presumably referring to the chanters among the ritual personnel, assimilated to the Saptarṣi.

X.32.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., I see this vs. as depicting a two-way, crisscrossed journey: Soma goes to the gods (a); Indra and the gods come here (bc). I am almost alone in identifying the subj. of pāda a as Soma. Ge suggests the poet, Sāy. the Hotar, Baunack Agni, Old Soma or Agni. Although I am not absolutely certain that Soma is the subject – Agni remains a distinct possibility – the sg. of *devayū-* is used more often of Soma than of any other entity.

The lexeme *prá√ric* cannot, in my opinion, have its usual sense ‘project beyond, surpass’ here, since that idiom generally takes an abl. However, Ge and Old both, in different ways, try to wring that sense out of it, with Old supplying “the others” for the missing ablative: Ge “Der Gottverlangende reicht weiter bis zu eurer Stätte”; Old “Hervor (über die Andere) zu eurer ... Stätte hin reicht der Götterverehrer.” Both construe *áchā* with pāda-final *padám*, which they interpr. as ‘place’. By contrast, because *ácha* is often postposed to its complement, I take it rather with preceding *vah* ‘you’, referring to the gods. (For postposed *ácha*, see the common pāda-opening *devāṁ áchā* I.44.4, etc., and for this collocation #PREV ENCL.-PRN *áchā* the identical IV.34.3 *prá vó ‘chā*, etc.) This frees up *padám* to be obj. of *prá√ric*, in a different idiom ‘leave behind’; cf. X.13.4 *priyām yamás tanvām prāṛirecīt* “Yama left behind his own dear body” (and see VI.20.4). Here I think the point is that Soma leaves a trail on his journey to the gods.

Meanwhile in b Indra, who is the single surpassing one (*ékaḥ ... turváṇiḥ*), drives to the place of sacrifice along with the Maruts (*rudrébhiḥ* b) or with the gods in general (c). I would now slightly emend the tr., to more or less match Ge’s “oder mit den Unsterblichen,” to “or (with) the immortals among whom ...” with gapped instr. in the main cl. and “immortals” demoted into the rel. cl. as a loc. The position of *vā* is then somewhat anomalous, but (in my opinion) anomalous within reasonable limits.

The rel. cl. seems a bit of a throw-away, without relevance to the topic of the vs. It seems that the immortals have it in their power to “give” old age; indeed, since they’re immortal, the only relevance of old age to them is to inflict it on mortals—or, more positively, to give it to them. If the latter is meant, presumably “old age” here stands for the “complete lifetime” we aim for elsewhere in the RV.

As noted above (comm. ad X.31.3) *ūma-* is only used of the gods, so here it must refer to the immortals of c or perhaps Indra and the Maruts in b. The pl. subj. of the impv. *pāri ... sīñcata* must be the mortal ritual personnel.

X.32.6–8: These three vss. concern Agni, or rather 6 and 8 do, with 7 a general statement motivated by the previous vs. The final vs. (9) stands apart, though it is in Triṣṭubh like 6–8.

X.32.6: This vs. begins the second, Agni-focused portion of the hymn, though Indra, as the impartor of knowledge about Agni, provides the transition. The last three pādas are identical to V.2.8bcd.

The identity of the *vrata-pā-* ‘protector of commandments’ is left unclear, and the poet may be having a little joke at our expense. Sg. *vrata-pā-* is most often used of Agni (I.31.10, VI.8.2, VIII.11.1, possibly X.61.7); the only other sg. god who serves as referent is Sūrya

(I.83.5). But since the contents of the Vratapā's speech concern Agni, he is unlikely to be the speaker. Since Varuṇa is particularly associated with *vratā-*, he might be expected to be the default referent, but the stem is never directly applied to him, and there is no other sign of him in this hymn. In order to avoid multiplying entities, I suggest that Indra, who is explicitly named at the beginning of the next pāda, is also the referent here. By virtue of his militant actions on behalf of the gods and their clients, he can be considered the protector of their *vratās*.

X.32.7: Just as vs. 3 serves as omphalos in the first Indra-oriented portion of the hymn, this vs., the middle one of the three devoted to Agni, seems to have a similar profile: it is detached from the ritually focused vss. that surround it and expresses a maxim embedded in a general truth: that asking directions leads to a good outcome. As indicated in the publ. intro. the emphasis on the instruction of the ignorant reminds us of X.28. In any case, the *ānuśiṣṭaḥ*- of 6d, modifying the 1st ps. speaker, is picked up by *ānuśiṣṭaḥ* of 7b and *anuśāsanasya* of 7c, both used in general statements.

Although the *-víd-* of *kṣetra-víd-* most likely belongs to *√ vid* 'know' (so Gr etc.; see Scar 482–83) and picks up *vidvān* used of the instructive Indra in 6c, note that *√ vid* 'find' provides the final finite verb in the vs., *vindati* in d, and 'finding the field' is not an impossible interpr. of the cmpd.

X.32.8: This vs. concerns the rekindling of the ritual fire, subsequent to its being re-deposited in 6a *nidhīyāmānam*.

The plupf. (or redupl. impf.?) *āmaman* belongs with *√ mar*² 'stay, wait', forms of which are confined to the Vasukra / Kavaṣa hymns (see comm. ad X.27.20, 31.2). Agni's waiting may refer to his sojourn in the waters or to his staying quiescent once reinstalled on the ritual ground – or both.

Although 'covered over' (*āpīvṛtaḥ*) could refer either to his time lying within the waters or to his being covered with kindling materials on the hearth, the sucking of his mother's udder (*adhayan mātūr ūdhaḥ*) most likely describes the nascent fire's contact with the kindling sticks.

The paradoxical expression "old age has reached the youth" (*āpa jarimā yūvānam*) presumably refers to the gray of ashes, once the fire begins to burn.

Note the enclitic doubling in *īm enam*.

X.32.9: Like immed. preceding X.31, this hymn ends with a twisted dānastuti-like vs. In the vs. here the poet seems to be praising gifts he (and his colleagues) are giving, rather than those they received – hence a sort of reverse dānastuti. The situation is further confused by the fact that the first hemistich contains two vocc., one apparent addressed to a soma vessel (*kalāśa*) and one to a certain Kuruśravaṇa, who, according to the next hymn (also by Kavaṣa), was a king (X.33.4 *kuruśravaṇam ... rājānam*) chosen as patron by Kavaṣa and, by the time of X.33, apparently dead. It is difficult to imagine a semantic or pragmatic class to which both the jug and the king could belong – and I think we would be wise not to try to identify one. Instead, the poet is addressing first the object (the vessel) and then the king, for different purposes. Both Ge and Old suggest that the *kalāśa-* is the referent of *sāḥ* in c—that is, it is the gift (or part of the gift) itself.

As a close parallel to ab Old and Ge aptly adduce V.30.12 *bhadrām idām ruśāmā agne akran, gāvāṃ catvāri dādataḥ sahāsrā* "The Ruśamas have done this auspicious thing, o Agni, in giving four thousand cows." In our pāda the poet may be addressing the soma vessel as an object made auspicious by being part of the gift we are giving. By contrast, in addressing

Kuruśrávaṇa in b, he may be asking covert permission of the king to perform this giving – or more likely calling attention to the unusual *giving* by the poet (& co.) in order to prompt lavish countergiving by Kuruśrávaṇa and the patrons, a sort of priming of the pump. Certainly the munificence of Kuruśrávaṇa to our poet is described in extravagant terms in the next hymn, X.33.4–5.

In c *dānāḥ* is universally taken (incl. by the publ. tr.) as nom. sg. of *dānā-* ‘gift’, but I now wonder if it is not another ex. of the root aor. med. part. (not recognized in the grammars) in passive value. See another possible ex. in V.52.14 (and comm. thereon). Here it would modify the unexpressed nom. *kalásah*: “(the vessel) being given—let it be yours, o bounteous one, and this soma here ...” Though the publ. “let this be a gift for you ...” works fine, the participial interpr. is smoother.

X.33 Lament of a singer

On the situation depicted in this hymn, see Old, Ge, Bl (RR ad I.105.8), Don (64). The meter of the hymn is quite various and reflects the changes of mood and theme in this consistently 1st person discourse. The hymn gives the impression of a remarkably personal testament.

X.33.1: My tr. of *prayúj-* as ‘advance team’ here and in I.186.9, X.96.12 is not a happy one, sounding too close to the operatives of a modern political campaign. Presumably *prayúj-* refers to the horse(s) at the front of the team, and here the point is that the poet is hitched up even in front of those forward horses, in an especially prominent position. Because I doubt that the “teams of the peoples” (*prayújo jánānām*), a phrase also found in X.96.12, actually did their own hitching, I would like to take *prayújah* as an acc. pl. (as it is in I.186.9, in the phrase *prá yuñjate prayújah*). I would then tr. “They hitched me up (even) in front of (before) the teams of the peoples,” though I’m not certain the syntax will work: no other forms of *prá √ yuj* have a double acc. Old dismisses the possibility of an acc.

The use of *sma* with pres. *váhāmi* is unclear. Re (EVP XVI.131) asks “premier ex. de *sma* prétérisant le verbe?” In the publ. tr. I render it as ‘always’, but also “preterize” the verb. This is in part because of the tenses of the other verbs in this narrative: the impfs. *araksan* (c) and *āsīt* (d) should situate the vs. in the narrative past, while *yuyujre* (a) is compatible with that reading. The situation depicted also strongly suggests the non-recent past: in the first three pādas the poet reflects on the privileged position he had under the previous, now dead, king and recalls in d the shout that presaged his abrupt change of fortune. Perhaps the pres. with *sma* here has a past progressive sense “I was always carrying ...”

Pāda b presents two other, related questions: why Pūṣan and what is the sense of *ántareṇa* here? The latter seems to have attracted more attention than it perhaps deserves. See the various suggestions of Old, Ge, and Scar (427 and n. 603). I think it is an adverbial instr. ‘interiorly, intimately’, expressing the close relationship between the poet and Pūṣan. Although Pūṣan is a minor deity, he is invoked for aid in finding the way on journeys, and given the poet’s position as metaphorical lead horse, Pūṣan is an appropriate companion. Old plausibly suggests that Pūṣan here may be connected with the unnamed ‘field-knower’ in the previous hymn, X.32.7, who “finds the straight course” (*srutīm vindati añjasīnām*); see also nearby X.26 (though by a different poet), a hymn to Pūṣan that ends (vs. 9) with a hope for Pūṣan’s aid to our chariot.

See Ge (n. 1d) for two possible interpr. of the hapax *duḥśāsu-*. I take it as referring to the new king, who will replace the poet’s old generous and benevolent patron.

X.33.2: The first hemistich is identical to I.105.8, uttered by a speaker in similar emotional distress. As Ge suggests (n. 2ab), this may be a stereotyped phrase.

ámati- (c) and *matí-* (d) form a contrastive pair. On the sense of *ámati-* see comm. ad X.42.10, where it is argued that it refers to a physical state, which would be supported here by “nakedness and exhaustion.”

X.33.3: The second half of I.105.8 (see immed. above) is found here.

X.33.4: It is striking that the poet “chooses” his royal patron, not vice versa, at least in this telling. Is this a role reversal similar to that of the svayamvara?

X.33.5: I take this vs. as the poet’s “choosing” expression at the time of vs. 4, when he chose Kuruśravaṇa. Sim. Ge.

X.33.6: I take the *yásya* cl. as parallel to 5ab, with 5c almost an interlude. The main cl. in this vs. is c, with neut. *kṣetram* a nominative compared to the unexpressed Kuruśravaṇa.

Ge (sim. Don) assumes that the sweet *gírah* of pāda were Kuruśravaṇa’s own (“dessen Worte angenehm waren”; “whose words were sweet”). But *gír-* doesn’t simply mean ‘word’, but refers to the praise songs / hymns produced by poets, and surely these *gírah* were presented to Kuruśravaṇa by our speaker, who in the preceding pāda announced his intention to praise the king (5c *stávai*).

I do not understand the function of *prá-* in *prásvādasah*. No other forms built to *svād-* are compounded with this preverb (anywhere in Skt.), nor does it appear with verb forms built to \sqrt{svad} or $\sqrt{sūd}$. There is an orphaned, functionless *prá* in V.7.6 *prá svādanam pītūnām*, but that doesn’t help much.

For a dwelling, described as *raṇvā-*, compared to an animate being, cf., e.g., I.66.3 *okó ná raṇvāh* “delightful like a home,” of Agni, VI.3.3 *raṇvó vasatīh*, also of Agni.

X.33.9: *śatātman-* ‘having a hundred selves’ verges on “a cat has nine lives” territory, as Don also suggests.

X.34 Gambler

See the publ. intro. for an assessment of the hymn. Like the immediately preceding hymn, X.33, it is a monologue that traverses a landscape of shifting emotions, though the 1st person speakers and their preoccupations are very different. It has been much translated; in addition to the standard ones, Re *Hymnes spéc.*, Macd both *Hymns from the Rigveda* and *Vedic Reader*, Maurer, Thieme *Gedichte*, Don, Falk *Bruderschaft* 181ff.

The Anukr. ascribes the hymn to Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, which is surely correct, or alternatively and fancifully to *Akṣa Maujavant* “The dice (/die) from (Mt.) Mūjavant.”

X.34.1: Note the phonological semi-scrambling in the openings of the first two pādas, *#prāvepā mā ... #pravātejā*.

The tr. ‘dangling’ for *prāvepāh* is a bit misleading; it should have a greater sense of movement; perhaps ‘quivering’ or ‘shaking’.

Although *írīṇa-* is literally a salt pocket (see comm. ad VIII.4.3), in this context it refers to a such a pocket, a hollow in the ground, used for gaming, since it can contain the nuts and allow them to whirl freely.

The root \sqrt{chand} can mean both ‘seem’ and ‘please’. I favor the latter sense in d, with most tr., but Ge (fld. by Don) takes in the former sense, with the simile as the predicate: “seemed to me like a *bhakṣá-*.” Since ‘seemed’ is essentially built into the simile, a verb meaning ‘seem’ is superfluous. Moreover, the attraction that the nuts exert on the speaker is better expressed by ‘pleased’. Ge (n. 1d) considers the point of comparison between the nuts and soma to be the wakefulness expressed by *jāgrvi-* in d, but this seems overelaborate. Although, as he points out, *jāgrvi-* is also used of soma elsewhere in the RV, other qualities of soma might make it seem pleasing to the speaker.

X.34.2: The “one die too many” (*akṣásya ... ekaparásya*) refers to the leftover nut once the handful has been divided by four. As indicated in the publ. intro., a single leftover nut is worse than two, which is worse than three.

X.34.2–3: Note the symmetry between 2d *ápa jāyām arodham* and 3a *ápa jāyā ruṇaddhi*.
Note the opening of 3c, *#áśvasya*, matching 2c *#akṣásya*.

X.34.3: The mother-in-law of pāda a is actually the mother-in-law of the wife, that is, the *mother* of the speaker. In the system of patrilocal marriage prevailing at this period, terms for in-laws would only refer to the in-laws of the wife, who would be embedded within them. See disc. ad X.28.1 and Thieme (M+A 14 and n. 5); in M+A (n. 5) and Gedichte (74 n. 5) he suggests that “mother-in-law” is used here because the woman in question no longer considers the gambler her son because of his unacceptable behavior. She has disowned him, and her relationship to him is only through her daughter-in-law.

X.34.4: Init. *anyé* in pāda a, as well as *anyéśām* init. in 10d and 11b, conforms to my rule that indefinite *anyá-* is always init., while def. *anyá-* is generally in 2nd position.

X.34.5: Although some tr. take b as continuing the direct speech of *ná daviṣāṇi ebhiḥ* (a), it seems best (with Ge, Thieme, etc.) to limit the direct quotation to the three words just quoted. In b the gambler then describes the unhappy effect of the virtuous resolve he just announced – abandonment by his *sákhi-*.

There is some discussion about who these *sákhi-* are, the dice themselves or his human gambling pals (see Old, Ge, etc.). I assume it refers to both.

The sense and morphological value of *áva hīye* in b are disputed. I take it as a passive to $\sqrt{hā}$ ‘leave (behind)’, while others (see esp. Kulikov, *ya-presents*, p. 448) as an intrans. ‘stay behind’. The RV gives us no help. This is, in my view, the only RVic form to the stem *hīya-* belonging to the root $\sqrt{hā}$ ‘leave behind’; the other two forms classified there by Gr are cmpd with *ní* and in my interpr. belong to the root $\sqrt{hā}$ ‘change position’ and mean ‘be bent double’ (see VI.52.1 and VII.104.10). Our RVic form is unaccented, and forms in Vedic prose show both accents (*hīya-* and *hīyá-*; for details see Kulikov). Kulikov interpr. it as a non-passive intransitive (anticausative) form, tr. “I fall behind.” Although the formal facts provide no help, I find the passive makes for better drama. Note also the ppl. to this root in passive value in vs. 10, *hīnā* ‘abandoned, left behind’.

As shown by the accent on *ákrata*, *ca* in *c* is a subordinator. See, e.g., Klein DGRV I.243.

X.34.6: On *śúśujāna-*, see comm. ad X.27.2, where, flg. Insler, I take it as a deformation of *śúśuvāna-* ‘swelling up’. As I have often remarked above (flg. Old), there are numerous close connections between the Vasukra hymns (X.27–29) and the Kavaṣa hymns (X.30–34), and the limitation of this supposed root ($\sqrt{śuj}$) in this particular phrase, *tanvā śúśujānaḥ*, to a Vasukra hymn and a Kavaṣa hymn adds to the list.

Among the many tr., opinion is divided about whether *jeṣyāmi* is a question, “will I win?,” introduced by *prchāmānaḥ* (Macd, Th, Don, Falk [185], Mau) or a confident assertion “I will win” (Ge, Re [Hymnes spéc], Scar [224, 306]). I think the best interpr. is that it’s both, showing the mind of the gambler divided between trepidatious self-doubt and boastful over-confidence, surely a psychologically astute observation. Formally the verb can be either question or statement, and note that it is situated just in between *prchāmānaḥ* and *tanvā śúśujānaḥ*, which express the two emotional poles.

X.34.7: This is the only Jagatī vs. in this Triṣṭubh hymn (though see 5c in the otherwise Triṣṭubh vs. 5); it is also the middle vs., esp. if we take vs. 14 as somewhat aside. Falk (p. 183) cleverly points out that Jagatī with its 12-syllable pādas is divisible by 4 – that is, it is essentially *kṛta*, the winning hand, and further suggests that if there’s a Wahrheitszauber in the hymn (as a number have asserted, with various candidates; see Falk 182–83), this is it. He considers it a *nāmagrāha*: the speaker knows the real names of the dice, or rather the real name, *aṅkuśá-* ‘hook’ (in *aṅkuśín*), which is a phonological scrambling of *akṣá-* (p. 185 n. 534). Although I’m not sure that I’d follow Falk all the way, I am quite taken by his observation that this vs. is the only one that can be divided by 4; he does not make anything of its being the middle vs. (his publication predates my work on the omphalos), but its position fits it to be an omphalos vs., which gives further support to Falk’s suggestion. Rather than considering the various adj.s in the first hemistich, or just *aṅkuśín-*, as the real name(s) of the dice, I wonder if the intent is the reverse, an intent signalled by *íd*: an attempt to demystify and disempower the dice by cutting their name down to size, “they are just *akṣāḥ*.” This would make it a kind of reverse omphalos: rather than embodying the enigma of the hymn, it reveals (or tries to) that the apparently irresistible actors, the nuts, are actually just pedestrian objects. But clearly this belittling doesn’t work: the compulsive attraction remains too strong, and the dice are depicted as animate agents in vss. 8–9, 11. For a similar reversion of inanimate actors to mere objects see the end of the pressing stone hymn, X.94.14.

For a somewhat over-the-top interpr. of the adjectives see Th’s tr., beginning (with *aṅkuśín*) “das sind Elefantentrieber, Ochsentreiber ...” This level of specificity seems unnec. and in fact counterproductive.

On *ní√tud* see comm. ad I.58.1, where I argue for rendering the *ní* (‘force down’), rather than the standard ‘spur on, goad’. I opted for the latter here, despite the sequence *nitodíno*, *nikṛtvānaḥ*, because rendering the *ní* produced the awk. “down-thrusting, down-putting.”

X.34.8: The Pp reads the Saṃhitā *nā* as *ná*, and Macd (VR ad loc. [p.191]) cites it as “the only example in the RV. of the metrical lengthening of *ná*,” but better, with Old, to take it as *ná + ā*, which preverb is not uncommon with \sqrt{nam} . Although some forms of $\tilde{a}\sqrt{nam}$ take an acc. (‘bend X’), others seem indistinguishable in usage from the simplex (e.g., VI.50.4 $\tilde{a} naḥ$... *namantām*).

X.34.9: Note that *divyá-* ‘heavenly’ evokes the pres. stem *dh̥vyā-* ‘gamble, play dice’.

X.34.10–11: The “scorching, burning” theme, from 7b *tāpanās tāpayiṣṇávaḥ* and 9d *nír dahanti*, is continued by *tapyate* (10a), said of the abandoned wife, and *tatāpa* (11a), said of the gambler—hence my tr. “is scorched / it scorched” rather than the more generic “is pained / it pained.”

X.34.10: Although my assumption (and I think that of most interpreters) is that the “mother” of pāda b is the gambler’s mother, who is pained by his wanderings occasioned by his poverty and consequent homelessness, EM suggests that the mother could be identical to the wife, who opens pāda a – that is, the mother of his child(ren). Although I think the standard interpr. is probably the correct one, due to the “wandering child,” there is nothing syntactic to prevent the alternative, and it may add some resonance.

Although “money” as a tr. for *dhānam* in c is anachronistic—the Rigveda does not depict a cash economy—I chose it over the usual renderings of this stem: ‘prize, stakes, wealth’, all of which would be misleading here. The gambler is not seeking riches, but just something to settle his debts.

With most, I consider the gambler’s purpose in d in “approaching the house of others” to be theft. See Re’s (EVP XVI.132) apposite invocation of the debtor turned thief in VI.12.5. However, Ge (n. 10c) suggests as an alternative that he hopes to borrow money, and Maurer in his n. suggests either borrowing or seeking shelter. The benign idiom *úpa √i*, rather than the more aggressive *abhí √i* or the like, might give some support to this view, but I still think theft is much more likely; *úpa √i* might simply indicate a stealthy approach.

X.34.11: Several tr. (Don, Falk 186, Kü 212) take the *strī-* to be the gambler’s own woman, now the wife of others. This seems quite unlikely (see Ge’s n. 11a); among other things, if she’s now the wife of (pl.) others, the sight will pain him in a different way. Furthermore, as far as I can tell, *strī-* never otherwise means ‘wife’. When it’s contrasted with something it’s generic ‘men’, and no passage requires, and most discourage, a ‘wife’ reading. The point here is that when he’s skulking around other people’s houses, nose pressed against the glass as it were, he sees scenes of domestic happiness that remind him of what he gave up.

The sense of the 2nd hemistich, particularly pāda d, is not entirely certain. In c he yokes his “brown horses,” the dice, in early morning and presumably keeps gambling all day. In d the questions are what *agnér ánte* designates and what *vṛṣalā-* (only here until BĀU) means. As for the former, I am inclined to see it as a temporal designation complementing *pūrvāhṇé* in c, and also matching the *náktam* of 10d. The “end of the fire” would be late at night, when the cooking fire would be allowed to subside into coals until the next day. Ge (n. 11d) considers this a possible alternative. But most take it as a location, “near the fire” (Ge “in der Nähe des Feuers”). In his n. Th interpr. the “end of the fire” as its ashes, a comparatively warm place for someone who has no fixed place to sleep – implying that the gambler has kindled a fire for himself outdoors. Others (esp. Maurer) seem to imply that the gambler has taken refuge with the cozy family of pāda b, but was only given a grudging place there. I still favor the phrase as a temporal designation, reminiscent of accounts of people who, in the sensory deprivation of Las Vegas casinos, gamble non-stop with no notion of whether it’s night or day. The time range from early morning to the end of the fire is an indication of how obsessed the gambler is.

As for *vṛṣalā-*, KH (Vedica 87 [MSS 41, 1982] = Aufs. III, 793ff.) considers this passage as well as the much later ones and settles on “Hausgesinde arischer Herkunft.” But this seems

too specific a social role for our period and our hymn. It seems more likely that this derivative of ‘bull’, with its diminutive and deprecatory suffix *-la-* with “popular” *l*, is a familiar and condescending way of referring to a social inferior or someone down on his luck, of the “poor guy” variety. A different species but the same general intent might be “miserable cur” or “mongrel” or “mutt.”

PS points out the mirror-image phonology of the two perfects, *tatāpa* ending pāda a and *papāda* ending d.

X.34.12: The second half of this vs. is taken, almost universally, as the gambler’s admission that he has no more funds to stake and as a gesture of submission to the dice, an interpr. with which I am in agreement. Falk (183–84), by contrast, thinks that “holding nothing back” means that the gambler has won, a victory set in motion by the Wahrheitszauber of vs. 7. Although Falk’s treatment of the other occurrences of *ná dhānam* √ *rudh* is suggestive, I find his interpr. contextually impossible.

X.34.13: *kṛṣīm it kṛṣasva* could go nicely into a Voltaire/Candide-style “cultiver notre jardin.”

The verb in d, *vī caṣṭe*, is given the sense(s) ‘explain / reveal / tell’ in all the tr. cited above. However, I am reluctant to ascribe a trans./caus. sense to this middle root pres., which ordinarily means ‘see’—despite Falk’s ingenious attempt (p. 187 n. 546) to make it a two-way street of lightbeams. I prefer ‘watch out for’ (similarly *vī cakṣate* in VIII.45.16): Savitar’s good and bracing advice is his way of exercising benevolent oversight over the (reformed) gambler.

Although *aryāḥ* is most likely the nom. sg. of the thematic adj. *aryá-*, it could also be the gen. sg. of *arí-* and modify *me* (“me, the stranger”), indicating that by his behavior the gambler has estranged himself from Ārya social bonds (as is amply demonstrated throughout the hymn), but that he is being brought back into the fold.

X.34.13–14: Note the juxtaposition of *aryāḥ* // *mitráṃ* across the verse boundary. It almost seems that the gambler is being reintegrated into Ārya society, and the two gods esp. associated with the smooth internal running of that society, Aryaman and Mitra, are indirectly invoked. Savitar seems like a stand-in for Aryaman here.

X.34.14: The particle *khálu*, though extremely common in Vedic prose, is found only here in the RV.

The instr. adj. *ghoréṇa* has been interpr. in a variety of ways: Ge and Th supply “Zauber,” Falk (somewhat anachronistically) “Kali”; Macd. tr. “magic power,” Don “the force of your terrible sorcery,” Maurer “cruelty,” and Re (Hymnes spéc) takes it adverbially “de cette façon cruelle.” I favor supplying either ‘eye’ (on the basis of the cmpds. *ghorá-cakṣas-* and *ághora-cakṣus-*) or ‘mind’ (on the basis of VII.20.6 *mánaḥ ... ghorám*; cf. also the beg. of the Purūravas/Urvaśī dialogue X.95.1 *mānasā tīṣṭha ghore*).

X.35–38: These four hymns are persuasively grouped together by Old (Prol. 229 n. 2, 235), though only the first two, which are a matched pair, are attributed to the same poet. The names of the poets given by the Anukr. for X.37 and X.38 are fanciful and based on the divine dedicand.

X.35–36: The next two hymns, both to the All Gods, are attributed to one Luśa Dhānāka, not otherwise mentioned in the RV. On the structural similarities between the hymns see the publ.

intro. to X.36. Both hymns are top-heavy with 1st pl. middles in (-) *īmahe* and *-īmahi*, both in their refrains and outside of them.

X.35 All Gods

On the matutine character of this hymn and its structure in general, see publ. intro.

The refrain that dominates the middle part of the hymn and the dense repetition found throughout give a slightly claustrophobic feeling to this hymn. Even before the refrain that dominates vss. 3–12 is established in 3d, pronounced chaining links the first three vss.: Heaven and Earth are found in all three vss. (1c, 2a, 3a), in the first as a dual dvandva in the nom., in the 2nd as a gen. du. dvandva (*diváspṛthivyóh*), in the 3rd again in the nom., but with the two members separated. The stem *uṣás-* is likewise found in all three vss., in different case/number (1b, 2c, 3c), and the adverb *adyá*-*ā* ‘today’ occurs in all three (1c, 2d, 3a). The end of vs. 1 (d *áva ā vṛṇīmahe*) is repeated in 2a, and *anāgāstvám* (2c) reappears in *ánāgasah* in 3a. Note also *mahī* (1c, 3b), *māṭīn* (2b) / *māṭārā* (3b). Lexical and phrasal repetition characterize the hymn throughout. See comm. ad vs. 5, for example. Particularly persistent is the word *adyā* ‘today’, found in vss. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 13, (i.e., half the vss.). It is notable that *adyā* and the VP *ávaḥ ... vṛṇīmahe*, which figure prominently in this hymn, form the post-caesura part of the refrain ... *ávo adyā vṛṇīmahe* that dominates the next hymn (X.36.2–12).

X.35.1: I am not sure why the fires are said to be *īndravant-*; is it because he is a regular at the early morning pressing?

X.35.2: With Old and Gr (contra Ge and Re), I take *śaryañāvataḥ* as acc. pl., not gen. sg.

X.35.3: When the refrain gets established in the final pāda of this vs., its verb *īmahe*, in final position, not only repeats the *īmahe* that ends 2c, but echoes pāda-final *vṛṇīmahe* (1d, 2a).

X.35.4: The form *sudevyām* occurs twice in the RV, here and in I.112.19, both pāda-final. In I.112.19 I take it, with some but not all interpr. (see comm. ad loc.), as an acc. of a PN *sudevī-* with *vṛkī* inflection, rather than assigning it to a them. stem *sudevyā-* as Gr (etc.) does. In our passage in the publ. tr. I attempted the same thing, except analyzing it as a nom. phrase **sudevī iyām*, with vowel contraction and shortening (**sudevīyam > sudevyīyam*) as well as loss of the accent on *iyām*. I wish I could make this work, but on reflection I see that it rests on too many shaky factors – not only the unprecedented sandhi and loss of accent, but the unlikelihood of starting and ending the pāda with the same deictic *iyām* with the same referent. Not to mention the fact that, like *sudevā-*, *sudevī-* should be a bahuvrīhi, which works for the PN in I.112.19, but would not work here, since it would modify a figure who is already a goddess. I would now detach this form from the identical one in I.112.19, still assigning that one to a *vṛkī* stem *sudevī-*, while accepting the thematic adj. deriv. here (though it occurs nowhere else) and taking it as an adverb. But I would still maintain that it was constructed to evoke *-devī-* and means something like “in the manner of a good goddess.” The emended tr.: “This foremost ruddy one here — in the manner of a good goddess, let her, the rich lady, dawn richly for our gain.” Just as the adv. *revāt* matches the fem. nom. sg. *revātī* “the rich lady richly,” so does *sudevyām* match the unexpressed **(su)devī*. Assuming an allusion to the goddess seems preferable to the almost random collection of meanings others have assigned to *sudevyā-*: Gr “Schar der guten Götter”; Ge “Glück”; Re (EVP V.50 tr. of this hymn) “la faveur des dieux” (as obj. of *vy ùchatu*, which is otherwise

generally intrans., though see possible exception in 5c), but in the notes on the hymn (EVP IV.112) “fait d’avoir les dieux pour soi” (see also EVP XVI.11 ad I.112.19 “rendant les dieux favorables”).

The stem *durvidātra-*, the negative of the better-attested *suvidātra-*, is found three times in the RV: twice in Luśa Dhānaka’s slender oeuvre (here and in the following hymn, X.36.2) and in X.63.12. The adj. is generally given a generic gloss: Gr ‘Schlechtes austheilend, Böses erweisend’, Ge ‘unzugänglich’, AiG II.2.170 ‘Böses erweisend’. The exception is Re, whose rendering ‘funeste à rencontrer’ has real semantics. As disc. with regard to *suvidātra-* (comm. ad II.9.6), the question is what root *-vidātra-* belongs to. For reasons detailed ad II.9.6, I connect it with $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’, and my assumption is that this root etymology also underlies Re’s ‘... à rencontrer’: ‘to find’, that is, ‘to run across / encounter’. Two of the three examples of *durvidātra-* actively support this derivation by wishing the entity described as *durvidātra-* to be or go far away: here “set the fury in the distance (*āré*)” and in X.63.12, where repeated *āpa* ‘away’ as well as *āré* ‘in the distance’ apply to a series of afflictions we seek to have banished. The point is that the further away all these things are, the less likely we will encounter them.

Re, somewhat bizarrely, takes *dhīmahi* as passive (“Pussions-nous être placés ...”), which requires him to construe the acc. *manyúm* rather loosely. Since *dhīmahi* is almost never passive, I see no advantage in this.

X.35.5: *uśāsaḥ* in b is morphologically ambiguous: it could be the gen. sg. or the (modernized) nom. pl. (as in 6a), agreeing with *yāḥ* in pāda a. Since b is identical to 1b, save for the gender of the nom. pl. pres. part.: m. *bhárantaḥ* 1b, f. *bhárantīḥ* 5b, the gen. sg., construed with *vyùṣṭiṣu* as in 1b, is the more likely choice (so also Re, though he allows for simultaneous readings). However, Ge opts for nom. pl. at least as the primary ident. (tr. *vyùṣṭiṣu* with a pronominal gen. “bei ihrem Aufgang”), and though Old favors the gen. sg. on the grounds of parallelism, he allows for both readings. It is certainly possible that the poet wanted to introduce variation, or at least doubt, in his repeated pāda.

Pāda c introduces another ambiguity: the Samhitā form *bhadrā* can represent either neut. pl. *bhadrā* or fem. pl. *bhadrāḥ* (Pp. the latter). The pub. tr. reflects the former, as acc. obj. with *vy ùchata*. I now think this is wrong: not only is $\sqrt{\text{vī}}/\sqrt{\text{vas}}$ otherwise intrans. (see comm. ad vs. 4), but unambig. *bhadrāḥ* modifies pl. ‘dawns’ elsewhere (IV.51.7, VII.41.7). I would now emend the tr. to “as auspicious ones, dawn widely today for our fame.” This adj. picks up *bhadrām* in 2d, where it is a neut. substantive, which is perhaps a weak support for taking it as such here. However, the other arguments outweigh that.

The vs. switches from 3rd pl. in the first hemistich (or at least pāda a; b is ambiguous) to 2nd pl. in the second, while maintaining the same subject (dawns) – as is, of course, often the case.

X.35.6: The ambiguous form in this vs. is *āyukṣātām*. The Pp. reads *āyukṣātām*, that is, based on a form with a lengthened augment (which conforms to Prātiśākhya 181), and this preterital interpr. is accepted by the standard interpr. (Gr, Ols, Ge, Re, implicitly Narten [Sig aor. 215]; see esp. Old’s disc. ad V.17.3). But I do not see why in this context we cannot interpr. the Samhitā form as *āyukṣātām*, with an imperative (or imperatival injunctive) plus preverb. The context favors it, with two parallel preceding impvs., *ā carantu* (a) and *úd ... jihatām* (b). There are, admittedly, countervailing factors in addition to the Prātiśākhya. In favor of the lengthened augment interpr. is the unambiguous form *āyunak* in I.163.2, which cannot have the preverb *ā*,

because of the lack of accent; there is also the fact that unambiguous $\bar{a}\check{y}uj$ is fairly uncommon. But cf. $\bar{a}yuyujré$ at V.58.2, X.44.7, where \bar{a} cannot be the augment because it is prefixed to a perfect, and so must be the preverb; also III.35.2 $\bar{a}yunajmī$ with \bar{a} and a pres. indic. It is true that the other occurrence of $\bar{a}yukṣātām$, at I.157.1, is very like our passage ($\bar{a}yukṣātām aśvínā ... rātham$) and is in preterital context with augmented forms (preceded by $\bar{a}bodhi ... \bar{a}vaḥ$, followed by $prāsāvīt$), so “have yoked” is the most likely interpr. But nothing prevents our form from being analyzed $\bar{a}yukṣātām$, versus $\bar{a}ayukṣātām$ in I.157.1. Or, even if the form in I.157.1 has a lengthened augment and no preverb, it is perfectly possible that our poet misunderstood the form as containing the preverb and, potentially, the unaugmented $yukṣātām$. One could construct a scenario to cover the standard interpr. and explain why the first half of our vs. is in the imperative, but the third verb is an augmented aorist: the Ásvins are notoriously early travelers ($prātar-yāvan-$, etc.), and so perhaps they had already yoked their chariot before we urge the dawns and the fires to spring into action. But on the whole an interpr. with three impvs. fits the context better.

X.35.7: The first hemistich of this vs. contains what is surely a deliberate echo of the Gāyatrī mantra (III.62.10), which begins $tāt savitūr vāreṇyam, bhārgaḥ ...$, very similar to our $... savitar vāreṇyam, bhāgām ...$. An expanded, Jagatī version of the Gāyatrī mantra’s 1st pāda is also found at I.159.5 (see comm. ad loc.), which contains the $adyā$ of our pāda: $tād rādhō adyā savitūr vāreṇyam$.

On $dhiśāṇā$ - see comm. ad IX.59.2.

X.35.8: Although $devānām$ is generally (Ge, Re, Lü [506]) construed with $pravācanam$, I follow Old in taking it with the b pāda, as a genitive indirect object – both because of the pāda boundary and because of the standard god/mortal polarity expressed here by $devānām ... manuṣyāḥ$.

I take pāda c as the content of the $ṛtāsya pravācanam$. Although it seems a somewhat banal satyakriyā, it does express a basic truth about the cosmos. Note that nearby X.37.2 contains a $satyókti$ - ‘statement of reality’ that also asserts that the sun rises every day.

X.35.9: The first word of the vs., $adveṣás-$, a negated s -stem, should by accent be a bahuvrīhi, of the type $cétas-$ ‘insight’: $acetás-$ ‘lacking insight’, $jávas-$ ‘speed’: $ajavás-$ ‘lacking speed’, etc. However, in none of its 4 (or possibly 3 or possibly 2 [see below]) occurrences is a straightforward bahuv. interpr. possible. In all 4 of the passages supposedly containing it, it is pāda-initial in the form $adveṣāḥ$, i.e., an apparent neut. sg. N/A, but with no neut. sg. referent in context. In our passage the publ. tr. interpr. it as a neut. abstract noun ‘lack of hatred’; Ge’s “Friedfertigkeit” also seems to assume an abstract noun (“Wir bitten heute um Friedfertigkeit”), as also, I think, Re’s elaborate “Nous demandons qu’on ne nous veuille pas de mal,” where the “que” clause seems to be his rendering of $adveṣāḥ$, though it’s not clear to me how his tr. matches up grammatically with the Skt. An acc. noun as object of \bar{imahe} works well here; the problem is, as indicated above, that it shouldn’t be that kind of compound. But the other three passages are less amenable to an interpr. as a noun. In V.87.8 $adveṣó no maruto gātúm étana$ “Without hatred, come on your way to us here, Maruts,” it seems to be a bahuv. used adverbially, to be more literally rendered as “in a manner without hatred,” apparently so interpr. by both Ge and Re. The same interpr. would in principle be available for I.186.10 $adveṣó víṣṇur vāta ṛbhukṣāḥ$ in a loose series of individual gods’ names, but here I think it preferable to take it as nom. sg. masc. of the thematic bahuv. adj. $adveṣá-$, marginally but clearly attested as du. $adveṣé$

at IX.68.10=X.45.12. Ge's "Die nie feindselige Viṣṇu" and Re's (EVP V.10) "Viṣṇu qui exclut l'inimitié" seem to reflect the same analysis, though neither comments. The final ex. is in I.24.4. Although the publ. (JPB) tr. of I.24.4 interpr. it as a noun 'freedom from hatred', this does not seem to be the prevailing view – which, however, is a bit hard to figure out. See esp. Old's elaborate disc. of this problematic vs., which does not mention *adveśāḥ*. Ge seems to take it again as a nom. sg. to the them. adj., referring back to *bhāgaḥ* earlier in the vs.; I *think* he tr. *adveśāḥ* as "unangefochten" (unchallenged, undisputed), but this seems so far from the underlying meaning that I matched the tr. and the Skt. only by process of elimination. Re tr. (EVP V.4) "à l'abri de l'envie," claiming his tr. of the vs. follows Thieme's (Oriens 6 [1953]: 399), who renders *adveśāḥ* as "[so, dass er] ohne Feind [ist]." Neither Th nor Re comments on the morphology or syntax, but judging from Th's representation (brackets and all), I assume he's taking it as the them. bahuv. adj. modifying *bhāgaḥ*. To return to our passage, I still weakly favor a noun 'lack of hatred', but given the problematic morphology (expect a bahuv.) and the distance between this hemistich-init. word and the hemistich-final verb that is supposed to govern it, I also consider it possible that we have an adverbial usage as in V.87.8, yielding an emended alternate tr. "In a manner without hostility we beg for the realization of our thought ..."

The next issue in this hemistich is the Saṃhitā form *sādhā* in b, analyzed by the Pp. as *sādhe*. The two preceding GEN LOC phrases referring to ritual activities invite us to interpr. *sādhe* as a loc., with dependent gen. *mānmanaḥ*, to a them. stem *sādha-*. It is so classified by Gr and Lub, and Re (somewhat defiantly) also holds to this analysis. But such a them. stem would be found only once in the RV (namely here) and in fact in Skt., acdg. to Wh's Rts and MonWms. Ge suggests rather that *sādhe* is a dat. inf. to the root (an interpr. Re disputes). This is certainly possible. But I am persuaded by Old, who restores *sādhah* for Pp. *sādhe*. This provides *īmahe* with a handy object; if *adveśāḥ* is in fact not a potential obj., *īmahe* will have need of one; if *adveśāḥ* is an obj. of that verb, *sādhah* would be an *s*-stem neut. morphologically parallel to it. The expressed wish for "the realization of our thought" (*mānmanaḥ sādhah*) follows directly on 8b where "we thought up" (*āmanmahi*) a truthful speech.

Finally, in pāda c the question is the identity of the 2nd sg. subj. Acdg. to Ge (fld. by Re), pāda c is a self-address by the singer, but the fire / Agni makes more sense to me. That Agni is referred to in the 3rd ps. in the next pāda is no impediment: that pāda is the refrain, detached from context, and in any case switch of persons is common (see vs. 5 above). The verbal complex *bhur(an)-* relatively frequently has Agni / fire or fires as subj.: e.g., *bhuraṇyūḥ* I.68.1, *bhuraṇyāvaḥ* X.46.7, *jārbhurat* II.2.5, X.92.1, *jārbhurāṇaḥ* II.10.5, and the type of movement – quivering, flickering – expressed by this verb is characteristic of fire, less so of the poet (though cf. *vīpra-*).

X.35.10: The first hemistich can be syntactically split in several different ways, none of which is entirely satisfactory. The most obvious disposition, made by both Ge and Re, is to take it as containing two clauses, the first ending after *īḷe* in pāda b. Although this provides a neat cut and two clauses each with a finite verb (*īḷe* in the 1st, *sādāyā* in the 2nd), it poses a few problems. For one thing in the first cl. there are two independent accusatives, *barhīḥ* (+/- *brhāt*) and *devān*, and only the second one is appropriate with *īḷe*. A related problem is that $\sqrt{\text{īḷ}}$ is never otherwise construed with *ā*. (Ge [n. 10ab] claims that it is also found in IV.3.9, but there the *ā* belongs to the phrase *ā gōḥ*, whatever that may mean. See comm. ad loc.) Ge (as he presents it in n. 10ab) and, as far as I can tell, Re construe *ā barhīḥ* together as a rough-and-ready adjunct to the verb: "call (the gods) to the barhis," which would be unprecedented with $\sqrt{\text{īḷ}}$ (admittedly many of our

RVic interpr. are without precedent). Ge also takes *bṛhāt* as a modifier of *barhīḥ*, which locates the ritual strew in an odd, presumably heavenly, place. (Re takes *bṛhāt* adverbially, which makes more sense.)

Old divides the sequence into two clauses, but with one being discontinuous: *devāṃ īle* is a parenthesis within a larger clause that construes *ā no barhīḥ* with *sādāyā saptā hótīn*, a more natural conjunction of words and supported by X.36.5 *éndro [= ā índro] barhīḥ sīdatu* in the next hymn. But he does not say what he would do with the rest of pāda a (*sadhamāde bṛhād diví*), at least the last two words of which might be expected to belong within his parenthesis, which would then begin to get unwieldy.

My own solution is, I think, superior to both the others but is certainly not without flaw. I split the sequence into three, continuous clauses: *ā no barhīḥ sadhamāde / bṛhād diví devāṃ īle / sādāyā saptā hótīn*. The first is a nominal clause, with *ā* functioning essentially as the predicate “here is ...” (substituting perhaps for *idám*). Alternatively, and perhaps better, the predicate may be the purpose dative *sadhamāde*: “the barhis here is for the joint revelry” or “the barhis is here for the joint revelry.” (Although Gr takes *sadhamāde* as the loc. to the them. *-māda-*, it can equally be the dat. to the root noun cmpd *sadha-mād-*, as I take it.) I would now, with Re, take *bṛhāt* as an adverb with *īle*; in this usage with a verb of speaking it reminds us of the Gṛtsamāda refrain in Maṇḍala II (II.1.16, etc.) *bṛhād vādema vidáthe suvīrāḥ* “May we speak loftily at the ritual distribution, in possession of good heroes.” A slightly revised tr. of the clause here is “Loftily I reverently invoke ...” The sequence *bṛhād diví* is reminiscent of the cmpds *bṛhāddiva- / bṛhaddivá-*, and Ge points out that the same phrase, *bṛhād diví*, is found in V.27.6, separated by the pāda boundary. However, none of these forms is helpful in the interpr. of our pāda.

The verb of the third cl., *sādāyā*, is morphologically ambig.; it can be a 2nd sg. impv. with lengthened ending or a 1st sg. subjunctive. I take it as the latter because of the immed. preceding 1st sg., as do Ge/Re, but the Pp. reads *sādāya*, as the impv. There is very little riding on the choice.

Pāda c contains a list of divine names in the acc., with another purpose dative. We can supply *īle* from c, as Re does. But since 11c has the same structure (i.e., a list of acc. god names) without a prior verb to govern them, it seems best to import *īmahe* from the refrain for both 10c and 11c, as Ge also does (see n. 10c).

X.35.11: It cannot be determined in pāda b whether it is our sacrifice (so Ge) or ourselves (so Re) that we wish to grow strong. The publ. tr. opts for the latter, but “aid our sacrifice for it to grow strong” or “aid our sacrifice to grow strong” is possible as well. Again nothing much rides on it.

X.35.12: The wished-for *supravācanam chardīḥ* “shelter good to proclaim” conflates the Ādityas’ shelter in 9c (*śárman-* not *chardís-*) and our *pravācanam* in 8a, which may help account for the slightly odd conjunction of ideas.

X.35.13: The first hemistich seems to contain an extra *vísve* (*vísva ūtī*).

The last occurrence of the refrain is found at the end of the previous vs. (12d). Here the poet steps away from it gradually by means of a transformation: the acc. sg. NP at the end of the refrain *agnīm samidhānām īmahe* appears in 13b in the nom. pl. *agníyah sámiddhāḥ*. This pāda could also be tr. “let all the fires be kindled” (so Sāy.; see Ge n. 13b), but the parallel clauses in the rest of the vs. speak against this.

X.35.14: The generalizing (“who(m)ever”) 3rd sg. relative clauses of abc (3rd ps. guaranteed, or at least suggested, by c *yáḥ ... véda*) are picked up by a 1st pl. *syāma* introduced by predicated *té* (“may we be those who(ever) ...”).

X.36 All Gods

On the parallelism with X.35, see publ. intro. X.36, however, seems to have a more miscellaneous character than its twin.

X.36.1: At best this vs. has been carelessly put together: the first hemistich is in the nom., as becomes clear at the end (*váruṇo mitró aryamā*), while the second continues the enumeration of gods’ names in the acc., as objects of *huve*. Even within this hemistich the waters are mentioned twice (c, d), and one du. dvandva referring to Heaven and Earth, *dyāvākṣāmā* in b is replaced by another, *dyāvāpṛthivī* in d. If this were all that was required to compose RVic verse, even *I* could do it!

X.36.2. Heaven and Earth return in the first pāda, this time as overtly coordinated singulars. This emphasis on H+E in these first two vss. matches that of X.35.1–3.

On *īśata* see comm. ad I.23.9.

The refrain for this hymn gets established in the 2nd vs. As noted in the intro. to the comm. to X.35, it is a minor variant of X.35.1d *adyā devānām áva ā vṛṇīmahe*, with scrambling of word order and the addition of an initial *tád*.

X.36.3–4: The c pādas of vss. 2 and 3 end with the variant optatives *naśīmahi* and *aśīmahi* respectively. In 4 the inherently heavy final syllable of immed. preceding *marútām* provides the necessary heavy syllable at the beginning of the Jagatī cadence, hence allowing *aśīmahi*—while in 2 *avṛkām* **aśīmahi* would have a light syllable there and *naśīmahi* usefully makes position. The other 3 exx. of *aśīmahi* at the end of a Jagatī, all close to each other, also follow heavy syllables, each ending with a nasal, as here: X.37.6 *jaraṇām aśīmahi*, X.40.12 *dúryām aśīmahi*. There are no other instances of *naśīmahi* at the end of a Jagatī line (of 3 total), but see subjunctive *násāmahai* at the end of 11c, where it likewise makes position. (Of course full-grade *naś* is expected in the subjunctive, but not the optative.)

X.36.5: In b note the presence of both *sāman-* and *īc-* (the latter implied by *īkvó arcatu*).

The verb *dhīmahi* is, of course, the medial root aor. opt. to *√dhā*. My tr. “compose,” borrowed from Re, is an attempt at an English pun that recognizes the apparent association between *dhīmahi* and *dhī-* ‘thought, vision’. The same VP *mánma dhīmahi* is found in X.66.2, which, however, also contains a loc., making the ‘place, set’ sense more overt.

X.36.6: Flg. Sāy., Ge takes Agni as the referent of the accusatives in c. Although it is true that Agni is almost always the referent of *āhuta-*, esp. when it is construed with an instr. of *ghṛtá-*, *yajñá-* seems an unimpeachable substitute. Ge’s interpr. requires him to supply a new verb, and it also goes less well with *prācīnaraśmim*, which fits the common sacrifice-as-chariot trope. Cf. also VII.7.3 *prācīno yajñáh*.

X.36.8: On *péru*- see comm. ad IX.74.4; the somewhat fuller rendering here follows the lead of Ge.

I have reinterpr. some instances of *-śrī*-compds with ritual items as first members; see I.44.3 and comm. ad III.26.5, and I now think an alt. tr. of *adhvara-śrī*- here as “perfecting/completing the ceremony” should be considered in this passage.

X.36.9: The first pāda has a triple etymological figure, *sanema ... susanītā sanítvabhiḥ*, which I can only call clunky. The two nominal forms, *susanītā*- and *sanítvan*-, are both hapaxes, which makes it difficult to figure out just what kind of winning and what kind of winners we’re hoping to employ. Ge (n. 9a) suggests that the *sanítvan*- are sons, but the parallel passages he adduces don’t support that notion. The double etym. figure in b, *jīvā jīvāputrāḥ*, is less inelegant, but this hemistich as a whole seems clumsily constructed. The figure *-(d)vīṣo vīṣvag* in c is somewhat more pleasing.

X.36.11: Pāda a contains another elementary etymological figure, *mahát ... mahatām*.

X.36.12: The first hemistich redistributes elements from the refrain of the previous hymn, X.35.3–12d *svastí agnīm samidhānām īmahe*, with gen. *agnēḥ samidhānāsya* in pāda a and *svastāye* ending d.

X.36.13: The ostensible dedicands of this hymn appear in a spaced-out nominal relative clause in ab: # *yé ... vīśve, ... devāḥ* #

The relative / correlative structure shows some signs of cleverness (rare enough in this hymn). The first hemistich appears to be a normal 3rd ps. relative clause (“which All Gods ...”), with the second hemistich opening with what appears to be a 3rd ps. resumptive prn. *té* (“they”). But d opens with a 2nd pl. impv. *dádhātana*, which forces the audience to reconfigure the whole vs.: the *té* in c reflects the usage of forms of *sá* with 2nd ps. ref. with impvs. (see my “*sá* figé”), which then requires that the nominal rel. cl. of ab have 2nd ps. ref. too (“[you] who are the All Gods ...”).

X.37 Sūrya

On the relationship between this hymn and the preceding ones, see publ. intro.

As noted above, the supposed poet of the hymn, Abhitapas Saurya (“Scorching Heat, son of the Sun”), is simply based on the divine dedicand.

X.37.1: With Re, I interpr. *mahāḥ* as an adverb; Ge, with Sāy., takes it as an honorary dat., while Scar (231) tentatively has it as a gen. dependent on *devāya* (“... den Gott des grossen [Lichts?]”).

X.37.2: The *satyókti*- ‘expression of reality/truth’ is, in my view, the statement in cd. See the *ṛtāsya pravācanam* “proclamation of truth” in X.35.8 in this same hymn group; in both cases the truth is the fact that the sun rises every day.

The *ca*’s in b conjoin an elliptical dual *dyāvā* ‘Heaven (and Earth)’ and the neut. pl. *āhāni* ‘days’. Although Ge (n. 2b) suggests that *dyāvā* might refer here to day and night, as it sometimes does (though he does not follow this interpr.), I think the poet is making a totalizing statement about both space and time.

In d nom. *āpaḥ* lacks a verb; both Ge and Re supply one. I simply extract *ējati* from the preceding pāda or *eti* (minus preverb) in the same pāda.

X.37.3: The verb that ends the first pāda, *nī vāsate*, is a hapax, and its meaning and root affiliation are disputed. It is discussed sensibly and at length by Old, who rejects affiliation with any of the roots \sqrt{vas} as well as the roots $\sqrt{vā}$, while tentatively favoring \sqrt{van} , by way of the desid. *vīvāsati*, -te (a suggestion that goes back to Ludwig). See also Gotō (1st class, 297), who refuses to endorse any suggestion. I find the Ludwig/Old explanation (fld also by Re) the most likely, though it does have some problems – chief among them: 1) the desid. stem does not appear with *nī* and 2) it is more commonly active than middle. However, forms of *vīvāsa-* of this metrical shape (L H L X) are very common at the end of Jagatī and dimeter pādas, and our *nī vāsate* rhymes nicely with *vīvāsati*, necessitating only haplology of *nī vī-* or—more likely in my view—the substitution of the preverb *nī* for the reduplicating syllable, which could appear to be the preverb *vī*.

So where does the *nī* come from and what is it doing here? First note the phonological parallelism with metrical shift: 2c ends *nī vīsate yād ējati* #, with the preverb *nī* construed with a verb with the template *v_SIB-ate*, exactly like our pāda. But in our pāda this verbal complex has been shifted to the right, and *yād eta(śébhiḥ)*, which echoes *yād ēja(ti)*, pushed into the next pāda (*nī vāsate* # *yād eta(śébhiḥ)*). The *nī* also polarizes with *úd* in 2d, where “the sun goes up” asserts the supreme positive and protective truth. This positive truth is reinforced by a negated negative in 3a: a godless one cannot bring it *down*, however much he wants to. I would prefer that *te* were **tvā*, but I interpr. this as an oblique expression, hence my “seek the upper hand against you.” Re’s “ne pourra gagner contre toi” is similar. The middle voice simply expresses the subject’s desire to bring the object under his control.

My tr. of *pradīvaḥ* in that pāda as “early in the day” is almost surely wrong. No other forms of this adverbial ablative have this sense; it generally instead means “from of old” vel sim. See for this passage Old’s “altersher,” Ge’s “seit alters,” Re’s “du fond des jours.” In fact the standard sense is perfectly compatible with the meaning I assign to the verb here. *pradīvaḥ* regularly appears with a present-tense verb, depicting a state of affairs that has obtained since hoary antiquity – where English would use the English “perfect” tense. See, e.g., III.47.1 *tvām rājāsī pradīvaḥ sutānām* “You are the king of the pressed drinks from olden days” (more idiomatic English “you have been”) (cf., e.g., III.51.4, VI.44.12, X.5.4, etc.). Here the point would be that no matter how often and for how long the godless has sought to keep the sun down, it keeps rising every day. I would therefore alter the tr. to “No godless one has sought the upper hand against you from olden times.”

The “Night Sun” and the “Day Sun” seem to appear in the 2nd hemistich—a pair more often invoked by commentators than I think warranted (see my disc. ad I.115.5). However, here the contrast between the one that “rolls eastward” (*prācīnam ... vartate*) and the other, which is light (*jyōtis-*) and goes upward, does suggest a picture of the dark side of the sun making a return journey to the east, whence it will rise again. Ge construes *rājāḥ* with *anyāt* in c, but I think *rājāḥ* is an acc. of extent of space, governed by *ānu*. With the verb *vartate* ‘turns, rolls’, ‘wheel’ seems the likely referent.

X.37.5: Both finite verbs in the first hemistich, *rākṣasi* and *uccāraṣi*, are accented. The default interpr. of the two accents would be that both verbs are in the domain of the *hī* in pāda a (so, e.g., Hettrich, Hypot. 188) and are parallel, and that is perfectly possible. However, semantically I

think the clause in b is dependent on the one in a, explaining in what way Sūrya demonstrates that he is guarding the commandment – namely by rising. I therefore take b as an unsigned “when” clause.

The standard interpr. of cd seems to be as a relative/correlative clause with gender disharmony: *yád ... tām ... krátum*: clearest in Re’s “(Ce dessein) pour lequel aujourd’hui ... nous nous adressons à toi, veuillent les dieux agréer ce dessein de nous” (but so, apparently, Ge; also, sort of, Hettrich 535–36). I do not understand why c is not a straight “when” clause with *yád*. Among other things *úpa √ brū* ordinarily only takes an acc. of the being(s) appealed to, not an accusative of the topic of the appeal. The few exx. given by Gr with supposed double acc. (IV.51.11, VIII.25.21, X.97.4) are equivocal and only contain *tád*, which could be adverbial; in any case they are far outnumbered by those with a single acc.

X.37.6: As is recognized by all comm., the first pāda with the patterned variation *tām* [MASC] *no* X [NOM.] *tán* [NEUT] *no* Y [NOM.] is picked up at the very end of the hemistich with the accusative objects of the appropriate genders, *hávam* [MASC] *vácaḥ* [NEUT]. It’s a clever, if artificial, construction.

śūna- ‘want’ generally takes a genitive; the loc. *saṃdṛṣi* is plausibly attributed to attraction to the loc. *śūne*. The clause could, however, mean “may we not be in want while we still see the sun,” though I consider that unlikely.

X.37.7–8: The d pādas of these two vss. are identical, save for the first word of each, and each takes as obj. a 2nd sg. phrase referring to the sun.

X.37.7: The enclitic *tvā*, found in Wackernagel’s position in pāda a, is pleonastically repeated in the same position in c.

X.37.8: In c I take *brhatāḥ* as a gen. dep. on abl. *pājasah*, supplying ‘heaven’ with that gen.: “from the surface of lofty (heaven).” Both Ge and Re take it as abl., modifying *pājasah*. This is of course quite possible and simplifies the expression somewhat, but I find the geography easier to envision in my tr.

X.37.9: The first hemistich seems more appropriate to Savitar (who is sometimes assimilated to Sūrya), since Savitar gives the signals both to go forth in the morning and to settle down in the evening. But of course the position of Sūrya’s beacon (rising / setting) gives the same type of signal.

The ‘blamelessness’ (*anāgāstvéna*) should be ours: see *anāgasah* modifying the 1st pl. in 7b. But it is the Sun, as the spy of Mitra and Varuṇa, who testifies to this state – or its absence. See esp. VII.62.2 *prá no mitráya varuṇāya voco, ’nāgasah ...* “You [=Surya] will proclaim us to Mitra and Varuṇa to be without offense.”

X.37.11: Pāda c consists of a series of neut. sg. participles (acdg. to most; other analyses of individual forms are possible), arranged in a logical series—from the consuming of food and drink, to the deriving of nourishment from them, to satiation. The neut. sg. referent isn’t entirely clear; most take it as a global reference to the two- and four-footed of b. This makes sense, though the syntax is a little lax. I suppose the sg. *jánmane* of pāda a accounts for both the singular and the neuter.

The final term of the series, *āśīta-*, is taken, quite plausibly, by Old as the ppl. to a caus. *āśayati* (not attested till the Brāh.). He struggles to account for the initial accent, since \sqrt{as} does not otherwise appear with the preverb *ā* and ppls to causatives ordinarily accent the *-tā-*, like ppls to roots (see Wh, Gr. §1051, Macd. VGS §168f), but Old's invocation of *ārpita-* is apposite.

X.37.12: To harmonize the hapax *práyuti-* with my view of the meaning of the ppl. *práyuta-* as 'scattered, dispersed' (see comm. ad V.32.2), I would now tr. *mánasaḥ ... práyutī* "through distraction of mind." Cf. also VII.100.2 *āprayutam ... mánah* "concentrated thought."

X.38 Indra

As with X.37, the supposed poet Indra Muṣkavant ("Indra possessing balls") is extracted from the hymn itself, in this case the final pāda of the hymn. The hymn contains some apparently slangy and irreverent expressions; see vss. 2 and 5.

X.38.1: On *śīmīvant-* see comm. ad X.8.2.

X.38.2: The *-in-*stem *medīn-* is glossed by Gr with the anodyne 'Genosse, Verbündeter'; sim. Ge "Wir möchten deine Verbündeten sein." My "share the fat" is a somewhat slangy rendering of the stem, based on its presumed relationship to *médas-* 'fat', etc. See EWA s.v. *médas-*, esp. 377, where Mayr. labels the semantic dev. of *medīn-* not entirely comprehensible, with the additional parenthetical remark "(Slang?)." Given the positive associations of fat in Vedic, having or sharing the fat that Indra has means having a share in the good things the god commands.

X.38.3: The adj. *suśāha-* takes the dative to express agency; cf., e.g., IX.94.5 *víśvāni hí suśāhā tāni túbhyam* "because all these things are easy to conquer for you." I therefore take the instr. *asmābhiḥ* not as the primary agent, but as an expression of accompaniment.

X.38.4: Despite its position, *adyá* might be better construed with the verb: "today may we make ...," as Ge does.

X.38.5: The interpr. of the hapax rt. noun cmpd *svavṛj-* has gone in two basic directions: Old "wer etwas als seinen Besitz an sich reisst" versus Ge "dein eigener Herr bist." In other words, Old takes the *sva-* as referring to an object that becomes Indra's property, Ge as referring to Indra himself. Interestingly Scar presents us with both, in different places, without comment: "einer, der [alles] als sein Eigentum an sich reisst" (flg. Old, p. 200 s.v. **anudā-*) and "über sich selbst verfügend" (flg. Ge, p. 505 s.v. *svavṛj-*). My 'tightly wound' is a slangy rendition, leaning in Ge's direction (but far from identical); a more literal version would be 'wound up in oneself, twisting oneself up'.

On the surprising and impertinent ending of the hymn, see publ. intro.

X.39–41: All three of these hymns are dedicated to the Aśvins. The first two are attributed to a female poet, Ghoṣā Kakṣivātī, in the family line of the dazzling First-Maṇḍala poet Kakṣivānt (I.116–26), who also focused on the Aśvins. The last very short one (X.41) is ascribed to her son Suhastya Ghauṣeya. There is no way to tell whether a female poet actually composed X.39–40, but at least the name is not a wholly invented one, like the supposed female composer of X.109, Juhū Brahmajāyā "Sacrificial Ladle, Wife of (a) Brahman," with both of the names extracted

from the hymn itself. However, it is the case that a woman identified as *Ghoṣā* is named in X.40.5, so a fictional woman may have provided the first of the names. For further on these hymns, see the publ. intro. to each hymn and to the series in general.

X.39.1: The voc. *aśvinā* was omitted in tr.; it can be inserted anywhere the English rhythm allows.

In b *uṣāsaḥ* in the temporal expression *doṣām uṣāsaḥ* could be either a gen. sg. or an acc. pl. (with Old and Lanman [Noun Infl. 546] I prefer the latter, *pace* Gr); in either case it must be a species of backformation, with the strong suffixal form *-ās-*, which is in the course of being replaced by weak *-ās-* in the RV even where it is lautgesetzlich, being introduced into a weak case. Old attributes it to the meter, somewhat reluctantly. He also adduces V.5.6 *doṣām uṣāsam* with the acc. sg., which has the historically expected *-ās-*, as possible influence on our passage, which seems plausible. One wonders, however, why the poet didn't just use *uṣāsam* here: being sg., it would be more parallel to *doṣām* and it is metrically identical to *uṣāsaḥ*.

The sequence *hāv(i)yo havīṣmatā* provides a phonological figure with forms built to two different roots. The second hemistich, which follows immediately, opens with nom. pl. *śaśvattamāsaḥ*, with what would ordinarily be a pāda-opening construction *tām u vām ...* seemingly displaced to the right. I wonder if this is to allow final *-matā* of b to have a mirror image echo in *-tamā-*. The final pāda ends with a figure both phonological and etymological, *suhāvaṃ havāmahe*, a sort of poetic repair to the discordant root affiliations of pāda b.

X.39.2: Ge provides an appealing tr. of d, different from mine, but one that has a syntactic problem: “machet uns den Gönnern angenehm wie Soma.” Under this interpr. we are asking to be commended to the patrons, so we can receive abundant rewards. He takes *cārum* ‘dear’ as characterizing ‘us’ (*naḥ*), but of course *cārum* is stubbornly sg. and *naḥ* is pl. It would be possible to finesse this by interpr. sg. *cārum* as attraction to *sómam* in the simile (and this must be Ge’s strategy). But since there’s a sg. noun in the immediate vicinity, *bhāgām* in c, I have gone with the syntactically safer option.

X.39.3: The *bhāgaḥ* of pāda a echoes *bhāgām* in 2c.

X.39.4: Note that the opening of pāda a *yuvām cyāvānam* seems to be telescoped into *yúvānam* in b.

On the apparent unredupl. pf. *takṣathuḥ* see Kü 206–7.

X.39.5: The subjunctive *prá bravā* “I shall proclaim” in pāda a semantically doubles the gerundive *pravācyā* “to be proclaimed” that ends vs. 4. The substitution of $\sqrt{brū}$ for \sqrt{vac} in this expression seems to reflect a tricky formulaic play. We would expect the annunciatory 1st ps. to be *prá vocam* as so often (see, of course, the celebrated I.32.1), and this would easily pick up the gerundive to the same lexeme. But *prá $\sqrt{brū}$* is considerably less common than *prá \sqrt{vac}* , and this is the only 1st sg. occurrence in the formula – though I must admit that 1st pl. *prá bravāma* is found several times (e.g., X.112.1) in this type of context. My point is that the poet invites us to expect *prá vocam* on the basis of *pravācyā* and then substitutes a less common variant. (Of course *prá vocam* would also not fit this metrical slot, but the poet could have juggled the word order if he had wanted to.)

The logical connection of pāda b with pāda a is not immediately clear. I think the point is the implicit contrast between the Aśvins' martial activities, expressed by *vīryā* 'heroic deeds' in a, with their healing and comforting described in b.

Pāda c introduces further contrasts. On the one hand, the Aśvins' 'ancient' (*purāṇā*) deeds of pāda a contrast with the Aśvins made 'new' (*nāvyau*) here. But more strikingly what *we* are doing to the Aśvins—making them new—is what they implicitly did for Cyavāna in 4ab. It isn't clear to me how we mortals can make the Aśvins new; we might expect this to be in the power only of the gods. I assume that our renovation involves making new hymns of praise, which, as it were, transfer their youthful luster to the dedicands. Ge avoids the problem by taking *nāvyau* as an adverb or quasi-adverb ("... bewegen wir euch aufs neue zur Gnade"), with the operative syntagm being a kind of periphrastic causative: ACC *āvase* √ *kṛ* "make you (to) help," like (acdg. to his n. 5c) X.38.4d in the preceding hymn. But there, like here, there is a predicate adj. (*arvāñcam*) with the acc. *īndram*, inviting an interpr. "make X Y" with double acc. I therefore think that we should take "make you two new" seriously, esp. because it plays off the Aśvins' action with regard to Cyavāna.

The meaning of the purpose clause of d and its connection to what precedes are somewhat puzzling. The interpr. depends on who we think the *arí-* is and what we think the near-deictic *ayám* is doing. Both Old and Ge (in somewhat different ways) consider the *arí-* to be the patron of the sacrifice (or so I interpr. Ge's "dieser hohe Herr"). Old, who takes *arí-* to mean "der Geizige," thinks that getting the *arí-* to trust will unlock his stinginess and cause him to give to us, the priests. If they are correct that the *arí-* is the patron (I think they're not), then the *ayám* would make sense: he would be right there on the scene. But I don't see why our actions with regard to the Aśvins would bring all this about – perhaps we're extraordinarily successful at getting the Aśvins to help us, including the patron? Re comments rather breezily about the *arí-*: "l'Homme (collectif) au nom de qui nous parlons"; I'm not sure what that is meant to mean. Thieme's view (Fremdl. 38–39) is quite different; he interpr. the *arí-* in the context of the dangers of hospitality given and received, which requires trust on both sides (I may be reading a bit more into his brief treatment than is overtly there). This fits my own understanding of the meaning of both *arí-* and *śrād* √ *dhā* (which latter I think is often specialized for trust in the hospitality relationship; see pp. 176–84 of my *Sacrificed Wife*). Th tr. "Damit dieser Fremdling Vertrauen fasse." The question is why the activity in the earlier part of the vs. should cause the stranger to trust. I think the answer is that the Aśvins are the guarantors of the safety of all sorts of beings in distress and that our renewing the Aśvins in order to enable them to dispense this aid is what will cause the *arí-* to trust and take heart: help is on the way. The catalogue of the Aśvins' good deeds that the poet has recited earlier in the hymn gives the *arí-* reason to hope that they will show the same care to him. I might now tr. pāda c as "Now we shall make you new (for you) to help," without the "us" that I supplied as obj. to *āvase* (it's not in the Sanskrit); the Aśvins' help is more generally distributed than just to us. But why "*this* stranger" (*ayám ... aríḥ*)? I am not entirely certain, but I wonder if *ayám* is a way of adducing a salient example – so it functions as rhetorical deixis rather than expressing physical proximity. In any case it also serves to introduce the initial *iyám* of the next pāda (6a) and the dramatic intrusion of the woman in distress, which may be its primary purpose.

X.39.6: As was just discussed, the fem. deictic *iyám* that opens this vs. explicitly contrasts with the masc. *ayám* qualifying *aríḥ* in 5d. The intrusion of the forceful female voice in this vs.,

demanding the Aśvins' attention, points up the poet's implicit assumption in vs., 5 that he and his colleagues were praising the Aśvins in order to make them inclined to help a *male* in need.

The speaker here is ordinarily identified as Ghoṣā, who is named explicitly in the next hymn (X.40.5) as well as being the putative poet of these hymns, per the Anukr. As I argue in the publ. intro., I find this identification unlikely, because Ghoṣā in X.40 is the daughter of a king, while the female speaker here emphasizes her utter isolation and lack of relatives and protectors.

As was also noted in the publ. intro., her appeal to the Aśvins is in part modeled on (or echoes) the first vs. of this hymn: her *ahve* "I invoked" is built to the same root $\sqrt{hvā}$ that is prominent in vs. 1: *hāvyaḥ* (1b), *suhávam havāmahe* (1d), and the simile involving the father found in *pítūr ná nāma* (1d) is elaborated in her *putrāyeva pitārā* (d).

The series of privative cmpds in pāda c that describe the woman's plight ends with *ámatih*. Although the other three—*ánāpir ájñā asajātyā*—reference her lack of human ties, I render *ámatih* as 'heedless', seemingly a defect of her own making. I now am inclined towards Re's interpr. "sans (personne) qui pense à moi" – 'heedless' in the sense of lacking anyone to heed me. Unfortunately I cannot think of a single word in English that expresses this – the closest perhaps is 'neglected' or, to maintain the privative sequence, 'without attention'. I would slightly alter the tr. to the latter. For further on *ámatih*– see comm. ad X.42.10.

In d I would also change 'shame' to 'curse'.

X.39.7–10: As noted in the publ. intro., the catalogue of the Aśvins' deeds, interrupted by the direct speech of the woman in vs. 6, continues thereafter, and in fact it is more formally constructed: 7 consecutive hemistichs (7a–10a) open with the dual pronoun *yuvám* 'you two' (see also 7d and 8d) whereas only one hemistich in the first part of the catalogue, 4a, begins with *yuvám*. This opening is a characteristic feature of Kakṣivānt's Aśvin hymns, though not as consistently carried out; cf., e.g., I.117.7a, 8a, 13a, 14a, c, 20c; 118.7a, c, 8a, 9a; 119.4a, 6a, c, 7a, 9c, 10a. (For another such sequence in the Ghoṣā hymns, see disc. ad X.40.) The same deeds are also treated in the Kakṣivānt hymns, often with very similar or identical phraseology. E.g., their bringing a wife to Vimada (our 7ab) is found in I.116.1 ... *vimadāya jāyām ... nyūhātū ráthēna*, 117.20 *yuvám ... vimadāya jāyām nyūhathuḥ purumitrāsya yōṣam*, like our *yuvám ráthēna vimadāya ... ny ūhathuḥ purumitrāsya yōṣaṇām*. For the parallels to the other stories see Ge's nn.

X.39.7: Ge takes *śundhyū-* as the name of Vimada's wife(-to-be)(so also Mayr, PN s.v.), but since *śundhyū-* is otherwise an adj. meaning 'preening, sleek', I see no reason not to take it as an adjective here. See also Remmer (Frauennamen 39–40), who also takes *śundhyúvam* as an adj. here and thinks Kamadyū is the actual name of Vimada's wife.

X.39.8: Ge makes *cakrathuḥ yuvád váyaḥ* into a double acc. constr. "Ihr machtet das Alter ... wieder jugendlich," but this requires interpr. *váyas-* as "Alter." Re remarks that "*váyas* s'orienté en effet vers <<âge>> au Livre X," but the passages he cites do not, in my view, support this statement. The very similar expression *tákṣan ... yúvad váyaḥ* in I.111.1 (Ṛbhus) is rendered by Ge "... zimmerten ... jugendliches Alter," but "youthful vigor" is a better creation for the Ṛbhus' parents than simply a youthful old age.

X.39.9: On the Atri saga, see my disc. in Hyenas (228–31), but I have emended my tr. of this passage (found on p. 230) in light of Houben's disc. in Fs. Migron, where he argues that *utá* here

connects two separate places where Atri was confined. See also Re's n., suggesting that two separate versions of the tale are conflated here.

X.39.10: This last vs. of the "deeds" sequence is entirely devoted to one story, whereas the first two (vss. 7–8) treated three each, and the following one (vs. 9) two.

I take the dat. *nṛbhyaḥ* as agent with the gerundive *havyam*, as often, not as a dat. of benefit as Ge does ("für die Herren"). But there's relatively little difference in effect.

X.39.11: Ge (n. 11a) takes the referents of the voc. *rājānau* to be Mitra and Varuṇa, not the Aśvins—both because the Aśvins are never called kings and because of the presence of the voc. *adīte*. I admit the justice of these two arguments and think it quite possible that the expression was adapted from an Āditya hymn. However, for me it beggars belief that a hymn that never takes its eyes off the Aśvins, in a vs. that caps a sequence of vss. containing the relentlessly repeated 2nd du. pronoun *yuvām* referring to the Aśvins, along with a sequence of 2nd du. verbs with them as subject, would suddenly address a different set of dual entities, who have nothing to do with the hymn otherwise, and then address the Aśvins again (voc. phrase *aśvinā suhavā rudravartanīc*) in the same sentence in the same vs. I think rather that the poet is borrowing M+V's qualities to enhance the Aśvins' prestige, and that this may have been originally suggested by an appeal to Aditi – who as a mother figure may have been addressed because of the females in distress whom the Aśvins helped, as well as the presence of the wife in pāda d. The same infusion of other deities' power and prestige may be seen in the voc. *rudravartanī*, which brings the Maruts into the mix (see comm. ad I.3.3). For another possible use of voc. *rājānā* for the Aśvins see X.61.23 and disc. there.

The 2nd hemistich is oddly and ambiguously phrased. It contains a double acc. construction with a bahuvr. as predicate adj.: *yām ... purorathām kṛṇuthaḥ* lit. "whom you make (to be) one having his chariot in front." The clause also contains an instr. of accompaniment (clearly so marked): *pātnyā sahā* "along with his wife." The question is whether the wife is being conjoined more closely with him and or with the chariot – that is, do the Aśvins make the chariot to be in front for him and for his wife, or do they make the chariot and the wife to be in front for him. Although it's a bit more complex, I incline towards the latter interpr. I consider this another allusion to the new ritual model that includes the Sacrificer's Wife as a participant in the sacrifice (a model I have discussed endlessly, both in the SW/SW book and in a number of articles addressing the introduction of the wife in the late RV). This model is sometimes presented through the image of a chariot with a team of equals (husband and wife) pulling it. The most striking exploration of this image is the Mudgala / Mudgalānī hymn (X.102, q.v.), where Mudgalānī acting as charioteer brings ritual and personal success. The wife leading here, alongside the chariot, presents a similar image.

X.39.12: The juxtaposition of instr. *jāvīyasā* and acc. *rātham* across the pāda boundary strikes a discordant note, since they are co-referential. But *rātham* is part of the rel. clause, with 'chariot' fronted around the rel. prn. (*rātham yām*). This was surely a deliberate effect by the poet to shake us up. (I have silently promoted 'chariot' to the main cl., since "Drive here with the swifter-than-thought one, which chariot ..." does not parse well in English.)

X.39.13: Although Gr interpr. the three occurrences of *jayūṣā* (also I.117.16, VI.62.7) as a dual modifying the Aśvins, I follow Ge in taking it as an instr. sg. modifying a gapped 'chariot', on

the basis of the parallels adduced in his n. 13a. See also Pirart (Aśvins I.219 ad I.117.16). The parallels sketch a myth even less filled out than most of the Aśvins' exploits, but the duplication of phraseology strongly suggests that the passages belong together. Note the echoes of our ... *yātām jayúṣā ví párvatam* in the three passages, two of which are from Kakṣīvant's Aśvin hymns:

I.117.16 *ví jayúṣā yayathuḥ sānu ádreḥ* "With your victorious (chariot) you journeyed across the back of the rock."

I.116.20 *vibhindúnā ... ráthena ví párvatān ... ayātām* "With your chariot that splits apart ... you journeyed through (/across?) the mountains."

VI.62.7 *ví jayúṣā rathyā yātām ádrim* "With your victorious (chariot), you charioteers drove through (/across?) the rock."

Ge tr. *yātām* here as an impv. ("Machet eure Umfahrt ..."), and in fact it should be one by rule: the subject-doubling prn. *tā* is proper with 2nd ps. only in the impv. (see my "sa figé"). Nonetheless, the parallels clearly refer to a past deed of the Aśvins, with two (and possibly all three) of them containing a preterital verb: I.116.20 impf. *ayātām*, I.117.16 pf. *yayathuḥ*, VI.62.7 injunc. *yātām* (per Pp.), but note that in the sequence *rathyāyātām* nothing forbids an augmented analysis *ayātām* as in I.116.20 (see comm. ad VI.62.7). Moreover, the rest of the vs. treats previous good deeds of the Aśvins, with two augmented impfs. (*ápinvatam* b, *amuñcatam* d). I have therefore (reluctantly) translated *yātām* as a preterite, against the syntax. Our passage may have been adapted from VIII.87.3 *tā vartir yātām*, which does contain an impv. Note that it also rhymes with the opening of 12a *ā ... yātām*.

X.39.14: The $\sqrt{takṣ} + rátham$ "fashion a chariot" motif returns from vs. 4, where the rejuvenation of Cyavāna was compared to it. See also 12b, where the Ṛbhus fashion the Aśvins' chariot, while here "we" compare ourselves fashioning a praise-song to the Bhṛgu fashioning a chariot.

The syntax and purport of pāda c are very troubled. The problems are 1) the sense of *ny àmrkṣāma* and 2) the function of loc. *márye*. There is an easy way to solve both, and that is to ascribe a contextual meaning to $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ that will make the case frame (acc. *yóṣānām*, loc. *márye*) work. This is the route that Ge takes: rendering $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ as "hingegeben" (give up, surrender), which works well (or well enough) with acc. + loc. This is also what Re's note seems to suggest, though he floats three different and not entirely compatible glosses for the verbal lexeme: "donner," "vouer," and "soumettre (comme en employant la force)." But I think that in this case the easy way is the wrong way. $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ is a striking idiom, and if the poet simply wanted to express 'give' or 'surrender' there are easier ways to do that. For $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ see comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3: it means lit. 'wipe / rub down' but metaphorically both 'drag down' and 'clasp to oneself'—sometimes, in sexual contexts, both at the same time. Cf. VII.26.3 *janīr iva pátir ékaḥ samānó ní māmṛje púra índraḥ sú sárvaḥ* "As a single common husband does his wives, Indra has dragged down all the strongholds to submission." This meaning could work in our passage: we clasp our own praise-song to ourselves, as a cherished object; the same sentiment is found in the next pāda, which is part of the same clause, where we hold the song close like a cherished son (*nítayam ná sūnūm ... dádhānāḥ*). I think we should take into account the complex semantics of this idiom. But this suggestion runs headlong into the problem of loc. *márye*: the dashing youth should be nominative, parallel in the simile to the 1st ps. subject in the frame: *he* should be clasping the maiden to himself. There is a way out of this – though it is slightly tricky. I suggest we are dealing with a mixed syntactic construction. In X.65.7 and X.66.9 we find a reflexive construction with this idiom: *tanvī* [loc.] $ní\sqrt{mrj}$ "clasp ACC to oneself [LOC]," with the loc. *tanvī*

coreferential with the subject. So, e.g., X.65.7 *yajñām janitvī tanvī ní māmījuh* “They [=heaven-rulers], having created the sacrifice, clasped it to themselves” (sim. X.66.9). I suggest that the construction here is based on this coreferential structure, such that we should have **máryo* [nom.] *márye* [loc.] *yóṣānām *mārṣti* “(as) a dashing youth clasps a maiden to [same] dashing youth.” In this hypothetical sentence the loc. *márye* should be replaced by the reflex. prn. *tanvī*, as in the passages just cited. But instead it’s the nominative **máryaḥ* that has been gapped, leaving the loc. *márye* unreplaced. In the publ. tr. this loc. is tr. as if it were nom., because conveying what I think underlies the passage could not be conveyed in brief. But perhaps it would be a bit clearer if tr. “We have clasped it to ourselves like a maiden *to* a dashing youth.”

Notice that the secondary sig. aor. *amṛkṣāma* (see Narten SigAor. 196–98) rhymes with *átakṣāma*, which opens the preceding pāda (b), though that form is of course not an aorist.

X.40 Aśvins

For my view that *Ghoṣā* in this hymn is not the same as the woman in distress in X.39 see the publ. introductions, as well as disc. above ad X.39.

The hymn is also tr. by Doniger (pp. 264–66).

This hymn contains another sequence of fronted 2nd du pronouns; see comm. ad X.39.7–10. The concentration here is in vss. 4–8, with such pronouns beginning 4a, c, 5a, 6a, c, 7a, b, c, d, 8a, b, c. Unlike X.39.10, where the only form found is the nom. *yuvām*, this sequence contains varied case forms: nom. *yuvām*, acc. *yuvām*, and gen. *yuvóḥ*, somewhat like the “versified paradigm” of *agní-* in I.1.

X.40.1–4: Note the emphasis on the two poles of the day, dawn and evening, esp. the former. The *āmreḍita vāstor-vastoh* is found in 1d and 3b, *doṣā (...)* *vāstoḥ* in 2a and 4b, and *prātār* in 1c and 3a.

X.40.1: With Ge, I take the final instr. phrase *dhiyā śāmi* with *prāti ... bhūṣati* in b. Doniger seems to construe them as instruments/agents with *vāhamānam* (“brought by thought and care”), but though the middle pres. *vāhate* is found with instr. of the draught animals, I cannot find a real passive usage of this middle.

X.40.2: The two interrogatives that introduce the question in vs. 1a, *kúha káh*, are here separated and given independent clauses, with *kúha* found 4x in ab and *káh* introducing the implicitly disjunctive question in cd.

Pāda c provides unequivocal evidence for *niyoga* or levirate marriage already in the (late) RV. See Ge’s n. 2c.

The maiden *yóṣan(ā)-* and dashing youth *márya-* of the end of the previous hymn (X.39.14) reappear here. The word *sadhástha-* ordinarily just means a ‘place’ or ‘seat’, but here it must carry the additional of a specific or special place, in this case their trysting spot. Doniger’s “as a young woman takes a young man to a room” seems somewhat anachronistic; I imagine trysts in Vedic times were more likely to occur in the open air.

X.40.3: The sequence *jarethe jaraṇéva* “you awake like two old ones” provides a nice phonological figure built to two different roots. The purport of the simile is unclear, however. Is it alluding to the fact that old people are light sleepers? (And is that a human universal or just a fact of the modern West?) The complete obscurity of the hapax *kāpayā* does not help.

Morphologically this can be an instr. sg. fem. to a *kāpā-* (so, e.g., Gr) or a nom. du. masc. to a *kāpaya-*. In the absence of any etymological help even its morphological identity cannot be determined; the interpr. vary wildly, and rehearsing them all would not be instructive (see Old, Ge [n. 3a], Re, EWA s.v. *kāpayā*, etc.). To add another baseless speculation to the array: if we start with a deriv. of \sqrt{krap} , *kṛp* ‘long for, mourn, lament’ (*kṛpā-* ‘pity’ would be nice, though it isn’t attested until MBh), and run it through the MIA sounds laws, we get (or could get) **kapā-*; cf. to the same root Pāli *kaṇa-* ‘pitiable’ and the RVic pres. *kṛpaṇa-*, *kṛpaṇya-*. From there, a vṛddhi deriv. might yield *kāpaya-*. But this chain of events has no foundation and my “(?)” should probably have at least two ?? As usual, Old pronounces the sensible verdict: “Mir scheint das Rätsel des Worts unlösbar.”

The second hemistich raises the usual anxious question – whose sacrifice will the gods attend, and whose will they pass over? This is usually formulated with regard to Indra, but it is of course an issue with all the gods. The case of the Aśvins’ non-appearance (in c) is nicely phrased: *dhvasrā bhavathaḥ* means ‘become occulted / occluded / obscured (by smoke or the like)’. See disc. of $\sqrt{dhvāms}$ and *dhvas(i)rā-* ad IV.19.7. Because the Aśvins travel early in the morning (see *prātar-yāvan-* in 1c), morning mists can hide their passage over the spurned sacrifices while they make their way to the favored one.

As disc. in the publ. intro., the tatpuruṣa *rājaputrā-* ‘king’s son’ is found only here in the RV. As I say there, I think this simile sets up the marriage to be depicted in the following vss. as a svayamvara. Ghoṣā as daughter of a king (*rājñāḥ ... duhitā* 5b) would, at least in later times, be likely to acquire her husband through Self-choice, and the suitors who would be eligible and would attend should be kings’ sons.

X.40.4: Although elephant-hunters probably didn’t set out to catch two (or only two) elephants, the simile *mṛgéva vāraṇā* has been attracted into the dual to match the Aśvins in the frame. The simile is striking and is only loosely connected to the verb of the frame: presumably elephant-hunting did not involve invocations or oblations. Ge’s “locken” (lure, entice) seems to presuppose a more precise knowledge of hunting techniques than I think we possess and is not supported by the additive semantics of *ní√hvā* ‘call down’.

The designation *śubhās pātī* occurs 4x in this hymn (as unaccented voc. *śubhas patī* 4d, 12c, 13c, as accented nom. 14b). Ge (also Don.) tr. *pātī* in all four occurrences with “Gatten” (husbands), even though elsewhere, even in the wedding hymn (X.85.15), where it also refers to the Aśvins, he uses “Herren.” Although our hymn is deeply concerned with marriage, I don’t see that this conventional epithet needs to be pulled into the marital orbit – except perhaps in vs. 12.

X.40.5–7: On the unexpected instances of *pāri* in these vss. see publ. intro. All four of the exx. (5a, 6a, 6c, 7c) occur in the same metrical position, in the break after an opening of 5, and the first three are found immediately before the voc. *aśvinā*.

X.40.5: In b *prché* can be a 1st sg. mid. or a dat. inf. (see Old, Ge n. 5b); I am strongly in favor of the 1st sg. The middle may be used to emphasize the special circumstance of a woman, esp. an unmarried woman, speaking.

The standard tr. take the 2nd du verbs in cd, *bhūtām ... bhūtām ... śaktam*, as impvs.; I think rather that they’re injunctives, expressing the questions Ghoṣā is asking the Aśvins.

How to take the datives in d is disputed. As Ge (n. 5d) and Old point out, the same general configuration is found in the previous hymn, X.39.6 *māhyam śikṣatam* “do your best for

me,” also in the mouth of a female speaker. Ge takes *áśvāvate rathíne* and *árvate* as two separate beneficiaries of the Aśvins’ help: “tut für den Besitzer von Ross und Wagen (und) für das Rennpferd, was ihr vermöget,” but (n. 5d) sees the whole phrase as a metaphor, referring to Ghoṣā and her desire to win a husband. Old offers two different interpr., the second of which I follow: like Ge, he supplies “me” as the real beneficiary, but suggests that she is compared to the *árvant*- ‘steed’, which should be helped to become possessed of horse and chariot, that is, to win the prize.

X.40.6: This vs. contains two of the sequence of *pari*’s (a, c). The 2nd enables a sort of pun, but the first is problematic. Ge divides pāda a into two clauses, with *sthaḥ* (/Samhitā *ṣṭhaḥ*) the verb of the first, and *pári* the preverb to a supplied verb “(fahret).” He does not indicate what Skt. verb he would supply – perhaps *√ vah*, which can take acc. *rátham*. I do not see the necessity, or the utility, of this division. Preverbs can follow their verbs, and esp. in this vs. sequence, where *pári* has a fixed place, the order *sthaḥ pari* poses no problem. What the lexeme *pári* *√ as* means in this context is harder to determine. As Ge points out (n. 6a), it has a different sense (‘encircle [to halt]’) even with *rátham* as obj. in VII.32.10. As I indicated in the publ. intro., I think the intrusive *pári*’s in this sequence are hinting at the marriage theme, by way of the circumambulation of the fire that is part of the wedding ceremony. In 5a Ghoṣā circumambulates the Aśvins; in 6a here the Aśvins seem to circumambulate their chariot—perhaps an allusion to the importance of the Aśvins’ chariot in the RVic svayaṃvara passages. (See my 2001 “The Rigvedic Svayaṃvara? [Fs. Parpola], 306–9.) For a possible association of the chariot with the simile of pāda b, see below.

Pāda b is difficult to interpr, primarily because of the uncertainty of the simile. The problem is to determine what belongs to the simile and what to the frame; in particular, the opening of the pāda, *vísó ná*, seems to plant *vísah* firmly in the simile, given the position of *ná*. In the publ. tr. I take it, much against my principles, as part of the frame (“you arrive at the clans of the singer”). This is given some support by the expression in the next (related—see comm. on X.39–41 above) hymn, X.41.2 *vísó yéna gáchathaḥ* “By which you [=Aśvins] come to the clans ...” But the positioning of the simile particle *ná* immediately after at least one part of the simile is almost exceptionless, and I have grown uncomfortable with disregarding that here.

The path to a solution has to begin with Kutsa, who must be a part of the simile, since he is in the nom. sg. and the verb (*naśāyathaḥ*) is 2nd dual, so Kutsa can’t directly be its subject. Although, as Ge says (n. 6b), our knowledge of the Kutsa saga “ist leider zu lückenhaft,” what we do know about Kutsa mostly involves his participation, with Indra, in the killing of Śuṣṇa – which myth involves an intermediate episode, in which Kutsa and Indra make a chariot journey to Uśanā Kāvya (for counsel or weapons or both—not entirely clear); see comm. ad V.31.7–8, 8, X.29.2, etc. I think this is the journey alluded to here, through oblique hints. First, the Aśvins are *kaví* in pāda a. There is nothing about the rest of that pāda that requires (or even invites) them to be identified as poets, and *kaví*- is a rare designation of the Aśvins, found only in I.117.23 (a Kākṣīvant hymn, note) and VIII.8.2, 5, 23. In the next vs. (7ab) the Aśvins come to a number of named personages, including Uśanā. That the elements of the name Uśanā Kāvya (including *uśānā*- itself) surround the pāda containing Kutsa suggests to me that the Aśvins’ journey in 6b is being compared to Kutsa’s to Uśanā. The somewhat puzzling mention of the chariot at the end of pāda a (see disc. above) may also be a clue to this mythic complex, since Kutsa is especially associated with the chariot (see comm. ad X.29.2).

The sticking point for me has been how to make *vísah* fit into the Kutsa / Uśanā Kāvya scenario, since “clans” don’t form a part of the mythic fragments available to us. Ge simply tr. “Häuser” (followed by Doniger “houses”), and in V.29.9 and X.22.6 Indra and Kutsa in fact drive to the *grhām* of Uśanā. My slightly sleight-of-hand solution here is to take *vísah* with both frame and simile: “you (Aśvins) arrive at the clans [cf. X.41.2 cited above, also X.43.6 disc. below] of the singer, as Kutsa (arrived) at the “clans” (of Uśanā),” with *vísah* a loose reference to the house or household of Uśanā. (It is also possible that *jaritūh* ‘of the singer’ can be read with both simile and frame as well.) I would now substitute that translation for the publ. one. As with a number of other passages involving Uśanā Kāvya, the disiecta membra of the myth have to be assembled from neighboring pādas and arranged into a simulacrum of a story. See disc. in my Rigveda between Two Worlds.

The hapax 2nd du. *nasāyathah* I take as a variant of the already anomalous *asāya-* (4x); see comm. ad VI.33.2. Note that one of the forms of the latter stem is found nearby in X.43.6, construed, as here, with an acc. of *vís-* (*vísam-vísam ... páry asāyata*).

As noted above, pāda c contains a second instance of *pári* in this vs.; it also contains both a simile and a bold image – and, if I’m right, a pun connecting the two, turning on the instr. *āsā* ‘mouth’. The striking image is that of a bee (*mākṣā-*, or fly, though that is contextually less satisfactory) holding enclosed (*pári ... bharata*) the honey of the Aśvins with her mouth. It is not entirely clear what this is meant to convey: the Aśvins are associated with honey (see, e.g., Macdonell, VedMyth 49–50), both as dispensers and consumers of it. So, the bee may either be carrying bee-produced honey to bestow on the Aśvins or, in a role reversal, holding the honey they produced – either physical honey or, perhaps, the honey of their words.

The simile in the same hemistich seems at first to have little to do with this image: *niṣkṛtām ná yōṣaṇā* “like a young woman a *niṣkṛtā*,” with the young woman compared to the bee and the *niṣkṛtā-* to the honey. A *niṣkṛtā-* is generally a place to which one goes, but often a particular type of secretive place: a trysting place, a rendezvous. Cf., e.g., IX.93.2 *máryo ná yōṣām abhí niṣkṛtām yán* “like a young blood going to a maiden at the trysting place.” Here I think it refers not to the place but to the tryst, the secret meeting itself, and the VP *pári ... āsā bharata niṣkṛtām* is figurative: the maiden “holds the tryst enclosed by her mouth” – that is, she keeps it secret. (Lü [211, 342] suggests the exact opposite: “mitteilen” [inform, notify], taken up by Re “transmettre par la bouche” → “communiquer.”) The Lü/Re view might seem to find support in I.119.9 (in an Aśvin hymn of Kakṣīvant) *utá syā vām mādhuman mākṣikārapat* “And the little fly [or bee] whispered honeyed (speech) to you [=Aśvins],” since the *mākṣikā* is conveying her *mādhumat* by speech. But I think this only points up the cleverness of the pun in our passage: the phrase *āsā pári √ bhṛ* can signal not only that the *mākṣā* has something for/or the Aśvins in her mouth (possibly to say to them), but by another reading of the *pári* that the maiden is keeping her secret within. The *arapat* ‘whisper, mutter’ in I.119.9 also emphasizes the secretive nature of the communication.

X.40.7: The first three personages to whom the Aśvins come are known from other Aśvin contexts – esp. Bhujyu, but also Vāsa and, less commonly, Śiñjāra (see Mayr. PN s.vv.); only Uśanā lacks a stable Aśvin association, but the reason for his appearance here was disc. ad 6ab.

Ludwig’s resegmentation of the first two words of c from *yuvó rārāvā* to **yuvór árāvā* has been generally, in my opinion rightly, accepted; *árāvā* belongs to the well-attested stem *árāvan-* ‘hostile, ungenerous’. The Aśvin passage VII.68.7 (adduced by Old), which contains both Bhujyu and a clear *árāvā*, supports this change. Gr lists two occurrences of the supposed

stem *rārāvan-*, this one and *rārāv^añām* in VIII.39.2, which should also be resegmented to **ārātīr ārāv^añām* (see comm. ad loc.).

Pāda c also contains another instance of *pāri*; the sense of the lexeme *pāri* √ *ās* here is unclear—another instance of the “off” nature of the *pāri* occurrences in this section of the hymn. Some (Old, Re) take the verb to be basically positive: (even) a hostile/ungenerous man will “court / pursue” (umwerben, brügger) the Aśvins, while Ge takes it as negative “verpassen.” I am inclined towards the negative approach; my “circumvent” is meant to reflect the *pāri*, though the term itself is somewhat off – but I think the general sense is either “avoid” or “impede.”

X.40.8: Śayu is another regular client of the Aśvins, including in the previous hymn (X.39.13), but Kṛśa is not otherwise associated with them. The stem *kṛśá-* is of course an adj. meaning ‘emaciated, starving’ and is attested in this meaning several times in the RV, including in the previous hymn (X.39.3). Its appearance in the sequence there, *andhásya cid ... kṛśásaya cid ... rutásya cid* “even of the blind man ... even of the starving ... even of the broken,” guarantees that it has the adjectival sense there and is not a personal name, as it appears to be here, at least in part. In our passage it might be possible to take *kṛśám* as an adj. with *śayúm* (“starving Śayu”), but the rhetorical structure of the pāda, with repeated subj. pronoun, makes that unlikely: *yuvám ha kṛśám yuvám aśvinā śayúm*. The two pronouns define two separate subclausal entities, as in the preceding vs., 7ab *yuvám ha bhujiyúm yuvám aśvinā váśam, yuvám śīñjāram ...*

In fact, I now think we are dealing with a pun here: *kṛśá-* and *śayú-* are indeed PNs here, in the manner of the catalogues of the Aśvins’ clients. But they also are adjectives: *kṛśá-* has its usual sense just mentioned, ‘starving’, and *śayú-* the sense ‘orphan’, on which see comm. ad IV.18.12. With these interpretations, the pāda conforms nicely to the following one, esp. the mention of the widow. I would now emend the tr. to “You two make wide space for Kṛśa, you for Śayu / for the starving, for the orphan, o Aśvins, you for the worshipper and the widow.”

As for *kṛśá-* as a PN, it is so twice in the Vāḷakhilya (VIII.54.2, 59.3). The latter passage is esp. suggestive with regard to our passage. In VIII.59.3 “the seven ‘voices’ of Kṛśa milk out a wave of honey for you two” (... *kṛśásya vām mádhva ūrmím duhate saptá vāñīḥ*). The “you two” in question are, in context, Indra and Varuṇa, the ostensible dedicands of the hymn. But as I point out in the publ. intro. to VIII.59 (see also comm. ad VIII.59.3), the vocabulary is in many cases more appropriate to the Aśvins (e.g., in that very vs. VIII.59.3c and also vs. 5, the voc. *śubhas patī* “o lords of beauty,” which in its numerous occurrences is otherwise only used of the Aśvins). It seems likely that Aśvin phraseology has been adapted to the Indra-Varuṇa context of VIII.59. I would suggest that in our passage the “thundering seven-mouthed enclosure” (*stanáyantam ... vrajám ... saptáśyam*) that the Aśvins open up in our cd can be compared to the “seven voices” of Kṛśa that pour out honey in VIII.59.3 – perhaps the dakṣiṇā, as Ge suggests (n. 8cd), more likely in my view a variant of the Vala cave and its contents, particularly since *saptáśya-* is an epithet of Bṛhaspati in that myth (IV.50.4; cf. IX.111.1) – perhaps both.

“The worshiper and the widow” in b do not form a natural semantic pairing, but are probably grouped together because of their phonology: *vidhántam vidhávām*. But the widow and the orphan of the pun in pāda a form a natural class.

X.40.9: On my interpr. of the images of this vs. in a marital context, see publ. intro. As I say there, the coming of age of the maiden in this vs. reminds us of Apālā’s (VIII.91), esp. the plants sprouting in b, which stand for the growth of pubic hair on the newly mature Apālā (VIII.91.5–6). It may not be an accident that Apālā’s fantasy suitor, Indra, is called a *vīraká-* (VIII.91.2)

“dear little hero,” while here, paired with the maiden (*yoṣā*), is a similar *-ka*-form, *kanīnakā* ‘little lad’ – referring either to the new husband or, as I suggest in the publ. intro., possibly to his penis.

The accent on *áruhan* in b indicates that the *ca* there is subordinating (*pace* Old n. 2). See Klein DGRV I.247.

As most comm. point out, *áhne* in d echoes *áhne ... aktáve* “for the day ... for the night” in 5c. As I discuss in the publ. intro., I see a role reversal in our passage: in vs. 5 she asks the Ásvins to “be there for me” (*bhūtám me*) day and night, but here it is she who (in my reading) will “be there for him” (i.e., the bridegroom; *asmaí ... bhavati*). Here the “for night” is not explicit. Perhaps it would be a sly reference to what happens at night, namely sex, but tactfully suppressed, given the innocent state of the new bride.

I take *tāt patitvanám* as a separate nominal clause, not the subject of *bhavati* because that interpr. loses the parallelism with vs. 5. Cf., e.g., Old’s “Ihm hilft zu (glücklichem) Tage diese seine Gattenschaft.” By my reading it is a triumphal announcement of the achieved marital state. The heavy suffix *-tvaná-* (on which see AiG II.2.716–17) may add a bit of gravitas to this final statement.

X.40.10: As disc. in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as concerning the public and social aspects of marriage, in particular the inter-family connection that it forges. However, there are a number of uncertainties in the vs., which has been much discussed; Bloomfield (AJP 21 [1900]) and Gonda (Fs. Norman Brown [1962]) each devoted an entire article to this verse alone, and Old’s, Ge’s, and Re’s remarks are relatively full, esp. Old’s. I will not discuss these treatments in detail, but for the most part simply present my own interpr.

The first question concerns the first clause in pāda a “they weep over the living” (*jīvām rudanti*). As Gonda (inter alia) suggests, *jīvām* implicitly invokes its opposite “the dead”; in fact, 3 of the 4 occurrences of *mṛtá-* in the RV are juxtaposed to *jīvá-*. Since the more natural trigger for tears is death, not life, the phrase “they weep over the living” is, on the one hand, a striking reversal of expectations and a paradox. However, on the other, tears are not an uncommon reaction to any emotionally charged situation, including a joyful one, and many people (including me) cry at weddings. This seems to be what’s going on here – whether as the result of universal human psychology (as I think) or a ritual mandate (so, approx. Gonda, who samples a wide range of the anthropological literature). It could also be more specifically related to the separation of the bride from her natal family as she sets out with her new husband to her new home – an esp. fraught part of the marriage ceremony, as I’ve discussed elsewhere (e.g., SW/SW 223–26). Although it is tempting to interpr. the clause in this light, with her family mourning her departure, the fact that *jīvām* is masc. or neut. makes that interpr. difficult (although it would be possible, but probably inadvisable, to emend to the fem. **jīvām*, which would be metrically identical in this context).

The sense of the rest of this pāda, *ví mayante adhvaré*, has also been much disputed. I see in it an expression of the mutual exchange between the bride’s family and the groom’s that lies at the heart of marriage socially conceived. Hence my “they make a mutual exchange at the rite.” The middle voice supports this reciprocal interpr., and the specifying loc. *adhvaré* indicates that the arrangements become legal at the marriage ceremony. Re’s suggested “faire un contrat” also has a legal aspect, though his added parenthesis “(lors du sacrifice: paradoxe!)” is puzzling – why would this be paradoxical? Gonda’s (p. 84) “they (i.e., those concerned, i.e., either the bridal couples or their relatives, the priests, etc.) take turns at the (marriage) sacrifice” doesn’t

make much sense to me; I assume he means that different people perform different ceremonial actions, but he doesn't say, and if so, the statement seems trivial. Gotō's (1st Cl. 241, cited also by Kü 257) "sie wechseln sich bei der [Hochzeits]feier ab" seems to reflect the same general sense as Gonda's, but even less defined.

In pāda b the interpretational debate has centered on the sense of *prāsiti-* and the phrase *dīrghām ānu prāsitim*. On the general sense of *prāsiti-* see comm. ad IV.4.1, where I suggest that the word is a conflation of two etymologically distinct words, one meaning 'onslaught' or, less pointedly, 'trajectory'. Here an attenuated sense referring to a stretch of time seems warranted; see KH Aufs. II.418. In my view this refers to the protracted marriage negotiations between the two families; I find it impossible to follow Gonda's (p. 85) speculation that "this pāda may allude to the men's gaining a visionary insight into the meaning of marriage, the deep secret of procreation, the continuation of family and race."

The second hemistich is less challenging. The two pādas are structurally parallel, with an opening abstract notion (*vāmām* 'a precious thing' c, *māyaḥ* 'joy' d) followed by a dat. of the beneficiaries of this abstract; the two datives refer, in my view, to the parents and close relatives who arranged the match (*pitṛbhyaḥ*) in c, and in d to the actual parties to the match, the husbands (*pātibhyaḥ*) and the wives they embrace. I do *not* think, with some interpr. (e.g., Old), that the *pītar* in c are the dead ancestors who will be benefited by the offspring of the new couple. As for *sameriré*, I take it to mean "set this [=marriage] in motion," "brought it together." The publ. tr. omits the *idām*, and should be slightly changed to one of the tr. just suggested. Although *māyaḥ* in d echoes (*vī*) *mayante* in a, I consider this word play only phonological, not etymological

X.40.11: In contrast to the detailed treatments of vs. 10 just cited, vs. 11 has attracted very little comment, though it is hardly perspicuous – and the first pāda ("we do not know this – proclaim it to us") makes the unclarity explicit. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think it concerns sex, or rather sex and procreation.

The second pāda seems to allude both to the sexual act itself and to the notion (at least later) that the husband is reconceived/reborn in his wife's womb: "that/how a young man dwells peacefully in the womb of a young woman" (see also X.85.45 in the wedding hymn). The plural *yóniṣu*, which I've silently emended to an English singular (like Ge's "im Schosse"), is, on its surface, surprising. The stem is extremely well attested and almost always in the singular, including the very common locatives *yónau* and *yónā*, so it is not a case of a body part that is plurale tantum. The only plural forms are 5 exx. of this very loc. *yóniṣu*. In the other 4 cases the wombs can indeed be multiple, including in a passage where procreation is at issue: X.63.15 *svastí naḥ putrakṛthéṣu yóniṣu* "(let there be) well-being for us in the wombs at the making of sons" (though in that passage plurality isn't necessary). In two of the passages (I.15.4, II.36.4) *yóniṣu* is qualified by *triśú* 'three' and clearly refers to the three fireplaces where Agni takes his ritual position. (The fifth passage is in the Vena hymn, X.123.5, and like the rest of that hymn is hard to interpret.) Despite the clear conceptual plurality in two of the five passages, in our passage (and quite possibly in X.63.15) I consider the pl. of *yóniṣu* a metrical contrivance: loc. sg. *yónau* is very common pāda-final in Triṣṭubh. Both our passage and X.63.15 are in Jagatī, where pāda-final *yónau* won't fit; I therefore consider the pl. an automatic adjustment to the meter. It is only these two passages where *yóniṣu* is pāda-final.

I now think the publ. interpr. of the first hemistich is wrong, or at least incomplete. The question I did not previously consider is the identity of the 1st pl. speakers and 2nd pl. addressees: *ná táśya vidma, tád u ṣu prá vocata*. Given the number, neither can have the Áśvins

as referent. The only previous 1st pl. in the hymn is *ní hvayāmahe* “we call down” (4b) in the early generic ritual portion of the hymn – though the next vs. (12d) contains the opt. *aśīmahi* “might we reach.” There are no 2nd pls. anywhere else in the hymn. Since pāda a of our vs. clearly sets up an interactive speech situation, we need to try to identify the parties to this exchange. I now interpret the vs. as a continuation of vss. 9–10, which concern the marriage itself. I suggest that the first hemistich treats the announcement of the consummation of the marriage. The 2nd pl. addressees are the elders who would announce the consummation, having been shown the evidence – most likely the bride’s bloody garment, as in X.85.28–29. The “we” who await the news are the bride’s relatives (or the relatives of the couple in general); cf. X.85.28, where, after the garment turns bloody, “her relatives are elated” (*édhante asyā jñātāyaḥ*). Note the verb *prā vocata* ‘proclaim’, which suggests a formal and public announcement. The 1st ps. speakers are not asking for private enlightenment about a mystery (as I first thought), but for an authoritative statement made to the assembled group.

On this basis I would now alter the translation from “*how ...*” (which is not supported by the *yád* in the text) to “*that ...*,” and interpret *yúvā* and *yuvatyāḥ* not as generic “a young man ... a young woman,” but as references to the couple in question – yielding an emended tr. “We do not know this – proclaim it to us – that the young man dwells in the womb of the young woman.”

The 2nd half of the vs. expresses the further wish that the marriage just consummated will be procreative and the new husband virile. This is expressed in the familiar bovine terms: the “seed-laden bull” (*vṛṣabhásya retínah*) and his beloved, the ruddy cow (*priyósriyasya*). Less familiar is the trope of the house: “may we go to the house” (of bull and cow), *grhām gamema*, but this image is reinforced in the next vs. (12d), *priyā aryamṇó dúryām aśīmahi* “Dear to Aryaman, might we reach his porticos (/house)” (per publ. tr.) or, perhaps better, “As dear ones, might we reach the porticos (/house) of Aryaman.” On the one hand, “reaching the house” in both vss. is a metaphor for attaining a desired state or situation: 11cd wishes for the new marriage to be generative; in 12d, since Aryaman is the patron of marriage, we are asking for a successful, divinely sanctioned marriage. On the other, we can take “house” more literally as the physical location, the container, of the desired domestic state and representative of it. The motif of the house continues in the final two vss.: 13a *mānuṣo duroṇā ā* and 14d *vīprasya vā yājamānasya vā grhām*; in fact *grhām* is the final word of the hymn. In 13 and 14 the “house” shows the more standard RVic usage, as the locus of ritual activity and the goal of the gods, here the Aśvins, coming to the ritual. Nonetheless, the “house” motif resonates throughout this last part of the hymn, even as the focus shifts back to the Aśvins.

X.40.12: As just noted, the Aśvins reappear here, having been absent from the three wedding vss. (9–11).

In b the publ. tr. attributes both the desires (*kāmāḥ*) and the hearts (*hṛtsú*) to us, but this is not explicit in the text. Ge expresses no ownership of the desires and attributes the hearts to the Aśvins: “die Wünsche sind euch ans Herz gelegt worden.” I was hesitant to assign the hearts to the Aśvins partly because of pl. *hṛtsú*: although I would not expect the poet to use the dual (the stem has no dual forms, not surprisingly), I thought it likely that for two beings, with only one heart apiece, he would use the sg. *hṛdī*. However, in at least one passage (I.179.5) pl. *hṛtsú* seems to belong to a single individual, so this argument doesn’t hold. Also, *hṛd-* is generally used of humans, but given I.32.14 with *hṛdī* used of Indra, this argument also falls. I now think that the desires are ours – the desires we just expressed for a successful marriage – but that the hearts are the Aśvins, or the gods in general (see Aryaman in d). Cf. X.64.2d *devēsu me ādhi kāmā*

ayamsata “My desires have fastened upon the gods,” with *kāmāḥ* + med. *s*-aor. *ayamsata*, as here; only the preverbs, *ní* here, *ádhi* there, differ (though X.64.2 is slightly complicated by having *hṛtsú* in pāda a clearly referring to our hearts). I would now change the tr. to “(Our) desires have been fastened down in (your) hearts.”

This is the only place in the RV where the Aśvins are identified as a *mithunā* ‘(oppositional) pair’. Though the stem *mithunā-* is by no means limited to a sexual pair – it is used in I.83.3, for example, of the pair of priests, the Adhvaryu and the Hotar – it is often so used, often in sexually charged context, e.g., in I.179.3 of Agastya and Lopāmudrā, VIII.33.18 of the sacrificer and his wife. I therefore think it is used of the Aśvins here to fit the marital context.

On *śubhas patī*, see comm. above ad vs. 4. I think it’s possible that in our vs. this conventional epithet of the Aśvins (found 3x elsewhere in the hymn) has been attracted into the marital context and might be interpr. “husbands of beauty,” as opposed to the standard “lords of beauty,” though its appearance in vss. 13 and 14 might either speak against this or suggest that they all have a marital undertone.

As disc. ad vs. 11, the phrase *dúryāṁś aśīmahī* echoes *grhām gamema* (11d), and both have both a metaphorical and a literal sense. The house here is that of Aryaman (*aryamṇāḥ*), who, of course, presides over the institution of marriage, and I attribute his presence here to that function. In the publ. tr. I construe this gen. with *priyāḥ* (“dear to Aryaman”) and supply him with *dúryān* (“his porticos”). I am now not sure that *priyāḥ* should be limited in that way. It is possible that we are dear to the married couple, or the married couple and their family circle, or to the Aśvins, whereas I am tolerably certain that the dwelling is Aryaman’s. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “May we, as dear ones, reach the porticos of Aryaman.”

X.40.13: The phrase *tīrthām suprapāṇām* “a ford that offers good drink” is somewhat jarring, but it cannot be separated from vs. 7 in X.114, a mystical treatment of the sacrifice: *āpnānaṁ tīrthām ... yéna pathā prapībante sutásya* “The Opulent Ford ... the path by which they take the first drink of the soma?” with both *tīrthā-* and *prá√pā*.

On *pathe-ṣthā-* (also V.50.3) see Scar 649. The anomalous loc. sg. *pathe-* is presumably a rhyme form to fairly common and inherited (cf. Aves. *raθaēštā-*) *rathe-ṣthā-* ‘standing on the chariot / chariot-fighter’, with loc. to a thematic 1st member.

X.40.14: As noted in the publ. intro., this final vs. echoes the opening of the hymn, with its anxious questions about the location of the Aśvins.

In c *ní yeme* responds to *ní ... ayamsata* in 12b, though the *s*-aor. in 12b is intransitive and our form is transitive, despite agreement in voice.

X.41 Aśvins

On the place of this hymn in the Ghoṣā Aśvins sequence, see comm. ad X.39–41 above and the publ. intro. to X.39–41 and to X.41. Besides the Anukramaṇī ascription there is little to connect this little hymn to the two preceding ones.

X.41.1: All three hymns in this sequence begin with a vs. dedicated to the Aśvins’ chariot – though since the Aśvins’ chariot often features prominently in Aśvin hymns, this is hardly diagnostic of a shared poetic lineage. This one is esp. close in phraseology to X.39.1 – though there the chariot is in the nom. for most of the vs., while here the first three pādas are couched in the acc., modifying *rātham*, which begins pāda b.

With regard to *samānām* ‘common’, Ge (n. 1a) asks whether the chariot is “common” to the two Aśvins or to all men, offering parallels that could support either. As the 1st word of the hymn, *samānām* seems positioned for significance, but it isn’t possible to determine what its scope is.

X.41.2: The focus on the chariot continues in this vs. The vs. also ends with a mention of the Hotar priest (*yajñām hótṛmantam*), setting the stage for vs. 3.

On *kīrī-* see comm. ad V.52.12.

X.41.3: After the mention of the Hotar in 2d, this vs. presents at least two more ritual functionaries and as many as four: the Adhvaryu and Agnidh are presented as disjunctive goals of the Aśvins’ journey, with double *vā*: #*adhvaryúm vā ... agnídham vā*. But the presence of a third *vā* in c in the off-balance expression *víprasya vā ... sávanāni* “or to the pressings of an inspired poet” suggests that *vípra-* is a third such personage, esp. since the *vā* immediately follows that gen., while *dāmūnasam* ‘domestic leader, household master’ can either be in apposition to *agnídham* or refer to yet another distinct person and role.

X.42–44: These three hymns are all attributed to Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa and all dedicated to Indra, with clear verbal connections among them, including sharing their two final vss. (X.42.10–11 = X.43.10–11 = X.44.10–11). To a poet of the same name are ascribed three Aśvin hymns in VIII (VIII.85–87), though there is no clear thematic or verbal connection between the two sets that I can see.

X.42 Indra

The hymn contains a number of striking comparisons, often not overtly marked as similes.

X.42.1: With Ge, I take *lāyam* as an early example of the *-am* gerund (/absolutive), rare in the RV/AV, more common in the Brāh. and Sū. (see Whitney, Gr. §995), to √*lī* ‘cling’, etc. Ge’s invocation of *nilāyam* in AVŚ IV.16.2 is apposite, whatever the form means there. Ge’s interpr. here, “geduckt” (crouching), is close to mine (“in ambush”), though mine spells out the scenario I see for the simile in pāda a more clearly—with the poet compared to an archer who, being hidden, can take his time aiming. The ultimate target is, in my view, Indra, who is brought down (like a game bird?) to our ritual in pāda d. The poet must “shoot further” in order to overcome the speech of the *arī-* in pāda c. Old, by contrast, thinks *lāyam* refers to the arrow being shot, flg. Gr (and Ge Gl., inter alia), and that it is compared to the *stómam* in b (which, however, is the object of a different verb).

X.42.1–2: The three even pādas 1d, 2b, 2d all begin with a 2nd sg. act. *-aya* impv. preceded by a preverb (*ní rāmaya / prá bodhaya / ā cyāvaya*), all with Indra as object, taking final position (1d, 2b *índran*#, 2d *sūram*#). In 1d and 2b the impv. is immediately followed by the voc. *jaritar* ‘o singer’.

X.42.2: Old advances good reasons not to accept Roth’s emendation of *dóhena* to *dóhe *ná*, primarily parallel passages with *úpa síkṣ-* + INSTR. Presumably the objection to the instr. that led to Roth’s emendation to the loc. is that milking would not be an enticement to a cow – but in

reality that is not the case: cows with full udders want to be milked. Ge (n. 2a) toys with the suggested emendation and in the end settles for a haplology **dóhena ná*, which seems like the worst of the options. I see no reason why pāda a can't contain a simile without overt marking, just as pāda b does.

On *úpa śíkṣa-* with acc. complement, see comm. ad I.112.19, 173.10.

As Ge notes (n. 2b), *jaritar jārām* is a word play, with the words belonging to two different roots.

X.42.3: The hapax nominal *śísayá-* is assigned by everyone to the root $\sqrt{sā}$ / *śí*, which furnishes the immediately preceding verb *śísīhi* 'sharpen!'. I therefore don't understand the apparently universal tendency to give it a gloss that separates it from its root (Gr 'stärkend, kräftigend, AiG II.2.85 'stärkend(?)', EWA s.v. *śā* 'stärkend', and most egregiously Ge "dass du ausgiebig bist"), even though it is explicitly recognized (by Ge and EWA at least) that it is a word play with *śísīhi*. The poet has heard that Indra is a consummate practioner of $\sqrt{sā}$ and asks him to perform this action. I might slightly emend my rendering to "you are the sharpener" or "you are sharpening." As to what "sharpen" means here, I assume the poet is asking Indra to sharpen his (=poet's) mental and verbal skills; the immediately following reference (c) to the poet's *dhī-* 'insight', which he hopes to monetize, supports this interpr.

In d the poet calls upon Indra to "bring to us" (*ā bharā naḥ*) Bhaga, while in 1b the roles were reversed: the priest is urged to "bring to him [=Indra]" (*prā bharā ... asma*) the praise – emphasizing the theme of reciprocity that dominates this hymn.

X.42.4: With Old, I accept Ge's (Gl) analysis of *mamasatyá-* as a univerbation of *māma sāt* ("[this] being mine"), with *-ya-* a nominalizing suffix, rather than deriving it from *māma satyá-*.

Pāda b contains the common contrastive juxtaposition of *sām* 'together' and *ví* 'apart, separately'; here the peoples take their stands together (*saṁtasthānāḥ*), that is, reciprocally facing each on the battlefield, while each side calls on Indra separately (*ví hvayante*) for his help.

Since there's no acc. prn. in c, the VP could also be tr. "... makes (him=Indra) his yokemate." My supplied "you" looks back to the 2nd ps. ref. to Indra in ab; "him" would look forward to the 3rd ps. *vaṣṭi sūraḥ* of d. The choice doesn't really matter.

sūra- returns here from 2d, in both cases referring to Indra. That vs. also contains *sākhāyam* 'comrade' referring to Indra (2a), while here *sakhyá-* ('fellowship', perhaps better 'comradeship') is what Indra seeks (or doesn't) with humans.

X.42.5–8: This set of 4 vss. has the formal presentation of a little omphalos. Vss. 5 and 8 define a ring: 5ab *bahulám ... tīvrān sómān* / 8b *tīvrāḥ sómā bahulāntasaḥ* // 5d *ní ... yuvāti* / 8c *ní yaṁsan* // 5b *āsunóti* / 8d *sunvaté*. The intermediate vss. 6–7 are responsive (as omphalos vss. tend to be): 6 *ārāc cit ... śátruḥ* / 7 *ārāc chátum*. But this set of vss. is not in the center of the hymn and the subject is not consequential enough or enigmatic enough to count as a real omphalos.

X.42.5: This vs. is a sort of duplicate and expansion of the 2nd hemistich of the preceding vs. (4cd), depicting the reward Indra provides to one who makes oblation to him. The reciprocal relationship between the two recipients, Indra and the sacrificer, is conveyed by the balanced dative pronouns: *asmai* (pāda a) referring to Indra and *tásmāi* (pāda c) referring to the sacrificer.

The simile that opens the verse (*dhānam ná syandrām bahulām* “like ample streaming wealth” / “ample like streaming wealth”) has a somewhat complex relationship with its target, *tīvrān sōmān*, found in pāda b. Ge (n. 5a) suggests that *syandrām bahulām* has been “attracted” by *dhānam*, implying that the phrase really modifies the pl. *sōmān*. His suggestion is understandable, because the root $\sqrt{\text{syand}}$ means ‘flow’ and generally has either liquids or animate beings as subject. In fact Soma is one of the standard subjects of the verb (see, e.g., the multiple occurrences of aor. *āsiṣyadat* in Maṇḍala IX). The adj. *syandrā-* generally modifies gods (in motion). Therefore applying it to an apparently static substance *dhāna-* ‘wealth’ seems off-balance. But as Ge also suggests, the adj. seems to have a double meaning here. The semantically straightforward application to soma, as a substance that flows, is semi-thwarted by the clash of number and the clear positioning of the adj. in the simile. not the frame. This forces a ‘flowing, moving’ reading on *dhāna-*; Ge: “... beweglich, von dem aus Vieh bestehenden Besitz.” In other words, this is wealth in livestock, wealth on the hoof. The use of *syandrā-* ‘flowing’ may reflect the visual impression of a large herd in movement, which from a distance can look like liquid flowing (google videos of “herds in motion”). Note that the Maruts are compared to “streaming bulls” (V.52.3 *syandrāso nokṣānaḥ*) and that other livestock serve as subjects of, or similes with, $\sqrt{\text{syand}}$ (for example, milk cows in IX.68.1).

In the other direction, *bahulā-* is quite at home modifying ‘wealth’ (esp. *rayí-*, e.g., II.1.12, III.1.19), but in our hymn is found in the cmpd. *bahulānta-* (8b) modifying the same *tīvrā- sōma-* as in our vs. So both adjectives in the opening simile of 5a are implicated, if unequally and in opposite directions, with both simile and frame.

As I indicated above, this vs. is an expanded variant of 4cd – but (if I’m right) with a twist. The first part describes the sacrificer offering soma to Indra in expectation of a reward. In 4c this reward is to form a team with Indra, to become his yokemate – a happy situation; 5cd also involves forming a team, but here the image of the team is negative. It consists of the rivals to the sacrificer, whom Indra makes into a team subject to the sacrificer, to be broken and controlled by him with spurs and goad. For a comparable expression see VII.18.9 *sudāsa índraḥ sutúkām amitrān, árandhayat* ... “Indra made those without alliance (to us) subject to Sudās, (as ones) easy to thrust away / easily goaded,” where the establishment of dominance over the *sutúka-* is more explicit. For the meaning and etymology of *sutúka-* see comm. ad VII.18.9.

I do not entirely understand why this should happen in the early morning, but I assume the temporal expression really applies to the soma pressing of the first hemistich, presumably the Morning Pressing.

The *śátru-* is also a preoccupation in the next two vss., 6–7.

X.42.6: The balanced reciprocity expressed by grammar in the immediately preceding vs. (5a and c) is also found here, in the two relative clauses of the 1st hemistich—with the locative #*yásmín* ... *índre*# of pāda a corresponding to loc. *asmé*# at the end of b. Both pādas contain a verb of setting that governs the locative, with the subject being the other member of the pair of opposites: “we” in *dadhimā* (a) versus Indra (*maghāvā*) in *śísṛāya* (b). The use of two different verbal roots keeps the balanced expression from giving too pat an impression.

In b in the publ. tr. I assigned the *kāma-* to Indra (“his desire”), thoughtlessly flg. Ge (“seinen Wunsch”), though there is no overt expression of possession. (Kü [526] neutrally “den Wunsch.”) I now think that the *kāma-* may be ours, the reward for our praise – or, at least, that it is ambiguous or meant to be read in two senses. The same expression, *kāmam* $\sqrt{\text{sri}}$ (PF), is found in the next hymn attributed to the same poet, with 1st sg. *śísṛaya* and Indra in the loc. (*tve*). There

the desire is mine—that is, it belongs to the subject. This parallel cuts both ways: on the one hand, if the coincidence between the subject of the verb and the owner of the wish is the important thing, interpreting it as Indra’s wish in our passage would be correct. On the other, if the human 1st person’s ownership of the wish is crucial, then it should be our wish in this passage as well. If the ambiguity is deliberate, we can interpret it to mean that Indra sets his desire for further praise in us, while at the same time we set our desire for the reward for our praise in him. I would now slightly alter the tr. to “fixed (his/our) desire in us.”

In d Ge takes *jánya-* as referring to other people (“die Herrlichkeit anderer Leute”), a sense ascribed to the stem already by Gr (meaning 2). This seems reasonable (or at least arguable) in context: the poet first hopes (pāda c) that Indra’s rival will take flight, and then that the *dyumná-* of the poet’s enemies should fall to Indra (who might redistribute them to the poet and his people?). But as discussed ad IV.55.5, all clear cases of *jánya-* refer to *our* people. On the other hand, a certain no. of the occurrences of pl. *dyumná-* are found in passages where “we” wish to wrest away, or otherwise take possession, of *dyumná-* belonging to others. Cf., e.g., IV.4.6, 9 (the latter cited by Ge n. 6d) and IX.61.11 *enā́ víśvāny aryá ā́, dyumnā́ni mānuṣāṇām / sísāsanto vanāmahe* “Seeking to gain all the brilliant things of humans (/sons of Manu) from the stranger, with it [=soma] we shall win them.” Although I don’t think I want to go as far as Ge in rendering *jánya-* here as “other people’s,” I think it may here define the *dyumná-* as belonging in the first instance to humans rather than gods, which latter might be the default interpr., given the etymology of *dyumná-*. This may be conveyed in part by *mānuṣāṇām* of IX.61.11. But *jánya-* may also have a more narrow interpr., referring to the people with whom we might have rivalrous relationships, fighting over the same goods and bragging rights—the larger Ārya community—rather than people beyond the pale, as it were. The same *mānuṣāṇām* of IX.61.11 with this more specific sense “sons of Manu” singles out the Āryas as members of the group that follows the ritual practices stemming from Manu. See also VI.19.6, also with *mānuṣa-*: *víśvā dyumnā́ vṛṣṇyā mānuṣāṇām, asmábhyaṃ dāḥ ...* “All things brilliant and bullish that belong to the sons of Manu -- give them to us,” which may envisage Indra as the redistributor of goods belonging to our rivalrous co-religionists.

X.42.7: The rival, who was already far away in the previous vs. (6c *ārāc cit sán ... śátruḥ*), now needs to be thrust away (7a *ārāc chátum ápa bādhasva ...*), which seems narratively reversed.

Pāda b is syntactically interesting, as containing an embedded nominal relative cl., resumed by the anaphoric pronoun of the main clause referring to the subject of the rel. cl.: ... *ápa bādhasva ..., ugró yáḥ śámbaḥ ... téna*. Here the *téna* is to be construed with the impv. *ápa bādhasva* “thrust away with that,” and the preceding rel. specifies what *téna* refers to. As I’ve discussed elsewhere (“Proto-proto Izafe,” Fs. Hale), such nominal clauses are exceptions to the ban on (or disfavoring of) relative-clause embedding in Vedic. But this example is esp. striking because it is a reverse izafe: the anaphor follows the relative. In function the relative clause here contains the hapax *śámba-* and seems designed to formally introduce this unfamiliar word. The construction is so unusual that it cannot be rendered both literally and intelligibly (“Thrust the rival far away – what is the mighty śamba-pole of yours, with that”).

Although the noun *śámba-* is found only here, the *-ín-*stem *śambín-* occurs in the AV (AVŚ IX.2.6 = AVP XVI.76.5), in a passage that helpfully limits the sense to a pole or long stick: AVŚ IX.2.6 ... *prá nude sapátnām chambīva nāvam udakéṣu ...* “I thrust forth my rivals as a man with a pole (does) a boat in the waters.” On Pāṇ. *śambā́ √ kr*, see KH (Aufs. 315) and for the word in general EWA s.v.

On *kṛdhī dhīyam ... vājaratnām* see VI.35.1. *dhīyaḥ karasi vājaratnāḥ*.

X.42.8: The postponed referent of the rel. prn. (a: ... *yám* ..., b: ... *índram*##) matches and expands the construction in vs. 6a #*yásmin* ... *índre*##, where the prn and its referent were contained in a single pāda.

For *vṛṣa-savá-* Ge (n. 8a) compares III.42.7, VI.44.20 with *vṛṣabhiḥ sutá-* “pressed by bulls” (probably the pressing stones, in my view). But I see no reason to introduce an agentive reading for the 1st member of the compound here. Instead it seems to me to contain the intensifying *vṛṣa-* ‘bullish’, often found as compd 1st member and often rendered by Gr (etc.) as “stark, männlich.”

Gr considers the *ánta-* ‘end(s)’ of soma to be the dregs or sediment (Bodensatz), but Ge cites VI.43.2, which has not only *tīvrá-* soma, but also its middle and end. He suggests, persuasively, that this refers to the three soma-pressings. The first pressing produces the sharp (*tīvrá-*) juice, which presumably mellows over the day (esp. at the 3rd pressing, where at least in later śrauta ritual it is made of re-pressed stalks). Here presumably *bahulánta-* suggests that the supplies remain ample even at the end of the ritual day, or, if we take *bahulá-* to mean ‘thick’ (as Gr does in some passage), that the soma has thickened over the course of the day. But this seems less likely.

X.42.9: The controlling image in this vs. is the dice game, and the interpr. is therefore hampered by our incomplete understanding of the terminology. A similar vs. is found in the next hymn (X.43.5). The passage is tr. by Falk (Würfelspiel 127, 183 [slightly differently]) and is discussed at length by Scar (698–700, with regard to *prahā-*). On the basis of AVŚ IV.38.3 Scar argues plausibly that *prahām* should be construed with *jayāti*, not with *atidīvyā* (contra Ge, Falk, though with Lü, Wurf. 44 [see Ge n. 9] and Wh [AVŚ VII.50.6]). He provides several different possible interpr. of the root noun, of which I find the most convincing the stakes / pool / kitty “left in front” (*pra √ hā*), which the gamblers play each other to win. See my disc. of *prahāvant-* ad IV.20.8.

The lexeme *āti √ dīv* in the gerund *atidīvyā* is found only here and in the parallel vs. AVŚ VII.50.6, which has the variant *átidīvā* (Wh “superior player”). (Note that this AV variant without gerund [if it is correctly transmitted] would also support construing *prahām* with *jayāti*; unfortunately there is no AVP parallel.) I take it to mean ‘overplay’ in the sense “go for broke” – that is, play excessively and daringly. (This lexeme might be compared to *ati √ prach* ‘ask beyond / over-ask’ in the famous exchange between Yājñavalkya and Gārgī in BĀUp III.6, where Y. warns G. about the dire consequences [=shattered head] of over-asking.) I take the subj. to be the poet (more or less with Ge, n. 9 “Opferer”), taking bold verbal chances to attract Indra’s attention. In this case the extremity of his action pays off.

The expression in pāda b, *kṛtām ví √ ci*, also belongs to dicing vocabulary and has a number of parallels in the RV (I.132.1, V.60.1, IX.97.58, X.43.5, X.102.2; see Falk 126–27 for this VP). It is clear that its overall sense is ‘win’, but the mechanism of that win is of course obscured by our ignorance of the minutiae of the game. Assuming the general correctness of the current understanding of the play – pulling out handfuls of nuts that are ideally divisible by 4 – I take the verbal lexeme as containing *√ ci* ‘pile’, and with *ví* to mean ‘pile apart’, which is similar but not identical to Falk’s “Abtrennen von Vierereinheiten vom *gláha* [the mass of nuts the player has pulled out],” with the gloss ‘fertig abtrennen, ohne Rest den *gláha* zerlegen’. Acldg. to Falk (pp. 116–17), *kṛtā-* refers to a group of 4 nuts (the best result). In order to avoid the

bewilderment that a more technically accurate tr. would occasion, I render the VP as “pull out [*vī* √ *cī*] the perfect [*kr̥tām*] (hand of dice).”

śvaghnín- lit. ‘dog-killer’ (even more lit. ‘having the dog-killing X’) is a slang term for the winner at dice. I tr. “having the best throws,” again in order to provide some interpretable analog in modern discourse. (Falk, 100–101, seems to make heavier weather of the derivation of this term than seems necessary.)

In c *yó devākāmaḥ* must be a nominal relative clause complete in itself, since *ruṇaddhi* is not accented. The lack of resumptive pronoun *sá* is not surprising, and the position of the *ná* is appropriate if the main clause begins there. This clausal division is supported by the two parallels I.102.10 *tvám jigeṭha ná dhánā rurodhitha* and X.34.12 *tásmai kṛṇomi ná dhánā ruṇadhmi*, in both of which the clause begins after the caesura, preceded by an independent clause (ending in an unaccented finite verb).

In our passage I take the main clause “he does not withhold the stakes” to mean what I take *atidīvyā* to mean in pāda a, namely that the poet has gone all out; he has not pulled any punches, has pushed his poetic skills to the limit. The two parallels just cited mean something slightly different and different from each other. In X.34.12 I (with most interpr., but contra Falk; see comm. ad loc.) think that the defeated gambler demonstrates by his empty hands that he has no more funds to stake. It is in this way that he holds nothing back. In I.102.10 after Indra is victorious he does not withhold the prizes won, but redistributes them to his clients – a different sense of “holds nothing back” – but both senses are available to the English expression as well.

In d the audacious chances the poet took are rewarded.

X.42.10: In pāda b the affliction to be overcome, hunger (*kṣúdh-*), is combatted with an appropriate remedy, barley (*yáva-*). The connection between affliction and remedy is not so clear in pāda a: how is *ámati-* (here rendered ‘neglect’) to be helped by cows? Here the solution lies in what kind of neglect is meant. The word *ámati-* lit. means ‘without having thought, without having [=receiving] attention’, for which ‘neglect’ is a reasonable single-word substitute. But it often seems to indicate the *physical* results of neglect or lack of attention. It is paired with *kṣúdh-* ‘hunger’ also in VIII.66.14 as well as in the next hymn X.43.3. It appears to refer to a physical state also in X.33.2, where it is paired with *nagnātā jásuḥ* “nakedness and exhaustion.” In I.53.4 it is checked by cows, as here, and by my interpr. of the difficult vs. III.53.15 a notional cow banishes *ámati-*. Hunger and the physical results of neglect can be countered by cows or rather their nourishing products, and that seems to be the sense here. See also X.39.6.

Although the instr.s in ab (*góbhiḥ ... yávena*) are clearly instruments, the function of those in cd (*rājabhiḥ ... asmākena vṛjānenā* “with our kings and our community”) is not clear: are they instr. of accompaniment “along with ... might we win” (that is, the kings and community share in the good fortune) or true instrument instrumentals (that is, we achieve the win by virtue of them)?

Note that *dhána-* is repeated from vs. 9.

In c *prathamā* is ambiguous. The Pp. reads as *-āḥ*, modifying the subject of *jayema* (so also Old, Ge, and the publ. tr.), but Gr as neut. pl. *-ā* with *dhánāni*. Either is possible and not much rides on it.

X.42.11: I take *bṛhaspátih* in pāda a as an epithet of Indra, and promote *índrah* from c to a (against Ge, who gives each a separate clause). HPS (B+I 80–81) also argues that it is an epithet or identification of Indra in this vs. and points out that no other god is mentioned in the hymn.

(His dismissal [p. 81 n. 19] of *bhágam* in vs. 3 is rather cursory, however.) Although it is not unusual for the final vs. of a hymn to name more gods than featured in the body of the hymn, Schmidt's other arg. (p. 80 and n. 18), that parallels to the protector-from-all-sides trope have a single god as subject, is stronger.

Contra Ge (and HPS) I take c with ab and keep d separate (implicitly also Klein DGRV I.343). Both Ge and HPS seem to take the ablatives in c as the source of the *váriveraḥ* made in d – e.g., HPS (80) “Indra soll uns von vorn und von der Mitte ... Weite schaffen.” I know of no parallels for making *váriveraḥ* out of something. Moreover, if the ablatives of c are not construed with ab, the protective shield is incomplete; in particular the crucial direction “in front” is missing.

X.43 Indra

On the different deployment of similar verbal elements between X.42 and X.43, see the publ. intro. to X.43.

X.43.2: On the reciprocal expressions involving LOC *kāmam* √ *śri* in these two hymns, see comm. ad X.42.6.

On *sadaḥ* as having impv. value, see comm. ad IX.2.2.

I take *asmín* ... *sóme* as a nominal loc. absol., though this is probably not nec.

On *avapāna-* see comm. ad VII.98.1. As disc. there, there is no verbal lexeme *áva* √ *pā*, but the noun *avapāna-* occurs 5x in the RV. In three of these it refers to a drinking hole frequented by wild beasts. In I.136.4 (the only pl.) it can just mean ‘drink(s)’, but I tr. it there as “drinking places”, and I think something like that should be at issue here, given the very limited attestation of the noun and its associated lexeme. Perhaps the idea is that we should provide the equivalent of a watering hole for Indra, perhaps an ample receptacle for soma or a suitable place to drink it; cf. the use of “watering hole” to mean a bar in modern English. I would therefore slightly change the tr. to “let there be a drinking place for you.”

X.43.3: The root noun cmpd. *viṣūvīt-* must belong to the root √ *vr* ‘obstruct, ward off’, despite the homonymous stem based on √ *vr* ‘turn’ in II.40.3. See Scar 507 and 511–12 respectively.

The pair *āmati-* *kṣúdh-* is also found in the previous hymn, X.42.10.

X.43.3–4: As Old notes, there's a pun on *várayaḥ* in these two vss., with 3d containing the neut. *s-* stem ‘vitality’ and 4a the nom. pl. to *vi-* ‘bird’.

X.43.4–8: Just as X.42.5–8 defines a small internal ring, so too in this hymn we find some evidence of an internal ring, with 4d *vidát svār mánave jyótir āryam* echoed by 8d *āvindaj jyótir mánave havíṣmate*. But the material in between is even more various than in X.42, and I hesitate even to call attention to this possible structure. However, it is the case that the immediately following vs., 9, abruptly shifts focus from Indra to (unnamed) Agni, and vs. 9 is the real final vs. of the hymn, since 10–11 are shared with X.42. So the echo of vs. 4 that is found in 8 may close out the Indra hymn proper, in preparation for the ritual vs. that follows. This suggestion is supported by the fact that “sun-finding” is also found in vs. 1 (pāda a), and so the whole Indra portion would be marked by a ring structure.

X.43.4: The VP *vidát svâr* resonates not only with 8d, as just noted, but also with 1a, where our thoughts are *svâr-víd-*. Here it is the soma drops, so that both the verbal and the physical parts of the sacrifice are sun-finding.

The appearance of *Manu* – and the consequent switch to mythological time – is surprising, since heretofore the focus has been on the ritual here-and-now and *Indra*’s appearance there, a temporal frame to which we return in the next vs. The (aor.) injunc. *vidát* facilitates this balance between ritual present and mythological past. The reprise at the end of the ring, 8d, contains by contrast an augmented imperfect, *ávin-dat*, which situates the action fully in the past.

Although Gr does not register a lexeme *prá √ dyut* and it is not found elsewhere in Vedic till ŚB, it is difficult to do anything with *prá* in c but construe it with the intens. part. *dávidyutat*. (VB does list this passage as a lexeme, the sole entry under *pra √ dyut* in the Veda vol.) Certainly other verbs of shining / lighting up take *prá* (e.g., *√ruc*). Although *prá* would be in tmesis with a participle, not a finite verb, this is hardly unknown.

X.43.5: The first pāda, with its technical dicing phraseology, is almost exactly X.42.9; see disc. there. Unlike that vs., however, I think *Indra* is the subject of *ví cinotí*, not the poet.

On *saṃvárga-* see comm. ad VIII.75.12, X.61.17.

The VP *sūryam jāyat* “wins the sun” matches semantically, but not lexically, *vidát svāḥ* in the previous vs., 4d. The verb is also an injunctive (though to a present stem this time), and at least in my interpr. has a present-time sense.

X.43.6: On the stem *asāya-* see comm. ad VI.33.2; the stem is found with *pári* as here also in I.34.7. Though in both I.34.7 and VI.33.2 the verb is active, a 3rd sg. mid. *asāyata*, matching the one here, is found in X.92.1. In nearby X.40.6 the related verb *nasāyathaḥ* takes *vísah* as goal/object, as here. See comm. ad loc.

On *dhénā-* see comm. ad I.2.3, 101.10, and V.30.9. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think this portion of the hymn has to do with the forward progress of the *Ārya* through desirable territory, under *Indra*’s watchful protection. In pāda a he encircles the clans perhaps to safeguard them (but see below), while in b he watches over the nourishing streams that the *Ārya* are conquering. The sense of geographical space as defined by these streams may be found in the similar passage VIII.32.22 *ihí tistráḥ parāváta, ihí páñca jánāṃ áti / dhénā indrāvacākaśat* “Pass through the three distant realms; pass over the five peoples, / keeping watch over the nourishing streams, o *Indra*.” Note the pl. *jána-* there as here. In VIII.32.22 *Indra* is urged to come to our soma sacrifice rather than someone else’s, and this involves traveling across a good deal of territory. It is possible in that passage that *áva √ cakṣ* would be better rendered literally, as “looking down upon the streams” from the air, as he passes over a series of them. The *dhénāḥ* could also refer to the inviting streams of soma that *Indra* is keeping an eye out for. And both these interpr. can work here as well. In that case, the āmreḍita *vísam-vísam* in pāda a might refer less to *Indra*’s protective embrace than to his passing over or circling around other clans to reach ours – where *Indra* will rejoice in our pressing (cd). Competitive soma sacrifices are also at issue in VIII.32.22.

śakráḥ in c picks up *śakat* in 5c.

The finale of the verse seems to sketch an infinite loop of beneficial streams. The successful soma presser pleases *Indra* with his streams of soma, which enables this same man to vanquish his foes in battle, allowing him (and his fellows) to conquer more territory containing nourishing rivers, streams of water.

X.43.7: The relationship between streams of soma and streams of water (=rivers) suggested in vs. 6 is reinforced in the first hemistich of this vs. by the similes that bookend the two pādas. The cause-and-effect between water and food is laid out in d, where the rain makes the barley grow. Barley (*yáva-*) returns from X.42.10, where it overcame hunger.

dānu- is ambiguous between ‘gifts’ and ‘drops’, and both fit here; indeed the gift *is* the drop, namely rain.

X.43.8: It is not clear to me why Indra should be “like an *angry* bull,” per the publ. tr., and I now think a tr. of *kruddhá-* as ‘raging’ (as in JPB’s V.15.3 *siṃhām ná kruddhām* “like a raging lion”) better conveys the unbridled behavior of a powerful animal. Note that Indra is a “tempestuous bull” (*vṛṣabhāsya śuṣmīṇaḥ*) in vs. 3.

Ge (n. 8b) suggests that the *aryá-* who becomes the husband of the waters (*aryá-patnīḥ ... apāḥ*) is Indra. This is most likely true: Indra leads the people in the conquest of the new land defined by rivers. But I think another sense is also latent: the land is being Aryanized by the conquest of rivers, and so the people (*jána-*) of the Ārya collectively become the husband(s) of the waters – though we might expect **ārya-patnī-*, with the vṛddhi deriv. as 1st member.

In c *jīrā-dānu-* incorporates the same pun as *dānu-* in 7d. Here the “drops” would presumably be soma, thus continuing the identification of soma with the life-giving waters of rivers and rain.

On pāda d see disc. above ad vss. 4–8 and on *āvindat* above ad vs. 4.

X.43.9: On this vs. as being outside the rings formed by 1–8 and 4–8, see above ad vss. 4–8.

As Ge (n. 9) points out (flg. Ludwig), the subject of this vs. must be the ritual fire, often compared to an axe (see, e.g., comm. ad IX.67.30). The hortatory impvs. *új jāyatām* (a), *vī rocatām* (c) mark the kindling of the fire in preparation for the ritual day.

As Ge notes (n. 9b), *ṛtāsya sudúghā* recalls VII.43.4 *ṛtāsya dhārāḥ sudúghā dúhānāḥ*. However, in VII.43.4 the Saṃhitā reading *sudúghā* represents acc. pl. *sudúghāḥ*, which is the obj. of *dúhānāḥ*, whereas here *sudúghā* is nom. sg. In VII.43.4 I take “the good milkers, the streams of truth” to be the hymns that the gods milk for themselves (from the poets). This is in general agreement with Ge (n. 4b). Here, though he cross-references VII.43.4, Ge identifies the *sudúghā* rather as the Schmalzlöffel. I do not see why. It can easily be, once again, the praise hymn recited as the fire is kindled. Or, perhaps, the stream of ghee that will cause the fire to flare up and shine out.

The second hemistich with its focus on the blazing fire compared to the sun is a culmination of the sun-finding theme found in vss. 1, 4, and (slightly disguised) 8; it turns out that the “sun” is in fact the ritual fire.

This hemistich also contains an echo of Svarbhānu, in the phrase *bhānúnā ... svār ná*, split between two clauses (in my tr. and Ge’s). Recall that, by my analysis (Hyenas), Svarbhānu is an epithet of Agni.

This hemistich also provides a sustained ex. of sibilant alliteration: ... *śúcīḥ, svār ná śukráṃ śusúcīta sátpatīḥ*, with three of the words also an etymological figure (*śúcīḥ ... śukráṃ śusúcīta*).

X.43.10–11: For these repeated vss. see comm. ad X.42.10, 11.

X.44 Indra

X.44.1: The stem *svápati-* occurs three times in the RV, all in X (here, and X.27.8, 31.4). Gr glosses ‘sein eigener Herr’, reasonably enough (sim. AiG II.1.264 ‘eigener Herr’). Other *svá-* cmpds. have the sense ‘(having) self/own-X’, and the well-attested stem *sva-rāj-* ‘independent king’ (lit. ‘ruling by oneself’?; see Scar 450 for disc. of the possibilities) is a superficially good parallel. We might then gloss *svá-pati* similarly as ‘independent lord’, via ‘lord of himself’ or ‘lord by his own (power)’? However, it should be noted that all other *svá-* cmpds in the RV are adjectives (generally bahuvr. like *svá-yaśas-* ‘having one’s own glory, self-glorious’), including probably *sva-rāj-* originally, and so there are in fact no direct parallels to the noun *svá-pati-*. And, though Scar also gives *svápati-* as a virtual synonym (“gleichbedeutend”) of *svarāj-*, in context *svá-pati-* is not as clear as we might hope: the referent of *svá-* is not necessarily the *-pati-* himself.

Clearest is X.27.8 (if anything in that devilish hymn is clear), which depicts cows straying and following false / other cowherds (in my interpr.; see comm. ad loc.). In the final pāda the question is asked *kíyad āsu svápatís chandāyate*, in my tr. “For how long will their own lord find pleasure in them [=cows]?” with the referent of *svápati-* being Indra. In this passage the most natural interpr. of *svápati-* is not ‘his own lord, lord of himself’, but rather ‘their own lord’, referring to the cows. Although Ge’s interpr. of the larger context is different from mine, he tr. sim. “ihr Eigentümer.” There are (at least) two plausible ways in which *svá-* could have acquired this unexpected sense in this cmpd, and both may have contributed. On the one hand, *svá-* in this cmpd may not have the adj. sense ‘self/own’ but rather be based on the nominalized neut. *svám* ‘own property’, which is marginally attested in the RV (see VI.28.2 *ná svám muṣāyati* “he [=Indra] does not steal the own property [of the sacrificer]”). An analysis of *svá-* as ‘own property’ in this cmpd seems to underlie Thieme’s (Fremdling, p. 12) “der Herr des Eigentums” (master of the property) in X.27.8. Since the “own property” here is in fact the cows, it is not difficult to reinterpret the referent of *svá-* as the cows themselves: “lord of the property of/in cows” = “lord of the cows” → “the cows’ own lord.” The other contributor may be the fact that differently accented *svapati-* is a bahuvrīhi, found once in the AV: AVŚ VIII.6.16 *yá imāṁ samvívṛtsaty, āpatih svapatīm strīyam*. “... whoever, not (her) husband, tries to embrace (?) this woman who has her own husband” (=AVP XVI.80.7, with *svapatīm*). Here, once again, the *sva-* is not coreferential with *-pati-*, but refers to the woman. (The use of *-pati-* not *-patnī-* in this fem. bahuvrīhi is noteworthy [see AiG II.1.90 with Nachtr.]; I would attribute it to the desire to match immediately preceding *āpati-* in this polarized expression.) This split reference, with *sva-* not coreferential with *-pati-*, might help enable split ref. in our non-bahuvrīhi.

The other two RVic occurrences of *svápati-* are harder to interpr. or, rather, less contextually defined and more amenable to a variety of interpr. In X.31.4 the referent of the whole cmpd. is Agni (or rather, he is the most likely referent of the pāda; see comm. ad loc.). He is also identified there as *nítyah ... dāmūnāḥ* ‘constant / one’s own ... master of the house / domestic leader’. The default interpr. of *svápati-* as ‘self-lord, lord of himself’ could work here: Agni functions independently; at least once (I.36.7) he is called *svarāj-* and is frequently characterized as *svadhāvant-* ‘possessing autonomous power’. On the other hand, Ge tr. *nítyah ... svápatiḥ* as “Der ständige Eigentümer (owner)” without comment; such a tr. might point to an interpr. of *svá-* as ‘(own) goods’, as discussed above. And this is certainly possible: Agni often holds sway over material goods; such goods could be his own or those of the household. And finally Re (EVP XVI.129) remarks that *nítya* reinforces *sva* in *svápati-*. I find this an appealing

suggestion, though it requires a small detour through *nītya-*. This adj. can mean both ‘regular, constant’ and ‘one’s own, own proper’; the former is generally the sense continued in later Sanskrit, but the latter is quite common in the RV, esp. used of relatives and friends. See, e.g., nearby X.39.14 *nītyam ná sūnúm tánayam* “our own son who continues our lineage.” Since each household has its own fire, *nītya-* ‘own proper’ is an appropriate modifier of this household fire. If Agni in X.31.4 is “our (own) proper” (*nītya-*), he can also be “the lord of ourselves / our own lord” (*svá-pati-*), and this interpr. is what is reflected in the publ. tr. – though see the revisions to the whole vs. in comm. ad loc.

Finally, the occurrence of *svápati-* in our vs. Here the various alternative possibilities for the interpr. of this cmpd. are unrestrained by context. The referent is Indra. He can be ‘self-lord, lord of himself’ just as he is often *svarāj-* and operates with and possesses *svadhā-*. Certainly his control of all sorts of power is emphasized in the vs. But he could be ‘lord of goods/possessions’, since his power over material goods is constantly on the poets’ minds. And, finally, he can be ‘(our) own lord’, whom we are urging to come to our soma sacrifice. This last alternative underlies the publ. tr., but I would not now rule out either of the other two. Indeed all three may be meant simultaneously.

In bc Indra’s power and energy are expressed by three etymologically independent words beginning *tu/v*: *tūtujānās túviṣmān / pratvakṣāṇāḥ*.

The sense of *dhármaṇā* is, as often, hard to pin down, but it needs to be evaluated in conjunction with the same word in 5d. I tr. it here as “according to his own principle,” which is shorthand for something like “his foundational essence,” the qualities and acts that define Indra. Indra is in a way the quintessence of power, which is his *dhárman-*, his “foundation.” And his actions projecting this power, as described in bcd, are done according to this foundational principle.

The *vísavā sáhāṃsi* over/beyond which Indra projects his vigor are presumably those of others.

X.44.2: The parallelism of the two *su-* cmpds in pāda a (*suṣthāmā ... suyámā*), echoed by *supáthā* in c, is broken by my tr. “provides a good standing place ... easy to control,” but attempts to produce parallel tr. came out stilted.

X.44.3: This vs. recycles some previous material. Perhaps most obvious is the adj. *prátvakṣasam* beginning c, which matches the part. *pratvakṣāṇāḥ* beginning 1c. Otherwise, *nṛpátim* in a echoes *svápatiḥ* in 1a (though in a slightly different metrical position) and matches *nṛpate* in 2b; *vájrabāhum* recalls the clause in 2b *mimyaḥkṣa vājraḥ ... gābhastau* “your mace is attached to your fist”; *taviṣāsaḥ*, used of his horses in b, is etymologically related to *túviṣmān* modifying Indra in 1b, and *sadhamādaḥ* (d) echoes *mádāya* (1a); Indra as bull (*vṛṣabhám*) in c recalls his bullishness (*vṛṣnyena*) in 1d. There are also the vs.-internal echoes *indravāhaḥ* (a) ... *vahantu* (d) and *ugrám ugrāsaḥ* (b).

The sole finite verb in the vs., *vahantu*, is postponed till the last word, while its etymological-twin subject *indravāhaḥ* is the first full word; in between is an alternating sequence of nom. pls. and acc. sgs. that further specify the two parts of the cmpd. *-vāh-* and *indra-* respectively. The publ. tr. dampens this poetic effect by inserting two extra copies of the verb “let ... (them) convey,” in pādas a and b. These should, at the least, be put in parens.

X.44.4: The poet plays a few tricks on his audience in this vs., in part arising from the repeated material noted in the comm. to vs. 3. The first is the use of *pátim* in pāda a: since Indra was identified as some variety of *-pāti-* in each of the first three vss., our expectation, on encountering *pátim* as the 2nd word in this vs., would naturally be that its referent is Indra as well. The next two acc. sgs., the hapax *dronasācam* ‘companion of the cup, accompanying the cup’ and *sācetasam* ‘like-minded’ do not rule out this interpr.: the first is liable to various interpr. and the second is used once of Indra (I.61.10). But the beginning of b, *ūrjā skambhām* “the prop of nourishment,” would begin to call our identification into question, and the 2nd sg. verb *ā vṛṣāyase*, which should have Indra as subj., pretty much demolishes this hypothesis and forces us to produce another referent, namely soma.

The verb itself is ambiguous. The denom. stem *vṛṣāyā-* generally means ‘act the bull’; in this sense it is entirely medial, and the voice of our occurrence thus conforms. Indra is often the subject, and he is the likely subject here, and his association with bulls and bullishness is already prominent in the first part of the hymn (1d, 3c). However, several factors complicate this picture: the other occurrences of this stem do not take the acc., but most of the first hemistich here consists of an acc. phrase. And none of the denom. forms appear with the preverb *ā*. There is another, less well-attested stem *vṛṣāya-*, belonging to the root *√ vṛṣ* ‘rain’, attested once in as an act. trans. *vṛṣāya* ‘make rain’ (X.98.1) and quite possibly in the middle in the meaning ‘rain’ in IX.71.3 (so Gr, Lub; I actually consider it a pun, like the similar form here [see below]). Perhaps more to the point, the zero-grade thematic stem *vṛṣa-* (6th cl. pres.? or them. aor.? – see Kü 474–77 [aor.]; Hill, Aor.-Präs 226–29 [pres.]) is also exclusively middle (mostly 2nd sg. impv. *vṛṣasva*) and exclusively found with the preverb *ā*. Although Kü argues that this stem belongs with the dominant *vṛṣāyā-* stem and means ‘sich erheben, sich ermannen’ (see also Baum, Impv. 130, ‘take courage’), Hill points out that it is almost always found in soma-drinking contexts; he assigns it to *√ varṣ* ‘schütten’ (= *√ vṛṣ* ‘rain’). Moreover, it can take an acc. (but only III.60.5) or gen. (regularly, e.g., X.116.1, 4) complement referring to soma, and several times also appears with the loc. *jaṭhāre* ‘in the belly’, as the destination for the soma (I.104.9, X.96.13). Such complements are not compatible with the ‘take courage’ interpr., as far as I can see. The preponderance of evidence thus favors a connection with *√ vṛṣ* ‘rain, pour’, with soma metaphorically standing for rain. Taking account of the middle voice and the *ā*, I tr. ‘drench yourself (in [liquid])’. The *ā vṛṣāyase* in our passage tracks *ā vṛṣasva* closely, with the acc. phrase referring to the soma (see above). The VP also contains the loc. *dharúṇe*, which can be parallel in function to *jaṭhāre* in the *ā vṛṣasva* passages. Ge (n. 4b), flg. Sāy., suggests it means “die Grundlage in Indra, d.h. sein Bauch”; see also Scar (590 and n. 837). I now find this interpr. of *dharúṇe* appealing, against my colorless “upon its support,” and would now slightly emend the tr. to “drench yourself in the lord ..., (pour it) into your ‘support’.” I have argued for a similar usage for the abstract *dhāman-* ‘foundation, fundament’, transferred to a body part, in VIII.92.24 (Vedic Body Parts, 81–83), also in soma-drinking context. See comm. ad loc.

To sum up, I consider *ā vṛṣāyase* here to have a double meaning and a double stem affiliation: on the one hand, it belongs with other forms of *vṛṣāyate* meaning ‘acts the bull’, a sense supported by the other occurrences of bull words in the preceding vss. But more dominant is the sense ‘drench yourself, rain/pour into your self’, parallel to *ā vṛṣasva* belonging to *√ vṛṣ* ‘rain’. To bring out the double sense I would slightly alter the tr. to “you act the bull / drench yourself ...”

Note the phonological echo in (*drona*)*sācam sāce(tasam)*; *drona-* and *dharúṇa* also respond to each other.

The image of Indra's physical assimilation of soma is continued in pāda c with *ójaḥ kṛṣva*: “make it your might / make its might your own,” with the middle voice emphasizing the internalization of the soma and its power – as well as *sám grbhāya tvé ápi* “take it entirely within you.”

Despite some problems it seems capricious to separate *kenipá-* here from *ākenipá-* in IV.45.6 and the *āke-* in that cmpd from *āké* in II.1.10. For *āké* as ‘in der Nähe’ see Gr s.v. and AiG II.2.519 (contrasting with, e.g., *parāké* ‘in der Ferne’). The unverbated form is found in *ākenipá-* in IV.45.6, and our *kenipá-* appears to be the result of false segmentation of this cmpd. (see, e.g., AiG II.2.744). Although the sandhi context here, *áso yáthākenipānām* in continuous text (analyzed by Pp. as *yáthā kenipānām*), would technically allow an analysis *yáthā *ākenipānām* matching IV.45.6 *ākenipá-*, this is unlikely because of the caesura flg. *yathā*, as Old points out. Nonetheless some such ambiguous context probably set the stage for the false segmentation. Assuming that *nipá-* derives from *ní√pā* ‘protect’ (whatever the contribution of the preverb *nī*), note that that lexeme is found with contrastive locales in X.63.16 *sā no amā só áraṇe ní pātu* “Let it [= ‘well-being’ *svastí-*] keep guard over us at home and in a foreign place.” As to who “those who keep watch nearby” are, I suggest the patrons, although it could be some other group in the relevant Ārya community.

X.44.5: The first hemistich contains a pseudo figura etymologica, which is esp. clever because the figure is displaced: the two words belong to different clauses (separated by the pāda boundary), but the second, the noun, evokes its gapped twin as the object of the preceding verb. The relevant material is ... *ā hí śáṃsiṣam, svāśiṣam bhāram ā yāhi* ... The 1st sg. aor. *ā ... śáṃsiṣam*, to *√śams*, unusually lacks an overt object. It also unusually appears with the preverb *ā*, which is otherwise rare with this root in the RV. The verb is immediately followed, across the pāda boundary, by the bahuvrīhi *svāśiṣ-* ‘having good prayer(s)’, belonging to the root *√śās* and containing the root noun cmpd *āśiṣ-* ‘prayer’. The bahuvrīhi here modifies *bhāram* ‘offering, what is borne (forth)’: this physical offering is accompanied by good prayers. This NP is the goal of the impv. *ā yāhi*. The juxtaposition of the two clauses suggests that *ā ... śáṃsiṣam* gapped its original object, which can be recovered from the immediately following bahuvrīhi: *ā ... śáṃsiṣam *āśiṣam / āśiṣaḥ* “I have pronounced my prayer(s).” This would look phonologically like a figura etymologica, but it of course is not, since *√śams* and *√śās* are distinct roots. Their apparent etymological relationship is furthered by the use of the preverb *ā* with the verb, matching the preverb in the root noun. The publ. tr. assumes a more realized figure than the Skt. text presents: it should read “I have expressed (my prayer),” with parens. (Ge’s rendering of *ā ... śáṃsiṣam* “denn ich rechne darauf” doesn’t seem to fall within the usual semantic range of *√śams* and can, I think, be ignored.)

The odd English “your cups cannot be ventured against” would be better as “your cups are inviolable.”

X.44.6: Ge suggests that pāda a contains the image of a race; this seems reasonable, and the winning of fame that the invocations achieve for themselves (note the middle *ākṛṇvata*) fits the picture well. I assume that the separate *devāhūti-* originate from separate sacrificers at distinct sacrifices, though if so, how is it that they all seem to win fame?

In any case the second hemistich provides a contrasting picture of sacrificial failures, memorably expressed in the striking “not able to board the ship of sacrifice.” Interpretation of this hemistich is considerably hampered by the impossible (Old “hoffnungslos”) hapax *képayah*,

which presumably modifies or indeed is the plural subject of the 3rd pl. verbs in the two clauses, *śekūḥ* and *ny àviśanta*—and therefore presumably belongs to a stem *képi*-. I have no solution to this word. Gr's connection to \sqrt{kamp} 'tremble' (see also Whitney's [Roots], tentatively) with the gloss 'zitternd, zappelnd' founders on the phonology, not to mention the fact that the root \sqrt{kamp} is almost exclusively of late attestation (though see Gotō, 1st Cl. 110–12 for Kāṭhaka-Kap. attestations of the present stem); Kü (510) keeps the tr. ("die zappelnden (?)"), though presumably as a placeholder. No other suggestion (see Old ad loc., EWA s.v.) is at all compelling. I do think that, as often with impenetrable hapaxes, it was contextually generated, at least partially. First note that the problematic hapax *kenipānām*, discussed at length above, is only two vss. previous (4d), and our word here, *képayah*, shares with that preceding one an initial *ke* (/ké) and a *p*, which seems to begin what might as well be the root syllable. I find it hard to believe that there's not some felt connection between *kenipānām* and *képayah*, esp. since they are both isolated. Note also that two verses later (8b) the hemistich-final *kopayat* shares phonology with *képayah* (6d) in the same metrical slot. These observations get us no closer to a meaning, a morphological analysis, or an etymology, but they do situate the problematic word in a context that favors its shape. The publ. tr.'s "*non-protectors (?)" is not a serious attempt at any of the three issues just raised, but a mild suggestion that this word may be meant to be a negative contrastive play off the positive *kenipānām*.

X.44.7: Doubled and doubly accented *evaívá* occurs only here and in IV.54.5 as far as I can tell. In the latter passage it correlates with doubled (but singly accented) *yáthā-yathā*. In IV.54.5 the second accent of *evaívá* is secure, but here, as Old points out, the Saṃhitā text is ambiguous (*evaívāpāg*), and the second accent is dependent on the Pp analysis. The reason for the doubling in this vs. isn't clear to me; I doubt that it responds to the single *evā* in 4a; as shown below, in the rhetoric of this vs. it corresponds to *itthā*, which begins the 2nd hemistich, but that form isn't doubled.

Pāda b is 11 syllables and, courtesy of the final *āyuyujré*, has a Triṣṭubh cadence. Gr (also tentatively Arnold) suggests reading **āyuyujrīré*, which would fix the problem. However, Old sensibly rejects the emendation, esp. in this hymn of mixed Jagatī and Triṣṭubh vss. See comm. ad IX.70.1.

Ge (n. 7) suggests that this vs. continues the thought of vs. 6, esp. 6ab. This seems correct. The apparent racing motif of 6ab is made more literal by the badly yoked horses in 7b, which cause their owners to fall behind. Beyond this there is no consensus on who is being contrasted with who(m), because there is no consensus on the sense in context of the ambiguous paired words *āpare* and *ūpare* or *āpāk* and *prāk*, or whether the first pair are nom. pl. m. or loc. sg. Ge takes the first pair as (near) synonyms (später and künftig). Since this makes it difficult to get a stark contrast between 7ab and 7cd, he decides the contrast is instead between the previous generations, identified as *prathamāḥ* in 6a, and new generations, referred to by *āpare* and *ūpare* in 7a and c. While *āpāk* and *prāk* he takes as opposites (zurück- and voraus), referring to different outcomes of ritual invocations. The point, he thinks, is that just as in the past (6) the results of invocations of the gods were variable (successful in 6ab, not in 6cd), so also are they now (unsuccessful in 7ab, successful in 7cd). Old, focusing on *āpāk* and *prāk*, takes these as cardinal directions, west and east respectively; for him the vs. concerns only one group of people, who are currently (7cd) doing well and facing east (the region of light), but who, as evil-doers, should end up facing west (the region of darkness). It is not clear to me what he does with *dāvāne* in c, which should problematize his interpr. of the people in that pāda as malevolent. Kü (407) also

takes *ápāk* as ‘westlich’, but since he does not consider the 2nd half of the vs., it is not clear what contrasts he sees there.

Another problem for the interpr. is the lack of *syntactic* parallelism in the two halves, contrasting with the strict pairing of *lexical* items in pādas a and c. Lexically the two pādas line up exactly:

a:	<i>itthā</i>	<i>ápāk</i>	<i>ápare</i>	<i>santu</i>	<i>dūḍhyàḥ</i>
c:	<i>evaívā (yé)</i>	<i>prāk</i>	<i>úpare</i>	<i>sánti</i>	<i>dāvāne</i>

But syntactically the two half-verses are skewed: ab consists of a main clause (a) and a rel. cl. dependent on it (b), but cd is, at least superficially, entirely made of dependent clauses, signaled by *yé* in c and *yātra* in d. We should instead have expected **(té) prāk úpare *santi* to correspond with *ápāg ápare santu*. (Though note that 6c is also a relative clause; however, 6d is its corresponding main clause.) Old is troubled by the skewed syntax and considers several possibilities – including the one that I adopt, which he rejects.

Without sorting further through the various proposed interpr. of this vs., I will set out my choices: 1) I take *ápare* and *úpare* as nom. pl., not loc.; 2) I do not consider them synonyms (as Ge does), though there is overlap in part of their semantic ranges in other contexts; instead, they are here functional opposites: *ápara-* ‘behind’ and *úpara-* ‘nearer, close by’; 3) I do not take a and c as parallel single clauses, despite the superimposable line-up of the parallel words, but split c into two: a nominal relative cl. *yé prāk úpare* “(those) who are nearer and facing forward,” with the main clause beginning with *sánti*, hence its accent: “they are (ready) to give.” There is no generational split (in the Ge mode) between vss. 6 and 7; rather both vss. present us with the same picture, of ritualists (6ab, 7cd) and their unsuccessful rivals (6cd, 7ab). As for d, I think it’s a temporal/circumstantial rel. -- the good guys are ready to give when the ritual patterns etc. are in place -- i.e., at the sacrifice. Ge (n. 7d) takes *yātra* as standing for *yéṣām* and pāda d as concerning the Dakṣiṇā; his interpr. depends on a dubious (to me) interpr. of *váyunāni* as Rechtwege.

X.44.8: We now turn to the heroic deeds of Indra, expressed by an interesting series of tenses. The first deed, giving foundation to mountains and plains, is expressed with an augmented imperfect (*adhārayat* 8a)). The actions performed by Heaven (b) are in the injunctive (*krandat ... kopayat*), while Indra’s propping apart of Heaven and Earth (c), usually treated as another of Indra’s cosmogonic deeds, is in the present (*vī śkabhāyati*). I do not quite understand the present, unless it is a way to transition to the current ritual moment in d, where Indra himself recites (in the present *śamsati*). Or perhaps the separation of the two spaces is considered to be a daily action, since the disjunction between earth and heaven only becomes visually clear at dawn, every dawn. In any case the injunctives in b mediate between the imperfect of a and the present of c.

The depiction of Indra as performing like a poet/reciter at the sacrifice is striking; see Ge’s n. 8d for some parallels.

X.44.9: The hook or crook (*aṅkuśá-*) that the poet presents to Indra most likely stands for the hymn, as Ge points out (n. 9a), but the exact employment of this metaphorical implement requires discussion. The word appears 3x in the RV. In VIII.17.10 Indra is urged to use a long (*dīrghá-*) *aṅkuśá-* to hold out (*prayāchasi*) goods to the sacrificer. Although it is not clear from the passage how the long crook will enable Indra to hold out goods, the image must be a compressed one, which is illuminated by the use of the related word *aṅkín-* ‘having a

hook/crook’ in III.45.4. There Indra is urged to shake down goods for us as if shaking a tree for its fruit: the hook allows its user to get purchase on the branch: *vṛkṣām pakvām phālam aṅkīva dhūnuhīndra ... vāsu* “As a man with a crook shakes a tree for ripe fruit, o Indra, shake (us) goods ...” In VIII.17.10 the tree and the fruit and their shaking by means of the crook must be understood. A long *aṅkuśā-* and a tree branch (and the root \sqrt{yam}) are also found in X.134.6, which seems to contain the same image, this time with the mediation of a goat: *dīrghām hy aṅkuśām yathā śaktim bībharsī mantumaḥ / pūrveṇa maghavan padājo vayām yāthā yamaḥ* “Because you carry your ability like a long crook, you rich in counsel / as a goat (holds) a branch with its forefoot, you will hold (a branch? fruit? goods?) (with your ability/crook), o bounteous one.” In the 2nd half of the verse the crook must be understood in the instr. parallel to the goat’s forefoot, the instr. *padā*, with which the animal, on its hind legs, pulls the branch down and keeps it steady with its forefoot in order to eat the leaves and bark.

But in our passage, despite the presence of a hoof or hooves (*śaphārūj-*), it seems impossible to extract the tree branch / fruit / goat+forefoot image; instead Indra is aggressively wielding the *aṅkuśā-* against opponents identified as *śaphārūj-* ‘breaking (with) the hoof’(?). Indra uses the (metaphorical) *aṅkuśā-* to break or shatter them in turn, also with the root \sqrt{ruj} . This alternative use for the *aṅkuśā-* allows us to formulate a clearer picture of the tool. Since something like a shepherd’s crook ending in a semicircular hook would be an inefficient tool to use for breaking/shattering, the two uses of the *aṅkuśā-* in the RV suggest that the single tool incorporated two different devices (a sort of rudimentary Swiss Army knife), a hook and something suitable to use for breaking – a combination that exactly fits the Indian elephant goad, not coincidentally called an *aṅkuśa* (modern *aṅkus*, etc.). This stick-shaped device ends in a point, but has a hook protruding backwards from the handle right behind the pointed end. (See numerous images on the internet.) At least according to (quite possibly suspect) discussion in Wikipedia, there is archaeological evidence for these tools in the 2nd half of the 1st millennium BCE, and, judging from the many images on the web, the shape of the elephant goad has remained stable for the ensuing two and a half millennia, which might suggest that even prior to its emergence in the archaeological and visual record, its form was set. (On the *aṅkuśa-* see also Trautmann, *Elephants and Kings*, 65–76.) So here Indra must be goading / ramming / sticking the *śaphārūj-* with the end of the *aṅkuśā-*, while in the other two occurrences he is using the hooked part to grab and shake a tree branch. A nice example of textual confirmation of the visual form of a piece of physical realia. We do not have to suppose the device was specialized for elephants at this period; any goadable animal would do.

Let us now turn to the object of the goading / breaking in this passage. The root-noun compd. *śaphārūj-* is found once elsewhere in the RV, in X.87.12, where it qualifies a sorcerer (*yātudhāna-*) against whom Agni is urged to act. But neither of these passages allows us to narrow down what heinous action these enemies perform. Although the publ. tr. (indeed most tr.) render it as a root noun compd with ACC first member (‘hoof-breaker’), there are in fact a number of possibilities, laid out in some detail by Scar (460–61), who does not choose among them. The uncertainty of the meaning is tied up with a formal problem. The Pp analyzes the compd as *śapha-ārūjah* (likewise the form in X.87.12) (see also Gr s.v.), with the verbal lexeme \sqrt{ruj} , which is found elsewhere. The Pp also analyzes the opening of the pāda, *yēnārūjāsi*, as *yēna ārujāsi* with the same preverb-verb combination. But root noun compounds with a nominal 1st member, esp. with object function, and a preverb+verb root combination are rare to non-existent – PREVERB + ROOT formations are of course very common; NOUN + ROOT formations likewise—but the two types are not ordinarily combined. See Scar (649 and n. 921) and my 2020 Fs. Lamberterie

article (p. 486), where I argue that a preverb has been gapped by rule in precisely this type of underlying NOUN + PREVERB-ROOT formation. (See also my forthcoming article on the limits of Indo-Iranian compounding.) This fact about root noun cmpds makes the *-ā* in *śaphārúj-* a problem, one that already exercised Wackernagel (AiG II.1.213) about precisely this form. Obviously in order to avoid positing a preverb between the nominal 1st member and the root, Wackernagel divides the cmpd as *śaphā-rúj-* and hesitates between taking the *-ā* as an instr. ending (‘breaking with hooves’) or as due to compositional lengthening. Scar considers both those possibilities, as well as that *śaphā* could be a collective or a dual (both as objects of *-rúj-*). He does also consider the Pp. analysis, with the lexeme *ā√rúj-*, but with the proviso that *ārúj-* would have to have been deeply anchored in the poet’s Wortschatz to allow the violation of root noun cmpd norms. Scar does not say anything about the verb that governs the cmpd in our passage, which, as we’ve seen, is taken by the Pp as *ārújāsi*. If this analysis of the verb were secure it would strongly suggest that the preverb is also incorporated in the root noun cmpd contrary to usual practice. However, the sandhi context is ambiguous: *yénārújāsi* could just as well be cut *yénā rújāsi*, with the final lengthening of *yénā* that is far from rare (acdg. to Lub 21x, v. 98 *yéna*, but the numbers of *yénā* could well be higher, since his *yéna* list contains numerous examples in which the rel. is combined with a following vowel in sandhi).

I can claim no more certainty than Wackernagel or Scar, but given the general ban on NOUN-PREVERB-ROOT combinations in root noun cmpds., I think the Pp. analysis of the cmpd as containing *ā√rúj* is unlikely, and we must find another way to account for the long *ā*. I also think that the finite verb in the same pāda lacks the preverb. For the cmpd. I am at least open to the idea that *śaphā-* is an instr. and the cmpd means ‘breaking/shattering with a hoof / hooves’. The use of an animal body part as a weapon could associate the sorcerer with the bestial and the primitive (as in other vss. concerning the *yātudhāna-* in X.87 at any rate)—though I am perhaps too influenced by the Western Christian image of cloven-footed Satan. In our passage, since Indra is urged to use an (elephant) goad against the *śaphā-rúj-*, the enemies might again be considered animal-like (though not elephants obviously, since they don’t have hooves). In any case, as an alternative tr. I would consider and indeed favor “against those who break with their hooves.”

X.44.10–11: For these repeated vss. see comm. ad X.42.10, 11.

X.45–47: The first two hymns (45–46) are dedicated to Agni and attributed to the same poet, Vatsaprī Bhālandana. As Old argued (1888: 236 n. 2), the next one, X.47, dedicated to Indra, belongs here as well on the basis of structural considerations: the three appear between groups identified by the Anukramaṇī as trios and also share Triṣṭubh meter (though on X.46 see below), against the triads on each side with Jagatī. The Anukramaṇī names the poet of X.47 as Saptagu Āṅgīrasa, but this has simply been extracted from vs. 6, where the two halves of the supposed name are qualifiers of the god Bṛhaspati.

The poet of X.45–46, Vatsaprī Bhālananda, is also identified by the Anukramaṇī as the poet of the first of the trimeter hymns in Maṇḍala IX, IX.68. The last hemistich of IX.68 (10cd) is identical to that of X.45 (12cd). Old (1888: 253) explicitly associates IX.68 with the Xth Maṇḍala and, more narrowly, X.45. IX.68 is concerned with the double birth of Soma and hidden versus visible forms of the same god, and these themes are important in X.45 and X.46, esp. the former, which treats the triple births of Agni.

X.45 Agni

X.45.1: The three births of Agni. The ordinals *prathamám* ‘first’, *dvitīyam* ‘second’, and *trtīyam* ‘third’, distributed through the first three pādas mark this structure well, but note that there is syntactic variation. The first pāda begins with ABL + POSTPOS. (*divás pári*), with close sandhi; in the second the ordinal intervenes in the same syntactic construction (*asmát ... pári*); whereas in the third the location of the birth (*apsū*) substitutes for the source. In b the form of Agni is identified explicitly as Jātavedas; in c the ‘waters’ point to Apām Napāt. The heavenly source of the first birth, in pāda a, suggests Agni Vaiśvānara, the solar form of fire, and *vaiśvānarā-* appears in the last vs. of the hymn (12b), sketching an implied ring.

The second hemistich is structurally ambiguous; see Ge’s (n. 1cd) and Re’s extensive discussions. On the basis of pādas a and b, where Agni is in the nominative, we expect the third birth also to be couched in the nominative, with the verb *jajñe* in pāda a serving for both b and c. This expectation seems to be supported by nom. *ṛmanāḥ*, an epithet characteristic of gods (mostly Indra, however). Re in fact renders the pāda this way, ending the cl. before *ājasram* at the end of c: “une troisième fois (il est né) dans les eaux, (le dieu) qui pense en seigneur.” The *ājasram* must be an acc., object of the part. *īndhānaḥ* ‘kindling’ that begins d, and so the Agni reference must have shifted to the accusative before the end of c. However, it would be awkward to have a nominative and an accusative, adjacent to each other in the same pāda, both referring to Agni, with a clause break between them. This awkwardness is greatly increased by the near paraphrase of 1cd in 3ab *samudré tvā ṛmánā apsv àntāḥ, ... idhe ...* “In the sea, in the waters has the one with a manly mind kindled you,” where *ṛmánāḥ* must refer to a priest-figure, not Agni, who is unambiguously the acc. *tvā* – a paraphrase that gives Re pause. (As an aside, *ṛmánas-* also refers to a human ritualist in X.92.14, by my interpr.) It therefore seems best to follow Old and Ge in taking cd as a single clause, with an unsigned switch of Agni to the acc. throughout the hemistich and *ṛmánāḥ* qualifying the priestly subject of the participle and finite verb in d.

The verb of d, *jarate*, could belong to either ‘awake’ or ‘sing’; Ge and Re opt for the former, but, with Gr and Gotō (1st cl., 154), I assign it to ‘sing’. Very little rides on this decision.

X.45.2: The four pāda-initial *vidmā* ‘we know’ produce a strong impression of certainty.

Both Ge and Re supply ‘forms’ with *tredhā trayāṇi* “threefold triads.” This seems unduly limiting: the poet is referring to different sets of three that pertain to Agni. Most obvious, given the preceding vs., are his three births, but surely any mention of three and Agni will evoke the three ritual fires. Since *trayāṇi* is pl., we might hope for more than these two triads – three to be exact, but the third is harder to identify: perhaps it’s an oblique reference to the service to the fire at the three soma pressings. Or perhaps to the ritual fire, the household fire, and the cremation fire (or the wildfire), or to the sun, lightning, and the earthly fire. In any case the neatly numbered triads contrast with pāda b *dhāma víbhṛtā purutrā* “domains dispersed in many places,” which I think refers to the fire found in every household; the *purutrā* indicates that there is no limit placed on the number. (For an almost identical expression, see X.80.4; see also III.55.4 and comm. thereon.)

The “highest hidden name” in c is implicitly single, thus contrasting with the multiplication of Agnis in pādas a and b. I don’t know if we are meant to identify this name, but it might be Vaiśvānara, as I suggested also for 1a. The appearance of this name in the last vs. (12b) would indicate that we are displaying the knowledge we assert in this vs.

Pāda d, concerning Agni's source, returns us to vs. 1, particularly the opening phrase *divās pári* "from heaven."

X.45.3: As noted ad vs. 1, the first hemistich of this vs. is a close paraphrase of 1cd. However, the vs. as a whole seems to reverse the neat progression of births in vs. 1. The first pāda here concerns the kindling in the waters (=1c); in our c the ordinal *ṭṛtīya-* opens the pāda, as in 1c, but in the loc., modifying *rājasi* 'realm'. The other occurrences of *ṭṛtīya- rājas-* (IX.74.6, X.123.8; cf. also IX.86.27 *ṭṛtīye prṣṭhé ádhi rocané diváh*), insofar as they can be interpr., seem to refer to heaven, or the highest part of heaven, and so it seems likely that cd here refers to Agni's residence and growth in heaven, which would then correspond to 1a. The middle pāda, b, would thus seem to match the birth in between, found in 1b, but the match is not exact if 1b depicts the kindling of the fire on the ritual ground. Ge (n. 3b) identifies the "the udder of heaven" (*diváh ... ūdhan*) as a cloud, though this is disputed by Lü (390–91), who wants to see yet another Himmelsquell. Ge's cloud would at least place this kindling in the midspace. But as often these riddling locales are hard to penetrate. Re thinks there are only two events in this vs. – Agni, residing in the waters (a), is kindled in b; Agni residing in heaven (c) is raised by buffalo in d. But the parallelism with vs. 1 favors a trio.

Buffalos, Agni, and the lap of the waters are found together in two other passages, neither of which is much help with this one (or vice versa). In VI.8.4 unidentified buffalos "grasped" Agni in the lap of the waters (*apām upasthé mahiṣā agrbhnata*); in X.8.1 Agni is himself the buffalo, but the verb is √ *vṛdh* as in our passage here: *apām upásthe mahiṣo vavardha*. The only possible clue in these passages is that VI.8.4 concerns Agni Vaiśvānara in particular (VI.8.4cd), and if our cd concerns the birth/growth in heaven, this would be (as noted above) Agni as Vaiśvānara. Also relevant may be X.5.1 also treating the birth of Agni in enigmatic terms.

X.45.4: I would now change my tr. of *ákrandat* "has roared" to a simple preterite "roared," flg. immed. on similarly augmented imperfect *avardhan* ending 3d.

With Old I interpr. *kṣāmā* as an elliptical dual; the two world halves of d (*ródasī*) support this interpr. Ge and Re take it as a sg., referring only to earth, presumably following Gr's explanation of the final *-ā* as metrical lengthening. Although the earth is the primary locale for the spreading and "licking" of fire, the rising flames can also be seen as licking at heaven.

X.45.5: *udārā-* is found only here in the RV, though it is fairly common later. Ge renders it 'freigebig' on the basis of later usage, but the usage of the fairly common verbal lexeme *úd√r* in the RV is surely a better comparandum – as in, for example, nearby X.37.4 *yéna sūrya ... , jágac ca víśvam udiyārṣi bhānúnā* "and with which radiance you rouse up every moving creature, o Sūrya" or, with bounties/gifts as obj. (more or less as here), VI.44.12 *úd abhrāñīva stanáyann iyartíndro rádhāmsy áśvyāni gávyā* "Like the thunderer the rain clouds, Indra raises bounties of horses and cattle." It's esp. noteworthy that transitive *iyarti* is found two vss. later in our hymn (7c), with Agni as subject (and smoke as obj.), and the flg. pāda begins with *úd*, though probably to be construed with the participle *ínakṣan*.

Given its accentuation *sóma-gopāh* should be a bahuvrīhi – as I take it (also Old, Re, and Scar [304]), *pace* Gr, Ge. The latter (n. 5b) notes that all commentators take it as a tatpuruṣa, though he reluctantly acknowledges that it could be a bv.

X.45.6: The word order of pāda a favors an interpr. of a pair of GEN – NOUN constructions; so Ge “Das Banner des Alls, das Kind der Welt” (also Gr). This interpr. would also fit well with the chiasitic pair of GEN – NOUN NOUN – GEN that opens the previous vs. (5a). But the very common phrase *vísva- bhúvana-* cuts the other way (so Re as well as the publ. tr.), suggesting that we should take the two genitives together and that this gen. phrase is dependent on *kétuḥ*, with *gárbhaḥ* is to be taken separately. Either interpr. would fit here, and there is little practical difference.

Ge (n. 6cd) identifies the second hemistich as an instantiation of the Paṇi myth. The parallel he cites, I.71.2, certainly concerns the breaking of the Vala cave by the Aṅgirasas, and it is in an Agni hymn. But Agni is not, to my knowledge, elsewhere a principal actor in the Vala affair; he is at best connected by his kinship with the Aṅgirasas and the association of both the Vala myth and Agni with dawn (see, e.g., IV.1, an Agni hymn with an embedded account of the Vala myth). In our vs. I do not know what mythic (or ritual) event is referred to by “he split even the solid rock in leaving it.” The Vala theme recurs in 11cd, where the priests open the cowpen.

X.45.7: I construe *pāvakāḥ* with flg. *aratīḥ* on the basis of the phrase in the paired hymn, X.46.4c *aratīm pāvakām* (a vs. that also contains *uśj-* in its first pāda). Ge/Re/Th (Unters. 35) instead take *pāvakāḥ* with *uśík*; there is precedent for this as well: I.60.4 *uśík pāvakāḥ*, cited by Ge (n. 7a). However, the parallel in X.46, immediately following and attributed to the same poet, should have more weight. Little rides on the decision, however.

X.45.8: I would now take *ḍṛśānó rukmāḥ* as a non-overtly marked simile “appearing (like) a bright ornament,” similar to Ge’s “(Wie) ein Goldschmuck aussehend.” Several parallels adduced by Ge (n. 8a) do have overt similes: IV.10.5 *śrīyé rukmó ná rocata upāké* “For beauty it shines like a gold ornament in the nearness” and VII.3.6 *vī yád rukmó ná rócasa upāké* “when, like a jewel, you glow nearby” (jpb), and *ḍṛśānāḥ* in our passage acts as a de facto simile marker. Note that both the just-cited passages have a verbal form of \sqrt{ruc} making an etym. figure with *rukmá-*, as does our passage, though postponed till the end of b: *śrīyé rucānāḥ*. Dat. *śrīyé* is also found in IV.10.5.

The phrase *durmārṣam āyuh* is variously construed. I take it as acc. extent of time; Re supplies a verb to which it serves as obj.: “(en sorte d’atteindre) une durée-de-vie inoubliable.” Gr seems to take it as a sort of Inhaltsakk. (s.v. \sqrt{ruc} meaning 2 [found only here]: “etwas [A] ausstrahlen, herbeistrahlen”). I’m not sure what syntactic role the phrase is meant to be playing in Ge’s “in unvergesslicher Lebenskraft zur Pracht erglänzend.” Sāy. takes *durmārṣam* as an adv., glossed *durabhibhavam*, separate from *āyuh*. Of these choices I favor my extent of time, as requiring less machinery and also belonging to a recognized syntactic class.

Assuming, contra Sāy., that *durmārṣam* is to be construed with *āyuh*, why is this lifetime ‘hard to forget’ (or, less likely, ‘hard to neglect’)? Most likely unforgettable because of its extraordinary length – or its brilliance? The two other occurrences of this stem are not much help. In IX.97.8 (q.v.) it qualifies *vāṇām* ‘music’, but a “music” that may be likened to the raucous honking of geese – hence either ‘difficult to forget’ or ‘... to neglect’ is possible. In VIII.45.18, acdg. to my emended tr. (see comm. ad loc.), *durmārṣa-* also modifies a sonic element, in that case a call (*imām hāvam*) and means “difficult to neglect” (i.e., to fail to pay attention to), and a number of the verbal forms to the root $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$ also take speech or the like as obj. (I.145.2 *vācaḥ*, III.33.8 *vācaḥ*, VII.22.5 *gīraḥ ... suṣṭutīm*). However, ‘lifetime’ does not fit this semantic pattern.

X.45.10: The transaction envisaged between Agni and his worshiper is more complex than it first appears. Agni is urged to give him a portion in two different things: *sauśravéṣu* (a) and *ukthá-ukthe ... śasyámāne* (b). The second, “in every solemn speech being proclaimed,” identifies it as a ritual act, which suggests that “in (things) deserving good fame” the otherwise unidentified *sauśravá-* falls in the same semantic domain, that of ritual activity (so Ge: “an ruhmreichen Werken”). This further suggests a two-step process: Agni does not directly give the worshiper in question a share in various desirable things (cows, horses, gold, or, in this case [see d] sons), but in the ritual acts that will indirectly yield such things, by pleasing the gods who bestow them.

Although the root noun cmpd *udbhíd-* is attested a robust 8x in the RV, this is the only instance of a verbal form of this lexeme in our text. On the lexeme see comm. ad VIII.79.1, with lit. The literal sense ‘burst out/up’ leads to the metaphorical use ‘be (dramatically) successful, have a breakthrough, get a lucky break’, esp. in gambling context, and that (minus the gambling) must be meant here. Notice that *√bhid* recurs here from 6c, where Agni is subject.

X.45.11: Ge (n. 11cd) again identifies the 2nd hemistich as the Paṇimythos (that is, the Vala myth); see above ad 6cd.

X.46 Agni

Although the Anukramaṇī gives the meter of this hymn as Triṣṭubh, it is actually a mixture of Triṣṭubhs and Virāj (5 / 5) vss. and those that could be either one (depending on distraction or not) or neither. As an ex., consider vs. 1 with three 10-syl. pādas (caesura after 5) followed by a regular Triṣṭubh (likewise caesura after 5). For further on the meter of the hymn see Old, Prol. 91 and Noten ad loc.

X.46.1: The hymn opens with the preverb *prá-*, with no associated verb in the first pāda. Although *prá-* does occur marginally with *√sad-*, which supplies the verb in b (and Gr so identifies this passage), Ge (see his n. 1ab), Re, and the publ. tr. supply a verb of motion with *prá-* rather than construing it with *sīdat* in b. For good reason: in addition to the fact that the expression ‘go forth’, realized by various verbs of motion (esp. *√i-*), is extremely common, elliptical *prá-* is the structural skeleton of the hymn, opening the middle vs. (5) and the last pāda (10d); see disc. ad locc.

The hapax *nabho-víd-* is generally taken as ‘cloud-*knower*’ (Gr, Ge, Re); Scar’s gloss (484) hedges (“des Gewölks kundig; Wolken findend”), but he tr. “Kenner des Nassen” in the passage. Ge explains (n. 1ab) that Agni is at home in the cloud(s), since one of his births takes place there (see X.45.3b, acdg. to Ge, with comm. ad loc.). But are “knowing” and “being at home in” the clouds the same thing? Without any certainty I have opted for ‘cloud-*finder*’, the image being Agni’s smoke and flames rising to the clouds on their way to heaven.

Pāda c (*dádhir yó dhāyi śá te váyāmsi*) is oddly constructed: the rel. cl. / main cl. dyad, with *yáḥ* corresponding to *śá* is of course unexceptionable, but the *dádhiḥ* that opens the pāda is taken by all (Ge, Re, publ. tr.) as the referent of *śá* and the verb substitute in the main cl., with *váyāmsi* as obj. On the one hand, this makes good sense: redupl. nominals of this type regularly show verbal rection; see, for example, the three such phrases in VI.23.4 *babhúr vájram papíḥ sómam dadír gāḥ* “bearing his mace, drinking soma, giving cows,” with the well-attested *dadí-* ‘giving’, rhyme form to our hapax *dádhi-* (though with different accent). Moreover, the VP *váyas √dhā* is very common, also in the root noun cmpd *vayo-dhā-*. But the interpr. represented by,

e.g., the publ. tr. “He who has been established establishes vital powers for you” would be an egregious example of an embedded relative clause, with *yó dhāyī* inserted between the main cl. subject and the rest of that cl., and, further, a tr. literally reflecting the word order would be awkward. I now think that *dādhih* is a predicate nominative with the rel. cl. verb *dhāyī* and that we must supply a verb form of $\sqrt{dhā}$ in the main clause, with subj. *sá*. I would now alter the tr. to “Who has been established as the establisher, he (establishes / has established) vital powers for you.” Although this creates more machinery, I think it better represents the word order.

The agent noun *yantár-* is found with both nominal and verbal rection, even though the suffix-accented form should only take the genitive. Our form takes the acc. here.

X.46.1–3: Vss. 2 and 3 are partially concerned with the well-known myth of the flight and concealment of the ritual fire and his finding and reinstatement. But the ritual here-and-now exerts its oppositional pull: both vss. begin with the near-deictic *ímám* ‘this one here’, pointing to the fire on the ritual ground at the time of recitation. The vss. are also connected by concatenation, which also ties vs. 1 to vs. 2: 1d *vidhaté* / 2a *vidhánto*, along with 1b *apām upásthe* / 2a *apām sadhásthe* // 2d *ichánto* ... *avindan* / 3a *avindat ichán*. The question is whether vs. 1 also contains a reference to the flight and concealment myth, esp. in 1b where Agni “sits/sat in the lap of the waters” – comparable to the *apām sadhásthe* in 2a. I’m inclined to think not: that *apām upásthe* in 1b is instead alluding to the same event as in the preceding hymn, X.45.3d, which seems to deal with one of Agni’s births. But since I’m rather hazy about what’s going on in that vs., I am far from certain about this one.

X.46.2: The first pāda is identical to II.4.2, which likewise makes reference to the flight and concealment myth. In both I would now emend the tr. “having done honor” to “doing honor,” in part to match the dat. *vidhaté* “to the man who does honor” in 1d, but also because the act of honoring Agni does not have to precede the following / finding him treated in the rest of the vs. In fact, I would be tempted to assign *vidhántaḥ* to the ritual here-and-now represented by *ímám* except that \sqrt{vidh} does not take an acc. of the honoree, but a dative, so *ímám* cannot be the direct obj. of the participle. Assuming the participle belongs with the rest of the mythic material in the vs., the likeliest sequence is that they do honor to Agni hidden in the water *after* they have pursued and located him.

Our pādas bc are also quite close in wording to I.65.1–2, which also treats this Agni myth. See comm. ad loc.

X.46.3: Like vs. 2 the first half of this vs. concerns the seeking and finding of the vanished Agni, but it is not clear that it refers to the same episode. The finder, Trita Vaibhūṣa, is different (from the Bhṛguṣ in 2d), and also, it seems, the find spot: “on the head of an inviolable cow” (*mūrdhāny ághnyāyāḥ*). Ge (n. 3) suggests that this resembles the version of the story in which Agni spends one of his nights on the lam between the horns of a ram (TS VI.2.8.4, ŚB III.5.2.18, etc.), but the two versions seem too divergent. Re cites as parallel I.30.19 *aghnyāsya mūrdhāni* “on the head of the inviolable (bull),” of the place where the Áśvins anchor one wheel of their chariot. This is a good match verbally (save for the gender); I suggest there that this is a mystical expression for the ritual ground, but that is unlikely here. Perhaps it simply refers to the earth. It might be worth noting that Trita destroys a three-headed monster in X.8.8–9 (though the ‘head’ word is *śíras-*), and that in that same hymn Agni seizes the head (*mūrdhán-*) of his parents

(X.8.3) and sets his own head (also *mūrdhān-*) in heaven (X.8.6), but I can't make anything of that for our vs, here.

Trita's patronymic (different from Trita Āptya found elsewhere) is *vaibhūvasá-*, found only here – abbreviated from **vaibhū-vasava-* (Mayr, PN s.v.), to the bvr. *vibhū-vasu-* 'possessing conspicuous goods', twice of Soma. Trita (without patronymic) is also found in the nearby hymn X.48.2 (by a different poet) as a recipient of cows, though it is not clear if the two Tritas are connected.

The second hemistich brings us back to the ritual ground and current time.

The sense of *śévṛdha-*, presumably haplologized from **śéva-vṛdha-*, is hard to pin down; see disc. ad V.87.4. I would here slightly alter the publ. tr. to "with kind attention" for the sake of the English.

X.46.4: The phrase *uśíjo nāmobhiḥ* is repeated in pāda a from 2c, both in the post-caesura position.

Most of the first hemistich consists of accusatives (mostly?) referring to Agni; *akṛṇvan* has to be imported from the second hemistich to govern them, as well as governing the accusatives in cd. There are several ways to interpr. the acc. in ab. One way, fld. by Ge and Old, is to allow the agent noun *netāram* to take both an acc. obj. (*prāñcam yajñām* to its left) and a gen. obj. (*adhvarāñām* to its right), although the suffix-accented *-tār-*stem should only take the gen. (but see *yantār-* above, 1d). Hence Ge's "der das Opfer vorwärts führt, zum Leiter des Gottesdienstes." The other, fld. by Re and the publ. tr., is to take *prāñcam yajñām* and *netāram adhvarāñām* as two separate objects of *akṛṇvan*, both with secondary predication: "made the sacrifice (to) advance and (Agni) the leader of the ceremonies." Old provides a good parallel (VII.19.1) for a suffix-accented *-tār-*stem with acc. and gen. rection simultaneously; Ge adduces several passages (X.66.12, 101.2) where *prāñcam yajñām* is the object of *prá √ nī*. These parallels support the Ge/Old interpr., which is also favored by the fact that construing *yajñām* directly with *√ kṛ* would interrupt the parade of statements about Agni. On the other hand, see I.18.8 *prāñcam kṛṇoty adhvarām* "he makes the ceremony advance" and III.1.2 *prāñcam yajñām cakṛma* "we have made the sacrifice advance," with the construction presupposed by the publ. tr., and see Re's comm. In the end I think either interpr. is possible, and I would allow an alternative "... made him the gladdening Hotar-priest, the one who leads the sacrifice forward, and the leader of the ceremonies."

On *aratīm pāvakām* see X.45.7 in the immed. preceding hymn.

Re construes *havyavāham* separately from *dádhatāḥ* ("ils firent (de lui) ... convoyeur d'offrandes, en (le) plaçant chez les humains"), but 10a *dadhiré havyavāham* speaks for the VP.

X.46.5: Note that the 2nd pentad of the first three pādas begins with a disyllabic noun with light first syllable ending in *-ām*: a *mahām*, b *purām*, c *vanām*, the second two of which are gen. pl. to root nouns. The fourth pāda is likewise 10 syllables but, with an apparent opening of 4, is a Virāṣthāna vs. (so Arnold, HvN). Analyzed in this way, the simile particle (which is badly positioned anyway – see below) would follow the caesura, coalesced with the flg. noun. Now it is my impression (though I have not sorted through the 2000+ exx. of *ná*) that simile-marking *ná*, like *iva*, does not immediately follow the caesura. Moreover, Arnold (§122) states that *ná* 'as' is ordinarily found in hiatus with flg. vowel (approx. 60x) and combined only 3x – our passage and I.104.5, X.106.7 "no one of the instances being quite certain." If we distract *nārvāṇam* to *ná árvāṇam*, we would get a regular 11-syllable Triṣṭubh, but with a quite irregular break (_ _) after

a five-syllable opening (if we assign *ná* to the opening to avoid a post-caesura position). But *árvāṇam* may be our problem (or one of them). It's notable that *árvāṇam* is the only acc. sg., indeed the only non-nom. sg., to the putative stem *árvan-*, beside quite frequent nom. sg. *árvā*, which serves as the de facto nom. sg. to *árvant-*. I wonder if we should read **árvām* here, along with distracted *ná*, that is, a pentad vs., *hírīśmaśruṃ ná *árvām dhánarcam*. This would allow the *ná* to avoid both post-caesura position and coalescence and also provide us with another pentad-opening disyllable nominal ending in *-ām*. This proposed form **árvām* would be a nonce, created to the nom. sg. *árvā*, and liable to redactional correction, in this case to match *dharmāṇam*, which ends pāda b.

This vs. presents us with a number of other problems, beginning with the 1st pentad: the sequence as analyzed by the Pp., *prá / bhūḥ / jáyantam*, cannot be easily construed. If *bhūr* (*/bhūḥ*) is taken as a 2nd sg. root aor. injunctive (the only possible verb form, though see Scar below), we are lacking a likely addressee (Sāy., in his first analysis, supplies voc. *stotar*), and the sense of *prá √bhū* 'overcome, dominate' would not work well with Agni as object. Various solutions have been suggested, which I will not rehearse; see Old, Ge n. 5a and vol. IV.269, Re ad loc., Scar 262 and n. 361. The most appealing and perhaps the oldest is *bhūrjáyantam*, registered already by Sāy. as Udgītha's reading. But Udgītha further analyzes it as *bhūrādīm̐ lokāñ jáyantam*. Ludwig (cited by Old and Ge) takes the same proposed *bhūrjáyā*- rather as a denom. to the unclear *bhūrj-* (AV, SV; see EWA s.v.). Whatever its further analysis is, the univerbation to an *-áya*-participle with root syllable *bhūrj*, which requires no alteration to the Saṃhitā text, seems the best of the proposals. In the publ. tr. my "*glittering" reflects an analysis as an intrans. *-áya*-formation built to the zero-grade of *√bhrāj* 'shimmer, glitter', which is used frequently of Agni, the same zero-grade as is found in *bhūrjā*- 'birch' (see EWA s.v.). Scar's (n. 361) first proposal is close to mine: a denom., to **b^hrHǵ-ó-* (rather than an *-áya*-formation built to the zero-grade root, like me), meaning (acdg. to the tr. in the text) "der hell hervorstrahlt (?)"; unaccountably he gives the resulting form with short vowel, as **bhurjáy°*. But the rest of his n. 361 is devoted to an alternative: an attempt to pry a 3rd pl. root aor. out of *bhūr*, which is unlikely. Another alternative analysis has recently been suggested by R. Ginevra (UCLA Conf. Proc. 2016), that *bhūrjáyā*- is the *s*-mobile-free version of *sphūrjáyā*- 'crackle, roar', used of Agni in X.87.11 – both belonging to a putative PIE root **(s)b^hrǵ(h₂)g*. He also derives the name *bhṛgu-* from this root; note the occurrence of the name in 2d. (Ginevra's proposed tr. for our passage, "sizzling," seems inapt, but 'crackling' or 'roaring' would do nicely.) Ginevra's proposal is appealing and certainly possible, but I will stick with the *√bhrāj* derivation. For further on his proposed root, see comm. ad X.68.1.

With the supposed injunctive *bhūḥ* off the table, the initial *prá* needs a home. As I said above (ad vs. 1), elliptical *prá* serves as the structural skeleton of this hymn. Our vs. has echoes of 1a: cf. 1a *prá ... mahān nabhovíd* 5a *prá ... mahām vipodhām*. As for the construction of *prá* here I would supply (or simply read backwards) *náyantah*, which opens the 2nd hemistich (see also *netāram* in 4b). Given the accent on *prá*, this seems preferable to reading it as in technical tmesis with the immediately following participle (as Scar seems to do).

We have already discussed the metrical and morphological problems with d, but the *ná* there poses another difficulty: the adj. it follows does not appear to be part of the simile, despite the well-nigh unbreakable rule that *ná* does not begin a simile. (It of course usually follows the first word, but can sometimes follow the second – and occasionally there is intervening material between the first word and the simile – but never [as far as I know] does it precede the first word.) Here by all accounts the simile consists only of *árvāṇam* (or **árvām*; see above) or at most

ārvāṇam dhānarcam (see Ge n. 5d). The adj. *hīriśmaśru-* ‘gold-bearded’ is used of Agni also in V.7.7, with the image presumably the flames shooting out of the center of the fire. It is highly unlikely that it is meant to describe the steed in the simile: “like a gold-bearded steed.” I do not have a real solution to the *ná*-flip, but if my proposal for the metrical and morphological situation in d given above is accepted, the rhetorically driven pattern of X-*ām* opening the second pentad of each pāda might have caused the displacement of *ná*, to allow **ārvām* to occupy that slot.

Finally we have the hapax *dhānarcam*, on which see esp. Old, with previous proposals. Perhaps influenced by the SV variant *dhanarcīm*, several interpr. take the 2nd member as ‘shining’ vel sim.: Gr ‘Glanz der Beute, des Reichtums habend, glänzende Beute tragend’, Re ‘qui ... brille sous l’enjeu’. Both Ge and Old by contrast connect the 2nd member to ‘sing’; Old’s interpr. (q.v.) seems over-busy. Ge (n. 5d) points out (correctly) that only the first part of the cmpd. is strictly applicable to the ‘steed’ in the simile: the steed receives a prize (*dhāna-*) appropriate to the race, whereas the *ṛc-* is only appropriate to Agni. Ge tr. “der sich den Preis aussingen,” with a verbal interpr. of the 2nd member. I prefer my double noun (*dhāna-* + *ṛc-*) interpr.: “for whom a verse is the prize”; in other words, Agni is rewarded with praise poetry after his victory in the equivalent of a race. Very sim. is Scar’s (262) “wobei die ihm zugeeignete (=dessen) Ṛc der { von ihm gewonnene } Kampfpfeis ist.”

X.46.6: It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that nom. Trita in pāda a = Agni here; Agni is clearly the nom. referent in c, and Trita apparently performs the same action (sitting: *sīdat*) as Agni did in 1b. But in vs. 3 Trita is emphatically *not* Agni; rather he finds the vanished Agni. Ge (n. 6a) cites Ludwig’s opinion that Agni is called Trita because Trita discovered him, but this seems a bit ad hoc. In any case the first hemistich depicts the fire’s installation (note *nī* in a, in tmesis with *sīdat* in b) on the ritual ground.

On *pastyā*- see comm. ad I.40.7, IX.97.18.

On *parivīta*- see comm. ad IV.3.2. I think it likely that this refers to the surrounding of the ritual fire by the *paridhī*- ‘enclosing sticks’.

While the 1st hemistich depicts – again! – the installation of the fire on the ritual ground, the second one, in my view, treats Agni’s journey to the gods in heaven conveying the oblations to them. By this interpr. *nīn* ‘superior men’ at the end of the d refers to the gods, as so often. The verbal form *īyā^{te}* is regularly used of this journey of Agni’s; cf., e.g., VII.3.3 *sām dūtó agna īyase hí devān* “For as our messenger, o Agni, you speed to the gods.”

The next puzzle is *saṃgṛbhya*: what, if anything, is its object? Both Ge and Re take *nīn* at the end of d as the object (both construing it also with *īyate*). Old instead supplies ‘goods’ vel sim.: “von dort zusammenfassend (Güter, Gaben ...),” adducing I.53.3, also beginning *ātaḥ saṃgṛbhya*, where *vāsu*, which ends the preceding pāda, is to be read as object. Cf. also III.54.15 *saṃgṛbhyā na ā bhārā bhūri paśvāḥ* “Having massed it together, bring to us here an abundance of livestock.” The publ. tr. follows Old: “having amassed (goods?),” but I now wonder if, with my current interpr. of the purport of cd, “the oblations” or similar should be supplied instead.

vidharmanā ‘through/with the/his spreading expanse’ can refer either to the expanse of the midspace between earth and heaven through which Agni’s smoke passes or the expansion of the smoke itself. On this stem see comm. ad IX.4.9, 64.9.

On *ayantrā*- Old says firmly “offenbar Bahuvr.” The question is what missing nominal notion it modifies. Old supplies “mit Kräften, Helfern,” while Ge (n. 6d) suggests ‘hands’ or ‘reins’. I think it more likely to be horses : Agni’s reinless horses are the billows of smoke,

which do not make straight and controlled progress towards heaven and are therefore ‘without reins/guiding straps’.

X.46.7: This vs. contains several bold (one might say “jarring”) images describing the fires.

The first is *ajarāsaḥ ... aritrāḥ* the “unaging oars” or “unaging rudders” of the houses (*damām*). Neither ‘oar’ nor ‘rudder’ is easy to understand here, and our lack of knowledge of the technology of boats at this period doesn’t help. If ‘oars’ is the right choice, perhaps the fires are considered to be the things that keep the houses moving; if ‘rudders’, they keep the houses steering on the right course. Ge (n. 7a), Re, and Scar (571 n. 808) all adduce the potentially helpful I.140.12 *rāthāya nāvam utā no gṛhāya nītyāritrām padvātīm rāsi agne / asmākaṃ vīrām utā no maghóno jánāms ca yā pārayāc chārma yā ca* “For our chariot and for our house, o Agni, give us a boat with built-in oars and a foot [=keel? rudder?], / which will carry our heroes and our bounteous (patrons) and our peoples to the further shore and which (will be) our shelter.” In this fuller expression the boat is a metaphor for something that will carry the people out of danger and to the safety of the far shore. The *aritra-* are likely oars, since the ‘foot’ is probably either a rudder or a keel/centerboard. Ge cleverly suggests that “for our chariot and for our house” refers to times of war and peace respectively. The *gṛhá-* ‘house’ there can correspond to our *dám-* ‘id.’, and the fires as oars here propel the houses (or rather their denizens) to success in a peaceful domestic setting. It would be nice to find a visual analogue to the oars in the ritual fire, but flames don’t look much like oars to me (at least the oars I’m used to); the only other visual candidate I can think of is the sticks of firewood – but the explicit identification in the verse is with “fires” (*agnīyah*), not their fuel.

The sense of the first member of the hapax cmpd *arcāddhūma-* is not entirely clear. Gr’s ‘glänzenden Rauch haben’ associates it with ‘shining’ forms like *arcī(s)-* ‘beam’, etc., but the (pseudo-)participial form suggest an affiliation rather with the verbal forms *ārcatī*, etc., which always mean ‘sing, chant, recite,’ not ‘shine’. So Ge “rauchsingend,” Re “(feux) dont chante la fumée,” the publ. tr. “with singing smoke.” Scar allows both, though apparently favoring the former: “mit dem glänzenden (/sirrenden?) Rauch.” It is hard to know what this synaesthetic description is meant to convey, but I wonder if it is the hissing sound that accompanies the first appearance of smoke from a newly lit fire. Besides the issue of root affiliation there is the question of what type of cmpd it is. I (and Gr) take it as a bahuvrīhi with adjectival first member, but Ge as a 1st member governing cmpd. (perhaps following Bergaigne; see AiG II.1.319). Although I am generally sympathetic to such interpr., in this case I find it hard to see how “smoke” could provide a meaningful direct obj. to “sing”: acc.s with *ārcatī* are either objects of praise (like gods) or the verbal products that provide praise (songs, etc.).

The adjectives of pāda c easily modify fire, but pāda d presents us with a new challenge: what at first glance appears to be a single simile *vāyāvo ná sómāḥ*, with two incompatible terms, “like winds, soma drinks.” This is universally (Old, Ge, Re, Scar) and convincingly interpr. as two distinct similes, each capturing a different facet of the shared quality *vanarśād-* ‘sitting in/on the wood’. Fire of course “sits in the wood” by virtue of its location on the firewood that feeds it. Soma drinks do so by taking their place in the wooden cups after the preparation of the soma, ready for offering (see a number of such passages in IX with *vāneṣu √sad*). As for “winds,” Ge finds this comparison suspect (verdächtig), a sentiment shared by Scar (571 n. 808). As Scar points out, we might have expected a comparison to birds – and perhaps *vāyāvah* is meant in part to call to mind phonologically similar *vāyah* ‘birds’). To circumvent the problem, Ge tries, not

very hard, to produce an alternative analysis (n. 7d), and already Gr simply declared *vāyāvas* an old genitive form). Old sees a sort of secondary comparison: the fires are compared to soma drinks, and since both flames and soma drinks can be driven by the wind (see Old's citations), they are then compared to the wind. This seems too complex to me; I think the wind simile is (somewhat) more straightforward: wind is more perceptible, both visually and aurally, when it blows through trees than in open country. Winds therefore can also be considered *vanarṣād-*, though 'sitting' might be an odd description, perhaps 'situated'. Given the "off" comparisons elsewhere in this vs., this one seems reasonably sensible.

X.46.8–10: The complex imagery and verbal expression of the earlier parts of the hymn are no longer evident in these final vss., and the meter settles down to straight Triṣṭubhs. From the 2nd hemistich of 8 through the first one of 10, Agni is the acc. object of several different verbs describing his birth, fashioning, and establishment by a variety of gods, natural forces, and primordial ritualists. Note also the near-repetitions: 8d *dadhire yájiṣṭhan#* / 10a *dadhiré havývāham#* // 9d *mánave yájatram#* / 10b *mānuṣāso yájatram#*

X.46.8: On *vépas-* see comm. ad I.80.8. Here, as there, the verbal component of Ge's "Wortswall" seems unrec.: the point is that his flame (=tongue), constantly in motion, shows Agni's state of trembling excitation. The middle voice of *prá ... bharate* is appropriate because the *vépas-* is Agni's own.

In b Ge supplies a new verb "(er kennt)," but the repetition of the preverb *prá*, found initially in tmesis in pāda a, strongly favors a gapped form of \sqrt{bhr} . If that surmise is correct, what's happening in b is that the bright light of the fire (its "appearance" – *cétas-*) allows the patterns of the earth (*vayúnāni ... pṛthivyāḥ*) to be discerned.

X.46.9: Notice the reappearance of the Bhṛguś from vs. 2.

X.46.10: The ref. to Agni switches from 3rd ps. to 2nd in pāda a, transitioning to the direct appeal to the god for benefits in c.

The very well-attested rt. noun cmpd. *puru-spṛṇ-* generally has the passive sense 'much craved / sought after', but at least in this passage an act. sense 'craving much' works better. So also Scar (670), Ge (n. 10b).

The VP *váyo dhāḥ#* in c responds to 1c *dádhiḥ ... váyāmsi#* (on the syntax of 1c see disc. ad loc.), forming a ring. It also echoes the middle verse 5a *vípodhām#* and 5c *dhíyaṃ dhuḥ#*.

On elliptical *prá* as a structural element in this hymn, see comm. ad vss. 1, 5. In this vs. the main cl. of d consists only of the preverb and a nom. sg. part.: *prá devayán -- yaśásah* does not belong there, for reasons given below. All the standard tr./comm. (Old, Ge, Re, publ. tr.) take *prá devayán* as an elliptical clause, only differing on what to supply to fill the ellipsis. I think it best to match the initial pāda of the hymn as closely as possible. There I supplied a verb of motion with *prá* ('goes forth'), here the same, though with a diff. English rendering, 'advances', to indicate that the subj. goes forth towards glory.

The phrase *yaśásah sám hí pūrvāḥ* is found also in III.1.11, thus showing that *yaśásah* does not belong directly with what precedes. In III.1.11 JPB tr. "for glory gets the girls." Although not entirely literal, this is far superior to the ploddingly accurate "many (fem.) (assemble) together for a glorious one," and I have adopted it. The phrase has the feel of a gnomic utterance, an old saying (Ge [n. 10d] Sprichwort) – a saying that leaves open the exact

identity of what the glorious man receives. *pūrvīh* is fem. pl., but there are many desirable feminine entities: women/girls, of course, but any fem. noun is fair game: cows, hymns, refreshments, waters, and so on (for other somewhat farfetched possibilities, see Re's comm. ad loc.). In VI.34.1, which contains a similar phrase, the fem. referent is spelled out: *sām ca tvé jagmúr gíra indra pūrvīh* "many songs have converged on you, Indra." But I doubt that hymns are what are meant here. In the words of Re, more tentative than necessary, "Peut-être n'était-il pas dans ses intentions de circonscrire le choix."

X.47 Indra

On the authorship of the hymn, see above ad X.45–47 and also the publ. intro. On the structure of the hymn and the persistent ambiguity of reference between Indra and 'wealth' see publ. intro. Ge (intro. to hymn) thinks all the acc. phrases qualify 'wealth', specifically wealth in sons, but I find this interpr. reductive.

Note that the d pāda throughout is a refrain.

X.47.1–5: As noted in the publ. intro., the non-refrain portions of vss. 2–5 consist entirely of accusative phrases dependent on vs. 1 (though *which* accusative in vs. 1 is the question). Given the syntactic independence of almost all RVic vss. (*muktaka* verses avant la lettre), this run-on sentence is noteworthy – though perfectly easy to interpret. If it were couched in the nominative, it would be an unremarkable example of RVic nominal style.

X.47.1: The syntagm "X-lord of X-es" appears twice in two pādas: b voc. *vasupate vásūnām* and c acc. *gópatim ... gónām*, the latter with the younger gen. pl. *gónām* rather than *gávām*, which wouldn't work metrically here. The presumed older form of this phrase, *gávām* (...) *gópati-*, does occur on several occasions (I.101.4, VII.98.6, X.108.3; also reversed in X.166.1 *gópatim gávām*).

X.47.2: My tr. of pāda b, "supporting four seas worth of riches," is not literal, in that *cātuḥsamudram* is a separate qualifier. On the phrase *dharúṇa-rayīṇām* see comm. ad X.5.1. In that passage the phrase is preceded by NUM. *samudrá-* (*ékaḥ samudráḥ*), rather like our cmpd. *cātuḥsamudra-* but a free phrase. Both seem to depict the sea as a particularly vast trove of riches.

X.47.4: Pāda b is found also in VI.19.8, where it modifies *śúṣma-* 'unbridled force'; see Bloomfield's (RV Reps.) somewhat acid remarks there about our hymn ("rigmarole"). In c *dasyuhānam pūrbhídā* favor Indra as referent, but 'wealth' is not entirely excluded.

X.47.5: The poet seems to have run out of steam here: *vīpravīram* (c) is repeated from 4a and lexically doubled by *vīrávantam* (a). On the other hand, *s''varṣām* 'sun-winning' nicely echoes 3c *śrutārṣi-* (to be read *śrutārṣim*).

X.47.6: Save for the initial *prá* this vs. seems to be starting like vss. 2–5, with a continuation of the string of accusatives, but pāda b confounds this expectation: we have a different acc. referent *bṛhaspátim*, a nominative (!) *matíḥ*, and a verb *jigāti*.

X.47.7: The hapax *vānīvānaḥ* clearly belongs to the root \sqrt{van} , or one of the roots \sqrt{van} , but its morphological identity is uncertain. Wh (Roots; fld. by MonWms) takes it as a primary nominal deriv. of an otherwise unattested intens. *vanīvan-*. The disyllabic redupl. ending in long \bar{i} would conform to exx. like *pānīphaṇ-* (\sqrt{phan}), *varīvart-* (\sqrt{vrt}) and thus would not decide for set \sqrt{van}^i ‘love, long for’ rather than \sqrt{van} ‘win’. Schaeffer calls our *vānīvānas* (wrongly cited as **vanīvanās*) an inten. part. (p. 27 n. 29) and lists *vānīvan-* as an intens. stem (p. 34). The form is not mentioned in AiG. An alternative interpr. takes it as a possessive nominal *-van-*stem built to the *-i-*stem *vanī-* ‘wish’ (so Gr), a stem found mostly as 2nd cmpd member (on this stem, see AiG II.2.31–33 etc.); *-i-*stems generally lengthen the final before *-van-* (AiG II.2.900–901; e.g., *śruṣṭīvān-*). Although this single occurrence gives us little to go on, I’m inclined towards the intensive interpr., because of the lack of a clear possessive sense – though ‘having desires’ is certainly not out of the question, esp. given *sumatīr iyānāḥ* “begging for favors” at the end of the hemistich. If it belongs to a *-van-*stem, it is straightforwardly a nom. pl. masc., as the passage requires. But if it belongs rather to an intens. stem, we must reckon with its aberrant inflection. I would like to analyze it as a haplology of a middle part. **vānīvan-āna-*. The haplology itself seems quite plausible, but the form in the passage *vānīvāno (-as)* has then to be a singular m. nom. This could be fixed by emending the final syllable to **-ās* (*-ā* in sandhi), and that is my preference, however unsatisfactory. However, there may have been an intermediate nominal form, or so I interpr. Wh’s listing of *vānīvan* as a primary nominal deriv., rather than as a verbal form to the desid. stem. But what kind of nominal? If it’s a pseudo-root noun, then the nom. pl. should be **vānīvan-as*, with short vowel in the root syllable (cf., e.g., nom. pl. *śatru-hānas*). To get a long vowel in that syllable we have to assume that it belongs to a *-van-*stem, which rather defeats the purpose of assigning it to a desid. stem *vānīvan-* -- unless he’s also positing a *-van-*stem built to that desid. stem (**vānīvan-van-*), which then underwent haplology – an unprecedented derivational path. It seems less cumbersome simply to emend the vowel of the final syllable to \bar{a} , as I just suggested. Or, if we want to follow Wh’s path, to assume that a root-noun-like stem *vānīvan-* was reinterpr. as having a *-van-*stem and given a nom. pl. *-vān-as*. In any case, there is no direct route to the form we have.

The sense of the root $\sqrt{vañc}$ in its various forms has been discussed frequently in this comm. (see lexical list). Since I think the root meant ‘move waveringly’ (sim. already Whitney / Macdonell [VGS 415] ‘move crookedly’; see Kulikov’s [ya-pres. 218] first gloss ‘move (waveringly)’), I find the standard renderings of individual forms as ‘jump’, ‘gallop’, ‘fly’, and the like somewhat puzzling, since these seem like very different kinds of movements. In our passage Ge tr. “mit dem Gedanken fliegend,” Scar (669) “vom Geist in galoppierenden Bewegung versetzen.” The closest passage to ours in content and phraseology is III.39.1 in which ‘thought’ (*matīḥ*) exits our “heart” (abl. *hṛdāḥ ā*) by a movement described as *vacyāmānāḥ*, which I render as “curling herself out of ...” See comm. ad loc. A similar graceful contortion seems depicted here, esp. in combination with the intimate contact expressed by immediately preceding *hṛdispṛś-* ‘touching the heart’. The publ. tr. has “intertwining with the mind,” which I still think is fine, but the root sense might be even better conveyed by “curling up with the mind.

X.47.8: *yād ... yāmi* “what I beg” in pāda a picks up 7b *sumatīr iyānāḥ* “begging for favors.”

On this trio of hymns see publ. intro. Of especial interest are the first two, Indra's ātmastuti, couched in the 1st ps. sg. On the genre of ātmastuti see esp. George Thompson (1997) "Ahaṃkāra and ātmastuti: Self-Assertion and Impersonation in the Ṛgveda," *History of Religions* 37: 141–71.

X.48 Indra

The 1st person self-assertion in this hymn is forcefully established in the first vss.: every pāda of the 1st vs. begins with a form of the 1st sg. prn.; in the 2nd vs. each hemistich begins thus; the third vs. presents itself as a type of versified paradigm (see comm. ad I.1), with four different oblique forms of the pronoun, each opening its pāda: 3a dat. *māhyam*, 3b loc. *māyī*, 3c gen. *māma*, 3d acc. *mām*. Thereafter the pronominal presence recedes: vss. 4–6 each begin with *ahām*, but there is no other tonic form of the pronoun in any vs.; vs. 7 has no tonic form, though here is an enclitic *mā* in the last pāda, along with two 1st sg. verbs, *asmi* (a), *hanmi* (c). Vs. 8 once again begins with *ahām*, and there is a postpositive *ahām* in d; vs. 9 has only an enclitic *me* (a) but two 1st sg. verbs. Vs. 10 lacks any 1st sg. reference at all and stands aside from the rest of the hymn in content. The final vs. (11) has an enclitic acc. *mā* (c) and a 1st sg. verb (*mināmi* [b]). As noted in the publ. intro., the only forms of the 1st sg. prn. absent from the hymn are the poorly attested instr. *māyā* and abl. *māt*.

On the distribution of tenses and moods in this hymn compared with X.49, see intro. to X.49 below.

X.48.1: Each pāda of this vs. has a finite verb; the verbs in bcd are all present indicatives: *sām jayāmi* (b), *havante* (b), *vī bhajāmi* (d), but pāda a contains a 1st sg. aor. injunc. *bhuvam*. In the publ. tr. I render *bhuvam* as a straight preterite: "I was" (sim. Ge. "Ich ward"; Sāy. *abhavam*). Given the present indicatives of the rest of the vs. and its general content, I now think that that rendering is wrong, but I am not certain what the correct one is. I would be inclined to tr. it as a general present ("I am / become") in keeping with the other present verb forms, save for two factors: The next hymn, X.49, which is the ātmastuti companion to this one, contains two forms of *bhuvam* (out of 5 total in the RV): X.49.1c, 4c. Although X.49 is dominated by injunctives and so the temporal values are hard to establish, most of the hymn concerns specific deeds of the speaker (=Indra) in the past, and so *bhuvam* there may have past reference. Moreover in our own vs. the adj. *pūrvyā-* is ambiguous: it can mean 'foremost' with regard to quality or location, with no temporal reference, but it can also mean 'former, earlier' or 'ancient, primordial' or 'foremost' in a temporal sense. If *pūrvyās pātīḥ* here means "earlier / primordial / first lord," then *bhuvam* must have some past reference, but if the adj. only refers to the quality of Indra's lordship, the temporal reference of *bhuvam* is unconstrained. It is probably worth noting that *pūrvya-* is found in the first vs. of the next hymn as well, X.49.1a, though not in the same clause as *bhuvam* in that vs. Although a survey of all the forms of *pūrvyā-* / *pūrvya-* in the RV shows that temporal reference predominates, there is a solid group with the meaning 'foremost' in quality or location, and a very large group where it is difficult or impossible to tell whether temporal or qualify/location reference (or both) is meant. In this case I incline towards the quality interpr. (so also Sāy., who glosses *mukhyah*). Weighing the various factors, I suggest an emended tr. to "I have become the foremost lord of gods," a role Indra has acquired by his regular winning of the stakes, as stated in pāda b. ("I am ..." would also work.) Alternatively IH suggests presential "I become," meaning that he acquires the role on a regular basis; I am not persuaded because I doubt that Indra would ever admit that he *lost* the lordship in between such

episodes. However, if *pūrvyā-* has a temporal sense here, the whole might mean “I am / have (always) been the primordial lord of goods / lord of gods (from) of old.”

Note that the phrase *vasunaḥ ... pātīḥ* reprises *vasupate vāsūnām* in the first vs. of the previous hymn (X.47.1), though they are by different poets. The phrase in our hymn has the newer gen. sg. *vasunaḥ*, found also in *vasunaḥ ... pātīḥ* in I.53.2, against *vasoḥ ... vāsupatim* in I.9.9. The phrase with gen. pl., *vasupāti- vāsūnām* is fairly common.

For *dhānam* √*ji*, see vs. 5 below.

The morphological identity and usage of *śāsīvataḥ* in b are disputed. Gr takes it as a gen. sg. dependent on *dhānāni* in the meaning ‘ein jeder, alle’ (his meaning #10; Sāy. also gen.). Ge takes it as acc. pl. masc. to be (irregularly) construed with the neut. acc. *dhānāni*, tr. “alle Schätze.” But *śāsīvant-* doesn’t mean ‘all’, at least not straightforwardly – rather, it indicates an unbroken, or regularly repeated, sequence: “one by one, one after another, time after time,” shading into “constant, perpetual.” Sometimes the sequence is synchronically distributive: “each and every,” which could be taken as tantamount to “all.” But rather than expressing an undifferentiated “all,” *śāsīvant-* indicates a succession of individual items considered collectively. Ge (n. 1b) cites III.3.7 as exhibiting another ex. of neut. pl. noun construed with masc. pl. adj., but that passage should be otherwise interpr. He also adduces IX.76.3, where pāda-final *śāsīvataḥ* (as here) modifies the masc. acc. pl. *vājān* earlier in its pāda: *dhīyā nā vājāni ūpa māsi śāsīvataḥ*. Presumably he cites this to show that acc. pl. *śāsīvataḥ* can modify a synonym for *dhānāni*, in the right gender, and need not be a gen. here. My interpr. of *śāsīvataḥ* in our passage starts from passages like IX.76.3; I take it as a quasi-adverbial acc. pl. ‘time after time’ that became detached from the NP in which it began because of its location at pāda end at some distance from its noun. In my own tr. of IX.76.3 “As if according to our vision, mete out prizes to us over and over,” *śāsīvataḥ* is also semi-independent, though it properly matches *vājān* in number, gender, and case. (A less independent Engl. tr. might be “ever-new/continuous prizes.”) I thus avoid the awkwardness of mismatch of gender in our passage, though at the cost of recognizing a new adverbial usage. It would also of course be possible simply to follow the Sāy./Gr interpr. and take it as a gen.: “I win the stakes of each and every one.”

As Ge (n. 1c) points out, *jantāvaḥ* has a double sense and should be read with both simile and frame – hence my “creatures ... kinfolk.”

Note the implicit contrast between *sām jayāmi* (b) and *vī bhajāmi* (d). The *dhānāni* gathered in b are redistributed to the deserving in d.

X.48.2: Acdg to Ge (n. 2), the named recipients of Indra’s help in this vs. are among the first Soma-offerers. Unfortunately the mythic incidents mentioned in this vs. are difficult to reconstruct, and the various figures named – Atharvan (if this is a PN, not a title), Trita, Dadhyañc, and Mātariśvan are not clearly connected elsewhere, except that Dadhyañc has the patronymic *ātharvañā-* already in the RV (I.116.12, 117.22; also VI.16.14 *putrāḥ ... ātharvañāḥ*).

In the nominal clause in pāda a, either Indra or the following common nouns (*ródho vākṣaḥ*) could be the primary predicate(s) of *ahám*. Contra Ge’s “Ich Indra ward ...,” which makes the second choice, I take *índraḥ* as the principal predicate, on the basis of vs. 5a, which also opens with *ahám índraḥ*, where the wording of the rest of the pāda suggests the opening two words form a nominal clause. However, the other alternative is certainly possible and changes very little.

Trita is elsewhere associated with cows, but as, himself, a releaser of cows – not the beneficiary of Indra’s action with regard to the cows. See the famous Trita Āptya appendix to the

Agni hymn, X.8.8-9, where Trita first smites the three-headed monster and then ... *nīḥ sasṛje trió gāḥ* “T. let loose the cows.” Indra is also mentioned in that brief passage, but it seems as if he is there being assimilated to – substituted for – the Indo-Iranian *Trita, who also figures in this myth in Avestan (under the name *Θrita* *Äθβiia*).

What exactly Indra does for Trita in our passage is also unclear, though not because of unclarity of the verbal expression. The *pāda* is unambiguous: *tritāya gā ajanayam āher ādhi* “I begat the cows from the serpent.” See Ge’s tr. “Für Trita *trieb* ich vom Drachen die Kühe *ab*,” with the somewhat dramatic *abtreiben* ‘abort’. There are two problems here (at least). The first involves which myth we’re actually dealing with. The word *āhi*- ‘serpent’ is a powerful clue that it is the *Vṛtra* myth, since *Vṛtra* is constantly identified as an *āhi*- and the encapsulating formula of that myth is *āhann āhim*. But when we can pin down Trita’s activities in the Vedic mythical universe, he is associated instead with the Vala myth. See I.52.5 *índro yád ..., bhinád valásya paridhīm̐r iva tritāḥ* “When Indra split the barricades of the Vala-cave, as Trita had.” Although the Vala and *Vṛtra* myths are often assimilated to each other, in our case (i.e., X.48.2) I think Trita has been grafted into the *Vṛtra* myth signaled by *āhi*-. This seems preferable to interpreting the serpent (*āhi*-) as an image of the Vala cave. (Nor do I, *pace* Ge [n. 2b], think that the serpent is *Viśvarūpa*, the monster of X.8.8–9.)

So what action does *ajanayam* depict? Presumably a simulacrum of birth: the cows (=waters, probably) are within the serpent and Indra causes them to come out, alive. If what is at issue is the identification cows = waters, the likelihood is that the snake swallowed them, as in X.111.9 (adduced by Ge) *ṣṛjāḥ síndhūn̐r āhinā jagrasānān* “You let loose the rivers that had been swallowed by the serpent.” The release of the waters from within the serpent would seem like birth – indeed like the breaking of the waters that precedes birth. The image is a striking one, but I think there is another reason the poet chose *ajanayam*: the beginning of this verb recalls and may have been meant to evoke in the audience several verbs more regularly found with “cows” in the Vala and *Vṛtra* myths: *√aj* ‘drive’ and *√ji* ‘win’. Cf. phrases like *gā ajati* (I.33.3) and *gā ājayah* (I.32.12).

I don’t know quite what to make of this mash-up of at least three myths in a single *pāda*: Trita (and Indra) and *Viśvarūpa*, Trita (/Indra) and Vala, Indra and *Vṛtra*, but I think it is deliberate on the part of the poet. Perhaps he is calling attention to the overreach of Indra’s boasting.

In c the verb *ā dade* could be either a pres. indicative to the redupl. pres. stem or a perfect. Because of the mythological content of the vs., I opt for the pf., as does Kü (241).

As discussed ad I.112.19 etc., simplex forms of the old desid. *śíkṣa-* (*√śak*) only take the dat., but here the part. *śíkṣan* also has an acc. obj., *gotrā*. The lexeme *ā śíkṣa-* does take an acc., in the sense ‘seek to obtain’, with *ā* in the same function as the lexemes *ā√yaj* ‘obtain by sacrifice’, *ā√pū* ‘obtain by purification’. See again I.112.19. I suggest that the *ā* is in fact found in our passage: *gotrā śíkṣan* can easily represent *gotrā ā-śíkṣan* in sandhi.

In the publ. tr. “their cowpens” refers to the cowpens of the *Dasyus*.

As far as I know, *Dadhyañc* and *Mātariśvan* are never otherwise associated.

X.48.3: On the verb *ārya-* see comm. ad VIII.16.6.

The fronting of the oblique 1st sg. prn. is carried through the whole vs., but it is broken in the publ. tr. in *pāda* d, since “me they recognize ...” sounded stilted to me.

X.48.4: The first hemistich lacks a verb and definitely needs one, since it has both a nominative and an accusative phrase. It's easy to supply 'win / gain' – perhaps from *sám jayāmi* in 1b, but cf. also the almost identical expression in V.61.5 *sánat sã áśvyam paśúm, utá gávyam ...* "She gains livestock in horses and cows," with a form of synonymous \sqrt{san}

On the slangy idiom *ní√sã* 'grind down' see ad X.28.6. As noted there, the referent of the obj. *purũ sahásrã* "many thousands" is likely to be enemies, perhaps the Dasyus of 2c.

X.48.5: Given the position of the *ná* in pāda a, it seems likely that *ahám índraḥ* is a nominal clause. See comm. ad vs. 2 above. So also Kü (189) "Ich bin Indra."

ná párá jigya íd dhánam is the negated opposite to 1b *ahám dhánāni sám jayāmi*, though the image in 5a is specifically from dicing (see Ge n. 5a), while that in 1b seems to be more generalized.

The lexeme *áva√sthā* with dative appears to be unprecedented. Normally it means 'go/step down' with an acc. of goal, incl. in the middle pf. (as here): V.44.9 *samudrām āsām áva tasthe agrimā* "The foremost of those (females) has stepped down into the sea." The sense of our passage is fairly clear contextually: 'descend/step down for death' can mean 'give way, concede' or perhaps simply 'come down [from heaven] to approach'; Gr anheimfallen (fall victim to), Ge verfallen (fall for).

In any case the two pronouncements in ab, each couched in the negative, seem odd things for Indra to boast about, esp. the latter, since Indra should not be susceptible to death anyway. Indra's promise in d is also expressed negatively.

Ge tr. the pres. part. *sunvántaḥ* as a functional impv., as if coordinated with *yācatāḥ*: "Presset Soma aus und bittet mich um Gut!" (Sim. Lowe, Part., 263.) I certainly agree that the two are closely connected and temporally / logically ordered, But such an interpr. fails to account for the *íd* (and I also see no reason to erase the morphological identity of the participle). I think the point is – do your begging only when you're pressing soma for me; don't even think about begging for stuff if you're not engaged in pressing soma.

X.48.6: The verb for pāda a must be supplied from *ahanam* in c (with a rel. clause intervening in b).

The intens. part. *śáśvasataḥ* echoes *śáśvataḥ* in 1b phonologically, though they are of course etymologically and semantically completely distinct.

Pāda b has a functional periphrastic causative in the present middle: *yudháyé 'kṛṇvata* "they caused to fight." It is not at first clear why this periphrasis is used here, since a morphological causative *yodháya-* exists. However, the various formations to the root \sqrt{yudh} show subtle functional and syntactic distinctions (see my *-áya-*, p. 151). The causative means 'set X (and Y) to fighting', where the various parties to the fight are in the acc. and the subject is the instigator, who takes no part in the fight himself. The *-ya-*present *yúdhya-* in the act. also takes an obj., but it means 'attack': the subject fights the object. Its middle equivalent, *yúdhya-* means 'contends (mutually)', the non-causative equivalent of *yodháya-*. The periphrasis in our b has yet another sense: "X (subj.) causes Y (obj.) to fight X" – in other words the subject both instigates the fight and participates in it. The middle voice of *ákṛṇvata* expresses this dual role. (For a different, and to my mind less compelling, interpr. see Zehnder, Periphr. Kaus, 24, 66.)

The publ. tr. renders *ánamasyur namasvínah* as "(I) unbowable ... those to be bowed"; very similar is Ge's "die sich Beugenden ... (selbst) unbeugsam." This is what context suggests it ought to mean—but there are problems. The stem *namasvín-* (8x) otherwise means 'reverent,

offering homage’ The gerundive feature in my tr. (“to be bowed”) is surely wrong, but even without that, it is difficult to square the usual meaning with the context here. If they are already reverent, why does Indra need to smite them – and how can the “challenging” acc. pl. (*āhváyamānān*) be reconciled with the meek *namasvínah* in the same case and number? Negated *ánamasyu-* is found only here, but *namasyú-* does occur twice elsewhere (I.55.4, VIII.27.11), again meaning ‘offering homage’, and it belongs to the larger morphological system that includes the denom. *namasyá-*, which means the same. If we take these observations seriously, the violence that dominates the whole vs. up to this last phrase is suddenly absent. Although I would prefer to keep some version of my and Ge’s interpr., I find that hard to justify. I would now take *namasvínah* as a proleptic descriptor of the challengers, who, once struck down and rendered humble, offer their homage to Indra. As for him, *ánamasyu-* would be a restatement of *ḍṛhā vādan* “talking tough.” Though his opponents have been subdued and offer him *námas-*, he does not do so in return. This is not particularly satisfactory, but I can’t otherwise account for the phraseology. I would now emend the tr. to “I struck down with my stroke those who were challenging (me), (I) talking tough, giving no homage to those (now) offering homage.” Note that Gr must have been sufficiently disturbed by *ánamasyuh* that he identifies it as a verb form, an imperfect (!) to the denom. *namasyá-* (which, however, doesn’t help matters).

X.48.7: The numerical sequence — “one against one” (*ékam ékah*), acc. “two” (*dvā*), nom. “three” (*tráyah*) — builds on the āmreḍita *dvā-dvā* “by twos” in 6a.

On the shape of the root noun in (*niṣ-*)*ṣāḥ*! see comm. ad IV.88.7. The lexeme *nīḥ* *√sah* is found only once as a verb form (I.127.3 *niṣṣāhamāṇah*) and twice as a root noun, here and in I.181.6. In the other two instances I render the movement implied by the preverb: I.127.3 “going forth to conquer,” I.181.6 “setting out to conquer.” The tr. “utter victor” here does not attempt to do so (nor do Ge’s Sieger, Scar’s “der überlegene Sieger” [603]), though I suppose an alternate “I go forth to conquer, one against one” would be possible.

The verb *karanti* is classified by Wh (Roots) as a root pres., a stem that otherwise doesn’t exist, but it surely is, with Macd (VGS verb list), a root aor. subjunctive. Although grammars give the 3rd pl. act. subj. ending only as sec. *-an*, it does not seem to me that the Sprachgefühl for this part of the paradigm is terribly strong, and it is easy to imagine extending the 3rd *singular* choice between sec. *-at* and prim. *-atí* to the 3rd pl. I would also point out that if it is to be interpr. as a pres. form, it could just as easily belong to a thematic Class I pres. (there being no accent), and have developed from the root aor. subj. A root pres. 3rd pl. should properly have the weak form **kranti*. A modal sense “can/will do” fits the context better than an indicative. For a parallel see *gámanti* in VII.34.20, which Wh identifies as a Class I pres.

The publ. tr. is somewhat clumsy, since the simile seems to qualify Indra rather than the multitude, who are being compared to threshed ears of grain. The intrusion of a homely agricultural image here is striking, esp. as one would expect a more exalted comparison from Indra’s own mouth. The word *parśá-* is a hapax, but its probable sense ‘sheaf, ears of grain’ is supposedly anchored by the YAv hapax *parša-* (Yt. 13.71), which is likewise the obj. of a form of *√han* (/ Av. *√jan*) – though it should be noted that the Avestan context is hardly diagnostic and there’s a certain circularity whereby the meaning of the Vedic word is supported by the Avestan one and vice versa. On the other hand, *khāla-* ‘threshing floor’ is reasonably well attested in Vedic (esp. AVP, which abounds in agricultural materials) and in Middle and Modern Indo-Aryan (see Turner s.v.), and its presence in this simile certainly helps establish the presumed sense of *parśá-*.

X.48.8: The Guṅgus are otherwise unknown, though they presumably have some connection with the isolated female divine figure Guṅgū in II.32.8. Atithigva is better known. In fact Indra slays the same Paṇaya and Karañja with Atithigva's help in I.53.8, though nothing further is known about these victims. It's also possible that there are multiple Atithigvas (see esp. Macdonell + Keith, Vedic Index, s.v.).

On the lexeme *īṣ* √*kṛ* see comm. ad VII.76.2. Ge (n. 8b) suggests that the simile *īṣaṃ nā* that begins the next pāda in fact goes with pāda a, as a word play; this seems eminently sensible and is reflected in the publ. tr. (though Scar [190] takes it with b). Ge disavows any etymological connection of the two *īṣ*- here, but as indicated in the comm. ad VII.76.2, it is quite likely that they are etymologically the same, though their meanings and functions have diverged; so also EWA s.v. *īṣ*-.

The cmpd. *ṛtra-túr*- (5x, always acc. sg. *ṛtra-túram*) occurs three times in positions 4–7 in trimeter vs., as here (*īṣaṃ nā ṛtratúram* ...). In each case HvN comment that a caesura after 3 is rare, but surely the caesura is simply a late caesura in 5th position as usual, coming at the cmpd seam after *ṛtra*-.

The question is who/what the *ṛtra-túr*- is. Since Indra is the subject, it cannot be him, though he would be the default. Gr suggests Atithigva, and this may be the best solution. Note that in IV.42.8 Trasadasyu is named as a *ṛtra-túr*- “like Indra”: ... *trasádasyum* ... *índraṃ nā ṛtratúram*, so non-gods qualify. But it is possible that it's Indra's mace: cf. X.99.1 *tákṣad vájraṃ ṛtratúram* “he fashioned the mace that overcomes obstacles.”

The (almost) identically built loc. sg. cmpds *paṇayaghne* and *karañjahé* in c contain two different thematic derivs. of √*han*. Scar (696) plausibly suggests that the *-ha-* in the latter is a metrically conditioned nonce form; he might also have noted *ṛtra-hátye* in the flg. pāda, which would have supported the *-ha-* form preceding it.

I consider the mention of the *Ṛtra*-smashing in d to be an implicit comparison: the smiting of the two presumably human enemies in c is likened to Indra's great paradigm deed. I think it less likely that the *Ṛtra*-slaying is simply lumped in, as a third ex., with two lesser such killings.

The redupl. 1st sg. *ásuśravi* is generally taken as a plupf. (Gr, Wh [Rts], Macdonell [VGS 425]), and it may well be. However, it is possible that it belongs instead to the redupl. aor. associated with the caus. *śrāvāya*- ‘make hear(d)’. This seems to be implied by Klein's (DGRV II.170) “after I had caused my fame to be spread.” The redupl. aor. is otherwise represented in the RV by the single form act. 3rd pl. *asuśravuḥ* (X.20.12). A mid. pluperfect might be expected to have passive value like the single indic. pf. in the middle, *śuśruve* ‘has been famed’, in VIII.66.9. A medial caus. could have the reflexive transitive sense ‘cause oneself to be heard of’, ‘spread one's own fame’, and the engagement of the subject in creating his own celebrity fits the boastful tone of this ātmastuti. No alteration of the publ. tr. is needed, since “I spread my fame” essentially expresses the reflexive nuance (though Klein's tr. is more explicit). The full grade (but light syllable) in both *ásuśravi* and *asuśravuḥ* may also fit the template of the redupl. aor. better than a plupf., though the weak forms of redupl. formations to such roots are quite variable.

X.48.9: Namī Sāpīya is found also in VI.20.6 and I.53.7, in the latter without the patronymic. But in its place is *sákh'yā* as a play on words. Our passage has the patronymic in c, directly flg. *námī*, though without distraction (probably), but in d *sakh'yā* appears in the same metrical position,

echoing the pun found in I.53.7 (though note that in I.53.7 *sákhyā* is the instr. sg. of *sákhi-* ‘comrade, partner’, while here (differently accented) *sakhyā* is neut. pl. to *sakhā-* ‘partnership’.

The double dat. *īśé bhujé* is also found in VIII.20.8. As Ge suggests (n. 9a), *īśé*, the functional obj. of *bhujé*, has been attracted to it in case. The double-barrelled tr. “restoring refreshment” for *īśé* is meant to capture the word play in 8ab. Tichy (KISch 207) takes *me* with *īśé* (“um meine Stärkung zu genießen”), but as Ge points out (n. 9a), in VI.20.6 it’s Indra who bestows *īś-* on Namī.

In d *éše* plays on *īśé*, though they are grammatically and etymologically distinct.

X.48.10: As noted in the publ. intro. as well as the hymn intro. above, this is the only vs. that lacks a 1st ps. reference. It is also entirely unclear why this vs., which violates the stylistic unity of the hymn, is found here at all – though I will speculate on this below.. It is true that the meter changes to Triṣṭubh from Jagatī, also for the immediately flg. final vs. 11, but vs. 7 is also in Triṣṭubh, and both 7 and 11 fit conceptually into the hymn. The puzzling content of the vs. does not help: it has given rise to quite different interpr., esp. because of the hapax *asthā* in b.

The hapax *asthā* is taken by Ge (flg. Ludwig) as the instr. sg. to **asth-* ‘bone’ (Aves. *ast*), which he then interpr. as referring to the myth of Dadhyañc and his revealing the location of the hidden soma. His tr. of the hemistich is “Bei dem Einen ward der Soma im Inneren geschaut; den anderen tut der Wächter durch den Knochen kund.” The contortions that he must engage in (see n. 10 and esp. n. 10ab) to fit the wording to the myth are sufficient evidence for the unlikelihood of the interpr. A more likely, though not entirely trouble-free, approach starts with connecting the word to the root noun *√sthā*, a possibility thoroughly discussed by Old; see also Scar (646–47). Although Gr interpr. it as an adverb ‘sogleich’, Old’s negated root noun “der nicht Stehende” yields a richer semantics. He sees the passage as contrasting the good person, in whom the presence of interior soma can be detected (a), and the evil one, who can be shown to be without it (b). “In Manchem (dem Guten) wird der Soma darinnen (verweilend) erblickt. Manchen (den Bösen, vgl. cd) macht der Wächter (über Gute und Böse) sichtbar (kenntlich) durch den (in ihm) nicht verweilenden (Soma).” By this analysis *asthā* is an instr. sg. to the root noun cmpd. This analysis is also fld. by AiG II.2.35 and with some hesitation by Scar, and it is registered, though not fully endorsed, by EWA 766 (s.v. *STHĀ*).

The publ. tr. in general follows Old’s interpr., but questions remain. In particular, who is the *gopā-* who reveals the lack of soma in the second party? And is that *gopā-* the unidentified subject of cd or not? Acdg. to Old, the *gopā-* is the one who watches over good and evil; he says nothing specific about the identities in the 2nd hemistich. My current views slightly emend Old’s interpr., in an attempt to explain why the vs. is found in this hymn. Let us begin with the fact that Indra’s signature deed, the slaying of Vṛtra, is barely mentioned in this hymn, found only in vs. 8 and backgrounded there. In that vs. someone/thing besides Indra is touted as a *vṛtratúr-* (8b) and the Vṛtra slaying is compared to Indra’s slaying of two lesser beings (8cd). I suggest that Indra’s signature deed is treated in our vs., which is the climatic one before the summary vs. 11, but it is an indirect treatment of the Vṛtra slaying, expressed in riddling fashion to escape the clichés of that narrative. I therefore think that the contrast in ab is not between good and evil beings (per Old), but between the one powerfully strengthened by soma and the weakling who does not possess it (who in this case is Vṛtra). In pāda a the soma that Indra drinks to prepare himself for battle is discernible (*dadṛśe*) in Indra, though the soma is within him. Presumably the signs of battle fury and soma exhilaration are evident in his external demeanor. In b the one who is exposed by his lack of soma is Vṛtra, and I am inclined to think that Indra is the *gopā-* who does

the exposing – by showing up Vṛtra’s inability to fight back. This seems more economical than dragging in a third party, and Indra is at least once called *gopā-* (e.g., V.31.1), though the designation is more often of Agni or Soma, less commonly other gods.

As for the subject of cd, I emphatically don’t think it’s the *gopā-*, *pace* Ge (n. 10c) and Heenen (Desid. 207–8). Rather it is Vṛtra (or if my identification of the soma-less being in b is not accepted, some unspecified enemy of Indra). The same desid. part. *yúyutsant-* ‘desiring/trying to fight’ is used of Vṛtra in V.32.5, where Indra in the exhilaration of soma consigns him to darkness (cf. also I.33.6 of a group of Indra’s enemies, also defeated).

By my interpr. the obj. of *yúyutsan*, the “sharp-horned bull” (*tigmáśṛṅga- vṛṣabhá-*), has a double sense. This phrase is several times used of Soma: he is clearly so called in X.86.15, and I argue ad X.28.2 that the same phrase refers to Soma there (contra Ge). See also *tigmáśṛṅga-* in IX.97.9, also of Soma. But the same phrase is used once clearly of Indra (VII.19.1). (The other similar phrase, *tigmáśṛṅga- vámsaga-* [“sharp-horned buffalo (?)”] in VI.16.39 applies to Agni.) The first reading here is probably Indra, with the two primal opponents, Vṛtra and Indra, serving as subj. and obj. respectively. But in trying to fight Indra, Vṛtra is also battling the soma within Indra that gives the god his invincible power.

With Ge (n. 10d) I supply a word for ‘fetter’ (*pāśa-*) with *bahulé*, on the basis of *baddhá-* ‘bound’ and VII.59.8 with the phrase *druháḥ pāśān* “the fetters of deceit” in VII.59.8. Note also that *bahulá-* directly modifies *drúh-* in III.31.19 *drúhaḥ ... bahulá ádevīḥ*. I have not found a passage that explicitly links Vṛtra with *drúh-*, but as in the just-cited III.31.19 anything Indra is against can be so characterized.

To summarize briefly: if I am correct, this apparently aberrant vs. in the otherwise unbroken ātmastuti, which contains no 1st sg. forms and makes no explicit indentifications, is Indra’s indirect boast about his major achievement, the Vṛtra slaying, made possible by Indra’s access to soma and Vṛtra’s lack of it.

X.48.11: Ge takes *devānām* as parallel to the gen. pls. of pāda a: “das Gesetz der Āditya’s, Vasu’s, Rudriya’s, der Götter.” But its positioning after *deváh* invites us to construe the two words together, and the archaic ring of the phrase (“god of gods”) fits nicely with the whiff of Indo-Iranian antiquity in the previous vs., where the arch-enemy of Indra is linked to the Lie.

The negated past participles, near-synonyms, that fill the last pāda, *áparājitam ástrtam áśālham* “invincible, indestructible, unconquerable” bring the hymn to a powerful close. Note that *áparājitam* harks back to 5a *ná párá jigye* and *áśālham* to 7a *niṣṣāl*.

X.49 Indra

Although X.48 and X.49 are companion pieces—ātmastutis consisting of the same no. of vss.—there are notable differences in the stylistic impression they make, esp. with regard to pronouns and verb forms.

As noted in the publ. intro., the nom. sg. *ahám* is ubiquitous in this hymn: 16 of the 20 hemistichs (excluding the summary vs. 11) begin with *ahám*, as do 4 of the even pādas (1b, 2d, 3b, 5d). This overwhelming presence contrasts with X.48, where the 1st sg. pronouns recede after vs. 3 (see intro. to X.48 above).

X.49 also presents a remarkable collection of injunctives – 19 in all, in the 10 vss. under consideration: 1a *dām*, 1b *kṛṇavam*, 1c *bhuvam*, 1d *sākṣi*, 2a *dhuḥ*, 3a *śísñatham*, 3c *yamam*, 4b *randhayam*, 4c *bhuvam*, 4d *bháre*, 5a *randhayam*, 5c *karam*, 6b *rujam*, 6d *karam*, 8c *karam*, 8d *vakṣayam*, 9a *dhārayam*, 9d *vidam*, 10a *dhārayam*. (A few of these require some comment.

Thematic 1st sg. mid. *bhare* in 4d could be either a present or an injunctive, but context favors a past reading and therefore an injunctive identification. In 5c *āyāve 'karam* the Pp. reads *akaram*, but of course *karam* is quite possible in this sandhi situation: Old says the augment is doubtful and points out that even Sāy. reads *karam*. In 6b and d the Saṃhitā *vrtrahārujam* and *rocanākaram* could conceal augments (*a/[ā]rujam*, *a/[ā]karam*), and the Pp. so analyzes, both times with accent, but injunctives are just as possible.) Against this accumulation of injunctives there are 5 securely augmented forms — 3b *āvam*, 5b *ājihīta*, 5d *arandhayam*, 8b *prāśrāvayam*, 10b *ādhārayat* — and a miscellany of other finite forms: 3 perfects: 2d *dade* (or redupl. pres., but see comm. ad X.48.2), 3d *rare*, 7c *āha*; 2 presents: 7a *yāmi*, 9c *tirāmi*, as well as whatever *kṛṣe* in 7d may be. By contrast, consider the distribution of tenses and moods in X.48: 7 injunctives: 1a *bhuvam*, 8a *iṣkaram*, 8b *dhārayam*, 9a *bhūt* (which, given phonological context, could be augmented (*a*)*bhūt*, but isn't so read by Pp.), 9b *kṛṇuta*, 9c *maṃhāyam*, 9d *karam*; 6 securely augmented forms (by meter): 2b *aṇayam*, 3a *atakṣat*, 3b *avṛjan*, 4d *āmandiṣuḥ*, 6b *ākṛṇvata*, 8d *āśuśravi*, and one likely one (6c *ahanam*, though the Saṃhitā text *hānmanāhanam* would allow an injunc. *hanam* reading); 10 presents: 1b *jayāmi*, 1c *havante*, 1d *bhajāmi*, 3d *āryanti*, 4c *śiśāmi*, 7a *asmi*, 7c *hanmi*, 7d *nindanti*, 10b *kṛṇoti*, 11b *mināmi*; 6 perfects 2c *dade*, 5a *jigye*, 5b *tasthe*, 10a *dadṛṣe*, 10d *tasthau*, 11c *tatakṣuḥ*; 2 subjunctives: 5d *riṣāthana*, 7b *karanti*; 1 imperative: 5c *yācata*.

As noted in the publ. intro., I find it surprising that Hoffmann did not treat this hymn as a testing ground for his interpr. of the injunctive. (He does treat a few vss. piecemeal.) In the publ. tr. I render the injunctives as general preterites, except for *sākṣi* in 1d, which I now would rethink.

On the metrical disturbances in this hymn, see Old's various comments.

X.49.1: As just noted, my tr. of *sākṣi* in d (“I have vanquished”) contrasts with my renderings of the other injunctives in this hymn and I would now change to a general preterite: “I vanquished.” There is no functional difference between the present and aorist injunctives in this hymn that I can detect, and although *sākṣi* is the only *s*-aor. form in this hymn, that should not correlate with a different usage.

X.49.2: Pāda c has no overt verb; I have supplied *ā dade* from d. Ge supplies ‘lenke’, though the parallel he cites, I.63.2, has instead the verb *veh* ‘pursue’. Ge also couches the whole hemistich in the present: “ich (lenke) ... ich ergreife ...” This is grammatically possible: as noted ad X.48.2 *ā dade* is ambiguous between 1st sg. redupl. pres. and 1st sg. pf. And it would also make sense if the half-vs. is describing Indra's usual preparations for his innumerable deeds in the present/future. However, in the context of this vs. a past tense reading works better: the first hemistich seems to depict the original initiation of Indra into his name and role, and the second half then describes his acquisition of his two most characteristic accoutrements, his pair of horses and his mace.

But I also wonder if 2cd should be read in conjunction with vs. 3, with the whole referring to the Uśanā Kāvya, Kutsa, Śuṣṇa myth. Or rather, that both readings are simultaneously possible — the first given above, that Indra is acquiring his horses and weapon for the first time after being given the name Indra, and the second, that the horses and weapon are specifically those for the Śuṣṇa battle, with this reading providing a transition to vs. 3. For the horses and weapon in the UK / Kutsa / Śuṣṇa saga, recall that when Indra takes Kutsa on his chariot to journey to UK, he first yokes the two horses of the Wind; cf., e.g., I.174.5 *rjṛā vātasya*

ásvā “the two silvery horses of the Wind” (cf. I.175.4, IV.16.11, VIII.1.11, X.22.4–5). Then when they arrive at UK’s, the latter produces the weapon for Indra to use against Śuṣṇa. In I.51.10 the weapon is referred to as the abstract ‘might’ (*sáhas*), but UK definitely ‘fashions’ it: *tákṣad yát ta uśánā sáhasā sáhaḥ* “When Uśanā fashions might with might for you.” But in I.121.12 the weapon thus fashioned is a mace: *yám te kāvyá uśánā mandínam dād, vṛtrahāṇam pāryam tatakṣa vájram* “What Uśanā Kāvya gave to you to provide exhilaration, that decisive, Vṛtra-smiting mace had he fashioned.” With more details V.34.2 *yád īm mṛgāya hántave mahāvadhah, sahásrabhṛṣṭim uśánā vadhám yámat* “... when Uśanā, possessing the great weapon, held the thousand-spiked weapon (out to him), to smash the wild beast.”

X.49.3: This vs. names by name two of the participants in the exploit just discussed, Kutsa in b and Śuṣṇa in c. I suggest that Uśanā Kāvya is also present, in the *kaváye* in pāda a; UK is elsewhere referred to by the designation ‘poet’ (*kaví-*), substituting for his patronymic. See, e.g., IV.16.2–3, 26.1, V.34.3 and comm. ad VI.20.4. Note that Sāy. glosses *kavaye* with *uśanase* here. Ge’s identification of the poet with Kutsa (n. 3ab) is a less happy choice and leads him to misinterpret the pāda in my opinion.

But determining the identity of the poet in pāda a is only the beginning of our challenges. On the surface of it, the pāda involves slashing, piercing, or otherwise doing harm to a cloak (*átka-*) for / on behalf of the *kaví-*. This somewhat puzzling action was obviously too much for Ge, who supplies the verb ‘gave’ to govern the cloak, from *raré* in d, and supplies Śuṣṇa from c as obj. of *śíśnatham*, thus manufacturing two separate clauses in the pāda, one lacking an overt verb, one lacking an overt object. (This interpr. was followed in all particulars by Elizarenkova [168].) This redistribution of elements seems somewhat perverse, esp. in this hymn and esp. in this verse, whose construction is so four-square, with an *ahám* at each corner (beginning each pāda)—esp. since there’s a perfectly good transitive verb to govern *átkam* in the pāda in question. Old defends interpreting the syntactic deployment of the pāda as given (that is, with *átkam* as obj. of *śíśnatham*), even though we can’t restore the plot. He also properly rejects the notion, found already in Sāy., that *átka-* here is a PN.

Clearly the cloak and what was done to it are the key to this pāda. Here we are lucky enough to find a cloak in another treatment of the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa myth, X.99.9cd; unfortunately it doesn’t provide a clear key: *ayám kavím anayac chasyámānam, átkam yó asya sánitotá nṛṇām* “This one here [=Indra] led the poet who was being praised, who won his cloak and was the winner among superior men” (by my tr.; others’ v. diff.). The first hemistich of this vs. contains a compressed account of the victory over Śuṣṇa, with Kutsa the beneficiary. In my view the “poet” in c is once again Uśanā Kāvya. Here (in my view) he carries off a/the cloak as a prize, perhaps a reward for supplying the weapon that did Śuṣṇa in. This suggests that the cloak belonged originally to the enemy, probably Śuṣṇa himself. In our passage then, Indra may be rendering Śuṣṇa’s cloak harmless and up for grabs – in which case perhaps ‘struck down’ or the like might be a better tr. than ‘pierced’ for *śíśnatham*. Indra dispatches the cloak (pāda a) before doing the same to Śuṣṇa himself (c). I tentatively suggest that Śuṣṇa’s cloak is a garment of enveloping darkness, consisting of *māyā-* (‘magic art’, etc.). Śuṣṇa’s *māyās* are mentioned several times, as objects of Indra’s attack (I.56.3, V.31.7, VI.20.4, prob. IV.16.9); it is also said that the slaying of Śuṣṇa keeps darkness away (V.31.9), and Śuṣṇa is also said several times to be hidden or in possession of something hidden (X.22.10, 61.13). By contrast Ge suggests (again n. 3ab) that the cloak is Indra’s or Kutsa’s and refers to the apparent switching or blending of the appearances of Indra and Kutsa, glancingly referred to in IV.16.10 and embroidered in

entertaining fashion in the JB. (See comm. ad IV.16.10 and the publ. intro. to that hymn.) I find this unlikely, since the cloak is the object of a hostile act that is identical to what happens to Śuṣṇa. (However, cf. VI.33.3, a passage containing instr. pl. *átkaīḥ* deployed by Indra; I explain these cloaks as a reference to Indra's shape-shifting; see comm. ad loc.)

There is another possible explanation for the cloak here; though I think it is less likely as the primary reference than what was just presented, it may contribute to the overall interpr. In the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa portion of IV.16 (vss. 9–14) we find (IV.16.13) *átkaṃ ná púro jarimā ví dardah* “You shredded their fortresses, like worn-out age a cloak.” The simile is hard to interpret (see comm., ad loc.), but syntactically the cloak is being compared to the fortresses (*púrah*) that Indra destroyed. Since it is Śuṣṇa's fortress(es) that are attacked in some passages (I.51.11, IV.30.13, VIII.1.28), the “cloak” here might be a metaphor for these destroyed fortresses.

In b “with this help” conceals the pl. of the Skt. phrase *ābhir ūtibhiḥ*. As so often, I have suppressed the pl. because in Eng. both “with these helps” and “with these forms of help” are awkward.

My tr. of c agrees with Ge's, in construing *śuṣṇasya* with the agent noun *śnáthitā*. More grammatically punctilious scholars, unwilling to accept that some root-accented agent nouns take genitive complements rather than expected accusatives (and vice versa: suffix-accented *-tār-* stems with genitives), have disordered what seems (to me) the obvious sense of the pāda to accommodate their syntactic scruples, construing gen. *śuṣṇasya* with *vádhaḥ* and supplying an object (from nowhere) for *śnáthitā*. Thus, Tichy (*-tar-* stems, 152; fld. word-by-word by Kü [421]) “Ich habe in meiner Eigenschaft, (jeden Gegner) zu Boden zu strecken, der Waffe des Śuṣṇa Einhalt geboten”; Tichy cites the similar ploy of Re (BSL 39.110) “c'est moi qui, (le) massacrant, ai arrêté l'arme de Ś.” The Tichy-Kü interpr. introduces a generalized enemy (“jeden Gegner”) that is out of place in the tight confines of the UK/Kutsa/Śuṣṇa saga. (Re avoids this by supplying Śuṣṇa as object of *śnáthitā*, which indirectly restores what I think the grammar says.) These interpr. also require that the *vádhar-* belong to Śuṣṇa and that Indra's act (expressed by the verb *yamam*) involves checking or parrying Ś's weapon in some way. These assumptions are not impossible: *vádhar-* can be the weapon of the enemy (e.g., I.174.8), and *√yam* can sometimes mean ‘restrain’. However, the more likely interpr. is that Indra is wielding the weapon; cf. the very similar phrase (*vádhar úd √yam*) in V.32.7, where Indra brandishes his *vádhar* against Vṛtra: *úd yád índro mahatē dānavāya, vádhar yāmiṣṭa ...* “When Indra held up to the great Dānava his weapon.” It is also worth noting that in another version of our myth Uśanā Kāvya performs a very similar action, proffering the weapon to Indra: V.34.2 (quoted above) *sahásrabhrṣṭim uśānā vadhām yāmat* “U. held out the thousand-spiked weapon (to him).” Ge (n. 3c) also adduces V.34.2 and suggests (n. 1 at bottom of page) that Indra is holding the weapon out to Kutsa, producing a kind of chain of transmission. I think it more likely that Indra is holding it out against Śuṣṇa, as in V.32.7 (though we lack the preverb *úd* here).

Pāda d seems to sum up the fortunate result of the destruction of Śuṣṇa, but what that result is also has to be probed. The Dasyu is presumably Śuṣṇa. Acldg. to Tichy (/Kü), Indra did not give away the Ārya Schar (host / troop) to him (“der ich die arische Schar nicht dem Feind preisgegeben habe”), with an unmotivated substitution of “group / troop” for “name.” (Ge. does not make this substitution: “der ich den arischen Namen dem Dasyu nicht preisgab.”) I think we need to take “name” seriously and read this pāda in conjunction with 2a, where the totality of creatures (“of heaven and earth and the waters”) conferred the name “Indra” on him. “Indra” is in some ways the “Ārya name” par excellence, and in 3d he seems to be saying that by his heroic actions he has not ceded or handed over this proud name to a creature with the opposing name

Dasyu. That is, he has not disgraced the name or allowed the Dasyu to lay claim to it. The middle voice of *raré* reinforces this boast; it can be tr. somewhat heavily “I did not give *my own* name ...” (though such self-involvement of the subject is not as strongly perceptible in all middle perfect forms to $\sqrt{rā}$).

X.49.4: The same personnel (more or less) appear in VI.20.8, VI.26.4; see comm. on the former esp. for some decipherment of the story involved. The presence of the same names in all three vss. makes it likely that a single mythic complex is involved in our vs., rather than a set of unconnected anecdotes, one per pāda. In both passages in VI, Indra works on behalf of Vetasu and Tuji and against Tugra. Vetasu and Tuji are found only in those two passages (the latter in disguised form in VI.20.8, q.v.) and this one; Tugra is better attested, esp. as the father of Bhujyu, but it’s not clear to me that these two Tugras are the same. (It is also worth noting that the client Tuji and the enemy Tugra appear to be etymologically related, with a Caland-y configuration; see EWA s.v. *túji*-.)

Vetasu in VI.20.8 and 26.4 is singular, against the pl. here.

In the publ. tr. I take acc. *vetasūn* with *pitéva* (“like a father to the V.s”) in order to avoid supplying a verb. But when *pitár-* has such a complement, it is normally in the dative (typically *sūnáve* ‘to a son’). I therefore now think a verb needs to be supplied to govern *vetasūn* and the dat. inf., perhaps a form of \sqrt{kr} (see *karam* in the next vss., 5c, 6d), as in I.129.1 ... *tám abhīṣṭaye, káraḥ* “you will make it prevail” or $\sqrt{pā}$, as in X.93.11 *sádā pāhy abhīṣṭaye* (also V.17.5). The latter would fit better with “like a father,” but the former makes fewer syntactic waves. I would now emend the tr. to “I, like a father, (made) the Vs prevail.” Ge supplies ‘help’, Old (ZDMG 55.328 n. 1 [=KISch 788 n. 1]) ‘brought’, citing I.129.1 just quoted, with *káraḥ*.

In b *smádibham* is generally taken as the PN of another enemy humbled by Indra, parallel to Tugra. VI.20.8 contains a similar configuration, with acc. *túgram* and *ibham* in the same pāda, subject to Indra’s will. Ge-Pi (Ved. Stud. I: xvi) take *ibha-* there as a short form of our *smádibha-*, both *ibha-* and *smádibha-* being PN. Old (ZDMG 55.329 [=KISch 788]) follows this interpr; see also Mayr (PN s.vv.). I am dubious. The word *ibha-* otherwise means ‘vassal’ or the like, and I suggest that in the phrase *túgram śásvad ibham* in VI.20.8, *śásvad ibham* is an appositive to *túgram*: “Tugra (as) perpetual vassal (to s.o.).” In our passage *smádibham* is phonologically similar to VI.20.8 (*śá*)*śvad ibham*. I suggest that our passage is based on, or rather deformed from, VI.20.8, with *smád-* an apheresized, phonologically adjusted form of (*śá*)*śvad*. Since *smád* can form cmpds (e.g., VIII.28.2 *smád-rāṭisac-* “(Agni), along with the Gift-escorts”), it has captured *ibha-*. Unfortunately I have to assume a serious amount of misunderstanding of VI.20.8 to arrive at our passage. The real problem is *ca*, which, in our phrase *túgram ... smádibham ca*, pretty unequivocally signals that we are dealing with two conjoined entities, rather than the single one I would like to see in VI.20.8. To get to my tentative interpr. of the passage here, we must first assume that a phrase like *túgram śásvad ibham* in VI.20.8 was reinterpreted as consisting of two people, not the original one: “Tugra (and) (his) vassal.” This interpr. could be made clearer in two different ways—either by adding a *ca* (**túgram ibham ca* “T and (his) vassal”) or by cmpding with *smád* (**túgram smádibham* “T along with (his) vassal”)—and our passage represents an irrational blend of the two. This may be far more trouble than it’s worth, and simply accepting a PN Smadibha may be the line of least resistance. But I faintly suggest an alternative tr. “I made Tugra along with his vassal subject to Kutsa.”

The challenges of this vs. continue. Pāda c contains the hapax *rājāni* (≠ differently accented *rājani* loc. sg. ‘king’), over which much ink has been spilled (see, e.g., EWA 445–46,

Keydana [Inf. 190–91, both with lit; most recently Weiss [“King: Remarks on an East-West Archaism,” Fs. B. A. Olsen (2017)]]). The form is surely a loc. sg. and is also fairly surely related to the G and Y Aves. *r̥n* stem *rāzar* / *rāzan-*, which is variously rendered (Barth. ‘Gebot, Satzung, Anordnung’, Insler ‘directive’, Humbach₁ ‘Verkündigung’, KP ‘adresse’, Humbach₂ ‘prayer’). I will not further pursue the Aves. evidence here, on the assumption that, if the more liturgically limited interpr. are correct, they result from inner-Avestan developments; not will I pursue the prehistory of the formations, for an ingenious account of which see Weiss. I also think it is unlikely to be an infinitive, as, e.g., Ge (n. 4c) suggests. (On this question see Keydana cited above.) But, assuming the stem means something like ‘rule, direction, control’ the question is who is doing the controlling – Indra or the sacrificer (*yájamānasya*), who is in the gen. and presumably dependent on *rājāni*. The categorical difference that even subtle changes in wording can express is clear in the two English phrases “X is in control of Y” and “X is in the control of Y”: in the former X controls Y, in the latter Y controls X. (My sympathies to non-native-speakers of English, who have to confront these two semantically opposite expressions, distinguished only by the presence or absence of the definite article.)

To approach this question it would help to know the identity of the sacrificer. Since this pāda is found within a vs. otherwise devoted to the Tugra, Vetasu, Kutsa, Tuji saga, it is unlikely to be a generic, present-day sacrificer; rather it should be one of the participants in the same story. Sāy. identifies him as Tuji, who appears in the next pāda. Given their proximity, this makes contextual sense, and note that in VI.26.4 Tuji is characterized as singing / a singer (*gr̥nānt-*), that is, as a ritual participant. Or it could be Kutsa, who appears in the preceding pāda (b); Kutsa is called ‘pious’ in VI.26.3 (*kútsāya ... dāsúše*), one of the treatments of this saga. In either case the sacrificer would be, not surprisingly, a devotee and client of Indra, not one of the enemies. This only gets us so far, however, because it is possible to construct opposing scenarios in which Indra is either “in control of” or “in the control of” said person. Although the former is, in some ways, the more likely—Indra is all powerful and can exert control over any mortal—I think the latter, the counterintuitive one, may be the more appealing. In response to a plea, phrased as a directive, from one of his clients confronting a threatening situation, Indra voluntarily puts himself under the direction of the emperiled mortal. This role reversal may account for the unprecedented verbal expression, with *bhuvam* + hapax loc.

We come, at last, to pāda d. As was already noted in the intro. to the hymn above, *bháre* could be either pres. or injunctive, and I take it as injunc. because it belongs to the mythological recital in progress, as the presence of Tuji shows. Before probing what the pāda means, we need to address its syntax: is d a single subordinate clause, dependent on c, or is *prá yád bháre tujáye* the subord. cl, with a flg. nominal main cl, *ná priyádhīše*. Both Ge and I take it as the latter, but Old produces two possible tr. both reflecting the former. The choice makes rather less difference than it might appear.

The next question is what, if anything, is the obj. of *prá ... bháre*. One of Old’s suggested tr. takes *priyā* as obj.: “bring forward the dear things (that are) not to be assailed”; Ge supplies “Wagen.” But I think it more likely that this mid. locution is reflexive / self-involved: “bring oneself to the fore, present oneself.” This action would be the logical follow-up to Indra’s putting himself under the direction of Tuji: he “puts himself out” for T, insuring that the T’s *priyā* were not vulnerable. What these *priyā* were, we don’t know: Ge thinks it’s a pair of horses, but horses don’t figure in the other passage(s) with Tuji, and the form does not have to be a dual. I think it’s more likely to be just general beloved stuff, in the neut. pl.

X.49.5: In contrast to the previous couple of vss., the episodes here are unfamiliar, but the verbal expression is more straightforward (with the major exception of pāda b). Note the bookending (*a*)*randhayam* “I made subject” in pādas a and d (echoing 4b). On likely injunc. *karam* in c, see intro. to hymn above.

Śrutarvan figures in VIII.74, where he is explicitly mentioned in vss. 4 and 13, but is in addition the object of the dānastuti in vss. 13–15 (see Anukr.). Vs. 14 of the dānastuti contains a comparison to the rescue of (Bhujyu) *tūgryam* ‘son of Tugra’. Although in my comment on the vs. just above (vs. 4) I am skeptical that this Tugra is the same Tugra as in the Tugra / Kutsa tale, it is possible that this sketch of the Śrutarvan / Mṛgaya episode was attached here because of the connection in VIII.74.14.

No opponent of Śrutarvan’s is mentioned in VIII.74 (which is an Agni hymn). The opponent here, *mṛgaya-*, is found as the designation or descriptor of different enemies defeated by Indra in IV.16.13 and VIII.3.19; because of its likely derivation from *mṛgá-* ‘wild beast’ (see EWA s.v. *mṛgá-*), it is quite possible that *mṛgaya-* is not a name, but an adj. ‘wild, bestial,’ or the like.

Pāda b is quite challenging: the only words that present no (or few) problems are the first two, *yád* and *mā*. Let us begin with the third word, the impf. 3rd sg. *ājihīta* (so Pp.). I assume (with Ge, Th [Unters. 25], and hesitantly Old) that Śrutarvan is the subj. of this verb and *mā* (=Indra) is the complement (though see below). To get further, we must first be clear on what the form is out of sandhi. Old points out that it could actually contain the preverb *ā-*: *ā-ājihīta*, but I think we can dismiss this suggestion quite easily: *ā-* is not otherwise found with *√hā* ‘move’. But this raises another issue: forms of *√hā* are almost never found without preverb; most of those listed as such in Gr either appear with derivational extensions of preverbs or belong to the other *√hā* ‘leave (behind) / be bereft of’. For an ex. of the former see VIII.20.6 ... *dyaúr, jihīta úttarā brhāt* “heaven raises itself higher aloft,” with *úttara-* substituting for *úd*, as in X.35.6 *úd agnāyo jihatām jyótiṣā brhāt* “Let the fires rear up loftily with their light.” In V.32.9d pāda-final *jihāte* does appear without preverb, but it contrasts with the immediately following *ní ... jihīta* in 10a. Only the part. *jihānaḥ* in III.38.1 seems to be a genuine independent ex. without preverb. What then to do with our apparently naked *ājihīta*? I suggest, very tentatively, that the *ānu* underlying *ānuṣāk* is to be understood with the verb; the lexeme *ānu √hā* is reasonably well represented (III.31.17, VI.18.15, VII.34.24, X.89.13) in the sense ‘follow, conform to, yield to’, as in the extravagant X.89.13, also with Indra as object: *ānv āha māsā ānv íd vānāny, ānv óṣadhīr ānu párvatāsaḥ / ānv índraṃ ródasī vāvaśāné, ānv āpo ajihata jāyamānam* “The months gave way to (him), the trees gave way, the plants gave way, the mountains gave way; the two world-halves eagerly gave way to Indra; the waters gave way to him as he was being born.” In our passage Śrutarvan may have yielded to Indra (per the publ. tr.) or simply followed him; in any case he is a client of Indra for whom Indra accomplished the deed presented in pāda a.

We still have more than half the pāda to go, however. Though the next word is the perennially problematic *vayúnā*, we might first address the value of the following word, *caná*, another perennial problem. This word has fortunately been treated in detail by Klein (DGRV I.285–92), though he does not deal with this passage. As he clearly demonstrates, although *caná* overwhelmingly appears in negative contexts, by itself it does not have negative value; the negative is expressed elsewhere in the context and, as it were, bleeds (not his term) into the *caná*, in part because of the coincidence of *-ná* with the negative *ná*. (See however comm. ad II.24.12, IV.18.8.) He finds only one passage where *caná* has “indisputably negative value” (VIII.1.5), but as I argue ad loc., this counterex. is only apparent, because a trio of negative expressions follow

caná in the same clause. Klein (p. 286) identifies only two examples of his fourth category of *caná*, “in positive clauses, where *caná* does not possess a negative value.” Our passage can be added to this category, as well as V.34.7 (see comm. ad loc.). In V.34.7 I suggest that *caná* is the equivalent of *cīd* in that context, and it may serve thus here as well. Note that Old says that *vayúnā* is “hervorgehoben” by *caná*. In any case we need not try to include a negative in our interpr. (as Ge does; see below). On the problematic ex. in X.56.4 see comm. ad loc.

Let us now return to *vayúnā*. The first issue is the grammatical identity of the form, which can be either instr. sg. or nom.-acc. pl. neut. Ge (n. 5b) opts for the former, although allowing the possibility of the latter if a participle is supplied. But Ge’s interpr. of the whole pāda renders *vayúnā* entirely too freely: “als er zu mir nicht einmal gebühlich, wie sich’s gehörte, eilte.” I think his interpr. of *vayúnā* is “gebühlich,” with *caná*, interpr. as a negative, accounting for “nicht einmal” and *ānuśák* for “wie sich’s gehörte.” In his note he suggests that Śrutarvan was in such a hurry to get to Indra that he in essence forgot his manners; this doesn’t accord with any other usage of *vayúna-* that I know of. By contrast both Th and Old interpr. *vayúnā* as neut. pl. and *caná* as non-negative. I think both choices are correct (inter alia, because neut. pl. *vayúnāni* is found twice nearby, in X.44.7, 46.8), but neither of the resulting interpr. do I find satisfying. If we take *vayúnā* as neut. pl., we then have to figure out how to construe it. Th takes it as an acc. appositive to *mā* in the meaning ‘protection’ (a semantic extension of his preferred interpr. of *vayúna-* ‘Umhüllung’): “als er (Śrutarvan) in stetiger Folge (immer wieder, unablässig [= *ānuśák* sj]) zu mir (Indra) kam als seinem Schutz.” He notes “[d]er harte Plural der Apposition” (to sg. *mā*) but explains it as expressing Śrutarvan’s repeated seekings of protection. Both the “hard plural” and the lack of other exx. of *vayúna-* as “Schutz” make this interpr. unlikely. It is Old’s interpr. that is closest to mine: “als er zu mir hinstürzte, den Ordnungen richtig folgend.” The syntactically controversial decision here is to construe *vayúnā* with *ānuśák*; he seems to take *ānuśák* as an adjective (“richtig folgend”) modifying the subj. of *ājihīta* and governing the acc. *vayúnā*.

Let us now turn our attention to *ānuśák*, for which see also Scar (588–89). As for adjectival use of *ānuśák*, Scar (589) finds no certain exx. of it, though a number of passages are suggestive and in his opinion the adverbial usage must have arisen from a predicative use of an original adj. Although Scar doesn’t discuss this, I can find no clear exx. of *ānuśák* governing an acc., as Old wants it to. What do I do with the combination *vayúnā ... ānuśák*? As disc. ad II.34.4 and passim, I interpr. *vayúna-* as meaning ‘patterns’, both physical patterns made, e.g., by the alternations of light and shade, and, by extension, ritual patterns, the template of repeated ritual actions, as in VI.52.12 *ímāṃ no agne adhvarām, hōtar vayunaśó yaja* “O Agni, Hotar-priest, perform this ceremony as sacrifice for us according to its patterns.” Now, *ānuśák* is regularly used of the proper ordering of the sacrifice or elements thereof, as in VIII.23.6 *ágne yāhi suśastibhir, havyā júhvāna ānuśák / yāthā dūtó babhūtha havyavāhanah* “O Agni, drive with our good lauds, pouring oblations in yourself in the proper sequence, as you have become our oblation-carrying messenger.” Since *vayúna-* often refers to ritual elements, I think we have the same type of expression here: Śrutarvan’s *vayúna-* ‘ritual patterns’ were properly ordered when he yielded to me or followed after me, and I responded positively to this evidence of Śrutarvan’s piety and helped him out. How does this fit syntactically in b? Since I know of no ex. of *ānuśák* with acc., I take *vayúnā* as neut. nom. pl., with *ānuśák* as adverbial predicate: “the ritual patterns (were) in due order,” in other words as a nominal clause. In the publ. tr. this is presented as an unsigned 2nd *yád* cl.: “when he yielded to me *when* the ritual patterns were in due order.” This is skirting the edge of acceptability, or has even crossed it, I realize. There are two other ways to

configure this, still keeping *vayúnā* as nominative. It may be that b contains two clauses: dependent *yád ...*, fld by *vayúnā canānuṣák* as the main cl.: “when he yielded to [or followed after] me, his ritual patterns were in due order,” such that the *yád* cl. does not depend on pāda a, as it is universally interpr., but on the flg. nominal clause. Or *vayúnā* could be the neut. pl. subj. of the sg. verb *ājihīta*: “when his ritual patterns followed after me in due order.”

I realize that all of these suggestions for pāda b (which now amount to over 1300 words, commenting on the 6 that constitute the pāda) are super-tricky and suspect because of their trickiness, starting with the manufacture of a preverb *ānu* from *ānuṣák*, which nonetheless gets to keep its own integrity. I’m certain of at least one thing – that *canā* isn’t negative here – and certain that several other interpr. are on the wrong track, notably Ge’s. The rest is much shakier, and I do not think anyone has cracked the code of this pāda.

The beneficiary of Indra’s action in pāda c, Āyu, is, as Mayr. points out (PN s.v.), sometimes a client of Indra’s (besides this passage, VIII.15.5), sometimes an opponent (I.53.10, II.14.7, VI.18.13, VIII.53.2 [Vālah., where the preceding hymn, VIII.52, is attributed to Āyu Kāṇva]) — in addition to many passages in which it has the adjectival sense (‘lively’ vel sim.) or refers to a different, primordial Āyu. Since the passages in which Āyu is Indra’s opponent all combine Āyu, Kutsa, and Atithigva into a trio and since Kutsa in our hymn is a client of Indra’s we may assume that we’re not dealing with two different Āyu-s but with different family takes on the Indra / Āyu, Kutsa dynamic.

Ge (n. 5c) interpr. the pāda as a clash between the Ārya, represented by Āyu, and the non-Ārya, identified as *veśá-*, which he takes as the settled (hence presumably indigenous) population subordinated by the conquering Ārya. This interpr. depends on what I consider wrong interpr. of Āyu and of *veśá-*. Although Ge identifies Āyu here as “der arischen Stammeskönig,” as was just noted there seem to be several Āyus, and I doubt that the client/opponent of Indra, associated with Kutsa, is the same as the primordial Āyu. As for *veśá-*, it is not well-attested -- 3x, plus *āsvaveśa-* (1x), *dāsáveśa-* (1x PN?), and *prátiveśa-* (1x) (*niveśá-* (1x) and *svāveśá-* (3x) appear to be independent derivatives of \sqrt{vis} with the sense ‘entry, entrance’; for the latter see comm. ad VII.97.7) – but its other two occurrences call Ge’s interpr. seriously into question. V.85.7 lists a series of associates against whom we might have committed an offense: *aryamyāṃ varuṇa mitryāṃ vā, sákhāyaṃ vā sádāṃ íd bhrātaraṃ vā / vesám vā nityāṃ varuṇāraṇaṃ vā, yát sīm āgaś cakṛmā śísráthaś tád*, with *veśá-*s of two different types ending the list. The publ. tr. reads “O Varuṇa, the offense that we have committed against any partner, be he one by alliance or one by custom, or against a brother, / or against a neighbor—whether native or foreign—o Varuṇa, loosen that.” I would be inclined to tr. *nitya-* here rather as ‘one’s own’ (see comm. ad X.44.1) and *āraṇa-* as ‘alien’, but whatever the fine-tuning, it is clear that a *veśá-* can belong to one’s own group, that is the larger Ārya community. The difficult vs. IV.3.13 contains a similar, though less elaborated, series of associates of the speaker: *veśá-, āpí-* ‘friend’, *bhrātar-* ‘brother’, *sákhī-* ‘partner’. Given that the other terms define a relationship of some intimacy with the speaker, it seems unlikely that *veśá-* would refer to an unrelated non-Ārya. Again ‘neighbor’ seems a reasonable interpr.; I suggest that this sense for the simplex was extracted from the cmpd *prátiveśa-* (RV 1x, X.66.13, but common starting in the AV, esp. in Saṃhitā and Br. prose), with the literal meaning given by AiG II.1.284 as “die Wohnung gegenüber habend.” Such an interpr. starts with a *veśa-* *‘house’ (quite possibly accented **veśa-* and the equivalent of Grk. φοῖκος, etc.), but given that all three RVic occurrences of *veśá-* denote people, synchronically *veśá-* must have the personal sense backformed from *prátiveśa-*. I realize that this interpr. is more complex (or complex in a different way) than the one set forth by Mayr (EWA s.v.), whereby *veśá-* is

from the *IE* nom. ag. **u_oi_k-ó-* (√*ue_ik* ‘sich niederlassen’) and not directly derived from Ved. √*viś*, but the occurrences of *veśá-* in V.85.7 and IV.3.13 require a relational meaning like ‘neighbor’, not simply ‘settler, inhabitant’. *dāsáveśa-* in II.13.8 is the PN of an opponent of Indra’s, but should mean ‘having Dāsas (/a Dāsa) as neighbor(s)’, so also seems to contain the back-formed personal sense. As for *āsvaveśa-* in the difficult vs. VII.37.7, see comm. ad loc.; it may contain the old ‘house’ sense. For other disc. of *veśá-* see Macd-Kelth Vedic Index, s.v., Thieme ZDMG 91 (1937): 107, Renou EVP IV.100 (ad VII.37.7), and EWA s.v., with further lit.: the word has attracted considerable attention. In any case in this passage I would now substitute “his neighbor” for “the vassal.” This change does not of course get us any closer to knowing what actually happened, but it does eliminate the misleading ‘vassal’ sense. Taking *veśá-* as a PN in this passage (Gr; explicitly rejected by Mayr, PN s.v.) does not advance us any further either.

Pāda d is quite straightforward, with another occurrence of the verb *randhaya-* and two likely PNs, one of Indra’s opponent (*pádgrbhi-*) and one of his client (*sávya-*). Both are almost speaking names. *Sávya-* must be related to the adj. *savyá-* ‘left’ with accent retraction; despite the usual negative associations of the left, he is Indra’s beneficiary here. Note that one Śavya Āṅgīrasa is the poet of I.51–57, acdg. to the Anukr. As for *pádgrbhi-* its transparent literal sense is ‘grabbing the foot’, and it is of course possible that this is not a name, but a description of the enemy. For the retroflex *d*, cf. *pádbīśa-* and the instr. pl. of *pád-* ‘foot’ (*padbhíh*); see Old (ZDMG 63.300–302 = Kl Sch. 316–18), EWA s.v. *pádbīśa-*. For the phonology see AiG I.172, etc.

X.49.6: As noted in the intro. to the hymn above, I interpret the hemistich-final verbs as injunc. *rujam* and *karam* respectively, because of the dominance of injunctives in this hymn. However, this comes at some cost: if we follow the Pp. in reading accented *árujam* and *ákaram*, we can have finite verbs for the subordinate clauses introduced by *yáh* (pāda a) and *yád* (c). By my interpr. both those clauses need to be otherwise configured, and it may not be worth the necessary contortions to keep the unaccented injunctives. However, even taking them as accented imperfects does not produce a smooth interpr. of either hemistich, as Ge’s tr. demonstrates.

To begin with, even if we read *árujam* and make it the verb of the relative clause beginning with *yáh*, it cannot govern the accs. in pāda a, *návavāstvam brhádhratham*, because this phrasal name (or names) is used of a client (or clients) of Agni in I.36.18 and *návavāst^uvam* alone of someone under the protection of Indra in VI.20.11 (see Ge n. 6a). Therefore he (or they) is/are unlikely to have been shattered by Indra in our vs. To deal with this problem Ge supplies a participle (“schützend”) to govern this acc phrase. If we don’t take a and b together (as I don’t), we simply need to supply a finite verb with a positive sense in pāda a. I see very little difference between Ge’s participle and my finite verb: both need to be manufactured and the accs. in pāda a construed differently from those in b. I tentatively supplied ‘aided’ in the publ. tr.; ‘led’ would be possible on the basis of I.36.18 *agnír nayan nāvavāstvam brhádhratham*, or some other verb with positive sense.

As for whether we’re dealing with one client or two, Sāy. takes them as two, and Ge follows. I prefer one (though not very strongly), with *brhádhratha-* an epithet or descriptor, “N. possessing lofty chariots.” Note that the full phrase *brhánt- rátha-* is found in I.35.4, the hymn immed. preceding the other attestation of *návavāstvam brhádhratham*, suggesting that it is a descriptor in I.36.18 too.

The interpr. of the 2nd hemistich is even trickier. See Old's thoughtful, somewhat discouraging, and ultimately indecisive disc. of the possibilities. Besides the question of *ākaram* v. *karam* and one clause or two, there are the issues of 1) who/what the referent of the acc. caus. participles in c is, 2) what the object of these participles might be (*rocanā* or to be supplied?), 3) what (*ā*)*karam* governs and how it interacts with the participles, 4) what to do with *ānuśāk*. Let us first examine what Ge does with a single-clause interpr. of cd – and how it fails – before attempting one with two clauses. Acdg. to Ge. (nn. 6cd, 6c), the referent of *vardhāyantam prathāyantam* is Vṛtra and as object to these two causatives we should supply *tanvām*, rendering the participles reflexive: "... den sich auswachsenden, gehörig [his tr. of *ānuśāk* sj] sich ausbreitenden (Vṛtra)." But these interpr. would better fit a medial simplex participle, like *vārdhamāna-* in III.30.8, which he cites as semantic parallel. (Note that Sāy. simply glosses the two participles with their medial simplex equivalents: *vardhamānam ... prathamānam*, making no attempt to account for the morphological differences.) The numerous act. forms of *vardhāya-* (and fewer but not negligible ones of *prathāya-*) are never so used: there is always an external object. And although one of the two medial forms of *vardhāya-* does take *tanvām* as object, it is not a mere reflexive but a transitive-causative with internal object: X.59.5: *ghṛtēna tvām tanvām vardhayasva* "strengthen your own body with ghee." Ge then construes *ākaram* with two accs., the participial phrase (X) and *rocanā* (Y), in the sense "make X into Y": "als ich den ... (Vṛtra) ... in Himmelslichter verwandelte." But this is a notion that is foreign to the RV: in all the seemingly myriad treatments of Indra's slaying of Vṛtra in this text, Indra's turning him into heavenly lights, or realms of light, is never the final (or any) act, as far as I know. Ge (n. 6c) cites one RV passage (X.138.6), which should be otherwise interpr. (q.v.), and a few equivocal passages in Vedic prose. Given that his interpr. of the participial acc. phrase is already deeply problematic, Ge's solution of desperation can be properly set aside.

There is another potential comparandum, adduced and discussed by Old, which I think is another red herring: II.11.8, which has *vardhāya-*, a transitive form of *√prath*, and *dūrē pārē*, but the two verbs are construed separately, with two different objects that have no counterparts in our passage, and the whole is quite obscure in any case.

In my view the passage that gives us the best clue is X.94.9, which contains parallel intrans. forms of *√vṛdh* and *√prath*, with Indra as subject: *tébhir dugdhām papivān somyām mādhu, índro vardhate prāthate vṛṣāyate* "Having drunk the somyan honey milked by them [=pressing stones], Indra grows strong, spreads out, plays the bull." On this basis I suggest that Indra [/ "me"] should be the supplied obj. of *vardhāyantam prathāyantam* in our passage, with the whole phrase the transitive equivalent of X.94.9. But who/what is the referent of the participles, their subject? Judging by X.94.9 alone, it should be soma – but soma is not found in our passage, and introducing yet another entity is not a good idea. Looking to the larger context, the subject could be the one who provided the soma, in other words the organizer of the soma sacrifice, the sacrificer. I suggest that this is Navavāstva, who receives Indra's aid in pāda a. He is the one who in c performs the strengthening and spreading out of Indra "in due ritual order" (*ānuśāk*), in other words, during the proper performance of a soma sacrifice. Recall that in the immediately preceding vs. (5ab), by my interpr., Śrutarvan was the beneficiary of Indra's action because *his* ritual patterns were *ānuśāk*; here Nāvastva organizes his sacrifice in the same proper way. In both vss. Indra does something for somebody (5a, 6ab), who does the right thing by him ritually (5b / 6c).

But how would this fit together syntactically? Here we come to the realm of dangerous speculation, which may bring my whole house of cards crashing down. As I just said, I take the

acc. sg. participial phrase in c to be coreferential with *nāvāstvam* in a, which is also acc. sg. In order to construe them together I suggest (very tremulously) that *yád* in c is functioning as a rough izafe connecting the two acc. phrases. Unfortunately this would be the only such ex. in early Vedic, to my knowledge. Although in Old Iranian (both OP and Aves) non-nom. forms of the rel. pronoun can connect non-nom. NPs and in YAves the neut. *yať* substitutes for various oblique forms of the rel. prn. in this type of construction, giving rise to the later Iranian izafe, insofar as Vedic has a similar construction, it shows different parameters. In the RV there exist nominal relative clauses with izafe-like characteristics, but they are always in the nominative, whatever case the antecedent is, and the rel. prn. agrees with the antecedent in number and gender. In early Vedic prose *yád* is in general use, instead of a number- and gender-matching rel. prn., but the clause is also always in the nominative. (For detailed treatment see my “Stray Remarks on Nominal Relative Clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Proto-proto-izafe,” to appear in a forthcoming Festschrift.) Here we would have two features that conflict with the other Vedic exx. of the phenomenon – 1) default neut. *yád* rather than matching rel. prn., 2) a (pseudo-)clause in the same case as the antecedent, not the default nominative. Even though both find matches in some of the Iranian materials, I certainly do not want to claim that the construction here is inherited – rather that it was a maladroitness attempt at a fix to a particular contextual problem. The presumed underlying phrase would have been a simple acc. NP *nāvavāstvam brhádṛatham vardháyantam pratháyantam*, which, however, was too long to fit in a single pāda. For whatever reason the poet inserted the parenthetical main cl. b (... *rujam*) between the name+epithet and the modifying participles, but the latter needed some resumptive device. The poet could have made it all into a rel. cl., **yó vardháyati pratháyati* – but this would have caused confusion with the opening construction of the vs., *ahám sá yáḥ* “I am he who ...,” where *yáḥ* is of course Indra. A 2nd *yáḥ* clause would have invited the Indra interpr. Wanting to make it clear that Navavāstva remained the referent, the poet kept the phrase in the acc. with an inert introducer. (Too bad this strategy sowed confusion rather than reducing it.)

Pāda d is again an independent cl., expressing one of Indra’s cosmogonic actions. Elsewhere he is said to have ‘upheld’ ($\sqrt{dṛh}$) the *rocaná*:- VIII.14.9 *índreṇa rocanā divó, dṛḷhāni dṛmhitāni ca / sthirāni ná parāṇúde* “Through Indra the luminous realms of heaven are firm and made firm, / stable and not to be shoved aside.” (Cf. also II.27.9=V.29.1 of other divinities.) Here he either created the realms or placed them (/ “made them be”) on the far shore of space. This pāda transitions us away from the specifics of the N. story and into the more general situation found in the next vs.

To summarize the structure I see for this vs.: a and c are a single clause, in which we have to supply a verb like “aided” to govern the long acc. phrase that bleeds from a to c. Their connection is signaled by the pseudo-izafe *yád* opening c. Pāda b is a parenthetical main cl., specifying the aid Indra gave N. – we might supply a dative: “(for him) I shattered the Dāsa ...” The final pāda is another independent main cl.; it is not strictly tied to the Navavāstva story, but falls more into the category of Indra’s cosmogonic deeds. I have no faith that my interpr. of the vs. is correct either in general or in detail, but I do think it is an advance on Ge’s and Old’s attempts.

X.49.7: Another discouragingly obscure vs. The first thing to note about it is that it is set in the present, after all the injunctives with past/mythological reference in previous vss. The first hemistich contains the finite present *yāmi* (a); the second the perfect *āha* (c), which always has present value (see Kü 115–17), and whatever *kṛṣe* (d) is, it’s unlikely to have preterital value, a

point made also by Kü (116 n. 47, *pace* Ge's tr. of *āha* and *kṛṣe* as "riet" and "beseitigte" respectively), but see disc. below.

The first hemistich is fairly straightforward: Indra drives around with the Sun's steeds (a), further specified as pl. *Étaśa*-s in b. Since in the sg. *Étaśa*- can be the name of Sūrya's horse and since *Étaśa* is regularly mentioned in the context of the dim story of Indra's conflict with Sūrya over the latter's wheel, our vs. seems to depict a post-conflict phase, in which Indra has prevailed and has acquired the Sun's steeds for his own use. This surmise is supported by the fact that the other two occurrences of pl. *Étaśa*- are in conjunction with the Sun (VII.62.2, X.37.3).

The 2nd hemistich is a different story. Its difficulties begin with the 3rd word *sāvāḥ*. As a simplex, it is a hapax, but (assuming it's the same word) it appears in the cmpds. *prātaḥ-sāvā-* (3x) and *sahasra-sāvā-* (2x). The stem is almost universally (incl. by Sāy.) derived from \sqrt{su} 'press', a derivation supported by the cmpds. (presumably 'early-morning pressing and 'pressing of thousand(s)' respectively), but the influential voice of Ge takes it instead to $\sqrt{sū}$ 'impel' (see n. 7c), tr. it as "Anweisung" (instruction), a rendering that actually seems relatively far from the root meaning 'impel' to me. Ge's deviating opinion can be discounted here (though Kü [116] allows the possibility of both, with "der Antreib / die Pressung"), even though it makes for a smoother tr.: that is, it is easier to imagine "instruction" as the subj. of a verb "says" than a soma-pressing. Nonetheless, RVic discourse contains far stranger pairings.

The next question is whose *sāvā-* is at issue. There is a dependent genitive, *mānuṣaḥ*, which Sāy., Ge, and Kü (116) take as referring to an unidentified man (see esp. Ge's n. 7; he thinks it might be Uśanas Kāvya). In contrast, with Old and Scar. (285) I take it as referring to Manu(s), the first sacrificer: "the pressing of Manu(s)" is both the primal offering of soma and every re-creation of it since. By associating it with Manu, the poet gives it the charter to make authoritative statements (*āha*).

And what is that statement? It is embodied in a single word, the dat. *nirṇīje* (in sandhi it could also be abl./gen. *nirṇījah*, but this is less likely; Pp. goes for dative). This dat. is found three times closely packed in IX (IX.69.5, 70.1, 71.1), as a purpose abstract / (quasi-)infinitive: "for / to be (s.o.'s) raiment" (see Scar 284–85). Here I think Soma is announcing himself as Indra's raiment – that is, that Indra's ritual drinking of soma, starting with the very first soma pressing, provides him with a protective garment or shield in preparation for battle. Alternatively Soma could just be telling Indra to suit up (which is what Old's "... sagt mich sauber zu machen" and Scar's "mich zum Ausschücken anhielt" more or less add up to), but the point of hearing this from Soma would be lost if Soma is not the garment itself.

The result of Indra's arraying himself is given in the main cl. in d. It is quite clear that Indra seriously damages the/a Dāsa with his *hātha-* ('blows, thrusts' vel sim.), but the verb in the clause, *kṛṣe*, is extremely problematic. It is presumably to be construed with the adv. *īdhak* 'apart, aside', but the morphological analysis and even the root affiliation are hard to determine. On the one hand, it looks like the accented *kṛṣé* found in VIII.3.20=32.3, but there are serious divergences. If *kṛṣé* is a finite verb, it is a 2nd sg.; the other possibility is a predicated dat. infin. (see disc. ad VIII.3.20). In either case, this allows a root affiliation with $\sqrt{kṛ}$, which fits the context. But here the default interpr. is 1st sg. (Gr simply invents an aor. stem *kṛṣa*, to which this is the 1st sg.). Though it would be possible to recast d as the words of Soma addressed to Indra: "you (will) do ..." (on this poss., see Ge's n. 7d) and preserve the 2nd sg. interpr., this doesn't fit the rhetoric of the rest of the hymn, where Indra is always the speaker, and it introduces another layer of complication. And we cannot interpret it as a -ṣe 1st sg. (of the *stuṣé* type), because those forms belong to a tight semantic class, that of praising. There is another factor to keep in

mind: two more exx. of *kṛṣe* are found in the next hymn, X.50.5 \cong 6, attributed to the same poet. These three forms must obviously be considered together, but finding a common denominator isn't easy. Among other things, the usual interpr. of the forms in X.50.5–6 is as 2nd sgs. (like *kṛṣé* in VIII), as opposed to the 1st sg. here – though see disc. ad loc. for my rejection of that interpr. Moreover if the repeated *kṛṣé* in VIII is a finite form, it is probably preterital, but that value doesn't fit here. Note Kü's explicit insistence (116 n. 47) that *kṛṣe* cannot be a preterite in our passage.

Taking it by itself (that is, in conjunction neither with *kṛṣé* in VIII nor *kṛṣe* in the next hymn), I see two possibilities, both of which have their problems as well as their advantages. 1) It belongs to $\sqrt{kṛ}$. The advantages are obvious: $\sqrt{kṛ}$ is an overwhelmingly well-attested root; moreover, *īdhak* $\sqrt{kṛ}$ is found elsewhere, in an appropriate meaning: 'put aside, set aside, separate'. Cf. VIII.18.11 *īdhag dvēṣaḥ kṛṇuta* ... "Set hostility aside" (also IV.18.4 and prob. IV.34.9). The publ. tr. "sideline" is a slightly idiomatic version of this. But the drawback of this interpr. is serious and indeed insurmountable in my opinion: we need a source for the -s-, and I have been unable to find any way to get the -s- that is not breathtakingly arbitrary. There is a marginally attested zero-grade medial s-aor. (*akṛṣi*, *akṛṣata*), found in JB and BSS (see Narten, s-aor. 96), presumably based on the old medial root aor. (so Narten). Our form could belong to such a stem – but 1) the stem is very late, 2) we would still have to assume that it had been reinterpr. as a pres. stem, to explain the -e ending – or else that it shows an archaic -e subjunctive ending (rather than -ai) built to an anomalously zero-grade stem. Just to set this down in writing shows how desperate a confection it is. If we want to preserve the root affiliation with $\sqrt{kṛ}$, I'm afraid we have to renounce any attempt to account for the -s-. 2) But there is another avenue: the root $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ 'plough; drag, draw'. Here the morphology is (relatively) unproblematic. The root has both a 1st class pres. *kārṣati* and a 6th class pres. *kṛṣāti*. Although both presents are generally active, both have medial forms in Vedic (e.g., to the 6th cl., *kṛṣasva* RV X.34.13). On the presents, see Gotō (1st. cl. 112–13) and Hill (Aor.-pres. 115–21); on injunc. *karṣat* see comm. ad X.28.10. Our form can straightforwardly be the 1st sg. med. pres. to *kṛṣá-*. Assuming a meaning 'drag, draw', there is no problem with the semantics of our passage: 'draw/drag aside/apart' can produce the same 'sideline' sense for *īdhak* $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ as for the same idiom with $\sqrt{kṛ}$. There are a few problems: the root is not otherwise found with *īdhak* and in fact forms of the root are relatively poorly attested in general, esp. compared to $\sqrt{kṛ}$. Moreover, the 'plough' sense is dominant; in fact Gotō (112) claims that the 6th cl. pres. is only used in this technical meaning, whereas *kārṣa-* has a wider semantic range (sim. Hill). But given the (Rig)Vedic propensity for metaphorical extension, I find it difficult to believe that *kṛṣá-* could not widen in the same way as *kārṣa-*. On balance I favor interpr. *kṛṣe* here as a med. 6th cl. pres. 1st sg. to $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$. Or, that *kṛṣe* is a blend, a form originally of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ that has borrowed the -s- from $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ on the basis of passages like this, where the semantics were neutralized ('put aside' = 'drag aside'). But the blend idea seems more trouble than it's worth.

The rest of the pāda is unproblematic.

X.49.8–10: These three vss. show concatenation, though their contents are otherwise divergent: 8a *sapta(hā)* matches 9a *saptá* in the same metrical position; 9a *dhārayam* matches 10a *dhārayam*, though in a diff. position. Note also 9b *sīrā(h)* and 10d *āśīram*.

X.49.8: This vs. comes as a relief after the many knots that precede it. It also returns us to the mythological past, with two injunctives (*karam* [c], *vakṣayam* [d]) in addition to the augmented *prāśrāvayam* in b.

On the seven whom Indra smites (*saptahā*) see Ge's n. 8a; of the parallels he cites, X.120.6, with its *saptā dānūn* shattered by Indra, is the most apposite. See also his remarks on Nahus in the same n.

The c and d pādas are implicitly contrastive: the definite *anyām* 'the one' in c evokes an unexpressed **anyān* 'the others' as complement, modifying the acc.s of d (so also Ge).

Since *sāhaḥ* is neut. and *anyām* is masc., they must be two parallel objects: the individual enemy (*anyām*) and the abstract power he represents (*sāhaḥ*); for a similar passage (also adduced by Ge n. 8c) where the *sāhaḥ* is Vṛtra's, which is defeated by Indra's corresponding *sāhasā*, see I.80.10 *īndro vṛtrāsya tāviṣīm, nīr ahan sāhasā sāhaḥ* "Indra has smashed forth the power of Vṛtra, has smashed forth the might of Vṛtra with his might."

The apparent act. participle *vrādhant-* is essentially isolated; the sole finite form to the supposed root *√ vrādh* (V.6.7) is plausibly explained by Hoffmann (Inj. 122 n. 32; see also Gotō [1st cl. 302]) as a backformation to *vrādhant-*. Lowe (Part. 291) considers the poss. that it is a Caland adj. In any case it lacks synchronic participial function, serving as a plain adj., but one with shifting value: 'arrogant, overweening' of enemies, 'proud' of clients. For the former, cf., e.g., X.69.11 *āva vrādhantam abhinad vṛdhaś cit* "as strengthener you [=fire] cut down even the greatly arrogant one." For the latter I.122.10, where Nahus, found also in our vs., is so described: *vrādhato nāhuṣaḥ ... śārdhastaraḥ* "more forceful than proud Nahus"; see also I.150.3. Since the ninety-nine here are the object of Indra's strengthening, a positive interpr. is called for. See Ge's n. 8d.

X.49.9: On Indra's holding the waters fast, see comm. ad I.51.4, also I.61.11 (adduced by Ge n. 9a). KH (Inj. 192) takes *dhārayam* as having the same presential-general sense as the identical form in 10 and tr. "ich erhalte die sieben Ströme", but, despite the pres. tense verb in c, I think the rest of the verse is couched in the mythological past.

I do not know why c has a pres. tense verb *vī tirāmi*, while d has the injunctive *vidam* (which could in fact be augmented *avidam* in its sandhi context: *yudhā[avidam]*, though this seems unlikely), esp. since, as Ge asserts (n. 9cd), the actions in the two pādas are elsewhere associated (see esp. X.104.9).

X.49.10: KH tr. and disc. this vs. (Inj. 192). He takes *dhārayam* as "generell" in function (= "allgemeine Eigenschaft bzw. Fähigkeit") and tr. "Ich halte ... fest," while the augmented *ād dhārayat* in b he renders as a semi-modal "festhalten konnte." As he points out, the vs. seems to concern one of the beloved Vedic paradoxes about cows and milk: that "cooked" milk comes from "raw" cows, or that white milk comes from red cows. But in fact the particulars of the vs. point to neither of these (save possibly for the *rúṣat* 'gleaming' in 10b); the content more resembles another standard paradox, that the fetus doesn't fall out of the womb or the sun out of the sky. It is also not clear why/how Tvaṣṭar failed while Indra succeeded, that is, what episode this refers to. Ge (n. 10ab) says that Tvaṣṭar is the creator of animals, but this only makes his failure in this endeavor the more mysterious. Because of the contrast between Indra's and Tvaṣṭar's actions here, I think it must refer to a mythological incident in the past, not a general situation holding now, contra KH.

Pāda b is metrically problematic; for various possible solutions see Old – while Arnold (metrical comm.) suggests reading *tvāṣṭa ádhārayat* with the contraction of *tvāṣṭādhārayat* unloosed and shortening of *tvāṣṭā* in hiatus. What no one seems to have suggested is to read *ná* not as the last word of pāda a, but as the first word of b. This would yield a well-formed Triṣṭubh in pāda a (and the following and final vs. 11 is in Triṣṭubh) and a Jagatī in b, without the need to dissolve the contraction of *tvāṣṭādhārayat*. The break of b would be irregular (two heavies), but it is also under the current pāda division, hence the makeshifts of Old, Arnold, and HvN. My suggested division also eliminates pāda-final *ná*, which is vanishingly rare and places the *ná* in a standard pāda-initial position. (There are numerous examples of # *ná* ... *caná*; see Lub s.v. *caná*.) For disc. of supposed exx. of pāda-final *ná* see comm. ad X.111.7.

The loc. pl. *ūdhasu* (or *ūdhaḥsu*) in c would be better read as degeminated **ūdhasu* to avoid a rare break (– – ∪).

The phrase *sómam āśíram* has been variously interpr. The problem is that although the acc.s throughout this vs. have so far referred exclusively to milk, we suddenly have soma, followed by *āśír-*, the technical term for the milk mixed with soma. Ge (n. 10d) suggests that *āśíram* here is an infinitive, with *sómam* as its complement: “to milk-mix into soma” in an awkward English rendering. (His is smoother: “um den ... Soma zu mischen.”) Alternatively he allows for the possibility of a loose cmpd “die Soma-Mischmilch.” The publ. tr. follows Old’s interpr. (given Noten I.411 n. 1), whereby the milk is *identified* with soma, presumably as a particularly exalted liquid, as well as with the milk to be mixed with it. After all it has just been called “the honey of honey,” another valued substance that is not chemically identical with it. (KH’s [192 and n. 162] “den Zusatz zum ... Soma” seems to follow Ge, though he cites Old.)

X.49.11: Unlike its companion hymn X.48, in this ātmastuti Indra does not remain in character through the whole hymn. The final vs. of X.48, vs. 11, continues the 1st sg. reference with *mināmi* in b and *mā* in c. By contrast, the final vs. of our hymn is a 3rd ps. summary, beginning with the formulaic summary-verse particle *evā* “just in this way,” with Indra the 3rd ps. subject of ab, followed by 2nd sg. reference to him (*te* + heavy voc. *harivaḥ śacīvaḥ* ... *svayaśaḥ*) in cd.

There are two problems associated with ab and esp. its verb. 1) The pf. *vivīye* is the only medial form not only to the pf. to $\sqrt{vī}$, but to any stem belonging to the root. (Wh’s and Gr’s root pres. part. *vyānā-* X.85.12 is universally interpr. instead as ‘breath’; see comm. ad loc.) 2) Moreover, the lexeme *prá* $\sqrt{vī}$ is relatively rare in the RV; see comm. ad I.34.4 as well as Scar (501). (Ge’s suggestion [n. 11a] that *prá* “excuses” (entschuldigen) the middle voice is belied by the fact that all other finite forms of *prá* $\sqrt{vī}$ are active.) I propose to deal with one of these issues by the simple expedient of separating a and b into separate clauses. Taking them as a single clause results in an unusual verbal configuration: not only would *prá* be separated from *vivīye* by tmesis, but it would follow it at some distance, introducing the next pāda. Although preverbs in tmesis sometimes follow their verbs, they generally follow them immediately and remain in the same metrical unit; I do not offhand know of another example of this type (which is not to say they don’t exist).

With the *prá* eliminated, we are free to interpr. pāda a with a simplex *vivīye*, which allows us to tap into a common formula. The VPs *devān* $\sqrt{vī}$ and *nṛṇ* $\sqrt{vī}$ are occasionally found as free syntagms (e.g., VI.50.2 and VI.2.11 respectively) and the cmpds *devā-vī-* and *devā-vīti-* are quite common, all in the meaning ‘pursue / seek to attract the gods (/men)’, i.e., seek to attract their attention and their presence. As a summary of the intent of his self-praise (*ātmastuti*), “Indra pursued / sought to attract the gods” seems accurate and would immediately evoke the

stereotyped VP. His string of boasts is meant to impress the audience with his powers and previous deeds and excite their admiration. The unusual middle voice would reflect Indra's intense self-involvement in the action; the verb is otherwise syntactically identical to the active, as Kü remarks (454) with some puzzlement.

In the publ. tr. I take *devān ... nṛṇ* as a conjoined phrase without overt conjunction: “gods and men.” I now think it at least equally likely that *nṛṇ* refers to the gods, as so often, and the whole should be tr. “the gods, the superior men.” Cf. VI.2.11 *vīhī ... divó nṛṇ* “pursue the men of heaven,” clearly referring to the gods.

This leaves us with pāda b, independent by my interpr. but lacking a finite verb. This can be easily remedied by attending to the first two words: *prā cyautnéna*. The latter of course is derived from \sqrt{cyu} ‘stir, rouse’; *prā* is the most common preverb with \sqrt{cyu} . I generate a verb form for b from this combination, *prācyāvayat* vel sim., supplying as obj. *devān ... nṛṇ* from pāda a.

It is also possible that the second hemistich should be divided into two clauses, rather than being a single cl, as in the publ. tr. The first (c) would be a nominal clause: “all these (deeds) are just yours,” with a displaced *íd*, or “all these (deeds) are yours.” Pāda d would then simply supply *tā* as obj. from its nominative in c: “The powerful ones applaud (them).” This separation might allow more of a role for the *íd* in c, though both interpr. are possible and pretty much amount to the same thing.

Since *abhī√gṛ* means rather ‘greet, welcome, applaud’ rather than ‘sing’, the tr. should be adjusted accordingly.

X.50 Indra

The hymn has an intriguing structural omphalos, although it does not seem to correlate with specially emphasized content. In vss. 3, 4, and 5 each hemistich in the vs. has a more or less matching opening: 3a *ké té*, 3c *ké te* (note the accentual and therefore morpho-lexical difference in the 2nd word); 4a *bhúvaḥ*, 4c *bhúvaḥ*; 5a *ávā nú kam*, 5c *áso nú kam*. Vss. 3 and 4 also have echoes of the opening further along: 3a and the beginning of 3b continue the pronominal pattern: *ké té nára indra yé ta iṣé*, *yé te ...*, with 3d opening with *ké* again; 4b starts with the same *bhúvaḥ* as 4a and c.

There are a few other patterns worth noting: the word *nṛ-* and derivatives dominate the first four vss. of the hymn: 1b (*viśvā*)*narāya*, 1d *nṛmṇám*, 2a *nárya*, 2b *naré*, 3a *náraḥ*, 4c *nṛṇ*. And note contrastive *paúmsye* in 3d. Pāda 5d and 6a are identical save for a minor variation (#*viśvéd etā* v. #*etā viśvā*). And the first (1a) and last (7d) pādas of the hymn end with *ándhasaḥ*, construed, not surprisingly, with a form of $\sqrt{ma(n)d}$.

X.50.1: The verb *prā ... árcā* can be either 2nd sg impv. or 1st sg. subj. I have followed the Pp. (etc.) in taking it as the former, despite the presence of 2nd pl. *vaḥ*. As I discuss in “Poetic Self-Reference” (Fs. Skjaervø, 2005: 69 and n. 10), a poet sometimes urges himself, in the 2nd sg., to praise, while referring to his priestly colleagues on behalf of whom he is acting in the 2nd pl. (regularly *vaḥ*). It is awkward to render the enclitic in English, and so I left it out of the publ. tr.; Ge. takes it as a possessive with *ándhasaḥ* (“an eurem Tranke”), but this seems just like a place to park the pronoun.

With Gr, Old, Scar (360), but contra Pp., I analyze *viśvābhū-* as *viśva-ābhū-* ‘present / available to all’, which distracted reading salvages the meter. The argument against this analysis might be that rt. noun cmpds generally don’t contain both a nominal 1st member and a preverb

(see my *iṣudhyā-* [Fs. Lamberterie, 2020] 486 and my forthcoming “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian”; Scar 649 and n. 921). However, this restriction seems to be limited to nominals with object function; *viśva-* is more loosely construed with the rest of the cmpd. here.

As disc. ad I.18.9, III.31.7, *makhā-* and its derivatives and cmpds can have both martial and bountiful sense. Here since *súmakha-* modifies *sāhaḥ* ‘strength, power’, it is more likely to be the former, hence my “good-battling strength” versus Ge’s somewhat discordant “des freigebigen ... Siegeskraft.”

I take *māhi* with *śrávaḥ* despite the pāda boundary between them, because *māhi śrávaḥ* is a fairly common phrase (I.43.7, 79.4, etc.), but there is no harm in taking it with *sāhaḥ* as Ge does.

X.50.2: The *sákhi-*, Indra’s “comrade,” doing the praising in pāda a is by implication the “man like me” who is supposed to celebrate Indra in b — which neatly identifies me as having such a privileged relationship with the god.

The various locatives in cd sketch a range of situations in which Indra is hard pressed and needs – and receives (*abhí ... mandase*) – the exhilaration of soma. The English might be more parsable if the locatives had been rendered more uniformly. I now would take the list as a series of unmarked locative absolutes, tr. “Whether it’s a question of ...” The standard interpr. (incl. in the publ. tr.) is that four different circumstances are enumerated: *viśvāsu dhūrṣú*, *vājakṛtyeṣu*, *vṛtré*, and *apsú*, with *vā* preceding the last member of the series in a construction “X₁ ... X_{n-1} (*utá*) *vā* X_n” (see JSK, DGRV II.172–73). I now wonder if there are only two items on the list, each with a characterizing loc.: the two items would be *vājakṛtyeṣu ... vṛtré vā* (with conventionally placed *vā*), with each further characterized by a circumstantial locative, the initial *viśvāsu dhūrṣú* and the final *apsú* – thus producing a chiasmic construction. On this basis I now suggest an alternative tr. “whether it’s a question of seeking prizes among all the chariot poles or of Vṛtra among the waters.” The reason for my change of heart (beyond a better placement of *vā*) is that an independent situation “among the waters” that would require Indra to rev himself up with soma is a bit difficult to conjure up, and “amidst all the chariot poles” is also somewhat hard to construe independently – witness the varying interpr. given by Sāy., Ge (n. 2c), and Klein. My second proposed item, “Vṛtra among the waters,” would refer to Vṛtra’s confinement of the waters, and Indra’s need to smite Vṛtra in order to free the waters.

As for the first item, we must first take a brief detour through *vājakṛtya-*. The 2nd member of this cmpd, *-kṛtya-* is presumably a neut. abstract ‘doing’ (so AiG II.2.828), found also in AV *karma-kṛtya-* ‘doing of deeds’. But what does ‘doing (or ‘making’) of *vāja-*’ mean? The syntagm *vājam / vājān √kṛ* is very rare: I have been able to find only one example, the throw-away final pāda of VIII.26, vs. 25 *kṛdhí vājān apó dhíyaḥ* “(O Vāyu,) make prizes, waters, and insights for us.” I suggest that *√kṛ* in our *vāja-kṛtya-* is, as it sometimes is, a dummy verb, that is, it serves as the abstract of the denom. to *vāja-*, *vājayá-* ‘seek prizes’; with its associated adj. *vājayú-* ‘seeking prizes’. With this array, we might expect a long-*ā* abstract **vājayā-* ‘the seeking of prizes’ – cf., e.g., *śravas-yá-* ‘seeks fame’, *śravas-yú-* ‘seeking fame’, and *śravas-yā-* ‘the seeking of fame’. I suggest that *vāja-kṛtya-* is substituting for **vāja-yā-*, perhaps to avoid a pile-up of fem. loc. pl. Alternatively *√kṛ* in this cmpd might be used in the same way as in VIII.26.25: ‘make’, that is, ‘supply’ prizes to someone else.

In either case the “seeking / making of prizes” happens “amidst all the chariot poles.” This must refer to the disordered scrum of chariots and the horses yoked to those chariots found

either on the battlefield or in a contest or chariot race. So acdg. to my two-item interpr., Indra receives an infusion of soma at his (mythological) battle with Vṛtra and in the confusion of (present-day) battles and contests in which he gives aid to mortals.

So I now suggest an alternative rendering of the 2nd hemistich “Whether it’s a question of seeking/making prizes amidst all the chariot poles or of Vṛtra amidst the waters, you find exhilaration.” I have not entirely rejected the four- (or an alternative three-) item interpr., however, because the independently construed *apsú* in the next vs., 3d, may respond directly to *apsú* here.

X.50.3: As Ge says (n. 3), the answer to “who are these men (*nárah*)?” is probably a resounding “we are!” This answer has been prepared by the explicit “a man like me” (*māvate naré* 2b). However, since *nṛ̥-* can also be used of gods and in the pl. is especially common with the Maruts, the poet may be setting up a sneaky identification between the human adherents to Indra and the gods who have the same type of relationship to him. In any case the concentration of *nṛ̥-* forms early in the hymn gives weight to the question “who are these men?”

Judging from the various tr., it almost seems that the dative pred. *iṣé* could belong to any number of stems *iṣ-* (several of which don’t exist). I take it to *iṣ-* ‘refreshment’ (so also Scar 291 and Sāy., who glosses *annāya*), the point being that the men in question provide Indra with *iṣ-* (in this case, probably soma). Ge “nach Wunsch” (wouldn’t this be an instr.?) or better (n. 3) “zu deiner Freude” (presumably to the same *iṣ-* as mine); Heenen (Desid. 80–81) “à ta force” (what stem?). Note that VI.68.1, adduced by Ge (n. 3), contains both *iṣé* and *sumnāya*, like the *sumnám* in our pāda b. See comm. ad loc. Our passage makes the reciprocity between the two terms clear: we provide Indra with *iṣ-* and in turn receive *sumnā-* from him.

On *sadhanyām* see comm. ad IV.1.9, VI.51.3, where I accept Scar’s re-analysis of this stem as ultimately based on *sa-dhana-* ‘common wealth’, with the developed meaning of *sadhanī-* ‘companion’, contra the usual deriv. from a rt noun cmpd with $\sqrt{nī}$. In Scar’s rendering of this passage he takes the companion to be Indra’s: “dein Wohlwollen, das dein [ständiger] Begleiter ist (?)” I think it more likely that the men are seeking to make Indra’s favor into *their* companion. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “as their companion,” eliminating “travelling,” which is a ghostly trace of the old interpr. with $\sqrt{nī}$. Curiously Ge tr. *sadhanyām* here as “deine Mitanteil an der Beute gewährende (Huld)” (fld. by Tichy [1983 = KISch 207 n. 22], W. E. Hale [Asuras (1986) 93, “booty-apportioning”], Heenen [“qui procure des butins”]) though Ge’s renderings of the stem elsewhere are in the “companionship” range.

In c the “lordly prize” (*vājāyāsuryāya*) for which the men strive matches the prize in *vājakṛtya-* in 2c. Likewise, the loc. phrase *apsú svāśūrvārāsu paúṃsyē* seems to have a function similar to the locatives in 2cd, except here they express what is at stake for the men, rather than for Indra as in 2cd. The presence of the reflexive adj. *svāsu* ‘their own’ emphasizes the men’s self-interest. Note that *apsú* is found in both 2d and here; in 2d it referred (probably) to the waters associated with Vṛtra, but here it must be the waters that the men are battling for. I therefore think that *svāsu* not only modifies flg. *urvārāsu* (“their own fields”) but, more importantly, preceding and likewise fem. *apsú* (“their own waters”), in order to contrast with the waters in 2d, which are in Indra’s domain. Gr, Ge, and, flg. Ge, Hale take *svāsu* only with *urvārāsu*. I would now slightly emend the tr. to “when their own waters (and) fields (or) their masculine power is at stake.”

The last loc., *paúmsye* ‘masculine power’, implicitly contrasts with the many forms of *nṛ-* so far encountered, esp. the subj. of this vs., pl. *náraḥ*. For a similar contrast see comm. ad X.29.7.

X.50.4: The three insistent pāda-initial forms *bhúvaḥ* are of course troublingly ambiguous, because formally they can be either injunctive or subjunctive (see disc. ad IV.16.18, X.8.5–6) and because the influential disc. of KH (Injunk., esp. 214ff.; see also just cited comm.) imposes what to me is an overly narrow interpr. of these forms. In the publ. tr. I take the three *bhúvaḥ* here as subjunctive “you will become” (so also JSK DGRV I.99); this may be supported by the undoubted subjunctives in the next vs. (*ásah ... vārdhāḥ* 5c). However, I now think it possible, though not necessary, to take them instead as injunctives “you become” — meaning that Indra periodically takes on these roles (see comm. ad X.8.5–6). If we maintain the subjunctive interpr., the first hemistich is a promise to Indra from the poet and ritualists, while the second portrays the aid Indra will provide in return. I think it less likely that the forms are injunctives in preterital sense “you became” (pace Ge’s “Du ... wardst ...”) although this is not excluded.

The stem *cyautná-* is otherwise neut. in the RV (pl. *cyautná(ni)*); as the numerous occurrences in Aves. (both O and Y) of the exact cognate *šīiaoθ(a)na-* are also neut., this seems like an inherited trait. The masc. nom. sg. *cyautnáḥ* here is a grammatical nonce, with the stem pressed into service as a rough-and-ready agent noun. I suggest that it was generated from the last vs. of the previous hymn (X.49.11) where I suggested that *prá cyautnéna* is a compressed expression of * *prācyāvayat cyautnéna* “With his stirring action he be(stirred) (them),” where in fact *nṛn* forms part of the object. Here, with Old, I take *nṛn* again as an acc. to be construed with the nonce nom. agentis *cyautná-*. The tr. would better reflect this as “you will become the rouser of men” (cf. Ge. Aufrüttler, sim. KH, JSK ‘mover’).

In d identifying Indra as a mantra, a solemn utterance, or if we take its suffix literally, “an instrument for thinking,” is a surprising turn; in fact it is rather like identifying him as a (hastily masculinized) *cyautná-* in the previous pāda. Since the ordinarily word *mántra-* is already masculine, it does not need to be masculinized here, but perhaps our form is the equivalent of masculinized *cyautnáḥ*, a nonce agent noun from a nom. act. (Gr glosses this usage as Berather.) Note also that the pair *cyautná- / mántra-* shows the deeply embedded IIr. opposition between deeds and words/thoughts.

Three of the pādas in this vs. contain *visva-* ‘all’: b *visveṣu sávaneṣu*, c *visvasmin bhāre*, d *visvacarṣane* – thus universalizing Indra’s roles. This *visva-* concentration resonates with *visvānarāya visvābhūve* in 1b, with *visvacarṣane* ‘common to all domains’ being esp. similar to *visvānarāya* ‘common to all men’ in sense.

X.50.5: *jyāyān* in pāda a picks up *jyēṣtha-* in 4d.

The hapax *ómatrām* is very problematic; see esp. Old’s detailed disc. He favors a combination of *óman-* (m.) ‘aid’ and *trā-* ‘protect(ion)’ because the two roots regularly appear together. But the morphological details are very difficult. I have rendered it as an unholy (or at least unorthodox) dvandva “succor and protection” without any faith in its correctness.

The conjoined subjunctives in c, *ásah ... vārdhāś ca*, seem functionally untethered, which is why I interpr. them as belonging to an unsignalled purpose clause dependent on (my interpr. of) d. This is not necessary, however – the pāda can simply mean “you will be unaging and will make (us) strong.”

As for *vārdhāḥ*, Gr, Ge, and JSK (DGRV I.80, 83) take it as intransitive (JSK: “grow (even) stronger”), but the active 1st class pres. *vārdhati* is overwhelmingly transitive. Gotō (1st Cl. 290) hesitantly registers only 3 possible intrans. forms of the act. simplex, incl. this one. It seems a simple matter to interpr. it in its usual function and supply ‘us’ (vel sim.) as object, esp. given that the first half of the vs. depicts the help Indra gives to mortals.

The last pāda (essentially repeated as 6a) has two problematic forms, which are run together in the Saṃhitā text: *tūtumākṛṣe*. The Pp. divides as *tūtumā kṛṣe*, an analysis followed by all subsequent tr. (but the publ. tr.) and interpr. (as far as I know), starting with Sāy. Flg from this word division, *tūtumā* is a hapax neut. pl. adj. modifying *sāvanā*, perhaps meaning ‘strong’ (Gr ‘kräftig’) or ‘abundant’ (‘ausgiebig’ BR) to $\sqrt{tū}$ ‘be strong’ and somehow derived from *tumrā-* (so Gr, AiG II.2.85 etc.). *kṛṣe* is a 2nd sg. verb to $\sqrt{kṛ}$, identical to the problematic accented *kṛṣé* found in a repeated passage in VIII.3.20=32.3 (see comm. ad VIII.3.20). The whole assemblage means “you made all these pressings strong / abundant.” There are several glaring problems with this interpr.: 1) The supposed adj. *tūtumā-* is oddly formed; 2) Although it is possible to interpr. *kṛṣe* in the same way as *kṛṣé* in the repeated pāda in VIII, this requires separating it from the identical *kṛṣe* in the immediately preceding hymn (X.49.7) attributed to the same poet as this one. The standard interpr. of that form is as a 1st sg., which would rest on a very different set of morphological processes. Ignoring the nearby form in favor of the distant one is not good philological method; 3) In terms of the content of the pāda, it isn’t really *Indra*’s job to make the pressings strong/abundant; that should fall to the mortal worshipers.

I have a radically different interpr., which depends on a different analysis of the Saṃhitā text: *tūtuma ākṛṣe*. (This requires no emendation of the Saṃhitā text, only a deviation from the Pp.) Note the lack of accent on *tūtuma* and the accented *ā* attached to *-kṛṣe*; both are crucial for the analysis to follow. With this word division we have, first, a 1st plural verb to the reduplicated stem *tūto-* (3x: *tūtos* VI.26.4, *tūtōt* II.20.5, 7). All three other occurrences are transitive, and the two in II.20 take ritual objects: *brāhmā* ‘sacred formulations’ and *sāmsam* ‘laud’, so *sāvanā* ‘pressings’ would be an appropriate obj. for my *tūtuma*. Contra Wh and Macd (VGS), *tūto-* probably does not belong to the perfect system but is a redupl. aor., as identified already by Gr and argued for by Kü (220-21), flg. KH etc. (see Kü’s n. 298); see comm. ad VI.26.4. Assignment to a redupl. aor. seems reasonable, since the single clear pf. form, *tūtāva* (I.94.2), is intrans. and so the *tūto-* forms are functionally distinct. I am somewhat disturbed that there is no *-āya*-pres. attested (**tāvāyati* ‘makes strong’), since in my view trans./caus. redupl. aorists are all secondarily dependent on such present stems. However, since verbal forms to this root in Sanskrit are confined to the RV and are quite rare, the absence of **tāvāyati* may result from the accidents of attestation – esp. since Old Persian has the corresponding stem *tāvaya-* (see EWA s.v. *TAV*⁷; Cheung, Etym. Dic of Iran. Verb 386; Schmidt, Altpers. Wö. 252, etc.), and Vedic could well have inherited the same. That the redupl. aor. is athematic suggests that it belongs to an early layer of such formations. The redupl. aor. analysis also explains the short root vowel – since $\sqrt{tū}$ is set, we might have expected **tūtū(-ma)* in weak forms – since the metrical template of redupl. aors. is heavy redupl. + light root syl. (not achievable in the *tūtos*, *-ot* forms however).

Having exchanged an oddly formed adj. *tūtumā-* for a well-formed finite verb, we now must confront my suggested *ākṛṣe*, and this requires revisiting *kṛṣe* in the previous hymn X.49.7. As argued in the comm. ad loc., I take *kṛṣe* there not as a form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ (the universal view), but of $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ ‘drag, draw’ – in that case the 1st sg. mid. of the 6th cl. pres. *kṛṣā-*. I assume the same root affiliation here, but take it not as a form of the 6th cl. pres. but rather as a dative inf. *ākṛṣe* with purpose sense: “to draw (you) here.” This makes for a satisfyingly conventional sense for the

pāda: we make our soma particular powerful / abundant in order to attract the god. There are a few loose ends to be cleaned up, however. First, *ā* is not otherwise attested with $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ in Vedic. However, it would be exceptionally easy to create on the model of the numerous lexemes with *ā* like $\sqrt{kṛ}$ ‘make (to be) here’, \sqrt{bhr} ‘bring here’, etc., and in fact $\sqrt{kṛṣ}$ ‘draw to oneself’, etc., is quite common in epic and Cl. Skt. A more serious problem is the accent: in a rt. noun cmpd like this we should expect *ā-kṛṣe*, rather than having the accent on the preverb. I have no good answer for this; I can only suggest that the accentuation was adjusted (with retraction onto the preverb) redactionally on the basis of (*ṛdhak*) *kṛṣe* in the preceding hymn (X.49.7) after the correct analysis of the form, and the configuration of the pāda, had been forgotten.

X.50.6: The rel. cl. in pāda b, depicting Indra’s assimilation of the pressings, seems to support my interpr. of 5d/6a.

The mantra takes its more accustomed place with other elements of the sacrifice, after its unusual identification with Indra in vs. 4.

X.50.7: On a slight ring with vs. 1, see comm. at the beginning of the hymn.

Ge construes *sumnāsya* with *pathā* “auf dem Pfade (deiner) Gunst,” while I take it with adjacent *mānasā*. There seems no principled way to decide.

X.51–53

These three hymns concern the well-known myth of Agni’s flight and concealment in the waters to avoid his ritual role as conveyor of the oblations, his discovery by the gods, and his return to his role. The first two hymns are in dialogue form. All three are attributed to Agni Saucīka, a name presumably generated from the subject matter of the hymns. On the patronymic *saucīka* see Ge’s intro. to the three hymns.

X.51 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., the responsion in vss. 4 and 6 define vs. 5 as an omphalos, and it is in this vs. that the gods emphasize Agni’s responsibilities to Manu as first sacrificer. The responsion is esp. pronounced in 4a ABL ... *varuṇa bībhyaḍ āyam* and 6c ABL *bhiyā varuṇa ... āyam*, but note also “this business” (4d *etām ārtham* / 6a *ārtham etām*).

The first four vss. are also characterized by the repetition of the adv. *bahudhā*.

In addition to the usual treatments, see Schnaus, Dialoglieder 233–52.

X.51.1: That Agni was covered with a caul on his entering the waters suggests that the episode is configured in part as a pregnancy and re-birth. On the caul, see below ad X.53.6.

Note the phonetic echo in ... (-) *viṣṭitaḥ* ... (-) *vivésitha*, though the two forms belong to diff. roots ($\sqrt{viṣṭ}$ and $\sqrt{viś}$). Note also (-) *viṣṭam* in 4b.

Final *ékaḥ* contrasts with hemistich-init. *viśvā* as well as *bahudhā*.

X.51.2: The use of $\sqrt{kṣi}$, which ordinarily means ‘dwell’, is somewhat surprising for Agni’s kindling sticks; its usual meaning is found in 5b.

Ge (n. 2cd) suggests that what lies behind Agni’s question about the location of his kindling sticks is his assumption that he could not be visually located in the waters by his pursuers because the kindling wood is not making him bright. That the kindling sticks are said to

“lead to the gods” (*devayāñīḥ*) seems a little off; perhaps Agni is suggesting what Ge did: that the brightness of the kindling sticks would lead the gods to him. See also comm. ad vs. 5.

X.51.3: The root √ *viś* from 1a returns, but as a ppl. -*viṣṭa-*, morphologically matching the ppl. to the root √ *viṣṭ* also in 1a.

On *daśāntaruṣyā-* and *antār* √ *vas*, see Old and AiG II.2.831.

X.51.3–4: The plupf. *aciket* in 3c has clear preterital function, parallel to the impf. *aíchāma*. It contrasts with the presential pf. *ciketa* in 4d (on the presential value of this pf. see Kü 169). The two forms also have different semantic values: ‘perceived’ versus the extended meaning ‘attend to’ ‘think about / consider’.

The opening of 3c *tām tvā* is echoed by the opening of 4c *tāsya me*, both reinforcing an enclitic personal prn. with a form of *sāl tām*.

X.51.5: On the gods’ somewhat disingenuous use of Manu as argument for Agni’s return, see publ. intro.

Opinions differ about the deployment of the gerund *aramkṛtyā* in b. With Ge, I take it with pāda a with Manu as agent, despite the pāda boundary. Like Ge (n. 5b), I supply **yajñām* as obj., extracted from *yajñā-kāma-*. Cf. with similar obj. X.63.6 *kó vo ’dhvarám tuvijātā áram karat* “Who will properly prepare the ceremony for you, o powerfully born (gods)?” But most interpr. take it with pāda b with Agni as agent: Old, Don., Schmaus (Dialog, 238–40 with disc.). Sāy. considers both possibilities and gives an alternative interpr. for each; Schnaus cites Tikkanen (Gerund, 352) as favoring the Ge solution. The problem with respecting the pāda boundary is that the result doesn’t make a lot of sense (at least to me). If Manu is the subject, the point is clear: the sacrificer has everything in readiness, but lacks the means (i.e., sacrificial fire) to offer it and convey it to the gods. But if Agni is the subject, what has he previously prepared? Sāy. supplies *ātmānam*, seeming to suggest that Agni has arranged himself so that he can’t be seen. Old thinks the object is the sacrifice: Agni previously prepared (/used to prepare) it (as a general rule?), but now he rests quietly out of the fray. Don implicitly takes *kṣeṣi* as a modal, suggesting (n. 9) that the gods are promising that if Agni will (return to) perform the sacrifice for them “you may rest after serving us.” Schnaus accepts Sāy.’s *ātmānam* and discusses possible semantic nuances, not to much purpose. The range of interpr. if the gerund belongs with the rest of b shows how ill it fits there. Taking it with pāda a fits the urgency of the gods’ address to Agni, with the three 2nd sg. impvs. (*éhi ... kṛṇuhi ... váha*): Manu is prepared and waiting impatiently for your (=Agni’s) action.

Note *tāmasi*: since Agni is a perpetual source of light, his dwelling “in darkness” is surprising, almost paradoxical. This paradox is also found in the 1st vs. of the famous hymn X.124 (on which see my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas”), where Indra tempts Agni to join his sacrifice, with the argument *jyóg evá dīrghám táma āśayīṣṭhāh* “For a long time indeed you have lain in long darkness.”

On *kṛṇuhi* see comm. ad vs. 7 below.

devayāñīḥ in 2d is reprised by *devayāñān* in c. As with the two forms of √ *kṣi* (see comm. ad vs. 2), the second occurrence is more easily interpretable than the first, and we may consider both pairs as showing a species of poetic repair.

X.51.6: On the responsions with vs. 4 see publ. intro. and the above intro. to the hymn.

The Pp. divides *rathīvádhvānam* as *rathī iva ádhvānam*; under this analysis *rathī* would be the nom. sg. of the *-ín*-stem *rathín-* ‘having a chariot’. Old (see also Gr s.v. *rathín-*) prefers to restore *rathīr va*, with the *vrkī*-stem *rathī-*.

Old remarks that *ánv ā* ... is not an exception to the accentual rule regarding two preverbs the second of which is *ā*, whereby the first preverb loses its accent. Here *ánu* is to be construed with preceding *ádhvānam*.

As is generally agreed (explicitly Gr, Old [with copious earlier lit.], Re [EVP XIV.79–80], Schaef. [Intens. 192–93], Schnaus [241], though contra Sāy., who favors \sqrt{vr}), on the basis of formulaic context the verb *āvarīvuḥ* must belong to the intens. of \sqrt{vrt} ‘turn, roll’ (*varīvart(t)i*, etc.). But the morphology is wrong, with a mostly missing root syllable: we should expect a 3rd pl. **avarīvrtur*. Old plausibly suggests that the 3rd sg. pres. *varīvart(t)i* with simplified underlying geminate *-tt-* and the *t*-less 3rd sg. impf. *avarīvar* gave rise to our *t*-less form, by haplology. Old does not, however, provide an intermediate preform. We should expect either **avarīvrur* with zero-grade root syllable or perhaps (on the model of the imperfects of redupl. pres.) **avarīvarur*, with full grade. The latter would be a candidate for Old’s haplology, the former for liquid dissimilation. Either process would work, but it’s too bad Old wasn’t more explicit. Re suggests that the impetus was “de conserver le quadrisyllabisme, typique dans cette classe d’intensifs” – but the zero-grade form would have done just that.

There is some difference of opinion about the structure of the phrase found in the simile (*gauro ná*) *kṣepnóḥ* ... *jyāyāḥ*. Both forms are abl.-gen.; one of them should be an ablative construable with *avije* ‘I flinched (from)’, with the other a genitive dependent on it. The uncertainty is located in the hapax *kṣepnú-*. This is a clear deriv. of $\sqrt{kṣip}$ ‘throw, hurl’, but the question is whether it refers to an agent who performs such an action (‘hurler, shooter’) or to an action or abstract. Most tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it as the former, i.e., ‘hunter, archer’ vel sim., in which case it is a gen. dependent on the abl. ‘bowstring’ (so my “from the bowstring of an archer”). But AiG II.2.742 takes *kṣepnú-* rather as an abstract ‘quickness, swiftness’ (das Schnellen), presumably connecting it semantically with another deriv. of the root *kṣiprá-* ‘quick’. This interpr. flips the case relations, imposing an interpr. “from the swiftness [abl.] of the bowstring [gen.],” as reflected in Schnaus’s “vor dem Schnellen der Bogensehne” (p. 241; see also her explicit case idents. on the same page). Without certainty about the meaning of *kṣepnú-* it is not possible to be certain; however, I still favor the first interpr. “Swiftness” is not the first quality one thinks of in a bowstring, and when an animal is afraid of being shot, its fear would not, I think, be concentrated on how fast the string would go from behind the shooter’s ear to its normal position a few inches in front, but on whether the shooter was going to use the bowstring to propel an arrow its way.

X.51.7: It is worth noting that this hymn contains one of only three forms in the RV of the developing irregular 8th class pres. to $\sqrt{kṛ}$ (*karóti*, *kuruté*), viz. 1st pl. act. pres. *kurmáḥ* here – the other two being the 2nd sg. impv. *kuru* (X.19.2, 145.2). The form here is esp. surprising because the standard 5th class pres. impv. *kṛṇuhi* is found two vss. earlier, also in the speech of the god(s). There is more to be said about *kurmáḥ*, some of it puzzling. The first thing to note is that the expected 1st pl. act. of the 5th class present, *kṛṇmās(i)*, is not found in the RV, though its medial counterpart *kṛṇmahe* occurs twice (VII.16.4, X.84.4). The 5th cl. form *kṛṇmās(i)* is, however, very common in the AV (approx. 15 occurrences in Ś, most with P parallels), but the AV entirely lacks the 1st pl. found here, *kurmās(i)*, even though the 8th class present is otherwise far better developed in the AV than the RV. (*kurmáḥ* predominates in the other early Vedic texts,

though KS also has *kṛṇmah* in addition to *kurmah*.) That *kṛṇuhi* and *kurmah* not only appear in the same hymn, but within two vss. of each other in the speech of the same individuals (and gods at that!) suggests that, at least for the composer of this hymn, the two forms didn't belong to different paradigms or signal different registers, but that *kurmah* was the de facto 1st pl. act. present to the "normal" pres. stem to $\sqrt{kṛ}$. I don't quite know what to make of this, esp. given the strong representation of *kṛṇmās(i)* in the AV.

In context the form also strains to be a modal: the gods seem to be promising that they will do something for Agni (hence my "will make") rather than that they are doing so at present. A subjunctive would have done nicely; both pres. subj. *kṛṇāvāma* and aor. subj. *karāma* are attested in the RV and would have been available (though not metrically apt).

The rest of pāda a contains an apparent nominal izafe-type clause: *āyur ajāraṃ yād* "a lifetime that is free from old age." On such constructions, see my article in the Mark Hale Fs. This phrase is so interpr. by all the standard tr. (Sāy, Ge, Re, Don). However, Schnaus takes it differently, and it is worth considering her divergent interpr.: she takes *yād* as subordinator ("wenn") of the whole pāda. Even though it is quite late in the clause, this seems syntactically possible, since what precedes it is in some sense a single constituent, the VP. So, by her interpr., the first hemistich is subordinated to the main clause found in the second. Like me, she takes cd as a non-overtly-marked question: "Wenn wir dein Leben alterlos machen ... wirst du dann ...?" This could be a solution to the non-modal form of *kurmah* just disc., since in a "when" clause the pres. indic. would be at home. I therefore consider that an acceptable alternative tr. would be "When (/if) we make your life free from old age ..., will you ...?" flg. Schnaus.

The standard tr. take cd as a flat statement: "then you will convey ...," not a question. This would seem somewhat presumptuous on the part of the gods and also not to square with the hard-ball negotiations Agni undertakes in the next vs. I prefer to take it as a question.

Pāda c reprises 5d, with the 6-syllable pres. part. *sumanasyāmānaḥ* occupying the whole of each pāda after the opening and the subjunctive *vahāsi* matching the impv. *vāha* in 5.

X.51.8: Agni bargains for considerably more than the life without old age that the gods were offering in 7a. The numerous examples of *ca* in this vs. nicely express the pile-up of perks that Agni is demanding, as Schnaus points out (245): "Agni will nicht nur die Voropfer, sondern auch noch die Nachopfer, und die Schmelzbutter und und und." The "long life" of the original offer is relegated to the final pāda.

The referents of the expressions in c, "the ghee of the waters and the man of the plants," are disputed, particularly the second. Ghee is of course a prized ritual substance and a main contributor to the blazing up of the offering fire. As to its relationship with the waters, it can be conceived of as the essence of liquids, the distillate of the class of substances whose cover term is waters, or as the final and best product of the process that begins when cows drink water. Both possibilities have been suggested; I favor the former.

On the model of the first expression we should expect "the man of the plants" to be 1) another ritual substance offered into the fire, and 2) the essence of the class of substances whose cover term is plants, or the product of a process that begins by the ingestion (vel sim.) of plants. It is very difficult to identify anything that meets both criteria. If "man" is taken literally, then we must use the second alternative of criterion 2: "product of process," since a literal man can't be the essence of a different class of substances (unless, with JSK I.141, we silently replace "plants" with "animate things," a superordinate class I doubt if Vedic India had). In the "process" interpr., we must assume that men eat plants and therefore count as the product of plants (the linkage here

being rather fragile). Even if we accept this reasoning, what ritual substance would man represent? Old (in his long and thoughtful disc. of the *pāda*), fld by Klein, suggests it's the dead body that is given to the fire to devour. I think this is unlikely: the "flesh-eating" (*kravyāḍ-*) fire of cremation is carefully distinguished and forcefully separated from the ritual fire that conveys oblations to the gods (see esp. X.16.9–10), and it's the latter that's in question here. I very much doubt that the oblation-conveying Agni who is speaking here would associate himself with the cremation fire or remind the gods that one form of fire has this inauspicious job. Though see the anxiety expressed in the next hymn, X.52.3, and also bear in mind that Yama is the one who found him in our vs. 3. Alternatively Schnaus (245) suggest that the man here is the sacrificer, who makes offering to and nourishes Agni – and that plants are the principal nourishment of men.

If we do not take "man" literally but as an entity embodying the essence / best of plants, other interpretational possibilities open up. Perhaps the best is that the "man" is Soma (see Ge n. 8c, Re), an idea that goes back to Hillebrandt. The plants are elsewhere said to have Soma as king (*óṣadhīḥ sómarājñīḥ* X.97.18–19, sim. 22); certainly in the RVic universe Soma would be considered the pinnacle of the plant world. And Soma is a ritual substance. The problem, however, is that soma is not offered into the fire – for obvious practical reasons: unlike ghee, which makes the fire blaze, a liquid like soma would put it out or at least put a damper on it. I therefore doubt that Agni would be requesting soma. Ge (n. 8c) suggests rather offhandedly that "the 'man' of plants" might be the tree, which, in the form of firewood, is crucial to the ritual fire's continued existence. Trees can have a vaguely anthropomorphic shape (trunk and limbs), and "firewood" makes sense as a ritual substance Agni would want— but "soma" has more conceptual oomph. Perhaps this is just a riddle we (and the bewildered gods, who ignore or reconfigure this request in their response) are meant to ponder. But in the end, I favor the tree / firewood interpr.: ghee and firewood together provide the food, the fuel, for the fire.

Schnaus (245) points out that Agni entered into the waters and plants (*apsv óṣadhīṣu*) in 3b, so their return here has been prepared.

X.51.9: The gods echo (and accede to) Agni's requests from the first hemistich almost word-for-word; the metrical disturbance in 9a (extra syllable) may be meant to call attention to the respension, as elsewhere: see, e.g., comm. ad Yama/Yamī hymn, X.10.11–12.

If (like us) the gods had trouble figuring out what Agni was demanding in 8c, their corresponding offer of "the whole sacrifice" (*yajñāḥ ... sárvaḥ*) in 9c may be meant to cover all possible bases. (Note *sárva-* for *vísva-*, which prevails in the older RV and is found [in the pl.] in vss. 1 and 2.)

X.52 Agni

Ge asserts that the entire hymn is in Agni's mouth (save for the final summary vs. 6); as noted in the publ. intro., I consider vs. 3 to be an intrusion from a human ritualist. Re tentatively considers 3 and 4cd not to be Agni's speech.

In addition to the usual treatments, see Schnaus, Dialoglieder 253–65.

X.52.1: The two hemistichs are constructed in parallel: a 2nd pl. impv. of speaking addressed to the gods (*śāstānā a, prá ... brūta c*), followed by a *yáthā* clause, with the *yáthā* reinforced / doubled by a second subordinating *yá-* form (*yád b, yéna d*). But this 2nd subordinator makes some trouble for interpr. in the first construction. The construction in cd is fairly straightforward: in *yáthā ... yéna pathā*, the phrase *yéna pathā* more nearly specifies *yáthā* "how, by what path"

(at least in my interpr.; see below) and *yéna* is clearly a modifier in a noun phrase. But the function of *yád* in b is more open to interpr. For one thing, it is not adjacent or near-adjacent to *yáthā*. For another, though it could be a neut. sg. NA and function as a modifier like *yéna*, there is no surface noun it can attach itself to, and of course it could instead be a subordinating conjunction, introducing a new clause, or doubling *yáthā* to introduce the old one. Old cf.s *kathā kád* in IV.23.5a, c, but there the two are adjacent and there is a noun *sakhyám* associated with *kád*. Ge (n. 1ab) cites III.32.14 with *yátra ... yáthā*, on which see comm. ad loc. Re compares *yád ... yáthā* in the immed. preceding hymn (X.51.7), but those two forms are quite unconnected contextually.

On first glance it appears that *yád* is pleonastically marking the gerund as a clausette, but gerunds don't require such marking. (See Hettrich, Hyp. 231 n. 41 on this point with regard to this passage.) Re supplies a noun referring to speech for the *yád*, though in a somewhat twisted construction: "... je pourrai concevoir (un thème poétique et) le quel." Although this solution is in part supported by an expression in the next hymn (X.53.4 *vācāḥ prathamām masīya* "might I devise the foremost of speech," also with a modal form of $\sqrt{\text{man}}$), the context here does not seem to me to be about Agni's poetic development but about his figuring out how to perform the role assigned, that of Hotar. On the basis of the similar construction in cd, I think *yáthā ... yád* are parallel subordinators, but this goes awkwardly into English ("how, what (task) I shall conceive ..."); in the publ. tr. the *yád* is therefore represented by "it." Ge's rendering (253) is more faithful without losing too much parsability: "wie ich and woran ich ... denken soll" (sim. Schnaus 253), but I would prefer not to use a simple "think (about)" for *manávai*.

This verb may be responsible for much of the trouble, and its presence here is, I think, part of a buried verbal play. Recall that in X.51.5 the gods argued that Agni owed it to Manu, who was all prepared to perform sacrifice, to return and take over the role of his oblation-conveyor. The verb *manávai* looks very like the dat. *mánave* "for Manu," save for accent (and ending), a dative that regularly occupies just this metrical position (e.g., IV.26.4 *havyám bháran mánave ...*). I take this as the poet's subtle reminder of Manu's part in this scenario.

In contrast to my interpr. of *yáthā ... yéna pathā* as doubled subordinators of a single clause, both Ge and Re both take them as introducing separate clauses, the first being a nominal cl. consisting only of *bhāgadhéyam yáthā vaḥ*, the second spanning pāda d with the finite verb – though Re in his n. considers the possibility of a unified cl. The best evidence I can see for a two-cl. interpr. is the doubled enclitic *vaḥ*, but as seen in the publ. tr., I take the two *vaḥ* as having different functions: as genitive with the nouns referring to the gods' share and as dative indicating them as recipients/goals with *ā (...)* *vāhāni*. Schnaus has yet another way of configuring cd, with *bhāgadhéyam* as the obj. of *prá ... brūta*, and what follows as a single cl. with double subordinators: "Sagt mir die Anteilsverschaffung, wie ich euch, auf welchem Weg ich euch die Opfergabe hinfahren soll." None of these interpr. takes proper account of the parallel structures of ab and cd.

X.52.2: The first hemistich reprises the first hemistich of vs. 1: pāda a *ahám hótā ny àsīdam ...* \cong 1b *hótā ... niśádyā*, while b opens like 1a with the *vísve devāḥ*, though in nom. not voc. But other elements have been added. Agni claims to be "the better sacrificing" (*yājīyān*) Hotar; as Ge suggests (n. 2a), he may be comparing himself to his older brothers or to the human Hotar or both. And in b all the gods are joined by the Maruts, for reasons that are not clear to me (though see the passages cited in Ge's n. 2b for the Maruts' presence at Agni's kindling).

I render the impf. *ny àsīdam* as an immed. past “I have sat down,” though this is not a standard use of this tense (see IH’s work). However, the context certainly favors this interpr.

The publ. tr. of the first part of d is quite different from the standard, which take *brahmā* and *samīd* as two independent subjects of *bhavati*: “the Formulator is (there, and) the kindling stick”; Re “le *brahmān* (est présent), la bûche-flambante est (là).” I take *bhavati* as expressing an equational transformation, “X becomes Y” – “The kindling stick becomes the Formulator.” Although this may not make immediate sense, I think it in fact gives richer semantics. It may be that the crackling of the just-kindled fire is compared to the verbal part of the sacrifice, or that the recitation of the formulation coincides with, and appears to cause, the kindling of the fire. However, as an alternative I would consider the tr. given above.

X.52–3: Both 2c and 3c begin with the āmreḍita *āhar-ahar*, which draws especial attention because in the first instance this produces a very rare opening of four light syllables (as Schnaus points out, 255), slightly ameliorated to three lights in 3c.

X.52.3: As indicated in the publ. intro. and the hymn intro. above, I think that this middle vs. is not spoken by Agni. Besides the third-person reff. in the vs., note that vs. 3 is distinguished structurally from the two flanking vss., 2 and 4. Vs. 2 opens *ahām hótā* rhyming and contrasting with 3a *ayām yó hótā*, while vs. 4 firmly reestablishes the 1st ps. reference by beginning *mām*. Nonetheless, Ge (flg. Sāy.) considers Agni to be the speaker of vs. 3; acdg. to Ge, Agni poses the questions in ab to himself, and answers them in cd. This seems overly complex. Most other comm. (Lanman [Reader, 387], Old, Re, Schnaus) agree that the speaker is “Andrer als Agni” (Old), but there is no consensus on who the speaker is. The most likely, in my view, is a human ritual participant (Re’s tentative “Le récitant?”; Schnaus “Sänger”). On seeing the newly (re-)installed Hotar, the speaker expresses some anxiety about the Hotar’s identity – and esp. his possible connection with Yama. Recall that it was Yama who discovered Agni in hiding in the previous hymn (X.51.3), and Yama’s role as king of the dead raises the unappealing possibility that the fire now installed as Hotar is actually the cremation fire or one closely related to it. Hence “who is he to Yama?” On the need and desire to keep the ritual fire of divine worship and the cremation fire strictly separated, see comm. above ad X.51.8 and passages in the funeral hymns, esp. X.16.9–10.

On *āpy ūhe* see comm. ad VII.104.14, where I uphold the old root affiliation with √ *ūh* ‘solemnly proclaim, laud’, rather than accepting Kü’s (489–90) assignment to a putative √ *vāh* ‘anerkennen’. I take *āpi* √ *ūh* to mean ‘(solemnly) address / call upon’, with the *āpi* contributing the sense of closeness, directness: in both passages the obj. of the verb is a god or gods in a ritual situation, and here especially the speaker is in intimate proximity to the ritual fire, addressing it with the words of the liturgy. With this second question I think the ritual officiant is asking which actual fire he is addressing in the current ritual, which is a sacrifice to the gods, not the dead.

Pāda c contains two āmreḍitas, *āhar-ahar* and *māsī-māsī* “every day / day after day” and “every month / month after month.” It is not clear if they are meant to be contrastive or sequential. In the publ. intro. I tentatively accepted Lanman’s suggestion (Reader, 388) that the birth every day is that of the ritual fire (for the Agnihotra, destined for the gods) and the birth every month is that of the fire for the Śrāddha celebration, destined for the ancestors (Pitars). I now consider this doubtful, because 1) I am not aware of any RVic evidence for the monthly Śrāddha, and 2) if this is actually the sense, it would mean that there is no distinction between the

fire(s) for these two purposes, even though I have just argued that this issue drives the anxious questions in the first half of this vs. I now think it more likely that the fire born every month is for the RVic equivalent of the Darśapūrṇamāsa, with the daily and monthly sacrifices marking the most temporally significant ritual observances.

It is for these sacrifices that the gods established Agni as their oblation-carrier. Note the middle *dadhire*, signaling the gods' stake in the action. Note also that *havyavāham* reprises 1d *havyām ... vāhāni*.

However, with regard to the Śrāddha, I have to admit that it does seem referred to in the *Atharva Veda*; see AVŚ XVIII.4.63 *pārā yāta pitarah ... / ādhā māśi pūnar ā yāta no grhān havir āttum* "O forefathers, go away; then in a month come again to our houses to eat the oblation."

X.52.4: Save for the emphatic reestablishment of the 1st ps. via vs.-initial *mām*, in pāda a Agni repeats 3d verbatim. Although many recommend reading disyllabic *mām* here (Gr, Lanman, Arnold, Schnaus [oddly Old doesn't comment]), I think this may be another instance in which metrical irregularity calls attention to patterned repetition; see in this hymn sequence X.51.8–9 as well as X.10.11–12 and comm. thereon.

Note the "popular" *I* in *āpamluktam* to the rare root \sqrt{mruc} , *mluc*, found only here in the RV.

With Ge (n. 4cd) I take cd as the gods' words – in my view, quoted by Agni as the verbal accompaniment of their formal installation of Agni in his role. Note that pāda c consists of 8 straight heavy syllables, with the first (and only – the final being anceps) light syllable found in the cadence at position 9. This metrical structure may express the solemn and ponderous nature of the gods' instructions.

Pāda d is identical to X.124.1d; interestingly that passage also depicts an attempt to coax Agni into becoming the oblation-carrier of the gods, though this time in the context of the "divine revolution" – on which see my 2016 "The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas" (Ged. Frits Staal). I will not speculate on the numerology in this characterization of the sacrifice; there is quite enough such speculation out there already.

X.52.5: The standard tr., incl. the publ. tr., take the 1st sg. med. aor. *ā ... yakṣi* in modal/desid. value; KH (Injunk. 253) includes this passage among the 1st sg. injunctives he considers to have immediate future value. Given that Agni doesn't seem to have embarked on his duties yet, some version of these views is probably correct. I do now suggest, however, that pāda b need not be as closely linked to pāda a as all tr. (incl. mine) assume, which would take the pressure off the modality of *yakṣi*. It does not make a lot of sense that Agni would win immortality for the gods so that he can make wide space for them: these two actions aren't causally linked. I now think that b may rather be a prelude to c: in order to win wide space, Agni wishes to put the mace in Indra's arms, so that Indra can perform his usual martial feats. Winning battles is generally the necessary prelude to gaining wide space elsewhere in the RV. Cf., e.g., VII.98.3 *yudhā devébhyo vāriṇaś cakārtha* "Through combat you [=Indra] made wide space for the gods" (= I.59.5, with Agni as subj.); sim. III.34.7 (Indra). I therefore suggest an alt. tr. for bc: "So that I may make wide space for you, o gods, might I place the mace in Indra's arms. Then ..."

X.52.6: This is a 3rd ps. summary vs. I do not think the speaker is the same as the ritualist in 3, who appears to be on the scene.

In c *aúkṣan ghr̥taiḥ* “they sprinkled (him) with ghee” seems to further specify *samañjānti devāḥ* “the gods anoint (him)” in 3b.

The final words of the hymn *hótāraṃ ny āsādayanta* echo 1b *hótā ... niśádyā* as well as 2a *hótā ny āsīdam*. This ring composition is hardly surprising, since the installation of Agni as Hotar was the aim of the dialogue and the hymn.

X.53 Agni

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. and the introductory remarks of Old and Ge. See also Schnaus, *Dialoglieder* 267–89 and Köhler, *Kaví*, 114–17 and 326–28.

One of the verbal tics of this hymn is the use of a rel. cl. beginning with *yéna* identifying the means by which something is accomplished: 4b the speech with which the gods defeat the Asuras, 7d the chariot by which the gods lead (something), 9d the hatchet with which Brahmanaspati hews his formulation, 10d the track or word with which the gods achieve immortality. See also 10b *vāśtbhir yābhiḥ* with the instr. rel. in 2nd position and a different gender and number, but functioning in the same way.

X.53.1: Note the annunciatory here-and-now quality of *sò 'yám*, which is difficult to render in English in conjunction with a relative cl.

In c it might have been better to render *yájīyān* as ‘better sacrificer’, given its use as a true comparative in X.52.2.

X.53.2: For a construction similar to pāda a see I.70.8 *árādhi hótā ... niśattaḥ*, adduced by Ge. My rendering there is “he has been brought to success, installed as Hotar-priest”; I use “realized” here to distinguish *árādhi* from the form of *√sādh* in the next vs.

On *yájīyān* see comm. ad vs. 1.

Pāda b is essentially identical to VI.15.15; see comm. there. On the position of *hí* and on the peculiar behavior of forms of *√khyā* with preverbs and *hí*, see comm. ad III.31.12.

I interpr. the function of the injunc. *abhí ... khyát* as presential/general. Ge as modal “so möge er ... sich ansehen”; Re and Schnaus as preterital “il a pris en considération” and “er hat ... beschaut” respectively. I connect b with cd and assume that b indicates that Agni has made the conditions favorable for the sacrifice that we wish to perform. The other tr. take b with pāda a. This is possible but, to my mind, less likely because his success / realization in pāda a is not the result of his watching over the oblations, as the *hí* would suggest.

The second hemistich is notable for the interjection *hánta* and for the two syntactically parallel fig. etym.: *yájāmahai yajñīyān* and *īḍāmahā īḍīyān*. Note also that *yajñīyān* echoes the two previous occurrences of *yájīyān* (1a, 2a)

X.53.3: The opening of pāda a, *sá āyur āgāt*, echoes the end of 1a *sò 'yám āgāt*. Pādas a and d are also entirely parallel in structure: ADJ (FEM. ACC) *akar deva-Xtīm no adyá* “he has made our X-of-the-gods Y today.”

Ge remarks on pāda b (n. 3b) that the hidden tongue is sacred speech (“die sakrale Rede”). This is one possible reading, but surely the primary referent is Agni, who is often called the tongue of the sacrifice (e.g., II.1.13). Although strictly speaking it wasn’t the human ritualists but the gods who found Agni in hiding, they can be pardoned for taking some of the credit. Re in his comm. recognizes both possibilities.

The publ. tr. agrees with Ge and Re in construing *āyuh* with *vāsānah*, as in X.16.5. Schnaus (269–70) takes it instead with *āgāt*, which would certainly be possible, but this leaves *vāsānah* without an object. She takes it as reflexive with a pred. adj.: “sich wohlreichend kleidend,” but I know of no reflexive uses of this present without an expressed obj. In X.16.5 I render the phrase more fully as “clothing himself in (new) life,” of the dead man’s embarking on the afterlife (see comm. ad loc.). The phrase here can be interpr. similarly. As noted ad X.51.1, the prominent mention of the caul in the first vs. of this hymn sequence suggests that Agni’s entry into his hiding place in the waters is configured as a pregnancy, and so his emergence to take up his duties as Hotar is a type of (second) birth.

Schnaus tr. *devahūtī*- as ‘Göttertrank’, a minor lapse, I assume

X.53.4: Pāda b contains one of the rare representations of the Deva/Asura conflict that so dominates the later Vedic mythological scene, but that is essentially absent from the RV, as W. E. Hale has definitively shown. Only in this late hymn and in X.157.4 do we find pretty clear evidence of the Asuras as a group in structural and hostile opposition to the gods. Hale in fact (p. 85) suggests that the Asuras here could instead be human enemies, but this seems unlikely. It’s noteworthy that Agni seems to think that a particularly well-devised speech is what will defeat the Asuras.

On the formation of *ūrjād*- and its problems see Old and Scar (34).

The 2nd hemistich is addressed to both gods and men, the former clearly identified as *yajñiyāsaḥ* and the latter as *pāñca janāḥ* (though see Ge’s n. 4d for some very flimsy evidence that the five peoples may have been deified). Who the *ūrjādaḥ* are is a little less clear, in part because the cmpd is a hapax. Acdg. to Re, they are gods, but since *ūrjādaḥ* is explicitly (*utā*) conjoined with *yajñiyāsaḥ*, we might expect it to have a different referent. Moreover, we regularly ask the gods to provide *us* with *ūrj*-; cf., e.g., VIII.35.10–12 *ūrjam no dhattam aśvinā* “provide nourishment to us, o Aśvins,” and as far as I know, the only instantiation of the VP *ūrjam* √ *ad* in the RV has cows as subj.: X.100.10 *ūrjam gāvo yāvase pīvo attana* “Cows, eat nourishment in the pasture, eat fat” (though these cows in fact stand for the milk to be mixed with soma). The question cannot be settled without considering the telling variant on the conjoined phrase in the next vs., 5b *gójāta utā yé yajñiyāsaḥ* “the cow-born and those who are worthy of the sacrifice.” Who are the “cow-born”? The word is found twice elsewhere (VI.50.11, VII.35.14); in the former it appears in a list with “earthly, heavenly, and watery,” in the latter, in a pāda identical to ours, with “earthly and heavenly” immed. preceding. Note that in our vs. the second hemistich contains references to both heaven and earth (as well as the midspace), though not to beings identified as earthly and heavenly. In both the other passages there is a presumption that all of these groups are divine in some way, though it is not explicitly stated. Ad VI.50.11 I tentatively accept a suggestion of Re’s, that the cow-born are the Maruts, and that is possible here. But I would not rule out a reference to livestock. To summarize, the referent of *ūrjādaḥ* in vs. 4 is not certain, and the parallel *gójātāḥ* in 5 isn’t as much help as it might be. In balance, I think humans are the more likely referent or *ūrjādaḥ*, but neither gods (or a set of gods) nor even livestock are excluded.

X.53.5: On *gójāta*- see disc. of immediately preceding vs. 4.

X.53.6: This vs. is addressed, presumably by the human ritualist(s), to Agni (ab) and the speaker(s)’ fellow priests (cd), who are urged jointly to proceed with the sacrifice. In particular,

Agni is to go towards heaven along paths readied by ritual speech. These paths are probably the “work” that the humans are urged to “weave,” in a different metaphor. Cloth-making metaphors in fact unify the vs.: Agni “stretches the thread” of the sacrifice (a), while the priests “weave” (c).

The word *anulbaṇā-* occurs twice in the RV, here and in VIII.25.9. Despite superficial similarity, it is generally held that it is unrelated to *úlba-* ‘caul’; see the curt rejection by KH (MSS 8 [1958]: 18 = Aufs. 398), followed by EWA s.v. I think this is worth revisiting. To begin with, the only occurrence of *úlba-* in the RV is found in the first pāda of this hymn sequence (X.51.1a); that one of the two RVic occurrences of *anulbaṇā-* is found two hymns later, in the same hymn group, seems unlikely to be a coincidence, esp. given their aberrant phonology – though it could, I suppose, be just a deliberate phonological echo. The negated *anulbaṇā-* is usually glossed ‘without bulges / knots’ (Gr “ohne Wulst oder Knoten”), for no particular good reason that I can see. It is then considerably widened to ‘faultless’ (Gr “ohne Fehl”). Let us first consider the example in VIII.25.9, where it modifies *cákṣas-* ‘(eye)sight, vision’. Since sight generally has neither knots nor bulges, the semantically widened version has to be used – e.g., Ge’s “mit fehlerlosem Gesicht” (or, as in the publ. tr., with a reasonable facsimile of knots, there ‘motes’). However, if we start with ‘caul’, an obvious interpretation imposes itself: the blurry vision and semi-opacity of the eye’s lens resulting from cataracts were surely known in ancient India (it’s a condition that afflicts most people as they age), and a “caul” over the eye is an appropriate metaphor for both the appearance and the experience of this condition. (For a [close-to] current day analogue, note that David Knipe in his *Vedic Voices* [p. 198] records how the smoke from the daily Agnihotra damaged the eyes of some of the Āhitāgnis he studied in late 20th c. Andhra, rendering them blind or close to it – though the fact that these Agnihotras were performed indoors may have exacerbated the eye condition.) The sense of the word in our passage is more difficult to determine, since as far as I know, there is no weaving failure that could be conceived of as a caul. Here I think it must be metaphorical for veiling, unpellucidity, or cloudiness of the poetic product, esp. since in the preceding pāda Agni is supposed to be associated with “paths of light made by insightful thought.” I would emend the tr. to “a work without a veil [=clear].” Note that Schnaus (276–77) discusses *anulbaṇā-* at length and comes to similar conclusions.

On the hapax *jógū-*, derived from the intens. of *√gū* ‘sing’, see Schaef (114). It is presumably a subjective genitive (so Schnaus, 275) with *ápas-*; that is, the singers are to perform the work that has been woven, not to receive it. Both Schaef. and Köhler (*Kaví-*, 327) assert that the stem no longer has intensive semantics, but I do not see on what grounds: my “ever-singing” or a more “intensive-like” “laut singend” (Gr) are perfectly compatible with the context.

The last pāda is syntactically and lexically straightforward, but has somewhat surprising content. Agni is urged to “become Manu” and “generate the divine race,” on first glance a cosmogonic act not within the capability of a human, even the first human. Ge (n. 6c) is surely correct, that Manu as first sacrificer *makes them appear* at the ritual (“zum Vorschein, zur Stelle bringen”) by his ritual activity; he thus “begets” them metaphorically at a particular place and time. The relationship between Agni and Manu first highlighted in this hymn sequence in X.51.5 comes to its climax here, with Agni actually transforming into Manu.

X.53.7: On *íṣ* *√kr*, see comm. ad VII.76.2.

Gr, Ge, Schnaus all supply *raśanāḥ* ‘reins’ as obj. of *ā ... pīmśata*. I follow Re (also JSK DGRV I.436), who supplies ‘chariot’, on the basis of the focus on the chariot in cd and the NP in I.49.2 *supéśasam ... rátham*.

Klein (l.c.) points out the unusual position of the second *utá* in this hemistich “following a preverb within a conjoined set of verbal lexemes,” where he would expect *ca*. (The set consists of ... *nahyata-utá ... íṣkṛnudhvam ... ā-utá pīmśata*.) Acdg. to him, this is the only such ex. in the RV, but he defines the context rather narrowly. For another ex. of *utá* between preverb and verb, see V.59.5.

There’s a surprising lack of comment on what the eight seats on the chariot represent in the ritual. I’d don’t mind admitting that I have no idea.

In d it is impossible to know if *priyám* is the object of *ánayan*, as in the publ. tr. (also Gr, Ge, Schnaus) or the goal, with the object “us” to be supplied or none at all: “led to something dear” / “led (us) to something dear” (so Re and Ge alt. in n. 7d). Since *priyám* isn’t further specified, we have no info. with which to make a decision. In any case, the pāda seems to reverse the direction and director(s) of the chariot. In abc it seems that the ritualists are being exhorted to prepare the chariot of sacrifice and drive it (presumably towards heaven and the gods), but in d the gods seems to have taken the reins. This may (as Schnaus seems to suggest, 278) reflect the two-way street of ritual reciprocity: “die Opfergaben werden damit ebenso zu den Göttern gefahren wie die Gaben der Götter zu dem Menschen.”

X.53.8: On the vs. see Old’s comments in his intro. to the hymn. On pāda a see Ge’s long n. 8. As he points out, this vs. is often used in later ritual for a real or symbolic river-crossing. Unfortunately, of course, the word ‘river’ is missing from our text; we must triangulate from the fem. gender of the nom. *ásmanvatī* (most words for river and most river names being fem.) and the meaning of the verb *rīyate* ‘flows’ (cf. X.40.9 *rīyante ... sīndhavaḥ* “the rivers flow”). The interpr. of the phrase is greatly aided by the variant verse in AVŚ XII.2.27 *úttiṣṭhatā prá taratā sakhāyó, ’śmanvatī nadī syandata iyám*, with an explicit ‘river’ modified by *ásmanvatī* and a verb, *syandata*, synonymous with our *rīyate*. This vs. immed. follows one that quotes our pāda directly (AV XII.2.26a *ásmanvatī rīyate ...*) and seems to be meant as a gloss or explanatory expansion – let us hope they got it right.

Ge suggests that the stones are stepping stones (or rather a bridge of them) in a powerfully flowing stream; I am dubious, because I think even a lot of closely bunched stones would provide precarious footing for horses pulling a chariot (if the chariot of 7 is still in question), or oxen pulling a cart, or even for a group of men walking. I think more of a river or stream with a stony bottom that would provide better footing than a soft one, but admittedly I know nothing about the bottoms of the rivers in NW India. (On the potential problems for vehicles crossing a river, see III.33, esp. 9–13, and III.53.17.) In any case the crossing here is metaphorical, but presumably involves the metaphorical chariot from vs. 7.

The medial idiom *sám √rabh* is generally construed with an instr. and means ‘be clasped / embraced by’ metaphorically (e.g., I.53.4–5). Here, however, it appears without instr. and must mean something like ‘clasp each other’. See X.72.6 where JPB tr. *súsaṃrabdhā átiṣṭhata* as “well clasped to one another, you stood ...” (of the gods). The point in that passage and ours must be that by embracing each other, a group creates a united and formidable front and can proceed to action. My tr. here, “pull yourselves together,” is not literal, but I think it conveys the intent better than “embrace each other” – but perhaps “pull together” or “stick together” might be closer to the literal.

In c the publ. tr. wrongly renders the subj. *ásan* as if it were an imperfect. The tr. should be changed to “those who will be unfriendly.”

In d the question is whether *śívān* modifies *vājān* or is an independent and parallel goal. Although Ge and Re choose the former solution (e.g., “zu günstigem Gewinn”), with Schnaus I think the latter is more likely. *śívān* is obviously meant to contrast with *ásēvāḥ* in the previous pāda, as their juxtaposition across the pāda boundary shows. And the *ásēvāḥ* in c are definitely beings (probably human enemies), not things. The point being that we want to find ourselves a more agreeable set of companions, as well as acquiring prizes.

X.53.9–11: As disc. in the publ. intro., these three vss., in Jagatī stand somewhat apart from the rest of the hymn, though they also continue its themes—the most important of which is the crafting of effective ritual formulations, as seen esp. in vs. 6 and also 4.

Vss. 9 and 10 are esp. parallel; note the repetition of *nūnām* and forms of the pres. *śísā-* / *śísī-*. More important is the fact that 9cd and 10ab depict the same actions (though with partly varying lexicon) performed by gods (Tvaṣṭar and Brahmaṇaspati in 9) and human poets (*kavayaḥ* in 10): the production by carving with axes/hatchets of the verbal portion of the ritual. Strikingly neither in 9b nor in 10b is there an overt object for the verb of hewing (*ṛṣcāt*) / carving (*tákṣatha*), despite the clear assumption that it is a verbal product.

X.53.9: See Ge’s note on this vs.

In the publ. tr. the pf. injunctive *vet* is rendered as the preterite “knew,” but, given the context (pres. part. *bíbhrat* b, pres. *śísīte* c, subj. *ṛṣcāt* d), I now would follow the other tr. in taking it as a general present ‘knows’. KH (Injunc. 169) pronounces it “generell.” In the sandhi context (*māyāvet*) it could be an augmented plupf. *avet*, but this is unlikely.

Calling Tvaṣṭar “the best worker of workers” (*apāsām apástamaḥ*) links his activity to that of the human ritualists in 6c, urged to “weave a work (*āpaḥ*).” Tvaṣṭar provides the drinking cups for the soma (pāda b), thus contributing to the oblation/physical portion of the ritual. But more important, in the second hemistich, he sharpens the tool that the “lord of the formulation”—“das göttliche Vorbild des Dichter,” in HPS’s felicitous phrase (B+I 126)—will use to produce the formulation, the verbal portion of the ritual.

Parts of this vs. are reminiscent of the enigmatic X.28.8, which I argue depicts the original instantiation of the sacrifice by the gods (see comm. ad loc.). The first hemistich of that vs. reads *devāsa āyan paraśúm̐r abibhran, vānā ṛṣcānto abhí viḍbhír āyan* “The gods came; they carried axes; hewing the trees, they advanced with their clans towards (the ritual ground),” with the redupl. pres. *abibhran* matching our part. *bíbhrat*, the axes (*paraśú-*), and the verb ‘hew’ (pres. *ṛṣcá-*) present in both. I don’t quite know what to do with these similarities.

The most puzzling part of the second hemistich is *étaśaḥ*, which must be a qualifier of Brahmaṇaspati. This stem usually names, or refers to, the sun’s horse or horses, but it is unlikely that Brahmaṇaspati is being identified with that animal. The stem is generally derived from *éta-* ‘mottled, dappled’, and most tr. render it as a color term here (buntfarbig / bigarré). But why would Brahmaṇaspati be multicolored? Th (Stud. z. idg. Wortkunde, 68), adopted by HPS (and see EWA s.v.), interpr. it as ‘bunte Tiere (Kleinvieh) gewinnend,’ but with an unfortunately typical Thieme overreach (*-śa- < *-psva-*). My “(chariot-)steed” is a placeholder, as if the image in this pāda were a sort of transition figure from the chariot image in vs. 7. But this may be worse than useless. However, I do think a whiff of the chariot image recurs in vs. 11 (q.v.).

X.53.10: The poets are now exhorted to follow the the model of Brahmanaspati.

The identity and function of *satáh*, which opens the vs., are much disputed. It is generally taken as an adverb (‘equally’ vel sim.: Ge, Re, Schnaus [281 and n. 302], Köhler [327]), but I follow Old’s preferred interpr. as an acc. pl. masc. of the pres. part. of \sqrt{as} , meaning ‘being (t)here’. As for its referent, flg. a suggestion of Re’s I think it picks up the *paraśúm* in 9c, which is the obj. of *śísīte* ‘sharpens’, with Tvaṣṭar as subj. Here the pl. Kavis are the subj. of pl. *śísīta* and we might expect pl. **paraśūn*. Instead we get, in the rel. cl., the fem. pl. *vāśibhiḥ*, a virtual synonym of *paraśú-*, and *satáh* referring to the *paraśú-* serves as transition to this synonym, which we might have expected as an acc. pl. **vāśīh* in the main cl. For disc. (and rejection) of other poss. exx. of *satáh* as adv., see X.27.4, VII.104.21, IX.21.7.

The connection between pādas c and d is loose at best. On the one hand, the *yéna* with which d opens has no clear referent. Given the structure of the hymn so far, with its *yéna* clauses (see hymn intro. above), we would expect its referent to be the pl. *padā gúhyāni* “hidden tracks/words” of c, but the numbers don’t match. On the other, there is also a mismatch of tenses: c contains an imperative *kartana*, but d a perfect *ānaśuḥ*. I think the clue to understanding the connection is the existence of both these anomalies. To take the second first, we cannot order the poets to create (impv. *kartana*) something that has already produced its effect (“they achieved” *ānaśuḥ*). So I think d presents the already successful model for the type of things the poets are now urged to create. It worked for the gods, so make more of them now. There is thus a disconnect between the two clauses, even though the same type of causal relation is gestured to as in 3cd, 7cd, and, with plurals, 10ab. Because that pattern was strongly set earlier, the audience is invited, in fact more or less compelled, to interpret 10cd in the same vein and to use its ingenuity to deal with the number and tense-mood mismatches. I do not see the advantage of taking *yéna* as a conjunction, despite Köhler’s detailed disc. (327 and n. 1008), and I actually don’t see how his “wodurch” differs from the usual instr. rendering of *yéna*.

Almost all tr. and interpr. take *padā* as ‘words’, and I am in agreement that this is the underlying intent. However, with Schnaus (“Fussspuren,” 291), I think the surface, literal meaning is ‘tracks’. This allows the vs. to be connected with 6b *jyōtiṣmataḥ pathāḥ ... dhiyā kṛtān* “the paths of light made by insightful thought.” The radiant paths to heaven are created by the poets’ insights and the words they are formed into, and so in 10cd the poets are exhorted to create these paths, these tracks, which are in fact words.

X.53.11: Unfortunately, if this final vs. is an example of the *padā gúhyāni* of 10c, as I think it is, the tracks remain hidden indeed. The first question is who the subj. of *ādadhuh* is. With Ge and Re (Old, Schnaus, and Köhler do not specify, though Kö seems likely to favor poets as well), I take it to be the poets addressed in 10 (*kavayaḥ*). They perform their work “with cryptic mind and tongue” (b *apīcyèna mānasotā jīhvāyā*), a phrase that resonates with *gúhyāni* of 10c and whose accuracy we can certainly endorse. Old sensibly says about the vs. “die vieldeutigen Rätsel zu lösen versuche ich nicht,” and though I will make a stab at solving them, I acknowledge the wisdom of Old’s forbearance.

Pāda a contains two chiasitic NP paradoxes—*gārbhe* (LOC) *yóṣām* (ACC) ... *vatsām* (ACC) *āsāni* (LOC) “in embryo young woman ... calf in mouth.” Between them is the verb *ādadhuh* “they placed,” which must owe its accent to its contrastive use with both NPs.

The first phrase is the clearer paradox: in real life the embryo would be placed in the young woman—that is, she would become pregnant—not the reverse (so also Ge n. 11). (My tr. “maiden” is somewhat misleading, since a *yóṣā* can give birth; cf., e.g., III.48.2 ... *te mātā* ...

yóṣā jānitrī “Your mother, the young woman who gave you birth”). The paradoxical content of the second phrase is more obscure, but it may be that, since mother cows ordinarily lick their calves (e.g., III.33.3, III.55.13=X.27.14, IV.18.10) and this involves putting their mouth, or at least their tongue, on the calf, putting the calf in/on the mouth reverses this image. This is Ge’s interpr. (also n. 11), but I am a bit dubious. The words for ‘mouth’, *ās-* and *āsán-*, aren’t found in expressions of the calf-licking image, as far as I can find, nor even ‘tongue’. However, I don’t have a better solution. (For a reversed image that does involve both cows and mouths, see IX.99.3 and comm. thereon; unfortunately it won’t work here.)

Such are the possible conceptual paradoxes behind these two phrases, but for them to work in the hymn they must have a real-world (that is, ritual) reference, and ideally this reference should connect with the content and themes of the rest of the hymn, the recovery of Agni as oblation-conveyor and the successful progress of the ensuing sacrifice. I think that Agni is present in both NPs in pāda a, but in different cases – loc. *gárbhe* and acc. *vatsám*. Both words, esp. *gárbha-*, are regularly used of Agni; for a passage containing both, see X.8.2 *mumóda gárbhaḥ ... vatsáḥ ... arāṁvīt* “he rejoices as an embryo ... the calf has bellowed” (as well as X.27.14). If my identifications are correct, we must determine the referent of the other word in each expression: acc. *yóṣām* and loc. *āsáni*. For the first, I think the most likely referent is (one of) the (paired) kindling sticks, who is/are regularly referred to as Agni’s mother(s), particularly the lower kindling stick. See, e.g., III.55.4 and esp. X.27.14bc (and comm. ad loc.) *tasthaú mātā víṣito atti gárbhaḥ / anyásyā vatsám rihatī mimāya* “The mother [=kindling stick] stands still; unloosened the embryo [=Agni] eats. Licking the calf [=Agni] of another [=kindling stick], she [=oblation] lows,” also containing both *gárbha-* and *vatsá-* referring to Agni. Placing the kindling stick in the embryonic fire may simply mean that the sticks are positioned where the fire will begin to catch. Alternatively the young woman might be some piece of ritual equipment with fem. gender (like the *ukhā-* ‘pot’) or even be a reference to Dawn, sometimes called a *yóṣā* (e.g., VII.75.5, 77.1), and be a metaphor for putting light into the newly kindled fire. But I strongly favor the kindling stick.

As for putting the calf into the mouth, what is the “mouth” here? The question is complicated by the fact that Agni himself is often called the mouth of the gods and oblations are poured into his mouth. Such an interpr. would produce the awkwardness of two references to Agni in this two-word phrase, and I do not think it means “they played Agni in Agni.” Instead I suggest very tentatively that in this case the mouth is the hearth or fireplace, rather than the fire itself. Although I cannot find a parallel usage, it seems conceptually possible – the place, roughly mouth-shaped, on the ground in which the kindling materials are set.

(For a quite different interpr. of this hemistich, see Schnaus 283. Though thoughtful, it is not convincing, at least to me.)

As for the 2nd hemistich, again I think we have to think about it in the context of the whole hymn and indeed the three-hymn sequence – the reinstallation of Agni and the successful reinstitution of the sacrifice. After Agni as embryo and then calf has been re-kindled in ab (by my interpr.), he proceeds to glorious victory in cd (again, by my interpr.). I do not think that the subject of this hemistich is either Indra (tentatively floated by Old) or a man (supplied by Re), but Agni himself. Given the focus in this three-hymn sequence on the return of Agni for the sake of the sacrifice, the supreme victor in the final vs. can hardly be anyone but him. Certainly the vocabulary doesn’t impede this identification. The adj. *sumānas-* can modify a variety of referents, but is particularly common with Agni; note esp. that in the first hymn of this sequence, X.51.7, the gods hopefully suggest that Agni should return, *sumanasyāmānaḥ* “showing your

benevolence.” The recurrence of *sumānas*- here implicitly announces that this has happened. Agni is also one of the most common subjects of the verb stem *vāna*- (e.g., I.140.11, III.19.1, V.3.10, 4.3, etc.). And although the strongly martial tone of the hemistich might at first point in another direction (Old’s Indra?), Agni is hardly lacking in martial aspects.

With most of the standard interpr. I take the Saṃhitā *kārā* as loc. *kāré*, against Pp. *kārāḥ*.

The problematic part of the hemistich is *yogyā abhí* in c. By most interpr. *yogyā* is taken as an acc. pl. fem (*yogyāḥ* out of sandhi). with postposition *abhí*, loosely construed either with *sumānāḥ* (Ge, Re, sort of Schnaus, 282) or with *siṣāsaniḥ* (Köhler, 328 and n. 1009). The stem *yogyā*- lit. means ‘harness/yoking cords’, a sense clearly found in III.6.6. In our passage (and supposedly in VII.70.4) it is taken metaphorically to mean something like ‘obligation, task’ (lit. ‘what is to be yoked [to oneself]’?). This is not impossible, and a tr. “well-disposed towards his tasks” is not excluded. But *sumānas*- doesn’t otherwise take such a complement, and the desid. *siṣāsa*- takes as object material things we want to gain (prizes and the like), not duties or tasks, so that Köhler’s “der die Werke zu gewinnen sucht” seems off. I am also dubious about postpositional *abhí*, though I confess that I haven’t checked all 739 examples (per Lub) of the form. For all these reasons I make bold to suggest an unorthodox reading of the two words, as a mangled instr. pl. In III.6.6 (one of the two other occurrences of the stem *yogyā*-) we find a pāda-final instr. pl. *yog’yābhiḥ* in a Triṣṭubh cadence. Here, in a Jagatī cadence, we have *yog’yā abhí*, which I suggest is a species of distraction and misinterpretation of **yog’yābhiḥ*. I take it in its literal (or literal-metaphorical value): Agni wins with his yoking strings, that is, with his horses yoked to his chariot. This would continue the chariot metaphor, with its technical terms, of vs. 7 (and possibly vss. 8 and 9d; see above). It’s a long shot, I realize, and the tr. floated above (“well-disposed towards his tasks”) is a possible alt. Still I favor the emendation. The publ. tr. should have an asterisk before “with the yoking strings.”

X.54–56

The next three hymns are attributed to Bṛhaduktha Vāmadevya, the first two dedicated to Indra, the last to the All Gods, per the Anukr. The Indra hymns have 6 and 8 vss. respectively, violating the usual principle of ordering – a fact that causes Old (Prol. 238–39) some distress. He rejects Bergaigne’s suggestion to assign the second hymn to the All Gods, which would restore order since the final, All Gods, hymn has 7 vss. and would follow one with 8. Old’s rejection is based on the supposed difference in content between 55 and 56, but, as disc. in the publ. intro. to X.55, I am inclined to follow Bergaigne, for reasons stated there: although 55 and 56 are indeed quite different, X.56 is a kind of one-off, while X.55 has a number of hallmarks of enigmatic All God hymns. Both fall well within the loose parameters of All God hymns. Although X.55 begins and ends with Indra (never named), it is hardly a conventional Indra hymn and its mysterious center (esp. vss. 4–6) strays far from Indra, while sharing themes, particularly “light,” with X.56. It does not help Old’s case that his only suggested explanation for the violation of ordering in the two supposed Indra hymns is that it reflects “eine alte, traditionelle Reihenfolge” based on grounds “die sich unsrer Kenntniss entziehen,” if not in fact on chance – hardly a compelling alternative hypothesis, esp. given the rigidity of the ordering in other (and older) parts of the RV.

X.54 Indra

X.54.1: The hymn begins with a syntactically incomplete pāda, with the acc. *tām ... kīrtīm* governed by no verb. Ge supplies “(will ich) ... (verkünden),” which is certainly possible, but I

think something trickier is going on. First of all, the structure of 1ab is very like that of the 1st hemistich of the following hymn, X.55.1ab. The b pādas are almost identical: 54.1b *yāt tvā bhīṭé ródasī áhvyayetām* / 55.1b *yāt tvā bhīṭé áhvyayetām vayodhaí*. And the first pāda of 55.1 also lacks a verb and its principal noun, *nāma* ‘name’, is semantically similar to *kīrti-* ‘reputation, fame’ here. The difference of course is that *nāma* is neut. and can therefore be the subject of a nominal clause (Ge: “Weit ... ist jener ... Name”), whereas the undeniably acc. *kīrtim* cannot be. On the one hand, I think this is the poet’s little joke.

But on the other it needs to be interpr. in the context of the overall sense of the hymn, at least as I understand it. As disc. in the publ. intro. to X.54, I think that in this poem the poet is implying “that Indra’s great deeds and the words that express them are essentially the same,” in fact that the words generate the deeds. The very first hemistich announces this, by equating Indra’s *kīrti-* with himself (*tvā*): the frightened world halves are actually calling on his reputation when they call out to him. (It might be noted that *kīrti-* is found only here in the RV, though it’s fairly common in the AV.)

In the c pāda the two verbs, *prāvaḥ* and *ātiraḥ*, can technically be either main-clause verbs with accented preverbs (*prá=āvaḥ*, *ā=atiraḥ*) or still under the domain of the *yád* of b with accented verb (*pra=āvaḥ*, *ā=atiraḥ*). The Pp. opts for the former, as do Ge and I, although I was tempted by the alternative. But the parallelism with X.55.1 supports the Pp. solution, since X.55.1c *úd astabhñāḥ* with unequivocally accented preverb has to be a main-clause verb.

The referent of *prajāyai tvasyai* of d is not made clear – again, I think, deliberately. Ge (n. 1d) thinks this already reflects the later notion of the double descent of Prajāpati (gods and demons), but the implicitly contrastive *tva-* form seems to me to set up a dichotomy with both terms in c: the gods whom Indra helped (*prāvo devān*) suggest their antonymic opposite, humans, and the *dāsas* he overcame suggest the other half of that pair, the Ārya. Putting those together, we get the ideal human – namely us, the Ārya.

X.54.2: If I am correct about vs. 1, that it expresses the identity between the verbal reputation of Indra and his actual actions, this same sentiment is expressed considerably less politely in this vs. The first hemistich has Indra going about *proclaiming* (*prabruvāṇāḥ*) his own powers—that is, representing them in words, rather than performing them as deeds—and this boasting is dismissed curtly in the next pāda (c) as just *māyā*, which in this context comes very close to the later meaning ‘illusion’. Indeed, “what they call battles” are simply Indra’s *māyā*. (Note that Ge’s tr. “da war nur Blendwerk, was sie von *deinen* Kämpfen sagen” [my ital.] is slightly wrong: *te* cannot qualify *yuddhāni*, because this would require an enclitic to begin the clause [... **te yāni yuddhāny āhúḥ*]; the *te* must go with the main clause and qualify *māyā*.) In this context pāda d has a cynical and deflating tone. It plays on, and against, the triumphal statement found in I.32.4, the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn, which states *tādītñā śátruṃ ná kílā vivitse* “you surely never found a rival since” – meaning that after Indra’s decisive victory over Vṛtra, no one could rival him. But here, despite the near identity of wording, *nādyá śátruṃ nanú purā vivitse* “neither today nor before have you discovered a rival” seems rather to mean that Indra has done none of his vaunted fighting, has never confronted an enemy – it’s all words and *māyā*. As both Old and Ge point out, this hemistich is quoted in the ŚB (XI.1.6.9–10), where it forms part of a denial of the truth of the tales of the Deva / Asura conflict. I think that it has been partly repurposed there, rather than that our passage already reflects the whole ŚB situation, which in fact primarily concerns Prajāpati’s acts of creation. It’s worth noting that the ŚB paraphrases our pāda d in less

ambiguous terms: *ná tvám yuyutse katamác canāhar ná te 'mítro maghavan kás canāsti* “Not for a single day hast thou fought, nor hast thou any enemy, O Maghavan” (Eggeling).

X.54.3: In this vs. the poet seems to retreat a bit from his extreme Indra-denigration of 2cd, but I think this is more a matter of ambiguous wording than a change of attitude: the intent of the vs. is hard to read. (I now depart in part from my assessment of this vs. in the publ. intro.) The initial impression of the first hemistich is that Indra’s greatness is such that it is impossible even for poets (previous poets) to have entirely grasped it, “reached its end.” This is a fairly common expression emphasizing the unlimited power of Indra. Cf., e.g., I.100.15 *ná yásya devā devātā ná mártā, āpaś canā sávaso ántam āpuḥ* “The limit of whose [=Indra’s] vast power no gods in their divinity, nor mortals, nor even the waters have reached.” However, I think in our passage the apparent exaltation of Indra’s *mahimán-* is undercut by the adj. *sama-* in the genitive phrase and, quite possibly, by the deed that exemplifies it in the 2nd hemistich.

To begin with *sama-*: as disc. ad X.29.4, this indefinite stem is always used in pejorative contexts, even when it appears to be neutral or positive. Particularly pertinent here is VI.27.3, which is very like our passage: *nahí nú te mahimánaḥ samasya, ná maghavan maghavattváśya vidmá/ ná rādhaso-rādhaso nūtanasyéndra nákir dadṛṣa indriyám te*. Ge’s rendering, more or less followed by the publ. tr., puts a positive spin on the phrase containing *samasya*: “But yet we do not know your whole greatness, nor generosity, o generous one”—implying that although we know some of his greatness, we have not yet experienced the full amount. But Ge’s “ganz”/ my “whole” for *sama-* is not a legitimate rendering of *sama-*, and the final pāda “your Indrian strength has not shown itself” (my “your (whole) Indrian strength” is even less justified than the earlier “whole”) indicates that Indra has simply not been there for us at all. Hence my emendation of VI.27.3 to “But yet we do not know any (*samasya*) of your greatness ...” I now would interpr. our passage in a similar way. Once again “whole” (Ge’s “ganz” again) for *samasya* is a contextual invention; once again I think the idea is not that Indra’s greatness is so vast that its limit cannot be reached, but rather that it’s a question whether *any* greatness has been deployed on our behalf. I would now emend the tr. to “what seers before us reached the limit of any greatness of yours?” – with a somewhat scornful emphasis on “any.” They didn’t reach the limit, because there was no limit to reach.

However we interpr. 3ab, the 2nd hemistich sits oddly in relation to it, though since it is introduced by *yád*, it should be dependent on what precedes. On first glance this is just another of the endless expressions of Indra’s cosmogonic powers, while also displaying the RVic partiality for paradoxes of birth, whereby the child gives birth to its own parents. Flg. Sāy.’s plausible suggestion that the mother and father here are Earth and Heaven, the statement at first does not seem *very* different from passages where Indra begets, for example, “the sun, heaven, and dawn” (e.g., I.32.4 *āt sūryam janāyan dyām uṣāsam*). But there are notable distinctions. For one thing, although Indra is often credited with begetting things / beings (generally in the active of the stem *janāya-*, as above), they are not identified as his family members. I do not know of any other passages in which Indra is credited with begetting his own parents. The closest is I.159.3, in which their sons, that is, the gods (presumably including Indra), are said to have begotten (act. pf. *jajñuh*) their “two mothers” (*mātārā*), Heaven and Earth. But our passage depicts the birthing as much more intimate: it is expressed in the middle, one of the only “real” middle forms (*ājanayathāḥ*) to the extremely common trans./caus. stem *janāya-*, whose middle forms are otherwise almost entirely confined to 3rd pl. *-anta* replacements (see my 1979 “Voice fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial 3rd plural *-anta* in active paradigms,” *III* 21: 146–69) and

forms based on them, with active sense. Here, though the form is transitive, the medial self-involvement of the subject is underlined by the reflexive abl. expression *tanvāḥ svāyāḥ* “from your own body.” The middle verb and the reflexive (one might almost say “double reflexive,” since *tanũ-* has quasi-reflexive value in addition to its lexical meaning ‘body’) expression of source highlight the physical aspects of this birth – and in fact depict Indra as a mother, a female from whose body the child emerges. This is, needless to say, uncharacteristic of Indra, at least in the RV—in my 1991 *Hyenas* (pp. 76–81 and passim) I argue that Indra is depicted as a mother hyena in a complex of Brāhmaṇa stories, but even there he is not shown giving birth to them (and, moreover, female hyenas are formidable, Indra-like animals).

But why is this episode here? Is it meant to be a culminating example of Indra’s greatness touted in the first hemistich – or, if I’m correct about the sly derogatory tone of ab, as an example of just how paltry his greatness is? Is his begetting of Heaven and Earth, his own parents, meant to awe us – or should his role as mother diminish him in our eyes? This feat, if feat it is, merits no further mention in this hymn, or elsewhere. What relationship there might be between the invocation of Indra by the frightened world halves in 1ab (also X.55.1) is not clear either. I confess myself baffled. It might be noted that 3cd is essentially the middle of the hymn, so bafflement is to be expected.

X.54.4: This vs. firmly returns us to the equivalence of words and deeds. It is in fact *through / by means of* his names that Indra performs his deeds (see pāda d). The names are presumably epithets like *vṛtra-hán-* (so also Ge n. 4ab) that encapsulate the deeds in question. They are *ádābhya-* — here tr. ‘unfalsifiable’ rather than the usual ‘undeceivable’ — because the very existence of the names testifies to the reality of the deeds. As Ge points out, the adj. implicitly contrasts with the *māyā* of 2c. What exactly the four names are I have no idea and won’t speculate, but see VIII.80, esp. vs. 9, for a similar connection between names and deeds, also with four as the number of names.

X.54.5: As the poet gets closer to the end of the hymn and the implicit “ask,” he softens his tone towards Indra. The last pāda of the vs. contains two agent nouns applied to Indra, *ājñātā* ‘heeder’ and *dātā* ‘giver’, which might be interpr. as among the names referred to in the previous vs.: the reality (or not) of “giver” would be esp. pertinent to the poet. By giving Indra the name “giver,” he is affirming the reality of the (expected and hoped for) act of giving, just as in vs. 4 a name like “Vṛtrahan” makes the act of killing Vṛtra “unfalsifiable,” undeniable. See X.55.6 for another pair of agent nouns.

The tr. of d would be more faithful to the rhetoric as “you are the one who takes heed; you the one who gives, Indra.”

X.54.6: By my interpr. (in part flg. JSK DGRV II.96–97), the first hemistich hangs off 5d, as another characterization of Indra, this time dynamic rather than the static expression via agent nouns. The last hemistich is a meta- hymn-ending summary. On the structure of the last pāda and the play on the poet’s name, see publ. intro.

X.55 Indra (per Anukr.; better, All Gods)

On the disputed dedicand of this hymn, see pub. intro. as well as the intro. to X.54–56 above.

In the publ. intro. of this hymn there is an error in the 3rd para.: “... in the next hymn

(X.55.1)” should read X.56.1.

X.55.1: As disc. ad X.54.1, these two initial vss. are very similar, esp. in their 1st hemistichs, with our pāda a syntactically better formed than that in X.54. The emphasis on the name as embodiment of power and of the potential for action is prominent here.

As Ge points out (n. 1b), the verb “prop up” is strictly only applicable to heaven, not to earth.

The identity of the *bhrātuh putrān* “brother’s sons” is quite unclear. First, whose brother? Although both Ge and I assume it is Indra’s brother (“die Söhne deines Bruders” / “... of your brother”), it could of course be someone else’s brother (Heaven and Earth’s?), although context favors Indra. The problem is to identify who it might be, since generally Indra appears to be an only child with a traumatic birth and a fraught homelife (see esp. IV.18). Ge starts with the sons and worries about the brother secondarily; he suggests (n. 1d) that the sons are the Maruts, the sons of Rudra, which latter would here count as Indra’s brother, since gods seem to use “brother” among themselves as a kind of courtesy title (see his citations). This is, as Old says, possible, but I do not find it compelling (nor does Old). The highlighting of the double kinship relationship, “sons of the brother,” seems too prominent for “brother” to be just a courtesy title, and although the Maruts seem to appear, unnamed, in vss. 7–8, that context is quite different from this one: the Maruts don’t generally participate in the propping up of Heaven and Earth (though see VIII.94.11). An even less likely possibility: in VI.55.3 Pūṣan is called the brother of Indra in a series of statements about Pūṣan’s kin, but this seems a deadend: if Pūṣan has sons they don’t figure anywhere, as far as I know.

I will now venture a very fragile alternative suggestion. Although the dominant account of Indra’s birth in the RV is the dramatic one found in IV.18 and alluded to glancingly elsewhere, he is also once named (in the MS) among the Ādityas, the eight sons of Aditi, born two by two. Although the RV vss. treating the pair-wise birth of the Ādityas (X.72.8–9) do not name the sons, nor do most of the Vedic prose versions, the MS passage (I.6.2 [104.10ff.]) gives the names in pairs: Dhātār and Aryaman, Mitra and Varuṇa, Aṃśa and Bhaga, and finally Indra and the aborted fetus, Mārtāṇḍa. (For the story and relevant Vedic passages, see KH, Aufs. 422ff.; my Hyenas 404–8; Brereton Ādityas 244–45.) By this account Indra is an Āditya, albeit a minor one barely mentioned among them, and his closest brother, with whom he shared Aditi’s womb, is the aborted fetus, “stemming from a dead egg,” who – notably – is the ancestor of mankind. So I tentatively suggest here that “the sons of your brother” are actually humans, and his “sparking” (*tītvīṣāṇāḥ*) them, energizing or even vivifying them, establishes the all-important relationship between Indra and his human devotees. Our RVic passage seems late enough to share mythological content with that early prose text the MS. I would now tentatively withdraw the statement in the publ. intro. that Indra has no brother.

X.55.2–3: The numerology in these two vss. is characteristic of All God hymns; the references of these numbers are not clear, as often in such passages.

X.55.2: The notion that it is by means of his name(s) that Indra performs his deeds, as expressed in ab, is also found in the previous hymn in vs. 4, with the same instr. rel. construction (X.54.4 *nāmā* [or -a?] ... *yébhiḥ* ..., 55.2 *nāma* ... *yēna* ...).

Note that the injunc. *janāyaḥ* is multivalent enough to express both the previous begetting and that to come. Contrast this with the impf. *ājanayaḥ* in a similar construction in 4b, which

refers only to the past.

Pāda c lacks two syllables; Ge (n. 2cd) suggests supplying another *priyám*, presumably at the end of the pāda, which would have been lost by haplology: *... *priyám, priyám priyāḥ*. This seems unlikely to me, esp. as it would produce a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. Old suggests various distractions, which are likewise unconvincing; Arnold (§227 iii c) suggests two “rests,” before and after the caesura, with a Triṣṭubh cadence. I think rather than trying to fix the meter, we should accept it as a truncated pāda, whose brevity is in harmony with its syntactic configuration as a kind of topicalized nominal clause, either marked as dependent by *yád* deep in the clause (“which light ...,”) or with *yád asya* as a nominal izafe (“the light that is his ...”), for which see my forthcoming “Proto-proto izafe.” The publ. tr. reflects the latter, but the former would also be syntactically possible.

The lexeme *sám √ víś* is barely attested in the RV (here and in the flg. hymn, X.56.1, as well as X.18.7; cf. also *saṃvśana-* also in the next hymn, X.56.1). Here and in the AV, where it is somewhat better attested, it seems to be partly specialized for funerary contexts, for the merging into or joining with light. If “merging into the light” here refers to death, then the vs. contains the endpoints, birth and death, both associated here with Indra, the begetter in b, the owner of the light after death in c.

The identity of the “five dear ones” cannot be determined. Ge (n. 2d) follows Sāy. in supplying *jānāḥ*. Although the phrase “five peoples” accounts for many of the occurrences of RVic *pāñca*, I do not think that is the referent here. Given the rarity of *sám √ víś* in the RV and its use in the next, related hymn (X.56.1) for the merging of the dead body with light, I find it hard to believe that the occurrence here, which also involves light, simply depicts a sociopolitical fact. Although it seems way too early for this idea to be circulating, could it refer to the later doctrine of the five elements that the dead dissolve into, in expressions like *pañcatām √ gam* (etc.) ‘go to fivehood’, i.e., ‘die’?

X.55.3: The vs. begins as a conventional Indra vs., with his filling of the world-halves and the space in between (pāda a), but the numerology that follows and the multiplicity of Indra’s lights, picking up the light of 2c, soon take it in a new and baffling direction. Ge makes trouble for himself (in my opinion) by construing the acc. in b with the verb in a, *ā ... aprṇāt*. Since the phrase *ā √ prā* WORLDS “fill worlds” is stereotyped in the RV as one of Indra’s deeds, trying to join a very dissimilar direct object, “gods,” to this expression puts both off balance. The presence of the “fill worlds” expression is probably owing to the emphasis on light: what Indra ordinarily fills the space with is light. Contrary to Ge I construe b with cd; besides avoiding the ill-assorted expression resulting from grafting b onto a (see above), this has the advantage of providing the verb in c, *ví caṣṭe*, with an object. Although *ví √ cakṣ* can occur without an object, it frequently has one.

The numerological material in b and c has been amply chewed over by both Old and Ge (nn. 3b, 3c), though there is no fixed consensus on the referents of the numbers – nor do I intend to add to the discussion. Based on my grouping of the pādas, the general outline of what’s going on seems to be that Indra surveys the ranks of the gods arranged by some numerical principle (perhaps, five groups of seven)(pāda b), by means of the light from thirty-four sources (pāda c), probably a collection of heavenly lights (stars, etc.), which are, however, really underlyingly only one light (pāda d), though with different functions. This single light is presumably the same as Indra’s “light born of old” (*pratnām jātām jyótiḥ*) of 2c, into which the mysterious five merged in 2d. We can also recall Indra’s deed in the previous hymn, X.54.6, whereby he “placed

light within light” (*ádadhāj jyótiṣi jyótir antáh*).

X.55.4–6: As disc. in the publ. intro., these vss. do not appear to be Indra vss., esp. 4–5, but rather seem to allude to cosmic mysteries or paradoxes. Since vss. 4–5 are the exact center of the hymn, they fit the omphalos template. In my opinion all three center on astronomical phenomena and form a sequence that sketches the end of night and the beginning of the day, though not quite in sequence. Vs. 4 announces the dawn, while vs. 5 describes the moon amid the stars and its disappearance in the gray of dawn; vs. 6 presents us with the ruddy sun at daybreak. For details see the comm. on the individual vss. below.

X.55.4: This vs. is addressed to Uṣas; her appearance here has probably been motivated by the emphasis on light(s) in the previous vss., esp. cosmic light, as well as by the theme of unity and diversity (see below). As noted in the publ. intro., the final pāda of the vs. seems a deliberate echo of the notable refrain in III.55 (1–22) *mahād devānām asuratvām ékam* “great is the one and only lordship of the gods.” It is remarkable that this solemn general pronouncement has been adapted for one of the less majestic (or at any rate non-male) gods.

Each of the first three pādas is a dependent clause under the domain of a *yá*-form: *yád* a, c, *yéna* b. In the publ. tr. I take the three clauses to be sequential and parallel and the *yá*-forms to be functionally similar, expressing cause (“in that ..., because ..., in that”), but I now think that the *yéna* clause in b should be taken separately from the surrounding *yád* clauses and that it is dependent on pāda a. I base this on the other instr. rel. clauses in this hymn sequence that express the means whereby a god (=Indra) accomplishes a deed—namely X.54.4 *yébhiḥ kármāni ... cakārtha* and esp., earlier in this hymn, X.55.2 *yéna bhūtām janáyo yéna bhávyam* “by which you begat what has been and by which (you will beget) what is to be.” Our pāda contains the same verb (though augmented), *ájanayaḥ* in addition to the *yéna*, and I doubt that this match is accidental. But what is the antecedent of *yéna* here? In both the Indra exx. just cited, the antecedent is “name(s),” and the point is that it is by the name(s) alone that the god performs his action(s). But there is no obvious antecedent in our main clause. Dawn is herself the subj. of *ájanayaḥ* and should not be the referent of *yéna*, not to mention that she’s feminine and *yéna* is not. It might be that a singular could be extracted from the gen. pl. *vibhānām* “of the radiant ones” in pāda a, but this hapax stem *vibhā-* is most likely (though not entirely certainly) fem. as well (see Scar’s disc. [350]). I think the referent has to be ‘light’ (*jyótiṣ-*) plucked from the larger context: 2c, 3d; note esp. instr. *jyótiṣā* in 3d. The main clause in 4a is suffused with light, even though *jyótiṣ-* is not found there. I would now emend the tr. of ab(c) to “In that, o Dawn, you dawned as the foremost of the radiant ones, by which (light) you begat the thriving of the thriving, / in that ...”

It is not clear to me what *puṣtásya puṣtām* refers to, but we should begin with the fact that though *puṣtá-* is formally a past participle to \sqrt{pus} , it never shows clear adjectival use in the RV but is always nominalized as ‘(a/the) thriving, flourishing’ vel sim. (see already Gr’s definitions 6 and 7, of neut. *puṣtá-*), essentially doubling the fem. abstract *puṣtí-*. Because all clear cases of *puṣtá-* are nominal, I doubt that the gen. here is implicitly adjectival referring to a person/being who thrives, with the sense of the phrase “the thriving of the thriving (one)” (implied by Gr’s interpr. of the gen.); rather I think it’s an implicit superlative: “the thriving of thriving” = “the thriving of (all) thriving(s),” “the best thriving.”

Exactly how to construe and interpret c is unclear, muddled by the often-paired relational terms *ávара-* and *pára-*, as well as by the question of whether *te* and *párasyaḥ* are coreferential or

to be construed separately. Let us begin with the paired terms *ávāra-/ pára-*, which can show several different spatial or temporal polarized values: “lower/higher” // “nearer/further” // “later/earlier.” As it happens, this pairing is found in the next, related hymn, X.56.7, where the temporal sense is found, referring to earlier and later generations. I think our passage also has a temporal sense, though displayed in a spatial metaphor. I assume it is expressing the familiar trope of the kinship, indeed identity, of all dawns, from time immemorial till the dawn of the current day and on to future dawns.

The trick is to figure out exactly what form this trope takes here. To solve this, we now turn to the second question: is *te* corefential with *párasyāḥ*? Although Sāy. interprets it that way and Gr so indicates (see also W.E. Hale, *Asura* 97), I think this unlikely, because it requires that the Dawn addressed in pāda a is the Dawn of the distant past, but if she is the past Dawn, how can she be on the scene to be addressed? True, she is called *prathamā* ‘foremost, first’ in pāda a, but in other Uṣas hymns (cf. esp. I.113.8, 15) *prathamā* is used of today’s Dawn, the first of those who are to come, as the passages in I.113 make explicit. I therefore think that *párasyāḥ* is to be construed independently of *te* and it refers to a Dawn long in the past. The enclitic *te*, which here could be either gen. or dat., depends on the *jāmitvām ávaram* and is explicitly contrasted with the previous (*pára-*) Dawn; note that Ge also takes them separately. The whole phrase then indicates that “you,” the current Dawn, have a close kinship (*jāmitvām ávaram*) even with the/a Dawn of the far distant past (*párasyāḥ*), with *ávāra-/ pára-* expressing a temporal relationship through a spatial metaphor. The theme of unity in multiplicity found in vs. 3, with the many lights counting as a single light (3cd) is reprised here, with a more familiar example, that of the fundamental identity of the infinite number of dawns in the past and to come. The unity is emphasized by the adaptation of the “one and only lordship” refrain to Dawn.

X.55.5: This is the most challenging vs. in the hymn and the middle verse of the three astronomical ones (4–6). Each of the pādas presents its own problems. The standard interpr. of this vs. runs counter to the usual: there is general agreement about the *referent* of the principal entity—the moon—but none about the meaning or etymology of its first epithet, *vidhú-*, though it is also generally agreed that it is a riddling designation in a riddling vs.

In my view, the first pāda continues the theme of unity and multiplicity found previously, and this polarity helps in interpreting the much discussed word *vidhú-*. The scholarly back-and-forth about this word has been conveniently summarized by Carmen Spiers in her recent (2020) EPHE diss., “Magie et poésie dans l’Inde ancienne,” 308–10, and I will not repeat this disc. in detail, nor will I engage much with the much disputed question of its etymology and word formation. Instead I will first focus on the rhetorical organization of the pāda in which it’s found: *vidhūṃ dadrāṇām sámāne bahūnām*, with its final loc.-gen. phrase “in a gathering/crowd of many.” Given the balanced contrast between one and many / unity and multiplicity that we have noted in the previous two vss., the “many” at the end of pāda a invites a “one / alone” interpr. of *vidhú-* at the beginning. And in fact much of the older lit. so interpr. it: Gr (flg. BR) ‘vereinsamt, einsam’, MonWms ‘lonely, solitary’, sim., though tentatively, Old. There are several, not entirely incompatible, ways to get to this sense, one of which involves a connection with *vidhávā-* ‘widow’ as ‘the solitary one’ (see Old, again tentatively) and/or derivation from the root $\sqrt{\text{vidh}}$ ‘divide’ (which, however, is a secondary root with somewhat different semantics). The connection with ‘widow’ was maintained by Tichy in her treatment of *vidhú-* (HS 106 [1993]: 15–17 = KISch 365–67), but she proposes a very different root etymology, to $\sqrt{\text{vyadh}}$ ‘pierce, wound’ or, in her gloss, ‘jdn. verletzen, mit dem Pfeil treffen’, besonders ‘tödlich treffen’. She

considers the interpr. “tödlich getroffen” for *vidhú-* justified by the fact that later in the vs. the referent dies (*mamāra*). But there is a certain rhetorical tone-deafness to this interpr.: it seems to me that the local context of pāda a, which favors ‘alone’ versus ‘many’, should outweigh the dying at the end of the vs., esp. because *mamāra* enters into its own rhetorical pairing with immediately following *sām āna* ‘he breathed’. Moreover, neither the phases of the moon nor the setting of the moon at daybreak (which are both possible real-world analogues for ab) conceptually involve wounding. Nonetheless, Tichy’s interpr. has mostly carried the day, having been adopted by Mayr. in EWA s.v. *vidhú-* (in a fascicle publ. in 1995, soon after Tichy’s art.) and by Kü (254). But note that Lubotsky (“RV *ávidhat* [1994: IXth Fachtagung IGG, 205]) asserts the connection with *vidhávā-* and with *√vidh*, though with a different and somewhat dubious etymology of the root and a different sense for *vidhú-* ‘divided in two parts, a crescent’. (Since this publication arose from a 1992 conference, the original paper predated Tichy’s article, which is not mentioned.) To summarize my own view briefly, I find Tichy’s etymology and interpr. of the word quite unsatisfactory, despite their current dominance; I am more sympathetic to Lub’s view, but I still find it dubious. (Inter alia, surely ‘divided in two parts’ with reference to the moon would identify a half moon.) To my mind, the ‘alone’ sense is rhetorically the best supported, and a connection with ‘widow’, whatever the further details of root and word formation, can underlie this sense. Thus the first pāda can depict the solitary (moon) running in a crowd of many (stars), as it crosses the sky from moonrise to moonset.

The next question is – what happens to this moon in pāda b? As I have indicated above, I think the image is that of the moon setting into the gray clouds/haze at the horizon at dawn, (or alternatively, as I also suggest in the publ. intro., the gray could be the smoke from the ritual fire kindled at dawn). A possibly similar image, of sunrise through gray clouds, may be found in the Pūṣan hymn VI.56.3 (q.v.), with a different word for ‘gray’ (*paraśā-*), but that passage is even more obscure than this one. I am puzzled by Old’s suggestion that the gray one is the “old sun” (“der alten Sonne”) – I cannot think of a naturalistic situation in which the sun could appear to swallow the moon, and furthermore the sun is hardly gray, esp. at sunrise. Ge’s suggestion (n. 5b) that the *palitā-* is “das personifizierte Greisenalter” is worth more consideration, but I think we are dealing with a semantic association of gray with old age, rather than a personification. The pāda set us a semantic polarization between the young and the old, via the association of gray (hair) with old age, with the young moon, presumably the new moon, being swallowed up by the gray cloudbank.

One issue that no one dealing with the passage seems to have confronted: despite the universal assumption that the referent of the accusatives in this half-vs. is the moon, the gender is masc. – and the standard word for moon is feminine. (However, other words used for the moon, most notably *sóma-* (already so used in the wedding hymn, X.85.1–5) can be masc.) I don’t know what to do about this, but given the other strong evidence for the identification of this entity as the moon, I do not think the gender mismatch invalidates it. Perhaps this is part of the riddle.

Although pāda c is morphologically and syntactically unproblematic and the words are all familiar, its sense and its relevance to the rest of the verse are not. To begin with, what is the referent of *devāsya*? Is this the moon from ab, once again unusually masc., or is a god external to the rest of the vs., perhaps Indra, who is the subject of the first and last vss. of the hymn? I am inclined towards the former, since it seems to point to the subject of pāda d, who seems to be identical to the accs. in ab.

Then, what does *kāvya-* mean here? I usually tr. it as ‘poetic skill/art’ or, in the pl.,

‘products of poetic skill, poems’. In passages with any sort of diagnostic context, the word is found in association with other words for speech and verbal products (e.g., IV.3.16, 11.3, V.39.5, VIII.79.1, IX.97.7). Others render it as “sagacity, understanding, wisdom”. But neither tack works very well here. In particular, if pāda d is meant as an illustration of the god’s *kāvya*- (as the colon after c in Ge’s, Tichy’s, and Kü’s (370) tr. suggests), dying does not seem a great example of his wisdom. But even less is d an example of poetic art. In the publ. intro. I suggest that *kāvya*- here refers to the *previous* hemistich, which is identified as a piece of *kāvya*-, a hyper-“poetic” description of the moon’s journey, which then, in pāda d, is expressed in stark and simple terms. In the absence of anything more convincing, I still think this is the best available interpr. But I remain disturbed by the *devāsya*: by this interpr. the *kāvya*- is not a product of the god [=moon], but *about* the god, which is a somewhat odd use of the genitive. I am also disturbed that d does not seem to describe quite the same situation as ab. The first hemistich, by my interpr., describes the moon’s traversal of the sky and its setting at dawn; d is most easily taken as a depiction of the moon’s phases, with “he died” referring to the dark period between the waning crescent and the new moon. But if “yesterday” can refer to the night before the dawn, perhaps the two pictures can be reconciled.

In d *mamāra* presumably owes its accent to the short contrasting clauses in this pāda, or else we should assume unsigned subordination: “(Although) today he died, yesterday ...”

X.55.6: As noted above and in the publ. intro., I think this vs. refers to the sun at daybreak. Ge (n. 6), similarly but not identically, to Indra as Sonnen-*haṃsa*. In favor of the sun as referent is the fact that the phrase *aruṇāḥ suparṇāḥ* is used of the sun in X.30.2 (so Ge’s n. 6a), V.47.3 (see comm. ad loc.), and *suparṇā-* by itself is frequently used of the sun (see Gr’s def. 6, even if the referent in not all these passages is correctly identified). I do not know why the sun is called ‘nestless’ (*ānīla-*)—perhaps because the sun is constantly on the move, even at night when most birds settle down in their nests, while he must make his invisible return journey to the east, to be ready for sunrise.

The first hemistich lacks a verb, and in addition the morphological identity and the syntax of *mahāḥ* is unclear. Ge takes *mahā-* as nom. sg. and supplies a verb of motion with *ā* in b: “der als der grosse ... herbei(kommt).” This may be the easiest solution, though not the most inspired. The publ. tr. reflects an assumed ellipsis of a verb form of $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$ (a type of haplology after *śākmanā śākāḥ* opening the vs.), with *ā*, governing *mahāḥ* (prob. an acc. pl., so Old). Note that finite forms of (*ā*) $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$ are sometimes used as essentially etymological glosses of *śakrá-*, e.g., VIII.32.12 *sá naḥ śakráś cid ā śakat* “He as ‘able one’ will be able for us” (also I.10.6, VII.20.9).

Pāda c expresses the common trope that the Sun, traversing the sky, sees everything and everyone and spies out the truth for Mitra and Varuṇa (see, e.g., VII.60.1–4).

The last pāda of the vs. effects a transition to the final two Indra vss., though it can also be applied to the Sun.

As Ge notes (n. 6d), the paired agent nouns *utá jétotá dātāḥ* recall the somewhat less tightly knit pair in the previous hymn, X.54.5 *ājñātā ... dātāḥ*, though interestingly with different accent. The suffixed-accented pair in X.54.5 function as names of Indra, whereas these root-accented forms describe deeds and govern an acc.

X.55.7–8: These two vss. return to Indra, who, however, is not named. But his epithet *vajrín-* and association with the Vṛtra-slaying in 7b make his presence undeniable, and his drinking of the soma in 8c is hardly less diagnostic. Much else remains unclear, esp. in vs. 7.

X.55.7: As was just noted, the unnamed Indra is the subject of this vs., but we must also identify the unspecified “gods” (*devāḥ*, the last word of the vs.) by virtue of whom Indra acquires his manly powers (pāda a) and becomes strong for the Vṛtra-slaying. Here I think Ge is correct (and Sāy. well before him) that these are the Maruts, who are regularly mentioned as Indra’s supporters in the Vṛtra battle. I do not think this necessarily means that Ge’s identification of “the sons of the brother” in 1d as the Maruts is also correct. It’s worth noting that though Sāy. names the Maruts as the referents here, in vs. 1 he has an entirely different (if unlikely) interpr.: the brother is Parjanya, and the sons are “a collection of water(s)” (*udakasamstyāyān*).

With the Maruts plugged in as the referents of *ebhiḥ* (a) and *yébhīr* (b), the interpr. of the first hemistich is fairly straightforward. Not so the second. Here the gods, who must be the Maruts, “were born / came into being / arose” under some unclear circumstances. The immediate cause or concomitant circumstance is “the greatness of the deed/action being done/performed” (*kármaṇaḥ kriyámānasya mahnā*). Given the context, it is difficult not to identify this deed as the Vṛtra-slaying of the previous pāda, which is depicted as happening concurrently, with the present passive participle. But did the Maruts come into being or arise because of the Vṛtra-slaying? Not in the standard accounts – and it is hard to see how they could have supported Indra at the time if they weren’t in existence yet. How to reconcile pādas c and d is made considerably more difficult by the word opening d, *ṛtekarmám*.

There has been curiously little discussion of the hapax *ṛtekarmám* despite the fact that its meaning is unclear (it’s been given two quite distinct senses in the literature), its second member seems to show a very early thematization of the old *n*-stem *kárman*-, and the accent may be anomalous. The only mention in the lit. that I can find is in EWA, s.v. *ṛté*, with a gloss ‘ohne (eigenes) Zutun’, but with no disc. of its formation. It is entirely absent, as far as I can tell, from AiG and from other standard grammars. In the older lit. the first member is taken as the loc. sg. of *ṛtá*-; see Gr’s ‘dem beim Gottesdienste vollbrachten Werke gemäss’ and the large (earlier) BR ‘handelnd nach der Ordnung, nach der Jedermann angewiesenen Bestimmung’ (though with ?). This analysis is also reflected in Sāy.’s gloss and paraphrase *ṛtakarma vṛṣṭipradānakarma*. But in the short (later) BR (/br) the word has been given a radically new meaning: the full entry there is “Adv. *ohne Werk*,” which is reflected in MonWms “without work” (attributed to “BRD,” presumably the short br). I have found no disc. or justification of this abrupt about-face. Ge’s “ohne eigenes Zutun” follows this new view. (Old fails to comment on anything in this strange verse.) This later interpr. obviously takes the first member as the adposition *ṛté* ‘without’, found sparingly in the RV, always with the ablative. This would be the only such cmpd. in the RV (*ṛte-jā*- ‘born in truth’ belongs with *ṛtá*-), but a few exx. begin to appear in Vedic prose, already MS and KS. See AiG II.1.314–15 and its Nachtr., p. 86. The MS contains two accented forms (with unaccented parallels in KS), whose accents clash with each other: *ṛté-mūlam* ‘without roots’ (MS I.10.17; cf. KS XXXVI.12) with 1st member accentuation and *ṛte-yajñám* ‘without a sacrifice’ (MS I.11.5; cf. KS XIV.5) with 2nd member accentuation, both to thematic stems. The only other accented form is *ṛté-gu*- ‘without cow(s)’ in ŚBK I.2.4.10, corresponding to the phrase *ṛté góḥ* in ŚBM II.2.4.13. With so little data it is hard to draw any conclusions about the accent, but, for what it’s worth, the two forms with first-member accent appear to be adjectives, whereas our *ṛte-karmám* and, probably, MS *ṛte-yajñám* are adverbs and so may show adverbial accent shift. As for the apparent thematic ending *-ám*, I am puzzled. Perhaps it is an effort to distinguish the adverb from the case forms to the neut. *n*-stem *kárman*- found in these two vss.: gen. sg. *kármaṇaḥ* (7c), clearly to an *n*-stem, and acc. pl. *kármāni* (8a), the usual *-n*-stem form, though it

could of course belong to a putative *a*-stem **kárma*-. We can also note that the word precedes a vowel-initial word *udájāyanta* and so the *m* could have originated as a hiatus-filler.

Let us now focus on the meaning. The fact is that neither the older interpr. nor the younger one fits easily in the passage. To start with the later one and with Ge's tr. of the hemistich: "die [=Götter] durch die Grösse (seines) getanen Werkes auch ohne eigenes Zutun emporkamen" – the tr. implies that because of Indra's ("seines") activity the gods arose / came into being / got born without any action on their part. But does this follow? What does Indra's deed have to do with the birth of gods – esp. if this act is indeed the Vṛtra-slaying, as I suggested above? And does the birth of gods involve their own activity under other circumstances? The Maruts' birth is generally depicted as complex and problematic (see esp. VI.66.1–6, where they do seem to take an active role in their own birth). Or must we reckon with a very bleached sense of *úd√jan* 'come to prominence' or the like? This lexeme is rare (6x in the RV), and it generally refers to real birth or at least to physical (a)rising. In short, Ge's interpr. is not impossible, but it does not conform to any mythological situation I'm aware of, and the formation envisioned, a cmpd with *rté* 'without', seems a little early. The older interpr. does not fare much better; here again we'd need an adverb, in this case meaning something like "in the manner of (an) action in (accord with) truth." Such an adverb could qualify the immediately preceding phrase *kármaṇaḥ kriyāmānasya mahnā* "by the greatness of the action being performed" and indicate that the action was not only great but in harmony with the truth – perhaps a nervous preemption of the blood guilt associated with killing. Once again the word formation is anomalous, but that's a problem with both interpr. Although the publ. tr. follows the later interpr., I am now inclined towards the earlier one: "... which gods arose/came into being by/because of the greatness of the action being done, in a manner of (an) action in accord with truth." This still doesn't solve the problem of what the Vṛtra-slaying (or other deed of Indra's) has to do with the birth/arising of the Maruts, but I think I've gotten as far as I can.

X.55.8: This vs. is blessedly straightforward. Assuming that it follows more or less directly on vs. 7, we can supply "with them/the Maruts" to flesh out *yujā*. The *kárman*- prominent in vs. 7 returns here, obj. of the root *√jan*, which, as we saw, complicated 7d. As was likely there, we have to deal with an attenuated sense of 'beget' -- 'give rise to', vel sim. -- rather than a literal one.

The hymn limps to the end with a 10-syllable pāda (d).

X.56 All Gods

On the aim of the hymn, see publ. intro. As was disc. there, there are two competing views: that the hymn is the poet's memorial for his dead son Vājīn (Sāy.) or that it concerns a dead horse, either sacrificed (Old) or deified (Ge). The horse interpr. is strongly defended also by Doniger, but Re (EVP XVI.133) questions it: "peut-être l'allusion au cheval est-elle à rejeter?" As was also noted in the publ. intro., I reject both interpr.; there is simply no evidence for a horse save for the word *vājīn* 'prizewinner', which need not apply to a horse (see the numerous passages under Gr's definitions 3–8), nor is there any evidence for a father-son connection between the poet and the dead entity. Instead the hymn seems to be a general treatment of what happens after death, picking up and developing some themes found in the previous hymn, X.55, particular that of light.

X.56.1: The fact that this vs. is found in the AV (AVŚ XVIII.7 ≅ AVP XVIII.69.5) and

elsewhere in a normal funeral hymn is another piece of evidence that the dead in question is a person, not a horse.

The three lights are probably more or less as Ge indicates (n. 1a): this one here (*idám*) is the light of earth, quite possibly the fire; the distant one (*paráh*) is that in heaven, probably the sun; the third one is in the furthest distant heaven beyond the sun.

As noted above ad X.55.2, the lexeme *sám* √ *vis* is very rare, and its attestation twice in this vs. and once in a vs. in the preceding hymn is strong evidence for the continuity of thought between the two hymns. Both passages concern the “merging” of being(s) with or into light.

As elsewhere (I.163.4, VII.34.2, 56.2) I take the instrument suffix *-tra-* serious in *janitra-* and tr. it ‘means of begetting’, not ‘birthplace’ with most. Here the point would be that merging with the third light is the best kind of birth.

X.56.2: It must be admitted that this vs. is found in AVŚ in a short hymn to a horse (VI.92.3; the AVP IX.34.13 equivalent is in a longer and more miscellaneous collection).

Sāy., fld by Ge and Don, interpr. *tanūḥ ... tanvām nāyantī* as meaning that the body of the horse is carrying the body of its rider, but this seems like a forcing of the horse theme on a phrase that resists it. For ex., Don tr. “carrying a body,” but √ *nī* doesn’t mean ‘carry’, but ‘lead’. For Don’s suggested meaning we would expect a form of √ *bhr* instead. Re appositely cites the compd. *āsu-nīti-* ‘leading to the (other) life’, found in the funeral hymns (incl. nearby X.59.5–6), referring to the one who guides the dead person to the beyond and reunites him with his faculties, a sort of psychopomp. In fact I now think that the nom. *tanūḥ* does not refer to the body of the dead man in question, which is rather the acc. *tanvām*; 2nd-position *te* can as easily qualify this following form, separated only by a voc. *vājīn*, as the preceding *tanūḥ*. (I do not think that the close sandhi *tanūṣ te* requires a syntactic connection to the preceding: a preceding rukifiable *-s* generally seems to ruki before *te* regardless of the syntax. See, e.g., *vidúṣ te* [I.11.6, 7], *nákīṣ te* [I.48.6, 69.7].) I would therefore change the tr. to “Let the body, leading your body, establish ...” Who the nom. body belongs to I’m not sure – perhaps it refers to a generic body, the psychopomp, that leads the other dead along the way.

The accent on *dhātu* is motivated by its participation in two clauses, between which it stands.

In d *jyótiḥ* can be read with both simile (to the left: *divīva*) and frame (to the right: *svám*). I take “own light” as referring to the *idám ... ékam* in 1a, “one light here [on earth]” – in other words, to the light that the person had while alive, which he will exchange for another light, the third one mentioned in 1b. Why the exchange partner is expressed in a simile “as if for the light in heaven” has to do with the three lights of 1ab. The dead is merging with the third light, beyond the one in heaven, i.e., the second light – but since that second one, the sun, is the only one we can see and therefore imagine, the poet compares the merging with the distant invisible third light with the less (but still) distant and visible second one. Ge’s interpr. is different: he supplies the sun in the simile, with the comparison between the sun’s exchanging its light (alternating between day and night?) and the dead man’s exchanging his. But I don’t understand the point of comparison: the dead person’s exchange is permanent – he’s giving up his own light for a higher one—whereas the sun’s exchange happens daily. Still less do I understand Don’s “change your own light as one does in heaven.”

X.56.3: The them. deriv. *vājīna-* is poorly attested and poorly defined; here it seems to be used as a pleonastic etymological qualification of the nom. *vājī* “you are a *vājīn* by your qualify of

vājina-.”

The rest of the vs. is structured by five occurrences of *suvitāḥ* ‘well gone’ (*su* √ *i*), which forms a non-etym. semantic figure with the single finite verb *gāḥ* ‘you have gone’ (to √ *gā*). This use of *suvitā-* is highly unusual. It is the only occurrence of this quite well-attested stem with an animate being; it is ordinarily neut. and a noun ‘good going, easy passage’.

The real problem in this vs. is the hapax *suvenīḥ* (see AiG II.380 “ganz unklar”), starting with its morphological identification. Sāy., Old, and Re take it as a nom. sg. (in different ways), while Ge, Don., and I take it as acc. pl. fem. Ge and Don think it refers to the heavenly mares (Ge n. 3a), the ‘well-loved’ (“zu den schönen Geliebten”) or ‘well-loving’ (Don: “who long for you”) ones, with an outmoded sense of √ *ven*. I associate it with the fem. pl. *venīḥ* ‘(female) trackers’ in VIII.41.3, which I now think refers to the dawns. (See comm. ad loc.) Here the same referent is quite possible; remember that the addressee is on a journey to merge with the distant light, and the dawns, sources of heavenly light, therefore fit the larger context. Recall that in the “light” section of the previous, thematically related hymn, X.55.4, Dawn featured prominently. As a goal in our vs., “dawns” fits well with heaven (*divām* b) and the gods (*devān* d). I would, however, slightly alter the tr., since *suvitāḥ* does not seem to be construed with *suvenīḥ*, as the publ. tr. implies. The new version would be “You have gone to the (dawns?), the good trackers, well gone to the praise, well gone to heaven ...”

X.56.4: On my general interpr. of the vs., see the publ. intro., where I suggest that the vs. describes the step-by-step mechanism whereby the recently dead regain their bodies. The last pāda is the clearest expression of this thought, with the dead entering (*ā ... nī* √ *viś*) their own bodies again. The use of √ *viś* recalls the lexeme *sām* √ *viś* ‘merge into’ (of the dead) almost confined to these two hymns (X.55.2, 56.1); see comm. above. It is used of the dead merging with light; in this pāda they (re-)merge with their own bodies.

The rest of the vs. is beset with difficulties, though the outlines of the process seem fairly clear – even though I’ve now changed my mind about some of it (see below). It involves uniting the previous mental force of the dead (*krātu-*, b) with their vibrant energy (*yāny ātviṣuḥ*, c; see below), and, with this package, entering into their own bodies again (d). What exactly is going on in pāda a is less clear.

The interpr. of pāda a depends on that of *caná*, in particular whether it is positive or negative. There is some difference of opinion here, but weighted towards a negative interpr. So, though Sāy. takes it as positive and both Old and Re consider this as a possibility, in the end Old prefers a neg. interpr. (Re does not decide), and Ge, Don, and the publ. tr. all follow the negative one, without disc. Certainly the apparent contrast between the Pitars in pāda a and the gods in b favors the negative, as Old points out. However, this interpr. collides with the usage facts of *caná* elsewhere. As disc. esp. ad X.49.5, flg. Klein (DGRV I.285–92), although *caná* overwhelmingly appears in negative contexts, the actual negative is always expressed by (an)other explicitly negative word(s) in those contexts. There are almost no clear examples of *caná* as the sole expression of the negative (though see comm. ad II.24.12); unfortunately Klein does not discuss our passage, which seems like a strong candidate – or at least it is often so interpr. On the one hand, we could assume that the negative sense had “rubbed off” on *caná* in this late passage, and it means “even ... not” as in the publ. tr. in contrast to its standard usage. As I explain in the publ. intro., this could mean that the immediate predecessors of the dead, their Pitars, do not control the “greatness” of those dead, which is in the hands of the gods and powers further above. However, given the overwhelming no. of *caná* passages that conform to the usage facts

just set out – there are nearly 100 exx. of *caná*- in the RV – I am now more reluctant to follow this path than when I made the transl. without full consideration of *caná*. But, if *caná* is positive, what then would this pāda mean? That interpr. must in turn depend on what we think *mahimán*- expresses. This well-attested word is of course an abstract meaning ‘greatness’, but that doesn’t get us very far. I would suggest, very tentatively, that the use of pl. *mahimānaḥ* in the famous cosmogonic hymn X.129.5 may help illuminate our passage. Late in the creation depicted therein, the creation becomes sexualized, with polarized male and female features: *retodhā āsan mahimāna āsan* “There existed placers of semen and there existed greatnesses,” with the “greatnesses” likely referring to pregnancies. If *mahimán*- (sg., I grant) in our passage can refer to the pregnant belly and, by extension, to sexuality, reproduction, and all the messy parts of physicality, this could be in the control of the Pitars, who are in fact vitally interested in the reproductive capacity of their descendants, while the mental power and vital energy belong to the gods. Although this suggestion is fairly fragile, given how many exx. of *mahimán*- lack this sense, it fits the context quite well, since the Pitars return in the vs. 6 to establish the continuity of generations. I would therefore now change the tr. to “Even though the forefathers are masters of their “greatness” (=procreative powers), the gods ...”

The next pāda is, by the standards of this hymn, pretty straightforward. By my interpr. the gods have control over the *krātu*- ‘mental force’ of the dead and deposit it among themselves. The mental *krātu*- contrasts with the physical procreative power (if my interpr. of *mahimán*- in a is accepted).

Pāda c presents several challenges: 1) what is *utá* doing in the middle of the pāda? 2) how should we interpr. *yāny átvīṣuḥ*? In particular, is *yāni* nom. or acc. and, related, is *átvīṣuḥ* intransitive or transitive? 3) What is the subj. of *sám avivyacuḥ*?

The question about *utá* has, I think, not previously been raised: it has simply been taken as connecting c with b, despite its mid-pāda position. See Ge’s tr., whose rendering of c begins with “Und.” Klein (DGRV I.380) is explicit that it connects the clauses across a distich boundary, despite its pāda-internal position. The publ. tr. reflects this shared view (notice my “and” beginning c). But I now think it is wrong. Instead I think it connects the unexpressed first obj. of *sám avivyacuḥ* ‘they enveloped / encompassed’ with the second, which is the relative clause that follows *utá*. In other words, it is the *utá* version of an “X and which Y” construction, usually expressed with *ca* (X *yá*- *ca* Y). The use of the preverb *sám* ‘together’ supports this view that two things are being united. The first object is, in my view, *krátum*, to be supplied from b. In other words they bring together the mental force of b and the vibrant energy expressed by *yāny átvīṣuḥ*. Once these have been combined, the crucial parts of the dead person have been reunited and are ready to be (re-)placed in the bodily envelope.

Let us now turn to the rel. cl. and specifically to its verb *átvīṣuḥ*. The first thing to note is that a different form of this root was found in the previous hymn, X.55.1 *títvīṣānāḥ* tr. there ‘sparking’, that is, energizing or vivifying. That form is a middle pf. part. and transitive, but opinions differ on the value of our act. form. For intransitive value: Sāy. (*yāni tejāṃsy atvīṣuḥ dīpyante*), Don (“all things that shine”), and apparently Ge (“Glanzleistungen”), as well as the publ. tr. (“those things that were in vibrant motion”). For transitive: Gr (“anregen ACC”), Kü (“welche sie erregten,” p. 500), and Old (“was sie aufgestürmt haben”). It is true that this is the only act. form to this root, and so an oppositional transitive might be expected (most of the middle forms, though not X.55.1, are intrans.). A trans. sense would certainly work within my scenario: “they encompassed the *krātu*- and the parts that they ‘sparked’.” But, despite the morphology, I weakly favor the intrans. version because it is more harmonious with the simple

obj. *krátum*. Putting the whole pāda together, I would now tr. “They enveloped / encompassed (the mental force) and those things that were in vibrant motion” – in other words intellect and life force. One final question about this pāda: who is the subj. of *sām avivyacuḥ*? Ge (/Don) thinks it’s the divine racehorses, which we can dismiss. It could be the gods of b, but I think it is more likely the dead themselves, who have reclaimed the various parts of themselves from the various places they ended up after death.

X.56.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the first hemistich of this vs. depicts the newly reassembled dead moving about in the other, upper realm. I’m not sure exactly what their “powers” (*sāhobhiḥ*) are, but I assume that this refers generally to the powers that come from the (re-)combination of mental force, life force, and body.

As also indicated in the publ. intro., in my view the 2nd hemistich refers to a different type of life-after-death. Though each separate being is limited to and held within a single body – even if that body is in heaven, as in the last pāda of the previous vs., 4d — by producing offspring, a single being can extend himself in many different beings. This is of course a standard Vedic sentiment. On the medial reflexive form *prāsārayanta* see my -aya-book, p. 170.

X.56.6: As Ge (n. 6) says, “Schwierige Str.” The first thing to note is that the configuration of two plus a third matches vs. 1, though the referents of the numbers cannot be the same. Since the final vs. of this hymn (7) seems to be a summary vs. applicable to the poet, the matching of 1 and 6 is ring compositional. In vs. 1 we have *ēkam ... ēkam ... tṛtīyena*, whereas here we have *dvidhā ... tṛtīyena*. In 1 the third entity is light (*jyōtiṣā*), here a deed (*kārmaṇā*). Light is represented in this vs., however – by *svar(-víd)*- ‘sun(-finding)’.

The vs. concerns the same subject as vs. 5: the ways in which the dead (or to-be-dead) can assure some kind of continued existence for themselves. This is also generally Ge’s take on the vs. (see n. 6ab), though we differ sharply on details, esp. the referents of the crucial terms. The topic of continued existence is also approached from two points of view, that of the sons of the dead (ab) and that of the already dead forefathers (cd).

With Ge, I take *dvidhā* ‘in two ways’ as referring to two different locales: yonder (i.e., heaven, or whatever we want to call it) and here on earth. My important differences from Ge are that I don’t think the “sons” are the Aṅgirasas, an idea of Sāy.’s that seems a distraction in this hymn, and I think the *ásura*- is the sons’ actual father, not heaven (so Ge) nor the sun (Sāy., Don). The sons have established their father, their “lord,” as a sun-finder—that is, they have made it possible for him to merge with the light, as in 1b. Yonder in heaven this is effectuated by the sons’ performance of the proper funeral rites; on earth by their extending themselves through offspring, thus producing grandsons for their fathers, the standard three-generation model in later Hinduism. This extension is produced by “a third action” (*tṛtīyena kārmaṇā*), which, with Sāy., Ge, and Don, I interpr as procreation. Although we might think that procreation was already covered by the second category, “extending themselves through offspring,” I think the offspring and the sexual intercourse that produces them are considered separately. Sexual intercourse is definitely an “action,” requiring another person, the ambivalently viewed female, and therefore involving some danger and risk of impurity. The hoped-for result, the offspring continuing the line of the grandfather, is not a given.

This is the extension of the line from the son’s point of view. Their fathers’ is given in the second hemistich. These (now dead) Pitars established their own offspring (*svām prajāṁ*), that is, the sons whose actions we observed in ab, as their “paternal power” (*pítryaṁ sāhaḥ*). In this

context “paternal power” seems to identify the offspring as the tool, the secret weapon, that the Pitars wield to ensure their continuity into the next generation(s). The sons will have sons (and so on), and they will stretch like a thread across the generations.

X.56.7: The first hemistich of the vs. is essentially unrelated to the rest of the hymn, simply expressing metaphorically all the difficulties Bṛhaduktha has overcome – though for a possible relationship between the boat in pāda a and the journey to the next world, see comm. ad X.135.4. The real meat is in the second hemistich. There the general statement in the previous vs. (6) is applied specifically to the poet Bṛhaduktha. This application is emphasized by the exact echoes in the two second hemistichs:

6cd #svām prajāṁ ..., āvareṣv adadhuḥ ...

7cd #svām prajāṁ ..., āvareṣv adadhāt ...

Just as the Forefathers establish their own progeny to provide continuity to later generations, so has Bṛhaduktha. This would seem simply to say that Bṛhaduktha, too, has produced sons. But what about the final phrase, *ā páreṣu* “among previous (generations),” found only in the Bṛhaduktha vs.? This is the finale of the hymn (and of the hymn sequence, X.54–56), and, when given some thought, it seems like a radical statement. The Pitars can only produce forward, as it were: their offspring connect them with generations to come. But how can one’s own offspring connect to the past? I venture to suggest, quite tentatively, that this is a statement about poetry. Bṛhaduktha’s “own offspring” are also his hymns, and by producing them he has not only set about ensuring the continuity of the poetic tradition to generations in the future, but he has also provided a continued existence to previous generations by celebrating them in his poetry. He has generated backwards, as it were, and given a new life to the Pitars who preceded him. Bṛhaduktha’s special ability to connect with both past and future is enabled by *mahitvā*, his ‘greatness’.

X.57–60

On these four hymns (and their possible resolution into three) see publ. intro. to the four hymns as well as the introductions to the individual hymns.

X.57 All Gods

X.57.1: Technically speaking, *somínah* could be gen. sg., as I take it (also Ge), abl. sg. with *yajñāt*, or nom. pl. agreeing with the 1st pl. subj.

X.57.2: The “thread stretched” (*tántuḥ ... ātataḥ*) to the gods is Agni: the ppl *āhuta-* is overwhelmingly used of him. The phrase exactly matches (save for case) *tántum ātatam* in the immediately preceding hymn (X.56.6), and, though the referents and contexts are completely different, this agreement may account for the placement of this set of hymns.

X.57.3: The mention of the Pitars also connects this hymn with the end of the last: see X.56.4, 6.

X.57.5: The tr. of *pitarah* here should have been harmonized with that of *pitṛñām* in 3, hence “o forefathers.”

X.57.6: *vraté* in this vs. echoes *vrātam* in 5c, despite their different senses. Both vss. end with

sacemahi.

X.58 “Return of Mind” (*manaāvartanam*)

On the relationship between this hymn and the previous one, see publ. intro.

X.58.1 (–12): The locational adv. *dūrakām* seems almost contradictory: the base *dūrā-* means ‘distant, far away’, but the suffix *-ka-*, diminutive or deprecatory, seems to undercut its base – with an implication “a little far away, sort of far away.” This may give us some reassurance that we can succeed in calling back the *mānas-* that has gone to those not-quite-so-distant parts.

X.58.6: As was noted in the publ. intro., the “sloping paths” (*pravātaḥ*) lead to Yama in the funeral hymn X.14.1. It is not clear to me whether the preceding *mārīcīḥ* ‘light-beams’ is meant to be identical to the sloping paths or a different destination. Distinct parallel accusatives seem less likely because we might otherwise expect a double *yād* as in vss. 2 (*yād ... dívam yāt prthivīm*), 7, and 8. But I’m not sure whether the sloping paths are really conceived of as beams of light. The word *mārīci-* is found only once elsewhere in the RV, in very late X.177.1; it is more common in the AV, esp. AVP (see Griffiths 2009, ad AVP VI.7.1), but it does not seem to have a technical or particularly well-defined meaning there.

X.59 Various divinities

On the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. In Old’s view (Noten, ad 57–60), vss. 1–7 belong together, but 8–10 belong with X.60.

X.59.1: The interpr. of b is disputed; I find both Ge’s and Old’s unsatisfactory because they miss connections between b and pādas a and c. To begin with the subjects of b, the dual *sthātārā*. With Old (also Re, but not Ge) I take the referents to be the two Aśvins; Ge (n. 1b, though see n. 1c) finds a reference to the Aśvins unnecessary (nicht notwendig), but the mention of one of the Aśvins’ clients, Cyavāna, in c, not to mention the fact that the form is dual, makes the Aśvins the prohibitive favorite. The Aśvins are addressed as *sthātārā* in I.181.3. I construe gen. *rāthasya* with the agent noun, *pace* Ge and Re, who take it with *krātumatā*. Cf. for this same phrase III.45.2 *sthātā rāthasya*.

The next question is the referent (and analysis) of *krātumatā*. Although Gr (and tentatively Lanman, Noun Infl. 516) take it as a nominative dual, such disregard for standard morphology should be avoided. Both Old and Ge (and I) take it as an instr. sg.; for them it refers to another person: Ge to another unidentified charioteer, Old to Cyavāna. But we really need no other personnel. Although a word meaning ‘possessing *krātu*’ might be expected to refer to a living being, in fact this is not necessary. In IV.41.1 *krātumān* modifies a praise song (*stómaḥ*) that is spoken by us (*asmād uktāḥ*). I therefore supply a verbal product here as well: the Aśvins did X “with their resolute (speech).”

And what is it that the Aśvins did? Here the well-known saga of Cyavāna comes into play: the Aśvins are famous for making him young again. This is where pāda a becomes relevant. There we have a passive syntagm “his lifetime has become extended” *prā tāry āyuh*, expressed with the passive aor. of the lexeme *prā √ tṛ*. The owner of this lifetime is the unnamed subject of this part of the hymn. But this extension of his lifetime is comparable to what the Aśvins did for Cyavāna, and in fact the same verbal lexeme is once used of this very deed: I.116.10 *prātiratam jahitāsyāyur dasrā* “You extended the lifetime of him who was left behind [=Cyavāna, mentioned

in the preceding pāda], wondrous ones.” I suggest that the syntactic relationship between pāda a (the frame) and pāda b (the simile) belongs to the phenomenon I’ve discussed under the rubric of “case disharmony in similes” (IJ 24 [1982]). Here pāda a is passive and the neut. *āyuh* is nominative; in b I supply a transitive form of the verbal lexeme (*prātiratam* as in I.116.10 just cited will do), with neut. *āyuh* available to serve as accusative obj. This tight and poetically ingenious connection between a and b, pivoting on a shared neut. noun but changing the voice of the shared verbal idiom, seems preferable to Ge’s invention of an obj. in the simile in b: “wie die beiden Wagenfahrer (ihre Fahrt fortsetzen),” which still requires the verb of the simile to be transitive and to be a variant of *prā* √ *tī*, at least as I understand him.

What task or goal (*ārtham*) the unnamed subject, (like) Cyavāna, sets his force to is not clear to me. Cyavāna set out to marry young women (see I.116.10d). Perhaps in the context of this revivifying hymn, the same end is in view.

Note that the adverb beginning the refrain of d, *parātarām* ‘further away’, phonetically echoes the opening of the verse, *prā tāri*.

X.59.2: As was hinted in the publ. intro., the relevance of this vs. to the life-restoring first vs. is not entirely clear. Given the presence of the *sāman* (pāda a) and of a singer (*jaritā* c), the vs. seems to concern the sacrifice and the material and non-material goods to be gained from it. Note also that there is a switch to 1st pl. reference in this and the following two vss. belonging to this section, from the unnamed 3rd sg. whose life was extended in vs. 1. Both these changes seem abrupt, despite the presence of the refrain in all the d pādas.

With Ge I take loc. *sāman* as in essence a truncated loc. absolute: “when the *sāman* (is sung),” “at the *sāman*.” A similar minimalist usage is found in VIII.89.7. With Ge, I reject Old’s ascription to a different stem built to √ *san* ‘win, gain’, represented by Gr’s “2. *sāman*” and fld. also by Re.

I do not understand the doubled *nū* in this pāda. The two other exx. of this phenomenon make rhetorical sense: in VIII.51.7 repeated *ín nū* connects two parallel adverbials (*úpopén nū ... bhūya ín nū* “over and over ... more (and more) ...”); in X.27.7 they connect two contrastive chiasmic clauses: *dārṣan nv pūrvo āparo nū darṣat*. But here there is no grammatical or thematic parallelism between the items adjacent to the two *nū*s, and the second *nū* does not signal a new clause.

The phrase *nidhimāt ... ānnam* is somewhat puzzling. A *nidhí-* is ‘a deposit, a treasure or treasury’; it is several times used with *mādhv-* ‘honey’: VII.69.3 *nidhím mádhumantam* “honeyed treasure,” I.183.4=III.58.5 *nidhāyo mádhūnām* “deposits of honey.” All three passages are in Aśvin hymns; if we assume that in this food context *nidhimánt-* has the pregnant sense “possessing treasures/deposits (of honey),” this might provide the link between this vs. and the first one, where the Aśvins are prominent though unnamed, but beyond this I can’t go.

The mid. subj. *kārāmahe* takes both *ānnam* and *śrávāmsi* as parallel and contrastive objects, with the self-beneficial sense “make one’s own” (so also Ge: “... wollen wir ... gewinnen”).

The c pādas of vss. 2 and 3 are almost identical:

2c *tā no víśvāni jaritā mamattu*

3c *tā no víśvāni jaritā ciketa*

In the first the speaker asks the “singer” to rejoice in all these things of ours (presumably the food and the fame); in the second the singer is to take note of them (there presumably our manly powers). In both cases I think the singer is not merely a human ritual participant, but must be a god – very likely Agni, who is sometimes called a *jaritār-* (e.g., III.15.5, VIII.60.19, X.100.6). In

this I differ from Ge (n. 3c), who identifies the singer as Subandhu, “der Wortführer der Gaupāyana’s.” But as disc. in the publ. intro., Subandhu is only found in the last metrically distinct part of this hymn (vs. 8), which does not seem to be a unified composition.

X.59.3: Gr and Ge take *aryāḥ* as acc. pl.; I follow Th (Fremdling, 54) in interpr. it as gen. sg., supplying a haplologized acc. pl. **paúṃsyā(ni)*. However, the Gr/Ge interpr. is certainly possible, producing an alt. “May we surmount the strangers with our manly powers.” The purport is the same.

On pāda c see disc. ad 2c immed. above.

X.59.4: Ge (fld. by Ober [Relig. II.59]) construes *dyúbhir hitāḥ* together and interpr. *dyúbhiḥ* as an agentive ‘heavenly ones’: “das von den Himmilischen bestimmte Alter.” See his n. 4c. But in all clear cases *dyúbhiḥ* has a temporal sense ‘through the days’; see esp. Old’s excursus ad IX.112.2. Re also favors ‘through the days’. Moreover, the form belongs to the noun *div/dyu* and should not have a derived adjectival sense.

X.59.5: On *ásu-* (in *ásu-nīti-*) as ‘(other) life’ see comm. ad X.12.1. The other three occurrences of the cmpd., all in the funeral hymns (X.12.4, 15.14, 16.2), refer to an object, a way or path leading to the other life. But the two vocc. here (vss. 5, 6) address a being capable of agency, perhaps just the animatized path.

Pāda c would make somewhat better sense if *rārandhī* were transitive/causative: “make us take pleasure in seeing the sun.” As it is currently tr., we must assume a certain selfless benevolence on the part of the Leader, who gets joy from the joy of others. It is hard to avoid this tr. because the other two occurrences of *rārandhī* (I.91.13 and III.41.4) unequivocally have the sense given to the form here in the publ. tr. There is, perhaps, a way around this, however. Though *rāran-* must belong to the pf. system originally (Kü 413–14), given that there is a fairly well-attested *-āya*-formation (*raṇāya-*) and given that *rāran-* has a heavy redupl., it is possible that it was reinterpr. as a redupl. aor. associated with *raṇāya-*. And *raṇāya-* has an interesting syntactic profile: most of its occurrences are intrans. (or I/T in my *-āya*-book terminology), with a complement in the loc. “take pleasure in,” but two are transitive (double I/T), with the sense “cause X to take pleasure in” (see my *-āya*-formations, pp. 75, 143). In fact one of these two shows the change in process, with the simile and the frame having different case frames: VIII.92.12 *vayām u tvā ..., gāvo ná yāvaseṣu ā/ ukthēṣu raṇayāmasi* “We will make you take pleasure in our hymns, o you of a hundred resolves, as cows do in their pastures,” with the simile a simple intransitive (I/T), the frame transitive (double I/T). (For further disc. see my 1982 “Case disharmony in RVic similes.”) If *rāran-dhī* has become associated with *raṇāya-*, the latter’s transitive potential may have been transferred to it, allowing the alt. tr. given above. See comm. ad V.54.13 for a more complex possible ex. of this same switch.

On med. caus. *vardhayasva* see comm. ad X.49.6.

X.59.6: Contra Ge I do not take *bhógam* as a parallel object to *cákṣuḥ* and *prāṇam*, partly because ‘use, enjoyment’ is a different type of entity from the first two, partly because only they are marked with *púnar*. I take *bhógam* adverbially, flg. Janert (Dhāsi, 22 n. 5).

X.59.7: The occurrence of *ásu-* here does not have the sense ‘(other) life’ that it does in the cmpd. disc. above ad vs. 5.

The three worlds, Earth, Heaven, and the Midspace, each serves as subj. to *dadātu*, each marked by its own *púnaḥ*. Given their distribution across the hemistich, Heaven (*dyaúḥ*) seems to be qualified as fem. *devī*, hence my tr. “goddess Heaven.” As is well known, *dyaúḥ*, though overwhelmingly masc., is occasionally modified by fem. adjs. and pronominal adjs. (see comm. ad I.57.5 and VIII.40.4). What is surprising about this passage is that Heaven is also called a god(dess), for Heaven is never otherwise called a *devá-*. And indeed he is not a god, but the father of gods, as the morphological derivational relationship implies. See my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of X.124,” p. 298 with n. 16. However, Heaven and Earth together, esp. under the designation *ródasī* ‘two worlds’ are sometimes modified by the dual *devī*, and that must be the source of the (apparently) sg. *devī* here. Note that dual *ródasī* is found in the next vs. (8a) and Heaven and Earth in the refrain (d pādas) of the next three vss.

X.59.8–10: The last three vss. of the hymn are unified by their meters (varieties of Pañkti) and their three-pāda refrain. Note also that vs. 8 begins with *sām*, which is echoed by the initial word of vs. 10, *sām*.

X.59.8: As Re notes, this is the first occurrence of the word *subāndhu-* in this hymn cycle – and the only one in this hymn. Though by the standard accounts a man named Subandhu is the focus of the desires for mental and physical restoration in these hymns, in fact the word need not be a personal name (though the occurrences in the next hymn, X.60.7, 10 make this more likely): it could mean ‘possessing good lineage/family’ as it can elsewhere.

Pāda b is identical to I.142.7c, where it refers to Night and Dawn. Its use in that context is responsible for Ge’s tr. “youngest daughters and mothers ...”; see comm. ad loc. I see no reason to see two distinct kinship relations in this phrase; in either passage, since there is no generational difference between the members of either pair. They would be esp. inappropriate here given the underlying gender difference between Heaven and Earth. Note that the dual fem. qualifying *ródasī* puts the apparently singular *devī* modifying *dyaúḥ* in 7b into a wider grammatical context.

X.59.9: Note the *-ká*-suffixed numbers, *dvaké*, *trikā*, and *ekakām*, each agreeing, in the appropriate number, with neut. *bheṣajá-*. Because these suffixed numbers are isolated, it’s difficult to know what semantic or stylistic sense the suffix may contribute. Edgerton (*The k-Suffixes of Indo-Iranian*, 1911: 26) suggests that the suffix forms “adjectives with a sort of distributive force” (rendering them “singly ... by twos ... by threes”). This is certainly possible, even attractive, but the addition of the suffix might just be a way to produce a morphologically parallel and phonologically unified series “two ... three ... one,” since the sequence made from the numerals directly would be more disparate: *dvé ... tríṇi ... ékam*. (And /) or the *-ka-* could convey a “popular” flavor on this popular hymn.

X.59.10: The first hemistich (that is, the non-refrain part of the vs.) is completely baffling with regard to its possible relevance to the rest of the hymn. The fem. name *Uśīnarāṇī* occurs only here. It is transparently related to the name of a people, *Uśīnara*, mentioned in the Aitareya Br and later, but that isn’t much help. Sāy. considers *uśīnarāṇī-* the name of a plant, and Old has a similar view (“Wagen der Kräuterfrau,” bringing healing plants). By contrast, Ge (n. 10b, flg. Ludwig) suggests that *Uśīnarāṇī* is the wife of Subandhu, whose name is really the ethnonym *Uśīnara*, and Indra is restoring his wife to him. This requires a longer chain of assumptions than

I'm willing to accept. But I do think that he is correct that a wedding context is implied, since *ānas-* can be for the wedding vehicle for the bride. I have nothing helpful to add, but the vs., with its hope that the ox and the cart should be whole and in good working order, reminds me of the tacked-on section of the composite hymn to Indra (etc.), III.53.17–20, which I describe (in the publ. intro. to the hymn) as “prayers to deflect various possible catastrophes that might befall a team of oxen and the vehicle they pull on a journey, and wish for safe return.” Given the outsize RVic interest in chariots and vehicles of all types, it would not be totally surprising that a hymn for the restoration of the health of a man might attract a vs. hoping for the restoration of the health of a draught animal. We can also recall that the journey of a new bride to her husband's household is considered to be fraught with perils (see, e.g., Sac Wife 222–26).

X.60 Asamāti, etc.

For the various divisions of this hymn, which probably consists of several hymns combined, see the publ. intro.

X.60.1–4: As noted in the publ. intro., these four vss. form a single sentence, the full skeleton of which is contained in vs. 1 — with the other vss. merely expanding on the recipient of the praise and his stellar qualities, by means of accusatives modifying the object of vs. 1 (vs. 2) and relative clauses dependent on that object (*yāh* vs. 3, *yásya* vs. 4).

X.60.1: I have followed the line of least resistance, encouraged by Ge and Old (see also Mayr, PN), and taken *māhīna-* as the name of a people. However it might be better, with Re, to take it as a variant of *māhina-* ‘great, might’ and tr. “of the great ones.” Re further suggests that the referent is the gods, but this is not necessary and is in fact unlikely.

X.60.2: On a literal reading, pāda b identifies, or at least implicitly compares, Asamāti to a chariot. This seems perfectly reasonable to me — the man as a juggernaut bearing down on his opponents — but the unmediated image seems to have caused consternation to some interpr. Ge alters it from chariot to chariot fighter by a strategic parenthetical addition: “dem ... Wagen(helden),” while Re considers *tveṣām ... rátham* a decomposed bahuvrīhi in tmesis, for *tveṣá-ratha-* ‘having a glittering chariot’, which does exist (V.61.13). Neither trick seems necessary to me.

Gr suggests reading *bhajā *ráthasya* “um zu gewinnen den Herrn des Wagens,” with a dat. inf. **bhajā*. See Old's disc. Since this would require emendation, and it's hard to understand why **ráthasya* would have lost its accent redactionally, I think it best, with most, to see here an otherwise unknown name of a person or place. So Ge, Mayr (PN).

X.60.4: On *marāyín-* see EWA s.v., citing Ingrid Eichner-Kühn 1976.

X.60.5: On *rátha-proṣṭha* see KH (StII 13/14 [1987]: 129–34 = Aufs. III.855–63, esp. 862), who analyzes the second member as *pra-úṣ-tha-* from the lexeme *prá√vas* ‘spend the night away from home’, with the developed meaning ‘camp bed’. Here ‘whose chariots are their camp beds’. In KH's view this identifies the Asamātis as “ein ‘reisiger’ Kreigerstamm,” and he further suggests that since the meaning of *próṣṭha-* was not previously understood, this led to the analysis of *rátha-proṣṭha-* as a PN. This seems plausible, and we might emend the tr. to “in the Asamātis, whose chariots are their camp beds” — though the density of PNs in this hymn might suggest that

we keep the tr. as given.

X.60.6: Ge (n. 6) calls this “eine kleine Dānastuti,” presumably because of the yoking of the *sāptī*. But that assumes that the subj. of *yunakṣi* is the patron, even though the most likely 2nd sg. referent is Indra, who was addressed in vs. 5. The victories attributed to the 2nd sg. referent in the 2nd half of vs. 6 also fit Indra far better than a putative patron.

X.60.7: Although this vs. is universally taken as meant to heal Subandhu and recall him to life, it presents this healing as a (second?) birth. The lexeme *nīr√i* is specialized for birth (see comm. ad I.37.9), and the presence of mother and father in pāda a reinforces this theme, with the movement expressed by *prasārpana*- ‘slithering forth’ also evoking birth.

Note the masc. *ayām* with *mātā*, this mismatch is doubtless due to the fact that the *ayām* is annunciatory: “here is ...,” though the genders match in c *idām ... prasārpaṇam*, which by my interpr. is also annunciatory.

X.60.9: Since the demonstrative is attributive, the genders match in the phrase *iyām pṛthivī*.

X.61–84

This next section of X consists of paired hymns, each pair attributed to a different poet, save for X.75–76, which clearly form a pair but are ascribed to different poets. The first three pairs (X.61–66) all consist of hymns to the All Gods, but of very different styles.

X.61–62

Acadg. to the Anukramaṇī, the poet is Nābhānediṣṭha Mānava, but see the publ. intro. of X.61 for my view of the source of the name. Both hymns are dedicated to the All Gods, but are of very different levels of complexity. Note that Re does not treat these two hymns in his Viśve Devāḥ fascicles, but provides comments (but no tr.) in EVP XVI.

X.61 All Gods

On the structure and contents of this devilish hymn, see the publ. intro., as well as the elaborate intros. by Old and Ge., though I differ from them on many points – and remain quite uncertain about many details of my own interpr.

X.61.1: This vs. sets the tone for the rest of the hymn by posing a number of puzzles that elude solution.

We can begin with the deictically announced “Rudrian formulation” (*raúdrām ... bráhma*), whose presence in the immediate circumstances is underscored by the annunciatory *idám (itthā)*. It is not obvious what is Rudrian about it (but see below), though both Old and Ge make attempts to account for it. The adj. is found also in vs. 15, there modifying the Áśvins, so one might argue that the “Rudrian formulation” here is one addressed to the Áśvins. But the Áśvins are not a presence in this part of the hymn. A more productive approach, partly flg. Ge, is to note that in the later Vedic versions of the incest myth, with Prajāpati and Uṣas as the main participants, it is Rudra who punishes the offender (see my Hyenas, pp. 288–97). The incest story occupies vss. 5–8 of our hymn, and the presence of this myth in the hymn might account for *raúdra-*. In particular, in vs. 7 the gods, concerned about the brutal rape, “begat a/the sacred formulation” (*janayan bráhma*), presumably to guard against such behavior. To me the most plausible interpr. of *raúdra-* is that, in the context of a brahmodya (signalled by *śácyām antár ājaú* in b), a “Rudrian formulation” is one that exhibits the aggressive hostility often characteristic of that god, which the poet can deploy to win the contest. The antagonistic relationship between Turvayāṇa and Cyavana is quite clear in vs. 2. Note that in 3cd Tūrvayāṇa’s verbal skill is likened to arrows that he successfully aims at a target, another war-like Rudra-type image.

The first hemistich lacks a verb – or appears to, on the assumption that the *s*-stem form *gūrtāvacāḥ* is a masculine nom. sg. and *raúdrām ... bráhma* is a neut. acc. We could avoid the need to supply a verb by taking *gūrtāvacāḥ* as a neuter; other *s*-stem cmpds modifying neuters occasionally show the apparent masc. *-āḥ* rather than neut *-aḥ*, esp. pāda-final as here (see Lanmann, Noun Infl. 599 and comm. ad VII.24.2 and II.31.5). We could then have a nominal clause “here is a ... formulation of welcome speech ...” Old considers this (and Re suggests that the cmpd modifies *bráhma*, but as a masc., puzzlingly), but Old rejects this interpr. for the same reason I do, that an unequivocal masc. splv. *gūrtāvacastamaḥ* modifies the poet in vs. 2c. (He is also concerned about the referent of *asya* in 1c.) The masc. splv. in vs. 2 may be considered an ex. of poetic repair, making the masc. gender of *gūrtāvacāḥ* explicit. Given that we need to supply a verb, I suggest a form of \sqrt{kr} , evoked by the *kr-* forms in the vs., etymologically unrelated *krátvā* (b) and etymologically related but somewhat detached adv. *krāñā* (c).

Pāda b is one of the few clear mentions (as signalled by *śācyām antār ājaú*; see above) of a poetic contest or brahmodya in the RV, an institution that other interpr. are more apt to see in RVic contexts than I am.

On *krāṇā* see comm. ad I.58.3.

The cmpd. *maṁhaneṣṭhāḥ* poses problems in both members. On the one hand, what is the case form of *maṁhane* and to what stem does it belong? On the other, what is the case and number of *-ṣṭhāḥ* and what does it modify? To begin with the 2nd member, Old, Ge, and the publ. tr. take the cmpd as modifying neut. *yád*, which picks up *bráhma* from the main clause. Ge (n. 1c) explains it as a masc. form for the neuter (with [not very strong] parallels but without exploring the morphology). Old simply says “... habe ich als Neutr. übersetzt; doch auch Mask. möglich,” without saying how he finesses the neut. or which masc. he might attach it to. By contrast Scar (652–53) suggests that it is an acc. pl. m. with the consonant-stem ending *-as* < **m̥s* added to the root-noun stem (depending on the chronological stage, presumably: **-aH-m̥s* or **ā-**as*), modifying *hótīn*. Although in this hymn with its many puzzles and blind alleys, a muddled neut. sg. form, as represented in the publ. tr., would not be surprising, I am somewhat attracted to Scar’s interpr. and suggest an alternate tr. “(a formulation) that ... will effectively guide across ... the seven Hotars (who are) standing ready for liberality.” Scar’s interpr. of the 1st member is also preferable to the standard, which takes *maṁhane* as the loc. of a putative short *-a*-stem **mámhana-*, though the only stem attested (mostly in the [admittedly ambiguous instr.] is fem. *mámhanā-*. Scar suggests rather that *maṁhane* here is a dat. infinitive, which allows a more appealing interpr. ‘standing ready for liberality’ than the loc. ‘standing in liberality’. For what this all might mean, see below.

There is also another alternative, not represented in any of the available interpr. as far as I know – that *maṁhaneṣṭhāḥ* is a nom. sg. masculine (the easiest morphological interpr.), modifying the poet referred to in ab, and that *yád* is not a neut. picking up *bráhma*, but a subordinating conj. This would yield another alternative tr. “when he, standing ready for liberality, will effectively guide ...” If the cmpd modifies either the poet (as I just suggested) or the formulation (in the standard and publ. tr. interpr.), ‘standing ready for liberality’ (with Scar’s datival 1st member) would express the poet’s / formulations’ readiness to *receive* liberality; if it modifies *hótīn*, it could refer to the Hotars’ readiness to dispense liberality, though it could also have the meaning suggested for the other two interpr.

Gr and Ge take *pakthé* as a PN, as the stem certainly is in VII.18.7, VIII.22.10, 49.10, but Old reports the suggestion of Wackernagel that it is an ordinal, ‘fifth’, here, construed with loc. *áhan*. So also KH (KZ 65 [1979] = Aufs. I.188–89). Re tentatively accepts this suggestion, though Scar’s tr. maintains the PN. Mayr (EWA, also PN, both s.v.) also accepts it. The “seven” of “seven Hotars” invites a numerical interpr. of the preceding phrase, even if the referent of “the fifth day” is obscure.

I do now wonder if the second hemistich has astronomical reference. Perhaps “two fathers / parents” here does not refer to the poet’s own parents, but, as often, to Heaven and Earth (e.g., I.159.2), and “the Seven Hotars” could be a variant of the Seven Ṛṣis (*saptarṣi*), who are later identified with the constellation Ursa Major. If *pítārā* refers to Heaven and Earth, it could set the stage for the incest episode starting in vs. 5. As for the application in this vs. the poet and/or his formulation would be assisting at an astronomical transit associated with “the fifth day.” This is all very speculative, and I can’t get any further. But it would be unusual for the human parents of the poet to be the beneficiaries of his poetic activity, esp. along with a gaggle of Hotars. Again, if the Hotars are heavenly beings, not earth-bound priests, they might be “standing ready to

(dispense) liberality,” if we accept Scar’s view of the cmpd as an acc. pl. Unfortunately, however, this speculative interpr. seems far from the poetic contest depicted in 1ab and 2.

X.61.2: As disc. in the publ. intro., in my view this vs. characterizes the verbal products of the losing (Cyavāna) and winning (Tūrvayāṇa) opponents in the brahmodya as metaphorical liquids – Cyavāna’s as mere add-ins to soma, Tūrvayāṇa’s as gushing semen (itself often a metaphor for soma). In taking *rétah* ‘semen’ as metaphorical, I part ways with Old, who thinks it’s the real substance, used in a ritual to produce offspring. And in general my interpr. of this vs. differs both from Old’s extensive analysis of it and from Ge’s tr. and notes.

To begin with, the standard interpr. is that the first hemistich has Cyavāna as subject, the second Tūrvayāṇa. But note that *cyāvānaḥ* appears only at the beginning of pāda b, while pāda a begins *sá íd*. While it is certainly not impossible that *sá íd* anticipates the mention of Cyavāna in the next pāda, the more natural way to interpr. *sá íd* in context is as a reference to the subject of the previous vs., the *gūrtavacāḥ* poet (1a), who in 2c will be further specified as *gūrtāvacastamaḥ*. This assumption underlies my interpr. of the vs., and it solves several problems in the construal of pāda a that the others must make heavy weather of.

First: in order to have the part. *vanván* ‘winning’ modify Cyavāna, other interpr. encounter difficulties of both syntax and sense. As to the latter, since Cyavāna seems actually to come out the loser in this match, any “winning” he does (by that interpr.) needs to be of a qualified or ironic type. Moreover, \sqrt{van} ‘win’ does not take the dative, except to express the beneficiary of someone else’s win; certainly the object won is not in the dative, as the standard interpr. of the syntax here requires. The supposed dat. complement leads Gr to create a unique def. of \sqrt{van} just for this passage (“11) jemandem [D.] wozu [D.] verhelfen”) and Ge also to stray far from the usual sense of \sqrt{van} (‘sich bemühen’ + DAT: “indem er sich um eine unsichere Gabe bemühte”). Note that the following two vss. each contain a verbal form of \sqrt{van} : *vanuthaḥ* (3b), *vavanvāmsaḥ* (4d), and these three forms should at least not contradict each other.

My interpr. avoids both these difficulties. Given the triumphant tone of the 2nd hemistich concerning Tūrvayāṇa, pronouncing him a winner in pāda a is unproblematic. I take *vanván* in absolute sense (“winning / a winner”) without expressed object (cf. pf. part. *vavanvāmsā* in the same usage in 4d). As for the dat. phrase *dānāya dābhyāya*, I begin with the fact that dat. *dānāya* is frequently used as an infinitive / quasi-infinitive “to give, for giving”; cf. e.g., I.180.5 *ā vām dānāya vavṛtīya ... gōḥ* “Might I turn you two here to give / for giving (of) a cow.” In fact it is several times found as the complement of $\sqrt{maṇḥ}$ ‘be ready (to give), be magnanimous’ (VIII.52.6, 61.8; including in the next hymn. X.62.8 = VI.45.32). Now recall the cmpd *maṇhane-ṣṭhāḥ* in the immed. preceding vs. and Scar’s interpr. of *maṇhane* as a dative infinitive. I tr. that cmpd. “standing ready for liberality” (see above). In our vs. here I suggest that we carry over the *-sthā-* ‘standing (ready)’ and construe it with the syntactically independent dative *dānāya*. The extra twist here is that I take the other dat., *dābhyāya* not as a deprecatory characterization of the type of gift (like Ge’s “eine unsichere Gabe” [with an unjustified extension of the sense of \sqrt{dabh}] or Re’s “mesquin”), but as characterizing an animate (‘who can be outwitted’) and the dative agent of the infin., of the familiar type (*īndrāya pātave*, etc.): “for the *dābhyā*-one to give.” The referent of *dābhyāya* is the defeated Cyavāna, and Tūrvayāṇa is waiting for the Cyavāna, whom he outwitted, to give him what is owed. The gerundive *dābhyā-* is found only twice in the RV, and in its other occurrence, X.108.4, it also has animate/personal reference, to Indra “who can (not) be outwitted.” It does not refer to things such as a paltry gift (as others take it here); it is not a synonym of *dabhrá-*, pace Re.

Pāda b describes Cyavāna's losing tactics: he measured out his vedi with *sūda*-s. In the publ. tr. I render the word as “‘sweet’ (dregs),” but see comm. ad VII.36.3, where I come around to favor Pischel's Beisatz, the ingredients added to soma. The point here would be that Cyavāna used only auxiliary materials, not the real substance itself. In terms of a verbal contest, this could mean poetry tricked out with flourishes but without true force, eloquence, or insight. I would now slightly change the tr. to “with sweet admixtures.”

By contrast, Tūrvayāṇa's product is the most forceful and vital substance of all, namely semen (*rétas*). In the metaphorical sacrifice in which he and Cyavāna are competing the *rétas* can stand for soma, as opposed to the add-ins that Cyavāna employed: for the identification of soma as *rétah*, see, e.g., I.164.35. In the verbal contest *rétas* can represent well-formulated words that reflect *ṛtá*- and produce results. And of course in the account of the divine incest myth that follows in this hymn *rétas* is actually semen.

On the problematic *itāūti*-, see comm. ad VIII.99.7.

X.61.3: This vs. enlarges on Tūrvayāṇa's verbal triumph, with his skill not only defeating Cyavāna but also attracting the Aśvins. The second hemistich uses the more familiar trope of words/praise as arrows shot at the target of the praise (see, e.g., my 2020 “The Aim of Praise”) in place of the more jarring eloquence-as-semen of 2d. This arrow image may also harken back to vs. 1 and the Rudrian formulation, which I suggested is meant to evoke the hostility inherent in a verbal contest.

My identification of the unnamed referents in this vs. follows Ge: the 2nd du. in b is addressed to the Aśvins (so also Old, flg. Pischel), who are also the addressees in the next vs. In cd Tūrvayāṇa is the referent of both the rel. *yáh* and the gen. demon. *asya*, though Pi takes Indra as the subject of cd (see Old). The loc. pl. phrase *yéṣu hávaneṣu* in pāda a is shorthand for *yásya hávaneṣu*, again with Tūrvayāṇa as referent of the gen.

With Old (but not Ge) I take the *mánaḥ* simile with *vípaḥ* ‘inspired words’, not with the Aśvins. And unlike both Old and Ge I think *śácyā* ‘with skill’ must refer to Tūrvayāṇa's skill, not the Aśvins'. The verbal contest (*ājí-*) in vs. 1 was a contest “in skill” (*śácyām*), and it was through his skill that T. won it. I would now slightly alter the tr. to better integrate this instr.: “... inspired words, like thinking sharp with skill.”

On *ásrīṇīta* see Narten, “Ved. *śrīṇāti* ...” (KZ 100 [1987]: 281–82 = KISch 351–52).

X.61.4: As indicated in the pub. intro., I consider this vs. to be a direct quote of Tūrvayāṇa's invocation of the Aśvins; note the 1st sg. verb *huve* (b) and the two forms of enclitic *me* (c). This 1st ps. reference contrasts with the 3rd ps. narration of vss. 1–3 and brings this section of the hymn to a close. As a welcome change, most of the vs. is straightforward.

The black female among the ruddy females is of course Night among the Dawn cows, at a time when the “early-coming” Aśvins are on their way to the sacrifice.

The one problem in the vs. is the final word *ásmṛta-dhrū*, specifically the root affiliation of the 2nd member and the meaning of the whole. There are two older competing views of the root affiliation. Starting with Sāy. (see also Old), *-dhrū* has been connected with *druh* ‘deceive’. Although this derivation makes (sort of) reasonable semantic sense, it encounters two formal difficulties: the initial aspirate *dh-* and the loss of the root-final consonant. To account for this, a two-step process is envisaged: the root of course has two underlying aspirates (**dhrugh-*), with the first ordinarily dissimilated by Grassmann's Law. But the nom. sg. would be, and in fact is, in this very hymn, *dhruk* (vs. 14 *ádhruk*), with the first aspirate surfacing when the second loses

its aspiration. The dual form in our verse then results from “abnormer Abfall des Endkonsonanten” (AiG II.2.33; see AiG III.326). But the loss of the root-final would be unusual indeed, and the route to getting a dual in *-ū* to an original root noun in final consonant would be quite tortuous. To start with, we should expect a dual to the unmutilated root noun to be **-druhā*. The consonant to be lost is not, in this form, an “Endkonsonant.” Moreover, in the expected dual, the root-final remains an aspirate so that the root initial is a plain *d* by Gr’s Law. The only paradigmatic form that could show aspiration on the initial and lose a final consonant, to produce an apparent stem **dhru-*, is the just-cited nom. sg. *dhruk*, but it is precisely this form that doesn’t lose its final consonant in this same hymn. But let us assume that was the immediate source: still our problems are not over. If we had a putative intermediate root noun stem ending in short *-u* *dhru-*, produced by the loss of the nom. sg. ending, it should add the empty *-t* found in other root nouns in short resonants. Only if such a stem were analyzed as containing a *suffixal -u-* could we escape the adding of the *-t* and get a dual masc. in *-ū*. If, by contrast, the result of the loss of the final consonant was (by compensatory lengthening?) **dhrū-*, we should expect a dual masc. in **-vā*. Getting the form we have from a root noun cmpd in *-druh-* thus requires considerable butchery. The alternative root affiliation is scarcely better. Wh (Rts) tentatively lists it under $\sqrt{dhvṛ}$, *dhur*, *dhru* ‘injure’, as short-vowel *dhru* (with ?); KEWA also classifies the form here (s.v. *dhvāratī*). Although the initial aspirate would no longer be a problem, the lack of appended *-t* remains an issue. A third way was suggested by KH (StII 5/6 [1980] 95 = Aufs. 757; accepted in EWA s.v. *DHVAR*), that *dhru-* (and related forms) belong to a separate root $\sqrt{*dhru}$ ‘deceive’, related to (/extended into) the more familiar \sqrt{dhru} -*gh*. This does not solve the lack of *-t*, but that turns out to be a problem with several forms in this hymn (*sabardhúm* vs. 17, *raghudrú* vs. 17). More from exhaustion than a deep conviction of its rightness, I adopt the KH solution. For further disc. on this form and related problems in this hymn, see Scar 279 and 226 n. 309.

X.61.5–8: These vss. relate (or allude) to the story of the incest of Heaven / Sūrya and his daughter, Dawn, found widely in the Brāhmaṇas with Prajāpati as the male figure (see my Hyenas pp. 289–302) and glancingly alluded to elsewhere in the RV (I.71.5, 8). No names are named in our passage, but as indicated in the publ. intro., I think the unifying topic of this hymn is Dawn, and therefore it is her story being related here – *pace* Ge (n. 5), who tentatively suggests that a different incest may be meant.

X.61.5: The cmpd *vīrákarmam* is by accent, and sense, a bahuvrīhi: ‘possessing the manly work’, a euphemism for the penis; see Gr, Old, Re. It is surely the subj. of *prāthiṣṭa*. By contrast Ge takes it, apparently, as a tatpuruṣa (“die Mannesarbeit”) and as the obj. of *iṣṇāt* (“nach der Mannesarbeit verlangend”). Note the nonce thematicization of the neut. *-an*-stem *kárman-*, presumably starting from first cmpd members in *karma-*. The thematicization in this context was surely facilitated, perhaps caused, by the fact that *-karmam* is followed by a vowel-initial word, and the *-m* avoids a hiatus between expected *-n*-stem neut. **vīrákarma* and *iṣṇāt*. The other two examples of them. 2nd member *-karma-* in the RV, both also late, are not amenable to the same interpr.: *deva-karmébhiḥ* (X.130.1) and *viśvá-karmeṇa* (X.166.4); see comm. ad locc.

With Old I supply ‘semen’ as obj. to the part. *iṣṇāt*; the same participle elsewhere takes a liquid as obj.: I.181.6 *pūrvīr iṣaḥ ... mādharma iṣṇán* ‘dispatching many refreshing drinks of honey.’ As was just noted, Ge instead takes *vīrákarmam* as its object and assigns the meaning ‘desiring’ to the participle. Acdg. to him (n. 5a) *iṣṇāti* “crosses” with other roots $\sqrt{iṣ}$, but in fact no forms with nasal have the ‘desire’ sense, only ‘send, dispatch’.

The referent of *yásya* in pāda a is *náryaḥ* in b. Although neither *vīrá-* nor *nṛ-* (and derivatives) is specialized for male-as-sexual-being, the presence of these two words so close together creates an atmosphere of sexual virility.

In b the rapist pulls out his penis, which has already ejaculated. The ppl. *ānuṣṭhitam* modifies the gapped ‘penis’. The not particularly common lexeme *ānu √sthā* generally means ‘follow, attend upon, stand beside’; for some disc. see Scar (644–45). My “attending upon” in quotation marks is meant to convey a somewhat euphemistic sense, but I now wonder if *ānu √sthā* in this context might be the equivalent of the current term ‘stalking’ for unwanted invasive attentions of a male to a female.

Note that pāda-initial *ānuṣṭhitam* somewhat echoes *práthiṣṭa* in the same position in pāda a.

The second hemistich essentially paraphrases the first, esp. pāda b. The verb *ā vrhati* ‘tears out’ doubles *āpauhat* ‘pulled out’ but in the more vivid present tense. The past part. *ānubhṛtam*, again modifying the gapped penis, echoes *ānuṣṭhitam*, but again more vividly – or more graphically: *ānu √bhr* in the RV and AV is erotic slang. See my 1981 “A Vedic Sexual Pun” (pp. 59–60) and for an unambiguous passage AV XI.5.12 *bṛhác chépo ’nu bhūmau jabhāra* “he *ānu jabhāra* his lofty penis in/on/at the earth.” The question is how to translate the idiom. In my 1981 art. I suggest ‘penetrate sexually, stick (one’s penis) in’ and tr. AV XI.5.12 “he stuck (his) great penis in the earth,” which is similar to Whitney’s somewhat more polite “has introduced in the earth a great virile member.” In Hyenas (295–96 with n. 290) I tr. the form in our passage with “what (had been) thrust in.” But I now think it is difficult to get from the literal meanings of the preverb + verb root to ‘thrust in’, and I also think that leering euphemism is more characteristic of the usage than clinical description. The rendering “brought to bear” in the publ. tr., again in quotes, seems better, as being both less literal and more menacing, though in English it has no erotic flavor that I know of.

The unextended imperfect to *√as*, *āḥ* (i.e., underlying *ās*), is notable here. Is *ā ānubhṛtam* a rough-and-ready pluperfect “had been brought to bear”? For further on this impf. form, see comm. ad X.85.6–12.

The 2nd hemistich also presents a syntactic problem. The phrase *kanāyā duhitúḥ* straddling the pāda break can be either gen. or abl., but it makes most sense as an abl. with ‘tears out’, as represented in the publ. tr. and Ge’s “Er reisst es von der jungfräulichen Tochter zurück.” But by word order it should belong in the subordinate *yád* clause, since the *yád* precedes it. Ge (n. 5cd) recognizes the problem, suggesting it’s a mixture of two constructions. It is possible to take the phrase as a genitive loosely construed with *ānubhṛtam* (something like “what had been brought to bear of [=for, with regard to] the maiden”), but an ablative with the main clause verb is far more satisfactory. It may simply be that the six-syllable phrase was too unwieldy to position it in its own clause, whereas the slight (if illicit) preposing of the neut. rel. *yád* allowed the two-word phrase to fit the metrical space. I’m not happy with this explanation, but I’m reluctant to give up the ablative.

X.61.6: This vs. is relatively easy to decode, and it is notable that the English euphemism “make love” (for sex) is closely replicated by *kāmaṃ kṛṇvāná-* in b.

The difficult word in this vs. is *manānág*. In the publ. tr. I render it as “a little,” flg. Ge’s tentative “ein wenig (?)”, which itself follows Sāy.’s *alpam* and assumes some kind of connection with Epic/Classical *manāk* ‘a little’ – a connection that is difficult to motivate in detail (though see Re’s vague sketch of an attempt). There is a competing, very different analysis, represented already in Gr: that it is a root-noun cmpd in *-naś*. This is the interpr.

favored by Old, with \sqrt{nas} ‘disappear’ (etc.), rather than \sqrt{nas} ‘reach, attain’, modifying *rétah*. (Ge [n. 6c], in recognizing the root-noun-cmpd interpr., entertains the possibility that *-nas-* belongs to ‘reach, attain’ and suggests a gloss ‘die Absicht erreichend’.) Old first suggests a sense ‘sich der Aufmerksamkeit entziehend’ (escaping attention), but produces a second, and to me more plausible, sense, that the discharge of the semen “die Erregung verschwinden lässt.” The 1st member would be *manā-*, which generally means ‘zeal’ or the like, but could certainly shade into ‘energetic excitement’ and be euphemistically applied penile erection. This would require transitive-causative semantics for the root noun *-nas* (‘cause to disappear’ rather than just ‘disappear’), but this is also necessary for what seems to be an undoubted example of such a cmpd, *jīva-nās-* ‘destroying life/living beings’, in MS I.4.13 (63: 3–4), where it characterizes an oblation (*āhuti-*) that falls in the wrong place. That passage brings up another problem, however: the form in the MS is nom. sg. with a final in retroflex *-ṭ* (*jīvanāṭ*), while our nom. sg. ends in a velar (*manānāk*). Of course root nouns in final palatals show both finals (*-ṭ*: *vīt* to *vís*; *-k*: *dīk* to *dīs*) and the data are messy. I would expect a retroflex here, as in the 3rd sg. s-aor. *avāṭ* (\sqrt{vah}) and 3rd sg. root aor. to the homonymous root \sqrt{nas} ‘reach’, *ānaṭ*. But a velar isn’t beyond the realm of possibility, nor is the interpr. of *manānāk* as containing such a noun. I therefore tentatively suggest an alt. tr. “the two left behind semen, which dissipates excitement.” For a summary of the problem see Scar (282–83), who, however, comes to no conclusions.

That *sukṛtāsya yónau* refers to the ritual ground is clear from the appearance of the same phrase in III.29.8, of the place where Agni is to situate the sacrifice. As noted there, suffix-accented *sukṛtā-* has been substantivized and the tr. here should be corrected to “in the womb of good work.”

X.61.7: Once again, part of this vs. paraphrases what went before. The sprinkling of the semen in 6cd (*rétah ... nísiktam*) is repeated in 7b *rétah ... ní śīñcat*. But the description is more violent and the agency made clear. In vs. 6 the two “going apart, left behind” the semen, as if the semen were a product of both male and female and mutually and tranquilly deposited. Here the father brutally “springs on” his own daughter, and he is the subject and agnet of the VP *rétah ... ní śīñcat*. (Because the lexeme is the same in 6d and 7b, I should have tr. it identically: I would now substitute ‘sprinkled his semen down upon the earth’).

HPS (B+I 45, see 44 and 47) takes *kṣmayā* as instr. with *saṃjagmānāḥ* (“sich mit der Erde vereinigend”), indicating that the Earth was the object of the rape. But though we lack another instr. to construe with the middle participle, this interpr. is surely wrong, on grounds both of content and of form. In the other versions of the tale, the female is Dawn; we would hardly expect Earth here, because she and Heaven are joint parents, not daughter and father. Moreover, though it does no doubt have an instr. ending, *kṣmayā* is always used adverbially.

As discussed above (ad 1ab), I consider the formulation (*bráhma*) begotten here to be the same as (or a model for) the “Rudrian formulation” (*raúdrām ... bráhma*) in vs. 1, namely a formulation with the hostile power associated with Rudra, enabling its deployer to overcome his enemy. As noted there, in the Vedic prose versions Rudra is sometimes named as the avenger of the rape depicted here. In our vs. I think the gods create the formula to be used against the violator and also create the being who is to carry out the vengeance. But I do not think this latter is Rudra (despite Ge’s n. 7d); instead I nominate Agni, who, in his guise as Svarbhānu, is the avenger in many versions of this myth (see my Hyenas, esp. 364–73). It would make sense that the gods should fashion Agni out of the semen spilled on the ritual ground since that is Agni’s domain; moreover, in the sg. the epithet *vrata-pā-* is most frequently used of Agni (see comm. ad

X.32.6), and *vāstoṣ páti*- “Lord of the Dwelling Place” can be an alternative lexical realization of Agni’s regular epithet *grhāpati*- ‘Lord of the House(hold)’. (On the use of this term [almost] exclusively for Agni, see my 2019 “The Term *grhastha* ...,” pp. 8–9.) As for the other RVic occurrences of the phrase, the identity of *vāstoṣ páti*- in V.41.8 is unclear, but could be Agni; in VIII.17.14 it is probably Indra; and in the other RVic occurrences (in adjacent vss., VII.54.1–3, 55.1) it seems to name the “personified guardian spirit” of the household. These occurrences seem irrelevant to the solemn use of the term here.

The 3rd pl. *janayan* here is one of only two such forms found in the RV, for expected *janayanta*; the other is in X.66.9 (q.v.). See my 1979 *-anta* replacement article, esp. p. 154, which treats the distribution of 3rd pl. forms to the transitive stem *janáya*-. Though the Pp. gives augmented *ajanayan*, the augment would have to be elided, and I am tolerably certain that in fact the form is underlyingly injunctive.

X.61.8: This vs. is the last one treating the incestuous rape, before the transitional vs. 9. It depicts (bc) the desperate attempts of the daughter to get away from her attacker, an episode found in some versions of the Vedic prose tale, as well as the rueful direct speech of her thwarted father in d.

In pāda a the father is compared to a bull in a contest (*ājau*, returning from vs. 1b) throwing off foam (*phénam*). In the real-world analogy, the foam presumably results from the bull’s straining hard work and the sweat thus produced, but in the frame the “foam” surely stands for the semen that the father keeps shedding.

Contra Ge, who take the subject in b to be the father, I take it to be the daughter, going in every direction to evade her rapist. The nom. sg. *dabhráčetāḥ* can be masc. or fem.; there is no other sign of the gender or identity of the subject of *ait*. The collection of preverbs with this verb, *ā parā ... āpa* “hither, thither, away,” seem to be summed up by the adv. *smát* ‘altogether’, indicating the almost random zigs and zags of her attempts to escape. Her desperate state of mind is also conveyed by *dabhráčetāḥ*, which I render ‘heedless’ – that is, ‘possessing little consciousness / attention’. In its other occurrence I tr. the cmpd. ‘small-witted’; here it does not reference stupidity but rather distraction: “out of her wits,” “not having her wits about her” would be appropriate.

The depiction of Dawn’s flight continues in c. The lexeme *pārā √ vrj*, found here in the root noun cmpd. *parāvṛj*-, needs to be distinguished from the much more common *pāri √ vrj*, lit. ‘twist around’, but regularly meaning ‘avoid’. The sense of *pārā √ vrj* is equally both additive (‘twist aside / away’) and idiomatic (‘shun’), and it does not differ substantially from *pāri √ vrj* in its idiomatic sense (‘shun’ versus ‘avoid’). The root noun cmpd elsewhere has passive semantics: ‘the outcast’, i.e., the one shunned (see I.112.8, II.13.12, 15.7), but here I see the active semantics more common with root noun cmpds, ‘turning aside, shunning’.

The two words *padā* and *dákṣiṇā* are taken together by Ge and tentatively by Re. Ge takes them as referring to the “southern direction” (zu den südlichen Orten) towards which the outcast daughter runs. Re, pointing out that ‘southern’ isn’t attested for *dákṣiṇa*- till the AV (not a particularly strong argument, given the short chronological span), renders the phrase rather “au pied droit,” with a question mark. But the two words do not have to form a phrase (as Old points out). I take *padā* as instr. sg., but *dákṣiṇā* as nom. sg., referring to the priestly gift (Dakṣiṇā), personified as a Gift Cow. Uṣas is regularly associated with the Dakṣiṇā, since the priestly gifts were distributed at the Dawn Sacrifice in RVic times. That the Gift-Dow is meant here is likely also because *adákṣiṇā*- ‘without a Dakṣiṇā’ is found two vss. later (10d). Here I think Dawn is

the personified (or bovinized) Dakṣiṇā, and, as a cow, she flees (*sārat*) on foot (*padā*). This detail plays on the fact that Dawn is elsewhere said to be ‘footless’; see VI.59.6 ... *apād iyām pūrvāgāt padvātībhyah* “This footless one has gone in front of the footed (cattle),” an esp. telling passage because it contrasts footless Dawn with the cattle, which have feet (sim. I.152.3). In her panic Dawn runs away on foot, having transformed herself into the Gift Cow that is associated with her. This transformation is perhaps the original model for the transformation of the victim into a red doe (*rohīt-*) in several of the Vedic prose versions (see my Hyenas, 290–93 with n. 276).

Pāda d contains the direct speech of the father, recognizing that his daughter has escaped his clutches. The word *prśanī-* is used of the ‘caresses’ the father wishes to bestow on his daughter also in the other RVic treatment of this incest story, I.71.5.

X.61.9–11: These next three vss. all begin with *makṣū* ‘right away’, which marks them as a unit, even though vs. 9 also tidies up (some of) the loose ends from the preceding narrative. The second pair of vss. (10–11) begin almost identically and are more closely related in content than they are with 9:

10a *makṣū kanāyāḥ sakhyām nāvagvāḥ*

11a *makṣū kanāyāḥ sakhyām nāvīyah*

The first three words and half of the fourth are the same. The close relationship of the two vss. does not make them easier to interpret.

X.61.9: This vs. depicts the birth of Agni. As noted above, ad vs. 7, I consider Agni to be the creature the gods produced after the rape, from the semen spilled on the ritual ground – Agni being suggested by the epithets *vratapā-* and *vāstoṣ pāti-*. This vs. treats the production of Agni in more detail, though without naming him: the only occurrence of the stem *agnī-* is in a simile in pāda b, referring to fire the substance.

In pāda a “trampling” (*upabdhī*) is compared directly to the chariot horse (*vāhniḥ*), though we might expect the horse to be in the gen., parallel to *prajāyāḥ*. Ge (n. 9a) attributes the nominative case of *vāhniḥ* to the reversion of nouns in similes to the nominative, a doctrine that I hope I laid to rest in 1982 (“Case Disharmony in RVic Similes,” IJ 24). I consider our passage to be simply a bold disjunction, with a quality compared directly to a possessor of that quality. Note that the simile particle is wrongly positioned, before *vāhniḥ*; it is unlikely that the preceding word *makṣū* is part of the simile, *pace* Old, since it is an adverb and, furthermore, also opens the next two vss. without involvement in a simile.

The “trampling” of the offspring=Agni probably refers to the crackling of the kindled fire.

I consider b to incorporate a pun on the homonymous stems *ūdhar-/ūdhan-*, both ‘udder’ and ‘cold’ (for the latter see comm. ad VIII.2.12 and EWA s.v. *ūdhan-* and *ūdhar*), with one stem used in the frame, one in the simile. The primary reading here is acc. ‘udder’, where Agni takes his seat – the udder presumably being the fireplace. But in the simile *agnīm ná nagnāḥ* I take it as a loc. ‘in the cold’. The simile is very close to VIII.2.12 *ūdhar ná nagnā jarante* “Like naked (ones) in the cold they stay awake.” The simile in our passage is esp. clever because it contains *agnī-* designating fire the substance in the acc., while the subject of the frame is the unnamed Fire the god.

In the second hemistich the two occurrences of the root-accented agent noun *sānitar-* with acc. objects *idhmām* and *vājam* (c) respectively are contrasted with a suffix-accented *dhartār-* without complement. Tichy (-tar-stems, 297–98) considers our passage as something of an exception to her interpr. of the accentual difference, claiming that *sānitar-* here designates a

habitual agent, but *dhartár*- an occasional one. It seems to me rather the reverse, with *dhartā* indicating the role that Agni was born to exercise, and *sānitā* incidental feats that Agni accomplishes. The rendering of *sānitā* + ACC as a straight past tense (“he gained the kindling ...”) in the publ. tr. is misleading, however. I would change to “he is one who gains the kindling wood and one who gains the prize.” This interpr. conforms to the general characterization of the two accent types by Benveniste (*Noms d’agent* ..., 11) that the root-accented type designates “l’auteur d’un acte” and the suffix-accented one “l’agent voué à une fonction.” However, the data are quite messy and, for any general characterization, require a generous, indeed over-generous, amount of special pleading.

The stable role of ‘upholder’ in d may be emphasized by the intensive (i.e., habitual or frequentative) nominal *yavīyúdh*- ‘ever battling’.

X.61.10: There is much disagreement about the referents and sense of this vs. – understandably – though there is general agreement that it has to do with the Vala myth. My own interpr. is quite tentative. The most solid identification in the vs. is that of the *kanā*- (also in 11), who is surely Dawn, since the same word was used of the incest victim in 5c. Since the Navagvas are associated with the myth of the Vala cave, it seems likely that the story has shifted from Dawn’s rape to Dawn’s imprisonment in the Vala cave, from which the Navagvas attempt to free her. Since elsewhere (see, e.g., I.62.4, V.45.7, 11) the Navagvas open the cave with sound, with song, it seems likely that “speaking the truth” (*ṛtām vādantaḥ*) refers to this activity and the “yoking of truth” (*ṛtā-yuktīm*) to their employment of this spoken truth in the opening of the cave.

The identifications become more challenging in the 2nd hemistich, esp. of *dvibárhas*-, *gopá*-, and *ácyutā*(ḥ?). As for the first, Gr takes it as a nom. pl., referring to the Navagvas; Ge as gen. sg. referring to the cave; Old as gen., tentatively supplying *rāyāḥ*. By contrast, I take it as referring to Dawn, who is called *dvibárhas*- in V.80.4. Both Ge and Old think the *gopá*- is the/a Paṇi, while I take it as the Vala cave itself. If I am correct, the phrase “protector of doubly exalted (Dawn)” is ironic, since the “protection” is actually imprisonment (consider the double usage of the root *√rakṣ* ‘protect / guard’).

The interpr. of *ácyutā* is complicated by the ambiguity of its form: out of sandhi it can either be *ácyutā* (so Pp.) or *ácyutāḥ*. The former is far more likely, and here I think Ge and Old have the right idea: that it refers to the solid rocks, the fastnesses, of the cave; cf. VI.22.6 adduced by Ge. Now, as to *adaḥśināsaḥ* ‘without Dakṣiṇā(s)’, modifying the Navagvas – Ge (n. 10cd, flg. Ludwig) thinks this refers to the Paṇi’s theft of the cows that the Navagvas brought to distribute at their sacrifice. I think rather that this refers directly back to 8c, where Dawn transformed herself into the Dakṣiṇā cow and ran away from her rapist. She has now been confined in the Vala cave and the Navagvas are “without the Dakṣiṇā” – namely without Dawn herself. They attempt to “milk” her out of the rocks that form the cave: their aim is to recover the imprisoned Dawn.

X.61.11: It gets worse! This vs. is well-nigh impenetrable, and I am fairly certain that the interpr. given in the publ. intro. and publ. tr. is wrong or at least incomplete. Nonetheless, the continuity of the vss. (if we can dignify it with that term) suggests that the milking the Navagvas attempted at the end of vs. 10 was successful, and the semen/soma/milk of vs. 11 is the tangible result.

A major clue is, or should be, that the second hemistich is identical to I.121.5cd, a hymn attributed to Kakṣivānt, who is also named in our hymn in vs. 16. But unfortunately I.121 does not give us much help, since, like much of Kakṣivānt’s oeuvre, it is bafflingly obscure. In I.121.5

the reference is to soma, the referent of *te* is Indra, but – significantly – it is in the context of the Vala myth, which is treated in the two preceding vss., I.121.3-4. Because our vs. is also found in the middle of a Vala context (vss. 10, 12–13), I now think that vs. 11 should be interpreted in that context as well and that my claim that vs. 11 concerns, at least in part, the birth of Agni (see publ. intro.) is incorrect. Instead I think that this vs., like I.121.5, concerns the soma that Indra acquired to give him the power to open the Vala cave. Although soma is not usually a necessary ingredient in the Vala myth (as opposed to the Vṛtra myth), in I.121.4 it clearly is: Indra is said to have opened the cave and freed the cows *asyá máde* “in the exhilaration of this (soma).” (Though the word *sómasya* is absent, *máde* makes the reference of *asyá* to soma inescapable.) And the following vs. (the relevant vs. 5) tells how Indra acquired this soma: brought to him by his parents, probably Heaven and Earth (ab), and acquired by sacrifice by unnamed but plural agents (cd = our cd). Other accounts of the Vala myth can also involve Indra’s possession of soma, e.g., VI.17.1–6.

Now let us examine our vs. in a bit more detail, first noting that although, unlike the second hemistich, the first is not identical to I.121.5ab, it has points of resemblance, particularly the opening of b *rādhō ná rétaḥ*, which is very like the opening of I.121.5b *rādhah surétaḥ*. In I.121.5 *surétaḥ* ‘having good semen’ modifies *páyah* in pāda a, which is also identified as a ‘bounty’. The whole phrase, “the bounty, the milk consisting of good semen,” refers to soma. This set of superimpositions allows us to identify the “semen, like a bounty” of our b with the milk, *páyah*, in d and to consider them also all to be soma. But it’s a bit more complicated, in that in pāda d the “milk” is produced by a different, and feminine, being, the “ruddy one who gives sap as milk” (*sabardúghāyāḥ ... usrīyāyāḥ*). The fem. *usrīyā-* ‘ruddy’ is always used of cows, or items conflated with cows, namely Dawns/light. So here we may be dealing both with milk=soma and milk=light, the latter produced by the Dawn confined in the Vala cave. The phrase *sabardúghāyāḥ ... usrīyāyāḥ* also has to be considered in connection with the phrase *sabardhūṃ dhenúm* in vs. 17.

However, contra the publ. tr., I no longer think that the semen is identical to the “truth” (*ṛtām íd*) that immediately follows it in pāda b. Instead I think this is a separate goal (of three) of the verb *turaṇyan*: “they hastened to the fellowship of the maiden, to the semen, (and) to truth itself.” In the immediately preceding vs. the Navagvas are speaking truth (*ṛtām vādantaḥ*) and their goal is the yoking of truth (*ṛtáyuktim*), namely (see comm. ad vs. 10 above) the use of their spoken truth to open the cave. Here they seek the imprisoned maiden, the semen = soma for Indra to use, and their own true song also to use in the opening of Vala.

The verb in this hemistich, *turaṇyan*, is generally taken as transitive (Gr, Old, Ge, HPS [B+I 46], Re), but other forms of this stem (incl. in I.121.1), as well as the derived adj. *turaṇyú-*, are intransitive (*pace* Re ad loc. and EVP XV.166), and I see no reason to impose a transitive sense here. The verb is simply a more insistent rephrasing of *agman* in the preceding vs. (10b), with the same goal, *kanāyāḥ sakhyám*.

In the second hemistich, identical to I.121.5, “your gleaming legacy” is again, surely, the soma. The introduction of a 2nd sg. *te* is surprising in our context, though it fits I.121.5 very well: there Indra is addressed in the immed. preceding vs. (I.121.4), and the first pāda of 5 begins *túbhyam*, which anticipates *te* in c. Old believes that our hemistich has been mechanically adapted from I.121.5 and implies that we need not pay attention to the *te*; HPS (46–47) by contrast thinks that the abrupt introduction of a 2nd ps. reference to Indra in the context of the Vala myth is not surprising, and I am in agreement (though not with the rest of his interpr.), esp. because it’s likely that Indra (or his alter ego Bṛhaspati) is the unnamed speaker in the next vs.,

12b.

Indra's "gleaming legacy" is, once again, the soma – and it is not, in my opinion, something Indra has left behind, but rather what was left behind for him. As I remark ad X.132.3, *rékṇas*- "is several times used of what we gain from the gods at the sacrifice (e.g., I.31.5, 121.5, VI.20.7); in keeping with its etymology (from the root *ric* 'leave'), it can be viewed as what was 'left behind' by the gods at the sacrifice." In my view, in our verse the unnamed subjects of *āyajanta* acquired the soma by their sacrifice, for the benefit of Indra. I think it likely that they are the Navagvas.

Although the vs. remains very obscure, I feel I have a better handle on it than in the publ. tr. and I would now substitute the following tr. for the one found there: "Right away they hastened anew to the fellowship of the maiden, to semen [=soma], which was like a bounty, (and) to truth itself -- / (the semen/soma), your blazing legacy, which they acquired through sacrifice, (and) the milk of the ruddy one who gives sap as milk."

X.61.12: This vs. appears to deal with the departure of the cows from the Vala cave and its aftermath, and it introduces an unnamed single speaker (b), probably either Indra or Bṛhaspati, in addition to the bards (*kārāvaḥ* c), who are surely the Navagvas we have been dealing with for several vss. and who serve as the unnamed subjects of pāda a. The vs. is hardly pellucid, however, and once again I think that the publ. tr. has gone seriously astray – with misinterpretations that I will attempt (no doubt not entirely successfully) to remedy here.

Our problems begin with the Saṃhita form *víyutā*, which is multiply ambiguous. The Pp reads *víyutā*, but *víyutāḥ* is equally possible in this sandhi context. The latter would be the nom. pl. m. of the past part. *vī-yuta*- 'separated' and agree with the subj. of injunc. *budhánta*, presumably the Navagvas. (Nom./acc. pl. fem. is also possible but probably contextually excluded.) The former, *víyutā*, has two possible morphological analyses, as neut. pl. to the same past part. (or fem. nom. sg., though this seems excluded contextually) or as loc. sg. to the *-ti*-stem abstract *víyuti*- 'separation' (as in IV.7.7). All three possibilities have entered into the discussion. In fact Old weighs all three (in order, *-tā* neut. pl. ppl., *-tāḥ* masc. pl. ppl., *-tā* loc. sg. *-ti*-stem) without making a decision. Gr. takes it as m. pl. ppl.; Lub lists it under the *-ti*-stem. But insofar as there's a standard view, it is as a neut. pl. — so Sāy., Ge, HPS (B+I 200) — an analysis that is the hardest to fit into the passage, since it requires supplying a neut. pl. referent. All three just-mentioned interpr. take the referent to be the place(s) where the cows were kept, for Ge and HPS the fastnesses of the Vala cave, with Ge adducing the neut. pl. *ácyutā* 'the immovable ones' in 10c, referring to the walls/rocks of the cave. In Schmidt's tr. "Als sie danach erkannten, dass (die Festen) vom Vieh getrennt waren." Though I originally took *víyutā* as the loc. to the *-ti*-stem (hard as that may be to get from the publ. tr.), I now think that the most likely interpr. is as the masc. nom. pl., modifying the Navagvas, subjects of *budhánta*. They become concerned that the cattle, departing from the cave, had also left them behind. The reassuring voice – and action – of Indra/Bṛhaspati intervenes at that point.

I am somewhat disturbed by the sequence of tense between pāda a, with an apparently preterital injunctive *budhánta*, and b, with present *bravīti*. I suggest that this combination of tenses is meant to remove this vs., which seems to depict the situation *after* the opening of the Vala cave, from the narrative of the besieging of the cave, which occupies vss. 10–11 and returns in vs. 13. This perturbation of chronology is also signaled by *paścā* 'afterwards' in pāda a.

Pāda b also contains the problematic form *vaktārī* (read with short *-i* in Pp). The morphological analysis of these *-tārī* forms (e.g., *kartārī* I.139.7, *etārī* V.41.10=VI.12.4) is

disputed; see also disc. ad V.41.10. Lanman (Noun infl. 426) considers them simply locatives to the *-tar*-agent noun with metrical lengthening. Old (ZDMG 55.302=KlSch 761 and Noten ad loc.) is inclined to follow the view that they are nom. sg., and he vigorously disputes the opinion that they are locatives or locatival infinitives. AiG III.205 (with considerable lit.) tentatively opts for nom./acc. sg. neuter, though allowing the possibility of locative, while AiG II.2.673 pronounces them “unerklärt ... bis jetzt.” Tichy (*-tar*- 59–60) takes them as locatives, but to verbal abstracts. She tr. our passage “So spricht (Bṛhaspati), der beim Reden freigebig schenkt.” Although in some instances her abstract value works reasonably well (see *etārī* V.41.10=VI.12.4), in others the agentive sense seems to be preserved. I would claim that for our passage. Here *vaktārī* serves almost as an improper loc. absolute with the part. *rārāṇaḥ*: “bestowing (gifts) as he talked / when talking.” As for the long final *-ī* of these forms, much as I dislike the convenient invocation of metrical lengthening, Lanman does make a good case for the metrical positions of the forms that show *-ī*, and it may be that as their morphological identity lost clarity, the integrity of their final was no longer guarded.

The *īti* in b seems to mark the following pāda(s), c and probably d, as direct speech. There Indra/Bṛhaspati speaks of himself in the 3rd ps.

The publ. tr. of pāda c suffers, I now think, from imposing a “moral” rather than material sense on *vasutvā* and *ānehāḥ*. To begin with the first, the tr. ‘goodness’ for *vasutvā* is misleading. Though this stem (*vasu-tvā-*) occurs only here, the extended stem *vasu-tvanā-* is found 4x in the RV, always in the sense of a mass of material goods. Esp. nice, because of the presence of voc. *vaso* referring to Indra, is VIII.1.6 ... *vaso, vasutvanāya rādhasē* “o you who are good for goods and largesse,” where *rādhasē* anchors the phrase in a material context. There is no moral or ethical nuance. In our passage the gen. *vāsoḥ* most likely refers to Indra/Bṛhaspati, as *vaso* in VIII.1.6 refers to Indra, and the phrase refers to Indra’s bestowal of a collection of material goods: “by the mass/collectivity of goods of the good one.”

We must also re-evaluate the sense of *anehās-*. Throughout the publ. tr. I have generally rendered this word as ‘faultless, blameless’, flg. EWA s.v. (and KEWA III.656), based on a suggestion of Hoffmann’s. Although I do not dispute KH’s etymology or assessment of the general meaning, I think that, at least in English, the glosses I’ve used are misleadingly located in the moral sphere. In a number of passages – incl., I’d claim, this one – the word falls into the physical sphere, meaning ‘without defect, without flaw, without lack, wanting nothing’. The word is seldom used of animate beings, the referents most likely to have a moral dimension – only III.9.1 (Agni), V.65.5 (we), VIII.75.10 (Heaven and Earth), VIII.18.5 (Ādityas), X.61.22 (patrons, in our hymn; see below), as well as in our vs. Instead it applies a number of times to the shelter or protection we pray the gods to extend to us (VI.50.3, VIII.18.21, prob. VIII.67.12, 31.12); what we want is shelter that is physically without gaps or weak spots, not shelter that is morally blameless. Similar are the passages referring to paths (I.129.9, VI.51.16=VIII.69.16); again a path is probably morally neutral, but it should be physically without flaw, to allow easy passage. The use of the adj. with “chariot” (VIII.22.2) falls in the same category. Verbal products like *māntra-* (I.40.6) and *stúbh-* ‘rhythm’ (III.51.3) could of course be ‘faultless’, but what is more likely meant is that they are perfectly composed, without flaw. Although the usual trajectory in semantic change is from the physical to the moral, it may be that this word went the other way, partly encouraged by the rhyme form *anenās-* ‘without offense / transgression’. When, in our passage, the bards are said to be *anehāḥ*, the point, I now think, is that they lack nothing, are in want of nothing, because Indra/Bṛhaspati bestowed gifts of goods upon them, in fact probably the cows that had left the cave. The bards were at risk of suffering a *material* lack,

but Indra/Bṛhaspati made it up to them. This statement in pāda c follows on the gifting depicted in pāda b.

Our form *anehā(h)* is problematic for another reason: morphology. The stem is otherwise an *s*-stem, but if *anehā(h)* belongs to this stem, it can only be a nom. *singular*. This is in fact how Sāy. takes it, modifying Indra, the putative subject of the next pāda. But not only does the pāda break intervene, but removing *anehā(h)* from pāda c leaves the *kārāvaḥ* with nothing to do: there is no verbal or nominal predicate available to them. I'm afraid we must take it as a nonce nom. pl. masc., as if to an *-a*-stem and chalk it up to the penchant of this poet for deforming morphology.

The subj. of d is presumably the same as that of c, Indra/Bṛhaspati, and identical to the referent of gen. *vāsoḥ* in c. I would refine my tr. of the verb *viveṣṭi* from 'exert control over', for which I now see no evidence, to 'toil/labor for', as in VIII.75.11 *kuvīt sū no gāviṣṭaye, āgne saṃvēṣiṣo rayīm* "Surely you will toil for wealth for us, for our quest for cattle, o Agni." The point in that passage and this one is that the god labors to procure material gain for his dependents.

The last major problem in the vs. is how to interpr. *ūpa kṣū*. The pāda-final monosyllable is concerning. Sāy. takes it as an abbreviation for *makṣū* and Gr as a deriv. of \sqrt{ghas} 'eat', hence 'food'. But the standard current view is that it derives from *paśū*- 'cattle'; see EWA s.v. The question is whether it should stand as an independent monosyllable. Ge considers it short for *kṣumāt* and tr. "aus Vieh bestehende," modifying *drāviṇam*. Another, and to me more persuasive, view is that it forms a cmpd with preceding *ūpa*: **upakṣū* like *purukṣū*, a view going back to Ludwig and Bloomfield, rejected by Old, positively entertained by Re. This would also take care of the problem posed by *ūpa*. The root $\sqrt{viṣ}$ does not otherwise appear with the preverb *ūpa*, though Gr creates the lexeme for just this passage, and it is positioned oddly for a preverb in tmesis, neither adjoining a metrical boundary nor right after the verb. I therefore accept the cmpd. interpr., which involves only the erasure of one accent in the Saṃhitā text.

In the first hemistich note the echoic phrases beginning both pādas: *paśvā ... paścā* and *īti bravīti*. Note also that, assuming that *kṣū* is derived from *paśū*-, the vs. begins (*paśvā*) and ends (*kṣū*) with forms of *paśū*-.

After this thoroughgoing rethinking of this vs., I would substitute the following translation:

When afterwards they became aware that they had been separated from the livestock, he [=Bṛhaspati or Indra] speaks thus, bestowing (gifts) as he talked / while talking.

"By the goods of the good one the bards are lacking nothing. He labors for all movable property, up to / including cattle."

X.61.13: This is the last vs. of this section of the hymn, and in my opinion it (still) concerns the besieging of the Vala cave – though there are some problems with this and it is not the standard view (not that there really is a "standard" view). One of the reasons I consider this vs. a continuation of the Vala narrative is the verb *agman* at the end of pāda a, which matches *agman* ending 10b, the first real vs. of the Vala narrative. The subjects in both cases are, in my view, the Navagvas, and the verb match marks an internal ring.

As is well known, in the Vala myth Indra and his helpers (generally the Aṅgirasas, of which the Daśagvas and the Navagvas [here] are subgroups) often open the cave by "sitting a 'session'" (the ritual known later [already AV] as a *sattrā*); see, e.g., III.31.9. The repetition of (-) *sad*- in a variety of forms hints at this ritual reference: *pariśādvāṇaḥ ... śādanto nārṣadām*. The first two, in the nom. pl., refer to the Navagvas. The problem is *nārṣadām*, which is, in my

opinion, a red herring that has distorted the interpr. of this vs. This vṛddhi stem is elsewhere a patronymic ('son of Nṛṣad') that seems to refer to Kaṇva in I.117.8, who is also identified as "son of Nṛṣad" (*kāṇvaṃ nṛṣadaḥ putráṃ*) in X.31.11. But Kaṇva is generally favorably viewed, and if *nārṣadám* here is the obj. of *bibhitsuṇ* 'they desired to split', he would seem to be an enemy. This apparent contradiction has generated much, mostly fruitless, discussion, which I will not reproduce here. I think a way out of the dilemma can be found if we 1) do not take *nārṣadá-* as a PN (whether of Kāṇva or someone else) and 2) do not construe this acc. as obj. of *bibhitsuṇ*. A related stem *nṛ-ṣádana-* is used of 'sitting(s) of men', that is, ritual sessions, and I now think that *nārṣadám* here falls in the same semantic sphere and that it's the cognate acc. with *sádantaḥ* 'sitting (a siege) like/related to a 'session of men'.' In other words, the tactic the Navagvas use to open the Vala cave both is and is like a (more benign) ritual session. This leaves *bibhitsuṇ* without an expressed object, but the object (Vala) is readily supplied from context. I take *purū* as I did in the publ. tr., as an acc. of extent of time, "for many (days)." In standard śrauta ritual a *sattra* is 12 days or more. I would now emend the tr. of the first hemistich to "They came just then as its besiegers; sitting (a siege) like/related to a 'session of men' for many (days), they strove to split (Vala)."

Although the Vala myth and the Śuṣṇa myth tend to be independent, the two are intertwined in I.121, the Kakṣīvant hymn that has clear connections to this one (see comm. above ad vs. 11). In I.121.10 we have Śuṣṇa associated with something *súgrathitam* 'well-knotted', like *śuṣṇasya sámgrathitam* here.

As Ge (n. 13c) (*vī*) √ *vid* is used several times of discovering and disclosing the *márman*- 'vulnerable spot' of an enemy, and that must be what's meant here. In I.121.10 it is Śuṣṇa's *ójas*- 'power' that is 'well-knotted' (*súgrathitam*).

X.61.14–15: The opening of the Vala cave and the vanquishing of Śuṣṇa having apparently been accomplished in the preceding vs., the hymn now (re)turns to the sacrifice, where the Áśvins are welcomed in vs. 15. The Áśvins are of course associated with the Dawn sacrifice, so the Dawn thread that runs through this hymn is continued.

X.61.14: With Old, I interpr. the two *utá*'s in a and c as connecting the two naming constructions in a and c, rather than seeing each as internally conjoining pieces of its pāda (as in KH Aufs. 19: "Dessen Name 'Glanz' ist und an dessen dreifachen Sitz sich die Götter ... Agni ist dessen Name und Jātavedas" [my underline]). Ge takes the first *utá* as 'auch' and the second as conjoining *agníḥ* and *jātávedāḥ*, but given that they take identical positions in their respective pādas (after #X *ha nāma*), they ought to have parallel functions. The two *utá* are oddly positioned for what I see as their function, but that seems a minor problem in this hymn.

X.61.15: The Áśvins are called *rudrá* a number of times (e.g., I.158.1); what exactly this is meant to convey I do not know. Although the presence of the rare vṛddhi stem *raúdra-* (RV 3x) twice in this hymn (also vs. 1, modifying *bráhma*) is suggestive, esp. with *gūrtáye* (b) echoing *gūrtávacā* (1a), I do not think that there is a strong conceptual link between the two occurrences. For the one in vs. 1, see disc. ad loc.

arcimántā, rendered 'who possess the chant' in the publ. tr., can also mean 'possessing rays/beams' (Ge "strahlend"), and both are probably meant. The 'ray/beam' reading would of course be appropriate to their connection with the Dawn sacrifice.

Ge supplies a nom. subj. "ich" for the infinitival *yájadhyaí* ("... will ich ... verehren"), on

the basis of parallelism with I.122.4 (adduced by Old; see Ge n. 15ab), which has a nominative subject. His parallel is drawn from the Kakṣīvant hymn immediately following Kakṣīvant's I.121, which shows important points of contact with our hymn (see above). Nonetheless I see no reason to supply an extraneous subject here, since the infinitive(s) can easily be taken as passive.

I take *gūrtāye* as a dative (pseudo-)infinitive parallel to *yājadhyai*; Ge, by contrast, takes it as a separate dative expression “um mir Beifall zu erwerben.” Although there are no other dative forms to *gūrti-* to support its infinitival status here, it appears parallel to *yajñā-* in IX.105.1 ... *yajñāth* ... *gūrtibhiḥ*, which suggests the connection. And it is worth noting that *gūrti-* in its other three occurrences is something originating from men and destined for the gods, not, as Ge has it, something a mortal might acquire for himself. The part.

rārāṇā picks up *rārāṇaḥ* in 12b, used of Indra/Bṛhaspati distributing gifts, probably cows, to the Navagvas. The myth provides the model for the ritual.

X.61.16–19: On my interpr. of these much disputed verses, which differs substantially from those of Old and Ge, see the publ. intro. I am not at all certain that I am right, but am tolerably certain that Old and Ge are not.

X.61.16: As indicated in the publ. intro., I take this vs. as relatively conventional praise of his royal patron by the poet of the hymn – praise that he will soon qualify. The near-deictic *ayām* that opens the vs. suggests that the person in question is present at the sacrifice, which favors my interpr. that it is poet's patron and the sacrificer (*yāṣṭā* 17a), the sponsor of the ritual.

Ge (n. 16b) takes pāda b as a “schönes Bild” – the subject overcomes all obstacles through his own power (‘being/creating his own bridge’: *svāsetuḥ*). Ge is no doubt correct, but I think that crossing the river is meant not only metaphorically but literally, referring to the Āryas' winning of new territory by crossing the boundary rivers, a feat also often attributed to Indra as leader. Here the king would be assimilated to Indra.

Ge (n. 16c) thinks the king makes Kakṣīvant and Agni both tremble because, as *vīpras* themselves, they fear that the king/*vīpra* will out-perform them poetically. I think the point is rather that he inspires them to create poetry praising him, and poetic inspiration as often sets the poet atremble (as the word *vīpra-* indicates). In my view Kakṣīvant is either the poet of this hymn or, perhaps more likely, the poet identifies himself with Kakṣīvant and has adopted some of his lines, as we saw above.

On *raghudrú* as probably not a root-noun cmpd see Scar 243–44, though see his somewhat different opinion p. 226 n. 309.

X.61.17: As I discussed in the publ. intro., I think that the poet follows his praise of his royal patron in vs. 16 by cutting him down to size. Specifically, he hints that the king is not producing the gifts due to the poet and ritualists, even while the poet himself is doing his job by roping in (almost literally) the gods Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman. The poet's description of his successful attraction of the gods in cd is close to menacing.

As I said in the publ. intro., I think *dvibāndhu-* means that the king is related to both gods and men—or thinks he is. It is this term that set both Old and Ge to constructing an elaborate backstory and family tree, and I do not think it should bear that weight Old and Ge put on it.

The agent noun *yāṣṭar-* ‘sacrificer’ in my opinion refers to the same figure as the technical term *yājamāna-*, namely the sponsor of the sacrifice, not a priest. It is not clear that *yājamāna-* has entirely acquired its technical meaning in the RV.

The “sap-yielding milk-cow” (*sabardhúm dhenúm*) echoes the *sabardúghāyāḥ* of vs. 11, which we identified as the Dawn in the form of a cow, confined in the Vala cave. Despite her circumstances, she produced milk (*páyaḥ*). Here I think the poet is indicating that a cow (or “cow”) assimilated to the sap-yielding cow in vs. 11 is available for the sacrificer to milk. The cow may be the Dakṣiṇā cow herself, the source of the necessary priestly gifts for the poet and other ritual personnel. Though she potentially yields “sap,” she has not yet given birth (i.e., she has not produced the gifts), and it is the sacrificer/king’s job to milk her. This ritual task harkens back to the mythological depiction of the Navagvas coming to the Vala cave and, though lacking the Dakṣiṇā, seeking to milk the cave (vs. 10). They seem to have been successful (vs. 11), a good model for the king’s activity here.

In the 2nd hemistich the poet is properly performing his task. Ge (n. 17c, flg. Sāy.) takes the verb *vr̥ñjé* as a 3rd ps., but there’s no reason to impose an anomalous morphological analysis on it, when the morphologically proper 1st ps. works better in context. As I said above, there is something faintly threatening about the poet’s account of what he does: he “enmeshes” (*sám ... vr̥ñjé*) Mitra and Varuṇa with his hymns. Verbal forms of the lexeme *sám √ vr̥j* are found only twice in the RV; in the other occurrence (VII.3.4) it refers to Agni’s encircling / encompassing food with his jaws. The noun *saṃvārga-* (VIII.75.12, X.43.5) is used of booty or winnings that has been completely encompassed and acquired; the root noun *saṃvṛj-* (II.12.3.) is used of the winner who does the encompassing. In all these passages there is a sense of dominance, which I think is also found here: the gods have been captured by the poet’s hymns, perforce.

But the hymns also act as protective defenses, *várūthaiḥ*, for all those within them, including those same gods, so that the hint of menace is countered by the positive protective association of *várūtha-*, which always has the sense of a protective defense, sometimes found with *śārman-* ‘shelter’ (IV.55.4) and *chardís-* ‘id.’. For the association of *várūtha-* with verbal products, cf. VIII.101.5 *varūthyām ... chándyaṃ váca stotrám* “a speech, a pleasurable, protective praise-song” and VIII.67.3 *ukthyām várūtham* ‘protection worthy of hymns’.

I would now no longer separate Mitra-Varuṇa in c from Aryaman in d and construe each with a different instr. and would therefore emend the tr. to “when I enmesh Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryman with hymns (that are) preeminent defenses.

X.61.18: On my general interpr. of this vs., which is taken very differently by others, see the publ. intro. As I say there, I take the subj. of this vs., the *sūrīḥ* (patron), to be the same as the king in vs. 16 and the sacrificer/sponsor in vs. 17. The adj. *tádbandhuḥ* opening the vs. aligns the subj. with the *dvibándhuḥ* of 17a. Ge (n. 18a) suggests rather that the subject here is a relative of the *yáṣtar-* in 17.

This leads us to the question of the referent of *te*. For Ge, it’s Agni—also Re, flg. Gonda; further HPS, 47–48; see also Scar 253–54. They also take *te* as an improper locative (e.g., Ge “auf dich im Himmel”). Citing the *te* in 11c and the voc. *indra* in 15b, Old tentatively suggests Indra. I suggest instead that it is the poet and that the *te* is a gen. dependent on *dhiyam* in the cmpd.: “setting your insight in heaven.” The patron is dispatching the poet’s own *dhī* to heaven as part of his sacrificial offering. My suggestion poses several problems. First, by my interpr. the poet was the 1st person speaker of the previous hemistich (17cd), and so we must switch to a 3rd ps. narrator addressing the poet. in the 2nd ps. I can point to numerous abrupt changes of person in the RV in support, but I am still uneasy with this particular one. Further, it is not usually the patron’s task (or privilege) to manipulate or physically position the verbal offerings in the sacrifice, but rather the poet-creators. The referents of this cmpd *dhiyaṃ-dhā-* in I.67.4 and

IV.45.4 appear to be the poets themselves – though as Scar points out, the referents of other occurrences are different and the meaning of the compound “schwankt je nach Kontext.” Moreover there are other passages in which the patrons do seem to provide the motive power to the poet’s productions. See, e.g., I.77.4 ... *yé maghāvānaḥ ... iṣáyanta mánma* “our benefactors who propel our prayers at length.” As many times elsewhere in the interpr. of this hymn, I am uncertain about my own choices, but fairly sure that the ones prevalent in the lit. are less justified. In any case the publ. tr. would be easier to interpr. if I had identified the referent, however.

The word *nābhānediṣṭha-* is taken by most as a PN, and that may be one of its values here. But I think its full lexical sense, ‘nearest to the navel’, is in use here – and as a pun. On the one hand, *nābhi-* ‘navel’ is often used for the physical focal point of the sacrifice, namely Agni (as in VI.7.4 *nābhiṃ yajñānām*). When the patron is described / describes himself as *nābhānediṣṭha-* he is accorded or claiming the preeminent position on the ritual ground, beside the ritual fire. On the other, as disc. in the publ. intro., *nābhi-* “is a standard metaphor for origin and close kinship (especially the point of origin of two disparate groups).” This same patron is credited in 17a with two lineages (*dvibāndhu-*), presumably both divine and human, and “nearest to the navel” would situate him high up the family tree of both, close to the point of bifurcation.

It is the latter sense of *nābhānediṣṭha-* that prompts the patron’s speech in cd, which again I interpr. quite differently from others. Ge thinks the *sā* opening the hemistich refers to Agni; it would be feminine by attraction to fem. *nābhi-*. (This exact attraction is, admittedly, found in X.10.4 [see comm. ad loc.].) I take pāda c as a disjunctive question (again unlike others): the patron is asking, in a bit of shorthand, whether his navel is higher than “his” or vice versa, that is, in my view, whether he is closer to the top of the tree of lineage than someone else. The someone else (*asyā*) is Agni; with this identification I am in agreement with HPS, though not Ge, who thinks it’s the *tād* of *tadbāndhu-* in pāda a. Note that *asyā* is accented, though pronominal. This may be because its referent is new to the discourse (which might exclude *te* as referring to Agni in pāda a) or because it is initial in the second half of the disjunctive question.

In d the patron provides the (rather flimsy) evidence for his claim to the higher position: he has a defined place (“the so-many-eth”) in the line of descent. “That one” is presumably the originator of the line.

To make the tr. more intelligible, I would now change the first hemistich to “Setting your [=poet’s] insight in heaven, the patron whose lineage this is, the one “nearest to the navel,” murmurs as he quests.”

X.61.19: In this vs., responsive to 18, Agni is the speaker (here I am happily in agreement with most interpr.), and he decisively refutes the patron’s boasts. Interestingly he does so by claiming both senses of *nābhā-* in *nābhānediṣṭha-* (see above). On the one hand, in the first pāda he emphatically gestures towards the *nābhi-* on the ritual ground: “here is my navel, here is my seat” – namely the fireplace where Agni is situated during the sacrifice. But in the rest of the vs. he claims both the first birth (*prathamajā(h)*), putting him higher than his interlocutor, and also double birth (*dvijā(h)*), responding to the other’s claim of two lineages (*dvibāndhu-* 17a). And of course Agni is both a god and thus divine by nature and kindled by men, thus, by the mechanism of his creation, part of the mortal lineage. For the former, note “these gods here are mine” (*imé me devāḥ*), which, as Ge points out (n. 19d), picks up 14a referring to Agni: *yásya devāḥ* “to whom the gods belong.”

We must assume that Agni is proclaiming all of this in the here-and-now, on the ritual

ground: the annunciatory initial near-deictics are insistent: #*iyám ... ihá ... imé ... ayám ... / ... , idám ...*

The referent of *idám*, the milk of the cow as she was being born, isn't clear. Ge tr. "dieses All"; Klein (DGRV II.118 "creation" (supplying *bhúvanam*). Similarly to Klein, I tentatively supply "world" (rather than the "earth" of the publ. tr.). I now think it probably refers both to the world and all its trappings, and also to the ritual ground right here – which, in some sense, are the same: the ritual ground as the microsmic representation of the universe. Who the cow is, in this instance, I won't venture to speculate – there have been (and will be) more than enough cows in this hymn.

X.61.20–24: The spat between the sacrificial patron and Agni having been decisively settled in Agni's favor, we now turn to the Dawn sacrifice in the five following vss. (20–24). Each begins with *ádha* and each (loosely) treats a different divine figure or figures at the sacrifice (though the patron is not absent), starting and ending with Agni (20, 24). The sacrifice in these vss. is properly conducted, in contrast to the difficulties that beset other sacrifices alluded to in the hymn.

X.61.20: I tr. *aratí-* 'spoked wheel', rather than the 'chariot' favored by Th (Unters. 35) for this passage, because Agni's circular appearance seems always a prominent feature when he is called *aratí-* elsewhere. However, since the *aratí-* is described both as 'unhitching' (*áva syati*) and 'having a double track' (*dvivartanīḥ*), it's an example of pars pro toto – wheel for chariot. The 'unhitching' presumably refers to placing the ritual fire in the hearth, in particular to conveying the fire taken out from the Gārhapatya to the Āhavanīya and settling it there. As Th already suggested (see also Scar [609 n. 873]), the "double track" refers to the course that leads to the gods in heaven and back again.

For *āsu* the publ. tr. supplies 'clans', flg. Old (flg. Ludwig) and Ge. (adopted by Scar). This interpr. can be justified with ref. to 15d *vikṣú yágyū* "the two that seek sacrifice among the clans." However, I am now not certain that it is correct; it could alternatively refer to the cows that are a constant presence in this hymn and will be the focus of the next vs.

Re appositely adduces VI.12.3 *aratír vanerāt* the spoked wheel (of the sacrifice), the ruler in the wood" as parallel to our *aratīḥ ... vaneṣāt* -- with rhyming root noun finals, though the underlying roots, *√rāj* and *√sah*, are quite differently shaped.

Re suggests that the nonce phrase *śísur dán* 'child of the house' is based on the formula *pátir dán* 'lord of the house' (5x, mostly at pāda end). The child is of course Agni, just after kindling, and pāda d depicts his mother (one of the kindling sticks, presumably) giving birth to him, "grown strong with kindness" or, after the comm. ad V.87.4, "with kind attention," probably of the maternal variety.

X.61.21: In my view this vs. concerns the distribution of the Dakṣiṇās at the Dawn sacrifice. The Dakṣiṇā, esp. the lack of one, has been a regular preoccupation of the hymn; see vss. 8 and 10 and my interpr. of 17. But here, in this well-ordered sacrifice, they are properly distributed. The "cows of the maiden" – with Ge I take *kanāyā(h)* with *gāva(h)*, not with *úpamātim* as Old does – can also refer to the light of dawn, as so often, but I think the Gift-cows are the primary referents. Contra Klein (DGRV II.118) I do not think the cows refer to the flames of Agni.

On *úpamāti-* see comm. ad VIII.40.9. The "someone swollen (with wealth)" (*śvāntásya kásya cit*) is, in my view, the patron, who is (/may be) then addressed directly in the 2nd

hemistich.

It is not entirely clear who the 2nd ps. addressee in c is. Ge seems to favor Agni, and this is possible. Re points out that *sudravīṇaḥ* is addressed to Agni in I.94.15. However, *drāvīṇa*-figured earlier in the hymn, in vs. 12. Like our vs. that vs. describes the departure of Dawn's cows, and in that vs. (at least by my interpr.) Indra has control over them, as "moveable property" (*drāvīṇam*), which – crucially – he distributes to the bards. Thus Indra serves in that vs. as the model of a patron bestowing Dakṣiṇās, and here I think the voc. *sudravīṇaḥ* is addressed to the human patron at this sacrifice, distributor of Dakṣiṇās, who has been the subject of the middle part of the hymn. The connection between them is, again in my opinion, signalled by the pāda-final *s*-aor. injunctive *yāt*, in imperatival function, which picks up the agent noun *yāṣṭā* at the end of 17a. Both of these are unusual forms: *yāṣṭar*- is found only twice in the RV, while injunc. *yāt* is found only here in all of Skt. (though the augmented *ayāt* is somewhat more common). As Narten points out (Sig-aor. 200), it substitutes here for the very common *si*-impv. *yākṣi*; it therefore seems to have been chosen to send a particular message, which, I think, is the connection with the agent noun *yāṣṭā* in vs. 17, tied together by their superficially deviant phonology.

With Ge (and tentatively Old), I take *vāṇṛdhe* as 1st ps., with the poet as subject. This is as close to a dānastuti as he is willing to come.

The name Aśvaghna, lit. 'son/descendent of a horse-slayer', is found only here and is a curious piece of nomenclature. It may refer to the performance of an Aśvamedha by an illustrious ancestor of the current patron. I also wonder if it's not a sly pun on the gambling term **śvaghna*- 'dog-killing (throw)', found in *śvaghñín*-, a term for a successful gambler. Is the poet subtly implying that his patron owes his wealth to risky speculation?

X.61.22: Both Indra, as the model of a patron, and the patrons themselves return here.

The accent on *viddhī* is unexpected. Old suggests that it might be for emphasis; Ge supplies the impv. "(komm)" before it, presumably to allow *viddhī* to open a new clause. My tr., with a dash after "Indra," is meant to suggest that *ádha tvám índra* "And now you, Indra" strongly signals a referent shift and can be taken as its own quasi-clause.

I would now render *viddhī* by "come to know, take note," rather than the misleading stative "know." The point is that we will come into Indra's ken, so he will be prompted to give us wealth.

On the phrase *mahó rāyē* see comm. ad IV.31.11. The tr. here should be modified to "greatly for wealth."

The adj. *anehásah* in d is morphologically ambiguous: it can be an acc. pl. modifying the patrons in pāda c (so Gr) or a gen. sg. modifying *te*. Although the pāda boundary separates it from the patrons and, in fact, c is a repeated pāda (=I.54.11c), I favor the acc. pl. On *anehás*- see comm. ad vs. 12 above, where I argue that the word refers to the absence of a material lack rather than a moral one. Here I think the point is that the patrons want for nothing and therefore can afford to be especially generous to us. I would therefore alter the tr. to "our blameless patrons who lack nothing ..." If the gen. sg. reading is preferred, it could indicate that Indra, the model patron, lacks nothing. In fact, both readings may be simultaneously meant.

X.61.23: Note that pāda-final *gáviṣṭau* picks up *abhíṣṭau* in the previous pāda (22d) and anticipates *puṣṭau* and *sātaú* in 24 (a and d), all also pāda-final.

The referents in this vs. are quite unclear. Let us begin with dual voc. *rājānā*. There are

two (or possibly three) candidates. Ge seems to think that it refers to earthly kings, but this seems quite unlikely, since *rājan-* is not used very often for mortal rulers. The two divine pairs in contention are Mitra and Varuṇa (so Sāy.) or the Aśvins (so Re, tentatively). Old vacillates between Mitra and Varuṇa and earthly kings. Both M+V and the Aśvins have already appeared in the hymn – the former in vs. 17, the latter in vs. 4 – and there are arguments in favor of each. The strongest support for M+V is that dual forms of *rājan-* almost invariably refer to them, with the exception (in my view) of X.39.11 (see comm. there). On the other hand, the Aśvins fit better in a Dawn sacrifice context than M+V do. Moreover, the rare adj. *saranyú-* ‘hastening’ reminds us that the fem. of this stem, *saranyũ-*, is identified as the female who bore (/carried) the Aśvins in the very obscure passage in X.17.2. The use of the adj. here might be meant to conjure up this association. In the end I find it difficult to decide, likewise in vs. 25, but am tolerably sure that a divine pair is at issue.

Then there is the question of the subject of *sárat* in b, modified by the adj. pair *saranyúh* ... *jaranyúh*, the identity of the dearest vipra (*vípraḥ prēṣṭhaḥ*) in c, and whether the referents in b and c are the same. My tentative answer is that the referents are the same and point to Agni, although this is by no means certain. In favor of this identification is the fact that in the following vs. (24cd) the same referent is characterized both as *saranyú-* and as a *vípra-*.

The pāda-initial *sárat* echoes the same form at the beginning of 8c, whose subject is Dawn. It is tempting to invoke her here as well, but the clear masc. adjectives (esp. since fem. *saranyũ-* is attested elsewhere) make that difficult. Another possibility is that the subj. of *sárat* is Soma, who is elsewhere sometimes the subj. of that verb (e.g., IX.62.16), in which case I would say that the subject switches to Agni in c – though given the evidence adduced above from vs. 24, I consider this significantly less likely. The identification is made all the more difficult because pāda b provides no clear cues. The adj. *saranyú-* essentially doubles the verb; the hapax *jaranyú-*, obviously modeled on *saranyú-*, could equally well belong to ‘age’, ‘sing’, or ‘awaken’. I have opted for the last (so also Ge, Old tentatively, JSK DGRV II.118) because of my belief that the hymn is really about the Dawn sacrifice, but ‘sing’ is represented by Sāy., Gr, and Re, inter alia, and a case could be made also for ‘age’.

There is a tendency to interpr. dat. *kāráve* as goal with *sárat* (e.g., Ge “zum Sänger eilt”), but datives should not be straight goals of motion. I think rather that *kāráve* ultimately is the beneficiary of the actions in cd – Agni’s aid and protection for the bard’s patrons, which will ultimately benefit the bard himself.

Agni as *vípra-* is well attested elsewhere.

X.61.24: This is the last of the *ádhā* verses. Several items of vocabulary get recycled here – *saranyú-* (c), *vípra-* (d) – but the vs. is confusingly structured.

No doubt the boldest part of my interpr. has to do with pāda b. In this pāda we singers explicitly “beg” (*īmahe*) for something, but the rest of the vs. is not phrased as a request (though so tr., e.g., by Ge, JSK DGRV II.118). There are no modals; the only finite verb is the indicative *así*. It is therefore hard to see cd as directly continuing b. I suggest that the request in b is postponed until the final vs. (27), with the intervening material establishing the right to have these requests fulfilled (though quite obscurely). Note that the end of our b pāda, *tád ū nú*, is matched by the beginning of 27, *tá ū śu*, which picks up 24b and provides the link to the actual request. Vs. 27 also contains the (likely) modal *bhūta* and so is phrased as a request.

As for the structure of the rest (removing b from consideration), I think it is framed by two locative phrases, joined by *ca*: ... *asya jényasya puṣṭaú* (a) ... *śrávasaś ca sātaú* (d). In

between the addressee is characterized, perhaps parenthetically, by two phrases, also conjoined by *ca*: *saranyúr asya sūnúr áśvo, vípraś cāśi*. (Note that this *ca* precedes the one that conjoins the locatives of a and d and that the two *ca*'s do not interact by my interp. [but see JSK DGRV II.116 for a contrary opinion].) The locative phrases, particularly the first, establish the setting of the request in b as the ritual. I take *asya jényasya* ("of him who is well-born") to refer to Agni: *jén-* is several times used of Agni (e.g., I.71.4) (on *jén-* in general, see comm. ad I.128.7). His "thriving" (*puṣṭau*) is the successful kindling of the ritual fire. As for the other loc., "at the winning of fame," I think this may refer to the poet's role in the production and conferral of fame on the gods, the patron, and himself.

This leaves c and the first half of d, "you, his son, are a hastening horse and an inspired poet," which I take as essentially parenthetical. What is the referent of "his" and what of "you" (implicit in *asī*)? I suggest (though tentatively) that "his" refers to Agni, also found in *asya jényasya* in pāda a, and the referent of "you" is the poet himself – with the poet addressing himself in the 2nd ps. The strongest evidence for this comes from the immed. preceding vs., 23, where, by my interpr. anyway, "the hastening one" (*saranyú-*) and the inspired poet (*vípra-*) both refer to Agni. Here we have the same two words, predicated of an unidentified 2nd sg. addressee, who is also identified as "his son" – and therefore presumably shares Agni's characteristics. This identification of Agni and the poet is the necessary preliminary to the next two vss., in which I believe that the unidentified subject is *both* Agni *and* the poet. I realize that this interpr. is quite a stretch, for it assumes that the poet is both participating in the plural "we" of the request in b and addressing himself in the 2nd sg. Such things are not impossible in RVic discourse (see my "Poetic Self Reference," Fs. Skjærvø 2005) but in a hymn this obscure it adds significant complications that can't be established with certainty.

X.61.25–26: As indicated in the publ. intro. as well as just above, I think that the unidentified subject of these vss. is Agni=poet, and the poet is establishing his noble lineage and right to the favor of the gods. The syntax of these vss. is clotted and almost impossible to follow: 25 and 26a and part of 26b form a single sentence, with the main clause in 26, which is preceded by the various dependent clauses in 25, seeming almost to constitute a series of false starts.

X.61.25: As was just noted, the syntax of this vs. is an intricate puzzle – or, to be more straightforward, a mess. I take the whole as an "if" clause, introduced by *yádi* in pāda a, which has two parallel verbs, *jujuse* in b and *dāśat* in d. Interrupting this "if" clause are two interrelated dative phrases in ab (*yuvóḥ ... sakhyāya* and *asmé śárdhāya*) and a parenthetical / embedded rel. clause (c and 1st half of d) introduced by *yásmín*, which refers to the subject of the verbs in the "if" clause. There are multiple ways to interpret the vs. (see esp. Old's disc.), which deviate markedly from mine in the overall construal, in the identification of the referents, in the analysis of the morphology, not to mention the purport of it all. I will not attempt to treat them, but concentrate on my own. I think the point of the vs. is that if Agni=poet is doing his ritual job for the sake of communion with the gods (pāda a) and the exchange of praise and material goods (d), then (in vs. 26) he is praised and seen to be "of good lineage," and he properly conducts the ritual.

The reference of dual *yuvóḥ* is much disputed. I think it must be the same two as the *rājānā* in 23 (q.v.), namely the Áśvins or Mitra and Varuṇa. See the standard treatments for other suggestions. In any case I think they are stand-ins for the gods in general, with whom we wish to establish communion by the sacrifice. As for "us, the troop" (*asmé śárdhāya*), I assume these are

the same “we” who made the request in 24b, namely the group of poets and ritual performers. I should note, though not pursue, that most interpr. take *asmé* and *śárdhāya* independently, with the latter referring to the troop of Maruts.

jujuṣé: contra Ge, but with Sāy., Gr, Old, and Re, I take this as a 3rd sg., not 1st sg. With Agni as subj., this means that he likes the praise given him; with the poet as subj., that he feels he has produced a good hymn.

The rel. cl. of c expands on the notion of the praise-hymn conferred or produced in b: in fact, it’s not a single praise-hymn, but hymns found in all places that converge on him. That is, Agni receives praises from all over; the poet is a hub of poetic inspiration. The point of the relative clause is clarified by the simile found at the beginning of d: the hymns reach their destination along many different routes.

The easiest part of the vs. is the simple second VP *dāśat sūnītāya* at the end. I take *dāśat* as a 3rd sg. injunc., which is accented because it still belongs to the “if” clause (and also because it begins a new clausette within that clause) – though others consider it a participle.

X.61.26: Here the good ritual work performed by the subject in vs. 25 is rewarded: he is “sung by the waters” and has the gods on his side. Moreover he is “of good lineage” – the *īti* seems intended to mark *subāndhuḥ* as a title bestowed on him. This is the lineage that his patron was aiming at and failed to achieve in vss. 17–19; note the term *-bandhu-* in 17–18.

I do not understand why he is hymned/sung by the waters (*gṛṇānó adbhiḥ*). It is true that waters are often considered to be noisy, but I assume there is a further ritual reference here.

With Old and Ge, I take the instr. phrase *nāmasā suktaīḥ* in b with the clause in pāda c, parallel to *ukthaīr vācobhiḥ*.

With Old and Re (but contra Ge), I supply an obj. for *vārdhat*. As Re points out, this would otherwise be the only intrans./reflex. form of the well-attested act. stem *vārdhati*.

The brief clause at the end of c, *ā hí nūnām*, lit. “for now here,” lacks both nominal and verbal forms. I think it refers to the accomplishment of the ritual. I supply “he has” and take *ā* as standing for “arrived.” This interpr. follows Ge’s, and it could refer to Agni/the poet. Or simply be the equivalent of “voilà.” In fact, given that the next vs. refers to the departing gods, the latter seems more likely – indicating that the ritual has been achieved – is at a successful end.

That clause is further amplified by d, which in my opinion simply means that the ritual, the ceremonial “course” (*ādhvan-* for *adhvarā-*) that the hymn has traversed, starts from the Dawn, from the “milk,” that is, the milky light at dawn, which is nicely contrasted with the ruddy color of Dawn herself. (See the same phrase *pāya usrīyāyāḥ* in vs. 11.)

X.61.27: With the end of the ritual proper (and the end of the tortured verbal path that led us there), the poet can now express his request with relative simplicity. (See 27b for the initiation of the request.)

The distracted phrase *mahāḥ ... ūtāye* should not have been rendered “for great help,” but, like *mahó rāyē* in 22, “greatly for help.”

X.62 All Gods

On the structure of this hymn and my disagreements with previous treatments, esp. Ge’s, see the publ. intro. For a complete tr. and disc., see also HPS, B+I 193–99. Its relative simplicity is a considerable relief after X.61. The hymn is metrically quite varied, with six different meters represented in its eleven vss.: the first four are in Jagatī, three others (5, 8, 9) in Anuṣṭubh, but

the other four meters are found once each (Bṛhatī 6, Satobṛhatī 7, Gāyatrī 10, Triṣṭubh 11).

X.62.1–4: The four Jagatī vss. are also united by a refrain in the d pādas and very parallel constructions in the c pādas.

X.62.1: The Dakṣiṇā was of course a preoccupation of X.61 as well, and the achievement of companionship / fellowship (*sakhyā-*) was the aim in X.61.25. Although the Aṅgirasas are of course gods and associates of Indra, in this vs. they seem to be acting as if in the role of mortal sacrificers vis-à-vis Indra, exchanging the sacrifice and the Dakṣiṇā for Indra's fellowship and immortality. For the Aṅgirasas' attainment of immortality see also X.92.3.

I do not know why “anointed” (*sāmaktāḥ*) is used here. Schmidt (193) suggests that it expresses the marriage-like (eheähnlich) relationship between the Aṅgirasas and Indra, based on some comments on *sām* √ *añj* in this vs. by Re , but this seems farfetched.

The c pādas of 1–4 have the structure X [ABSTRACT NOUN] *aṅgiraso vo astu* “Let there be X for you, o A's.” Our c begins with the dat. prn. *tébhyaḥ*, which ordinarily has 3rd ps. ref. Here, however, I think it doubles the *vaḥ* later in the pāda and therefore has 2nd ps. ref. – like the common nom. phrase *sá tvám* (see my 1992 “*sa* figé”). I suggest that it's used here to anchor the case value of dative for the multivalent enclitic *vaḥ*. Once the structure of this pāda was established in that way, the subsequent c pādas needed no such help.

Since Ge believes that the speaker is the Mānava named in the refrain, he supplies “me” as the primary obj. of *prāti gṛbhṇīta* (so also HPS), but since I think Mānava is related to the poet's patron (see publ. intro. and vss. 8 and 11), I do not follow him. I think rather that the poet is commending his patron to the Aṅgirasas.

X.62.2: The signature deed of the Aṅgirasas: the splitting of the Vala cave and release of the cows. The signature verb of the release is often *úd* √ *aj*, as here.

Properly speaking, *dīrghāyutvām* is an abstract meaning literally “long-life-ness,” but no non-awkward English equivalent comes to mind.

X.62.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this set of deeds is more appropriate to Indra than the Aṅgirasas.

As in 2c, we have an nominal abstract that does not go easily into English: good-offspring-ness. The form *suprajāstvá-* is somewhat oddly formed; assuming it's based on (*su*)*prajā-*, the *-s* before the abstract suffix is intrusive and seems to be based on a case form, probably nom. sg. *-prajāś*, though opinions differ. See Scar (143), who doesn't pronounce on it but gives clashing reff. to AiG. It is notable that the *s* makes an already over-heavy syllable **ā-tv-* even heavier.

X.62.4: The first three vss. of this quartet (vss. 1–4) have the same structure in the first hemistich: a relative clause introduced by *yé* treating the past deeds of the Aṅgirasas. In vs. 1 this rel. cl. has 2nd ps. ref. (2nd pl. pf. *ānaśá*) matching the 2nd pl. in cd; in the other two the 3rd ps. of the rel. cl. in ab gives way to 2nd ps. in cd with the same referents. Here in the final vs. the structure and temporal reference of ab change abruptly. The opening *ayám* ‘this one here’ signals that the time is the here-and-now, as well as switching the referent to the singular: the subject can no longer be the Aṅgirasas of long ago.

The interpr. of this vs. has been muddled by the assumption that *nābhā* is a short version

of the PN Nābhānediṣṭha, the supposed poet of X.61–62; both Ge and HPS (p. 193) tr. “in der Sippe” (in the clan) and suggest it’s a word play on the name (and therefore presumably on the lineage). But I think it simply refers to the fireplace on the ritual ground, as it does (in my view) in X.61.19 (q.v.). In this interpr. *ayám* “this one here” refers to the priest/poet, speaking at the sacrificial hearth.

What “in the house” refers to, I’m not certain – it could be a shorthand reference to the ritual ground as Agni’s house, of which he is lord (the title *grhápati*- almost exclusively refers to Agni in the RV). Or it could be referring to a more intimate sacrifice than most, performed in the family household, a grhya ritual avant la lettre, in this period that predates the Grhya / Śrauta ritual split.

Because of the voc. accent, *déva-putrāḥ* can be either a bahuvrīhi ‘having gods as sons’ (<*devá-putra*-) or tatpuruṣa ‘sons of the god(s)’ (<*deva-putrá*-). Gr assigns it to the former, though allowing the possibility of the latter. Ge and HPS take it as the latter, “Göttersöhne.” In the publ. tr. I opted for the bahuvrīhi because it is securely attested in the RV and elsewhere in Vedic, whereas the tatpuruṣa is not found in Vedic at all (unless here), as far as I can tell. However, I now feel I was wrong, on grounds of sense. The Aṅgirasas are not known as the fathers of other divinities, but are several times called “sons of heaven”: *divás putráṣaḥ* (III.53.7=nearby X.67.2, IV.2.15). Since the tatpuruṣa would have been simple to create (see *rājaputrā*-, e.g.), I would now change the tr. to “sons of the god(s).” Note that the next vs. (5) presents them as sons of Agni, the (sg.) Aṅgiras, and that vs. 6 gives both Agni and Heaven as progenitors.

X.62.5–6: These two vss. form a pair, mostly repeating the same information or variation thereon and amplifying 4b. It is not clear to me why this duplication was deemed necessary. It is almost as though the poet was considering two different versions, in different meters, and failed to prune one of them.

X.62.7: The first hemistich repeats the motif of the Aṅgirasas, here along with Indra, releasing the Vala cows. Curiously it is not only cows but horses (*vrajám gómantam ásvínam*); the latter are not ordinarily associated with the Vala myth elsewhere, and it is not immediately clear to me why they are found here (but see vs. 8 below). The same pāda is found in X.25.5, not in a Vala context, where Soma is urged to release the animals from their pen. Here I would suggest that the action portrayed provides a transition from the Vala myth to the poet’s current desire for recompense, and he wants horses as well as cows. The mixture of myth and the here-and-now is also found in the 2nd hemistich, where a generous gift to “me” (presumably this very poet) reorients the Aṅgirasas’s mythic deeds towards the present time. To make this clearer I would now substitute “have made fame” for “made fame.” Since the subjects of cd are not identified, they can represent the current patrons configured as Aṅgirasas.

The act. part. *dádataḥ* in c is interpr. by all as nom. pl., modifying the subj. of *akrata* in d, and I am certain that that is the correct analysis. However, it could instead be a gen. sg. modifying *me*, which adjoins it. Sense speaks against this analysis, but it must be admitted that word order favors it – or, better, tempts the hearer to make the gen. sg. analysis before the more likely nom. pl. one surfaces.

The first member of the adj. *aṣṭakarmīyah* is much discussed; see HPS (194) for lit. The “cut-branded” of the publ. tr. follows the etym. of Kuiper, enlarged by KH, on which see EWA s.v. *AKṢ*.

X.62.8–11: The *dānastuti* that occupies the last four vss. builds on the model of giving provided by the *Āṅgiras* in the previous vs.

X.62.8: The intrusive presence of the horses in the Vala cave in 7b finds its explanation here, where the poet praises the imminent gift not only of the thousand (cows) found in 7b and 8c, but also one consisting of a hundred horses (*śatāśvam*).

The phrase *dānāya māṁhate* picks up *māṁhate* from 6d and thus connects the patron Manu's munificence with the *Āṅgiras*; it also reminds us of *māṁhaneṣṭhāḥ* and *dānāya* in the vss. 1 and 2 of the previous hymn X.61.

X.62.10: On *smāddiṣṭi*- see comm. ad III.45.5.

X.62.11: “Aligning itself with the sun” of the *Dakṣiṇā* in c of course refers to the fact that in RVic ritual the *Dakṣiṇās* were distributed at the Dawn sacrifice.

X.63–64

The next two hymns to the All Gods are attributed to *Gaya Plāta* and appeal to a variety of gods, with the *Ādityas* esp. prominent in X.63. Neither hymn presents major challenges.

X.63 All Gods

X.63.1: As Ge points out (n. 1a), the sandhi form *dīdhiṣanta* could represent the act. part. nom. pl. *dīdhiṣantaḥ* rather than the finite med. 3rd pl. *dīdhiṣante*. The desid. stem has both act. and mid. forms. Against the participle suggestion one might object that the act. participle slot is already filled by the *u*-stem (pseudo-)participle *dīdhiṣú-*, but since that stem is specialized in the sense ‘desiring to acquire (a spouse)’, there would be room for a non-lexicalized participle stem. Still, I favor the Pp medial *-ante* analysis; among other things it avoids the need to posit a predicated pres. participle (not that I object to them).

Ge supplies the verb “kommen” in b to govern *jānimā*, but I see no reason not to construe that noun with *dīdhiṣante* in pāda a. Since the gods have been gratified by Manu (*mānuprītāsaḥ* b) and already in the RV Manu is called Manu Vivasvant and later regularly has the patronymic *Vaivasvata* (see Macd., Ved. Myth. 139), it makes sense that the gods would wish to help Manu by establishing the races associated with him.

The interest of the 2nd hemistich lies in the mention of *Yayāti Nahuṣya*, but there is no evidence in the two bare mentions of him in the RV (also I.31.17) of the dramatic episodes concerning *Yayāti Nāhuṣa* in the MBh (I.70–80); he is merely a minor ritualist in the RV.

X.63.2: Ge (n. 2cd) follows Sāy. in seeing *Aditi* here as *Heaven*, which would make sense of the rest of the trio. However, I don't know of any particular support for this identification; the next vs. is not sufficient (see comm. there).

X.63.3: Re points out the double alliteration in pāda a: *mātā mādhumat pínvate páyaḥ*, the latter continued in b by init. *pīyūṣam*. The rest of b, *dyaúr áditir ádribarhāḥ*, is also a phonetic figure with the repetitions of *d*-s and *r*-s and the initial *ádi .. ádri* echo.

Again Ge (n 3ab) considers this vs. to concern “Himmel-*Aditi*,” with *dyaúḥ* being

feminine, as it sometimes is. I find this unnecessary and also detrimental to the complexity of the thought. Aditi is instead *compared* to heaven, in an unmarked simile. The basis of comparison is twofold. On the one hand, as JPB (*Ādityas*, p. 235) points out, Aditi is like heaven in producing liquid nourishment (rain on the part of heaven, milk on hers). On the other, there is a pun on the name *āditi-* lit. ‘without bounds’; in this sense heaven is *āditi-* ‘unbounded’. JPB (pp. 235–36) rejects this pun, which is favored by Bergaigne and Hillebrandt, but I find the suggested pun persuasive.

The sense and semantic application of the cmpd *ādri-barhas-* are hard to discern, in part because *-barhas-* does not occur independently but only in two cmpds, this one (a hapax) and the considerably better-attested *dvi-bārhas-*. In all instances of the latter the publ. tr. renders the cmpd ‘doubly lofty / exalted’ in contrast to the standard rendering ‘doubly strong’ (e.g., Gr “doppelte Festigkeit, Stärke, Grösse habend”. (The publ. tr. of course presupposes a bahuvrīhi ‘having double loftiness/height’.) The sense ‘height, loftiness’ rather than ‘strength’ for the underlying *s*-stem is supported by the YAvs. correspondent *barəzah-* ‘height, mountain’ and by the existence of the extremely well-attested and inherited non-participial *-nt*-stem *brhánt-* ‘lofty’. The latter is ordinarily associated with the Caland system (among the many reff., see, e.g., Lowe, *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit*, pp. 284–85), and, though I am generally slow to invoke the Caland system, *bārhas-* might well be a Caland *-s*-stem. associated with *brhánt-*. The contexts of *dvibārhas-* are not diagnostic: either ‘doubly strong’ or ‘doubly lofty/exalted’ fits them all without adding much meaning in either case. There are some suggestive collocations, however; see esp. VIII.15.2 *dvibārhaso brhát*, VII.8.6 *úd ... janīṣṭha dvibārḥāḥ* (noting the *úd*), and IV.5.3 where *dvibārhas-* follows 2 occurrences of *brhánt-* in vs. 1. See also vs. 4 here.

So much for *dvibārhas-*; the form in our passage is actually the other cmpd, the hapax *ādri-barhas-*, likewise a bahuvrīhi. I render it in the publ. tr. by ‘massive as a stone’, which accords more or less with Gr, Ge ‘felsenfest’, Re ‘à la résistance de rocher’, but which attributes a different sense to *-barhas-* than the one we gave to *dvi-bārhas-*. This certainly needs to be rectified, and, assuming the correctness of ‘loftiness’ in *dvibārhas-*, our cmpd should mean ‘having the loftiness of a stone’. What would this really mean, and what would it mean in context? Now *ādri-* refers not only to stone the substance and stone(s) the object(s), but also to mountains or mountain peaks (possible exx. include III.32.16, V.87.2, VI.48.5, etc.), so *ādri-bārhas-* can have the sense ‘having the loftiness of a mountain peak’. Here the adj. would apply to heaven, and though it might seem like a comedown (literally) for the height of heaven to be compared to that of an earthly mountain, the visual effect of soaring mountain peaks actually gives a stronger impression of height than simply looking at the sky. I would now emend the tr. to “(like) unbounded heaven, which has the loftiness of a mountain peak.” Support for the ‘lofty’ rendering of *-barhas-* here comes from the next vs., with *brhát* in 4b and a different word referring to the height of heaven in 4d (*divó varṣmāṇam*). It might be tempting to consider *ādri-* here as a designation of heaven, reflecting the notion of the stony firmament that is prominent in Avestan texts, but it is a temptation that I think should be resisted. I know of no real evidence in Vedic for this concept – the passages under Gr’s def. 5) s.v. *ásman-* “der *Himmel*, der als steinernes Gewölbe gedacht ist” should all be interpr. otherwise, and in any case we would expect *ásman-*, corresponding to Aves. *asman-* (*/asan-*), in this sense, rather than *ādri-*.

The sense of the cmpd *vr̥ṣa-bhará-* is unclear. Parallel formations like *vājam-bhará-* ‘bringing prizes’, *sahasram-bhará-* ‘bringing thousands’ suggest that *vr̥ṣa-* should function as object; hence Gr’s “Männer hegend,” Ge’s “Stierlasten tragenden,” Re’s “qui portent (des charges de) taureaux,” but none of these seems satisfactory, primarily because *vr̥ṣa* has to be

attenuated or manipulated in some way. Moreover, those other cmpds have an overt acc. marker on the first member, whereas this has the stem form. I take *vr̥ṣa-* as a pseudo-adverbial ‘bullishly’. Note also that the compound seems to invite an alternative segmentation *vr̥ṣabha(-rá)-* with a different word for bull, *vr̥ṣabhá-*, though this does not yield sense. The 2nd member -*bhara-* also scrambles -*barhaḥ-* in the preceding pāda.

Pāda d contains a poetic self-address (so also Ge n. 3d).

X.63.4: For the relevance of *br̥hát* and *var̥ṣmāṇam* to the previous vs., see comm. there.

X.63.6: Unaccented *manuṣaḥ* must be a part of the vocative phrase beginning *vísve devāsaḥ*, but its role is disputed. Gr and Old take it as a voc. pl., presumably (neither translates) parallel to *devāsaḥ* – hence “o all gods (and) men.” Ge takes it as gen. sg. dependent on *vísve devāsaḥ*, and I follow him; the lack of accent on the gen. is regular in tightly constructed voc. phrases of the type *sūno* [voc.] *sahasah* [gen.] “o son of strength.” Ge points out (n. 6b) that taking it as a voc. would require it to refer to the interrog. *káḥ* in pāda a, while *vísve devāsaḥ* would double the subj. of 2nd pl. *jújoṣatha*, a complex distribution of vocc., which would also match a sg. *káḥ* to pl. *manuṣaḥ*. Re also takes it as gen. sg., but supplies additional material: “o tous dieux (et) (fils) de l’Homme,” which seems to combine the drawbacks of both interpr. with no particular benefit. The presence of sg. *mánuḥ* in the. next vs. favors Ge’s (and my) interpr.: since Manu was the first to establish sacrifice for the gods, they can legitimately be termed “the gods of Manu.” Manu is perhaps the (or an) implicit answer to the questions introduced by *káḥ* in pādas a and c, even though those questions refer to the present (*rādhati*) and future (subj. *karat*).

X.63.7: On the morphological and metrical problems of *āyejé* see comm. ad I.114.2. There is also a conceptual one, at least in the standard interpr. Both Ge and Re take *hótrām* as a common noun (Ge “das Opfer,” Re “la ... oblation”; Gr “Opferguss”), but the lexeme *ā́ yaj* means ‘attract/win by sacrifice’, not simply ‘offer/sacrifice [a substance]’ (see comm. ad IX.7.8). In this particular case the obj. *hótrām* is, in my interpr., not merely the libation, but the deified Libation, who is clearly present in the next hymn, also by Gaya, in X.64.15. The point here, as I see it, is that Manu attracted the goddess Libation to his sacrifice by his initial sacrificial performance, and she then contributed a significant element to the subsequent sacrifice, namely the libation. For a similar ambiguity between ritual element and goddess with this verbal lexeme, see I.40.4 *īlām ... ā́ yajāmahe* and comm. ad loc. Note that the goddesses Hotrā and Idā ‘Refreshment’ are found together in the Āprī hymn I.142.9; cf. also II.1.11.

This interpr. has implications for the interpr. of the rest of the hemistich: in b *mānasā* could be construed either with *sámidhāgniḥ* or with *saptá hótr̥bhiḥ*. Ge opts for the latter, Re for the former (“ayant allumé le feu avec réflexion”); I think Re is correct. If Manu initially lacked one of the crucial elements of sacrifice, namely libation/Libation, he had to institute the sacrifice, kindle the fire, mentally, before the physical element was attracted to the sacrifice by Manu’s purely mental observance.

X.63.8: This vs. modulates from 3rd ps. in the rel. cl. (*śīre*, pāda a) to 2nd ps. in the main cl. (*pip̥ṛtā* d); the modulation pivots on *té*, which opens the 2nd hemistich: *té* can of course be the 3rd ps. correlative to *yé* opening the rel. cl., but it can also have 2nd ps. ref. with the impv. in d. (See my “*sa* figé.”) The ambiguity of pāda c cannot be conveyed in tr.; it is only in pāda d that the voc. *devāsaḥ* and the 2nd pl. impv. *pip̥ṛtā* unambiguously signal the change in person.

X.63.10: The long accusative phrase in abc of this vs. at first appears to be a continuation of the accs. in 9cd, which are objects of *havāmahe* in 9a. The surfacing of a well-oared boat in 10a calls this initial interpr. into question, since we would be unlikely to invoke a boat, and in d we come upon a new verb, *ā ruhema* ‘may we mount’, which reconfigures the audience’s interpr. of the verse. Or such is my interpr. – Ge takes ab with vs. 9 and starts a new sentence with 10c. (Re’s punctuation is unclear and a bit incoherent.) Ge’s interpr. is of course possible, but since we try to preserve the integrity of verses when possible and since this poet shows some interest in syntactically misleading the audience (see vss. 8 and later 13–14, both with comm.), I prefer to take 10 as a unit. See further comm. ad vs. 14.

X.63.11: As Re points out, *ādhi vocata* reprises *ādhi bruvantu* in 1d, though with relexicalization. But this echo does not seem to signal a ring or other structural feature, and the tendency for this hymn to keep circling around the same topics makes the thematic repetition fairly unremarkable.

X.63.12: Almost predicably, Re interprets the first hemistich in a Dumézilian (though his name is not mentioned) trifunctional fashion: disease, absence of oblation, hostility (Functions 3, 1, 2, I assume). I do not see that such a formal structure is needed to appreciate the variety of threats envisioned.

X.63.13: As transmitted, pāda a is a syllable short and would have a rare break of three heavy syllables (*mārto víśv[a]*). Arnold (*Metre*, metrical comm. ad loc. and p. 101) suggests reading **mārt’yo* for transmitted *mārto*, a change endorsed by Old and reflected in the HvN edition. Bloomfield (VV ad I.41.2) rejects this emendation on what seem insufficient grounds, but he does draw attention to the fact that our imperfect pāda *āriṣṭaḥ śá mārto víśva edhate* seems based on *āriṣṭaḥ śárva edhate* in I.41.2=VIII.27.16 (in the latter case directly following our pāda b). Although I would not accept Bloomfield’s rather mechanical attempt to generate our pāda from the shorter one (*āriṣṭaḥ śá [mārto víś]va edhate*, with *śá ... va* the disjecta membra of *śárvaḥ*), it does seem as if some effort was made to replace *śárva-* with *víśva-* -- oddly, since *víśva-* is somewhat in retreat in Maṇḍala X, in favor of *śárva-*. But this is a Viśve Devāḥ hymn and forms of *víśva-* are prominent in it (vss. 2a, 6b, 8b, 11a, 13d, 17b). See also Ge’s (n. 13a) and Re’s brief comm. on *víśva-* and *śárva-* in this passage.

Pāda b is also found at VI.70.3 and VIII.27.16; as was just discussed, the latter also has a variant of our pāda a.

X.63.14: The structure of this vs. is very close to that of vs. 10, in that the first hemistich focuses on accusative referents (*yām ... yām*), which seem to continue the acc. reference of 13cd (*yām*), but which in the end can be construed with the acc. phrase in pāda c, headed by *rātham*, which is the obj. of *ā ruhema* in d. This redirection of the accusatives in ab from connection with the end of the previous vs. to what follows in their own vs., the focus on a material means of transportation (*nāvam* in 10c, *rātham* in 14c), and the presence of the same verb governing it in d (*ā ruhema*) in pādas of identical structure (negated acc. sg. pres. part. [*āsra vantīm / āriṣyantam*] *ā ruhema s^u vastaye* – all this imposes my interpr. of vs. 10, against Ge’s.

X.63.15: The rendering of *vṛjāṇa-* as ‘precinct’ rather nicely taps into their shared etymological semantics, from ‘enclosure’, then to area or district, inter alia. For more on *vṛjāṇa-* see comm. ad

X.27.2. I do not subscribe to Ge's understanding of *vrjāṇa-* as "Kampf"; better Re's tr. of the phrase "dans le district pourvu de lumière solaire."

On pl. *yóniṣu* see comm. ad X.40.11.

X.63.17: It is possible, but not necessary, to supply *devāḥ* with voc. *viśve* and take *ādityāḥ* as a separate term—"o All (Gods), Ādityas, (and) Aditi"—to signal in this last vs. that the hymn is in fact dedicated to the All Gods

The name, or nom de plume, of the poet Amartya Gaya recalls Aves. *gaiia-* *marətan-*, the (name of the) first man, and in my view is a pun based on a reminiscence of this Indo-Iranian figure. For a similar, but slightly different view, see KH "Mārtāṇḍa and Gayōmart," MSS 1957 = Aufs. 422–38, esp. 435. See also Ge's n. 4.

Ge takes *īśānāso nāraḥ ... jāno divyāḥ* as an (unsigned) conjoined NP: "Die mächtigen Herren und das himmlische Volke," both subjects of sg. *ástāvi*. Sāy., at least, considers the former to refer to rich human men; Ge does not make his view about the referent known. Although a singular verb for this conjoined NP could perhaps be justified by having it agree with the nearer member, sg. *jānaḥ*. I think it more likely that sg. *jāno divyāḥ* is an appositive to the preceding pl., which would make the sg. verb easier to account for. So, it seems, Re: "Les seigneurs puissants, la gent céleste."

X.64 All Gods

X.64.1: Note the etymological figure *sumāntu (nāma) ... manāmahe*; *sumāntu-* here does not seem to have anything to do with *māntavaḥ* 'counselors' in the previous hymn, X.63.8. With the *sumāntu nāma* here compare Yama's *durmāntu ... nāma* in X.12.6, where it is contrasted with one that is *sumāntu*; see comm. ad loc.

Ge takes *yāmani* to well-attested *yāman-* 'journey' and construes it with the gen. pl. part. *śṛṇvatām* in b ("die auf der Fahrt erhören"); this is certainly possible. He cites several supposed parallels, esp. X.92.13 *yāmani śrutam* "hear this on your journey" (addressed to the Aśvins). However, though the Aśvins are famous for their travel, the assumption of a journey for the unnamed group of gods, in the first vs. of the hymn, is perhaps less appealing. The publ. tr. "as they listen to my plea" follows Re's "qui (nous) entendent dans (notre) imploration," with *yāman-* to *√yā* 'beg, implore'. Other passages containing *yāman-* 'plea' (may) include I.25.20 (also with *√śru*; Ge 'Fahrt'), VIII.52.5 (Vāl.) *āyāman* (again generally interpr. as 'journey'), as well as the cmpd *yāma-hūti-* (X.117.3). It may of course also be a pun, also in passages like X.92.13. For a semantically similar phrase in this hymn see 4d *śṛṇotu ... hāvīmani* "let him harken to my call."

X.64.2: Note the matching etymological figures opening pādas a and b: *kratūyānti krátavaḥ ... , vénanti venāḥ*, also with matching syntax (3rd pl. act. pres. + nom pl. masc. subj.). The denom. *kratūyá-* is found only here and in IV.24.4, while the pres. *véna-* is better attested. On *vená-* and its relatives, see esp. comm. ad VIII.100.5, as well as Re's comm. to this vs. (ÉVP IV.118).

Old seems somewhat inclined to read *ādísah* here (as also at I.119.2), which would yield a tr. "(Our) aims are flying," vel sim., which would yield reasonable sense. Evidence in favor of this reading might be found in IX.21.5 *dádhātā venám ādīse* with similar lexicon. However, the *ādīse* there is infinitival and the *vená-* refers to soma, so the similarity is far less than it first appears. It is also the case that 7 of the 9 occurrences of *ādís-* (all of which are trisyllabic) occur

at the end of the pāda, as here. Nonetheless, since the transmitted text makes sense, and as an acc. pl. *dīśaḥ* provides a goal for the verb of motion *patáyanti*, I do not favor emendation. In fact given the preponderance of pāda-final *ādiśe*, etc., it would be hard to explain how an original *ādiśaḥ* acquired a second accent, since other occurrences of the root noun cmpd. in the same metrical position would favor maintaining the singly accented form.

For a somewhat similar expression of the poet's senses and sense organs flying apart widely in his inspiration, see VI.9.6.

X.64.3: The *vā* in 2nd position in the vs. is a bit surprising, and several emendations have been proposed: to the particle *vaí* (see Klein DGRV II.206), to *vah* (Old). However, the transmitted text makes fine sense: given the long list of divinity names occupying most of the four pādas of the vs., the poet chose to signal early that it was a *disjunctive* list; otherwise a *vā* would have to have been placed after every (or almost every) term (and there are 12 different entities) or would have to be postponed till the end of the last pāda. Ge's "Soll ich vielleicht ...?" and Re's "Dois je éventuellement ...?" both capture the force of *vā* nicely; Klein also slightly favors this solution, though he worries about the lack of parallel usages.

Note that the loose cmpd. *nārā-śāmsam* is split by *vā* taking Wackernagel's position.

The referent of *āgohya-* is disputed and unclear. Gr identifies it as Agni; Macdonell (Ved. Myth. 35) suggests it's an epithet of Pūṣan here, but there is no evidence for that elsewhere, and the other passages suggest that he is an independent figure. Re identifies him with Indra in this passage, but gives no evidence. Ge goes rather for Savitar, which is the default (if there is one); see the parenthetic ident. for most of Gr's entries. JPB (pub. intro. to I.161) suggests the sun, but possibly Savitar, the latter identification being the one he favors in the publ. intro. to IV.33. I do not have my own candidate, but it should be noted that the word appears generally in association with the Ṛbhus (though not here). See I.110.3, 161.11–13, V.33.7; the only passage besides ours outside of this context is VIII.98.4, where it seems to be used in adjectival sense ("who cannot be concealed") of Indra. The Ṛbhu passages concern their twelve-day sleep (IV.33.7) "in the house of Agohya" (I.161.11). This may refer to the intercalary days needed to bring the lunar calendar into synch with the solar cycle. Given some of the other potential recipients of the praise in this vs. – Sun and Moon, (New and) Full ['bright'] Moon, Dawn and Night, all entities that regulate time – I wonder if Agohya here refers to the divinity who oversees the intercalary period (who could, of course, be Savitar or the Sun).

The hapax *abhy ārcase* (1x) belongs to the class of *-se* annunciatory 1st singulars in the realm of praising, of which well-attested *stuṣé* is the standard example and presumable source.

Ge (n. 3c) suggests that the dual *candrāmasā* is a pregnant dual dvandva for "Neu- und Vollmond," though he offers as an alternative a mere pleonastic doubling of *sūryāmāśā*. I find his first alternative quite appealing. Although *candrā-mas-* is attested a number of times in the singular, where it seems simply to refer to the moon, this is the only dual form. The dual could easily refer pregnantly to two forms of the moon (Re's "des deux (formes de) Lune"), full and new, of which the "bright, gleaming" (*candrā-*) full moon would be the more conspicuous of the two and give its name to the duo.

There is some disagreement about the scope of *diví*. Ge (fld by the publ. tr.) takes it with immediately preceding *yamám* ("Yama im Himmel"), but Re with *tritám*, despite the intervening pāda boundary – presumably on the basis of Trita's association with heaven elsewhere (see the passages cited by Ge [n. 3c]: V.9.5, 41.4). To me both these interpr. seem too limited and assume that *diví* can only be construed with one immediately adjoining term. I would suggest that *diví*,

which in final position-produces a fine Jagatī cadence, is to be construed with all the elements in the pāda or, better, with the two duals referring to heavenly bodies: *sūryāmāsā candrāmasā*. Elsewhere *divī* doesn't have to immediately adjoin the entity whose position it specifies. I would now slightly alter the tr. to “or the Sun and Moon, (the new and) bright [=full] Moon in heaven, Yama, Trita ...” Note that the pāda-final loc. *sadhāstha ā* in 8c applies to all the terms in its pāda.

Re points out that this is the only passage where *aktú-* is found with *uśás-*, and the phrase *uśásam aktúm* substitutes for the dual dvandva *uśásānāktā*. Given the two dual dvandvas in c, we might expect that dvandva here as well. But that form would produce a very irregular break, as well a bad cadence and hiatus before *asvínā*. One might have expected as substitute here *uśásam *nāktam*, which would have given a somewhat better break (the standard ~ ~ –, rather than the transmitted ~ ~ ~, which, acdg. to Arnold, is considerably less common than the former, but still within his parameters). See VIII.27.2 (ad comm. ad loc.) with the hybrid pāda opening *uśásā nāktam*, with the 1st member of the dual dvandva followed by the sg. of ‘night’. I might almost speculate that a putative original *uśásam *nāktam* in our passage underwent degemination of *-m n-* and the old *nāktam* was replaced by phonetically similar *aktúm*, which lacks the nasal initial. But this probably goes too far.

X.64.4: The poet Gaya uses almost the same words to describe himself in vs. 16 that he applies to Bṛhaspati here: 4a *kathā kavís tuvīrávān ...* / 16a *evā kavís tuvīrávān ...*, ... *gáyaḥ*, thus clearly identifying himself with Bṛhaspati. I wonder if *káyā* in the instr. phrase ending pāda a here, *káyā girā*, is meant to evoke his name.

The stem *ṛkvan-* ‘chanters, versifiers’ usually refers to non-humans, several times of a group connected with Bṛhaspati (VII.10.4, X.14.3), so the instr. *ṛkvan-* here expresses accompaniment, not the agency of human poets creating the call.

X.64.5: The *vā* here seems to add further choices of goods to praise and/or pursue to the ones offered in vs. 4. However, the syntactic structure of the vs. is rather loose. The dual dvandva *mitrávaruṇā* is acc. with *ā vivāsasi*, generally replicating the syntax of vs. 2: god(s) ACC *abhy ārcase*. But M+Vs’ constant partner Aryaman appears in the 2nd hemistich as nominative, though we might expect him to be a third obj. to *ā vivāsasi*. Since there is no finite verb in cd or any obvious predicate, Aryaman simply hangs there, a notional, but not syntactic, object. I do not like the idea, sometimes floated by Ge., of simple reversion to the nominative. Here I think we must interpr. the dual *mitrávaruṇā*, ambiguous between nom. and acc., as the pivot to the nominative in cd. Re is obviously disturbed by the syntactic rupture and re-supplies *ā vivāsasi* and re-establishes the acc. pattern, in a parenthesis that supplies all relevant parts of the sentence and rests on nothing in the text: “(veux-tu le gagner à toi).”

On the first pāda, see the disc. of HPS (*Vrata* p. 74), who strongly asserts Agni as identical to Dakṣa (hesitantly so also Ge, n. 5a); so also tentatively Ge (n. 5a) and JPB (*Ādityas*, 243), as well as the publ. tr. HPS is himself hesitant about whose *vratā-* it is, but JPB argues persuasively that it is Aditi’s, and the publ. tr. follows his view by implication.

Aryaman is called *ātūrtapanthāḥ* and *pāñcahotā* in V.42.1, *purujātāḥ* in VII.35.2.

X.64.6: As discussed ad VIII.103.3, which contains an almost identical pāda, *tmānā* ‘by themselves / himself’ contrasts the individual effort that goes into the winning with the multiplicity of things won (“thousand(s)”). I do not think, with Ge, that *tmānā* should be construed in the simile with *medhāsātau* (“wie bei dem Kampf um die (Dichter)meisterschaft

selbst”). Among other things, in VIII.103 the next vs. also contains *tmānā* juxtaposed with a form containing ‘thousand’ and expressing the same contrast: *tmānā sahasrapoṣiṇam* “who fosters a thousand by himself.”

Re takes *medhāsātāv iva* as a simile with *samithēsu* in d – in his clotted tr. “... dans les compétitions, comme (d’autres font) dans les (occasions où l’on obtient un) gain (pour prix) de l’inspiration-poétique.” But this requires scooping up the simile from the main clause in c and inserting it in the relative clause in d, which would violate standard RVic syntactic practice.

X.64.7: Note the phonetic figure in d: ... *sācante sacītaḥ sácetasah*, with the last two words also an etymological figure. *sācante* also etymologically echoes *sakhyāya* in b.

Ge takes both *sacītaḥ* and *sácetasah* as nom. pl.; on poetic grounds, I prefer Re’s interpr., with one gen. sg., referring to Savitar, and the other nom. pl. Either of them would in fact fit either morphological role.

X.64.8: A somewhat maladroit phonetic and etymological figure in d, *rudrām rudreṣu rudrīyām*, which also serves as a particularly heavy final Behaghel’s Law member.

X.64.10: Ge and Re both give lexical weight to *bṛhaddivā*, both rendering it as an apparent bahuvrīhi (“die im hohen Himmel wohnt,” “celle du haut du ciel”). But it does not have bahuvrīhi accent (as opposed to *bṛhaddiva-*), and it is rather the name of a minor goddess, who appears in company with other such. See II.31.4, where she is found with Idā, Rodasī, and Puramdhi, as well as Tvaṣtar and the wives of the gods as here; V.41.19 with Idā and Urvaśī; V.42.12 with Sarasvatī and Rākā.

On *devébhir jānibhiḥ* see comm. ad II.36.5 (also VI.50.13).

On the morphologically problematic *rāthaspātīḥ* and the possibly associated metrical issue (11-syllable Jagatī) see comm. ad V.50.5.

X.64.11: The first pāda is identical to I.144.7d. I take it as a continuation of the previous vs., whose final pāda (X.64.10d) also begins with *raṇvāḥ*. Ge and Re by contrast construe it with the following pāda, b. Although we generally aim to interpr. RVic vss. as self-contained units, in this case there is a gender clash between pādas a and b, since the subj. of b is fem. *ūpastutiḥ*, which does not match the masc. *raṇvāḥ* in a. One could explain the masc. as attraction to the gender of the simile (m. *kṣāyāḥ*) or, with Bl (ad I.144.7), consider its lack of fit simply a sign that it was secondarily inserted here. But I prefer to consider it an afterthought to 10d.

X.64.12: The series of vocatives in ab, *māruta índra dévāḥ ... varuṇa mitra* displays odd accentuation: the first three are accented, though their position internal to the pāda should not trigger accentuation; the two in b are unaccented, though they occupy the same position as those in pāda a, namely after an early caesura.

Two of the three 2nd pl. act. verb forms in this vs., *ádadāta* (b) and *pīpayata* (c), are morphologically irregular. The first is surely an imperfect to the redupl. pres. *dádāti*, but we should expect a weak form in the pl.; cf. the equivalent form *ádattana* (I.139.7). (Trying to make it into a pluperfect would gain us nothing, since, as far as I can see, that form should be identical.) Unexpected full grade in the 2nd pl. act. (of all types of stems) is not altogether unusual, esp. in the imperative: see *dádāta* (VII.57.6) and *dadātana* (X.36.10) beside *datta* (2x); here it might have spread from the impv. to the impf. As for *pīpayata*, probably (but not

certainly) belonging to the perfect -- in addition to the full-grade root syllable, there is also the thematic vowel. For a 2nd pl. act. impv. to the perfect, we should probably expect **pīpita* (cf. *pīpihī* 2x); a thematized stem with full-grade root syllable should belong to the subjunctive. A subjunctive interpr. might be favored by the undoubted 2nd pl. pres. act. subjunctive *vāhātha* in the next pāda. However, the 2nd pl. act. subj. is supposed only to take the primary ending *-tha*, not *-ta* as here. (Note the undoubted 2nd pl. pf. subj. *bubódhatha* in the next vs., 13b.). Moreover, the pf. to $\sqrt{pī}$ includes a number of apparent thematic forms, though most are built to the weak stem (e.g., likewise 2nd pl. impv. *pīpyata* II.34.6, on which see comm. ad loc.). For disc. of these pseudo-thematic forms see my 2018 “The Vedic Perfect Imperative and the Status of Modal Forms to Tense-Aspect Stems” (Fs. Lubotsky). As for the full-grade root in our *pīpayata*, I think it likely that the tendency for 2nd pl. imperatives to take full grade is at work here; however, it is worth considering Kü’s compromise (p. 300 n. 495): that these impvs. with full grade are “hybride Bildungen zu einem Konjunktiv *pīpáyat*.”

X.64.13: As with 10d and 11a, our pāda a begins like the final pāda of the preceding vs. (12d), with *kuvíd*.

Ge interpr. *yáthā cid* as an indefinite “irgendwie,” followed by Re (“en quelque sorte”) and the publ. tr. (also Hettrich, *Hypotaxe* 149, though without discussion). Such an interpr. fits the context in my opinion: the poet is looking for any kind of acknowledgement of his kinship with the gods. Old argues strenuously against this interpr., on what seem to me fairly weak grounds; he thinks rather that the *yáthā* signals that there’s an intervening syntactic link (“Mittelglied”) between the *kuvíd* and the *yáthā*, which keeps its subordinating function: “Ob doch (es geschehen wird) dass ihr diese Verwandtschaft mit uns wahrnehmen werdet.” I do not see the advantage of this distancing construction, and his rendering seems to ignore the *cit*.

The navel in pāda c is surely, as Ge persuasively argues (n. 13c), a pun, referring both to the Opferaltar, where mortals and gods meet at the ritual, and to the bodily navel as a symbol of kinship, as so often in the RV.

X.64.14: This vs. seems to play on the gendering possibilities and ambiguities of the dual dvandva *dyāvāprthivī* that is its subject. In the first hemistich the cmpd not only displays the feminine grammatical gender that is appropriate to a dvandva with fem. 2nd member: so the introductory fem. du. pronominal adj. *té* and the adj. *yajñīye* (b). But it also aggressively ascribes female characteristics to the pair, identifying the two as dual mothers and great goddesses: *mātārā mahī devī*.

The third pāda is less insistently female, though still grammatically feminine (*ubhé*): the two support/carry/bear both (breeds). The redupl. pres. *bibhṛtaḥ* can express simple non-gendered support; however, it’s worth noting that it can take a mother, esp. Earth as mother, as subject (e.g., X.4.3 *mātā bibharti*; III.55.22 *prthivī bibharti*) and a child or embryo as object (e.g., III.46.5 *gārbham ná mātā bibhṛtaḥ* with both). Given the dual mothers of the 1st hemistich, a female/motherly interpr. might be the first to come to mind.

The final pāda contrastively asserts the masculinity of the same pair, Heaven and Earth. Here both together “sprinkle much seed/semen” (*purū rétāṃsi ... siñcataḥ* -- a decidedly male action and something of a shock after the pervasive motherly focus of the rest of the verse. The participation of the “fathers” (/forefathers/ancestors) is also unexpected and unexplained. I think that they appear here to balance out the “mothers” of the earlier part of the verse and to remind us that Heaven is, outside of this dvandva, both male and the Father par excellence (*dyaús pitā*).

By this interpr. the Pitars are sidekicks to the Ur-Pitar in this male activity. A possible clue to this indirect use of *pitṛbhiḥ* for contrastive purposes may be provided by the *ca* that follows it. This conjunction is oddly placed in its pāda and it seems to be doing none of its usual conjoining work. Klein (DGRV I.103) considers it a clausal *ca* but is hard-pressed to explain what it's doing and why it's so positioned. I suggest that it implicitly – and conceptually -- conjoins *pitṛbhiḥ* with *mātārā* in pāda a, to add up to a dvandva with both genders represented. Admittedly, this is a speculative explanation, but such aberrant usages invite speculation.

The phrase *devān jánman-* raises problems in its various appearances – not only here, but I.71.3 and VI.11.3. On the one hand, the existence of a parallel phrase *devānām jánman-* (I.70.6, VI.51.2 [though see comm. ad loc.], 12; not adjacent IX.81.2) supports the widespread view (Lanman, Noun Infl. 353–54, Old [for some of the passages], Ge, etc.) that *devān* is an archaic (or truncated) gen. pl. On the other, I am generally reluctant to posit such a form, if it is possible to construe the acc. pl. that *devān* appears to be. In both I.71.3 and VI.11.3 an acc. interpr. is possible, but it is very difficult in this passage. I therefore must accept the gen. pl. interpr. here, and at least as an alternate in the other two passages. Whether the form represents a deeply archaic gen. pl. *devām* < *-ōm I do not venture to say.

ubháya- ‘both’ is found fairly regularly with *jánman-* to refer to “both breeds/races [of gods and men]” (e.g., I.31.7, II.6.7, X.37.11), and I therefore “borrow” *jánman-* from pāda b to be head noun, in slightly different sense, for *ubháyam* in c. Given the emphasis on kinship, esp. the joint kinship of gods and men, in this section of the hymn, I am sure this is the primary reading. However, given also the stress on gender opposition in this vs., ‘both’ here might refer to women and men, or mothers and fathers, with an alternative tr. “... support both (males and females / mothers and fathers) ...”

X.64.15: Note the opening figure *ví śā ... víśva(m)*.

The lexeme *ví√naś* here is generally rendered ‘attains, acquires’ (Ge “erlangt,” Re “atteint”), without registering the *ví*. But in nearby X.67.7 the VP *dráviṇam vy ānaṭ* “he reached through to the treasure” is found in a Vala context, with Bṛhaspati as subject, and ‘reach *through*’ is therefore appropriate. He reaches into the Vala cave from outside to take possession of its contents. Since Bṛhaspati is one of the subjects here, I think the lexeme has its full semantic value in our passage as well. For disc. of other uses of *ví√naś* see comm. ad X.27.20.

The passive *ucyáte* (with passive accent) occurs three times with *grāvan-* ‘pressing stone’ as subj. (our passage = X.100.8, as well as V.25.8 with the same phrase in a simile, *grāve vocyate bṛhát*). This quite well-attested verb form otherwise has undoubted passive value in the sense ‘be called’ or, much less frequently, ‘is spoken’. Neither sense works here; the standard response is to tr. it as a simple intrans. ‘sounds, speaks’ (Ge “erklingt,” Re “parle,” Scar [615] “spricht”), but this ignores the unequivocal passive morphology. It almost seems like the passive to a causative, ‘is made to speak’ (though *vācayati* is not attested till Vedic prose and we would expect its passive to be **vācyáte*). I tr. ‘is given voice’ to capture the passive formation and the lack of agency of the stone, in contrast to the “inspired thinkers” (*manīṣīṇaḥ*) of the next pāda, who bellow.

The rt noun cmpd *madhu-śūd* appears to contain the root *√su* ‘press’ (-*sú-t*), and it is generally so analyzed (e.g., Gr, Scars 615) and so rendered in the publ. tr. (and in the standard tr.). Nonetheless, I wonder if there is semantic overlap with the root(s) *√svad* / *sūd* ‘sweeten, prepare’ of ritual offerings. *havya-sūd-* occurs twice, and there is a single occurrence of *saṃ-sūd-* with short root vowel (VIII.17.6), ordinarily ascribed to *√svad*, but see my doubts ad loc. As

Scar (626) says, “Die Alternation °*sūd-* ~ °*-sūd-* ist offenbar metrisch ausgenützt worden.” Since the form in our passage is nom. sg., the final *-d* in sandhi could either be the automatic voicing result of the empty *-t* added to °*su-* ‘press’, or simply reflect the voiced root final of °*sūd* ‘sweeten’. (Though there are two other occurrences of *madhu-ṣút/-d-*, none of them is in a phonologically diagnostic position.) Note that a reading with long vowel *-sūd-* here would produce a slightly better break, but not better enough to justify emendation.

It is not possible to decide whether cd form a separate sentence, with c dependent on the main clause in d – or whether they are parallel clauses and both dependent on the main clause of ab. I have opted for the latter, along with Re and HPS (B+I 127), while Ge and Scar (615) prefer the former. Fortunately almost nothing rests on the choice; I went for independent sentences because cd don’t seem integrally connected with ab semantically.

X.64.16–17: The final vs. of the hymn, 17, is identical to the final vs. of X.63, also 17. Our vs. 16 essentially doubles vs. 17, with relexification. Both begin with a hymn-summary *evā* followed by a nom. of the poet (16 *kavīḥ*, 17 *platēḥ sūnūḥ*), who is later identified as Gaya (16d, 17d). Both vss. contain an augmented redupl. aor. with the general sense ‘strengthen’ (16d *āpīpayat* ‘has swelled’, 17a *avīṛdhat* ‘has strengthened’) whose obj. is the gods or a subset thereof (16d *divyāni jānma* “the divine races,” 17ab *vo vīśva ādityā adīte* “you, o all you Ādityas and Aditi” [or “... o All (Gods), Ādityas, and Aditi”; see comm. ad 63.17]), with the *divyāni jānma* of 16d nearly matched by *jāno divyāḥ* in 17d. Vs. 16 fills out the rest of its bulk with qualifications of the poet and his aims, while the second hemistich of 17 rephrases and emphasizes the poet’s act of praising.

X.64.16: The phrase *kavīs tuvīrāvān*, used here of the poet Gaya, is repeated from vs. 4, where it qualifies Bṛhaspati; Gaya is obviously identifying himself with that eloquent god. See HPS (B+I 127) for further spec.

X.65–66 All Gods

On the poet of these two hymns, Vasukarṇa Vāsukra, and his relatives see the publ. intro. to X.65 – also for the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain that ends both hymns.

X.65 All Gods

X.65.1: This has to be the easiest RVic verse to translate of all the ca. 10,000 vss. in the text – consisting as it does of a series of divine names in the nom., along with a couple of adjectives. Happily the hymn doesn’t stay at this level of simplicity.

X.65.2: The two nom. sgs. that begin vs. 1, *agnīr indrah*, appear in reverse order in the dual dvandva that opens vs. 2, *indrāgnī*, which is to be read quadrisyllabically here—as often, but not invariably, elsewhere. In these quadrisyllabic readings, because the distracted syllable is surrounded by heavy syllables (*indr* and *agn*), its quantity cannot be definitely determined. However, almost all the distracted forms are pāda-initial (as here), and heavy 2nd syllables are favored in trimeter vs. A reading *indrā-agnī* following this pattern would contain the dual *-ā* expected in dual dvandvas (like *indrā-vāruṇā*) – but it must be noted that the other dvandva containing Indra that has only one accent, namely *indra-vāyū*, contains the stem form. So a reading *indra-agnī* is far from excluded. For further on this cmpd see comm. ad VII.35.1.

The phrase *mithó hinvánā tanvā* “spurring each other on mutually” is reminiscent of IV.56.6 *punāné tanvā mitháh* “purifying their own bodies / each other mutually,” of Heaven and Earth. See also X.28.12 *yé hinviré tanvāh* “who urged themselves / each other on,” adduced by Old -- keeping in mind that X.28 is attributed to Vasukra, and our poet has the patronymic Vāsukra.

The subject shifts abruptly from the dual of ab to pl., signaled only by the 3rd pl. verb *ā papruḥ* in c. The default 3rd pl. referent would presumably be the All Gods or else the enumerated list of gods in vs. 1. The next hymn, by the same poet, contains the same VP: X.66.9c *antárikṣam ... ā papruḥ ...* “they filled the midspace,” where the gods (*devāsaḥ* 9d) are the likely subj. However, since Soma is found independently in our pāda d, it would be possible to interpret the subj. of *ā papruḥ* as Indra+Agni plus Soma, though this seems artificial to me.

Scar (550–51) suggests a number of possible interpr. of *ghṛta-śrī-* (4x), without making a definite decision among them. I opt for the simplest, ‘glorious through ghee’, rather than, say, “durch die Schmelzbutter vollkommen [gemacht].” Two of the four occurrences of this stem modify Agni (I.128.4, V.8.3), and ghee is of course completely at home in Agni contexts. One modifies Heaven and Earth, in a passage (VI.70.4), indeed a hymn, where ghee figures prominently as an attribute of H+E – perhaps a reference to rain? But the relevance of ghee to Soma is less clear; judging from the use of the independent stem *ghṛtā-* in Maṇḍala IX, it is used there to refer to the milk with which the soma is mixed, perhaps to indicate how rich and unctuous that milk is. On *-śrī-* cmpds in general see comm. ad III.26.5 and on this cmpd in particular I.128.4.

X.65.3: My construal of the instr. *mahnā* differs from that of Ge and Re. They take it as a sort of internal instr. with gen. pl. *mahatām* “of those great by their greatness,” while I construe it with the 1st sg. verb “By [or perhaps, because of] their greatness I rouse my praises.” Although an internal reading is likely in I.166.11 *mahānto mahnā*, in the other two passages Gr ascribes this syntax to (nearby X.67.12=X.111.4) the *mahnā* also goes with the verb; the standard tr. agree (see also HPS, B+I, 227).

Note that *iyarmi* responds to the part. *īráyan* in 2d, which is built to the secondary *-áya-* stem arising from the redupl. pres. represented by *iyarmi* (weak form *īr-*).

Note the scrambled phonetic figure of *anarváṇām* (a) and (*-am arṇavám* (c); *arṇavám* also participates in a rhyme figure with immed. preceding *apsavám*.

With Ge (n. 3c) I consider *apsavá-* an irregular deriv. to the loc. pl. *apsú*, which, as Ge points out, sometimes serves as a pseudo-stem (*apsu-kṣít-*, etc.). By contrast, Gr considers it a cmpd. with *-savá-*, glossing the cmpd ‘Wasser spendend’ -- with the 2nd member *savá-* ‘impulse, stimulus’ belonging to $\sqrt{sū}$ ‘impel’. But ‘water’ does not appear to serve as an object to this verb and the semantics would have to be somewhat attenuated. It’s also worth noting that uncompounded *savá-* ‘impulse’ never appears in a context without at least one other form from $\sqrt{sū}$. Although AiG II.2.96 follows the *-savá-* interpr., Deb does point out that it would have to be a nom. agentis here, though *savá-* and its various cmpds with preverbs are nom. actionis – another argument against this interpr.

However we interpr. *apsavá-*, we must reckon with the absence of a verb in the rel. cl. of c. Ge (n. 3c) supplies the verb from the main cl. in d (*rāsantām*). But this brings the further problem of how to construe the acc. phrase *apsavám arṇavám*. The easiest solution is Ge’s, to take it as obj. of the supplied ‘give’ (“die die Wasserflut (spenden)”), but I think we are hoping the gods will give us something more appealing than water. I take the bahuvrīhi *citrá-rādhas-* lit.

‘possessing bright bounties’ as pregnantly expressing our hope: that the gods who possess these bounties will grant them to us. As for the acc. *apsavām arṇavām*, I take it as an unsigned acc. of extent: “(across) the watery flood” – the space that the gods will traverse in bringing these gifts. Cf., e.g., I.19.7 *tiráḥ samudrām arṇavām*. Re’s solution is even more radical: he seems to supply the verb ‘possess’ extracted from the bahuvrīhi *citrā-rādhās-* and construe *apsavām arṇavām* as its obj. “eux qui ... (possèdent) l’océan aux (riches) eaux,” a syntactic sleight of hand that stretches the boundaries.

Pāda d poses its own problems. Most importantly, the morphological identity and function of *mahāye* are unclear. The standard view (Gr, Ge, Re) is that it’s a dative infinitive; Gr assigns it to a hapax stem *mahí-* (different from the NA *máhi*), while in contrast Re asserts that the infinitive is built to the *-āya-* verbal stem *mahāya-*. (Ge does not pronounce on the morphology, though his tr. [“um (unseren Mut) zu erhöhen”] reflects an infinitival interpr.) Neither of the morphological analyses is appealing. Though *-ti-* stems regularly build *-taye* infinitives, dative infinitives to straight *-i-* stems are fewer and less well established, save for a few well-known exx. like *drśāye*; see Keydana’s detailed disc. (*Infinitive im Rgveda* 212–19, which concludes with an indecisive treatment of this very form and passage. But Re’s solution seems to invent a category: treating the *-āy-* of the verb stem as if it were a root noun onto which a dative *-e* could be slapped. He also fails to mention that the standard way to make an infinitive to *-āya-* stems is with *-dhyai* – e.g., *mādayádhyai*, *vartayádhyai*; we should expect **mahayádhyai* here. I propose a more radical reinterp.: to take *mahāye* as a finite verb, the 1st sg. middle of the verb stem *mahāya-* ‘magnify’, beginning a new clause and therefore accented. Though most of the forms to this stem are act., 1st sg. verbs of praising have a tendency towards middle voice, and see also the technically middle *-anta* replacement form in III.3.3. If *mahāye* is a 1st sg., it echoes the semantically similar *stómām iyarmi* in pāda b; see also *maháyantaḥ* in the next vs. (4c).

However, this reconfiguration of the syntax requires a different interpr. of following *sumitryāḥ*, which must then belong to the *mahāye* clause. This form, found only here in the RV, is standardly taken as nom. pl. masc. agreeing with the *té*, subject of *rāsantām*, but that is not possible under my new interpr. of *mahāye*. I take it as a fem. acc. pl., modifying **vísāḥ* ‘(heavenly) clans’ to be supplied. Although this might seem arbitrary, note that in nearby X.69 (not attributed to the same poet, however), vs. 1 contains the phrase *sumitrā vísāḥ* “well-allied clans,” with the base adj. *sumitrā-*. For divine clans, see, e.g., VIII.75.8 *devānām vísāḥ*.

X.65.4: The phonetic manipulation found in the last vs., with the pair *anarváṇam ... -am arṇavām*, is continued by the first word in this vs. (*s^u*)*varṇaram*. Note also the final words of c and d: *surātāyaḥ# ... sūrāyaḥ#*.

On *svārṇara-* see comm. ad IX.70.6.

The opening of b is striking for the *prthivīm* doubling the second member of the dual dvandva *dyāvābhūmī*. As Ge points out (n. 4b), a similar doubling is found in the phrase *dyāvākṣāmā prthivī* in I.102.2, III.8.8 (on which see comm. ad I.102.2). In such configurations *prthivī-* may show its origin as an epithet of the earth (‘the broad one’) rather a word for earth itself.

On *skambhuḥ* see comm. ad VI.72.2, where the competing interpr. as de-redupl. pf. or root aor. are weighed and Kü’s extensive disc. is noted. As indicated there, I do not have a strong feeling either way, but Kü’s desire to see a “generell-zeitlos” sense in the contexts of these verbs, to justify an aor. injunctive interpr., seems to me unnecessary.

On *prkṣā-* see comm. ad II.34.3.

The participle *mahāyantaḥ*, though picking up *mahāye* from 3d, has the gods as subject. This may be a playful reversal on the poet's part, since his audience would expect humans to be the subj. The last pāda also presents the gods in a role generally associated with humans, that of "(sacrificial) patron" (*sūrī-*), a role they also assume in the next hymn (X.66.2). For the object of *mahāyantaḥ* I borrow the accusatives from ab; Ge supplies "Mut," Re "l'homme," with no obvious support for either choice.

X.65.5: Ge (flg. Ludwig) and Re construe *dāśūṣe* at the end of pāda a with the rel. cl. that occupies the next pāda (e.g., Ge: "die gegen die Spender ... nie gleichgütig werden"). This is (barely) syntactically possible: the rel. pronoun *yā* would be in 2nd position flg this dative. However, I think this type of configuration is unlikely (/nonexistent?) when the rel. prn. opens a pāda. Moreover, dat. *dāśūṣe* immediately follows dative *vāruṇāya*, which adjacency suggests they belong together. Especially because the very same phrase, *vāruṇāya dāśūṣe*, occurs in the very same position in the following vs. (6c; see also X.113.5), where both Ge and Re bow to the need to construe them together (and in n. 5a Ge expresses doubts about his interpr. of the word in 5). The four-square construction of vs. 5, with a clause occupying each pāda (the last three of which are introduced by rel. prns.) also speaks against their interpr. Obviously the reason Ge/Re separated the two datives in this vs. is that *dāśvāms-* is almost exclusively applied to humans (though see comm. ad X.104.6). But we have already noted, in the previous vs. (4), this hymn's tendency to attribute human ritual roles to gods, and this would be the same phenomenon.

Pāda c is notable for containing both *dhāman-* and *dhárman-*, which, however, seem easy to separate in this context.

On *vṛt-* see comm. ad VII.98.4.

nādhasī is a hapax. See Old's disc. He flirts with the poss. of a long-īloc., but opts in the end for a dual.

X.65.6: Flg. Ge (n. 6a), I tentatively interpr. the cow as the offering ladle; there is similar phraseology in III.7.2, as he points out.

Note the echoes between *vartanīm* (a) and *vrataniḥ* (b), already pointed out by Old – to which we can add immed. flg. *avārātaḥ*. All of these prepare the way for *vāruṇāya* in c.

In the rt. noun cmpd. *vrataniḥ*, rather than taking *vrata-* as the obj. of *-niḥ* (e.g., Re: "qui conduit le vœu (divine)," I interpr. it as an instr. adverbial, "leading according to / by / at the commandment (of Varuṇa)." For a very similar configuration see X.16.2 *devānām vaśanīḥ* "leading at the will of the gods" and comm. ad loc. I supply "of Varuṇa" because he is the standard possessor of *vratas*, and he is quite prominent in this set of vss. (5–6, 8). See esp. 8c *vāruṇāya sāvrate* "(the two) obeying the same commandment to Varuṇa."

My interpr. of *avārātaḥ* roughly follows Ge's (who follows Sāy.'s), namely that it is derived from √ *vṛ-* 'choose'. Both Sāy. and Ge think it means "without seeking something for herself" (Ge: "ohne sich etwas auszubitten"), whereas my "not by choice" is in implicit contrast to *vrataniḥ* "leading by the commandment (of Varuṇa)" – that is, she does not control her own ritual movements but follows what has been established by Varuṇa. However, it is easier to get the Sāy./Ge meaning, from *vāra-* 'choice (thing), thing of value' (through accent shift in the adverbial *-taḥ* formation [see, e.g., *ubháya-* : *ubhayátaḥ*]), than from *vāra-* 'choice', so 'not because of a thing of value' is a possible alternative. It must be admitted, however, that the Sāy./Ge/SJ interpr. of this form is not the standard one, which is as a deriv. of *ávāra-* 'near (side),

with *avārātaḥ* supposedly meaning ‘from here / this side’ (e.g., Re: “de ce côté-ci”). See Gr, AiG III.591, EWA s.v. *āvara-*; although the long *ā* might seem to be a stumbling block, VS (+) has *avārā-* ‘the nearer (bank)’, *avāryā-* ‘near(er)’, matching the semantic opposite, *pārā-* ‘far bank’ beside *pāra-* ‘farther’ (see esp. AiG III.591). The problem for me is that ‘from this side’, even interpr. as ‘from this world’, doesn’t make much sense in context.

I take the middle part. *prabruvāṇā* as passive (or possibly reflexive, ‘announcing herself’); so also Re. However Ge supplies “(das Opfer)” as obj., and it is true that most of the forms of this part. take an object. Nonetheless, though the interpr. is possible, I don’t think supplying an object is necessary.

Note the allit. *dāsūṣe*, *devébhyo dāśad dhavīṣā*, with the allit. of the last word produced by sandhi.

X.65.7–8: The poet takes pleasure in mixing and contrasting forms from the two phonologically similar roots $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ and $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘rule’: 7a *divākṣasaḥ*, 8a *parikṣitā*, 8b *kṣayataḥ*, along with, as a wildcard, *sāmokasā* to an entirely different root.

X.65.7: The adj. found here as nom. pl. *divākṣasaḥ* (also as gen. sg. in III.7.2; nom. sg. *divākṣā(s)* III.30.21) raises a number of formal and semantic questions. It is ordinarily (Gr, Ge, Re) taken to mean ‘dwelling in heaven’, even though already in AiG II.1 (1905) Wack assigned its second member to $\sqrt{kṣā}$ ‘rule’ (II.1.127, etc.), an analysis fld by EWA (I.427) and Scar (92–93). If the 1st member *divā-* stands for gen. sg. *divās* (gen. cml. to verb of ruling), as Wack. takes it, the absent final *-s* needs explanation. Wack (loc. cit.) attributes it to the loss of final *-s* before a cluster consisting of stop + sibilant (his three exx. all involve *-kṣ-*), somewhat refined by Scar to dissimilatory cluster simplification (with ? after “dissimilatorische”). If the 2nd member is a root noun, we need also to account for the 1st-member accent and, even more crucially, the apparent *s*-stem gen. sg. / nom. pl. These could be explained by positing not a root-noun 2nd member, but an *-as* stem built to the zero-grade root, as Scar suggests, which seems to me to be the best overall solution. But this makes the nom. sg. in III.30.21 problematic, because it immediately precedes *asī* in a pāda that has two many syllables. An asigmatic *divākṣā + asī*, contracted to **divākṣāsī*, would provide a metrical solution, but neither a root noun nor an *as*-stem should be asigmatic in the nom. sg. (See comm. ad loc. for the likely double-sandhi solution, provided by HvN.) For the various formal problems in these forms see Scar’s disc. (92–93). His positing of a parallel *-an*-stem to account for the nom. sg. in III.30.21 seems de trop, but the *-as*-stem he suggests instead of a root noun seems quite plausible.

On the anomalous accent of the bahuvrīhi *agni-jīhvā-* see AiG II.1.297, which, however, does not give a satisfactory account of it.

The lexeme $\sqrt{mṛś}$ is found in the RV only here and in X.88.16, in the AV at AVŚ XIII.1.8 = AVP XVIII.15.8. Although the root $\sqrt{mṛś}$ clearly means ‘touch’, often in a forthrightly physical sense (see the hyper-sexual *ūpopa me pārā mṛśa* in I.126.7 and the sad fate of the gambler’s wife in X.34.4 *anyé jāyām pári mṛśanty asya*), the standard tr. attenuate the meaning here to something like “think about” (Ge’s gloss “überdenkend” of his own tr. “beführend”; Re’s “considérant-en-leur-pensée”). These mental interpr. are probably based on the other attestation of the lexeme in X.88.16 *mānasā vímṛṣtam* “‘stroked’ by his mind,” but surely the *mānasā* there is meant to signal that the use of $\sqrt{mṛś}$ is metaphorical, rather than to indicate that the root itself has a fundamental mental rather than physical application. In the same manner that I always argue when the standard interpr. flatten or attenuate the sense of a word or

lexeme, I would point out here that the RV has numerous roots that fall squarely in the domain of thinking, considering, etc., and therefore when the poet chooses to use instead a fairly rare root with a specific, non-mental sense, he is aiming to plug that specific sense into a context that might not seem immediately receptive to it – such is the RVic poetic enterprise.

What the gods are stroking is the *ṛtasya yóni-* ‘womb of truth’, a common trope for the ritual ground (see also 8b). Here it probably refers to the part of the ground prepared as seats for the gods, where in fact they are sitting (*āsate*). Although I considered the possibility that *vimṛśanta āsate* is a periphrasis for the present progressive, with *√ās* as an auxiliary (“keep stroking” vel sim.), I think we should take *āsate* in its full lexical value here as indicating the gods’ physical location and posture at the ritual.

The 2nd hemistich contains two examples of the *-tvī* gerund, *skabhītvī*(c) and *janītvī*(d). The example in c, *dyām skabhītvī ... ójasā*, echoes 4b *dyāvābhūmī ... skambhur ójasā*, and this echo suggests that *ójasā* in our pāda should be construed with the gerund, not the finite verb, despite the word order (and *pace* Ge, Re, and the publ. tr.): “having propped up heaven with their might, they ...”

The verb in d, *māmṛjuḥ*, belongs to the root *√mṛj* ‘wipe’, which is phonologically similar to, and in some derivatives phonetically indistinguishable from, *√mṛś*, which we met in b. The roots are semantically similar as well, particularly in idioms like this. For the sense of *nī√mṛj* ‘clasp (to oneself)’, see comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3, X.39.14. The intimate physical relationship between the gods and the sacrifice is strongly signaled in these two pādas (b, d). The post-caesura portion of this pāda, *tanvī ní māmṛjuḥ*, is also found in the next hymn, X.66.9, though with a different object. See disc. there.

X.65.8: The rt noun cmpd *parikṣīt-* occurs 3x in the RV, always in the dual. Twice (here and III.7.1) it is used of Heaven and Earth identified as *pitārā*. (The third occurrence, in I.123.7, is usually also interpr. as H+E, but I prefer Night and Dawn there; see comm. ad loc.) How exactly it applies to H+E is a little uncertain. I take it to mean that they ‘encircle’ or ‘surround’ the space between them, that is the surface of the earth where human life takes place and the midspace, here perhaps defined more narrowly as the ritual ground that is the conceptual center of this space. It is mildly noteworthy that the occurrence of this cmpd in III.7.1 is found in a vs. immediately preceding one of the three occurrences of *divákṣas-* (III.7.2), which here is found in similar proximity, in the preceding vs., X.65.7.

Like X.64.14 in the immediately preceding hymn (attributed to a different poet), this vs. plays on the different genders of the gendered pair Heaven and Earth. Their dual designation here, *pitārā* ‘two fathers’ (for ‘(mother and) father’), of course explicitly references the masc., and the preceding dual adj. *parikṣītā* could be equally masc. or fem. But the immediately following adj. *pūrvajāvarī* is not only fem. but has the archaic, inherited, synchronically suppletive fem. *-ar(-ī)* suffix associated with *-an-*stems (type *pīvan-* / *pīvarī-*). Discomfort with the gender mismatch is perhaps conveyed by Re’s curious tr. of *pitārā* as “les deux mères” – or it may be a rare lapse.

The finite verb in b, *kṣayataḥ*, is perfectly ambiguous: it can be the pres. indicative of *√kṣā* ‘rule’, as the publ. tr. takes it, or the pres. subjunctive of *√kṣi* ‘dwell’: ‘they two will dwell’. Opinions are divided: Ge, HPS (Vrata 97), and Scar (92) opt for “herrschen” (though Ge allows for either in n. 8b); Re and JPB (Ādityas 110–11) for ‘rule’ (though Re doesn’t tr. as subjunctive). I now think that choosing one is unduly restrictive, given the apparently deliberate fluidity of the *-kṣ-* forms in these two vss., and would now slightly emend the tr. to “rule / will

dwelling.”

The final word of the pāda b, *sāmokasā* ‘having the same house’, appears to echo the first word of vs. 7, *divākṣasaḥ*, esp. for those who interpret the latter as ‘dwelling in heaven’ (rather than ‘ruling over heaven’, as is now the norm; see above). But even though *ókas* contributes to the -kṣ- play in this sequence as well as to the semantic play, it is of course etymologically unrelated to $\sqrt{kṣi}$.

I construe *vāruṇāya* with *sávrata* since vratas are Varuṇa’s special province. The question then is whether the dat. *mahiṣāya* in the next pāda is coreferential with *vāruṇāya*, as in the publ. tr. (as well as explicitly Gr, Re, JPB [Ādit. 110–11]). If, as Ge and JPB assert, the “ghee-filled milk” is really rain, a substance that H+E do indeed have in their control, then the identification makes sense, esp. given Varuṇa’s growing association with the waters. (That the next vs. begins with the dvandva *parjanya-vātā*, two divinities associated with storm and the atmosphere may support the ‘rain’ interpr.) But if the *ghṛtāvat páyaḥ* is more closely tied to the ritual, a different referent might be more appropriate, esp. since, as far as I know, this would be the only passage in which Varuṇa is identified as a *mahiṣā*-. Indra and Soma are both regularly called *mahiṣā*- and both would be likely beneficiaries of the swelling of milk on the ritual ground. It is, of course, quite possible, that *mahiṣāya* is meant to be ambiguous here.

X.65.9: This enumerative vs. seems to return us to vs. 1, though the syntactic frame changes in midstream: ab are presumably in the nominative (though this is signalled only by the last three words, the singulars *vāruṇo mitró aryamā* – the rest is in the dual and could just as well be acc.), but the divinities in c are in the acc. and the objects of *havāmahe*.

As was just noted, the dvandva *parjanya-vātā* seems to pick up the theme of rain from 8d, esp. given the adj. *purīṣiṇā* ‘overflowing’. Ge also appositely cites VI.49.6 on this quality.

The final pāda is an expansion of the enumeration in a relative clause – a variant of the “X and which Y” type, without overt conjunction. It is oddly framed by a rel. prn. at the beginning and the end: #*yé* ... *yé*#. All three terms in between are locational, but the first two are adjectives in the nom. pl., the last a locative. A slightly more faithful tr. might be “(those) who are earthly (and) heavenly (and) who are in the waters,” with the two *yé*’s associated with the two different constructions.

X.65.10: Another enumerative vs., this time couched entirely in the acc. These accusatives are presumably governed by *īmahe* ‘we beseech’, which is the absolute final word of the vs., though it’s possible instead to carry over *havāmahe* ‘we summon’ from the previous vs. (9c); it hardly matters.

The rel. prn. *yá* in the Saṃhitā text could reflect either sg. *yáḥ* or pl. *yé*. Either would be possible in context, since there are potential antecedents in both sg. (Tvaṣṭar, Vāyu) and pl. (Ṛbhus) and the verb in the rel. cl., *óhate*, can also be sg. or pl. (see below). Most tr. and interpr. (incl. the publ. tr.) opt for the sg. *yáḥ*, flg. the Pp as well as Sāy., with Vāyu as the likely antecedent (and voc. *ṛbhavaḥ* interposed). I would not rule out a pl. interpr. with *ṛbhavaḥ* as antecedent, since a rel. cl. dependent on a voc., even a rel. cl. in the 3rd ps., does not seem wildly outlandish to me. This would produce an alt. tr. “... o (you) Ṛbhus, who vaunt themselves.” Since the rel. cl. has no specific content – every god is always available for praise or self-praise – there are no contextual clues that favor one interpr. over the other. I favor the sg. interpr., since it avoids the implicit change of person. It is also possible that the rel. cl. identifies another individual who vaunts himself or who (per Ge, Re, JSK [Part. u 162]) considers himself

an Rbhu, but this seems to introduce further syntactic complications without much gain in content.

The verb *óhate* and its relatives are slippery both morphologically and functionally, as was disc. esp. ad V.52.10. A number of its occurrences belong to a root present; see the athematic participle, *óhāna-* ~ *ohāná-* and the clear (II.23.16, V.52.10, 11) or likely (VII.66.12) 3rd pl. *óhate*. However, most of the occurrences of *óhate* are singular (as is 2nd sg. *ohase* VIII.80.9; on *ohase* in I.30.4, see comm. ad loc.). These presumably began life as subjunctives to the root present, but subjunctive value is not prominent or necessary in a number of passages (like this one), and it seems likely that the stem *óha-* was reinterpr. as a 1st class present. On the morphology see Narten (Fs. Kuiper 10–12 = KISch 98–100) and Gotō (1st Kl. 81). As for semantics, see comm. ad V.52.10. Although a few forms appear to be transitive with the sense ‘solemnly proclaim’ (esp. I.30.4) like some forms of the corresponding Aves. verb *√aog*, most are either reflexive ‘proclaim oneself (as), vaunt oneself’ or passive ‘are praised (as)’. (Most of the passages Gr identifies as having an acc. obj. should be otherwise interpr; see the publ. tr. of and comm. on the particular passages.) Verbs of praising have a tendency to slip into reflexive and then passive value.

The epithet *vṛtrakhādā-* ‘gnawer of Vṛtra’ occurs 3x in the RV, twice clearly of Indra (as we might expect) (III.45.2, 51.9). Here it appears to modify Bṛhaspati, since it is placed between the name Bṛhaspati and an epithet that is more appropriate to that god, *sumedhás-* ‘of good wisdom’. Since gnawing Vṛtra is distant from Bṛhaspati’s usual sphere of operations, we might interpr. the epithet here as indirectly inserting Indra in the list of invoked deities; or we can simply take the assignment of the epithet to Bṛhaspati at face value. Certainly HPS (B+I 32) takes it as modifying B.

Although *dhanasā(h)* is simply a nom. pl. modifier of the unexpressed subj. (“we”) of *īmahe*, it may implicitly express purpose (“so that / such that we win the stakes”).

I do not understand the position and function of *u*. JSK (Part. *u* 162) suggests that it’s conjoining *havāmahe* (9c) and *īmahe* (10d). I would almost prefer to claim that it connects the morphologically non-parallel purpose expressions *svastáye* (b) and *dhanasā(h)* (d).

X.65.11: This vs. contains three predicated pres. participles (a: *janáyanta(h)*, c: *roháyantaḥ*, d: *visṛjántaḥ*) in the nom. plural and no finite verb. This structure is particularly clear because the vs. cannot be taken as syntactically dependent on the previous vs., whose 1st pl. subj. “we” cannot perform the cosmogonic deeds described in this vs., or as anticipating the next vs., whose subj. is the Aśvins in the 2nd dual. The plural subject in our vs. is not identified, but presumably it’s the gods in general or some subset of them, perhaps the ones invoked in the previous vs(s).

X.65.12: Four of the Aśvins’ good deeds, briskly summarized one per pāda. The tenses are oddly varied: a: pres. *pīpṛthaḥ*; b: aug. impf. *ajīnvatam*; c: pf. *ūhathuḥ*; d: pres. *sṛjathaḥ*. I have no explanation for this temporal grab bag.

On Viṣṇāpū see Remmer (Frauennamen 39–40) and comm. ad X.39.7.

X.65.13: And now we have a nomenclatural grab bag. On Pāvīravī see Remmer (96), though there is little to say. The name is also found in VI.49.7, which also contains Sarasvatī; the previous vs. in that hymn, VI.49.6, also has the dual dvandva *parjányāvātā* found in our vs. 9, in similar context.

X.65.14: Pāda a condenses the second hemistich of vs. 13, though eliminating Sarasvatī; the second pāda simply expands on *vísve devāh*.

On the *rātiṣāc*- see comm. ad VIII.28.2; on *abhiṣāc*- see Scar (587–88). It's worth noting that in III.51.2 *abhiṣāc*- is immediately followed by *svarvíd*-, as it is here.

Ge takes *svâr* in d as part of the subject, rather than part of the object as I (and Scar do [Re has a more complex take]). Although removing *svâr* from the object phrase produces a more thematically unified object (songs, formulation, and hymn – all verbal products), the pāda break speaks for the acc. interpr., as does the fact that the subjects are “sun-finders” and so should not include the sun him/itself.

X.65.15: The 2nd hemistich is identical to VII.35.15 (likewise a hymn-final vs.), whose pāda b is identical to our 14b. The final pāda of our vs. and of VII.35.15 is of course the Vasiṣṭha clan refrain, and it is therefore at home in VII.35 in the Vasiṣṭha maṇḍala. VII.35 is an enumerative hymn, like this one, and includes some of the same minor divinities: the Escorts and Gift-escorts (VII.35.11c), Sarasvatī along with insights (11b), and Aja Ekapad (13a). The first pāda of our vs. also identifies Vasiṣṭha as the praiser in our hymn. It is not possible to say whether our poet is borrowing the mantle of Vasiṣṭha or belongs to Vasiṣṭha's poetic lineage, or perhaps just plundered VII.35. See the publ. intro. for indecisive disc.

X.66 All Gods

This hymn is even more focused on divine enumeration than the last one and contains a capacious catalogue, including many minor divinities. In this it is even closer to the spirit of VII.35 than X.65 is. Its final vs. is identical to the immed. preceding hymn, X.65.15, and thus also links the hymn to Vasiṣṭha. In fact the penultimate vs. (X.66.14) makes a strong claim to the poetic lineage of the Vasiṣṭhas and their eponymous ancestor.

X.66.2: Since the *yé* at the beginning of the second pāda follows an opening pāda containing only a single constituent, I consider it to have domain over the whole hemistich, which provides a more satisfactory structure.

On *mánma dhīmahi* see comm. ad X.36.5.

With Ge and Re (also AiG II.2.132) I take *māghone* as an abstract, ‘generosity’. It is tempting, however, to interpret this vṛddhi deriv. of *maghávan*- as more directly related to the usual referent of that epithet, i.e., as meaning ‘associated with the Maghavan=Indra’, and construe it with *vṛjáne* in c, as a parallel to *marudgaṇe*: “... on the community having the Maruts as their troop and associated with Indra.” This is exactly what Sāy. does (*māghone maghavata indrasya sambandhini*). Given the pāda break I think the Ge/Re/publ.tr. interpr. is probably better, but the other is at least lurking.

As in its companion hymn X.65, pāda d attributes ritual roles to the gods that are usually filled by mortals; see comm. ad X.65.4.

X.66.4: The first hemistich is couched in the nominative, although only the first term, *áditiḥ*, is unequivocally nom.; the others could alternatively be acc., because they are dual dvandvas, neuters, or, in the case of *marútaḥ*, a consonant stem identical in nom./acc. pl. The second half-verse is entirely and unequivocally in the acc., to be construed with *havāmahe*.

X.66.5: *sárasvān dhībhiḥ* is a variant of *sárasvatī sahá dhībhiḥ* in the preceding hymn (X.65.13; cf. also VII.35.11). The masc. figure *sárasvant-* is of course far less prominent than the goddess/river *Sarasvatī*. I do not now why he was introduced here as a substitute for the feminine.

The abstract *mahimā* ‘Greatness’ is an anomaly in the list of gods’ names in b, though of course English speakers would have no trouble interpreting (His/Your) Highness or (His/Your) Majesty in such a list. Re’s suggestion that it is the Greatness of Indra seems plausible; see the passages cited by Ge (n. 5b) where *mahimán-* stands in for Indra.

Ge’s suggestion (n. 5c) that the Maruts are the formulation-makers (*brahmakṛtaḥ*) also seems plausible. As we see in passages like V.52.1, 5 the Maruts are praisers as well as recipients of praise.

X.66.6: It is unclear how large the domain of the impv. *santu* is. I take it as extending through the whole vs., or at least the first hemistich (with appropriate adjustment in number), while Ge’s tr. implies that only the 2nd part of pāda a falls under its sway. In a verse of this banality it scarcely matters.

The unbroken predication of *vṛṣan-* in a series is strongly reminiscent of the first part of the Atri hymn V.40, esp. vss. 1–3.

X.66.7: The bulls continue in this vs., but at least they have a little more to do.

X.66.8: The hapax root noun cmpd. *yajñā-niṣkṛt-* is unusual in apparently cmpding a root noun both with a nominal and with a preverb; this type (NOMINAL–PREVERB √ROOT) is rare to non-existent. See Scar (649 and n. 921) and my 2020 *iṣudhyā-* (Fs. Lamberterie): 486–87, as well as my forthcoming “Limits on Root-noun Compounds in Indo-Iranian.” In fact, the next phrase, *adhvarāṇām abhiśrī-*, may illustrate the point (see below). As for this cmpd., see Scar (78–79), who suggests that it results from confusion between synonymous *nīṣ* √ *kṛ* and *iṣ* √ *kṛ*, the latter an idiom with a synchronically unanalyzable pseudo-preverb. He even suggests an underlying form **yajñam-iṣkṛt-*, with an accusative, which was reanalyzed as *yajñā-niṣkṛt-*. Although this last suggestion seems fanciful (or desperate), a confusion between the two idioms may have led to the creation of this anomalous form.

The cmpd *abhiśríyaḥ* is of course plural, but “full glories” does not go well in English; *adhvarāṇām* is also plural, despite the singular rendering in the publ. tr. (a lapse). For this phrase GEN *abhiśrī-* I would now substitute “excelling in glory over the ceremonies,” parallel to VI.70.1 *bhúvanānām abhiśríyā* “excelling in glory over the creatures.” The root noun *abhiśrī-* is generally construed with a genitive, and the *abhi-* suggests the notion of superiority or dominance over. This interpr. differs somewhat from that given by Scar (547–48) and the lit. cited there. It is striking that, beside our phrase *adhvarāṇām abhiśrī-* (here and VIII.44.7), there exists a cmpd *adhvara-śrī-* (5x). Scar (545–46) is hard pressed to account for the construction and interpr. of the cmpd, but I wonder if it represents an underlying **adhvara-abhi-śrī-*, with both nominal and preverb. The cmpd. has expelled the preverb because root noun cmpds can have only two members (see immed. above, on *yajñā-niṣkṛt-*). This would be exactly parallel to the expulsion I hypothesize in an original **iṣu-prati-dhādh-* ‘arrow-aiming’, resulting in **iṣu-dh-*, in my 2020 article cited above. The full phrase *adhvarā+abhi-śrī-* would be preserved with the gen. pl. of the nominal and the preverb+root noun, as here.

X.66.9: The injunctive *janayan* is one of only two 3rd pl. active injunctives to this stem, where we expect instead the likewise transitive *janayanta* with *-anta* replacement. The other is in nearby X.61.7; see disc. there and my 1979 *-anta* replacement article (IJ 21), esp. p. 154.

The phrase *abhí vratā* is difficult to parse. Most tr. take it as a separate prep. phrase, loosely construed: So Ge “für die heiligen Werke,” Re “selon les vœux (divins)” (commenting that the phrase “resolves” a compd. **abhivratam* [no accent given]), HPS (Vrata 63) “um der Gelübde willen.” The publ. tr., “to their commandments,” is of this type, though it might be easier to interpr. as “according to their commandments” or, with a looser gloss of *vratā*-, “to their standards.” I think some version of this interpr. is probably correct, but it is possible that *vratā* is simply another object to *janayan*; cf. VII.75.3 *janáyanto daívyāni vratāni*. This, however, would leave *abhí* stranded; it’s difficult, though perhaps not impossible, to take it as a preverb in tmesis with *janayan*. For another problematic ex. of *abhí vratā*, see VIII.32.28 and comm. thereon.

Note that *āpah* in b shows the occasional substitution of nom. pl. for acc. pl. in this stem. It is noteworthy here because in the previous vs. the last pāda begins with a correct acc. pl. *apāḥ* (X.66.8d); however, the c pāda of the next vs. (X.66.10c) begins exactly like our pāda, *āpa śadhīḥ*, where the nominative is correct. Cf. also other exx. of this pāda opening (V.41.11, VII.34.25 with expected nom. – though cf. also the acc. *apā śadhīḥ* in VI.39.5). It is possible that the redactors altered our phrase to match the nearly identical expression in the following verse; since sandhi across the pāda boundary would have amalgamated the final and initial vowels to *vratāpa śadhīḥ*, the only change would have been the erasure of the accent on the putative acc. **apāḥ* (that is, **vratāpā*).

In c the form *svāra* raises questions. Ge (n. 9c) simply pronounces it an honorary instr. and tr. “mit Sonnenlicht” (sim. HPS, Vrata 63). Re attenuates the sense but leaves the grammar intact, tr. “le ciel” as a second obj. to “fill.” I am reluctant to tamper with either morphology or sense, though I’m not sure what filling the sun would actually mean. Kü (372) also takes this austere road.

The last part of d, *tanvī ní māmṛjuḥ*, is found identically in the companion hymn, X.65.7d. There the gods clasped to themselves the sacrifice they had just created; here the object is both more intangible and more comprehensive: their “will” (*vāśa*-). I take this to mean that they have fully appropriated and deployed the motivation and ability to effect the actions described in the earlier parts of the vs.

X.66.10: With the gen. phrase *mahiśāsya tanyatōḥ* both Ge and Re supply a head noun ‘master’, modifying the dual dvandva *vātāparjanyaś*. This is certainly possible, but I think it is also possible that the relationship between Wind + Thunderstorm and thunder is meant to be more open-ended. Unfortunately the publ. tr., which reflects this idea, is hard to interpr.

X.66.11: The formation of *tanayitnú-* here differs from *tanyatú-* in the preceeding vs. (10b) as well as in the preceding hymn (X.65.13), and I’m not sure what, if any, distinction is meant to be drawn. I tr. *tanyatú-* as “Thunder” and *tanayitnú-* as “Thundering,” but this is simply to register the difference in formation. Note esp. that X.65.13 contains the sequence *tanyatúr ékapād ajāḥ*, which seems a minimal reverse reordering of our *ajā ékpāt tanayitnúḥ*—which might suggest that *tanyatú-* and *tanayitnú-* refer to the same entity. Since sorting out these minor divinities is difficult anyway, I won’t speculate further.

In d we may have two different groups – the All Gods *and* my patrons – or the gods may be identified as my patrons, with patrons an appositive. The position of *utá* could be compatible

with either reading, conjoining all of d with the list in abc or conjoining the two terms of d. The standard interpr. (Ge, Re; also JSK, DGRV I.335) opt for the former, but it's worth noting (as Ge does, n. 11d) that the gods were identified as patrons (same word *sūrāyaḥ*) and creators of the sacrifice in vs. 2, and so the second possibility is a strong one.

X.66.12: Ge/Re take *mānavah* as 'humans' and as modifying the 1st pl. subject of *syāma* ("may we humans be ..."). The publ. tr. "might we be Manu-s," with the more specific interpr. of the stem *mānu-*, which then is predicated of the subject, comes from a suggestion of JPB. The idea is that we all want to enact the role of Manu as first sacrificer at the first instantiation of the sacrifice, which would then be a joint venture between Manu (/us Manus) and the gods, who, as we saw in 2d (and X.65.7d), begot the sacrifice. In b it is surely the gods who are urged to lead the sacrifice east. Re cites Bergaigne as having an interpr. similar to the publ. tr. ("puissions-nous être à vos yeux des Manus ...").

X.66.13: The divine model for the current sacrifice is further set forth here.

See extensive disc. of *prātiveśa-* (only here in the RV, but common later) and related words ad X.49.5. The literal gloss in AiG II.1.284, 'die Wohnung gegenüber habend', and its suggested meaning 'neighbor' seem reasonable.

X.66.14: This vs. makes a strong claim on the part of the poet(s) to belong to the poetic lineage of Vasiṣṭha, who is surely the referent of *pitṛvāt* 'like/in the manner of (their) father'. I think it quite likely that the seer embedded in *ṛṣivāt* 'like/in the manner of the/[a] seer' is also Vasiṣṭha, rather than a generic figure.

The close partnership between us humans and the gods in the sacrificial enterprise is also depicted here, where the gods are referred to as prized and pleased 'kinsmen' (*jñātāyaḥ*).

X.66.15: This vs., identical to the final vs. of X.65, also asserts the Vasiṣṭha connection.

X.67–68 Bṛhaspati

Two hymns dedicated to Bṛhaspati. In addition to the usual treatments, see HPS's detailed discussions in B+I; Re treats the Bṛhaspati hymns in ÉVP XV. On the supposed poet Ayāsyā see comm. ad X.67.1.

X.67 Bṛhaspati

X.67.1: The first word of the hymn, *imām*, is a near-deictic "this ... here" and implicitly locates us on the ritual ground, with this hymn (*dhî-* 'insightful thought') being recited now. In this particular case, the speaker credits "our father" (*pitā nah*), by implication Bṛhaspati, with finding (that is, composing) the hymn, with an augmented imperfect *avindat*. This is unlike the usual RVic situation, in which the poet claims to be himself composing the hymn, though "in the manner" of a father or ancestor – e.g., in the immediately preceding hymn, X.66.14 *vāsiṣṭhāsaḥ pitṛvād vācam akratai* "like their father(s) the Vasiṣṭhas have made speech"; instead it seems to depict something closer to the later śrauta ritual situation in which already existing ritual texts are recited in a fixed liturgy.

On the various possible referents of "seven-headed" (*saptāśṛṅgīm*) see Ge (n. 1a), HPS (228).

The adj. *br̥hatīm* ‘lofty’ evokes the dedicand’s name, Bṛha(spa)ti; we might also see the anagram in *pitā* (←) -*pāti*-.

The “fourth one” (*turīyam*) in c cannot be directly coreferential with *imām dhīyam* in pāda a because of the gender difference. It could, however, match *ukthām* in d. As noted in the publ. intro., it is strongly reminiscent of the fourth part of speech or the fourth formulation often prominent in Vedic discussions of the nature and powers of speech. Indeed, HPS takes it as the fourth formulation (*brāhmaṇa*)-(224).

The adj. *ayāsyā*- ‘irrepressible’ is used of various gods (Indra, Soma) and surely here refers to “our father,” that is, Bṛhaspati, as HPS (227–28) argues. The Anukramaṇī has probably extracted it from this first vs. as the name of the poet, to whom not only these two hymns (X.67–68) but also IX.44–46 are attributed, and who becomes an independent figure in the later tradition. On the reinterpretation of the adjective as a PN, see HPS (165–66, 227–28), citing Pischel; Mayr (PN s.v.); and comm. ad I.62.7; and for Ayāsyā’s later existence, see Macdonell-Keith, Vedic Index s.v.

X.67.2: This vs. is lexically chained to vs. 1 (see HPS 228): 1d *sām̐san*: 2a *sām̐santaḥ* (both pres. participles, in adjacent pādas); 1a *dhīyam*: 2a *dīdhyānāḥ*; 1b *ṛta(-prajātām)*: 2a *ṛtām*; note also *pitā* (1a) contrasted with *putrāsaḥ* (2b). This chaining superimposes the pl. Aṅgirasas (vs. 2) on the sg. Bṛhaspati (vs. 1) as the original joint devisers of the verbal portion of the primal sacrifice. The important connection between *dhī-* (1a) and *dīdhyāna-* (2a) is not signalled in the publ. tr. due to the difficulty of coming up with a non-awkward English verb. Perhaps “seeing insights straightaway” in 2a.

The agreement of the participles *sām̐san* and *sām̐santaḥ* also suggests that their objects, *ukthām* (1d) and *ṛtām* (2a), can be superimposed and identified with each other (see Lü 421, Re comm. ad loc.). There is also verse-internal lexical and morphological play: the pres. mid. participles ending pādas a and c, *dīdhyānāḥ* and *dādhyānāḥ*, share not only a suffix and ending (-*ānāḥ*), but also a reduplicative skeleton, *d_dh*. And *dhāma* in d picks up *dādhyānāḥ* in c.

The meaning and referent of *vīpram padām* are disputed, as instances of *padā-* often are. Ge takes the phrase as a double acc., with *padām* predicated of *vīpram* and meaning ‘track’: “den Redekundigen zu ihrer Wegspur machend”; he explains (n. 2c) that they follow in their speech the tracks/traces of Bṛhaspati. But most interpr. take *vīpram* as a modifier of *padām*, meaning “inspired word/speech.” See Lü (522 n. 6), Re (ad loc.), HPS (225). I do not see why it cannot be a pun, as the publ. tr. presents it (though perhaps it should be better phrased in the manner of Ge: “laying their inspired word as their track,” in this case the track of the ritual cursus.

Most interpr. take *mananta* to mean “they thought up / devised” the *dhāma* of the sacrifice: Ge “haben ... ersonnen,” HPS (225) “haben ... erdacht,” Re “ont inventé.” Certainly the *prathamām* ‘first’ qualifying *dhāma* supports this view. However, the occurrence of the VP *dhāma māna-* in X.97.1 *mānai ... dhāma*,” where it refers to the various forms of plants, favors a more neutral “think about / bring to mind,” with no sense of creation or invention. Hence my “pondered” – though I do not entirely reject the standard view.

X.67.3–8: The narration of the Vala myth begins here and continues through vs. 8. As noted in the publ. intro., the pattern associated with the name Bṛhaspati in this sequence is significant. The name first appears in vs. 3 at the beginning of pāda c, and this nom. *bṛhaspātīḥ* occupies the same position in 4c and 5c, as well as 8c, with acc. *bṛhaspātīm* beginning 9c and 10c after the recital of the myth proper. Bṛhaspati’s variant *brāhmaṇaspātīḥ* opens the c pāda of 7. But in the

center of this sequence, vs. 6, we find instead *índrah* at the beginning of the vs., a vs. with no occurrence of Bṛhaspati – structurally imposing, as I suggest in the publ. intro., the superimposition and identification of Bṛhaspati and Indra.

The preverb *ví* figures prominently in this account (3b, 4d, 6b, 7b, 7d).

X.67.3: This vs. is esp. focused on the soundscape of the myth. On the one hand, the two intensive participles, *vāvadadbhiḥ* (a) and *abhikānikradat* (c), both of sounds associated with animals, convey a sense of the constant cacophony in the background of the mythic actions: the Aṅgirasas' constant vocalizations compared to the disordered honking of geese, Bṛhaspati's continual roaring at the cows like a bovine himself. On the other hand, the final pāda depicts the ritually regulated starting up of the praise song and its hymn tune, the province of the priestly figures the Prastotar and the Udgātar, an oasis of sonic order in the midst of an uproar of voices.

The presence of both *utá* and *ca* in pāda d is curious, esp. since they seem to form a “both ... and” structure, conjoining the two verbs *prāstaut* and *úd ... agāyat*. This kind of subclausal usage is rare with *utá*, as is the mixed construction with *ca*. See JSK (DGRV I.357) for disc. Of course, in pāda-initial position *ca* could not be used, but there doesn't seem any reason why *prāstaut* could not have been separated through tmesis by *ca* (**#prācāstaut ...*), like *úc ca ... agāyat*. Because these finite verb forms are preceded only by participles (*vyāsyan ... abhikānikradat*) modifying the subject, we cannot interpr. the *utá* as a clause connector.

X.67.4: The three feminine entities, divided into two and one in pāda a, but aggregated as three in d, are universally interpreted as “doors” (for which I substituted “gates” as slight more suitable to a cave). As Ge points out (n. 4d), the ‘doors’ (*dúras*) are found in this Vala context in VI.18.5 and X.120.8. Re cleverly suggests that there may have been a (notional) haplology from the sequence *dvā(bhyām) *dvārbhyām* that resulted in the gapping of the ‘door’ word here.

Note the echo of the first word of the vs., *avāḥ* (*lavó*) ‘below’, and the last, *āvaḥ* ‘opened up’ (underlying *āvar*).

X.67.5: Here we meet another “three,” but neut. (*trīṇi*), not the fem. of 4d (*tisráḥ*).

Pāda a contains the problematic *śayáthem* (Pp *śayáthā īm*), which has received a variety of interpr., none of them satisfactory. The publ. tr. follows Old (as does Re) in taking *śayáthā* as a neut. acc. pl. (Old “Lagerstätten,” publ. tr. “lair”) as parallel obj. beside *purám*. The stem is otherwise only found in two passages in adjacent hymns, dat. *śayáthāya* (VI.18.8) and loc. *śayáthe* (VI.17.9). Both those forms appear to have (quasi-)infinitival value ‘to lie’, although only the dative fits this function well morphologically (see comm. ad VI.17.9). Gr suggests we should read *śayáthe* here as well (with no explan. of the *-m*); Ge (n. 5a) reads *śayáthā* (with the Pp, the likely analysis), but claims that the form is an infinitive (with no explan. of the morphology). HPS (B+I 225–26) takes it as an instr. (flg. a correction by Thieme [IIJ 3.15] of HPS's tr. in Vrata 47 n. 84), attributing the sense ‘riverbed’ to the stem: “Nachdem er den zurückgebeugten Wall durch ein Flussbett zerspalten hatte.” I have no idea what this is meant to mean; how can a fortress be split by a riverbed, and how did Bṛhaspati get hold of such an instrument in the first place? In his tr. in Vrata, *śayátha-* is also ‘riverbed’, but (I think) as an acc. pl., expressing what parts the fortress separated into after Bṛhaspati split it (“Die ... Burg ... zerspaltete er in (Fluss-)betten”), which are then the referents of the “three” in pāda b; this interpr. basically follows Ge's alternative, given in n. 5a. Given that the various tricky manipulations of morphology or meaning don't yield plausible sense, Old's acc. pl. seems the

simplest and the least harmful. But I am still disturbed by several features. First, at least in my interpr. the fem. sg. *āpacīm* modifies *pūram*, but is separated from it by *śayāthem*. However, this word order might be iconic for splitting *apart* the fortress. More serious is the position of the particle *īm* (assuming that's what's lurking in *śayāthem*). In my treatment of this particle ("Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*," Fs. Cardona 2002) I point out (pp. 303–4 and n. 23) that *īm* is almost always found either in second, or modified second, position (as in 7a) or directly before the verb. Of the 208 instances of *īm* (per Lubotsky), only nine fail to conform – including this one. After reconsidering the problems posed by *śayāthem* I now find I cannot accept the neut. acc. pl. + *īm* interpr. found in the publ. tr. The need to posit an out-of-place *īm* seems close to fatal, esp. because the acc. pl. 'lair' doesn't fit the passage all that well, and further the other two occurrences of the stem *śayātha-* are (quasi-)verbal usage, not concrete. I now find myself sympathetic to Gr's suggestion that we read **śayāthe*. This entails assuming that the *-m* was originally a hiatus breaker (notionally *-m̃*) that was reinterpreted as a real *m* – even though (and this is a major problem) this is not a sequence (*-e a-) where a hiatus-breaking *-m̃* would be introduced. If this dubious analysis is accepted, *śayāthe* would have the same quasi-infinitival use as in VI.17.9 and depict the collapse of the *pūr-* and its subsequent position. I would now tr. "Having split apart the stronghold to lie facing backwards," eliminating "(from front) to back, (having split apart) the lairs" and picking up with "at one blow." The use of a form of 'lie' would thematically connect this account of the Vala myth with the Vṛtra myth, where *√śi* is a signature word (see esp. I.32).

The next problem is the identity of the three (neut. *trīṇi*) in pāda b, which in part depends on the sense of the lexeme *nīṣ √kṛt*. In its only other RVic occurrence, in IX.108.6, the object is something desirable (cows) that one cuts out from its surroundings (stone) (... *āśmano nīr gā ākṛntat*), i.e., essentially the same context as here. Our *nīṣ √kṛt* seems parallel also to *nīṣ √bhṛ* in a similar context in the next, paired hymn (X.68.8). With Ge (n. 5b) (and Sāy., sim. Re) I identify the three as the dawn, the sun, and the cow found in pāda c (*uśāsaṃ sūryaṃ gāṃ*), despite the gender mismatch between neut. *trīṇi* and the assorted fem. and masc. items in c; the neut. may be a cover term for "three (things)," esp. since neither masc. nor fem. would encompass all three. (Re supplies "trésors" with *trīṇi*.) Although together pādas cd name four things (including *arkām*), this last term is in a separate pāda and, as Ge points out (n. 5b), Bṛhaspati had already found it (see 1ab *dhīyam ... avindat*). Moreover, in the parallel in the next vs., X.68.9, the verb 'find' (*avindat*) has three objects, and though *arkā-* also occurs in that vs., in a separate pāda as here, it is in the instr., not the acc. of the other three.

"Water-holder, reservoir" (*udadhī-*) is a slightly odd way to refer to the Vala cave, but it can hardly have any other referent. The usage is similar to that of "well" in English, which can be used metaphorically as a container for substances other than water (e.g., "well of loneliness"); in fact, we also have metaphorical expressions with this very word – e.g., "reservoir of goodwill," "reservoir of infection" (apparently a technical term in epidemiology), etc.

X.67.6: On the significance of the vs.-initial placement of *īndraḥ* here, see comm. above ad vss. 3–8 and the publ. intro. Not only is Indra superimposed on Bṛhaspati here, but he has access to the same verb: (*vī*) *cakarta*, like Bṛhaspati's (*nīḥ* ...) *ākṛntat* in 5b.

As noted in the publ. intro. *rakṣitār-* 'guard' is an ambiguous and potentially menacing term. See Re's comm.

Gr, Ge, and HPS (226) render *karā-* as 'hand', a sense well established in the epics and later, but, as Re points out, this is likely the only example in Vedic. (The other RVic

occurrence of the stem, in I.116.13, refers to the Aśvins. Ge and the publ. tr. [JPB] take it as ‘hand’, but a more generic ‘doer’ seems more likely. The occurrence in AVŚ XII.2.2 likewise fits its context better with such a sense.) A meaning ‘hand’ here would seem distinctly odd, since the action of ‘cutting apart’ (*ví√kṛt*) is not something a hand by itself can manage (outside of Kung Fu movies) – better a physical ‘doer’, concretized as ‘tool’ or, with Re, “un instrument (à découper)” like a knife.

On sweat as a sign of ritual activity, see my 2015 “Avestan *xšuuīd*.” A more literal tr. of this bahuvr. would be ‘whose ointment/unguent is sweat’. The theme returns in the next vs., 7d.

X.67.7: Note the allit. in *sá ... satyébhiḥ sákhībhiḥ śucádbhiḥ* (also unified by instr. pl. ending) and (*gó*)*dhāyasam ... dhanasaír (a)dardah*.

The cmpd *gó-dhāyas*- ‘cow-nurturing’ is presumably meant ironically, continuing the ambiguity of *rakṣitāraṃ dúghānām*. It has an Old Avestan cognate *gaodāīah*- (Y 29.2). Perhaps it is not an accident that the Avestan occurrence is in the famous Lament of the Soul of the Cow, when the Cow is complaining that the cow-tending is not entirely satisfactory. The Aves. correspondent supports a rendering ‘nurturing cows’, ‘having the nurturing of cows’ (so Gr). However, most tr. interpr. *gó*- not as an obj. of the 2nd member, but rather as the source of nourishment – Ge “der von den Rindern sich nährte”; Re. “qui tétait [le lait] des vaches”; HPS “dessen Nahrung die Kühe sind.” I assume that all these interpr. are trying to capture the fact that the Vala cave is a sinister, not a nurturing figure towards the captive cows. But this seems to me sufficiently covered by an ironic interpr. of the cmpd. (like *gópati*- in the next vs.). Against the “source” interpr. is the fact that several of the host of X-*dhāyas*- cmpds – *arí-dhāyas*-, *kārú-dhāyas*-, *bhūri-dhāyas*- -- clearly have 1st member objects (‘nourishing the stranger’, etc.). *viśvā-dhāyas*- is ambiguous: either ‘nourishing all’ (with obj.) or ‘having all nourishments’, but it certainly doesn’t mean *‘deriving nourishment from all’; by my interpr. *hári-dhāyas*- means ‘having golden nourishment’, not ‘nourishing the golden’, but again certainly not *‘deriving nourishment from the golden’ (see comm. ad III.44.3).

The root-noun cmpd *dhana-sā*- is found 6x in the RV, including in nearby X.65.10; *dhana-sā*- here is a nonce thematization. See Scar 581.

The *gharmā*- in *gharmā-sveda*- may well refer to the gharma pot at the Pravargya ritual; cf., in the frog hymn, VII.103.8 *adhvaryávo gharmīṇaḥ siṣvidānāḥ* and comm. thereon.

For the sense of *ví√naś* here, see comm. ad X.64.15.

X.67.8: *iyānā*- ‘begging’ may be used sarcastically here. They used verbal means, which is like begging, but the words in fact ‘compelled’.

iṣanayanta – This hapax, which belongs in the hazy group of *iṣaṇa*-, *iṣanya*- and the nominals *iṣāṇi*- and *iṣanyā*-, is rendered by Re and HPS as intrans./reflex. But it is surely an *-anta* replacement and so is trans., as Ge (and I) take it.

mithó-avadya-pa- is one of the few three-member cmpds in the RV; I have found fewer than 20 (not counting negated two-member cmpds, cmpds with *su*- and *dus*-, and cmpds. with a lexicalized member [like *gopa*-]). This rarity adds to the difficulty of interpreting it. It seems to have been rather casually assembled. The final member *-pa*- is, like *-sa*- in 7 above, thematized from the root noun *-pā*- ‘protect’ (see Scar 308). For *avadya-pa*-, Renou cites the syntagm I.185.10 *pātām avadyāt*. To this “protecting from fault,” the adverb *mithāḥ* ‘alternately, mutually’ would be loosely joined. If ‘protecting each other from fault’ (e.g., Old “einander wechselseitig als Abwehrer von Schande habend”) vel sim. is really the sense of the cmpd., its

application to the Aṅgirasas is somewhat puzzling. But there is an alternative. In my copy of HPS's B+I, which belonged to Stanley Insler, he penciled in the margin "protecting from falsity and disgrace = dvandva." This seems eminently worth considering, esp. if *mitháḥ* here has a sense closer to that found in Iranian, where it refers to wrong or falsehood. For the Old Persian evidence see R. Schmitt, *Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften*, p. 215 with lit. In Avestan the adverb is esp. associated with false speech: Old Avestan *miṭah-uuacah-* 'having false speech', YA *miṭaoxta-* 'falsely spoken', *miṭō.aog-* 'falsely speaking'. Here it would be paired with *avadya-*, whose literal meaning is of course 'not to be spoken'. I now suggest an alternate interpr., based on Insler's dvandva analysis: "protecting from the false and the unspeakable" – an appropriate description of the Aṅgirasas, whose realm is true and effective speech. Alternatively, it is possible that we are dealing with two words here, with *mitháḥ* a separate adverb (as in the next hymn, X.68.10, where it means 'alternately') and a standard two-member cmpd. that should be accented **avadya-pébhiḥ* (cf. *dhana-saḥ* in 7b), with the accent having been erased redactionally. The problem then would be: what does *mitháḥ* mean in that context? It seems unlikely that Bṛhaspati and the Aṅgirasas alternated in releasing the cows or did so rivalrously. I therefore prefer the dvandva analysis.

úd usriyā asṛjata reprises 4d *úd usrā ākar*.

X.67.9: This is the transition vs. back to the present time and the 1st ps. poets – but we don't find that out till the 1st pl. *madema* in d. Till then it could the subject could be the Aṅgirasas.

Note that Bṛhaspati here is credited with martial, more-Indra-like skills.

X.67.10: With Old, I attach ab to the previous vs. because it seems to continue the victory narrative from there, but this is not necessary. The second hemistich lacks a finite verb; I supply *ānu madema* from 9d.

Pāda c is a mash-up of 9a *vardháyantaḥ* and 9c *bṛhaspátim vṛṣaṇam*.

My interpr. of d differs from the standard ones, and infuses it with more content – perhaps going beyond the evidence. It is dependent on the interpr. of *nānā*. Ge (n. 10c) follows Sāy. (*nānā dikṣu santaḥ*) in taking it locationally ("da und dort weilend"), while Re seems to project this onto conceptual social location ("bien qu'étant diversement (situés sur le plan social)"). I suggest that the *nānā* refers to the varying capacities of the poets, who each "bring light with their mouth" (*bībhṛato jyótir āsā*), but in different ways according to their particular verbal skills.

X.67.11: On the formation of the infinitival *vayodhaí* (also X.55.1), see Scar 261.

X.67.12: The intrusion of the Vṛtra myth (pāda c) and other violent Indraic exploits is surprising in this insistently Bṛhaspati/Vala-oriented hymn. The vs. seems tacked on; on the other hand, the invocation of Heaven and Earth duplicates that of the two world halves in 11d. More to the point, there is some ring composition: *saptá* in 1a and 12c, *mūrdhán-* in 12b recalling *sṛṣan-* in 1a.

X.68 Bṛhaspati

On the complex style of this hymn see publ. intro.

Like X.67, this hymn has its share of verse-, hemistich-, and pāda-initial occurrences of *bṛhaspāti-*: 1d, 2d, 3c, 4c, 5c, 6b, 7a, 8d, 9c, 10b, 11d, 12c. There is one, and only one, per verse.

As discussed below ad vs. 7, it is likely that all these occurrences are extra-clausal and topicalized.

X.68.1: This vs. has three marked similes (a, b, c), each of which presents difficulties of interpretation. In all three cases the comparandum is the chants (*arká-*) directed towards Br̥haspati in d.

In the first simile the point of comparison is noisy water birds “constantly gabbling” (the intens. part. *vāvadataḥ*; see in the previous hymn X.67.3 where the Āṅgirasas are modified by the same participle). There is some unhappiness among interpreters about the other participle in this simile, *rākṣamāṇa-*. Gr suggests reading *yākṣamāṇa-* (‘appearing, displaying’?); Old favors Brunnhofer’s suggestion *krākṣamāṇa-* ‘howling’ (vel sim.), which is associated with *udaprūt-* in IX.108.7. However, as Ge points out (n. 1ab), this would involve adjusting the sandhi of transmitted *vāyo*. And I for one see no semantic problem with *rākṣamāṇa-*. Flocks of birds on water are often found in fairly tight, noisy groups, which can be seen as (and probably are) mutually protective. I take the middle participle as reciprocal; Re interpr. it as passive (“qu’on tenait enfermés”), but the middle of *√rakṣ* is never passive.

Note that the part. *vāvadataḥ* occurs across the pāda boundary from the birds and sits exactly between the first and second similes. This allows it to be construed with both, as, e.g., HPS (218) sees. With the first it is a nom. pl. masc., with the second it is the homonymous gen. sg., modifying *abhríyasya*: “of the ever-speaking (lit.) X of the cloud.” Although most interpr. *abhríya-* as the cloud itself, I prefer to see it as the adj. it is formally, modifying a gapped “thunder.”

The difficulty of c lies in the hapax *giribhráj-* and within this cmpd there are several problems: 1) what is the second member? and 2) what is the relation of the first member to the second? For a detailed disc. see Scar (373–74). A number of possibilities have been suggested for the etymology of *-bhráj-*, of which the strongest competitors are **bhlegʷ* ‘swell’ (also possibly in the root noun *bhráj-* AV VII.90.2, possibly meaning ‘penis’) and **bhreg* ‘break’ (for a recently suggested alternative root see below). The ‘break’ interpr. is the one favored by most tr. and comm.: Gr, Ge, Re, HPS (218), Mau (155) [Pokorny IEW also includes it there] and generally involves a direct-object function for the 1st member, or at least a goal, though an ablatival source is also sometimes considered: e.g., Re “brisant la montagne” (direct obj.) versus Mau “as they break upon the rocks” (goal) versus Gr (alt. gloss; sim. Re’s alt. in n.) “aus ihnen [=mountains] hervorbrechend” (source). For “waves” in a similar direct object context, see VI.61.2 *iyám ... arujat, sānu girīṇām taviṣébhīr ūrmíbhīḥ* “She [=the river Sarasvatī] broke the back of the mountains with her powerful waves.” The problem is that there are no other certain (and few if any possible) traces of **bhreg* in Indo-Aryan. Mayrhofer (EWA s.v. *bhráj-*) considers it “willkürlich” to involve the ‘break’ root here.

The ‘swell, be erect’ interpr. has the merit of an at least tenuous connection with another Vedic word, the aforementioned root noun *bhráj-* ‘penis’(?). The publ. tr. follows this interpr. and the exact wording, “stiff-peaked (like) mountains,” was adapted from a suggestion of Darms, reproduced in EWA (“Steifheit wie Berge habend”). Scar also favors ‘swell’, but points out that *giri-* as first compound member often has a locatival sense (e.g., *giri-kṣīt-* ‘dwelling in the mountains’; Scar’s suggested gloss, ‘im Gebirge schwellend,’ is more plausible, if less poetic, than the one based on Darms.

Recently (WECIEC 28, 2016; Proceedings publ. 2018: 79–81), R. Ginevra suggested a different interp. of both parts of the cmpd and a diff. meaning for the whole. He glosses it “loud-

roaring.” The 2nd member belongs to a root **bhr(h₂)g* ‘roar’, of his manufacture, whose nearest Vedic relative is, by his account, *bhūrjáyant-* in X.46.4 – but see comm. ad loc.: it is not at all clear that this stem even exists. As for the first member, he takes it as a reduced form of **g^herh₂* ‘heavy’. This is of course a particularly bold interpr., since ‘heavy’ has *u*-vocalism in Skt. (*gur-ū-*); Ginevra has a complex and ultimately unconvincing way to get to *giri-*, but the real problem is that it’s hard to imagine a **giri-* ‘heavy’ surviving the competition not only of the well-attested *giri-* ‘mountain’, but the even better attested *gír-* ‘song’. That a cmpd ‘loud-roaring’ would have survived with that meaning in Vedic when neither of its members has any support in the attested language, beggars belief.

But Ginevra’s alternative interpr. has the merit of reminding us that the cmpd. should somehow fit the simile in which it’s embedded, and that simile concerns noise. Wave(s) are at least marginally associated with sound elsewhere in the RV: see I.44.12 *sínthor íva prásvanitāsa ūrmáyah* “like the clamorous waves of a river”; IX.50.1 *sínthor ūrmér íva svanáḥ* “like the roar of the wave of a river,” and so perhaps the cmpd *giriḥhráj-* does not have to contribute semantically to the simile; on the other hand, deploying a hapax cmpd that is irrelevant to the content of the passage seems an unlikely move on the part of a skilled RVic poet. Assuming that it does contribute to the noise simile, I now think that “breaking the mountains” is more compatible with the simile than “stiff-peaked (like) mountains,” since breaking or pounding the rocks is going to produce a certain amount of noise. At least as an alternative, I would therefore now change the publ. tr. to “breaking the mountains” (see VI.61.2 cited above), despite the problematic absence of other reflexes of **bhreg*.

The collocation of *ūrmí-* and *√mad* ‘be/make exhilarated’ found here (*ūrmáyo mādantaḥ*) is also found elsewhere: VI.44.20, VIII.14.10, passages laconically cited by Ge (n. 1c; see also HPS). The association presumably arose because *ūrmí-* is often used metaphorically of “wave(s)” of soma, whose signature verb is *√mad*.

X.68.2: On the interrelated and developing similes in this vs., see the publ. intro. as well as Ge’s n. 2ab.

The opening phrase *sám góbhiḥ* participates in two different images in the first hemistich. The first, unrecognized by other tr./comm., is triggered by the end of the preceding vs., (*abhí ...*) *anāvan* “they bellowed.” In the Aṅgiras context *góbhiḥ* can be associated with the root *√nu* ‘bellow’. See, e.g., IV.3.11 *sám áṅgirasō navanta góbhiḥ* “The Aṅgirasas roared along with the cows” (also V.45.8), with both *sám* and *góbhiḥ*. The joint bellowing refers to the mutual recognition-by-sound that allowed the Aṅgirasas to free the cows penned up in the Vala cave. (Note also that Bṛhaspati roared at the cows in the previous hymn. [X.67.3], though with a different root: *bṛhaspátir abhikánikradad gāḥ*.)

But *sám góbhiḥ √nī* also exists independently; see V.42.4 *sám indra ṇo mánasā neṣi góbhiḥ* “Through your thought, Indra, lead us together with cows,” and the final word of the hemistich, *nināya*, is thus also to be construed with the opening. The object of the frame construction is gapped, but with Ge and Re (and HPS in n.) we can supply. the Aṅgirasas, whom Bṛhaspati reunites with the (freed) cows. In the simile Bhaga leads Aryaman (*bhága ivéd aryamāṇam*); as I explained in the publ. intro. “Bhaga (Fortune or Good Fortune) leads Aryaman, the “civilizing” god of custom, one of whose roles is patron of marriage, to the marriage ceremony in order to preside.” The ceremony itself is found in the next pāda. That the simile in b relates to the marriage is the view of Ge, Re, and Mau (156 n. 2), though HPS explicitly disavows this interpr. (219 n.).

In my opinion, the verse-initial *sám góbhiḥ* that we've already used twice in the first hemistich gets reused in pāda c, as Ge also suggests (n. 2c, tentatively also Re n.). The simile, which dominates the pāda, is of the marriage ceremony, with the officiant (*jāne mitráḥ*) in the nom. "anointing" the married couple in the acc. (*dāmpatī*). As Ge points out, this step in the ceremony is ordinarily expressed with the lexeme *sám √ añj* (e.g., in the final vs. of the wedding hymn, X.85.47 *sám añjantu víśve devāḥ*; see also Ge's other citations). It is rather nice that *sám* 'together' unites the various pieces of this vs.

Two questions remain about the verse. First, who is the referent of *jāne mitráḥ*? second, how does the frame, which must be entirely supplied, match the simile? As for the first, most take the *mitrá-* to be an actual friend or close associate of the couple (so Ge, Re, Mau), while HPS, with a different arrangement of simile and frame, opts for Mitra. I think instead that it is Agni, who is elsewhere called *jāne mitráḥ* (II.4.1, VIII.23.8; for disc. see my "Rigvedic Svayamvara?" Fs. Parpola [2001]: 312). Agni officiates at the wedding by virtue of the centrality of the ritual fire at the wedding ceremony.

My answer to the second question is given in the publ. intro.: "Just as Agni anoints the marrying couple with milk, so Bṛhaspati "anoints" the Aṅgirasas (compared to the couple) with cows." Alternatively, Ge and Re take the Aṅgirasas and the cows as the two parties to the ceremony representing the dual *dāmpatī* 'married couple'; this is also one of the possibilities that HPS entertains. This is possible, but it fails to make use of the instr. *góbhiḥ* as the anointing medium. And the image of the Aṅgirasas and the cows pairing off in marriage might be a bit extreme.

Pāda d breaks this mood, with competition substituting for union. Again, the identity of the object in the frame, to which the swift horses are compared, is unspecified and somewhat unclear; I assume the Aṅgirasas, who are spurred to action to open the cave. (This action is, of course, out of order, since the rest of the vs. assumes the cows have already been freed, but chronological scrambling is scarcely unknown in the RV.)

Another question about d: who is addressing Bṛhaspati? I assume that the abrupt departure from the topic of abc also returns us to the larger context of the hymn, and the poet is the speaker, but both Ge and Re take the address to be internal to the scenario of pāda c and spoken by the officiant (*jāne mitráḥ*). In this case it could not be urging the Aṅgirasas to open the cave, since the cave is already open. If we interpret the impv. clause internally (which, as I said, I am not inclined to do), we might compare Agastya's address to his wife Lopāmudrā in I.179.3 *jáyāvéd átra śatánītham ājīm* "let us two win here the contest of a hundred strategems," as a programmatic blueprint for marriage. It too contains the word *ājí-* 'contest'. However, I think this is farfetched.

X.68.3: The first hemistich consists entirely of fem. pl. adjs. with no referent specified until pāda d *gāḥ*, but of course the cows are in the discourse and were mentioned in the instr. in 2a.

There is no agreement on the sense or even the formation of the hapax cmpd *sādhv-aryāḥ*. Glosses range widely: Sāy. *sādhūnām kalyāṇām payasām netrīḥ*, Gr "gerade aus, vorwärts strebend," Old "bei denen die Arier ihr Ziel erreichen," Ge "die einem trefflichen Herrn gehören," Re "très amicales," Th (Fremdl. 87) "in guter Weise (schönstens) fremdenfreundlich (gastlich)," HPS "die gut gastlich sind," Mau "dear to the pious," JPB (Ādityas 162 n. 23) "correctly civilized." Several of these (notably Old and Ge) assume that the cmpd is a bahuvrīhi, but the accent is an obstacle. Old refers laconically to AiG I.2.296(d), treating bahuvrīhis with 2nd-member accent whose 1st member ends in *-i-* or *-u-*. But even if this rule worked better than

it does, all of the cases listed there have 1st members with light initial syllables (*purú-*, etc.), and *sādhú-* decidedly does not (cf. also the bahuvrīhi *sādhú-karman-* X.81.7 with expected accent). Moreover, the simplex *aryá-* is an adjective and should not therefore be the head of a bahuvrīhi unless the adjective has been substantivized (as Ge's Herr and Old die Arier implicitly assume). The publ. tr. follows JPB's interpr. of the adj. *aryá-* as 'civilized/civilizing' (discussed at length in Ādityas, 155–62), that is, "adhering to or upholding to (*sic*) the rites and customs of the Vedic peoples" (155), who are the others (*arí-*) who belong to the larger Ārya community (on which see comm. ad IX.79.3). The term is used here of cows in the context of hospitality (see immed. flg. *atithínīḥ* and Thieme, *Fremdl.* 86–87), a cardinal Ārya principle, but I do not think it necessarily has the narrow meaning "fremdenfreundlich" that Th gives it. It could simply emphasize the cows' status as domestic animals that ordinarily form part of the social group (see JPB's "they are domesticated and hence a part of the community," 162 n. 23) and have been reintegrated into it after their abduction and imprisonment outside of it. With Th I. take *sādhú-* as adverbial here, rather than as referring to a group of particularly worthy people (e.g., Mau's "the pious").

The final word of pāda a, *iśirāḥ*, makes a bad Triṣṭubh cadence. In fact, though the stem *iśirá-* generally behaves well metrically when internal, often occurring right after the caesura where two light syllables are at home, there are several pāda-final occurrences like this one, making a bad Triṣṭubh cadence: in addition to this one, II.29.1, V.37.3, IX.96.15, X.98.3 (see also, in dimeter VIII.46.29). In all these cases a heavy second syllable (**iśīrā-*) would be preferable, but precisely this shape would be anomalous in the post-caesura occurrences.

X.68.4: Judging from the 2nd hemistich, this vs. returns us to the moment of the opening of the Vala cave and the release of the cows. Bṛhaspati split open the enclosure ("the skin of the earth") so easily that his tool for splitting is compared to water in pāda d; see a similar characterization of the ease of this deed in the next vs., 5d. It is harder, though not impossible, to fit the first hemistich into this picture. I take ab as referring to the ritual preliminaries to the assault on the cave. The phrase *ṛtasya yóni-* is quite common in the RV, used for the ritual ground and esp. for the place where the ritual fire is installed (III.62.13, etc. etc.; see comm. ad X.65.7). The "honey" with which Bṛhaspati is sprinkling it may be milk or soma or even water. Despite Ge (n. 4a) and others (Mau, esp.) I don't think the liquid is rain, because Bṛhaspati isn't particularly associated with rain elsewhere.

Pāda b is the real problem, in part because of the ambiguous sandhi form *arká*. The Pp takes this as nom. sg. *arkáḥ*, and this is followed by most interpr. Before assessing that interpr., we should investigate what its referent might be. The stem *arká-* means both 'chant' and 'ray/flame'. Its proximity to *ulkā-* 'firebrand' in this pāda has led a number of interpr. to favor the latter identification (e.g., Ge "Wetterstrahl"; also Re, Mau). However in a Bṛhaspati context the word should mean 'chant' – as it in fact does elsewhere in the hymn: 1d, 6b, 9b; see also in the previous hymn X.67.5. The chant is the means by which the Vala cave is opened. Old and HPS both recognize that *arká-* must mean 'chant' here; they both decide that Bṛhaspati is the personified *arká-* and therefore accept the nom. interpr. of the Pp. This is possible, but I prefer interpr. the sandhi form as loc. *arké*, as a minimal loc. absolute: "when the chant (was chanted)," referring to the moment when the cave is opened. That the chant can be secondarily associated with fire, and so the juxtaposition of *arka* and *ulkām* here is probably not accidental, is shown by 6b *agnitāpobhir arkaīḥ* "with his fire-hot changes."

The problem that I can't solve is what is the object of *avakṣipán* in the frame, compared to the "firebrand of heaven" (*ulkām ... dyóḥ*) in the simile. In the publ. tr. I tentatively supply

‘honey’ from the first pāda, and in the absence of anything better I will stick with it – but it would depict a fairly aggressive sprinkling of the ritual ground, and I also don’t see what it represents mythologically. Ge gets out of the problem by making the whole of b the simile (violating ordinary simile structuring principles by assuming a different verb in the simile from the frame, which for him is pāda a). Re, HPS, and Mau make the *iva* weakly adverbial (“pour ainsi dire,” “gleichsam,” “as it were”). This is tempting as an easy way to avoid the problem, but I am reluctant to do this because of the prominence of *iva* and the quite specific similes in this part of the hymn (3d, 4b, 4d, 5b, 5d).

X.68.5: The similes continue. In the first hemistich a four-element frame (gapped subject Bṛhaspati, object *tāmaḥ* ‘darkness’, instr. ‘with light’, abl. ‘from the midspace’) is more or less matched by a three-element simile (subj. ‘wind’, object ‘Śīpāla plant’, abl. ‘from the water’), with only the instr. missing: ‘wind’ can stand in for it as well.

The purport of the simile in the 2nd hemistich is not as clear – or rather, my interpr. differs from the general consensus. The standard interpr. is that the simile goes with the main verb: “brought the cows here like the wind a cloud.” But to me this doesn’t make sense: the wind doesn’t bring clouds *here*; they stay in the midspace, wherever the wind pushes them. I think that the simile instead belongs with the gerund *anumṛśyā*. The lexeme *ānu* √ *mṛś* occurs only here in the RV, and the tr. universally render it as ‘lay hold of, seize’ vel sim. — but √ *mṛś* generally depicts a less aggressive action, ‘touch, stroke, fondle’. In KS XXV.9 (116: 6) the causative *anumarśaya-* is used of healers touching a sick man, where ‘seize’ seems out of place. There is also a brief narrative in TS VI.1.3.6, where Indra seeks to prevent anyone else from being born from the womb from which he has just emerged. He *ānu* √ *mṛś* the womb and splits it: *tāsyā anumṛśya yónim āchinat*. Keith tr. ‘stroking her womb he split it.’ Although “seizing” isn’t ruled out here, the context invites a more intimate, if no less devastating, action. In our passage the object of *anumṛśyā* is generally taken to be “the cows of Vala,” but esp. given the TS passage I think it better to supply ‘skin’ (*tvācam* from the immed. preceding vs. 4d) or even ‘womb’ (for the Vala cave as a womb, see IV.50.2; *yónim* is also found in the preceding vs., 4a, though with a different referent). Note that, like the womb in the TS passage, the “skin” was split in 4d (though with a different root), and Bṛhaspati splits something of Vala’s in the next vs. (6ab) and, by my interpr., splits the *gārbha-* of the mountain in 7c. What does this have to do with the simile “like the wind a cloud”? I think the point is that the wind needs merely to “stroke” a cloud to move it, and this emphasizes how light and minimal a touch Bṛhaspati needed to open the Vala cave, a point also made in 4d.

With the simile of d associated with the gerund in c, the rest of d contains the main VP, whose meaning is straightforward: *ā* √ *kṛ* in the middle means ‘bring here, make one’s own’. What I don’t understand is the doubling of *ā*. Old (Noten ad I.3.7) says it’s not uncommon and lists some passages, but I would still like an explanation. Perhaps the two *ā*’s convey different senses: ‘make one’s own’ and ‘bring here’; this is what I meant to imply in the publ. tr.

X.68.6: The abstract noun *jāsu-* ‘feebleness’ may seem an odd object for the verb *bhed* ‘split’, which seems to call for a concrete object. However, it neatly summarizes the point of the similes in vss. 4 and 5, that Vala was easily breached. Ge unaccountably renders *jāsu-* here by “das Gefängnis” (prison) without comment, though in its other occurrence (X.33.2) as “Verschmachten.” Perhaps he was swayed by Sāy.’s concrete gloss *āyudham* ‘weapon’ in our passage.

On the pun that structures the 2nd hemistich see publ. intro. As discussed there, the pun is enabled by two ambiguous forms: *páriveriṣṭam* and *ādat*. The former can be the ppl. to either \sqrt{vis} or $\sqrt{viṣ}$. In the former case, it means ‘surrounded’, in the latter ‘served’. As for *ādat*, it can be the (remarked medial) 3rd sg. root aor. to $\tilde{a}\sqrt{dā}$ ‘take’ ($\tilde{a} + (a)da-t$) or a pseudo-thematic imperfect to the root pres. of \sqrt{ad} ‘eat’ ($a-ad-a-t$): the expected athematic form would have been **āt* (< **a-ad-t*), which cries out for remodeling. At least with regard to the publ. tr., only the former would be strictly correct, since the imperfect of \sqrt{ad} , without preverb, should not be accented in a main clause (see also Ge n. 6c). But secondary readings in puns can be lax about accentuation, and in any case nothing forbids *c* from being still in the domain of *yadā* in pāda a, in which case both of the proposed verb forms would be accented in the subordinate cl. I therefore offer an alternative translation “When Bṛhaspati split the feebleness of taunting Vala with his fire-hot chants / (and) he took / ate (the cows) ...,” with the main clause represented only by *d*. Only Mau of the standard tr. takes this option.

As for the pun itself, taking *páriveriṣṭa-* to \sqrt{vis} with the sense ‘surrounded, trapped’, the ppl. can be construed with the instr. *dadbhīḥ* as the agent/instrument; the more appropriate main verb would be $\tilde{a}\sqrt{dā}$ ‘take’ (though ‘eat’ is also possible). The image is the familiar and slightly unpleasant one of using the tongue to worry tiny particles of food stuck between the teeth and suggests that Bṛhaspati scoured all the nooks and crannies of the Vala cave for stray cattle. If *páriveriṣṭa-* is taken to $\sqrt{viṣ}$ in the lexeme ‘serve’, the more appropriate main verb would be ‘eat’ (though ‘take’ is not excluded), and the tongue and teeth together do the eating. HPS objects to Ge’s supplying the cows as obj. of ‘eat’ because Bṛhaspati doesn’t eat the cows – but supplying Vala as object, as he, Re, and Mau do, is subject to the same objection: Bṛhaspati doesn’t eat the cave either. Surely “eat” is a metaphor and, in my opinion, works better with cows as object: Bṛhaspati sucks them all out of the cave at one time.

X.68.7: The position of *hí* is at first surprising, coming superficially in 3rd position: *bṛhaspátir ámata hí* ..., but is easily explained if we take *bṛhaspátīḥ* as extraclausal and topicalized, as I suggested above (intro. to hymn comm.) for all occurrences of the name in this hymn. Under this analysis *hí* would be in its standard 2nd position; see the same configuration in 12c *bṛhaspátīḥ sá hí* ..., where the coreferential pronoun *sá* underlines the extraclausality of the immediately preceding name in the same case. Further, in 11d *bṛhaspátir bhínát* ... it is easiest to explain the accent on the verb *bhínát* if it is actually first in its clause (same explanation for the repeated pāda in I.62.3) – the accent on *ámata* in our vs. can be ascribed to the presence of *hí*, though under the extraclausal analysis it would also be clause initial. Finally, in 1d the apparent second position of the preverb *abhí* in tmesis – *bṛhaspátim abhy àrkā anāvan* makes better sense if it is notionally initial after extraclausal *bṛhaspátim*, since preverbs in tmesis ordinarily move to first position (though the position after the caesura, as here, is not infrequent). In the publ. tr. I did not mark off the occurrences of *bṛhaspátī-* typographically (with dash or sim.) because I think it would be distracting.

All the standard interpr. construe *sádane* with *gúhā yát* (e.g., Ge “der an de Orte verborgen war”). I do not, because *gúhā yát* is a pāda-final formulaic tag, at most preceded by *paramám*, which does not further participate in the clause to which it’s attached beyond modifying a neuter noun earlier in its clause (*nāma* in this case). Interestingly the tag is only found in the RV in Maṇḍala X, though *gúhā* and *gúhya-* are common throughout. The occurrences: X.45.2, 61.13, 68.7, 85.16 (=AV XIV.1.6) [*yád gúhā*], 181.2; AV I.13.3, II.1.1, 2.

The simile in c has tied interpr. in knots, primarily because they want to make some bird or other the agent of *bhittvā*, either the baby birds inside the eggs (Ge, HPS, Lu 522) or the mother bird (Re), all these birds being in fact invented. See Mau's useful n. on the passage, though his English deserts him in his own unparsable tr. In addition to the invented birds, some of these interpr. seem to assume that acc. *gárbham* is the agent of *bhittvā* in the simile, which is syntactically impossible. As Ge says somewhat despairingly (n. 7cd), the simile "ist etwas schief geraten." The problem is that they all assume that *gárbham* in c must be part of the simile; the difficulty disappears if we take *gárbham* with the frame, with *párvatasya* in d dependent on it. *gárbham* is then the object of *bhittvā*, parallel to *āṇḍā* in the simile: "having split the *gárbha* of the mountain like the eggs of a bird." Although *gárbham* is somewhat more distant from its genitive than I would like, the phrase exists; see V.45.3 *párvatasya gárbhaḥ* adduced by Old and see also Ge's n. 7d. And the "womb of the mountain" is a fine description of the Vala cave with the cows inside.

X.68.8: The simile in c is a bit slippery. From ab, where the cows are simply enclosed by the stone, we expect *nīḥ ... jabhāra* in c to depict a simple removal. But the simile "like a cup from a tree" assumes the shaping and crafting of what was removed into an object of artifice: a cup, not just a block of wood.

X.68.9: Most of the first hemistich is a near variant of X.67.5cd in the immediately preceding hymn: *bṛhaspátir uśasaṃ sūryaṃ gām, arkám viveda ...* versus our *sóṣām avindat sá svàḥ só agnīm, só arkéṇa ...* This close agreement is all the more surprising since there are very few verbal echoes between the two hymns, despite their kinship and shared subject matter. In our passage "fire" substitutes for "cow," as the third object of 'find', but "cows" should be supplied as the obj. of *nīḥ ... jabhāra* in the second hemistich.

The second simile with *nīḥ ... jabhāra*, flg. directly on the one in 8c, is less daring, though still striking.

X.68.10: The simile in ab is neatly structured: both simile and frame are tripartite, with nom. subj. (woods / Vala), acc. object (leaves / cows), instr. agent of stealing (cold / Bṛhaspati). Connecting the subject and the object is the verb *akṛpayat* 'lamented', found overtly only in the frame but shared by simile and frame; connecting the object and the agent is the ppl. *muṣitā* 'stolen', found overtly only in the simile but shared by simile and frame.

X.68.11: The first three pādas of this vs. seem at best loosely connected with the Bṛhaspati / Vala theme. Although, as Mau (n.) suggests, Bṛhaspati's freeing of the cows from Vala can be seen as an act of creation, with the Pitars joining in the cosmogonic fun, the specificity of the decorating of the night sky and the day sky seems different from the usual blaze of dawn after the opening of the cave. It seems possible that the alternate rising of sun and moon in 10d suggested this particular treatment.

The ornamenting of the dusky horse in pāda a is reminiscent of the Aśvamedha when the Wives of the king/sacrificer weave jewels into the hair of the horse just before it is sacrificed (see SW/SW 99–100 with reff.).

Pāda c is a perfect syntactic palindrome: LOC₁ ACC₁ VERB ACC₂ LOC₂, with the verb equally applicable to both VPs. Or, as Re says dismissively, "chiasme banal."

The last pāda, which is the final pāda of the hymn before the summary vs., briskly summarizes Bṛhaspati's accomplishment: "he split the rock; he found the cows," an abrupt and terse end to an elaborate hymn. For the accent on *bhinát* see comm. ad vs. 7 above and I.62.3, where the pāda is also found.

X.68.12: As indicated just above, this is clearly a summary vs. standing outside the hymn proper, whose content was just boiled down in the last pāda of the preceding vs. (11d). The near-deictic *idám* and the aorist *akarma* at the beginning of 12 locate the vs. in the ritual here-and-now, referring to the hymn, called an "(act of) reverence" (*námah*), that was just recited.

The vs. also forms a ring with the first vs. of the hymn: the fairly rare word *abhríya-* 'belonging to a cloud' is found in both (1b, 12a), and the verb *ānónavīti* (12b) echoes two verbal forms in vs. 1: *anāvan* (1d) by root ($\sqrt{nū}$), *vāvadataḥ* (1b) by morphology (both intensives), as well, of course, as semantics. Interestingly, the referent of *abhríya-* / subject of *ānónavīti* in 12 is Bṛhaspati, but that is not the case in vs. 1.

Pāda b has only 10 syllables, and there is no obvious fix. HvN suggest a rest at syllable 4, which seems the best solution: *ānu ānónavīti* handily fills the post-caesura slot.

The referent of *pūrvīḥ* is unclear, at least to me. The standard tr. supply voices or the sounds of thunder vel sim., which Bṛhaspati is imitating; see, e.g., HPS (222) "der viele (Stimmen dem Donner) nachbrüllt." (Similarly, but not identically, Mau sees the "many" as our praise hymns.) This strikes me as a rather distant notion to attach to the unspecified "many" and not in accord with the use of *ānu* $\sqrt{nū}$ elsewhere. It is possible that *pūrvīḥ* signals a time period, as often (e.g., IV.19.8 *pūrvīr uśásaḥ śarádaś ca* ... "for many dawns and autumns"). However, I think this less likely than that *pūrvīḥ* refers to the feminine beings after which Bṛhaspati bellows. The lexeme *ānu* $\sqrt{nū}$ takes an acc. of the longed-for object in both I.80.9 and VIII.82.33, and it is not difficult to supply the likely fem. acc. here: "cows" (also secondarily suggested by Re in his n.). Surely his freeing of the cows did not end Bṛhaspati's fond engagement with them: he yearned for them still.

On the opening of c, *bṛhaspátīḥ sá*, see disc. ad vs. 7.

The lack of accent on the verb *dhāt* is surprising to me, since it must still be part of the *hí* clause begun in c, given the sequence of *sá* + instr. that unifies cd. Also surprising is the fact that no one comments on the absence (not even Old!). I would explain it by the fact that *váyo dhāḥ* (/ *dhāt*) is a common hemistich ending (II.4.9; III.29.8, 51.6; IV.17.18; VI.40.1, 4; IX.90.6; X.46.10 [also pāda final in X.30.12]), where the verb is never accented. Either the poet simply reverted to this formulaic usage or the redactors adjusted it to that usage.

X.69–70

One hymn addressed to Agni, the other an Āprī hymn. The Anukr. ascribes them both to Sumitra B/Vādhryaśva, both names extracted from X.69. Although Vadhryaśva and the associated vṛddhied patronymic do appear to be PNs, *sumitrá-*, which occurs 5x in X.69, is best taken in its literal sense 'good ally, having good allies'. As for *vadhryaśvá-*, that an original bahuvrīhi 'having gelded horses' was reinterpr as a PN may be shown by the final accent (*vadhri-aśvá-*); we would otherwise expect **vādhri-aśva-*, with standard b-v accent like *vādhri-vāc-* (VII.18.9).

X.69 Agni

On the subject matter of the hymn, see publ. intro. The language is for the most part straightforward, at least superficially, but there are some twists. For much of the hymn the verses proceed in pairs; they are not technically Pragāthas, but they mirror and complete each other thematically and often share phraseology.

X.69.1–2: The first two vss. are not tightly bound, but they share the phrase *ghṛténāhutaḥ* (1d, 2c).

X.69.1: The two supposed PN *vadhryaśvá-* and *sumitrá-* that provide the poet's name in the Anukr. are both found in this 1st vs. As noted above (intro. to X.69–70), *sumitrá-* is better taken in its literal sense.

X.69.3–4: On the shared features of this pair, see disc. ad 4.

X.69.3: The double *yád* phrases, sharing the same verb *samīdhé* but paired with two different nominatives, clearly refer to two occasions in the past when the ritual fire was kindled, starting with the primordial institution of the sacrifice by Manu. The main clause *tád idám nāvīyaḥ* then points to the ritual fire right here and emphasizes both its identity with those previous fires and its novelty. None of the standard renderings (Ge, Re, Proferes) fully registers the repeated *yád*'s; Re, esp., seems to have missed the point.

The 2nd hemistich has four occurrences of *sá* with 2nd ps. reference, each matched with an imperative (or imperative substitute like injunc. *dhāh*) by (my) rule.

X.69.4: The first hemistich is modeled on 3ab:

yát te, samīdhé agne tád idám ...

yám tvā, samīdhé agne sá idám ...

4a adds another previous (*pūrvam*) kindling of the fire to those in 3ab, but this one is temporally close, since the kindler is Vadhryaśva, whose fire is the focus of this hymn. He is thus associated, in his first kindling, with the primal sacrificer Manu, but he is also responsible for a new kindling, in *pāda* b.

The referent of neut. *idám* in b is not specified. In the paired expression in 3b, it is Agni's *ánīkam*, and I supply that here as well. Ge suggests rather the hymn and the sacrifice, perhaps basing himself partly on *sá gíro juṣasva* in c, matching 4b *sá idám juṣasva* save for the object. Re supplies "sacrifice," though in his n. he says that *idám* stands for the *gírah* in the phrase in 3c; Proferes just "this." The parallelism of 3ab and 4ab seems to me to impose the *ánīkam* interpr.

Vadhryaśva is "solemnly invoked" (*īlītá-*) at the first kindling in 4a. This ppl. ordinarily characterizes Agni, but Agni esp. in his role as Hotar (see, e.g., VII.7.3 *agnír īlító ná hótā*). The use of this term suggests that Vadhryaśva must have served as Hotar on that occasion and also implicitly identifies him with Agni, that is, with his own ritual fire.

X.69.5–6: Like vss. 3 and 4, this pair should be read together. It is the near repetition of 5c by 6c that allows us to identify "the son of Vadhryaśva" with Agni, on which see Proferes (40–41).

X.69.5: Note the solemn and ceremonial *prá nú vocam* "I shall now proclaim," which links the announcement to others like it (e.g., I.32.1) and establishes the importance of the *name* of

Vadhryaśva's son. The name is presumably "Agni," given in the next, paired vs., but not till pāda.

X.69.6: The first hemistich flirts with another contender for the name of V's son, namely Indra, who is the usual conquerer of obstacles (*vr̥trāṇi*). And of course Indra is the target of *prá vocam* in I.32.1 just alluded to.

On the phrase *dāsā vr̥trāṇi āryā* see comm. ad VI.22.10.

X.69.7–8: The second hemistichs of both vss. are paired: the instr. pl. + pass. phrase in 7c *nṛbhīḥ mr̥jyāmānaḥ* is expanded in 8cd to *nṛbhīr dākṣiṇāvadbhīḥ ... sumitrébhir idhyase devayádbhīḥ*, with the last two instr. also matching the loc. pl. of 7d *sumitrēṣu ... devayátsu* in the same metrical position. The close pairing of the 2nd halves of these vss. draws attention to the sharp thematic contrast between the barren cows (*-starī-*) in 7b and the milch-cow (*dhenú-*) of 8ab.

X.69.7: Once again the phrase *ayám agnīḥ* "this fire here" emphasizes the immediacy of the new fire. This suggests that *dīrghá-tantu-*, lit. 'having a long thread', should be interpr. with Proferes as referring to the "long line (of ancestors)," some of which we have met in vss. 3–4. The fire in front of us may be new, but it has deep roots.

The lofty bulls (*bṛhád-ukṣan-*) by contrast are probably his flames, as Ge suggests.

The puzzling descriptor is *sahásra-starī-* 'having a thousand barren cows', esp. since the barren cows seem to substitute for the harmless and well-integrated *-cetas-* found in the otherwise identical pāda I.100.12 *sahásracetāḥ śatānītha ṛbhvā* "of a thousand insights and a hundred counsels, skillful." (Curiously, Bl [RVReps] finds our version "insipid," an adj. I'd be more likely to apply to I.100.12.) Ge finds no clear reason for the barren cows (n. 7b), while Re and Old are silent on them. The impetus for their appearance here is, I think, to be found in the name of the fire's owner and producer, Vadhryaśva. Since his name literally means 'having gelded horses', his clan fire matches the nomenclatural model with "having a thousand sterile cows", with equally deficient livestock – a deprecatory model that reaches back into prehistory, most famously in Zarathustra 'having old camels' (by most interpr.). Happily we need not worry too much about the reality of this description, since in the next vs. Agni is credited with a 'milch-cow' (*dhenú-*), whose fecund productivity is described at length.

X.69.8: On the *dhenú-* see comm. just above.

With Ge and Re (contra Gr, Old, who interpr. it as an instr. sg.), I take *asaścatā* as a dual fem. referring to Heaven and Earth. The same form is used of them in I.160.2 and *ásaścantī* of the same in VI.70.2.

Ge takes *dākṣiṇāvant-* as referring to the dispensers of Dakṣiṇās, namely, the Sūris or patrons, who, in his view, are the referents of *nṛbhīḥ* in 7c, 8c, 9d, and 11b. Since in all these occurrences but 9d (which is non-diagnostic) these men are ritual officiants, kindling (8c) and tending (7c) the fire and providing pressed soma (11b), they should be receiving the Dakṣiṇā, at least by later custom.

X.69.9–10: This pair of vss. don't share much phraseology or syntactic structure, but they are thematically (and partly lexically) connected. In both, Agni is identified as the son of Vadhryaśva and the beneficiary of his service, which enables Agni to overcome opponents. The patronymic voc. *vādhryaśva* takes the same position in 9b as the name *vadhryaśvāḥ* in 10b. And

the nearly synonymous 2nd sg. imperfects *ajayaḥ* and *avanoḥ* take the same positions in 9d and 10d. We can also note two different words that play off the PN. Vadhryaśva: (*tvā*)*vṛdhebbhiḥ* (9d) and *vṛādhataḥ* (10d).

X.69.9: As disc. in IV.18.2, I would now tr. *sampṛcham* as ‘to consult’. As Proferes (41) points out, the *mānuṣīr víśaḥ* “clans of the sons of Manu” are Agni’s (and Vadhryaśva’s) own people, come to take counsel about an external threat (c), and it is with these men that Agni conquers in d. The publ. tr. makes the clans sound as if they’re the enemy.

I would now slightly emend the tr. of d to “whose strengthener is you,” to match *vṛdhāḥ* in 11d, if that analysis is correct.

X.69.10: In pāda a *abibhar* is better read *abibharr* (< *-rt). See comm. ad VII.75.1 and Old.

The identity of those whom Agni vanquishes in d is not made explicit, and contextual clues pull in two different directions. On the one hand, the next vs. (11a) proclaims the victory of Vadhryaśva’s fire over rivals (*śatrūn*); the default interpr. would probably be of human rivals, enemies outside the domain of Vadhryaśva. This seems to be the Ge/Proferes interpr. On the other, *pūrvān* ‘previous, former’ echoes *pūrvam* in 4a, where it referred to a fire that Vadhryaśva had kindled previously, to which the current one is superior. This accounts for my tr. “the former (fires),” as also Re “(les Agni) antérieurs,” sim. JSK (DGRV I.381). I think both might be meant (as Re rather awkwardly seems to indicate in his n.).

The position of *utá* is somewhat odd, but acdg. to JSK (same ref.) it joins the second hemistich with the first, despite appearing at the beginning of d. He adduces several similar exx.

On the formation and sense of *vṛādhant-* see comm. ad X.49.8. We already noted the phonological similarity between this stem and the name *vadhryaśvá-*.

X.69.11–12: These two vss. do not seem twinned. Rather, vs. 11 gathers up a number of the elements of the immediately preceding vss., while vs. 12 is a hymn-summary vs.

X.69.11: In b *nṛbhir jigāya* matches 9d ... *nṛbhir ajayaḥ*, with both instr. *nṛbbhiḥ* modified by a pāda-final instr. In d there reappear both *vṛādhantam* (see 10d) and *vṛdhá-*, reinforcing the play with Vadhryaśva’s name noted above.

The publ. tr., along with Ge and Proferes, tr. *sutásomavant-* as if it were synonymous with the well-attested bahuvrīhi *sutásoma-*, with a pleonastic possessive suffix *-vant-*. However, Re (and in fact Gr) must be correct that *-vant-* here signals accompaniment (like *índra-marútvant-* “Indra along with the Maruts”). I would now alter the tr. to “by means of the (aforementioned) men along with those who have pressed soma.” The men (*nṛbbhiḥ*) are the same as those in 9d.

There is disagreement about the identity of *vṛdhāḥ* in d. The publ. tr. follows Sāy., Gr, and Proferes in taking it as the nom. sg. of the thematic stem *vṛdhá-*, found also in the cmpd *tvā-vṛdha-* in 9d. Ge and Re take it rather as the abl. of the root noun *vṛdh-* and construe it with *vṛādhantam*, which functions (for them) as a quasi-comparative: Ge “... die stärker fühlte als selbst der Starke” (see his n. 11d and Re’s n.). This would cleverly bring *vṛādhant-* and *vṛdh-* into conjunction and would also account for the position of *cíd*. But this otherwise has little to recommend it, since *vṛādhant-* is not a comparative, and Ge’s supplying of extra material verges on the reckless. True – a nom. sg. *vṛdhāḥ* is rhetorically a little flat, and the *cíd* has nothing to do,

but that hardly disqualifies it. The *cid* may have the position it does to emulate the vs.-final *cid* in 10d.

X.69.12: This summary vs. begins with the annunciatory *ayám agníh* “here is Agni,” found also, less prominently, in 7a.

Another phonological play on Vadhryaśva: *vṛtra(-hán-)*. This sonic link may help account for the application of this Indraic epithet to Agni (though this is not the only such occasion), but the emphatic militancy of Vadhryaśva’s fire provides another reason. It might be better rendered ‘smasher of obstacles’, although this would lose the phonological echo.

vījāmi-, clearly playing off *ājāmi-*, is a hapax and has been variously rendered. The publ. tr. ‘estranged kin’ (with *vī* ‘apart’) is due to JPB and seems the most persuasive of the possibilities.

X.70 Āprī

One of the two Āprī hymns in Maṇḍala X (the other being X.110). Re tr. in EVP XIV.47ff. There are connections esp. with the Āprī hymn VII.2.

X.70.1: For reasons unclear to me both Ge and Re tr. the instr. *devayajyā* as a dative.

X.70.2: I take *ṛtasya pathā* in c with ab, as more appropriate with a verb of motion (*yātu* in a) than with *√sūd* in d; cf. I.129.9 *yāhī pathān̄ anehāsā* “drive along a faultless path” as well as exx. with other verbs of motion. However, the existence of other exx. of the sequence *ṛtasya pathā nāmasā* (I.128.2, X.31.2) does give me pause. Ge and Re take the hemistich break as the syntactic break, in contrast to my enjambment, which I still weakly prefer.

With Ge, Old, and Re, I take *miyédhaḥ* as belonging to a neut. *s*-stem, not the thematic *miyédha-* found elsewhere. As Old points out, in other Āprī hymns at the corresponding point we find an obj. *havyám*, *yajñām* et sim.

X.70.4–6: The part. *uśánt-* ‘(being) eager’ figures prominently in these vss. (4d, 5c, 6c [2x]); see also 9d.

X.70.4: Note the pleasing etymological and phonetic figure *dīrghám drāghmā*. On the instr. sg. *drāghmā* (only here) to *drāgh(i)mán-* see AiG III.268. It is striking that the following vs. contains another instr. to a *-mán*-stem, *mahinā* (5c) with a different shape. We might have expected **drāgh(i)nā* here.

X.70.5: Ge (n. 5a and see Re’s tr.) is quite insistent that *vārīyaḥ* is adverbial and does not modify *sānu*, as I take it. This is possible, but I don’t know what “touch more widely” means, and both Ge and Re have to introduce some extra verbiage to make it make sense. See also 8a.

Contra Pp. but with all standard interpr., gen. *prthivyāḥ*, not instr. *prthivyā*.

The apparent nom. sg. *rathayúḥ* is the problem in b, as also in the very similar Āprī vs. VII.2.5. We should expect a fem. nom. pl. here and a fem. acc. pl. in VII.2.5. Old (ad VII.2.5) simply suggests sg. for pl. (accepted by Wack., AiG III.159). But surely this substitution was occasioned by uncertainty on the part of the poet, or the redactors, as to what the fem. pl. form to such a stem should be. I therefore am sympathetic to Gr’s *-yús* for **-yūs*. In any case I don’t know what the chariot is doing here.

X.70.7: Given the position of adverbial neut. *bṛhāt*, it could go with both NPs. I suggest a minor adjustment to the tr.: “the pressing stone is loftily upright; the fire has been loftily kindled.”

The phrasing of pāda b may seem somewhat opaque, but its purport seems clear. The “lap of Aditi” (e.g., IX.26.1, 71.5, 74.5; X.5.7) is generally a kenning for the ritual ground. The point here is that the ritual fire and the pressing stone both have their places there. (Somewhat different, Ge and Re.) For the kindling of the fire in the lap of Aditi, see X.5.7. In the publ. tr. I would erase the ? after “ground.”

The keyword in this vs. is *ṛtvijā*, substituting for the standard *daívyā hótārā* at this point in Āprī hymns.

X.70.8: As in 5a, *vārīyaḥ* is placed pāda-final, following a neut. noun (*barhīḥ* in this case). I take it as modifying this noun; Ge and Re as adverbial. I doubt that the goddesses are urged to sit as far apart as possible, as a species of social distancing; rather, that the barhis has been widely spread. See, e.g., I.85.6 *sīdatā barhūr urū vaḥ sādās kṛtām* “Sit on the barhis; a wide seat has been made for you.”

X.70.9: In the Āprī hymns Tvaṣṭar, as shaper of creatures and releaser of the semen that produces them, is also called on, conversely, to start the journey of one of his created creatures, the sacrificial animal, to its death, a task continued by Vanaspati “Lord of the Forest” (=sacrificial post), who occupies the next vs. in the litany. Because of the taint of death, both the Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati vss. in Āprī hymns are often euphemistic and/or underdeveloped, and our vs. is no exception. (For further on Tvaṣṭar and Vanaspati and their occasional conflation, see comm. ad II.3.9.) In pāda a “has attained/achieved loveliness” (*cārutvām ānaḥ*) is a reference to Tvaṣṭar’s role as the shaper of creatures, as Ge (n. 9a) points out. Re suggests that the phrase has a loose connection to the epithet *viśvá-rūpa-* ‘having/providing all forms’ that is used of Tvaṣṭar in other Āprī hymns. I do not understand the connection of the Aṅgirasas in pāda b.

Pāda c is almost identical to 10b, addressed to Vanaspati, and so Tvaṣṭar is essentially identified with Vanaspati here, as sending the sacrificial animal “into the fold of the gods.” However, because of its inauspicious nature it contains neither verb nor object. The verb can be supplied from *vakṣī* (‘convey’) in 10b, but the victim is never directly expressed in the Āprī hymns. The object is either gapped or the anodyne ‘oblation’ (*havís-*) is substituted; see *havīṃṣi* in the second hemistich of 10.

X.70.10: The gerund phrase in pāda a, *raśanáyā niyūyā* “harnessing with a halter” comes closer than other Āprī hymns to acknowledging the animal victim. The object is still gapped, but one doesn’t harness a generic *havís-* with a halter.

[X.71–72 JPB]

X.73–74

Two hymns to Indra attributed to Gaurivīti Śāktya. The Anukr. also attributes to him V.29, another Indra hymn, where the poet names himself in vs. 11, and the first two vss. of IX.108. On possible thematic connections between V.29 and IX.108.1–2 see comm. ad IX.108.1–2; for possible thematic connections between V.29 and X.73 see comm. ad X.73.8.

X.73 Indra

On the structure and contents of this difficult hymn, see the publ. intro. Caland-Henry give a complete (though very loose) translation, pp. 301ff., and HPS treats the hymn in a 2002 article, “R̥gveda 10.73” (StII 23).

X.73.1: Note the rhyming forms at the beginning and end of the vs.: # *jāniṣṭhā(h)* ... (*d*)*hāniṣṭhā*, though they are morphologically distinct: 2nd sg. mid. injunctive and fem. superlative respectively.

The adj. *ugrá-* in pāda a is matched by its superlative *ōjīṣṭha-* in b, whose etymological identity would have been clear to Vedic speakers despite their phonological divergence.

On the various meanings of *abhí√man* see comm. ad X.27.11. Here I think the sense is ‘designs on / intentions towards’, i.e., ‘plans’. I don’t know where Ge gets his “von reichlichem Selbstgefühl.”

The pf. subj. *dadhánat* is anomalous in two ways: 1) it appears to be transitive, though most of the other forms of the pf. of *√dhan* are intransitive (incl. *dadhanvān* in X.113.2; see comm. ad loc.) (see Kü 255–56); 2) it does not have the usual value of the perfect subjunctive. As I established in my article on the perfect subjunctive (García Ramón Fs.), the vast majority of these forms supply the only subjunctives to their roots and have simple subjunctive value (“will/shall X”) without any “perfect” nuance at all. However, such an interpr. does not work here: the form is in a subordinate clause, whose main clause has an imperfect (*āvardhan*), and the whole refers to the mythic past, the birth of Indra. As far as I can see, it is not possible to avoid interpr. *dadhánat* as a past prospective (Kü 156: “Prospektiv der Vergangenheit”) “was going to set to running / moving.” Whether the two anomalous features are related is not clear.

We might, however, try to figure out the mythological situation being depicted. And in my view this requires taking a closer look at the superlative that ends the vs.: *dhāniṣṭhā*. On the surface, we have a straightforward, somewhat banal, etymological figure *dadhánad dhāniṣṭhā* “(she), the best runner, was going to set (him) to running.” However, in this sandhi position, the superlative could also stand for *hāniṣṭhā* to *√han* ‘smite’. Recall that Indra’s birth was a troubled one, at least as depicted in the famous hymn IV.18, where Indra in utero declines to be born vaginally and instead comes out of his mother’s side (IV.18.1–2). I wonder if *√han* in a birthing context could refer to what is called “pushing” in modern English: the movements the mother makes to expel the fetus from the birth canal: “slamming” might be what *√han* expresses. Thus “best at pushing/slamming” would identify Indra’s mother as possessing the skill and strength to give birth even to Indra, despite his prodigious qualities. I also wonder if *dadhánat* refers to the movement of the baby through the birth canal: “she, best at pushing, was going to set him in motion.” The perfect subjunctive here might express a potential thwarted: she was going to make him move through the birth canal, but he went out her side instead.

Alternatively, we might consider the rather confused situation depicted later in IV.18. At various points in that hymn it seems that his mother abandons him and goes away (IV.18.3, also 4, 8), which could fit with the reading *dhāniṣṭhā* “(she) best at running (away).” But closest to our phrase is the sequence in IV.18.10–11, in which (in my interpr.) his mother “impelled her calf to wander” (10a, c ... *sasūva* ... *vatsān carāthāya mātā*) and then followed after him (11a *utā mātā mahiṣām ānv avenat*). Our *dadhánat* could correspond to vs. 10 and *dhāniṣṭhā* to 11a – though I prefer my birth interpr. A final alternative interpr. of *dadhánat* could take it as intransitive, referring to the mother’s own running, following after her son, as in IV.18.11a.

So, to summarize, I have suggested three different interpr. of the obscure pāda d, one depicting the birth itself, two soon after the birth:

1) When the mother, best at pushing/slamming, was going to set the hero in motion [=expel him from the birth canal].

2) When the mother, best at running [/smiting], was going to set the hero to run [=send him away from her].

3) When the mother, best at running, was going to run after the hero [after she had sent him away].

I prefer no. 1.

Any of these interpr. rests on taking IV.18 as a widespread, fairly standard depiction of Indra's birth – an assumption that we can, of course, not count on. One thing that calls into question my use of IV.18 as background for our vs. is the fact that the Maruts do not figure in IV.18, though in X.73.1 they occupy the main clause (c) on which our *yád* clause is dependent. I do not know other references to Indra's birth that involve the Maruts.

X.73.2: This vs. is considerably more baffling than even the one before. But we do have one thing to hang onto: pāda b ... *vāṽrdhuṣ tā índram* echoes 1c *āvardhann índram* ... Since the Maruts are the subject in 1c, they are likely the referents of *té* in 2b. This further suggests that the female in 2a is identical to the mother in 1d. The pādas in the two hemistichs are simply flipped: 1cd: Maruts / Indra's mother; 2ab Indra's mother / Maruts. This is essentially Ge's view of the structure too (n. 2a), though I don't quite understand his view of the sense of pāda a.

It further seems that the fine plans that Indra's mother had in 1d have not come to pass, and she is considerably chastened (*nīṣattā* 'sunk down'). I agree with Ge that what has reduced her to this state are the "ways of deceit / the activities of the Lie," referring to harm intended for her infant Indra by enemies, not any hostile actions against him on her part. But the enemy/enemies is/are not identified. Old is in general agreement, though he considers the possibility that it is the mother whose hostility against her son is at issue. He also toys with the female as the Maruts' mother, on the basis of the similarity between the word *prśanī* and the Maruts' mother *Prśni*, but though a phonological play is surely intended, the structure of the passages imposes Indra's mother.

Despite her demoralized state, she still expresses affection for the newborn – or so I interpr. *prśanī*. On the fem. stem *prśanī* as well as related forms, see comm. ad IX.97.54. The two fem. pl. forms *prśanyàs* (I.71.5, IX.97.54) seem to mean 'caresses' (Re EVP XVI.137: "gestes d'amour pour attirer"), but our nom. sg. occurrence must refer to a person and hence an agent: caresser, one who caresses. I do not, with Ge and Re (loc. cit.), think it has developed here to mean 'courtesan' or the like: Ge Buhlerin, EWA Liebeslockung, Buhlerin, Kurtisane. Rather, Indra's mother is bestowing affection on her newborn, despite the circumstances.

Starting with the 2nd hemistich of this vs. through the first one of vs. 5, the contents become extremely obscure, though much of it seems to concern prodigious births and Indra's part in them. For my quite speculative interpr. see publ. intro.

With most others I take *tā* as neut. pl. referring to the worlds or beings (see Ge n. 2cd). They are "covered over" (*abhīṽṛtā*) by a great footprint (*mahāpadéna*) that seems to obstruct light and movement, but the same covering seems to have sexual overtones (as in a cow "covered" by a bull), given the immediate production of *gárbhas* in the next pāda. It seems likely that the footprint is Indra's, since his feet feature in the next vs., 3a.

Ge (n. 2d) takes the embryos as everything that comes out of the darkness, esp. rivers and the lights of heaven – which makes it sound like a mash-up of the Vṛtra and Vala myths. Old suggests d depicts the Maruts’ birth, but gives no evidence. I’m more inclined to see the referents as generic living beings, which could be generated by a sexual encounter – since it seems likely that Indra impregnated the worlds when he covered them with his big “foot.” But since I really don’t know what’s going on in these vss., I am not insistent.

X.73.3: As was just noted, Indra’s “lofty feet” (*ṛṣvā ... pādā*) here suggest that the big foot of 2a is also Indra’s.

In b Indra is once again strengthened (*āvardhan*), but his strengtheners are no longer the Maruts as in 1c and probably 2d), but the Vājas and unspecified others who were on the scene (*utá yé cid átra*). Caland-Henry (302) think these latter are the Maruts, and the repetition of *cid átra* from 1c might support this identification. As for the Vājas, Ge, flg. Sāy., takes them to be the Ṛbhus. It is certainly the case that plural *vāja*- is used of, or at least adjacent to, the Ṛbhus (e.g., IV.36.2–4, 7), but the Ṛbhus aren’t, as far as I know, ordinarily implicated in Indra’s birth or strengthening.

Pāda c brings the surprising intrusion of the hyenas (*sālāvṛkân*), a thousand of which Indra takes into his mouth. Ge (n. 3c) thinks this is a measure of the great size of Indra’s mouth, esp. given the fearsomeness of the jaws of the hyenas. He explicitly denies that the mention here has anything to do with the “bekannte Sage,” in which Indra feeds a group of priests to hyenas. As I discuss in my extensive treatment of this “well-known saga” (*Ravenous Hyenas*, 1991), I think Ge is wrong here. The word *sālāvṛká*- and its relatives are rare in Vedic; it only occurs twice in the RV, and only once in connection with Indra. It seems extremely unlikely that the widespread Brāhmaṇa story (already in Saṃhitā prose) of Indra and the hyenas isn’t in the poet’s mind. I treat this RVic passage in *Hyenas* pp. 78–79 and argue that our RVic passage depicts a scene of parental tenderness: adult hyenas carry their young in their mouths like cats. Here I think the *gārbhas* that Indra generated in 2cd are now being carted around in his mouth.

But the scene shifts abruptly to current-day ritual, and Indra is urged to turn the Aśvins our way, presumably to the early morning sacrifice that they are esp. associated with.

X.73.4: The journey of Indra and the Aśvins continues in 4ab, with 4b a slightly elaborated version of the last two words of 3cd (*aśvínā vavṛtyāḥ*). But in the second half of the vs. we return to matters of procreation in the past.

The adv. *samanā* ‘in the same way’ must refer to Indra’s repetition of his habitual journey to the sacrifice. It may also be meant to play off *sānāmānā* in 6a, likewise vs.-initial. Gr suggests that in this passage *samanā* introduces the first clause in a coordinated structure “sowohl ... als auch,” and a similar interpr. seems to underlie Caland-Henry’s “En même temps que ...” (302), but this adverb is not otherwise so used, and in any case I think we’d expect the first verb to be accented.

I would now change “—swiftly—” to “advancing, you drive to the sacrifice,” with a more apt sense of *tūrṇi*-. For the meaning and root affiliation of this stem, see comm. ad III.11.5.

The rendering of *sakhyāya* as ‘fellowship’ in the publ. tr. would be better as “for comradeship” to harmonize with *sākhibhiḥ* in 5b.

The difficult 2nd hemistich is parallel to the difficult 2nd hemistich of 3:

3cd *tvám indra sālāvṛkân sahásram, āsán dadhiṣe (I) aśvínā ...*

4cd *vasāvyām indra dhārayaḥ sahásrā, (I) aśvínā ...*

The points of contact include the direct object ‘thousand(s)’ (*sahásram, sahásrā*), a 2nd sg. verb ‘take, hold, make fast’ (*dadhiṣe, dhārayaḥ*), a loc. indicating where the thousand(s) are held (*āsán, vasāvyām*), and an abrupt shift to a new clause beginning *aśvínā* -- as well as a voc. *indra* (the least important point of contact). Though both half-verses are difficult to interpr., they should be interpreted in tandem, or at least as deliberately contrastive. As indicated in the publ. intro., I think 4cd is another depiction of prodigious birth, with Indra engendering thousands of offspring in a single female. I don’t think that these thousands are the same ones Indra was carrying in his mouth in the previous vs. – though that is far from excluded, esp. if we take 3cd as chronologically later than 4cd (as often in RVic recountings of myth). But whether they are narratively connected or not, the point is that Indra is responsible for massive fertility.

The otherwise unknown female *vasāvī* can be either the wife of a/the good one (*vāsu-*) or of someone named Vasu (see Mayr. PN s.v.). I favor the former, since Indra’s fecundity is clearly viewed favorably.

X.73.5: In my view, the first hemistich summarizes the accounts in the last few vss. of Indra’s generative powers: Indra achieved his goal (*ártham, b*), which was to produce progeny (*prajāyai, a*; on *prajāyai* as a quasi-infinitive see also VII.36.9 and possibly the preceding hymn, X.72.9). He did so “from truth” (*ṛtād ádhi*), that is (probably), from his adherence to the sacrificial model and to proper procedures. See I.36.11 where Agni is kindled *ṛtād ádhi*. My interpr. of the sense would be clearer with some rearrangement: “... with his vigorous comrades Indra (went) to his goal, to produce progeny from truth.”

Indra reached his goal along with, or with the help of, his comrades (*sákhībhiḥ*). Although Indra has been prominently associated with the Aśvins in the last few vss. (3d, 4b, d) and indeed he conveyed them “for comradeship” (*sakhyāya*) in 4b, the plural of *sákhībhiḥ* cannot be exclusively identified with the two Aśvins. Perhaps, with Sāy., the Maruts (see Ge n. 5b), who figured in vss. 1–2, or all the sidekicks previously named: the Maruts, the Vājas (/Ṛbhus?) and the others there at the time (3b), as well as the Aśvins.

The topic of procreation is now at an end, and the poet turns to more usual Indraic fare, his great victories over enemies. The first up is a *dasyú-* who may well be Vṛtra, since the foe has *māyās* (see I.32.4 *māyínām ... māyāḥ* “the wiles of the wily one [=Vṛtra]”) and the battle takes place amid mists (*míhaḥ*) and darkness that have been scattered (see I.32.13), both passages in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32. I do have to note that Namuci is rendered “without wiles” (*vímāya-*) in 7b, so it is possible that Namuci is the referent here.

Essentially all comm. and tr. supply *māyābhiḥ* with *ābhiḥ* in c, for good reason.

Again with all comm. and tr. (Ge, C-H 302, Lü 180, HPS), I take the *hí* cl. of c with the main cl. of d.

X.73.6: The action and personnel (besides Indra) in the first hemistich are not clear. As for personnel, there are two “of the same name” (*sánāmanā*) as well as a singleton in the dative. If we start with the latter, we can begin to unravel the passage, for the dative is the unaccented *asmai*, which must refer to a referent already in the discourse. In my view, this can only be the *dasyú-* of 5c – though Ge (n. 6a) suggests rather Namuci, who figures in vs. 7, and HPS also considers this possibility. However, unaccented *asmai* speaks against this (unless Namuci is the *dasyú* in 5c, which is possible but less likely than Vṛtra, in my opinion – despite *vímāya-* in 7b; see disc. just above).

To get closer to an identification of the two “of the same name,” we must first tackle the verb *ní dhvasayaḥ*. The stem *dhvasáya-* (3x) belongs to the root \sqrt{dhvam} s ‘smoke’ (in my view), and as I discussed in my *-áya-Formations* monograph (54–55), I consider all three occurrences intransitive, in the sense ‘smoke, produce smoke’. The two occurrences of the participle in I.140.3, 5 refer to Agni and his flames respectively, and an intransitive sense seems to me clear, though those who wish to impose a transitive interpr. (like Ge) supply objects. The occurrence here is generally taken as transitive; see not only Ge, but Gotō (1st Class, 60 and 190, with lit. in n. 351). The object is taken to be the dual *sánāmānā*, and the referents are then identified as the two wives of Namuci, who are supposed to be hostilely dealt with in I.104.3 and V.30.9. All of this turns out to be a tissue of speculation, which evaporates on examination. In V.30.9 women are mentioned in the context of Namuci, but these women are *plural* (*stríyaḥ*). Moreover, Indra does them no damage. In I.104.3 there are indeed *two* females, but there is no mention of Namuci in this hymn; in fact they are called “the two maidens of Kuyava” (*kúyavasya yóṣe*). Though a bad end is wished for them, they have nothing to do with Namuci. (For further on these passages, see comm. ad locc. and publ. intros. to both hymns; in both cases I think we’re dealing with rivers.) Thus, not only is *asmai* unlikely to refer to Namuci on syntactic grounds, but Namuci is not elsewhere associated with a pair of females.

Moreover, *sánāmānā* need not be – and in fact is unlikely to be – feminine. The number of feminines built to *n*-stems is quite limited; see Lanman (Noun Inflection, 528). However, Lanman cites a number of fem. bahuvrīhis built to *-nāman-* in the AV, which are suffixed with *-ī*, e.g., *durnāmnī-*, *pāñcanāmnī-*, etc. Though no such forms are found in the RV, in this late hymn it is likely that the AV practice would have been followed (expect **sánāmnī-*). Therefore *sánāmānā* is probably masc. What then are its referents? Old suggests dual body parts of the Dasyu or Indra’s two *hárī*, neither of which is terribly plausible. Ge (n. 6a) reports Fay as suggesting Vṛtra and Dānu. (Sāy. is silent on referents.) We need to ask: in the context of this hymn who would be “the two with the same name”? This produces an obvious answer: the Aśvins ([Nāsatyas]), who have been insistently mentioned by name in the dual in 3d, 4b, 4d. What has impeded accepting this obvious answer has been the assumption that the two of the same name must be enemies of Indra subjected to a hostile action expressed by the verb *ní dhvasayaḥ*, and the Aśvins would not fit. But if the verb is neither transitive nor necessarily hostile, the way is cleared. In my view *ní dhvasayaḥ* continues the picture of the immediately preceding pāda, 5d, where Indra scatters mist and darkness to obfuscate the place of battle. Here he sends down smoke for the same purpose; the smoke is “for” the Dasyu (*asmai*), a dative of malefit. But it also beclouds his companions, the Aśvins. Note that the Aśvins are called *dhvasrā* in X.40.3, and since they travel in the early morning, it is not surprising that they become obscured by morning mist and, here, by Indra’s smokescreen.

In c *ṛṣvā-* ‘lofty’, which characterized Indra’s feet in 3a, returns to modify his comrades (*sákhībhiḥ*) of 5b.

Opinion is divided on the morphological identity of *pratiṣṭhā hṛdyā*. The Pp. reads both words with final *-ā*, hence as instr. sgs. Old accepts the Pp. reading, as does Scar (651–52), supplying the enemy as object of *jaghantha*. Gr reads underlying *pratiṣṭhās hṛdyās*, fem. acc. pls., perfectly possible in this sandhi context. In this he is followed by Ge, C-H, HPS, and the published tr. Although either is technically possible, I find it harder to imagine how Indra would wield “firm standing / foundation” as a weapon, so I prefer the acc. interpr.

X.73.7: On Namuci as *vīmāya*- see disc. ad 5c. On the connection of Manu's path with Namuci, see V.30.7.

The identity of the "seer" in b, for whose benefit Namuci was rendered wileless is not entirely certain. It most likely refers to Manu, also benefited in pāda c. But Ge (n. 7b) alternatively suggests Namī Sāpya, who is associated with Indra in the Namuci battle in I.53.7 (see comm. ad loc.) and VI.20.6 (see also X.48.9).

X.73.8: The expression *nāmāni* √*prā* "fulfill (your) names" is found also in the next hymn (by the same poet), X.74.6. It must refer to Indra's performing the deeds encapsulated in his epithets (so also Ge, n. 8a) and gestures towards the complex interrelationship between words and actions in Vedic India. For a similar exploration of this theme, see VIII.80.

The object of *dadhiṣe* in b is most likely the names of pāda a, producing a strikingly physical image of Indra holding his names in his fist.

Pāda c is almost identical to I.102.1, but in scrambled order. As I did there, I take *śávasā* as referring to Indra's power, which incites the gods' acclaim. Ge (and others) take it as semi-adverbial (Ge "mächtig"), referring to the energy with which the gods cheer Indra on.

The puzzling pāda is d, and my interpr. is quite different from the standard, in two ways. The standard assumes that *vanínaḥ* must refer to trees, but, though *vanín*- often has that referent, it literally just means 'wooden, having wood' and, in my view, could refer to any wooden object. My second deviation from the standard is more controversial: I suggest that d should be read with the first pāda of the next vs. (9a), with 9b beginning a new clause. I do not make these departures lightly, but the standard interpr. seems to me to lead to very unlikely scenarios and also produces syntactic problems in 9ab. Ge (n. 8d) suggests that turning the trees upside down, with roots facing up, is just a metaphorical expression "für die umwälzenden Taten des Indra," but the image seems too precise to serve vague metaphorical ends. HPS tr. "You have made the trees aboveground," suggesting that Indra's separation of the two world halves allowed the trees to grow (not a standard result of this standard cosmogonic deed). I think rather that the 'wooden' things are chariots or pieces of chariots, including the wheel in 9a, and that this is another obscure reference to the chariot race between Indra and the Sun, in which Indra tears the wheel off the Sun's chariot and also reverses the position of the chariots (a topsy-turvy image). See the tantalizing hints in the Indra hymns of the Vth Maṇḍala, esp. V.29.5, 9–10 and V.31.11). I unfortunately don't have a precise image in mind, but the sudden reversals in the passages in V and the prominence of the wheel there suggests that this is a promising direction to explore – esp. since the poet of our hymn is also the poet of V.29, per the Anukramaṇī. (One can also think of Karṇa's wheel stuck in the earth in the climactic MBh battle.) Given the uncertainties of the situation depicted, the referent of *asya* is not clear to me, but see below.

X.73.9: For my suggestion that 8d and 9a form a sentence, see immediately preceding disc. One of the further advantages of this interpr. is that, if the *yád* clause of 9a leans backwards, this configuration avoids the awkwardness of trying to make 9b, with its initial *utá*, into its main clause. Both Ge and JSK (DGRV I.453) give *utá* the sense 'also' here, but *utá* is of course a coordinating conjunction and should not connect subordinate and main clauses. (However, see the disc. of problematic *utá* in 10b.) Moreover, the sense Ge and JSK give the whole – that Indra can find the good in any situation, even one like 9a – seems foreign to Indra's character; he is no Pollyanna-esque optimistic stoic.

Note that *nīṣattam* reprises *nīṣattā* in 2a, of Indra's mother.

In the 2nd hemistich Ge (et al.) once again tries to impose a subordinate clause (c) / main clause (d) structure, but once again runs into textual difficulties, because the verb in d (*ádadhā(h)*) is accented. Ge suggests, rather weakly, that it's accented because it's between two vocatives (n. 9cd); Old's account is similarly unsatisfactory. The syntactic solution seems to me obvious – to take d as part of the *yád* clause begun in c, with both of them subordinated to b. I further take *yád* as a neut. rel. prn. (not a subord. conjunction), with *tád* in b as its antecedent. The *yád* agrees with both *ūdhaḥ* and *páyah*.

With the syntax sorted out, we can turn to the sense. The assumption of Ge et al. seems to be that c depicts a bad situation that Indra remedies in d. Exactly what is supposed to be bad in c is not clear, and the fact that the lexeme *áti* √ *sā* is otherwise unattested doesn't help (see Ge n. 9cd). I think rather that c and d are benefits conferred by Indra: he positioned the udder, presumably abounding in good things, on the earth and put milk in the cows and plants. All of this seemed should/would seem good (“seem honey”) “to him” (*asmai*), who must be a beneficiary of Indra's positive actions. The referent of *asmai* is probably the same as that of *asya* in pāda. It could perhaps be Manu (see ad 7), though this is less likely for a than for b.

X.73.10: Note that Old makes no comment on this vs. – surely not because he found it crystal clear!

Leaving aside the content, the structure of this vs. is very challenging and may undercut my argument about *utá* in 9b, as it is difficult to interpret *utá* as a coordinating conjunction in pāda b (though see an attempt below). The most natural way to interpr. ab is with pāda a as a subordinate clause whose main clause is b, expressing two contrastive views of the source of Indra's birth, one held by unidentified 3rd pl. ‘they’, the other by me. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr., with *utá* arbitrarily rendered as ‘rather’. In a similar vein, JSK (DGRV I.447–48) suggests that here and in a few other passages “the scope of *utá* is limited to some constituent of its clause,” here the person of the verb: 1st sg. *manyē* versus 3rd pl. *vádanti*. He tr. “When they say, ‘he has gone (forth) from the horse,’ (then) I also (i.e. for my part) think him to be born from strength.” The problem is that there are 752 occurrences of *utá* (per Lubotsky), and at best not even a handful of them need this “scope” interpr. This interpr. also leaves pāda c somewhat hanging: who holds that Indra came from battle-fervor – the “they” of a, the “I” of b, or some other entity or entities? Is c the *real* story of Indra's birth? Probably not, since d indicates that no one know that but Indra. But the close parallelism between the expressions in a and c, ABL *iyāya*, carries no rhetorical weight in this interpr.

My tentative – and quite arbitrary – attempt to account for the *utá* and for the floating pāda c involves taking b as a parenthetical aside; c then is either what “they” really mean when they say he comes from a horse, or else an alternative, possibly the dominant view. In either case the obvious contrast between the phrases in a and c is properly exploited. I therefore suggest the alternative translations: “When they say ‘he came from a horse’ – and I think of him as born from strength – (they mean) ‘he came from battle-fervor ...’” Or “While they say ‘he came from a horse’ – and I think of him as born from strength – he (really) came from battle-fervor ...”

The sense of *harmyéṣu tasthau* is also unclear. Ge (n. 10c) thinks that the jealous gods imprisoned Indra after his birth, but I see no evidence for this. I think rather that *harmyá-* refers to the womb. It is even possible that the beginning of d should be construed with this VP: “he stayed in a secure house (=womb), from which he came forth,” with “Indra knows this” a separate clause.

In any case this vs. returns us to the 1st vs. of the hymn, indeed the first word: *jāniṣṭhāḥ* ‘you were born’. Since the final vs. (11) is a summary vs. detailing the requests of the poets, vss. 1 and 10 are conceptually ring compositional, but contrastively. It is striking that the beginning of the hymn focuses on Indra’s *mother’s* role in his birth, whereas the various suggestions for Indra’s origin in vs. 10 are either masc. (‘horse’, ‘battle-fervor’) or neut. (‘strength’). There is also more certainty about the facts of the birth at the beginning than in this vs.

X.73.11: As just noted, this is a summary vs., unrelated in content to the rest of the hymn. This is also the only appearance of the Priyamedhas in X; they are more at home in VIII.

ūrṇuhí is accented because of its contrastive proximity to *pūrdhí*.

X.74 Indra

Although Ge suggests that the theme of the hymn is a plea for the dakṣiṇā, I see no evidence for this – nor for his previous view (registered and rejected by Old) that it celebrates a victory in racing.

X.74.1: This vs. provides an unusual number of disjunctive possibilities for objects and instruments of celebration: the vs. contains 5 occurrences of *vā* ‘or’. Perhaps this wide range at the beginning makes the narrowing focus on Indra in the 2nd half of the hymn more pointed.

With Old (implicitly), I supply *sumnām* ‘favor’ as obj. of the part. *īyakṣan*, as in I.153.2, II.20.1, X.50.3. Ge (also Scar 557) instead makes the objects of praise (Vasus, world-halves, etc.) the objects of *īyakṣan* as well as of *carkṛṣe*. This is not impossible, but does require doubling the genitives with *carkṛṣe* with supplied accusatives to serve as objects of *īyakṣan*, which does not take the gen.

As Ge points out (n. 1b), *dhiyā vā yajñāir vā* is reprised in 3c by *dhīyaṃ ca yajñāṃ ca*.

The two pādas in the second hemistich are syntactically parallel: both contain *yé* rel. clauses with the genitive antecedent (complement of *carkṛṣe*) gapped and the nominal expression of it found as nom. pl. in the rel. clause “... pay tribute to (those), which steeds ...,” etc. Needless to say, a literal rendering of these constructions produces non-parsable English.

(*su*)*śrúṇa-* is a hapax; such a *na*-stem is not otherwise found to *√śru*. It may have been created to split the difference between *vanúm* and *suśrútaḥ*.

X.74.2: With Ge I interpr. *háva* as loc. *háve*, against the Pp and Old. In favor of Old’s analysis (“asurischer Ruf den Himmel erreichte”) is 3a *īyám eṣām ... gīḥ*, with a nom. sg. of a verbal product plus dependent gen. *eṣām*. But I find *ásura-* as a qualifier of ‘call’ unlikely; it is the only such passage registered by Gr. The more likely subj. is Agni; see Ge’s n. 2a for *dyām √naś nakṣ* with Agni as subject and WE Hale (68–69) for Agni as *ásura-*. It is characteristic of Agni that his smoke (and flames) reach heaven while he spreads across the earth.

Of the three finite verbs in this vs., *nakṣata*, *nīṃsata*, and *kṛnávanta*, the last one is an unambiguous subjunctive, and the second one is most likely subj. as well: though Gr classifies it under a them. *nīṃsa-*, the few other forms to this (secondary) root are all athematic (as Gr recognizes): 3rd pl. *nīṃsate*, part. *nīṃsāna-*. (Wh Rts gives only a Class 2 pres.) By contrast *nakṣata* looks like the injunc. to the well-attested thematic stem *nákṣa-*, and this may well be so, since injunctives can mix with modal forms – though an *s*-aor. subjunctive to *√naś* can’t be formally excluded.

On the semantics of *√nīṃs* see comm. ad VIII.43.10.

Ge (fld by WE Hale, p. 69) takes *cākṣāṇā(h)* as intrans. ‘appearing’, but med. *cāṣṭe* (etc.) overwhelmingly has the sense ‘see’, even when used absolutely without expressed object. In the publ. tr. I take the dat. *suvitāya* as what the gods are looking out for; it would also be possible to supply an acc. obj. like *vīśvā*, as in IX.57.2 *vīśvā cākṣāṇaḥ* “observing all,” with the dat. serving as goal: “surveying (all things) for easy passage.”

Ge’s (and Hale’s) interpr. are also unpersuasive because the simile in d is left hanging: “während die Götter ... es sich nach ihren eigenen Wünschen einrichten sollen wie der Himmel”; “while the gods ... will act by their own desires like the sky.” Doing whatever it feels like is not a quality I associate with heaven; instead I think we have an incomplete simile, which lacks an instr. parallel to *vārebhiḥ* ... *svaīḥ*, which, however, is easily supplied: *stṛbhiḥ* ‘with stars’ (cf. for the full simile II.2.5, 34.2, IV.7.3). The use of the medial *kṛṇávanta* is idiomatic: ‘make oneself (to be) with, provide oneself with’. The idea is that before their journey to the earth, the gods provide themselves with desirable things proper to themselves to distribute in return for sacrifice. The ritual reciprocity is described in the following vs. (3).

X.74.3: *kṛpánanta* echoes *kṛṇávanta* in 2d; it’s worth noting that this is the only form built to this stem.

X.74.4: The verbal echoes continue, with *pananta* (pāda a) reading like a truncated form of *kṛpánanta* in 3b.

The vs. is notable for containing two desideratives in parallel rel. clauses with the same subject, one subjunctive (*títṛtsān* b) and one injunc. (*dudukṣan* d). It is not clear to me what the functional difference is between the two, and unfortunately Heenen (Le désidératif en védique) does not discuss the functions of modal forms to the desiderative or even list the relevant forms. (For the latter see Avery, Verb Forms of the Rig-Veda 1268–70, and Lanman, Vedic Gr. 389. Unfortunately both omit the injunc. *dudukṣan*.) Of *títṛtsān* Heenen says (149) that the verb “fait référence à un effort intense de volonté, suscité par l’émerveillement pour la récompense,” but this reflects his usual ad hoc imposition of context on morphology. I do think that we must take the modal difference between the two verbs seriously: although, being pāda-final, there is no metrical difference between subj. *-ān* and injunc. *-an*, it is highly unlikely that redactors would have introduced the difference – much more likely that the two endings would have been secondarily harmonized. In trying to figure out what’s going on, we are hampered by the fact that the role of the plural *Āyus* is not well defined. Gr considers the pl. to refer to men who are active in the service of the gods. Certainly almost all of the plural occurrences are found in specifically ritual situations, esp. the preparation of soma. Note in particular IX.62.20 *páyo duhanty āyávaḥ* “The *Āyus* milk the milk [=soma],” with the same root as here -- though this may be a red herring (see below).

My suggestions in what follows are extremely tentative. I start with the assumption that the desiderative subjunctive *títṛtsān* expresses an action that the *Āyus* desire to perform that temporally and logically follows the action of the desiderative injunctive *dudukṣan*, even though the rel. clauses are in the opposite order. I further assume that this logically sequential action is drilling into the Vala cave, “the enclosure full of cows” (*ūrvám gómantam*), to reach and acquire/free the cows. The logically prior *dudukṣan* must be what might enable them to do this: the milking of the great lofty (cow) with a thousand streams. As it happens, this cow is found elsewhere in the RV, esp. in two identical hemistichs: IV.41.5cd = X.101.9cd *sā no duhīyād yāvaseva gatvī, sahásradhārā páyasā mahī gauḥ* “She should yield her milk to us like a great cow

with her milk in a thousand streams who has gone to the pastures.” (See also X.133.7d, which is identical to the other d pādas.) Who is this prodigious cow? In IV.41.5=X.101.9 it is quite clearly identified as the *dhî-*, the inspired or visionary thought (IV.41.5b, X.101.9a)(in X.133.7 there is no referent, but *dhî-* is certainly not excluded). I suggest that the milking of the *dhî-* is at issue here as well: the Āyus must milk all the good out of their *dhî-* in order to penetrate the Vala cave and reach the real (or at least real-er) cows. Note that *dhî-* has occurred twice already in this hymn (1b, 3c); further the Āyus are elsewhere associated with ritual speech (I.117.25, 130.6, 131.2, 139.3; II.31.7; VIII.3.7–8). And of course the opening of the Vala cave was effected by speech and song, not by brute force. It is a nice touch that to reach the real cows the Āyus have to milk a metaphorical cow. For clarity I would now slightly rephrase the last three pādas of this vs. to “... -- they who will intend to drill through to the enclosure full of cows, who strive to milk the great (cow [= visionary thought]) ...”

It should be noted that the only other occurrence of *dudukṣan* (there unaccented) is in the devilish hymn X.61.10 also in a Vala context, where I take it to refer to the milking of the Vala cave itself (see comm. ad loc.), but not much can be made dependent on the interpr. of that hymn.

X.74.5: With Old (et al.), it is best to take *śácīva(h)* as displaced from a voc. phrase *śácīva indra*, as in I.53.3. This voc. is overwhelming applied to Indra.

On *suvṛktī-* as a secondary bahuvr. applicable to gods who receive hymns, see comm. ad II.4.1. It modifies Indra in X.104.7.

X.74.6: There is some disagreement about several words in pāda a: the verb *vāvāna* and the root-noun cmpd. *purāṣāt*. To start with the latter, though the standard view is that the cmpd. consists of adverbial *purā* ‘earlier, previously’ (e.g., Gr, Scar 604), with the cmpd meaning ‘previously victorious’ vel sim., Ge, flg. Sāy., renders it ‘Burgenzwinger’, without providing a morphological analysis. Such an interpr. would require that the 2nd member be a preverb-verb combination *ā√sah*, which does not occur, with the root noun *pūr-* ‘fortress’ as first member. Even if *ā√sah* did occur, root-noun cmpds don’t contain both a nominal 1st member and a preverb, as I’ve discussed elsewhere (Lamberterie Fs.). If the 2nd member is only *śāh-*, then the 1st member would have to be a case form of *pūr-*, but the instr. doesn’t work semantically and there are no other possibilities. I like ‘previous victor’ vel sim. for another reason: it contrasts nicely with *purutāmam*. Although most interpr. take the latter as adverbial (Ge, Scar “am häufigsten”), if we take the *-tama*-suffix as expressing not a superlative but the last of a series (as is common), Indra is identified as a victor both long ago and right this minute.

As for *vāvāna*, in contrast to the near-universal interpr. as the pf. to *√van* ‘win’, Kü (448–49) assigns it instead to *√vanī* ‘love’, for complex reasons that I will not rehearse because I find them implausible.

Note the return of the expression “fulfill his names,” as in the previous hymn X.73.8.

X.75–76: The Anukramaṇī attributes these two hymns to different poets, Sindhuṣṭit Praiyamedha and Jaratkarna Airāvata respectively. The contents of the two hymns are also quite distinct. Nonetheless, it is best to follow Old (Prol. 236 n. 3) in assuming the two hymns belong together, since they are found in the midst of the series of dyads (X.61–84).

X.75 Rivers

The first few vss. are dominated by the preverb *prá* ‘forth’: pāda-initial in 1a, c, d, 2a, internal in 2c, 3c).

X.75.1: There is much disc. of the numerical phrase *saptá-sapta tredhā*. In addition to Ge and Re, see Lü (684–86), Mau (203–4), also Kü (146). Mau’s disc. seems the most sensible: he thinks we’re dealing with three geographical groupings consisting of (roughly) seven rivers apiece, rather than a straight multiplicative 3 x 7. The number of rivers named in vss. 5–6 is eighteen (by my count) – close enough to seven groups of three. For a similar expression used of the river Sarasvatī see VI.61.12 *triśadhāsthā saptādhātuḥ*.

I do not understand the placement of *hí* in c.

Ge (n. 1d) suggests supplying *sasre* in d. Given the repetition of *prá*, I prefer to continue with a form of \sqrt{kram} as in c (*prá ... cakramúḥ*).

X.75.2: The gen. pl. phrase *eṣām ... jágatām* is interpr. by all as referring to the rivers (e.g., Re “... de ces (rivières) mobiles”), and this is quite plausible, esp. given 1d. However, ‘river’ is of course fem., and adjectives modifying the rivers should be fem. too (like *sītvarīṇām* in 1d). But *eṣām* identifies the phrase as masc.; the contrast between *eṣām ágram* here and fem. *āsām ágram* in 4d is quite pointed. I’m afraid we must take *jágat-* as a quasi-masc. substantive here, though it does presumably refer to the rivers.

X.75.3: On *bhūmyā* as instr., pace Pp., Gr, see Old.

Apropos of *śúśmam* in b, In VI.61.2 the river Sarasvatī is compared to “a root-grubbing (boar) with its snortings” (*śúśmebhir bisakhā iva*); see comm. ad loc.

I read *vṛṣṭāyaḥ* both with the simile, as “real” rain, and with the frame, as the spray from the rushing river. “The rains thunder” is a type of synaesthesia or, at any rate, the conflation of two separate phenomena related to a single event: rain and thunder associated with a storm. Re’s “Les pluies (pleuvent) comme (les tonnerres) tonnent” sorts the two phenomena into separate, more logical categories – losing the concentrated poetic focus. Moreover, his rendering is grammatically impossible, as RVic similes always share the same verb.

X.75.4: Note that vs.-initial *#abhí tvā* slightly echoes 3c *#abhrād iva*

The first hemistich presents Sindhu as a helpless calf to whom the motherly cows flock. This might seem like a reversal of the depiction of the power and dominance of Sindhu over the other rivers (1d, 2d), but of course the other rivers are bringing their “milk” to contribute to her strengthening stream.

If there was even a moment of doubt about her dominance, it is dispelled by the second hemistich, with Sindhu as a “battling king” (*rājeva yúdhvā*).

X.75.5–6: These vss. enumerate the names of rivers. As indicated in the publ. intro., much has been made of this list for the geography of NW India, and I refer the reader to such discussions, e.g., that of Mau.

X.75.8: The two hapaxes *sīlāmā(-vatī)* and *madhuvṛdh-* are plausibly taken as plant names. (For the latter see Scar 521.)

X.75.9: The referent of the genitive phrase in cd, *asya ... ádabdhasya sváyaśaso virapśínah*, is unclear, but the most obvious and desirable referent, Sindhu herself, is excluded by the gender, which must be masc. or neut. This leaves the chariot (*rátha-*), the prize (*vāja-*), or the contest (*āji-*). Ge, Re, and Mau opt for the chariot, though in his n. Re allows the possibility that it is Sindhu “concu(e) comme masc.” Old is of the same opinion, based on the implicit comparison of Sindhu to a Wettfahrer in ab. I am reluctant to go this direction because of the stress laid on the grammatical gender of ‘river’ words, esp. emphasized for Sindhu in vss. 7–8.

X.76 Pressing Stones

It is totally unclear to me why this hymn is attributed to a snake (*sarpa*), much less why this snake is called “Having old ears.” As MM (PN s.v. *járatkarṇa-*) points out, the phrase *járataḥ kárṇa-* is found in nearby X.80.3 as a personal name, but the connection is not straightforward.

X.76.1: On *ṛñjase* see comm. ad IV.8.1. The form expresses an act of reverence, several times in the form of a hymn (*girā* IV.8.1, VI.15.1).

The expression *ūrjāṃ vyùṣṭisu*, assuming the two words go together (as most do, incl. Caland-Henry p. 271, but notably not Ge), is at first glance somewhat bizarre: “at the first dawn flushes of nourishment(s)” (in the publ. tr. I suppressed the pl. of *ūrjāṃ*). But I think it economically combines two different concepts. On the one hand, like “the milk of the dawn cows,” it refers to the visual effect of dawn: the milky white sky at the horizon just before sunrise. On the other hand, the appearance of the dawn inaugurates the soma pressing, that is, the production of nourishment, and so the pressing stones need to be deployed. Ge prefers to construe *ūrjāṃ* with (*ā ...*) *ṛñjase*, (“ich begehre eurer Kräfte”), but *ṛñjase* does not take a genitive elsewhere (and it does not mean ‘desire’).

I take *udbhídā* as referring to what in English is also called day-*break*.

It’s not entirely clear what “make every seat spacious” is meant to convey, but I assume that, with the coming of daylight, places appear larger. The particular seats in question may be the ritual ground and its parts.

X.76.2: This vs. provides ample puzzles, though the straightforward first pāda gives no hint of what is to come.

The first issue is *sotári* in b. This appears to be the loc. sg. of the well-attested agent noun *sotár-* ‘(soma-)presser’, and that is how I take it (also in its other occurrence in X.100.9). But this is a minority view, at least as to function. Ge (n. 2b) cites Ludwig’s view that it is a nom. sg., while Ge himself suggests it might be an infinitive (which he glosses as a functional imperative/modal “soll pressen”); Re follows suit by pronouncing it a hortatory infinitive. Tichy, by contrast, considers the locc. in *-tári* as verbal abstracts, here “beim Somapressen.” My interpr. starts with the simile *átyo ná hástayataḥ* “like a steed controlled by the hands.” The stone (*ádriḥ*) is compared to the steed, and, in my opinion, the soma-presser is compared to the hand(s), the first member of the cmpd., the controller of the steed – as often, we have a cmpd. corresponding to a free syntagm. Caland-Henry’s rendering, “comme un cheval tenu en main [est] le Pierre pour le pressureur,” is closest to mine.

One of the questions posed by the 2nd hemistich is the identity/-ties of the subjects of *vidát* (c) and *tarute* (d), but before tackling that we must figure out how to construe d. Despite the glaring absence of accent on *tarute*, the standard tr. take d as a subord. clause controlled by *yád*. The accent problem is rather casually waved away, even by Old. I am quite unwilling to ignore

the lack of accent, and therefore interpr. *yád árvataḥ* as a nominal rel. cl. of the type frequent at the ends of sentences/verse lines (see my Fs. Hale paper). The antecedent of *yád* is *paúmsyam*, the obj. of *vidát* and gapped obj. of *taruṣe*. The subj. of *vidát* is the stone, that of *tarute* the presser, who attains the power that the stone found by virtue of his (presser's) wielding of the stone. Figuring out what to do with *tarute* is complicated by the fact that it is the only form to this stem (anywhere) and the only middle form of $\sqrt{tṛ}$ without a preverb (save for *taruṣanta* in I.132.5, which is an *-anta* replacement).

On *mahó rāyē* see comm. ad IV.31.11.

The publ. tr. misleadingly renders both *átya-* (b) and *árvant-* (d) as 'steed', implying that the same word is used in both places. Both are marked words, in contrast to *ásva-* -- as 'steed' is in English -- but I would now substitute 'charger' (another marked word) for the second.

X.76.3: The opening of this vs., *tád íd dhy àsya sávanam* ..., is a kind of mash-up of the 2a *tád u x x x sávanam* ... and 2c *vidád dhí* with flip of vowels in the latter. These echoes may underline the fact that 3 continues the theme of 2.

Pāda a presents several problems. One is accentual: *apáh*, so accented, should be the acc. pl. of *áp-* 'water(s)'; the same phrase, *vivér apáh*, is also found in X.147.1. In both cases, the form is better taken as the wrongly accented neut. sg. **ápah* 'work'; so interpr. by Sāy (with gloss *karma*), Ge, and Old. This interpr. is supported by the same phrase with neut. pl. *vivér ápāmsi* (I.69.8 and VI.31.3) showing the expected accent. By contrast, Caland-Henry (271) tr. *apáh* as 'waters', and Lub seems to accept 'waters' not only for this passage and X.147.1 but also for I.69.8 and VI.31.3, judging from the ! that he uses to mark those occurrences of *ápāmsi*.

Another question is the morphological identity and syntactic function of *sávanam*. With Sāy. and Old, I take it as acc., a parallel object to **ápah*; the subject is then the stone. As Old points out, the spressing stones are associated with *apas-* in vss. 5 and 8. However, Ge takes *sávanam* as the subject, referring not to the action of pressing but its result, the Trankspende; this doesn't make a lot of sense to me: in what way has the oblation accomplished its work?

Finally, what is the referent of *asya*? For Ge (n. 3a) it is Indra, who was indeed mentioned in 1b; I think rather the stone, with (explicitly) Sāy. and (implicitly) Old. Although by this interpr. *asya* is coreferential with the subject, a reflexive is not required under these circumstances -- anymore than in the Engl. tr. "it has labored ... at its task." As this tr. shows, I think *asya* is actually dependent on **ápah*, not adjacent *sávanam*; the enclitic *asya* is taking modified 2nd position after *tád* plus the complex of particles *íd dhí*.

Having dealt with pāda a, we must determine how the rest of the vs. fits together, and once again there are competing views. Ge (n. 3c) takes b as a parenthetical intrusion, with c continuing pāda a and d a separate sentence. Caland-Henry take b with a, with cd belonging together; this seems to be the implicit assumption of Kü (527), in that he tr. cd as a single clause and ignores the first hemistich. My interpr. departs from all these and begins with the fact that the *yáthā* clause of b contains the root aor. *ásret*, which is echoed by the main verb in d, the pf. *asísrayuh*. Although Re explicit states that the two verbs have entirely different senses (without saying what he thinks they are), the root agreement between the two verbs strongly invites an interpr. with *yáthā purā* "just as previously ..." serving as long-ago model and exemplar for the main clause, which expresses action of the more recent past.

The phrase *mánave gātúm* VERB several times has Indra as subj. (V.30.7, X.49.9; once Aśvins I.112.16), and so it seems reasonable to supply Indra as the mythological subject here. It also seems reasonable to attach c to the subordinate clauses in b, with the main clause

constituting d. Not only does the mention of Tvaṣṭar in c locate it in the realm of mythology, but syntactically d “presents” as a new clause, with the preverb *prá* in tmesis, followed by an enclitic particle/pronoun *īm*, doubling the obj. *adhvarān*.

What then does pāda c add to the mythological picture begun in c? Here we need to determine whether the vṛddhi derivative *tvāṣṭrá-* refers to anything associated with the god Tvaṣṭar or specifically to Tvaṣṭar’s son, Viśvarūpa. The other occurrences of this stem can refer to either one, but with a decided preference for the latter: in I.117.22 it’s Tvaṣṭar’s honey (*mádhu*), possibly soma, but in the remaining clear passages, II.11.19, X.8.8, 9 [that is, leaving aside III.7.4], Viśvarūpa is the referent and his defeat and the loss of his cows the topic. In our passage I now think either is possible – and neither is particularly compelling. In the publ. tr. I supply ‘wealth’ as the referent of *tvāṣṭré*, in part because one of the other adjectives in this NP, *góarṇas-* modifies *rayí-* in X.38.2. In this interpr. the loc. phrase serves as the goal of Manu’s course in b. It could also be a loc. absolute: “when Tvaṣṭar’s (wealth) (was at issue).” If *tvāṣṭré* here refers specifically to Tvaṣṭar’s hapless son, the phrase again could either be a goal or a locative absolute: “... course to Tvaṣṭar’s son, who had a flood of cows and a raiment of horses” or “when T’s son ... (was at issue).” Unfortunately I know of no tale involving Manu and Tvaṣṭar’s wealth or son, and so there is no easy (or indeed hard) way to make a decision – except in one particular: the loc. goal is somewhat favored over the loc. absol., because the main clause verb (*prá ...*) *ásíśrayuḥ* also takes a loc., which is unlikely to be in absolute function.

It also has to be admitted that the main clause of d provides no help at all. Though I stand by the argument that the two verbal forms of \sqrt{sri} in b and d impose the structure laid out above, it is difficult to see how bc provides a model or comparandum for d. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that the main clause verb seems to be construed with *prá* in tmesis, but there are no other exx. of *prá* \sqrt{sri} in the RV [in I.149.2, cited by VB, the *prá* belongs rather with the participle to \sqrt{sri}], and the only one anywhere else in Vedic is found in a single passage in KS (XXVI.3), which contributes nothing. My feeling is that in our passage *prá* doesn’t do much work, though perhaps a tr. “set forth ceremonies upon ceremonies” would at least register its presence. Another issue about the perfect is that it’s plural, but there’s no likely plural subject in the immediate vicinity. I think it likely that it’s the pressing stones, who get directly addressed, in the plural, in the next vs. Perhaps the point of all of this is that just as Indra set Manu on the course to acquire Tvaṣṭar’s wealth or Tvaṣṭar’s son, so it’s the pressing stones that set the ritual cursus at sacrifice after sacrifice. The exhortations to the stones in the next vs. may delineate what their relevant actions should be. But this is all very tentative and unsatisfactory.

X.76.4: On *bhaṅgurāvant-* see comm. ad VII.104.7.

In c *sunotana* reprises the same impv. in 2a.

“Carry a tune” for *bharata ślókam* is my playful and not entirely literal rendering, which I found impossible to resist. For the sense of *ślókam* see comm. ad I.51.12, IX.92.1 (the latter with regard to the pressing stones’ role). The point here is that the stones are so noisy that the sound will reach heaven as a signal to the gods that the soma is ready.

X.76.5: The rigid, four-square pāda structure with a pāda-final comparative in the dat. pl. and a pāda-initial standard of comparison in the ablative (a, c, d), made by *cīd* (*ā*), should impose an ablative interpretation on *vibhvánā*, and indeed a number of comm. (see Old) suggest emending to **vibhvánaś*. However, as Old asks, how would such a corruption have arisen? He opts for taking it as a “comparative instrumental,” which is a fine description but is not a standard

syntactic category as far as I know. I do not have a better solution, however. It is worth noting that the stem to which it belongs is somewhat problematic. It has two different accents: initial *vībhvan-* in well-attested nom. sg. *vībhvā* and suffix accent only in this form and the (infinitival?) dat. *vībhvāne* (VI.61.13, where, it might be noted, it's found in the same vs. as the superlative *apāstama-* 'busiest'). The stem is also used in two different senses, as an adj. 'wide-ranging' and/or 'distinguished' and as the PN of one of the Ṛbhus. In this passage the latter seems the default interpr. (see the standard tr., incl. Caland-Henry and the publ. tr.), given the names in the other three pādas and the fact that *apās-* 'industrious' several times modifies the craftsmen Ṛbhus (III.60.3, IV.33.1, maybe V.42.12). It is possible, however, that *vībhvánā* here should also be read in its general sense and with an instr. function "by (your) distinction." But I suggest this only very tentatively.

Another way in which b deviates from the surrounding pādas is the apparent lack of *ā̃*: both a and c begin ABL *cīd ā̃*, but though b has a long *ā* flg. *cīd*, it is unaccented and belongs to the 1st cmpd member *āśú-*. It would be possible to argue that the accent was removed redactionally, but I think it more likely that it's another way in which b is marked out as different. The *ā̃* is also missing from d, where an *a*-vowel follows *cīd*, but a short one: *agnés cīd a[rca]*.

arca is also somewhat problematic. It is, of course, on the surface a straightforward 2nd sg. impv. However, it coexists, a bit uneasily, with the 2nd pl. enclitic *vaḥ* in pāda a, referring to the pressing stones -- giving two 2nd ps. with different referents in a single sentence. Therefore a number of interpr. (Ge, Caland-Henry, etc.) silently or explicitly emend to 1st sg. subj. **arcā* "I shall sing / let me sing." Metrically this would be acceptable, and the mechanism is easy to see: since 2nd sg. impvs. frequently lengthen their final *-a*, coinciding with the 1st sg. subj. ending *-ā*, a backformation of the latter to short *-a* would be unexceptionable. However, this reanalysis is unnecessary: poets frequently exhort themselves, in the 2nd sg., to praise or perform other ritual acts, and these exhortations can co-occur with 2nd plurals referring to others, often the poet's ritual colleagues -- as the pressing stones are here. See my 2005 "Poetic Self-reference" (Fs. Skjaervø). Old also resists the 1st sg. interpr.

X.76.6: Yet again, this vs. poses some niggling grammatical problems, the most serious of which is *sótu* in pāda a. This appears to be a 3rd singular root aor. impv. to *√su* 'press', which is how Gr classifies it (though with an alternative suggested; see below) and the publ. tr. renders it. However, it follows a 3rd plural impv. (*bhurantu*), whose subj. (*grāvāṇaḥ*) is continued in b. In other words, if *sótu* is a singular impv. it has to be parenthetical (as in the publ. tr.). I still subscribe to this interpr. In its favor I will point out two factors: 1) references to plural stones alternate with singular ones in this hymn; see esp. 2a with pl. impv. *sunotana*, fld. by 2b with a single stone (*ādriḥ*) (and if I'm right, also 2cd and 3a; then 3d, 4 with pl. stones). 2) the 3rd plural impv. of the root aor., to correspond to preceding 3rd pl. *bhurantu*, would be **svāntu*, almost surely undistracted (cf. the overwhelmingly undistracted med. root aor. part. *svāná-*), which is unattested and, if found, would lose the distinctive root syllable of this root. I think this form would be avoided, and the 3rd sg. would provide a robust substitute (with root syll. *so-*).

However, I seem to be alone in this interpr., so I will briefly consider the alternatives that have been suggested. Old's is the one that requires the least machinery, but it is unlikely for two reasons. After flirting with *sótu* as a loc. he takes it as a neut. acc. *-tu-* stem (presumably meaning 'soma-pressing'), which serves as obj. to *bhurantu* (apparently partially fld. by Scar 44–45, 186). However, as Re also points out, *bhurá-* (and related stems) is otherwise intrans. Moreover, a

masc. acc. *sótum* is attested (VIII.19.18) with the same apparent meaning, and it is not exactly parsimonious to posit an identical stem but two different genders, each attested only once – esp. since masc. acc. **sótum* would neatly avoid hiatus here. Gr in fact suggests emending to **sótum*, and Ge seems to follow this suggestion (without explicit note), but rendering it as an infinitive “um uns Saft auszuschlagen.” This infinitival stem is attested elsewhere, as dat. *sótave* (I.28.1) and abl. *sótos* (X.86.1). The *-tum* infinitive, so characteristic of later Skt., is of course quite rare in the RV, but in this relatively late portion of the text it is certainly thinkable. If the 3rd sg. impv. interpr. is rejected, I would favor the infinitive above the others, tr. “Let the glorious ones clatter for us, to press (soma) out of the stalk.” But this still requires emendation, whereas the impv. interpr. does not.

I take *ándhasaḥ* as an abl. of source (“out of the stalk”) rather than partitive gen. obj. (“press of the sap/soma”). On the meaning of *ándhas-* see comm. ad IV.1.19.

On *divít(mant)-* see comm. ad IV.31.11; unsuffixed *divít-* occurs only here, *divít-mant-* only 4x. The *-mant-* suffix seems pleonastic, so a satisfactory and semi-literal tr. is hard to achieve – perhaps “with their heaven-bound voice going to heaven.”

As noted in the publ. intro., I take *náraḥ* in c (and in 7d) to refer to the pressing stones, not human ritualists, since the voc. *náraḥ* in 8a must be addressed to the stones. Among other things, this saves us from taking c here as parenthetical, as Ge does, since he recognizes that d must have the stones as subj. (n. 6d).

I supply “heaven and earth” as obj. to *āghoṣáyantaḥ* ‘causing to heed’, on the basis of passages in the other principal pressing stone hymn: X.94.4 *āghoṣáyantaḥ pṛthivīm* “making earth heed,” as well X.94.12 *ā dyām ráveṇa pṛthivīm aśúśravuḥ* “they have made Heaven and Earth listen by their bellowing.”

On *mithas-túr-* see Scar (186).

X.76.7: The stem *rathirá-* ordinarily modifies gods, and the usual gloss ‘charioteer’ (Gr Wagenlenker) fits those contexts. However, in VIII.50.8 (Vālakh.) it qualifies horses (*hárayaḥ*), and ‘fit for the chariot’ or sim. seems a better rendering. In our passage, too, I would now substitute ‘fit for the chariot, chariot-broken’ for ‘charioteers’, on the basis of 2b, where the stone is compared to the steed controlled by the hand of the charioteer.

With Ge (and Re, Scar 55) I take *gavíṣaḥ* as gen. sg. (with *asya*), not nom. pl. (with Sāy., Gr, Caland-Henry, Ob II.46). The referent of the gen. phrase in b, *asya ... gavíṣaḥ* “of him/the one seeking the cows,” is of course soma, which always seeks mixture with cows’ milk. It is possible, however, that *gavíṣaḥ* could also be read as nom. pl., modifying the stones that are “milking” out the juice.

The simile in d is puzzling. Given the position of *ná*, it should signal that the simile is limited to *havyā* (so “the men groom [X] like oblations”), but this doesn’t make a lot of sense: the milked-out soma *is* the oblation. Nonetheless, this is the interpr. in the publ. tr. Ge silently flips the *ná*, taking it with *náraḥ* (and does not include *havyā* in the simile): “Wie die Herren machen sie das Opfer mit ihren Mäulen sauber.” So also Scar (55), though with a long, puzzled note (n. 68) on the problems with the simile. Although this is an easy solution, I don’t think it is the correct one. For one thing, the stones have already been identified as *náraḥ* (6c) and will almost immediately be addressed as such (8a); they are not like men, but men. For another, there is no metrical or other barrier to the proper positioning of *ná* for such a meaning: *náro* **ná havyā* is, if anything, metrically better than the transmitted text (see Arnold’s statistics on the rhythm of

the opening, p. 188). I reluctantly conclude that this may be one of the few occasions in the RV where the simile particle should be taken with the verb: “they, as it were, groom ...”

X.76.8: The publ. tr. takes the two parallel nominal clauses in the 2nd hemistich as statements of fact; Ge by contrast supplies a modal “sei.” This is possible but not necessary.

X.77–78: These two hymns are attributed to Syūmaraśmi Bhārgava and dedicated to the Maruts. They are also unified by an unusual metrical scheme and a tightly controlled stylistic reliance on similes. For both of these features see the publ. intros. to the two hymns; for the meter esp. see Old, Prol. 92ff., as well as the intro. to X.77 in the Noten.

X.77 Maruts

X.77.1: A dense vs. We can start with the root noun cmpd *abhraprūṣaḥ* and its etymologically twinned verb *pruṣā*. Both of these forms are morphologically ambiguous: the former can be nom. pl., acc. pl., or abl.-gen. sg., the latter 2nd sg. impv. or 1st sg. subjunctive. On the basis of *astoṣi* in d I opt for the subjunctive, and for the cmpd. the nom. pl., to allow the referents of the cmpd. to be directly compared with the subject of *pruṣā*. (These are generally the choices made by other interpr., though the Pp. reads short-vowel *pruṣa*, hence the impv.)

The next question is the relation between the cmpd members in *abhra-prūṣ-*. (For disc. see Scar 342.) An acc. relation is possible; so Re “... qui font-fuser la nuée.” But I favor an ablative, like *abhrāt* in c and, closer in sense, the phrase in nearby X.75.3 *abhrād iva ... vṛṣṭáyāḥ* ‘like rains from the clouds.’ Here as well I supply ‘rain’ as the suppressed object of *-prūṣa-*, parallel to the ‘goods’ (*vásu*) that I, the poet, shower down. The referents of *abhraprūṣaḥ* are surely the Maruts, the dedicands of this hymn, who thus appear, disguised, in its first word. It is a nice touch that the poet compares himself with the very gods he is also praising.

I read *vācā* with both simile and frame. In the frame, of course, it refers to the poet’s speech, but in the simile it can refer to thunder, the Maruts’ speech (cf. I.168.8 [Maruts] *abhríyām vācam* “speech stemming from a cloud”). Scar (342 n. 481) also mentions the ‘thunder’ possibility but stops short of reading *vācā* twice.

Pāda b contains the morphologically aberrant gen. sg. *viṣṇūṣaḥ*. The standard explan. of this form (see, e.g., Old with reff., AiG II.2.910, more recently Kü 203–4, Lowe [Part. 25, 252]) must be correct: that it is a contamination/blend of the pf. participle of *√jñā* (expected weak form **jājñ-úṣ-*) and the 9th cl. pres.part. (expected weak form **jān-át-*). The reason for this blend is not apparent, since the gen. sg. of either stem would fit metrically and should have been morphologically transparent.

The poet is the referent of this gen., and the point of the pāda is that *his* sacrifices, which consist of well-wrought words are just as good as those that consist of physical oblations. There may be a slight asymmetry of expression here. On the surface *haviṣmantaḥ* in the simile of course modifies *yajñāḥ*, which participates in both simile and frame, with the meaning “(like)sacrifices consisting of oblations,” but in fact well-attested *haviṣmant-* generally modifies the ritualists who provide oblations, rather than the sacrifice that consists of them. We might almost have expected gen. **haviṣmataḥ*, parallel to *viṣṇūṣaḥ*, with the sense “The sacrifices of a discerning one are like (those)*of one who provides oblations.” I do not suggest emendation; instead I think the poet is keeping his audience off balance and confounding their expectations.

The syntax and constituency of cd are multiply ambiguous and interpr. in multiple ways: see the very different treatments of Old (at some length), Ge, and Re. I will not examine their versions in detail. As for mine, there are several structural clues that may help to sort out the competing possibilities. First, the dat. *-āse* forms that end each pāda (c *arhāse*, d *śobhāse*) seem meant to be parallel, though a number of interpr. deploy them differently. Second, given their localization in different pādas, the accusatives of c (*sumārutam (ná) brahmāṇam*) and d (*gānam*) should be kept separate, with the phrase in c being compared to that in d. Again, this is not the universal view.

Pāda d is straightforward, with the 1st sg. *astoṣi* “I have praised,” with *gānam ... eṣām* “the flock of them,” referring to the Maruts, as obj. The dat. *śobhāse* ‘for beauty’ belongs to a root, *√śubh*, that is characteristic of the Maruts. See esp. the similar use of the root noun dat. *śubhé* in Śyāvāśva’s Marut hymns (V.52.8, 57.3, 63.5,6), also *śubhamyú-* in the next hymn, X.78.7. Despite the position of *ná*, I think it marks *śobhāse* as the simile, compared to *arhāse* in c. As discussed elsewhere (see, e.g., comm. ad X.21.1), simile-marking *ná* is blocked from pāda-final position and flips with its target if it would take that position.

This now leaves pāda c. Since, per my structural analysis, the acc. phrase in this pāda cannot be identical to that in d (pace Re) and it should not be the obj. of *arhāse* (pace Ge), we need to identify a referent for *sumārutam ... brahmāṇam* different from the Marut flock in d. Taking *sumāruta-* as adj. with *brahmān-* (pace Old, who claims it has to be a noun) points to an obvious referent: Indra, who is, of course, often accompanied by the Maruts (*marútvant-* being one of his standing epithets). And Indra, in his role as *bṛhaspáti-*, is closely associated with the formulation and indeed called *brahmān-* directly (e.g., VIII.16.7).

Now *arhāse* – who is deserving, and deserving of what? Re takes it as passive; Ge’s interpr. I don’t understand, and it is informed by his somewhat peculiar view that this is all about weather; Old takes *sumārutam* as its obj. (“damit er Anspruch habe auf schöne Marutgnade”) and *brahmāṇam* as its subj. I supply soma as the obj., because the soma drink is the most common obj. of *√arh* (see comm. ad VIII.20.18). I am not entirely happy with this intrusion, but it might make sense of comparing the Marut flock with Indra: they both deserve the soma, but Indra especially.

X.77.2: The dat. *śrīyé* that opens the vs. picks up the *śobhāse* that ends vs. 1. Both are common elements in the Marut lexicon; for *śrīyé* see, e.g., V.55.3, 60.4.

The problematic pāda is b, which contains *sumārutam* like 1c. There is no consensus about its usage here, or even its case form. Re takes it as a neut. nom., collectively referring to the pl. subject *máryāsah* (“en tant que bonne troupe mārutiennne”), while Ge takes it as acc. referring to “ihr schönes Marutwetter.” My interpr. differs significantly from these, and depends on three factors: I take *sumārutam* as acc. and supply *brahmāṇam* from the phrase in 1c *sumārutam ná brahmāṇam*; I take the verb *akṛṇvata* in pāda a as controlling a kind of śleṣa, where *sumārutam ná* is structurally compared to *añjīn*, though they have somewhat different relationships to the verb; I take *pūrvīr āti kṣāpaḥ* with the phrase in c, not the simile in d. In c the obj. *añjīn* denotes what the Maruts made/provided for themselves – ornaments -- appropriate to the middle voice of *akṛṇvata*. The phrase *pūrvīr āti kṣāpaḥ* “across the many nights” is also appropriate here, because the ‘ornaments, unguents’ they make for themselves are elsewhere compared to stars. See, e.g. I.87.1 1 ... *añjībhir, vyānājre ké cid usrā iva tṛbhīḥ* “with their unguents [the Maruts] have anointed themselves ... like the ruddy (dawns) with stars,” In the simile in d *sumārutam* is a predicate adj. modifying the gapped *brahmāṇam*: “(as) they have

made (the formulator) well-provided with Maruts.” This latter usage is rather like III.11 4 *agnīm ... váhniṃ devā akṛnvata* “The gods made Agni their oblation-conveyor.” My interpr. of this hemistich is not particularly secure, but I think it is better than the other ones available.

On the curious intrusion of the Ādityas, see the publ. intro. I have no explanation; I am somewhat dubious about Th’s view (Fremd. 158) that what the Maruts and the Ādityas have in common is their care for the stranger (expressed by the epithet *riśādas-* of disputed meaning [see comm. ad I.2.7, V.60.7] in 3d and 5c). In any case, the word order, with *té*, ordinarily a first-position pronoun, following *ādityāsaḥ*, seems to me to signal that *ādityāsaḥ* is an unmarked simile.

On *akrá-* see comm. ad I.189.7.

X.77.3: The first pāda of this vs. departs from the already aberrant meter of this part of the hymn: rather than having an opening of 5 ending with a light syllable, followed by a heavy syllable that can count as two lights (see disc. in publ. intro.) allowing a Jagatī cadence, this has an opening of 4. However, the 5th syllable is light and the heavy 6th syllable can “count” as two lights, as elsewhere in this little group. The other 3 pādas conform to the meter elsewhere in these vss., with an opening of 5.

The *ná* in pāda a does not seem to be doing real simile work, since it seems unlikely that earth is being compared to heaven: they usually form a pair. My “as beyond earth” renders the *ná* unobtrusively and not very convincingly. It is possible that it’s marking pāda-final *barhāṇā* as the simile, with the same flip as in 1d, but “as if by might” seems to belittle the Maruts’ power.

In c #*pājasvanto ... panasyávo*# echo each other, further taken up by #*práyasvanto* in 4d.

X.77.4: The first two pādas diverge from the metrical template of this part of the hymn in a different way from 3a: they have light 6th syllables. It is also a challenging vs. in structure and content.

In pāda a I take the gen. *yuṣmākam* with *yāmani* and the gen. *apām* with *budhné*, with Old and Re (though not, with the latter, introducing Ahi Budhnya into an already crowded vs.). I also take the simile as consisting of *budhné apām ná* despite the position of *ná*. (As we have seen and will see, the position of *ná* in this hymn can be all over the map.) The point of this first hemistich is that the earth (*māhī*) trembles at the Maruts’ journey, a common image in Marut hymns. In my interpr. the simile in the first pāda compares the earth to something based on water – that is, without a solid base.

Pāda b contains two verbs of parallel formation and near-identical sense, #*vithuryāti* ‘wavers, falters’ and *śratharyāti*# ‘slackens’. Both are hapaxes, but the former is clearly based on the reasonably well-attested adj. *vithurá-* ‘wavering’, while *śratharyá-* has no associated *r*-form, **śrathara-* or the like, and must be directly based on *vithuryāti*. So also Re, though he cleverly also adduces *śithirá-*, also with *-r-*, as a near-relative. I assume that the accent of *śratharyāti* was also adapted from *vithuryāti*, as there is no syntactic reason for this verb to be accented. For *vithurá-* in this exact context, see I.87.3 [Maruts] *praiśām ájmeṣu vithuréva rejate, bhūmir yāmeṣu ...* “At their drives, their journeys the earth trembles like one with faltering step” (sim. I.168.6, also Maruts).

The second hemistich is oddly constructed. In c we find a pāda-internal deictic pronoun followed by a Wackernagel particle chain: ... *ayám sú vaḥ*##. This is unprecedented as far as I can tell: *ayám* (etc.) is overwhelmingly pāda (/clause) initial; the few non-initial forms are generally preceded by at most one item, and I have found no other exx. where a mid-pāda *ayám* supports a

clitic chain. The referent of *ayám* here is clearly the nom. phrase that precedes it: *viśvāpsur yajñó arvāk*. Because of the unusual configuration of *ayám*, in the publ. tr. I took it as introducing a new clause, which continues into d. I now think this is wrong; certainly my English tr. is scarcely parsable. I now think that c is a self-contained nominal cl. with a heavy left-dislocated NP: “the sacrifice close by consisting of all good things -- this is for you.” The simile that opens d, *prāyasvanto ná*, then qualifies the unexpressed subj. of the impv. *ā gata*, the Maruts: “Like dispensers of ritual delight, come here to those who are concentrated (on you).”

On the adj. *viśvāpsu-* see comm. ad I.148.1. Th’s ‘breath’ interpr. (see KISch 74f.) “ganz aus Atemhauch bestehend,” which is also responsible for Re’s “consistant entièrement en souffle,” does not make sense in most contexts, as Th’s special pleading for it in this passage demonstrates.

Re pronounces that *satrāca(h)* is for **satrāñcaḥ* [he omits accent] by fiat; Ge (n. 4cd) would like to do the same. But I see no reason why we, the goal of their journey, would not be focused on the arrivals, with the form therefore the acc. pl. it appears to be.

X.77.5: Acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, this vs. is in Jagatī, against the rest of the hymn, which the Anukr. labels Triṣṭubh. For vs. 5 the Anukr. is half right: the first two pādas again have a Jagatī cadence but 11 syllables and do not fit the template of what emerged as the standard such pattern earlier in the hymn. But the 2nd hemistich consists of two entirely well-behaved Jagatī pādas.

This is the last of the simile-laden vss., a structure signaled by ring composition: the last word of 5 is (*pari-*)*prūṣaḥ* ‘showering (all around)’, which matches the first word of the hymn, (*abhra-*)*prūṣaḥ* ‘showering (from a cloud)’ (see also the impv. *pruṣā* also in 1a).

In b it is unclear what ‘light-possessors’ (*jyótiṣmant-*) the Maruts are being compared to. Both Ge and Re fail to provide a referent, while Scar (343) supplies ‘dawns’, which would be difficult, since *jyótiṣmantaḥ* is masc. I suggest rather ‘fires’, on the basis of X.35.1 ... *agnáyo, jyótir bhāranta uṣáso vyūṣṭiṣu* “... fires bringing light at the early brightenings of the dawn,” with the same *vyūṣṭiṣu* as here.

In d *prava-* belongs to the root \sqrt{pru} / *plu* ‘float’; the *r*-form here allows the phonetic figure *pravāsaḥ ... prāsītāsaḥ pariprūṣaḥ*.

X.77.6–8: The last three vss. are conventional in content and have proper Triṣṭubh cadences throughout.

X.77.6: The structure of the vs. is somewhat unclear. Both Ge and Re take bc as qualifying the subj. of the *yád* clause in pāda a, with d as the corresponding main clause. I find this unlikely: pāda d is a repeated pāda (=VI.47.13, X.131.7, save for *yuyota* for *yuyotu*; cf. also VII.58.6), and repeated pādas are less likely to be integrated into a subord. cl. / main cl. diptych. Moreover, d has no logical connection with the rest. I instead think bc is itself the main clause, though it lacks a finite verb. We can either supply a verb of motion, as in the publ. tr., or take the participle *vidānāsaḥ* as the predicate of the main cl.

However we choose to take bc, the structure of these two pādas is itself noteworthy. What governs the gen. phrase *mahāḥ saṃvāraṇasya vāsvaḥ* in b must be the participle *vidānāsaḥ* in c, which contains another gen., *rādhyasya*, to be construed with the genitives in b. The postponement of the governing verb across the half-vs. boundary strikes me as somewhat unusual, though far from excluded. Note the play on *vāsu-*, which knits the pādas together.

Pace Gr, *vidānā-* must belong to √ *vid* ‘know’, not ‘find’, since, as Re points out, only ‘know’ takes genitive complements.

X.77.7: The *ná* in b seems unnecessary, or at least displaced, since it would be odd to compare some entity to the Maruts in their own hymn. (Ge supplies “[to the singers], as to the Maruts,” since he thinks that b concerns the distribution of the Dakṣiṇā. But this would be an odd use of *ná*, and further I see no evidence of the Dakṣiṇā. Re vaguely adds “pour ainsi dire.”) In a hymn with so many *ná*-s, often in the “wrong” place, a pleonastic *ná* should not surprise us, but in fact I think we can justify it. In my interpr. two factors are at work. On the one hand, it may be playing off 8b:

7b xxxx *ná mān(uṣo)* xxx

8b xxxx *nām̐n(ā)* xxxx

[On the reading of ‘name’ in 8b, see comm. ad loc.] On the other hand, I think there is a suppressed comparison in pāda a. The human priest, descendant of Manu (*mānuṣaḥ*), in b is implicitly compared to the figure who is often “standing up at the ceremony” (*adhvareṣṭhā-*), namely Agni. See Scar’s phraseological parallels (643–44) VI.63.4 *ūrdhvó vām agnír adhvarēṣu asthāt* and X.20.5 *ūrdhvas tasthāv íbhvā yajñé*, both of Agni.

X.77.8: As noted ad vs. 7, I read distracted *nām̐nā* (with Gr and, tentatively, Old), which, in my interpr., allows a phonetic play with 7b. Distracting *ādit’yéna* as HvN do seems far less plausible: this stem is almost never distracted, and in this case it would produce a highly unusual rhythm for the opening, with light syllables in the 2nd and 3rd positions, and for a late break, with two heavy syllables.

Note the etymological play between *ūmāḥ* (a) and *avantu* (c).

As disc. above, ad 2d, the connection with the Ādityas is puzzling.

The rt-noun cmpd *rathatūr* in c raises several questions: it is a singular used of plural subjects and it doesn’t seem to have any bearing semantically on the Maruts’ activity here: aiding our inspired thought. In my view it must be an unmarked simile, with a horse as underlying referent (see I.88.2 *rathatūrbhir áśvaiḥ*) and generally refer to the Maruts’ swiftness and victoriousness, qualities that might help produce a swift and victorious inspired thought for us. On the pl. Maruts compared to a singular entity, see the next hymn, X.78.2 *agnír ná*. Contra JSK I do not think *rathatūr* is conjoined with pāda d: “overtaking the chariots [*rathatūḥ* for **rathatúraḥ*] and finding pleasure in the ceremony in their great course” (DGRV I.95) (sim. Ge). Among other things, the Maruts can hardly enjoy the ceremony if they’re on the road.

As for d and the *ca* therein, I take it as conjoining the two locc., (*mahás ca*) *yāman* and *adhvaré*, in a modified X *ca* Y construction (with the *ca* following the first word of the first loc. phrase. The standard X Y *ca* construction was avoided here to forestall the double *ca* that would have arisen because of the flg. pf. part. *cakānāḥ*: **mahó yāman adhvaré ca cakānāḥ*.

Finally, what is the referent of *maháḥ*? I suggest that it is the Maruts’ “great host”; cf. in the next hymn X.78.6 *mahāgrāmó ná yāman* “like a great host on their journey.”

X.78 Maruts

On the tight structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

Though the Anukr. identifies vss. 1, 3, 4, 8 as Triṣṭubhs and 2, 5–7 as Jagatīs, in fact 1, 3, and 4, like many of the “Triṣṭubhs” in the previous hymn, mostly consist of 11-syllable pādas with Jagatī cadences, and though the vss. identified as Jagatīs have Jagatī cadences, at least 6c has only 11 syllables. By contrast, the final vs., 8, begins with a pāda containing 12 syllables but a Triṣṭubh cadence, but then provides three conventional Triṣṭubh pādas to bring the hymn to a settled and metrically safe conclusion.

X.78.1: Pāda c has 10 syllables but a Jagatī cadence.

The first three pādas end in an adj. in *su-*, which furnishes the point of comparison. The first two seem to sketch a ritual progression: the poets (*vīprāsaḥ*) of pāda a have good intention or purpose, are attentive in their ritual activity. Elsewhere such ritualists are depicted as “seeking the gods”: cf. III.8.4 *svādhyò mānasā devayántaḥ*, VII.2.5 *svādhyàḥ ... devayántaḥ*. This is the next step in our vs., with *devāvyàḥ* ‘pursuing the gods’ (with root \sqrt{v} *vī*, not *-ya*-denom.) opening pāda b. And the happy result is found at the end of b, *svāpnasaḥ* ‘having good profit’; as we all know, successful ritualist get well rewarded.

Re sees the vs. as embodying the three functions, which seems a stretch to me.

As Ge points out (n. 1d), the Maruts are described as *māryā arepāsaḥ* in V.53.3.

X.78.2: In this supposedly Jagatī vs., d contains only 11 syllables; the other pādas conform. This pāda is also structurally aberrant, in that the shared property, *suśármanah* ‘providing good shelter’, occurs first in the pāda, not last. (Pāda a also deviates in this regard: the shared property is *bhrājas-* ‘flash’ in mid-pāda.)

For the possible senses of *svayúj-* see Scar 433–35. I favor ‘own yokemates’ rather than ‘self-yoking’: the winds and the Maruts can be yoked together because they are equally speedy. (This sense of *svayúj-* also works well in the other two occurrences: X.67.8, 89.7.) This swiftness is underlined by the shared property, ‘bringing immediate aid’ (*sadyáūtayaḥ*): they appear as soon as needed.

In c I would slightly alter the tr. of *prajñātāraḥ* to “who know the way forward.”

I do not know why soma drinks are esp. associated with good shelter. In the IXth Maṇḍala Soma occasionally provides or is asked for shelter (e.g., IX.86.15; see passages in Lub s.v. *śárman-*), but not so often as other gods in other maṇḍalas. The bahuvr. *suśárman-* once modifies Agni and Soma in the dual (I.93.7), but this is surely because of Agni, who is the usual referent of this adj. (e.g., V.8.2).

X.78.2–3: As noted in the publ. intro., “winds” are the comparanda in these two adjacent vss., 2b and 3a.

X.78.3: *dhúnayaḥ* can belong either with the simile (so Ge, publ. tr.) or the frame (so Re). The structure of the hymn, with, usually, a single shared property per simile, favors the former, but the fact that *dhūni-* regularly modifies the Maruts (I.64.5, 87.3, etc.) the latter. A possible alternative tr. would be “The boisterous ones who, like the winds, are always on the move.”

Given the metrical patterns established, we should expect pāda c to have a Jagatī cadence despite its 11 syllables. But in fact it has a cadence that fits neither Jagatī nor Triṣṭubh: L H H x (*śímīvantaḥ*). Elsewhere this stem sometimes has to be read **śímīvant-* with light 2nd syllable (see comm. ad X.8.2), but that wouldn’t help here. Best would be **śímīvataḥ*, but we need the nom. pl. *-vantaḥ*.

In d we see the same ritual cause-and-effect as in 1ab: the “lauds of the ancestors” (*pitṛñām ... śāmsāḥ*) result in lovely gifts, as the proper reciprocal response to praise.

X.78.4: *sānābhayaḥ* is a pun, in that *nābhi-* refers both to the nave of a wheel into which the spokes are fitted and the navel of the human body. The Maruts “have the same navel,” because they are the sons of the same mother, Pr̥śni (also the same father, Rudra, but it’s motherhood that’s relevant to the navel).

In c the *māryāḥ* reappear from 1d (also X.77.3). The common property shared by the Maruts and the “young bloods gone awooing” is *ghṛtaprūṣ-* ‘sprinkling ghee’, which is not directly appropriate for either party – although more for the Maruts than the wooers. The root $\sqrt{pruṣ}$ is very prominent in the immediately preceding Marut hymn (X.77), with the rt noun cmpds *abhra-prūṣ-* (1a) and *pari-prūṣ-* (5d), as well as impv. *pruṣā* (1a), so the act of showering/sprinkling is characteristic of them. The ghee that they are showering here must be metaphorical, representing rain (so also, e.g., Scar 343); the same act is attributed to them in I.168.8 *yādī ghṛtām marútaḥ pruṣṇuvánti*, where it clearly refers to rain. Moreover, two other occurrences of *ghṛta-prūṣ-* (VI.44.20, VII.47.1) modify *ūrmí-* ‘wave’ and presumably refer to water as well. But it is hard to envision *māryāḥ* showering either real or metaphorical ghee. Ge’s tr. indicates that in the simile he takes the cmpd to mean “verschwenderisch” (prodigal), and this is possible; Re bleaches it to mean simply “zélé au rite.” I would alternatively point to III.13.4 ... *pruṣṇavad vāsu* “he will shower goods” and suggest that we supply “goods” as the gapped obj. of *-prūṣ-* in the simile; “goods” would be the potential bridal gifts.

X.78.5: I render *jyēṣṭha-* differently here and in 2c, because neither ‘elder’ nor ‘superior’ easily fits both contexts.

Pāda b can be variously interpr., depending on the sense attributed to the desid. part. *didhiṣú-*. As discussed elsewhere (comm. ad I.71.3, X.26.6 and see my Bühler lecture), *didhiṣú-* can have the developed sense ‘desiring to acquire (a wife)’ = ‘suitor, wooer’. Ge takes it thus (“wie freierende Ritter,” though see his cautious n. 5b), as does the publ. tr. This interpr. has the merit of making sense of *sudānavah* ‘having good gifts’, i.e., providing good bridal gifts, and it also thematically matches 4c *vareyávo ná māryāḥ* “like young bloods gone awooing” in the immediately preceding vs. The charioteers on this bridal errand are (somewhat) reminiscent of the bride-seeking journey in Kakṣivānt’s dānastuti, I.126.3, 5, esp. 3b *vadhūmanto dāśa ráthāsaḥ* “ten chariots carrying brides.” However, it would be possible to interpr. *didhiṣú-* literally as ‘desiring to acquire’, without a marital context. In this case, *sudānavah* would be proleptic, expressing the gifts they will acquire. Re’s tr. uses the non-technical sense of the participle, but considers its gapped object to be victory, not gifts: “qui (reçoivent) de beaux dons comme des conducteurs-de-char cherchant à obtenir (la victoire).” I prefer the Ge/publ. tr. version but an alternative would be “who (will) possess good gifts like charioteers seeking to acquire (them).”

Note that *jigatnāvaḥ* returns fro 3a.

The question in c is what to do with *udābhiḥ*, and this question can be divided into two: 1) should it be construed with *nimnāḥ*, likewise instr. pl.? 2) does it belong in the simile or the frame? The first is easily answered: though Re takes the two together (“avec les eaux déclives”), *nimná-* is always elsewhere a noun (‘depth, the deep’) and so the two instr. pl.s must be taken separately. The second is more difficult. Ge (as well as Re) takes *udābhiḥ* with the simile (“wie die Flüsse ... mit ihren Gewässern”), and this is certainly possible: though there are two words for ‘water’ in the phrase (Ge’s “Flüsse” is misleading for *āpaḥ*), *āpaḥ* are of course animate and

agentive, while *udān-* is neuter and an inert substance. Nonetheless, I think *udābhiḥ* must be at least partially part of the frame, referring to the water the Maruts produce as rain (just referred to in *ghṛtaprūṣaḥ* in 4c), hence my “always on the move with their moisture.” However, I am now willing to entertain the possibility that *udābhiḥ* is shared by simile and frame and suggest the alternative translation “always on the move with their waters [=rain] like the Waters with their waters (moving) through the depths.”

The exact point of d is unclear, though I don’t think Ge helps by making *viśvārūpāḥ* a proper noun qualifier of the Aṅgirasas. I see *viśvārūpa-* as the shared property, placed unusually in initial position (but see *suśārmāṇaḥ* in 2c). I think the idea here must be that the Maruts are inventive and skilled singers like the Aṅgirasas and their *sāmans* are thus ornamented with every possible variation. The Maruts’ “*sāmans*” are quite possibly the sounds of the thunderstorm: the thunder itself and the howling of the wind, often highlighted in Marut hymns.

X.78.6: Once again Re considers this vs. to express the three functions (First Function in ab, Third (?) in c, Second in d – he is only explicit about ab). This seems to me to be in the realm of fantasy.

Pāda a is difficult to interpr. because it is not clear what is the shared property and what belongs to the simile. Ge (at least in his tr., but see his n. 6a) takes *sūrī-* as the shared property, which he tr. as an adj. “freigebig”: the Maruts give abundant rain, the pressing stones abundant soma. In his interpr. *sīndhumātaraḥ* exclusively modifies the stones (“wie die sindhugéborenen Presssteine,” though again see his n. 6a). Re also takes *sūrī-* as the shared property (though he properly tr. as a noun, with a certain amount of extra machinery), with *sīndhumātaraḥ* exclusively modifying the Maruts: “(Eux qui jouent le rôle de) patrons comme les pierres-presseuses, (ces dieux) dont la Sindhu est la mère.” Klein’s tr. (DGRV I.350) seems to contain no shared property, but identifies the Maruts as *sūrī-* and the pressing stones as Sindhu-mothered: “The lords, like pressing-stones whose mother is the Indus.” In contrast to all of these, the publ. tr. takes *sīndhumātaraḥ* as the shared property, with the Maruts identified as *sūrī-* (as in V.52.16). As to *sīndhumātaraḥ*, I see the stones as having a river as mother because they have been smoothed as they tumble in the river (though I have no textual evidence for this) and the Maruts are said to have a heavenly river as mother, who would produce the water they distribute as rain. See nearby X.75.3, which establishes a heavenly (3a *divī*), rain-producing (3c... *prā stanayanti vṛṣṭāyaḥ*) Sindhu (3d *sīndhur yād éti* ...), and note that this would continue the watery theme of our vs. 5c. Although I think this interpr. is more than defensible, I would also consider an alternate more like Ge/Re, though I then don’t know who to identify as *sīndhumātaraḥ*: “Patrons, like the pressing stones whose mother is a river” or “Having a river as mother, they are patrons like the pressing stones” (slight preference for the first).

In b the shared property occupies most of the pāda: #*ādardirāsaḥ* ... *viśvāhāḥ*#. The word *ādri-* can also be used to refer to the pressing stones (like *grāvan-* in a), and the image is of their constantly pounding the soma plant, as the Maruts-as-storm pound the earth. Note the phonetic figure *ādardirāso ādrayo*. The use of *ādri-* as subj. of *√dr* is rather cute, because on several occasions it is the object, when it refers to the Vala cave: see IV.16.8 ... *yād* ... *ādrim dārdar*, IV.1.14 ... *dadr̥vāṃso ādrim*.

In c the hapax *śīsūla-* seems to be an affectionate, colloquial diminutive (note the *l*-form), though AiG II.2 862–63 doesn’t explicitly recognize such a function for the *-la*-suffix. Note that pāda-final *sumātaraḥ* exactly echoes *s(indh)umātaraḥ*, which ends pāda a.

There is no agreement on the position and function of *utá* in d. Ge seems to take it as introducing the shared property (which he takes as *tviṣā*) and therefore connecting d with the rest of the vs., though displaced: “und mit ihren Funkeln wie ein grosser Klan auf dem Kriegszug.” Klein (DGRV I.350) also thinks *utá* is conjoining pāda d with the rest of the vs., but without flg. Ge’s linkage of the two words in the phrase *utá tviṣā*, he therefore offers no explanation for the late position of *utá* if it is conjoining pādas. Re and the publ. tr. take *utá* as (unusually) conjoining nouns, in the case-mismatched phrase *yāmann utá tviṣā*. I still think this is the best explan., with *utá* used instead of *ca* perhaps because of the case disharmony. But a tr. like Ge’s “And with their turbulence (they are) like a great host (of warriors) on their journey” would be possible and would offer a different explanation for the unusual position of *utá*.

The use of *mahāgrāmā*- here certainly fits Rau’s interp. of the term *grāma*- as, in the first instance, “a roving band”; see comm. ad X.27.19, though as disc. there I think it has already developed the sense ‘village’ in some occurrences in the RV.

For *tviṣā* here I’d now substitute “turbulence” or “agitation” for “turmoil.”

X.78.7: My rendering of *adhvaraśrīyaḥ* as “providing splendour to the ceremony” is nextdoor to transitive. On the interpretational problems of *-śrī*-cmpds in general see comm. ad III.26.5 and for this compd I.44.3. I’d now consider a more overt transitive rendering “completing/perfecting the ceremony” as alternative here.

As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. introduces the first finite verbs in this hymn: *vy āśvitan* (b) and *mamire* (d).

I also think that the vs. has loosened up in another way: the rigid independence of pādas found through the rest of the hymn is broken in the second hemistich, by my interpr. (and Re’s). By this interpr. the simile of c consists only of *sindhavo ná yayyāḥ*, with the last word in this pāda, *bhrājadṛṣṭayaḥ*, belonging with d; it does not fit easily with the simile in c. Ge takes it with the rest of c, but not, it seems, as the shared property: “Wie die Ströme eilend mit blinkenden Speeren.” In either type of interpr. the problem is *yayyāḥ*, which ought to be fem. and therefore not applicable to the Maruts. Re suggests it’s been attracted to *sindhavaḥ* and, more to the point, adduces II.37.5 *yayyām ... rātham*, where the adj. modifies a masc. I think it likely that it matches / assimilates to masc. *vrkī*-inflected stems like *rathī*- ‘charioteer’, with nom. pl. *rathyāḥ*.

The last question in this vs. concerns the simile in d, and how we interpr. it depends on the morphological identity of *parāvataḥ*. Usually this form is an ablative “from the/a distance,” but in a minority of cases it is the homonymous acc. pl. This morphological identity is clearest when it is construed with *tisrās* “the three distant realms” (I.34.7, VIII.5.8, 32.22), though it is found elsewhere. I think this is one of those places: acc. pl. *parāvataḥ* is the comparandum (*ná*) for acc. pl. *yójanāni*, hence my tr. “the stages of their journey (*yójanāni*) like distant realms” – indicating how vast a distance the Maruts can cover in a single stage. If I am correct, this is also the first and only simile in this hymn that is not in the nom. pl. I seem to be alone in this interpr., however: both Ge and Re (in different ways) take *parāvataḥ* as ablative and the simile is quite recessive.

X.78.8: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. entirely departs from the style and structure of the rest of the hymn, both in content and in meter. It is a conventional hymn-final vs. begging for rewards for the praise conferred. It also contains the only occurrence of the word Marut in the hymn – solving the implicit riddles posed by the torrent of similes. Metrically it is the only standard Triṣṭubh – *except* for the 1st pāda, which has a Triṣṭubh cadence but twelve syllables

(the opposite of much of the rest of the hymn with Jagatī cadences and eleven syllables). One of these syllables is entirely unnecessary: the *no* in 4th position, which doubles the *asmān* opening b. But, as sketched in the publ. intro., the *no* is the punning link between this vs. and the rest of the hymn. Almost every previous pāda has the simile particle *ná* in 2nd position, usually in syllable 4 (sometimes 5, occasionally elsewhere). The enclitic *no* in 8a deliberately (in my view) echoes this pattern of *ná*-s, and the fact that it disturbs the meter draws attention to it.

The part. *vāṇrdhānāḥ* is rendered as reflexive/passive by Ge and Re. This is the usual function of this form, but it can also be (self-beneficial) transitive. I read it as both; see VIII.96.8, where it is transitive in the frame and intransitive in the simile.

On the slightly awkward phrase *ratnadhéyāni sánti*, see VII.53.3 *utó hí vāṇ ratnadhéyāni sánti* and (with $\sqrt{bhū}$) IV.34.4 *ābhūd u vo vidhaté ratnadhéyam*.

X.79–80

Two hymns to Agni, both attributed to Agni Saucīka or Agni Vaiśvānara, with Sapti Vājambhara listed as an alternate poet for X.79. This last name is obviously extracted from X.80.1 *sāptim vājambharām*.

X.79 Agni

On the (pseudo-?)omphalos structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.79.1: Unaccented *asya* should not be a demonstr. adj. with *mahatāḥ* (pace Re “de ce grand (dieu)” and probably Ge), and it should refer to something already in the discourse, despite being only the 2nd word in the hymn. The ritual fire beside which the poet is reciting the hymn fits the bill – the “discourse” must include the shared ritual situation.

The sense of *nānā* ‘each for itself’ (see comm. ad II.12.8) is rather attenuated here, to ‘alternately’ vel sim. It is notable that *nānā* appears often with duals: II.12.8, III.54.5, 55.11, V.73.4.

With Re, I take *ásinvant-* (and the adj. *asinvá-*) to mean ‘insatiable’, contra Ge (and EWA s.v. *asinvá-*) ‘without chewing/biting’. ‘Insatiable’ fits the contexts better, as well as the derivation from **seh₂* ‘sate, satisfy’ (EWA ibid.). Esp. in this context, ‘not biting’ would be directly contradicted by the flg. word *bápsatī* ‘chewing’.

X.79.2: This vs. focuses on body parts – of the fire (head [*śírah*], eyes [*akṣī*], tongue [*jihváyā*]) and of the priests (feet [*padbhīḥ*], hands [*-hasta-*]). The image of the fire must be standing on its head, with the (top of the) head on or in the ground, where the flames originate and differentiate, and the flames above this source being his tongues. What exactly his eyes are and where they are are unclear to me – much less why Agni has two (and only two?) eyes, but *akṣī* must be dual and is so interpr. by the Pp. This puzzle has elicited little or no comment from moderns; Sāy.’s interpr., that Agni’s two eyes are the sun and the moon, may be correct. They are light sources comparable to Agni and roughly eye-shaped. This certainly accounts for the dual, which needs to be accounted for, and they are spatially ‘separate, apart’ (*śdhak*) from the rest of the scene. If this is correct, the visual image conjured up is a kind of Vedic proto-cubism, with the eyes removed from the upside-down face and stuck into the sky, rather than between the top of the head and the mouth/tongue, where they ordinarily are found. So be it – it wouldn’t be the strangest RVic image ever!

And it is already challenged by pāda c. The priests collecting foodstuffs for Agni “with their feet” (*padbhīḥ*) makes them sound as if they have prehensile monkey-like toes, but surely it just refers to the priests’ walking in the brushland to collect firewood (though I’m quite sure the poet was well aware of the bizarre image he was creating).

Note that the pāda-final verb *sām bharanti* matches *sām bharete* in the same position in 1d.

X.79.3: With the standard tr. going back to antiquity, I interpr. “the hidden place of the mother” (*mātūḥ ... gūhyam*) to be her breast, which the child /young fire is seeking.

Also with the standard tr., I assume an unsignaled change of subject in cd. Agni must be the one “gleaming” in the acc. (*śucāntam*) in c, so the subj. of *avidat* is the priest or another mortal. His “finding” of Agni may depict the moment when the fire-kindling priest perceives the first glimmer of flame in the dried vegetation assembled for the kindling.

There is some difference of opinion (see Ge n. 3c) as to whether *sasām ... pakvām* refers to “cooked food” or “ripe grain(field),” with the former mostly favored (Sāy., Ge, Re), though Old and Kü (429) opt for the latter, as do I. I take *śucāntam* as the shared property; most take the simile just with *avidat* (“found him like cooked food”). The image in my view is that of the sun gleaming on the golden heads of ripe grain (see the photos in Google Images of ripe barley).

ripāḥ is a problem. With most, I take it as belonging with the phrase *ripó ágram* in III.5.5, which is a variant of the likewise problematic *ágre rupāḥ* in IV.5.7 (see comm. ad loc.). Here *upásthē antāḥ* substitutes for *ágra-* as the location of the mysterious *ri/up-*.

X.79.4: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. structurally functions as an omphalos vs. and is introduced as if with a revelation: *tád ṛtām ... prā bravīmi* “I proclaim this truth” – though the truth is fairly humdrum. Note also that though the poet began the hymn with *ápaśyam* “I saw,” in this vs. he asserts that he, as a mortal, does not perceive (*nāham ... mārtyaś ciketa*); only Agni does.

X.79.5: This vs. accomplishes a tricky switch of referents: pāda a contains a dat. sg. m. pronominal *asmai*, c the same, but *tasmai*. The first is a 3rd ps. ref. to Agni, the second a 3rd ps. ref. to the sacrificer, who is represented in ab by *yāḥ* as subject of the three verbs in that hemistich. Meanwhile, Agni resurfaces as subj. of cd but in the 2nd ps. (*vī cakṣe ..., ágne ... asi tvám*).

There is a possible alternative interpr. of ab, which does not actually change much. In both the publ. tr. and the standard tr., *púṣyati* at the end of b has the sacrificer as subj. and a (semi-)transitive sense, ‘prosper s.o.’ It owes its accent to being in the relative clause. However, it’s possible to read it as the verb of the main clause to which *yāḥ ... juhóti* is subordinated. It would then owe its accent to being 1st in its clause, and would express the happy result for the hard-working sacrificer: “Whoever sets out dry food for him, pours oblations with melted butter and ghee for him, he [=sacrificer] prospers.” The verb would have the less common intrans. sense. The second hemistich would begin a new sentence. I do not favor this alternative, however.

The puzzling “two eyes” of Agni in 2a are here replaced (/repaired) by a thousand eyes (*sahásram akṣábhiḥ*) more appropriate to a multiply glittering god.

X.79.6: This vs. turns on the pun between the perfects *cakartha* (√*kṛ*) in pāda a and *cakarta* (√*kṛt* ‘cut’) in d. The first thing to say is that the publ. tr. contains an outright error: *cakarta* is of course a 3rd sg. (‘he cut’) not a 2nd sg. (‘you cut’), however tempting the latter is. The pāda should read “he cut apart (the wood) piece by piece, as a knife does a cow joint by joint.”

The vs. also presents itself in the fashion of an omphalos hymn, with the speaker, confessing ignorance, asking the god for enlightenment (b: *ágne pṛchāmi nú tvāṁ ávidvān* “Agne, unknowing I ask you now”) about a grave offense to the gods (pāda a). This is highly reminiscent of the anguished questioning of Varuṇa by the poet in the famous dialogue hymn VII.86 (esp. vs. 3). But here it’s actually a joke! The poet isn’t asking about his own faults, but Agni’s – and the only evidence that Agni has committed a transgression is that he “eats without teeth,” a natural fact that never slows down Agni’s consumption, as d demonstrates.

As Re points out, *áttave ‘dán* is a pun on √*ad* ‘eat’ (*át-tave*) and *dánt-* ‘tooth’ (*a-dánt-*), which, if we backproject it far enough, becomes an etymological figure.

X.79.7: The tr. ‘that face in all directions’ is misleading for *vīśūcaḥ*, since it sounds as if *vīśva-* were involved. Better ‘facing in diverse/multiple directions’; see comm. ad VI.59.5. These horses are of course his flames.

Although Gr glosses *ījīti-* as ‘glühend, strahlend’, most modern comm. and tr. take it rather to mean ‘of straight course’ vel sim; see the tr. of the various passages by Ge, Re, as well as EWA s.v. – though see Kü’s tr. of the phrase in this passage (149) “mit glühenden (?) Zügeln.” Although *ījī-* ‘shining’ could easily be a Caland form to *ījrá-* in the part of the latter’s range that means ‘silvery, shining’, a relationship to *ījū-* ‘straight’ is also probable. The formation of *ījīti-* is not clear: though AiG II.2.628 seems to favor a suffixal form, comparable to *dabhīti-* ‘harmful’, it also mentions the possibility of a cmpd with *īti-* to √*i* ‘go’, which I would favor. See EWA, which mentions both. The stem occurs 4x in the RV; the passage that most clearly supports ‘having a straight course, going straight’ is VI.75.12, where it qualifies an arrow. In our passage, ‘straight’ is better than ‘shining’, though since Agni is involved, ‘shining’ isn’t excluded. X.21.2 of an oblation and X.75.7 of a river are friendlier to ‘shining’, but ‘straight’ works well in both.

With Ge and Re, I take *mitrá-* as a qualifier of Agni (my ‘ally’; their ‘friend’), in contrast to Kü (107, 149), who takes it as a ref. to Mitra. Agni as distributor of the oblation to the gods makes better sense than Mitra as subj. of *caḥṣadé*. The adj. *sújāta-* is also more appropriate for Agni, esp. since his birth featured earlier in the hymn: most of the singular forms of (differently accented) *sujātá-* qualify Agni, as well as the majority of the same to *sújāta-*.

X.80 Agni

On the insistent repetitive structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. Because of the relentless fronting of Agni in the original, I have tried to keep Agni close to the front in the tr., even when it is awkward.

X.80.1: The cmpd. *karmaniṣṭhā-* is variously rendered (see the standard tr. as well as Scar 648–49); on my understanding of *niṣṭhā-*, which matches Scar’s, see comm. ad III.31.10 and of further cmpds using *niṣṭhā-* VIII.2.9; as for root noun cmpds of the type NOUN – PREV.+ROOT (and their avoidance) see comm. ad I.124.7.

As I have argued elsewhere (see now comm. ad X.28.2, inter alia), *kukṣí-* originally, and in most of its Vedic occurrences, meant ‘cheek’; however, here it shows the transferred sense

‘belly’ in the cmpd *vīrā-kukṣi-* ‘having a hero in her belly’ (< ‘having a belly with a hero [in it]’). It is surely no accident that this is a pregnant belly, which physically resembles a puffed-out cheek.

X.80.2: The form of Agni that opens pāda a, gen. *agnéḥ*, is the only interruption of the string of nom. sg. *agnīḥ*-s that open every pāda (14 in all) until *agnéḥ* reappears in 4d. Despite the grammatical difference, note that it involves only the change of one vowel.

The problem in pāda a is the gen./abl. *āpnasaḥ*, about which there are many and diverse opinions (see esp. Old). As a neut. noun it cannot modify the other gen., *agnéḥ*. Old and Ge, in different ways, take *āpnasaḥ* as directly dependent on *samīdh-* “the kindling of *āpnas-*” – e.g., Old “Das Holzschait der Gabe des Agni sei herrlich.” Re takes it rather as semantically parallel to *bhadrā* despite the case difference: “... soit réjouissante, (soit signe) de bénéfice.” I’m inclined in the Re direction because (as Ge [n. 2a] and Old point out) *bhadrā-* and *āpnas-* are parallel in I.133.9, 20. Here the adj. *bhadrā-* modifies *samīdh-* directly, but the noun *āpnas-* must be in an oblique case: “of/for profit.”

Agni “enters” the two world-halves by being kindled and spreading his light between them.

Pādas c and d are obviously contrasted, through the polarized terms *ékam ... purūṇi*. The sense in the publ. tr. would be clearer if I had fld. Ge and Re in tr. *ékam* as ‘alone’. In other words, Agni gives aid to the warrior fighting alone and against odds, as well as having the power to take on many opponents.

X.80.3: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. is reminiscent of the brisk catalogues of the Aśvins’ deeds (so also Re), particularly those found in Kakṣīvant hymns (I.116–20). The similarity extends to the fact that most of the deeds (in pādas a, b, and d) are unknown or barely so. Only the Atri episode (c) is familiar, on which see my Hyenas 228–29; it is worth noting that it’s usually the Aśvins who rescue Atri, which supports the notion that this vs. is based on Aśvin models. The destruction of Jarūtha is mentioned twice elsewhere (VII.1.7, 9.6), but with no further details: in VII.1.7 Agni burns him up, but in VII.9.6 it is Vasiṣṭha who smites him (though with Agni apparently present). Nṛmedha figures briefly in X.132.7, but as a rescuer, not a beneficiary. Nṛmedha Āṅgīrasa is also a poet to whom the Anukr. attributes VIII.89-90 and 98-99 (all Indra hymns), as well as IX.27 and 29; see also Śakapūta Nārmedha, the supposed poet of X.132. None of these hymns gives any clue to the role of Nṛmedha here.

As noted in the opening comm. to X.76, the Anukr. attributes that hymn to a snake Jaratkarṇa. The relationship is clear, the reason for it is not.

In b *adbhyāḥ* could be either dat. or abl.; the standard tr. (incl. the publ. tr.) take it as abl., presumably because ‘for the waters’ makes little sense, and in any case Agni would probably need to get his victim out of the water before burning him. But in the absence of more information about the story, we can’t be certain.

X.80.4: On the NP *dráviṇam vīrapeśā(ḥ)* and the gender (dis)agreement therein, see comm. ad IV.11.3. Although in our passage, *vīrapeśā(ḥ)* could be nom. sg. m. and modify Agni, in IV.11.3 Agni is in the ablative: *tvád eti dráviṇam vīrapeśā(ḥ)* and so neut. *dráviṇam* must be the target noun.

X.80.5: Ge (n. 5c) thinks the birds call on Agni “aus Angst”; I’m not sure that this limitation is necessary, esp. since it’s not clear to me what Agni could do for flying birds-in-need.

X.80.6: As Ge points out (n. 6a), pāda a is almost identical to nearby X.83.2, except that Manyu (battle fury) is the addressee there. Although I usually render the vṛddhi deriv. *mānuṣa-* as ‘stemming from Manu’ or the like (so persuaded by JPB), here the more standard ‘human’ might be better, given *mānuṣaḥ ... jātāḥ* in the next pāda, which would otherwise seem to double *mānuṣa-*.

On *vī* in b see Old.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 6b; see also Macdonell/Keith, Vedic Index s.v.), Manu and Nahus are two clan ancestors of the Ārya, which seems approximately correct, though Manu is obviously more prominent.

The interpr. of c is hampered by the absence of a verb and by the unclarity of the phrase “the Gandharvan path of truth” (*gāndharvīm pathyām ṛtasya*). Ge supplies ‘knows’ and thinks the phrase refers to the right way to sing; Lü (540 n. 2) agrees. Re is rather vague about the purport of the pāda but supplies ‘finds’ on the basis of III.31.5 *viśvām avindan pathyām ṛtasya*. Although this parallel lacks the Gandharva connection (Gandharvas in the RV tend to spread obscurity), it otherwise seems close enough to favor supplying ‘find’ here too. The path Agni finds is presumably connected with the ritual process, perhaps, with Ge, the sung or at least verbal portion of the ritual.

The word *gāvyūti-* is regularly associated with ghee, though the ghee is metaphorical for rain, in the phrase “sprinkle the pastureland with ghee” (*ghṛtēna/ghṛtaír gāvyūtim √ ukṣ*): III.62.16=VIII.5.6, VII.62.5, 65.4. Here I think this metaphorical phrase is given a literal spin: Agni’s pastureland – the place he forages for food – is in the actual ghee of the poured oblation. (I owe this explanation to JPB.)

X.80.7: As pointed out in the publ. intro., this vs. breaks the rigid structural pattern of the rest of the hymn – first by beginning the vs. with a trisyllabic form of Agni, dat. *agnāye*, and then by addressing him directly in the 2nd hemistich, with two vocc. *ágne*, thus introducing the 2nd ps. for the first time in the hymn.

[X.81–82 Viśvakarman JPB]

X.83–84 Battle Fury

The next two hymns to “Battle Fury” (Manyu) are attributed to a poet Manyu Tāpasa, whose name is transparently derived from the dedicand of the hymn; for the patronymic see *tāpasā* in X.83.2, 3. Although not as rigidly structured as X.80 with its relentlessly fronted *agní-*, both of these hymns are quite insistent on the name: *manyú-* appears at least once in every vs. in both hymns and once considerably more (4x in X.83.2) -- except for the last vs. in X.83 (in a different meter). The diction and contents are fairly straightforward, but there is considerable sharing of vocabulary both within and across the hymns. Both hymns are found, in opposite order, in AVŚ IV.32–33; also in AVP IV.32 [=RV X.83] and IV.12 [=RV X.84] but not adjacent.

X.83 Battle Fury

X.83.1: On the voc. phrase *manyo ... vajra sāyaka* see comm. ad X.96.3.

An etymological figure involving \sqrt{sah} ‘be victorious’, beginning in b, continued in c, and exploding in d. For other forms of \sqrt{sah} see below.

X.83.2: I don’t understand the pf. *āsa*; these identifications would be more powerful if they were not set in the past.

As indicated above, c is almost identical to nearby X.80.6a, though with Agni as the addressee.

X.83.4: Note ... *abhībḥūṭy-ojāḥ* and *abhimāti-ṣāhāḥ* ending the two pādas of the first hemistich.

Another flurry of \sqrt{sah} forms, beginning at the end of b and continuing in c.

X.83.5: It is difficult to ascribe to the nom. part. *sān* its usual concessive force.

For ease of tr. I render the gen. *taviṣāsyā* as a voc. beside *pracetaḥ*.

Note the phonetic figure *tāva krātvā taviṣasya*.

Note also the contrastive *krātvā* (b) and *akratūḥ* (c).

On nonce act. transitive *jihīḍa* as generated to medial *jihīḍe* ‘is angry’ (as also suggested by the vocalism), see Kü 610–11.

X.83.5–6: Note the repetition of *mēhi* (5d, 6a), reminiscent of the more ubiquitous and regimented concatenations in X.84.

X.83.6: Another \sqrt{sah} form, *sāhuri-*, a Lieblingswort of these two hymns: X.83.4, 6; 84.2, 5.

‘Suckling all’ (*viśvādhāyas-*) seems an incongruous epithet for Battle Fury; it usually characterizes more benign subjects, esp. Agni, but also wealth, the earth, etc. I don’t know what it is meant to convey here—perhaps that the Manyu that sweeps us to victory provides us with the spoils we need to thrive.

With JSK (DGRV I.371–72), I take *utā* as conjoining the two imperatival clauses ... *ā vavartsva* (c) and *utā bodhi āpēḥ* (d), with the first dual subjunctive clause *hānāva dāsyūn* parenthetically inserted.

The impv. clause *bodhi āpēḥ* raises the question: which root does *bodhi* belong to -- $\sqrt{bhū}$ or \sqrt{budh} ? Re opts for the former, on the basis of VIII.3.1 *āpīr no bodhi* “become our friend” and of the impv. *bhavā* in the next vs. (7a). However, this leaves him floundering in attempting to explain the clear gen.(/abl.) *āpēḥ*. Much better to follow Old, Ge, and Klein (inter alia) and take it to \sqrt{budh} ‘be aware’, which takes a gen. complement by rule.

X.83.7: This vs., particularly the 1st hemistich, is apparently modeled on VIII.100.2, in a brief dialogue between Vāyu (VIII.100.1) and Indra (vs. 2): the even pādas (100.2d, 83.7b) are identical and the preceding odd pādas very similar: VIII.100.2c *āsaś ca tvām dakṣiṇatāḥ sakhā me* “and you will be my comrade on my right side” v. our *dakṣiṇatō bhavā me* “be on my right side” (with *āpi-* ‘friend’ in 6d). Indra’s offer to Vāyu of the first drink of soma in VIII.100.2ab is similar to our cd, where the poet offers Manyu the best of the soma and suggests they two will drink it together silently. The ritual tech. term *upāṃśú* is found only here in the RV; on its sense see Re (Vocab. rit. véd.), Sen (Dict. of Vedic Rituals) both s.v. It refers to a kind of near-silent recitation; the first drawing of soma at the Morning Pressing is done this way. And of course Vāyu gets the first drink of soma.

X.84 Battle Fury

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn is characterized by verbal concatenation, with the final word of one vs. picked up at the beginning of the next: *agní-* ‘fire’ in 1d/2a, *éka-* ‘alone’ 3d/4a, *ví√ji* ‘be victorious’ + *√kṛ* ‘make’ 4d/5a, *ā√bhū* ‘(come) into existence, be at hand’ 5d/6a, (*dhana-*) *sám√sṛj* ‘pour in spoils’ 6d/7a; only 2d/3a lacks this type of concatenation (but see below). In fact, the concatenation carries over the hymn boundary: in vs. 1d *abhí prá yantu* “let them go forth on attack” echoes X.83.7a *abhí préhi* “go forth on attack” in the last vs. of the preceding hymn.

X.84.1: On the verbal concatenation with the last vs. of the previous hymn, see immed. above.

The adverbial phrase *tváyā ... sarátham* “on the same chariot with you” is a variant of *tváyā yujā* “with you as yokemate” in the 1st vs. of the preceding hymn as well as 4c in this hymn.

X.84.3: Although, as noted above, the final/initial concatenation that prevails in the rest of the hymn does not link vs. 3 with vs. 2, vs. 3 is nonetheless tightly bound to the two preceding vss. Initial *sáhasva* repeats pāda-final *sahasva* in 2a, and vs.-final *śátrūn* repeats *śátrūn* in 2c. Moreover, *ruján* (3b) echoes *ārujántaḥ* (1a) and *préhi* (3b) *abhí prá yantu* (1d).

The VP *sáhasva ... abhimātim* corresponds to the cmpd *abhimātiṣāhā-* in the preceding hymn, X.83.4.

In d both Ge and Re supply a second object in the phrase *vásam nayase*, namely “them” presumably picking up *śátrūn* in b and the subj. of *ā rurudhre* in c: “bringst du ... (sie) in deine Macht”; “tu (les) mènes à (la) volonté,” with *vásam* an acc. of goal. I instead take *vásam* as adverbial “at will,” as I do also in the rt-noun cmpd. *vaśa-nī-* in X.16.2. See comm. ad loc. and Scar (290). I do not supply an acc. ‘them’.

X.84.4: Note the juxtaposition of the semantically polarized terms *éko bahūnām* “one/many.” The function of the gen. *bahūnām* is disputed. With Ge I take it as (an irreg.) gen. agent with *īḍitāḥ*; Ge (n. 4a with suppl. n. 1) cites X.93.4 *nṛnām stutāḥ* as parallel. Re explicitly rejects an agentive reading and tr. “Tu es seul parmi beaucoup ...” (so also Proferes, Sovereignty, p. 18) with a more orthodox use of the genitive. Because of the āmreḍita *viśam-viśam* in the next pāda, I nonetheless favor the agentive interpr.: Manyu performs various services for the many who invoke him. I also can’t imagine who “the many” would be who are not being called upon – gods like Indra? other emotional states?

sām śísādhi echoes *saṃśísānāḥ* in 1a. There the participle took *āyudhā* as object, while here the impv. has *yudhāye* as dative of purpose.

On the voc. bahuvrīhi *ākṛtta-ruk*, see, briefly, Scar (459).

On *tváyā yujā* see comm. ad vs. 1.

On *kṛṇmahe* see comm. ad X.51.7.

X.84.4–5: The final two words of vs. 4 *vijayāya kṛṇmahe* are matched by the rt. noun cmpd. *vijeṣa-kṛt*, which opens vs. 5. Several remarks about this pairing are in order. First, *vijayāya kṛṇmahe* is not a tight syntagm: *kṛṇmahe* has its own direct object (*ghóṣam* ‘cry’) and *vijayāya* is a dative of purpose with the whole predicate. Second, as Scar (80) points out, *vijeṣa-* is not otherwise found in the RV (though it is found non-compounded in AVP V.23.1), though *jeṣā-* is

found a couple of times – and, I’d point out, there are *s*-aor. forms *jéṣ(a)-*. Scar considers various possibilities for its formation in this cmpd. (see also Re), but does not mention the clear impetus for its creation: the chaining between 4 and 5. Clearly a nominal form of *vi√ji* was wanted as first member of the *-kṛ-t* cmpd, but simply repeating *vijayá-* is not possible for metrical reasons: **vijaya-kṛt* would produce an opening of 4 light syllables (since *-kṛd* is followed by a vowel), whereas *vijeṣa-* provides the very desirable heavy second syllable and breaks up the unacceptable sequence of light syllables.

X.84.5: The hapax *anavabravá-* is very difficult to interpr. because the lexeme *áva√brū* does not seem otherwise to exist, nor in fact does *áva* plus a verb-of-speaking, like *áva√vac* or *áva√vad*, in early Vedic. (In the Brāh. *ava√vad* is found [e.g., AB V.22] in the apparent sense ‘speak ill’; one could also point to *ava√man* ‘despise’, although this lexeme doesn’t really show up till Epic/Classical.) Both the context and the preverb *áva* ‘down’ suggest that the lexeme has a negative value, lit. ‘talk/speak down’ – with this negative sense reversed by the privative *an-*. The range of available tr. reflects this assumption, but there is otherwise little or no agreement: Gr “von dem man nichts übles sagen kann,” Ge “keine Absage [refusal] geben,” Re “sans dédire (la promesse),” Scar (80) “untadelig,” Wh (AVŚ IV.31.5) “not to be talked down.” There are no grounds on which to choose among these. The publ. tr. sticks close to the additive/literal, but assumes that the form is active (so Ge, Re), not passive (so Gr, Scar, Wh). In the publ. tr. the unexpressed assumption is that Manyu can become our overlord (*adhipā-*) without verbally demeaning us.

X.84.5–6: The formal concatenation between *ābabhūtha* (5d) and *ābhūti-* (6a) is undeniable; their semantic connection is a different matter. Re explicitly asserts that they have different meanings, and the standard tr. render the verb and the noun differently: Ge “... du entstammst” v. “mit dem Erfolg”; Re “... tu as pris naissance” v. “avec le succès”; Wh (AVŚ IV.31.5–6) “thou camest” v. “with efficacy.” Since *ābhūti-* is found only here in the RV (and very seldom elsewhere), it is embarrassing to attribute to it a sense different from the juxtaposed verb. Consequently the publ. tr. attempts to unify them: “you came to be ready to hand” and “with readiness.” One of the usual senses of verb forms of *ā√bhū* is ‘come into being’, as in the repeated *yāta ābabhūva* “... from where [this creation] came to be” in the famous creation hymn (X.129.6–7). Our clause, *yāta ābabhūtha*, matches the X.129 usage exactly, and I would now emend the tr. to “... whence you came into existence.” Another sense of *ā√bhū* is ‘be at hand, be ready’, and this is the usual meaning of the rt noun cmpd *ābhū-* ‘standing by, ready at hand, available’; see Scar 359–61. Our isolated *ābhūti-* seems to be the abstract ‘readiness’ corresponding to this rt noun adj.; so approx. also Scar. In this instance the concatenation implicitly contrasts two somewhat different senses of the same lexeme.

X.84.6: On *ābhūti-* see immed. above; note that the voc. of another such *-ti*-stem cmpd., *abhibhūte*, is found in the next pāda. The latter is also found in the cmpd. *abhibhūty-ojas-* in the preceding hymn, X.83.4.

On *sahajā-* see Scar 148. The first member is presumably the adv. *sahá* ‘together with’, and this first cmpd member is construed with the instr. *ābhutyā*. However, as Scar points out, a connection with *√sah* ‘be victorious’ is also thinkable, esp. since forms of this root are all over these two hymns, incl. *sāhaḥ* in the next pāda. However, the phrase *krátvā ... sahá* “together with your resolve” in c seems to stabilize *saha-* in *sahajā-* as the adv.

The sequence *vajra sāyaka, sāhaḥ* is found also in X.83.1, likewise split across a pāda boundary.

The rhyming phrase *med'y edhi* is phonologically catchy and recalls the repeated *méhi* of the previous hymn (X.83.5, 6). On the meaning of *medín-* see comm. ad X.38.2.

X.84.6–7: The concatenation of these two vss. is phrasal: *(mahā)dhanásya ... saṃsṛjī* in 6d matches *sāṃsṛṣṭam dhānam* in 7a.

X.84.7: On *sām √ sṛj* see comm. ad X.27.10 and Scar 627–28. My rendering ‘pour in’ may be a bit over-literal. In 7a spoils that are *sāṃsṛṣṭa-* are contrasted with those that are *samākṛta-*. Ge suggests (n. 7a) inanimate and animate respectively; Re’s interpr. is more elaborate (see below). Although both *sām √ kṛ* and *ā √ kṛ* are common, *sam-ā √ kṛ* is quite rare. I take the preverbs as additive – ‘bring here [=make (to be) here] together’ – and assume that it involves actual collection, whereas *sām √ sṛj* may refer to things that have accumulated on their own. This is somewhat like Re’s “celui qui s’est déversé (de soi-même) et celui qu’on a poussé (devant soi pour le faire aller) ensemble” – which seems to be the exact opposite of Ge’s suggestion. I can’t get any further, but I favor something like Re’s solution (without the excess verbiage).

I do not understand why the peaceable Varuṇa is brought in at the last minute, to pair with Battle Fury.

X.85–191 From here on till the end of the maṇḍala, the hymns are discrete, arranged (roughly and with a number of exceptions) by decreasing number of verses. See Old, Prol. 228, 237, 240–49.

X.85 Wedding

This long and complex hymn is clearly a composite, as suggested by its length (one of the longest hymns in the RV), the abrupt changes in its tone and subject matter, and its metrical variety. It has been treated by a range of scholars too numerous to mention. Most of its vss. are found in the AV (AVŚ XIV.1–2; AVP XVIII), though not in the same order and with many additional vss. interspersed: the RV version has 47 vss., the Śaunaka AV a total of 139. For my overview of the structure and contents of the RV version see publ. intro.

X.85.1–19: This long preamble treats the mythical wedding of Sūryā, daughter of the Sun, and Soma, who here is identified with the Moon, as in later texts but very rarely in the RV. The structure of this hymn-within-a-hymn is

vss. 1–5 Soma’s astronomical qualifications

vss. 6–12 identification of items associated with the wedding with astronomical and other phenomena

vss. 13–16 the pre-wedding: the “wooing”

vss. 17–19 blessings and more astronomy

On the various possible boundaries of this Sūryā hymn, see Old.

X.85.1: This vs. is notable for the parallel hemistich-initial instr. *satyéna* (1a) and *ṛténa* (1c). In keeping with my (perhaps overscrupulous) insistence that *ṛtá-* means ‘truth’ in the RV (flg. Lüders), not ‘cosmic order’, ‘law’, or the like, I tr. *ṛténa* here as ‘by truth’ and *satyéna* as ‘by reality’: in much of the RV the adj. *satyá-* means ‘real, actual, actually present’. However, I now

realize that I must reckon with changing semantics in the late RV, and just as Soma here assumes his later role as the Moon, *satyá-* may here have acquired its later meaning of ‘truth’, impinging on the semantic domain of *ṛtá-*, while *ṛtá-* may have narrowed its usage to the principle of truth associated with the Ādityas, as is suggested by their presence in pāda c. (See Re’s remark, EVP XVI.144, that in Maṇḍala X *ṛtá* “coincides” with *satyá-*.) I would now change the tr. to “By (realized) truth ..., by (immanent) truth ...” – or, more simply, “by truth ... by truth,” however against my principles that is.

The next question is why the earth needs to be propped up (*úd*). I have no answer, and it’s not a question that seems to have exercised other commentators.

Though underlyingly and overwhelmingly masc., *dyaúḥ* is fem. here (adj. *úttabhītā*), as it tends to be when associated with reliably fem. ‘earth’.

The nuance of *tiṣṭhanti* isn’t entirely clear to me – perhaps ‘take their stand’ or ‘stand firm’; the other three pādas in the vs. concern the stable position of the entity in question.

Pāda d establishes Soma in heaven and implicitly as a heavenly body.

X.85.2: A major lapse in the publ. tr.: in pāda b “by Soma” should be substituted for “by truth”!

X.85.3: Having established the celestial and cosmic bona fides of Soma, the poet now distinguishes this Soma from the ritual drink.

On the knowledge possessed by ‘formulators’ (*brahmāṇaḥ*) see comm. ad vs. 16.

X.85.4: This vs. develops the thought of vs. 3: that the Soma under discussion here is not the ritual drink, and he therefore can listen to the sound of the pressing stones with equanimity, since he will not be smashed by the stones and consumed.

So much is clear from the 2nd hemistich; the first one presents interpretational difficulties in the two instr. pls., *āchádvidhānaiḥ* (a) and *bārhataiḥ* (b) – in both cases the protectors of Soma. The first is a hapax, the second occurs only once in the RV (though it is common elsewhere in Vedic), but their formations are fairly clear: *bārhata-* is a vṛddhi deriv. of *brhánt-* ‘lofty’, and the two members of the cmpd. *āchád-vidhāna-* are both found elsewhere. But this doesn’t get us very far, nor do the various tr. offered of the cmpd., including the unobtrusive one in the publ. tr. “whose regulation is sheltering.” Perhaps the closest to the mark is Doniger’s non-literal “by those charged with veiling you.” I think this has to do with the phases of the moon. *ví√dhā* can refer to temporal regulation, indeed of the moon. Cf. X.138.6 *vidhānaṃ māsām* “the apportioner of the months”; and in our hymn vs. 18 *ṛtūṃ anyó vidádhaḥ jāyate púnaḥ* “The other [=the moon] is born again as he portions out the seasons.” The cmpd. should be a bahuvrīhi, and I suggest something like “those who have [=oversee] the regulation of (your) covering” or, a bit less awkwardly, “those who regulate your covering” – i.e., whatever forces control the regular covering and uncovering of the moon in its monthly phases. For further on the cmpd. see Scar 129–30.

As for *bārhata-* ‘those belonging to the heights’, this could refer to heaven-dwellers (cf. *brhád-diva-*, etc.) or, since the earthly plant soma grows in the mountains, to mountain-dwellers (hapax voc. *brhad-giri-*). Since the focus in this hymn is on heavenly Soma, the former is more likely.

In c it is possible that *tiṣṭhasi* + PRES PART is a periphrastic constr., “keep X-ing,” though in the standard tr. *tiṣṭhasi* is rendered with its lexical value “you stand, listening ...” The *tiṣṭhanti*

in 1c without participle might support the lexical reading, though I am attracted to the periphrasis.

X.85.5: Since the last pāda of the preceding vs. (4d) proclaimed that no earthling consumes Soma, the subject of *prapībanti* must be other – presumably the gods and, in particular, Vāyu, mentioned in c, who receives the first drink at the Soma Sacrifice.

I take “you swell up again” as a reference to the moon’s phases, as I do in 4a.

X.85.6–12: These vss. consist for the most part of bandhus equating parts of Sūryā’s wedding chariot and equipage with astronomical phenomena, inter alia. In several instances identification is difficult because of the specialized lexicon. I also think it likely that we are missing a number of astronomical references.

It is a little surprising how many overt copulas are found in these equational clauses. True, they are all preterital, and technically only present-tense copulas are ordinarily gapped. But still I would have thought that once the temporal situation had been established, the preterital copulas could have been dispensed with. The examples are all impf.: sg. *āsīt* (6a, 7c, 8d, 10a, 10b), du. *āstām* (9b, 10c, 11c), pl. *āsan* (8a), and notably the unextended impf. *ā(s)* (7a, 7b). We (linguists) tend to view this form as a precious relic, the expected 3rd sg. impf. to \sqrt{as} (*a+as+t*), which is almost universally replaced by remarking it with the 3rd sg. sec. ending to set roots (*-īt*, as in *ābravīt*). But the RV distribution of *ās* gives me pause: there are 5 exx., all in (late) X and all appearing before vowels, so they appear in sandhi as minimalist *ā* (accented *ā̃* once in X.61.5). These seem to me signs of artificiality, and I suggest that *ā(s)* was reverse-engineered as a kind of parlor trick by linguistically savvy poets. This isn’t to say that *ās* / *ās* never existed – it must have, on system-internal grounds and to provide the foundation for *āsīt* – just that it had disappeared by the time of the RV but could be recreated as a pseudo-archaism.

A number of pādas in this sequence are semi-duplicates. I don’t know the reason for this – it might just be a taste for repetition, but (more likely in my view) it may be that in various circles there were alternative phrasings of the same general vs. for various stages of the wedding enterprise, and when the hymn was assembled, the assemblers kept the alternative versions. These semi-duplicates include

7d *yád áyāt sūryā́ pátim*
10d *yád áyāt sūryā́ gṛhám*
12cd ... *sūryā́, ... prayatī́ pátim*

8c *sūryā́yā aśvínā́ varā́*
9b *aśvínā́stām ubhā́ varā́*

10a *māno asyā́ ána āsīt*
12c *áno manasmáyam sūryā́ ...*

as well as other, less precise, echoes. There are other such semi-duplications in other sections of the hymn; see below *passim*.

X.85.6: Raibhī and Nārāsaṃsī are names of particular gāthās that were presumably sung on (or before and after) the wedding journey. The two feminines with which they’re equated, *anudéyī*

and *nyócanī*, are difficult to identify because of limited attestation: the latter is a hapax and the former almost so. (Fortunately their verbal lexemes, *ānu √dā* and *nī √uc*, are a bit more secure.) There is a wide range of interpr. of these two terms, which I will not rehearse. On *anudēyī* see my “Inborn Debts of a Brahmin” (JA 302.2 [2014], esp. 248). In my opinion the two feminines refer to servants/attendants of the bride: the *anudēyī* is one from her natal place, lit. ‘to be given along with/following (the bride)’. I interpr. *nyócanī* in light of *nyòkas-* ‘(being) at home’ (*nī √uc* ‘be at home, at ease’) and suggest that she is a female servant at the husband’s home, who will become the bride’s attendant when she comes into the household. This is somewhat similar to Re’s suggestions (EVP XVI.144, not Hymnes Spec.) that *anudēyī* is “qqch. qui est à mettre en place” and *nyócanī* “qqch. qui est d’ores et déjà en place” – though he then immediately claims that they are doubtless parts of the chariot. It is impossible to prove my conjectures (or any of the other suggestions floating out there), but the two suggested meanings are compatible with the verbal lexemes, and they also make the two terms explicitly contrastive, which many of the other suggestions do not.

The standard tr. (Ge, Re [HySpec], WD) take *cd* as a single clause and as if the verb were a copula. E.g., Ge “Das gute Kleid der Sūryā ist mit der Gāthā ausgeputzt.” But *d* clearly contains *eti*, a verb of motion, which is represented in the publ. tr. (“... goes adorned ...”). Although garments don’t ordinarily move on their own, the focus on the wedding journey in this section justifies a verb of motion. The standard rendering seems to be the result of a collective Homeric nod.

X.85.7: The logical connections between the terms in each pair elude me (save for *b*), though *c* would make more sense if I interpr. *kóśa-* with most, incl. Gr, Ge, and Wh (AVŚ XIV.1.6), as a traveling chest, cask, or coffer, since the cosmic spaces can be seen as hollow containers, which could be compared to a traveling chest mounted on the wagen and containing the bride’s possessions brought from her natal family. I would therefore emend the pub. tr. to ‘coffer’.

Pāda *d* depicts a somewhat different model of the wedding from the one we find later (both later in Vedic and later in the hymn), since the bride Sūryā seems to be traveling by herself to her new husband. Ordinarily the bride’s wedding journey is taken in company with her husband after the ceremony, to her new home with his extended family. (See my Sac. Wife 125–26, 223–26.)

X.85.8: As generally rendered, the first pāda refers to parts of the chariot, the second to bridal finery. Because of this mismatch Wh (ad AVŚ XIV.1.8) reasonably suggests the *pratidhāyaḥ* “must rather be some article of a woman’s dress.” None of this can be further determined.

X.85.8–9: As disc. in my Sacrificed Wife (221–24), “wooer” (*varā-*) refers not to a hopeful suitor, the future bridegroom, but to his sidekicks, who accompany him to the bride’s house to ask her male relatives for her hand and conduct some of the negotiations.

X.85.10: On the *ānas-* ‘cart’ as the proper vehicle for a bride, see comm. ad I.126.5 and my 2003 “Vedic *vrā*” (Fs. H-P Schmidt).

Pace Re (HymSpec, fld by Don), the two *śukraú* are far more likely to be the Sun and Moon than the two summer months Śukra and Śuci.

Pāda *d* is almost identical to 7*d*.

X.85.11: On the disputed sense of *sāmanā-* see comm. ad III.30.9. Here its usage is complicated by the fact that there is a play on *-sāmābhyām* in the preceding pāda. A rendering like “of one accord” fits well here, though it’s rather different from what I suggest in III.30.9.

What *c* is meant to convey baffles me, esp. because of the number disagreement between ‘ear’ (or perhaps ‘hearing’) and ‘two wheels’. The ear/hearing part fits well with the *īc-* and *sāman-* in pāda *a*, but the wheels are puzzling – though it is the case that wheels can creak in Vedic. Or perhaps ears are here conceived of as circular, with the various articulations of the outer ear seen as the axle and spokes. Given the shape of most ears, they wouldn’t provide a smooth ride!

X.85.12: Here at least a dual is equated with the two wheels, but what exactly *śúcī* refers to is unclear. Since an etymologically related dual *śukraú* occurs two vss. previously (10c), they might refer to the same entities. Indeed, Re (HymSpec, + Don) identify them again as the two summer months. However, perhaps the two oxen and the two wheels ought to be identified with two different pairs — though not necessarily, if these vss. are variants of the type disc. ad 6–12. Re (EVP XVI) points out that *śúcī* is used of Heaven and Earth in X.56.5, and this informed my tentative choice of referents in the publ. tr. However, H+E are not very wheel-like (not that superficial resemblance is guiding the bandhus in this section), so we are back to Sun and Moon, which at least are circular (more so than ears). Ge (n. 12ab) also suggests ‘eyes’, which would fit the surrounding context better, but I don’t think *śūci-* is otherwise so used. On the basis of Sūryā’s two wheels in 16 and the regular succession of sun and moon in vss. 18–19, I would now change the bracketed ident. in the publ. tr. to “[=Sun and Moon].” On the genders of *śukraú* and *śúcī* with further disc. of these passages, see comm. ad X.26.6.

X.85.13: *vahatú-* can mean both ‘wedding’ and ‘wedding procession / journey’, in keeping with its etymology (√*vah* ‘convey’) and with the emphasis on the wedding journey in traditional treatments of ancient Indian marriage; see the reff. given above ad vs. 7. Here either would work.

The locc. *aghāsu* and *árjunyoh* refer to nakṣatras; for further see, e.g., Ge n. 13c, Wh (n. to AVŚ XIV.1.13). The “cows are killed” presumably for the wedding feast.

X.85.14: On the Aśvins as wooers and the use of the mid. part. *prchāmāna-* see Sac.Wife p. 222.

Pūṣan’s appearance and role in *d* are puzzling. The med. verb *vr̥ṇīte* in a wedding context is specialized for the bride’s choice in a svayaṃvara ‘self-choice’ marriage. See my 2001 “Rigvedic svayaṃvara” (Fs. Parpola), and for this particular passage p. 306. Elsewhere there are hints that Pūṣan was considered, in certain circles, the husband of Sūryā (see VI.58.4 and comm. ad X.26.6), but even so he should not be the “chooser” (though see the reversal in VI.58.4) and in any case he is choosing his *fathers*, not a spouse. As disc. in the Fs. Parpola art., I think we are dealing with “formulaic slippage”: though *avṛṇīta* has the wrong subject and the wrong object, it covertly signals that we’re dealing with a self-choice marriage, as Sūryā’s marriage is depicted elsewhere in the RV (see Parpola Fs. art. for the evidence).

X.85.14–15: Another semi-duplication: 14ab *yád aśvinā ... áyātam, ... vahatúm sūryāyāḥ* // 15ab *yád áyātam śubhas patī, vareyām sūryām úpa*.

On the relevance of the questions in *cd* to the “wooing,” see SacWife 222–23.

X.85.16: The question of enigmas and who understands them has been ratcheted up a notch. In vs. 3 the ‘formulators’ (*brahmāṇaḥ*) possessed the esoteric knowledge about the real nature of Soma (*sómaṃ yám brahmāṇo vidúḥ*), but here they know only about Sūryā’s two wheels, but not the hidden third (*ékaṃ cakráṃ yád guhā*) – knowledge of which is limited to the *addhātí*-, clearly a more intellectually elite group than mere *brahmán*. The stem *addhātí*-, found only here in the RV though slightly more commonly in the AV, is a *-tí*-stem built to the adverb *addhā* ‘certainly’. As Old points out, the adverb *addhā* appears several times with forms of *√vid*, so its derivative fits the context here well. Though, per vs. 12, the two wheels are most likely the Sun and Moon, I have no idea what the third wheel is meant to be; Sāy. suggests it’s the year (see Ge n. 16). Because of the identification of the two wheels as the Sun and the Moon, since vss. 18–19 portray the regular alternation of sun and moon I would now change the tr. of *ṛtuthā* in our pāda b to “in their succession.”

In order to make the connection between this vs. and vs. 3 clearer, I would now also match the translations of *brahmāṇaḥ* in the two vss. The emended tr. of ab should now read “Your two wheels [=Sun and Moon], o Sūryā -- the formulators know them in their succession.”

X.85.17: This vs. seems the rough equivalent of a maṅgala vs. and interrupts the semantic connection I see between 16 and 18–19. In a RVic context it reads like a final summary vs., which in this case might bring the first section of the hymn, the mythical marriage of Sūryā, to a close; in that case vss. 18–19 would seem to constitute a loose appendix. AVŚ separates both our 17 and our 18–19 from the other Sūryā materials, which are transmitted together as XIV.1.1–16. Our X.85.17 is the far distant AVŚ XIV.2.46; our 18–19 less distant, but still separated from the Sūryā vss., as AVŚ XIV.1.23–24.

X.85.18–19: As noted above, these two vss. concern the regular alternation of sun and moon.

X.85.18: The first hemistich treats the two heavenly bodies together, the second contrasts them as separate entities.

In d the participle *vidádhat* is picked up by *ví dadhāti* in the next vs. (19c), as well as echoing the cmpd *āchād-vidhāna-* in 4a, which in my view concerns the phases of the moon (see disc. there), as it does here.

X.85.19: The subject of this vs. is universally considered to be only the moon. I disagree: I think ab concerns the sun, cd the moon. To begin with, it is difficult to apply b to the moon: both “beacon of the days” and “forefront of the dawns” bring to mind not the retreating moon, but the daylight produced by the rising sun. As Ge points out (n. 19b), *āhnāṃ ketú-* is otherwise used of the sun (III.34.4, VI.7.5) or the dawn fire, not the moon. Pāda a is more easily attributed to the moon, esp. since *návo-navah* ... *jāyamānaḥ* seems a variant of the last words of the preceding vs., *jāyate púnaḥ*, which do describe the moon. But “becomes ever new as he is born” can just as well characterize the sun rising anew every day: both sun and moon are cyclically renewed, just on different timetables.

With cd we return to the moon and its signature verb *ví√dhā*.

X.85.20–27: On the somewhat various contents of these vss., see publ. intro. It’s worth noting that 20–23 are found scattered in the AVŚ wedding hymns, but 24–27 occur together (in slightly jumbled order) in AVŚ XIV.1.18–21.

X.85.20: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. may be placed here because Sūryā is addressed in it. It also reprises the mounting (*ā roha sūrye*; cf. *sūryārohat* 12cd), the *vahātu-* (13a, 14b), the dat. *pātye* (9c; also acc. *pātim* 7d, 12d), and Sūryā's journey in general, as depicted in the Sūryā portion of the hymn.

X.85.21–22: These two vss. are variants of each other in lexicon and content, but in different meters (Triṣṭubh and Anuṣṭubh respectively). The first is found in AVŚ XIV.2.33 (more or less), but the second is not part of the AV marriage suite.

X.85.21: Viśvāvasu is the name of a Gandharva; on the Gandharva as the bride's second supernatural husband (after Soma), see vs.. 40–41.

In c *vyāktām* is usually interpr. as indicating that the girl is post-menarche – though with delicate euphemisms (e.g., Re “pubère,” Don “ripe”), but the use of *vī√āñj* in vs. 28 invites a more literal interpr. I also think it's a pun: she is not only ‘smeared (with menstrual blood)’ but also ‘adorned’, that is, in bridal finery.

In d *sā te bhāgāḥ* looks literally to mean “this [masc.] is your portion,” but the preferable “*she* is your portion” is syntactically possible – on the basis of the syntactic rule, esp. well represented in the Brāh., that in equational sentences pronominal forms are attracted into the gender of the equated noun.

X.85.22: On *prapharvī-* see Narten, “Vedisch *prapharvī-*” (Die Sprache 32 [1986] = KISch 330–39). Acdg. to her it means ‘young, unmarried maiden’ – referring to a short time-period after puberty but before marriage. She plausibly suggests that it's related to / derived from *phāla-* ‘fruit’.

X.85.23: The universal interpr. of *anṛkṣarā-* is ‘thornless’, based on a supposed *ṛkṣarā-* ‘thorn’. As I have argued at length elsewhere (“Thornless Paths and Others: Vedic *anṛkṣara-* : Greek φθεῖρω,” Fx. Rix 1993), there is little or no support for an independent *ṛkṣara-* ‘thorn’, and I suggested an alternative segmentation *a-nṛ-kṣarā-* and an alternative interpr. ‘not sweeping men away’ (*√kṣar*), ‘harmless to men’.

Note the archaic nom. plural of *pānthā-*; the AV version (Ś XIV.1.34, P XVIII.4.3) already substitutes the newer form *pānthānas*, which disturbs the meter.

In d I failed to tr. *naḥ*; I would now substitute the tr. “by which our comrades go to woo (her),” with *vareyām* matching the same word in vs. 15.

Aryaman, patron god of marriage, and Bhaga, who represents good fortune, are appropriate deities for the occasion.

X.85.24–27: These vss. treat the wedding ceremony itself, rather cursorily (24–25), the journey to the new home (26), and blessings bestowed on the bride on her arrival (27). This last vs. has the feel of a final vs., and though nearly half the hymn follows, there is an abrupt change of tone and subject after it. These four vss. are also found together in AVŚ (XIV.1.18–21).

X.85.24–25: Another pair of vss. saying much the same thing but in different meters (24 Triṣṭubh, 25 Anuṣṭubh). They are found together in AVŚ (XIV.1.18–19), but in opposite order. The other salient difference between the vss. is that 24 addresses the bride in the 2nd ps., while

25 describes her in the 3rd. On the binding of the bride and her release, see my Sac.Wife 42–48. This action is the equivalent of the Upanayana for women, as Manu says (MDŚ II.67).

X.85.24: As disc. ad III.29.8, suffix-accented *sukṛtā-* has been substantivized and the tr. here should be corrected to “in the world of good work.”

X.85.25:

X.85.25: The locational designations “from here” (*itáh*) and “from yonder” (*amútaḥ*) show that the wedding ceremony is being performed at the bride’s natal place (from which she will be “released”) before she journeys to her husband’s family place, where she will be forever bound. This squares with the treatment of the wedding in the later ṛghya sūtras.

X.85.26–27: The setting of vs. 26 is still the bride’s natal place, as shown by *itáh* ‘from here’ in pāda a, but the scene has changed in vs. 27: the 1st word, *ihá* ‘here’, reinforced by *asmín ṛghé* “in this house,” now refers to the husband’s domicile. The wedding journey has been accomplished in the meantime. The near and far deictics in this sequence of vss. (25–27) do a lot of the work.

Note also the repetition of the ‘house’ words and their derivatives in 26c and 27b, each in an alliterative VP: 26c *ṛghān gacha ṛghápatnī* (with etym. unrelated [*hasta-*]*ṛghya* in 26a) and 27b *ṛghé gārhapatyāya jāṛghī*.

X.85.26: As pointed out by many, Pūṣan is appropriate here because he knows the paths. We saw his association with the Aśvins also in the enigmatic vs. 14.

X.85.28–35: As I say in the publ. intro., “Verses 28-35 are a strange, sinister, and menacing interlude between the generally happy tone of the first part of the hymn and the blessings with which it closes. These, especially vss. 28-30 and 34-35, are also the most discussed and disputed verses in the hymn.” As I see it, they treat, in somewhat jumbled order,

vss. 28–30 the deflowering of the bride

vss. 31–33 the wedding journey (which logically precedes the deflowering)

vss. 34–35 the wedding feast (?)

There are many areas of disagreement among the standard tr. and comm.; I will not treat them in detail, but give my own interpr. An outlier among modern interpr. is that of Falk (Fs. Risch), which is imaginative though not ultimately convincing -- but still well worth reading.

X.85.28–30: These are the most challenging vss. in the hymn and, in my opinion, display a very astute sense of the psychological effects of sex -- here presented from the groom’s point of view. The three vss. are found together in AVŚ XIV.1.25–27 (in slightly different order).

X.85.28: The bride’s garment is stained with blood, as the first word, *nīlaloḥitām* ‘dark red’, announces. Although this word is ordinarily taken as a dvandva ‘blue (and) red’, I think *nīla-* here simply means ‘dark’ and modifies *-lohitā-*; cf. the bahuvrīhi *nīla-ṛṣṭha-* ‘dark-backed’. The stained garment is of course a sign that the bride was a virgin. This is good news for her relatives (c), since the marriage is proved valid, but by the same token it makes it impossible for the husband to legally escape it: he is “bound in bonds” (d).

This background ambivalence is what I think underlies pāda b, whose subject is, in my view, the bride, not the garment. (See more explicitly in the next vs., 29c *kṛtyaiśā ... jāyā*.) As a (newly) sexual being and the husband's sexual partner, she becomes the embodiment of the dark magical hold that sex will exert over him: in the publ. intro. I quote the old American song lyrics "that old black magic" describing women's sexual power, corresponding to *kṛtyā*- 'witchcraft' in b. This word is found in the RV only in this pair of vss. (28–29), but is quite common in the AV. It's worth noting that in one of the AVŚ hymns against witchcraft, *kṛtyā*- is compared to "a bride at her wedding" (AVŚ X.1.1 *vahataū vadhūm iva*).

The other noun in this pāda, *āsakti*-, is variously rendered: e.g., Gr Verfolgung (pursuit), Ge Ansteckung (contagion), Re (HymSpec) empreinte (impression, imprint), Wh (AVŚ XIV.1.26) infection, Falk Anhaftung (attachment); see also EWA s.v. *sañj*, etc. Of these, only Falk's seems to reflect the presumed derivation from *ā*√*sañj* 'hang, fasten on', as in I.191.10 (the venom hymn): *sūrye viśām ā sajāmi* "I hang the poison on the sun." I take *āsakti*- (only in this passage in RV and AV) as an abstract 'hanging' developed into the means of hanging, a noose. Like the bonds in which the husband is bound in d, the wife-as-noose symbolizes the emotional and legal ties in which the husband is now trapped. In the publ. intro. I compare another American English (outdated, one hopes) slang expression, "the old ball-and-chain" for a wife.

The last word in this short pāda, *vy ājyate*, also requires comment, since it can be derived either from √*aj* 'drive' or √*añj* 'anoint'. With most (but see Wh 'is driven away (?)') I strongly favor the latter. The bride is smeared / adorned with the blood of her deflowering; recall the young girl, just past menarche, in vs. 21, *vyāktā*-.

X.85.29: In the first half of this vs. the stained garment, now called a *śāmulyā*m, is disposed of; however useful it was as a sign of the bride's virginity, the blood stains surely make it inauspicious. In b (other) goods are distributed to brahmins, perhaps those who officiated at the wedding or simply bystanders who lend their own auspiciousness to the scene.

The word *śāmulyā*- (or -ī-), occurring only in this wedding passage, is obviously related to / derived from JB *śāmūla*- 'garment', but there is no good etym.

The second hemistich takes up the plight of the groom again, picking up esp. from 28b. Here (in my view) it is once more said that the bride has become witchcraft -- witchcraft with feet (*padvātī*), i.e., in human form. In d it is paradoxically said that the wife "enters" (*viśate*) the husband, reversing the actual facts of sexual intercourse. But once again this is a psychological, not physical state, and once again American pop culture of a certain vintage offers the perfect correspondence: the 1936 Cole Porter song "I've got you under my skin," which became a signature song for Frank Sinatra. The bride has penetrated the groom's defenses and become part of him, possessed him.

X.85.30: Opinions diverge even further about what's going on this bizarre vs. The crux is found in cd, where the groom seems to be intending to clothe his member in the bride's garment—an act of apparent cross-dressing of stunning oddness, which has provoked interpr. of even more oddness. But I think I have solved the problem: the garment of the bride (*vadhvò vāsasā*) is not an actual piece of clothing -- rather it stands for the body of the bride herself. A standard act of sexual intercourse is envisioned (unlike the reversal in 29b). When he puts his penis into her, it is enveloped, enwrapped, by her flesh as if by a tight-fitting piece of clothing -- clothing that reminds us of the stained garment with which this section began.

As for the first hemistich, with his body “glistening in that evil way” (*rúṣatī pāpāyāmuyā*) -- I suggest that the glistening refers to sexual fluids, or perhaps even just sweat produced by energetic intercourse. His loss of splendour (*ásrīrā*) and the evil glistening simply once more refer to his loss of control and autonomy in a sexual relationship. It is good to remember that throughout ancient Indian culture, giving in to sex entails weakness and loss of power for men, while withholding sex builds power -- all those filmily clad Apsarases seducing great ascetics in the Mahābhārata come to mind.

X.85.31–33: A relatively benign interlude (save for the diseases and the highwaymen) about the wedding journey again. This is out of place, since the deflowering must chronologically follow the trip to the husband’s house. These three vss. are not grouped with the equivalent of 28–30 in AVŚ. Instead the equivalent of 31–32 are AVŚ XIV.2.10–11 and 33 = XIV.2.28.

X.85.32: The most natural reading of the first hemistich, followed by all tr. including the publ. tr., takes *dāmpatī* in b as the obj. of *vidan* in a. This makes *yé āśīdanti* an unabashed embedded relative clause with finite verb. In a late hymn like this we can expect some loosening of syntactic restrictions, but it is also possible to produce an unembedded reading. The lexeme *āśīd* essentially always has an acc. complement, including occasional personal acc., as in X.142.4 *āśītvā ... vāsavaḥ śadantu* “Let all the Vasus attend upon you.” It is therefore possible to take *dāmpatī* primarily with *āśīdanti* and supply it with *vidan*: “Let the highwaymen who beset the married couple not find (them).”

X.85.34–35: In AVŚ the equivalents of these two vss. (AVŚ XIV.1.28–29 [in opposite order]) follow immed. on the equivalents of our 28–30 (AVŚ XIV.1.25–27). This is a more satisfactory arrangement, since the two sets of vss. share a tone of menace and seem to take place in the same general setting (as opposed to the intervening journey vss.). The AVŚ ordering certainly supports the notion that our 31–33 are an intrusion.

Most tr. and comm. consider these vss. to refer still to the stained bridal garment, and the fact that the vss. most likely immediately followed vss. 28–30 strengthens that interpr. The idea is that the inauspicious aspects of the garment are treated and neutralized, and it is then purified and given to a learned brahmin. However, the actions performed on the referent -- eating (or non-eating) in 34b, various types of carving in 35ab -- are hard to square with the interpr. that they are performed on a piece of cloth. I suggest rather that the focus has now shifted to the wedding feast, in particular to the cow(s) killed for this purpose (remember 13c *aghāsu hanyante gāvaḥ*). True, the referent must be neut., which eliminates ‘cow’, but *māṃsā-* ‘flesh, meat’ or *krūrā-* ‘bloody (flesh)’ would work fine, or even just *ānna-* ‘food’ (I favor the first). The point is that eating meat unsanctioned by ritual makes it distasteful, even dangerous, esp. for brahmins -- a sentiment we should not find surprising in such a late hymn, as restrictions on meat-eating begin to develop.

What renders the meat fit to consume is “knowing Sūryā” (34c *sūryām ... vidyāt*); this is taken by many to refer to the Sūryā hymn (e.g., Ge “das Sūryā-lied”), that is, as a meta-reference to the hymn we’re in the middle of. I find this unlikely, esp. because *sūryāyāḥ* in the next, paired vs. cannot have such a reference. I think the referential domain is broader -- it’s knowing the cosmic significance of the goddess Sūryā and her mythical relation to marriage.

X.85.35: In my view the first hemistich is a graphic depiction of the carving up of the wedding-feast cow, but this violent dismemberment is, in some sense, the public display of the private (sexual) violence just enacted in the bridal chamber (in vss. 28–30). This accounts for pāda c, “behold the forms of Sūryā!” (*sūryāyāḥ paśya rūpāṇi*) -- in other words, “marriage,” as represented by Sūryā, is not only the joyful, festive occasion everyone is celebrating, but has its dark and brutal side. Happily it only takes a brahmin (or a learned brahmin) to neutralize the latter. (See comm. ad X.26.6 for speculation that the garments may be included in this purification -- though I am not particularly convinced by my own tentative suggestion there.)

X.85.36ff.: From here until the end of the hymn, the interpr. is fairly straightforward and the tone generally sunny.

X.85.36–41: The speech of the husband, followed by the famous sequence about the previous divine husbands of the bride.

X.85.36: The 1st ps. / 2nd ps. cast of this vs. and the following one seems to connect them with the set of vss. that preceded the dark interlude, esp. 23–27. But it is striking that in the same formula “grasp the hand,” the 1st ps. declaration in our vs., *grbhṇāmi te ... hāstam*, has the older *bh* form of ‘grasp’ (√*grabh*), while the compounded gerund *hasta-gīhya* in 26a has the newfangled √*grah* that is only just beginning to creep into usage in the late RV. This suggests that *grbhṇāmi te hāstam* is the quotation of a traditional formula, which would not be surprising.

There are other lexical connections between this vs. and 23–27 just mentioned: *saubhagatvāya* (a) echoes *subhāgā* (25d; also *saubhāgyam* 33c), *māyā pātyā* (b) *sahā pātyā* (24d), *yāthāsah* (b) *yāthā ... āsati* (25cd); *gārhapatyāya* is repeated from 27b. ‘Reaching old age’ (*jarādaṣṭi-*) is lexically different but semantically similar to *jīvrī* ‘elderly couple’ (27d). And the divine actors, Bhaga, Aryaman, Savitar, Puramdhi (36c, with Pūṣan in 37a), are mostly the same: Bhaga and Aryaman in 23c, Savitar 24d, Pūṣan 26a; only Puramdhi is absent from the earlier section.

X.85.37: Don renders *śívātamām* proleptically as “rouse her to be most eager to please,” which is appealing.

Given the context, my “humans” for *manuṣyāḥ* in b might seem jarring, and inferior to the “men” of the standard tr. (save for Re’s lapsus [HymSpec] “les dieux,” which indirectly supports my “humans”). But *manuṣyā-* and related forms are never gender-focused: the contrast is humans/men v. gods, not men v. women. Taking it in its standard sense (“humans”) works here because the next vss. concern the previous *non*-human husbands; see *manuṣya-jāḥ* in 40d, of the fourth, human, husband after the first three.

In cd “eagerly” might be better than “willingly.”

X.85.39: This vs. presents a minor syntactic problem, which has led to divergence of interpr. By my interpr, cd is a rel. clause hanging off ab, which lacks an overt antecedent to *yāḥ*. It seems to me an easy matter to supply *tasmai* in ab “has given (to him), who ...” -- not an unusual phenomenon in the sometimes loose world of Rigvedic relativization. Other tr. separate ab and cd syntactically. As far as I can see, Ge’s interpr. “Langes Leben werde dem, der ihre Gatte ist” is syntactically impossible because it requires taking unaccented *asyāḥ* as the first word of the relative clause. He also appears to be taking *dīrghāyuh* as a karmadhāraya ‘long life’, rather than

a bahuvrīhi ‘having long life’, as does Re (fld. by Don). However, the latter two split the hemistich differently, with *dirghāyur asyāḥ* being the first clause and the second beginning with *yāḥ* (Re: “Longue durée de vie soit à elle! Et l’époux, puisse t-il vivre cent automnes!” He simply suppresses the rel. prn.) By this interpr. the long life is the wife’s. It is not possible to determine the nature of the cmpd *dirghāyus-* by accentuation: because *dirghá-* and *āyus-* are accented on the final and initial respectively, *dirghāyus-* can have either underlying karmadhār. *dirgha-āyus-* or bahuvr. *dirghá-āyus-* accent. However it’s worth noting that essentially all the other *dirgha-* cmpds in the RV (rt. noun *dirgha-śrūt-* is a bit of an outlier) are bahuvr. and that both the other two occurrences of *dirghāyus-* (IV.15.9–10) and the lone voc. *dirghāyo* (stem - *āyu-*) (VIII.70.7) are bahuvrīhis. I thus favor the bahuvr. analysis, which is reflected in the publ. tr.

X.85.41: The contrast between *dadat* (a, b) and *adāt* (c) is noteworthy and the reason not clear to me -- though the augm. aor. may cast this action as the recent past (see also the near deictic *imām* referring to the wife) as opposed to the further past of ab. The publ. tr. reflects this. Redupl. *dadat* itself is something of a mystery: though it should belong to the redupl. pres. *dādāti*, it can’t be a straightforward injunctive, which should of course be **dadāt*. Interestingly, injunctives to the redupl. stem with long root vowel (i.e., the type **dadāt*) are not attested, though imperfects of the type *adadāt* are. The slot is filled by forms like this, which look like thematizations, but which are probably old short-vowel subjunctives, reinterpr. as injunctives. Hoffmann (Injunc. 134 n. 53) tries to claim that the type *dadat* is always subjunctive, but that’s not possible here, since the sequence ends with the augmented *adāt* in c.

X.85.42–47: Generalized blessings and good wishes posing no rhetorical challenges.

X.85.43: The almost featureless god Prajāpati, who has a great future ahead in Middle Vedic, only begins to make his appearance in the late RV. Here he enables an etymological figure: *prajāṁ janayatu prajāpatiḥ*.

Pl. *naḥ* ‘for us’ presumably refers to the whole extended family, not to the dual married couple.

ādurmaṅgalīḥ picks up *sumaṅgalīḥ* in 33a.

X.85.44: *devākāma-*: a bahuvr. that can mean either ‘loving the gods’ < ‘having love for the gods’ (approx., objective genitive) or ‘having the love of the gods’ (i.e., loved by the gods) (subjective genitive). Renou does it the latter way: “aimée des dieux,” though most, incl. the publ. tr., go for the former. But given the fact that the gods are asked to provide blessings – and the fact that god-loving piety (in the mode of later bhakti) isn’t particularly characteristic of Vedic religion, perhaps Renou is right.

X.85.45: The first hemistich ends with *kṛṇu*, the second with *kṛdhi*. Although ingenious arguments could be constructed to explain the use of metrically equivalent 2nd sg. act impvs. to the pres. and aor. stems respectively, I think this would be taking ingenuity too far.

The phrase “her husband the eleventh” is probably not an indication that her immature husband is going to behave for the rest of his life like an overgrown teenager, lounging around playing video games and eating pizza while she indulges him. Rather it probably reflects the

notion, commonly expressed later, that the husband enters his wife's womb and is reborn as a son.

X.85.47: The actors in the last hemistich, Mātariśvan, Dhātār, and (fem.) Deṣṭrī, do not figure in the standard wedding line-up. Mātariśvan is ordinarily the fire-bringer or fire itself, later wind. None of these roles overlaps significantly with the wedding. Dhātār “the Placer / Disposer” is at least in early Vedic an abstract sum of his derivation: agent noun to $\sqrt{dhā}$. Deṣṭrī occurs only in this context.

X.86 Vṛṣākapi

This justly famous hymn consists of a sometimes raunchy dialogue between Indra, his wife Indrāṇī, and a monkey (Vṛṣākapi). It has received a vast range of interpr.; besides the standard, see Re, Hymnes spec.; Don; Schnaus, Dialoglieder. I tr. and discussed it at length in SacWife (74–88), where I introduced my own interpr. of the hymn as reflecting a mock-Aśvamedha (see also publ. intro.). I will not reproduce all this disc. here, though I still strongly believe it, nor engage in detail with other interpr.

X.86.1–23: All 23 vss. of this hymn end with the refrain *viśvasmād indra úttaraḥ* “Above all Indra!” Since there are many places in this hymn in which Indra's fortunes seem to be at a low ebb (starting with vs. 1), the refrain can sometimes seem out of place. But if the hymn depicts an Aśvamedha for Indra, all actions would ultimately glorify him.

X.86.1–2: In SacWife (p. 76) I suggest that these first two vss. represent the year-long journey of the Aśvamedha horse before it returns to be sacrificed.

X.86.1: The standard interpr. ascribe this vs. to Indrāṇī, but I think it makes more sense in the mouth of Indra, esp. the ref. to *mātsakhā* ‘my comrade’ identifying Vṛṣākapi.

Because *āsṛksata* (a) is accented and *amaṁsata* (b) is not, the domain of *hī* is only pāda a, with b the main clause, a syntactic distinction that is elided in some tr.

In *vṛṣākapi*- both the accent and the length of the stem vowel of the 1st member are anomalous. Assuming the 1st member is *vṛṣan*- ‘bull(ish)’, the 2nd-syllable accentuation deviates from its base form (rather like the troublesome simplex *viśva*- versus cmpd *viśvá*-), and 1st-member accentuation for a tatpuruṣa is also unusual. For description / recognition of these issues, without real explanation, see, e.g., AiG II.1.42, 251 (with Nachtr. 73), 266 and KH, Aufs. 356.

The thieving, intoxicated Vṛṣākapi is reminiscent of the monkeys drunkenly wrecking the grove in Rāmāyaṇa V.59–61.

X.86.2: Here I follow the general view that Indrāṇī speaks this vs. She is trying to match Indra's rhetoric, which may account for the unusual use of *hī* in the first hemistich, matching his *hī* in 1a. Her *anyātra* also echoes his *yātra* in 1c.

X.86.3: There are various ways to construe the parts of this vs., esp. pāda d. I (and others) take d as an afterthought disjunctive object to *cakāra*, parallel to the more important *tvām* in pāda a. Positioning it as a sort of appendix to the rest of the sentence not only downplays its importance (as I just suggested), but also reinforces the structural parallelism of this dialogue: 1d *aryāḥ*

puṣṭéṣu mátsakhā is partly matched by 3d *aryó vā puṣṭi-mát vásu*. JC pointed out the *mát* immediately following *puṣṭi-* in both pādas but with quite different grammatical identities.

The pāda-final sequence *u nú* in c is a close mirror-image of pāda-initial *ná ū* in 2c.

X.86.3–4: The rhetorical matching is esp. tight at the beginning of these two vss.:

3a. *kím ayám tvám vṛṣākapiḥ*

4a. *yám imám tvám vṛṣākapim*

Note also that forms of *vṛṣākapi-* are found in all 4 vss. so far, 3x at the end of an odd pāda (1c, 3a, 4a), once at the beg. of an even one (2b).

X.86.5: The rhetorical echoes continue, linking 4 and 5: the first word *priyā* picks up *priyám* at the beginning of 4b; pāda-final *kapiḥ* (a) matches the three previous pāda-final (*vṛṣā-*)*kapi-* (1c, 3a, 4a); the c pādas are structurally the same:

4c. *s^{ai} vā n^u asya jambhīṣat*

6c. *síro n^u asya rāviṣam*

This rhetorical template may explain why the sigmatic aor. of \sqrt{ru} , an apparent aniṭ root (ppl. *rutá-*; see EWA s.v. *RAV²*), shows up here as an *-iṣ-*aor. This is the only verb form to the root in the RV; however, it must be admitted that there are other *seṭ* forms, including aor. *rāviṣta* in a widespread mantra in Vedic prose. See Narten 225.

The root $\sqrt{duṣ}$ ‘spoil’ can be used elsewhere in Vedic and later for specifically sexual misbehavior.

X.86.6: Indrāṇī’s boasting about her sexual prowess may seem jarring; in fact scholars like Thieme (see SacWife p. 278 n. 156) deny that Indrāṇī, the wife of the great god Indra, could speak like this and assign the vs. elsewhere. But there is a precise analogue in the Aśvamedha -- when the chief wife lies down with the dead horse and speaks a verse that contains the complaint *ná mā yabhati kás cana* “no one at all is fucking me,” while her female entourage is engaging in sexual banter with the priests (see SacWife 78–79 for the comparison with our vss. here; 66–72 for the fuller Aśvamedha script).

On the style of Indrāṇī’s speech, see comm. ad vs. 7.

On *-yāśu-* see comm. ad I.126.6.

X.86.7: This is the first vs. spoken by Vṛṣākapi, and it is in a markedly lower register than the dialogue so far -- even vs. 6, which, though vulgar in content, is morphologically and syntactically elevated: Indrāṇī punctiliously distinguishes between the primary and secondary comparative and uses the injunctive (/subjunctive *bhuvat*) against Vṛṣākapi’s finite future *bhaviṣyāti*.

In addition to this verb form (finite futures being relatively rare and late-ish in the RV), other signs of the register difference are the intimate and informal voc. *amba* (twice), the popular/diminutivized voc. *sulābhike* to the *I*-form of \sqrt{rabh} (\sqrt{labh} being late and rare in the RV), and the use of *iva* to qualify a verb, not mark a simile -- also surely the initial *uvé*, whatever it may be (see below). My tr. tries to represent the abrupt register shift; in most of the standard tr. Vṛṣākapi might as well be speaking like an Oxbridge don.

The initial word of the vs. *uvé*, found only here in Skt., is disputed: the leading contenders are the older one, that it is an exclamation/interjection, or what is probably the current one, that it is the 1st sg. of a verb \sqrt{u} ‘see’ (= Hittite *au-/u-* ‘see’). I share the latter view. See

EWA s.v. *uvé* (with lit.) and LIV s.v. **h₁ey*. However Kloekhorst in his 2008 *Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (p. 229) disputes this connection, in part because the meaning of the hapax *uvé* cannot be independently verified, and revives the exclamatory explanation. He fails to cite the Pkt. (Ardhamāgadhī) *ua(ha)* ‘see!’ adduced by W. P. Schmid, whose sense is pretty clear and which supports the interpr. of *uvé* here as a verb ‘I see’. On the Pkt. form, esp. the apparent thematic -a-, see v. Hinüber *Überblick* §430. That the only Indic correspondent to RV *uvé* is found in Pkt. is another indication that Vṛṣākapi’s speech is low register.

X.86.8: Indra, the speaker, seems to be trying to wrench the discourse back up to a higher level. Though Indrāṇī’s physical charms continue to be praised, the adjectives are quite decorous -- see Thieme’s demonstration (1985: 244) that they correspond almost uncannily to descriptors of Greek goddesses. Closer to home, the phrase *subāhūḥ svaṅgurīḥ* modifies the minor goddess Sinīvalī in II.32.7, who appears with Indrāṇī in the last vs. of that hymn (II.32.8). Note the *r*-form of the ‘finger’ word, *aṅgūri-*, against parallel *aṅgūla-* — perhaps an indication of the elevating of the discourse; stronger evidence is the cmpd *pṛthu-ṣtu-* ‘broad-braided’, a truncated form of *pṛthu-ṣtuka-*, which characterizes Sinīvalī in the hymn just cited (II.32.6). The word for ‘braid’ is simply *stūkā-*; there is no evidence that it’s a diminutive or popularly suffixed form, but Indra seems to be reacting to Vṛṣākapi’s *sulābhike* by lopping off what he may have perceived as the “low” suffix -ka-. EWA calls *pṛthu-ṣtu-* a false archaism.

X.86.9: On the suffix -*āru-* in *śarāru-* see comm. ad III.30.8. As for the word itself, JC (Diss.) cleverly suggests that the word means ‘horny’ (in the English sexual slang sense) and is yet another deriv. of the IE stem **Ker-h₂-* ‘head, horn’, extensively disc. by Nussbaum 1986. For derivational details, see JC’s diss. s.v. I would now emend the tr. to “this horny creature ...”

On the possible double sense of *abhī√man*, both ‘have designs on’ and ‘disrespect’, see comm. ad X.27.11.

X.86.10–11: Most tr. and comm. assign these next two vss. to Vṛṣākapi and his supposed wife Vṛṣākāpāyī respectively. I very much doubt the existence of a separate figure Vṛṣākāpāyī, as I discuss in *SacWife* (pp. 81–82); for my interpr. of the voc. *vṛṣākāpāyī* in 13a, see comm. below. And I find it difficult to believe that after his slangy informal speech in vs. 7, Vṛṣākapi could so easily code-switch to the solemn hieratic diction of vs. 10. Instead, as disc. in the publ. intro., I think 10–11 are spoken by the narrator, who affirms Indrāṇī’s exalted status -- not only as Indra’s wife, but as the central figure of the ritual, the Aśvamedha, that will ensure Indra’s prosperity and long, indeed unbounded, life. In other words, after the vulgar and unseemly sexual squabbling between Indrāṇī and Vṛṣākapi (the “sacrificed horse” figure), we are reminded that it was all in service of the greater good and that we should glorify Indrāṇī for her (selfless) act.

X.86.10: The standard tr. and comm. take this vs. as temporally unified: the glorification of Indrāṇī (cd) happens/happened at the gatherings depicted in ab. I instead think her habitual past behavior (ab) is contrasted with her exaltation now (cd). In the past she went to and participated, as Patnī, in the normal recurrent rituals (perhaps the Patnīsaṃyajas), but at the Aśvamedha she has taken on a much more central role, allowing her to be magnified (*mahīyate*) not only as the possessor of a hero (*vīrīṇī*) and one whose husband is Indra (*īndrapatnī*), but as the “Adept of Truth” (*vedhā rtāsya*), an august Indo-Iranian title, here surprisingly applied to a female. (For further disc. see *SacWife* p. 80 and nn. 160, 161.)

X.86.11: The tone of solemn celebration continues here. Note the fronted name *indrāṇīm* and the 1st person aorist *aśravam* “I have heard of Indrāṇī (as) ...,” which has an archaic and ceremonial air. The 1st ps. speaker is the poet/narrator, by my interpr. For similar phraseology, cf. IV.39.6 *dadhikrāvṇo akāriṣam* “I have celebrated Dadhikrāvan.” Or, for that matter, I.32.1 *indrasya nū vīryāṇi prā vocam*, etc.

I do not understand who “these women” (*āsú nārīṣu*) are. Perhaps Indrāṇī’s female attendants at the Aśvamedha, or -- more likely -- (all) women here on earth?

X.86.12–14: In my view, all three of these vss. are spoken by Indra. (The standard view assigns 13 to Vṛṣākapi.) In 12 Indra laments the loss of his friend -- who (again in my view) has now been sacrificed and is going, in the form of an oblation, to the gods. But the happy result of this sacrifice is indicated in 13–14: Indra is once again receiving abundant offerings, after the hiatus noted in the first hemistich of the first vs. of this hymn. I take this to be the direct result of the successful Aśvamedha. On these vss. see SacWife (81–82).

X.86.12: Note that two of the words used to describe Vṛṣākapi in the opening of the hymn, -*sākhi*- (1b) and *prīyá*- (4b) recur here.

The pronom. adj. *idám* qualifying *havīḥ* suggests that the sacrifice is happening here and now.

On “watery” (*ápya*-) see disc. in SacWife (pp. 278–79 n. 165).

X.86.13: The voc. *vṛṣākāpāyi* that opens this vs. is singlehandedly responsible for sending so many interpr. off the rails. A figure, Mrs. Vṛṣākapi, has to be invented for it, and she then needs to have things to do and vss. assigned to her to speak -- even though there is otherwise no evidence for her existence, her actions, or her words. Within my Aśvamedha model there is a simple explanation that avoids these unconvincing excursions: because Indrāṇī has copulated with the (now dead) monkey, Indra can address her as “wife of Vṛṣākapi,” right after he addressed her as Indrāṇī in 12a. Ritually she fills both roles, and it is in her role as (temporary) wife of Vṛṣākapi that she has brought about the rich feast of oxen on which Indra will gorge himself, as well as providing herself with good progeny.

X.86.14: On *kukṣī* as ‘cheeks’, see comm. ad X.28.2, etc.

X.86.15: This vs. reaffirms that soma is being offered to Indra again, in implicit answer to 1a *vī ... sotór āśrkṣata* “they have left off pressing (soma).” For the evidence that soma is referred to here (*pace* most interpr., who seem willfully to misinterpr. the words), see SacWife (82–83). Most assign this vs. to the wife of Vṛṣākapi. I am inclined to think that it belongs to the narrator, but if the 2nd ps. address to Indra calls that into question, I would suggest Indrāṇī as alternative.

X.86.16–17: These two verbally responsive and sexually explicit vss. carry the message of the hymn, in my view. See disc. in the publ. intro. and SacWife (83–84). The first of them expresses what might seem to be a self-evident statement: the sexually successful male dominates (“is master” *īśe*). This is what in later Sanskrit might be called the *pūrvapakṣa*. The following vs. exactly reverses the statements of the first: all the words in the same order are found in both; only *ná sēśe* “he is not master” and *séd īśe* “just he is master” are flipped, each acting as main

clause to the other relative clause. This second statement is counterintuitive: the sexually *unsuccessful* male is the one who dominates. We can see this as the *siddhānta*, in later terms. And it is fitting and perfectly appropriate exactly in the Aśvamedha: the king and sacrificer stands aside, impotently, while his wife copulates with another (a horse, as it happens). But the horse is killed: sacrificed and offered to the gods -- much good its sexual “success” did it! And the sexually inactive king receives all the benefits of the sacrifice and his power and dominance significantly increase after an Aśvamedha.

This pair of vss. is the climax of the hymn; the remaining vss. seem like an appendix, with 19–22 forming a little group that treats the year-long travels of the animal-to-be-sacrificed that chronologically precedes the action of the rest of the hymn.

X.86.18: On this vs. see my disc. in *SacWife* (84–85). Flg. Old (somewhat contra v. Schroeder), I interpr. it with ref. to charm for virility in AVŚ (VI.72) in which a *párasvant-* with an esp. big penis serves as model. In a sense this vs. summarizes the ritual in advance: Vṛṣākapi finds ritual paraphernalia and a slaughtered animal that represents virility, just as he will, likewise slaughtered, at the end of the ritual involving him. This vs. introduces the journey vss. 19–24.

X.86.19–24: As indicated above, I believe these vss. describe Vṛṣākapi traversing the year-long circuit prescribed for the horse in the Aśvamedha. This journey was briefly alluded to in vss. 1–2. Vṛṣākapi (vs. 19) embarks on his journey with a noble purpose: to distinguish between Ārya and Dāsa, between wise and foolish -- establishing the boundaries, as the Aśvamedha horse does in the later ritual, between “our” domain and that of outsiders. In the succeeding vss. Indra and Indrāṇī attempt to lure him back to his fate.

X.86.19: Most assign this vs. to Indra, but it then has little or no narrative connection with what follows. See disc. *SacWife* (85 and n. 175).

X.86.20: Pāda a contains an “X and which Y” construction, which I have not represented in tr. As JSK points out (DGRV I.135), we should have expected the order ... *yác *ca kṛntátram*. On *kṛntátra-* see comm. ad X.27.23, where I suggest ‘cleft’ would be better than ‘chasm’ here.

Since the pl. of *grhá-* is often used to refer to a single homestead (presumably consisting of a number of buildings), this could also be tr. “to the nearer house.”

X.86.21: With most I assign this vs. to Indrāṇī, adding her encouragement to the preceding vs. (20), which I think Indra speaks. There is sinister ambiguity in everything she says. Although superficially it sounds like an enthusiastic “welcome home,” promising delights on Vṛṣākapi’s return, under the surface it alludes to Vṛṣākapi’s impending sacrifice and death.

To begin with, the 1st du subjunctive *kalpayāvahai* can be either inclusive (I and you = Vṛṣākapi) or exclusive. In the former case she’s suggesting that she and Vṛṣākapi can together arrange pleasures for each other. In the latter case, the other subject would obviously be Indra, her husband and, perhaps more important, the Yajamāna of this Aśvamedha. The obj., *suvitá-* ‘easy going, easy passage’, is reminiscent of *sugá-*, which we met in 5d. And more to the point the same *sugá-* is found in a telling passage in the RV Aśvamedha hymn, at the moment when the horse is put to death, with the death and the subsequent journey to the gods euphemistically expressed: I.162.21 *ná vā u etán mriyase ná riṣyasi, devāṃś íd eṣi pathíbhiḥ sugébbhiḥ* “You do not die nor are you harmed. You go to the gods along easygoing paths.” In our pāda b it certainly

sounds as if Indra and Indrāṇī would arrange similar paths for Vṛṣākapi. This impression is strengthened by the last pāda, *ástam eṣi pathā púnaḥ* “you go home again along the path” -- *eṣi path* [INSTR] being exactly the expression in I.162.21. Here ‘home’ can stand for ‘heaven / the gods’.

Even the cmpd *svapna-nāṃśana-* can be read doubly. If *nāṃśana-* belongs to \sqrt{nas} ‘disappear / perish, (transitive) destroy’, ‘sleep-destroying’ could be read as Indrāṇī’s invitation to Vṛṣākapi to continue their sexual relationship, but if to \sqrt{nas} ‘attain’, with ‘sleep’ = ‘death’, it can identify Vṛṣākapi as one about to attain his final “sleep.”

X.86.22: The last of the journey vs. The grammatical puzzle it poses, not evident in tr., is that, though only two entities are addressed, Vṛṣākapi and Indra, the 2nd ps. verb (*ajagantana*) is plural, as is the adj. modifying the subjects, *údañcaḥ*. I discuss this in *SacWife* (86 and n. 178) without finding a satisfactory answer. Perhaps, Indrāṇī is an unexpressed third, or perhaps all the victims of the Aśvamedha are included.

I do think the vs. refers both to the sacrificial procedure and to the death journey. The directional adj. *údañc-* can mean both ‘northward’ and ‘upward’: the latter can refer to the same journey to the gods in heaven as I suggest for vs. 21. As for the former, as I point out in *SacWife*, the place where the horse is killed in the Aśvamedha is north of the Mahāvedi, and it is led there just before the killing. The same double sense may be found in *-yopana-*. It can be a pun on *yūpa-*, the post to which sacrificial animals are tied. But a form of \sqrt{yup} is found in one of the funeral hymns, X.18.2, where the living turn away from the dead and take up their lives again: *mṛtyóḥ padám yopáyantaḥ* “effacing the footprint of death.”

I don’t quite know why the last hemistich is framed as questions, but perhaps the uncertainty created by the double reading is the reason.

Note the *I*-form *pulu-* for standard *puru-*. It may be telling that the only other occurrence of *pulu-* is at the end of another dialogue hymn, I.179 (Agastya and Lopāmudrā), whose vs. 5 contains the cmpd *pulu-kāma-* ‘having many desires’.

X.86.23: This vs. notoriously has no obvious connection to the rest of the hymn. However, there are some verbals echoes with other parts of the hymn (see *SacWife* 86–87). More important, the prodigious fertility of Manu’s wife in this vs. resonates with at least one of the aims of the later Aśvamedha, namely to remedy childlessness and produce sons (as at the beginning of the Rāmāyaṇa).

For disc. of the larger Indo-European context of this vs., see Watkins (*Dragon*, p. 53).

X.87 Agni Demon-smiter

Not surprisingly given the subject matter, both recensions of the AV contain versions of this hymn: AVŚ VIII.3 and AVP XVI.6, with somewhat different vs. orders.

X.87.1: The hymn opens with the word ‘demon-smiter’ (*#rakṣohāṇam*), setting the tone for what follows. As if to contrast Agni’s roles, or to soften the effect of that first word, the second pāda opens with the oppositional *mitráṃ* ‘ally (→ friend)’.

Re rejects ‘sprinkle’ for *ā jigharmi* in favor of his ‘attirer à soi’—on which see my objections ad X.6.4. He claims that the context doesn’t favor ‘sprinkle’ here, but rousing Agni to smite demons requires kindling him and, indeed, producing a roaring fire. The ritual sprinkling (with ghee) in this first vs. readies Agni for his aggressive actions in the rest of the hymn.

On *mūra-deva*- see comm. ad VII.104.24. I realize that the alternative interpr. ‘having roots as gods’ is given some support in this hymn by the occurrence of *mūla*- ‘root’ in 10d (and possibly *sahāmūra*- in 19c), but I still find this alternative unlikely.

X.87.2: This vs. nicely depicts a sequence of actions involving Agni’s mouth. The sequence is set up by the first word in the vs., *áyo-daṁṣtraḥ* ‘having metal jaws’: first he “brushes / touches” the foes with his flame (ab), his flame often being likened to his tongue; then he “seizes” them with his tongue (c), and finally puts them in his mouth (d).

The root affiliation of *vr̥ktvī* is disputed: Old and Wack favor $\sqrt{vraśc}$ ‘hew’, while most (incl. the publ. tr.) opt for \sqrt{vij} ‘twist, wrench’. Because of the mouth imagery, I find ‘hew’ unlikely.

X.87.3: Given the continuing focus on Agni’s mouth, Sāy’s equation of *ubhayāvin*- as *ubhayā-dant*-, reflected in all the standard tr., seems correct, even though in its other occurrence in VIII.1.2 it has a more general sense. The point here is to contrast Agni as predator animal with peaceable ruminant *paśu*-s like cows that have teeth in only one jaw.

X.87.4: As Lub convincingly argues ad AVP V.8.4, the evidence of the Paippalāda demonstrates that *śalyā*- means ‘tip, point’ of an arrow, not the shaft. Given this, *asāni*- in the same pāda should not also mean ‘(arrow) point’. Ge takes *asāni*- as whetstone here: “die Pfeilspitzen (wie) an Schleifsteinen streichend.” But \sqrt{dih} ‘smear’ is an odd action to perform with a whetstone, esp. if poison is what is being smeared. Better to take *asānibhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment, indicating a different if similar weapon -- quite likely slingstones for a slingshot. I would now emend the tr. to “smearing their tips, along with slingstones ...” Both sharp projectiles would “pierce” their targets and introduce poison into their bodies.

X.87.5: Notice *bhindhi* in pāda a, echoing *bhañdhi* in 4d.

If *asāni*- is ‘slingstone’ in 4, it must be here as well: I emend the tr. to “Let the murderous slingstone smite him ...” Although “with its blaze” (*hārasā*) might seem inappropriate to a slingstone (or an arrow point), we should keep in mind that it is Agni / fire that lies behind all these weapons. *hāras*- is quite common in this hymn: vss. 5, 10=14, 16, 25. For further on this word, see comm. ad X.16.7.

In the special register of this hymn, it can be hard to determine the particular nuances of lexemes found elsewhere, and \sqrt{vici} is no exception. Ge “verstreuen,” Re “sépare (ses membres) déchiré(s).” Although I think Re is in some ways closer to the mark, the problem with his rendering is signalled by the final parenthesis “(s),” sneakily making the singular obj. *vr̥knām* into a plural that can be separated into parts. My own “open up” is based on the use of \sqrt{vici} for clearing / opening up paths. See comm. ad I.90.4. After hewing apart the body, the aggressor pulls it apart to get to the bloody flesh.

X.87.6: The *yād* opening c is pleonastic, functionally doubling the *yātra* that opens the vs.; it also provides a useful prop for enclitic *vā*.

X.87.7: Whether what is recovered is inanimate (my “what was seized”) or animate (most other tr., e.g., Klein [DGRV I.390] “... the one seized ... from the sorcerer seizing (him)”) cannot be determined from *ālabdham* -- nor does it really matter.

As Re points out, the *l*-forms *ālabdha*- and *ālebhānā*- contrast with the *r*-forms of the same lexeme in vss. 2 and 8: *ā*(...) *rabhasva*. Besides the two forms in this vs., there is only one other occurrence of *√labh* in the RV, also in the late Xth Maṇḍala (X.130.7).

The phonologically marked animal name *kṣvīṅka*- occurs only here in the RV, though it is marginally attested in the BYV Saṃhitās as well as in the AV versions of our hymn. A carrion-eating bird of some sort makes contextual sense.

X.87.8: Unlike the rest of the hymn, where Agni is urged to perform direct violent actions, here in the first hemistich he is asked to “proclaim” (*prā brūhi*) who the sorcerer is, in a quasi-legalistic way -- though direct action returns in the 2nd hemistich. This brief switch to the verbal may prefigure the emphasis on the deceptive, untruthful qualities of the foe in some of the following vss.: 9d, 11b, 12d, 13ab, 15.

The theme of true and false speech may also be indirectly reflected in the use of the epithet *nṛcākṣas*- ‘having his eye on men’ in this section: 8d, 9d, 10a (and 17b), since this cmpd is often used of gods, esp. Sūrya, witnessing (and then judging) the behavior of mortals. Because the other three occurrences of *nṛcākṣas*- in this hymn clearly modify Agni, the genitive in the phrase in d, *nṛcākṣasaś cākṣuṣe* most likely refers to Agni too (so explicitly Ge and Re), even though it would be awkwardly coreferential with the implicit 2nd sg. subj. of the impv. *randhaya*: “(O Agni,) make him subject to the eye/gaze of the one [=you] with his eye on men.” However, it is possible that this instance actually refers to the Sun, with whom Agni is then conflated in the next vss.

X.87.9: The re-use of *cākṣus*- from 8d, clearly identifying Agni’s eye, supports the standard view that the *cākṣus*- in 8d is also Agni’s, despite my comm. above.

The ambiguity of value of the root *√rakṣ* is on full display in this vs. On the one hand Agni is urged to *rakṣ* the sacrifice (pāda a), but his enemies are identified as *rākṣas*- in c (and 10a).

X.87.10: Ge (n. 10b, fld by Re) plausibly suggests that the phrase “three points” (or “tops”) *trīṇi ... agrā* actually represents “top, middle, and root,” as in III.30.17 *úd vṛha rākṣaḥ sahāmūlam indra, vṛścā mādhyam prāty agrām śṛṇīhi* “Tear out the demonic power, root and all, Indra; cleave its middle; shatter its top.” Note that our passage contains two of the three verbs in III.30.17: *śṛṇīhi* (2x) and *vṛśca*.

X.87.11: *sphūrjāyan* is the only form of this root in the RV, though it occurs later. Here it phonologically anticipates *śaphārújam* in 12b and *dhūrvantam* in 12d. For a recent etymological proposal see comm. ad X.46.5.

X.87.12: On the formation of *śaphārúj*- see comm. ad X.44.9. As there, I would here consider an alternative tr. ‘breaking with the hoof/hooves’.

X.87.13: Pādas a through c each identify a different kind of speech that Agni can weaponize in d. The coreferential pronoun *táyā* in d simply picks up the last of these, fem. *yā* in c.

The *vācās tṛṣṭám* “harshness of speech” uttered by the *rebhāḥ* supports my interpr. of *rebhā*- as ‘hoarse-voiced’, against the standard anodyne ‘singer’. See comm. ad VI.3.6, etc.

X.87.14–15: All four pādas of 14 and the first of 15 begin *pārā*, which is echoed by the first word of 15b *pratyág*. The 1st three pādas of 14 also have the same verb, 2nd sg. impv. *śṛṇīhi* (which should also be supplied in d), and the first pāda of 15 has the 3rd pl. equivalent *śṛṇantu*.

On *mūra-deva*- see vs. 2 above.

X.87.15: As noted in the publ. intro., this is one of two vss. that lack direct address to Agni and grant other gods a piece of the action.

Both $\sqrt{\text{śap}}$ ‘curse’ and *ṛṣṭá-* ‘harsh’ are reprised from 13ab, here construed together.

X.87.16: The standard tr. take *ásvyena páśunā* as referring to two entities: “horse (flesh) and cow(’s flesh),” while I take it as single, with *ásvya-* modifying *páśu-*.

X.87.17: The root affiliation and meaning of the desid. *títṛpsa-* are unclear. On the one hand, the only root $\sqrt{\text{tṛp}}$ with a full repertoire of forms, including verbal forms, is $\sqrt{\text{tṛp}}$ ‘be satisfied / satiated’; $\sqrt{\text{tṛp}}$ ‘steal’ is confined to the root noun, found in cmpds like *páśu-tṛp-* ‘cattle-stealing’, *asu-tṛp-* ‘life-stealing’. On the other hand, an instance of the latter cmpd is found in our 14d, which sets up the presumption that a verb form containing this root syllable three vss. later should belong to the same root. Moreover, Ge (n. 17c) points out that $\sqrt{\text{tṛp}}$ ‘be satisfied’ generally takes a gen. complement, not the acc. found here. And indeed Ge and Re, as well as Heenen (p. 150), interpr. *títṛpsāt* as ‘seeks to steal’, in contrast to Wh (AV VIII.3.16 “would fain enjoy”). The publ. tr. takes it as a pun, an interpr. I still think is correct.

X.87.18: The second hemistich brings another pair of pāda-initial *pārā*, like vss. 14–15.

X.87.19: The cmpd *sahámūra-* potentially connects with two different pieces of this hymn. The 2nd member *-mūra-* is phonologically identical to the 1st member of *mūra-deva-* in 2c (on which see comm. ad loc.). As noted there, I take the *mūra-* in *mūra-deva-* with *mūrā-* ‘dumb, doltish’; others, however, consider it an *r*-form of *mūla-* ‘root’. At least with regard to the cmpd in this vs., that is a reasonable hypothesis, for *sahá-mūra-* has a doublet *sahá-mūla-* in III.30.17, a passage quoted above ad vs. 10. Vs. 10 contains simplex *mūla-*, referring to the base or foundation of the sorcerer, which should be ripped out (“rooted out,” in the English phrase). I think that is the primary sense of the cmpd *sahámūra-* in our vs.: Agni is supposed to destroy the sorcerers entirely, “root and all.” But I also think that the use of the *r*-form deliberately evokes *mūra-deva-* in 2c: destroy the sorcerers along with their foolish (gods). Note that *sahámūrān kravyādaḥ* in our vs. echoes *mūradevān ... kravyādaḥ* in 2cd.

X.87.21: After pāda a, which is an abbreviation of 20ab, this vs. is structured by a series of etymological dyads: *kavīḥ kavyena* (b), *sákhe sákḥāyam* and *ajāro jarimṇé* (both c), *mártāṃś ámartyaḥ* (d).

The verse is characterized by the absence of the imaginative violence urged on Agni in the rest of the hymn. In particular, “as a poet with your poetic skill” is a far cry from the hewing apart, burning up, and eviscerating that Agni has engaged in earlier in the hymn (and later).

X.87.22: As in 21b, we find Agni in his role of poet (here *vípra-*). In both passages Agni-the-poet is conceived of as a protective enclosure (*pári*).

On *bhaṅgurā-vant-* see comm. ad VII.104.7.

X.87.24: On *kimīdīn*- see comm. ad VII.104.2.

Once again Agni as poet (*vīpra*), and in this vs. “we” also figure in that role.

X.88 Sūrya and Vaiśvānara

On the structure and contents of the hymn see publ. intro.

X.88.1: The first hemistich of this vs. is straightforward syntactically and semantically, but the elements in the second hemistich can (and have been) construed in a variety of different ways. Among the questions are 1) are *bhármaṇe* and *dhármaṇe* syntactically parallel, and if so are they infinitives? 2) if either or both is/are infinitives, is *tásya* to be taken as subj. or obj. of one or both? 3) what is the syntactic function of dat. *bhúvanāya*? 4) whose *svadhā-* is in question? 5) is *paprathanta* injunctive or subjunctive, and in either case is it transitive (with *-anta* replacment) or a medial intransitive contrasting with the well-established transitive active? 6) If transitive, what is its object? The answers to these questions crucially affect what cosmic situation we think is depicted. I will not explore the various, quite distinct, answers that have been given (besides Ge, Re [EVP XIV], Old, see also, for ex., Kü 320 and Köhler [RV *kavi* 117, 131–32]), but will simply detail my own interpr. -- which does not agree in its entirety with any other, though it does agree with some on a number of points.

In my interpr. the two *-maṇe* forms are parallel infinitives, whose logical subject is *tásya*, referring to Agni. Their object is *bhúvanāya* ‘world’, which has been attracted into the dative by its governing infinitives. The *svadhā* is the gods’, since it’s closer to their verb *paprathanta* than to words relating to Agni. The verb is an injunctive, referring to cosmic origins; it is transitive and takes a gapped acc. *bhúvanam* as object (i.e., the same word that has been attracted into the dative [see above]). As I interpret it, the point is that in the beginning the gods spread out the world by their inherent power, but it is now Agni’s responsibility to maintain it (through the ritual associated with him).

X.88.2: The second hemistich begins with *tásya* and ends with *asya*, both with the same referent, namely Agni. Re takes them as contrastive: “de cet (Agni) là, de cet (Agni) ci,” But this seems unlikely: if the first form were meant to refer to the celestial, distant Agni, we should expect a form of *asaú*, viz. gen. *amúśya*. Ge’s (n. 2cd) explanation of the doubling as tautological is more persuasive. In fact *tásya* is in the standard position for an anaphoric *sá/ tām* form, and it is doubled by *asya* adjacent to the noun on which it’s dependent (*sakhyé*). This doubling might be an argument against taking *tásya* in 1c with *svadhāyā* in 1d, since, to match 2cd, we might have expected an *asya* in 1d close to its noun.

X.88.3: On the clash of gender and deixis in *prthivīm dyām utémām*, see comm. ad VIII.40.8d. The phrase is repeated in vs. 9.

X.88.4: I take the subj. of *samāñjan* in d to be the gods at the primal installation of the ritual fire, when they chose (*vṛṇānāḥ*) Agni as their Hotar -- pace Re, who supplies “prêtres,” presumably referring to human priests. This action of the gods is in harmony with my interpr. of 1cd, where I suggest that the gods, having spread out the world in the beginning, left it in Agni’s charge.

X.88.5–6: In these vss. Agni first *stands* “at/on the head of the world” (*bhúvanasya mūrdhán* 5a) and then “*becomes* the head of the world” (*mūrdhā bhavaḥ* 6a). I take the first to refer to the location of the fire on the ritual ground and the second, of course, to the fire itself. Agni is elsewhere referred to as “the head of heaven”; see disc. ad X.125.7. That Agni becomes the head of the world “by night” (*náktram*) in vs. 6 results from the lack of competition from the sun during the night; the sun’s appearance in the early morning presumably dethrones Agni from his exclusive position.

X.88.5: The two clauses of the 2nd hemistich imply that our ritual praise of Agni was necessary to enable him to become *yajñíyaḥ*.

X.88.6: The standard tr. (see also Köhler, Kavi 118) take *tátaḥ* as “from him [=Agni]”; though Ge’s parallel (n. 6b) from AB VIII.28.13 *agner vā ādityo jāyate* is telling, I think the source here is left vaguer.

The acc. phrase in c, *māyām* ..., needs a governing verb; “behold, see” seems reasonable on the basis of passages like X.55.5 *devāsya paśya kāvyam* ... See Ge n. 6c.

The referent of d is not specified, and as far as I can see, it could be Agni or Sūrya -- or both, though some identify it specifically as Agni (Gr s.v. *tūrṇi*-, Re; neither Ge nor Old weighs in). Although I think both are probably meant, the description fits Sūrya somewhat better. As disc. ad III.11.3, 5, I now think that *tūrṇi*- is a synonym of *tarāṇi*- and derived from √*tṛ*. The basic meaning of *tarāṇi*- seems to be ‘transiting’ (e.g., I.50.4), used of the sun journeying across the sky. The same sense fits nicely here, and I would replace the publ. tr. with “that he pursues his work as he transits, knowing the way.” This can secondarily be applied to Agni, who is qualified as *tūrṇi*- (III.11.5) and *tarāṇi*- (I.128.6, etc.) ‘advancing’.

X.88.7: “Whose womb is in heaven” (*divíyoni*-) of Agni seems a mirror image to the birth of Sūrya from Agni or his general environs in the immed. preceding vs. (6b).

The morphological identity and referent of *tanūpāḥ* have elicited more dissension than seems warranted. The question is whether it modifies the gods (*devāḥ*) or the oblation (*havíḥ*), with the former position taken by Sāy., Gr, Re, and the publ. tr., the latter by Ge and Köhler (Kavi 118, 333), while Old and Scar (305) consider both options, though Old leans towards *havíḥ*. The ending *-āḥ* speaks strongly for nom. pl. m.; it is difficult to see how it could be straightforwardly a neut. sg. Ge’s (n. 7d) invocation of X.61.1 is no support: his attempt to make *maṃhaneṣṭhāḥ* in that passage a neut. sg. is quite dubious; see comm. ad loc. The contextual argument for taking *tanūpāḥ* as modifying *havíḥ* rests on the next vs., which contains a masc. sg. phrase *yajñāḥ ... tanūpāḥ* -- the thought being that if the sacrifice in that vs. is *tanūpā-*, then the oblation in the previous vs. must be too. But I see no problem with a conceptual evolution: the gods being *tanūpā-* transfer this quality to the sacrifice that they create. In fact the evolution is expressed by the first hemistich of the next vs., 8ab.

X.88.8–10: The impfs. *ajanayanta* (8b), *ājanayanta* (9a) and aor. *ājījanan* (10b) have the same subject (gods) and object (Agni) and appear to refer to the same long-past event; there is no “aoristic” coloring of the third verb. The only syntactic difference is that *ājanayanta* in 9 is in a rel. cl., but this should not condition a difference in tense/aspect stem (and doesn’t in 8b). In this particular case, the two forms seem to be interchangeable. The medial ending *-anta* is of course

an *-anta* replacement (see my 1979 IJ article), functionally equivalent to an active. Cf. act. *ajanayan* in 13b, again with the same subj. and obj. referring to the same event.

X.88.8: In c Ge (n. 8c) takes sg. *sá* as attraction to the number of the predicate *yajñáh* but representing a plural -- so notionally “*these* became their sacrifice” -- a construction that would follow the practice of Vedic prose in nominal clauses. Although I think the three elements that the gods created in ab do go into making the sacrifice of c, I’m not sure we need to invoke this syntactic rule, since a summary “this” would work as well. By contrast Re takes *sá* as referring to Agni: “C’est (Agni) protecteur de nos corps qui est devenu pour eux le sacrifice (même).” Since Agni is only one of the elements that the gods create in ab, this seems to violate the logical structure of the vs.

Note that the last phrase in the vs., *tám āpah*, somewhat echoes *tanūpāh* closing pāda c, as well as 7d.

X.88.9: *bhúvana-*, which earlier in the hymn is sg. and means ‘world’ (vss. 1, 2, 5; see also 12a), here transitions to pl. ‘beings, creatures’ (also vss. 11, 16).

On *pr̥thivīm dyām utémām*, see above ad vs. 3.

X.88.10: Köhler (35) identifies this vs. as an omphalos vs., referring back to the 1st vs. and forward to the end of the hymn, vss. 18–19.

There are a few points of difference between the various interpr. of ab. Ge (fld by Scar 334) construes *diví devāsaḥ* (a) together as “die Götter im Himmel,” whereas I (with Re and Köhler 334) construe *diví* with *ājījanan*, referring to the location where the gods created Agni. That *diví devāsaḥ* is found in the next vs. (10d), where it must refer to the gods’ placemenet (*ádadhuh*) of Agni in heaven (so also Ge), supports my (/ Re’s / Kö’s) interpr., as does the cmpd. *divíyoni-* ‘whose womb is in heaven’ used of Agni in 7b.

Another question of deployment of an adjunct involves *śaktibhiḥ*. Ge construes it with *rodasiprām* “der mit seinen Kräften die Welt erfüllt,” while Re, Scar, Kö, and I assign the powers to the gods. Since *rodasiprā-* is found in 5d without an instr., it seems likely that the same usage of this root noun cmpd is found here, and their powers are what the gods use to create Agni.

Gr, Ge, and Re take *bhuvé* in the phrase *bhuvé kām* as an infinitive: more or less “made him to become threefold.” But “to become” seems pleonastic; I prefer (with Kö) to interpr. “for the world,” which anticipates the fuller *vísvasmai ... bhúvanāya* “for the sake of the whole world” in 12a. I do acknowledge, however, that *kām* appears twice elsewhere in the hymn with an infinitival dative: 1d *dhármaṇe kām* “to support” and 18d *vidmāne kām* ‘to know’.

The threefold nature of fire encompasses the sun, lightning, and the earthly fire, acdg. to Ge (n. 10c), but it could in addition (or even instead) refer to the three ritual fires.

X.88.11–14: The phrases *bhúvanāni vísvā* “all living beings” (11d) and *vísvasmai ... bhúvanāya* “for the whole world” (12a) trigger the suite of repetitions of Agni’s *vaiśvānara-* in 12b, 13a, 14a.

X.88.13: The negated pres. part. *áminant-* occurs here without expressed object. I supply *daívyāni vratāni* “divine commandments,” on the basis of I.92.12=I.124.2 (both of Dawn), where the neut. acc. pl. phrase is object of *áminatī*. Ge (n. 13c) supplies *dísaḥ* ‘directions’ as object on the basis of I.124.3, while noting *vratá-* as a possible alternative. Both possible objects are found

frequently with $\sqrt{m\bar{r}}$ and both here would indicate that Agni Vaiśvānara moves unerringly. With *vratā-* as object, the expression would indicate that though he wanders (*carīṣṇū*), he moves the way he's supposed to, not contrary to the cosmic order. Supplying *dīśaḥ* produces much the same result: he doesn't confuse the direction he's supposed to go in.

X.88.15: This vs. has been much discussed, seeming as it does (perhaps misleadingly) to refer to the *devayāna* and *pitryāna*, already found in the RV and important conceptually later. One of the problems confronting such an interpretation for this passage is that in this vs. there are two routes (*dvé sruṭī*) but three genitives: *pitṛñām* (a), *devānām utá mártvyanām* (b). Given the formulaic nature of “gods and mortals” and the separation of this phrase from the gen. of ‘forefathers’, it is hard to match the Pitars and the gods with the two paths and sideline the mortals. The disposition of the three genitives and its theological implications are much discussed (see Ge's long n. 15, Old, etc.). I follow Ge (and Kö 335) in construing *pitṛñām* with *aśṇavam*, as the source of my information, not as owners of either path. Since the Pitars are explicitly asked for esoteric cosmic knowledge in 18c, this seems reasonable. I have no particular views on the nature or ownership of the paths.

X.88.16: Vs.-initial *dvé*, matching *dvé* opening vs. 15, invites the identification of the two entities, with the two routes of 15a referred to here as well. But this is not the standard view: Ge takes *dvé* as Heaven and Earth, Re, similarly, the two cosmic masses, and it is the case that the du. adj. *samīcī* can have such a reference; see, e.g., III.30.11, VIII.6.17. Moreover, since H+E appear in the last pāda of the preceding vs. (as Father and Mother) and since the vs. seems to concern Agni as the Sun making his daily transit (cf. *tarāṇīḥ* in d), the two world halves make sense as defining the space through which he journeys. But I would not rule out a reference to the routes of vs. 14, esp. since one can conceive of the Sun traveling along a fixed route. Perhaps the two routes in this vs. are the (visible) one from east to west and the opposite, unseen one from west to east that brings the Sun back to his starting point.

Pāda b seems deliberately obscure. The root affiliation of the 2nd ppl., *vīmṛṣta-*, is uncertain: it could belong to either $\sqrt{mṛś}$ ‘touch’ or $\sqrt{mṛj}$ ‘wipe’, which in this lexeme are in fact semantically quite close. With Gr, Ge, Re, etc., I take it to $\sqrt{mṛś}$. However, unlike them I would insist on the literal meaning of the root, not a watered-down mental equivalent (e.g., Re's “scruté-distinctivement”). On this lexeme and its literal interpr., see disc. ad X.65.7.

Pāda c is almost identical to II.3.1, of Agni, as Ge points out (n. 16c), while *tarāṇīr bhrājamānaḥ* is found in VII.63.4b of Sūrya (Ge's n. 16d). The hemistich thus captures the dual identity of Agni in this hymn.

X.88.17–19: On these vss. and esp. the participants in the dialogue, see publ. intro. As disc. there, I consider the dialogue to be at first between Heaven and Earth, who have figured prominently in the past few vss. and who are spatially identified by *āvaraḥ páraś ca* “the lower and the higher” (17a). The standard view (in addition to Ge, Re, Old, see Scar 289 n. 408, Kö 336) is that the participants are two priests on the ritual ground, on the basis esp. of 19cd. Although these interpr. discount the implicit vertical axis of *āvaraḥ páraś ca* in favor of “nearer and further,” the vertical orientation is clear in the related phrase *avástāt ... parástāt* in 14d; see also *āvaram páram ca* in the immed. preceding hymn (X.87.3). As indicated in the publ. intro., I think the participants silently morph into the priests found in 19cd. This would fit the oscillation

between the divine primordial instantiation of the sacrifice and its present-day performance of it that structures the rest of the hymn.

X.88.17: My interpr. of this vs. differs significantly from the standard in another respect: I consider the two clauses in cd between the *kātarah* question in b and the *kāḥ* question in d also to be questions. In other words, everything from 17b through 18b belongs to the question sequence, even though the *ā śekur* clause in 17c and the *nákṣanta* clause in 17d do not contain explicit interrogatives. These two questions, with the subject *sákhayaḥ* ‘comrades’, concern the success both of the gods in their original creation of the sacrifice and the priests who perform it now.

X.88.18: As Sāy. already pointed out (see Ge n. 18ab), the answer to these *kāti* questions -- “one” -- is given in the Vāl. hymn VIII.58.2.

The impossible hapax *upaspíj-* has received more than its share of attention. Its general sense and tone are clear: it refers to a frivolous or insulting question. Its phonological similarity to *sphíj-* / *sphigť-* ‘buttocks’ suggests something in the latter, rude or contemptuous, realm. In addition to the lit. cited in EWA s.v., see Scar (664–65) and most recently J. T. Katz, “The Riddle of the *sp(h)ij-*: The Greek Sphinx and Her Indic and Indo-European Background” (in Pinault and Petit, eds., *La langue poétique indo-européenne*, 2006). Katz takes it as a dvandva “lap-buttock” (*upa(s)-sp(h)ij-*) referring to a trick or double-sided question. Like most attempts at etymologizing this word, it is more clever than persuasive.

X.88.19: As indicated in the publ. tr., I think this vs. asserts that the (daily) performance of sacrifice will continue as long as the cycles of the natural world do -- an assertion that may be esp. important to establish the neologistic *brāhmaṇa* priest as an eternal figure.

Ge somewhat perversely takes *ná* as the negative here despite being in a position strongly associated with the simile particle and in fact in the same phrase in VI.50.8 *uśáso ná prátikam*, where Ge does take it as a simile marker. No other interpr. follow his lead.

The fem. pl. adj. *suparnyàḥ* surely refers to Agni’s flames, as is generally agreed. The question is why it is feminine. I think the ref. is to metaphorical mares, as in IX.86.36 *harítaḥ suparnyàḥ* “fine-feathered golden mares,” there used of soma drops.

The flames “clothe themselves as if in the face of Dawn” because flames are red-gold like the dawn sky.

X.89 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., this is an old-fashioned well-made hymn, making use of familiar rhetorical devices like patterned repetition: e.g., the negatives in 6ab, the pāda-initial perfects in 7, the preverb *prá* in 8cd–9ab and again in 11, *índrah* + GENITIVES in 10, *ánu* in 13.

X.89.1: Instead of *stavā* the Pp reads *stava*, which Old pronounces (persuasively) “wahrscheinlich falsch.” As disc. in the publ. intro. this hymn almost self-consciously locates itself in the IIr. praise-hymn tradition and would follow the convention of the annunciatory 1st ps. at the beginning of a hymn (as in I.32.1a *índrasya nú vīryāṇi prá vocam*) – here 1st sg. subj. *stavā*. Note that, as in I.32.1, Indra is the first word of the hymn: *índram stavā*.

Pādas a and d end with the alternative instr. *mahnā* and *mahitvā*; I render them both as ‘greatness’, as I don’t think the poet is attempting to draw a semantic distinction, but simply

reacting to different metrical circumstances (disyllabic v. trisyllabic cadence end) and perhaps aiming for variety.

With Ge (n. 1c) I take *várobbhiḥ* as referring to the dimensions of the worlds, not of Indra; see IV.21.8 *vārāṃsi párvatasya*. As Ge points out, 2a supports this interpr.

X.89.2: At first glance the sun (in pāda a) and Indra (b) appear to be identified, since both appear in the nom. and there is only one overt verb – so Old (flg. Bergaigne). However, this makes for both syntactic and conceptual problems in the rest of the vs. My interpr. is similar to Ge’s: I take a and b as separate clauses, and supply an intrans. form of \sqrt{vrt} with *pári* in a, partly matching the trans. idiom $\tilde{a}\sqrt{vrt}$ in b. The object of this transitive verb is then found in c, which describes, without naming, the sun of a in the acc. In other words, the sun is doing its daily circuit in pāda a, and Indra is urged to turn the sun more in our direction in bc. The simile of Indra’s turning chariot wheels is, of course, quite apt, given the sun’s circular shape.

X.89.3: Old suggests that *arca* is a misunderstanding for **arcā*, matching *stavā* in 1a, and Ge tr. as a 1st sg. subj. without comment. So also Scar (508 with n. 708). Yet I see no reason not to take it as the 2nd sg. impv. it appears to be, as an ex. of poetic self-address.

Although *samānām* can modify *bráhma* in the following pāda (and is so taken by Gr, Ge, and Scar), I do not see why a formulation chanted by a single person and directed at a single god would be ‘common’ or ‘joint’ (e.g., Ge “das gemeinsame Erbauungswort”; he thinks it’s held in common by the group of singers [n. 3a]). I prefer to take it as a neut. adv. ‘in the same way’, contrasting with *návyam* ‘new’, in the usual Rigvedic productive paradox concerning praise poetry, that it is both traditional and new. The word also phonologically resembles, and so contrasts with, negated *ásamam* ‘without equal’.

The root noun cmpd *ānapāvrt* is potentially multivalent syntactically: it can be an adv. (as the other occurrence in V.32.5 is, in my view; see comm. ad loc.), or it can modify either the subj., i.e., the chanter, or the formulation. With Ge and Scar (508), I take it with the last: the formulation that goes directly, without swerving, to its goal, the god Indra, but the other possibilities cannot be ruled out.

The expression *kṣmayā divāḥ* seems to show the same case disharmony as is found in paired temporal expressions like *divā náktam* “by day and by night.” Scar (508 n. 708) tentatively suggests rather that it is underlyingly *kṣmayā *divā u*, with matching instrumentals, and means “mit der Erde und mit dem Himmel nicht zu vergleichen.” But this seems overfussy; moreover it unnecessarily deprecates the formulation in question: that is, it implies that the formulation cannot be compared to H+E and is therefore not as good – but why would it be compared to them in the first place?

Our *ví yāḥ prṣthéva jānimāni aryāḥ ... cikāya ...* is very like IV.2.11 ... *cinavad ví ..., prṣthéva vītā vṛjinā ca mártān* “he will distinguish ... like backs, straight and crooked, (like) mortals” (a parallel that is generally remarked). Although the owners of the backs under comparison are not identified, I assume that they are horses (so also Ge) and that Indra is being presented as, in the first instance, a judge of horseflesh. Note that though our passage lacks “straight and crooked,” *vṛjinā* ‘crooked’ appears in 8b. Th. (Fremdling 64–68) disputes this interpr. of *prṣthā-* and derives it instead from \sqrt{pras} ‘ask’, with the meaning Rätselfrage, for both our passage and IV.2.11: “Welcher Indra gesondert hat (=auseinander kennt) wie Rätselfragen die Ursprünge des Fremdlings, keinen Freund sich wünscht.” Although this is clever and the

morphological derivation itself is unimpeachable, it is unnecessary, and he still must reckon with numerous undoubted exx. of *pr̥sthá-* ‘back’.

X.89.4: The bahuvrīhi *ánisīta-sarga-* ‘having restless surges’ echoes the phrase *átis̥thantam apasyāṃ ná sárgam* “like a busy surge that never stands still” in 2c. I consider *ánisītasargā apāḥ* in our vs. to be an unmarked simile (so also Ge) matching the explicit simile in 2a.

There is phonetic play between *-sargā(h)* (a) and *ságarasya* (b).

As Ge points out (n. 4ab), “the depths of the sea” can refer to the heart, the source of poetic inspiration, as in IV.58.5 (cf. 11) *h̥r̥dyāt samudrāt*, etc.

The wheels in c (*cakríyā*) pick up those in 2b *cakrá*. I suggest that the pf. *cikāya* in 3d phonologically mediates between these two, esp. resembling *cakríyā* with flips of vowel quality and quantity.

X.89.5: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. seems intentionally designed to mislead. The subj. of the hymn is of course Indra, whose name has appeared in all four of the previous vss. in prominent pāda-initial position (1a #*índram*, 2b #*índrah*, 3d #*índrah*, 4a #*índrāya*). The string of nom. sg. masc. descriptors in 5ab invites the audience to assume the same referent, esp. since 4cd has Indra (though unnamed) in the nom. as well. But when we reach the beginning of the 2nd hemistich we find instead #*sómah*, and we must scramble to shift the adjectives of the 1st hemistich to this new referent. The adjectives are in fact applicable to both referents, though with slight adjustments of sense. For ex., the hapax bv *āpānta-manyu-* if applied to Indra would mean ‘deriving battle-fury from the drink’, whereas Soma ‘provides battle-fury in/from his drink’.

The first member of the next hapax cmpd *tṛpāla-prabharman-*, *tṛpāla-*, is found independently in IX.97.8, modifying *manyú-* (which precedes it here). See comm. ad loc., where I accept Mayr’s tentative connection to *tṛprá-*, found only once in RV (VIII.2.5; see comm. ad loc.), characterizing soma, but also occasionally later. With Mayr I tentatively take *tṛprá-* to mean ‘sharp’, a well-known quality of soma (though usually expressed by *tivrá-*), an interpr. supported by some later Iranian evidence. The second member, *prábharmān-*, is found independently (along with other nominal derivatives and numerous exx. of the verbal lexeme *prá √ bhṛ*), referring to the presentation of ritual offerings. My “first impression” is a bit loose; Ge’s “Anstich” (first draught) is better, capturing the *pra* while maintaining the physical quality of the soma offering.

The adjectives in b are less rarified than those in pāda a, and the first and last (*dhúni-* ‘bositerous’ and *ṛjīśín-* ‘possessing the silvery drink’) are frequently applied to Indra. In fact *ṛjīśín-* is overwhelmingly an Indra word – applied to soma only once elsewhere (VIII.79.4). So just before introducing Soma as the subject, we get a qualifier that seems to clinch the Indra reference.

The construction of the second hemistich is unclear. Ge takes c as an independent clause, which requires him to supply, indeed invent, a verb (wiegt ... auf ‘outweigh’). Not only is there no support for this verb, but having *sómah* lean forward into a new clause diminishes the drama of the surprise introduction of this subject for the expected Indra. I therefore take *sómah* as the enjambed final word of the nominal clause of ab, with a new clause (comprising the rest of c along with d) starting immediately after. The syntactic isolation of *sómah* allows the referent switch to reverberate. This suggested disposition of the hemistich is essentially that of Ludwig’s (see Old’s disc. and partial endorsement). The neut. pl. phrase *vis̥vāny atasā vānāni* “all the [other] bushes and trees,” subject of *debhuḥ*, is picked up by *pratimānāni* ‘counterparts,

equivalents' in d as a sort of secondary predicate. Although Old hesitates somewhat to accept Ludwig's interpr. because of the "etwas harte Satzteilung," note that there has to be a pāda-internal clause break in the next vs., 6b.

As Ge points out (n. 5d), this indicates that already in the (late) RV there may have been ritual substitutes for the soma plant – however we interpr. the syntax of cd.

There is some debate about the meaning and function of *arvāk*. Ge (flg. Ludwig) interprets it first as locational 'below' and then by metaphorical extension 'lesser'; Old in addition suggests temporal 'until now'. I take it in its standard sense 'nearby', here characterizing *pratimānāni*.

My only hesitation about the interpretation of the hemistich championed here is that it involves a "all ... did not" construction (*viśvāni ... nā debhuḥ* "they all did not deceive ..."). Some time ago I made a study of the interaction of quantifiers and negatives in Vedic (which I thought I had published long ago but evidently did not) in order to assess the scope of the quantifier in such contexts (total "all do not" versus partial "not all do"). In the RV there are essentially no examples of *viśva-* / *sārva-* plus *nā*; the only apparent exceptions involve the All Gods (*viśve devāḥ*) (see, e.g., III.32.8), where the total interpr. is the only one possible, since the All Gods are a corporate entity and could not participate in a "not all do" construction. In the AV the apparent restriction against such constructions is slightly loosened, but they are still quite rare; early Vedic prose has a few more, but it still seems to be avoided. In positing an "all do not" reading here, I would point out that this is a late hymn; moreover the sequestering of the "all" phrase in pāda c, taken up by a non-quantified *pratimānāni* in d and with the neg. opening d, may have made the construction acceptable: "All the bushes and trees – (as) near counterparts, they do not deceive ..."

X.89.6: The first hemistich consists of a rel. clause (*nā yāsya ...*) that lacks not only a finite verb but any predicate at all, followed by brief main clause: *sómo akṣāḥ*. These two words cannot belong to the rel. cl. because the verb is unaccented. As was just noted, the mid-pāda clause break here supports the similar interpr. of 5cd.

As to the predicate in the rel. cl., Ge supplies a verb "gewachsen sind," with no justification given; in fact in n. 6ab he suggests importing *pratimānāni* from 5d, as does Old --- and the publ. tr. concurs. There is a subtle shift in sense, however: in 5cd the bushes and trees were not quite counterparts / equivalents of soma; here no cosmic geographical features are counterparts / equivalents of Indra.

I am taking *yāsya* as referring to Indra; though both Old and Ge consider soma another possible referent, they both seem to opt for Indra, and he seems the only possible one to me. To knit the two clauses together we should expect *tásmāi* or *indrāya* to begin the main clause.

Ge (see also Kulikov 142) takes cd as a single cl. dependent on the main cl. of b. This is certainly possible but it requires seeing *manyúḥ* as the subj. of the two verbs in d, *śṛṇāti* and *rujāti*. I prefer to interpr. cd as another depend. cl. (c) / main clause (d) dyad, with Indra as the subj. of the two main cl. verbs, which are accented because each is initial in its claus(ette) and *śṛṇāti* is also init. in its pāda. This interpr. means that the pres. part. *adhinīyāmānaḥ* is predicated in the c-clause. Kulikov (142) tr. the part. "being enhanced," Ge "gesteigert." The lexeme *ádhi* √ *nī* is found only once elsewhere in the RV (VIII.30.3) and, acdg. to MonWms, nowhere else in Skt. In VIII.30.3 it means 'lead /from out of' (though it is likely that *ádhi* there, flg. an abl. and not in a normal preverb position, is actually simply a postposition). I think the same sense may

be found here: the *manyú-* is being drawn out of Indra, enabling him to perform the violent deeds in d and the following vs. (8).

Note that the two verbs in d are reprised in the next two vss.: *rurója* (7b), *śṛṇāsi* (8b).

X.89.7: The first three pādas begin with fronted perfects *jaghāna*, *rurója*, *bibhēda*.

X.89.8ff.: As disc. in the publ. intro. and see also Ge n. 8, the focus of the hymn shifts to the punishment of those who break alliances (*mitrá-*) or have no alliances at all – a theme with deep Indo-Iranian roots, as Ge also points out.

X.89.8: On the strongly emphatic use of *ha tyád* with 2nd sg. prn. see I.63.4–7, VI.18.3, VIII.96.16–18 and comm. ad locc.

In d I take the object *yújam ... mitráṃ* as inanimate: “a bound alliance” (see also JPB, *Ādityas* 30: “a union (or) an alliance”), while for Ge it’s animate: “einen verbündeten Freund” (which in my terms would be “yokemate (and) ally”). In favor of the JPB/SJ interpr., *prá√mī* almost always takes an inanimate obj. (though this argument may be undercut by the following vs. [however see below]), and, as the obj. in this simile, the phrase is parallel to inanimate *dhāma* ‘ordinances’ in the frame. In favor of Ge’s rendering, the root noun *yúj-* is otherwise overwhelmingly animate. I would consider an alt. tr. “yokemate (and) ally” here, but see comm. on 9 immed. below.

X.89.9: As was just noted, *prá√mī* almost always takes an inanimate obj. Here the verb has four distinct objects, each marked out by the repetition of the preverb *prá* immediately before. One of these, *saṃgírah* ‘agreements’, is definitely inanim. (and in its other occurrence is also the obj. of *prá√mī* [IX.86.16]), while *mitrá-* can, of course, be either the divine name or the common noun ‘alliance’. Thieme (M+A 62–63) takes all four objects as inanimate nouns: “... who deceive/betray ... a contract (*mitrá*), a [*sic*] hospitality (*aryamán*), [friendly] agreements (*saṃgír*), true speech (*váruṇa*).” JPB (*Ādityas* 86–87) follows Th in taking all four nominals in an appellative sense, though with different renderings of *aryamāṇam* (“custom”) and, esp., *váruṇam* (“commandment”). His argument for the appellative sense in part rests on an observation similar to that made above, that “the object of *prá mī* is never a god or a man, but rather a principle” (87). Although I’m not sure I want to go so far as to eliminate the gods from this passage entirely, esp. given the undoubted presence of Mitra and Varuṇa in the preceding vs. (8c), I now see that the presence of clear inanimate *saṃgírah* and ambiguous *mitráṃ* invites or requires at least a secondary inanimate reading for *aryamāṇam* and *váruṇam* too and I would now tr. the VP “... who transgress against Mitra [/alliance] and against Aryaman [/custom], against agreements and against Varuṇa [/commandment].” In other words, to transgress against the god is to transgress against the principle he embodies – or, perhaps better, vice versa.

The rel. cl. in ab is either dependent on *amítreṣu* in the main clause (c) (“on those without alliance who ...”) or covertly conjoined with it (“on those without alliance (and those) who ...”).

Note the acc. *vīṣāṇam*, with vṛddhi in the suffix, against the overwhelming number of forms to this stem with guṇa in the suffixal strong forms (acc. *vīṣaṇam*, etc.). There is only one other such form (in IX.34.3; see comm. ad loc.). It is not surprising that such *n*-stems would be attracted into the dominant vṛddhi type; what is a bit surprising in this passage is that it’s in the same vs. with *aryamāṇam* which maintains guṇa in its suffix.

X.89.10: Acdg. to Schindler (Root noun s.v. p. 45), the root noun *vṛdh-* is only a Nom. act. “Vermehrung” (etc.): “An keiner Stelle ist *vṛdh-* Adj. oder Nag.” Although this statement is accurate for the numerous singular occurrences of the stem, it cannot apply to this gen. pl., parallel to the gen. pl. *médhirāṇām* “of the wise (ones)”; it must mean “strong (ones).” Perhaps the presence of them. adj. *vṛdhā-* in the next vs. influenced the usage, though this is not much of a hypothesis.

Pāda d has both a rare break (—) and a bad cadence (◡ ◡ — ×) (see, e.g., HvN metr. comm.). Arnold (322) suggests flipping *yóge háv'ya* — × to *háv'yo yóge* — ×, which would fix both problems — and would also distribute the paired terms *kṣéme yóge* in a way more in keeping with the other three pādas, where the pairs are broken up. Although Arnold’s suggestion neatly solves two problems, my hesitation is that it is difficult to see why the word order would have been disturbed redactionally. Old also is not convinced.

X.89.11: This vs. contains 8 occurrences of the preverb *prá*, each with an associated ablative. The verb with which they are construed and which provides the idiom that controls the abl. (“project beyond”) is *ririce*, which is found only in the break of the last pāda. Note also that *prá* is teasingly doubled by the *s*-stem abl. *práthasaḥ* in c.

X.89.12: The preverb *prá*, so prominent in 11, has one last gasp at the beginning of 12, but in a different verbal lexeme (*prá √ vṛt*), a small ex. of the poet’s sly misdirections.

The simile in c, *ásmeva ... divá ā srjānāḥ* “like a stone being launched from heaven,” seems at first to connect with the last word of b, *hetīḥ* (“... missile like a stone”), but the 2nd sg. impv. *vidhya* in c redirects the comparison: it’s Indra, the implicit subject of the impv., who’s being compared to the stone, not his missile — yet another ex. of the subtle shifts and red herrings that this poet cleverly indulges in.

The cmpd *drógha-mitra-* is generally taken as a tatp., e.g., “ein arglistiger, falscher Freund” (Gr), with unexpected accent (AiG II.1.266), or, with Ge (n. 12d), as a cmpd with a governing 1st member (“die Freundbetrüger”). Old sensibly wants it to be a bahuvr. and suggests the somewhat less sensible gloss “den Trug zum Freund habend.” Given the abstract use of *mitrá-* elsewhere in this hymn, I suggest rather the bv ‘whose alliances are deceitful’.

X.89.13: Like vs. 11, in which the repeated *prá*-s culminate in the last pāda with the withheld verb *ririce*, here repeated *ānu*-s (6, this time) find their verb in *ajihata* in d. The obj. of this verb is also withheld till the 2nd hemistich: *īndram* in c.

Gr, Lub, and the publ. tr. take *āha* as the particle *āha* (of unclear function), but Ge (see n. 13a) as the neut. pl. of ‘days’. An argument against Ge’s interpr. would be that in the rest of the vs. each *ānu* is associated with only a single element, whereas here there would be two: “days (and) months” — and a similar one-to-one relationship is found in vss. 8cd-9ab and 11 with repeated *prá*. However, in this vs. the various nominals associated with the preverb are ill-assorted: “months” is the only temporal designation, with the others being features of geography/landscape: trees (a), plants (b), mountains (b), world-halves (c), waters (d). If the first *ānu* syntagm contains both days and months, the conceptual imbalance would be considerably lessened. I therefore would now substitute the tr. “The days (and) months gave way ...” For another short-vowel pl. *āha* see I.92.3.

X.89.14: The root affiliation of the hapax *cetyā-* is disputed: to $\sqrt{cr^3}$ ‘avenge, requite’ or to \sqrt{cit} ‘perceive’ (Gr); see Old, EWA s.v. The tone of the hymn certainly favors the former, and this is reflected in most tr. (Ge, Scar 88, publ. tr.).

Ge construes *aghāsyā* with *cetyā*, but the pāda boundary is (weakly) against that, and it works perfectly well with *rākṣaḥ*.

Although Gr assigns *éṣat* to a separate root $\sqrt{eṣ}$ ‘gleiten, schleichen’, it is better analyzed as *īṣat* + *ā* to the them. pres. *īṣa-* (so Old, Ge, Gotō [1st Cl, 109 n. 84]).

The cmpd *mitra-krū-* (Gr. *-krū-*) and esp. its 2nd member are much discussed; see esp. Scar 88–89, EWA I.414–15. The word is obviously related to *krūrā-* ‘bloody’ (AV+), *kravís-* ‘bloody flesh’; the question is whether *krū* is a verbal root or pseudo-verb root or is simply a nominal ‘blood’ (vel sim.). In my view, whether or not there was a “real” root $\sqrt{krū}$ ‘be/make bloody’, in this hapax cmpd the second member is treated as such. Only this interpr. accounts for the accent and the likely meaning.

As disc. in the publ. intro., I consider pāda d an intertextual reference to two famous phrases in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn I.32, both describing the slain Vṛtra: I.32.5 ... *śayata upapṛk prthivyāḥ* “... will lie as the embracer of the earth” (like our *prthivyā āpṛk ... śayante*) and I.32.8 ... *amuyā śayānam* “... lying in that way” (like our *amuyā śayante*). (Both passages are also adduced by Ge, n. 14d.) Because of the strong similarities between I.32 and our passage I think it likely that our *āpṛk* is a simple substitution under different metrical conditions for *upapṛk* in I.32.5 and it is therefore unnec. to seek a special sense of the root noun cmpd here – as in Ge’s “... nur so platt auf die Erde liegen werden” [I’m not sure how he gets that] or Scar’s “als ein die Erde anfüllender Haufen derart daliegen.”

X.89.15: The hapax *ogaṇá-* is taken by Gr (etc.) as derived from **avagaṇa-* lit. ‘von seiner Schar verstossen’. Both the deriv. and the proposed sense were vigorously disputed by Old, with ample ref. to previous lit. Old suggests a connection with SV *úgaṇa-* and the sense ‘strong’, which is reflected in current tr. (Ge, Kü 205, publ. tr.). The likely deriv. was sketched by KH (Aufs. 397–98 [MSS 8 (1956)]); see also EWA s.v.), from a putative **ogṛ-ná-* with MIA dev. of syllabic **ṛ*; cf. Aves. *r-stem aogaṛə* ‘power’. This is very likely and is reflected in the publ. tr., but it should be pointed out that these enemies should not *be* powerful, but think themselves so – the word must somehow fall under the domain of *vrādhanta(h)*. See KH’s tr. (397) “die sich als Machtvolle sehr hochgemut fühlenden.”

Pādas c and d present contrastive images: the unallianced associated with “blind darkness” in contrast to “the nights with their good lights” (*suṣyotíṣo aktávaḥ*) that overcome the enemies. But why are the nights the agents here? Old suggests that the nights stand for our allies, who prevail over the darkness of the foe. Possibly, but a more standard RVic image would be for the day (/dawn/sun) to prevail over the darkness of night – not to compare the victorious side with the only comparatively brighter night. In fact Ge (n. 15d) asserts that the sense is “Das Licht soll über die Finsternis triumphieren,” so the emphasis in d is on the *lights* of the nights. This still doesn’t seem to me entirely satisfactory.

X.89.16–18: Starting with vs. 16 the hymn winds down with standard hymn-ending clichés: urging Indra to come to *our* sacrifice (16) and expressing the hope that we may reap the benefits of his presence (17). There here-and-now of the ritual is expressed by *imām ... śáhūtim* “this common call here” (16c) and *nūnām* “now,” the final word of 17. The *evá* opening 17 is a common way to introduce the final summary vs. of a hymn. And as often in final verses, the poet

explicitly identifies himself and his lineage with “(we) Viśvāmitras” in 17d. In fact 17 is the real final vs.: vs. 18 is borrowed from III.30.22, the final vs. of an Indra hymn in the Viśvāmitra maṇḍala -- another way of stamping the Viśvāmitra signature on this Xth Maṇḍala hymn attributed to a Viśvāmitra descendent, Reṇu Vaiśvāmitra.

X.89.17: The poet’s presentation of the Viśvāmitra signature just discussed is somewhat complicated by this vs. As just noted, he borrows a final vs. (18) from the Viśvāmitra mantra (though it does not mention the Viśvāmitras directly), and he associates himself explicitly with the Viśvāmitras in 17d. But 17cd is a direct borrowing of (or, to be more circumspect, is identical with) VI.25.9, another hymn-final vs., *except* that for *viśvāmitrā(h)* in d, VI.25.9 has *bharādvājā(h)*. In other words, our crafty poet’s most direct claim for his Viśvāmitra identity is made by boldly manipulating (/stealing) the signature vs. of a different poetic lineage – another sign of the intertextuality disc. ad vs. 14.

On the syntactic issues in cd, see comm. ad VI.25.9. As I suggest there, the problematic *utā* may be connecting the two temporal expressions *vāstoḥ* and *nūnām*, and the tr. could be altered to “as we sing at dawn and also now.”

[X.90 Puruṣa JPB]

X.91 Agni

As noted in the publ. intro., this hymn resembles X.89, as a well-crafted consciously traditional poetic product, even though the poet to whom it is ascribed is not the same as that of X.89 and the starkly innovative X.90 intervenes between them. The composition is nicely balanced with pleasingly intricate patterns of repetition and variation.

X.91.1: This vs. is crammed with both etymological figures and figures of sense (that is, synonyms or near-synonyms that are not etymologically related). The former include *dāme dāmūnā(h)* (b), *suśākhā sakhīyaté* (d), and possibly *hótā havīṣaḥ* (c) [it’s hard to know whether a Rigvedic audience would perceive an etymological relation between the two]. Figures of sense – in many ways more interesting – are *jāgrvādbhīr jāramāṇa(h)* (a) and *iṣáyann iḷāḥ* (b) (on the assumption that to the Vedic Sprachgefühl the root nouns *íḍ-* and *ís-* [with its verbal form *iṣáya-*] were etymologically unconnected). A third type is exemplified by *vibhúr vibhāvā* (d), in which the near phonological identity overcomes lack of etymological or semantic identity.

X.91.2: The dominant stylistic feature in this vs. is the āmreḍita, with one per pāda: *grhé-grhe* (a), *vāne-vane* (b), *jānaṃ-janam* (c), *viśaṃ-viśam* (d), which are tightly patterned. Those in the first hemistich are both in the loc. and are adjacent to each other, at the end of a and the beginning of b. Those in the 2nd hemistich are in the acc. and maximally distant, at the beginning of c and end of d.

The āmreḍita is not the only stylistic feature. The first hemistich contains two nom. sg. rt-noun cmpds in *-īr* (in sandhi), *darśataśrīr ... takvavīr*, with nom. sg. *ātithir* also participating in this phonetic figure. The 2nd member *-śrīr* (a) is echoed by *śísīriye* (b), though they are etymologically and semantically unrelated (so also Ge n. 2ab). The second hemistich goes in for etymological figures connected to the āmreḍitas: c *jānaṃ-janam jānīyaḥ* and d *viśaḥ ... viśyo viśaṃ-viśam*. And we might note that *jānīya-* and *viśya-* are similarly formed and similarly related to the root syllable of their respective āmreḍitas.

On *darsāta-śrīṭ-* see Scar 552 and for the general challenges of interpr. *-śrīṭ-* cmpds 546.

On *takva-vīṭ-* see comm. ad I.151.5, 134.5, also Scar 497–98. Note that *vāne-vane* is read differently in simile and frame.

X.91.2–3: Almost like a textbook demonstration, these two vss. showcase the contrasting presents to the roots $\sqrt{kṣi}$ ‘dwell’ and $\sqrt{kṣā}$, *kṣi* ‘rule, own’, both in the active indic. sg. for convenient comparison: 2d *kṣeti*, 3c *kṣayasi*.

X.91.3: The first three pādas are defined by etymological figures of a straightforward sort: *sudākṣo dākṣaiḥ* (a), *krātunā ... sukrātuḥ* (a), *kaviḥ kāvyaena* (c), *vāsur vāsūnām* (c). Again there is internal patterning. All three pairs in the first hemistich have a nom. / instr. pairing; the nominatives in pāda a are compds with *su-* and the pairs in a are chiastically arranged. In c the 2nd term is gen., not instr. All three pairs in ab have parallels elsewhere (see Ge’s nn.), though not all together or so densely arranged.

In c (*ék*)a *íd* provides a rhyme for b (*visv*)*avíṭ*, which make help to account for the unusual, though by no means unprecedented, position of *íd*.

X.91.4: *īlāyās padé* picks up *ilās padé* in 1b. Note the close sandhi in both phrases.

On the sandhi of *ivétayaḥ* (prob. *iva étayaḥ*) see Old with further lit.

X.91.5: In pāda a *śríyaḥ* picks up (*darsāta-*)*śrīṭ* of 2a.

The phrase *cikitra uśāsām* recurs in 5b from 4c; in both cases of course *uśāsām* is not directly construed with the verb. In 5b the verb also enters into an etymological and phonological figure: *citrās cikitra* (in sandhi).

X.91.6: After Agni’s attack on the plants in 5c and his consumption of them as his food in 5d, this vs. depicts the temporally / logically prior actions whereby the plants, with the help of the waters (here probably the rains that foster plant growth or the water [=sap/juice] internal to the plants), conceive Agni/fire and give birth to him.

Pāda-final *ṛtvīyam* is repeated from 4a; see also 10a below.

The second hemistich contains three instances of *ca*. The one in c is an inverse *ca* connecting the nominals *vanínaḥ* and *vīrúdhāḥ*. The second pair, in d, conjoin the two predicates *antárvatīḥ* and *súvate*. As JSK (DGRV I.172) points out, we should supply a finite form of $\sqrt{bhū}$ vel sim. with the adjective *antárvatīḥ* (though correct his sg. [*bhavati*] to [*bhavanti*]). *súvate* is presumably accented because it is a contrastive predicate (see Old as well as Re’s n. on the passage).

Ge (n. 6d) adduces as parallel III.55.5c, which in fact adds a new wrinkle in the form of a paradox. It too concerns the birth of fire from plants: *antárvatīḥ suvate ápravītāḥ* “Having (him) within, (though) unimpregnated they give birth to (him).” In that passage *antárvatīḥ* contrasts with *ápravītāḥ* -- the presumable difference is that though the plants have embryonic fire within and are in that sense pregnant, they are not so because of sexual activity.

I consider *samānām* (c) and *visvāhā* (d) as conceptually contrastive, despite their distance from each other. Hence my tr. “who is just the same everywhere.” This is not the standard interpr.: JSK (172) takes *samānām* as an acc. sg. m. emphasizing the identity of the preceding *tām* with the two *tām*-s opening pādas a and b; Ge and Re take it as an adv. (gleichmässig / en commun) loosely applied to the woody plants and sprouts. I think my interpr. yields richer

semantics and reflects the standard trope that there are many fires, which are also the same fire. However, the repetition of *samānām íd* in 8c may lend some support to JSK's interpr.

X.91.7: This vs. returns to the theme of 5cd, with the mature Agni consuming the plants (that gave birth to him in 6).

The position of *yád* is at least a minor violation of the usual rules; see also vs. 12 below.

X.91.8: In Engl. the vs. seems to veer abruptly from the 3rd ps. to the 2nd at the very end (see also Old, who remarks on the switch), but the Skt. of the first 3½ pādas does not *have* to be read as 3rd ps. It consists of a string of acc. singulars, so there is no obligatory ps. marking, and could simply take up the 2nd ps. ref. to Agni in vs. 7. However, the repeated *tām*-s in cd, as well as the acc. *agním* in b, would incline the audience to a 3rd ps. reading. See also comm. on the next vs., 9.

I do not understand the case mismatch between the contrastive pair *árbhe* (loc., c) and *mahé* (dat., d). Perhaps the surface identity of the case endings in *-e* outweighs their grammatical disharmony.

X.91.9: The first hemistich of this vs. closely tracks vs. 8, with the differences between them seeming to force a 3rd ps. interpr. on most of vs. 8 (see disc. just above) contrasting with the overt 2nd ps. of 9ab: instead of *tām íd ... vṛṇate* (8cd) we have *tvām íd ... vṛṇate tvāyávaḥ* (9a); instead of *agním hótāram* (8b) *hótāram agne* (9b) – both with explicit 2nd ps. readings.

X.91.10: This vs. is identical to II.1.2. In his usual quest to identify the original locus of repeated vss. (a quest we would not undertake in this post-Parry-Lord era), Bloomfield (RR, ad 2.12) suggests that ours is the original: “The stanza is rather abrupt in 2.1, whereas in 10.91 its sequence is peculiarly fit.” Presumably he is referring to the three mentions of Agni as Hotar in the two preceding vss. (8b, 9b) and the following vs. (11c) and the occurrence of the rare denom. *adhvarīyási* in 11d – but one could argue in reverse that these occurrences invited the insertion of a stock vs. containing *hotrām* and *adhvarīyási* on the principle of concatenation. Note also that pāda-final *ṛtvíyam* (a) matches those in 4a and 6a.

X.91.11: Re suggest that this vs. is a gloss of 10; as I just indicated, I would argue in the opposite direction, that 10 is a ready-made vs. that was inserted between 9 and 11 on the basis of lexical and conceptual similarities.

X.91.12–13: The vs.-initial *imāḥ*, *imām* usher in the last section of the hymn, in which the poet announces the here-and-now of the current ritual and esp. the praise the poet himself is offering to Agni. To emphasize the parallelism of the two vss., the tr. of 13 should begin “this good praise here would I proclaim ...”

X.91.12: The first hemistich piles up an impressive array of ritual speech types.

The second hemistich returns to the etymological figures that were prominent in the early vss.: *vasūyávo vásave* (c), recalling *vásur vásūnām* in 3c, and *vṛddhāsu ... vārdhanaḥ* (d). The position of *yāsu* in d is a more egregious violation of the usual placement of relatives than the one noted in 7. It may have been displaced to the right in order to accommodate the etym. figure that opens the pāda.

Re claims that *vārdhana-* must be intrans. here, contrary to its other occurrences (and, I'd add, to the standard trans./caus. function of *-ana-*nominals), but there is no necessity for this view. *vārdhana-* responds implicitly to *vasūyávaḥ*: Agni strengthens the already strong ritual praises he receives by awarding them goods.

X.91.14: The extravagant list of domestic animals in ab is structurally parallel to the list of ritual speech types in 12ab. However, I don't understand what actually happens to these beasts. With Ge and Re, the publ. tr. takes *āhutāḥ* to be the equivalent of 'offered' (/ 'sacrificed'), but these are not standard Vedic sacrificial animals – even the horse, whose sacrifice is rare and special. Although it might be possible to interpret the animals as standing for sacrificial substances they produce – like “cows” for “milk” – none of them is associated in that way with an offering substance. Moreover the juxtaposed ppl. *avasṛṣṭāsa āhutāḥ* seem self-contradictory, since *áva* √*srj* means 'release'; cf. the internal contradictions of Ge's "... freigelassen geopfert werden" and Re's "... sont offerts après avoir été mis en liberté" (though see Scar's tr. [311], which harmonizes them: "... [zum Opfer] losgelassen, geopfert werden"). I now think that *āhuta-* must be used as it is when Agni is the referent – that it means, literally and actually, 'bepoured, besprinkled' (see the same usage of *prāhuta-* in the next hymn, X.92.3). If *avasṛṣṭā-* 'released' refers to a situation like that in the Aśvamedha in later śrauta ritual where multiple *wild* animals are tied to yūpas as if to be sacrificed but then released, perhaps our passage alludes to a similar situation but with domestic animals. Perhaps at their release they were sprinkled with a token portion of ghee that sacralized them. I would feel more comfortable about this hypothesis if there were any other evidence for it that I am aware of. It also makes some trouble with *yāsmīn*: *yāsmīn ... āhutāḥ* can most easily be interpr. as "into which/whom (they are) offered." But perhaps it refers to the animals' proximity to the ritual fire: "at which ..." In any case, I would now change the tr. to "at whom/which horses, bulls, oxen, mated cows, rams are released (and) anointed (with ghee)," though without a lot of confidence in its correctness.

It is possible that this parade of domestic animals is related to the hapax epithet of Agni in c, *kīlāla-pā-* 'k.-drinking' (on which see Scar's minimal disc., 311). Although *kīlāla-* is found only here in the RV, it is common in AV (both Ś and P) +. As its phonology also suggests, this drink seems to belong to a lower-register domestic sphere and is sometimes associated with farm animals. See, e.g., AVŚ VII.60.5 (≅ AVP III.26.5) *úpahūtā ihá gāva úpahūtā ajāváyah | átho ánnasya kīlāla úpahūto grhēsu naḥ* "Called on here are the cows, called on the goats and sheep; then called on is the *kīlāla* of food in our houses." In Ś IV.11.10 (/P III.25.12) the draft-ox (*anadvāh-*) and plowmen "go to" *kīlāla-*, while in P VIII.11.3 two draught-oxen are involved. Although I can't (yet) construct a scenario that provides a function for the list of animals in ab, I now think this unusual ritual assemblage must be connected to the unusual *kīlāla*-drink – though I don't know why this association is found in the penultimate vs. of an otherwise traditional Agni hymn.

X.91.15: *āsyè* returns from 5d.

X.92 All Gods

On the (lack of) organization of this hymn, see publ. intro. Ge suggests that it is not correctly transmitted.

X.92.1: With Ge and Re, I supply a 1st ps. verb of speech to govern the acc. phrase of ab. This phrase has a stately traditional feel. Though Agni is not named, the descriptors unambiguously identify him: *yajñāsya* .. *rathyām* closely resembles *rathîr adhvarāṇām* “charioteer of the ceremonies” used of Agni in I.44.2=VIII.11.2 and VI.7.2; *viśpāti- viśām* is a standard epithet of Agni (e.g., III.2.10, V.4.3). Hotar is of course his regular role (and is heavily present in the preceding hymn; see comm. ad X.91.10); *âtithi-* ‘guest’ is also standard for Agni and appears in the preceding hymn (X.91.2). *vibhā-vasu-* is only used of Agni, and cf. *vibhāvā* in X.91.1.

The description of Agni switches to the nom. in the 2nd hemistich, capped by the finite injunc. *asāyata* of which Agni is the subj. On this stem see comm. ad VI.33.2. IH suggests that this injunc. should have presential value, and an alt. “reaches heaven” is certainly possible; so KH (Injunk. 119).

The two word pairs in c, *śocañ chūṣkāsu* and *hāriṇīṣu jārbbhurad*, are syntactically parallel though chiasitic: nom. sg. m. pres. part. / loc. pl. f. // loc. pl. f. / nom. sg. m. pres. part. They also have a pseudo-etymological feel enabled by phonology: *śoc* and *sūṣk* / *hār* and *jārbbhur*.

X.92.2: Both Ge and Re construe *akṛṇvata* with two acc.: “make Agni (into) X.” Although this is certainly possible, I prefer to take this mid. verb in the meaning ‘make (their) own’, a meaning found elsewhere, with the other acc.s further descriptors.

The 2nd member of the rt noun cmpd. *añjas-pā-* is variously interpr. Old and Re take it to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘protect’, Scar (317) to a third (and in my opinion unnec.) root $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘gehen, sich bewegen’. With Gr and Ge, I assign it to $\sqrt{pā}$ ‘drink’. The point, as Ge notes (n. 2a), is that Agni consumes the oblation without intermediary, unlike the (other) gods, who have Agni as their mediating mouth. In its other occurrence, in nearby X.94.13, the cmpd modifies the pressing stones, who get the (literally) first crack at the soma.

Agni’s role as supporter (*dharmān-*) reminds us of nearby X.88.1, where, at least in my interpr., Agni is charged to “support the world” (*bhūvanāya ... dhārmane*). In the publ. tr. I implicitly construe *dharmāṇam* with *vidāthasya* (also dependent on *sādhana*), but in light of X.89.1 an alt. might be “supporter (of the world), furtherer of the rite.” This alternative might be favored by the appearance of the parallel phrase *vidāthasya prasādhana* in the preceding hymn (X.91.8), suggesting that it is a (semi-)fixed phrase with the gen. locked in. And indeed most occurrences of *sādhana-* have a gen. sg. of the sacrifice / rite, etc.

For my defiant maintaining of the sense ‘kiss’ for \sqrt{nims} , see comm. ad VIII.43.10. What does it mean for the dawns to “kiss” Agni like night? The simile is easier to decode: as dawn breaks at the horizon, it is in intimate physical/visual contact with the dark sky, contact that could be likened to kissing. Dawn’s kissing of the ritual fire is more conceptual and temporal: the moment of dawn’s appearance is when the fire is roused: this can count as contact. It is also possible, if the fire in question is the offering fire (as *puróhitam* implies), that the light of dawn spreading from the east first encounters and, as it were, touches that fire, which is of course stationed at the east end of the ritual ground.

The phrase *tánūnápātam aruśāsya* is, in my interpr., a piece of tricky syntax. The stem *tánū-nápāt-* is otherwise used as an epithet for Agni, almost always in the 2nd vs. of Āprī hymns, where the figure has taken on a (quasi-)independent existence. Here I think we should read it literally, with the sense ‘descendant of (him)self / his own body’. In conjunction with immediately preceding *puróhitam* ‘set in front / to the east’, this is a designation of the offering fire, which has been *taken out* of the household fire to the west and carried eastward to be established there – it is a descendant of itself. I take gen. *aruśāsya* as doubling the cmpd’s 1st

member, *tánū-*: *aruṣá-* ‘ruddy’ frequently modifies Agni. Here it is an independent case form that has the same referent as the cmpd member *tánū-*.

X.92.3: The first two vss. having been conceptually consistent and well-crafted, we now encounter the non sequitur quality that will characterize much of the rest of the hymn. The exclamation *bád* that opens the vs. may signal this change of direction.

I am utterly baffled by the first pāda: I don’t understand what the Paṇi / niggard is doing here. Who would ever think that we would confuse the *nīthā* of wise Agni with those of a Paṇi, and what is the point of contact between Agni and this figure, who belongs to a different mythic complex? The Paṇi finds a phonological near-match in *pānīyasī* ‘more/very admirable’ in the next vs. (4b), but this gets us nowhere.

Never mind – this theme disappears; the rest of the vs., incl. the next pāda, is unrelated. Pāda b concerns the pouring (of ghee) onto the wood for kindling. The pāda is notable for a periphrasis with an overt copula, *práhutā āsuḥ*, which is quite unusual esp. in a main clause (see my Predicated Past Participle); we would expect the bare ppl. What the ppl. + perfect is meant to express is unclear to me; one could speculate that it aims at a plupf. “had been bepourd,” but there’s no contextual support for this. Perhaps the publ. tr. (“have been bepourd”) is correct, and the *āsuḥ* is meant to guard against both “are” and “were” and enforce an immediate past reading (with a perfect because *√as* lacks an aor.).

There is some uncertainty about *vayā(h)*, my “twigs.” Gr splits the stem into two (unnecessarily), with our form belonging to his “Opferspeise”; Ge (n. 3b) asserts that *vayā-* are otherwise not used as Brennholz, and we should perhaps read *avayāh* “Sühnopfer.” Since *vayā-* is not particularly frequent, I do not see the lack of other attestations in the sense of Brennholz as an impediment. Moreover, anyone who’s ever tried to build a fire knows that twigs are far more useful in the early stages than logs. Perhaps Ge is reluctant to accept that *práhuta-* can modify the goal or target upon which something is poured rather than the substance poured, but Agni himself is often so designated (though usually with *āhuta-*); see disc. above ad X.91.14.

But never mind again – the second hemistich appears to be entirely unrelated to either a or b; instead we have unnamed fearsome ones (*ghorāsaḥ*) reaching immortality and praising the gods. Old (fld. by Ge n. 3c and Re) identifies the subj. as the Aṅgirasas, with good parallels, but the connection of cd with pādas a and b escapes me. On the A’s reaching immortality see also X.62.1. As I comment there, the Aṅgirasas “seem to be acting as if in the role of mortal sacrificers vis-à-vis Indra,” and a similar situation may be depicted here, which would at least connect pāda c with the ritual fire kindling in b. For possible connections to 4a see comm. immed. below. I would make a small change in the tr. of c, to “they attained immortality,” to better match 7a below.

X.92.4–5: Several phrasal (near-)repetitions knit these two vss. together, without giving significant help in the unraveling of the puzzles: *urú vyācaḥ* (4a) is a near-equivalent to *urú jráyaḥ* (5c), both pāda-final, and *mahy ārámatih* (4b) appears as *mahīm arāmatīm* in 5b.

X.92.4: Ge and Re both take the whole vs. as a single sentence with *sām cikitrire* (c) as the main verb and a miscellaneous list of subjects. This is syntactically impossible for the transmitted text, since *cikitrire* is unaccented and pāda a contains *hí*, which conditions verbal accent. Since 10d also contains *sām cikitrire*, it could be argued that the verb here has lost its accent redactionally,

to match 10d. But there is little to be gained by taking all of vs. 4 as a unit and perhaps a bit to be gained by imposing some internal structure.

The *hí* in pāda a could look either back (to the preceding vs.) or forward (to the rest of 4). I will tentatively and speculatively try the former. Since in 3cd the Āṅgirasas attained immortality, which may have involved their moving to heaven, and they praised the divine race (*jānasya daívyasya*), I suggest that heaven in 4a picks up this theme, and I take pāda as an equational nominal sentence: Heaven (is) the *ṛtasya prāsitiḥ*.

And what is this? Ge (n. 4a) claims that it is only a poetic paraphrase for *ṛtām*, but it seems unlikely that the poet would use a highly specific and fairly uncommon word like *prāsiti-* in an essentially empty locution. On *prāsiti-* and the two separate words it may represent, see comm. ad IV.4.1. As I say there, the dominant meaning is ‘onslaught’ derived from PIE **seh₁(i)* ‘loslassen’, but it seems in some contexts to mean ‘(hunting) net’ (< *√sā*, *sí* ‘bind’). IV.4.1 contains two occurrences of *prāsiti-*; the first is qualified as ‘broad’ (*prthvīm*) and is the comparandum to *pājah* ‘leading edge’, and I take it in the “net” meaning, with the net spread as wide as possible to catch as much as possible. Here too broadness is at issue: the *prāsiti-* is equated with heaven “the broad expanse” (*urú vyācaḥ* [pace Re, I don’t think the latter phrase evokes the earth]). I therefore suggest that Heaven is “the (hunting) net of truth” (Ge also “das Netz des Gesetzes”) – what this means (in my view) is that Heaven captures and keeps the “truths,” the true formulations and praise hymns directed its way. I would now therefore change the tr. to “For Heaven, the broad expanse, is the (hunting) net (/snare) of truth.”

This interpr. leaves pāda b at loose ends. The two entities in it, Reverence and Devotion, could be lumped in with the gods listed in c and d, but these pious abstractions are of a different type from the well-known gods in cd. In the publ. tr. I take the pāda as locating the two in heaven, and I have nothing better to offer here. Reverence and Devotion certainly have more in common with truth than with the embodied gods of cd, and the location of Devotion in heaven may be at issue in 5b (q.v.).

The comparative *pānīyasī* echoes the mysterious *pañés* in 3a, but I can’t do anything with this fact.

The verb *sām cikitrīre* could be interpr. either as passive/intransitive “they are jointly perceived” or transitive in absolute usage “they jointly perceive.” The former is adopted by Re (“... se sont signalés de concert”) and JSK (DGRV II.86: “have shown themselves (to be) together”), against the publ. tr. and, probably, Ge (“sind eines Sinnes”). The latter sense is favored also by X.30.6 *sām jānate mānasā sām cikitre* “They are agreed in mind and they perceive alike.” Although the middle pf. of *√cit* often has pass./intrans. sense, the preverb *sām* probably conditioned the middle voice of *cikitrīre* despite its “active” semantics.

X.92.5: Although I usually disdain Lü’s celestial rivers, in this case the *sīndhavaḥ* seem to be located in heaven / the midspace. If (as I suggest) Aramati in 4b is located in heaven, that’s where the rivers need to be to run over her in 5b. And in cd they seem to be the source of the water with which the Earth-circling one besprinkles everything.

In pāda a the appearance of “journeying Rudra” (*rudréṇa yayínā*) associated with the rivers is a bit unexpected, but if it is (as I think) a reference to the Maruts, it fits the general sense of the verse better. Note first that “the Rudras, the Maruts” (*rudrā marútaḥ*) appear in the next vs. (6a). Note also a phrase in X.78.7 with rivers and an adj. ‘coursing’ (*yayī-*) formed very like *yayín-*, but with the Maruts as referents, *sīndhavo ná yayyàḥ* “(the Maruts) coursing like rivers.” Although a grammatically singular *rudrá-* standing for the Maruts would be unusual, it would, I

think, be interpretable (esp. since the Maruts are often referred to in the sg., as a *gaṇá-* ‘flock, throng’ or *śardha(s)-* ‘troop’) – and in the rainstorm context of the 2nd hemistich the Maruts make sense.

I don’t know why the rivers “run across” (*tiráḥ ... dadhanvire*) Aramati; it sounds disturbingly as if they run her over. But perhaps the idea is that they go beyond the boundaries of heaven (where I’ve located Aramati in vs. 5) and into the midspace to become rain.

The choice of possible referents for *párijman-* is fairly wide: Ge favors Vāta (on the basis of VII.40.6), Sāy. Indra, but Ge (n. 5c) also suggest Parjanya, which I prefer. The phrase *párijmā pariyān* is almost an anagram of his name, and the description *róruvaj jātharé* “constantly rumbling in his belly” is more characteristic of a thunder god than a wind god.

X.92.6: Pace Old and Ge (n. 6a), I separate *krāṇā* here from the adv. (old instr.) *krāṇā* ‘successfully’ (see comm. ad I.58.3) and follow the Pp. reading *krāṇāḥ* as a nom. pl. m. root aor. middle part.

With Gr (apparently) and Ge, I take the referent of *ásurasya* to be Heaven, contra W.E. Hale (78), who suggests Rudra.

Most take *caṣṭe* as pass./intrans. ‘is seen, appears’ (Gr, Ge, Re, Hale), but as argued in comm. ad X.74.2 (see also VIII.19.16), med. forms of *√cakṣ* are overwhelmingly transitive ‘see’, even when used without expressed obj. Forms of this root without preverb (as here) are quite rare, but are standardly transitive. Taking *caṣṭe* as ‘sees’ harmonizes it with (my interpr. of) med. *sām cikitrīre* (4c, 10d), to a different root but having the same general semantics. As for the sense here, I interpr. it as an interesting variant of the common trope that Varuṇa + Mitra (etc.) see the activities of men through the eye of the sun, who travels the sky as their spy looking down. Here the Maruts, who journey through the midspace, serve as alternative eyes of the Ādityan trio. As for the singular number of the verb, the RV allows either a plural or a singular verb for multiple singular subjects.

The stem(s) *árvaśa-* / *arvaśá-* is found only here. It is ordinarily taken as a deriv. of *árvan(t)-* ‘steed’ (see, e.g., AiG II.2.919–20, EWA s.v. *árvan-*). I don’t understand the reason for the accent difference, and the sec. lit. (incl. AiG) offers no explanations.

X.92.7: The publ. tr. interpr. the loc. phrases in a and b as parallel, contra Ge and Re. I now think they are correct to separate them. Pāda b is identical to IV.41.6b, where it forms part of a series listing the elements at stake in a battle. I would now substitute “... they obtained their benefit in Indra, when the sight of the sun and the masculine nature of the bull (were at stake).”

The larger question is – who are the subjects of this vs.? There is a curious silence on this in all the sec. sources, save for Sāy., who identifies them as *stotārah*. I suggest rather the Aṅgirasas for several reasons. First, in 3c they obtained immortality (*amṛtatvām āśata*), with the same verb as here. Although “benefit” and “immortality” are obviously different, the phraseology is structurally the same. Furthermore, assuming that *nṛśádana-* refers to the multiday ritual type known later as *sattra* (‘sitting’), in the Vala myth the Aṅgirasas participate in *sattras* that lead to the opening of the Vala cave. Against this identification is the fact that they are credited here with fashioning Indra’s vajra; this is not otherwise a deed of the Aṅgirasas, as far as I know – and in fact no other pl. entities perform this action that I know of.

X.92.8: Ge and Re interpr. *sūrah* as nom. sg. to *sūra-* and subj. of *rīramat*, Old (also Lub) instead as gen. or abl. to *svār-*. Ge allows possibility of gen. in n. 8a; Gr seems not to register the form at

all. Scar (559) allows both interpr. I take it as gen. to *svâr-*, with Indra the unnamed subj. Not only does it immediately follow a vs. with that same form (*sūrah* 7b), but the 2nd sg. subj. in the parallel I.121.13 *tvām sūro harīto rāmayah* ... “you brought to a halt the tawny mares of the Sun” clearly slots *sūrah* into the gen. Cf. also *sūryasya harītaḥ* (V.29.5, etc.) with unambig. gen. In our passage gen. *sūrah* is somewhat inelegantly picked up by coreferential *asya*, but this can’t be helped.

In c my distribution of the ablatives and genitives in a chain of dependencies follows Scar (559).

In d *stan* is good candidate for a general pres. reading of the injunc. (see KH 137).

X.92.9: For “show forth (praise)” for \sqrt{dis} see A. Nikolaev, “Showing Praise in Greek Choral Lyric and Beyond” (AJP 133 [2012]: 543–72), where he argues persuasively that this is an IE poetic idiom, found also in Greek, Latin, and possibly Hittite.

In the main clause in ab a dat. *tébhyaḥ* needs to be supplied, parallel to *rudrāya*, as antecedent to *yébhiḥ* in c. The referents are of course the Maruts, the sons/associates of Rudra. The adj. *evayāvabhiḥ* also picks them out exclusively: the pl. forms of the rare stem(s) *evayā(van)-* only characterize the Maruts, and see also the curiously formed *evayā-marut-* in the refrain of V.87 (1–9); see also V.41.16.

The adj. *śívāḥ* here implicitly modifies Rudra – the only such occurrence in the RV, though it is used of other gods. The exclusive application of this adj. to Rudra and its transfer from epithet to god’s name are post-RVic developments.

With Old I take *divāḥ* as a gen. characterizing the Maruts (see his parallels), rather than as an abl. specifying where Rudra is coming from (Ge, Re).

X.92.10: I take the point of this opaque vs. to be that because Bṛhaspati and his associates pass their fame on to their progeny (ab), the primal priest can perform the next step (c) – leading to the situation in d, where the gods and the Bṛḡus, legendary fire-priests, think and perceive alike. They are, as it were, on the same page because of the transfer of sacrificial know-how from the gods to mortals (or semi-mortals). But I am by no means certain of this interpr. In any case note the parallel verb forms in a *ābharanta ví* and c *ví dhārayat*, which suggest similar sequential actions. HPS (B+I 55–57) has a rather different interpr., though also generally centered on the primal priesthood.

With Old (and apparently HPS 55], in pāda a I read dat. *prajāyāi* against Pp. gen. *prajāyāḥ*.

‘Fame’ (*śrávas-*) seems to have an extended meaning here – perhaps the knowledge/actions they are famous for.

‘Those akin to soma / having soma as their relative’ (*sómajāmayah*, a hapax) are universally (Ge, Re, HPS) identified as the Āṅgirasas (Sāy. as the All Gods); I have nothing better to offer, though the link between soma and the Āṅgirasas does not seem to me to be strong. It is clearly the presence of Bṛhaspati that undergirds the identification.

The verb *ví dhārayat* in c lacks an overt object. I supply *śrávaḥ* from pāda a; as just indicated, I think the verbs signal sequential actions of the same type. Ge supplies “die Ordnung” (presumably an underlying cognate acc. **dhārmā(ni)*), though the passages he cites (n. 10c) provide no support (and do not contain *dhārman-*); Re “les arrangements diverses (du monde),” without argument; HPS (55) “(die Welthälften).” All of these possibilities seem to me plucked from thin air, and I prefer to stick with an object that can be supplied from context.

As indicated above, I think that *d* expresses the harmony of mind and perception between gods and the mortal or semi-mortal Bhṛguṣ, but it would help if I were surer what exactly the Bhṛguṣ are doing here. Their standard role is as primal installers of the ritual fire (e.g., I.58.3, II.4.2, VI.15.2), but this signature action is not in evidence here. However, they do seem to be associated with the Atharvan and the first institution of the sacrifice in *c* and to share their sacrificial skill with the gods.

On *sám cikitrīre* see comm. ad vs. 4.

X.92.11: This vs. presents us with the same syntactic problem as vs. 4: a first pāda containing *hí*, a long list of ill-assorted divinities in the nominative, and a single finite verb (*arhire* in *d*) that lacks an accent. Once again most tr. take the vs. as a single sentence, despite the disharmony between the particle *hí* and the unaccented verb, and in this case the publ. tr. succumbed to the same temptation. Unfortunately it is more difficult to impose internal structure than it was in vs. 4 (see comm. there). The vs. also seems an intrusion between 10 and 12, which both, however obscurely, seem to concern priests and sacrifice. Because of the jumble of divine names and the lack of any connection to the surrounding context, I am therefore more willing to assume that the vs. is a haphazard assemblage of gods inserted into an All God hymn, where it would find a natural home, and that syntactic niceties were not honored. The fact that the verb *arhire* is morphologically anomalous – a perfect apparently without redupl. and medial to a root otherwise active – contributes to the sense that the vs. was carelessly produced. On this verb form see Kü (108); though he entertains the possibility that it might exhibit archaic reduplication, in the end he favors an analysis as an ad hoc formation, possibly influenced by neighboring forms in *-ire* (by which he presumably means *cikitrīre* in 10d [/ 4c]). The presence of *hí* in pāda a may result from simple repetition of the opening of vs. 10 (*té hí*), which is reproduced at the beginning of 11. There is also a little formula *#té hí dyāvāprthivī* ... (I.160.1, X.64.14), which may have contributed.

The b.v. *bhūri-retas-* ‘having abundant semen’ occurs 3x in the RV, always modifying *dyāvāprthivī*. As Re implies by his parenthetical tr. “(divinités féminines),” the application of this epithet to a grammatical feminine is a nice paradox.

The identity / application of *cāturaṅgaḥ* ‘four-square’ is unclear: Gr implies that it modifies *nārāśaṃsaḥ*; Sāy and Bergaigne in different ways apply it to fire (see Ge n. 11b), while Ge himself expresses no opinion. Re claims that it’s Varuṇa, because he has the epithet *cāturanīka-* ‘four-faced’. However, this word occurs only once, in V.48.5, where it in fact characterizes Agni (Varuṇa appears in a different pāda), so that the Sāy. / Bergaigne intuition seems closer to the mark. But in a list like this, the referent scarcely matters.

I tr. Rodasī (contra Ge and Re: Heaven and Earth / the two Worlds) because of the accent (*rodasī*, not *rōdasī*) and because Heaven and Earth are already represented in this list. Rodasī is also the consort of the Maruts, who are adjacent to her here – but in a list of such chaos their adjacency is almost an argument against!

X.92.12: A different priestly title, Uśij, appears here, identified with “us.” If, as I suggest ad vs. 11, this vs. should follow directly on 10, the transfer of priestly skill and knowledge has passed from gods to legendary priestly figures (in vs. 10) to us of the present day. The *utā* opening this vs. would signal this chaining with vs. 10, and the *syá* may suggest that the referent is current.

All the standard renderings take pāda a with b and c, all loosely construed with the sg. verb *śṛṇotu*. By contrast I separate pāda a as a nominal clause – for several reasons. For one

thing, b is identical to X.64.4d, which speaks against integrating our pāda a into it, with Ahi Budhnya identified as the *kavī*. Moreover the adv. *urviyā* in pāda a hints at internal structure. I take the *kavīh* to be Agni (as so often) and *urviyā* as signaling an unexpressed verb. Cf. *urviyā vy ādyaut* of Agni in III.1.18, X.45.8; *urviyā ví paprathe* of him in X.69.2. In the publ. tr. I supply “is widely perceptible,” but, on the basis of those passages, “has shown widely” or “has spread widely” is also possible. The gen. *nah usījām* marks Agni as our own sacrificial fire.

In the publ. tr. I take the call (*hāvīman-*) in b to be Agni’s; I now think it’s quite possibly that of us, the Uśij priests (so explicitly Re), since the Uśij priests are elsewhere associated with the production of a *śāmsa-* ‘laud’, incl. in the related vs. II.31.6 (see below); see comm. ad II.31.6. I suggest a marginally altered alternative “listen to (our) call.”

With most tr., I take the dual phrase in c as an expansion of b, with Sun and Moon the afterthought subjects of the 3rd ps. impv. *śṛnotu* in b, with number mismatch. Alternatively the pāda could connect with d, which has a dual verb that fits the number of *sūryāmāsā* better, but in that case we would prefer a voc. Sun and Moon. (Of course, a simple erasure of the accent on -*māsā* would produce a voc.)

In d *śamīnahusī* is a problem. At least since Roth, the verse has been compared with II.31.6 and the opening of this pāda compared with the phrase in II.31.6d *dhīyā śāmī*#, a phrase that also occurs in X.40.1 (also pāda-final) and pāda-initial with non-shortened final vowel in IX.74.7 #*dhīyā śāmī*. Roth’s invocation of II.31.6 is esp. apposite because the vs. contains other elements found in our vs. (as he notes) – particularly the Uśij priests (a) and Ahi Budhnya (b). It is therefore tempting (and, I think, correct) to read *dhīyā *śāmī nahusī* ..., with word boundary and accentuation of *śāmī*, tr. the first two words as “with visionary thought and ritual labor.” (In the publ. tr. an asterisk should be inserted before “ritual labor.”) The alternative is to take *śamī-nahusī* as a voc. dvandva “o Śamī (and) Nahusī” (so Ge and Re) – but though Nahus at least is a PN elsewhere (though not Nahusī), Śamī is not. Ge (n. 12d) suggests that it’s personified Ritual Labor, but given the existence of the bipartite instr. formulaic phrase *dhīyā śāmī*, this seems unnec. and farfetched. What then to do with *nahusī* – if that’s the correct form (Roth emends to *nāhuṣo*)? I would like to (and in fact do in the publ. tr.) interpret it as an elliptical dual dvandva in the voc. to the stem *nāhus-*. The problem is the gender: we should expect masc. du. voc. **nahuṣā*. The only explanation I can offer for the -ī is perseveration from *śamī* in an unclear context, which I realize is weak. (Ge and Re simply assume a name Nahusī; I suppose this is possible, but it simply multiplies elements and also assumes a feminine addressee, which is unlikely if not impossible.) If, as I think, *nahusī* is an elliptical dual, what is the other member? In the publ. tr. I suggest Manu, on the basis of X.80.6, where people born from Manu and Nahus (*mānuṣo nāhuṣo ví jātāh*) invoke Agni (cf. also X.99.7). Here they would be legendary performers, who both engage in ritual activity (through their *dhī-* and *śāmī-*) and take cognizance of the ritual of today.

The referent of accented *asyā* is not clear. I’m now somewhat inclined to accept Ge’s suggestion (Nachtr.. ad loc.) that it is the singer (sim. Re), who has not yet been mentioned in the discourse. However, given the relatively frequency of expressions like I.147.2 *bódhā me asyā vācasah* “take heed of this speech of mine,” with gapping of the noun in, e.g., the refrain of I.105 *vittām me asyā* “take heed of this (speech) of mine,” it may instead be a reference to the speech/poem itself.

X.92.13: In the first hemistich I take *carātham* (a) as obj. of the inf. *iṣṭāye* (b) (“to seek our movable goods”), despite their distance, because *carātha-* in the acc. is generally used of

“moveable (goods)” → “livestock.” This is contrary to the Ge/Re interpr., both of whom take *carátham* and *iṣṭáye* as separate complements of *prá ... avatu*, with *carátha-* an abstract meaning something like “movement.” Although I recognize that the two words I construe together are far apart, my interpr. avoids the problem that Ge/Re face: to supply something else as complement of the inf. *iṣṭáye* (“dass wir rasch (zum Ziele) kommen”; “pour (faire réussir notre) quête (de biens)”).

The stem *ātmán-* here has its original (?) meaning ‘breath’ (see EWA s.v.), appropriate to its identification with Vāta ‘Wind’, as is agreed by all standard tr.

Although the neut. of the comparative *váśyaḥ* ordinarily means ‘better state’, the machinery that Ge and (esp.) Re (“pour (qu’il nous obtienne) un (sort) meilleur” – a lot of words to tr. one) require to employ that sense here makes me prefer my economical adverbial interpr. “all the more.”

X.92.14: As is generally agreed, the main object of praise in this vs. is Agni, save for pāda c, where we find Aditi and the Wives (of the gods).

On *adhikṣīt-* see esp. Ge (n. 14) and Scar (94). Although I agree that this rt noun cmpd belongs primarily to *√kṣi* ‘dwell’, I think there is some crossover with *√kṣā* ‘rule’ – hence my tr. ‘preside over’ (borrowed from Re), which splits the semantic difference. Although verb forms of this lexeme sometimes just mean ‘dwell’ (I.126.1, 154.2), ‘preside over’ works better for VII.96.2 and VIII.40.2, 41.9.

On *anarváṇam*, see esp. comm. ad VIII.31.12 as well as other loci noted in the lexical commentary. The problem is that this adj. several times modifies, or seems to modify, feminines despite its masc. appearance. Although in these cases ad hoc fixes can be contrived by finding (or inventing) a masc. for it to modify, the fact that there is a group of such passages strongly suggests that the adjectives in each case are actually fem. On this passage esp., see JPB (Ādityas 218–19), where he convincingly argues that acc. *anarváṇam* is built to a fem. **e*-grade *n*-stem like *yósan-* ‘young woman’, whose nom. pl. is *yóṣaṇaḥ*. Our *anarváṇam* would be the correct acc. sg. to such a stem, next to nom. sg. fem. *anarvā* (II.40.6, VII.40.4).

áktoḥ is formally a genitive, and it is universally (incl. in the publ. tr.) taken as dependent on *yúvānam ... pátim* here. However, the form is often used adverbially (“by night”), as in our own 1b, and I think that usage is possible here.

nṛmánā(h) is most likely a nom. sg. (but see Old for other poss.) and is taken by most as the name of the poet, while I (and Scar [94]) prefer to take it in its usual adjectival sense (‘of manly mind’). By either interpr. we must reckon with an unsignaled change in number from 1st pl. *gṛṇīmasi* in b, either to 1st sg. or 3rd sg., and must supply the appropriate verb (“I/he hymn(s)”). With Scar, I prefer the first alt., because it involves changing only one grammatical category (number), not two (number + person), but Ge and Re opt for 3rd sg.

On *ádha* conjoining two nominals (here *áditim* and *yúvānam ... pátim*), see JSK (DGRV II.128–29).

X.92.15: On my interpr. of the meaning of *√ribh*, see the various reff. listed in the lexical comm.

Both Ge and Re consider the *pūrvō āṅgirā(h)* to be Bṛhaspati, but in the sg. *āṅgiras-* is almost always Agni, who is also the subject of the previous vs. (14) and so the default referent in context. The identification with Bṛhaspati is vigorously disputed by HPS (B+I 38, 56), who favors Agni or possibly Soma.

In c, because of the agency of the stones and because of the insistence on *vī* (*vīhāyā(h)* ... *vicakṣaṇāḥ*), I render *vīhāyā ābhavat* as “became widely extended,” flg. Re’s “à pris toute son extension” rather than my usual tr. of *vīhāyas-* as ‘of extensive power’. The point is surely that when pounded by the stones, the soma plant and its juices spread out physically, just as its power more extensive because it has been transformed into the deified ritual drink.

The final pāda of this hymn is, as Re says, “finale mystérieuse.” Syntactically it must consist of two nominal sentences of two words each. Ge (n. 15d) plausibly suggests that it has to do with an animal sacrifice. As he points out, *pāthaḥ* ‘fold’ (as in ‘sheepfold’), ‘pen’ is associated with the animal sacrifice in the horse sacrifice hymn (I.162.2) and in the Āprī hymns, where after being sacrificed the animal victim “goes to the pen of the gods” (*āthā devānām āpy etu pāthaḥ* II.3.9, et sim.) The second clause, *svādhitir vānanvati*, is the positive equivalent of the negative *nā svādhitir vānanvati* in VIII.102.19 (as is generally remarked). In that context it seemed simply to indicate that the speaker did not have firewood for kindling the ritual fire; whether the axe here has more sinister associations (with the killing of the animal) isn’t clear.

X.93 All Gods

On the manifold difficulties in this hymn and the universal near-contempt for it (which I’m afraid I share), see publ. intro. I will not engage with the numerous metrical problems, and will scant many of the morphological and syntactic issues.

X.93.1: On the problematic *māhi*, see esp. Old, Ge (n. 1a).

The instr. pls. *tébhiḥ* ... *ebhiḥ* most likely refer to the gods; see Ge (n. 1c).

The hapax *sūśāni* is unclear. Ge takes it as a loc. inf. to $\sqrt{sū}$ (flg. Gr), tr. “... schützt uns, um überlegen zu sein” (cf. Keydana, *Inf* 111: “damit wir gedeihen”). But can loc. infinitives express purpose, and, if we are its subj. (most clearly in Keydana’s tr.), why do we need protection? Re’s interpr. is quite similar (“pour que (nous soyons) gonflés (de biens)”), though he analyses it as “une variante inorganique de *sūśa*” (whatever that means) rather than an inf. By contrast, Th (see EWA s.v. *sūśā-*) derives it from $<*(p)sū-śa = \text{YAvs. } fšū-śa-$ ‘winning cattle’. Clever – but again, why would we need protection in those circumstances. I (tentatively) suggest that the referent is the same as that of *sāhyas-* ‘one more powerful’, the person from whom we needed protection in the preceding pāda, and it’s a loc. absol. referring to circumstances (“when he [=the more powerful one] is swollen with strength”). Ge suggests a similar alt. in his n. 1d.

X.93.2: This vs. is syntactically and morphologically well-behaved; not so its meter.

X.93.3: Although the default assumption would be that the two pāda-initial gen. pl. #*viśveṣām* ... #*devānām* should be construed together, esp. in an All God hymn, the parallel in VIII.46.16 *viśveṣām irajyāntam vāsūnām* (pace Ge’s “nur zufällig”) suggests a different configuration, with *viśveṣām* dependent on the voc. *irajyavaḥ* and *devānām* on *vār* (as in the publ. tr). Very little is at issue, however, if the two are taken together and construed with *vār* as in Ge’s “Aller Götter Schutz is grossartig, ihr Gebieter.” I do not see how Re gets a voc. “o tous dieux” out of this gen. phrase; he clearly thinks it’s coreferential with *irajyavaḥ*, which he tr. “O vous qui commandez,” but how?

Note the four occurrences of *viśva-* (*/viśvá-X*) in the vs.

X.93.4: Pāda b is identical with I.79.3c. The referent of *párijmā* is unclear. It could be an epithet of Varuṇa, but in I.79.3 I take it as Wind on the basis of VII.40.6 (see comm. ad loc.). But here the word needs to be evaluated in the context of the preceding hymn (X.92.5), which contains an occurrence of *párijmā*. As disc. in the comm. on that vs. above, I identify that occurrence with Parjanya, but other referents have been suggested. Since it is found in a god list here, there's nothing that depends on a precise identification.

It is not clear whether the scope of the question particle *kád* extends over all the gods listed in the 2nd hemistich (Ge, Re) or only Rudra (publ. tr.) – nor is it clear why there is any question about him/them. Perhaps Rudra is singled out because his nature is not completely benevolent, as opposed to the others on the list; c could be a parenthetical “Is Rudra praised of men?” Such special treatment of Rudra may be supported by 7a below.

The form *pūśanaḥ* is of course surprising: formally it could be nom. pl. (so Re: “Pūśan-et-autres”), but is far more likely (so Old, citing Lanman; see Ge n. 4d) to be a nom. sg., backformed from the acc. *pūśanam*; see esp. the matching expression *pūśanam bhágam* in X.125.2 cited by Old.

X.93.5–7: These three vss. begin *utá no* and appear to form a tṛca. All three also concern the Aśvins (at least by my interpr.).

X.93.5: Ge calls this a “fast unverstandlichen Str.,” and it has received a wide variety of interpr. (see esp. Old's multiple alternatives). I will primarily deal with my own, by no means certain, account.

Let us begin with the voc. *vṛṣaṇvasū*. This fairly common form, always in the dual, is overwhelmingly used of the Aśvins. Given the Aśvin theme of the following two vss, which are linked to this one by their opening (see immed. above), that is surely the referent here, despite the dual dvandva *sūryāmāsā* that opens the next pāda.

The two words in the middle of this 1st pāda, *náktam apām*, give trouble. Ge's interpr. (n. 5) is the most radical: noting that Apām Napāt is found often (his term; the occurrences don't seem that numerous to me) in conjunction with Ahi Budhnya, he suggests emending *náktam* to **náptam*, yielding the acc. phrase **náptam apām*. The problem (or one of them) is that **náptam* is not the acc. to *nápāt-*, which is always (20x) *nápātam*. Although it is true that nom. *apām nápāt* is found in the preceding hymn (X.92.13), directly after a vs. containing Ahi Budhnya (X.92.12), this does not seem sufficient reason to make a radical emendation yielding a non-existent form. I take *náktam* as an adverbial acc. ‘by night’, as so often, and supply its formulaic partner ‘by day’, to match up with the Sun-and-Moon dvandva in b.

As for *apām* Old construes it with the voc. *vṛṣaṇvasū*, on what seem to me weak grounds. Re, while not accepting Ge's emendation, nonetheless sneaks in *nápāt-* in parentheses: “... la Nuit, (le Fils) des eaux ...” Flg. Gr's laconic indication, I take this gen. instead with *sádanāya* in the next pāda (so also Scar 29), though this connection is explicitly rejected by Old). For a similar phrase, see *apām sadhásthe* (I.149.4, II.4.2 = X.46.2, VI.52.15). The gen. *apām* may have been moved from the immed. vicinity of its head noun to enable the phonetic figure *sádanāya sadhanyā* (/ ... *sádi*) in b (/c).

Now, what is the overall structure of the hemistich? Most interpr. supply a verb: “bring” (Ge, JSK [DGRV I.426]) or “protect” (Old tentatively, Re), with Sun and Moon (+/- other acc.s) as acc. obj. By contrast but with Scar (291), I take the hemistich as a nominal clause, with *sūryāmāsā* as subj. and *sadhanyā* ‘joint guides’ predicated of them. There are problems with this:

first, it requires separating *sadhanyā* here from forms like *sadhanitvá-* (see comm. ad IV.1.9, VI.51.3, also X.50.3), which I now take as deriv. from *sa-dhána-* (flg. Scar), and maintaining the root noun cmpd analysis *sadha-nī-* ‘leading jointly’; it also assumes a dat. (*sádanāya*) goal with this cmpd, which is syntactically shaky; and it posits an unusual configuration: Sun and Moon leading us to the seat of the waters. I am not certain what this refers to – but Agni is elsewhere associated with the seat of the waters, and so perhaps this describes the daily ritual round as defined by the alternation of Sun (day) and Moon (night).

The referent of *eṣām* is undetermined; it cannot be the waters, the only plural entity in the 1st hemistich, because of gender mismatch. Old and Ge suggest the gods, which is a reasonable default.

X.93.6: A relaxingly straightforward vs. The only real question is what is the referent of *sá* in c. The pāda is identical to I.149.1 (or, rather, is the dimeter version of a Virāj pāda there). The standard, and most likely, view of our pāda is that the (or a) (mortal) whom the gods protect in ab is the referent of *sá* (Ge, Re, Bl [ad I.149.1]), but in I.149.1 the referent is most likely Agni, who is not excluded here.

X.93.7: The agglomeration of gods in this vs. becomes more random. The first puzzle is found in pāda a, where the Aśvins are called on for mercy, “even though (*cīd*) [they are] Rudras.” The Aśvins are called Rudras a number of other passages (e.g., I.158.1, II.41.7), as Ge points out (n. 7a), but without the deprecatory concessive of this passage. This (positive/neutral) identification must be via the Maruts, who as Rudra’s sons are also called Rudras (pl.). The Aśvins share the midspace with the Maruts and on several occasions (e.g., VIII.22.1, 14) are called *rudrá-vartanī* ‘following the course of the Rudras [=Maruts]’. Since the Rudra=Aśvins identification is mediated through the positively viewed Maruts, there are no bad associations. Here, by contrast, the ambivalence about the Aśvins as Rudras seems to connect with 4c, where I suggest there is some question about whether Rudra is/should be praised, given his often hostile spirit and behavior. See comm. above. With regard to this vs. one might note that Rudra is not known for his mercy.

On *ráthaspati-* see comm. ad V.50.5.

The Earth-encircler (*párijmā*) recurs from 4b (q.v.), as well as X.92.5.

The voc. *viśvavedasaḥ* in d is a semi-scrambling of *viśve devāsaḥ* in b.

X.93.7–8: There is chaining between 7c *ṛbhúr vāja ṛbhukṣaṇaḥ* and 8a *ṛbhúr ṛbhukṣā ṛbhúḥ*.

X.93.8: The standard tr. take *te* [=Indra] in b as the antecedent of the rel. *yásya* introducing cd. Although this is the most straightforward analysis, I disfavor it because the clauses in cd seem to characterize a ritual performer, not Indra. I therefore take b as a parenthetical interjection, supplying an impv. “(let ... come),” with Ge and Re. The *yásya* then is coreferential or parallel to the gen. *vidhatāḥ* in pāda a: “of the one who does honor (and) of whom ...” In d the sacrifice and its accoutrements of the present sacrificer are compared to those of the first sacrificer, Manu.

X.93.9: Another fairly hopeless vs., of which I’ve made what sense I can.

In pāda a, with Old, Ge, and apparently Re, I take *áhrayaḥ* as a negated neut. *s*-stem, next to the them. adj. *áhraya-* (11x, not counting this one) ‘immoderate, unabashed’. This *s*-stem is also probably found in IX.54.1 (q.v), though there it is usually taken as a nom. pl. m. to a hapax

stem *āhri-*. Here *āhrayaḥ* would have to be a nom. sg. if to the them. adj.; it would then have to modify the addressee, Savitar, and would deprive *kṛdhī* of an obj. As an *s*-stem deriv., it could be either a noun ‘immoderation’ or a bahuvrīhi adj., as Ge points out (n. 9a). (The occurrence in IX.54.1 is an adj. modifying *pāyas-*.) In either case it is likely to reference n. *rādhās-* ‘wealth, largesse’, which is modified by *āhraya-* 5x (though in our passage Ge, Re, and JSK [DGRV I.228] take it simply as the abstract ‘lack of shame’). As a minor alt. to the publ. tr. “immoderation (of wealth)” with *āhrayaḥ* as noun, we could have “immoderate (wealth)” with an adjectival form. For the accent, cf. the b.v. *ān-āgas-* ‘without offense’.

In b the grammatical identity and function of *stuṣe* are in question. Ge, Re (explicitly), and JSK take it as a 3rd sg. passive ‘is/should be praised’ (or [JSK 229] possibly a “falsely unaccented infinitive”). The subj. would be *sá*, but its referent is unclear: the consensus is that he is one from among the (gen. pl.) *maghónām* ‘patrons’. I prefer to take *stuṣe* as the form it usually is, one of the well-known group of *-se* 1st sg.s with “active” sense in the domain of praising (*grñīṣe*, etc.). See comm. ad I.122.7–8, X.22.1.

The *sá* could be one of the extremely rare RVic examples of the *sál tām* pronoun doubling the 1st ps., rather than the far more common 2nd (see my 1992 [HS 105] “*sá figé*” article, esp. pp. 217, 230–31). However, given that the function of *ca* in this pāda is uncertain (see JSK 229) and further that JSK (272 n. 110) lists this as one of only four passages in the RV containing the sequence *sá/tá- ca*, I suggest that instead of *sá ca* we read **sácā* ‘along with, in company with’, here to be construed with the gen. *maghónām*. See *sácā ... eṣām* in 5c. The emendation is slight: the erasure of the notional word boundary of course means nothing in the Saṃhitā text, and since the 2nd vowel precedes a cluster (*st-*), a redactional shortening would be easy and have no metrical consequences. In the publ. tr. there should be an asterisk before “in company with.” A **sácā* here could parallel the *sahá + u* that opens the next pāda (as *sahó*) and indeed give the *u* there something to do. In fact, JSK (Part. u, 169 n. 3) classifies our *sahó* among forms where the existence of an *u* is unlikely because it is found in a passage lacking a proper syntactic environment for *u*; however, if it links *sácā* and *sahá*, it belongs with JSK’s *u* linking a series of adverbs (his Chap. 7) and the *u* has much better contextual support.

The second hemistich is fairly impenetrable; Ge says of his tr. (n. 9cd) “Nur versuchsweise übersetzt.” My tr. rests on a double interpr. of the lexeme *ní√yu*. On the one hand, it can be used with the object ‘wealth’ (*ráyim* vel sim.) in the sense “hitch up wealth (like a team)” – see VII.92.3 (*niyúdbhiḥ ...*) *ní no rayím ... yuvasva* “with your teams, hitch up wealth for us” (sim. VII.5.9, also VII.40.2). On the other hand, *ní√yu* can mean ‘rein in, control’, as in X.42.5, where “rivals” (*śátrūn*) are the obj.; see also *úd√yu*, with the oppositional preverb to *ní*, in the opposing sense ‘give free rein to’ (VI.57.6). Both the positive and the negative semantic extensions of *ní√yu* start from the etymological figure *niyútaḥ ní√yu* ‘team/hitch up teams’, as in VII.91.5 *niyuvānāṁ niyútaḥ*. My “Indra keeps hitching up (wealth) for these (patrons) of ours and keeps hold of “the wheel of the domains” like a rein” represents both idioms. Unfortunately in the “wealth” idiom the object has to be supplied; in my view the gen. pl. *eṣām* refers to the patrons from b (so also Ge, n. 9c) and is distinct from the gen. pl. *carṣaṇīnām* immed. flg. the pāda break. As for “the wheel of the domains” (*carṣaṇīnām cakrām*) Ge (n. 9d) takes the wheel as “das Symbol der Herrschaft,” as in later Indic. Although the first idiom is minimally represented here, I find it difficult to render the whole hemistich without incorporating it.

X.93.10: Again with Ge (n. 9c), I take *eṣu* as referring to the patrons; however, I do not consider it coreferential with *vīreṣu* as Ge and Re do, but as identifying two distinct groups. I also take

asmé not as another term in that series (like Re’s “en ces hommes-d’élite, en nous-mêmes”), but as defining the larger group in which the *vīrá-* are found. However, little rides on this distinction.

The position of *utá* in d is somewhat disquieting. It conjoins the two bipartite dative purpose NPs *vājasya sātāye* (c) and *rāyā ... turváne* (d), but takes second position in the second phrase, as if it were *ca*. JSK (DGRV I.301) simply says it “takes enclitic position within its phrase,” which is a description, not an explanation. However, I don’t see any other way to construe it, and in the context of this hymn it’s a minor issue. (On instr. *rāyā* see Old.)

X.93.11: The first hemistich lacks a verb. It’s possible to borrow *pāhi* from c, as Re does. But I prefer to supply a verb of motion, probably **yāhi*, rhyming with *pāhi* – both because *asmayú-* is several times found with this impv. (I.135.2 (2x), IX.14.8, 64.18; also (dual) VII.74.4, VIII.26.14) and because *kūcīt sántam* “wherever it may be” invites a verb of motion.

Pāda d can be (and has been) variously interpreted. The standard view (so Ge, Re) sees *medátām* as a 3rd sg. mid. impv. to a hapax 6th cl. pres. with anomalous full-grade root vocalism (or else what should be a 1st cl. pres. with anomalous suffixal accent – see Ge’s n. 11d, where he suggests *medátām* is an error for **medatām*), beside the *ya*-pres. *médyaṭi*, which has a broader attestation (on which see Kulikov, *ya*-pres. 599). By contrast, Old suggests that it’s a *tā*-abstract and hesitates whether it belongs with *medín-* ‘pal’ (not his gloss!) or *médas-* ‘fat’, tr. “beschütze unser Genossentumswesen (unser fettes Gedeihen?) entsprechend unserm Weisheitswese.” The nominal interpr. has been widely accepted; see EWA s.v. *médas-*, Lub. In *-āya*-Formations (142 n. 78) I accept Old’s interpr. and tr. “For (our) superiority do thou always protect our prosperity with wisdom” (in both tr. the verb *pāhi* of c reapplies). In the publ. tr. I revert to the older view of *medátām* as a verb, but interpr. *vedátā* as a nom. sg., not the instr. sg. others take it to be, belonging to *√vid* ‘find, acquire’ rather than *√vid* ‘know’. (Note that, like *medátām*, *vedátā* is a hapax: the forms seem to have been created to mutually interact with each other.) My reversion was in great part caused by the position of the 2nd *abhīṣṭaye* at the end of c (the first ending b). This “final” dative seems to me to be rhetorical final, and a new clause should begin in d. Nonetheless I have had partial second thoughts about positing a hapax pres. stem beside an already existent one, and so I now suggest as alt. the tr. cited above from my *-āya*-book (with “dominance” substituted for “superiority”).

X.93.12: Another challenging vs. Its opening, *etām me stómam*, echoes that of the previous vs. (11a), *etām sámśam*. This parallelism was not, regrettably, signaled in the publ. tr.

The rest of the hemistich is disputed. Ge (n. 12a, fld. without remark by Re) takes *tanā* as a nom. sg. fem., which in the phrase *tanā ... sūrye*, is the Daughter of the Sun (equivalent to *sūre duhitā*, acdg. to him). This seems extraordinarily bold, in fact reckless. There exists no *tanā* ‘daughter’ (or other such female figure); *sūrye* has no claim to a genitive interpr., unlike *sūre*; and the Daughter of the Sun has no obvious role in this vs. (though Ge claims she has a relationship to poetry). There has to be a better way, although I admit that mine has its share of awkwardness. I take the simile *tanā ná sūrye* as an unusually constructed comparandum to the b.v. *dyutád-yāman-* ‘whose course is dazzling’. I take *tanā* as the instr. of the rt noun *tán-* ‘extension’. Although the instr. sg. of this stem generally has root accent (*tánā*) and an adverbial sense (“in full measure,” “at length,” etc.), I suggest that the form here retains the expected ending accent because it has the full nominal sense “by stretching.” In this reading, *sūrye* is the goal, and the point is that as the praise-song is sent towards heaven, its trajectory is as bright as a sunbeam or a flame of the fire reaching aloft.

The subj. of *vāṇṛdhanta* is unexpressed. Because this vs. contains the poet's praise of his own composition (in my view) and because it provides the transition to the *dānastuti*, I suggest it is the patrons, who have been gestured to in recent vss. (9–10) and return (in 13, as well as 14–15). They “strengthen” the poet's praise hymn by their material gifts to him.

Despite the two simile particles (*nāc*, *iva* d), the 2nd hemistich must be a single simile, as Old points out. *saṃvānana-* is generally (and surely correctly) understood as a piece of horse or wagon tackle; its literal sense, ‘harmonizer, conciliator’, is probably euphemistic for something that keeps horses under control.

X.93.13: With Ge (see n. 13ab), fld. by Re (Old's speculations seem off the mark), I take the unidentified gen. pl.s *yēsām* and *eṣām* as referring to the patrons and the unidentified nom. sg. f. (on the basis of the f. adj. *yuktā* and *hiraṇyāyī*) as the Dakṣiṇā. This vs. thus introduces the *dānastuti*, which becomes more explicit in the flg. vs. Both *vāvārta* and *yuktā* suggest that the Dakṣiṇā here is conceived of as a chariot or wagon.

It is the second hemistich that provides the problems in this vs. It consists of two (or possibly one: see comm. ad 12cd) similes, to which the fem. entity in the 1st hemistich is presumably compared, but everything else is up for grabs. See the despairing flounderings of Old, Ge (n. 13cd), and Re, to which I have nothing particularly useful to add. The general impression I get from the two similes is that the feminine subj. of ab is being deliberately compared (and thus contrasted) with hypermasc., aggressive, and successful entities, esp. in c with *paūṃsyā* ‘manly, masculine’. As with *paūṃsyāni* in I.169.6 I take this as referring to manly forces, i.e., troops. Here the ending *-ā* can be either a fem. sg. or the short neut. pl. On *nemā-dhiti-*, here in the loc. as in its other 3 occurrences, see comm. ad I.72.4. It is used of battle arrays drawn up against the enemy. In other words, the Dakṣiṇā of ab seems to be compared to troops in a state of combat readiness – I have no idea why.

The sense of d is even harder to fathom because the b.v. *viṣṭā-anta-* is multiply ambiguous and the morphological identity and meaning of *viṭhā* are disputed. As for the former, *viṣṭā-* can of course be the ppl. either of *√viś* ‘enter’ or *√viṣ* ‘toil, accomplish’. Gr takes it to *√viś*, glosses ‘hindurchgehende Enden habend’, and applies it to an axle, presumably qualifying the chariot that is the hidden metaphor in ab. This doesn't get us very far, esp. since it leaves *viṭhā* dangling. Old tries out several possibilities but doesn't settle on one. Ge refuses to tr. My rendering is closest to Re's (for the whole pāda) “semblable à des choses accomplies de bon gré,” but I think both of our interpr. rest on a dubious cross-linguistic slippage: the assumption that ‘end’ (*ānta-*) can also mean ‘goal’. Nonetheless this is reflected in the publ. tr. “whose ends have been accomplished” (with *viṣṭā-* from *√viṣ*). However dubiously achieved, this interpr. makes more sense than introducing an axle, and it fits fairly well with c, in comparing the Dakṣiṇā to something successful. It also allows *viṭhā* to have its usual adverbial sense ‘at will’, rather than taking it (with Sāy. and Ge; see Ge's n. 13cd) as a separate fem. noun, which Ge renders as “Schöpfrad” (whatever that may be).

Thus, piece by piece the 2nd hemistich can be tentatively teased out, but the point of the two similes still escapes me.

X.93.14: The first hemistich consists of a list of patrons' names in the loc., summed up by *maghāvatsu*. This stem first appeared in gen. pl. *maghónām* in 8d; in between the patrons have been regularly alluded to, but not overtly identified. The reappearance of *maghāvan(t)-* here almost defines a ring.

The syntax of *cd* is problematic. It should consist of a rel. cl. introduced by *yé* picked up by a main cl containing the referent of *yé*, namely *eṣām* (both referring to the patrons) (see the similar configuration in 13ab). The problem (or one of them) is that the “main” clause in which *eṣām* finds itself has an accented verb, *viśrāvi*. The various treatments attempt various makeshifts. In mine, I supply a transitive verb of motion in the rel. cl. (“send”), because *yuktvāya* ‘having yoked’ assumes a subsequent journey, as does *pathā* (if it belongs in this clause), and *asmayú* also favors a verb of motion (see comm. ad 11).

As I just implied, I am inclined to breach the pāda boundary (not much of a problem in this metrical messy hymn) and include *pathā* in the rel. cl., though it could belong to my second clause (“... widely famed along the path”).

I take the subj. of *viśrāvi* to be the Dakṣiṇā (so also Re): for the patrons the point of all this giving is for it to be noisily celebrated by the poet-recipient. What I would like is for this to be a straightforward main clause: “of them (the Dakṣiṇā) is widely famed.” But no such luck in *this* hymn. Barring an emendation to **vī śrāvi*, this little clause must also be subordinate. I have adopted the trick used by Ge and Re and made it an unsigned purpose clause, on no better basis than desperation.

X.94 Pressing Stones

On the supposed authorship of “the snake Arbuda Kādraveya” see Ge’s headnote.

X.94.1: Note the four verb forms of √*vad* in the 1st hemistich, with their initial *va*’s reinforced by *vayām* and *vācam* (and indeed [*grā*]va[*bhyo*]). The addressees of the 2nd pl. *vadatā* in b are presumably the priests (so also Ge), while those of *bhāratha* in d are the stones.

On the meaning of *ślōka*- see comm. ad I.51.12.

X.94.2: I take *śatāvat sahāsravat* as indicating that the (limited number of) stones make as much noise as hundreds and thousands of them -- not that they speak in a hundred or thousand different ways (as it is generally interpr.) or a hundred or thousand separate utterances. The emphasis in this hymn is on how much noise they make.

As Ge points out (n. 2b), they have golden mouths because they are stained with the golden soma.

Note hemistich-final *āsābhiḥ* (b) / *āsata* (d).

Pāda c is almost identical to III.60.3 (R̥bhus), with *sāmībhiḥ* there substituting for our *grāvāṇaḥ*. Though they are rendered differently in the publ. tr. (III.60.3 [JPB] “... by applying themselves to their labors, ritually acting well by good ritual action”), the divergence seems justified by the lack of agreement on the 2nd word in the pāda.

The Hotar in d is surely Agni (as so often). The point is that even before the oblation is poured into the ritual fire, the stones have tasted it because they are pressing it.

X.94.3–4: The repeated phrase *āvidann anā mādhu* (3a, 4b) could also be rendered with an aoristic immediate past “they have found,” which would fit with the generally presential context.

The sense and/or function of adverbial *anā* is difficult to determine. It occurs four times (counting this duplicate phrase only once): here, IV.30.3, VIII.21.13, 47.6. In none of these passages (incl. the phrase here) does “in this way / because of this” fit particularly well (despite the publ. tr. here). In this passage the stones do not find the honey *because* they speak; rather the reverse: their speaking (in both 3 and 4) signals that they have found the honey. I now think that

anā means something like ‘evidently, clearly’, deriving ultimately from ‘by this’ (=previous action) the actuality of the current action/state can be inferred. I would now alter the tr. to “evidently they have found the honey.” That is, we hear them and figure they must have found it. For the other passages see comm. ad locc.

X.94.3: In the sequence *vadanti ávidann* the two verbs have a quasi-palindromic relationship.

In later Vedic, *nyūñkha-* (and associated denom. forms) refers to a particular alteration in the recitation of the Hotar, whereby an *o* is substituted for the 2nd vowel of each hemistich (see, e.g., Re’s Vocabulaire du rituel védique s.v.). This is the only attestation of this lexeme in early Vedic, and it is hard to imagine that the exact later technical sense is meant here (though see G. Thompson’s tr. [unpubl. handout, Leiden Vedic Workshop, 2002] “they chant ‘O’ over the well-cooked delicacy”). Given the content of the 2nd hemistich as well as the obj. of the verb here (“cooked flesh”), the context seems to involve powerful animals devouring meat. Since later *nyūñkha-* has to do with sound, our *ny ũñkhayante* should express some sort of vocalization appropriate to such a scene. I’ve chosen ‘growl’ (like dogs [vel sim.] jealously guarding their piece of meat), but I wish I knew why this oddly formed, very precise technical term was imported into this context. (Perhaps *o* as a mid back vowel sounds most like threatening animal noises from the throat?) Re seems (rightly) not to have taken his own definition of the ritual term into account in *Hymnes spéculatifs*, where he tr. “mordent en grondant” (bite while growling: why use one verb when two will do?); Ge “schlampfen” (slurp), Gr “gierig brummen oder grunzen” (roar or grunt greedily).

It is noteworthy that soma, or rather the soma plant, is conceived of as *cooked* (*pakvá-*) flesh; *pakvá-* can’t have its other sense, ‘ripe’, because *āmiṣ-* is unambiguously an animal product (‘raw flesh’), not a vegetable one. Ch. Malamoud in his *Cuire le monde* (1989) claimed that every Vedic sacrifice involves the offering of cooked food, but he had to make soma a special case, since it is not cooked in any conventional sense. In my review of the 1996 English tr. of this collection (Hist. of Religions 39 [2000]: 384–86), I drew attention to this problem. But as it turns out, at least on the basis of this passage we were both wrong about soma: soma does count as “cooked” to the ritualists themselves, presumably because of the elaborate nature of its preparation. And this makes Malamoud righter about the larger principle than I was willing to allow at the time.

The “branch of the reddish tree” (*vr̥kṣásya śákham aruṇásya*) must again be the soma stalk, but this time in more natural guise as a member of the vegetable kingdom.

In IX.79.4 the stones gnaw (*bapsati*) the soma, as here. The part. *bápsat-* modifies a dog in VII.55.2, which might support my conjecture that dogs are growling over meat in pāda b. In fact, nothing forbids taking *c* with *b* rather than *d*.

On *sūbharva-* see EWA s.v. *BHARV*, with lit.

X.94.4: The participles *krósantaḥ* (b) and *āghoṣáyantaḥ* (d) are partial rhymes, and *āghoṣáyantaḥ* picks up *ghóṣam* in 1d.

Note the repetition of *ávidann anā mádhu* here. On this phrase and esp. *anā* see comm. ad vss. 3–4 above, where I suggest an altered tr. for both occurrences of the phrase. Here the shrieking to Indra signals that they have found the honey.

Contrary to standard gr. and tr., I take *saṃrābhyā* not as a gerund but as a gerundive (pausal form *saṃrābhyāḥ*) because of the instr. case of the agent *svásṛbhiḥ*. Although in later Sanskrit gerunds can take instr. agents, the conditions for this are clear: the matrix clause in

which the gerund is found is passive (see, e.g., Speyer, Skt. Syn. p. 297, Wh Gr. §994c), and *anartīṣuḥ* “they have danced,” though intrans., is not passive. Moreover, it’s not clear to me that the instr. agent with a passive matrix clause is found at all in Vedic: a quick look through Delbrück (AIS) and Speijer (Ved. u. sansk. Syn.) didn’t turn up any; Wh. (§994c) only provides Classical examples; Macdonell (VGS pp. 332–33) doesn’t mention this usage.

X.94.5: The first hemistich compares the stones to two very different animals: the eagle because their noise soars upward; the antelope because of their trampling of the plant on the ground. The root accent of *kṛṣṇa*- identifies it as the animal (the black antelope) as opposed to the suffixally accented color term *kṛṣṇā*- ‘black’.

Phonetic figure, *n’yañ ní yanti* in c.

On neut. singular *purī* see comm. ad V.33.4. As I say there, all of the supposed occurrences of this form can be otherwise interpr. (as neut. pls.) – except for this one: it is difficult to find any other function for it here except as a modifier of *rētaḥ*. In this late hymn, the fact that both *-u* and *-ū* can be used for neut. plural may have allowed a nonce spread of *-ū* to the singular, where *-u* is the only regular form. I also wonder if the immed. flg. *r*- had anything to do with it – as if though a degeneration and compensatory lengthening of **-ur r*-, though it’s hard to see how this would have come about.

In d *sūrya-śvītaḥ* could be either nom./acc. pl. or abl./gen. sg. Both have their advocates: Old favors nom. pl.; Scar (560) allows either; most others (incl. the publ. tr.) prefer the sg., though even there there is disagreement about whether it’s gen. or abl. (the latter, acdg. to the publ. tr.). I favor the sg. because the source of the semen should be indicated.

X.94.6: I don’t understand the usage of *samāyamuḥ*. Act. forms of the fairly rare lexeme *sám / ā √yam* are otherwise transitive, in the meaning ‘hold fast (reins, vel sim.), guide’, but this form appears to have no obj. I take it as absolutive or reflexive ‘hold (themselves?) fast’, despite the act. voice. It’s also possible that *dhúraḥ* ‘chariot poles’ is the obj. not only of part. *bībhṛataḥ* but also of this verb.

X.94.7: Both Ge and Re (Hymnes spec.) refuse to tr. *dásāvani*-, a failure that seems over-scrupulous. The simplex *avāni*- means ‘stream’ or ‘streambed’; from the latter one can generalize to ‘course, track’. Gr renders the cmpd “zehn Bahnen durchlaufend.” Although the following four b.v.s with *dása*- refer to particular pieces of horse tackle (also *dásayantra*-in 8a), it would not be surprising for the first in the series to refer to something more general, namely the track that the harnessed stones (/horses) will follow. The “ten” of course refers to the fingers in all instances.

X.94.8: Apropos *ādhānam*, for *ā √ dhā* used of hitching up horses see VII.34.4.

It’s a bit of a challenge to distribute the five gen. sg.s in cd: *sutásya somyásya ándhaso, amśóḥ ... prathamásya*. I have grouped the three in c and the two in d together, with the latter two dependent on the former three. On the distinction between *ándhas*- and *amśú*- see comm. ad IV.1.19. The problem is the “first” – and as Ge points out (n. 8d), it would better if it modified *pīyūṣam* ‘beestings’, i.e., first milk – as in II.13.1 *amśóḥ pīyūṣam prathamám*; our variant shows a displaced modifier, of the “cold glass of milk” (for **“glass of cold milk”*) type. It should be “the first beestings of the pressed somyan stalk of the plant.”

X.94.9: On my view of \sqrt{nims} (contra Gotō, etc.) see comm. ad VIII.43.10. Although it might seem odd to assert that the pressing stones “kiss” the two horses of Indra, as Ge points out (n. 9a) Indra’s horses are given the soma dregs, the pressed-out soma-plants, as fodder. “Diese fressen also Mund an Mund mit den Steinen” – an appropriate image of kissing.

Ge (n. 9b) calls b a śleṣa: the stones sit on the cow(hide), as milkers sit by a cow.

X.94.10: The $\sqrt{rṣāyāte}$ that ends the previous vs. is picked up by the first word of this vs.: $\sqrt{rṣā}$, which is predicated of $\sqrt{amśúh}$ ‘plant’.

There is also a referent shift, which is not entirely clear in the publ. tr. Indra was the 3rd ps. subj. of the previous hemistich (9cd), and we might expect that the “your / you” of vs. 10 refers to Indra, with the very common switch from 3rd to 2nd ps. However, all the 2nd ps. forms in 10 (4 finite verbs, plus enclitic \sqrt{vah}) are plural and must refer to the pressing stones, which were also in the 3rd ps. in the previous vs. This identification is made clear only in 10d by the voc. $\sqrt{grāvāṇah}$.

It’s worth noting (though I don’t know quite what to do with this observation) the concentration of 2nd pl. act. endings enlarged by *-na*: $\sqrt{rṣāthana}$ (a), \sqrt{sthana} (b and c).

I’m not sure why the stones need to be reassured that they won’t be harmed. Perhaps the point is that their plant is a powerful bull and can therefore protect them. The similar reassurance in VII.33.4, given to the Vasiṣṭhas, rests on the protective power of Indra.

The problem in the 2nd hemistich is $\sqrt{raivatyéva}$ — starting with the grammatical identity of the form. Gr sets up a stem $\sqrt{raivatyá}$ - “Reichtum,” to which this would be the neut. pl., an analysis fld by Caland-Henry and Delbrück, acdg. to Old. The only other such $\sqrt{vṛddhi}$ form in the RV is masc. $\sqrt{raivatá}$ - in V.60.4, to which this could, alternatively (and I think correctly), be a fem. $\sqrt{raivatī}$ -. Both Ge and Re accept the fem. interpr. (Ge: “die Tochter eines Reichen”; Re [Hymnes spéc] as a plural: “comme les filles du Riche”), but they both seem to take it as a nom., without indicating how they arrive at their grammatical identifications. (Ge’s n. 10c on possible irregular sandhi just throws more sand into the gears.) I am fully sympathetic to this tactic, because a nom. works better in context, but feel that I must agree with Old that it is most likely instr. ($\sqrt{raivatyā}$). The masc. $\sqrt{vṛddhi}$ form in V.60.4ab throws some light on our passage, in that it establishes a marital wooing context: $\sqrt{varā} \sqrt{ivéd} \sqrt{raivatāso} \sqrt{hiraṇyair}$, $\sqrt{abhí} \dots \sqrt{tanvāḥ} \sqrt{pipísre}$ “Just like wealthy wooers, with golden (ornaments) they have emblazoned their bodies.” The referents are the Maruts, compared to richly ornamented suitors; later in the same vs. (d) they put “marks of greatness” ($\sqrt{māhāmsi}$) on their bodies – cf. our $\sqrt{māhasā}$. In V.60.4 the $\sqrt{raivant}$ - are the wooers come to seek a bride. In our passage the $\sqrt{raivatī}$ belongs presumably to the other side of the negotiations: the daughter of a rich man (per Ge, Re) on offer to a suitor or suitors. This casts the pressing stones in the role of the father (/male relatives) of this girl, who pleases the suitor by bestowing his daughter who comes with a rich dowry. The well-pleased suitor is not overtly present in the main clause, but must be supplied as antecedent to $\sqrt{yásya}$ in d — or such is my interpr. Re (fld. by Don.) takes the referent of $\sqrt{yásya}$ to be the rich man; Ge seems to take $\sqrt{yásya}$ as standing for $\sqrt{yád}$ (“wann”) with the gen. expressing an indefinite (“an de Opfer jemandes”).

As for the ceremony the stones have enjoyed, this may refer to pāda b, where the stones are well-fed and satiated.

X.94.11: Ge couches the first hemistich in the 3rd ps. (“... sind die Steine”), presumably because of accented $\sqrt{ádrayah}$, which cannot be voc; he then switches to 2nd ps. (“... seid ihr”) because of 2nd pl. pres. \sqrt{stha} in c. Re (fld. by Don.) simply uses the 3rd ps. throughout, ignoring the \sqrt{stha} .

Because the stones are insistently addressed in the 2nd ps. throughout the immediately preceding vs. and this 2nd ps. is again overt in our pāda c, I take it all as 2nd ps. I see no problem with a nom. *ádrayaḥ* in a 2nd ps. context.

The pair *ṛḍilā áṛḍilāsaḥ* have been variously interpr. Because the only difference between the two is the privative *á* (and consequent accent shift), I think these refer neutrally to different shaped stones, both of which types are equally good at the work required.

X.94.12: Acdg. to Ge (nn. 12a, 12cd), the first hemistich concerns the (stony) mountains, conceptualized as the fathers of their miniature versions, the pressing stones, while the second half of the verse returns to the pressing stones. The publ. tr. accepts this interpr., but I now think that pāda c is an ambiguous transition, which can be applied both to the mountains and the stones. The reason for the identification of mountains and stones is pretty clear. The willed immobility of the mountains is implicitly contrasted with the dynamism of the pressing stones. Since we are nearing the end of the hymn, when the stones will be unhitched and return to immobility, the mountains provide a sort of grand model for this state.

As I just said, pāda c seems applicable to both mountains and stones: *ajuryá-* ‘unaging, undecaying’ in fact fits the mountains better than the stones. Both mountains and stones can be “companions of the golden (soma)” – the mountains because soma famously grows in the mountains, the stones because they press the plant (see their “golden mouths” *hárítebhīr āsábhiḥ* in 2d).

The next word, *harídrava(h)*, is glossed by Gr “den gelben Rossen nachrennend,” but the standard interpr. now (e.g., Old, Ge, Re, Don, Scar [295 and n. 845], EWA s.v. [though with a diff. botanical ident.]) is that this refers to the Haridru tree (*Adina cordifolia*), a tree with yellow-colored wood and yellow flowers (per internet), much used later in Āyurveda. Why either mountains or stones would be compared to this tree isn’t clear to me, but the *hari-* of course carries it a long way.

Pāda d definitely applies to the stones. The use of the redupl. aor. *aśuśravuḥ* ‘made listen’ with an acc. of the listener and an instr. of the sound reprises the same construction, with different verb *āghoṣáyantaḥ*, in 4b.

X.94.13: The locc. *vimócane yáman*, adjacent across the pāda boundary, must be contrastive: “on their unhitching and/or on their course.” Given that rhetorical structure and given that *añjaspā(h)* doesn’t work well as a simile, I have interpr. *iva* as a sort of hypercorrection for **vā* ‘or’. Since *iva* sometimes needs to be read ’*va* in late RV (including nearby X.97.10), the poet thinks *vā* can be optionally realized as *iva*. The verbal complex *vā ghā* is fairly common in the RV (I.161.8, 162.8; III.28.2; V.85.8 [=X.139.5]; VIII.12.16, 21.17, 44.23, 47.15; X.61.18), while I find *iva gha* (as *iva ghéd*) only in VIII.43.3. The publ. tr., complete with asterisk, reflects this emendation. I am concerned about the location of the phrase, which should be in 2nd position; however, this is a problem also if we read *iva*, since *ghā* is overwhelmingly a 2nd-position (or after *vā*, etc., a modified 2nd-position) particle. (Ge [n. 13b] is also disturbed by the particle placement.)

On *añjas-pā-* see comm. ad X.92.2. Here the point is that the stones have the first direct contact with the soma; they do not drink an already prepared beverage.

upabdíbhīḥ is repeated from 4d.

The standard tr. effectively take *vápantaḥ* as belonging only to the simile (despite the position of *iva* after *bījam*); that is, the simile is “like grain-producers scattering seed.” But it

seems as if this action should correspond to something performed by the stones as well – in other words, it should express the shared characteristic. I therefore take *bījam* as a pun, to be construed with both simile and frame. In the simile it is grain-seed, but in the simile it is (metaphorical) semen. For *bīja-* as semen, see, e.g., X.85.37 (the wedding hymn) *yāsyām bījam manuṣyā vāpanti* “in whom [=the bride] men scatter their seed.” As for the metaphor, see 5d *purū réto dadhire* “they [=stones] have themselves produced much semen.” That “semen” is of course the liquid pressed out from the plant, but it can be configured as the semen of the stones themselves, which in our vs. is then reinfused into the soma (*prīcānti sómam*). This idea is then restated in another image in the post-caesura portion of d: the stones do not make the soma smaller by eating it.

Gr analyzes *dhāñyākṛt-* as *dhāñya-* + *ākṛt-*, but this is impossible, since root noun cmpds can have as prior member a nominal or a preverb, but not both. (See disc. in my 2020 “*iṣudhya-*” [Fs. Lamberterie]: 486 with n. 5.) Better, with Scar. (74–75), to take *dhānyā-* as a collective pl. or as. metrical lengthening in the cadence.

X.94.14: The stones are unhitched and return to their desacralized inanimate state as mere stones. The vs. has several puns that have not been previously recognized.

vācam akrata is found also in 5a; nonetheless I tr. them slightly differently, preferring ‘speech’ in 5 and ‘voice’ here. (There is of course no difference in the Skt.)

As Re points out (EVP XVI ad loc.), soma is *tunná-* by the pressing stone in IX.67.19–20 – hence the simile here in b.

In c *vī ... muñcā* reprises *vimócane* in 13a.

The pf. part. *suṣuvúṣaḥ* is taken by the standard tr. as gen. sg., referring to the priest who has produced the *manīṣām* (‘inspired thought’). But it can equally well be acc. pl. m., referring to the stones, and I think both are meant. This double interpr. entails a double interpr. of *vī ... muñcā*: with the stones as obj. it means ‘unhitch’ (or horses; see, e.g., V.53.7), but with the thought as obj. it means rather ‘release (into the world), set free’.

In V.53.7 *vī √ muc* is followed immed. by *vī √ vṛt*, as here. In that passage it seems to refer to turning aside from the road to rest, after unhitching. That sense works here as well.

The last pāda has been various interpr., esp. because the sense of *cāyamānāḥ* is not agreed upon. On this participle, see comm. ad VII.18.8. In our passage I find Ge’s interpr. the most compelling: that it is intrans./pass. ‘appearing (as), being perceived (as)’, indicating that the dynamic protagonists of our hymn are now just seen as inert stones. But I also think *cāyamānāḥ* is a pun: it could also be interpr. as *ca āyamānāḥ*, that is, with a negated mid. part. to the root aorist of *√yam* (see act. *samāyamuh* in 6a), ‘not being harnessed (anymore)’. The *ca* would of course be oddly placed, but I would not be surprised at such a manipulation to enable the pun.

Commentary X.95–191

X.95 Purūravas and Urvaśī

On this famous hymn and the later Sanskrit versions of this story, see publ. intro. The general approach to the RVic hymn has been to retroject the narrative found in the Śatapatha Brāh. version onto the RVic hymn, interpreting all enigmatic details in the light of that later version. As I said in the publ. intro., I think the ŚB version misunderstood or deliberately reconfigured the RV one. Similes and other images were taken literally – e.g., the lambs tied to the bedpost in the ŚB were invented out of a simile in vs. 3; there are no real lambs in the RVic hymn. If we approach the RVic version directly, without invoking the ŚB, a very different picture emerges. To readers used to the standard take on this hymn, my interpr. may seem radical and disconcerting. This way of reading the hymn dates back, for me, to an intense exploration of it with Stanley Insler and Joel Brereton sometime in the early 1970s (1973 or 1974?), perhaps the first time that I saw the exhilarating possibilities of close reading of the RV. Some of the ideas in the current tr. and comm. date back to those sessions of 50 years ago and emerged from our joint discussions then.

Needless to say, numerous others have tr. and commented on the hymn, and I cannot consider them all in detail. A recent one is found in Susanne Schnaus’s 2008 *Die Dialoglieder im altindischen Rigveda*, 355–404, and Elizabeth Thornton provides a detailed formal and rhetorical analysis in her 2015 (unpublished) UCLA dissertation “The Double-Voiced Rig Veda: Poetics and Power Dynamics of Formal Structuring Devices.”

The pattern of this dialogue is that P speaks and U responds, generally taking up and, indeed, upending his words. Most of the verses are paired, and it is illuminating to read them against each other, but this pattern does not establish itself until vs. 4. In vss. 1–3 P speaks 1 and U responds with 2, but then P completes her vs. with 3. Following this we get

P:	4	U:	5
	6		7
	8		9
	10		11
	12		13
	14		15

The last three vss. break this pattern: the speakers have changed places -- U speaks 16, P 17 – and the two vss. are not responsive. The final vs., 18, seems to be in the mouth of a narrator speaking for the gods.

X.95.1: The first two words of this hymn provide one of the most striking openings of any RVic hymn: *hayé jāye* “Woe, wife!” with its in-your-face jingly rhyme (rhyme in general being rare in the RV). On a technical note, it’s somewhat surprising that voc. *jāye* is accented here in apparent 2nd position. The other RVic occurrence of *hayé* is also followed by a voc. but an unaccented one: II.29.4 *hayé devāḥ*. The disorganized, staccato-like nature of Purūravas’s speech, esp. initially (note the parenthetic command inserted after the next word in this pāda), may account for the accent, with voc. “wife!” effectively starting a new detached utterance.

The function of *mānasā* and its syntactic status are disputed. Some (e.g., Re, Hymnes spéc.) take it as an independent clause, but most construe it with the clause in pāda b, with *tīṣṭha ghore* an interjection. This latter view is more satisfyingly dramatic: having got her attention with *hayé jāye*, P starts his plea – but after the first word has to try to arrest her in her flight, with

an imperative and another voc. Moreover, I don't see how *mānasā* can be an independent utterance; Re's "sois sage!" is a very loose rendering of the instr. Assuming that *mānasā* belongs with pāda b, what is its function there? With most (Ge, etc.) I take it as a semi-adverb, "with thought, thoughtfully," but Hoffmann (in his complete tr. of and comm. on this hymn, *Injunk.* 198–208) provides parallels for construing it with *mīśrā* (199 n. 179). Again for me the drama is enhanced by having *mānasā* a separate constituent rather than subordinate to a flg. NP (*mānasā ... vācāmsi ... mīśrā*).

Note the phonetic figure over the hemistich boundary: ... *nú / ná nau*.

Note the pres. subj./impv. *kṛṇavāvahai* (b) contrasting with the aor. subj. *karan* (d) to the same root.

As noted by many, P's use of two deriv. of \sqrt{man} 'think', *mānas-* and *māntra-*, situates (or attempts to situate) his approach in the rational, perhaps even coolly logical, realm – an attempt that fails before it even begins.

X.95.2: Urvaśī ignores his gesture towards the rational, but picks up his *vācāmsi* \sqrt{kr} (1b), though with an idiom (INSTR. + \sqrt{kr}) entirely different from his (even though her subj. *kṛṇavā* matches his *kṛṇavāvahai*): *vācā* \sqrt{kr} 'do with speech'. Her emphasis is on action—an emphasis reinforced by the next pāda, where she announces her (already accomplished) departure.

By comparing herself to "the foremost of dawns" (*uśāsām agriyā*), she makes her departure inevitable and irrevocable, since nothing can stop the foreordained journey of each day's dawn. I don't know why the simile particle *iva* is placed after the 2nd word in the simile -- perhaps because the NP *uśāsām agriyā* is felt to be a unit.

It is worthy of note that she twice uses the (syntactically unnec.) nom. prn. *ahām* with a 1st sg. verb (a: *kṛṇavā ... ahām*, d: *ahām asmi*), presumably emphatically and contrastively, to distinguish and separate herself from P.

X.95.3: By most accounts, this vs. is spoken by P, though Old suggests rather U. In the vs. P nostalgically reminisces about U's untameable and tumultuous beauty. The vs. certainly bears the hallmarks of P's disordered speech, being both metrically and syntactically jagged, and this has given rise to uncertainty of interpretation. In fact, the difficulties of the 2nd hemistich are responsible for the implausible Gandharvas-sheep-and-bedposts of the ŚB version.

There is some disagreement about the position of the pāda break in the first hemistich: either after *iśudhēr*, producing an 8-syl. pāda a and a conventional Triṣṭubh in b; or after *asanā*, with pāda a 11 syllables, though without a Triṣṭubh cadence, and b 8 syllables. I strongly favor the former: the hemistich trails off U's statement in the preceding vs., 2d, with P adding other similes describing U's fleet beauty. A truncated first pāda calls attention to the fact that it is just finishing a thought already articulated. Moreover, the shared quality of all the similes is U's word (*dur*)*āpanā* '(difficult) to attain', the unspoken beginning of P's speech, and it would rhyme with *asanā* beginning pāda b. Most interpr. construe *asanā* with pāda a, however (e.g. Ge "Pfeilschuss" somehow combining the two nominatives *iśuḥ ... asanā*, KH "ein Geschoss aus dem Köcher," with *iśudhēr asanā* a separate NP), which would favor a pāda break after *asanā*. I instead take *asanā* with the flg. *goṣāḥ*, parallel to the next, overt, simile *śatasā ná rāṃhiḥ*, supporting the pāda break after *iśudhēr*.

On the phraseology in b, cf. X.178.3 *sahasrasāḥ śatasā asya rāṃhiḥ* "his charge that wins thousands, that wins hundreds" of the mythical racehorse Tārksya. See also *rāṃhi-* in the next hymn, X.96.4.

Against the Pp. and essentially all other tr./comm., I take *śriyā* in sandhi as standing for gen. sg. *śriyās* (a paradigmatic form not certainly found in the RV to this stem, but cf. *dhiyās* to *dhī-*, as well as possible abl. *śriyās* in IX.94.4 [see comm. ad loc.]). The “quiver of beauty” adds a metaphor to the simile.

I will not engage with the numerous variant interpretations of cd, all heavily influenced (not to say misled) by the ŚB version, but simply attempt to justify my own. In pāda c there are two grammatical issues on which one must take a stand before attempting to interpret the pāda further: 1) does the sandhi form *davidyutan* represent a 3rd sg. in *-at* (so Pp.) before *n-* or a real 3rd pl. in *-an*? 2) is *nā* the negative or the simile particle? I opt for 3rd sg. and simile particle respectively. I take U as the subject of *davidyutat* and interpr. the verb as an irregular subjunctive (for **davidyotat*); cf. the injunc. in 10 *dāvidyot*. In fact the occurrence in 10 provides the clue for the interpr. of our pāda here. In 10 P compares U to lightning, with an overt simile: *vidyūn nā yā ... dāvidyot* “She who kept flashing like lightning ...” I think the same simile is covert here, conveyed by the preverb+verb *vī davidyutat*; the noun “lightning,” which should be the grammatical focus of the simile, does not have to be expressed because it is embedded in the verb, and so the simile particle dangles rather uselessly right after the verb and at the end of the pāda. Though I have elsewhere (see comm. ad X.21.1) argued that simile-marking *nā* is blocked from pāda-final position, I take its position here, as well as the absence of an overt nominal simile, to be another symptom of P’s emotionally distorted speech. The explicit simile in 10b, also applied to U, seems designed to repair the truncated one here.

As to what the pāda is conveying -- P is saying that she is dazzling and that she cannot be mastered (“under no man’s will”), with the suggestion that even in her sexual transports she is not subject to male control.

Given the use of *vīra* in 5d, where I tr. ‘hero’, *avīre* here might be alternatively tr. ‘no hero’s’.

Pāda d is also tricky syntactically, with the verb *citayanta* furnishing the trick. As I long ago argued (“Case Disharmony in R̥gvedic Similes,” IJ 24 [1982] 258–59 with n. 25), *citayanta* here shows two different constructions, one with the simile, one with the frame, both supported by independent occurrences of this stem elsewhere. In the simile the verb is transitive “manifest/display X” (lamb its bleating) with overt acc. obj., while in the frame it is intransitive “be manifest/displayed” ([her] noisy [cries] / tumultuous [tempests]). This image is the third in a series depicting U. as a thunderstorm: the wind (2b), the lightning (3c), and the thunder (3d).

Though this interpr. of vs. 3 is radically at odds with all the standard ones, I think it is rhetorically truer to the rest of the hymn and more powerful emotionally than those that introduce the Gandharvas (unnamed anywhere in this hymn) and pet lambs (extracted from an overt simile).

X.95.4–5: Here P and U present wildly incompatible visions of their previous married life.

X.95.4: In my opinion, in this vs. P. continues his nostalgic reverie, here focusing on U’s seamless fit into family life -- until his crude depiction of their sex life in the final pāda. But there are multiple interpr. of all parts of the vs., starting with the identity of the speaker. Both Ge and Re assign the vs. to a narrator, perhaps because U. is described in the 3rd person, even though P. is supposedly conversing with her directly. But his dreamy reversion to a happier time, narrated as if she weren’t there in front of him, makes psychological sense. And her sarcastic

citation of his final phrase in this vs. (4d) in her response to him in the next (5a) makes it clear that she was the audience for this speech.

The meter of the first three pādas is disturbed and cannot easily be fixed -- nor, given P's disordered state, should it be. With KH, I read *vāya(h)* at the end of pāda a, rather than initial in b, because it should be read with the participle *dādhatī*. Moreover, the position of *yādi* in b is better if only one item precedes it in its pāda/clause.

How to construe pāda b and what relation, if any, it has to cd are matters of dispute. The first question involves the word *uśaḥ*, interpr. by Gr and Ge (apparently also Re, Hymnes spec., Don) as a nom. sg. m. to a hapax thematic stem *uśa-* 'lover' (see Ge's n. 4b). By this interpr., U, having been kind to her father-in-law in pāda a, is at the beck and call of her lover, namely P, whenever he wants her (*yādi vāṣṭi*) for sex. Even leaving aside the precarious status of the supposed hapax noun *uśa-*, I find that pāda b works better as a continuation of U's attention to her father-in-law, because of the word *ántigrha-* 'house opposite' (vel sim.). Although we know nothing about the housing arrangements of the RVic joint family and *ántigrha-* is a hapax, it still seems more likely that her in-laws would inhabit a separate but nearby dwelling than that she and her husband lived in separate houses and she had to go to his whenever he wanted sex. Instead, I take the subject of *vāṣṭi* to be the father-in-law (so also KH, as I read his tr.), whom she dutifully served (not sexually) whenever he asked her to. (Schnaus takes U to be the subject, on the assumption that U was in fact not a dutiful woman, but did what she pleased. I take the point, but P's musings here focus on his [false] memory of her agreeable subservience.)

What then is *uśaḥ*? With Old (also KH, Schnaus), an acc. pl. to *uśás-* 'dawn'. Old himself takes it as a third object to *dādhatī*, "dawns"; that is, U. bestows three boons on her father-in-law -- goods, energy, and "dawns," standing for day upon day added to his lifespan. But it's better as a temporal adv.: "mornings, (all) mornings" (so KH, also Schnaus). See AiG III.282 and for the accent III.26.

The subordinator *yādi* should be read *yád *ī* 'when it' rather than 'if'.

The next pāda (c), again in my opinion, contrasts the home (*ástam*) that was U's own with the one opposite (*ántigrha-*) that belonged to her in-laws. She obtained it and took pleasure in this dwelling of hers, or thus do I interpr. the reference of *yásmin*. Others (Ge, Re, Don) take the referent of the relative to be rather P (e.g., Ge "(zu ihm), an den sie Gefallen hatte"; Don "and took her pleasure in him"). I find it easier to believe that U was house-proud than that even P could delude himself that she was madly eager for his sexual assaults -- esp. given his *avīre krátau* "under no man's will" in the preceding vs. (3c).

X.95.5: Note the typo in the publ. tr., "used to pierced" → "used to pierce."

As noted above, in pāda a U picks up the final words of the previous vs. (4d), good evidence that P spoke vs. 4 and U was there listening. She now expresses her distaste for his relentless sexual demands in the first hemistich, while, in the second, indicating that she behaved as a dutiful and submissive wife at that time.

The words *kétam* (c) and *vīra* (d) implicitly contrast with the phrase *avīre krátau* in 3c. Though I tr. both *krātu-* and *kéta-* as 'will' in these two vss., I am playing on the ambiguity of the English word 'will'. In 3c 'will' refers to the power to control: U was under the control of no man. Whereas in this vs. 'will' refers to P's desire, which U went along with -- until she didn't. I think she is using the voc. *vīra* ironically; see vs. 11 with vs. 7 below. It would in fact be possible in this sandhi context to read (*me*)'vīra 'o non-hero', but I think the ironic insult is truer to U's rhetoric. Moreover, in pāda b of this same vs. the transmitted *mé 'vyatyai* has to be read with

restored initial *á*-; it seems unlikely (though not impossible) that a putative **me* 'vīra would be treated differently.

X.95.6–7: Here P reminisces about the sensuous beauty of U's companions, the Apsarases, while U points out that the Apsarases were not there to delight P's senses but to assist her when she gave birth.

X.95.6: Once again P conjures images from his memory's eye – here of alluring but elusive Apsarases, who, as we learn in the next vs., were attending on the birth of U's child. (I do not follow the view that the Apsarases are currently running away.)

Many tr. (e.g., Ge, Re [Hspec], Don) take the first hemistich as a list of personal names, but interpreting the words as descriptors of the Apsarases provides a richer semantics.

The vs. is structured by a clever grammatical mismatch: it begins with a rel. prn. *yā*, which is fem. *singular*, with the collective sg. noun *śréṇīḥ* 'rank, row'; *yā* is picked up by matching *tā*, which opens pāda c – but this is *tā(h)* in sandhi and a fem. *plural*: the implicit plurality of the collective sg. here takes grammatical form. The difference in number is subtly emphasized by rhyming final *caranyúḥ* (singular adj.) in b with final *sasruḥ* (pf. plural.) in c.

For *sumnāāpi*- see VIII.13.3 *sumné ... sákḥā*. Our form is of course a bahuvrīhi, but I have suppressed the possessive aspect, since 'consisting of friends in good favor' is too clunky.

Most tr. take *añjāyaḥ* as an adjective characterizing the subject, with just *aruṇāyaḥ* in the simile, evoking the dawns – e.g., KH "diese schmucken (?) (Frauen) ... wie die rötlichen (Morgenröten)." This is not impossible, and I admit that the placement of *ná* favors taking *aruṇāyaḥ* as the first (and only) word in the simile. (However, recall the misplaced *iva* in 2b.) But *añjī-* is otherwise only a noun 'salve, ointment' and turning it into an adjective is not trivial. I think (the motion of) the Apsarases is here compared to the fluidity of such semi-liquid substances, which are also appropriate in this context since they could serve as cosmetics for the Apsarases.

The verb *sasruḥ* phonologically evokes *apsarás-*, a word not found in this hymn, though U is an Apsaras and these center vss. (6–9) concern a troop of them.

X.95.7: The depiction of the Apsarases and the rivers assisting at the birth of U's son reminds us of the waters at Indra's birth (IV.18.6–8), though their role there is somewhat equivocal.

Schnaus points out a syntactic problem with this vs.: *asmin* in pāda a, presumably referring to the child of U+P, is unaccented, but the referent is not yet in the discourse, though such an unaccented form should have a prior referent. I don't have an answer for this – but making P. the referent (as the only masc. sg. in the discourse) is too radical, giving grammar more power over sense than even I would favor. The lack of accent may in part signal U's lack of interest in her son (see esp. vs. 13) – making a truly unidentified and unemphatic 'him'. Moreover, in this vs. U seems to adopt some of the careless speech habits of P: her pāda a has an opening of 3; there's the just mentioned problem with accentless *asmin*; and the segue between pādas b and c is a non sequitur.

With regard to this last, U jumps from the birth of her child and the motherly nurturing of the rivers (*avardhan*, b) to the gods' strengthening of P (*ávardhayan*, d) and their purpose in doing so: for great battle and Dasyu-smiting. Though the same (or almost the same) transitive verb is used for both actions, they otherwise have little in common. Instead, U is preparing to make her case for P.'s generally unheroic behavior and his evasion of his god-destined role, and

so she slips this remark in here, pendant to the description of the birth of her son. The use of the son's birth as contrast to P's is found also in vss. 10–11. As for the construction, Ge (n. 7cd) suggests that *yád* is short for **yáthā yád* "just as when ..."

X.95.8–9: In this pair of vss., spoken by P. and U. respectively, she turns his whole vs. against him (see below). Again, he sees the Apsarases as females susceptible to his seductive advances, while she tartly declares their indifference to him. The vs. pairing is signalled by slightly slant repetition: 8a X *yád āsu* ... / 9a *yád āsu*.

X.95.8: On *sácā* as a pleonastic marker of an abl. absolute, see comm. ad IV.31.5. Here as sometimes elsewhere it seems to signal that the action of the loc. absol. is temporally the same as that of the main verb.

The pres. part. *tarásantī* and the impf. *atrasan* belong to the same pres. stem *trāsati* to the root \sqrt{tras} ; the distraction of the initial cluster in the participle is unprecedented. KH (Injunk. 203 n. 185) cleverly – if, in my view, implausibly – suggests that it's the reflex of Sievers-Edgerton Law after a heavy syllable, from underlying *mát* **trāsantī*, while the cluster remains after the light syllable in *atrasan*. Even if we were inclined still to believe in the Edgerton portion of S-E Law (distraction of initial clusters after heavy syllable), it seems unlikely to have been preserved only here, in this very late hymn. I suggest instead that it's another symptom of P's lack of control over his speech, here manifesting as stuttering. (That the first simile [the one in c] has a singular, but the frame a plural may be another symptom.)

X.95.9: U uses P's vs. 8 against him, matching him point by point. His *āsu* ... *āmānuṣṭṣu mānuṣaḥ* is taken up by her *āsu mārto amṛtāsu* with a synonym pair; his *ratha-spṛś-* by her *niṣpṛś-*; his double similes about animals in the 2nd hemistich matching hers in the same place, with the 2nd simile in both involving horses. In the course of this she turns his point upside down. In vs. 8 he depicts the Apsarases as timid (cd) but potentially eager for his advances (shown by their removing their garments [a]). Her depiction is quite different: her Apsarases may participate in sex with him, even demonstratively ("with their cries" *kṣonṭbhiḥ*), but it is on their own terms. The male is fooling himself if he thinks it was "by his intentions" (*krátubhir nā*); see *avīre krátau* in 3c indicating the U's sexual life is "under no man's will." The two animal similes in cd show the Apsarases, indifferent to the male, absorbed in preening themselves and playing among themselves – a far cry from the bashful creatures of P's 8cd. Note the reflexive expression *tanvāḥ śumbhata svāḥ* (on *śumbhata* see below) and the middle part. *dándaśānāḥ*, both suggesting the Apsarases' focus on themselves and exclusion of the male.

Though belonging to different roots ($\sqrt{spṛś}$ and $\sqrt{pṛc}$), *niṣpṛk* at the end of pāda a and *pṛikté* at the end of b echo each other, rather like *tarásantī* and *atrasan* in 8ab, even as *niṣpṛś-* also picks up *ratha-spṛś-* in 8d. For the sensual nuance of *ní* $\sqrt{spṛś}$, see the same root noun cmpd. in nearby X.91.13, where it refers to a wife caressing her husband.

Gr and Ge (fld. by Re [Hspec], Don) take *śumbhata* as 2nd pl. impv. act. to the common thematized pres. *śumbhāti*. However, Old clearly sets out the arguments for taking it as a medial 3rd pl. nasal-infix pres., an analysis supported by the existence of the athem. mid. part. *śumbhāná-* (/*śumbhāna-*). The early thematization of such a 7th cl. pres. isn't surprising when one contemplates putative forms like 3rd sg. mid. **śu-m-bdhé*, but the 3rd pl. keeps the root form reasonably intact. Flg. Old's analysis are KH, Schnaus, and the publ. tr.

X.95.10–11: Like vss. 8–9, these two vss. are paired, with P’s speech (10) taken up and twisted by U (11). Here the lexical pivot is *√jan* ‘be born’.

X.95.10: Another of P’s rosy recollections of U’s beauty and sexual compliance. His speech is also marked by metrical disturbance (pāda a) and syntactic disjunction: a relative clause describing U (ab) trails off, to be followed by an unconnected clause about the birth of the child (c) and ending with another clause with U as subject.

As discussed above, pāda a “repairs” the ill-formed simile in 3c, with both passages comparing U to flashing lightning. But it requires some repair of its own: the missing syllable in pāda a could be repaired by the preverb *vī* in tmesis, that is, **vī vidyūt ... dávidyot*, cf. 3c *vī dāvidyutat*. The repeated **vī vi(dyūt)* would have undergone haplology – or, perhaps better expressed, the missing syllable gestures towards a preverb that ought to be there but isn’t.

In b the adj. *ápyā* is grammatically ambiguous: it can be nom. sg. fem. referring to U or acc. pl. neut. modifying *kāmyāni*. With most (but not Schnaus), I take it as the former. The phrases *ápyā yóṣā* (X.10.4) and *ápyā yóṣaṇā* (X.11.2) support this interpr., as Old points out.

By most interpr., in b P is reminiscing about the joys of love that U brought to him. KH suggests instead that she is taking them away, depriving him of them, as she leaves, but this doesn’t fit his nostalgic tone.

The son is born in pāda c. KH notes the etymological figure *jāniṣṭaḥ ... sújātaḥ*. The form *apāḥ* is one of the few exx. of a singular form, in this case ablative, of *áp-* ‘water’. This source of his birth identifies him with his mother, who was just called *ápyā* in b, as well as with the birth as depicted in 7ab, with the participation of the rivers. In my view *náryaḥ* ‘belonging to men’ connects him with his father, the human P – though this argument is weakened by the fact that *nárya-* can be applied to gods as well as humans.

The standard interpr. of d is that it is U’s life that is lengthened (e.g., Ge “Urvaśī soll langes Leben haben”), with the only disagreement being about the modality of the injunctive (*prā*) ... *tirata*. But as an Apsaras, U is surely immortal – note they are called *amṛta-* in 9 a -- and so it makes little sense that she would lengthen her own lifetime. Instead I think the life in question is the son’s and that this is a pun. The name of U’s (and P’s) son is Āyu; see, e.g., IV.2.18, V.41.19, and Macd. Ved. Myth 135 n. 9. The obj. phrase *dirghám āyuh* “long lifetime” in d therefore plays off his name. Since the son has a mortal father, he is limited to a mortal lifespan, but his mother does what she can to make it a long one. (Of the comm. and tr. I’ve consulted, only Don interprets it this way: “Let Urvaśī lengthen the span of his life.”)

It is striking that this is the first occurrence of the name Urvaśī in this hymn, found also in vs. 17. By contrast, U addresses P in the vocative in vss. 2, 5, 7, 11, 15, that is, in most of the vss. she speaks (but not 9, 13, or 16).

X.95.11: U matches P’s *jāniṣṭa* (10c) with *jajñiṣé* (11a), both pāda-initial, but she’s pivoting to P’s own birth: the purpose for which he was born and his failure to fulfill that purpose – a more explicit follow-up to 7cd. Though as king and warrior he was born to provide protection to his kingdom and subjects, instead he has exerted his force (*ójas-*) only on her.

I do not entirely understand the function or position of *hí* in 11a, but I assume that it is meant to mark the preceding purpose dative *gopṭhyāya* as a separate small clause, much like purpose datives in Brāhmaṇa prose.

It is not made clear in c on what precise day (*sásmin áhan*) she issued her warning, but the general view (e.g., Ge n. 11c) that it was the day they first came together seems reasonable.

X.95.12–13: Another pair of vss., this time devoted to the fate of the child. P (12) tries to play the family harmony card, but U (13) shows herself quite willing to abandon the child to his father.

X.95.12: As just noted, P tries to persuade her to return on the basis of family ties, three generations of them: the sorrow of a single-parent child (ab), the indissoluble bond between the joint ‘masters of the house’ (*dāmpatī*) (c), and the parents-in-law (d). The in-law relation thus returns from 4ab. Although *śvāśureṣu* is plural here, it presumably only names the parents of the husband, with the plural appropriate to a general statement about the relationships in a joint family.

In b the identity of *cakrān* has long been disputed (see Old, Ge n. 12b), though has generally been assigned to \sqrt{krand} ‘roar, cry out’. However, KH’s ingenious interpr. of *cakrān nā* as *cakrām nā* “like a wheel” (already MSS 8, 1956, but repeated in Injunk. 205 n. 190 and repr. in Aufs. II) has won general acceptance (e.g., Re HSpec, Schnaus, publ. tr.).]

Most interpr. assume the child is crying because he (now) knows he’s separated from his father, but why would this recognition (*viñānān*) come to the child only now. I think it’s instead possible that these are tears of joy at seeing his father (again). Although I recognize that this doesn’t seem to work well with 13a, I think P is imagining a sentimental little scenario of tender reconciliation, which U then cruelly twists in the next vs.

X.95.13: U’s curt dismissal of the child and his feelings (or the feelings invented for him by P) is shockingly harsh.

The sequence *vartáyate áśru*, *cakrān nā* almost replicates, in mirror image, 12b *cakrān nā áśru vartayat*, though split across the pāda boundary. But, though it thus begs to be interpr. as a unit, this is not possible because of the unaccented *krandat* that immediately follows: *cakrān nā* must be part of the *krandat* clause, while it is very difficult to fit *vartáyate áśru* into the same clause. KH’s solution seems the correct one. The wheel is no longer the comparandum for the tear (sharing roundness), but for the child, who screeches like an unoiled wheel – as in the English saying “the squeaky wheel gets the grease.” U has transferred the simile from one target to another, and the picture is distinctly less attractive: a noisy crybaby, not a sad child silently releasing a single tear.

Her distaste for her child comes through even more strongly in c, where she refers to him with neuter pronouns (*tát ... yát*). Although Ge (n. 13c) suggests that the neuter refers to everything U still has from P, including the child, such an interpr. dilutes the power of her statement – and seems a modern version of the later Indian attempts to soften U into a more conventional female.

In d she tries to wrap up their conversation ring-compositionally, echoing phrases from the vs. containing her first speech: *párehi ástam* repeats 2c (*púnar*) *ástam párehi* and *nahí ... māpāḥ* “you will not attain me” is more or less equivalent to 2d *durāpanā ... ahám asmi* “I am hard to attain.” But P ignores the closure generated by the rhetorical structure. For a similar attempt to close a dialogue ring-compositionally, see Yama’s words in X.10.2 and 12; as with U, his efforts are unavailing.

X.95.14–15: The last pair of responsive vss.: P’s over-the-top self-dramatizing (14) is met by U’s weary pacifying.

X.95.14: P responds with maudlin, self-pitying threats to do himself in. All three verbs in this vs., *prapátet*, *śáyīta*, and *adyúh*, all in the optative, are accented, though there's no overt mark of subordination. Old (ZDMG 60: 735 = KISch 210; fld by KH and Schnaus) suggests the accent is emphatic, but this is not terribly satisfactory. (Everything P says is emphatic.) I suggest they are unsignaled “what if” clauses. The publ. tr. represents this for *prapátet*, but in the 2nd hemistich the verbs should rather be tr. “(Of) if he should lie ... or if the wolves should eat ...” This interpr. essentially follows Re's tr. (HSpec, fld. also by Don), though he doesn't discuss the accent. The implied main clause in all instances is “wouldn't you be sorry?!”

X.95.15: U's first hemistich echoes P's three clauses, but in *mā* prohibitives with expected adjustment of aspect stem and/or root: her redupl. aor. *prá paptah* picks up his pres. *prapátet*; her aor. *akṣan* (√*ghas*) his pres. *adyuh* (√*ad*, which lacks an aor.). Her *mṛthāh* “(don't) die” paraphrases his more elaborate *śáyīta nīṛteḥ upásthē* “should lie in the lap of Dissolution” – and of course an aor. to √*śi* barely exists at this period.

Her deprecatory remark about women in the 2nd hemistich seems to me not the result of self-hating misogyny on her part but rather an attempt to deflect him into the general: all women are bad — stop ranting at me.

X.95.16: This remark of U's seems like a non sequitur (see Old's similar puzzlement). It is also difficult for those with even a passing familiarity with Greek mythology to avoid interference from the Persephone story. But it *should* be avoided: this verse is surely not indicating that U, having consumed some mortal food, is now stuck living at least part of the time with mortals, but the reverse – that she's tasted quite enough mortal food, however tiny her portions, and she's taking off. As KH says, the verse provides the reason “warum Urvaśī persönlich vom irdischen Leben ‘genug hat’.” Unfortunately the reason is expressed obliquely. Don suggests that butter (i.e., ghee) may stand in for semen, and U is saying that she's had more than enough sex with P. A clever suggestion, but somehow it doesn't ring true to me.

Pādas a and b can form one subordinate clause, or b can be a main clause, since the accented verb *āvasam* opens the pāda. With most others, I favor the first option.

I take the 1st ps. sg. forms *acaram* (a) and *carāmi* (d) as functionally contrastive: *acaram* has full lexical sense (“I roam”) and *carāmi* is an auxiliary with *tātṛpāñā* “I continue to be sated.” Most interpr. treat the two thus (see, e.g., Ge n. 16d), but not Kü (216–17: “... wandle ich hier befriedigt”) or probably Schnaus (“... lebe ich hier als Gesättigte”).

X.95.12: P makes one last-ditch effort to persuade her, but she has already departed – as the impv. *nī vartasva* “turn back” (d) shows. The high-style descriptors of U in pāda a, “she who fills the midspace, who is the measurer of the dusky realm,” may suggest that she is literally, before his eyes, traversing the midspace on her way to heaven (so approx. Ge n. 17). In V.41.19 U is described as *bṛhaddivā* ‘of lofty heaven’, so her ordinary dwelling may be there.

On *ūpa śikṣa-* with acc. complement see comm. ad I.112.19, 173.10.

P's characterization of himself as *vásiṣṭhaḥ* is puzzling, esp. since the generic superlative sense is vanishingly rare, as against the PN of the poet of Maṇḍala VII; once again Old is similarly puzzled. In VII.33.11 it is said that Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇa was “born from Urvaśī” or “born from the mind of U” (*urvāśyāḥ ... mānasō 'dhi jātāḥ* (cf. also VII.33.13 *apsarāsaḥ pári jajñe vásiṣṭhaḥ*). But P is hardly representing himself as U's son, and the possibility (which Old

entertains) that we are now dealing with that Vasiṣṭha rather than P as speaker is strongly countered by P's usual tone of desperate longing (esp. pāda d). I have no answer.

The verb in c, (*úpa ...*) *tīṣṭhāt*, is accented, with no sign of subordination. As in vs. 14 I think the accent indicates that this is an unmarked subordinate clause, in this case giving the grounds for the action he hopes she will perform: doing a good deed — that is, returning to him — will bring her a reward.

X.95.18: The dialogue is at an end, and the last vs. seems to be spoken by the poet or by a disembodied heavenly voice – at least acdg. to most interpr: KH puts it in the mouth of U (as she flies up through the midspace?). In any case, whoever the speaker is, there is another layer of quotation, since the speaker ventriloquizes what the gods said to P.

The syntax and sense of b are unclear. The most straightforward way to take it is with *bhāvasi* as the verb in the *yáthā* clause (so Old, Ge, Re, Don). But the sense is not entirely satisfactory, since it takes P's bond with death as a given, not the result of some (recent) action – as the change-of-state verb *bhāvasi* implies. I therefore follow KH's more complex split into two clauses, with *bhāvasi* starting the main clause and owing its accent to its position. (Acdg. to Old, this is the interpr. in Ge's Komm., which he abandoned in the tr.) The point is that though P has a divine (/semidivine?) mother, Iḍā (hence the voc. in pāda a, *aīḷa*), he remains bound to mortality because U did not snatch him up and make him immortal (unlike Tithonus, made immortal by Eos in Greek mythology). Nor did she make their child immortal, so he will sacrifice to the gods (c), rather than himself receiving sacrifice.

But it seems that, nonetheless, P may receive special treatment after death, in heaven (*svargé*, d). It is difficult to interpr. this last statement, however. For one thing, this is the only occurrence of the word *svargá-* in the RV. For another, the root \sqrt{mad} is used of the exhilaration enjoyed by the Pitars (/forefathers) after death in the funeral hymn X.14 (see esp. vs. 10, where it is clear that the subject of *mādanti* is the Pitars) – and so the verb in d, *mādayāse*, which declares to P that he will reach exhilaration in heaven, may not be promising more than the usual postmortem joys that all humans receive.

X.96 Indra's horses

On the extended puns in this hymn, see publ. intro. Almost every pāda contains a form of *hári-/hárita-* or *harya-*, sometimes more than one. Outside of vs. 13, the final summary vs., only 6a and 12c lack such forms.

X.96.1: The lexeme *prá ... śaṃsiṣam* here substitutes $\sqrt{śaṃs}$ in the more standard formula *prá vocam*.

Although *prá* is rare with \sqrt{van} , I do not think, *pace* Re, that it is found here only to match the *prá* beginning pāda a. Cf. the inf. *právantave* in I.131.5.

The tr. of the subject of pāda c should be emended to “the delightful (drink) ...” As for the verb, Wh (Rts) registers one occurrence of a 1st class pres. *sécate*, namely this one. It should probably be interpr. instead as the subjunctive to the root aor. marginally found in the Br and tr. “will drip” here. However, note that Gotō (327) argues for its identity as a 1st class indic. present.

X.96.2: The syntax of this vs. is surprisingly clotted, and there are several possible ways to interpr. the overall structure. I take the two hemistichs as syntactically separate; in the first

hemistich, pāda a is a preposed rel. cl. and pāda b is the main cl., with the pres. part. *hinvántaḥ* functioning as main verb, whose subject is the same as the *yé* of a. This rel. cl. / main cl. structure begins with an acc. phrase *hárim ... yónim* “the golden womb,” presumably referring to the soma cup (vel sim.). It functions as the goal for both verbs in this complex: *abhí ... samásvaran* “they have cried out together towards” and *hinvántaḥ* “spurring [horses]” towards” and should be taken as fronted around the whole structure, not merely from the rel. cl. The acc. simile ending b, *divyám yáthā sádaḥ* “like a heavenly seat,” is to be matched with the golden womb opening the hemistich; it can be read with both a and b or only with b. The polarization of these two heavy acc. phrases accounts for much of the apparent awkwardness of the phrasing.

The subjects are presumably the priestly officiants.

The second hemistich also consists of a rel. cl. followed by a main cl., whose structure is more pellucid than ab. Indra is the referent of the rel. *yám* in c and is named in the main cl. of d. In the simile in c, *háribhir ná dhenávaḥ*, *háribhiḥ* is the shared property: the priests fill Indra with golden soma as the cows do with golden ghee. The only slight syntactic problem in the hemistich is that the verb of the rel. cl. is 3rd pl. *prṇánti* while that in the main cl. is 2nd pl. *arcata*. We can either assume that the impv. *arcata* is addressed to a different set of officiants than those in abc, or that a switch to direct address has happened in midsentence, which would not be unusual.

The use of the adj. *hárivantam* in d to modify the fortifying hymn (*sūśám*) is cute: this stem, usually in voc. *harivas*, is of course almost entirely used of Indra “accompanied by his fallow bays.” Here, though Indra is explicitly present in the pāda, it does not modify him but rather than hymn, and it refers not to his horses but to the soma. See vs. 8 below for another ex.

X.96.3: It is quite possible that the *vájra* is the only referent of the two forms of *háriḥ* in b. The mace is described as *níkāma-* in VI.17.10, and the location of the *vájra* in Indra’s two fists is widespread (I.130.4, VI.45.18, VIII.12.7; cf. with sg. fist VI.20.9, X.44.2). However, there is no reason why soma should not be eager for Indra, and the fists are associated with the pressing and purification of soma (e.g., IX.71.3 and a number of repetitions of *mṛjyámāna- gábhastyoḥ* (IX.20.6, etc.).

hári-manyu-sāyaka- is one of the very few multimember compounds in the RV. (I count no more than 15 exx.) It has received a surprising number of alternative translations. Gr takes it as ‘dessen Zorneswaffe [= *manyusāyaka*] (Blitz) goldfarben ist’, with Zorneswaffe standing for *vájra*. Ge, flg. Sāy. (n. 3c), sees the 2nd and 3rd members as a dvandva, with both equated with *hári-*, standing for soma: “sein Ingrimme [= *manyu*] und sein Geschoss [= *sāyaka*] ist der goldgelbe (Soma).” Re appositely cites the voc. phrase in the Battle Fury hymn X.83.1 *manyo ... vājra sāyaka* and on this basis seems to consider the middle member *manyu* to be predicated of both the 1st and the 3rd members: “qui a pour arme-de-jet la Fureur, pour (foudre [*vájra*]) doré (la Fureur).” But this would be an oddly constructed compound indeed. My interpr. differs from all three, though is perhaps closest to Gr’s: I consider *manyu-sāyaka-* a determinative compd with *manyu-* in genitival relationship with *sāyaka-*; this compd in turn is equated with *hári-*, which stands for both *vájra-* and soma, which are, of course, both necessary for Indra’s successful fighting.

X.96.4: The mace undergoes a series of metaphorical transformations in this vs. – from the static sun (a), to a racehorse (b), to Indra himself (c), before becoming a weapon again (d). The first three pādas also trace the trajectory of the mace’s use in the Vṛtra battle. It is first put in Indra’s hand; Indra then swings it energetically and (likely) in a wide arc; it then hits the serpent.

As Ge points out, the beacon placed in heaven must be the sun; this is a disguised instantiation of the formula “place the sun” that I discussed in the Melchert Fs. (“Sūre Duhitār’s Brother, the ‘Placer of the Sun’,” 2010). The location where the mace has been set in place is not specified, but it is either Indra’s fist (as in 3b) or, less likely, Indra himself (3d).

In b the mace seems to be compared to a racehorse “with its charge” (*rāmhyā*); see the “charge” in the preceding hymn X.95.3 as well as that of the mythical racehorse Tārṣya in X.178.3 *sahasrasāḥ śatasā asya rāmhiḥ* “his charge that wins thousands, that wins hundreds.” As noted just above, I think this pāda depicts Indra’s energetic swinging of the *vájra*. This movement would be the *vájra*’s “charge.” The verb in the pāda, *vivyácat*, is ambig. in both form and function. The publ. tr. follows Kü’s (505) interpr. as a perfect subjunctive, but given the injunctives in the neighboring pādas (*dhāyī* a, *tudát* c), I might be inclined towards Old’s interpr. as thematic pluperfect (injunctive). As for meaning, *vyac* ordinarily means ‘contain, envelop, encompass’, with object. But given *vyacas-* ‘expanse’, the nuance seems to be that the space that is encompassed is extensive. Here without object the idea seems to be that the racehorse gobbles up the distance of the course it runs on, and so encompasses it. In the same way the *vájra* encompasses the space that it swings through.

The poet plays tricks with reference in pāda c, which harks back to two different phrases in the preceding vs., which point to two different referents. The first we encounter is *hārisīpraḥ* ‘golden-lipped’, which echoes *susīpraḥ* in 3c, referring to Indra. But the next phrase, *yá āyasāḥ* “which is made of metal,” found in 3a, seems to swing the interpr. definitively to the mace (but see 8a below). Why/how is the mace golden-lipped? It may simply mean that it is golden, as has been repeatedly emphasized. Or perhaps it is now closely identified with Indra, whose lips are dripping with soma. In any case the *vájra* has agency here, as the one who thrusts/pushes the serpent, in effect *vṛtra-hán-*.

In d *harimbhará-* must be Indra, so that the *vájra* (identified as *hari-*) has been demoted to a material object again. I do not understand why Indra becomes ‘thousand-flamed’ under these circumstances.

X.96.4–5: Note that initial *tudád* is echoed by *tuvaṃ(-tuvam)* opening 5a and c.

X.96.6: The stem *mandín-* ordinarily modifies soma and means ‘exhilarating’, and I have followed that path here, though a passive ‘exhilarated’ of course fits Indra better.

X.96.7: As in vs. 2, *hārivant-* modifies not its usual referent, Indra, but, here, *kāma-* ‘desire’.

X.96.8: The poet returns to the conundrum of vss. 3–4. In 4c we were whiplashed by the incompatible phraseology, which first suggested that Indra as the referent, but then seemed to decisively identify the *vájra* because of the izafe-type rel. *yá āyasāḥ* “which is made of metal.” But here the referent can hardly be anyone but Indra: all the rest of the phraseology in the vs. points to him. But he is called *āyasāḥ*. Is this simply a metaphorical application of this adj. to mean especially strong and invulnerable, like the superhero Iron Man? or is Indra now identified with his mace, as his mace is transformed into him? If so, it’s a mace that can drink (see b).

X.96.9: As Ge suggests (n. 9b) *vājāya* is probably an abbreviation for *vājapēyāya-* ‘drink of victory’ vel sim. Although the cmpd is not attested until the AV and already there is the name of a particular ritual (parallel to the Rājāsūya, Áśvamedha, etc. [e.g., AVŚ XI.7.7]) not a drink, the

ritual must have been named after a ritual drink, and in our passage *turaspéya-* ‘drink of overcoming’ (?) in the preceding vs. (8b) would have conjured it up. I offer an alternative tr. “sets his two lips to twitching for (the drink) of victory.” The vs. is stuffed with reff. to drinking.

With Ge (also Kü 294) I take *dávidhvataḥ* as the gen. sg. of the intens. part. agreeing with *yásya* in pāda a, *pace* Sāy., Gr, who take it as 3rd du. Schaf. identifies it as a 3rd du., but then says *śípre* is its object, which sounds like the Ge interpr., since there are no other duals that could serve as subj.

X.96.10: “Both dwelling places” are presumably Heaven and Earth; see *ródasī* in 11a.

The epithet *hárivant-* now finally has its proper referent, Indra (see above vss. 2 and 7).

X.96.11: With Ge, I supply ‘fill(ed)’ with *ā* in pāda a, on the basis of the stereotyped expression “fill the two worlds with greatness.” Cf., e.g., III.54.15 *ubhé ā paprau ródasī mahitvā* (repeated twice elsewhere).

X.96.12: On *prayúj-* see comm. ad X.33.1. I would now change the awkward “advance teams of the peoples” just to “teams of the peoples.”

Contra Pp (and Lub), the sandhi form *pībā* must be an underlying subjunctive *pībās* in the *yáthā* purpose clause, not an impv. *pība*. So Old.

On the problematic *dásoni-* see comm. ad VI.20.4. Here it is supposed to refer to the “10-armed sacrifice,” i.e., one conducted by 5 priests.

X.96.13: The second hemistich of this summary vs. is found elsewhere (cd = X.116.4; d also = I.104.9). As pointed out above, the key words of this hymn are almost lacking in this vs. (save for *harivaḥ* in pāda a), a sign that it is extra-hymnic.

X.97 Plants

As Ge points out, the hymn is entirely Atharvan in character. It corresponds roughly to AVŚ VIII.7 and AVP XVI.12–14, with very different orders and selections of vss., as well as various YV versions. The variety and lack of overlap gives a free and somewhat improvisational feel to the healing herbs verses.

X.97.1–2: In 2ab *dhāmāni* contrasts with *rúhaḥ*, which I render ‘shoots’, and it is therefore tempting to tr. it as ‘roots’ – the emplaced part of the plant, the foundation – or the body or stem of the plant, but that works less well in 1d. In 2ab Ge (n. 2b) suggests rather than the *rúhaḥ* are the individual plants and the *dhāmāni* their types (/species) (Arten); the difference in numbers (100 versus 1000) could support his view.

X.97.2: The adj. *agadā-* appears twice in the RV (here and X.16.6); it is probably also related to *vigadā-* in X.116.5 (q.v.). It is usually etymologically connected with *√gad* ‘say’, whose verb forms are first attested considerably later. (Note also that the root violates IE root-structure constraints, beginning and ending with a plain voiced stop.) The chronological gap in attestation is not as troubling as it might be, given that the RVic occurrences of *-gadā-* are in the Xth Maṇḍala in non-hieratic contexts. The sense ascribed to it here – ‘without disease’ – (as well as Cl Skt. *gada-* ‘disease’) is explained by Th as a dev. from *‘curse, spell’. See EWA s.v. *GAD* for

disc. The speech component of the underlying root may be found in the other occurrence of *agadā-* as well as *vigadā-*.

X.97.4: This vs. is structurally complex, in that its first hemistich contains fem. pl. vocatives (*mātarah ... devīḥ*) and a 2nd pl. enclitic prn. (*vaḥ*) and its second a masc. sg. voc. *pūruṣa* and a 2nd sg. prn. (*tāva*). The second half must be the direct speech of the poet-healer, signaled by pāda b *tād ... ūpa bruve* “I say this to you / I implore you in this way” and probably also by the *īti* in pāda a, though that also marks *ōṣadhīḥ* as a quoted name. The speech in cd seems to be addressed by the poet-healer to his sick client. As Ge cleverly suggests (n. 4c) the three acc. in c *āsvaṃ gāṃ vāsaḥ* indicate what the healer hopes to get for his fee, while *ātmānaṃ tāva* refers to the self of the person being healed. (That d is repeated in 8d in a different context supports the notion that it can be separately interpreted here.) The sense might be clearer if it were rendered “Might I gain a horse, a cow, a garment – and for you your very self, o man.”

X.97.5: One might ask what earthly good getting a cow would do the plants, but (more or less with Old) the idea must be that the plants are the poet-healer’s helpers and will technically have a share in the cow he hopes to get for himself (4c).

X.97.6: Again the aid of the plants makes the poet successful at healing: poet + plants → healer.

X.97.7: I take the acc. sg.s in ab to be plant names (see Ge n. 7ab), an interpr. supported by 9ab.

X.97.8: As in 5c, in pāda c here the poet uses the conceit that the plants desire a material fee for healing the client. Again as in 5, the difference between the two objects of \sqrt{san} would be clearer with the tr. “... as they seek to gain the stake -- and for you your very self, o man.”

X.97.9: The stem *sīrā-* in most of its RVic occurrences (I.174.9, etc.; see EWA s.v.) appears with a form of \sqrt{sru} ‘flow’ and seems to mean ‘stream’, a sense acknowledged by Mayr (EWA), though he finds the word “problematisch.” Ge (n. 9c) thinks that meaning is excluded here, but he does not sufficiently explore the metaphorical possibilities. The phrase *sīrāḥ patatrīṇīḥ*, lit. “winged stream(bed)s” describes plants; the wings can be leaves, while the stream(bed) can be the stem/stalk, a hollow tubelike shape with liquid running through it like a streambed

The primary 2nd pl. ending *-tha* of (*nīs*) *kṛtha* is surprising, since the verb must belong to the root aorist stem. KH (Injunk. 111) plausibly explains this (and similar formations) as an attempt to make clear that the form is being used as an injunctive, not an imperative, as the imperative use of morphologically ambiguous forms like *kṛta* is the prevailing one.

X.97.10: I don’t understand the image of ab: what are the plants actually doing? Are they growing riotously over the fence (in their garden, as it were), or are they breaching the body’s envelope to heal from within? I favor the latter; I find it hard to imagine Rigvedic settlements as having fenced-in gardens.

X.97.11: Ge takes *vājāyan* as the denom. “nach dem Siegerpreis (Gewinn) verlangend,” but it’s best to take it to the other stem *vājāya-*, inherited transitive ‘invigorate, incite’; see my *-āya-* book (89); so Re as well as Forssman 1987.

The real puzzle in the vs. is pāda d, esp. the rt.noun cmpd *jīva-gṛbh-*. Scar (113–14) discusses the phrase at length, following Forssman’s 1987 (Fs. Rau) treatment. Forssman interpr. *purā* as “temporal-präventive” (“zum Schutze vor, zur Vermeidung von”) and the cmpd as an abstract (since only abstracts are construed with *purā* in that sense). The point here seems to be that the mere act of the healer’s picking up the healing plants causes the sickness to die, so as to avoid being “captured alive” – that is, having the remedy directly applied to it. I would now alter the tr. to “as if against [=to prevent] being captured alive.” I think we can safely dismiss Macdonell-Keith’s (Vedic Index, s.v.) reproduction of Roth’s view that it refers to a police officer in the RV.

X.97.12: The voc. *oṣadhīh* was omitted from the tr. Alter to “O plants, him ...”

A different rt. noun cmpd. causes trouble here, *madhyama-sīt-*, lit. ‘lying in the middle’. Given the context, it refers to someone who is powerful (*ugrāh*) and successful drives away enemies like illnesses. The word is discussed at some length by Ge, Old, and Scar (535), as well as Macdonell-Keith (Vedic Index, s.v.) Whitney (ad AVŚ IV.9.4), and Jeong-Su Kim (2014, ad AVP IX.8.9 [p. 276]). It seems to refer to a king, or similar figure, whose position in the center gives him particular power or authority – perhaps the positional version of “primus inter pares.” It seems quite unlikely to be, *pace* Old, a person in the middle of a bed, who pushes his companions to the right and the left edges of the bed. The sense might be clearer as “situated in the middle,” rather than “lying ...”

X.97.13: *nihākā-* is another puzzling word. Re (Fs. Turner, cited EWA s.v.) interpr. it as ‘blizzard’, hence a derivative of \sqrt{snih} , the IE ‘snow’ word.

X.97.14: The unidentified fem. pl. referents are of course the plants, again as helpers of the poet-healer.

X.97.18: Although the publ. tr. does not make this clear, the “you” of c is sg. and fem. It presumably refers to the particular medical plant singled out in 19d and 21d.

X.97.22: The *pārayāmasi* in d should be considered beside *pārayiṣṇvāh* in 3d. In both cases the verb means “deliver (to the far shore) / deliver (from evil/illness).”

X.98 Rain

On the structure and backstory of this hymn, see publ. intro., as well as the extensive intros of Old and Ge, and HPS’s extensive treatment (B+I 89–92). The hymn provides a basis for an elaborate itihāsa (Nir. 2.10, BṛhDev. 7.155ff.), which, however, does not seem to be reflected in the RVic hymn.

X.98.1: This vs. has received a wide variety of interpr., depending in great part on the interpr.’s notion of the nature of Bṛhaspati. Ge (n. 1a), for ex., takes Bṛhaspati as a protean god, able to take form as any of the gods mentioned. However, as HPS points out, there is no parallel for this. Moreover, in the RV *prāti* \sqrt{i} does not mean ‘take form as’ (vel sim.), but ‘go up against, confront’. (For other interpr. of the vs., see esp. HPS’s disc. pp. 90–91.) My interpr. rests on an alternative suggested by Ge (also n. 1a), that bcd are the direct speech of Bṛhaspati to the gods in question, seeking one who can exert influence on Parjanya.

The impv. *vr̥ṣāya* is somewhat problematic. It must be trans./caus. ‘make rain’; see Sāy.’s gloss *varṣaya* – in which case, why not just use that causative stem (*varṣāya*)? The obvious answer is meter: *varṣaya* would not fit the cadence – though meter is never an entirely satisfactory answer. Two homonymous verb stems are joined in *vr̥ṣāyā*:- the more common us the denom. ‘act the bull’, always middle; the less common one found twice in the middle (IX.71.3, X.44.4), with the intrans. meaning ‘rain’. In both these passages there is also a likely pun on ‘act the bull’ (for disc. see comm. ad locc). The sole act. form is here, and it has developed a contractive trans./caus. value. It is possible that there’s a buried pun on the ‘bull’ sense, but I don’t see any positive evidence for this.

X.98.2: The god Agni, one of the only prominent gods not mentioned in vs. 1, appears here—having apparently taken Devāpi’s message in vs. 1 (delivered in front of the ritual fire?) to Bṛhaspati. Rather than serving as Devāpi’s intermediary with the other gods, Bṛhaspati offers to place effective speech in Devāpi’s mouth, presumably so he can approach the gods directly.

Note the insistent *praticīnāḥ prāti* (... *vavṛtsva*) in c, picking up *prāti* (... *ihi*) in 1a.

X.98.3: Devāpi happily accepts Bṛhaspati’s offer, as is seen in his near word-for-word repetition in pāda a of B’s speech in 2d.

On metrically bad *iśirām* see comm. ad X.68.3.

Pāda d plays on multiple senses of *drapsá*- ‘drop’. Ge and HPS think the primary referent here is ‘soma’; however, although both *drapsá*- and *mādhumant*- are commonly used of soma in Maṇḍala IX, I think this referent is a distant third here. Since Bṛhaspati has just offered to put speech in Devāpi’s mouth and Devāpi has accepted, I think it likely that the honeyed *drapsá* is this very speech, which Devāpi is consuming by mouth. And it is hard not to see a reference to rain in a word ‘drop’ (as pointed out by many).

X.98.4: There is disagreement about the speaker of this vs.: Ge opts for Bṛhaspati, while Old (hymn intro.) prefers Śaṃtanu. Although Bṛhaspati would make the four-vs. sequence more symmetrical, and 4a answers 3d, as 3a did 2d, I find it unlikely that Bṛhaspati would have to say “*let the drops enter...*,” since, as a god, he presumably has some control. Moreover, the orders given to Devāpi to sacrifice in cd seem likely to have been issued by his patron, not the god.

The drops in pāda a are (in my view) most likely the rain for which Śaṃtanu was eager (see esp. 1d, 3c).

As Old and HPS suggest, the thousand cows and a chariot in b sound like a Dakṣiṇā, but (*pace* both), I don’t think this means that Śaṃtanu has to be identified with Indra – rather Indra has to give these items first, before they can be redistributed to Devāpi.

The middle voice of *yajasva* in c does not conform to its canonical later usage, since it here seems to be addressed to Devāpi, the officiating priest (who should be the subject of active forms of √*yaj*): *yajasva* would properly be addressed to the patron, i.e., Śaṃtanu.

X.98.5–6: The second half of 5 and all of 6 provide a textbook example of Lüders’s heavenly ocean – which all too frequently otherwise seems to rest on flimsy evidence.

X.98.6: The waters confined in the higher sea sound very much like the waters confined by Vṛtra. Cf. I.32.11 ... *atiṣṭhan, níruddhā āpaḥ* “The waters stood still, hemmed in” and our pāda b *āpo devébhir nírvtā atiṣṭhan* “The waters stood still, confined by the gods.”

The hapax *mṛkṣīnī-* is of unclear sense and etymology. I opt for a connection with *√mṛj* ‘wipe, groom, curry’ and, more narrowly, with *mṛkṣā-* in VIII.66.3 meaning (in my view) ‘currycomb’ (see comm. ad loc.). The tracks left by the rains gushing over the land in rivulets would resemble the tracks of a currycomb.

X.98.9: The bahuvrīhi *rohīdaśva-* is otherwise only used of Agni, so the reference to Agni must persist in this vs., though he is unnamed.

X.98.11: The vṛddhi form *aulānā-* in d is utterly opaque; it is even unclear whether it is a personal name (most likely) or, as Gr would have it, the designation of an offering.

X.99 Indra

The Anukr. attributes this hymn to Vamra “Ant,” and in a playful spirit in the final summary vs. (12) the poet names himself as *vamrakā-* ‘little ant’. There is no clear connection between this humorous self-deprecatory nickname and the often puzzling contents of the hymn, though an “ant couple” (*vamrāsya ... mithunā* appears in vs. 5).

On the pronominal skeleton that structures the hymn, see publ. intro. The lack of divine names in the hymn, noted in the publ. intro., invites the audience to try out multiple referents, and in fact a number of the vss., esp. in the early parts of the hymn, are ambiguous. In my view previous interpr. have been too quick to assume that Indra is the exclusive referent throughout the hymn.

The hymn has some striking similarities to I.51, an Indra hymn attributed to Savya Āṅgīrasa. These include the “hundred-doored” vs. 3 : I.51.3 / ants vss. 5/12 : I.51.9 / Pipru vs. 11 : I.51.5 / Rjīśvan vs. 11 : I.51.5 / Kutsa+Śuṣṇa vs. 9 : I.51.6, 11 / Dasyus vss. 7–8 : I.51.6, 8.

X.99.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn begins with maximal referential uncertainty: the first vs. contains two questions about identity, with the two interrogatives *kām* and *kād*, opening the two hemistichs. Moreover, there is 2nd sg. address, via the verb *iṣanyasi*, with the 2nd sg. subject unidentified. And the pronominal gen. *tāsya*, assuming (as most do) that it has personal reference (“of his/its”), is also unspecified. In fact, the only semantic anchor is the *vājra-* in d, further identified as *vṛtra-tūr-* ‘obstacle/Vṛtra-overcoming’, which situates the verse in the larger Indra narrative.

In addition to the referential problems, there are a number of uncertainties in the syntax. These include – 1) do *citrām* and *vāśrām* belong together, as obj. of *iṣanyasi*, or is *vāśrām* separate and the obj. of *vāvṛdhādhyai*? 2) is *pr̥thugmānam* a bahuvrīhi or a karmadhāraya? 3) is *śāvasaḥ* (+/- *tāsya*) to be construed with *dātu* or *vyùṣṭau*? 4) Is cd one clause or two? With regard to all these questions the publ. tr. takes a different stand from most other tr., views that I will in part now defend. I will also try to impose a bit more interpretive sense than the often vague publ. tr. did – though the hymn remains maddeningly opaque.

Let us begin with the 2nd ps. subject to the verb *iṣanyasi* in pāda a. The only thing we know about him is that he’s capable of setting in motion something bright (*citrām*) and he’s *cikītvān* (cognizant, observant, attentive). This pf. part. may be the clue: it is esp. common as a modifier of Agni, and since at the beginning of any RVic hymn a reference to the ritual fire would not be amiss, Agni is a reasonable suggestion. Here Agni could be sending out his bright beam (vel sim.). On the other hand, if we follow Ge (n. 1a) in supplying ‘song, praise’ with *citrām*, the addressee could be the poet, urged by his fellow officiants to send out his hymn on

our behalf. I think either of these (or a combination of both – e.g., Agni acting in lieu of the poet) is plausible here.

As for *vāśrā-*, the evidence goes in several directions. The distance between the two words *citrām* and *vāśrām* (in separate pādas) and their proximity to two different verbal forms (*iṣanyasi* and *vāvṛdhādhyai*) disfavor construing them together. However, *vāśrā-* is often used of cows and the stem *iṣanya-* several times takes cows as obj. (III.50.3, IX.96.8); moreover, *vāśrā-* also modifies *gīrah* ‘songs’ in VIII.44.25 and so would still work if we think ‘song, praise’ is the object of *iṣanyasi*. The publ. tr. “bright bellower” does construe the two together, with the object of *vāvṛdhādhyai* left unspecified. However, I would entertain the alternative, “Which bright (hymn?) did you send ... to strengthen the bellower” – the interpr. of Ge (also Scar 190). In that case the referent of *vāśrām* is in question; Ge (n. 1b) suggests Indra. This is also plausible, though it should be noted that *vāśrā-* is never used of him.

As for *prthu-gmānam*, it is generally taken as a bahuvrīhi (so, e.g., Gr ‘breite Bahn habend’, Gr ‘breitspurigen’), modifying *vāśrām*. Its second-member accent would be paralleled by some (though not all) bahuvrīhis with 1st-member *prthu-* (e.g., *prthu-pājas-* ‘of broad dimension’). However, the b.-v. interpr. goes back to the period in which the 2nd-member -*gmān-* was taken as a form of \sqrt{gam} ‘go’ (see the glosses given above and Gr s.v. “(*gmān*)”). It is now clear that it belongs to the ‘earth’ word (*kṣām-*), with a zero-grade *ghm-* parallel to *jm-*. The apparent -*n*-stem we have here was backformed to the loc. **gm-án* (cf. loc. *jmán* and EWA s.v. *kṣām*). With 2nd-member -*gmān-* meaning ‘earth’, a b.-v. interpr., i.e., ‘having the broad earth’, no longer fits the context; see Scar’s awkward and semantically stretched “den auf der weiten Erde {bekanntesten} Brüller.” Instead, it must simply be a karmadhāraya meaning ‘broad earth’, here as an acc. extent of space with *iṣanyasi*. Old appositely compares voc. *prthu-jman* in AVŚ V.1.5, also showing a backformed -*an-* stem extracted from the loc.; again it must mean ‘o broad earth’, not *‘o (one) having (a) broad earth’. Note also that in our vs. 2b the phrase *prthúm yónim* ‘broad womb’ is found in the same metrical position and refers to the same space, in my opinion.

The second hemistich brings a new set of problems. First, Ge takes cd as a single clause through *vájram* in d, with *vṛtratúram ápinvat* an unsigned dependent clause [“(wenn)”], making *kát ... dātu* the subj. of *tákṣat* (“Welche Gabe wird ... die Keule zimmern”), an expression that seems strange even in the context of the general strangeness of RVic discourse. It seems more natural to take c as an independent nominal cl. (so also Scar). See below.

The next question is whether *dātu* belongs to $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘give’ or $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘divide’ (EWA’s *DĀ⁴*): Ge opts for the former, Gr, Old, publ. tr. the latter, Scar either one. The decision rests in part on what *śávasaḥ* is construed with. Save for the publ. tr., it is universally taken with *vyùṣtau* (e.g., Ge “im Erwachen seiner Kraft”; Scar “beim Aufflammen seiner ... Kraft”). But *vyùṣti-* is never construed with a genitive of anything but Uṣas -- except X.76.1 with *ūrjām* “at the first dawn flushes of nourishment,” a passage that Ge. (n. 1c) adduces. But I take the expression there as referring to “the milk of the dawn cows”; see comm. ad loc. I prefer to take *śávasaḥ* here with *kát ... dātu* “what is his share/portion of strength?” This question would follow naturally upon the *vāvṛdhādhyai* that ends the preceding pāda: if either Indra or the hymn is what is to be strengthened in ab, then it makes sense to inquire how much strength he/it has received. I tr. *tásya* as “his,” but if the question is about the hymn (as Scar tentatively suggests), “its” could be substituted. (Since Ge and Scar both take *tásya* as an independent genitive, as do I, there is no point in exploring the possibility of its modifying *śávasaḥ*.)

This brings us to pāda d. Here the problem is that it's too easy to fill in the blanks. There are two good possibilities for the subject of *takṣat*. As Ge points out (1d), Tvaṣṭar is quite frequently the subject of *tákṣad vájram* and related expressions (esp., in the great Indra-Vṛtra hymn, I.32.2 *tváṣṭā ... vájram ... tatakṣa*). It is difficult to believe that the audience wouldn't immediately think of Tvaṣṭar when confronted with *tákṣad vájram*, esp. with that noun qualified as *vṛtra-tuṣam*. Although Tvaṣṭar might be thought of as the default here, I actually favor Uśanā Kāvya, who also several times fashions the mace: see, e.g., I.121.12 ... *kāvyā uśānā ... vṛtrahānam ... tatakṣa vájram* and comm. ad X.49.2. In my view is also found in this hymn in vs. 9, and so introducing him here would provide some continuity, whereas Tvaṣṭar has no further role here. Ge rejects Tvaṣṭar in favor of Soma, the referent (in his view) of *dātu* in c. I see his point: Tvaṣṭar seems like a red herring – too obvious in the otherwise hazy rhetoric of the hymn. But it may be that the poet wants to throw his audience a belated lifeline: nothing so far in the hymn gives any indication that Indra is the dedicand, so in the last pāda of the 1st vs. he sets up a situation that refers uniquely to Indra: the *vāja* and its unnamed, but easily supplied fashioner, and Indra's standard target *vṛtrá* (whether the personal Vṛtra or the generic 'obstacle') – without having to mention Indra's name or any of his epithets. In other words, pāda d is the semi-riddling answer to a riddle that hasn't been directly posed.

The last word *ápinvat* provides a last difficulty. It is accented; if it belongs with the apparent main clause introduced by *tákṣat*, it must begin a new asyndetic clause. This is how the publ. tr. takes it. One problem is that that interpr. assumes that the obj. is the *vāja* and the subj. the unnamed Tvaṣṭar. Each of these assumptions is less than ideal: the *vāja* doesn't "swell," at least literally, and Tvaṣṭar is not the most likely agent of such an action. We could supply "waters" as the obj. of *ápinvat*, which is a more natural VP, but Tvaṣṭar remains a less likely agent. By contrast, if we take *ápinvat* as part of an unmarked dependent cl., owing its accent to this subordination, it doesn't need to be initial in its cl. Its obj. can then be *vṛtratúram*, which need not be coreferential with *vájram* but instead refer to Indra (as in IV.42.8). This little clause could then depict Tvaṣṭar's supplying soma to Indra to swell him up. The drawbacks: 1) soma-supplying is not usually Tvaṣṭar's role either; 2) the (pseudo-)root *√pinv* is not used elsewhere of Indra's reaction to soma-drinking. Nonetheless, *pinv* and soma both inhabit the realm of the liquid, which is more than the *vāja* does, and so I propose an alternative tr. "(Tvaṣṭar) fashioned the mace, (when) he made swell the Vṛtra/obstacle-overcomer."

X.99.2: The long portion of the hymn with anaphoric *sá* as subject of every vs. (2–9) begins here, but this pronominal expression of the subject doesn't help as much as it might. We still lack explicit referent(s).

At least in the first hemistich the referent is, in my view, open. Although Indra is for most interpr. the default, Agni seems to me a distinct, indeed the likely, possibility for various reasons. To begin with, the other occurrence of instr. *dyutā* in VI.2.6 is in a comparison of Agni's flashing with that of the sun, and it is overwhelmingly Agni who takes a seat on the ritual ground, here characterized as "the broad womb" (*prthúṃ yónim*) – though Ge (n. 2b) conjures up a few passages with Indra as subj. In favor of Agni see esp. VIII.29.2 with similar phraseology (*yóni-*, *√sad*, and *dyut-/dyot-*): *yónim éka ā sasāda dyótanaḥ*.

The second hemistich, with its own initial *sá* (therefore opening the [to me unlikely] possibility of different referents for ab and cd), likewise seems applicable to Agni or Indra (or neither). The unidentified subject has both nestmates (*sániḥbhiḥ*) and a brother as helpers in his action. Ge (n. 2cd), who takes the subj. as Indra, identifies the nestmates as the Maruts,

reasonably enough, and the brother as Viṣṇu, with less justification. The only passage I know of that names a brother of Indra is VII.55.5, where the brother is (oddly) Pūṣan. If the referent is Agni, the nestmates can be his flames; for this possibility see (admittedly obscure) X.31.6 *asyā sánílā ásurasya yónau* “in the womb of this lord are those of the same nest,” where “this lord” is most likely Agni (so also Ge). The lexical similarity to our passage (*ásura-*, *yóni-*, and *sáníla-*) is striking. Moreover, Agni’s brothers are well known (cf. I.164.1, maybe X.11.2, and the story of the flight of Agni, with his brothers mentioned in X.51.6), and in IV.1.2 Varuṇa is named as his brother. The curiously indirect expression “not without his brother” (*bhrátur ná ṛté*) could reflect the story of Agni’s failed attempt to escape his ritual role and the fate of his brothers. Contra most interpr., Old considers the *ná* here to be the simile particle; he suggests it means “as if without a brother,” and indicates that the subject used the help of the *sáníḍa-* because he lacked a brother or his brother was somehow absent. This is an alternative worth considering, whoever the subject is meant to be.

The VP *prasahānāḥ ... māyāḥ* “overcoming *māyās* is equally applicable to Agni and Indra. In V.2.9 Agni *prādevīr māyāḥ sahate* “overcomes ungodly *māyāḥ*, while in VII.98.5 it is Indra: *yadéd ádevīr ásaḥiṣṭa māyāḥ* in almost identical words.

The identity of “the seventh” (*saptáthasya*) is unclear. Ge (n. 2cd) considers it to be one, or the first, of a group of seven well-known demons, possibly Vṛtra. (The passages Ge cites for the existence of this group are suggestive but not utterly convincing.) Old instead weakly endorses Bergaigne’s view that it’s Varuṇa, on the basis of vs. 10, but gives no reason why he’d be “seventh.” With Ge (n. 2cd) I tentatively adduce X.49.8, where Indra claims to be *saptahán* ‘the smasher of the seven’; that same vs. is connected with our vs. 7, and our vs. 9 has thematic and verbal parallels in X.49.3.

Note the predicated participle *prasahānāḥ*, the only verbal form in this hemistich; the opening *sá* makes it likely that cd is a clause independent of ab. Ge also takes it as separate.

X.99.3: Another obscure verse with obscure referents. Once again both Agni and Indra seem to me reasonable possibilities, though different pieces of the vs. fit one or the other better. Indeed at this point in the hymn Indra begins to outweigh Agni, who seems to me the more plausible referent of the first two vss., but who is being increasingly elbowed out as the hymn proceeds.

As for this vs., Indra is more generally associated with the winning of the sun, the topic of pāda b, than Agni. See, e.g., VI.17.8 *svaṛṣātā vṛṇata índram átra* “They choose Indra here at the winning of the sun,” though Agni also participates in this activity. For example, in X.8.6 Agni’s head is *svaṛṣā-* ‘sun-winning’. Indra’s signature verb *√han* is found in the pres. part. *ghnán* (d), and in general the aggressiveness of the vs. and even the drive to the prize in pāda a seem more characteristic of Indra. However, the phrase *abhí várpasā bhūt* “prevailed with his form” exactly matches the phrase in X.3.2 *kṛṣṇám yád énīm abhí várpasā bhūt* “when with his form he has prevailed over black, mottled (Night)” of Agni, and *várpas-*, a term that seems to refer to an often indistinctly defined form or shape laid on top of another, is esp. associated with Agni (e.g., I.140.5, 7, 141.3; VI.3.4) and with the smoke that envelops him. (The same phrase *abhí várpasā bhūt* also of course occurs near the end of this hymn in 11d.)

Ge interpr. the hapax instr. *ápa-duṣpādā* as ‘not lame’ (“mit einem Nichtlahmen”), with *ápa* functioning as a sort of privative to *duṣpād-* ‘lame’, lit. ‘having a bad foot’ (I.53.9). But *ápa-* isn’t a privative prefix in the RV; the closest would be *ápa-vrata-* ‘(one) contrary to commandment’, which is, however, distinct from *a-vratá-* ‘without commandment’ (see disc. ad I.51.9). Moreover, the context here favors a negative notion: the idea seems to be that the subject

succeeds despite having bad equipment, not because his equipment is good (as “not lame” would indicate). See the next vs., 4c, with *apādaḥ ... arathāḥ* “(they, though) lacking feet and chariots ...” The interpr. of the cmpd by (Gr /) Old, “auf einem Weg, dem Schlimmfüssiges fern ist,” better accounts for the *āpa*, but still errs by inserting a positive value in a context that invites a negative one. Old seems to mean that the subject is following a path that a lame person couldn’t, and so it is a good one. This actually doesn’t follow logically, but see Gr’s paraphrase as “sichern Ganges.” In contrast, I suggest that *āpa*- here has the same sense as archaic English “off” as in “off ox,” the one further from the driver. So here the horse (if that’s what the referent is) is lame, but since it’s the off foot that’s lame the driver (*yātar*-) may not have noticed this defect.

I have no idea what the “hundred-doored” (*śatādura*-) refers to; the same descriptor is found in I.51.3, associated with Atri, but otherwise unclear.

X.99.3–4: The negated nom. sg. *anarvā* begins 3c, while 4a ends with *ārvā*. The propinquity of these two forms highlights their semantic divergence: *ārvan(t)*- refers to a horse, specifically a ‘charger, steed’, while the adj. *an-arván*- (etc.) means something like ‘without assault / unassailing / unassailable’. Most of the philological energy has been expended upon accounting for the protean stem of the negated form (see the reff. in the lexical comm., inter alia), but I know of no real attempt (incl. by me) to reconcile the meanings. In RV the unnegated form refers only to a horse (real or metaphorical), but since *auruua(ṇt)*- is found as an adj. in Aves., incl. in the bahuvr. *auruuaḥ.aspa*- ‘having *auruuant* horses’, a meaning like ‘headlong, breakneck, precipitous’ could underlie the semantic development of RVic *anarván*-.

X.99.4: The vs. begins promisingly with an apparent Indraic theme: the youthfully exuberant streams (*yahvyò ’vánīḥ*) that the subject pours out (*ā juhōti*) could be the waters released by Indra after smashing Vṛtra. Both these fem. plurals are used in such a context (e.g., *avānīḥ* I.61.10, *yahvīḥ* V.29.2). However, the verb *ā√hu* introduces at least the metaphor of ritual oblation, and a different metaphor, that of a horse racing for the prize, is represented by *gōṣu ārvā ... pradhanyāsu sasrīḥ* “as a charger running for the cows that are at stake.” By sheer number of words, this last image, of the racehorse, dominates the first hemistich. However, that image feeds back into the ritual one, since soma is regularly compared to a horse (e.g., IX.10.1=66.10 *ārvanto ná śravyāvaḥ / sōmāso rāyē akramuḥ*) running towards the cows, that is, the milk with which the soma will be mixed.

It is this ritual image that takes over the second hemistich – until the end. As Ge points out (n. 4cd), in IX.97.20 the soma-drinks are described as running, though “without reins, without chariots (*arathāḥ*, as here), unyoked,” while the subjects of cd are “without feet ... without chariots.” (Though the subjects here *are* yoked [*yújyāsaḥ*], this hardly matters: the drops are moving like teams of horses despite lacking horse tackle.) The bahuvr. in d, *droṇy-āśva*- ‘having wooden (cups) as horses’, clinches the soma context, since *drōṇa*- is used only of the wooden cups into which soma is poured (see comm. ad VI.2.8). However, although *droṇī*- confirms the soma-ritual context, it creates an awkward image. Soma cups aren’t mobile, much less swift like horses; they are instead the stationary goal towards which the soma-horses are racing. And ‘having wooden cups as horses’ conjures up the comic image of the soma drinks clumping around in cartoon versions of Dutch wooden shoes. The ineptness of the image makes me wonder if we’re once again changing imagery in midstream, as it were – though I don’t have a good suggestion for what it might be. Gr paraphrases *droṇy-āśva*- as “Regenwolken als Rosse

habend,” and the apparent goal of the verb *īrate*, *ghṛtām vāḥ* “ghee (and?) water,” does not fit in a soma context. This phrase is also found in X.12.3 *duhé yád éñī divyām ghṛtām vāḥ* “when the speckled (cow) gives as her milk the heavenly ghee, the water” – an apparent reference to rain (see publ. intro.). I there suggest that the speckled cow might be a rain cloud, but, *pace* Gr, I do not see how *droṇy-āśva-* could refer to the same. I confess myself baffled.

Ge takes *īrate* as transitive “strömen lassen,” but med. forms of *īrte* are always intrans. and furthermore ‘stream’ is not one of the meanings of this stem. He recognizes the intrans. possibility in n. 4d.

X.99.5: For a change, the referent, at least of the first hemistich, is tolerably clear. The stem *ībhvan-* ‘craftsman(?)’ is used primarily of Indra, though, it must be admitted, several times of Agni. The association of the subject with the Rudra – in the plural almost always a designation of the Maruts – tips the balance towards Indra. See esp. the almost identical phrase adduced by Ge (n. 5a) describing Indra in I.100.5 *rudrébhir ībhvā*. The puzzle here comes from how the subject is described – as one “whose wish is unpraiseworthy” (*āsasta-vāra-*) but “who keeps disrepute at a distance” (*āré-avadya-*). It is striking that, in his first undoubted appearance in this hymn, Indra should enter under an ethical cloud, as it were. Now Indra in his long career does many disreputable things, but which one this is, and why it’s brought up here, are questions to which I don’t have answers. I seem to be alone in this uncertainty. Other interpr. (notably Ge, but also Old), try to connect the first hemistich with the second, in which the ant couple (*vamrásya ... mithunā*) figures. This impulse is understandable but I don’t think successful. It requires Indra, as supposed subj. of the verbs in d, to steal the food (of the ant couple or of unspecified other(s)) and make them cry. Indra’s “unpraiseworthy wish” is, acdg. to Ge (n. 5a), to steal – in this case, to steal food. For Ge (n. 5c) this further entails (though I don’t see the logical connection) that Indra turned into an ant in order to commit the theft, and his taking the ant-form from the ants that used to possess it left them uncovered (*vívavṛī*). For Indra as thieving ant does Ge have in mind ants at a picnic (vel sim. – it’s rather nice to imagine Ge picnicking in the German countryside)? I frankly find this ludicrous – I don’t see the great god Indra having the ambition to become an ant and steal a crumb, nor do I imagine the victim of the theft of a crumb weeping over it.

I instead think that cd is a separate incident. In fact I take it as an animal fable in embryo, like those I identify in X.28 (q.v). The *manye* in c, “I think of,” “this puts me in mind of,” seems like a casual introduction to such a tale. And in fact a similar tale, though with a different ending, is familiar to all of us – the Ant(s) and the Grasshopper, attributed to Aesop. There the ants diligently store up food for the winter during the delightful summer, while the grasshopper mocks their toil while taking his pleasure. When winter comes and he is unprepared, he begs food from the ants, who refuse, and he starves. Here we might be confronting an alternative version, in which the ants’ stockpiled food is plundered while they are out of their lair. Not surprisingly this theft makes them cry when they discover it. My interpr. leaves the subject of *arodayat* and *muṣāyán* unspecified (certainly *not* Indra, in my view), but if the story was well known, the identity of the thief would be too.

What then would be the connection between ab and cd. In my opinion, it’s not the unpraiseworthy wish and the evaded disrepute, but rather leaving one’s home. Indra came here *hitvī gáyam* “having left behind / abandoned his home”; the ant couple are *vívavṛī* ‘without/outside their covering/lair.’ Notably *vavṛīm* serves as object to *√hā* ‘leave’ twice: IX.69.9 *hitvī vavṛīm ...* / IX.71.2 *jāhāti vavṛīm*. Although my interpr. of the vs. leaves several

loose ends – why did Indra abandon his home? (a question not addressed by Ge either), what was his unpraiseworthy wish? who stole the food? – the answers previously provided to these questions seem unsatisfactory to me.

X.99.6: The referential whiplash continues here. Having just learned in the last vs. that Indra left his home behind, the subject of this vs. is identified with the archaic phrase *pátir dán* ‘lord of the house’ – a phrase more appropriate for Agni, so often identified as *grhapati-*, *dāmūnas-*, and similar designations, than Indra and used of Agni in I.149.1, probably I.153.4, and in a variant (*śísūr dán*) in X.61.20; it is applied to Indra (somewhat oddly) only in X.105.2. But the actions recounted in our vs. belong to Indra, or to his older alloform Trita Āptya. As Ge (n. 6) points out, this vs. concerns the same deed(s) as are found in X.8.7–8. There, curiously, a muddling of the identities of Agni and Indra, not to mention Trita, is also found. As discussed in the publ. intro. as well as in the comm. to X.8, the three vss. concerning the slaying of Viśvarūpa (X.8.7–9) are appended to an Agni hymn (X.8) at the end of an Agni cycle (X.1–8). This myth goes back to Indo-Iranian times, with an Avestan version where figures corresponding to Trita Āptya, namely Ōrita and Āθβiia, are found. In RV X.8.7–9 the hero who slays Viśvarūpa morphs before our eyes. In vs. 7 the subject is *tritá-*, which can be read simultaneously as Trita and as “the third (fire),” namely Agni. In the next vs. (8) Trita Āptya is named as the slayer of “the three-headed, seven-reined” (*triśīrṣāṇam saptárāsmim*) enemy, like the “six-eyed, three-headed” (*ṣaḷakṣām triśīrṣāṇam*) Dāsa here, but he was urged on by Indra (*índreṣita-*). But in the final vs. (9) Indra has supplanted Trita Āptya as the slayer of the three-headed Viśvarūpa; he is not just an enthusiastic bystander. The same blurring of identities seems to be found in this vs.: as just noted, the phrase *pátir dán* suggests Agni; the default referent is Indra; and Trita (otherwise unknown in this hymn) is explicitly named as the slayer in c. The phrase *asyá ... ójasā vṛdhānāḥ* “grown strong through his might” is in fact ambiguous as to the referent of *asyá*. Although we might expect *asyá* to refer to Trita, the subject, it is possible that *asyá* is Indra, referring to the same invigoration of Trita by Indra that is found in X.8.8 *índreṣita-*.

The last pāda tosses in further confusion. Here the victim is specified as a boar (*varāhá-*), a rare word and one that doesn’t occur in this myth elsewhere. And the weapon is “metal-tipped poetic inspiration” (*vipā ... áyoagrayā*), a curious and clashing phrase, both internally and externally. (I suppose we might paraphrase it as “weaponized rhetoric.”) But this discordant element can also be interpr. in the context of the version in X.8.7–9. As I argue there (see comm. ad loc.), the weapons that Trita uses there are words, and the myth is assimilated to the Vala myth, in which the cave is opened by verbal means. The same explanation can account for the much abbreviated expression here as well.

Note the rhyming pāda-final monosyllables *dán* (a) and *han* (d) of the first and last pādas. There is also internal near-rhyme in pāda d: (*var*)*āhām* immediately precedes the caesura, while (*áyoagray*)*ā han* ends the pāda, with *-āhaN* positioned before the two metrical breaks. Verse-final *han* is also picked up by the verse finals of 7 and 8; see below.

With *áyo-agra-* here compare *áyo-apāṣṭi-* ‘having metal claws’ in 8d.

X.99.7–8: The last word of 7, *dasyuhátye*, is expanded into the last phrase of 8, *hanti dásyūn*. This word order is somewhat anticipated by the full phrase following the caesura in 7d, (*ar*)*han dasyuhátye*. And recall the *han* that ends vs. 6.

X.99.7: At least we can be tolerably certain that Indra is the referent of this vs. The stem *arśasānā-* (on which see further below) in b is elsewhere used of an enemy of Indra's; Indra is associated elsewhere with Nahus (e.g., X.49.8)(c); and he is of course a master splitter of fortresses and smasher of Dasyus (d).

The stem *arśasānā-* is generally taken as a PN for a demonic enemy of Indra's – throughout the publ. tr. and in the standard tr., as well as Mayr PN. It may indeed be a PN, but I now consider its formation to be contextually driven. The form appears three times independently in the RV (I.130.8=VIII.12.9, II.20.6, and here). In two of these three occurrences it is found in conjunction with a participle or pseudo-participle in *-(a)sāna-*. The clearest ex. is I.130.8fg in Atyaṣṭi meter, where it is part of the rhyme pāda: ... *tatrśānām oṣati, nī arśasānām oṣati* “... scorches the thirsty, scorches the *arśasānā-*,” where the two forms are near phonological matches. (VIII.12.9 repeats the g pāda but lacks the f pāda.) The occurrence in our vs. immediately follows one ending in *ūrdhvasānā-*, a patently artificial *-(a)sānā-* form. Note that one of the best established of these forms is found in vs. 9, *śavasānā-*. (Both parallels pointed out already by Old.) On the type see comm. ad IV.3.6 and AiG II.2.236–37. The only independent occurrence of *arśasānā-* that lacks an *-(a)sānā-* form in its context is II.20.6, but this passage in fact is verbally connected with this one (as Old and Ge [n. 7a] point out): the pāda preceding the form of *arśasānā-* contains the phrase *ūrdhvō bhuvan mānuṣe*, a paraphrase (or at least equivalent) of our *mānuṣa ūrdhvasānāḥ*. I'm therefore inclined to take *arśasānā-* as belonging to the shadowy root *√ṛś* ‘harm’ (so Wh. Roots), built to the *s*-stem *árśas-* ‘harm’ (supposedly VS+), as suggested in EWA s.v. *arśasānā-* (and adumbrated by Gr s.v. *arś*); many of the *-asānā-* formations of course sit next to *s*-stems (like *śavasānā-* : *śavas-*). The form may still be a PN, but perhaps it would be better to tr. “Harmer.”

In c Ge takes the superlative *nītama-* as standing for a comparative and the phrase *nītamo náhuṣaḥ* as equivalent to Indra's boast in X.49.8 *náhuṣo náhuṣtarah* “(I am) more Nahus than Nahus.” (For another passage with *náhuṣaḥ* + COMP, see I.122.10 *náhuṣaḥ ... śárdhastarah* “more forceful than N.,” there of a human patron.) In the publ. tr. I rejected this interpr. and instead construed *náhuṣaḥ* with what follows: *náhuṣo 'smát sújātaḥ* on the basis of X.80.6 *mānuṣo náhuṣo ví jātāḥ* “those born variously from Manu and from Nahus” and IX.88.2 *vísṣvā nahuṣyāṇi jātā* “all creatures stemming from Nahus,” with *-jāta-* as here — tr. “well born from Nahus and from us.” I now think this was wrong, because Nahus is the progenitor of humans, of Ārya (see comm. ad VI.26.7, etc.), and Indra decidedly does not fit this category. I would now emend the tr. to something closer to Ge's: “He, more manly than Nahus, because of us split the fortresses ...” I'm following Ge in taking *asmát* as an abl. of cause, though an alt. might be to take it parallel to or dependent on *náhuṣaḥ* “more manly than Nahus, than us” or “more manly than Nahus from among us.”

X.99.8: In b the Pp reads *vidát*, a 3rd sg. injunc., and the publ. tr. accepts this analysis. However, there is no good reason for the accent; although Old endorses the Pp reading, he lumps this passage with others for which he can find no explanation (ZDMG 60: 736 [=KISch p. 211]), and in fact in n. 5 on that page he considers the masc. pres. part. *vidán* to be a possible alternative. Against the part. interpr. are two facts: the part. stem *vidánt-* is otherwise unattested (though there is no obstacle to such a form existing), and the main clause of the first hemistich would lack a finite verb. Still, I now prefer to take it as a predicated pres. part. rather than a finite verb with unmotivated accent and would change the tr. to “He ... is the one finding a way ...” For another pred. tense-stem part. in this hymn, see vs. 2.

Note the pronominal doubling in b: *no asmé*. It's possible that the two are not doubled but are meant to be construed separately: "finding for us a way to peaceful dwelling for us" or even "... for us to dwell peacefully." Ge (n. 8b) adduces the identical pronominal sequence, but split over the pāda boundary, in VI.50.3 ... *no, asmé kṣáyāya*, a phrase that also includes the same dative goal. The publ. tr. of that passage interpr. the sequence as doubling, but it's possible there too that the pronouns should be construed separately. See comm. ad loc.

The publ. tr. renders pl. *śārīraiḥ* as "with his limbs," but this sounds awkward, to say the least. I would now, with Ge, substitute "with his body."

āyo-apāṣṭi- 'metal-clawed' of d echoes *āyo-agra-* 'metal-tipped' in 6d.

X.99.9: The pronominal structure that dominates the hymn changes mid-verse: the first hemistich begins with *sá*, the second with *ayám*. This may signal Indra's approaching epiphany. Because of the prominence of the pronominal skeleton, I would slightly alter the tr. of the first pāda to "He, along with ...," rather than having the subject pronoun parenthetical and deep in the clause.

With Ge I supply a verb in pāda a, rather than construing *vrādhataḥ* with *pārādat* at the end of b. It is easy to borrow *√han* from 8d. Cf. IV.32.3 *hāmsi vrādhantam ójasā* with the same VP.

I dealt with this vs. extensively in my 2009 "An Indo-Iranian Priestly Title Lurking in the Rig Veda?" (Fs. Salomon), esp. 114–16, apropos of the hapax *kṛpāṇe* (and the similar hapax *kārpāṇé* in X.22.10 (see comm. ad loc.)). I argue there that these two words are deformations of an Indo-Iranian priestly title, found in Avestan as *karapan* (always disyllabic, i.e., **karpan-*). Part of my argument rests on the association in this passage of the equivalents of the Aves. priestly trio, *kauui-*, *usij-*, and *karapan-*, namely *kaví-* (pāda c) and *auśijá-* (11a), the vṛddhi deriv. of *uśij-*. For further disc. of this apparent mythic complex, incl. its association in various parts of the RV with the Śuṣṇa / Kutsa myth, see the art. cit., esp. pp. 112–16 and nn. 12–13.

As indicated in that art., I consider the Kavi in c to be a reference to Uśanā Kāvya, who figures prominently in the Śuṣṇa / Kutsa story (see n. 12 in art. cit.). The mysterious cloak in pāda d is also found in a Śuṣṇa / Kutsa / (Uśanā) Kavi passage in X.49.3; see the extensive disc. there. In that passage Indra does some sort of harm to a cloak "for the poet" (i.e., for Uśanā Kāvya in my opinion); in our passage it is unclear what happens to the cloak. Ge thinks the poet wore / put on the cloak (cf. also JSK DGRV I.367 "who (put on) his (i.e. Indra's) cloak," supplying *avasta*). This is not impossible, but a more economical solution is to construe *átkam* with the only verbal form in the rel. cl., the agent noun *sánitā* (so, actually, Gr). Besides avoiding the need to supply a verb out of nowhere, this can also explain the position of *utá*, which causes JSK some distress because, if the syntagm is *sánitotá nṛṇām*, *utá* is in "enclitic" position. If, however, we read *sánitā* with what proceeds as well as what follows, *utá* can connect the constructions that share *sánitā*. In my view, the cloak originally belonged to Śuṣṇa (contra Ge n. 3a [though he considers this as an alternative in n. 3a] and JSK) and was awarded to Uśanā Kāvya, probably because of the help he provided Indra in the Śuṣṇa fight, as I suggest ad X.49.3. I also suggest there that Śuṣṇa's cloak may have consisted of *māyāḥ*; note *māyī* in the next vs. (10b), as well as in 2d.

For another connection between our hymn and X.49, see vs. 7 and X.49.8.

X.99.10: In pāda a *náryebhir asya* echoes *śavasānébhir asya* in 9a, and the *nárya-* picks up the *nṛṇām* that ends vs. 9. It is not clear whether *náryebhiḥ* should be construed with *devébhiḥ* in b

as a single constituent (so Ge) or the two instr. refer to different groups (so, implicitly, the publ. tr.).

In c *avedi* could belong either to $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘know’ or $\sqrt{\text{vid}}$ ‘find’. The publ. tr. takes it to the latter, Ge (and Scar 310) to the former. I am now inclined to change my allegiance to ‘know’, with some slight rearrangements of the rest of the pāda. Flg. Scar, I would supply ‘already’ with *kanīnaḥ*, referring to Indra’s early forays into soma-drinking. The qualifier *ṛtupāḥ* ‘drinking acdg. to ritual sequence’ may be euphemistically polite here, if the reference is to Indra’s commandeering Tvaṣṭar’s soma right after his birth (e.g., IV.18.3). My revised tr.: “This one here, (even) as a lad, became known as drinking according to the ritual sequence.”

The verb of d, *āmimīta*, is taken to mean “changed into” (verwandelte) by Ge, who suggests that the form is an “entgleiste” form of **aminīta* (to $\sqrt{\text{mī}}$ ‘(ex)change’). This root affiliation is also held by Sāy., Gr, Thieme (see Kü 370), Kü 369–70, and Lub, but I see no reason not to assign it to $\sqrt{\text{mā}}$ ‘measure’, where it would be the correct 3rd sg. mid. impf. There is no evidence that Indra was transformed into Araru – though Indra’s shape-shifting seems to be a bit of an idée fixe of Ge’s for this hymn: see his peculiar view that Indra turned into an ant in 5c. Rather, the default scenario would be that Araru is yet another enemy that Indra handily dispatched. I take *āmimīta* to mean ‘measured himself against, gave his (full) measure against,’ an abbreviated form of a phrase like V.31.7 *ójaḥ...āmimīthāḥ* “you measured out your strength against ...”

X.99.11: Verse-init. *asyá* is the last of the initial deictics in this part of the hymn; it would be better to give it a more prominent position in the tr.: “Through praises to him, AṚ ...”

On *ausījá-* see comm. above ad vs. 9.

In c Ge (n. 11c) emends *yajataḥ* to **yājataḥ* gen. sg. of the pres. act. part., construing it with *gīḥ* (“die Lobrede des Opfernden”), while Old takes *gīḥ* as a masc. ‘singer’ (see Noten ad I.37.10 n. 1, with several other such occurrences suggested, none of them convincing). Neither of these makeshifts seems necessary. The publ. tr. instead takes c as containing two parallel subord. clauses: the nominals *sútvā yád yajataḥ* “when the one worthy of the sacrifice possesses the soma-pressing” and (*yád*) *dīdáyad gīḥ* “(and when) the song will shine.” For the synaesthesia of the latter, see VI.16.36 *bráhma ... yád dīdáyat*.

X.99.12: This summary vs. contains a pun on the poet’s name (or at least the poet as identified by the Anukramaṇī), Vamra ‘Ant’. Here he identifies himself as ‘Little Ant’ (*vamraká*); the presence of the pl. *paḍbhír* ‘with feet’ indicates that the subject is not conceived of as a two-footed human. The ant of course also occurs in vs. 5.

X.100 All Gods

On the structure of the hymn and on the refrain, see publ. intro.

X.100.1: Old considers *tvāvat* adverbial, leading to a convoluted rendering “Indra, sei fest, Gabenreicher, in der dir eignen Weise, damit man (dich) geniesse” (with a slightly less convoluted, but still unconvincing paraphrase offered immed. after). The interpr. as a neut., the subj. of *bhujé*, is snappier and conforms better to the sense of pāda b.

A nice rhyming figure in b: *stutáḥ suta(pāḥ)*, which is echoed by *śrutám* in c.

With Ge I supply ‘speech, word’ vel sim. with *śrutām*, but take the latter as proleptic: “help (the speech) (such that it is) heard,” rather than attributive like Ge’s “dem gehörten (Worte).” I do not, with Old, consider it an early ex. of *śrutá-* meaning ‘learning’.

X.100.2: The publ. tr.’s “bring forward for the taking” loses the etymological figure in *bhārāya ... bharata*, but something like “bring forward for bearing away,” which better captures it, is less idiomatic.

As Ge points out, *bhāgām ṛtvīyam* is found also in I.135.3 (in the nom.), also of Vāyu.

There is no agreement on the meaning or structure of the hapax *krandád-iṣṭi-*, with both the cmpd type and the root affiliation of the 2nd member variably interpr.: Gr “mit Brausen dahineilend,” Ge “der den brausenden (Soma) wünscht” (sim. Re “qui aime (le *soma*) hurlant”), Old (ZDMG 61: 474) “unter Gebrüll sein Suchen betreibend,” Burrow (see Lowe, Part. 272 n. 75) “conquering riches,” Scar (314) “wenn er brausend daherkommt.” It surely should be interpr. in conjunction with the rhyming cmpd *bhandád-iṣṭi-*, likewise a hapax (V.87.1). In both cases I take *-iṣṭi-* to \sqrt{is} ‘desire, seek’ and the cmpd. as a bahuvrīhi with an intrans. (pseudo-)participial 1st member. Here ‘having a roaring quest’ (vel sim.), whose English has been somewhat adjusted for parsability. My interpr. is closest to Old’s quoted above. On these two *-ad-iṣṭaye* cmpds, see comm. ad V.87.1 and Lowe (Part., 270–72, esp. 272 with n. 75). Curiously Lowe does not treat *bhandád-iṣṭi-* and *krandád-iṣṭi-* as parallel and does not commit to a semantic or functional interpr. of either, though his diachronic account of the dev. of non-governing pseudo-participial cmpds is persuasive.

This is the only occurrence of *gaurá-* in the RV that Gr identifies as meaning ‘white’ (as opposed to ‘buffalo’), and his assessment appears to be correct. Although it’s tempting to unify all the RVic occurrences and therefore translate “of the buffalo milk” vel sim. here, EWA (s.v.) indicates that the color term is well represented across both Middle Indic and Middle Iranian languages.

X.100.3: The publ. tr. renders the subjunctive *sāviṣat* with modal “may he impel”; I would now change to “he will impel.” The point is that we can count on Savitar to provide us with the requisite energy to do our ritual duty.

Note the etym. figure *savitā sāviṣat*, Savitar often participates in such figures.

The adverbial *pākavāt* ‘guilelessly’ connects semantically with the refrain for the first time.

X.100.4: As in vs. 3, pāda c begins with *yáthā* (actually the āmreḍita *yáthā-yathā*), but the *yáthā*’s have different functions in the two vss. In vs. 3 it introduces a purpose clause, while here it provides a clausal comparison.

The sense and syntactic configuration of c are not agreed upon. Brereton (Ādityas 35, fld. more or less by Klein, Āmreḍitas; see also Ober. Relig. II.183) takes the gods of ab as the subject of *saṃdadhūḥ*: “according to the terms of the alliance they agreed to” (Klein: “precisely as (if) they had made friendship-pacts with us”). However, these interpr. can’t work because the verb is not dual, but the first hemistich only mentions Indra and Soma. Both Ge and Re supply dummy subjects (“man,” “les hommes”) for *saṃdadhūḥ*, with *mitrádhītāni* as obj. I think they are closer to the correct interpr., but I prefer to take *mitrádhītāni* as the subject. From this cmpd I pull *mitrá-* out to serve both as the noun modified by *mitrádhītāni* and as the object, but using different senses of *mitrá-*. As the subj. it means ‘pact, alliance’, as the object ‘ally’ (as it does as

the 1st cmpd member, in my view), yielding “(alliances) concluded by allies bind (them [=allies]) together.” This may seem overly tricky, but it allows the crucial word *mitrá-* to dominate. As for the connection of c to the first hemistich, the idea seems to be that we’re trying to forge the same kind of relationship with the gods as we do with each other.

X.100.5: I take *párus-* as referring to the articulations or joints of the sacrifice, on the basis of X.53.1 *yajñásya vidvān páruṣaś cikitvān* “knowing the sacrifice, attentive to its articulation.” On *párus-* in general see comm. ad IX.15.6. For similar phraseology, but with ‘sacrifice’ as obj., see I.3.11 *yajñam dadhe sárasvatī* “Sarasvatī has received our sacrifice.” That the sacrifice is at issue is suggested by pāda c. Alternatively *párus-* could refer to the joint of the soma plant and thence to soma itself (so Gr); for a parallel see III.22.1 *sutām dadhé*. (I favor the first suggestion.) Others (Old, Ge, Re, HPS [119]) take *párus-* as referring to an actual limb or joint, which produces a grotesque image—Indra (or us) with a super-bendable arm or with three arms?!—leading in turn to a watered-down interpr.: that Indra grows strong (Ge n. 5a) or (Old) acquires or grants “Fähigkeit gelenkiger Bewegung.”

X.100.6: Both Ge and Re take *súkṛtam* as the predicate: “Indra’s divine might is well made.” This is of course possible, but the pāda-initial position of *índrasya* and its parallelism with *agnīḥ* in the same position in b support my interpr.

My interpr.—that the sacrifice is *our* dear intimate—may seem somewhat strange, but it should be judged in conjunction with 5c, where the sacrifice is our father. Moreover, *ántama-* overwhelmingly refers to intimacy or nearness to *us*. Both Ge and Re take the more conventional route, assuming that the sacrifice should be dear to the gods (Re: “aux dieux” supplied) or (Ge) “der Kennerschaft genehm,” with an unsupported interpr. of *vidátha-* (found also in his tr. of VII.84.3, adduced as parallel, n. 6c). Both also render the injunc. *bhūt* as a modal, though that is certainly not necessary, and I prefer a preterital interpr.

X.100.7: *duṣkṛtām* plays against *súkṛtam* of 6a, though the accent difference distinguishes the adj. *súkṛta-* (versus *sukṛtá-* ‘good work’) from the nominal *duṣkṛtá-* ‘ill-doing’. As indicated in the publ. intro., in this vs. the refrain becomes an integral part of the vs. as we disavow bad behavior and untruth and lay claim to wholeness and innocence. Tge vs. serves as a rough omphalos, though it is not in the exact center of the hymn. However, the *duṣkṛtām* (6a) : *súkṛtam* (7a) contrast may link vss. 6 and 7, and the two vss. could form an omphalos in the exact center.

Both Ge and Re take the pāda boundary between a and b more seriously than I do: in their interpr. the ill-doing would have been committed in secret, and the god-angering in the open. This seems peculiar to me, as if doing ill in the open would have been ok. Surely what is meant is a categorical denial of ill-doing under any circumstances, in a standard disjunctive merism of the type “neither by day nor by night.”

My rendering of pāda c differs significantly from the standard. Most (Old, Ge, Re, KH [102: reproducing Ge’s tr.]) take the gods, present as voc. *devāḥ*, as 2nd ps. subj. and supply a verb like ‘punish’ (e.g., Ge “Nicht (sollt ihr) Götter uns ... (bestrafen)”). Although this makes reasonable sense after the first hemistich, it still requires supplying a verb out of thin air. It also requires *mā́kis* to have 2nd ps. reference (lit. “let no one (of you gods) ...”) or to function simply as a prohibitive negative. (That KH cites it in a set of passages with unadorned *mā́* would indicate that he takes no account of the *-kis*.) But *mā́kis* (and *ná́kis*) have only 3rd ps. reference

and are overwhelmingly nominative (for potential counterexx. and their explanations, see comm. ad X.11.9 and I.147.5). The phrase *ánrtasya vápasah* also does not fit easily into such an interpr.: *vápas-* must be taken as ‘mere/false appearance’, which might lead the gods to punish us wrongly. But though *vápas-* may be an indistinct shape (see comm. ad X.99.3 above), it does not seem to be a false one. My tr. avoids supplying a verb and ascribing 2nd ps. value to *mākis*; we (or rather “no one of us”) remain the subject, and *ánrtasya vápasah* is a genitive of quality.

X.100.8: The phrase *savitā sāviṣat* repeats the same phrase in vs. 3 – a responson that might support the omphalos-structure interpr. (see immed. above). In vs. 3 Savitar impels good things towards the sacrifice and sacrificer; here by contrast he impels bad things away from it.

Both Ge and Re take *ádrayaḥ* as “mountains” (die Berge, les montagnes), an interpr. I find puzzling. The stem *ádri-* is extremely common as a designation for the pressing stones (see, e.g., X.76.2 cited for other reasons below); the alternate term *grāvan-* is found in the next pāda (and in 9a); and the context is entirely a ritual one.

On the unusual usage of the explicit passive *ucyāte* see comm. ad X.64.15, which contains the identical pāda.

X.100.9: The form *sotári* has caused no end of problems, though it seems uncomplicated to me. I take it as the loc. sg. of the well-attested *-tár-*stem *sotár-* ‘presser’, with standard agent-noun value. Here I think it’s a single-word loc. absol.: “when the presser (is there)” / “the presser being (present).” But I seem to be alone in this: see comm. ad X.76.2, which contains the identical form. Here Ge takes it as a nom. sg. modifying *grāvan-*, Re sim., both flg. Old (ZDMG 55), who endorses the Ludwig/Neisser theory that there are nom. sg.’s in *-tari*, which I find implausible; Tichy (*-tar-* p. 60) considers forms in *-tári* to be locatives to verbal abstracts, here “beim Somapressen.” I do not see the need for these evasions of a morphologically straightforward form to a stem whose other 12 occurrences all mean ‘presser’.

X.100.10: As Ge points out (n. 10b), the cows stand for the milk to be mixed with soma.

Ge (n. 10c) flg. Sāy. suggests that the cows’ milk is “medicine” for the soma, presumably because without the milk mixture the soma is intolerably sharp to drink. But the failure to identify which bodies are referred to seems deliberate, and I wonder if the soma+milk is (also?) medicine for our bodies.

X.100.11: The “singer” (*jaritā*) in pāda a is almost surely Agni, not an indefinite mortal ritual officiant (“ein Sänger”: Ge, Scar [332]). Agni was so identified in 6b: *agnír gr̥hé jaritā médhiraḥ kavíḥ*, and in that hemistich Indra was his foil (6a), as he is here (11b).

The referent of *yásya* in c is unclear: *whose* heavenly udder is full for pouring? The only referent in the vicinity is Indra in b, but this doesn’t make much sense. I think it must refer to soma, even though soma is only obliquely referred to, as *suta-* in the gen. pl. *sutāvatām* in b.

X.100.12: The final vs. lacks the refrain pāda and is in Triṣṭubh, not the Jagatī of the rest of the hymn. Nonetheless its connection with the preceding vs. is affirmed by the root-noun cmpd *kratu-prā-*, which picks up *kratu-prāvan-* in 11a – and contrasts with *jaraṇi-prā-* in the next pāda, 12b. As the publ. intro. points out, neither the internal structure of the vs. nor its conceptual connection with the rest of the hymn is clear. The first pāda happily celebrates an unidentified

referent, but the second introduces rivals who seem to pose a threat. The second hemistich could be a fragment of a dānastuti -- or not.

Although the referent of *te* in pāda a is not specified, it must be Agni. The bahuvrīhi *citrā-bhānu-*, matched here in the syntagm *citrās te bhānūḥ*, almost always modifies Agni. Moreover *kratuprāḥ* is a variant of *kratuprāvān* in 11a, which, as we just saw, refers to Agni.

The sense of pāda b turns on the meaning of the hapax *jaraṇi-prā-*, obviously coined in opposition to *kratu-prā-*. The pāda sets up a set of rivals (*spṛdhah*), who may (or may not) be menacing (to you, Agni, or to us). The adj. *ādhr̥ṣṭa-* ‘unassailable’ might indicate that they do pose a threat, but *jaraṇi-prā-* has been taken in two opposing senses—though there is general agreement that *jaraṇi-* belongs with *jaraṇā-* ‘old’, *jaraṇā-* ‘old age’, etc. For some (notably Gr, Re, and Scar [332 and 333]), the force of the compound is essentially negative: those qualified by it suffer from the frailty and decrepitude of old age (e.g., Re “qui parachèvent (leur propre) décrépitude”) and therefore are no longer a threat. The problem with this interpr. is that it has to be squared with *ādhr̥ṣṭa-*, and it takes all of Re’s characteristic parenthetical sleight of hand to do so – via the parenthetical “(tout en passant à tort pour) inexpugnables,” an addition for which there is no textual support. With Old and Ge (in somewhat different ways), I think that the cmpd is essentially positive: they “fulfill their old age,” that is, they live a successful life, to full term (escaping early death at our hands or Indra’s) (see Ge’s n. 12b). For the desire to secure old age, see V.41.15, 17 and X.59.4, as well as VII.61.2 (cited by Scar [333]). What is positive for the rivals is of course negative for us. On this interpr., pāda b is a reminder that threats remain, despite the generally sunny outlook of the last few vss.

As for the second hemistich, we can start with the fact that the last word, *duvasyūḥ*, is also, acdg. to the Anukr., the name of the poet (Duvasyu Vāndana). However, this supposed poet is found nowhere else, and it seems best to take the word in the usual sense of its stem (and its variant *duvoyú-*) and related denom. *duvasyá-* ‘offers friendship / friendly service [to a god or gods]’. On this stem, see comm. ad IX.65.3.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 12cd), the subject of the clause is the poet, who is seeking a dakṣiṇā, in an image drawn from racing for the prize of cows or tracking cows. This seems reasonable, though some of the details are hazy.

The verb *tūtūr̥ṣati* is the only attestation of this desid. stem (on which see Heenen [Desid. 154–55], with a fanciful explan. of the long reduplication). It could belong to $\sqrt{tṛ}$ or \sqrt{tvar} , though it is usually ascribed to the former (or a development thereof). Morphologically it seems akin to the perfect optative stem *tuturyā-* (4x), though there is no special connection between their usages. In the publ. tr. I render it “seeks to rush,” though this is not altogether satisfactory. The problem is compounded by immed. flg. *pāri*, which does not appear as a preverb with either $\sqrt{tṛ}$ or \sqrt{tvar} . I now think that *pāri* has to be considered in conjunction with the heavy opening phrase *rājīṣṭhayā rājyā* “with/in the straightest line”: *pāri* ‘around’ provides a strong semantic contrast. My “to round up” attempts to express the contrast, and I think it is fundamentally correct, though I wish there were a better way to integrate the verb and the preverb in Engl. I have no view on the long redupl.

I take the obj. of the round up to be *paśvá ā góḥ ... ágram* “the foremost of bovine stock,” but the supposed gen. phrase is problematic both because of *paśváḥ* and of *ā*. To take the latter first, the pāda-final phrase *ā góḥ* occurs three times elsewhere, all in Maṇḍala IV (IV.3.9, 22.4, 23.6). In none of these passages is its function or even the case form of *góḥ* clear (see comm. ad locc.); at least twice it may be an abl., which would make better sense of *ā*. However, here I think the phrase should be gen. with *ágram*. As for *paśváḥ*, is it being used to generalize the *góḥ*, as in

my tr. “bovine *stock*” (cf. Ge “der Rinderherde”; Re “bétail (consistant en) vache(s)”) – or does it refer to a distinct animal, as in Watkins’ (1979 Folk Taxonomy of Wealth,” 278 = 1994 Sel.Wr. II, 653) “sheep (and) cow,” metonymically “flock (and) herd” (for disc. see Sojkova, 2022, *Animals in Vedic Prose*, DPhil. diss. Oxford Univ., pp. 31–32)?

The noun *rāji-* ‘line’ is found only here, with differently accented *rajī-* occurring in X.105.2 (see comm. ad loc.). On the accentuation see Lub. (Nominal Acc. 30), who considers the form here the accentually innovating one, perhaps because of its occurrence in a phrase containing *rājiṣṭha-*.

X.101 All Gods or Priest(s)

X.101.1–2: The first two vss. contain seven straight 2nd pl. mid. impvs in *-dhvam*, five of them in vs. 2. Of those in vs. 2, four are identical (or almost): *kṛṇudhvam* (a, b, c) ~ *īṣkṛṇudhvam* (c). The repetition of this heavy clump of morphology makes a marked impression, quite distinct from the usual fleet and quicksilver RVic style. It may be meant to imitate the rhythmic predictability of a work song. In any case it gives a more demotic impression.

The last pāda of vs. 2 breaks the string of middle impvs. with an active 2nd pl. impv., *prā nayatā*, followed by one opening vs. 3, *yunākta*. But there’s a last gasp of *-dhvam* in (vī) ... *tanudhvam* closing 3a, replicating (ā) *tanudhvam* at the end of 2a. Another clutch of *kṛṇudhvam*-s is found in vss. 7–8 and some more *-dhvam*-s in vss. 10–11.

X.101.1: The first verb of the hymn *úd budhyadhvam* may be responsible for the name of the poet in the Anukramaṇī, Budha. On the name see Ge’s n. 2 (bottom of page).

Agni and Uṣas are of course associated with Dawn and the early morning sacrifice. The presence of Dadhikrā, the deified racehorse, is somewhat puzzling. Re (Hymnes spéc.) says he is the/a “symbole du lever du jour,” though without specifying on what basis he claims this. It’s true that Dadhikrā is compared to the sun at the end of the first hymn dedicated to him, IV.38.10, but that’s not quite the same thing. Our pāda is also found in III.20.5, but as part of a longer list of divinities. For one possible reason for the inclusion of Dadhikrā here, see below ad vs. 11.

X.101.2: This vs. produces a plethora of images drawn from ordinary life as comparanda for the priests’ work. This skipping from image to image is anchored by the repetition of *-dhvam* noted above.

Ge (fld. by Re, HySpéc [but not EVP XVI], Don.) takes *dhíyaḥ* with the first verb: “Machet die Gedanken wohlgefällig.” But this is grammatically impossible: *dhíyaḥ* is fem. acc. pl., and so neut. acc. pl. *mandrá* cannot modify it (would need to be *mandráḥ* in sandhi). I gather from his n. 2a that he takes *mandrá kṛ* as a phrasal verb, but positing such a construction requires more argumentation. Old points out that *mandrá-* and *dhī-* are associated in IX.86.17, but I don’t see that as a sufficient reason to contravene the syntax.

X.101.3–6: These four vss. fall into two pairs, with 4 essentially repeating 3(ab) and 6 repeating 5.

X.101.3: There’s a common metaphorical connection in Vedic (and later) between sowing seed for crops and semen to impregnate a woman, but the metaphor usually goes the other way: the

furrow is the metaphor for the vagina. Here it's the vagina that's a metaphor for the furrow in an agricultural context. (Of course the whole thing is metaphorical for the priests' work.)

The second hemistich indirectly expresses the reciprocity that underlies the RVic ritual system: that the response to a praise hymn should be equal to it, though in material form.

The accent on *ásat* suggests that *ca* is subordinating; so the standard tr.

X.101.5: Note the rhyming heavy 2nd pl. active impvs. ending the first two pādas: *kṛṇotana ... dadhātana*.

As Ge (n. 5b) points out, these must be the cords attached to the buckets.

X.101.6: As was noted above, 6 is a version of 5, with the same lexical materials, scrambled and recombined.

X.101.7: The reason for the stress on the well in vss. 5–6 becomes clear here in the 2nd hemistich, where the features of the well are identified with parts of the soma apparatus in equational bahuvrīhis.

X.101.8: I don't quite understand why we should make a "pen" (*vrajám*) for soma: perhaps because if it provides drink, it must be like a cow and need a pen.

In d *vaḥ* was omitted from the tr. Correct to "your beaker."

X.101.9: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Don, though see Ge n. 9 for possible alternative) are agreed that *dhíyam* here refers to the gods' thought. I think it must rather refer to *our* thought. The position of *vaḥ* immediately before *dhíyam* is of course not probative, since *vaḥ* is in standard Wackernagel's Position and can be construed with anything in the clause (including *ūtáye*, as Ge suggests in n. 9). The plural *dhíyaḥ* in 2a clearly referred to our thoughts. The image of the *dhī-* as a milk-yielding cow does not require her to be a creature from the gods. Instead she represents the usual reciprocity relationship (as seen also in 3cd): if our thought=cow pleases you gods, she will yield milk in the shape of material rewards from you.

On *duhīyāt* see comm. ad IV.41.5.

X.101.10: These images of the soma pressing need decoding. The "lap of wood" in pāda a is presumably the wooden cup. In b the publ. tr. takes the object also as the wooden cup, in part flg. an unpubl. paper by HPS. However, I now think (with Old) that the "axes of stone" (*vāśībhiḥ ... aśmanváyībhiḥ*) are the pressing stones, based esp. on 7c *ásma-cakra-* 'whose wheel is the (pressing) stone'. Soma is then the object, and I would emend the tr. to "Fashion (it [=soma]) with axes made of stone."

The 10 girthbands are the fingers (so Old, Ge, Re [HSpéc]); cf. X.94.7 *dásakakṣyebhyaḥ*, modifying the pressing stones. The object here should therefore also be the stones and not soma. So I would emend to "Embrace (them [=stones]) with ten girthbands." The two chariot poles in pāda are the hands and the draught horse the soma (so Old, Ge, Don for both identifications). I think this is probably right, but if *vāhni-* is soma, it must be the soma *plant*, not the pressed juice, for the image to work, since juice can't be yoked to the implements that pressed it – even though the pressed juice is already referred to in pāda a. It is also possible that the two are the pressing stones.

X.101.11: As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn takes a surprisingly erotic turn at this point. Pāda a essentially repeats 10d, with *ubhé dhúrau váhniḥ* “the two chariot poles ... the draught horse”; again, I think the horse must be the soma plant and the chariot poles may be either the hands or the pressing stones. But an erotic simile is applied to this trio: a man, comparable to the draught horse, with two wives, comparable to the two chariot poles.

On *pībd-* see comm. ad VI.46.6 and EWA s.v. *PAD*: ‘sich hin und her [auf den einen und anderen Fuss] fallen lassend, stampfend’ citing Strunk and Gotō for this interpr. as an iterative. A stronger iterative sense would fit this sexual passage well, esp. give the two wives.

The *vānaspati-* is presumably soma, placed in the cup, but given the simile of b probably also the penis in the *yóni*.

The final pāda has two competing syntactic interpr. One, which is essentially universal in the standard tr., is that *útsam* is the obj. both of *ní ... dadhidhvam* and of the negated pres. part. *ákhanantaḥ* -- e.g., Don “sink the well deep without digging.” The other, found in the publ. tr., is that the obj. of pāda c, *vānaspátim*, is the obj. of the main verb, with *útsam* obj. only of the participle. The reason for my interpr. is that *ní ... dadhidhvam* seems the logically next action after *áststhāpayadhvam* and should take the same object (see the next vs. for syntactic continuity), and the deeper foundation of the soma / deeper penetration of the penis is what is demanded. This can be effected without digging a well/spring. But since I don’t really understand the image of the spring/well (and none of the tr. attempts to explain it), the standard view is not excluded.

Note that *dadhidhvam* is a near-rhyme with *dadhikráṁ* in the first vs. (1c), providing a sort of phonological ring composition, which might help account for the presence of that racehorse in this hymn.

X.101.12: Since the penis is the overt object of a set of 2nd pl. movement verbs, my interpr. of it as the object of *ní ... dadhidhvam* in 11d seems to gain some support.

It is hard not to be reminded here of the Sappho fragment “raise high the roofbeam, carpenters” (here filtered through the J. D. Salinger) in a wedding context.

The feminine name (or nickname) *niṣṭigrī* is found only here. In context it is a designation of Indra’s mother. The word is treated by Scar (112) and, at greater length, Remmer (*Frauennamen* 63–64), but the disc. doesn’t get us very far.

X.102 Mudgala and Mudgalānī

For my general interpr. of this famous hymn, see the publ. intro. As I say there, I consider the hymn to be part of the under-the-surface debate in the late RV about the introduction of the ritual Patnī – in this case, very much in favor of this introduction, as she leads to victory and fertility. For disc. of this hymn in that context, see my 2018 “‘Sacrificer’s Wife’ in the *Rgveda*: Ritual Innovation?” (*Creating the Veda, Living the Veda*, papers from 13th World Skt. Conf., ed. Brereton and Proferes, 19–30, esp. 23–25), also “The Secret Lives of Texts” (JAOS Pres. Address, JAOS 131 [2011], esp. 5–6) and, in earlier form, *SW/SW*(1996): 108–10.

It is striking that this hymn immediately follows the final, explicitly sexual vs. of the preceding hymn, X.101.12. In addition the “chariot pole” that figures in X.101.10, 11 is found here in vs. 10.

X.102.1: The speaker of the first vs. is taken by Ge (fld. by Don) as Mudgala; this seems reasonable. But this identification has further implications, given the enclitic pronouns *te* (a) and *naḥ* (d). Since Indra is in the 3rd ps. in this vs. (b *índro avatu*), the *te* can only refer to Mudgalānī,

and it must identify the chariot as “yours” (namely, hers). The *naḥ* (Saṃhitā *no*) would then refer to the two of them or, perhaps, to their general household. If the former, the number is wrong – *unless* the form should really be dual **nau*, i.e., *nāv* in sandhi. As HvN point out in their metrical comm., “Exceptionally, -o in no should be scanned as long before a following vowel to avoid the uncommon cadence ~~~~.” If the original enclitic was dual *nau*, however, this metrical license isn’t necessary, since it would scan as *nāv* before vowel – and the sense is better as well. The tr. could be changed to “help *us two.”

Most tr. render *mīthūkṛtam* as ‘wrongly made’ vel sim.: e.g., Brereton 2002: 227 ‘wrongly used’, Scarlatta (78) ‘auf falsche Weise gefertigt, unbrauchbar’, Ge ‘vertauschten’ (the lexeme *mīthū kṛ* further glossed in n. 1ab as ‘verwechseln, vertauschen, falsch, verkehrt machen’), Don ‘perversely transformed’ (resting, I think, on Ge). But the second member is not ppl. *kṛtā-* but the root noun *kṛt-*, and X-*kṛt-* compounds are always transitive or, at least, active in sense – not passive, as most tr. assume for this one. Scar indeed asserts that -*kṛt-* is passive here, and Ge clearly favors the passive interpr., though in the n. he allows for an active sense “Fehler machend, umschmeissend.” In the publ. tr. I go with the passive interp. ‘wrongly made’ as one reading, but I would now substitute an active ‘wrongly functioning’. In addition, and more important, I think this word is a pun, with *mīthū* referencing *mīthunā-* ‘(sexual) pair’: “forming a sexual pair” looks forward to the successful sexual pairing effected by the chariot race.

Vs. 3 of the Agastya–Lopāmudrā hymn, which also treats fraught gender relations, also contains both *mīthunā-* and *ājī-*.

X.102.2: In her first appearance in the hymn (save for, probably, the ungendered *te* in 1a), Mudgalānī appears both as a victorious charioteer and as a highly sexualized female. The wind whipping up her dress in pāda a reminds us of the many Apsarases in the epic who seduce ascetics through the judicious application of a breeze to their filmy garments.

At least in this hymn *sma* + present seems to have the function of a past iterative/durative; see also 4b *sma ... eti* and 6d *ṛchānti sma*.

On the dicing idiom *kṛtām ví√ci*, see comm. ad X.42.9.

X.102.3: This vs. is in Bṛhatī, like the first and final (12) vss. of the hymn, unlike the Triṣṭubh of the rest. It also has nothing to do with the specifics of the hymn, being a conventional plea to Indra for help in combat. (Vss. 1 and 12 are also somewhat distant from the hymn in sense, but closer than this one.) I do not know why this intrusive vs. is found here; it actually disrupts the depiction of the race and introduces an incongruous scene of general warfare.

On *abhi√dās*, see Narten (Sig. Aor. 140; also KZ 78: 56ff.). She considers it a secondary root, based on an *s*-aor. subjunctive.

It is worth noting (but probably not pursuing) that Indra is asked to parry his own signature weapon, the *vajra*, presumably in the hands of another; the *vadhā-* in d that he is asked to keep away is also often his. (This issue is also raised by Don, n. 6.)

X.102.4: The bull that is one of the yoked team that Mudgalānī controls makes its appearance.

The stem *kūṭa-* is rare to non-existent in Skt. outside of this passage (see Ge n. 4b, EWA s.v.; the interpr. owing to Neisser), but is found in Pāli as a word for ‘hammer’ (*kūṭa*³ in Cone, Dict. of Pāli; see also *aya-kūṭa-*). It seems likely (to me) to be a specialization of *kūṭa*¹ ‘a prominence or projection; a horn; a summit, a peak’. Here it seems to be used as a nickname for the bull, characterizing its assaultive intensity and persistence. For a similar nickname, cf. Matt

“the Hammer” Hamill, a “mixed marital artist and wrestler,” whose profile is available on the web.

Ge suggests (n. 4b) that *ṭṛṃhát ... eti* is almost a periphrastic. Although I am generally sympathetic to periphrastic analyses, in this case I think *eti* should be interpr. as a full lexical verb, with *sma* (on which see comm. ad vs. 2), meaning “kept going” – that is, nothing kept him from running the full race.

ṭṛṃhát is the only form of the nasal infix pres. in RV, but it is robustly attested in the AV (both Ś and P). Pace Gr, the expected form here is not **ṭṛṃhán*, since neut. *kūṭam* is the subject.

X.102.5: The first hemistich describes how the efforts of the opponents/competitors to check the progress of the bull – against which, as we saw in 4b, he “kept going.” As Ge (n. 5ab) and Don (n. 8) point out, the animal would be forced to stop either to roar or to piss.

X.102.6: The form *kakárdave* is a hapax and has received a variety of interpr. Gr takes it as dat. to a *-u*-stem meaning “der Knurren in den Eingeweiden” (rumbling in the guts), Ge as loc. to an *-a*-stem, an onomatopoetic word for the cart or its shaft. Old dithers around these various possibilities, but suggests that it is best to leave the word unerklärt, an opinion apparently shared by EWA (s.v.). (Don tr. it as a verb [“rumbled”], with Gr’s semantics, but no indication of how she sees the morphology.) I am strongly drawn to, and in fact persuaded by, a suggestion of Dumézil’s (*Nouvelle Clio*, 1953: 261–62; repeated and rediscussed in *Mariages indo-européens* 1979: 282ff., esp. 288–89), reported by Re (ÉVP XVI ad loc.). Dumézil suggests that the word contains the cross-linguistically common nursery word *kaka* for excrement. As for the rest of the form, he half-heartedly suggests that roots or enlargements containing the phonological sequence *-ard* are “fréquents dans cette zone sémantique” (1953: 262 = 1979: 289 n. 1), a rather hazy explanation. I suggest rather that it contains a form of the root \sqrt{rd} ‘shake (out), scatter, spray’. As Dumézil points out, this interpr. of a dat. *kakárdave* as “ut stercus faceret” fits well not only with the companion verb *ameháyan* ‘made piss’ in 5b but also with the droppings that hit Mudgalānī in 6d. I construe this dative with *yuktáḥ* ‘yoked’ in the sense of ‘employed, set to the task’, since I see this startling image – of the bull droppings hitting Mudgalānī as she drives – in this middle vs. of the hymn as establishing a perverse type of sexual contact between bull and woman, which sets up her gaining of fertility at the end of the hymn.

The apparent intensive *āvāvacīt* is found only here, and is ordinarily assigned to the root \sqrt{vac} ‘speak’, but I think it makes much more sense to assign it to $\sqrt{vañc}$ ‘move crookedly’. Ge (n. 6b) explicitly rejects Roth’s suggestion to this effect, as does Schaeffer (Intens. 176–77; she tr. “redete unaufhörlich,” which at least fits the context better than Ge’s simple “schrie”). Schaeffer asserts that roots of the shape *KeRK* always have the R represented in intensive redupl., and we should therefore expect ***vaṃvañc-*, which could later be replaced by the grammarians’ *vanīvañc-*. I don’t consider intensive redupl. to be as well regulated as she claims, and in particular the ambiguity of long-redupl. perfects like *rārandh-* (with impv. *rārandhī* VI.25.9), interpr. by many as an intens., would allow the nonce creation of an intens. stem *vāvac-* to $\sqrt{vañc}$ here. Such a root assignment fits the context much better: Mudgalānī keeps dodging the bull’s turds, but unsuccessfully. Rendering it as crying out or speaking incessantly adds nothing to the passage.

The nom. phrase *sāraṭhiḥ ... keśī* “long-haired charioteer” should be masc. In its other occurrences *sāraṭhi-* has masc. reference, and feminines to *-īn*-stems are in *īn-ī* (see, in fact, fem. pl. *keśīnīḥ* 2x), not *-ī*. However, the gender-ambiguous *vṛkī*-form *rathīḥ* in 2c, used of

Mudgalānī, has prepared the way for a fem. interpr. of *sāraṭhiḥ* here, and of course the nom. sg. *keśī* looks like a nom. sg. to a *devī*-type fem. Ge (n. 6b) and Don (n. 10) claim that the long hair identifies the subject as a woman, but since masc. *keśīn-* is used a number of times of male munis (ascetics) in X.136, this claim is not straightforward.

In c “bull” should be in parens, since it doesn’t appear in the Skt.

The adjacency of *niṣpādo mudgalānīm* “the droppings Mudgalānī” is nicely iconic, since the droppings do in fact touch the woman.

X.102.7–8: These vss. depict the yoking of the ill-assorted pair, the bull (vs. 7) and the piece of wood (vs. 8), as the team for the race. It is not initially clear if this yoking actually precedes the headlong race described in vss. 4–5 or whether this represents a new stage in the proceedings. My surmise is the former – that is, as in other RVic narratives the events have been scrambled and some episodes are duplicated. The first description of the race in vss. 4–5 simply omits mention of the piece of wood, while in vss. 7–10 the full measure of the accomplishment – a victory despite a faulty team – is emphasized. One of my reasons for thinking this is that Mudgala’s win is described in almost identical terms in 5cd and 9cd:

5cd *téna ... śatāvata sahasraṃ, gāvāṃ mūdgalah ... jigāya*

9cd *yéna jigāya śatāvata sahasraṃ, gāvāṃ mūdgalah ...*

This near-identity suggests that the two statements are summarizing the same event.

X.102.7: The word *pradhī-* seems to refer to a part of a wheel that can come in segments (see I.164.48, IV.30.5 for explicitly numbered *pradhī-* and II.39.4 for dual *pradhī*). Scar (267) lists it with other *-dhī-* compounds but makes no further remarks. Ge (n. 7a) thinks it refers the wheel-rim (Radkranz, like “later” *nemī-* [though *nemī-* is well attested already in the core RV]), constructed of boards/planks (Brettern). This doesn’t seem like it would produce a smoothly running and swift chariot, but I don’t know enough about archaic wheel construction to judge. Nonetheless, I would think it referred to some part of the wheel that didn’t have contact with the ground.

The publ. tr. contains an awkward doubling of the word ‘bull’ – representing both *vāṃsaga-* in b and *kakúdmant-* in d. The rendering of the latter should be corrected to “humpbacked (bull),” with bull in parens. The full phrase is found in X.8.2 *vṛṣabhāḥ kakúdmān*. The prior term *vāṃsaga-* is more problematic. Don tr. ‘steer’ and (n. 13) identifies it as “the castrated bull” as a metaphor for the wooden club yoked and contrasted with the virile bull, the “husband of the cows” in pāda c. I think she may have been hastily misled by German “Stier” (Gr’s gloss and Ge’s tr. of *vāṃsaga-*), which is not the direct semantic equivalent of English steer, but refers more generally to bulls. And certainly elsewhere *vāṃsaga-* is compared to a *vṛṣan-* (I.7.8). Moreover, Indra himself is compared to a *vāṃsaga-* (e.g., I.55.1, 130.2, VIII.33.2), and it seems unlikely that the super-virile Indra would regularly be compared to a castrated animal. The virility of the animal is suggested by, e.g., X.144.3, where it is found “among his own females” (*āsú svāsu*). I tr. the word as ‘buffalo’ sometimes elsewhere, in part following EWA’s gloss ‘Stier, Büffelbulle’ and in part because some of the behavior of the *vāṃsaga* seems like that of a wild animal: sharpening its horns (I.55.1, VI.16.39) and thirstily approaching to drink (I.130.2, V.36.1, VIII.33.2). Esp. telling are V.36.1, where the thirsty animal is *dhanvacará-* ‘roaming the wastelands’, and VIII.33.2, where the thirsty animal is ‘following its own track’ (*svabdīn-*, on which see comm. ad loc.). In any case in our vs. I think there is only one male bovine at issue – the virile bull, yoked by Indra.

X.102.8: To harmonize with the other occurrences of *áṣṭrā-* (IV.57.4, VI.53.9, 57.2), I would change the tr. of *aṣṭrāvín-* to ‘goad in hand’. The subject is probably Mudgala, though the goad and the *kaparda-* hairstyle are also characteristic of Pūṣan, as Old points out (see also Ge n. 8ab and Don n. 14).

The goad and strap also appear in the agricultural hymn IV.57.4 in conjunction with *śunām*: *śunām varatrā badhyantām, śunām áṣṭrām úd ingaya* “For prosperity let the straps be bound; for prosperity brandish the goad.” In that vs. I take *śunām* as an adverbial acc.; here I construe it with *acarat* “achieved prosperity,” more lit. “practiced / proceeded to.” It would be possible to take *acarat* as a (quasi-)aux. with *ānāhyamānaḥ* “continued to / kept binding,” but I think the point here is that the binding needs to be done quickly and efficiently.

As for *varatrā-* ‘strap’, see X.60.8, where a yoke is tied with a *varatrā-*.

In IV.22.9 I tr. *kṛṇuhi ... nṛmṇāni* as “activate your manly powers,” arguing (comm. ad loc.) that *nṛmṇā-* does not refer to manly deeds but the abstract powers that allow these deeds to be performed. Such an interpr. works better here as well, since the yoking just performed makes it possible for the chariot victory to be achieved. This is directly expressed by the end of d *táviṣṭr adhatta* “he assumed his powers.” I would therefore emend the tr. to “activating his manly abilities.”

I am not sure who the “many folk” (*bahú-jāna-*) are or why they are the beneficiaries of this action. Quite possibly the spectators, who will speak the next vss. (9–10).

I am in agreement with Ge (n. 8cd) and Don that the subject in the 2nd hemistich changes to the bull.

X.102.9–10: These two vss. are the direct speech of the spectators watching the unexpected victory. So also, e.g., Ge and Don. They in fact include vs. 11 in this direct speech section, but I consider it a summary vs. and the “moral” of the hymn.

X.102.9: On the root noun *yúj-* and the “strong” forms *yúnjam* (here) and du. *yúnjā* (I.162.21) see Schindler (Rt noun s.v.), who takes these forms as secondarily strengthened on the model of paradigms like *sánt-/sát-*, with the weak pres. stem *yuñj-* as the basis. Our form occurs at the end of a Triṣṭubh line, where the ordinary acc. sg. *yújam* wouldn’t fit; *yújam* is fairly common in the iambic cadence of dimeter lines. As for dual *yúnjam*, its metrical position also favors a heavy syllable; see comm. ad loc.

The position of the wooden club is expressed in phraseology very similar to that of Vṛtra after his smiting in the famous Indra-Vṛtra hymn, I.32.10: *kāṣṭhānām mādhye níhitam śārīram* “his body sunk down in the middle of the race courses” versus our *kāṣṭhāyā mādhye drughaṇām śáyānam*. Although that particular pāda in I.32 does not have a form of *√sí* ‘lie’, it is the signature verb of that section of the hymn and our *śáyānam* may be meant to recall the larger context. I find it hard not to interpret the expression here as a direct echo of that well-known hymn.

On the second hemistich, see comm. ad 7–8 above.

X.102.10: With others, I consider this vs. to concern the wooden club, which was also the focus of attention in vs. 9. However, I think the club is assimilated to Mudgala, who (in my view) has been impotent and inert like a piece of wood. But just as the club has pulled off an improbable victory in the race, so Mudgala has (re)gained his potency. The key to this interpr. is pāda b, with

the verb *ā sthāpayanti* “they make mount.” On the one hand, as Ge (n. 10) suggests, after the race the bystanders just pick up the club and put it on the cart – as opposed to its yokemate, the bull, who will be fed, watered, and possibly allowed access to the waiting cows. On the other hand, ‘mount’ can be meant sexually (see the use of *āsthāpayadhvam* in the immed. preceding hymn, X.101.11), and so we can infer that Mudgala has recovered his sexual powers and can mount his wife. The negatively viewed excreta of vss. 5–6 have been, in some sense, transformed into positive sexuality, as is even clearer in vs. 11.

The apparent nonsequitur of the last pāda, with “the higher end of the chariot pole” (*úttaro dhurāḥ*), is, again in my view, a reference to the new ritual model with the Sacrificer’s Patnī. As disc. in my 2018 art. cited above (22–25), the chariot pole, with one side slightly higher, is a metaphor for the new ritual pairing, with husband and wife both yoked to the same pole, but his side somewhat higher. In our vs. the husband’s (/wooden club’s) side is given a slight edge, but an almost equal yoking is necessary for the chariot to go forward.

X.102.11: As noted above, although Ge (/Don) consider this vs. part of the spectators’ reactive direct speech, I take it instead as a summary of the successful outcome of the race: the recovery of the fertility of both Mudgala and Mudgalānī (and, by extension, the success of the new ritual model). It is in essence the last vs. of the hymn narrative, since vs. 12 is in a different meter and celebrates Indra. The 1st person speakers of the second hemistich of vs. 11 are not the narrative-internal spectators but the ritual officiants who have recited the hymn and express their hope for similar success from their ritual performance. The “charioteer” (*rathī-*) in c is a metaphorical reference to the ritual Patnī, identified with Mudgalānī the charioteer(ess) in the narrative just recounted.

On the “Avoided Wife” (*parivṛktā*) esp. in the later ritual lit. (there usually *parivṛktī*), see my *SW/SW* 99–110. One likely reason she is “avoided” is that she has failed to have children (/sons), and here she recovers her husband by “swelling” – that is, lactating as a consequence of birth -- itself a consequence of his “dripping” with semen, as a sign of the recovery of his potency. The dripping is in turn a sort of transformation of the bull’s pissing in vs. 4. Ge (n. 11b, with his tr. fld. by Don) considers masculine *siñcān* as a substitute for fem. *siñcāntī* at pāda-end, so that she would be both swelling and dripping. But the image of both members of the married couple exuding fertile fluid is surely stronger than assigning it only to her, and a poet capable of composing this complex hymn could surely have found a way to incorporate the fem. part. *siñcāntī* had he intended that form.

The “poor (water) wheel” is presumably a little deprecatory joke.

The hapax *eṣaiṣī-* has been variously analyzed; see some of the possibilities laid out by Old. I follow Old and Ge (n. 11c) in taking it as built to an adj. **eṣā-* ‘swift’, which has been doubled to produce a colloquial emphatic: ‘super-swift, swifter than swift’. A very similar formation is found in the next hymn, X.103.1 *ghanāghanā-* ‘smiting again and again’. The *-ī-* fem. is due to matching that of *rathī-* (so Old).

On *sīna-* see comm. ad II.30.2, where I suggest ‘gear’ as a gloss. In *sīnavant-* here I think it refers to material winnings, in contrast to non-material *sumanḡāla-* ‘bringing good luck’.

X.102.12: As noted previously, this vs. is in Bṛhatī, like the 1st vs. and vs. 3. It celebrates Indra, who engineered the victory of Mudgala and Mudgalānī. The first hemistich is generic – and somewhat off-kilter -- praise of the god: why is Indra called “the eye of the world”? The second half briskly summarizes the point of the hymn narrative – particularly the yoking of a virile bull

with a impotent castrate – though without the telling details. Although Ge (fld. by Don) takes Mudgala to be the speaker, I see no reason for this assignment.

I follow Old and Ge (12cd) in taking *vṛṣṇā* as an irregularly distracted instr. sg. (beside *vṛṣṇā* 2x), not a dual. One of the two occurrences of *vṛṣṇā* is in fact in the next hymn, X.103.2, and (faulty) distraction is possible there too. Though most of X.103 is in Triṣṭubh and the form is in a good Triṣṭubhs cadence (... *-hastena vṛṣṇā*), two of the three other pāda in this vs. are actually Jagatīs with the cadences *jīṣṇúnā* (a) and *dhṛṣṇúnā* (b), so **vṛṣṇā* (d) would be possible (though producing a light penult); a similar faulty distraction would also be possible in c: *sahadh^(u)vam*.

X.103 Indra

As noted in the publ. intro., there is considerable lexical chaining in the hymn.

This hymn has several features reminiscent of the previous one; see comments esp. to vss. 1 and 2.

X.103.1: The passages collected by Ge (n. 1a) make it clear that “horns” should be supplied in the simile. Ge also supplies “weapons” as object in the frame, while I take the participle simply as reflexive. Ge’s addition is certainly possible.

As noted ad X.102.11, the hapax double cmpd here *ghanāghanā-* ‘smiting and smiting, smiting again and again’ is constructed like *eṣaiṣṭ-* in X.102.11, if the latter’s analysis as *eṣa-eṣā-* / *-ṭ-* is correct. Note also that the base *ghanā-* is found in the unique cmpd *dru-ghanā-* ‘wooden club’, which in X.102.9 is yoked with the bull for Mudgalānī’s chariot race.

Although *saṃkrāndana-* is glossed as intrans. (Gr ‘brüllend’; Ge’s “Heerrufer” is ambig.), *-ana-*nominals ordinarily pattern with *-āya-*verbs and have transitive value; see in fact *kṣóbhana-* in the preceding pāda. Here I supply as its obj. the *carṣaṇí-* that is construed with *kṣóbhana-* in b.

X.103.2: The already heavy phrase *saṃkrāndano ’nimiṣāḥ* of 1b becomes even more so in its instr. transformation *saṃkrāndanenānīmīṣēṇa* in 2a. The lexical chaining is initiated with a bang! Note that this transformation eliminates the caesura in this pāda (as HvN point out), a lack that would focus even more attention on the heavy phrase.

Note the rhyming and morphologically parallel finals of the first two pādas: ... *jīṣṇúnā* # (a), ... *dhṛṣṇúnā* # (b). This figure would draw attention to the fact that these two pādas are Jagatīs in an otherwise Triṣṭubh hymn (save for the final vs. 13: Anuṣṭubh). As noted ad X.102.12, one of the two occurrences of instr. sg. *vṛṣṇā* is found at the end of our d, in contrast to distracted *vṛṣṇā* in X.102.12. I suggest there that the *vṛṣṇā* here could possibly be read distracted, given the Jagatī cadences of the first two pādas of the vs. Of course, this would produce a bad cadence, with light penult, but I think it’s possible that the distraction possibility was lurking in the background – esp. since the final of c, *sahadhvam*, could also be read *sahadh^uvam*, with the same light penult, but a match to the Jagatī cadence of a and b.

The string of *-ana-*forms continues with *duś-cyavana-*. The transitive value of *cyavana-* is maintained, but with the modified nominal as obj. not subj.

X.103.3: The most salient ex. of lexical chaining is *īṣuhastaiḥ* picking up *īṣuhastena* in 2d, but *yúdhaḥ* in b matches *yúdhaḥ* in 2d (and *yut-* in *yutkārēṇa* in 2b). There is internal chaining between the forms of *sám* √ *srj* in b and c: agent noun *sámsraṣṭā* and ppl. *sámsrṣṭa-jít-*.

The tr. of *vas̥tā* as ‘willful’ is misleading; I’d now substitute ‘exerting his will / who exerts his will’.

X.103.4: No chaining between 3 and 4, save for *yudhā* in c picking up the various *yudh*- forms in 2 and 3. The intrusion of Bṛhaspati is surprising; even as an alloform of Indra, he is not usually excessively martial, but he certainly is here. HPS (B+I 100) suggests that Bṛhaspati is here Indra’s Hauptpriester and his charioteer, reciting Zaubersprüche. But the vs. shows him in a more physically active role than that of priest; vs. 8 ties him more directly to ritual activity.

The phrase in pāda a *pāri dīyā rāthena* is addressed to Parjanya in V.83.7, where it makes more sense. As Ge (n. 4d) points out, pāda d is almost identical to VII.32.11c, addressed to Indra. This Bṛhaspati vs. seems to have been assembled from spare parts.

X.103.5: This vs. returns to Indra and modulates through a series of phonological and etymological figures: *sthāvīraḥ prāvīraḥ ... / abhīvīraḥ → abhīvīro abhīsatvā, sāhasvān ... sāhamāna(h) ... / ... sahojā.*

prāvīra-, *abhīvīra-*, *abhīsatvan-* are found only here in the RV and so their preverbal prefixes must meaningfully contrast.

X.103.6: After a few vss. without chaining, this vs. has numerous echoes in what precedes: *gotrabhīdam govīdam* opening pāda a pick up the *go-* of *govīt*, which ends 5d: in fact, of course, *govīt* and *govīdam* belong to the same stem, and *gotrabhīdam govīdam* also rhyme. Still in a, *vājrabāhum* picks up *bāhuśardhī* in 3c; *jāyantam* in b *jāyan* in 4c; *pramṛṇāntam* in b *pramṛṇāḥ* in 4c; and in c *vīrayadhvam* echoes *prāvīraḥ ... abhīvīraḥ* in 5a, c.

In d “Indra” should be substituted for “him,” an oversight in the publ. tr.

X.103.7: This vs. is a veritable “greatest hits” of the hymns so far: *gotrā-* (see *gotra-bhīd-* 6a); *sāhasā* and (*prtanā-*)*śāt* (see *√ sah* forms in 5, also 2c); *vīrāḥ* (see 5 and 6); *duścyavanā-* (2b); *ayudhyāḥ* and *yutsū* (various *yudh* forms: 2b, 2d, 3b, 4c, *sénā-* (1d, 4c), *avatu* (4d).

X.103.8: As noted above ad vs. 4, Bṛhaspati is here in a priestly (as well as martial) context.

In c *√ bhañj* (*abhibhañjatīnām*), *sénā-* (*devasenānām*), and *√ ji* (*jāyantīnām*) recur from 4c *prabhañján sénāḥ ... jāyan*, but in vs. 4 the *sénāḥ* were objects of *√ bhañj* and *√ ji*, whereas here it is the armies themselves that do the shattering and conquering. This is typical of the shifting use of the repeated lexical items in this hymn.

The Maruts make their first appearance here.

X.103.9: The Maruts recur here, and Varuṇa and the Ādityas are introduced. The pres. part. *jāyant-* is found again (see vss. 4 and 8).

The cmpd. *bhuvana-cyavānām* echoes *duś-cyavanā-* (2b, 7c), but the echo *-ānām / -aná-* is morphologically misleading, since *-cyavānām* is the gen. pl. of *-cyavā-*.

X.103.10: The vs. is structured by the *úd* opening all four pādas. The first is construed with the 2nd sg. impv. (*(d)harṣaya* (*√ hr̥ṣ*) in pāda a, the last with the 3rd pl. impv. *yantu*. Since the nouns in b and c are neut. pl., they can either be objects of the verb in pāda a or subjects of the verb in d. I chose the former (as did Ge), but the latter is not impossible.

More repetitions: *sátvan-* (5c *abhí-satvan-*), *mānas-* (9c *mahā-manasām*, which partly overlaps with *māmakānām* preceding *mānāṃsi* here); *rátha-* (4a, 4d, 5d), *jáyant-* (4b, 8d, 9d), *ghósa-* (9d).

The peculiar deriv. *māmakā-* of the gen. sg. 1st ps. pronoun *māma* is striking. It is curious to find this diminutive/deprecatory type of formation in this highly martial context. Perhaps the tone is one of proprietary affection.

X.103.11: Like vs. 10, this vs. has identical openings to all four pādas, the emphatic 1st pl. pronoun, with a slight variation in the final pāda: acc. *asmān* instead of gen. *asmākam*.

With Gr (and implicitly Ge) I take *úttare* as a nom. pl. with pronominal inflection (as elsewhere).

The *úttara-* chains with the pāda-opening *ud-*s of vs. 10, while the pāda-openings ‘(of) us’ can be seen as chaining semantically with *māmakānām* of 10b.

X.103.12: On *apvā-* see EWA s.v. and esp. KH (Aufs. 52–57). It is found also in AVŚ IX.8.9, as well as AVŚ III.2.5 = AVP III.5.5, which are variants of our vs.

X.104 Indra

As indicated in the publ. intro., this hymn, attributed to a Vaiśvāmitra, ends with the Vaiśvāmitra refrain common in Maṇḍala III, and it has an almost self-consciously old-fashioned well-made air. Like the preceding hymn (X.103) there is a fair amount of chaining between vss.

X.104.1: The dat. prn. *túbhyam* both ends pāda a and begins pāda c; in between pāda b ends with the rhyme form *tūyam*. Pāda-final *túbhyam* recurs in 2c and 3b.

On the curious bahuv. *vīpra-vīra-* see comm. ad IX.44.5. The sense presumably is that the creators of ritual speech are just as heroic as more martial men.

X.104.2: Ge construes gen. *sutásya* with *jathāram pr̥ṇasva* “fill your belly with the pressed (soma),” and it is conceivable that *√pr̥* ‘fill’ could take a partitive genitive. However it ordinarily takes the instr., and it seems better here to take *n̥bhīḥ sutásya* in b as parallel with *apsú dhūtásya* in pāda a. That in IX.62.5 (cited by Ge n. 2ab) *apsú dhūtó n̥bhīḥ sutáḥ* is a single phrase supports this analysis. Another passage containing *jathāram √pr̥* with a potential gen. is found in VI.69.7 *sómasya ... jathāram pr̥ṇethām*, where Gr and Ge both construe the gen. with *pr̥ṇethām*. However there as well the gen. is better taken with the preceding verb: *píbatam mádhvo asyá, sómasya ...*, like our *píba*. The fact that the preceding vs. in this hymn ends with the short exhortative clause *píbā sutásya* provides addition support for a syntagm *píba ... sūtasya* here.

I take *jathāram pr̥ṇasva* as a brief parenthetic clause, rather like the *píbā sutásya* that ends the previous vs. (1d). The rel. clause in c then hangs off the genitive complements of *píba* in pāda a.

The root affiliation of the verb *mimikṣúḥ* in c is unclear. Gr takes it as the pf. to the desid. of *√mih* ‘ausgiessen, pissen’, with the developed sense ‘reichlich zuströmen’. Ge tr. “schmackhaft gemacht haben” (root affiliation?). Kü (387) takes it to *√myakṣ* ‘attach, be attached’ but in an unusual constr., tr. “Den bei sich halten die Presssteine, Indra für dich ...,” which satisfies neither syntactically nor semantically, though it accounts for the -ṣ. Somewhat daringly, I take it as belonging semantically to *√mih* ‘piss’, but after the roots *mih*, *myakṣ*, and **miś* (‘mix’) had become hopelessly confused. My ‘trickle’ is a semantic development of ‘piss’.

The pl. *tébhiḥ* in d has no clear referent, but it probably refers to plural soma drinks; as Old points out, the soma described in pādas a, b, and c could almost be taken as three different somas.

X.104.3: On *prayaí*, see Keydana (Inf. 201–2), who denies that it’s, technically, a real infinitive. Nonetheless, it might as well be. Moreover, he bases his decision on the fact that the subject of the putative inf. would fill the recipient role in the matrix clause, but I think it’s possible, and so tr., that the expression of the recipient is limited to *vīṣṇe* in pāda a, with *túbhyam* in b reserved as subj. of *prayaí*.

On *dhénā-* as ‘nourishing stream’, see comm. ad I.2.3. Ge’s “an den Reden” relies on an out-of-date interpr. of the word. Instead, cd indicates that Indra is receiving both soma and verbal praise.

The tr. of *śácyā* as ‘ably’ in d was conditioned by its chaining with *śacīvaḥ* in the next pāda, 4b. Another ex. of chaining: *suásya* in b repeats the same in 2b (and 1d).

X.104.4: The phrase “in the house/dwelling of Manu” (*mānuṣo duroṇé*) is found four times elsewhere (VII.70.2, VIII.87.2=X.40.13, X.110.1), three times in Aśvin hymns, once in an Āprī hymn in a Jātavedas vs. (X.110.1), and here in an Indra hymn. It is always in a ritual context and presumably refers to the ritual ground.

Act. *gr̥nántaḥ* contrasts with passive *gr̥nānāḥ* in the previous vs., 3d; as just noted *śacīvaḥ* (a) chains with *śácyā* in 3d.

X.104.5: This vs. is essentially a continuation of vs. 4, with Indra’s praisers as subject, achieving their goals through Indra’s aid. The vs. lacks a finite verb; I take the participle *dádhanāḥ* as predicated.

The participial phrase *ūtīm ... dádhanāḥ* echoes *váyo dádhanāḥ* in 4b. Another echo is furnished by the vs. opening *prāṇītibhiḥ te haryaśva* (5a), which matches 4a *ūtī śacīvas táva* in structure: INSTR *te* VOC (5a) : INSTR VOC *táva* (4a). Here the *te* is expanded with a series of genitives, *suṣṭóḥ ... suṣumnásya pururúcaḥ*. The opening instr. is matched by *sūnītābhiḥ* at the end of the vs. And *ūtī* of 4a is repeated as *ūtīm* in c.

The form *suṣṭóḥ* has caused much consternation, summarized in brief by Scar (637). Since a root noun cmpd *suṣṭú-* would be ill-formed, lacking the stem-final *-t* expected for roots in short resonants (like *-stú-t-* itself), another analysis is required. Re’s 1937 suggestion (reported by Scar) that it belongs to a stem **su-ṣṭótu-* ‘praiseworthy’, whose gen. **suṣṭotoḥ* underwent haplology, is appealing, if not definitive.

X.104.6: The banal first hemistich packs in a lot of echoes from earlier in the hymn: *harivo hárībhyām* picks up *hárībhyām* (1b) and *harivaḥ* (2a), not to mention *haryaśva* (3b, 5a); *sutásya* is also found in 1d, 2b, 3b; *úpa ... yāhi = úpa yāhi* (1b) as well as *prayaí* (3b); *pītāye* recalls *pītīm* (3a); *sómasya = sómaḥ* (1). Only *bráhmāṇi* is new.

The second hemistich shakes things up a bit. In pāda c it is striking that the sacrifice goes to Indra, not vice versa (as in 1a *yajñám úpa yāhi*), and that (at least in my interpr.) Indra has been patiently waiting for it (*kṣámamāṇam*) – not a characteristic Indraic trait! (Ge’s der Nachsichtigen [“indulgent, forgiving”] is hardly more Indraic.)

Then in d Indra is called both “pious” (*dāśvān*) and “the visible sign of the rite” (*adhvarásya praketāḥ*). To treat the second anomaly first: this description is far better suited to

Agni, and is in fact applied to him in a pāda almost identical to this one: VII.11.1 *mahāṁ asy adhvarāsyā praketaḥ* (cf. also III.8.8 ... *adhvarāsyā ketúm* also of Agni, and other similar expressions). It is of course possible to construct a rationale for using this phrase of Indra: his presence at the sacrifice is the sign that it is actually proceeding. But the change of referent is jarring nonetheless.

As for *dāśvāms-*, this very well-attested stem is used overwhelmingly of mortal worshipers, but here it must modify Indra. Gr gives a handful of passages where it modifies divinities: gods I.3.7, Savitar I.110.5, and esp. Varuṇa X.65.5, 6, X.113.5 in the pāda-final formula *vāruṇāya dāśúṣe*. Given Varuṇa's ethical proclivities, "pious" fits him rather better than the freewheeling Indra, and in X.65.5–6, as I say there (comm. ad loc.), the hymn has a tendency to attribute human ritual roles to gods. For I.3.7 and I.110.5 see comm. ad locc. Ge simply ignores the usual sense of *dāśvāms-* and tr. "der Freigebiges." There is no note on the passage, so I don't know if he thought that this sense was possible for *dāśvāms-* or if he misread the word as *dāśvān* 'rich in gifts' (or thought a pun on that form was intended).

The cluster of un-Indra-like characteristics in this hemistich seems intended to jar the audience out of the complacency fostered by the standard tropes that have dominated the hymn so far (and will return).

X.104.7: As in a few other places, *svrktī-* is a secondary bahuvr. referring to the recipient of "well-twisted" hymns, not the hymns themselves. See comm. ad II.4.1. It is used of Indra in X.74.5. For an exactly similar usage, see *suśastī-* in 10a.

In the face of near-universal agreement that *namasyā* is underlyingly *namasyāḥ* and a nom. pl. (Pp., Gr, Ge), Old points out that desid. substantives in *-yā* do not form plurals and are normally adverbial frozen instr. sg. -- though he allows as how the instr. sg. would produce a less natural ("minder natürliche") construction here. Nonetheless, I find an instr. perfectly acceptable semantically and much more likely morphologically: the singer produces the songs with a desire to do homage.

X.104.8–10: After seven relatively banal vss. about Indra's journey to the sacrifice and the predictable delights that await him there, the last three vss. (before the Viśvāmitra clan refrain, vs. 11) concern Indra's exploits, esp. the Vṛtra battle.

X.104.8: An unobtrusive chaining connects this narrative vs. with the ritual one(s) preceding: 7b *suté-ṛaṇam* : 8a *su-rāṇā(h)*.

I am puzzled by the instr. *yābhiḥ* in b, referring to the seven divine waters of pāda a. In Ge's tr. and in the publ. tr., it seems to portray the seven divine waters as the instruments by which Indra crossed the *síndhu*, but this makes no sense. Lü (132–34) shares my puzzlement, but I do not find his solution any more satisfactory than Ge's: he (re-)interpr. *síndhu-* as 'Meere' and $\sqrt{tṛ}$ as 'durchdringen', with the seven waters of pāda a the waters freed in the Vṛtra battle. (Pāda c then gets construed with d, with the 99 streams constituting the *gātú-* that Indra produced for the gods and Manu.) There is a simpler solution: to take *yābhiḥ* as an instr. of accompaniment, to be construed with *síndhum*. In other words, Indra crossed the *síndhu* along with / in addition to the seven divine waters (presumably, indeed, the *saptá síndhavaḥ*). This goes somewhat awkwardly into English, but is perfectly compatible with the Sanskrit. I would now emend the tr. to "Seven are the divine waters ... along with / in addition to them you ... crossed the boundary river ..." The 99 streams in c are then additional riverine barriers to cross.

X.104.9: Ge takes *cakārtha* in c as a gaming term and tr. “Die du ... gewonnen hast.” But though terms like *kṛtá* and *kārā* (see his n. 9c) do have such senses, I do not know of other exx. of the bare finite verb being so used. I take the verb in its standard sense, and think it probably means that in freeing the waters he actualized them, as it were – made them really exist. It’s also possible that \sqrt{kr} is a dummy verb or with a gapped infinitive, in the sense ‘made/let flow’, but in the absence of anything in the context that encourages this interpr. and of any parallel expressions elsewhere, this seems less likely.

X.104.10: The first word of the vs., *vīrénya-*, has attracted more disc. than I think it deserves; see Old’s and Ge’s (n.10a) treatments, both referring to Bloomfield, who thinks that the phrase *vīrényaḥ krātuḥ* stands for the cmpd *vāreṇya-krātuḥ* (RV 2x). Although the influence of this cmpd, not to mention the much better attested simplex *vāreṇya-*, on the hapax *vīrénya-* is likely, I see no reason to emend the text. Moreover, I find overfastidious the concern expressed by all that *vīrá-* is not a verb and does not deserve a gerundive suffix, producing a “monstrous” (Old) form. On the one hand, as Ge points out, there is a denom. *vīraya-*; however, Ge also argues that the denom. is intrans. and for *that* reason doesn’t deserve a gerundive. So he constructs a possible transitive sense “desire to have X as hero/master,” which – finally – deserves a gerundive. His tr. of the relevant bits is “Indra muss man also seinem Meister wünschen” (fld. by JSK, DGRV II.212 “Indra, the one to be desired as a hero (by men)”). All of this seems to demand too much machinery for what appears to be a playful riff on *vāreṇya-*, hence my “proper to [/worthy of] a hero.”

In any case, unless one emends to a bahuvr. *vāreṇya-krātuḥ* “whose resolve is worthy to be chosen,” it’s still necessary to take *krātuḥ* as identified with Indra, as Ge/JSK in fact do (e.g., JSK “(is) determination (incarnate),” as does the publ. tr.

I take *suśastīḥ* as a secondary bahuvr., like *suṽṛktīm* in vs. 7 (see comm. there), though it’s possible that it’s an identification like *krātuḥ* earlier in the pāda: “Indra is resolve (and) good praise.”

On *dhénā* see comm. ad vs. 3. In context Ge’s “Reden” fits better here (with the verb *īṭe*), but if good contextual fit were our highest interpretational criterion, the RV would look very different. As in vs. 3 the point here is that Indra receives both praise and soma. I consider this to be signaled by *utāpi* opening b. In my opinion there’s a tricky shift of function in *suśastīḥ* at the end of the preceding pāda. In pāda a it is a secondary bahuvrīhi ‘receiving good praise’ modifying Indra, but it reverts to a karmadhārayā ‘good praise’ in order to serve as conjoined subject of *īṭe* in b, where *dhénā* is either a conjoined nominative – a series of singular subjects can take a singular verb – or an instr. “along with the (soma-)stream.”

Pāda d contains another identification of Indra with an abstract entity – here “superiority” (*abhiṣṭīḥ*).

This last vs. before the clan refrain exhibits some ring-like behavior with the beginning of the hymn: *puruhūtá-* (1a, 10b), (*vípra-*)*vīrāḥ* (1c): *vīrénya-* (10a), *dhénā-* (3a, 10b).

X.105 Indra

On the extreme metrical and textual problems in this hymn, see publ. intro. (in addition to detailed discussions below). I will not engage further with the meter.

The hymn also acts like a dress rehearsal for the impossible X.106 that follows immediately – still within the realm of possible decoding, if barely, but pushing the envelope.

X.105.1: The meter of this 1st vs. is esp. aberrant. See Old.

The publ. tr. follows Old's alternative word division *áva śmasāru dhad vāḥ*, which requires no change to the Saṃhitā text and has the merit of providing a full form of the 'beard' word: *-śmasāru-* is found also in the cmpd *hāri-śmasāru* in X.96.8. (It is likely not an accident that *hāryate* is found shortly before the 'beard word' here.) Ge (n. 1b) suggests rather a haplology **śmasā(ru) rudhad*, which is also possible. But I find his suggested meaning less likely than the one associated with the Old reading. Ge thinks Indra's beard will dam up the water=soma and keep Indra from drinking; Old that the beard (which surrounds Indra's mouth after all) will descend into the water=soma to drink. Since I prefer Old's reading, the publ. tr. should have an asterisk before "descend."

On *vātāpya-* see comm. ad IX.93.5.

X.105.1–2: Note that 1b, 2a, and 2c all end with monosyllables (*vāḥ*, *véḥ*, and *dán*) respectively

X.105.2: As Old points out, *yāsya* stands in effect for **yó asya* – or perhaps better **yó yāsya*.

There is some disagreement over the grammatical identity of *véḥ*. Gr takes it as the gen. sg. of *vī-* 'bird'; he is followed by Lub (who does not, however, discriminate between nom. and gen. *véḥ*). By contrast Ge considers it the 2nd sg. to the root pres. of *√vī* 'pursue', and I concur: the parallel I.63.2 *ā yád dhārī indra vívratā véḥ* seems to me decisive.

In b *ārvantānu* (i.e., Pp. *ārvantā ānu śépā*) Old suggests a haplology from *ārvantā *tānu-śépā*, a reading that also requires erasure of the accent on *śépā*. Given the difficulties in construing *ānu śépā*, I have accepted his haplology.

Flg. Lub (Nominal Acc., 30), I take *rajī-* here as equivalent to *rājī-* 'line' (X.100.12) (*rajī-* in VI.26.6 is a PN.) Lub considers our form accentually older. See comm. ad X.100.12.

As noted ad X.99.6, *pátir dán* "lord of the household" is a somewhat incongruous designation for Indra, and it hardly fits the context here, with its emphasis on the speed of Indra's horses: he's unlikely to be sitting at home.

X.105.2–4: At least acdg. to my interpr. the two relative clause of 2 (*yāsya*) and 3ab (*yóḥ*), with two different referents, are never resolved. Instead 3cd begins a new subord. cl. (*yád*), whose main cl. is (sort of) found in 4. The syntax thus adds to the general shiftiness of the hymn.

X.105.3: The apparent mockery of Indra begins here.

Another monosyllable, *yóḥ*, though not in final position. Assuming that the standard identification of this form as gen.-loc. du. of the rel. prn. is correct, it is the only instance of this in the RV; the ordinary form is disyllabic *yáyoḥ*. The pāda-opening sequence *āpa yóḥ* plays off *sácāyóḥ* opening 4a.

The verb *pāpaja* is the only verb form attested to a putative root *√pāj* in Sanskrit (though it has abundant cognates across IE). On the grounds of accent and heavy redupl., Sch (Intens. 151–52) takes it as an intensive (so already Old, contra Wh), though with *t*-less perfect-like 3rd sg. ending. Kü tacitly accepts this non-perfect interpr., since he does not discuss the form; his tr. of the passage (336, 525) follow Sch's. As an intens., the verb matches *cárkṛṣe* in the same position in 4a. Note the distant phonetic figure with the preverb in tmesis: *āpa ... pāpaja*.

On the position of *ná* in Lub's pāda division, see comm. ad X.111.7: *pace* Lub, *ná* is not pāda-final, but internal in the next cl.

Note rhyming *bibhīvān* # / *tāvisīvān* # at the ends of pādas b and c, anticipating *śiprīṇīvān* at the end of 5c.

Although Ge takes c with ab, and of course the verse boundary favors this, the *yád* clause of pāda c does not belong logically with ab: if Indra is apart from his horses, he hasn't yoked them. Pāda c makes more sense with the contrastive 4a.

X.105.4: The sequence *sácāyóḥ* (also in 9c) can be resolved in several different ways. The Pp. takes the second word to be *āyóḥ*, presumably gen./abl. of *āyú-* 'lively', while Gr (fld. by Lub) prefers *ayóḥ* (gen./loc. du. of *ayám*) and Old and Ge *yóḥ* (gen./loc. du. of rel., as in 3a; so apparently also Sch [Intens. 108]). The first is unlikely; the other two have complementary merits and demerits. The rel. prn. would account for the accent on *cárkṛṣe*, but would leave us without a main cl.; the demonstr. has the exact opposite qualities. I weakly favor the demonstr. *ayóḥ*, despite the verb accent. The identical sequence in 9c appears to have the demonstr., as do those in I.174.6, III.54.2, and I also feel that a main cl. works better in context. I do not have an explanation for the accent; we could ascribe it to the supposed corruption of this particular hymn, which seems facile, or to the parallelism of the intens. *pāpaja* in 3a (though the forms are not phonologically or morphologically similar), but I do not find that satisfactory either. Perhaps because it implicitly contrasts with the same verb to be supplied in c, it has contrastive accent.

The form *upānasáḥ* has been much discussed: see esp. Old and Ge. I follow Ge's suggestion (n. 4b) that it is a Beiwagen, an auxiliary vehicle of some sort – as a metaphorical measure of Indra's relative unimportance in comparison to his horses (in the teasing vein found in this hymn).

The opening of the vs. *sácāyóḥ* is paralleled by the opening of the hemistich *nadáyor vívratayoḥ*. Note that *vívrata-* was also found in 2a; the term associated with it there, *suyújā*, has already been actualized in 3c *yád yuyujé* "when he has yoked (the two)."

X.105.5: The ref. of the dual *vyācasvantā* in the simile is unclear. Ge takes it as modifying the horses and meaning "die gleichsam Platz haben," which is unsatisfying on several counts; it's not really a simile and *vyācas-* doesn't mean simply 'place' but 'expanse'. The identical form *vyācasvantā* is found in VI.25.6, referring to the two opposing martial forces, which is no help here. The fem. pl. *vyācasvatīḥ* is used twice of the Divine Doors, again no help. I think the most likely referent is Heaven and Earth, which individually or jointly serve as both subj. and obj. of *√ vyac* (in different passages), e.g., X.112.4 *yásya tyát te mahimānam ..., imé mahī ródasī nāviviktām* "you whose greatness these two great world-halves did not encompass." The point of such expressions is to indicate that even very expansive entities, like H+E, cannot contain Indra; they are themselves therefore implicitly *vyācas-vant*. The problem is that H+E / world-halves expressions are generally feminine. Here, I would attribute the non-fem. -*vantā* form to agreement with the simile frame *késasvantā* immediately preceding it across the pāda boundary. The use of *ádhi √ sthā* for 'mounting' heaven is found in IX.83.2, 85.9, 86.8.

The adj. *śiprīṇīvān* is way overdetermined, with both an *-in-* suffix and a *-vant-* suffix. The latter appears to be attached to a fem. *śiprīṇī-*. This reminds us of the unexpected fem. for masc. gen. pl. *śiprīṇīnām* in I.30.11 (see comm. ad loc.). However, here I think the impetus to create this nonce form came from the desire to rhyme with *babhīvān* (3b) and esp. *tāvisīvān* (3c).

X.105.6: With Ge, I take *ṛṣvébhiḥ* as a ref. to the Maruts.

Also with Ge, I would supply *vájram* as the obj. of *tatákṣa* in b, even though it seems somewhat odd for Indra to fashion his own mace, rather than Tvaṣṭar (though see I.121.3 adduced by Ge [n. 6b], not to mention the next vs., 7a, where the middle voice of *cakré* supports the interpr.). (The designation *śūrah* seems to guarantee that the subj. is Indra: see 4c *śūra indrah*.)

I have no idea what to do with Mātariśvan here, nor does anyone else. See comm. on the next vs., however.

X.105.7: Vss. 6 and 7 seem intertwined. As was just noted, 7a supplements or indeed repairs 6b, and I will now suggest that Mātariśvan at the end of 6 should be construed with the orphaned simile at the end of 7.

The two words that form pāda b, *hirīmaśó hirīmān*, most likely display a playful riff on *hári-* ‘golden’ (see EWA II.806). In particular, *hirīmaśáh* echoes the likewise phonologically deformed (*háryate...*) *śmaśá (ru-)* in 1b, itself built on *hári-śmaśāru* in X.96.8, as well as *híri-śmaśru-* ‘having a golden beard’, an epithet of Agni (V.7.7, X.46.5) with the same *hírī-* as here. The word ‘beard’ seems to attract word play. Given this web of verbal associations, I’d now emend the tr. to “gold*bearded, golden,” in an attempt to capture the phonological manipulation in *hirīmaśó*. See Old on this word, though he rejects the association with ‘beard’.

The word play continues in c: *-hanu-* ‘jaw’ plays on *-hánāya* ‘to smash’. Ge (n. 7c) is somewhat puzzled about why Indra is described as ‘having an unbroken jaw’. As he points out, there is a surprising amount of attention paid, here and there, to Indra smashing Vṛtra’s jaws, so perhaps the description here of Indra’s intact jaw is a counterweight to Vṛtra’s jaw injury – but the pun it allows with *-hánāya* also has to be taken into account, and that pun becomes cuter when a different word for ‘break, smash’ is used in *áruta-* ‘unbroken’.

The simile *ádbhutam ná rájaḥ* poses yet another puzzle, and the publ. tr.’s “(Indra) is like the infallible airy realm (?)” is worse than useless. (Ge [n. 7c] at least tries to make sense of it.) I don’t have a simple solution, but I can at least now offer something potentially better than what I produced in the publ. tr. We can start with the fact that *rájas-* is regularly a vast expanse to be crossed or measured out, mostly located in or around the midspace, since birds are among its traversers. It could then be used here as a measure of Indra’s own vastness – hence a simile in the nom., as both Ge and the publ. tr. take it. However, I will tentatively suggest a bold alternative – desperate situations call for desperate measures. As noted just above, Mātariśvan hangs at the end of vs. 6 with nothing to do, unintegrated into the rest of the vs.; *ádbhutam ná rájaḥ* is similarly positioned and similarly unintegrated in this vs. It might be possible to read them together, as a disjunctive simile, with an indirect connection to the Vṛtra myth. Recall that in the archetypal Indra–Vṛtra hymn I.32, after killing Vṛtra, Indra, like a frightened falcon, flees across the *rájāmsi* (I.32.14 *śyenó ná bhītó átaro rájāmsi*). Recall also that Mātariśvan is the fire-stealer, who brings fire from heaven (*diváh* I.93.6), from afar / a great distance (*parāvatáh* I.128.2, III.9.5, VI.8.4). I suggest that in 6c/7c Indra’s flight across the *rájas-* is compared to Mātariśvan’s, if we construct the simile from the undigested pieces that end those two vss. – however hard this is to convey in translation. I’d suggest something like the following as revision for both vss.

6. He of lofty might has struck up the praise song with the lofty ones. The champion fashioned it with his swelling strength,

like an artisan (R̥bhu) in accord with his intentions. (Like) Mātariśvan ...

7. Who made his own mace, to smash the barbarian easily -- he, golden-colored, golden, with unbroken jaw -- (fleeing) like (Mātariśvan) across the *ādbhutam* realm.”

This leaves us with the always difficult *ādbhutam*: the standard ‘unerring, infallible’ does not fit well here (nor does it always elsewhere; see, e.g., comm. ad V.87.7). Perhaps, with semantic bleaching in this late hymn, ‘ineffable’.

X.105.8: I take *yajñā ṛdhak* as referring to a sacrifice undertaken by a particular, individual sacrificer -- a sense that seems to be supported by X.93.8. It could also be a sacrifice destined for an individual god (here Indra), an interpr. that is supported by VI.49.10.

The problem in c is *joṣati*. Ge takes it as the 3rd sg. finite verb it appears to be, but this comes at a high cost: he must assign it a meaning ‘please, give pleasure’ (“dass es dir gefalle”) contrary to the sense of the overwhelming number of attestations of this very common root, which consistently mean ‘enjoy, take pleasure’. (Ge [n. 8c] cites only two parallels, which can both be interpr. otherwise.) One could attribute this unexpected meaning to the act. voice, as opposed to med. *juṣáte*, etc., but other active forms have the ‘enjoy’ sense (e.g., *joṣat* in X.81.7). I prefer Old’s suggestion (explicitly rejected by Ge) that *joṣati* is a loc. of a pres. act. part., forming a loc. absol. with *tvé*. Unfortunately this is not morphologically unproblematic: no such part. is attested, and the status of the thematic *jōsa-* stem with full-grade accented root isn’t clear to me. It’s possible that this restrained set of forms are subjunctives built somehow to *juṣá-*, or to a root aor. distinct from that stem (so Wh. Roots and Macd. VGS; see now comm. ad X.158.2) and then misinterpr. -- though both the voice and the accent would have to shift. Nonetheless, the loc. absol. interpr. causes fewer problems than Ge’s finite form.

X.105.9: Verse-final *sácāyóḥ* matches the same form opening vs. 4 (q.v.); I take then both as containing the loc. du. demonstr. *ayóḥ*. Although one might hypothesize that these two identical forms demarcate a section of the hymn ring-compositionally, the contents of these vss. seems too various to admit this explanation. I do think the dual referent should be the same as in vs. 4, namely Indra’s two horses – though the boat makes difficulties.

With Gr and Ge, I take *tretínī* as referring to the totality of the three ritual fires, but the feminine is puzzling. For this reason Old suggests that it might instead refer to fem. entities that might be ‘aloft, upright’ (*ūrdhvā*), like Dawns or prayers, but neither of those comes in a standard triad. The sequence *-ínī bhūt* may anticipate *upasécanī bhūt* in the next vs. (10a), which might account for the unusual fem. I would make a small alteration in the publ. tr., from “threefold one” to “triad.”

The acc. phrase *nāvam svāyaśasam* “boat having its own glory” is left hanging in c, with nothing to govern it; a verb needs to be supplied. Ge goes with “board” reasonably enough, on the basis of *ā√ruh / sthā* passages (e.g., VII.88.3); “make” would be possible on the basis of nearby X.101.2 *nāvam ... kṛṇudhvam*, and “launch/send forth” is also possible (e.g., X.116.9 *prérayam nāvam*). In any case the boat is metaphorical; the question is what it stands for – the sacrifice or a hymn/sacred formulation are the most likely candidates. Cf., e.g., II.42.1=IX.95.2 *íyarti vācam aritéva nāvam*.

X.105.10: Ge (n. 10a and tr.) interpr. *pṛśnir upasécanī* somewhat oddly as a dappled cow that pours (“die bunte Kuh, die zugiesst”), but the same fem. *upasécanī* in X.21.2 he takes as a ladle

(appropriately). I think it must be a ritual instr. here as well, qualified as ‘dappled’ because the substance it contains (melted butter?) has that appearance.

It seems a little odd that Indra should be pouring his own drink, but perhaps it’s of a piece with his making his own mace in vss. 6 and 7.

X.105.11: The first pāda is puzzling. Ge supplies both another measuring unit, to account for the *vā*, and a verb, producing “Wenn dich auch Hundert oder (mehr) dagegen (preisen).” This yields sense: even if 100 or more other poets praise you, Sumitra [the poet of the hymn] has praised you -- presumably better or more effectively. Unfortunately it also requires supplying a lot of material, and it also does not account well for the *prāti* (his “dagegen”): *√stu* does not occur with *prāti*. Old toys with this interpr. among others, incl. the possibility that *prāti* expresses equivalence, as in II.1.8 *tvām sahasrāṇi śatā dāśa prāti* “you are the counter(-part) to thousands, hundreds, tens” (cf. also II.1.15). The publ. tr. adopts this interpr., as it requires supplying no additional material. I now realize that at least as it appears in the publ. tr. it also doesn’t make a lot of sense. The point as I see it is that even if there were a hundred Indras, or heroes like Indra, Sumitra’s praise would be sufficient to include them all. It might be a little clearer if the tr. were altered to “Even if a hundred are counter(part) to you, Sumitra has praised (you) to just such an extent.”

The echo clause with Durmitra is obviously some sort of joke, but of what sort escapes me. These two oppositional clauses with Su/Dur-mitra are matched by the last two clauses of the hymn. The second one, with lower-register *kutsa-vatsām* “Kutsa’s kid [lit. calf]” substituting for the more formal *kutsa-putrām* “Kutsa’s son,” has something of the same jokey feel as the Durmitra clause.

X.106 Aśvins

As discussed in the publ. intro., this hymn has an impenetrable center, and verses 5–8 therefore remain untranslated and will be furnished with minimal commentary here. For the simile as structural principle, the omphalos shape, and the parallelism with the Aśvin hymn II.39 see the publ. intro.

X.106.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the opening of this vs. (and hymn) ... *tād id arthayete* “you two have just this as your aim” is reminiscent of II.39.1 ... *tād id ārtham jarethe* “you two awaken to just this aim,” with the denom. *arthaya-* substituting for the acc. *ārtham* in II.39.1. The finite verb ‘awaken’ in that vs. is postponed to our pāda c: transitive *ajīgaḥ* corresponding to intrans. *jarethe* in II.39.1.

Various suggestions have been made for the (unexpressed) subject of *ajīgaḥ* (see Ge n. 1c, Old) – perhaps most likely is the hymn (or its singer) or Dawn. Properly speaking “you” should be in parens., since the dual obj. is expressed only by *sadhrīcīnā*.

As goal of *yāṭave*, Re suggests supplying *ārtham*, extracted from the verb in pāda a, and cf. X.143.1 (also an Aśvin hymn) *ārtham ... yāṭave*.

What to supply with *sudīnā* is the next question; as Old points out, *sudīnā* can be either masc. du. or neut. pl. He favors the former, and since most of the similes in this hymn refer to the Aśvins, this might seem the better choice. But Ge’s clumsy tr. as a dual (in n. 1d he claims it can only be a dual) characterizing the Aśvins, “die guter Wetter haben,” shows the drawback to this morphological analysis. Moreover, the stem *sudīna-* is generally a neut. pl. and modifies ‘days’

(*áhāni*, etc.). Such an interpr. fits the context better: the point of the simile is that the Áśvins, who are early-morning visitors to the sacrifice, “bring” the days.

The VP *pṛkṣa ā tamsayethe* is a more vivid version of, e.g., I.47.6 *pṛkṣo vahatam aśvinā* “convey nourishments [/provisions], o Áśvins.” As disc. in my *-āya-* book (p. 93), the sense of \sqrt{tams} is difficult to circumscribe, given its rarity and (contrariwise) the variety of preverbs found with it, but ‘tug, yank’ and similar abrupt movements fit the contexts. The preverb *ā* ‘here’ makes the action goal-directed, and ‘haul’ may capture a certain arduous quality. As Re points out, the verb is also playing off (*ví*) *tanvāthe* to \sqrt{tan} in b.

X.106.2: This vs. is full of uncertain words, several of which appear to concern agriculture. I will not pursue the desperate and dubious etymologies and meanings suggested for them – here consult Old, Ge, Re (EVP XVI.74), and EWA s.vv.

Needless to say, I make no claims of certainty about the translation – save for pāda c, which seems surprisingly straightforward. It is probably not an accident that c also has a semi-parallel in II.39.1 *dūtēva hávyā jānyā purutrā* “like messengers serving the people, you are to be called upon in many places” (cf. our *dūtēva ... jāneṣu*). As with vs. 1 and its parallel in II.39.1, one word is postponed: *purutrā* appears in 3c.

X.106.3: Lacking opaque words, this vs. is clearer than the last.

In b we should expect dual **paśū*, as in the YAvs. dual dvandva *pasu. vīra*. We can’t put too much faith in the morphology of this hymn anyway, and I would suggest that the *paśvā* that underlies *paśvéva* simply shows an assimilation to the numerous duals in *-ā* characterizing the Áśvins in this hymn, particularly *pakṣā*, which immediately precedes it across the pāda break — as well as matching the *-ā-iva* → *-eva* pāda-opening similes that abound in the hymn (1d, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3d, 4b, 4c [2x], 4d, etc.).

For ‘bright’ (*citrā-*) livestock, see the passages cited by Ge (n. 3b).

The goal *yájuḥ* in b may play off (*sākaṃ*) *yújā* in pāda a.

As Re points out, the Áśvins are earth-circlers themselves (*párijman-* I.46.14), so it’s somewhat pleonastic to compare them to the same.

X.106.4: The publ. tr. follows Ge, Re (and implicitly Old) in supplying a verb of address (“I call upon you ...”), with the Áśvins and their trailing similes now in the acc. This is partly because of the apparent enclitic *vah*, which needs some structure to attach to, and partly because of the father/son configuration: one of the things sons do to fathers is call on them (e.g., VII.32.3 *putró ná pitāraṃ huve*). But with regard to the latter, it is puzzling why both fathers and sons are in the dual (see Ge’s equally puzzled n. 4a). And the *vah* is even more troubling: it’s plural, and if there’s anything the poet of this hymn knows how to do it’s produce duals! Despite Old’s ultimate rejection of this idea (after toying with it for quite awhile), I accept Henry’s suggestion that the sequence *āpī vo asmé* conceals the simile particle *iva*; Old (in his toying phase) suggests the reading **āpīva asmé*; since *vo* would have been read *va* in this sandhi situation, the real underlying *-va* was wrongly restored to *vo* once *āpī* was separated from *iva*. This eliminates the problematic plural and its need for structure. Since the Áśvins are relentlessly nominative throughout this hymn (even apparently in the untranslatable parts) as well as in the similar II.39, and since “I call upon” is made up out of whole cloth (the *hávam* in d, adduced by Re, is irrelevant: *hávam ā gamiṣtam* there is just a variant on *yájur ā gamiṣtam* in 3b), I would simply eliminate “(I call upon you,) who are” and tr. the first three pādas as a string of nominal similes:

“like friends to us, like fathers, (like) sons, like ...” Although *putrā* lacks a simile marker and it might seem slightly strange to compare the Aśvins to our sons, this first pāda proposes a series of close relationships we might share with those gods.

In the simile *ugréva rucā* I supply Heaven and Earth as the referents of *ugrā*. They are called *ugrā* in X.121.5 and appear with *rucā* in IV.56.1.

On *ūrya*- see comm. ad V.58.4. Since it twice appears with *gopā*- ‘herdsman’ (VII.13.3, VIII.41.4), both times in similes, I have supplied ‘herdsmen’ here as well, esp. since there is an agriculture strain in this hymn.

On the likely meaning of du. *kirāṇā* (presumably separate from *kirāṇa*- ‘dust’) as labia (or at least something “obscene,” so Old), see Old, Ge n. 4c, Re; EWA does not treat it separately as far as I can tell.

X.106.5–8: Although these vss. contain a number of (apparently) interpretable words and phrases (e.g., 5b *mitréva rtā*, 7d *kṣayad rayīṇām*), they glitter like fool’s gold in the mass of material that seems frustratingly always just on the other side of intelligibility. What is most salient about the passage – as others have also remarked – is the phonological and morphological patterning. For example, forms with intensive-type reduplication or near reduplication: 6ab ... *jarbhārī turphārītū* ... *turphārī parpharīkā*, 7a *cārcaram*, 7b *tartarītha(h)*, 7d *parpharat*, 8c *turphārī phārivāram*; adjacent deformations like 7c *kharamajrā kharājṛur*; runs of slightly variant syllables like 7a *cārcaram jāram marāyu*, 6c (*udanya*)*jéva jémanā maderū*, 6d *jarāyṽ ajāram marāyu*. The rare-ish phonemes *ph* and *kh* are especially highlighted (starting actually with *phārvareṣu* in 2a).

X.106.9: As noted in the publ. intro., the exit from the gibberish of the middle omphalos vss. to the relative intelligibility of the outer ones is teasingly accompanied by a promise of “firm standing in the depths.”

In pāda a I again supply “Heaven and Earth” as referents for *bṛhāntā* ‘lofty’. The fem. dual *bṛhatī* regularly modifies *ródasī* the ‘two world halves’, as well as *dyāvāpṛthivī* (IV.56.1, VII.53.1), and a reference to H+E here in the first of the post-omphalos vss. would form a ring with the reference in 4b, the last of the pre-omphalos vss.

śāsuh in c matches the same word in 2b, helping to provide the ring around the omphalos (though not situated in the directly corresponding vs.).

In d, flg. Ludwig (see Old), I take *āmśā* as an elliptical dual referring to two minor Ādityas, *Amśa* ‘share’ and *Bhaga* ‘portion, fortune’ (on the close association between *Amśa* and *Bhaga* see Brereton, Ādityas, 307–8). *Bhaga* is indirectly present in the verb *bhajatam* of this pāda, as well as (perhaps) in *bhāgevitā* in the preceding vs., 8b. Note in passing that the poet of this hymn is named *Bhūtāmśa* (named in 11d and assigned the hymn by the Anukr.).

X.106.10: The agricultural cast of the second vs. of this hymn returns in this, the penultimate vs.

Gr and Re suggest that the hapax *āraṅgarā*- is a word for bee, but this seems unlikely; instead it seems a phonological play on the actual word for bee, *sāraghā*-, that begins the next pāda. Best, with Ge, to leave it untr.; in context it ought to refer to a husbandman or someone/thing responsible for producing milk in cows (assuming *gāvi* refers to an actual cow).

In the publ. tr. I supply parenthetical “(milk)” as the obj. of *érayethe* in the frame, with *mādhu* the corresponding object in the simile. I now think it is more likely that *mādhu* is used metaphorically for milk as well as literally to (bees’) honey and is shared by simile and frame. For the structure of the frame, cf. VIII.89.7 *āmāsu pakvām aīraya(h)* “you raised/produced the

cooked (milk) in the raw (cows).” Note also the final vs. of this hymn, 11c *pakvām mādhu gōṣv antāḥ* “the cooked ‘honey’ within the cows.” I would now slightly emend the tr. to “... you produce the ‘honey’ in the cow ... as bees produce honey.”

On *-bāra-* in *nicīna-bāra-* see comm. ad VIII.40.5. The explanation of this form (also in *jihmā-bāra-* ‘with sloping banks’) as showing a Middle-Indic-type intervocalic voicing of *pārā-* ‘opposite shore, edge’ is very plausible and would fit the register of this hymn.

I attach pāda c to ab, because like them it concerns the production of a liquid substance.

On the hapax *kīnāra-* and its relation to *kīnāśa-* (RV 1x, but common later), both of obscure etymology, see EWA s.vv. It is very likely that our hapax owes its *-āra-* to the phonological deformation that characterizes this hymn.

Ge renders *kṣāmeva* as “wie zwei magere (Tiere),” flg. Sāy. *kṣāmā* = *kṣīnā gauḥ* (see also, tentatively, Scar p. 38 and n. 47); I’m not sure what etymon he is thinking of. But it surely belongs to *kṣām-* ‘earth’, with Old and Re. It should be an elliptical dual, (Heaven and) Earth, as it is in II.39.7. But here the analysis is complicated by the fact that the associated adjective *sūyavasāt* ‘feeding on good pasture’ (*sūyavasa-ad-*) is sg. (and the Pp reads *kṣāma*). I think that the poet created a nonce singular (aided by the vowel-quantity-obliterating sandhi in *kṣāmeva*) and that only the earth, conceived of as a cow (as often), is at issue.

Note that *sacethe* is also found in II.39, vs. 2, though in a slightly different usage.

X.106.11: As noted in the publ. intro., the last vs. of this hymn resembles the last one of II.39 (vs. 8). The praises for the Aśvins are proffered -- *bráhma stómam* in II.39.9, *stómam ... mántram* here – and the poet urges the Aśvins to drive near: *úpa yātam* in both. In both the poet or poets proclaim their achievement with their own name: II.39.8b *bráhma stómam gr̥tsamadāso akran* “The Gr̥tsamādas have made the formulation and praise song”; X.106.11d *ā bhūtāmśo aśvinóḥ kāmam aprāḥ* “Bhūtāmśa has fulfilled the desire of the Aśvins.”

X.107 Dakṣiṇā

This hymn has certain points of contact with the second section of Kakṣīvant’s Prātaritvan hymn, I.125, vss. 4–7, which describe the cosmic rewards for the generous sacrificer.

X.107.1: As Ge points out, dakṣiṇās were distributed at the dawn sacrifice in RVic times, in contrast to the midday distribution in classical śrauta ritual. The emphasis on the coming of light in this vs. fits this ritual fact.

X.107.2: See I.125.5–6, esp. for our second hemistich.

X.107.3: It is quite possible that *kavārībhyah* in b is abl., not dat., as it is usually taken: “It is not *from* the stingy” (so Maurer, p. 299). I think it is likely meant to be both: the dakṣiṇā doesn’t come *from* the stingy, and the great rewards of giving it don’t come *to* the stingy. I would now allow the alt. tr.

X.107.4: Similar cosmic fertility is described in I.124.4–7, though there is little or no overlap in phraseology.

X.107.6: As Ge points out (n. 6ab), the five figures named are the poet and the four principal priests (Brahman, Adhvaryu, Udgātar, and Hotar) of the classical śrauta ritual.

I do not follow Ge (n. 6c, fld by Maurer, p. 299) in seeing the “three bodies of the blazing one” (*śukráśya tanvāḥ ... tisráḥ*) as the three Vedas, but rather as the three ritual fires.

X.107.7: Note the “X and which Y” construction in b.

As Ge points out (n. 7c), there is gender attraction in the nominal pseudo-izafe clause *yó na ātmā*, which qualifies neut. *ánnam*.

X.107.8: Although it is tempting (a temptation that Ge and Maurer gave in to) to tr. the pf. *mamruḥ* as presential, “they do not die,” the parallel pf. *īyuh* has preterital value, and as Kū demonstrates (370–71), in older Vedic the pf. of *√mr̥* had past-related usage.

Note the appearance of both *víśva-* and *sárva-*, overlapping here in the late RV. Here the older form *víśva-* appears in the very common fixed phrase (*idám*) *víśvam bhúvanam* “(this) whole world (here)” (I.73.8, 102.8, etc. etc.), while its replacement *sárva-* is found in freer usage.

X.107.9: Another izafe-type construction, ... *vadhvām yā suvāsāḥ*. There are a surprising number of such nominal relatives in this hymn.

The exact sense of *antaḥpéyam sūrāyāḥ* “the right to the inner drinking of liquor” is unclear to me (and others); it seems odd to grant to the pious and generous sacrificer access to the generally forbidden, or at least disdained, *surā*. For speculations see Old, Ge, Re.

In d the obj. **tān*, referent of the rel. *yé*, has been gapped (so already Sāy.; see Ge n. 9d). The defeated uninvited (*áhūtāḥ*) contrast with the invited (*hūtāḥ*) dakṣinā-bestower in 5a.

X.107.11: The first hemistich contains two elementary etymological figures: *-vāho vahanti* (a) and *-vṛt ... vartate* (b), both involving root noun cmpds.

[X.108 Saramā JPB]

X.109 All Gods [Brahman’s Wife]

On my interpr. of the hymn see not only the publ. intro. but the detailed treatment of it in my 2016 article “R̥gveda X.109: The ‘Brahman’s Wife’ and the Ritual Patnī,” in *The Vedas in Indian Culture and History: Proceedings of the Fourth International Vedic Conference (Austin, Texas 2007)* (ed. Joel P. Brereton), pp. 207–20, which also discusses the tangled history of its interpr. To sketch my views briefly, the hymn is one of several in the late RV that concern the fraught introduction of the ritual Patnī into solemn sacrifice. The hymn both proclaims the great benefits that the Patnī brings to the sacrifice and also discounts the possible risk of placing her on the ritual ground in contact with the gods. The implausible interpr. that held sway previously, that this is a very early version of a tale in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa about King Soma’s abduction and return of Bṛhaspati’s wife, can now fortunately be discarded.

My treatment of the hymn assumes an omphalos structure: the initial and final vss. (1, 7) present the “offense” (*kilbiṣā-*) and its expiation; the outer ring (2, 6) the giving back of the wife; the inner, omphalos vss. (3–5) the wife’s activities on the ritual ground.

As noted in the cited article, there are two not-entirely-parallel versions of the hymn in the AV: Ś V.17, P IX.15, whose interrelations I discuss in n. 54 of the article. Jeong-Soo Kim’s edition and tr. of AVP VIII and IX (2014) appeared long after I wrote the article and while it was still languishing in press, but the Kim treatment does not add much relevant.

The hymn is too short for its position in the text; we should expect 11 vss. I discuss this question in connection with the two AV versions in n. 54 of the art. cit.

I would now add a few things to the interpr. found in the article, inspired by the difficult vs. 5 (for more on which see below), which I did not treat in that article. Although I still believe that the hymn primarily concerns the ritual Patnī, I think it also has connections to the Brahmacārin, the Vedic student, whose designation appears in vs. 5 for the only time in the RV. Like the Patnī the Brahmacārin is an innovation in the religious structure: he is well established in the AV – the word *brahmacārín-* appears dozens of times, along with a fair representation of the abstract *brahmacārya-* – but neither the word (save for our vs. 5) nor the concept is Rigvedic. The pioneering reformers responsible for the introduction of the ritual Patnī were no doubt also implicated in the development of celibate studentship, and they must have been aware of the conceptual polarization that the Patnī and the Brahmacārin represented – one embodying sexuality and fertility, the other chastity and fervent austerity. Our hymn has some phraseological and conceptual connections with the AV hymn “extolling the Vedic student (brahmacārín)” (Whitney’s title): AVŚ XI.5 ≅ AVP XVI.153–55. In addition to the word *brahmacārín-* itself, also *tāpas-* (vss. 1, 4), a word that appears in practically every vs. of the AV Brahmacārin hymn. Other connections will be noted ad the individual vss.

X.109.1: As noted in the art. cit., the speakers in this vs. are mostly natural forces, esp. the waters both in their own form and as the boundless ocean (*ākūpārah salilāḥ*). I suggest there that since in later Vedic waters are prescribed for the removal of a *kilbiṣā-*, esp. at the final bath (*avabhṛtha*) of the Sacrificer and his Wife in śrauta ritual, the waters may owe their prominence in this vs. to that function. I cannot so readily account for the other players. However, note that Mātariśvan is found in the AV Brahmacārin hymn along with the waters (*mātariśvan ... apsú*: Ś XI.5.13≅P XVI.154.4) and *salilā-* in the same hymn (Ś vs. 26 = P XVI.155.6).

Both *salilā-* and *tāpas-* are ordinarily neut., but appear to be masc. in this vs. (so Old), perhaps as animatized forces? Re (EVP XVI.162) suggests that *vīlūharās tāpa(h)* is the “resolution” of an avoided three-member compd **vīluharastapas* (no accent given), an explanation I am somewhat sympathetic to, though it would help if he had indicated what he thought it meant and what its structure would be. Perhaps a 2nd member dvandva *-haras-tapas-* in a bahuvrīhi: *“(possessing) staunch rage and fervor”? But we must deal with the ill-assorted elements we have in the text.

As also disc. in the art., the *brahma-kilbiṣā-* could be either an offense committed against a brahman or by him. I opt for the former (as do most interpr.). The precise offense, in my view, is the separation of the Wife from her husband when she performs her duties on the ritual ground and interacts with the gods there, in what could be interpr. as sexual contact. Even though the brahman probably initiated the ritual, the separation could technically be considered a *kilbiṣā-* committed against him.

X.109.2: This is the first mention of the “giving back” of the Brahman’s wife. The list of gods involved in her return remind us of the gods who serve as husbands to the bride before she is married to her human spouse in the wedding hymn (X.85.40–41) – as I am not the first to notice. The first and last gods there are Soma and Agni, matching the endpoints of our list here. However, the middle figure in the wedding hymn is a Gandharva – not a good functional match for Varuṇa, or Varuṇa and Mitra, here. As I suggest in the art. cit., the Third Pressing, in which the Wife has a major role, with simulated sexual contact with the gods, is dedicated to the

Ādityas, whose two principal gods are Varuṇa and Mitra – this ritual episode may be alluded to here, but see also below.

There is much discussion about the derivation of the agent noun *anvartitā*: to *ānu √ṛ(t)* (the Pp. interpr.) or *ānu √vṛt* with simplification of **anuvart-* (see Old, Ge n. 2c, etc.)? Old favors *√ṛ(t)* and is fld. by Ge, Tichy (Nom. ag. 126, flg. I. Eichner-Kühn), with the sense ‘demand-er back’ (Zurückforderer). But since the few passages adduced for this lexeme are late and seem divergent in sense, I favor the connection with *√vṛt* (as does Re, but he thinks it means “consentant”). The lexeme *ānu √vṛt* is reasonably well attested in both RV and AV and means ‘follow after, escort’, which fits the context well. The AV has a future *ānvartīsyē* in a wedding context (Ś XIV.1.56=P XVIII.6.4). The form is phonologically ambiguous in the same way as ours, but Wh (AV ad loc.) and Kim (Index verborum s.v. *vart*) both interpret as **ānu vartīsyē*. AVŚ XIV.1.56 *idāṃ tād rūpāṃ yād āvasta yōṣā, jāyāṃ jijñāse mānasā cārantīm / tām ānvartīsyē sākhibhir nāvagvaiḥ, kā imān vidvān ví cacarta pāsān* Wh “This [is] that form in which the young woman dressed herself; I desire to know with [my] mind the wife moving about; I will go after her [/escort her? swj] with nine-fold comrades: who, knowing, unloosened these fetters?” The “fetters” in d are “the fetters of Varuṇa” (mentioned explicitly in the two flg. vss., XIV.1.57–58), with which the bride is briefly bound at the beginning of the wedding ceremony, before being released to marriage. That Varuṇa is the *anvartitā* in our vs. seems significant.

I render *mitrāḥ* here as ‘ally’, an appositive to *vāruṇaḥ*, rather than as the god Mitra (contra the standard tr.), primarily for this reason: i.e., that the idiom *ānu √(v)ṛt* is also found in a passage that links Varuṇa (alone) with the wife (*jāyā*). It is also the case that there’s a singular verb and agent noun, though that is not so strong an argument, since singular nouns in series can take singular verbs.

X.109.3: This vs. has received a number of (over-)elaborate interpr., bending it to fit the purāṇic story (or whatever scenario the interpr. favors). I cannot engage with these in detail; see the extensive disc. of, e.g., Old, Ge, and Doniger (275–77). Suffice it to say that the supposed plot the interpr. see does some violence to what is actually in the text.

In my interpr. the vs. concerns the Patnī’s activity on the ritual ground. Her presence there is announced in b. In pāda a the standard interpr. assume that the hand belongs to someone else, but I take it to be hers (see pāda-final *asyā(h)*). Only she can touch and transfer the ritual substance from the earthly to the divine realm. Her exclusive role in this transfer is further treated in pāda c: she does not allow a proxy or messenger to be sent; she must do it herself. As I say in the art. cit., the mid. perfect *tasthe* with dat. inf. may go too easily into idiomatic Engl. (“stand for” = “allow, permit”), though Ge’s “gestattete” is sim. (Kü doesn’t treat this passage.) Note the double dative infinitival phrase *dūtāya prahyē*.

I do not have a particularly good explanation for pāda d. I do not think it has to do with tension and hostility between the two varṇas, brahmins and kṣatriyas, although I think this vs. probably contributed to the reorientation of this expanded hymn in the AV to just this issue. (See n. 54 in my 2016 art. for disc.) Varṇa-consciousness barely exists in the RV, though it does begin to surface in the later parts of the text. But even there the relation between king and priest is generally one of cooperation and complementarity. I think such a situation may be depicted here: she is the wife of the Brahman, quite possibly a/the priestly sacrificer, but the correct performance of the sacrifice ensures the continued successful function of the overarching social and political structures – the kingdom and its ruler. Note also that the AV Brahmacārin hymn contains a very similar statement: AVŚ XI.5.17=AVP XVI.54.7 *brahmacāryeṇa tāpasā rājā*

rāṣṭrām ví rakṣati “By brahmacarya and by fervor the king protects his kingdom.” In both cases kingship is supported by the characteristic activity of priestly personnel.

X.109.4: This vs. continues the celebration of the Patnī’s critical role in the sacrifice. It is a canny move on the part of the ritual innovators who recently introduced the Wife into the sacrifice to ascribe these praises of the Wife to “the ancient gods and Seven Seers” (*devāḥ ... pūrve, saptaṛṣāyaḥ*), thus providing this innovation with a supposedly primordial pedigree.

My interpr. of what they say is quite different from the standard, turning on a different understanding of the hapax *durdhā-* (besides the standard tr. and comm., see also Scar 252). It is generally taken to mean ‘disorder’; by contrast I interpr. it as ‘difficult to place’. It is not that she causes trouble in heaven, but that she performs difficult and dangerous tasks in the sacrifice – particularly the preparation of the sacrificial animal – and transfers the perilous material to the divine world.

The standard interpr. also must take *úpanītā* as ‘led away’ (Wh [AVŚ V.17.6] ‘led away’, Don ‘taken away’), referring to her supposed abduction. But *úpa* doesn’t mean ‘away’, but its opposite ‘up to, near’; moreover *úpa √ nī* has a technical idiomatic meaning: ‘initiate’. Given the presence of *brahmacārín-* in the next vs. (5a), it is difficult to believe that this technical meaning wasn’t in the poet’s and audience’s minds, since already in the AV the Brahmacārín undergoes Upanayana; see, e.g., AVŚ XI.5.3. Here I think both the additive meaning ‘led near’ and the technical ‘initiated’ are meant: the Wife is led into intimate association with the personnel and activities of the sacrifice, and she is also initiated as a performer in her own right. (In śrauta ritual the Patnī undergoes Dīkṣā along with her husband.)

X.109.5: For another take on this vs., which I find no more plausible than the others, see HPS (B+I 120–22).

This vs. contains the only occurrence of *brahmacārín-* (or *brahmacārya-*) in the RV. As noted above, I think the poet who lobbies so effectively for the new ritual Patnī in this hymn also infuses the hymn with hints of the Brahmacārín. I also think the poet was well aware of the literal sense of the compound ‘practicing *brāhman*’, in addition to its newly developed technical sense. This is immediately evident in the double etymological figure that opens the vs.: *brahmacārī carati véviṣad víṣaḥ*. Here I think that *carati* functions as an auxiliary, reinforcing the iterative value of the participle *véviṣat* (“keeps constantly laboring”). If *brahmacārī* is interpr. in its literal sense, this would mean that the priest/poet, who produces formulations, just keeps doing what he’s always been doing in the ritual, while the newly introduced Patnī, the “wife of the formulation” (*brahmajāyā-*), a possible interpr. of that cmpd. (see 2016 art.), brings novelty to the ritual. If *brahmacārī* is interpr. in its new idiomatic sense, the student keeps accomplishing the many types of cosmic deeds attributed to him in the AV Brahmacārín hymn.

The second pāda is difficult, in part because *ékam* can be interpr. in diametrically opposed ways: does he become *one* limb of the gods, of which there are potentially more, or the *single* limb of the gods, of which there are no more? As is often my technique, I think it can be interpreted as both. On the one hand, if *brahmacārī* refers here to the standard ritual formulator, the priest-poet, pāda b may be pointing out that he is now (just) one limb of the gods; the new Patnī is another, and together they will form a more effective team. This could also be true if *brahmacārī* refers to the student (forming a polarized pair with the Patnī), but I think “the single/only limb” interpr. fits the student better – if we’re allowed a more expansive interpr. of *āṅga-* ‘limb’. In the wedding hymn X.85.30 sg. *āṅgam* clearly refers to the bridegroom’s penis;

the designation “one/single limb” would make that referent even clearer here. Of course, it’s a shocking paradox to call the chaste student “the penis of the gods” – but the kind of shock a RVic audience would enjoy. Moreover, the Brahmacārin is credited with an astounding and unambiguous sexual act in the AV Brahmacārin hymn: Ś XI.5.12 = P XVI.154.2 *bṛhác chépo ’nu bhūmau jabhāra / brahmacārī siñcati sñau rétaḥ pṛthivyām* “He “bore down” his lofty penis on the earth; the Brahmacārin pours semen on the back, on the earth.” (On the sexual idiom *ānu √ bhr̥* see my 1981 ‘A Vedic sexual pun: *ástobhayat*, *anubhartrī*, and RV I.88.6” [*Acta Orientalia* 42 (1981[82]) 55-63].) It seems that the very fervor of his chastity makes him prodigiously sexual.

I don’t quite know what to do with pāda c, which has provided (weak) support for the abduction narrative – though I now have a few new ideas.

The first problem is *tēna*: this is ordinarily (incl. in the publ. tr.) taken as an instrument instrumental: “by/with him,” referring to the Brahmacārin; it could alternatively be an instr. of accompaniment: “... discovered the wife along with him” or “along with him, Bṛhaspati discovered ...” Or it could be an adverbial “in this way ...” None of these possibilities is particularly compelling, though I now weakly favor the last.

The subject *bṛhaspātīḥ* is, not surprisingly, generally taken as the god, but I now wonder. I think it is a multifaceted pun: in the RV this well-attested compound is doubled by the less common, but more transparent *brāhmaṇas-pāti-*, and the genitive 1st members of these compounds could easily be replaced by the stem form *brahma-*, which we find in *brahma-jāyā-*. In other words *bṛhaspāti-* here can count as the husband of the pair, a putative **brahma-pāti-* – and he also can be taken as a different realization of *brahma-cārīn-* ‘practicing formulations’, which begins the vs. In other words, I now think that *bṛhaspātīḥ* here designates not a god, but the husband of the *brahmajāyā-*, from whom he has been separated during her activity on the ritual ground. He now finds her: this is the beginning of the “return” of the Brahman’s wife, which will occupy the next vs. And just as Soma was the first to give her back in 2a, here she is led to her husband by Soma.

The simile in d is interpretable if *juhū-* ‘ladle / tongue’ is taken as standing for Agni (see VI.66.10 for “tongues of fire”). It is a glancing allusion to the myth of Agni’s flight from his ritual role and rediscovery by the gods.

X.109.6: The vs. corresponding to vs. 2 in the outer ring of this omphalos hymn; see publ. intro. and art. cit.

As disc. in the cited article, “kings” in the plural is almost never used of mortal kings in the RV, but only of the Ādityas. As the deities of the Third Pressing, their particular participation here is understandable. Once again, the scenario of the supposed hostility between the kṣatriya and brāhmaṇa varnas is subverted by closer attention to the actual text.

On *adaduḥ* (a), *daduḥ* (d), and the gapped verb of b, see the art. cit. There is no justification for the modal interpr. of b and d in the standard tr., and I take them all as preterital. Everyone involved in the ritual, gods and mortals alike, have restored the wife to her husband after her ritual activities.

X.109.7: This vs. forms a ring with the first, particularly in their shared *-kilbiṣā-* – an esp. nice example of a ring, because the second example cancels out the first: the offense has been expiated. On the possible ref. to the avabhṛtha or “final bath,” taken by the Sacrificer and his Wife in śrauta ritual, see art. cit.

The standard tr. have some trouble with the instr. *devaīḥ*; they must assume that the mortals make expiation with the help of the gods. But in my interpr. the gods are equally guilty of the offense of separating the wife from her husband and participate in the expiation.

The last hemistich of the hymn seems only loosely connected to it, expressing the good results that the participants in the sacrifice, both gods and men, share (c). I see no reason to bring Viṣṇu into d (like Ge, e.g.). Although *urugāyá-* does elsewhere modify Viṣṇu, he is not the only typical referent. Instead the form often refers to the wide space so prized by Vedic people – see VI.28.4, where cows wander *urugāyám ābhayam* “(space) that is wide-ranging and free of fear,” and the repeated passage VII.35.15=X.65–66.15, where the gods are asked to grant *urugāyám* to us. In neither case is Viṣṇu appropriate.

Note the non-standard gerund suffixes on *kṛtvī* and *bhaktvāya*.

X.110 Āprī

A fairly unremarkable Āprī hymn: an 11-verse version with Tanūnapāt in vs. 2 (like I.188, III.4, VII.2, IX.5) instead of Narāśaṃsa (like II.3, V.5, X.70). I.13 and I.142 have both, with Tanūnapāt in vs. 2 and Narāśaṃsa in vs. 3.

X.110.1: On the phrase *mānuṣo duroṇé*, see comm. ad X.104.4, also (for *duroṇé* X.11.2).

On the accent on *vāha* in *ā ca vāha*, see comm. ad I.74.6. At least functionally we do not seem to be dealing with subordinating *ca*, *pace* JSK (DGRV I.243–44) and others.

X.110.2: On the phrase *pathá ṛtasya yānān*, see Re’s extensive disc. (EVP XIV.119). To my mind we are dealing with the crossing of two expressions: on the one hand, *ṛtasya pānthā-* “path(s) of truth” is a common expression (I.46.11, 136.2, etc. etc.); on the other, the phrase *ṛtām yaté* “to the one going to / following the truth” (though with the part. of \sqrt{i} , not $\sqrt{yā}$) is a fairly common pāda-ending, incl. in the Tanūnapāt vs. in the Āprī hymn I.188.2. I think they’re combined here, with “truth” as goal supplanted by the genitive. This seems easier than assuming a decomposed **ṛta-yāna-* [no accent given] as Re does.

Pāda d contains a *ca* whose coordinating role is not immed. clear. JSK (DGRV I.223) plausibly explains it as connecting the *kṛṇuhi* clause of cd with the *svadayā* clause of ab, but preceded by the heavy participial phrase that occupies all of c. That phrase itself contains an *utá* conjoining the acc. objs. *mānmāni* and *yajñām*.

X.110.5: Pāda c consists of a single voc. phrase, with a single accent, on the initial syllable of *dévīḥ*.

X.110.6: On *suṣvāyantīḥ* see comm. ad the other RVic occurrence of this stem in VII.36.6, as well as my *-āya-* book (pp. 52–53), where I argue that our form is based directly on VII.36.6.

X.110.7: I take *yājadhyaī* as a purpose inf. with *mīmānā*, with the two Hotars as subjects of both (so also Re). Ge (fld. by Keydana, Inf. 61) instead construes it as a predicated inf. with “I” as supplied subj. (“... will ich verehren”). But in other Divine Hotar vss. in Āprī hymns, it’s the Hotars who sacrifice; they aren’t sacrificed to. Cf. I.13.8=I.142.8=I.188.7 *yajñām no yakṣatām imám* and II.3.7 *yakṣataḥ ... / devān yājantau*. Acdg. to his n. 7b, he bases his tr. on VII.2.7 *mānye vām ... yājadhyaī*, but that is better interpr. as “I think you are to perform the sacrifice, rather than his “... euch gedenke ich zu verehren.” In neither interpr. is there a finite verb in this

vs. In this type of “mentioning” context a finite verb does not seem necessary, but the vs. does contain three pres. participles that could be taken as predicated: *mímānā* (b), *pracodáyantā* (c), and *diśántā* (d).

The “dwelling of Manu” (1a) has now been further specified as the “sacrifice of Manu.”

A more significant piece of chaining is *prācīnam ... pradísā* (d), which picks up the same phrase in 4a. In 4 the “east-facing” substance was the barhis; here it is the light (*jyótiḥ*), which is presumably the ritual fire (so Ge n. 7d, referring to “all commentaries”). The root noun cmpd *pradís-* occurs three times in this hymn, twice as instr. (4a, 7d), once as loc. (11c). This stem also has several different senses, rather like its English counterpart ‘direction’ – either as a geographical term, leading ultimately to its use for quarters or regions, or as an instruction, order, or command (see Scar 222–23). In our 4a it is clearly the former, in our 11c clearly the latter. In my opinion the one in our vs. is a modulation from one to the other and can be interpr. in both senses. Ge seems to ignore the strong phraseological agreement between 4a and 7d and interpr. *pradísā* only in the ‘instruction’ sense (“mit ihrer Weisung,” versus 4a “in der Richtung der Erde”). My tr. is meant to capture both: the Hotars direct the fire towards the earth’s eastern direction, just as the barhis was arranged in 4a, but they also do so at their own direction.

X.110.8: On Iḍā’s instruction of Manu, see I.31.11 *īlām akṛṇvan mānuṣasya śāsanīm* “They made I. the instructor of M.”

Barhis as *syonā-* for gods to sit on returns from 4a, d.

X.110.9: The verb *āpiṃśat* picks up *sukra-pís-* in 6d.

The 2nd hemistich echoes and scrambles 3cd: *hótā ... yakṣi iṣitó yājīyān* matched by our ... *hotar iṣitó yājīyān ... yakṣi*.

X.110.10: I take the Lord of the Forest, the Butcher, and Agni as three different entities because of the pl. verb *svadantu*. In II.3.10 the three figures appear in different pādas and have different associated verbs. Ge merges the Butcher and Agni, but doesn’t mention the number of the verb.

The phrase in 2b *mādhvā samañjān svadayā* is picked up and parceled out here: *samañjān* (a) ... *svádantu mādhunā* (d). In b *pāthaḥ* echoes *pathāḥ* of 2a, though they are entirely different words.

X.110.11: More echoes: *vy āmimīta yajñām* recalls 7b *mímānā yajñām*. On *pradísī* see comm. ad vs. 7. And *adantu* (d) plays on *svádantu* 10d.

X.111 Indra

On the hymn’s reflections on the connection between poetry and deeds, esp. in vss. 1–4, see the publ. intro.

The hymn is overstuffed with *hī*’s, esp. at the beginning, often without clear function: 1d, 2a. 3b, also 6a. The publ. tr.’s attempt to render them all as causal may be misguided.

X.111.1: The interpr. of pāda b is somewhat open-ended: does *yáthā-yathā* mean “exactly as ...” (so, e.g., JSK, “Āmreḍitas ... [JAOS 123 (2003): 785]) or, its opposite, “in whatever way” (which Klein also allows as possible for this passage)? I favor the latter, in part because it seems a loose paraphrase of the poet’s patronymic Vairūpa ‘having many/different forms’, in part because the beginning of the hymn seems to celebrate the range of poetic possibilities.

There are several different ways to take *satyañ ... kṛtébhiḥ*; Ge's anodyne "durch seine wahrhaften Taten" is perhaps the most obvious, with *satya-* modifying nominalized *kṛtá-*; Lü (508–9) flips the grammatical values, with *kṛtá-* modifying nominalized *satya-*: "gemachten Wahrheiten," which he further specifies as Satyakriyas (truth-formulations). This seems to me to go too far, esp. as it's *ṛtá-* that participates in RVic truth-formulations. My interpr. reads *kṛtá-* twice, both as nominalized 'deed' and as an adj. predicating *satya-* ("made real"). As indic. in the publ. intro., I think the point is that poets by celebrating Indra's deeds give them reality – this is a minor variant on the IE "imperishable fame" theme that pervades archaic IE poetry: it is not enough to *do* something heroic; it needs to be enshrined in words, words artful enough to last. That Indra, the hero (*vīráḥ*), realizes this is shown by pāda d.

X.111.2: HPS (B+I 229–30) takes this vs. as a depiction of the Vala myth, with the "cows" (*góbhiḥ*) being the cows trapped in the cave, not (with Ge n. 2b) hymns. Interpr. the vs. in this way helps account for its place in the hymn and esp. the first pāda (with *hī*). Since in the Vala myth Indra functions as poet, opening the cave by his true and well-formulated speech, he understands the power of the ritual speech produced by human poets. I now take pāda a as further explaining 1d. In 1cd it is said that the poets make Indra's deeds real (in poetry) *because* (*hī*) "he is known to long for song." Pāda 2a explains Indra's particular penchant for songs: *because* (*hī*) his own hymnic vision (*dhītīḥ*) "flashed out" effectively when he was positioned at the Vala cave, just as the same type vision flashes out from the human poets on the ritual ground with the same efficacy.

In pāda b I would now replace "the cows [=Dawns/hymns]" with "the cows (from the Vala cave)."

Indra's mother is identified as a *gr̥ṣṭī-* in IV.18.10, the only occurrence of this word in the RV, just as the metronymic *gār̥ṣṭeyá-* only appears here. The tr. "heifer" is a bit misleading, since the usual def. of the English word is "a young cow, esp. one that has not given birth to a calf." But "young cow" is flat, and "heifer" conveys the tone better, I think.

Pāda c is a clearer version of pāda a; that is, it depicts Indra's action at the Vala cave. The presence of *rāveṇa* is a tipoff, because this word is almost always used in a Vala context for the roar that breaks open the cave (e.g., *valāṃ ruroja ... rāveṇa*).

I interpr. *mahānti cīd ...* as a concessive nominal clause, in great part because *purūṇi cīd* in 4c invites the same treatment; both modify *rājāṃsi*. See also *mahīm cīd* in 5c.

Acđg. to Kü (503), the indic. pf. of *√vyac* is only stative presential, and he so tr. this passage. But in this mythological context a presential interp. seems strained; see HPS's preterital "... hat er ganz umspannt."

X.111.3: My interpr. of the first pāda differs considerably from the standard. In my view (see publ. intro.) it asserts the crucial role of poetry in Indra's self-fashioning: he knows about his deeds and powers from hearing about them in praise poetry. Contra the Pp (and all standard interpr.) I take the Saṃhitā form *śrútyā* as standing for abl. *śrútyās*, not dat. *śrútyai*. (For abl.-gen. in *-yās* to fem. short *i*-stem, see, e.g., *yuvatyās* to *yuvatí-*).

The referent of *asyá* 'of this' is, broadly, the Indra mythology related in the first vss. as well as what is to come.

It's a good thing that *he* knows it, because the rest of the vs. is deeply puzzling to the rest of us. HPS (229 n. 106) claims that it also concerns the Vala myth. Although this would be both convenient and make sense, since 2 and 4ab are Vala vss., I see no points of contact – although

there's a cow, it's singular, and the Vala cows are plural. As Old and Ge (n. 3c) point out, pāda c, with *mēnā-* and a cow, is reminiscent of the likewise deeply puzzling I.121.2, and I have interpr. our passage in light of my own interpr. of that vs. (see comm. ad loc.). Here I think the context is (the time of) dawn, and the *mēnā* and the cow are both Dawn, who becomes Indra's consort. The dawn context is set in pāda b, where Indra becomes the "path-maker" for the sun, implying a time before the sun rises and begins its journey across heaven.

The second hemistich must continue pāda b, both thematically and syntactically, because the accent on *bhúvat* in c can best be explained if it's still under the domain of *hí* in b -- so Old, implicitly contra Ge; alternatively Scar (147) makes the first part of c an unmarked subord. cl ("Wenn ..."). In this hemistich I read both *góḥ* and *pátīḥ* twice. I first take *góḥ* as abl., in the phrase "making a wife from a cow," and then as gen. with *pátīḥ*: "husband of the cow." In both cases the cow is Dawn. *pátīḥ* is positioned between two adjacent genitives and can also be read with flg. *diváh* as "lord of heaven" (for Indra as "lord of heaven" see VIII.13.8, 98.4–6). This is a bit tricky, but the overall interpr. makes at least a bit more sense than the others.

X.111.4: The first hemistich returns to the Vala myth, signaled most clearly by the presence of the Aṅgirasas. Although there are no other unambiguous exx. of *arṇavá-* 'flood' referring to Vala (pace Ge n. 4a and HPS [Vedisch *Vrata* 47 n. 84], the occurrence in VIII.40.5 is not at all clear), but several occurrences of *udadhí-* 'water-holder, reservoir' probably do refer to Vala (X.67.5, possibly VII.94.12), and it is not difficult to think of Vala as a reservoir of cows/dawns/waters, and by some semantic fiddling as a flood: "flood" – i.e., the contained (cows/dawns/waters) -- can be used to name their container, the Vala cave.

The statement "Indra by his greatness confounded the commandments of the great Flood [=Vala]" (*índro mahnā mahatō arṇavāsya vratāmināt*) is quite extraordinary in a RVic context. *vratās* are otherwise almost the exclusive province of gods, esp Varuṇa. (On *vratā-* in general see HPS, Vedisch *Vrata*, and for important adjustments to HPS's views, Brereton, Ādityas, 69–81.) When construed with $\sqrt{mī}$ (+/- *ā* or *prā*), the syntagm is almost always negated: "he/they [generally mortals] do/did *not* confound the *vratā(s)*"; in the few positive occurrences the subjects who do confound the *vratas* [again mortals] are inviting divine punishment, though often hoping for mercy. Acdg to HPS, who discusses this vs. at length (Vedisch *Vrata* 46–47), this is the only place in which a "widergöttlich" being has *vratas*. He reasonably asks what Vala's *vratas* might be and concludes, also reasonably, that it is the lie (*drúh-*), untruth (*ánṛta-*). The ascription of *vratas* to Vala is a remarkable index of his power, almost an indication that his power is equivalent to that of the gods, a sense encouraged by assigning greatness to both Indra and Vala in this vs. (*mahnā mahatāḥ*). If this power is linked to Untruth as the gods' is to Truth, the picture is almost like that of the uneasy Avestan balance between those two forces – a hint of Zoroastrian dualism that does not get further developed in Vedic. Here, happily, Indra's own greatness is sufficient to overcome great Vala's *vratas*, but the fact that the verb is *amināt* (per Pp, or possibly *ā-amināt*), whose subjects in this formula are otherwise disobedient mortals, is unsettling; it casts Indra in the role of a less powerful being challenging the implicitly legitimate commandments of an implicitly legitimate and powerful authority.

The lexeme $ní\sqrt{tan}$ does not otherwise occur in the RV, but in the AV and early Saṃhitās there are various plant names based on it, presumably meaning 'stretch(ing) down' of roots. See Griffiths's disc. ad AVP VII.5.6. I take c to concern the fixation of the earthly realms. On *purūṇi cid* see comm. ad 2d, also 5c.

The final word of d, *satyātātā*, may form a ring with *satyañ* in 1c, bringing to a close the section of the hymn concerned with the intertwining of divine deeds and poetry. The form is universally taken (incl. by the publ. tr.) as an instr. to *satyātāt-*. Acdg. to the publ. tr., Indra performed these deeds by means of the realization provided by their poetic encapsulation, by the Aṅgirasas (as in the publ. tr.) or in general. An alternative analysis could start with the stem **satyātāti-* (attested 1x in the RV, but as an unaccented voc.), which would then be in the loc. (as often with *-tāti-* stems; e.g., *devātātā*, *sarvātātā*). In this case it would mean “buttressed their buttress in reality / in poetic realization.” The two are equally likely (or unlikely). We should also consider *satyātātā* in conjunction with the unexpressed, but implied, linkage of Vala and his *vratas* to Untruth, discussed immed. above. Under this interpr. Indra did his various deeds *by means of truth/reality* or rooted the realms and buttressed their buttress *in truth/reality* (depending on whether the *-tāt-* or *-tāti-* stem is selected).

X.111.5: This vs. is a bit of a mythological grabbag; one of its points, esp. in the first pāda, may be to reestablish the superior power of Indra after the destabilization in the previous vs., 4ab. The first hemistich echoes III.31.8. Bl (RV Reps, ad III.31.8) dismisses our vs. with characteristic acidity: “[III.31.8] has furnished material for a hackneyed, commonplace stanza, in which the repeated pāda is varied insipidly, to wit X.111.5. ... the overshrewd thought of an epigonal poet ...” It is always bracing to read Bl at his most censorious, but his judgments need not be accepted.

Pāda d is marked by the heavy etym. figure *cāskambha ... kāmghanena skābhīyān*, where, cleverly, each word begins with a different consonant.

X.111.6: Another etym. fig.: *vṛtrahā vṛtrām*.

The verb *ástar* can be either 2nd or 3rd sg.; Ge opts for the latter, while I do the former. It doesn’t really matter: it’s a modulation form between the 3rd sgs. of vs. 5 (ending with *cāskambha*) and the 2nd sgs. of 6cd (*jagantha .. abhavaḥ*).

Pāda b lacks a verb and can be construed either with pāda a (so publ. tr.) or c (Ge). Again it doesn’t really matter.

X.111.7: The first hemistich is relatively straightforward, the second bristling with difficulties.

The only real question in ab is whose *ketús* are at issue – the sun’s or the dawns’? Though Ge (see also JS, Root nouns 41) takes the beacons to be the sun’s (with *asya* dependent on *ketávaḥ*), I think they are actually the dawns’. Although *ketú-* can be associated with both the sun (e.g., X.37.1 ... *ketáve ... sūryāya* ...) and the dawns (e.g., VIII.43.5, X.78.7, 91.5 *uśásām iva / ná ketávaḥ*), it is my impression that the connection with dawns is more common. I therefore take *asya* as limiting *citrām ... rām* “glittering gift,” referring to the sun’s light or even to the sun itself.

My real departure from the Ge and Old interpr. comes with c. They take c and d as antithetical clauses concerning the not-yet-risen sun (c) and the unknowable goal of the sun once set (d). Flg. Ludwig, they both take *yāt* in c as a neut. pres. part. to *√i* (construed with *ā* “coming here”), complementary to (*púnar*) *yatāḥ* “going away again.” The *yāt* in c is therefore not (or not primarily) the subordinating conj.; eliminating an overt subordinator requires the accent on *dadrśé* to be explained: Old suggests antithetical accent; Ge (n. 7cd) adds the possibility of haplology **yád yád*. All of this seems plausible and I am almost convinced. The resulting tr. would be “(When) the heavenly body coming here from heaven [or, “the day’s heavenly body,”

with Ge's "Tagesgestirn," construing *divāḥ* with *nákṣatram* in the meaning 'day'] is not (yet) seen, no one knows about its going (away) again." I now consider this a possible alt., though I don't see how pāda c furnishes the logical basis for d, and the position of *ná* creates difficulties (see below).

The publ. tr. reflects a different construal of pāda c – as a rel. cl. appositive to the "glittering gift" of b, with the rel. prn. attracted to the neut. gender of the internal referent *nákṣatram* (from the fem. of *citrām ... rām* in b). Pāda d is then a separate clause. By this interpr. *dadṛśe* has its accent because it is in a subord. cl. I would now, however, tr. the verb as "appears," rather than preterital "appeared," given the usual presential use of the middle pf. of $\sqrt{dṛś}$ (Kū 233).

This interpr. leaves pāda-final *ná* out of the rest of c and is the most problematic part of my interpr.: I take it as an emphatic expletive, anticipating the next pāda with its own neg. (*nákiḥ*) and its own emphatic (*addhā*). I recognize the ad hoc nature of this interpr., but pāda-final *ná* is problematic for everyone. Ge (7cd) weighs both "wie" and "nicht" (both to be construed within pāda c) and decides for the latter – on apparently reasonable grounds, because simile-marking *ná* seems essentially excluded from final position (see comm. ad VIII.76.1, X.21.1), as he himself noted elsewhere. But as it turns out, pāda-final negative *ná* is also on shaky ground; see immed. flg. disc.

To aid our interpr. we need to make a detour to a general consideration of pāda-final *ná* in the RV. I have made a complete (so I hope) collection of pāda-final *ná*, which is extremely rare, especially if *caná* passages are excluded. For reference I patch in the repertoire of *caná* passages: pāda-final *caná* (12x): II.23.5 *ná ... ná ... kútaś caná*; V.34.5 *ná ... caná*; VI.54.9 *ná ... kádā caná*; VII.82.7 *...ná ... kútaś caná*; VIII.19.6 *ná ... kútaś caná*; VIII.23.15 *ná ... caná*; IX.69.6 *ná ... kím caná*; X.39.11 *ná ... kútaś caná*; X.48.5 *ná ... kádā caná*; X.62.9 *ná ... kás caná*; X.85.3 *ná ... kás caná*; X.152.1 *ná ... kádā caná*.

We can now consider possible examples of simile-marking *ná* and negative *ná* in that position. There is one, seemingly secure, ex. of pāda-final *ná* in a conventional simile (VII.68.8). X.95.3 also has a pāda-final 'like', but it occurs in a truncated simile and, more importantly, in Purūravas's disordered speech and can serve as an index of how his mania has affected his syntax (see comm. ad loc.). The pāda formatting in Lub in the metrically complex hymn X.105.3 appears to provide another ex.: *āpa yór índraḥ pāpaja ā márto ná*, but the hemistich continues *śásramāṇó bibhīvān*, and the correct pāda configuration is clearly *āpa yór índraḥ pāpaja, ā márto ná śásramāṇó bibhīvān*, with 8 12 (so HvN), with *ná* safely inside the pāda.

There are even fewer secure pāda-final *nás* in negative than in simile-marking usage, and they all have, as it were, extenuating circumstances. In IV.13.5 [=14.5] *ánāyato ánibaddhaḥ kathāyām nyànni uttāno 'va padyate ná* "Not held firm, not tied down -- how does this one not fall down, head over heels?" the *ná* echoes the two negated adjectives that open the hemistich, creating a chiasmic *#án ... án ... ná*, and it also poses a negative question, which may have affected its position. In X.49.10 *ahám tád āsu dhārayam yád āsu ná, devás caná tváṣṭādhārayad rúṣat* "I held fast in them that which the god Tvaṣṭar never held fast in them: the gleaming ...," the pāda-final *ná* (if so it is) is clause-internal in a rel. cl. that straddles the pāda break, with *caná* doubling it in the following pāda. Moreover, pāda b is metrically problematic (see comm. ad loc.), and it is highly probable that *ná* opens that pāda (*#ná devás caná ...*) rather than ending pāda a, and so this ex. can be scrapped. X.129.7 contains the famous final phrase *yádi vā dadhé yádi vā ná*, which is both syntactically and metrically incomplete: the unusual final *ná* draws attention to this principled lack of closure.

In short, save for IV.13.5 there are no examples of a pāda-final negative *ná* that *ends* a complete clause and is construed within it – the function that the Ge interpr. of our pāda c requires. Since there is no body of such usage to set against my (admittedly unique) interpr. of *ná* here as an emphatic anticipation of the next, negative clause, I cautiously favor my interpr. in the publ. tr.

With Ge and Old, however, I do consider pāda d to concern the unknowable whereabouts of the sun after setting.

X.111.8: As noted in the publ. intro., this vs. serves as a sort of semantic pivot, with the unidentified females of most of the first hemistich (gen. pl. *āsām* [a], *yāḥ* [b]) seeming to continue the subject of the Dawns in vs. 7, but identified instead as waters by the last word of the hemistich (*āpaḥ*), an identity hinted at by the immed. preceding verb *sasrúḥ* ‘flowed’. This transitions us to the Vṛtra myth, which is overt in vs. 9. Since the action in pāda a is characteristic of Dawns – the daily passage of one after the other – the introduction of waters in b is even more unexpected.

The first pāda of this vs. also responds indirectly to the end of the preceding vs.: we do not know about the sun’s going away, but the subjects of 8a “have gone into the distance” (*dūrām ... jagmuḥ*). The certainty of our knowledge of their trajectory seems signaled by *kīla* (see the same particle in 2a), in contrast to the radical *uncertainty* of 7d (*nákir addhā nú veda*). Uncertainty returns in the second hemistich of this vs., however.

A slight adjustment to the tr. to “the first ones ...” would avoid the apparent number mismatch of “the first ... have gone.”

The second hemistich shows a different transition, from 3rd ps. (fem. gen. pl. *āsām*, like 8a) in c to 2nd ps. in d (*vaḥ*), by way of *āpaḥ*, which must be voc. here, but was nom. in 8b.

X.111.10: With Ge I take *āritāḥ* with *jārāḥ* (“acknowledged as their lover”). Although it is tempting on the basis VIII.33.5 *yāḥ pūrbhíd āritāḥ* “who is acknowledged as the stronghold-splitter” to construe *āritāḥ* with flg. *pūrbhíd*, the context favors the first alternative.

X.112 Indra

The poet’s name in the heading to the publ. tr. contains a typo: his name is Prabhedana, not Prebhedana. The hymn is fairly elementary and trouble-free.

X.112.1: *vīryā prā bravāma* echoes the famous opening of I.32; for an even closer echo see vs. 8 below.

X.112.3: Ge (n. 3ab) suggests that ab really refers to soma, under the guise of the sun. Possible but not necessary.

X.112.5: This vs. is formally a riddle, though hardly a challenging one. The referent of both the relative (*yāsya* [a]) and the two *sá-s* (c, d) is withheld till the final word: *sómah*.

śátrūn is the problem here, since there is nothing that clearly governs this acc. Ge simply supplies a plausible verb (erschlugest); making use of a trick of English, I’ve given *cakārtha* two different senses – “do in” and “do” – for the two different accs., *śátrūn* and *anānukṛtyā ráṇyā*. But I doubt that *√kṛ* has the “do in” sense, and I should probably simply follow the Ge path by supplying ‘conquered’, ‘smote’, vel sim. There is another, trickier, possibility, which I think is

unlikely in a hymn on this rudimentary rhetorical level, though I would certainly consider it in a more sophisticated hymn. It would be possible to read *anānukṛtyā* with both the following acc. *raṇyā* (as is already done) and the preceding one, *śātrūn*, in two different senses. The whole phrase would mean “made your rivals not to be emulated and did inimitable martial (deeds).” Of course, *anānukṛtyā* is not acc. pl. masc. like *śātrūn*, but since the two objects differ in gender, it can agree with only one. I would not hesitate to suggest this interpr. in another type of hymn, but its trickiness is out of place in the plain-vanilla context of this one. For *anānukṛtyām* + √*kṛ*; see X.68.10, where it has the “inimitable (deed)” sense.

The primary sense of *raṇyā*- is ‘joyous’, but it also shares the martial sense of its base noun *raṇa*- ‘joy’ / ‘battle’; the noun is found in 10c, probably in both senses as well.

X.112.8: Like vs. 1, this vs. echoes I.32.1 *īndrasya nū vīryāṇi prā vocam, yāni cakāra prathamāni vajrī*. Our vs. has a counterpart for everything but *vajrī* and the rel. prn., and indeed elaborates on some elements. The enclitic + voc. *te indra* matches *īndrasya*; *nūnām* matches *nū*, which occurs in an expanded phrase *pūrvyāni ... nūnām; vīryā ... prathamā* as a single NP matches *vīryāṇi* in the main cl. of I.32.1 and *prathamā* in the rel. cl.; *prā ... prā ... vocam* with tmesis and doubled preverb corresponds to simple *prā vocam*; *kṛtāni* takes the place of the finite *cakāra* in the rel. cl. in I.32.1. It is hard not to conclude that our poet modeled this hemistich on I.32.1, or at least that both poets were working from the same template, given the various other versions, like V.29.13, 31.6.

Interestingly, given the fairly slavish imitation of I.32.1, what follows is not the Vṛtra myth, but Vala. (Perhaps I’m underestimating the skill of this poet – or at least his awareness of the poetic tradition.)

X.112.9: Indra now takes on his role as Bṛhaspati, singing open the Vala cave. See esp. pādas b and d.

Note that the superlative + genitive phrase *vīpratamaṃ kavīnām* “the best *vīpra* of *kavīs*” shows the virtual synonymy of the two terms, or at least their fungibility.

X.112.10: In b the impv. *bodhī* can belong either to √*bhū* or √*budh*. Gr, Old, and I opt for the former, with *sākhe* a predicative voc.; Ge and Scar (99) for the latter (though Ge [n. 10b] offers the former as an alternative).

I take the double etym. figure *raṇaṃ kṛdhi raṇakṛt* as a pun, with *raṇa*- meaning both ‘joy’ and ‘battle’; see *raṇyā*- in 5b and disc. there. Certainly the bahuvr. *satya-śuṣma* ‘whose impetuous powers are real’ suggests a martial context, since *śuṣma*- and its deriv. are common in them (e.g., VI.68.7 *yēśāṃ śuṣmaḥ pṛtanāsu sāhvān* “whose impetuous force, victorious in battles ...”). Note that *satya-śuṣma* is a variant on *satīnā-manyu*- ‘whose battle fury is real’ (8c).

On first glance *ābhakte ... rāyē* appear to belong together morphologically as they do semantically. But of course they don’t, despite the surface agreement in endings (-e): *rāyē* is a dat., *ābhakte* a loc. The lexeme *ā√bhaj* ordinarily takes a loc.; it is difficult to find a function for dat. *rāyē* in this cl. If we take the dat. seriously, we might tr. it as a purpose dat.: “Give us a share even in unapportioned (goods/wealth/booty), for wealth.” But it may be better to follow Ge’s suggestion (n. 10d) that dat. *rāyē* can substitute for the unattested loc. to this stem, here encouraged by the superficial agreement of the endings.

X.113 Indra

X.113.1: In the publ. tr. I construe *sācetasā* with the instr. *vīśvebhīr devāḥ* “of one mind with all the gods,” but since *sācetas-* doesn’t otherwise appear with the instr., it might be better to take the instr. as an independent instr. of accompaniment: “H+E, of one mind, along with all the gods ...” The difference in sense is fairly minor, though it emphasizes the agreement between H+E.

The preverb *ānu* is fairly rare with *√av* (though see VIII.7.24, with the same obj. *śúṣmam*). My “assist” is meant to convey that they gave auxiliary aid, since Indra’s *śúṣma-* is not likely to need a lot of help. As noted in the publ. intro., the model of auxiliary help continues through the hymn.

It’s possible that *āt* is a sort of aux. with *kṛṇvānāḥ* “as he went on creating ...,” though I prefer the publ. tr.

X.113.2: A verb needs to be supplied in pāda a; since this pāda has the same general structure as 1ab: *tām asya* GOD(S) INSTR. ACC [POWER], I supply “assisted” (*ānu ... *āvaṭ*) based on 1b *ānu ... āvatām*. Ge (n. 2ab; sim. Kü 255–56) instead supplies **avardhat*, anticipating *āvardhan* in 3d (and [not noted by Ge] serving as the corresponding transitive to *avardhata* in 1d). Either will work, but anticipating a verb almost two vss. in the future seems less likely than basing the passage on a preceding one with the same structure.

In b *dadhanvān* is universally interpr. as transitive (e.g., Ge “der den (Soma)stengel fliessen liess”; sim. Kü 255–56). But as disc. ad VIII.19.1, the secondary root *√dhanv* as well as the pf. part. *dadhanvān* (which can belong to *√dhan* [so Kü], but has been assimilated to *√dhanv*) is otherwise intrans., and the two other occurrences of *dadhanvān* (IX.67.2, 107.1) are definitely intrans., with soma as subject. Clearly the trans. interpr. of our passage assumes a flip of soma from subj. to obj., but I find such syntactic malleability implausible. I think it more likely that Viṣṇu runs to the plant, to prepare it for Indra. On Viṣṇu’s participation in soma preparation, see, e.g., I.85.7, II.22.1, VI.17.11.

Acddg. to Ge (n. 2b), the subj. of *vī rapśate* is Indra, but since the same expression in IV.45.1 *mādhuno vī rapśate* has as its subj. a leather bag (*ḍṛtīḥ*), the plant, as a container of soma like the bag, seems more likely.

X.113.3: The infinitival phrase *śāmsam āvīde* “to acquire a laud” may be a semi-technical expressing for earning a *prāśasti*, the formal praise that a king would receive for a heroic deed.

The obj. in d, *mahimānam indriyām*, is repeated from 1c, and *mahimānam* is also found in the same metrical position in 2a.

X.113.4: In contrast to the first 3 vss., in this catalogue of deeds Indra apparently operates alone.

X.113.5: Likewise in this vs.; Mitra and Varuṇa do appear in the vs., but not as helpers but as beneficiaries of Indra’s actions.

In c (*d*)*hṛṣitāḥ* is a pun facilitated by the sandhi: the form can belong either to *√dhṛṣ* ‘dare’ or *√hṛṣ* ‘be excited’. Old tots up passages that favor the one or the other, but surely the point is that it represents both. (The Pp. reads *dhṛṣitāḥ*, and this analysis is followed by Gr and Ge.)

In d Ge tentatively takes *dāśūṣe* as a third party, the mortal worshiper, in addition to M+V. Although it is true that the stem *dāśvāms-* is overwhelmingly used of mortal worshipers, there are a limited no. of passages where it modifies a god; see disc. ad X.104.6. Since our exact

phrase, *vāruṇāya dāśúṣe*, is found in X.65.5, 6, separating these two datives is not indicated here. See comm. ad X.65.5.

X.113.6: My interpr. of the first hemistich diverges significantly from the standard, starting with the subject. Sāy. and Ge supply the waters, for which I see no evidence; in fact at the time the vs. takes place they are held captive by Vṛtra (pāda d) and in no position to be hastening anywhere. I favor the Maruts (as does Gr [s.v. *raṁh*]). Their presence here is signaled by *virapśīnaḥ* ‘teeming’. Gr and Ge take this adj. as gen. sg. modifying Indra, and admittedly the stem regularly modifies him (which must be why Ge takes Indra as subj. of *vīrapśate* in 2b). However it is also used 3x in the plural of the Maruts, each time adjacent to a form of *tāvas-* vel sim.: I.64.10 *tāviṣībhir virapśīnaḥ* #, I.87.1 *prātavaso virapśīnaḥ* #, I.166.8 *tavaso virapśīnaḥ* # -- just like our *tāviṣībhyo virapśīnaḥ* #. By my interpr. the Maruts hasten to the site of the Vṛtra battle to give their support to Indra and his powers and battle fury, hence the datives. It is well known that in some versions of the Vṛtra myth the Maruts provide such support to Indra. It is appropriate that they are characterized as “teeming,” given their identity as the thunderstorm.

In c *vy āvr̥ṣcat* echoes *āvṛṣcat* in 4c; nicely, the use of this verb connects the Vala myth of 4a with the Vṛtra myth here. Another echo: the redupl. pres. participle acc. *bībhratam* modifying Vṛtra and the same stem in the nom. *bībhrat* modifying Indra in 3a.

X.113.7: As Ge points out (n. 7), this vs. presents the Indra–Vṛtra battle as a dual between two, nearly equally matched, rivals, rather than the usual one-sided slaughter of Vṛtra by all-powerful Indra. See the duals *yátamānau samīyātuḥ*, and esp. the preverb *sám*. This balanced account is reminiscent of the depiction of the same battle in the later part of the most famous account of it, in I.32, esp. vss. 12–13 (see comm. ad I.32.12).

The vs. begins ambiguously, and indeed misleadingly: since the initial rel. prn. *yā* immediately precedes a neut. pl. expression, *vīryāṇi prathamāni kártvā*, it is natural to read it as a neut. pl. “which heroic deeds ...” But this leads to a deadend, as there is no correspondent in the main cl. in cd. Only when we reach the second part of b do we encounter the duals that are the real referents of *yā*, which can also be du. masc. “which two ...” The main cl. of cd does not have a resumptive pronoun (*tā* vel sim.), but does have an implicit “the one ... the other” construction, with c devoted to Vṛtra and d to Indra. The interpr. of *yā* as dual is Ge’s (n. 7a), though he in fact suggests reading *yā* twice, as dual masc. and neut. pl.; Old rejects Ge’s dual interpr., but this leaves us with an unresolved rel. cl.

Note that *vīryāṇi prathamāni kártvā* is quite similar to *vīryā ... prathamā kṛtāṇi* in the previous hymn (112.8), attributed to same or related poet. See comm. there.

Note also the return of *patyate* (cf. 5a). Ge interpr. d as referring to Indra’s right to the first drink of soma: “ein Anrecht auf die erste Einladung (zum Soma).” I think that this is correct and my tr. is somewhat opaque. I’d now slightly alter to “over the Early Call (to soma).”

X.113.8: The “causative” *āvardhayan* opening b is in the same position as semantically and functionally identical *āvardhan* opening 3d, and the two verbs have nearly identical subjects: 3a *vísve ... marútaḥ*, 8a *vísve devāsaḥ*.

The content of the 2nd hemistich is startling and syntactically skewed – these two features are probably connected. It is stated that someone/something *ate* (*āvayat*) Vṛtra, with the subject unexpressed. Indra is in an oblique case, the gen. dependent on *hánmanā*, which might almost seem to exclude him as subject of “ate.” But what other candidate is there? Certainly Ge

(n. 8d) thinks Indra is the subject and cites the epithet *vṛtra-khādā* ‘gnawer of Vṛtra’ used of Indra in III.45.2, 51.9 and of Indra’s alter ego Bṛhaspati in X.65.10. However, this semi-cannibalism is not a standard part of the Indra–Vṛtra myth and seems rather shocking – though eating a snake isn’t as bad as eating a being more human in form. I suggest that Indra is not specified as subj., but shunted into an oblique case, to lessen the shock. On the verb *āvayat* see my *-aya*-book, p. 71. The other occurrence of the verb in the RV, in VIII.45.38, is in a slangy context (see comm. ad loc.).

X.113.9: As disc. in the publ. intro., this vs. spells out the reciprocal partnership agreement between Indra and his mortal worshipers (ab) and then provides an example of it from the semi-mythic past (cd). The mutual aid between Indra and various gods (esp. the Maruts) earlier in the hymn provides the model for the agreement in ab. As I say in the publ. intro., the language is “labored,” esp. in ab, presumably to approach legalese as closely as possible. Esp. important are the balanced forms of *sakhyā*- ‘(act of) comradeship / partnership’.

As for the illustrative example in cd, elsewhere in the RV it is clear that Indra eliminated Dhuni and Cumuri for Dabhīti because Dabhīti performed ritual service for Indra. See esp. VI.20.13 “Dabhīti who presses for you with the soma juices, who brings the firewood and the cooked food, along with the chants” (... *túbhyaṃ sómebhiḥ sunván, dabhītir idhmábhṛtiḥ pakthy àrkāḥ*); in a nearby hymn (VI.26.6) these actions of Dabhīti’s are summarized as *śraddhā*- (pl.) ‘hospitality offerings’. For detailed disc. of *śraddhā*- as ‘trust in hospitality relations’, with hospitality often embodied in the ritual, see my *Sacrificed Wife*, 176–84. Here *śraddhā-manasyā*- refers to Dabhīti’s ‘mind/thought on/of hospitality’; it is rather like the epithet of Manu in the Manu’s Cups story (see SW/SW disc. just referred to), *śraddhā-deva*- ‘whose deity is hospitality’. In the cases of both Manu and Dabhīti, the hospitality is specifically that of the ritual.

X.113.10: In this, the final vs. of the hymn, the poet turns his attention to a different reciprocal relation: not between god and gods, nor god and humans, but human and human – viz., that between the poet and his patron, who is, however, not overtly referred to. The poet asks Indra for material goods (horses in this case) in exchange for the poet’s praise – but the goods are not for the poet himself. Instead, they should make the poet considered to be an effective wordsmith (*máṃsai nivācanāni śáṃsan*). In other words, the unmentioned patron will receive an abundance of horses and conclude that his poet has effectively praised Indra, which roused Indra’s generosity.

X.114 All Gods

On the manifold difficulties of this hymn, see publ. intro.; I have little to contribute to understanding the content, though I can tinker with phraseology and form. Re treats it (insofar as he does) in EVP XVI, not in the Viśve Devās fascicles. Old’s treatment is scanty. (I have the feeling he had the same unenthusiastic reaction I have to the numerological extravagances of the hymn.) Köhler translates and discusses the whole hymn at length in his 2011 Kavi *im Ṛgveda* (110ff.). For attempts to decode the referents and especially the numerological referents, consult these standard treatments.

X.114.1: The lexeme *ví√āp* is found only here in the RV, but is already tolerably well attested in the AV, including in the strikingly similar passage AVŚ VIII.9.20 *kathám gāyatrī trivṛtaṃ vyāpa*

“How did *gāyatrī* permeate the triple [*stóma*]?” (Wh)(no AVP corr.), which, however, is just as obscure.

The root affiliation of *aveṣan* is disputed. Gr assigns it to a root $\sqrt{viṣ}$ ‘sich ergiessen’, separate from $\sqrt{viṣ}$ ‘toil’, and he is followed by Narten (Sig.Aor. 245) and Gotō (1st Kl. 249). On this supposed root, see comm. ad I.178.2; I see no need for it. Ge instead takes it to $\sqrt{vī}$ and tr. “sie für sich beanspruchend” (whose relationship to the standard meanings of $\sqrt{vī}$ is opaque to me). Köhler (110–11) also takes it to $\sqrt{vī}$ but with a sense in line with the usage of that root: “haben ... aufgespürt”; unlike other tr. he takes *divás páyaḥ* as the obj. of *aveṣan*, not *dīdhiṣānāḥ*. But the existence of an *s*-aor. to $\sqrt{vī}$ is questionable, and I see nothing against assigning this form to $\sqrt{viṣ}$ ‘toil’ – at least without a clearer sense of what this vs. is about.

Assuming that *aveṣan* is an impf., it should not have the recent past sense “have toiled.” I am inclined to recast the tenses of the first three pādas to “pervaded ... came ... toiled.”

X.114.2: I have no idea what *nīṛtīḥ* refers to. The only other pl. to this stem in the RV (VIII.24.24) is no help.

Although I would prefer the root-noun cmpd *dīrgha-śrūt-* to have active meaning, ‘hearing long / afar / for a long time’, in all clear cases it has the passive sense ‘heard of / famed for a long time’ (either from the distant past or for the foreseeable future or both), as Scar (555) interpr. it, flg. the standard view. It is therefore essentially equivalent to the bahuvr. *dīrghá-śravas-*. In this passage (far from clear!) in the publ. tr. I rendered it with my preferred tr. “who hear afar,” which makes sense in context: the conveyers recognize the *nīṛtīḥ* because of their keen hearing. But I doubt that the cmpd has active sense in just this passage, and so I might emend to “the conveyers of far fame ...” Alternatively (and now, to me, preferably), *dīrghaśrútaḥ* could be nom. pl. fem. and modify *nīṛtīḥ* in the previous pāda: “Three (Goddesses of?) Dissolution, of long fame ...” The logical connection between the clauses would then be stronger: the conveyers recognize the *nīṛtīḥ* because they are famous. Taking the adj. with what precedes also makes sense of the displaced *vī hí* in b, which should begin a clause. I would now substitute “Three (Goddesses of?) Dissolution of long fame reverently approach to be pointed out, for the conveyers (of songs?) recognize them.”

Although this doesn’t help much, it’s worth noting that the same conjunction of lexical items – *nīdāna-*, *vāhni-*, and multiple occurrences of *kaví-* -- is found in VI.32.2–3. For *nī cikyuḥ kaváyāḥ*, see the identical phrase in X.124.9.

X.114.3: The referent(s) in this vs. and its general purport are completely opaque to me, and I have nothing to contribute to the multiple identifications suggested by others (see esp. Ge, Re, and Th. Unders. 16, 60–63). Th favors the night sky as the overall referent and downplays (or denies) any ritual associations, but as in the rest of the hymn, it is likely that both types of referents are in play. The general view (Ge, Ober [RdR II.133]; see also the reff. in Th, p. 61 n. 3) that in the ritual realm the female referred to is the *vedī* seems hard to dismiss, though Th tries mightily.

X.114.4–5: As indicated in the publ. intro., I take these two vss. as contrastive treatments of the poetic enterprise. In 4 the 1st ps. speaker, with his simple mind (*pākena mānasā*), saw a single eagle as a unity, while the inspired kavis (*vīprāḥ kaváyāḥ*) in 5 configure this single eagle in many ways (*bahudhā*) with their words (*vācobhiḥ*). The power of poetry to create and represent the multiple manifestations of the world could hardly be more clearly expressed.

As for the identity of the eagle (*suparṇā-*), it is generally taken as the sun or the sun identified with the ritual fire (Ge, Lü 299f., Köhler 112), though Th (62) opts for the moon, and other referents have been suggested (see Köhler’s detailed disc.). In my opinion, the emphasis on identifying the referents (and defending the identification against others) has distracted interpr. from the more interesting depiction of how poets operate and what they provide.

X.114.6: The consideration of the poets’ contribution, esp. in creating the sacrifice and making it effective, continues in this vs. The role of meter, mentioned in 5c, is elaborated on in 6b, and the focus narrows to the specifically ritual. Again, there is much disc. of what exactly is going on, with a deep dive into the numerology. Although obviously to a contemporary audience the referents of the exact numbers were interpretable, I still think that too much attention has been lavished on decoding the numbers and too little on the celebration of the role of poets.

X.114.7: By my rules, *anyé* should be definite in this position: “the others ...,” not with most interpr. indefinite “others ...” If Ge (n. 7a) is correct that this is a reference to the variants of the model ritual, a definite reference makes sense: the first, unnumbered one would be the model itself.

On a *tīrthā* associated with drink, see *tīrthām suprapāṇām* in X.40.13 and comm. thereon; see also the “famous *tīrthā*” in IX.97.53. In the comm. there I suggest that it may refer to the place or time in the sacrifice when the dakṣiṇās are distributed. If the hapax *āpnāna-* is related (however sketchily) to *āpnas-* ‘property, wealth’ (see AiG II.2.275–76), as is reflected in my tr. ‘opulent’, the same situation may be referred to here.

X.114.8: The lexeme *prāti√pad* occurs in the RV only here. The standard tr. are contextual (e.g., Ge “hat ... erkannt”). Re points out that the later ritual sense of the idiom is “entamer le répons,” which he hesitates to employ here, but I don’t know why ‘undertake, begin’ would be excluded.

X.114.9: Pādas a and b seem to me contrastive, with the unidentified some / ones making an extended journey to the end of the earth, despite being stably yoked to the chariot poles. With Köhler (114) I’m inclined to see the subject as the poets, or particularly skillful poets. As for the rest, it’s just as baffling as the rest of the hymn.

X.115 Agni

On the curious structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.115.1: The “two mothers” in b are of course the kindling sticks.

In c I take *yādi* as standing for **yād ī*, even though it does not precede a cons. cluster that would have encouraged redactional shortening. The form occurs right before the caesura in an opening of 5, and it seems unlikely that both syllables would be light in that position.

In the standard renderings (incl. the publ. tr.), we find a non-conjoining *ca* in c, apparently marking the beginning of the main cl. of cd after the subord. cl. that begins c. (See JSK, DGRV I.211–13, II.106 for attempts to account for its use here.) However, it is possible to assign it its usual conjoining function if we take the *ādhā ca nū* clause as parallel to what precedes, with both under the domain of *yādi*: “when the udderless one has begotten him and then he has waxed strong ...” This double *yādi* cl. would depend on the main cl. in ab. The

vavákṣa would be accented in either reading – either as a subordinated verb or one first in its pāda.

Note the distant etymological figure: *vakṣáthaḥ* (a), *vavákṣa* (d).

X.115.2: The vs. has a number of teasing word plays, initiated by the sequence *nāma dhāyi*, which appears to contain the idiom *nāma √ dhā* ‘give a name’ (*nāma-dhā-* 1x, *nāma-dhéya-* 1x), but in fact the two words should be separately construed.

In context *dán* can hardly be anything but an endingless loc. to *dám-* ‘house’: as Ge (n. 2a) points out, ‘establish the ritual fire in the house’ is a widespread locution. The question is how we arrive at this form. A gen. sg. *dán* to this stem is widely accepted (e.g., AiG III.243–44, EWA s.v. *dám-*), but this is from a preform **dám-s*, with the nasal assimilating to the dental ending. It is possible that in ambiguous passages (like I.120.6) gen. *dán* was misinterpreted as a loc. and spread to unambiguous loc. contexts. (In fact JPB tr. as a loc. there, though I would substitute the gen. “you two house-masters of beauty,” flg. Ge.) (That *dán* here is on the model of gen. *dán* elsewhere is essentially Old’s view – though he also considers the possibility that it’s really a gen. here. I’m not sure how that would work contextually. And he also floats the possibility that *dán* is a redactional change for **dám*.) Given the instr. *datā* ‘with his tooth’ in b, one should factor in a word play with *dánt-* ‘tooth’ (so also Re). In any case the form is not directly comparable to the Old Aves. vṛddhied endingless loc. *dqm*.

On *abhipramúrā* see Scar 390–91.

X.115.2–3: The mid. part. *próthamāna-* in d is the only mid. form attested to this (not very well attested) root; it is followed immed. by the act. *próthantam* in the next vs. (3b), whose voice is confirmed by other occurrences of this stem. The middle form here also occupies metrical positions 4–7, making a caesura after 4 or 5 impossible. Given that the opening of 2d *inó ná* is somewhat echoed by 3b *índum* and that immed. following act. *próthantam* allows a caesura after 5, 3b seems to repair 2d, where the irregularities call attention to the form. I have no explan. for the contrastive voice of *próthamāna-*; I very much doubt that semantics is involved.

X.115.3: This vs. is couched entirely in the acc. and has no syntactic connection with either the preceding or the flg. vs. With Ge and Re I supply a harmless 1st ps. verb of calling/praising to govern both the acc.s and the *vah*.

As Ge (n. 3ab) points out, the vs. is dense with imagery, and as I point out in the publ. intro., the words can do double or even triple duty: *dru-śád-* is appropriate for the frame (the fire sitting on the firewood) and for two associated similes (the latter unmarked as a simile): a bird sitting in a tree and the soma drop sitting in the wooden cup. (The applicability to the drop is not noted by Ge/Re, but is by Scar [566–67]; also more or less by Old.)

Agni is several times directly identified as *váhnir āsā* “conveyor by mouth” (I.76.4, 129.5 [in opposite order], VI.11.2, 16.9=VII.16.9), not in a simile – so *ná* here seems at first pleonastic. However, I think it contributes to the density of imagery noted above: *váhniḥ* should be read twice, with Agni explicitly compared to a draught-horse.

virapśín- and its associated forms are not usually construed with the instr., but see IV.20.5, cited by Ge.

The hapax pres. part. *sarájantam* is anomalously formed (apparent disyllabic root syl *saráj*). It must be construed with *ádhvanaḥ* (prob. acc. pl., but possibly gen.-abl. sg.). The form has been ascribed to numerous different roots: *√ sr*, *√ srj*, *√ raj*; for details consult KEWA s.v.

(EWA simply refers to the earlier work). As far as I know, no one has tried *srāj-* ‘garland’ or *sarā(g)h-* ‘bee’ (though I was sorely tempted by the latter: “buzzing along the ways”?). I see no grounds for decision, but I think it’s possible that it’s a portmanteau (/mash-up) of $\sqrt{s_r}$ ‘flow, run’ and $\sqrt{s_rj}$ ‘(be) released’, both of which appear with *ādhvanaḥ*: X.22.4 *srjānāḥ ... ādhvanaḥ* [acc.] and VIII.59.2 *sīsratū rājasah pāre ādhvanaḥ* [gen.]. Such a tricky form would be at home in this tricky hymns.

X.115.4: As disc. in the publ. intro., this and vs. 6 are the two most complex vss. in the hymn, and in each vs. I think the topic is Agni (sg.) and his flames (pl.). My interpr. differs in many details from Old, Ge, and Re, though is closer to Old. In particular, with Old but contra Ge/Re, I take *nā* in b as simile-marking rather than negative (though unfortunately it precedes the simile proper). I will not otherwise register agreements and disagreements.

In my interpr. the trick in the first hemistich is that the two nom. pl. masc. forms *vātāḥ* and *ācyutāḥ*, which, cutely, iconically encircle the verb *pāri sānti* ‘encircle’, are *not* to be construed together in an inherently self-contradictory phrase “immovable winds.” Rather they belong to two different similes, the second unmarked (as in 3b). Thus Agni’s flames are compared to two conceptually opposite natural elements, the ever-volatile winds and the never-moving mountains. For the encircling of winds, see IV.24.4 *pārijman ... vātāḥ*. For *ācyuta-* with mountain / rock, see I52.2 *pārvataḥ ... ācyutaḥ*, VI.17.5 *ādrim ... ācyutam*. In the latter passage, the rock surrounds (*pāri ... sāntam*) the cows (see also IV.1.15 and [with pl. *ādrayaḥ*] III.32.16).

On *jrayasānā-* and its type see comm. ad IV.3.6.

In the 2nd hemistich I take Trita as identical to Agni, though he could also (with Ge, etc.) be the one sent to search for Agni. See comm. ad X.46.6, 3.

X.115.5: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. has the feel of a final vs. – the first of several. It has some associations with vs. 7. The cadences of a and c are disturbed.

For the connection with the Kaṇvas, see Ge (n. 5a).

X.115.6: As indicated in the publ. intro., this vs. appears to belong with vs. 4, with vs. 5, the pseudo-final vs., an intrusion. As in vs. 4, I think the vs. concerns Agni and his flames. In vs. 4 the flames surround him and urge him on to battle; in this vs. they concede to his superior power. In vs. 4 they are in the pl., in this vs. the sg. That Agni is the referent of the dative phrase that dominates all 4 pādas is clear, but Ge/Re identify the sg. nom. as the wind, against my ‘flame’.

The hapax voc. *supitrya* is taken by most as ‘good for the Pitars’ – possible, but at least in my opinion the base adj. *pītrya-* generally means ‘ancestral’. In any case, the voc. does not seem to have much connection with the rest of the vs. thematically.

In b the phrase *tṛṣū cyāvānaḥ* reminds us of the cmpds *tṛṣu-cyāvas-* (VI.66.10) and *tṛṣy-cyūt-* (I.140.3). The latter qualifies Agni, but the former is used of Agni’s tongues, i.e., his flames – and this is the exact usage I see here. Note that *cyāvānaḥ* picks up *ācyutāḥ* in 4b.

There is no finite verb in this vs., but as Ge (n. 6b, fld. by Re) suggests, *ānu* in b invites a verb to be supplied; the best choice is *ānu* $\sqrt{dā}$ ‘concede’, which regularly takes a dative.

The dat. phrase of ab is continued by ... *saté* in c and *mahīntamāya ... avīṣyate* in d. The syntax of c is otherwise problematic, however: the problem is the rel. prn. *yāḥ*, which interrupts the dative phrase as (if?) an embedded rel. cl., but what the rest of that rel. cl. might be is unclear. Re essentially ignores the *yāḥ*; Ge (n. 6cd) says that a verb needs to be supplied with *yāḥ*, similar to what was supplied in ab, but I don’t quite see how he puts the pāda together and

in particular what he does with dat. *saté*. I now think that the phrase consists of *yó* + adverbial instr. *dhṛṣatā* and that it is a nominal izafe, embedded in the dative phrase. As argued in my 2022 Fs. Hale paper, nominal rel. clauses (i.e., izafe-like structures) can be embedded in the RV, contrary to be-verbed rel. clauses. Our cl. would mean, literally, “who [is] with daring.” It is very similar to VIII.21.2 *ugrás cakrāma yó dhṛṣát* with the adverbial neut. NA *dhṛṣát* to the same stem. I now think that supplying a verb (“acts”) in the publ. tr. was wrong, and I would emend the tr. to “to him in his daring when ...”

As for the rest of the pāda, with Gr I construe *anudré cid* with *saté* despite their distance. Note that *anudré* echoes *ānu* in b, and the *d* might even hint at the $\sqrt{dā}$ to be supplied in b. Moreover *anudré cid* corresponds to *dhānvanéd* “even through a wasteland” in d (so also Ge n. 6cd), both indicating the unpromising locations in which fire seeks its food.

Now as for *vāram* – in adverbial usage, this form is usually construed with *ā*, and in fact this is easily extracted from immed. preceding *dhṛṣatā* (i.e., as *dhṛṣatā-ā*). But I don’t quite understand what “by choice / acdg. to wish” adds semantically to this pāda.

Pace Gr, *dhānvanā* must belong to ‘wasteland’, not ‘bow’.

X.115.7–9: As indicated in the publ. tr., each of the last three vss. of the hymn presents itself as a final summary vs., each in a different meter. Vs. 7 is the last Jagatī vs. of this otherwise Jagatī hymn and may have been the original final vs.; vs. 8 is in Triṣṭubh, 8 Śakvarī. These last two vss. explicitly name the poet – or at least provide a name for the Anukramaṇī to affix to the hymn: Upastuta (8b), the sons of Vṛṣṭihavya, the Upastutas (9ab).

X.115.7: This vs. seems to pick up vs. 5, with its mention of *sūri*-s (5c, 7a). These patrons (in the instr.) receive praise along with Agni, while the instr. in b (*nṛbhiḥ*) must, in my view, refer to the poet/singers (contra Ge, who thinks they’re still the patrons). The plural subjects of cd are unidentified, but I think they are likely the patrons again.

In b *sāhasaḥ sūnāraḥ* “the spirited (son) of strength” obviously plays on *sāhasaḥ sūnū-* ‘son of strength’, defeating expectations in the second syllable of the second word. Note also that (*sū*)*nāro* plays on immed. following *nṛbhiḥ*. I don’t think we’re dealing with haplology (per Ge n, 7b) but with deliberate misdirection. As Re points out *sūnāra*- and its relatives are never elsewhere used of Agni.

Pāda d is almost identical to IV.16.19, as Ge (n. 7d) points out.

X.115.8: This vs. responds in a way to vs. 2, where Agni’s name was at issue (*agnīr ha nāma*). Here he is explicitly given another name or epithet: “child of nourishment” (voc. *ūrjo napāt*). This name can also be seen as a substitute for the name “son of strength” gestured to, but avoided, in the preceding vs., 7b – and note that *sahasāvan* in this address picks up the *sāhasaḥ* in the name in 7b. Unfortunately this connection cannot be seen in the publ. tr., because I translate *sāhasaḥ* and *sahasāvan* differently. I would now alter the publ. tr. in 8a to ‘possessing strength’ from ‘mighty one’.

X.115.9: Pāda c *tāmś ca pāhī grṇatās ca sūrīn* is a reprise of 5c *agnīḥ pātu grṇatō agnīḥ sūrīn*, which may account both for the metrical lapse (10-syl. pāda for 11) and the wrong placement of the 2nd *ca* (on which see JSK DGRV I.135). As for the meter, Old suggests distracting *tān*, but the parallel in 5c speaks against this: the 4-syllable openings match (*agnīḥ pātu* and *tāmś ca*

pāhī), and what follows the caesura should match too – but *ca* does not match the syllable count of *agnīḥ*.

X.116 Indra

For the structure of paired vss. see publ. intro.

X.116.1–2: Each of the four pādas of vs. 1 begins *pībā*, non-initial unaccented *piba* in 2a provides continuity.

X.116.3: As in vs. 1, each pāda of this vs. begins with a repeated impv., *mamātu*. In the bcd pādas everything after that impv. is in a rel. cl. whose antecedent is the unexpressed subj. of *mamātu*. To bring out the parallelism, b might be better tr. “let that exhilarate (you) which is pressed among earth-dwellers.” In any case the “you” of b should be parenthetical.

X.116.4: This is the only really challenging vs. in the hymn, the challenge lying in the second hemistich, esp. d, and what to do with *khédām*. Scar (683) takes it as a unit of measure, used adverbially, on no clear grounds. Ge (and implicitly Old) take it as obj. to *ā vṛṣasva*, but this doesn’t work either syntactically or semantically. The lexeme *ā vṛṣ* takes gen. objects almost exclusively (the only exception is III.60.5 *sutām sómam ā vṛṣasva*). Moreover, the obj. of the lexeme is always soma. This pattern is found in the 1st vs. of the hymn, 1b *pībā mádhvas tṛpád indrā vṛṣasva* and matched in our vs. by *sutásya ... mádhvah ... ā vṛṣasva*. As for the semantics: *khédā-* in its two other appearances (VIII.72.8, 77.3) is a concrete object capable of being threefold or triply turned (*trivṛt-* VIII.72.8); I take it as ‘hammer’ in VIII.77.3, where it is used to fix spokes into a wheelrim. On both counts it seems best to detach *khédām* from the verb *ā vṛṣasva*, which should be construed with the long gen. phrase that occupies all of pāda c.

What then to do with *khédām*? I start with the observation that forms of *√khid* (verbal and nominal) are regularly found in conjunction with *√han* forms (IV.25.7 *khidāti hānti*, VIII.77.3 *sám ... vṛtrahákhidat, khé ... khédayā*, VI.22.4 *khidvah ... asuraghnāḥ*). Here it immed. precedes *aruśahā*. I suggest taking it as a detached 1st cmpd member, assuming **khedā-hán-* “smashing the hammer,” parallel to *aruśahán-* -- or else as an external argument to *aruśa-hán-* “smashing the hammer on the *aruśa-*.”

As for *aruśa-*, Old and Scar (683–84) take it as a PN, but the interpr. of Gr and Ge (seemingly accepted by EWA s.v. *rúśant-*) as a negation of *rúśant-* ‘shining, white’ is appealing, given Indra’s penchant for slaying dark beings. Scar, who discusses the proposal at length, is understandably concerned about the formation. We might expect *ruśat-* as 1st cmpd member (as in *rúśad-vatsa-*) -- though this would produce a difficult-to-parse **ruśad-dhán-*. But I think it likely that *aruśa-hán-* was produced and perceived as a near-anagram of *asura-hán-* (RV 3x).

X.116.5: On *ní* reversing the fundamental meaning of the verb *bhrāśáya-*, see Ge (n. 5ab) and my *āya*-Formations (p. 86).

The hapax *vigadā-* is most likely derived from the much-later-attested root *√gad* ‘speak’. See comm. ad X.97.2 on *agadā-*. Although Ge tr. “im Streit,” in his n. 5d he specifies this as “Wortstreit”; cf. Old’s tentative “unter verwirrten Reden (der Feinde).”

X.116.6: This vs. takes the verbal lexemes used in vs. 5 with concrete objects and applies them to abstract qualities and to an animate being (Indra). In 5b *āva √tan* ‘loosen’ was used of

bowstrings; in 6ab *ví√tan* takes as object ‘fame’ (pl. *śrávāṃsi*, so lit. ‘fames, reports of fame’ – unfortunately not an English idiom), ‘might’ (*ójaḥ*), and ‘hostilities’ (*abhímātīḥ*) – with the bowstrings kept, but in a simile. The switch from *áva* to *ví* is potentially problematic, because *ví√tan* ordinarily means ‘stretch out, stretch through’, not ‘loosen’, so it should have essentially positive value here and mean the opposite of *áva√tan*. This is argued at length by Old, similarly by Th (Fremd. 72–73). Although I see their point, the attempt to impose a positive value on the verbal lexeme requires Th to produce a highly unnatural interpr. of the hemistich. I think in just this passage we must reckon with the essential equivalence of *áva√tan* and *ví√tan*, in line with Ge’s interpr. This is not hard to motivate: *ví* has a number of different senses: ‘apart, widely’, ‘through’, and – crucial here -- ‘without’ (generally in nominal forms, admittedly). The negating value of this last usage can be transferred to this nonce verbal form.

In 5a *ní√bhr̥ś* was used of arrow points made blunt; in 6d Indra himself is ‘unblunted’ (*ánibhr̥ṣṭaḥ*).

X.116.7: The past participles in c, *sutáḥ ... pakváḥ*, are in a chiasmic relationship with the impvs. in d: *addhí ... píba*. That is, Indra is urged to eat what is cooked and drink what is pressed.

The impvs. in d, *addhí ... píba ca*, are both accented; *addhí* owes its accent to its pāda-initial position, *píba* owes its perhaps to the fact that it’s explicitly conjoined with *addhí* but more likely because it’s perceived as opening a new clause, even though *prásthitasya* must be construed with both verbs, as 8a *addhí ... prásthitemā havīṃsi* shows.

The final phrase, *píba ... prásthitasya*, picks up the same in 2a, forming a weak ring.

X.116.8: Pāda b provides yet another pairing of food and drinking (see 7cd), here with concrete nominals, *pacatā ... sómam*.

X.116.9: This final vs. opens out first to Agni in addition to Indra (in a dual dvandva) and then to the gods in general. As indicated in the publ. intro., the final image of the gods as dice whirling around, giving and withholding luck, is a surprising one. On *udbhíd-* see comm. ad VIII.79.1.

X.117 Generosity

On the unusual nature of this hymn in a RVic context, see publ. intro. Although the hymn is made up of bromides, it makes some artful use of word order.

X.117.1: I would now prefer to tr. *vadhá-* here and in vs. 6 as ‘bane’ or ‘deadly bane’.

As Ge (n. 1b) points out, the AV reckons the “forms of death” to be 100.

X.117.2: This vs. alternates nominatives referring to the miserly rich man and datives referring to his hungry (ex-)friend, as if to intertwine them even as the subj. refuses the importuning beggar.

The hapax *raphitá-* has no obvious etymology (see EWA s.v. *rāpas-*) or meaning, though it obviously refers to some sort of miserable state. I have interpr. it as semantically adjacent to *rāpas-* ‘defect, malady’, rather than *√rap* ‘jammern’ (per Th., Ged. 78), though neither of these works phonologically.

X.117.3: On *grhú-* see EWA s.v.

I take *yāma-* in the cmpd *yāma-hūti-* to *√yā* ‘beg’, rather than with the usual *yāma(n)-* ‘journey’; see comm. ad X.64.1.

X.117.4: The play on the root \sqrt{sac} in ab can hardly go unnoticed: *sákhā ... sákhye, sacābhúve sácāmānāya*. The isolation of nom. *sákhā* (the stingy non-companion) from the rest of the \sqrt{sac} forms and the distance between the verb *dádāti* and its (partitive) obj. *pitvāḥ* seem to be iconic for the separation between the non-companion and his would-be companion and between a potential act of charity and the actual gift. This separation contrasts with the intertwining of the same two figures in vs. 2.

In d *anyām* should, by my rules, be definite since it is non-initial, but I can see no way to interpret it as anything but indefinite “another”; the āmreḍita *anyām-anyam* in the next vs. (5d) is properly positioned for an indefinite. For another anomalous positioning of *anyā-* (though in the opposite direction) see nearby X.119.7. This syntactic rule may be eroding in the late RV.

X.117.5: I’m not sure what to do with *íd* – it’s perhaps displaced, and the pāda should be interpr. “it’s just the stronger man who should give ...”

I take the phrase in b to be the equivalent of English “take the long view.”

X.117.6: As noted ad vs. 1, I’d now change the tr. of *vádha-* to ‘bane’ or ‘deadly bane’ for fluency.

X.117.7: In later Skt., forms of *apa* \sqrt{vrj} , lit. ‘twist away’, mean ‘complete, finish’. This appears to develop from an idiom specialized for weaving. See AVŚ X.7.42 *nāpa vrñjāte ná gamāto ántam* concerning two weavers: “They wrest not off; they go not to an end” (Wh). The the first verb, *ápa vrñjāte*, must express the somewhat delicate manoeuvre (see YouTube videos on this procedure) of removing the woof (=vertical) threads from the loom when the cloth is finished. I use the less specific English idiom “wrap up,” which also signifies closure. I’m not sure what idiom English uses for the removal from the loom (if there is one), but the equivalent in knitting is to “bind off.”

X.117.8: The solution of this numerical riddle provided by Ge (n. 8) seems quite convincing and bears some resemblance to the Greek riddle of the sphinx, as Don points out. It is somewhat curious that herd animals come in groups of five (*pañktīḥ*), but see Old and Ge (n. 8d). The use of *pañktī-* here is surely in part because ‘five’ is the next number in the series of riddles, but the fivefold classification of *paśu*-s found across Vedic prose is probably also at issue. On this classification see B. Sojkova, *Animals in Vedic Prose* (DPhil. diss., Oxford Univ., 2022). The larger question is what is the riddle meant to be conveying here: it doesn’t seem entirely on message. Presumably that having more feet doesn’t make you better off, but instead worse. If there’s relevance to this hymn it may be that giving away what you have (and thereby having less) will be a good move for you.

X.117.9: The examples given in this vs. seem even less relevant to the generosity theme than vs. 8, since they are concerned with the differential performance of two apparently identical items. Pāda d forces the topic back to “giving” but not very convincingly. It almost seems as if, in vss. 8–9, the poet went off on a riddle track, started by vs. 7, and lost sight of his main theme. I suppose the whole vs. could be interpr. as counseling generosity to the less fortunate because of the inherent inequality in the world – but this seems somewhat counter to the standard Vedic worldview.

On the non-**o*-grade in kinship terms as 2nd compound members (apropos *sammātārā* here), see J. Lundquist, “Does *tvátpitārah* = εὐπάτωρ?” *IEL* 9 (2021), esp. 133–36.

X.118 Agni Rakṣohan

This hymn is banal in the extreme; its salient feature is the inter-verse chaining.

X.118.1: As noted in the publ. intro., despite the Anukramaṇī ascription, “demon-smiting” Agni is barely visible in this hymn, though the first pāda of this initial vs. does establish such a theme.

X.118.1–2: There is no explicit chaining between these two vss., but *út* opening 2a may respond to *ní* in 1a.

X.118.2–3: (*s^uv*)*āhutaḥ* (2a): (*sá*) *āhutaḥ* 3a.

X.118.4: This vs. consists of almost nothing but links to preceding vss. In pāda a *ajyate* responds to the same form in 3c; both are construed with instr., though with slightly different functions: *srucā* in 3c identifying the instrument performing the anointing and *ghṛtēna* the substance. The latter also picks up *ghṛtāni* in 2b. In b (*mádhu-*)*pratīka(h)* echoes *prátikam* in 3c, and *āhutaḥ* the same forms in 2a and 3a. In c *rócamānaḥ* matches *ví rocate* in 3a; the preverb *ví* there is teasingly replicated in the sequence *rócamāno vi(bhāvasuḥ)*, though the *ví* in 4c is not construed with the preceding participle.

X.118.5: After the frenzy of linkage in vs. 4, this one marks a new start: the only link is the preverb *sám*, with *sám idhyase* (a) echoing *sám ajyate* (4a).

The pāda *devébhyo havyavāhana* occurs in this form 3x (III.9.6, X.150.1, as well as here) and once as the minimally different *devébhyo havyavāhanaḥ* in the next hymn, X.119.13. The formula presupposes that nominative, rather than the voc. found here and in the other two occurrences, since *devébhyaḥ* must belong to the phrase and an initially accented **dévebhyaḥ* would be expected in a voc. phrase (even though *devébhyaḥ* is of course not a voc. itself).

X.118.6: Despite the transmitted *martā(h)*, it seems best, with Old, to restore **martíyā(h)*, both for the meter and for the chaining with *mártíyāḥ* in 5c.

X.118.7: *ádābhíya-* is the link between 6 and 7. This is also the first vs. since 1 with a *rakṣohan* theme, and it also has echoes of that vs.: the voc. *ágne, śociśā* picking up *śuci(-vrata)* (1c), *dīdihi* picking up *dīdyat* (1b).

X.118.8: The immediate link between 7 and 8 is *dīdyat* (c) with *dīdihi* (7c), but this of course also matches *dīdyat* in 1b. Another link to vs. 1 is (*uru-*)*kṣāyeṣu* with (*s^uvé*) *kṣāye* (1c), and note also *prātīkena* (a) echoing *prátikam* (3c) and (*mádhu-*)*pratīka* (4b).

Ge and Re (see also Mayr., PN s.v.) take *urukṣāya-* (also in 9a) as the PN of a poet or his family, which seems unnec. to me. Although the Anukramaṇī ascribes this hymn to one Urukṣaya, this can have been plucked from the hymn, as elsewhere, esp. in X. In I.2.9 the stem modifies Mitra and Varuṇa and means ‘having wide dwelling’, and the *tī*-stem abstract *urukṣití-* also means simply ‘wide dwelling’ (VII.100.4, IX.84.1). The fact that *urukṣāya-* here seems to respond to *kṣāya-* in 1c seems to me an argument against a PN.

X.118.9: On *urukṣāya*- see ad vs. 8.

The first two pādas are made entirely of recycled materials: *tām tvā* (also 5c), *gīrbhīḥ* (*girā* 3b), *urukṣāyāḥ* (*urukṣāyeṣu* 8c), *havyavāham* (*havyavāhana* 5b), *sām īdhire* (*sām idhyase* 5a). The last pāda breaks new, if similarly hackneyed, ground.

X.119 Labasūkta

A number of pairs of vss. pattern together: 2–3 share a pāda (2b=3a); 4–5 concern the *matí*-; 6–7 have the identical phrase *#nahí me ... caná* and both concern the insignificance to the poet in his current state of major components of the world; 9–10 both have *prthivīm* as obj. and share the phrase *ihá vehá vā* at the end of the b pāda.

X.119.1: The opening of the hymn, with *ítí vā ítí*, is unusual, to say the least. The repeated *ítí* cannot be taken as a standard use of the quotative particle – nor can the *ítí* that marks the end of the refrain. The various tr. render it as “such” or “thus,” which to my mind dampens the rhetorical exuberance of the 1st-person assertions. (A particularly stilted version is Maurer’s “My inclination is thus.”) I therefore render it as a strong affirmation, flg. Thompson 2003 (*EJVS* 9).

X.119.2: The standard tr. (Ge, Re, Mau) supply “trees” as obj. in the simile in pāda a, either modified by an acc. pl. *dódhataḥ* (Ge, Mau) or not, interpr. *dódhataḥ* as nom. pl. Like Don and Thompson I consider the added trees unnec.

X.119.2–3: I now think that *pītā(h)* should be tr. more literally; I’d substitute “(the soma-drinks) when drunk” in both vss. (2b, 3a).

X.119.4: The use of *putrá-* for a calf, a bovine “son,” seems a bit unusual to me, but I have not checked all the RVic exx. of this stem.

X.119.5: The chariot-fashioning imagery applied to a “thought” (*matí-*) is a strong indication that the speaker is the poet, since this is a common trope.

X.119.6–7: I take both these vss. as implicitly subordinated (by *nahí*) to vs. 8. Having established the insignificance of the principal features of the cosmos in comparison to himself, the speaker asserts his complete dominance in 8.

X.119.6: The point here seems to be that the poet in his soaring flight looks down on the earth and the whole Ārya population is visually reduced to a tiny speck.

X.119.7: In the companion vs. to 6, the two world halves are reduced to the size of just one wing of the speaker (poet=bird). The predicate of this vs. is *práti* ‘(be) the counterpart (to)’.

Pāda-initial *anyám* should be indefinite, but it is difficult to make the expression mean “not equal to *another* wing of mine.” The phrase “the one wing ... the other (wing)” is found in 11ab, where the two definite forms of *anyá-* are correctly positioned in non-initial position. For another wrongly positioned form of *anyá-* in the vicinity, see X.117.4 and comm. thereon.

X.119.10: On the hapax *oṣām* see EWA s.v., where it is plausibly derived from $\sqrt{uṣ}$ ‘burn’. I have rendered it slangily as “to blazes.”

X.119.11: The *anyá-pakṣá-* phrase picks up 7b.

X.119.12: As Re points out, *mahāmahá-* is otherwise used of Indra.

X.119.13: For my take on this final, disconcerting vs., which has complicated (and I think skewed) other interpr. of the hymn as a whole, see publ. intro. As I say there, vs. 12 seems to me the climax of the hymn with Indra’s assertion of supreme power. Vs. 13 I take as Agni’s rather weak counterassertion; the vs. certainly should not impose Agni as the speaker of the entire hymn, contra Re, etc.

Pāda b is identical to 5b in the immed. preceding hymn (X.118.5), except that it’s in the nom., not the voc.

X.120 Indra

This is mostly AVŚ V.2, AVP VI.1, which latter is treated at length in Griffiths’s (2009) edition of AVP VI and VII, pp. 3–18, which is well worth consulting. Griffiths (henceforth AG) also draws attention to the comm. on vss. 1–3 in JBr II.144, cited in his disc. (pp. 3–4). On my interpr. of the knotty problem of the identity of Bṛhaddiva, see publ. intro. Unlike AG, who follows Bergaigne in identifying him as Indra, I think he is actually Bṛhaspati, the alloform of Indra.

X.120.1: The identity of the neut. “foremost among beings/existences” (*bhūvaneṣu jyēṣṭham*) from which/whom Indra was born is unclear to me. Given this uncertainty, I would at least delete “living” from the tr. “living beings” – better: substitute “among beings / existing things.” At this late stage of the RV we may be dealing with an undefined principle. AG tr. “the chief in the worlds.”

On the ambiguous (and likely multiple) identities of the helpers (*ūmāḥ*), see publ. intro.

X.120.2: This vs. is a loose paraphrase of vs. 1, with ab corresponding roughly to 1bc and d to 1d; c lacks a parallel.

The preverb \sqrt{v} is found with \sqrt{an} only here in the RV, though it becomes quite common later, starting in the AV.

The neut. sg. *sāsni* is problematic. Gr and Old (partially) want to emend to masc. nom. **sāsniś*, and the following *s* (*sām*) might help (though for real degemination we should have a cluster *-s sC-*). Old also considers the transmitted form possible, but he wants to make it part of a neut. NP in c serving as another obj. to *dadhātī* in b: “Indra stellt Atmendes und Nichtatmendes als *sāsni* hin,” which seems an anacoluthon too far. It is probably better to take it as an “adverbial” or “infinitival” usage of this transitive redupl. stem. AG takes c as a nominal sentence, flg. the JBr interpr.: “Both the one which does not breathe, and the one which does breathe, is winning.” This works syntactically, but what would be its relevance to this vs.?

As subj. in d, best to supply *ūmāḥ* from 1d, flg. Ge (n. 2d); that it recurs in 3b supports this.

X.120.3: On *āpi* \sqrt{vrj} see comm. ad VI.36.2.

The point of b must be that the *ūmāḥ* subordinate their wills to Indra's, even though there are many more of helpers than of Indra. I do not understand Ge's n. 3b, where he contrasts the number of helpers with the number of gods. AG takes the numerical expressions in b quite differently.

I take cd as the direct speech of the helpers, addressed to Indra; the *īti* that opens the next vs. suggests this interpr., though Ge does not follow it.

Note the insistent alliteration in c, not to mention the etymological figure binding the first three words.

Ge's suggestion (n. 3d) that "yonder honey" (*adāḥ ... mādhu*) is the rain seems reasonable.

X.120.4: On *īti* see comm. on 3cd. The direct speech of the *vīprāḥ* may continue in 4cd, merging with the speech of the poet of this hymn. For the presumed identity of that poet, see publ. intro.

Pāda b is a variant on 1d *ānu vīśve mādanti ūmāḥ* : 4b ... *anumādanti vīprāḥ*. This near repetition suggests that the *ūmāḥ* and the *vīprāḥ* are the same, *pace* Ge, and also sketches a small ring.

X.120.5: On the meaning and etym. of $\sqrt{śad}$ see EWA s.v. *śAD²* and Schaef., Intens. 30–32. The use of this verb of young women and their bodies (I.123.10, 124.6) favors the sense 'exult, flaunt' (so already Gr), against 'sich stark fühlen' favored by Th and Re and fld. by Kü and AG, on which see Kü 512–14 and n. 1032, AG (AVP VI+VII: 11), who also cites Pinault on this root.

X.120.6: The acc. phrase of ab characterizing Indra requires a verb to govern it; I supply "I praise," picking up the 1st ps. poet's discourse in 5cd. Alternatively – but this is a long shot – the hapax "Doppelstamm" gerundive *stuṣé'yam* that opens the pāda may conceal a 1st ps. verb. This is a tempting possibility (though a similar suggestion by Roth is dismissively rejected by Old). Among other things the supposed gerundive begins *stuṣé-*, with its first two syllables coinciding with the well-attested 1st sg. -*sé* form *stuṣé* "I (shall) praise," which occurs 13x at the beginning of a pāda. I am now inclined to assume that that's what we started with here – but what about the rest (-*yam*)? Is it a separate acc. that has been mangled in some way, or, more likely (insofar as "likely" enters into it), has *stuṣé* been extended as a nonce 1st sg. optative? (This sugg. is similar to Roth's ill-fated idea.) Such a form would be tantalizingly similar, but unfortunately not similar enough, to the *dheyām* opt. type, over which so much ink has been spilled (also by me: see my 1999 Ged Schindler article). Although I do not see a way to work out the details, I would now favor an alt. tr. "I would praise the craftsman possessing many forms ..." AG (citing Kü 1996) assumes a haplology **stuṣé stuṣéyyam*.

X.120.7: The referent of *ávaram páram ca* is unclear, though it might be neut., given the *tád* (though that could be adverbial). Ge, flg. Sāy., supplies *dhānam* 'prize, stake, wealth' (Ge "Schatz"). This seems harmless enough, though nothing particularly favors it, save for *dhānā* in 4a. Moreover, *dhāna-* is not usually simply 'treasure', but is rather a prize (vel sim.) to be won (as in fact in 4a). It *is* frequently construed with $\sqrt{dhā}$, as it would be here, but in the sense "set a prize," esp. in the common loc. absol. *dhāne hité* "when a/the prize is set." If *dhāna-* is the correct referent here (which I very much doubt), the clause should mean "you set (the prize), both the lower and the higher" – with no role for *ní* and no obvious contextual sense. AG (p. 14)

suggests rather *rátanam*, in the same semantic sphere, which is also construed elsewhere with $\sqrt{dhā}$, but again there is no compelling reason to supply this word.

The oppositional pair *ávāra- pára-* is fairly common, with a variety of meanings (see comm. ad X.55.4) and no fixed pair of referents. Probably the closest parallel to our passage is I.155.3 *dádhāti putró 'varam páram pitúr, nāma tṛtīyam ādhi rocané diváh* “The son sets in place the lower and the higher names of the father and the third name in the luminous realm of heaven,” with “name” as the immediate referent, although the contextual referent is the three strides of Viṣṇu. But this is of no help here. If I were to speculate, I would suggest that Agni is the referent (and *tád* an adverbial red herring) because of the appearance of *ní√dhā*, a lexeme often used of the establishment of the ritual fire, and of *duroṇé*, which is almost always used of the house in which the ritual fire is kindled. If this is correct, the “nearer/lower” would be the ritual fire and the “further/higher” would be the sun. This would fit with the cosmic reference in c as well as Indra’s (or Bṛhaddivī’s) winning of the sun in 8b. However, it has nothing to do with either the Vala or the Vṛtra myth. I tentatively suggest an alt. tr. “Then you established the nearer (fire) and the further one, in the house ...,” with no confidence in its correctness.

X.120.8: I take the praise of Indra as beginning in the middle of b, contra Ge and HPS (B+I 208). Among other things, *svarṣā-* is never used of human, but does modify Indra in III.34.4 and his vajra in I.110.13. On the other hand, if (as I suggest in the publ. intro.) Bṛhaddivī is actually Bṛhaspati, or a proxy for him, *svarṣā-* would be appropriate, since the adj. modifies him in VII.97.7. An alt. tr. would be “Bṛhaddivī, the first to win the sun, speaks these sacred formulations fortissimo to Indra: ‘he has dominion ...’ ”

With HPS I take *svarāj-* as referring to Indra, despite the slight awkwardness of the apparent double ref. to Indra in the clause (both subj. and gen.). Ge’s identification of the sovereign king as Vala is unlikely on conceptual grounds; see HPS’s remarks. AG (p. 16) takes Bṛhaddivī as subj. here, with Indra the referent of *svarāj-*.

The referent of *svāḥ* ‘own’ is not clear – are these Indra’s own doors or the own doors of the cowpen (*gotrá-*)? This pāda is identical to III.31.21, where it is harder to find any referent but Indra. The adj. may be applied proleptically: the cowpen is about to be his and so are the doors. The prominent position of *svāḥ* as the final word of the vs. is probably the result of phonological play with the finals of b and c: *s^uvarṣāḥ* and *svarājāḥ*.

X.120.9: On my assumption that Bṛhaddivī is really Bṛhaspati and is therefore addressing his alloform Indra, see the publ. intro. It is pretty much impossible to escape the interpr. that he is addressing “his own self (*svām tanvām*), namely Indra (*índram evá*). RVic discourse is seldom so straightforward. See, however, Ge’s attempt to evade this interp. (n. 9b).

On the hapax *mātarībhvarīḥ* (to a putative stem *mātarībhvan-*), see Old ad loc. and AiG II.2.177 (neither v. satisfactory). If it does mean ‘staying by their mother’, this would correlate semantically with *ariprá-* ‘flawless, stainless’: both would refer to virginal girls (so Ge n. 9cd). The further referent is probably to hymns. As is regularly noted, *mātarībhvan-* recalls *mātaríśvan-*, incl. the anomalous accent on *mātarí*. But Old is surely correct that the form should not be emended to a form of *mātaríśvan-*. AG (in collab. with W. Knobl) suggests a novel interpr. of this hapax (pp. 17–18), which I am afraid I find farfetched: that it is a haplogitized form of **mātarī-ribhvarīḥ* “singing on Mother (Earth).” Among other problems, as I have discussed at length (see reff. in Comm. lexicon), \sqrt{ribh} does not mean ‘sing’, but ‘rasp, croak’;

moreover, the meaning suggested seems reverse-engineered from the constructed pre-haplogologized form and doesn't, to me, ring true.

[X.121 JPB]

X.122 Agni

As indicated in the publ. intro., the hymn is attributed to a Vasiṣṭhid and ends with the Vasiṣṭha refrain (8d). The given name of the poet acdg. to the Anukramaṇī, Citramahas, has been extracted from the first pāda of the hymn, where Agni is called *citrāmahas-* 'having brilliant might'.

The meter of the hymn vacillates between the dominant Jagatī and occasional Triṣṭubhs. Although acdg. to the Anukr. vss. 1 and 5 are Triṣṭubh, vs. 1 has only one unambig. Triṣṭubh pāda (a); c is clearly Jagatī and b and d end with *-Cyam* sequences that are almost surely to be distracted: *advīṣeṇīyām* and *suṇīyam*. As for 5, pāda a ends with another word that invites distraction, *vāreṇīyah*. The pāda then has only 11 syllables, but a Jagatī cadence. Pāda b is Triṣṭubh, but c and d are Jagatī. On the other hand, 3d is a clear Triṣṭubh (and 3b has a Triṣṭubh cadence but 12 syllables), and the Vasiṣṭha refrain (8d) is a Triṣṭubh pāda and limited to the Triṣṭubh hymns of VII. In this late hymn the fungibility of the two trimeter types is manifesting itself.

X.122.1: Note the caesura at the cmpd seam of a non-dvandva: *citrā-/mahasam*.

On *śurūdh-* see comm. ad IX.71.5.

X.122.2: Pāda d requires an object to be supplied; there are two candidates: *bráhma* (from c), so Ge, Re, and the publ. tr.; *vrátam* (from d), so Th (Unters. 21 and n. 1), HPS (Vrata 66). Both are paralleled: VII.22.9 *bráhmāṇi janáyanta* (cf. also VII.31.11); VII.75.3 *janáyanto daívyāni vrátāni*. Although I think either is possible, I am now somewhat inclined towards the Th/HPS suggestion, since I think it would be unusual for gods to create *bráhma-*; in the two passages just cited, the subjects are poets. I would therefore now suggest an alt. tr. "Following your commandment, the gods begot (their commandment(s))."

X.122.3: As Ge and Re point out, the "seven domains" are the domains of the sacrifice (cf. IX.102.2, IV.75, as well as nearby X.124.3 *ṛtásya dhāma ví mime purūṇi* with vs. 1 *yajñám ... saptátantum*).

Unlike Ge/Re but with Kü (354), I take dat. *sukṛte* with *māmahasva*, not as parallel to *dāsūṣe* with *dāśat*. There are no implications, but it's attractive to supply *māmahasva* with a compliment. (For dat. with *√maṇh* see, e.g., VIII.1.32.)

Note *suṇīra-* here, between *suṇīrya-* in 1d and 4d.

X.122.4: Ge (n. 4b) appositely adduces the seven Hotars in VIII.60.16, etc.; the "seven domains" of 3a is of course also relevant.

X.122.5: The referent of *amṛtāya* is unclear. Ge considers it a reference to "die Götterwelt"; Re tr. "pour le (principe) immortel." Because of the associated impv. *matsva* 'become exhilarated', I take it as a reference to soma (so also Gr), though I realize that Agni is not a standard drinker of soma.

I don't know what the Maruts are doing here, though see Ge (n. 5c).

In d *rurucuḥ* would be better read **rūrucuḥ*, as also in the almost identical IV.7.1. For this possibility see comm. ad IV.7.1, 16.4.

X.122.6: I interpr. *duhán* as taking a double acc. construction, “milk the cow (for) milk,” with Ge (tr., though he considers alt. in n. 6a), contra Re, who thinks all the acc. refer to the milk substitute. The pāda-final adj. *viśvādhāyasam*, repeated from 1c, could in principle modify either the refreshment or the cow. I take it with the former, since in 1c it modifies “riches,” a desirable product, not a producer.

Although Gr, Ge, and Re agree in interpr. the hapax *yajña-prī-* as ‘loving the sacrifice’, transitive forms of $\sqrt{prī}$ don't mean ‘love’ but ‘please’. The rendering ‘pleasing to the sacrifice’ in the publ. tr. uses this sense, but I now think it should be refined. In the similar cmpd *brahma-prī-* (2x) I take *prī-* with this transitive sense, but the first member *brahma-* as instr. in function: “pleasing [X] with the formulation” (see comm. ad I.83.2). A parallel sense “pleasing [X] with the sacrifice” works well here, conforming to the other descriptions of the ritually active sacrificer in this hymn (3b *dāśúse sukṛtāya*, 4b *yás ta ānaṣ samídhā*, 4d *prṇaté*). I would now emend the tr. to “... for the sacrificer who pleases with the sacrifice” – the object of “please” presumably being the gods.

In b the voc. *sukrato* returns from 2b, and in d this nominal stem is made into a denom.: *sukratūyase*.

In c *ghṛtasnú-* recalls 2c *ghṛtanirṇik*.

The distribution of elements in cd is uncertain. Both Ge and Re (in his tr.) take *ṛtāni* as obj. of *ḍḍyat* (e.g., Re “en éclairant trois fois les (domaines de) l'Ordre”). But as Re points out in his n., “*ḍī-* n'est factitif qu'avec des régimes internes” – or, better, $\sqrt{ḍī}$, esp. in the participle, is almost always in absolute usage: “shining,” not “shining on X” or “making X shine.” I therefore take this pāda-final participle in purely adjectival usage, interrupting the acc. phrase that continues in d. As Ge (n. 6cd) points out, *trīḥ* in c should be construed with *vartīḥ ... pariyán*, referring to the triple fire-circuit. I take *ṛtāni* as parallel to *yajñām*. This is essentially identical to Re's emended tr. in his n.: “toi qui, en brillant, parcourt le circuit autour des *ṛtā*, (autour du) sacrifice,” though he leaves out the *trīḥ* (probably by mistake).

pariyán returns from 3a.

X.122.7: The idiom *ní√mrj* is rare and fairly idiosyncratic in its usage, usually meaning ‘drag down, clasp to oneself’ sometimes with loc. *tanvī* (hence my “(on your body)” here; see, e.g., comm. ad II.38.2, VII.26.3, X.39.14). Even without the preverb, \sqrt{mrj} does not take as object the substance to be wiped (here *ājya-* ‘melted butter’) but the animal figure to be wiped upon. I wonder if *ājyam* is meant to evoke *átyam* ‘steed’, which is an occasional obj. of \sqrt{mrj} (e.g., VII.3.5 *agním átyam ná marjayanta*). In any case the usage here seems at best a mixed construction, and it is possible that the *ní* simply anticipates the *ní* that opens the following vs. Both Ge and Re render this pāda rather vaguely.

X.123 Vena

On the difficulties of this hymn and its connections with other hymns, see publ. intro. As I say there, I consider the *vená-* ‘seeker’ to be both Soma and the Sun. The treatments of this hymn are too manifold and often too fanciful to engage with in detail. I will just set out my barebones interpr. Ge's notes are useful to consult and stay sensible.

X.123.1: Note that the first word of the hymn, *ayám*, situates the subject in the ritual here and now, which positioning is reinforced by *ímám* beginning the 2nd hemistich.

Whatever the exact referents, this vs. depicts a conceptual birth, with the two RVic hapaxes *pṛśni-garbha-* (fem. pl., ‘whose embryo is dappled/the dappled one’) and *jyótirjarāyu-* (masc. nom. sg., ‘whose afterbirth is light’) (sim., for both, Ge nn. 1ab and 1b) as well as the licking of the infant in d, an action performed by a mother cow just after a calf is born (also Ge n. 1d). The females in question can be both the waters, whose embryo is soma, and the dawns, whose embryo is the sun. The afterbirth of light could be, for Vena=soma, the spreading of the golden liquid across the filter; for Vena=sun the radiance after sunrise. Pāda d treats the importance of poets and their hymns in the production of both soma and sunrise.

X.123.2: On this vs., see comm. ad VIII.100.5, which is similar in phraseology. As disc. there, the Vena is regularly associated with heights (also in IX.85.9–12). Here the first three pādas seem to depict the first sighting of the soma emerging from the pressed plant on the top of the filter and the first sighting of the sun rising through the clouds.

Against Ge’s attempt (n. 2b) to make *nabhojāḥ* modify *pr̥sthám*, it seems better to take the two as independent nom. sg. So, more or less, Scar (140), though he tries to accommodate Ge’s views.

On *vr̥ā-*, see comm. ad VIII.2.6 and my treatment of this word in the 2003 HPS Fs. Here it probably refers to the hymns eagerly seeking the Seeker; thus, like 1d and 3d it keeps the theme of the importance of the praise hymns in the forefront.

X.123.3: This vs. recycles vocab.: *samānām* (a =2d); *ṛtasya s̥nāv ādhi* (c =2c); *rihānti* (d = *rihanti* 1d). In pāda a I supply *yónim* with *samānām* on the basis of the immediately preceding pāda, 2d *samānām yónim*; all standard treatments supply instead “child” (Ge: “Kind,” Don) or “calf” (Gr, Lü 605). This is certainly possible, and the phrase *samānām vatsám* is found elsewhere (I.146.3), but in the absence of any compelling reason to switch referents I weakly prefer my solution, esp. since *samānām yónim* is also found in III.33.3 and X.17.11.

The part. *vāvasānāḥ* in pāda a is most likely a pun, belonging to both √ *vās* ‘bellow’ and √ *vas* ‘desire’.

With Ge (n. 3d) I take *mādhvo amṛtasya* as the gen. obj. of *rihānti*, though not very happily: I don’t really think that ‘lick’ should take a partitive genitive. Gr (s.v. *rih*) seems to suggest that *vāñih* is the object, but identifies the same form as a nom. pl. s.v. 2. *vāñī*.

X.123.4: On the possible connection of this vs. with “name-and-form” see publ. intro.

Ge connects b with a, while I connect it with c because there movement is depicted in both b and c.

X.123.5: The introduction of the Apsaras responds to the mention of the Gandharva in 4d. Beyond that I make no effort to interpr. this vs., though see Ge’s nn. for more or less plausible possibilities.

X.123.5–6: Because I consider vs. 6 to be dependent on 5cd, I take the injunctives *cárat* (5c) and *sīdat* (5d) as preterital, because of augmented *abhy ácakṣata* in 6b. Ge (and Don) keep vs. 6 independent – it’s not clear to me how Ge deals with the subordination of 6: he tr. *yád* as “als”

but the attachment to 7 is vague. If vs. 6 is independent, then presential “wanders” and “sits” would be appropriate for 5cd, but thematically 6 seems to fit better with 5, with the wing (5d, 6c) – though the presence of *nāke* in both 6a and 7b does give me pause.

X.123.8: On the downplayed “climax” in this vs., embodying name-and-form, see publ. intro.

This vs. forms a slight ring with vss. 1–2: *rājasi* (d): 1b *rājasah*; *vidharman* (b) recalls *vimāne* (1d); *samudrām* (a): *samudrāt* (2a).

Ge (fld. by Don) construes the instr. *śukrēṇa śocīṣa* with the pf. part. *cakānāḥ* (“mit ihre hellen Glut begehrt”), but the Vena vs. IX.85.12 *bhānūḥ śukrēṇa śocīṣā* without part. makes this unlikely. Kü (142 n. 132) is in agreement with me.

X.124 Various divinities

On this famous and much discussed hymn, see publ. intro. and, especially, my detailed treatment of it in my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. F. Staal: *On Meaning and Mantras: Essays in Honor of Frits Staal*, ed. George Thompson and Richard Payne, 289–306), which challenges the entrenched view of the hymn as depicting the conflict between the Devas and the Asuras so ubiquitous in Middle Vedic literature. I will not here repeat the arguments found in that article in detail, but make global reference to it.

The sec. lit. on this hymn is immense; I will just note two fairly recent treatments: Theodore Proferes (2007), *Vedic Ideals of Sovereignty and the Poetics of Power* (New Haven: American Oriental Society), 106–13, and Joel Brereton (2016), “Reconstructing Ṛgvedic Religion: *Devas*, *Asuras*, and Rites of Kingship” in *Vedic Investigations* (Proceedings of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference, Helsinki, Finland, July 2003), ed. Asko Parpola and Petteri Koskikallio, 35–58 – neither of which I am in complete agreement with, though it is important to note that both scholars free themselves from the dominant Asura/Deva model. Again I will not engage with the multiple other interpr. of the hymn.

The hymn is in dialogue for the first 6 vss., though there is no agreement on who all the speakers are. 1st and 2nd person references abound. The last three vss. (7–9) are in the 3rd ps. and spoken, presumably, by the poet.

X.124.1: As Ge points out (n. 1b) there are a number of ways to “solve” the numerological references here. The exact referents matter less than the fact that Indra is offering Agni participation in an elaborate, already worked-out ritual system; he’s not just improvising, even though, as I argue in the art. cit., we are watching the primal instantiation of the sacrifice.

The “long darkness” in which Agni has been trapped in d is, by my interpr., the pre-yajña stage in which the ritual fire was not kindled.

X.124.2: In my interpr. the being that Agni is leaving behind is Father Heaven (Dyaus Pitar). Although identifying him as a “non-god” (*ádeva-*) might seem paradoxical, I argue at length in the art. cit. that though Heaven is the *father* of the gods, he is not a god himself.

Both words in the phrase describing Agni’s goal, “an alien lineage” (*áranīm nābhim*), need unpacking. With regard to *áranī-*, I argue in my 2016 art. that the word “seems generally to refer to ‘foreign’ or ‘alien’ places and people primarily in terms of physical distance and separation from familiar surroundings, not kinship or natural affinity.” I also suggest that it participates in word play here: the differently accented *aránī-* is the word for the kindling sticks

used to produce the ritual fire. As for *nābhi-*, lit. ‘navel’, it is used both for kinship affiliation and, more often, to refer to the ritual ground, indeed the ritual fire itself, as the conceptual navel or center of the universe. So, under the ritual interpr. of those two words, Agni is going from a pre-sacrificial to a sacrificial state.

X.124.3: Against many interpr., I take the speaker of this vs. not as Agni (e.g., Ge, Re), but Varuṇa (so also Don, Proferes). The “guest of the other branch” (*anyāsya átithim vayāyāḥ*) is Agni, whose journey (in vs. 2) Varuṇa has just witnessed. Recall that Agni is frequently called the guest (of men, etc.), since he is a god, whose original domain should have been heaven, installed in a mortal setting.

Varuṇa’s claim to “measure out the many domains of truth” refers, in my view, to his measuring out the ritual ground for the instituting of the sacrifice. See the parallels adduced in the Staal Ged.

“Father Asura,” again in my view, is Dyaus Pitar. See the art. cit. for instances where he is called an asura. “Father” is of course part of his title.

X.124.4: Again, rather than Agni, I think Soma is the speaker here (with Don, Proferes). His defection means that the crucial ritual materials – fire and soma – are now available for yajña. The assemblage of the four principal gods, Indra, Agni, Varuṇa, and Soma, signals that the conceptual revolution is complete.

The speaker’s curious expression “I have ‘done’ many years within him” refers to Soma’s confinement and inactivity, deprived of any ritual role.

X.124.5: On this vs. as expressing the twin kingship of Indra and Varuṇa with their complementary functions, see the art. cit.

Pāda b contains subordinating *ca*, as shown by the accent on *kāmáyāse*.

X.124.6: I argue in the art. cit. that the first hemistich depicts the passing of the old heaven/sun-centered religion to one based in the midspace, closer to the mortal world.

“Come forth” (*niréhi*) in c, addressed to Soma, implicitly responds to Soma’s statement about doing many years “within” the father (4a), while pāda d expresses his desired transformation into a ritual substance, an oblation. On the purport of this pāda see disc. in art. cit.

X.124.7–9: These three final vss. contrast sharply with the first six, esp. in leaving dialogue behind in favor of strict 3rd person. For my view that these vss. effect the transition from the closed loop of gods sacrificing to themselves to the divine–human partnership that prevails now, see art. cit. As I argue there, vss. 7–9 are delimited by a ring, and it is through the shifting referents of that ring that the movement from divine to human sacrificers comes about, what I call there “an indirect transfer of sacrificial responsibility.” Vs. 7 begins *kavíh kavítvā* “the poet with his poetic craft”; the referent is Indra. Vs. 9 (and the hymn) ends *kaváyo manīṣā* “the poets with their inspired thought”; the poets are human, with Indra (acc. *índram*) their object.

To sum up these verses I say in the art. cit.

Without calling attention to it, the composer of X.124 has modulated from the gods-worshipping-gods model, with Indra as a kavi, to one in which other, presumably human, kavis offer praise and sacrifice *to* the

god(s). The closed circle is broken and the human/divine dynamic established, but the verbal identification of Indra and the human kavis implies that the current model of sacrifice derives from the older one depicted earlier in the hymn and that the human officiants are occupying formerly divine roles.

X.124.7: Although there is a sharp stylistic break between vss. 6 and 7 and although, as I just argued, vss. 7–9 form a unit, there is, nonetheless, conceptual continuity between 6 and 7. In 6c Indra and Soma prepare to smite Vṛtra; throughout the RV it is the killing of Vṛtra that allows the waters to flow, starting in 7b.

The poet-agent (*kavīḥ*) in pāda a is not identified, though the agent of pāda b is: Varuṇa. It would be possible to take Varuṇa as the referent in pāda a as well. In fact, though Indra is sometimes called a *kavī-* (e.g., I.11.4, VI.32.3), Varuṇa is a more poet-like figure than Indra. See, e.g., from a hymn dedicated to Varuṇa, VIII.41.5 *sá kavīḥ kāvyaṁ purú, rūpām dyaúr iva puṣyati* “he is a poet who fosters the many poetic arts, as heaven does its (concrete) form [=sun],” which also contains the *rūpā-* in heaven found here. Nonetheless I think Ge (n. 7a) and Re are correct that Indra is the subject. He is the focus of these three vss., and, moreover, it is the peaceful royal partnership that Indra invited Varuṇa to join (see vs. 5) that is celebrated in the rest of the hymn.

Placing the sun in heaven is one of Indra’s standard cosmogonic actions (e.g., I.7.3 *ā sūryam rohayad diví* “he made the sun mount in heaven,” etc. etc.); I therefore take *rūpām* here as a reference to the sun (so also Re: “la forme (solaire)”), rather than “his [=Indra’s?] form” (Don, Proferes) or “die Farbe” (Ge). See VIII.41.5 cited immed. above, where *rūpām* also appears to be a ref. to the sun.

The releasing of the waters in b is also prototypically Indra’s deed – here presumably credited to Varuṇa because of the power-sharing arrangements of the two gods, aided by Varuṇa’s growing association with water.

Note the phonological and morphological similarity of the two parallel, pāda-final verbs: *sajat* and *srjat*.

As I point out in the Staal art., co-wives are notoriously *unpeaceful* towards each other (see RV X.145, 159); the peace achieved here is thus esp. noteworthy – or else the pāda slyly hints that the rivers are not all that peaceful. This pāda is variously interpr. – see, e.g., Re’s over-elaborate “Les rivières ... ont fait (d’elles-mêmes) une possession-pacifique (à l’usage d’Indra)” – but my interpr. seems to conform best to the Skt. phrase.

I do not know what “bear his color” refers to. First, what is the referent of *asya*? Ge (n. 7d) opts for Varuṇa, but his parallels are not strong – though the echo *váruṇo* (b) / *várṇam* (d) is suggestive. Indra seems more likely, esp. since he is surely the referent of *asya* in 8a. But I am uncertain about what exactly his *várṇa-* is. I am toying with the possibility that it is the physical manifestation of Indra’s impurity, the blood guilt, incurred by slaying Vṛtra: Indra distributes the impurity arising from killing to various natural elements in Vedic prose accounts (e.g., TS II.5.1). Since waters are well known as removers of impurity (see, e.g., I.23.22), this could make sense.

X.124.8: The phrase *svadháya mādantīḥ* is also used of waters in VII.47.3. In both cases I think the *svadhā-* belongs to the waters, even though in this case the previous pāda states that they follow Indra’s power. But in the next pāda they exert their *svadhā-* by choosing him as king.

The depiction in c of the chosing of a king by the the clans (*viśāh*) is striking and has been much discussed (e.g., Proferes 94, 110–11, Ober. Relig. I.352, Jamison art. cit.).

X.124.9: I forebear from speculating myself on the mystical image of the roving goose, but see Proferes’s discussion (110–13, 127–28) of the goose as royal symbol and symbol of the sun, associated with unction waters.

X.125 Speech

On this famous hymn and the carelessness its fame has induced in its many translators, see publ. intro. Re (HymSpec) points out that the word *vāc*- does not occur in the hymn, which is, therefore, an extended riddle. I am not at all certain that I would have solved it, but we don’t need to: *Vāc* is identified by the Anukramanī as both the poet and the dedicand of the hymn. The hymn also belongs to the genre of *ātmastuti* “self-praise,” with forms of *ahám* extremely prominent, esp. at the beginning: the first 7 pādas all begin with *ahám*, with an extra one in 1d.

X.125.1–2: The speaker’s association with divinities progresses from groups of undifferentiated gods (1ab), to dual divinities (1cd), to single gods (2ab).

The pres. *bibharmi* (1c, 2a) is a good candidate for a habitual reading of the redupl. pres.

X.125.1: In all clear cases (uncertain: VI.51.7, VII.25.11), the cmpd *viśvādeva*- is a bahuvrīhi meaning ‘possessing / belonging to all the gods / the All Gods’, as its accent indicates. In this passage it is universally interpr. (incl. in the publ. tr.) as a nominal designation ‘All Gods / all the gods’. However, it could in fact be a bahuvrīhi and modify the three previous instr.: “with the Rs, Vs, and Ās, comprising all the gods.” In favor of this interpr. is the fact that the Rudras, Vasua, and Ādityas are sometimes mentioned together, implicitly as the totality of the divinities (see, e.g., nearby X.128.9 and Macd., Vedic Myth., 130). However, the position of *utá* speaks against this interpr. — which, however, I consider a strong alternative.

The three paired entities in cd are progressively less differentiated: the dual dvandva *mitrāvāruṇā* has two accents and two inflectional endings and is split across the caesura; the dual dvandva *indrāgnī* has a single accent, a single inflectional ending, is not read distracted (as it sometimes is), and precedes the caesura (though it occupies the same metrical slot as *mitrāvāruṇā*, immediately after pāda-initial *ahám*); *asvínā* is not a compound of two divine names but refers to a pair without individual names.

X.125.2: The Anukr. identifies this vs. as Jagatī, but the first pāda is a Triṣṭubh.

On the difficult word *āhanās*- see comm. ad V.42.13.

Bhaga is universally taken as a separate god here, though it would be possible to take *bhāgam* as an epithet of *pūśanam*, “Pūśan the distributor,” an interpr. weakly favored by the position of *utá* (though JSK [DGRV I.340] considers this an X *uta* Y Z construction).

After the divinities in the first verse and a half, we arrive at the human ritualist in cd.

X.125.3: It is only in this vs. that the gender – feminine – of the 1st ps. speaker is established – by a flood of fem. nouns and adjectives in ab and d, *rāṣṭrī saṃgāmanī ... cikitúṣī prathamā ... bhūriṣṭhātrām ... āveśāyantīm*, and by the demonstrative *tām* reinforcing the (genderless) 1st ps. enclitic prn. *mā*. The gender is of course an important clue for the solution of the riddle, esp. since female divinities are scarce. The content of this vs. also provides a few clues to further

narrow the already narrow field of female gods. The fem. agent noun *rāṣṭrī* ‘ruler’ (a) is found once elsewhere (VIII.100.10), where it clearly refers to Vāc. (On the single form of anomalous masc. *rāṣṭrī* see comm. ad VI.4.5.) In c the statement that the gods distributed her in many places would remind any Vedic hearer of the divisions of speech that are a staple topic of Vedic enigmas (see, e.g., my Hyenas, 251–60).

The two characterizations of Vāc in d *bhūriṣṭhātrām* and *bhūry āveśāyantīm* are clearly meant to complement each other. The morphology of the second term is also very clear, namely a transitive-causative participle to *ā√viś* ‘enter’, which should have the sense ‘cause to enter’; cf. I.176.2 *tāsmīnn ā veśaya gīraḥ* ‘cause the hymns to enter into him.’ The poet must have meant the causative morphology to be taken seriously, because in the corresponding vs. 6 (forming the ring around the omphalos vss. 4–5) we encounter the non-causative pf. *ā viveśa* (6d). Despite all this clear signaling, translators have tended to ignore the morphology and make the phrase mean what they think it ought to: e.g., Re “j’entre en beaucoup (de formes)” (HymSpec, but see EVP XVI.166, where he is more sensitive to the morphology); Don “I ... enter into many forms”; Mau “entering upon many a form”; Ge slightly better “viele (Formen) annehme” (though this still doesn’t accurately represent the morphology). If we take the morphology seriously – and I think we must – the phrase has to mean “causing many things to enter (me).” This provides a striking contrast to *bhūriṣṭhātrām* “having many stations.” On the one hand, she has been infinitely subdivided and is found in many different places, but on the other she encompasses everything – the multiplicity of things enters into the single entity that is Speech, which can express them all. As often, if we hold ourselves to taking the grammar literally, it leads to a more interesting result than just going by what we think it ought to mean: by the standard interpr. *bhūry āveśāyantīm* is simply a paraphrase of *bhūriṣṭhātrām*, but taking the causative seriously produces a sharp contrast and sketches a totalizing project.

X.125.4–5: On these vss. as the omphalos, see publ. intro. Note, inter alia, the repetition of *vadāmi* (4d, 5a).

X.125.4: On the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro. The first hemistich provides another clue to the identity of the speaker, but once again it is oblique. She asserts her power over a bodily function – but, surprisingly, it is not speaking, but rather eating. This at first appears to be a nonsensical statement: how does Speech enable eating? The connection is the location: the mouth is the locus of both speaking and eating, and so, by a bit of slippery logic, Speech claims control over eating. She also makes another assertion, which is subtly conveyed by the syntactic structure: the primacy of eating over any other sensory activity – seeing, hearing, breathing. These last three are conveyed in relative clauses (“who sees ...,” etc.), which are dependent on the main cl “he eats.” Since food is essential to life, sensory activity is dependent on eating. (The hierarchy between eating and the other senses is elided by tr. like Don’s “the one who eats food, who truly sees ... (etc.),” which ignore the *sá ... yāḥ* structure.) See the publ. intro. for a second possible message, directly relevant to the poet, in this same passage.

The final pāda of the vs. is justly famous for its phonological and etymological patterns: *śrudhī śruta śraddhivām te vadāmi*. Watkins (Dragon 111) argues that it contains “an exhaustive classification of the speech sounds of the Vedic language, with one example of each class: the vowels *a*, *i*, *u* and a single icon each of the oppositions of quantity (*a* : *ā*) and nasalization (*a* : *aṁ*); a single sibilant *ś*; a single liquid *r*; a single semi-vowel (glide) *v*; a single nasal *m*; and a

single order of stops, *t d dh* as tokens of the oppositions of voicing (*t: d*) and aspiration or murmur (*d: dh*)."

The pāda is also at almost the exact center of the hymn, where the "message" is often located. It contains the only imperative in the hymn, which must be addressed to the poet, and the only 2nd ps. prn. (*te*). Once again, the familiarity of the pāda has led to some lack of focus in tr. The tendency has been to take *śruta* in its common usage as 'famed, famous'; see Ge "Höre, du Berühmter"; Watkins (Dragon 111) "Listen, o famous one." Even further afield, Re (HSpec) "Écoute, toi qui sais," which is either a major extension of 'hear' to 'know' or a lapse on his part. The trick to (which I think) is the correct interpr. is to take *śruta* as 'heard' → 'listened to', not 'heard of' → 'famous'. Speech is addressing the poet as the conduit of her message; others listen to him, and he can therefore convey what she says to a wider audience as long as he himself listens to her.

X.125.5: The first hemistich seems to echo the content of *bhūry āveśāyantīm* in 3c in other terms. Although she acts on her own (*ahām evā svayām* "just I myself ..."), what she says is applicable to and favorably received by both the divine and the human realms – that is, to all beings.

The anomalously accented old past participle to *√juṣ* 'enjoy', *júṣta-*, ordinarily takes a dat. complement (presumably conditioned by its accent retraction). This is the only place in the RV where it is found with the instr. expected with a ppl. It is probably no accident that this involves the phrase "by gods and men" (*devébhīr utá mānuṣebhiḥ*); cf. the three instantiations in Old Avestan of the similar phrase *daēuuaišcā* (...) *mašiiāišcā* (Y. 29.4, 34.5, 48.1), though with the Avestan semantic shift of *daēuua-* to the negative side.

The second hemistich concerns the choosing and creating of a poet by Speech. It is reminiscent of Vasiṣṭha's happy memory of the day when the god Varuṇa made him a poet: VII.88.4 *ṛṣīm cakāra svāpā mähobhiḥ, stotāraṃ vípraḥ* ... He [=Varuṇa], himself skillful in his work, made him [=Vasiṣṭha] a seer through his great powers. / The inspired one [=Varuṇa] (made him [=Vasiṣṭha]) a praise singer."

X.125.6: I do not know why this vs. is so aggressive in tone. Perhaps the mention of the "formulator" (*brahmán-*) in 5d brings to mind the enemy of the formulation (*brahma-dvīṣ-*) and reminds Speech that true speech must always be defended.

dyāvā-prthivī brings us back to the dual dvandvas of 1cd; like *mitrā-varuṇā* there the dvandva here is split by the caesura and also has all the furbelows of a true dual dvandva: double accent and double inflectional ending.

Re (HSpec.) suggests that *samādam* is a verbal contest (p. 253 n. 11 "la joute oratoire"), an idea taken up by both Don and Mau. This is not impossible, esp. given the identity of the speaker (Speech). However, it is far from necessary: well-attested *samād-* isn't otherwise specialized for verbal contests, and Speech can be implicated in regular battles ("fighting words"). On *samād-* see Scar 381–83.

The pf. *ā viveśa* contrasts with *āveśāyantīm* in 3c, as discussed there. In vs. 3 many things enter her; here she herself enters.

Her entering Heaven and Earth here picks up the gods and men of 5b: both phrases are merisms of a sort, referring to the totality of beings / realms by their two most conspicuous and contrastive members. She will further develop this in the next vs.

X.125.7: This vs. expresses Speech’s total pervasion of Heaven and Earth, announced in 6d. It does so by using two deep-structure formulas, with gapped members – a demonstration of her own virtuosity. I do not think this vs. has been understood correctly by previous interpr. We start with the apparent paradox, “I give birth to the father on his head.” In my view, the father (*pitár-*) is Father Heaven, Dyaus Pitar (of whom we heard so much in the immed. preceding hymn, X.124). The paradox of his place of birth, “on his [own] head” (*ahám suve pitáram asya mūrdhán-*), can be resolved by reference to a different formulaic phrase, “the head of Heaven” (*mūrdhán- diváh-*): this phrase is regularly used of Agni (e.g. I.59.2, III.2.14, VI.7.1, VIII.44.16 -- cf. also X.8.6 *diví mūrdhānam dadhiṣe* also of Agni). To expand this: “I give birth to Father Heaven on the head of Heaven [(i.e., Agni). In other words, we are dealing with two formulae: *dyaus pitā* and *mūrdhán- diváh-*. They intersect in this pāda, and in both formulae one of the words in the formula is gapped – but the *same* word, namely “Heaven.” What this means is that by being present and officiating on the ritual ground, beside the ritual fire, Speech creates and sustains the cosmos – from the restricted space on earth to the very top of heaven. From this space she spreads through all realms and across all beings and touches heaven.

As sometimes elsewhere (see comm. ad I.57.5, VIII.40.4), ‘heaven’ is modified by a fem., in this case the pronominal adj. *amūm* ‘yonder’, which may seem esp. disturbing because (at least in my interpr.) Heaven is the father in pāda a. But this can be interpr. as part of Speech’s totalizing project: she has contact with both aspects of a putatively androgynous Heaven. (At least *amūm* has the right deixis; sometimes the fem. demonstr. with heaven is *iyám* ‘this here’; see comm. cit.)

varṣmán- (and apparently synonymous *várṣman-*) is regularly construed with *diváh* (VI.47.4, X.63.4), so, *pace* Re (HSpec), Don, and Mau, Speech does not touch heaven with *her* *varṣmán-*.

X.125.8: In the final vs. Speech claims a larger territory than even heaven and earth – in c she asserts that she goes beyond them both. She also manifests as the wind, which is of course suitable for speech, which is carried by breath.

Strictly speaking, *enā* cannot modify *pr̥thivyā*, despite the standard tr., because *pr̥thivī-* is fem., and instr. *enā* in masc.-neut. Unlike ‘heaven’ (see ad 7d above), ‘earth’ does not switch genders. Hence my “this earth here” is misleading, but I can’t come up with a suitable adverbial rendering.

X.126 All Gods

On the elementary structure of this hymn and on its meter, see publ. intro.

X.126.1: As often, a pattern in a hymn takes a while to settle down: although in vss. 2–7 pāda b is occupied entirely by the same trio of gods in the same order, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman (in nom., except voc. 2b), in this initial vs. the three are scattered across cd.

X.126.2: The lexeme *nīh* √*pā* is found only here and seems to have been confectioned in order to find some way to repeat *ámhas-* from 1a.

X.126.3: The construction *té ... (a)yám*, with pl. nom. *té* seemingly doubled by sg. nom. *ayám*, in pāda a gives Old fits and he spins increasingly complex scenarios to explain it. Re (EVP XVI.167) claims that ‘*yám*’ was borrowed from 1c, which seems quite dubious to me. I think that,

given the individual listing of gods in b, it's conveying that each one is both separately and jointly here.

On the dependence of splv. *pārṣiṣṭha-* on *parṣāni* see Re ad loc.

X.126.5: A verb needs to be supplied in ab; "lead" seems the obvious choice, given its prominence in the rest of the hymn (1c, 2d, 3c, 4d, 6a) (so also Ge).

A surprising intrusion of other divinities in cd.

X.126.7: Ge and Re take *śunām* as adverbial or (Re) "semi-interjektiv." I don't see why it can't be another object to *yachantu* in c. The word order in this vs. is tortured enough.

X.126.8: This vs. is identical to IV.12.8 in an Agni hymn. Why it has been added here, in a metrically variant hymn that contains only one glancing mention of Agni (5d), is unclear to me. Perhaps because of the *āṃhas-* in c, recalling the occurrences in 1a and 2c. Bloomfield makes no comment (and in fact doesn't register the repetition ad IV.12.8). The alternative poet's name given by the Anukr., *Amhomuc Vāmadevya*, bases the first name on *muñcata vy āṃhaḥ* in 8c and the patronymic on the original site of this vs. in the Vāmadeva maṇḍala. The full name is found only here in the Anukr., though there are several other poets with the Vāmadevya patronymic in X.

X.127 Night

X.127.1–3: Nom. *devī* appears in the same place in all three vss.: in pāda b in the 4th and 5th syllables. My attempt to render this parallelism was impossibly stilted, so I abandoned it.

X.127.1: Night's "eyes" are presumably the stars. For stars see also vs. 7.

X.127.2: The actions ascribed to Night here are otherwise associated with Dawn and the sun. See, for ab, e.g., IV.52.5 *ōṣā aprā urū jráyaḥ* "Dawn has filled the broad expanse," and for c X.37.4 *yéna sūrya jyótiṣā bādhase támaḥ* "by which, o Sūrya, you repel the darkness with (your) light." With *urū* I supply *antárikṣam*, since this phrase is extremely common. See, e.g., nearby X.124.6 *urv antárikṣam*. However, *jráyaḥ*, as in IV.52.5 just quoted, would also do.

X.127.3: The part. *āyatī* returns from 1a.

The root aor. *askṛta* is the only such form in the RV. In fact the Pp. reads *akṛta*, which, however, would produce a bad cadence. The preservation (if that's what it is) of *s*-mobile here must have been fostered by real or imagined degemination of the idiom *nīṣ-(s)kr*; ; cf. I.92.1 *nīṣkr̥ṇvānā* — though of course here the preverb is in tmesis and the augment would have intervened in any case.

X.127.4: The initial *sā* must be coreferential with the 2nd ps. relative expression *yásyāḥ ... te*. As I demonstrated in my 1992 "Vedic 'sá figé': An Inherited Sentence Connective," 2nd ps. reference for nom. forms of the *sá/ tām* pronoun is only found in impv. clauses, and so I supply an impv. in the *sā no adyá* main clause – a form of (*ā*) *√bhū* or (*ā*) *√as* (with the *ā* possibly concealed in *sā*). As Ge (n. 4ab) points out, the same pāda opening *sā no adyá* is found in the Dawn hymn, V.79.3; there it occurs with an overt 2nd ps. impv. *vy ūchā*. I am not alone in

supplying an impv here: it goes back to Sāy., though he takes the reference as 3rd ps. (*prasīdatu*), and as far as I can see simply ignores the *te*. Ge's imperative "(Steh) du" more accurately captures the usage of 2nd ps. *sā*. Re supplies a pres. indic. ("tu es"); other tr. -- Macdonell (VRS), Don, Mau – also recognize the 2nd ps. ref. but supply a past-tense verb (e.g., Macd. "So to us to-day thou [hast approached]") – though in *Hymns from the Rigveda* Macd tr. "So, goddess, come to-day to us," with an impv. but an invented voc.

X.27.5: This passage provides good evidence for Rau's contention that *grāma*- means 'roving band, horde' in the RV, not 'village'; though see comm. ad X.27.19 for a more nuanced assessment.

The parallel forms *padvánt*- and *pakṣín*- 'footed' and 'winged' respectively are a good argument against the view that there's a consistent functional difference between the *-vant*- and *-in*- possessive suffixes.

There is a range of possible tr. for *arthín*- lit. 'having a goal', e.g., 'busy' (as in the publ. tr.; cf. Ge's "geschäftigen"), but I think 'hungry' (Macd. *Hymns*), 'greedy' (Macd., VRS; Mau) go too far. However, a rendering more focused on the goal might be better; AR suggests "intent (on their prey)."

X.27.6: The transmitted Saṃhitā contrast between the two pāda-initial impvs. *yāváyā* (a) and *yaváya* (b) is surprising. (The Pp. reads them both with short root syllable, *yaváya*.) As was established in my *-áya*- monograph (174–75), both stems are almost equally well attested in the RV, but their distributions don't overlap except in X: *yāváyā*- is well established in the Family Books, from which *yaváya*- is missing. The short-vowel form is clearly a replacement for the long-vowel stem. For further on the distribution see the disc. just cited. Why the poet chose to use both here in identical metrical and syntactic situations I have no idea.

X.127.7: The act. intens. part. *pépiśat*, the only intens. form in the RV (though see comm. ad V.57.6), appears to be intrans., despite its diathesis. C. Melchert has point out, however, that there are no transitive neuter participles in the RV (save for *várdhat* V.62.5). On this intens. and its problematic intransitivity, see Schaef. (152–53); after the RV the stem appears as middle *pépiśāna*-, whose middle form better fits its usage. The ornaments in question are clearly stars; cf. I.68.10 *pipéśa nākaṃ stṛbhiḥ* and VI.49.3 *stṛbhiḥ anyā* [=night] *pipíśé*.

The simile in c is curiously hybrid. Although as Ge (n. 7c) points out, *ṛṇám √yat* is a later expression for 'settle a debt', in the RV the idiom is *ṛṇa-yā*- (on which see the thorough disc. of Scar. 407–9). This *√yā* does not have any verbal forms (see tentative disc. in EWA s.v. the bracketed *YĀ³*); if it did, we should expect **yāpaya* here. The poet seems to be frustrating expectations with the odd, but phonologically similar expression *ṛṇā √yat*, which may also have been encouraged by *yāváyā* ... *yaváya* in the previous vs. The obj. in the frame must be darkness, with the point being that Dawn on her arrival should put it down or aside.

X.127.8: The poet is once again playing games with us. The voc. in the previous vs. was *úṣaḥ* 'o Dawn', and the first voc. in this vs. *duhitar divaḥ* (b) "o Daughter of Heaven" is regularly addressed to Dawn (or to Sūryā). But it is immed. followed (c) with the voc. *rātri* 'o Night'. Are both females present in this vs. or are we to assume that Night is also the daughter of heaven (as she rightly should be)? Note also that the middle impv. *ṛṇīṣva* 'choose' is the svayavara verb,

esp. appropriate to Sūryā (see my 2001 Fs. Parpola “The Rigvedic svayamvara? Formulaic evidence”).

On the complex simile and the verb therein see Ge (n. 8b). The full expression, as he points out, is “make [=drive] cows homeward.” Cf. X.169.4 *śivāḥ satīr ūpa no goṣṭhām ākaḥ* “(Prajāpati) has sent (the cows) here, being well-disposed, to our stable.” This simile participates in the uneasy ambiguity between Night and Dawn just noted. In real-life terms cows are driven home at the beginning of the night, not (as apparently here) at its end with the advent of dawn.

Perhaps the most obvious problem with the simile is that it seems to have no object in the frame, but two in the simile: *gā iva* (a) and *stómam ná* (c). Moreover, *stómam* is exactly the object we would want in the frame (hence my supplied parenthetical “hymn”). The various tr. attempt to have it both ways, understandably. I now think that the simile marker *ná* is displaced, and the simile in c consists only of *jigyúṣe *ná*. As disc. elsewhere (see comm. ad VIII.76.1, X.21.1), simile-marking *ná* cannot appear pāda-final and is flipped with its target under those circumstances. I would now therefore slightly emend the tr. to “Like cows (to their pen) I have driven a praise song up to you, as if to a victor.” Unfortunately pāda b has to be parenthetically inserted, which makes the parsing all the harder.

Note the faint sign of ring composition: *rātri* opens the hymn and opens its final pāda.

X.128 All Gods

On the theme of competing sacrifices, see publ. intro. The hymn is also (more or less) AVŚ V.3 and AVP V.4 (ed. and tr. Lubotsky).

X.128.1–4: These first vss. are dominated by (usually) fronted 1st sg. pronouns: *māma* (1a), *māhyam* (1c), *māma* (2a), *māma* (2c), *māhyam* (3d), *māyi* (3a, 3b [2x]), *māhyam* (4a), *māma* (4a), *me* (4b). But these pronouns abruptly cease at this point – though one might consider the regular repetition of *mā* ‘don’t’ (4c, 5c [2x], 5d, 8d [2x]) a continuation by other means.

X.128.1: In addition to the forms of the 1st sg. pronoun, note 1st pl. *vayām* (1b) and 2nd sg. *tvā* (2b) and *tvāyā* (1d).

In b I take acc. *tanvām* as referring to both the subject (“we”) and the obj. of the part. *īndhānāḥ* (“you” = Agni). Forms of √*pus* ‘thrive’ regularly take the acc. Scholarly opinion is divided on the referent – Agni: Ge; us: Proferes (*Sovereignty*, 44), Wh (AVŚ), Lub (AVP); Re (EVP XVI) sits on the fence. I see no reason why it can’t be both. In favor of “us” are 3d, 5c.

X.128.2: Note *devāḥ ... sārve* versus *vísve devāsaḥ* in 4d, 5b.

The hapax *urú-loka-* must be a bahuvrīhi, as it is standardly taken – even though bahuvrīhis with *urú-* often have 2nd member accent (e.g., *uru-cakrá-*). There are, however, exceptions – e.g., *urú-yuga-*. The corresponding nominal expression is the truncated *u loka-*. It’s also worth noting that the noun this cmpd modifies and which it immediately follows is *antárikṣam*, which is regularly modified by *urú*, as was noted above ad X.127.2 – usually, but not invariably, in the order *urv antárikṣam* (I.91.22, etc.; but III.22.2, IV.52.7 *antárikṣam urú*).

The publ. tr. does not render *asmín*; it could be modified to “for me, at this (my) desire,” but it hardly seems worth it.

X.128.3: Ge renders *vanuṣanta* as a modal, “sollen Partei nehmen.” On the one hand, the modals that surround this form – impvs. *ā yajantām* (a), *astu* (b), opt *syāma* (d) – might support a modal

reading. On the other, *pūrve* ‘ancient, previous, earlier’ suggests that the divine Hotars in question performed an action in the past that can serve as a model. Since the verb stem *vanuṣ(a)-* is only attested here (though cf. *vanuṣyá-*), the morphology is not clear: is it an injunctive or a subjunctive? The AV versions (AVŚ V.3.5, AVP V.4.5) substitute *sanīṣan*, an *-iṣ*-aor. subj., but this substitution for the morphologically isolated RVic form is of little evidential value for the interpr. of the RVic form, since the AV often replaces forms it clearly finds puzzling.

X.128.4: The construction of pāda a is unclear. Ge simply takes the two parts *māhyaṃ yajantu* and *māma yāni havyā* as separate parallel clauses: “Für mich sollen sie opfern, mein sind alle Opferspenden,” ignoring the rel. prn. Wh (AVŚ V.3.4, which has *yānīṣṭā* [i.e., *yāni iṣṭā*]) ingeniously takes the nom. rel. as subj. of *yajantu*: “Let what sacrifices I make make sacrifice for me,” but I doubt that either *iṣṭā-* or *havyā-* can be subj. of act. *√yaj*; I certainly know of no such passages. (Lub’s tr. of AVP V.4.4 seems to follow Wh’s, though it is not unambig.: “For me let them sacrifice, whichever sacrifices are mine.”) Like Wh and Lub, I want to take account of the rel. prn., but I also think the construction should follow a more conventional model. When the means of sacrifice, the oblation, is construed with *√yaj*, it is in the instr.; cf., e.g., V.3.8 *tvām ... ayajanta havyaiḥ* “They sacrificed to you [Agni] with oblations.” I therefore assume a gapped instr. in the first part of the pāda, which is coreferential with the nominal izafe-like expression that follows.

X.128.5: On *dévīḥ śaḥ urvīḥ* see comm. ad X.14.16. I now see that the standard view, found already in Gr (def. 14 s.v. *urū*), that this is a ref. to the three heavens and the three earths (or some other sixfold division of the cosmos) is most likely correct – or at least provides a plausible solution. Why fem.? perhaps as a pluralization of sg. *urvī* modifying *bhūmi-* / *prthivī-* ‘earth’ or of du. *urvī* modifying *ródasī* ‘two world-halves’ (common) or *dyāvā-prthivī*. I would now alter the tr. to “you six divine broad (world-spaces),” however awkward the English.

On the passive value of the *s*-aor. injunc. *hāsmahi* see Narten, Sig. Aor. 285.

X.128.6: On *nigút-* see comm. ad IX.97.53.

On *neśat* see comm. ad IV.1.17.

X.128.8: Old, flg. Ludwig, suggests that *uruvyācā(h)* can be a neut. modifying *śárma*, but there seems no need to take it as anything but the masc. nom. sg. it appears to be. This adj. regularly modifies Indra (e.g., VII.31.11).

X.128.9: A touch of ring composition: *adhirājām* (d) recalls *ádhyakṣa-* in 1d.

[X.129–130 JPB]

X.131 Indra

On the contents and later use of the hymn see publ. intro.

X.131.1: The pattern of the repeated preverb in tmesis *āpa* followed by acc. pl. directional adj. creates a nice phonological effect, esp. in the first two pādas: #*āpa prācaḥ* ... #*āpāpācaḥ*.

X.131.2: On the interpr. of the inagery in this vs., see publ. intro. As I say there, the most obvious initial interpr. has to be set aside as the vs. continues.

X.131.3: For the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro. I have rendered pāda a rather loosely, to capture its slightly slangy tone. As I indicate in the publ. intro., a more literal tr. would be “there is nothing which, when drawn by a single animal, has travelled in the right way” or, per JSK DGRV I.375, “For it is not driven in the proper manner by means of a single horse.” The periphrasis *yātām āsti* is somewhat puzzling: I don’t see the need for an overt copula. Since the overt 3rd sg. pres. of *√as* is usually existential, not copular, I have so tr. it in my literal rendering just given. But wonder if it’s there instead to make it clear that *yātām* is not the common dual impv. to *√yā* so frequently used of the Aśvins. Moreover, as I disc. in my 1990 “Tense of the Past Part.” article, surface copulas are more likely to be found in subord. clauses, as here. See comm. ad VII.22.2.

On *sthūri* see Bl’s comments (RReps ad IV.17.16); he also favors “one-horse” as an Eng. rendering.

Note that though *utā* suggests that pādas a and b are conjoined, *vivide* (b) is not accented, unlike *āsti* (a), and so cannot be in the domain of *hi* in a. JSK (loc. cit.) does not note the differential verb accentuation and seems to think that *utā* is conjoining clauses that are at least loosely parallel. I assume that *utā* in this somewhat vernacular style is simply introducing a new clause.

Ge supplies a subj. “ein solcher” for *vivide*, but I follow Gr in taking it as passive with *śrávaḥ* as subj.; this would match the passive expression in pāda a. For other pass. usages of this med. pf., see Kü 493.

The 2nd hemistich is identical to IV.17.16ab, but the sentence continues there in cd. In both places Ge supplies a main verb “call on.” This is possible, but in the pub. tr. I supply “seek” semantically extracted from the *-yā-* denominatives. In IV.17.16, by contrast, I read *vājāyantaḥ* as a pun: not only ‘seeking prizes’, but also (as often) ‘rousing’. See comm. ad loc. This is possible here as well; I now suggest an alt. tr. “inspired ones, seeking cows, seeking horses, seeking prizes / [are] rousing the bull Indra for partnership.” In this case, *vājāyantaḥ* would also be a predicated pres. part.

X.131.4–5: As discussed in the publ. intro., these two vss. make brief mention of the Aśvins’ healing of Indra, who got sick from drinking the liquor *surā*. This myth is treated extensively in Vedic prose, esp. in connection with the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, which seems already alluded to here, and there is abundant sec. lit. on it (see reff. in the publ. intro., also Ge’s n. 4a).

The word *surāma-* is found only in these two vss., and its meaning and formation are much disputed (see Gr, Ge n. 4a, Old, EWA s.v. *sūrā-*, etc.). I favor the suggestion of Brune (cited by Old) that it is a blend, or portmanteau, of *sūrā-* and *sóma-* (of the “brunch” type). It is, after all, the obj. of *ví√pā* ‘separate in drinking’ in 4c. The word also, obviously, plays off *sutrāman-*, the epithet of Indra in vss. 6 and 7 and the base for the name of the Sautrāmaṇī ritual.

On *ví√pā* ‘separate in drinking’ see esp. comm. ad VII.22.4, I.191.10.

X.131.5: The publ. tr. conceals a grammatical problem in the first hemistich, though not a very interesting one. The Aśvins are nom. (or acc.) in pāda a, with suffixal accent *aśvínā*. But the du. verb in b is 2nd ps. *āváthuh*. Moreover, there is a voc. *índra*, so an extra 2nd ps. ref. The simplest

solution, reflected in the tr., is Old's: read 3rd du *āvātuḥ* for *āváthuḥ*; he suggests 2nd ps. form was influenced by *āvatam* in 5d.

X.131.6–7: These vss. are identical to VI.47.12–13, where they do not seem to have any connection to the Sautrāmaṇī ritual, unlike here.. As noted above, both vss. contain the epithet *śutrāman-*.

X.132 Mitra and Varuṇa

On the problematic nature of this hymn, see publ. intro. I will not engage deeply with the various other interpr. and in fact will not spend much time trying to justify my own -- taking as my guide Old's introductory remark: "Nur teilweise verständlich." On the hymn and esp. vs. 4, see Ingrid Eichner-Kühn, "Ein Eidbrück im Ṛgveda," MSS 41 (1982) 23–31. Her solution for the problematic hapax in 4d is brilliant and puts a very different complexion on the interpretation of the difficult vss. 4–5, but I cannot follow her in her interpr. of the whole hymn (27) as an oath-breaker's attempt, through an expiatory sacrifice to Agni, to avert Varuṇa's retribution for this offense – however ingenious this interpr. is.

X.132.1: As noted in the publ. intro., the repeated pf. mid. part. *ījānā-* seems to be identifying the role later called the "Sacrificer" (Yajamāna).

The first hemistich lacks a finite verb; something needs to be supplied to govern the loc. inf. *prabhūṣāṇi*. Pace Gr, Wh (Rts), AiG II.2.624, it seems better to take *prabhūṣāṇi* to *√bhūṣ* 'attend on', than to *√bhū*, since *prá√bhū* ordinarily means 'project, dominate', not 'help' vel sim. Old is uncertain which root to choose.

X.132.2: As noted in the publ. intro., act. *yajāmasi* seems a deliberate contrast to the three exx. of the mid. part. *ījānā-* I vs. 1 and may identify the 1st pl. subjects here as the working priests. This vs. reprises some of vs. 1: in addition to the contrastive forms of *√yaj* we have *suṣumnā* echoing *sumnaiḥ* (1d), mid. *krānāya*, which I take as synonymous with *ījānā-*, and *abhí√as* in d may pick up *abhí prabhūṣāṇi* in 1b (though I confess I'm not sure how).

īṣitatvātā is a remarkable piece of morphology: a double abstract (*-tva+ tā-*) built to a ppl. (Somewhat similar, though built to a noun, is *puruṣatvātā*- RV 2x.) I think *īṣita-* refers to the ritual prompt to sacrifice; see, e.g., X.110.3 *sá enān yakṣīṣitāḥ* (i.e., *yakṣi īṣitāḥ*) "sacrifice to them when prompted" (cf. X.110.9, III.4.3, VI.11.1, VII.39.1).

For c, cf. VI.19.13.

X.132.3: On the interpr. of this vs., see publ. intro., where I claim that the vs. continues the opposition between the sacrificing priests and the Sacrificer. The publ. tr. would be easier to understand if parenthetical identifications were inserted: "And even now, when we [=priests] seek to establish you two [M+V] here, while coming into possession of our own dear legacy, / or when the giver [=Sacrificer/Patron] prospers with regard to his legacy, no one shall bring his [=Sac./Patron] bounties (for us) into collision [=destroy them]."

As I say in the publ. intro. (see also comm. on X.61.11), the word *rēkna-*, used twice here (b, c), is several times (I.121.5 [=X.61.11], VI.20.7, VII.40.2, possibly I.31.14 [note typo in publ. intro.], VI.16.26) used of what the gods "leave behind" (*√ric*) for the mortals at the sacrifice. Here both the sacrificing priests ("we" ab) and the Sacrificer/Patron (c) should receive

part of this “legacy.” In addition the Sacrificer/Patron should be distributing “bounties” (*māghāni*) to the priests (d).

On the pf. part. *dadvāms-* see Kü (238), who claims that it never takes an obj. in the RV. I think he is correct in this case, and although it is tempting to construe *réknaḥ* with *dadvān* (like VIII.46.15 *dadī réknaḥ*, which must mean ‘giving a legacy’; cf. also VI.20.7), it is better to take *réknaḥ* as an acc. of respect with *púṣyati* (sim. Kü: “oder wenn ein Spender das Erbteil mehrt”).

The verb in d poses two problems. On the one hand, its sandhi is ambiguous: it may represent 3rd pl. *āran* (so Pp., fld. by Lub, Re, implicitly Kü) or sg. *ārat* (Gr, Ge [n. 3d], Heenen [163], publ. tr.). (Old is uncertain.) By the former analysis *maghāni* is the subject, by the latter *nākih*. Then there is the question of the morphological identity of either form. Whether *ārat* or *āran*, it is generally taken as an augmented thematic aorist, which would require a preterital interpr. Since I consider d to be the main clause for the parallel *yád* clauses in ab and c, which are presential (marked even further as such by the opening *ádhā cin nú* “and even now”), a preterital interpr. poses problems (see Re’s attempt to wriggle out of this by emending to *āran* with preverb *ā*, allowing him an underlying injunctive *aran*; EVP VII.64). However, nothing prevents us from taking it as a pf. subjunctive (indic. *āra* etc.), and that is the analysis I strongly favor on the basis of the structure of the vs.

I am less certain about what the pāda means, and the numerous other renderings do not help. The publ. tr. starts from the fact that in the middle *sám √ṛ* means ‘clash together’; in the act. it could therefore mean ‘cause to clash together, bring into collision’ – hence destroy. I do not see a better route to interpr., but I confess I find my own solution weak.

X.132.4–5: As noted in the publ. intro., the interpr. of these two vss. is highly uncertain. (Please also note another typo in the intro.: “The first half of vs. 5 ...” should read “vs. 4.”)

X.132.4: The first half of this vs. is structured by a twist on the classic *anyá- ... anyá-* “the one ... the other” construction: the second *anyá-* is replaced by a 2nd ps. Although the apparent assignment of kingship to both Heaven (pāda a) and Varuṇa (b) is at first puzzling, in fact it can easily be interpr. within the context of the famous hymn X.124 (in my interpr.), on which see the comm. ad loc. and my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of R̥gveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. Staal), as well as the publ. tr. of that hymn. I argue that the “divine revolution” in X.124 involves the peaceful passing of the kingship from Father Heaven (Dyaus Pitar) to a complementary duo, Indra and Varuṇa (see esp. X.124.5). Our hemistich here can be interpr. within the same framework, with a chronological gap between the two pādas: *previously* Heaven was consecrated (*sūyata*) as king, but *now* Varuṇa is king. Esp. telling is the placement of the voc. *asura*: it is found in pāda a between *asaú* and *dyaúh*, which add up to the standard designation “yonder heaven,” but it must be construed with the voc. *varuṇa* in b. But Heaven is called “Father Asura” in X.124.3 and elsewhere, while Varuṇa also frequently is so called. It is as if our poet wants to associate the word with both figures: Heaven by word order and Varuṇa by grammar.

The second hemistich is harder. In pāda c both the referent of the nom. *mūrdhā* and the morphological identity of the verb *cākan* are up for grabs. I take *mūrdhā* as continuing the reference to Varuṇa, from the previous pāda. This suggests that *cākan* is 2nd sg., rather than 3rd (per Gr, etc.). For both identifications, see Re’s tr. (EVP V). What chariot does he take pleasure in? Obvious answers are the chariot of sacrifice or the war chariot (both have been suggested – e.g., sacrifice Scar 245, war chariot Re) – or both. If it is the latter (or partly the latter), this might

help in interpr. the baffling pāda d. In the power-sharing arrangement between Indra and Varuṇa, Indra is the Kriegskönig, while Varuṇa presides over peacetime. Suggesting that he gets pleasure from war might suggest that he is violating his nature and perhaps committing a transgression (*énaś-*).

As noted above, Eichner-Kühn provides an inspired solution to the problematic hapax in pāda d. The second word of the sandhified sequence *énaśāntakadrūk* is read as *antakadrūk* by the Pp, and all subsequent treatments of the word have started with that reading. But E-K suggest reading instead *āntakadrūk* (which requires no emendation to the Saṃhitā text), with *ānta(ka)-* the expected ppl. to the set root *√am* ‘swear’. The cmpd then means ‘deceiving (/breaking) an oath, a sworn agreement’, and it is essentially synonymous with *mitra-drūh-*, a cmpd not found in the RV (though see *drógha-mitra-*) but attested in the MS and later and the direct correspondent to well-attested YAvestan *miθrō.drug-*. That *āntaka-drūh-* here is meant as a substitute for the resonant and inherited Indo-Iranian technical term *mitradrūh-* is shown by the presence of *hité mitré* “when an alliance is/was concluded” in the complementary contrastive passage in the next vs, 5b.

E-K thinks this pāda means that the oath-breaker is (no longer) burdened with sin because he has performed his sacrifice to Agni, who, acdg. to her, is the subject of the preceding pāda c. But I think this requires too much backstory to be supplied – though I admit my own interpr. is pretty shaky. As hinted at above, I suggest that Varuṇa’s penchant for the war chariot might have been – but is not – considered a transgression worthy of the description ‘oath-breaking’ – in this case breaking his power-sharing agreement with Indra. What really counts as oath-breaking is described in the first hemistich of the next vs.

X.132.5: One thing all interpreters can agree on is that 5ab must be read with 4cd, with contrastive treatments of *énaś-* ‘transgression’, which is lodged in someone called, or described as, *śākapūta* lit. ‘shit-purified’ or ‘durch Mist gereinigen’. E-K (28) thinks that this personage is really Agni, and the *énaś-* of the oath-breaker has been deposited (harmlessly) in this god to whom the original offender made expiatory sacrifice – i.e., it has been offered into the fire. Agni is then the subject of b, punishing others who have committed the same offense. With others I take *śākapūta* as a derogatory personal name, the negative sense of which identifies him as an enemy or someone who operates outside Ārya norms. He is the one who deserves the appellation “oath-breaker,” and pāda b describes what his offense consists of: killing men who have already fallen (or have surrendered by prostrating themselves) after a peace agreement has been reached.

Note that the sandhi form *chāka(pūta)* echoes *cākan* in 4c.

As I indicate in the publ. intro., I think the 2nd half of vs. 5 belongs with vs. 6 and concerns the current ritual, where Mitra and Varuṇa are present. The description of this ritual unfolds in a series of disjointed clauses.

For *avór vā yád* I read (with Gr, Old AiG III.350, and JSK [DGRV II.209]) **vām*. Both of the other occurrences of *avóḥ* are fld. by *vām* (VI.67.11, VII.67.4), and *vām* could have been redactionally changed to *vā* here to match 3c *#dadvām vā yád*. The specification with *vām* would help clarify the unusual pron. form *avóḥ*, which is, per Lub (121), probably an assimilation from *ayóḥ*. For a similar doubling see 2a *tā vām*. (This emendation is explicitly rejected by E-K [n. 13] and is ignored by Ge and Re, who both tr. the *vā*.)

With most (Old, Ge, Re, E-K), I take *arvā* as a ref. to Agni as ritual fire.

X.132.5–6: Note the play: 5c *#avór ...*, 5d *#ávaḥ ... arvā#*, 6a *#yuvór ...*, 6c *áva ...*

X.132.6: The first hemistich is highly reminiscent of 1ab, which provides at least limited help in interpr. this obscure mess (as both Old and Re point out). Both passages contain *dyaúh ... bhūmih* + LOC. INF. The first help vs. 1 provides is in interpr. 6b *dyaúh ná bhūmih*. Although Ge takes *bhūmih* as the frame corresponding to *dyaúh* in the simile (“die Erde ... wie der Himmel”), vs. 1 suggests that they should be read as parallel and essentially conjoined “Heaven (and) Earth,” with both in the simile (so also Old and Re). Placing *ná* between the two nom.s is rather like breaking up a dual dvandva with a particle.

On the loc. inf. *pupūtāni* see also Keydana (Inf. 182). Exactly who or what is being purified is unclear to me – or even whether the inf. is to be interpr. as act. or pass. In the publ. tr. I opt for an act. interpr., which would parallel *prabhūṣāni* in vs. 1, and assume that Aditi as a maternal figure is purifying with mother’s milk, as H+E purify with rain. But I am by no means certain of any of this. Re suggests that soma is the obj. of Aditi’s purification – this seems reasonable, insofar as “reasonable” is applicable to this hymn.

The identify of the 2nd pl. subjects of the verbs in cd (*áva ... didiṣṭana, ninikta*) is again unclear. I assume M+V plus Aditi – and whatever other gods are hanging around the sacrifice. We have finally come to the point of making our demands.

What it means to “wash with the sun’s rays” is unclear to me, but it seems to be parallel to “purify with milk” in b.

X.132.7: I have nothing to contribute to the interpr. of this vs. See publ. intro.

On *apna-rāj-* and the discrepancy between the 1st member *apna-* and putative base *ápnas-*, see Scar 446; on *dhūr-śád-* and *vanar-śád-*, Scar 567. See also Kü (223), who tr. the whole vs.

X.133 Indra

On the hymn and its connections to others in the RV, see publ. intro. It is also quite similar to the next hymn, X.134, although the Anukr. attributes them to different poets.

X.133.1: The bahuvrīhi *purorátha-* occurs once elsewhere (X.39.11), where it refers, semi-metaphorically, to a man “whose chariot is in front”—that is, who is dominant and/or victorious. Here the metaphor has been extend to describe a hymn that will prevail over the hymns of our competitors (so Ge, plausibly). My “leading chariot (of a hymn)” is meant to avoid the awkward and barely intelligible “(a hymn) whose chariot is in front.”

On *sūṣá-* see esp. comm. ad X.31.3.

As noted in the publ. intro., the refrain is an elaboration on the Nābhāka Kāṇva refrain of VIII.39–42, with further use of the deprecatory low-register *-ka*-suffix.

X.133.2: Despite the pāda boundary, *adharācaḥ* must be construed with the previous pāda, as shown by the accent on immed. flg. *áhan*, which must begin a new cl. in the middle of b.

X.133.3: The first two pādas of this vs. are illuminated by the more expansive parallel in IX.79.1 (on which see comm. ad loc.) *ví ca náśan na iṣó árātayo, aryó naśanta sániṣanta no dhíyaḥ* “If hostilities will reach our refreshments, those of the stranger will go to destruction. Our insightful thoughts will prevail.” Acdg. to the clever interpr. of Old (who also discusses our passage ad IX.79.1), in IX.79.1 the two verbs *náśan* and *naśanta* can belong to different √*naś* roots – ‘reach, attain’ and ‘disappear, go to destruction’. I adopt – but modify in details – this insight both for

IX.79.1 and here. The same double sense can be seen here, but embodied in the single verb form *naśsanta*, which should be interpr. as ‘go to destruction’ in pāda a and ‘reach beyond’ in b. The gen. *aryáh* that opens b can be read with both pādas. This interpr. is also reflected in Ge’s tr.

X.133.5: The phrase *mahīva dyaúh* appears to mean “like great Heaven” and, due to fem. *mahī*, shows a fem. *dyaúh*, a gender assignment that is rare but not non-existent for this stem. This interpr. is reflected in the publ. tr. However, there are other possibilities. *mahī* might by itself mean ‘great (Earth)’, since *mahī* regularly refers to the earth. In this case we would have a simile exactly like that in the immed. preceding hymn X.132.6 *dyaúh ná bhūmih* “like Heaven (and) Earth” (see comm. ad loc.), but in reversed order: “like great (Earth) (and) Heaven.” Or *mahī* might be an elliptical dual, modifying gapped *rōdasī* ‘the two world-halves’, and specified here only by *dyaúh*: “the two great ones, Heaven (and Earth).” Although this might seem like a long shot, see I.22.13 *mahī dyaúh prthivī ca* with (possibly) the full expression: “the two great ones, Heaven and Earth.” See comm. ad loc. I don’t have a particularly strong feeling about any of the three possibilities, but given that the final vs. of this hymn (7) wishes “a great cow” to swell and give us milk, and this great cow might be the earth (though she is more likely an insightful thought [*dhī*]), perhaps the alt. taking *mahī* as standing for the earth should be adopted.

X.133.5: See above ad vs. 5 on the identity of the “great cow.” It is possible that this is a metaphor for the earth, but in IV.41.5cd=X.101.9cd, whose pāda d is identical to our d, the reference appears to be to a *dhī* ‘insightful thought’; see comm. ad X.74.4.

X.134 Indra

As noted above, these two hymns, X.133 and X.134, both dedicated to Indra, are quite similar, though attributed to two different poets by the Anukr. For their similarities, see the publ. intro. to each.

X.134.1: The first 6 vss. have the same refrain, but only in this vs. is it clearly syntactically integrated into the rest of the vs.: pādas cd serve as the obj. of *ajījanat* in the refrain. (In the other vss. the obj. of the verb in the refrain must be supplied, and abcd are independent -- though see comm. on vs. 4 below.)

X.134.2–5: All four of these vss. begin with *áva*, each in tmesis with a different verb; vss. 3–4 both contain a form of *dhūnu* ‘shake down’ (though in different tense/mood and voice), while 2 and 5 have verbs belonging to other roots.

X.134.2: This vs. shows esp. close connections to X.133.4 *yó nah ... ādideśati / adhaspadām tám im kṛdhi*, which, slightly abbreviated, is our *adhaspadām tám im kṛdhi, yó asmā ādideśati*. The generalizing rel. cl. (“who(ever) will ...”) appears before the main cl. in 133.4 and after it in 134.2, which speaks against a fixed position for this type of clause, as some Vedic syntacticians have argued.

X.134.3–4: Given the close similarity between these two vss., act. *áva ... dhūnuhi* and med. *áva ... dhūnuṣé* seem functionally identical, and in fact the act. and mid. forms of this stem in general (as well as the other, less well-attested stems to this root) are both transitive and show no obvious functional differentiation. The essential identity of the two vss. is shown also by the near

repetitions *viśvá(ścandrāḥ)* (3b) / *viśvāni* (4b) and *viśvābhir ūtibhiḥ* (3d) / *sahasrīṇibhir ūtibhiḥ* (4d).

X.134.4: Note that *viśvāni* can't directly refer to the obj. in 3 because of the change of gender, though the neut. pl. "all (things)" can be a generalized reference to it.

The obvious way to read the simile in cd is as a comparison to *viśvāni* in b – that is, as the material that Indra shakes down (all things being compared to wealth). So Ge. However, it would be possible to take it as a comparison with the implicit *tvām*=Indra that serves as obj. of *ajījanat* in the refrain, with Indra being compared to wealth. In this case the structure of vs. 4 would be like that of vs. 1, with cd serving as obj. to the verb in the refrain. I weakly favor this interpr., because a simile "all (things) like wealth" seems weak. The publ. tr. deliberately allows both interpr., though tipping towards the latter.

X.134.5: It is not clear whether pāda c goes with d (so Ge) or ab (publ. tr.). Ge gives no explan. for why he thinks the blades of *dūrva* grass would be compared to 'malevolence' (*durmatīḥ*); perhaps the near coincidence of their initial syllables (*dūr-* / *dur-*) is sufficient. I connect b with what precedes, because the multiple blades of grass could be compared (at least in number) to beads of sweat and missiles. Macdonell and Keith (s.v. *Dūrvā*) make the baffling comment about our passage: "A simile occurring in the Rigveda seems to indicate that the ears lay horizontal with the stem," which deduction seems to suit neither ab nor d.

X.134.6: On the *anikuśā-* in general and this image in particular, see the extensive disc. ad X.44.9. Anyone familiar with goats will recognize this scene: the goat, standing on its hind legs, uses its forefeet to pull down a branch so it can graze on the leaves (see images on internet). The question is what is the obj. in the frame that would correspond to the branch (*vayām*) in the simile? I think that the branch should be read in both simile and frame, since, as Ge points out, this vs. picks up the "shake down" imagery of vss. 3–4. Indra is obviously using the hook on the *anikuśā-* (see X.44.9) to shake a fruit-laden branch. See Ge's n. 6ab, though he doesn't seem to recognize the relationship of the goat to the branch.

It is quite possible that *śākti-* is a pun, meaning both 'ability' and 'spear'; Ge (n. 6ab) suggests this as an alternate. Although the 'spear' meaning is generally confined to later texts (though see II.39.7), this kind of passage with its homely pastoral image is a context in which words in use in a lower register are likely to show up. I would now slightly alter the tr. to "Because you carry your ability/spear ..."

Note also that *śāktim* (b) picks up *śācībhiḥ śakra* in 3c.

X.134.7: This final vs. is in a different meter and lacks the refrain of the rest of the hymn. It also expands from Indra to the gods in general.

The obj(s). to *minīmasi* and *ā yopayāmasi* must be supplied. The former verb takes a wide variety of objects, but esp. *vratāni* 'commandments'. *√yup* is of course far less common; of the objects with which it is found, *dhārma* (VII.89.5) 'foundations, ordinances' is closest to *vratā-* and the apparent purport of our passage. With Gr, therefore, it makes sense to extract *māntra-* from *mantra-śrútyam*, which serves as the obj. of the third 1st pl. verb *carāmasi* and supply *māntrān* 'solemn utterances' as the obj. of the 1st two verbs.

The 2nd member of *mantra-śrútyam* found only here seems to be independent of the fairly well-attested, formally identical gerundival *śrútya-* 'worthy to be heard, worthy of fame'.

AiG II.2.284, 288 points to a number of pairs of root noun and associated *-ya-* form, and that seems the best way to account for this compound, which must then mean ‘the hearing of (→ obedience to) mantras’.

The final verb of the hymn *abhí sám rabhāmahe* recalls *ā rabhāmahe* in the previous hymn (X.133.6) and is another index of their connection. Ge (n. 7cd) thinks that the reference here is to horseback riding, with the subject grabbing onto the horse (=Indra by his interpr.) with his thighs. The introduction of the horse and rider seems abrupt and unnecessary to me; I merely thought that we were grabbing the gods (pāda a; note that Indra is absent from the vs.) by *their* sides and shoulders. On *apikakṣá-* as ‘region of the armpit, shoulderblade’ (against Ge’s “Gurt”), see my 1987 Vedic Body Parts (Ged. Cowgill), p. 84.

X.135 Yama

Another famous hymn with a plethora of competing interpr. Since I have treated the hymn at length myself (“The Earliest Evidence for the Inborn Debts of the Brahmin: A New Interpretation of R̥gveda X.135” – *Journal asiatique* 302 [2014]: 245–57), I will not discuss the hymn in detail here but refer interested readers to the art. cit.

X.135.1–2: In my view, these two vss. are spoken by a boy whose dead father has made the journey to Yama’s world, where he now lives pleasantly, drinking with the gods in the shade of a tree. The boy, missing his father and longing to see him again, decides to follow the same path – but he is also apprehensive and reluctant to undertake the journey – a plausible psychological portrait of a bereft child.

The pairing of the vss. is underscored by the near repetition in the first pāda of 2 of the last pāda of 1: 1d *purāṇāṁ ānu venati* / 2a *purāṇāṁ anuvénantam*.

X.135.2: I take the intens. *acākaśam* in the same way as *vicākaśat* in VIII.91.2 (Apāla), as a frequentative ‘keep looking’.

X.135.3–4: These vss. concerning the (metaphorical) chariot are likely to be spoken by the father, since the speaker addresses the previous speaker familiarly with the voc. ‘lad’ (*kumāra* 3a, 4a).

Again the pairing is signalled verbally: 3a *#yám kumāra ... rátham* / 4a *#yám kumāra ... rátham*.

X.135.4: In the last pāda of these paired vss., a boat makes a sudden surprising appearance: the chariot is set on it (*nāvy āhitam*), as if on a car ferry. Although the RVic funeral hymns (X.14–18) give no sign that there’s a River Styx-like barrier between this world and the next, there’s at least a hint of this in X.56, a hymn focusing on the afterlife. The last vs. (X.56.7) begins *nāvā ná kṣódaḥ pradísah pṛthivyāḥ, svastíbhīr áti durgāṇi víśvā* “As if with a boat across the swell through all the earth’s directions, (having gone) beyond the difficult places with blessings,” apparently describing the journey to the next world -- though the boat there is in a simile.

X.135.5–6: These vss. are paired both by the difficult and much discussed word *anudéyī* and by the crucial structural fact that vs. 5 poses questions and vs. 6 begins by answering one in almost the same words (though see below for a crucial interpretational shift): 5d *anudéyī yáthābhavat*, 6a *yáthābhavat anudéyī*.

As I have disc. *anudéyī* at length in the 2014 art. (esp. 247–50), I will not repeat the details here. The gist is that I interpr. the word in the context of an AV passage (and its Vedic prose parallels), which contains an idiom *ṛṇám ánu √ dā* ‘forgive a debt’ in the context of Yama’s world. The gerundive here is part of an underlying phrase “(debt) to be forgiven”; its fem. gender (versus the neut. of *ṛṇám*) is due to the metaphor found in the AV (etc.) passages: the “rope (of debt)” (with fem. *rájju-* ‘rope’). The debt in our passage is in reference to what later become the trio of debts a brahmin owes on birth, one of which is to produce a son. In the RV, I suggest, there was only a two-debt system: beget a son and perform sacrifice, since the system of studentship was only just developing in this period. In our vs. Yama asks the father, who has arrived at Yama’s world, about the two debts and whether they have been discharged. The father answers affirmatively.

X.135.6: The result of this positive answer is that the father is reborn in Yama’s world, a birth depicted, with technical terminology, in 6bcd. The trick to interpr. the two vss. is to see that although 5d *anudéyī yáthābhavat* and 6a *yáthābhavat anudéyī* are identical except for word order, *yáthā* is being used in two different senses: “how” in 5d, “as” in 6a.

X.135.7: This final vs. pairs with vs. 1, describing the delights of Yama’s world, into which the father has been reborn.

X.136 Muni

On the subject of this hymn and its similarity to the Laba-sūkta (X.119), see publ. intro. As with the next hymn (X.137), the Anukr. assigns each of its vss. to a different poet – in this case the seven (unsung) sons of the muni Vātaraśana, a name plucked from the bahuvrīhi ‘wind-girt’ (lit. ‘whose halter is the wind’) in vs. 2.

X.136.1: Pāda c lacks a verb. The most obvious way to construe the pāda is to supply ‘bears’ from pāda b, though there’s a wide variety of other interpr.

X.136.2: The expression “when the gods have entered (them)” is striking. In this context it presumably means they have been en-theos-ed – possessed -- as it were.

X.136.5: All consulted tr. interpr. the first member of *devéṣita-* as pl. (“impelled by the gods”). But given the focus on the wind in pāda a (also 2a, c), I take it as a sg. ref. to Vāyu.

Pāda d contains a novel twist on the izafe-like nominal rel. cl.: the sg. nom. *yáḥ* has a dual as its antecedent, *ubhaú samudraú*, and the rel. cl. contains two conjoined sg. adjectives, corresponding to the dual antecedent. The clause also begins (*yás ca*) as if it were going to belong to an “X and which Y” construction, in which the X would belong to the main cl. and have the appropriate case for that cl. (acc. in this instance). However, both X and Y are found in the *yás ca* clause, both nom.

X.136.6: Since the muni is flying in the midspace, I take *mṛgá-* here as ‘wild bird’, not the more general sense ‘wild animal’ (which of course is narrowed in a different direction to ‘deer’ in later Skt.). The Avestan cognate *mərəya-* means ‘bird’, and other RVic passages seem to call for that sense. Cf. esp. I.182.7 *parṇā mṛgásya patáruḥ* “the feathers of a wild bird in flight”; IX.32.4

mṛgó ná taktáḥ “like a wild bird launched in flight” (comparable to IX.67.15 *śyenó ná taktáḥ* “like a falcon launched in flight”). See also comm. ad IX.32.4.

Apropos *kétasya vidvān* Ge appositely adduces *kéta-vedas*- I.104.3.

The adjectives *svādúr madíntamaḥ*, modifying the muni, seem meant to evoke soma, just before (vs. 7) the poison drink reappears.

X.136.7: The preparation of the poison drink in ab mimics that of soma.

This vs. rouses great excitement in scholars of the history of Indian religion as the (possible) “oldest reference to the Rudra-Śiva cult of traditional Indian civilization” (Maurer, comm. on vs. 7). Since this topic has been (more than) sufficiently treated by others, I reserve comment.

X.137 All Gods

As with the immed. preceding hymn X.136, the Anukr. attributes each vs. of this hymn to a different poet, but unlike the unrenowned poets of X.136, these are the celebrated Seven Seers (Saptarṣi). However, as noted in the publ. intro., the elementary contents of the hymn do not justify the exalted ascriptions.

X.137.1: This vs. seems to be overstuffed with pointless repetitions: four (!) voc. “o gods,” one in each 8-syllable pāda, an *utá* opening each hemistich, and *púnaḥ* ending each one. This leaves each pāda with just four syllables to convey content.

X.137.2: The two occurrences of *ā* + ABL in b might appear to express parallel senses (“from X, from Y”) (so Lub, for AVP V.18.3), but because of the contrastive directions of the winds in cd, I follow the standard interpr. (Ge, Re, Wh [AVŚ IV.13.2]), which takes the first *ā* as ‘from’ and the second as ‘to’.

X.137.5: Both AV versions read *imám* for *ihá*, which makes more sense: an absolute use of $\sqrt{trā}$ ‘rescue’ is awk.

X.138 Indra

On the contents of this hymn and some of its difficulties, see publ. intro.

X.138.1: The first hemistich is quite straightforward: the conveyors (*váhnayah*) are conveyors of songs, the Aṅgirasas (as in VI.32.3) of the Vala myth, who also stand in for the present-day priests. The opening of the Vala cave by the Aṅgirasas in conjunction with Indra is of course standard fare.

The second hemistich is more problematic, in great part because of its syntactic ambiguity. The two verbal forms in c, *daśasyán* and *riṇán*, can be either nom. sg. masc. pres. participles or 3rd pl. act. injunctives (accented because in a *yátrā* cl.). In the former case, the part. modify the 2nd sg. subj. of *daṃśayaḥ* in d, namely Indra; in the latter, the subj. continues to be the *váhnayah*. Ge, Old, and the publ. tr. take them as part.; Gr, Lü (534–35), and HPS (B+I 145–46) as 3rd pl. There is no way to tell for certain, I just wonder if so much credit would be given to the Aṅgirasas and so little to Indra in this vs. Note that the next vs. (2abc) contains 5 2nd sg. verbs with Indra as subject. Moreover, in my interpr., having cd a single cl. simplifies the interpr. of *ca* in d (see below).

Ge (fld. by JSK [DGRV I.127]) supplies a verb in d: “(be)standest)” to construe with *kútsāya mánman*; this is presumably a form of \sqrt{av} ‘help’, but he doesn’t say (and rather obfuscates in n. 1d; though JSK explicitly supplies *ávīh*) – but \sqrt{av} doesn’t ordinarily take the dat. (or the loc.). He (also JSK) assumes (n. 1d) that *ca* connects this ghost clause with *ahyàś ca dāṃsāyaḥ*. But I see no reason to manufacture a verb that doesn’t fit the very elements it’s meant to go with.

The interpr. of this pāda is not helped by the fact that the verb *dāṃsāyaḥ* is a hapax, though it very probably belongs with *dāṃsiṣṭha-* ‘most wondrous’, *-dāṃsa-* ‘wondrous power,’ *dāṃsas-* ‘id.’, etc.; a form of *dāṃsas-* is found in the next vs. (2c). See my *-āya-* monograph (p. 83). Here it clearly governs *ahyàḥ* ‘fertile cows’ in its immediate vicinity; I suggest that it can also be taken with the fem. acc. pl.s in c, *apāḥ* and quite possibly *uśāsaḥ*, and that the *ca* in d signals this conjoining. All three are multiforms, as it were, of the females released from the Vala cave; see 2a. What then does *dāṃsāya-* mean (assuming its connection to the ‘wondrous power’ words)? In the publ. tr. I render it “exerted your wondrous power”; in the *-āya-* book “made capable (of bearing).” I see no way to decide, but I would now allow the second interpr. as an alternative.

As for *kútsāya mánman*, we should start by pointing out (with HPS 146) that Kutsa is out of place here, since he has no part in the Vala myth ordinarily. In the publ. intro. I suggest (or hint) that he’s being kept in reserve, as it were, for vs. 3, the theft of the wheel of the Sun, in which myth Kutsa regularly figures. Lü (/HPS) think that the thought is Indra’s, on behalf of Kutsa (Lü: “im Gedenken für Kutsa”; HPS same except “an Kutsa”), but Old asserts that *mánman-* is almost always that of a human and so it should not be Indra’s thought. Here I think the *mánman-* is Kutsa’s product, a hymn or sim. for Indra, and in response Indra then acts on his behalf.

X.138.2: This vs. continues the account of the Vala myth, here with Indra the dominant actor.

Note that of the five parallel verbs in abc, only one, *śvañcāyaḥ* (a), is unaugmented.

The “fecund females” (*prasvāḥ*) in pāda a are, in my opinion, all three feminines from 1c, the dawns, the waters, the fertile cows – different designations for the beings imprisoned in the Vala cave.

The sticking point in this sequence of 2nd sg. actions is the referent of *asya* in c. One expects the wondrous power to be Indra’s, esp. after reciting his series of wondrous deeds, but I know of no instances where *asya* (vel sim.) has 2nd ps. reference. Since *asya* is unaccented, it should refer to something already in the discourse. Ge (n. 2c) suggests either soma (b) or the sun (d); Lü (519) opts for the sun. I’d prefer not to have a referent that follows, even as closely as pāda d, and think soma is much likelier on other grounds as well. The publ. tr. reflects what I now think is an over-complex and artificial interpr., that *vanín-* ‘wooden’ refers to the wooden cups Indra drinks soma from, and by soma’s power he strengthened them. I now see that there’s a simpler and more satisfying solution, found already in my *-āya-* book (p. 83 n. 10), that Indra did all these deeds (not only the one in c, but those in the first hemistich) through (soma’s) wondrous power: that is, as usual, drinking soma gave Indra the strength and skill to perform his great deeds. I would now substitute the tr. “you released the fecund females (etc.) ... you made the trees grow – by its (=soma’s) wondrous power.”

X.138.3: The last three pādas belong together, as an account of Indra's defeat of Pipru for R̥jīśvan, but the relevance of pāda a is unclear. However, the stealing of the sun's wheel and the defeat of Pipru are found together elsewhere (see, e.g., IV.16.12–13).

The Ārya is R̥jīśvan, the Dāsa Pipru, and it is Indra who's the "match" (*pratimānam*).

X.138.4: The problem in this vs. is localized at the beginning of c, *māsēva sūryaḥ*. What the sun and moon are doing here is unclear, made harder to interpr. by the lack of scholarly agreement on the form of 'moon'. See Old's disc. As it stands, it must be *māsā* and an instr., but Ge (n. 4c) wants to see it as irreg. sandhi for gen. **māsās iva* "wie die Sonne (den Glanz) des Mondes," which requires too much machinery and doesn't match any known myth. Better to accept the sandhi form we have and take the instr. moon as parallel to the likewise instr. "flashing (weapon)" (*virūmatā*) at the end of the pāda. Although a myth in which the sun uses the moon as a weapon is also unknown, it doesn't require altering the text.

X.138.5: Like *daśasyān* and *riṇān* in 1c, *dāśat* in c could be either a 3rd sg. injunc. (accented because it opens the pāda) or a nom. sg. m. pres. part., although there is less riding on the decision than in 1c, since Indra is the subj. in either case. I opt for the part. (so Old) – Gr and Ge for the finite verb.

X.138.6: On the obscure contents of this vs. and their possible relationship to vss. 3–4, see publ. intro.

X.139 Sūrya

On the links between this hymn and the immed. preceding one (X.138) see publ. intro. I do not understand the contents of the hymn and will not try to explain its larger purpose.

X.139.1: The tr. of the bahuvrīhis *sūryaraśmiḥ* and *hārikeśaḥ* by "with" make them sound like instr.; to clarify, better "Savitar, having the rays of the sun and golden hair ..."

X.139.2–4: Note the emphasis on sight and visual survey: 2a, 3b *nṛcākṣāḥ*, 2c *abhī caṣṭe*, 4b *dadṛśúṣīḥ*, 4d *pāri ... apaśyat*.

X.139.2: The referents of the two fem. pl.s in c, *viśvācīḥ* and *ghṛtācīḥ*, is unclear and disputed. Since the latter, 'facing towards ghee', is obviously the more semantically limited, it seems best to determine its referent and go from there. The first alternative in the publ. tr., "mares," is based on VII.60.3 *harītaḥ ... ghṛtācīḥ*, in a hymn to Sūrya and Mitra-Varuṇa, in a vs. also concerning visually surveying the world. Re supplies "sacrificial ladles" (my 2nd alt.) on the grounds of VIII.44.5 *juhvaḥ ... ghṛtācīḥ*, see also VII.43.2–3, where 'ladles' is obviously to be supplied and they are characterized as *ghṛtācīḥ* (2b) and (sg.) *viśvācī* (3c). In the sg. *ghṛtācī-* regularly refers to the ladle (see Gr's def. 3). There are other possibilities: Lü (539) supplies "quarters, directions" (*dīśaḥ*, already Sāy., Gr), which better fits the cosmic context here, but requires a metaphorical stretch (which, as always, Lü is ready to make). Unfortunately there are no parallels. Ge (see n. 2c) weakly prefers *dhīyaḥ* 'thoughts'; see I.2.7 *dhīyaṃ ghṛtācīm* and, with a synonym, VII.5.5 *gīraḥ ... ghṛtācīḥ*. The presence of *dhīyaḥ* in 5d (twice) might support his choice. I do not find any of these suggestions particularly compelling, though I would now downgrade 'mares' and add 'quarters' as the preferred alt.

X.139.3: On *samará-* see comm. ad VI.9.2.

X.139.4: I have no idea what is going on in this vs. For an elaborate account see Lü (539–41), who thinks it deals with Indra finding the sun, aided by the Gandharva. See also Ge’s extensive notes.

X.139.5: On the precative *avyās* see comm. ad II.38.10.

X.139.6: This vs. presents a reassuringly recognizable account of the opening of the Vala cave (at least in b) and has echoes of the first vss. of the previous hymn, X.138.

X.140 Agni

On the varied meter of the hymn, see publ. intro.

X.140.2: The first pāda is striking with its three bahuvrīhis with *-varcas-*. It is also two syllables too long; I wonder if this an iconic overkill reflection of the 1st member of the final compd, *ánūna-* ‘without lack/deficiency’.

Although act. *íyarti* is usually transitive, there are some intrans. exx., like IV.45.1 adduced by Ge (n. 2b). Two close parallels with transitive forms give me pause: X.37.4 *jágac ca víśvam udiyārṣi bhānúnā*, X.75.3 *śúśmám úd iyarti bhānúnā*. However, in the absence of any obvious thing to supply, best to accept intrans. sense.

The “two mothers” in c are most likely Heaven and Earth, given the cosmic contents of the flg. pāda. But in an Agni context the two kindling sticks are always a possibility, esp. with Agni identified as *putráḥ*. (And both, of course, could be meant.)

In d *prṇákṣi* would be better rendered ‘pervade’ or ‘permeate’, to distinguish it from a form of *√prā*. However, the matching form in 4d cannot be interpr. that way.

X.140.3: In b *hitáh* is ambiguous; it can be the ppl. of both *√dhā* and *√hi* and in this case is surely meant to be read as both.

In cd the distribution of nominals is unclear. Although *íśaḥ* could be the nom. subj., it is much more likely to be the acc. obj., with “gods” as subj., on the basis of Ge’s parallels (n. 3cd) I.80.15, VII.82.2. *citrótaḥ* must be nom. pl. and therefore modify the gods (if they are indeed the subj.), but *bhūri-varpaḥ* and *vāmájātāḥ* can be either nom. pl. (masc.) or acc. pl. fem. I take both as modifying *íśaḥ*. III.53.1 *vāmîr íśaḥ* “precious nourishments” supports a connection of *vāmá-* and *íś-*, and the *vāmá-* / *íś-* nexus in 5c is even stronger evidence. The fact that *bhūri vāmám* is a fixed phrase (I.33.3, etc.) may attract *bhūri-varpas-* into the orbit. Others distribute them differently: Gr takes both as nom. pl. m. as does Re; in his tr. Ge takes *bhūri-varpas-* with *íśaḥ*, but *vāmájātāḥ* with the subj. (though see his uncertainty in n. 3c). In fact, the distribution matters little.

X.140.4: Note *iraj-* (a) : *ví rāj-* (c).

I interpr. *prathayasva* as a real medial causative, with reflexive sense: “cause yourself to be extended.”

Note *prṇákṣi*, which matches the same form in 2d; see comm. there on the difference in meaning.

X.140.5: Most of this vs. is couched in the acc., but the acc. phrases in ab and cd have distinct referents: while cd describes the various good things Agni establishes, the accusatives in ab must refer to Agni himself. This hemistich is syntactically untethered: there is no verb to govern the acc.s in ab. Old suggests that the phrase anticipates 6b *agním ... dadhire purāḥ*, and I have adopted this solution.

On *īṣ* √ *kṛ*, see comm. ad VII.76.2. As I say there, though *īṣ* behaves like a pseudo-preverb in this lexeme, its source is probably the noun *īṣ*- ‘refreshment, nourishment’, and here that sense still (or again) seems to be present. Note *īṣam* in c as well as *īṣaḥ* prominent in 3c.

X.140.6: *sapráthastama*- echoes 4a *prathayasva*.

X.141 All Gods

X.141.1–2: The opening of 1c, *prá no yacha*, is picked up by 2a *prá no yachatu*, and the four repeated *prá*-s in b and c prolong the idiom with a series of different gods. But 2d introduces a new verb, *dadātu*, which responds to 1d (*dhana*-)*dāḥ*.

X.141.3–4: These two vss. are likewise structured by a shared verb, *havāmahe* (3b, 4b) here with a series of objects.

X.141.5–6: Here the shared verbal expression is *dānāya codaya* (5b, 6d). Its construction varies, however: in 5 the obj.s of *codaya*/ subj.s of the infinitive are in the acc. (*aryamāṇam* ...), but in 6 the obj./subj. has been attracted into the dat. (*devātātaye*) to match the infinitive (as often). So also Old and Ge.

X.142 Agni

On the structure of the hymn, see publ. intro. Since it is found in a group of six-vs. hymns, it is two vss. too long. But the last two vss., in dimeter meter, appear to be an appended charm.

Preverbs/nominal prefixes are esp. prominent and effectively deployed in this hymn. The sharp contrast between aggressively active *úd* ‘up’ and gently settling *ní* ‘down’ is found several times (4a, 5d [extra *ní* in b], 6c [extra *úd*-s in 6ab]), with the calming charm having further *ní*-s in 7ab. See also the *prá*-s in 2a, c, 4b, d, and the *ānu*-s of 4c, 5cd (supplied in 5b), as well as the contrastive *ā*- and *parā*- in 8a.

X.142.1: This vs. contains two forms of accented *ásti* (b, c). The first is existential, as overt forms of the 3rd sg. pres. to √ *as* generally are, since it is ordinarily gapped in copular usage. However, the form in c does appear to be the copula; an existential interpr. – “for there exists auspicious shelter of [=from] you ...” – can be constructed but seems artificial. Here accent is the crucial factor; as I demonstrated in my 1990 “Tense of the Predicated Past Participle in Vedic” (IJ 33), pp. 4–5, accented 3rd sg. pres. copulas are optionally allowed.

Re points out the phonological play in the final words of a and b: *āpī*#, *āpīyam*#,

X.142.2: There is no agreement about the etymology, morphology, meaning, or even the length of final vowel of *sācī*. See KEWA and EWA, both s.v. *sākām*, Gr, Old, Re (EVP XIV.99), and

the use of the simile particle (*sācīva*) may signal a certain vagueness on the part of the composer. For want of a clear alternative, I follow the (K)EWA line and connect it with *sākām* ‘at once, all together’, though I have no particular confidence in this interpr.

X.142.3: The sense of *utá ... utá* is not clear. Ge “bald ... bald”; Re “tantôt ... tantôt”; JSK (DGRV I.456) “sometimes ... at other times.” But JSK gives no other exx. of this usage, and I do not see why it’s not merely additive “and ... and” – as if in a somewhat breathless play-by-play.

The lexeme *pāri √ vrj* usually has the idiomatic sense ‘avoid’, a development of its literal sense ‘twist/bend around’. Although the other tr. (Ge, Old, Re, Th [Gedichte], JSK [DGRV I.456]) take the verb in its idiomatic sense here (‘spare, avoid’), I think the literal one works better: the forest fire takes a twisting and unpredictable course putting all vegetation at risk – rather than sometimes sparing trees and bushes, sometimes not.

X.142.4: More phonological, morphological, and etymological echoes: *udvát-*, *nivát-* flg. *pravát* in 2a; then b *pṛthag pragardh-*, c *vāto ... -vāti*, d *vápṭeva ... vapasi*.

X.142.5: The other tr. (Ge, Re, Th) take b as containing two parallel phrases in the nom.: “one downward course, many chariots” – presumably referring to the single fire with its many flames. I prefer to take *ékam niyānam* as an acc. of extent, supplying *ānu* found in c and d (and 4c), but I would certainly allow the alternative.

Another echo: b *bahávo ... c bāhū*. It seems a bit strange that a raging forest fire would have only two arms (i.e., branching divisions), but the bodily metaphor may have overridden the physical image.

X.142.6: As indicated in the publ. tr., this vs. abruptly returns us from the forest fire to the ritual fire, which, however, shows the same type of intense movement as the forest fire.

There are several different ways to interpr. b, particularly the referent of *śāśamānāsya*. Because of the *úd* that opens the pāda, repeating the two *úd*-s of pāda a, the skeletal structure of b seems clear (to me): the verb *jihatām* should be supplied from pāda a, and the nom. *vājāḥ* is grammatically parallel to *súṣmāḥ* and *arcīḥ* in pāda a, though it does not belong to the same semantic realm as the other two, which describe Agni’s physical characteristics. These assumptions about the structure of b are not shared by all other tr. Ignoring the repeated *úd*, Ge simply supplies a different verb “(sollen) ... (kommen),” presumably in tacit recognition of the different semantics of *vājāḥ* (“Belohnungen” for him). Th replicates the structure, but alters the sense of *vājāḥ* to “Kräfte” to accord better with the nominatives in pāda a. Only Re keeps both the structure and the usual sense of *vāja*:- “Que tes crépitements éclatent haut, haute la flamme, hauts tes prix-de-victoire ...” All (incl. Gr) take *śāśamānāsya* to be coreferent with *te*, referring to Agni, who is performing his ritual labors. This is certainly possible. But in contrast I think it refers to the human officiant. Although *śāśamānā-* can modify Agni (e.g., X.11.5), more often it qualifies the human laboring *for* Agni. See, e.g., I.141.10 *tvám agne śāśamānāya sunvaté, rátnam ... invasi* “You, o Agni, impel treasure ... to the man who labors and presses soma,” where Agni rewards the human ritualist. I think the same situation is depicted here: the prizes are for the *śāśamānā-*, and the *te* is a dat. to be construed with that part. The attendance of the Vasus in d provides a parallel set of officiants from the divine world.

X.142.7–8: In both these vss. *samudrā-* should be tr. ‘gathered waters’ vel sim., rather than ‘sea’, since in both cases (but esp. 8) the scene is a lushly watered landscape, not the boundary between land and a large body of water. I’d now substitute “here the settling down of the gathered waters” and “these are the homes of the gathered waters.”

X.142.7: Here the wild fire is deflected away from the peaceful place of waters.

Init. *anyám* is a good example of my rule of placement for *anyá-*: indefinite forms take initial position.

X.143 Aśvins

See publ. intro. on the contents of the hymn and the identity of its poet.

X.143.1: Old is esp. insightful on this vs., often flg. Baunack.

The first hemistich is couched in the acc. but lacks a verb to govern the acc. phrase. Various verbs have been suggested, but the most likely semantically, and the easiest to implement, is to borrow the verb from cd ($\sqrt{kṛ}$) or indeed the whole verb phrase (*návam* $\sqrt{kṛ}$) (so, more or less, Old, alt. for Re). “Make new” → “make young” fits nicely with *ṛtajúram*, which probably means ‘grown old in/by truth’ (see Scar 164) and may well refer to growing old in ritual labor, as we find, for ex., in the Agastya-Lopāmudrā hymn, I.179 (sugg. by Old). Although it would be possible just to supply a form of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ to govern the inf., as a periphrastic caus., “make Atri to drive ...,” context favors the fuller VP.

I take *yádī* in c not as ‘if’, with final-vowel lengthening, but as yet another ex. of my **yádī* “when him ...” (“Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*,” Fs. Cardona, 2002).

This allusion to “making Kaksīvant [the well-known poet of I.116–26] new” is supposedly supported by I.51.13 (so Ge, n. 1cd, flg. Baunack), though that passage is not all that supportive: it simply states that Indra gave K. a little female named Vṛcayā. As Ge also points out, however, the real comparandum is with Cyavāna, whom the Aśvins definitely rejuvenate in V.74.5, X.39.4 (etc.).

X.143.2: This vs. is quite problematic both in syntax and in contents, and a number of different solutions have been suggested; my interpr. differs from all of them. What we have to hold onto is the fact that vss. 1 and 2 begin the same way, 1ab *tyám cid átrim ... áśvam ná ...*, 2a *tyám cid áśvam ná ...*, both with an acc. phrase with no verb to govern it and a comparison to a horse. I therefore avail myself of the same strategy I used in vs. 1, to supply the verb for ab from cd – in this case *vī syatam* ‘untie, unloose’.

The referent of *areṇávaḥ* ‘dustless’ is unclear; Gr, Old, Ge, and Re opt for ‘gods’, which seems to me to create more problems than it solves. (Moreover, though the Maruts are once so identified, the gods themselves are not.) Of the eight occurrences of *areṇú-*, two modify ‘paths’ (I.35.11, 163.6) and one (VI.62.6, an Aśvin hymn) a measure of distance, *yójana-*. In all three passages the adj. ‘dustless’ signifies the ease of travel: note the presence of *sugá-* ‘easy to go (on)’ in I.35.11 and I.163.6. I supply paths here as well: the dustless paths stretching towards the unloosed horse are an image of the open road, promising a journey without obstacles or discomforts.

In d I supply ‘stretch’ as well, to govern *rājaḥ* (so, more or less, Ge’s 2d, though not reflected in his tr.), though now I think a more neutral verb like ‘travel, drive’ (from *yāṭave* in 1b) might be better.

X.143.3: The expression *átraye ... sísāsataṃ dhíyaḥ* has given interpr. fits, because (they think) the Aśvins should not be winning insights for Atri; rather *his* insights should themselves win, as in the immed. preceding hymn, X.142.2 *prá saniṣanta no dhíyaḥ* and (if *dhíyam* is to be supplied there) in our 5d. This has led to some over-complex and awkward tr., like Scar’s (531) “... wünscht dem Atri, dass seine Dichtungen den Sieg davon tragen,” where the desiderative feature of *sísāsataṃ* is attributed to the Aśvins, but the “winning” feature to the insights, a functional split that I don’t think is grammatically legitimate. I think we can take the syntax at face value: the Aśvins are trying to jumpstart Atri’s poetic powers by supplying him with some insights to work with. The gods regularly give *dhî-* to their praisers; see, e.g., VIII.86.2, where the Aśvins *dhíyaṃ dadathuḥ*; X.64.12, where an array of gods ... *me dhíyam ... ádadāta*.

In c although *divó narā* doesn’t have the expected (lack of) accent for a voc. phrase, it surely should be taken as such. See Ge (n. 3c); Old disc. at length and favors splitting *diváḥ* off from the voc. and construing with the rest of the hemistich, though without figuring out exactly how.

The dat. inf. *viśāse* is universally taken to *ví√śams*, a lexeme that barely exists (despite the many many occurrences of the root *√śams*). Of the two occurrences identified by Gr., only VIII.1.1 *ví śamsata* is a certain example (though with an uncertain sense and a likely nonce creation; see comm. ad loc.); III.39.2 #*ví ... śasyámānā*# would show tmesis in a participle, which is not common, and the *ví* seems to add nothing and is ignored by tr. I suggest our infinitive actually belongs to *ví√śas* ‘carve up’, attested in *viśāsana-*, (*a-*)*viśastár-*, and the finite form *ví śasta*. (This root affiliation is explicitly rejected by Old, but with no grounds given.) The sense here is that if the Aśvins help Atri gain poetic insights, the praise-song (*stóma-*) he produces for them will not have to be carved up and parcelled out.

X.143.4: Ge considers *sádane* and *sámāne* to be contrastive, with the first referring to the seat of the sacrifice and the second to contest or battle. However, *sámana-* is often an assembly or festive gathering, and I take this rhyming pair here as referring to parts of the sacrifice to which the Aśvins are bringing the poet and his colleagues.

X.143.5: On the basis of VII.67.5 Ge (fld. by Re) supplies *dhíyam* with the periphr. caus. *sātáye kṛtam*. The expression here would contrast with the one in 3ab; see above.

X.143.6: Though Ge follows Sāy. in supply “kings” as the referent of the simile *śamyū íva*, I prefer the suggestion he floats in his n. 6ab, that it should rather be “parents” as in IV.41.7 *mámhiṣṭhā pitāreva śambhū*.

X.144 Indra

A metrically varied hymn, which, *pace* the Anukr., mostly focuses on soma, not Indra. Indra’s name appears only once in the hymn, a nom. in 6a, and he is otherwise represented by two occurrences of the oblique enclitic *te* (1a, 5a) (and possibly the voc. *sukrato* in 6c), about as uninsistent a presence as it is possible to have. The two occurrences of *indu-* ‘drop’ (1a, 6a) also evoke Indra phonologically but of course refer to soma.

Some patterns: hemistich-init. *ayám* 1a, 2a, 2c, picked up by vs-init. *yám* 4a, 5a; pāda-init. *enā* 5c, d, *evā* 6a. Also, *viśvāyuh* 1c is answered by *ví tāry āyu(h)* in 5c, 6c.

X.144.1–2: I take vs. 1 as implicitly subordinated to vs. 2ab, because of the *hí*(1a).

X.144.2: For ab Ge appositely cites as parallel IX.87.3 *ṛbhúr dhîra uśānā kāvyaena* “an insightful craftsman [Ṛbhu], Uśānā by (his) poetic skill.” This passage in fact helps solve an (unacknowledged) problem in our vs. The Pp. reads *kāvyaḥ* here, thus a nom. sg. masc. adjectival form of initially accented *kāvya-*, rendered by Ge as “dieser Seherische.” The problem is that *kāvya-* is otherwise only a neut. noun, “poetic skill/art”; the adjectival form is suffix-accented *kāvya-*. Note that in IX.87.3 the root-accented neut. is in the instr. I suggest that here we should read loc. *kāvye*, against the Pp., and, like the instr. in IX.87.3, it is specifying the realm in which the craftsman operates.

There are numerous, sometimes fanciful, interpr. of the bahuvrīhi *ūrdhvā-kṛśana-*, which also furnishes the Anukr. with an alternate name of the poet of the hymn. I am partial to my own: that the “pearls” are the bubbles on the surface of and above the exhilarating drink.

X.144.3–5: These vss. relate, in allusive fashion, the theft of soma from heaven by the falcon. The vss. are difficult to interpr. in places but contain striking images. Needless to say, in various places I go my own interpretational way.

X.144.3: The vs. depicts Soma amid the heavenly fortresses awaiting the falcon to carry him away and looking down from heaven towards earth, the goal of the journey.

The unidentified fem. pl. *āsú svāsu* “among his own (females)” has no clear referent. The default is, as usual for fem. plurals, “cows,” and this would make sense, given that Soma is called a *vāmsaga-* (on which word, see comm. ad X.102.7). But the scenario just sketched suggests another, narratively appropriate, interpr., already raised by Ge (n. 3b): “fortresses” (*pūrṣú*). The stem *pūr-* is of course feminine, and in IV.27, with IV.26 the locus classicus for the RVic Somaraub myth, Soma announces in the first vs. that “a hundred metal fortresses guarded me” (*śatām mā pūra āyasīḥ arakṣann*). Thus the image in b sets up a conceptual tension: Soma is depicted both as a virile bull situated in the middle of his cow-harem, as it were, but also as a helpless hostage surrounded by fortifications. These same fortresses are, in my view, also represented in the next vs., 4c, in the bahuvrīhi *śatā-cakram* ‘hundred-wheeled’.

On *ahī-sū-* see comm. ad VIII.32.2 and Scar 538–39. Contra the standard tr., who take the stem as the name of demon(s), I give it a full lexical tr. ‘swelling like X’. (Scar splits the difference: the name of a demon, derived from a lexical reading.) The question is whether the first member is based on *āhi-* ‘snake’ with final lengthening or *ahī-* ‘fertile cow’. For the three passages in VIII (32.2, 26; 77.2) I favor the former; here I think both may be available. The question is – what is Soma looking down (*áva dīdhet*) upon? A possible answer immed. arises from the scenario sketched above: Soma is in heaven looking downward in hopes of spotting the falcon on its journey upward; what he will see is clouds – which can be imagined as “puffing up like snakes: (specifically cobras with their hoods) and/or “swelling like fertile cows” – either/both displaying the puffy curvy contours of clouds seen from above.

X.144.4: The final pāda (c) of this vs. is very difficult; in fact Ge does not tr. it after the first word. It is also metrically problematic: as transmitted it has 9 syllables. This could be raised to 12, with a fine Jagatī cadence by reading *ahīyo avartanīḥ*, that is, restoring the *a-* elided by the Saṃhitā text and distracting the *-hy-* cluster of *’hyò* and assuming an initial **a-* on *vartanīḥ*,

elided without marking in the Saṃhitā text (a solution favored by Old). Whether these manipulations are worth it – esp. the last one – is unclear.

In any case I take acc. *śatācakram* as continuing the acc. phrase of ab, referring to Soma. As noted in the immed. preceding vs., I think “having a hundred wheels” is another reference to the fortresses surrounding Soma in heaven. Recall that acdg. to IV.27.1 there are a hundred metal fortresses guarding Soma. I take the ‘wheels’ are referring to the roughly circular shape of the fortifications.

The rest of c, *yò ‘hyò vartanīh* I take as a nominal *izafe*-like cl., also referring to Soma. Whether to read *vartanīh* or **avartanīh* (see above) is hard to determine, because neither reading yields a lot of sense. The publ. tr. follows the Saṃhitā text. Cows regularly follow *vartanī-* (III.7.2, X.65.6, X.172.1, 4); identifying Soma as a *vartanī-* for a fertile cow might be an allusion to the mixing of milk with soma in the ritual, which is often depicted as cows racing to join the bull Soma. A negated **avartanīh*, though metrically better, is initially harder to interpr. Perhaps, with ref. to *ahīśvāh* in the previous vs., if that means “(clouds) swelling like fertile cows,” it indicates that, while still confined in the 100 fortresses, Soma “had no track through the fertile cows [=clouds]” (with *ahyāh* acc. pl., not gen. sg.). I suggest this as an alt. tr., for which I now have a mild preference.

X.144.5: On *ándhas-* as ‘soma stalk’ (not the “Saft” as Ge tr. here), see comm. ad IV.1.19. Here I take *ándhasah* as a subjective gen.: “the stalk (*ándhas*) houses (the juice),” not “X houses the *ándhas*.”

On the final pāda, see publ. intro.: I think the “family tie” is that between men and gods, kept in working order by the sacrifice.

X.144.6: Ge (n. 6ab) considers the *māhi tyājah* as a reference to the enmity between the young Indra and the other gods at the time of the soma theft or the enmity with Tvaṣṭṛ because of Viśvarūpa, translating “So mag ... Indra diese grosse Feindschaft selbst unter dem Göttern auf sich nehmen.” But this doesn’t make sense in an otherwise upbeat ending, and the backstory to enable such an allusion is nowhere to be seen. Moreover, *tyājas-* doesn’t mean “Feindschaft,” but “surrender, abandonment; legacy.” I take it instead as one of the first instances of the later notion of sacrifice as *tyāga*, the “surrender” to the gods of men’s offerings. The sentiment seems to follow directly on 5d, and point out that Indra is taking the oblation, which is the symbol for the family connection between gods and men, and fixing it up among the gods – for his sake as well, since *dhārayāte* is middle.

I do not understand the abl. *asmāt*, though perhaps it hints at the “surrender” just noted: the oblation produced by us is separated from us by Indra’s appropriation of it.

X.145 Against co-wives

This hymn is found, more or less identically, in AVŚ III.18 and, in part but also much expanded, in AVP VII.12. See Griffiths’s full treatment of the latter.

X.145.2: On *kuru* see comm. ad X.51.7.

X.145.4: Ge (flg. Sāy. and fld. by Don) takes the husband as the subj. of b and the co-wife the ref. of *asmín ... jāne*: “und nicht hängt er an dieser Person,” for reasons that are not clear to me.

Old is of my opinion, and see AVŚ III.18.3 *nó asmín ramase pátau* “you do not rest by this husband,” addressed to the co-wife.

I do not know who the 1st pl. subj. of *gamayāmasi* is; it obviously includes the wife-speaker and possibly the plant, but in the next vs. (5c) the first dual is used for wife+plant: *sahāvahai*.

X.145.6: On *abhí√dhā* as ‘harness’, see *abhíhita-* V.50.4, X.85.11.

X.146 Lady of the Wilderness (*Aranyānī*)

On the contents and tone of the hymn, see publ. intro. There are numerous tr. (inter alia, Macd (VRS and Hymns from the RV), Re (Hymnes spec.), Don, Mau, Th (Fs. Kuiper), van Buitenen (Intro. to transl. of MBh 3), Gerow (Lits. of India). I cannot engage with the details of them all.

The hymn contains a number of apparently pleonastic *iva*-s (1b, d, 2c, 3a, b, d), some of which show the aphoresis found also in Middle Indic. The pluti in 1d is another sign of informal register.

X.146.1: On *grāma-* see comm. ad X.27.19. Certainly in this passage it is used as the complete opposite of the *āraṇya-* and whether it refers to a permanent settlement in the RV or (per Rau) not, the implication here is that it offers the safety and domestic stability of a village, in contrast to the wilderness.

X.146.2: The identities of the *ṛṣṣāravā-* and the *ciccikā-*, beyond probably being animals that make noise, is up for grabs, and many possibilities have been floated. The point, however, is clear: the wilderness is full of alarming noises that serve as a sort of intimidating accompaniment to the progress of the Lady of the Wilderness herself.

X.146.3: I follow Th (who is fld by Don) in taking c as parenthetical. The speaker has reconfigured (or is trying to) the alarming noises and sights of vs. 2 to domestic ones, appropriate to the village. But in c the *Aranyānī* still looms. The other course, taken by most tr., is to assume that the *Aranyānī* herself “creaks like a cart,” which I find unlikely.

X.146.4: The speaker’s attempt to domestic the noises around him continues here, until the stark announcement “(something) has shrieked!”

X.146.5: Macd, Th, and Don take *Aranyānī* as the subj. of cd. This is poss., but I find it psychologically more compelling to assume that the nervous speaker has finally made his peace with the wilderness and gives himself over to its pleasures.

X.146.6: A formal *praśasti* (*prā ... aśamsiṣam*) ends the hymn.

X.147–148

Although these two hymns to Indra are attributed to two different poets and are stylistically varied, they share some themes and some lexicon, in particular a fondness for the root *√kan* ‘take pleasure’: 147.3a, 4a; 148.1c, 3b, 4c.

X.147 Indra

X.147.1: I take bcd all as *yád* clauses detailing examples of Indra's effective *manyú-*. Ge parcels them out into a series of subord. and main clauses, but this seems inelegant.

We should expect **āpaḥ* in b, rather than *apāḥ*, which should be the acc. pl. of 'waters'; see the same problem in X.76.3 and the comm. thereon. In our passage the association of Vṛtra with (the release of) the waters might have led to a redactional misunderstanding and accent shift.

X.147.2: Ge (n. 2d) believes that *viśvāsu hávyāsv iṣṭiṣu* stands for *viśvāsu *hávyam iṣṭiṣu* and should be tr. "to be called upon at all sacrifices," with *hávyā-* belonging to *√hū* 'call', not *√hu* 'pour, libate'. Although *hávyā-* (so accented) does ordinarily mean 'to be called', as opposed to *havyā-* 'oblation', there are other exx. of *hávyā-* that can or do belong to *√hu* and ambiguity is inherent in this stem. And in any case I believe we should tr. the text we have, not the one we wish we had. In fact, it seems quite likely that in this passage the poet is playing off less common homonyms of common lexical items. Our root-accented *iṣṭi-* belongs to *√yaj* 'sacrifice', but this form is quite rare (and may be found with suffix accent in II.1.9; see comm. there), esp. in contrast to *iṣṭi-* 'desire, quest', which is found in the immediately preceding pāda in the same pāda-final position in *gāviṣṭiṣu* 'quests for cattle'. The poet surely meant the contrast, esp. given a third rhyming pāda-final form in 3c *pāriṣṭiṣu* 'in encirclements' (to a different lexeme, *pāri* *√as*). In this playful context, *hávyā-* to *√hu* rather than the usual *√hū* would simply add to the joke – amplified by calling Indra *puruhūta* 'much invoked' in the next pāda (3a).

X.147.4: I take this vs. as spelling out the reciprocal policy between Indra and mortals: a man who realizes that Indra has to be sacrificed to and, esp., provided with soma will acquire the bounty that Indra has to distribute (as described in 3b). The reciprocity is signalled lexically by the complementary forms *cākandhi* (subj. = Indra, 3a) and *cākanat* (subj. = mortal, 4a).

In b I see *mādam ... asya rāṁhyam* as a type of indirect discourse with *cīkatati* "will realize (that ...)," with the gerundive *rāṁhya-* predicated of *mādam* and *asya* referring to Indra: "his exhilaration is to be hastened" – i.e., soma should be offered forthwith. Ge's interpr. is quite diff.: "der sich auf seinen eiligen Rausch versteht." As far as I can tell, Ge thinks that *asya* refers to the mortal subject (though his tr. is ambig.), but in an Indra context the default would be Indra's *māda-*.

X.147.5: This vs. seems to situate Indra among other gods, mostly by indirection. In pāda a *śārdhāya* may refer to the "troop" of us mortals, esp. the patrons in vs. 3, but since *śārdha-* and *śārdhas-* often refer specifically to the Maruts, they would be available to the audience by association. Mitra and Varuṇa are present in c, though the former is also used as the common noun 'ally', and the latter is in a simile. In d *vibhaktā* evokes Bhaga (see V.46.6).

X.148 Indra

Old sees a special relationship between this hymn and II.11, esp. the penchant for a trisyllabic reading of *īndra-*. And vs. 2 contains two pādas (b, c) identical to II.11.4d, 5a.

X.148.1: The accent on *stumási* is surprising, since it appears to be a main clause verb. Old (ZDMG 60.726 [=KlSch. 201]) explains it by taking ab as the Grundlage of the *ā no bhara* clause

in c, but this seems ad hoc. I think rather that the accent is indirectly generated by the two perfect participles, *suṣvāṇāśaḥ ... sasavāṁsaś ca*, which bracket the finite verb. The two participles depict two different occasions for praising Indra: at the sacrifice and after victory in a battle/contest. A fuller expression would be “After having pressed soma we praise you, and also after having won the prize, (we praise you).” Therefore *stumāsi* is effectively doubled and the accent is contrastive (with its gapped self).

The construction in c is more complex than it appears, at least in my view. In the rel. cl. *yāsya* would seem to have a straightforward antecedent, *suvitām* – hence “bring us well-being in which you take pleasure” (so essentially Ge). But this is somewhat incoherent as a wish: why would Indra bring *us* something *he* particularly enjoys? It also doesn’t conform with the usage of \sqrt{kan} in these two hymns. When Indra is subject of \sqrt{kan} (X.147.3, 148.4), what he takes pleasure in is mortal worshipers: e.g., 147.3 *aīṣu cākandhī ... sūrīṣu* “take pleasure in these patron” – though in both instances the complement is in the loc. I therefore think *yāsya* must refer to a ritualist favored by Indra, one among our (*naḥ*) number. As for the gen., this may be a mixed construction: a gen. would work for the recipient of the main cl. (“bring X for him [gen.]” and has been carried over into the rel. cl., where a loc. would be better.

X.148.2: As noted above, bc = II.11.4d, 5a. The pāda II.11.5a refers to Vṛtra, as is clear from the rest of the vs. But most tr. (see Bl’s [RR] comments ad II.11.4–5 in addition to Ge, JSK [DGRV II.189]) take our c pāda with d and assume that “the one placed in hiding” is soma. (The pāda is also found in III.39.6, with unclear referent – maybe sun/light; see comm. ad loc.) In contrast I link pāda c with b, not d, which allows the acc. phrase in c to be a second obj. of *sahyāḥ* (though I supply a past indicative form of \sqrt{sah} for c), with the referent Vṛtra as in II.11.5. Bl splits the difference: he takes c with d, but considers it a ref. to Vṛtra (or a demon) – tr. “we hold (the demon) who is hidden in the waters like soma in a prasrávaṇa (pitcher?).” This doesn’t have much to recommend it. It is also possible that c has double reference – both looking backwards to b, with Vṛtra as reference, and forwards to d, with soma as referent. The soma “hidden in water” would then be the soma plant as it is swelled with water before pressing. There are also a couple of other possibilities for c. It could be a reference to the well-known myth (see esp. X.51–53) in which Agni runs away from his ritual duties and hides in the waters, before being found by the gods. If Agni is the referent, “we” would be bringing the two crucial requisites for the sacrifice: fire and soma. It is also worth considering X.72.7 *átrā samudrá ā gūḍhám, ā sūryam ajabhartana* “then you brought here the sun, which was hidden in the sea,” where it’s the sun, hidden in a type of water, that is brought – although I find it hard to fit the sun into our context. If either of the last two alternates is selected, the tr. of *bibhṛmāsi* should be changed from ‘offer’ to ‘bring/bear’.

X.148.3: The syntax of this vs. is a little loose – beginning with the *vā*, which is not in a clear disjunctive structure. JSK (DGRV II.188–89) suggests apropos 2–3ab that *vā* “conjoins nearly parallel interstanzaic modal clauses interrupted by an intervening indicative clause.” The “nearly parallel ... modal[s]” are 2b opt. *sahyāḥ* and 3a impv. *arca*, which don’t seem all that parallel to me; the intervening indicative clause is 2cd. I think rather that the disjunction signalled by *vā* is conceptual: the difference between Indra as martial hero (vs. 2), as esp. exemplified by the Vṛtra battle (2c by my interpr.), and Indra as the priestly hero of the Vala myth (3ab). This conceptual division corresponds to the one in 1ab, between the ritual and martial circumstances for praising Indra.

The *aryāḥ* opening pāda a is most likely a gen. dependent on *gírah*; cf. I.112.14 *aryó gírah*. The question is the identity of the *arí-*. Ge (n. 3a) suggests *Prthī* (see 5a), the Opferherr, who would be a subjective gen. (i.e., he is the singer); Th (Fremdl. 31; see also HPS B+I 155) suggests (rather hazily) that it's Indra himself, or perhaps rather, whatever (divine) stranger is being invited to the ritual: an objective gen. (someone sings to him). Although this non-reflexive doubling of referents in a single clause seems, at best, tricky, the fact that Indra serves as priest and leader of the *Āṅgirasas* in ab (so explicitly Th) as well as recipient of offerings in d makes this trick at least thinkable.

In b it is unclear what *śīṇām* should be construed with. I take it with *vípraḥ* as a variant of the “king of kings” construction; most take it with *sumatīm* “the good thinking of the seers.” This is perfectly possible, and not much rides on it.

The gist of the second hemistich is that we hope to be the ultimate beneficiaries of our offerings to Indra; that is, we hope and expect compensation from him as reciprocity for our ritual service – it is in this way that we derive (indirect) pleasure from the soma drinks. The *áya-* formation *raṇáyanta* is intransitive (or in my old terms “I/T”) with the meaning “find pleasure” in most of its occurrences; a transitive (/double I/T”) *raṇáyati* is found in only two places in the RV, under special circumstances (see my *-áya-* monograph, pp. 75, 143). Ge (with Sāy.) wants it to be transitive here, meaning “cause (you) to enjoy,” but frets about the medial form (n. 3c). This is the wrong thing to worry about: it's simply an *-anta* replacement of my usual type. The real reason that it isn't transitive is that that stem is usually not. But the poet may have enjoyed hinting at a transitive formation on the basis of the *-áya-* (“please [you] with soma drinks”), but opting for a somewhat paradoxical “be pleased by soma drinks (offered to you).”

What puzzles me is the *enā*; it would have been easy enough to conjoin *sómaiḥ* and *bhakṣaṇī* with *utá*. I assume *enā* is summarizing the whole rest of the ritual hoopla, including the soma drinks.

In the publ. tr. the voc. *ratholha* is not tr. as a voc., since “o chariot-conveyed one” sounded impossibly stilted.

X.148.4: In pāda a *imā bráhmā ... śamsi* is one of the relatively rare exx. in the RV of the inherited syntagm of a neut. pl. as subj. of a sg. verb – here a bit complicated by the fact that the verb itself is a pass. aor. (This morphological analysis, with Sāy. and Ge [n. 4a], more appealing than 1st sg. mid., with Gr.)

X.149 Savitar

X.149.1: Old points out the sequence of cosmic spaces: *prthivīm* (a), *dyām* (b), *antárikṣam* (c), *samudrām*.

There are several different ways to interpr. the second hemistich. In c the question is what is the shared element between the frame and the simile. I take it to be the verb: “milked the midspace like a (male) horse.” This is of course absurd on the surface, but would conform to the kind of gender-bending paradox that is often found in RVic cosmic discourse. Ge, who considers the possibility of this interpr. in n. 1c, suggests that it refers to a horse urinating. A less striking interpr. which goes back to Sāy. and is represented in Ge's and Re's tr., takes *dhúnim* as the shared quality: “... the midspace boisterous like a horse.” This is certainly possible, but I prefer the more conceptually challenging interpr.

Re (flg. Lü 124) further considers *adhukṣat* to have a double acc., with the 2nd obj. *samudrām* in d: “milked the midspace for the sea” / “milked the sea out of the midspace,” though he himself thinks that √ *duh* with double acc. is generally middle. Ge seems to take *samudrām* as an appositive to *antārikṣam*. I take *antārikṣam* and *samudrām* as separate objects of *adhukṣat*, one corresponding to the animal being milked, the other to the substance yielded. This is akin to the Lü/Re double acc. interpr., but does not require them to be in a single larger syntagm.

X.149.2: From the sea milked out in 1d the rest of the cosmos arises. This cosmogony flatly contradicts the one in 1ab, where the various parts of the cosmos exist already independently and are set in their places by Savitar.

Pāda c contains one of the rare exx. of the unextended 3rd sg. impf. of √ *as*, namely *ās*. On the artificiality of this archaic-looking form, see comm. ad X.85.6–12. Here it forms a phrasal verb with the ppl. *útthitam*.

X.149.3: The cosmogony gets even murkier here, and interpr. diverge. Ge and Re seems to take *idám* and *anyád* as coreferential, but since the rest of the hemistich seems to define the *anyád* (‘other’) as the heavenly/godly world, the near-deictic *idám* would be out of place. I think the two are contrastive, and – somewhat paradoxically – the point is that this earth was created before the heavenly world.

I would prefer to render *ánu dhárma* “according to his ordinance / principles,” but the phrase *dhartā diváh* in the next vs. (4d) constrained me. Still, I think the point is that the sun was born acdg. to Savitar’s overall plan, and so I would favor one of the alternative tr. just given.

X.149.4: Ge pulls *sumánā(h)* out of the simile to modify Savitar (“freundlich wie die ... (Kuh)”). Since the form is ambig. between masc. and fem. nom. sg., this is possible, but it breaks up the sequence of similes in series.

X.149.5: The Anukr. clearly interpr. *árcan* in c as a PN and attributed the hymn to Arcant Hairanyastūpa. Ge takes it both as a PN and as the pres. part. it appears to be (see n. 5c), but this seems unnec., esp. given the attestation of verbal forms to this pres. stem in this stratum of hymns (X.147.3, 148.3).

X.150 Agni

For the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro. As noted there, the final pāda of each vs. begins with a form of *mṛīkā-*; in vss. 1–3 and 5 it’s the dat. *mṛīkāya*, but in 4 the acc. *mṛīkām*. The refrain in vs. 4 also deviates from the other vss. in another way: 1–3, 5 repeat the last four syllables of pāda c after *mṛīkāya*, but vs. 4, which needs five syllables after *mṛīkām*, innovates with the dat. *dhānasātaye*, based on, but not identical to, *dhānasātau* in the middle of c.

X.150.1: On the accentuation in the voc. phrase, see comm. ad X.118.5.

X.150.2: On the interpr. of the first hemistich, see comm. ad I.91.10, which contains the identical hemistich. An alt. tr. with both acc. phrases construed with the part. *jujuṣānāh*, is also possible.

X.150.4: Pāda a has two extra syllables; III.2.8d is identical save for lacking *devó*, so it is tempting to delete it. Old gives his cautious imprimatur, so also Arnold.

X.150.4–5: On the use of *puróhita*- here, see publ. intro.

X.151 Śraddhā

X.151.3: That the gods make themselves trusted / trustworthy among *ásureṣu ... ugréṣu* “powerful lords/Asuras” shows that even at this very late stage of the RV *ásura*- does not (have to) have a negative sense and designate the eternal enemies of the Devas. Here the “powerful lords” are the equivalent for the gods of “benefactors who offer sacrifice” (*bhojéṣu yájvasu*, 2c, 3c) for men – in other words, positively viewed authority figures.

X.151.4: It is notable that the gods are depicted as performing sacrifice, as in the more famous passages X.90.16 and X.124.6.

X.152 Indra

Found also in AVŚ I.20.4, I.21; AVP II.88.

X.152.2: Starting with Sāy., *vimṛdhāḥ* has regularly been interpr. as the nom. sg. of a them. bahuvrīhi *vimṛdhá-* meaning ‘die Verächter abwehrend’; so Old, Ge (n. 2b), AiG II.1.281, Scar 212 n. 289, as well as the tr. of the AV repetitions of this vs., Wh (AVŚ I.21.1) and Zehnder (AVP II.88.4). The only significant holdout being Gr, who takes it as a gen. to a hapax root noun cmpd *vimṛdh-*, “mit unregelmässiger Fortrückung des Tons.” I am quite dubious about the dominant interpr. for several reasons. For one thing, the importation of the verbal notion “abwehrend” seems unjustified, borrowed from the formulae (to be disc. below) in which the root noun *mṛdh-* participates; only Zehnder’s “der keine Beleidiger hat” confines itself to the elements actually found in the cmpd. Scar justifies the addition of the verbal notion by explaining *vimṛdhá-* as “Hypostase aus *ví mṛdhas* + \sqrt{HAN} -, \sqrt{NOD} , etc.,” but this is simply a description of the interpretational process. I instead think it must have been generated from the formulaic phrases found in this very hymn, involving *mṛdh-* *ví√han*, occurring twice in tmesis: *ví mṛdho jahi* “smash away the scornful” (3a, 4a; see also VI.53.4, VIII.61.13). Here, given the rt noun cmpd *vitra-hán-* immediately preceding, I think we can “borrow” that *-hán-*. Since a cmpd **vi-mṛdh(o)-hán* or **mṛdh(o)-vi-hán-* is impossible, the *hán-* was gapped, and the gen. sg. *mṛdhaḥ* depends upon this gapped head. I do recognize the accentual problem (the sticking point for both Wh and Old), but consider it less serious than the creation of a thematic stem of dubious meaning. In any case I think the poet is playing with formulaics throughout this hymn, esp. involving *ví*. See comm. on 3b..

X.152.3: Since *rákṣaḥ* is entirely parallel to *mṛdhaḥ* in the syntagm in pāda a, and *rákṣaḥ* must be a neut. sg. *-as-* stem, we might expect *mṛdhaḥ* to have the same grammatical identity – and indeed an *s*-stem *mṛdhas-* does exist, albeit marginally. However, Gr and Ge take *mṛdhaḥ* here as acc. pl. The repetition of the formula in 4a is followed by a cl. with a parallel acc. pl. *pṛtanyatāḥ*, which would favor the interpr. of *mṛdhaḥ* there as the acc. pl. of the root noun *mṛdh-*. So the evidence pulls both ways, but given the marginality of the *-as*-stem, best perhaps to interpr. both as belonging to the root noun.

Note the clever misdirection in b: *ví vṛtrásya hán(ū)*. Though *hánū* is of course a noun, “(two) jaws,” and the obj. of *ví ... ruja*, the presence of *vṛtrahā* in 2b and *ví ... vṛtrahan* in the next pāda (3c) invite the audience to assume another instance of *vṛtrahán-*.

X.153 Indra

X.153.1: The identity of these tender female attendants on the new-born Indra is not clear, but perhaps their exact identity is less important than their maternal solicitude.

The med. pf. to \sqrt{bhaj} means ‘receive as share’ (see Kü 334–35). Again, I am not sure why they receive this share of good heroism.

X.153.5: The 2nd ps. ref. of *sá* here does not conform to its ordinary usage (as disc. in my “Sa figé” art.); we should expect an impv. here. But I assume in this late hymn the rules for this distribution are breaking down.

X.154: The dead

X.154.1: As pointed out by Ge (n. 1) *inter alia*, the various foodstuffs are appropriate to gods and pitars in the afterlife. It is to them that the dead man should go in d. The use of the “future imperative” *gachatāt* is a little surprising, since what prior action it should follow isn’t specified. It could possibly refer to the various present tense verbs in abc, but, more likely in my view, it presupposes the subject’s death before his journey to the afterlife.

X.155 Against a witch

On the contents of the hymn see publ. intro. As noted there, the Sadānvās are quite prominent in the AV.

X.155.2: *Pace* Gr, *cattó* represents *cattā + u*.

X.155.4: The verb *ājaganta* appears to be a plupf. to \sqrt{gam} and is so taken by the standard tr. (as also Kü 159). However, it doesn’t make a lot of sense in context (“when you went at/to the breast ...”). I suggest emending the form to **ajaghanta*, a plupf. to \sqrt{han} . The witches are beating their breasts in mourning at the slaying of Indra’s enemies (=their friends and allies). Although I strongly resist emending the RVic text, in this Atharvan hymn with numerous unusual forms, I have fewer scruples.

On *dhāṇikī-* as a term for female genitalia, see already Edgerton, *-ka-*suffixes, 56, citing also TS VII.4.19.3, AV XX.136.3 = RVKh V.22.8. He derives it from *dhāna-* ‘receptacle’. Sim. EWA s.v. *dhāṇikā-*. See also EWA s.v. *maṇḍūra-*, where it is suggested that the “rust” is menstrual blood.

On *-yāśu-* see comm. ad I.126.6. On *budbudā-*, with its unusual phonology (plain *b*) and morphology (exact redupl.), see EWA s.v. *budbudā-yāśu-*

X.155.5: On the leading around of the cow, see X.165.5.

X.156 Agni

X.156.2: *sénā-* could alternatively be ‘army’, as Ge and Re take it, but ‘weapon’ works just as well. Both senses seem to be necessary in the RV and are often difficult to distinguish, though the cmpd *sena-nī-* must contain ‘army’.

X.156.3: On the SV reading *pavīm* ‘wheelrim’ for *paṇīm*, see Old and Ge (n. 3c). Neither seems to produce the best argument for retaining the RV form – that it is semantically the more difficult – and more interesting – reading, while the SV form is a trivial correction.

X.156.4: Making the sun mount in heaven is ordinarily Indra’s deed.

X.156.5: Gonda (Vedic Lit. 225) points out the rhyming splvs. *préṣṭhaḥ śréṣṭhaḥ*, which in this late hymn are undistracted.

X.157 All Gods

As indicated in the publ. intro., vss. 4–5 in this hymn have one of the few depictions of the Asuras as a corporate group, counterpoised against the Devas (see also X.53.4). See also X.124 and my 2016 “The Divine Revolution of Ṛgveda X.124: A New Interpretation. Beyond Asuras and Devas” (Ged. F. Staal: *On Meaning and Mantras: Essays in Honor of Frits Staal*, ed. George Thompson and Richard Payne, 289–306).

X.157.4: Ge takes all of vs. 4 as a subord. cl.: “when the gods had smashed the Asuras and ...,” but this requires him to take *āyan* as an auxiliary in periphrastic construction with the gerund *hatvāya* (“geschlagen hatten”; see n. 4a). But this would be an unprecedented periphrasis, as far as I know, and the *yád* subordinator would be too deep in the cl. I take pāda a as a somewhat abortive sentence, with *hatvāya devāḥ āsurān* as the beginning of a main cl., and *yád āyan* a subord. cl. having the Asuras as subject. The sentence then begins again in the next pāda, repeating the subj. *devāḥ*, with the main cl. flg. in 5.

X.158 Sūrya

X.158.1: As indicated in the publ. intro., the ablatives in this vs. are conceptually ambig.: do they name the places from which the god exercises his protective function or the inimical forces from which the god is asked to protect us? Opinions differ; see Ge n. 1. Ge opts for the latter interpr., Re for the former. Pāda c of the next vs. (2) favors the Ge solution, but I am still uncertain.

X.158.2: This vs. is a metrical mess.

The morphological identity of *jōṣā* (Pp. *jōṣa*) is disputed. Most (Gr, Ge, Old, Re, Lub, Baums) take it as a 2nd sg. impv., but it would have to be derived from a full-grade thematic stem with root accent, which does not exist. Lub tries to deal with this problem by pronouncing it an imperative to a subjunctive stem, which seems to me a bit of a morphological monstrosity. I prefer to take it as a 1st sg. subjunctive; this does not have to belong to a root aor. as Wh (Rts) takes it – though it could. It might simply be the subj. to the extremely well-attested thematic stem *jūṣā-*, with the full grade characteristic of the subj.; in the 1st sg. the expected them. vowel + subj. marker → *-ā-* would be neutralized. However, a major problem is the root accent, and so perhaps Wh’s root aor. subj. interpr. is better, esp. since it can also account for the 3rd ps. *jōṣat(i)*

(see comm. ad X.105.8). Old's objection to a 1st sg. interpr. is the impv. *pāhí* in c, which he thinks should be parallel. But mixing 1st and 2nd ps. in a RVic vs. is hardly unprecedented.

By my interpr. the main cl., consisting only of *jóṣā* (plus the voc.) lacks an antecedent to the rel. phrase *yásya te*; the *te* has been, as it were, demoted to the subord. cl. Those who interpr *jóṣā* as an impv. take it in absol. usage ("enjoy!"), with the rel. cl. dependent on the voc. ("o Savitar, whose ...")

On *háras*- see comm. ad X.16.7.

I see a pun in *savān* in b. When this stem appears with a numeral (as here), it refers to soma-pressings. See, e.g., IV.26.7 ... *abharat sómaṃ, sahásraṃ savān̐ ayútaṃ ca sākām* "(the falcon) brought the soma, a thousand pressings and ten thousand all at once." But in a Savitar context (as here) it generally belongs to the stem cognate with that god, meaning 'impulsion, stimulus'.

X.158.3: I don't understand what the mountain is doing here. Ge (n. 3ab) adduces several passages containing both Savitar and Parvata, but they're just that -- passages with both, but no obvious reason why.

X.158.5: I take *nṛcákṣasaḥ* as a pun, with two essentially opposite meanings: 1) "having the eyes of men," that is, merely human, not divine, sight; 2) "having 'the eye of men' [=sun]," which enables sight.

X.159 Against Cowives

On the style of this hymn, see publ. intro. The hymn is dense with 1st sg. pronouns and presents itself as an *ātmastuti* cum victory paean.

X.159.1: In addition to the striking 1st ps. pronominal adj. *māmaká-*, whose low register status is mentioned in the publ. intro., the *-l*-suffixed form *vid-valá-* also gives the impression of the demotic, against the usual *-r*-form of the suffix (*-vara-*); see AiG II.2.906–9 on these suffixes. There are very few *-vala-* stems.

X.159.5: On cd see Narten, MSS 14: 43 [=KlSch 5–6], with disc. of previous lit. The root affiliation of the verb *āvrkṣam* has been much disputed, with $\sqrt{vraśc}$, \sqrt{vrj} , and \sqrt{vrh} to choose among (see Old, Ge n. 5cd). Narten makes a good case for \sqrt{vrh} 'tear, rip' on syntactic grounds.

On the negated primary comp. *ástheyas-* see AiG II.2.450, Ge's n. 5cd, and Narten's disc. Its positive is *sthirá-* 'steadfast'

X.159.6: Note the phonological future *vīrásya virājani*.

X.160 Indra

X.160.4: The vs. begins and ends with lexemes with the preverb *ānu* (a: *ānu* $\sqrt{(s)paś}$, d *ānu* $\sqrt{diś}$).

The sense of the idiom in c, *aratnaú nīḥ* $\sqrt{dhā}$ "hold/put out/off at/on/by the elbow" can only be guessed at, though it's clear that it's a hostile act. See Old and Ge (n. 4c). Ge suggests it's a boxer's trick; the publ. tr. substitutes the Engl. idiom "at arm's length" (i.e., keeps him at a distance), though I'm not sure what role the elbow would play.

The sense of *ānānudiśta-* isn't clear. There are no other exx. of *ānu* $\sqrt{diś}$ in the RV, but the lexeme is fairly common in Sāṃhitā prose, meaning 'point out, specify'. Gr and Ge take it as

‘unaufgefordert’ (unsolicited, unasked), presumably from ‘unpointed-out / unappointed’(?). My ‘unprecedented’ is based on the later use of *anudeśa* in the sense of a rule referring back to another rule. but perhaps the Gr/Ge route is preferable.

X.160.5: On the last two words, *śunām huvema* and their connection to the earlier Viśvāmitra oeuvre, see publ. intro.

X.161 Contra disease

X.161.1: I failed to render the *utā*; the tr. should read “and from the kingly disease.”
Also, in c “truly” should be deleted.

X.161.2: Pāda b might read more elegantly as “if he has gone down to the very face of death.”

X.161.3: I don’t know what the oblation is doing “with a thousand eyes,” esp. when the parallel adjectives refer to time periods. But I see no reason to emend or re-semanticize it.

X.162 Contra miscarriage

X.162.1: The morphological identity of *āmīvā* here and in 2a is disputed. Ge and Old consider it an instr. to the fem. *āmīvā-*, but I wonder whether such an under-marked instr. would be freely formed at this late date. I prefer to take it as a nom. sg., but this does cause problems with the masc. rel. *yāh*. Re suggests that a *-van*-stem *āmīvan-* was secondarily formed after the cmpds *āmīva-cātana-/hān-*. My solution would be similar, but simpler: because there are masc. stems ending in *-ā*, the gender clash was not overly worrisome to the poet; I don’t think we need to manufacture an intermediate masc. *-an*-stem. Or, with Ge’s alternative adapted from Sāy. (n. 1c), it’s possible that the fem. stem was appositional to *yāh ... durṇāmā*, “als Krankheit.”

X.162.3: On this vs. as depicting successive stages of pregnancy, see Ge (n. 3ab) and the publ. intro.

X.162.5–6: The lexeme *nī√pad* here seems to have a sexual sense, like *nī√gam* in X.10.12 (q.v.).

X.163 Contra disease

X.163.5: Flg. a very tentative alternative suggestion of Old’s that *vanam* might be derived from *√van* ‘love’, I take *vanamkāraṇa-* as ‘love-maker’, a euphemistic designation of the penis. Alternatively, if *vanam* belongs with *vāna-* ‘wood’, it could mean ‘wood-maker’ and refer specifically to the erect penis; cf. American slang “woody” for an erection. The problem with either of these interpr. is that the penis would be referred to twice, by adjacent words, contrary to the practice of the rest of the hymn. But perhaps the fact that both words are euphemistic substitutes and also designate different functions of the same body part would allow this duplication. The other body parts here, hair and nails, do not form a natural class with what precedes, so they are of no help.

X.164 Contra bad thought

For the unifying theme of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.164.3: The three instr. in pāda a, *āsāsā*, *niḥśāsā*, and *abhiśāsā* are unified by their derivation from the root $\sqrt{\text{śams}}$ ‘pronounce, proclaim’ plus a directional preverb, but they also all have developed idiomatic meanings. Both the first and last of these lexemes are reasonably well attested: *āsās-* generally means ‘hope, wish’, presumably via a more literal ‘bring/attract by proclaiming’ (like $\sqrt{\text{ā}} \sqrt{\text{kr}}$, $\sqrt{\text{ā}} \sqrt{\text{pū}}$, $\sqrt{\text{ā}} \sqrt{\text{yaj}}$ ‘bring/attract, ... by purification, ... by sacrifice’). *ābhi* $\sqrt{\text{śams}}$ - means ‘curse’, via ‘pronounce against’; though *abhiśās-* is found only here, the *-ti*-stem abstract *abhiśasti-* is well represented. The middle term, however, is very limited. The root-noun compd is found only here, and the only other RVic occurrence of this lexeme is *āniḥśasta-* in IV.34.11, whose meaning is underdetermined. The literal sense of the lexeme must be ‘proclaim away/out’ and because of the oppositional preverbs $\sqrt{\text{ā}}$ ‘(towards) here’ ... *nīḥ* ‘away, out’ it should be the opposite of *āsās-*, perhaps ‘ban, banishment’ (see *nīṣkṛtim* ‘exclusion’ in the next hymn, X.165.1) – but this doesn’t work well in the passage. Although ‘blame’ is not a true antonym for ‘wish, hope’, it fits better in the trio – and the result of “proclaiming out” may be ‘blame’. On all three words, see Scar 528–30.

The position of *āpa* is unusual for a preverb in tmesis.

X.165 All Gods (Bird of Ill Omen)

As noted in the publ. intro., the hymn is devoted to averting the potential danger produced by the arrival of a dove. Despite Western associations of the dove with peace and love, it has negative associations in Vedic. The grhya sūtras consider a dove coming into the house a bad omen; see, e.g., ŚGS V.5.1, ĀśvGS III.7.7, etc., which prescribe the recitation of this hymn.

X.165.1: Ge (also Wh AVŚ VI.27.1) takes *yād* as goal of *ichán*; the *tásmai* in c should then pick up *yād*: “what(ever) the dove is seeking, to that we will chant.” But this seems unduly restrictive. I think *ichán* in absolute usage is more sinister: we don’t know what the dove is after, but it’s surely nothing good. And *tásmai* ought to refer to the dove, at least in my opinion.

X.165.2: The imperatival *hí* clause in c gives the grounds for the further imperative d, as often. In other words, because we hope/expect that Agni will enjoy our oblation, we hope/expect that he will arrange for the bird to avoid us.

X.165.3: The fem. loc. *āṣṭryām* is difficult and its interpr. depends entirely on context. Because of the parallel loc. *agnidhāne* it’s generally rendered as ‘fireplace, hearth, stove’ vel sim. (Gr, Wh AVŚ VI.27.3, EWA s.v.), with a bit of a twist in Ge’s ‘kitchen’ (Küche). Re suggests the more general ‘maison’ on the basis of *grhēṣu* in 2b. My longshot ‘corner’ presupposes a connection with *ásri-* (fem.) ‘corner, edge’ (RV *cátur-ásri-* 2x). Its form here would represent either a morphological regularization (substituting a well-known suffix *-trī-* for the rare *-ri-*) or a blend with *āṣṭrā-* ‘goad’ (I’d favor the former).

X.165.5: The leading around of the cow in b is reminiscent of a similar ritual act in X.155.5, as Ge points out. Effacing all difficulties in c is like the effacing of the traces/footprints of death on returning from the funeral, using the same verb. See X.18.2 *mṛtyóḥ padām yopáyanto yád aíta* “Effacing the footprint of death when you have gone.” Here it must refer to the footprints the dove has left in the house (see 3b, 4b).

X.166 Against rivals

The aggressively triumphant tone of this hymn is reminiscent of X.159, the first-person victory paean of a wife having conquered her rival wives (*sapátnī-*), as here the first-person speaker proclaims his triumph over his *sapátna-* (1b, 2a, c). This masc. stem is, of course, a backformation from the fem. *sapátnī-*; see EWA s.v. *pátnī-*, and this hymn may be modeled on the cowife hymn just cited.

X.166.1: The Engl. tr. obscures the difference between the two words for ‘rival’: *sapátna-* (b) and *śátru-* (c). Given the derivation of the former (see just above), it may refer to a more intimate rival than the *śátru-*.

X.166.4: *viśvákarmeṇa* in b is the only thematic form to what is usually an *n*-stem *viśvákarma-*. This thematic stem may have been extracted from a compound like **viśvakarma-dhāman-*, as suggested by Ge (n. 4b), or it may simply be that at this late stage thematization is in the air. Note, however, that the correct *n*-stem instr. sg. *viśvákarmaṇā* is found nearby in X.170.4.

On the arguably trifunctional array in cd, see publ. intro.

X.166.5: JL points out the nice phonetic figure of *maṇḍūkā (...)* *udakān*.

X.167 Indra

pári seems to be the Lieblingwort in the first few vss.: 1a, 1d, 2a.
In the last sentence of the intro., subst. vs. 3 for vs. 4.

X.167.1: I take *sutásya* as dependent on *kalásasya*, not coreferent with it like Ge.

puruvîra- is a standard epithet of *rayí-*; see comm. ad VI.32.4. In most of these occurrences the adj. is masc., but here it is fem. Although it is generally said that *rayí-* can be either masc. or fem., in fact most of the supposed fem. occurrences can be otherwise explained (see comm. ad VI.8.5). However, the fem. occurrences cannot be reduced to zero, and this is one of the stubborn ones. Old thinks the fem. *puruvîrām* here is metrically conditioned.

X.167.3: As Ge points out (n. 3a), *râjñah* belongs with both Soma and Varuṇa and is positioned between them.

X.167.4: With Ge (n. 3d) I think *bhakṣam akaram* (“I did consuming”) is an analytic version of *abhakṣayam* (“I consumed,” 3d). The reason is obvious: Indra wants to use an aorist and the secondary root √*bhaks* does not have one.

In this vs. Indra explicitly recognizes the reciprocal bargain of the sacrifice: he gets the soma and the praise hymn *if* he arrives with something to give.

X.168 Vāyu

This hymn has attracted numerous tr., which is somewhat surprising for a fairly inconsequential – if pleasingly constructed – hymn. In addition to Ge and Re (EVP XV), see Macd. (VRS), Th (Gedichte), Don.

As noted in the publ. intro. (in addition to most of those just cited), although Anukr. names Vāyu as the deity of the hymn, he doesn’t appear in it – only his less divinized, more

physical alloform Vāta. It's worth noting that *vāta-* is also found in the next two hymns: X.169.1 and, in the compd. *vātajūta-*, X.170.1.

X.168.1: The first pāda consists merely of an acc. NP, but, as noted in the publ. intro., the template GEN [god's name] *nū* ACC [greatness/deeds, etc.] reminds us of openings like the famous beginning of I.32: *īndrasya nū vīryāṇi prā vocam*, and I (like Ge, Macd, Re, Th, but not Don) supply "I proclaim."

Various suggestions have been offered for the real-world equivalent of the "making (things) red" phrase; consult the tr. referenced above. In addition to those, I wonder if it describes the dawn, a frequent referent of *aruṇā-*, as Re points out. Although only *vāta-* appears in this hymn, the Anukr. considers Vāyu, the wind god, to be the dedicand, and Vāyu of course is the first recipient of soma at the dawn sacrifice.

X.168.2: Again, there is a wide range of views on the meaning and referents of *viṣṭhāḥ*, for which consult the other tr. The lexeme *vī* √ *sthā* generally means 'spread out, be dispersed'; here I think it refers to the eddies and countergusts that are part of a strong wind – in my experience, such a wind does not seem to be a single unified movement of air, but varies in speed and direction and therefore seems to consist of numerous parts.

X.168.3: "Companion of the waters" – presumably, as Th suggests, because wind often accompanies rain. But as he also suggests, perhaps because a strong wind sets bodies of water in motion, raising ripples and then waves, thus appearing to play with them.

X.168.4: The expression "his sounds are heard, not his form" is an obvious zeugma. Most tr. add "is not seen" to accommodate the "form," but the Skt. does not – and I think the expression is more striking in its truncated form.

X.169 Cows

The Anukr. ascribes this hymn to a descendent of Kakṣīvant (Śabara Kākṣīvata), but it lacks the flair of his eponymous ancestor.

X.169.1: *jīvādhanya-* elsewhere explicitly modifies waters (e.g., I.80.4).

X.169.2: On the use of the names of the cows in ritual, see Old and V.3.3, adduced by Ge.

The mention of the Aṅgirasas of course refers to the Vala myth.

X.170 Sūrya

Gonda (Ved.Lit. 212) considers this hymn to be banal, mediocre, and devoid of deeper meaning; it hardly seems fair to single out this brief hymn for such scorn, esp. because in fact it has some nice rhetorical flourishes and some tricky gender switches.

Forms of (*vī*) √ *bhrāj* 'blaze (forth)' open hemistichs in all four vss.: 1a / 2a *vibhrāḍ bṛhāt*, 3c *viśvabhrāḍ bhrājāḥ*, 4a *vibhrājan*.

X.170.1: The gender of the subj. changes from neut. in ab (on the basis of *bṛhāt* and part. *dādhat*) to masc. in cd (on the basis of *vātojūto yāḥ*), with the masc. rel. technically not in gender agreement with its antecedent. Old gets rather exercised by this, but it seems simple enough to

supply the neut. subj. ‘light’ (*jyótis-* found in 2d, 3a, 4a) in the first half-vs. and allow the rel. to agree in sense if not in gender. See Ge (n. 1a) and Re. By contrast Scar. prefers to supply “Wesen” = Sūrya, but the insistent presence of *jyótis-* in the other vss. of the hymn favors the former solution.

I don’t know why the sunlight should “drink the somyan honey,” but I suspect that the phrase here refers to water, perhaps “drunk” by evaporation. Alternatively, and in fact simultaneously, like the other gods at the ritual, principally Indra, Sūrya should partake of the soma at the soma sacrifice and offer good things to the sacrificer in return, as pāda b indicates.

The final phrase of the vs., *ví rājati*, nicely echoes initial *vibhrāj-*.

X.170.2: The gender of the subj. remains neut. throughout this vs., though the beginning of the 2nd hemistich flirts with a switch to masc., like 1c: *amitrahā vṛtrahā* appear to be masc., and usually are. However, with AiG III.239 I take *-hā* as serving for the neut. as well (though see comm. ad VI.48.21). If this is considered morphological apostasy, the cmpds can be taken as secondary predication: “As a smasher of foes, as a smasher of obstacles, the best smasher of Dasyus ...” (likewise the two *-hā* cmpds at the end of d). Neut. *dasyuhántamam* puts a stop to this flirtation.

The phonetic figure of 1a *vibhrāḍ bṛhāt* is amplified in 2a with a third term, *súbhṛtam*.

X.170.3: The pattern of vs. 1, with neut. in ab and masc. in cd, returns here. This time the gender flirtation in c is in the opposite direction: since *-bhrāt* in 1a and 2a was neut. and it opens pāda c here, we expect the neut. to continue, but masc. *bhrājāḥ ... sūryaḥ* immediately follows.

Contra Ge (and the publ. tr.), Re takes the neuters of d as appositive nominatives, and *paprathe* as intrans/refl. But it can surely just be self-involved.

X.170.4: Gender trouble continues. The vs. begins with a clear masc. part. *vibhrājan*, which is followed by neut. *svār*, which I take as an appositive to the (unidentified) 2nd sg. subj. The first half-vs. is found also as VIII.98.3, where the 2nd sg. subj. is Indra and *svāḥ* is an unmarked simile.

Ge takes *rocanām divāḥ* as another appositive in the nominative, not as acc. goal as I do (with Re).

Indra is called *viśvákarmā viśvādevāḥ* in VIII.98.2c, the pāda immediately preceding the repeated hemistich just noted.

X.171 Indra

X.171.2: Don tr. *makhāsya dódhataḥ* as “of the rebellious Sacrifice,” presumably on the basis of PB VII.5.6 (also elsewhere in the Br), where the story of Makha and the gods is briefly told and Makha is identified with the sacrifice. Nothing in this vs. encourages that identification. Note that *-makha-* is found in a cmpd in the next hymn (X.172.2).

On *áva √ bhr* see comm. ad VIII.93.23. As I say there, the lexeme can take an acc. of a body part, depicting bringing down an enemy by a downstroke that removes the body part – here severing the head clean from its body.

X.172 Dawn

On the structure of this hymn and its relation to early morning – though less so to Dawn proper – see publ. intro.

X.172.1: The *s*-stem *vānas-* is found independently only here (though in cmpds like *gír-vanas-* ‘having a longing for songs’. It is completely unclear what it is meant to convey here, a lack of clarity made worse by the fact that the identify of the subject is unknown (Dawn? Sūrya?).

The end of b *yád ūdhabhiḥ* must be construed apart from the rest of the pāda, since the verb *sacanta* is unaccented (so also Old). Something needs to be supplied, since “... the cows, when with udders” or “... cows, that is, with udders” doesn’t make sense as an independent unit. The instr. pl. *ūdhabhiḥ* occurs 3x in the RV; once (VIII.9.19) it is construed with *duhré* “they give milk with their udders.” I therefore supply a preterital version of that verb here: the cows have been milked and are now going to pasture. Old rather “strotzen” and Ge “kommen.”

X.172.3: The cmpd. *jārayán-makha-* tr. by Ge “der die Freigebigen weckt,” sim. Old (Gr takes it as a PN, an interpr. firmly rejected by Mayr PN). The problem is that *makhá-* doesn’t usually mean ‘bounteous’, and in fact is used of a hostilely treated being in the immediately preceding hymn (X.171.2). On its dominant meaning ‘battling’ and its acquisition of the secondary ‘bounteous’ sense (via *maghá-*), see comm. ad I.18.9. Here I take the cmpd as a pun: Dawn is well known as one who both awakens and ages mortals, expressed by the homophonous *jārayati* ‘awakens/ages’ (see my *-āya*-Formations 126–27, 154). Though Dawn herself can’t be the subj. here (because of masc. *mámhiṣṭhaḥ*), the subj. is clearly a dawn-related being, who could perform the same dual actions. I suggest both parts of the cmpd are homonyms: *jārayán-* ‘awakening/aging’ and *makhá-* ‘bounteous/battler’. The splv. *mámhiṣṭha-* ‘most bounteous’ helps attract the ‘bounteous’ sense of *makhá-* despite its primary meaning. (I would now modify my statement in *-āya*-formations (127 n. 4) that the cmpd (only) has the ‘awaken’ sense.)

X.172.4: The verb *vartayati* is construed with two preverbs in two different senses, at least in my interpr. (and basically Ge’s, though he toys with supplying a different verb in pāda a [n. 4ab]): *āpa* √ *vṛt* ‘roll away’ / *sám* √ *vṛt* ‘roll up together’.

vartaním returns from 1b.

X.173 Royal consecration

This hymn has been much treated: e.g., Don, Schlerath (*Königtum* 117–18), Ober (Relig. RV I.352). It is found in the AV (Ś VI.87–88, P XIX.6) and elsewhere. On *dhruvā-* ‘firm’ as its signature word, see publ. intro.

X.173.2: Note the insistent repetition of *ihá* (a, c, d).

X.173.6: Pāda a repeats 3b and reinforces the ritual aspects of the royal installation.

X.174 Praise of king

A companion piece to the preceding hymn – found in AVŚ I.29, AVP I.11. On the signature lexeme *abhí* √ *vṛt* ‘roll over’, see publ. intro. Vss. 1–3 contain 10 pāda-initial occurrences of *abhí*, vs. 4 lacks this word, but the first word of b, *ābhavad*, mimics it (and vs. 4 is a borrowed vs. anyway). The final vs., 5, has *abhí* opening b.

X.174.1: Both AV versions substitute an amulet (*maṇí-*) for the oblation (*havíṣ-*) here – a nice illustration of the different effective means valued by the two textual traditions.

X.174.2: Both ab and cd are structured as “X and which Y” constructions, though with the “and” missing. In other words, in the second clause of each hemistich the acc. in the main clause has been gapped – although the pub. tr. has inserted it (“those” and “the one” respectively). A more literal tr. would be “over who are hostile ...” / “over who is envious ...”

X.174.3: This vs. is rather cunningly constructed: each of the first three pādas parcels out a bit of the syntax of the whole: pāda a has the preverb *abhí*, b the preverb plus the verb (*abhí ... avīṛtaṭ*), and c adds the obj., *viśvā bhūtāni*. Taking this last phrase as the obj. (with Ge and Zehnder et al. [AVP I online]) is preferable to taking it as subj. (so Wh, AVŚ).

X.174.4: This vs. is identical to X.159.4, a cowife hymn, with masc. *asapatnāḥ* instead of *asapatnā*, spoken by the triumphant wife in 159.4. This is the only verse in our hymn lacking *abhí* (see above), and it surely has been borrowed into this hymn from X.159 – a conclusion supported by the fact that this hymn has too many vss. (5) for its place in the collection and that this vs. is not found in the corresponding AV versions.

X.175 Pressing stones

X.175.2: The “ruddy ones” (*usrāḥ*) are probably the soma plants; cf. “the red tree” (*vrkṣāsya ... aruṇāsya*) that the pressing stones eat in X.94.3. See also Ge n. 2c.

X.175.4: This vs. is a near repetition of vs. 1, providing a ring.

X.176 Agni

Despite my characterization of this as “a simple hymn” in the publ. intro., it reads more like a real RVic hymn, with unclear referents, metaphorical language, and bold imagery, than the straightforward, repetitive Athavan hymns among which it’s found.

X.176.1: The identity of the “sons of the Ṛbhus” is not entirely clear. Ge, Re, and the publ. tr. take them as the offering fires or their flames; see esp. Ge’s n. 1a, where he argues that the Ṛbhus are priests, here associated with the kindling of the ritual fire (though this is not their usual ambit). Old is dubious, in part because of the verb *navanta* ‘bellow’ – but this isn’t much of an argument, since flames are always making roaring noises in the RV.

With most, I take *vrjāṇā* as a nom. pl. appositive to the sons of the Ṛbhus, but what aspect of this multifaceted word (on which see comm. ad X.28.2) is being referred to here is unclear. In its physical manifestation as ‘enclosure, circle’, it could refer to the fireplaces themselves or to the circle of flames; in its metaphorical meaning, to the community of fires or flames. Interpr. vary – see Old, Ge, and Re.

kṣāmā with long final vowel is found twice elsewhere in the RV: IV.2.16 and X.45.4. Although in all three cases the Pp. reads short-vowel *kṣāma*, I think all three are elliptical duals, for *dyāvākṣāmā* ‘heaven and earth’ (see comm. ad locc. for the first two), though here (as in the other passages) the standard tr. take it as sg. In our passage the flames feed (*ásnan*) on heaven

and earth: since flames reach towards heaven while being grounded on earth, a dual source of food makes sense.

It is in this context that I interpr. *viśvādhāyasaḥ*. The interpr. of *-dhāyas-* cmpds is tricky; see comm. ad III.44.3, X.67.7. They can mean ‘having nourishment for X’, with the first member the beneficiary/consumer of the nourishment, but can also have an adj. first member, e.g., *hāri-dhāyas-* ‘having golden nourishment’. Ge and Re both interpr. it in the former sense: ‘all-nourishing’, i.e., ‘having nourishment for all’. But this seems to contradict the verb phrase “they feed on H+E.” Although I render almost all of the 11 occurrences of this cmpd as “all-nourishing,” all of them could also be interpr. as having an adjectival first member “having all nourishment(s)” – it is difficult to identify a diagnostic context that would distinguish between the two. Such *bahuvrīhi*s can be further interpr. not only as ‘providing XY’ but as ‘deriving/acquiring XY’, and here the latter sense seems in play – as they feed on H+E they derive universal nourishment.

X.176.3: In I.35.4, adduced by Ge, *abhīṣṛta-* is used of an extravagantly decorated chariot

X.176.4: As indicated in the publ. tr., the sense of the first hemistich is obscure, though the syntax is not complex. The verb *uruṣyā-* lit. ‘make wide (space)’, fig. ‘deliver/release’ takes an abl. Here the VP can be construed either as “delivers (himself) from his immortal birth, as it were” (so the publ. tr.) or “... from his birth as if from the immortal.” It is also possible that the abl. *jánmanaḥ* can have a temporal sense as well. I think there may be a play on the ablatives in b: Agni delivers himself from his immortal birth (as a god) after his birth (on the ritual ground), reading *jánmanaḥ* twice. And this may further suggest that Agni inhabits the domain *between* birth and death/immortality, that is, the human realm, where people live – not the divine realm of non-death. This idea may be reinforced by “he was made for living” in d.

X.177 Patamga

On this hymn, see now also Köhler (*Kavi*, 123–25). I will not speculate on the mystical import of the hymn – there’s quite enough of that by others. The grammar is fairly straightforward.

X.177.2: In c *svaryām* poses two problems. Since it’s modifying *tām ... manīṣām*, it should be fem. and therefore belong to a *vrkī-*stem *svarī-* (so, sort of, Gr, who sneaks it into the lemma for *svaryā-*). Also, the various tr. take it as ‘sunlike’, ‘sonnenhaft’ – understandably, given the visual context -- but *svaryā-* always refers to noise, and so I tr. it.

X.177.3: Various referents have been suggested for the fem. plurals in c (e.g., Ge ‘waters’). Given the return of “see” from vs. 1: 1b *paśyanti*, 3a *āpaśyam*, I’m in favor of bringing back the light rays (*mārīcī-*) of 1d.

Note also a potential reverse phonetic figure: *patam-gá-* (1a) and *go-pā-* (3a), esp. since the most obvious referent for *gopām* is the bird, who is the object of “see” in 1ab as well.

X.178 Tārksya

On the subj. of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.178.1: For the collocation of \sqrt{sah} and \sqrt{tr} in connection with a horse, see III.49.3 *sahāvā prtsú tarānir nārvā* “victorious in battles like an overtaking steed.”

Since Tārksya is obviously a horse, *āriṣṭanemi-* modifying him obviously doesn’t ascribe a wheel felly to the body of the horse itself, but rather to the associated chariot. Still Scar’s tr. (15) “der macht, dass der Radkranz unversehrt bleibt” seems a little overfussy.

X.178.1–2: As Old already noted, pādas 1d and 2b play off each other: 1d *svāstaye ... ihā huvema* / 2b *svāstaye ... ivā ruhema*, with *ihā* and *ivā* differing from each other only in the interior consonant and the two 1st pl. optatives having near-mirror-image root syllables.

X.178.2: The referent of the dual in cd is unclear to me. Ge takes it as Heaven and Earth, but this requires ignoring, or rather aggressively reinterpreting, the simile particle *nā*, which seems to me unequivocally to mark (unnamed) H+E, identified by their standard descriptions, as the comparandum. Old decides H+E are a second comparandum serving as obj. to *ā ruhema* “we board T. like a boat, like you two, H+E,” but this doesn’t help. First, that second simile doesn’t make sense: how are H+E like a racehorse to mount? And the discord between 2nd ps. *vām* and the duals in the simile is disturbing. I don’t have a solution to the identity problem, but I suspect that it’s some dual entity connected with horse tackle or chariot parts.

X.178.3: A satisfyingly constructed simile with three parts (nom., instr., acc.), with all three expressed in both simile and frame.

Acdg. to Ge (n. 3d), a “youthful arrow” is one that still has its feathers and so on.

X.179 Indra

On the ritual context of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.179.1: The context strongly favors Ge’s rendering of *mamattāna* as “so wartet noch,” fld. by publ. tr. “wait!” This should belong with \sqrt{man}^2 ‘wait’, on which see comm. ad X.27.20. The problem is that the other forms belonging to this root have clear *man* forms, but this appears to belong to \sqrt{mad} (so assigned by Gr). There is a complex way to get this form by analogy, however. The impv. in X.27.20 *mamandhi* ‘wait!’ is properly analyzed as *maman-dhi*, but could instead be **mamand-dhi*, as if to a root \sqrt{mand} ‘wait’ (distinct from the secondary root \sqrt{mand} ‘be exhilarated’ derived from \sqrt{mad} ‘id.’), with simplification of the geminate in a cluster. From such a putative underlying form, a zero-grade stem *mamad-* could be derived; with the 2nd pl. ending *-tāna* the result will be our *mamat-tāna*. This is perhaps over-clever, but the contextual meaning ‘wait’ is so clear that fiddling around with a “become/make exhilarated” meaning here would be senseless.

X.179.2: On *kulapā* see Ge (n. 2d) and, somewhat less illuminating, Scar (302). As Ge points out, the other early attestation of this stem (AVŚ I.14.3) specifically identifies the referent as feminine.

On *vrājāpati-* as ‘Einpferchungsmeister’ see KH (Aufs. 572 n. 22).

X.180 Indra

X.180.3: In the voc. phrase *vṛṣabha carṣaṇīnām* the gen. has its ordinary accent. See Old.

X.181 All Gods

On the ritual context of this hymn see publ. intro.

X.181.3: I would now slightly alter the tr. to “did they carry ...,” since impfs. should not have immed. past sense (per IH).

X.182 Bṛhaspati

X.183 Birth of a son

For the structure of this hymn, see publ. intro.

X.183.1–2: In pāda a of both vss., I take *mānasā* both with the preceding *āpaśyam* and the following participle (*cékitānam* / *đđhyānām*).

X.183.2: On *tanū* see AiG III.188. It belongs to the category of endless locatives discussed by TY (WECIEC Proceedings 2022).

X.184 Birth charm

X.185 Aditi

X.185.2: Old follows Benfey in emending *vāraṇeṣu* to *vāraṇeṣu* < *vā āraṇeṣu* “or on alien ways”: clever, but as Ge (n. 2b) points out, not nec.

X.185.2–3: Ge (n. 2a) convincingly takes *tēṣām* (2a) as the antecedent of *yásmai* (3a), with change of number – rather than referring to the gods in vs. 1. This fits the Weltbild much better.

X.186 Vāyu

X.187 Agni

X.188 Agni

X.188.2: On *vípravīra*- see comm. ad IX.44.5.

X.189 Sārparājñī or Sūrya

On the dedicand of the hymn, see publ. intro. I will not contribute to the abundant speculation on the identities and activities of the actors in the hymn, for which see Old., Ge, and Re (ÉVP XV) inter alia.

X.189.1: This vs. contains a rare ex. of splitting an NP across a hemistich boundary: *mātāram ... / pitāram ca*. Of course in Gāyatrī the boundary between pādas b and c is less rigid than in meters with hemistichs of equal numbers of pādas.

In c it is possible (with Re and as an alt. of Ge’s [n. 1c]) to take *svàḥ* as an appositive to the subj.; “going forth as the sun.”

X.189.2: This vs. seems to have induced a certain amount of grammatical confusion in our usually reliable tr. + comm.

Ge, Old (with a great deal of verbiage), and Re (in comm. but not in tr.) take *rocanā* as fem. nom. sg. -- but *rocanā-* is not an adj., but a neut. noun. The other supposed fem. nom. sg. of this stem in III.61.5 (adduced by Ge and Old) should not be so interpr.; see comm. ad loc.

Re also tr. *rocanā* as “les deux domaines-lumineux,” though the dual of this neut. -a-stem would be *rocané* – and despite the fact that in his comm. he assumes “une haplogogie **rocanā* (nt. pl.) + *rocanā* (fem. sg.)” (my bolding). Re’s invented dual must result from the fact that *antár* √*car* ‘wander between’ can take a dual, as in I.173.3 *antár dūtó ná ródasī carad vāk* “Speech wanders between the two worlds like a messenger.” But the pl. is also possible; cf. I.95.10 *antár nāvāsu carati prasūsu* “he roams within the new, fruitful (plants).” The form *rocanā* then is a neut. pl., and only a neut. pl.

As Re points out, this vs. contains the first trace of the opposition of breaths: *prā* √*an* (*prānā-*) and *āpa* √*an* (*apānā-*), already very prominent in the AV

X.190 Cosmogonic

X.190.3: There are three matched pairs serving as obj. of *akalpayat*; as JSK (DGRV II.85–86) points out, they show three different patterns of conjunction: dual dvandva: *sūryācandramāsau* (though with only one accent); double *ca*: *dīvaṃ ca pṛthivīm ca*; and the rather loose *ātha* + *u*: *antārikṣam ātho svāḥ*. As he also points out, these correspond to different degrees of semantic cohesion between the two members of the pair.

X.191 Unity

On the purpose of the hymn and its placement in the Saṃhitā, see publ. intro. The preverb *sām* ‘together’ and the adj. *samānā-* ‘common’ dominate the hymn: there are 6 occurrences of *sām* in the 1st two vss. (incl. the doubled *sām-sam* that opens the hymn) and 8 occurrences of *samānā-* in the last two vss., as well as one of *sāmiti-* ‘assembly’ and two of *sahā* / *sūsaha* ‘together (with)’.

X.191.2: The use of *pūrve* ‘earlier, of long ago’ with the pres. *upāsate* is a bit jarring, but I think the point is that the gods’ agreement made earlier had long-lasting effects into the present, just as ours presumably will.